A TREATISE

ON

CRIMINAL PLEADING

AND

PRACTICE.

BY

FRANCIS WHARTON, LL.D.,

AUTHOR OF TREATISES ON "CRIMINAL LAW," "EVIDENCE," "CONFLICT OF LAWS," AND "NEGLIGENCE."

IN ONE VOLUME.

NINTH EDITION.

PHILADELPHIA:

KAY AND BROTHER,

LAW BOOKSELLERS, PUBLISHERS, AND IMPORTERS.

1889.

COLLINS PRINTING HOUSE,
705 Jayne Street.

PREFACE TO NINTH EDITION.

SINCE the issue of the eighth edition of this work, in 1880, the accumulation of important rulings bearing on it has required its careful revision. In carrying out this revision I have condensed the text as far as I could, but I have found it necessary, nevertheless, materially to increase the bulk of the volume. In the notes will be found references to more than three thousand cases not included in the prior edition.

F. W.

WASHINGTON, *Jan.* 1889.

ANALYSIS.

CHAPTER I.

ARREST.

I. Arrest Generally, § 1.
II. By Officers, § 5.
III. By Persons not Officers, § 10.
IV. Breaking Doors, and Search-warrants, § 18.
V. Fugitives, § 28.
VI. Privilege from Arrest, § 59.
VII. Right to take Money from the Person of the Defendant, § 60.
VIII. Rights of Bail to Arrest Principal, § 62.

CHAPTER II.

HEARING BEFORE MAGISTRATE.

I. Commitment for further Hearing, § 70.
II. Evidence Requisite, § 71.
III. Final Committal and Binding Over, § 74.
IV. Vagrants, Disorderly Persons, and Professional Criminals, § 80.
V. Bail after Habeas Corpus, § 81.
VI. Bail after Verdict, or after Quashing, § 82.

CHAPTER III.

FORM OF INDICTMENT.

I. Indictment as Distinguished from Information, § 85.
II. Statutes of Jeofails and Amendment, § 90.
III. Caption and Commencement, § 91.

IV. Name and Addition, § 96.
V. Time, § 120.
VI. Place, § 139.
VII. Statement of Offence, § 151.
VIII. Written Instruments, § 167.
IX. Words Spoken, § 203.
X. Personal Chattels, § 205.
XI. Offences Created by Statute, § 220.
XII. Duplicity, § 243.
XIII. Repugnancy, § 256.
XIV. Technical Averments, § 257.
XV. Clerical Errors, § 273.
XVI. Conclusion of Indictments, § 279.
XVII. Joinder of Offences, § 285.
XVIII. Joinder of Defendants, § 301.
XIX. Statutes of Limitations, § 316.

CHAPTER IV.

FINDING INDICTMENTS, AND HEREIN OF GRAND JURIES.

I. Power of Grand Jurors to Institute Prosecutions, § 332.
II. Constitution of Grand Juries, § 341.
III. Disqualifications, § 344.
IV. Sanction of Prosecuting Attorney, § 354.
V. Summoning and Indorsement of Witnesses, § 357.
VI. Evidence, § 358 *a*.
VII. Powers of Prosecuting Attorney, § 366.
VIII. Finding and Attesting Bill, § 368.
IX. Misconduct of Grand Juror, § 377.
X. Duty to Testify, § 378.
XI. Tampering with, an Offence, § 381.

CHAPTER V.

NOLLE PROSEQUI, § 383.

CHAPTER VI.

MOTION TO QUASH, § 385.

CHAPTER VII.

DEMURRER, § 400.

CHAPTER VIII.

PLEAS.

I. Guilty or not Guilty, § 408.
II. Special Pleas, § 419.
III. Plea to the Jurisdiction, § 422.
IV. Plea in Abatement, § 423.
V. Other Special Pleas, § 429.
VI. Autrefois Acquit or Convict, § 435.
VII. Once in Jeopardy, § 490.
VIII. Plea of Pardon, § 521.

CHAPTER IX.

PRESENCE OF DEFENDANT IN COURT, § 540.

CHAPTER X.

COUNSEL.

I. Counsel for Prosecution, § 554.
II. Counsel for Defence, § 557.
III. Duties of Counsel, § 560.

CHAPTER XI.

MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE, AND CHANGE OF VENUE.

I. On Application of Prosecution, § 583.
II. On Application of Defendant, § 584.
III. New Trial, § 600.
IV. Question in Error, § 601.
V. Change of Venue, § 602.

CHAPTER XII.

CHALLENGES.

I. Challenges to Court, § 605.
II. Challenges to Jury, § 606.

III. Mode and Time of taking Challenges, § 672.
IV. How Challenges are to be Tried, § 684.
V. Juror's Personal Privilege not Ground for Challenge, § 692.
VI. Revision by Appellate Court, § 693.

CHAPTER XIII.

CERTAIN SPECIAL INCIDENTS OF TRIAL.

I. Furnishing Copy of Indictment, § 696.
II. Concurrent Trial of Separate Indictments, § 697.
III. Severance of Defendants on Trial, § 698.
IV. Arraignment, § 699.
V. Bill of Particulars, § 702.
VI. Demurrer to Evidence, § 706.
VII. View of Premises, § 707.
VIII. Charge of Court, § 708.

CHAPTER XIV.

CONDUCT OF JURY.

I. Swearing, § 716.
II. Conduct during Trial: Adjournment: Discharge, § 717.
III. Deliberations of Jury, § 727.
IV. Curing Irregularities by Consent, § 733.

CHAPTER XV.

VERDICT.

I. Where there are several Counts, § 736.
II. Defendant must be Present, § 741.
III. Double or Divisible Count, § 742.
IV. Adjournment of Court Prior to, § 744.
V. Special Verdict, § 745.
VI. How Verdict is Rendered, § 747.
VII. Sealed Verdict, § 749.
VIII. Polling Jury, § 750.
IX. Amending Verdict, § 751.
X. Designation of Degree or of Punishment, § 752.
XI. Valuation of Property, § 753.
XII. When Court may refuse to receive Verdict, § 754.

XIII. When there are several Defendants, § 755.
XIV. Defective Verdict, § 756.
XV. Recommendation to Mercy, § 757.
XVI. Effect of Sunday or Legal Holiday Rendering, § 758.

CHAPTER XVI.

MOTION IN ARREST OF JUDGMENT, § 759.

CHAPTER XVII.

WRIT OF ERROR.

I. To what Court, § 770.
II. How one bad Count affects Conviction, § 771.
III. Bill of Exceptions, § 772.
IV. In whose Behalf Writ of Error Lies, § 773.
V. At what Time, § 775.
VI. For what Errors, § 777.
VII. Error in Sentence, § 780.
VIII. Assignment of Error, § 781.
IX. Joinder in Error, § 782.
X. Supersedeas, § 783.
XI. Removal to Federal Courts, § 783 *a*.

CHAPTER XVIII.

NEW TRIAL.

I. In what New Trials Consist, § 784.
II. In what Cases Courts have Authority to grant, § 785.
III. For what Reasons:—

1. Misdirection of Court, § 793.
2. Mistake as to admission or rejection of evidence, § 801.
3. Verdict against law, § 805.
4. Verdict against evidence, § 813.
5. Irregularity in conduct of jury, § 814.
6. Misconduct of prevailing party, § 849.
7. After-discovered evidence, § 855.
8. Absence of defendant on trial, § 875.
9. Mistake in conduct of cause, § 876.
10. Surprise, § 881.
11. Irregularity in summoning of jury, § 886.

IV. At what Time Motion must be made, § 890.
V. To whom Motion applies, § 893.
VI. When Conviction is for only Part of Indictment, § 895.
VII. By what Courts, § 897.
VIII. In what Form, § 899.
IX. Costs, § 901.
X. Error, § 902.

CHAPTER XIX.

SENTENCE.

I. Defendant to be asked if he has Anything to say, § 906.
II. Distribution of Punishment as to Counts, § 907.
III. Defendant's Presence Essential, § 912.
IV. Amendment or Stay, § 913.
V. Capital Punishment, § 914.
VI. Corporal Punishment, § 918.
VII. Fines, § 922.
VIII. Form of Sentence, § 923.
IX. Sentence by Appellate Court, § 927.
X. Sentence by succeeding Judge, § 929.
XI. Successive Imprisonments, § 931.
XII. When severer Punishment is assigned to second Offences, § 934.
XIII. Disfranchisement and Incapacitation, § 939.
XIV. Joint Sentences, § 940.
XV. Bindings to keep the Peace, § 941.
XVI. Considerations in adjusting Sentence, § 942.
XVII. Ex post facto Penalties, § 946.
XVIII. Benefit of Clergy, § 946 *a*.

CHAPTER XX.

CONTEMPT, § 947.

I. When the only Method of Suppression is by Summary Commitment, § 948.
II. When the Contempt can be Suppressed otherwise than by Commitment, § 957.

III. By whom Such Commitments may be issued, § 962.
IV. Indictability of Contempts; Embracery, § 965.
V. Practice, § 967.
VI. Punishment, § 970.
VII. Conviction no bar to other Proceedings, § 973.
VIII. Appeal, Error and Pardon, § 974.

CHAPTER XXI.

HABEAS CORPUS, § 978.

ERRATA ET ADDENDA.

§ 373, note 3, *add* "but see State *v.* Harris, 91 N. C. 656."

Chap. IV., Sub-head XI., *after* "WITH" *insert* "GRAND JURY."

Between § 380 and § 381, *insert* "XI. TAMPERING WITH GRAND JURY AN OFFENCE."

Between § 757 and § 758, *insert* "XVI. EFFECT OF SUNDAY OR LEGAL HOLIDAY RENDERING."

PLEADING AND PRACTICE.

CHAPTER I.

ARREST.

I. Arrest Generally.
- Criminal procedure usually begins with oath before magistrate, § 1.
- Officer may be described by office, § 2.
- To arrest, corporal control and notice are essential, § 3.
- But notice may be by implication, § 4.

II. By Officers.
- Officer not protected by illegal warrant, § 5.
- Warrant omitting essentials is illegal, § 6.
- Not necessary for officer to show warrant, § 7.
- Peace officers may arrest without warrant for offences in their presence and for past felonies or similar crimes, § 8.
- Reasonable suspicion convertible with probable cause, § 9.

III. By Persons not Officers.
- Peace officers may require aid from private persons, § 10.
- Officers may have special assistants, § 11.
- Pursuers of felon are protected, § 12.
- Private persons may arrest with probable cause, § 13.
- May use force necessary to prevent felony, § 14.
- May arrest felon after escape, § 15.
- May interfere to prevent riot, § 16.
- And so as to other offences, § 17.

IV. Breaking Doors, and Search-Warrants.
- House may be broken open to execute warrant in felonies or breaches of the peace, § 18.
- In felonies this may be done by private person, § 19.
- Peace officers may, on reasonable suspicion, break doors without warrant, § 20.
- Private person requires stronger ground for interference, § 21.
- Search-warrants may be issued on oath, § 22.
- Houses of third persons may be broken open to secure offender or stolen goods, § 23.
- In opening trunks, etc., keys should be first demanded, § 24.
- Warrant must be strictly followed, § 25.
- Search-warrants limited by Constitution, § 26.
- That arrest was illegal is no defence on the issue of guilt, § 27.

V. Fugitives.

1. *Between the several United States.*
- Under federal Constitution fugitives may be arrested when fleeing from State to State, § 28.
- Arrest may be in anticipation of requisition, § 29.
- Sufficient if offence be penal in demanding State, § 30.
- Requisition must be duly framed and lies only for fugitives, § 31.

Federal courts cannot compel governor to surrender, § 32.
No objection that fugitive is amenable to asylum State, § 33.
Governor of asylum State cannot impeach requisition, § 34.
Ordinarily gives warrant of arrest, § 34 *a*.
Habeas corpus cannot go behind warrant, § 35.
Bail not to be taken, § 35 *a*.
Indictment or affidavit must set forth a crime, and must be in course of judicial proceedings, § 36.
Fugitive may be tried for other than requisition offence, § 37.
Officers executing process protected by federal courts, § 37 *a*.
For federal offences warrants may be issued in all districts, § 37 *b*.
2. *Between Federal Government and Foreign States.*
Limited by treaty, § 38.
Offence must be one recognized in asylum State, § 39.
Treaties are retrospective, § 40.
Extradition refused when there cannot be fair trial, § 41.
And so for political offences, § 42.
And so for persons escaping military service, § 43.
But not because person demanded is subject of the asylum State, § 44.
Where asylum State has jurisdiction there should be no surrender, § 45.
Conflict of opinion as to whether foreign State can claim a subject who has committed a crime in a third State, § 46.
Extradition does not lie for a case not in treaty, § 47.
Nor where defendant is in custody for another offence, § 48.
Trial should be restricted to the offence charged, § 49.
Courts may hear case before mandate, § 50.
Complaint and warrant should be special, § 51.
Warrant returnable to commissioner, § 52.
Evidence should be duly authenticated, § 53.
Terms to be construed as in asylum State, § 54.
Evidence must show probable cause, § 55.
Evidence may be heard from defence, § 56.
Circuit Court has power of review, § 57.
Surrender is at discretion of executive, § 58.
Remedy by *habeas corpus*, § 993.
VI. PRIVILEGE FROM ARREST.
Foreign ministers privileged from arrest, § 59.
VII. RIGHT TO TAKE MONEY FROM PERSON OF DEFENDANT.
Proof of crime may be taken from person, § 60.
But not money unless connected with offence, § 61.
VIII. RIGHT OF BAIL TO ARREST PRINCIPAL.
Bail may arrest and surrender principal, § 62.

I. ARREST GENERALLY.

Criminal procedure usually commences with oath

§ 1. THE usual commencement of a criminal procedure is a preliminary oath before a magistrate, upon which, if it appear on the face of such oath that a criminal offence has been committed by the defendant within the magistrate's jurisdiction, a warrant of arrest issues.[1] The affidavit

[1] See Blodgett *v.* Race, 18 Hun, 132; People *v.* Pratt, 22 Hun, 200; Housh *v.* People, 75 Ill. 487; Woodall *v.* McMillan, 38 Ala. 622; State *v.* Graffmul-

must be specific,[1] and must aver personal knowledge on the part of the affiant. Mere belief is not sufficient. If the affiant cannot testify to knowledge of the facts, other witnesses should be brought forward to supply the defect; but without affidavit to the inculpatory facts a warrant should not issue.[2] before magistrate.

§ 2. The affidavit being thus specific and direct, a warrant issues for the defendant's arrest. Under the common law practice, this warrant is addressed to a constable, or officer, or other person whose name is specified;[3] the usual and best course being to name the constable of the ward or precinct. When addressed to the sheriff of the county, the latter may act by deputy. Whether a constable may act through deputy has been doubted; and in England the negative seems to be held.[4] In English practiee a warrant may be directed to officers by the description of their office. When addressed by name, the officer named may execute the warrant anywhere within the jurisdiction of the magistrate granting the warrant. When addressed to officers designating them only by the description of their office, the officer acting can execute the warrant only within the precincts of his office.[5] Officer may be described by office.

§ 3. To constitute an arrest, so as to make the defendant guilty of escape in case he does not submit and follow, it is enough that there should be some degree, however slight, of corporal control. Thus to inform a defendant that he is arrested, and to lock the door,[6] or to touch him with only a finger, provided he be informed at the time that he is arrested,[7] constitutes an arrest. And corporal touch is not necessary, provided it be waived by the defendant, which can be done To arrest, corporal control and notice is essential.

ler, 26 Minn. 6. Even though the punishment inflicted is only a fine, the defendant may be arrested and required to find bail. Jackson, ex parte, 14 Blatch. 245.

[1] State *v.* Burrell, 86 Ind. 313.

[2] Com. *v.* Lottery Tickets, 5 Cush. 369; People *v.* Recorder, 6 Hill, 429; Swart *v.* Kimball, 43 Mich. 27; People *v.* Heffron, 53 Mich. 527. That hearsay is not excluded when the object is information, see State *v.* Good, 9 Lea, 240.

[3] See R. *v.* Whalley, 7 C. & P. 245; Meek *v.* Pierce, 19 Wis. 300.

[4] 1 Chit. Crim. Law, 48.

[5] Ibid., citing 1 B. & C. 288; 2 D. & R. 44.

[6] Williams *v.* Jones, Cas. temp. Hardwicke, 284.

[7] Genner *v.* Sparks, 1 Salk. 79.

by his submission to the process, and placing himself in the power of the officer.[1] But it is essential that there should be notice of arrest given either expressly or by implication; and without such notice no amount of physical restraint can constitute an arrest.[2] The amount of force justifiable in arresting is discussed elsewhere.[3]

But notice may be given by implication.

§ 4. But this notice may be given by implication.[4] If, as has been seen, a constable command the peace,[5] or show his badge or staff of office,[6] this is a sufficient intimation of his authority. In such a case it is not necessary to prove the officer's appointment as constable; proof that he was accustomed to act as constable is sufficient.[7] Where he shows his warrant,[8] or where it appears that he is known to the defendant to be an officer; as, for instance, when the defendant says: "Stand off; I know you well enough; come at your peril;"[9] this is notice enough.[10]

II. BY OFFICERS.

1. *With Warrant.*

Officer not protected by illegal warrant.

§ 5. It is elsewhere shown[11] that there is a distinction between a warrant that is illegal and one that is irregular. When a warrant is *illegal*—*e. g.*, when the magistrate has no jurisdiction,[12] or when on its face the offence charged is

[1] Emery *v.* Chesley, 18 N. H. 198; Russen *v.* Lucas, 1 Car. & P. 153; George *v.* Radford, Moody & M. 244; Searls *v.* Viets, 2 Th. & C. 224. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 402, 444, 1672–4.

[2] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 395–444; Mackalley's case, 9 Coke, 65; Yates *v.* People, 32 N. Y. 509; R. *v.* Howarth, 1 Ry. & Moody C. C. 207; R. *v.* Gardener, Ibid. 390; R. *v.* Payne, Ibid. 378; State *v.* Belk, 76 N. C. 10.

[3] In Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed., the topic in the text is discussed at large in §§ 402 ff.

As to the right to resist officers, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 647–9.

[4] People *v.* Pool, 27 Cal. 572. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 402, 444, 1672.

[5] 1 Hale, 561.

[6] Foster, 311; Yates *v.* People, 32 N. Y. 509; R. *v.* Woolmer, 1 Moody C. C. 334; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1646.

[7] 1 East P. C. 315; Whart. Crim. Evid. § 833.

[8] 1 Hale, 461.

[9] R. *v.* Pew, Cro. Car. 183.

[10] 1 Hale, 438. See People *v.* Pool, 27 Cal. 572. Infra, § 8.

[11] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 402, 444.

[12] Hence an arrest, out of the jurisdiction of the magistrate issuing the warrant, is illegal. State *v.* Bryant, 65 N. C. 327; State *v.* Shelton, 79 N. C. 605.

not the subject of arrest, or when the constitutional pre-requisite of an "oath or affirmation" has not been complied with;[1] or when the officer holding the warrant is acting out of his jurisdiction,[2]—then the officer is not protected by the warrant, and acts on his own peril.[3] He is liable, also, if it appear that there was no reasonable ground for arresting the defendant, to an action of trespass; and if the defendant kill the officer, there being no such reasonable ground, this is only manslaughter.[4]

§ 6. A warrant is illegal, in the sense above specified, which does not state the specific offence with which the party to be arrested is charged;[5] or which does not aver that information was duly made thereof by oath before a magistrate having jurisdiction.[6] And it is fatal to the efficacy of such warrant for it to omit to specify the defendant's name otherwise than as "John Doe or Richard Roe, whose other or true name is to the complainant unknown;"[7] or if it omit the Christian name.[8] Yet if the warrant substantially comply with the requisites specified above, it will not be avoided by merely formal or clerical errors,[9] or by preliminary defects in the sufficiency of the

Warrant omitting essentials is illegal.

[1] State *v.* Wimbush, 9 S. C. 309.

[2] People *v.* Burt, 51 Mich. 199.

[3] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 648; 20 Alb. L. J. 215.

[4] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 414–7; Hale P. C. 465; R. *v.* Curvan, 1 Mood. C. C. 132; Com. *v.* Drew, 4 Mass. 391; Com. *v.* Carey, 12 Cush. 246; State *v.* Belk, 76 N. C. 10; Rafferty *v.* People, 69 Ill. 111; S. C. 72 Ill. 37; Galvin *v.* State, 6 Cold. (Tenn.) 283.

[5] Nisbitt, ex parte, 8 Jur. 1071; Money *v.* Leach, 1 W. Bl. 555. In People *v.* Phillips, 1 Parker C. R. 104, Judge Edmonds said: "In describing the offence, a mere compliance with the terms of the statute will not suffice, for if a magistrate merely states the facts of the offence, in the words of the act, when the evidence does not warrant the conclusion, he subjects himself to a criminal prosecution. R. *v.* Thompson, 2 T. R. 18; R. *v.* Pearse, 9 East, 358; R. *v.* Davis, 6 T. R. 178; Avery *v.* Hoole, Coop. 825." See to this effect, 2 Rob. Jus. 54.

That a warrant in larceny must state value of stolen property, see People *v.* Belcher, 58 Mich. 325.

[6] Caudle *v.* Seymour, 1 G. & D. 454; 1 Q. B. 889.

[7] Com. *v.* Crotty, 10 Allen, 403; Alford *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 545.

[8] R. *v.* Hood, 1 Moody, 281.

[9] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 402, 444; Com. *v.* Martin, 98 Mass. 4; People *v.* Mead, 92 N. Y. 415; State *v.* Jones, 88 N. C. 671; State *v.* Toll, 56 Wis. 577; Johnson *v.* State, 73 Ala. 21. See Pratt *v.* Bogardus, 49 Barb. 89; State *v.* Rowe, 8 Rich. 17.

As requiring greater exactness, see State *v.* Lowder, 85 N. C. 564; State *v.* Whitaker, 85 N. C. 566.

proof on which it issues.[1] But the filling up of a blank warrant, after it is issued, by an unauthorized person, does not cure the defect.[2] And the warrant must have a seal to it,[3] if required by statute or local usage, though at common law it seems that the signature of the magistrate is enough,[4] or at all events, a wafer or scroll.[5]

Not necessary for officer to show warrant.

§ 7. It is not necessary at common law for a bailiff or constable to show his warrant in making an arrest, even though it be demanded, provided he state its substance to the party arrested.[6] And, indeed, to show and read such warrant before arrest might make an arrest impossible. The defendant, knowing the arresting party to be an officer, is bound to submit to the arrest, reserving the right of action against the officer in case the latter be in the wrong.[7] But in Massachusetts, by statute, the officer is bound, if requested, to exhibit the warrant.[8]

2. *By Officers without Warrant.*

Peace officers may arrest without

§ 8. Sheriffs, constables, and officers of the police, are not only authorized to arrest public offenders without warrant, but are required to do so, if there be reasonable ground for suspicion.[9] For all offences committed or attempted[10] in

[1] State *v.* James, 80 N. C. 370.

[2] Rafferty *v.* People, 69 Ill. 111.

[3] Stockley's case, 1 East P. C. c. 5, s. 58; State *v.* Drake, 36 Me. 366; Welch *v.* Scott, 5 Ired. 72.

[4] Davis *v.* Clements, 2 N. H. 390; State *v.* Vanghan, Harper (S. C.) 314.

[5] State *v.* McNally, 34 Me. 210; Dewling *v.* Williamson, 9 Watts, 311; State *v.* Thompson, 40 Mo. 188; R. *v.* St. Paul's Cov. Gar. 9 Jur. 442; 7 Q. B. 232. In New York, by statute, "public seals may be made by a mere stamp on paper." Whart. on Evid. § 693.

[6] 2 Hawk. P. C. c. 13, § 28; though see State *v.* Garrett, 1 Wins. (N. C.) No. 1, 144; and Gen. Stat. Mass. c. 158, § 1. Infra, § 10. That some notification is necessary, see Codd *v.* Cabe, 13 Cox, 202.

When the offence is flagrant and obvious on the spot, it need not be stated by the officer. Shevlin *v.* Com., 106 Penn. St. 362.

[7] See R. *v.* Allen, 17 L. T. N. S. 222; R. *v.* Woolmer, *ut supra;* Com. *v.* Cooley, 6 Gray, 350; Drennan *v.* People, 10 Mich. 169; Arnold *v.* Steeves, 10 Wend. 514; State *v.* Townsend, 5 Harring. 487; Boyd *v.* State, 17 Ga. 194; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 647.

[8] Gen. Stat. c. 158.

[9] This does not authorize State arrest by police officers without military warrant of a deserter from service. Kurtz *v.* Moffitt, 115 U. S. 487.

[10] R. *v.* Hunt, R. & M. 207; R. *v.* Howarth, R. &. M. 207; Handcock *v.* Baker, 2 B. & P. 260. Infra, §§ 493–4. As to "attempts," see Greaves's view, note to infra, § 17.

warrant for offences in their presence, and for past felonies or similar crimes.

the presence of an officer, this power exists;[1] though for past offences the power is limited to outrageous crimes of the type of felony.[2] In the case of such crimes, however, it is the duty of the officer to begin immediately after notice the pursuit of the person charged with the offence, provided only that there be at the time reasonable ground of suspicion.[3] And the better view is, that the right, even as to offences committed in the officer's presence,[4] is limited to felonies, breaches of the peace,[5] and such misdemeanors

[1] Fost. 310, 311; R. *v.* Mabel, 9 C. & P. 474; Derecourt *v.* Corbishley, 5 El. & Bl. 188; Galliard *v.* Laxton, 2 B. & S. 363; Com. *v.* Deacon, 8 S. & R. 47; State *v.* Brown, 5 Harring. 505; Wolf *v.* State, 19 Oh. St. 248; People *v.* Wilson, 55 Mich. 506; State *v.* Ferguson, 2 Hill S. C. 619; State *v.* Bowen, 17 S. C. 52; Staples *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 136.

[2] By the English practice, the officer is not limited, even in misdemeanors, to the actual moment of the commission of the misdemeanor. He may arrest after the misdemeanor (*e. g.*, an assault) is committed, if all danger of continuance of the misdemeanor has not ceased. R. *v.* Light, 7 Cox C. C. 389; Dears & B. 332. See Shanley *v.* Wells, 71 Ill. 78. As limiting power see Donovan *v.* Jones, 36 N. H. 246. See article in Cent. L. J., Oct. 28, 1880, p. 321; 4 Crim. Law Mag. 193.

"By the common law of England, neither a civil officer nor a private citizen had the right, without a warrant, to make an arrest for a crime not committed in his presence, except in the case of felony, and then only for the purpose of bringing the offender before a civil magistrate." Gray, J., Kurtz *v.* Moffitt, 115 U. S. 487. See Com. *v.* Carey, 12 Cush. 246; Com. *v.* McLaughlin, 12 Cush. 615; Shanley *v.* Wells, 71 Ill. 78; People *v.* Cahill, 106 Ill. 621; State *v.* Grant, 76 Mo. 236.

For offences against license laws arrests cannot be made without warrant. Meyer *v.* Clark, 41 N. Y. Sup. Ct. 105.

A constable may be resisted for attempts to arrest without warrant except in the cases above mentioned. R. *v.* Spencer, 3 F. & F. 857; R. v. Lockley, 4 F. & F. 155; Galliard *v.* Laxton, 2 B. & S. 363. As to arrests generally see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 404–429; R. *v.* Marsden, L. R. 1 C. C. R. 131; R. *v.* Chapman, 12 Cox C. C. 4; State *v.* Oliver, 1 Houst. 585; Tiner *v.* State, 44 Tex. 128. As to Massachusetts statute of 1876 see Phillips *v.* Fadden, 125 Mass. 198.

[3] Butolph *v.* Blust, 5 Lansing, 84. See State *v.* Russell, 1 Houst. 122.

[4] Whatever is in sight and reach is in presence. People *v.* Bartz, 53 Mich. 493.

[5] Com. *v.* Kennedy, 136 Mass. 152. See Quinn *v.* Heisel, 40 Mich. 576; R. *v.* Hunt, 1 Ry. & M. 93; R. *v.* Howarth, Ibid. 207; People *v.* Bartz, *ut sup.*

That the breach of peace must be in the "immediate presence," see Sternack *v.* Brooks, 7 Daly (N. Y.) 142.

As to Texas limitation, see Johnson *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 43. That the breach of the peace must substantively exist, see Quinn *v.* Heisel, 40 Mich. 576.

as cannot be stopped or redressed except by immediate arrest.[1] Why, if the misdemeanor is completed, and the offender is not likely to escape, should the check and safeguard of a warrant be waived? Constables and other minor officials are apt enough to abuse their powers; and the policy of the law not only requires that they should be kept under strict control,[2] but that in prosecutions for private misdemeanors there should be responsible private prosecutors. In conformity with this view, it was rightly held in New York, in 1871, that neither a justice of the peace nor a constable can, at common law, arrest without warrant, a person committing an illegal act in his presence, unless such act be a felony or involve a breach of the peace; and that cruelty to an animal, though a statutory misdemeanor, is not such an offence as authorizes arrest without warrant.[3] Nor can a police officer who arrests without proper cause, and is resisted, treat this resistance as a substantive offence which will justify an arrest. It is, however, within the power of a municipal corporation to authorize its police officers to arrest without warrant for breach of health or police ordinances.[4] And when an arrest is made without warrant, it is not essential that the officer should inform the accused of the charge, and of the officer's official position when both charge and officer are known to the accused.[5]

§ 9. What is reasonable ground of suspicion? The fact that an indictment is found against an individual is in itself sufficient justification for an officer to arrest him though without warrant.[6] But

[1] R. *v.* Spencer, 3 F. & F. 859; R. *v.* Lockley, 4 F. & F. 155; State *v.* Crocker, 1 Houst. 122; People *v.* Haley, 48 Mich. 495; State *v.* Bacon, 17 S. C. 58. In State *v.* Sims, 16 S. C. 486, it was held that the right is extended to an assault committed immediately before the arrest, though not in the officer's presence. In Donavan *v.* Jones, 36 N. H. 246, it was held that a person insisting on putting a nuisance on a road could be arrested without warrant.

[2] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 648. See Cent. Law Jour., Oct. 22, 1882, p. 321. And see 2 Hawk. P. C. c. 12, § 80; R. *v.* Curran, Ry. & M. 132; Bowditch *v.* Battin, 5 Exch. 387; Com. *v.* Carey, 12 Cush. 246; Com. *v.* McLaughlin, 12 Cush. 615; Quinn *v.* Heisel, 40 Mich. 576.

[3] Butolph *v.* Blust, 5 Lansing, 84. See also Boyleston *v.* Kerr, 2 Daly (N. Y.) 220; Ross *v.* Leggatt, 61 Mich. 445.

[4] Mitchell *v.* Simon, 34 Md. 176; 43 Md. 490; Thomas *v.* Ashland, 12 Ohio St. 127; Roberts *v.* State, 14 Mo. 158; Boyan *v.* Bates, 15 Ill. 87; Man *v.* McCarty, 15 Ill. 422. See Com. *v.* Hastings, 9 Metc. (Mass.) 251. As to vagrants, see infra, § 80.

[5] Wolf *v.* State, 19 Ohio St. 218. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 428.

[6] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 402–444. Infra, § 920.

the question before us goes beyond this, and may be treated as convertible with that of probable cause, as laid down in civil actions of malicious prosecution. Had the officer good grounds to believe a felony has been, or is about to be committed? If so, it is his duty to arrest the offender, nor has the latter a cause of action against the officer, if the officer acted without malice, and upon such probable cause.[1] Thus in a remarkable English case, a constable was held not to be justified in shooting at a man whom he had seen stealing wood growing in a copse (which is, when a first offence, only a misdemeanor, though for a second offence, after conviction, a felony), although the constable had no means of arresting the culprit without firing, and although the latter had been previously convicted of the same offence, the constable not being aware of such prior conviction. The question here was whether the constable had to his own mind probable cause; and as he had not, the attempt to arrest without warrant was held illegal.[2] Mere *manner* in a party when accused of crime is not probable cause;[3] nor are the private suspicions of the arresting officer.[4]

Reasonable suspicion convertible with probable cause.

III. BY PERSONS NOT OFFICERS.

1. *Persons called on by Officers, Pursuers, &c.*

§ 10. At the outset it must be noticed that a constable, sheriff, or police officer has the right to call in the aid of private individuals,[5] either to arrest persons charged with past felony, or to prevent impending violation of the

Peace officer may require aid from private persons.

[1] See R. *v.* Woolmer, 1 Moody, 634; Hogg *v.* Ward, 3 H. & N. 417; Davis *v.* Russell, 2 Moody, P. C. 607; Lawrence *v.* Hedgar, 3 Taunt. 140; Com. *v.* Carey, 12 Cush. 246; Com. *v.* Presby, 14 Gray, 65; Burns *v.* Erben, 40 N. Y. 463; Brooks *v.* Com., 61 Penn. St. 352; Eames *v.* State, 6 Humph. 53; State *v.* Underwood, 75 Mo. 230.

[2] R. *v.* Dadson, T. & M. 385; 2 Den. C. C. 35; see Nicholson *v.* Hardwick, 5 C. & P. 495; People *v.* Grant, 79 Mo. 113.

[3] Summerville *v.* Richards, 37 Mich. 299.

The officer must follow the statute as to the magistrate to whom the defendant is to be taken; and in default of so doing is a trespasser. Papineau *v.* Bacon, 110 Mass. 319.

[4] Hale P. C. 90; 4 Crim. Law Mag. 196; People *v.* Burt, 51 Mich. 199.

[5] As to how far the officer must be present in command of his unofficial assistants see Coyles *v.* Hurtin, 10 Johns. 85.

law. To refuse to render such assistance is an indictable offence.[1] And the warrant to the officer protects his assistants.[2]

Officers may have special assistants.

§ 11. It has been seen that private persons thus acting must be either actually or constructively under an officer's command.[3] But the officer may have special private assistants temporarily in charge, especially when he goes for further aid.[4]

Pursuers of felon are protected.

§ 12. By the common law, when a felony has been committed, arrest may be attempted by pursuers, the county being raised, who start with hue and cry after the felon. In such case, though there be no warrant of arrest, nor any constable in the pursuit, yet, the felony being proved, it is murder for one of the defendants to kill one of the pursuers.[5]

2. *Powers of such as to Arrests.*

Private person may interfere on probable cause.

§ 13. A private person may arrest without warrant or official authority persons concerned, in his presence, in riot, or felony, or other heinous crime; and, in cases of crimes of the type of felony, if he has reasonable ground to suspect another of being a guilty party, he may, if acting without malice, and in good faith, arrest such other, in order to bring the case to a magistrate; and for such arrest he cannot be made responsible, though the arrested person be shown to have been innocent.[6] It has been said, however, that in order to excuse such arrest, and to protect the arresting person, it must appear that the offence was in fact committed, and that there was reasonable ground to suspect the arrested person;[7] though if there be probable

[1] Infra, § 16; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 402-444, 1555; R. *v.* Sherlock, L. R. 1 C. C. 20.

[2] State *v.* James, 80 N. C. 370.

[3] See R. *v.* Patience, 7 C. & P. 775; People *v.* Moore, 2 Douglass (Mich.) 1; State *v.* Shaw, 3 Ired. 20; Mitchell *v.* State, 7 Eng. 50.

[4] Coyles *v.* Hurtin, 10 Johns. 85; 1 Chitty C. L. 16.

[5] Jackson's case, 1 East P. C. 298; Brooks *v.* Com., 61 Penn. St. 352. See Galvin *v.* State, 6 Cold. (Tenn.) 283; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 433.

[6] Reuck *v.* McGregor, 3 Vroom (N. J.), 70; Holly *v.* Mix, 3 Wend. 350; Ruloff *v.* People, 45 N. Y. 213; Com. *v.* Deacon, 8 S. & R. 47 (citing Wakly *v.* Hart, 6 Binn. 316); Brooks *v.* Com., 67 Penn. St. 352; Smith *v.* Donelly, 66 Ill. 464; State *v.* Roane, 2 Dev. 58; Brockway *v.* Crawford, 3 Jones N. C. 434; Wilson *v.* State, 11 Lea, 310. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 405–40. That a fugitive felon from another State may be arrested without warrant, see Savina *v.* State, 63 Ga. 513; infra, § 29. In Texas the right is limited to offences in presence of the party arresting. Alford *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 545.

[7] Burns *v.* Erben, 40 N. Y. 463; Brooks *v.* Com., 61 Penn. St., 352;

cause of the commission of the offence, this would seem enough. But when the question arises whether it is murder for an innocent person to kill the person arresting him on an untrue charge (though the person arresting have probable ground), we are to consider the hot blood naturally aroused in an innocent person believing himself to be unjustly arrested. In such case the killing would be but manslaughter.[1] But a private person so interfering should give notice of his object, lest his purpose be mistaken;[2] though this notice may be implied from the circumstances.[3]

§ 14. Certainly a person endeavoring to prevent the consummation of a felony by others may properly use all necessary force for that purpose,[4] and resist all attempts to inflict bodily injury upon himself, and may lawfully, according to the law, as expressed in New York in 1870, detain the felons and hand them over to the officers of the law. The law, it is said, will not be astute in searching for such line of demarcation in this respect as will take the innocent citizen, whose property and person are in danger, from its protection, and place his life at the mercy of the felon.[5] Hence the felon may be arrested after the commission of the offence, if he can be in no other way secured.[6] But an arrest cannot be justified on the ground of conjecture.[7]

May use force necessary to prevent perpetration of felony.

§ 15. It is also ruled that a private person may arrest a felon who, after conviction upon his plea of guilty, has, without actual breaking or force, escaped from the place of imprisonment to which he was sentenced.[8]

May arrest felon after escape.

Hawley *v.* Butler, 54 Barb. 490; Adams *v.* Moore, 2 Selw. N. P. 934. That an indictment found is probable cause, see 1 East P. C. 301; Krous, ex parte, 1 Barn. & C. 261.

[1] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 433–4.

[2] Foster 311; Brooks *v.* Com., *ut sup.*; State *v.* Bryant, 65 N. C. 327; Long *v.* State, 12 Ga. 293.

[3] Wolf *v.* State, 19 Ohio St. 248; see R. *v.* Howarth, Ry. & Moo. 207.

[4] 2 Hale P. C. 77; 2 Hawk. P. C. 120; Ruloff *v.* People, 45 N. Y. 213; Keenan *v.* State, 8 Wis. 132. To refuse to interfere to prevent the execution of a felony may even subject the party refusing to indictment. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 241 *et seq.*

[5] Ruloff *v.* People, 45 N. Y. 213. See Com. *v.* Deacon, 8 S. & R. 47; Ryan *v.* Donelly, 71 Ill. 100; State *v.* James, 80 N. C. 370; Dill *v.* State, 25 Ala. 15; Cary *v.* State, 76 Ala. 78; Carr *v.* State, 43 Kan. 100; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 495.

[6] Simmerman *v.* State, 16 Neb. 615. Supra, § 8.

[7] Davis *v.* Russell, 5 Bing. 364; 3 Mood. & P. 590; Hobbs *v.* Branscomb, 3 Camp. 420.

[8] State *v.* Holmes, 48 N. H. 377 (Smith, J., 1868).

3. *Prevention of Offences.*

May interfere to prevent riot.

§ 16. Is, however, a private person justified in interfering to prevent or suppress a misdemeanor? This question has been not infrequently considered in cases of riotous homicide; and the law undoubtedly is, that every good citizen, when a breach of the peace is threatened, is bound to intervene, and to render his assistance to the constituted authorities; and when the riot is raging he is justified in arresting any persons concerned in it, first notifying them that his object is the preservation of the peace.[1] When a magistrate or duly authorized public officer is on the spot, citizens engaged in the preservation of the peace should obey his orders; and a mere oral direction from him will authorize them to arrest without warrant.[2] When, however, the riot has ceased, and order is restored, the right of arrest without warrant by private individuals ceases.[3]

And so as to other offences.

§ 17. In respect to other misdemeanors, the rule is that while it is not the *duty* of non-official persons to arrest offenders, yet a *right* so to arrest exists, when the act cannot be otherwise stopped. Thus it has been held that a private person may without warrant arrest a notorious cheat, or persons using false weights or tokens.[4] But this is supposing there is no opportunity to obtain a warrant. If there be, the claim of a private person to arrest without warrant must be denied, as this claim is based exclusively on the failure of justice that would otherwise occur. But this rule is not to be stretched so as to preclude a private person from detaining an offender attempting a crime until an officer be obtained.[5]

[1] R. v. Wigan, 1 W. Bl. 47; Res. v. Montgomery, 1 Yeates, 419; Whart. on Homicide, Trial of Kensington Rioters, etc., Appendix; Phillips v. Trull, 11 Johns. 486; Pond v. People, 8 Mich. 150; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed., §§ 1544, 1555; and see Price v. Seeley, 10 Cl. & F. 28.

[2] See Whart. Crim. Law, § 1555; State v. Shaw, 9 Ired. 20; see Judge King's charge in 8th edition of this work, § 17.

[3] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 410.

[4] 2 Hawk. P. C. c. 12, § 301.

[5] Grant v. Moser, 5 M. & G. 125; Wooding v. Oxley, 9 C. & P. 1. See Com. v. Carey, 12 Cush. 246; and see Mr. Greaves's note, published in Cox's Crim. Consolid. Acts, p. lxii., where he argues that as an attempt to commit a felony is only a misdemeanor, the right of a private person to arrest in cases of such attempts, is a right to arrest for a

IV. BREAKING DOORS, AND SEARCH-WARRANTS.

1. *Right to search in general.*

§ 18. The first point to be here noticed is the right, when a warrant has duly issued for the arrest of a person, to break open the door of his house. The law in this respect is, that this may be done, if the offender cannot otherwise be taken, in cases of felony, of imminent breach of the peace, or of the reception of stolen goods; and in such cases a warrant is a justification if there be no malice.[1] Admittance into the house must, however, be first asked and refused; but the officer cannot be treated as a trespasser because he failed to notify the owner who the person to be arrested was, no inquiry having been made in relation thereto.[2] In cases of misdemeanors, unaccompanied with breach of the peace, this power, according to the old law, cannot be exercised.[3] But when there is probable immediate danger of a felony or breach of the peace, or other grave offence, the officer, giving notice of his character, may enter without warrant.[4]

House may be broken open to execute warrant in felonies, etc.

2. *Its Exercise by Private Persons.*

§ 19. When a felony has been committed, or there is good reason to believe it to have been committed, then, if the offender take refuge in his own house, even a private individual may, without warrant, break into the house and arrest the offender. In case of the party arrested proving innocent, however, an action of trespass may be sustained against the party so breaking open the doors without warrant, there being no probable cause. But the probability of the commission of a felony must be very strong to justify this extreme remedy being used by a private person. Mere suspicion will not justify its being employed by such.[5] As will be seen,[6] after indictment found, no place is a sanctuary for the offender.

In felonies this may be done by even private person without warrant.

misdemeanor, citing Fox *v.* Gaunt, 3 B. & Ad. 798. But see supra, § 8.

[1] 4 Bl. Com. 290; Foster, 320; 1 East P. C. 322; 2 Hale P. C. 117; 2 Hawk. P. C. c. 13, § 11. For a full statement of authorities see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 439.

[2] Com. *v.* Reynolds, 120 Mass. 190.

[3] As to practice in issuing warrant see Elsee *v.* Smith, 1 D. & R. 97; 2 Chit. 304.

[4] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 439.

[5] 4 Bl. Com. 292; 2 Hale P. C. 82, 83.

[6] Infra, § 23.

3. *Its Exercise by Constables or Peace Officers.*

§ 20. *A constable or peace officer* may, on reasonable suspicion and without warrant, break open doors; and he has this additional protection, that it is his duty in the case of a felony being committed, so to act.[1] Certainly, if he has reason to believe a felony or an affray is impending, he has a right to break into a house to prevent it.[2] Whether, in cases of felony, he must first demand entrance, has been doubted. It is always best, however, to take this precaution; and in misdemeanors it has been considered requisite.

Peace officer may on reasonable suspicion break open doors without warrant.

Doors may be broken open to re-arrest a person who has escaped.[3]

4. *What is "Suspicion."*

§ 21. It should be kept in mind that a "bare suspicion" is to be distinguished from what is called by Blackstone a "probable suspicion."[4] To act officiously and intrusively on "bare suspicion" implies recklessness if not malice; and even a peace officer (*a fortiori* a private individual) cannot shelter himself from the consequences if he break into the house of a private person on such bare suspicion. Here, again, we strike at the reason of the distinction between a peace officer and a private person in such respects. There are degrees of suspicion which would justify a peace officer in thus interfering which would by no means justify a private person. It is the duty of the former to ferret out crime; such duty is not assigned to the latter. What, therefore, in the peace officer is a meritorious though distasteful service, in the performance of which the law would save him harmless, may be in the private person an officious impertinence, for which damages in a civil action will be awarded.

Private person requires stronger grounds for interference.

5. *Search-warrants; their Issue and Effect.*

§ 22. *Search-warrants* may be granted by justices of the peace on oath made before them that certain goods feloniously acquired

[1] 1 Hale P. C. 583.

[2] So, also, he may break doors to arrest a person who has escaped from arrest. Com. *v.* McGahey, 11 Gray, 194.

[3] Cahill *v.* Rufe, 106 Ill. 621.

[4] See supra, § 8.

are probably in the defendant's possession, or that certain articles, necessary to the course of public justice, are secreted in such a way as to make such a procedure essential to obtain them.[1] When legal in form, such warrant is a justification to the officer using it, though it was granted on evidence that subsequently appeared inadequate, and though there were other latent defects in its concoction. But a prosecutor who maliciously and without probable cause, resorts to such instruments is liable for damages in an action of malicious prosecution.[2] And a warrant must accurately specify the building to be searched.[3]

Search-warrant may be issued on oath.

§ 23. *Houses of third persons* may be broken into, after the usual demand, to secure the offender, or his alleged spoils; though the probable cause necessary to justify such an invasion of private rights should be of a higher degree than that which is sufficient to justify a breaking into the offender's own house. After indictment found, however, the defendant may be pursued and seized wherever he takes refuge; no house being a sanctuary to him.[4]

Houses of third persons may be broken open to secure offender or stolen goods.

§ 24. *In executing search-warrants*, it is proper, before breaking open boxes or trunks, to demand the keys. Not until these have been refused is it lawful to force a lock.[5] But the right to such a preliminary demand, on the part of the owner or custodian, is considered as waived, when there is no person left in charge on whom the demand could be made.[6]

Keys ought to be first demanded.

§ 25. The warrant must be strictly followed. If it authorizes the searching of a specified building, no other building can be searched under such warrant.[7] So, when the officer is directed to seize a particular article, he can under the warrant seize no other article without being

Warrant must be strictly followed.

[1] See Elsee *v.* Smith, 1 D. & R. 97; 2 Chit. 304.

[2] 2 Hale P. C. 151.

[3] Com. *v.* Intox. Liquors, 109 Mass. 371–373; Ibid. 118 Mass. 145; Flaherty *v.* Longley, 62 Me. 420; State *v.* Whiskey, 54 N. H. 164. See Santo *v.* State, 2 Iowa, 165.

To open letters, a warrant in the nature of a search-warrant is required. Jackson, ex parte, 96 U. S. 727.

[4] 2 Hale P. C. 117; 5 Co. 91; 4 Inst. 131; 2 Hawk. P. C. c. 14, § 3.

[5] 2 Hale P. C. 157; and see Entick *v.* Carrington, 19 St. Tr. 1067.

[6] Androscoggin *v.* Richard, 41 Me. 234.

[7] State *v.* Spencer, 38 Me. 30; Jones *v.* Fletcher, 41 Me. 254; McGlinchy *v.* Barrows, 41 Me. 74; State *v.* Thompson, 44 Iowa, 399; Reed *v.* Rice, 2 J. J. Mar. 44. See Dwinnells *v.* Boynton, 3 Allen, 310.

exposed to an action of trespass, unless such other article appear necessary to substantiate the proof of the felony.[1]

The practice as to searching the person in this respect will be hereafter specifically discussed.[2]

6. *Constitutionality of Search-warrants.*

Search-warrants limited by Constitution.

§ 26. Search-warrants, by the constitutions and bills of rights of the several States of the American Union, are strictly limited, it being generally provided that they cannot issue except upon oath setting forth probable cause; and in some instances it being required that they should specify the place, person, or things to be searched. But this is in substance what is required at common law.[3]

7. *Illegality of Arrest as Ground for Release.*

That arrest was illegal is irrelevant on the issue of guilt.

§ 27. Where a party, who has been illegally arrested, is brought on *habeas corpus* before a judge, having the power of a committing magistrate, or when such a party sets up his illegal arrest as a defence, the question of the legality of the arrest is not at issue, the only question being whether the party charged should be tried on the merits.[4] Nor is it any ground for relief that the party had been kidnapped in a foreign country (though he might be surrendered by the executive on demand of the sovereign of such country), the courts, on the question whether he should be held to trial, or, if tried, should be subjected to sentence, having nothing to do with the mode of his arrest.[5] Civil service, however, against a party so

[1] Crozier *v.* Cundy, 9 D. & R. 224; 6 B. & C. 232.

[2] Infra, § 60.

[3] See State *v.* Spencer, 38 Me. 30; Allen *v.* Colby, 47 N. H. 544; Com. *v.* Dana, 2 Met. (Mass.) 329; Dwinnells *v.* Boynton, 3 Allen, 310; Com. *v.* Cert. Intox. Liquors, 6 Allen, 596; Ibid. 13 Allen, 52; Downing *v.* Porter, 8 Gray, 539; Robinson *v.* Richardson, 13 Gray, 454; Com. *v.* Ducey, 126 Mass. 269; Grumon *v.* Raymond, 1 Conn. 40; Santo *v.* State, 2 Iowa, 165. In Moore *v.* Coxe, 10 Weekly Notes, 135, it was ruled by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania that as the limitation in the federal Constitution applied only to federal process, under the Constitution of Pennsylvania "jewelry and other personal effects" is a sufficient description.

[4] R. *v.* Marks, 3 East, 157; Kraus, *ex parte*, 1 B. & C. 258; R. *v.* Weils, 9 Q. B. D. 701.

[5] Scott's case, 9 B. & C. 446; R. *v.* House, 6 Cr. L. Mag. 354; R. *v.* Richards, 5 Q. B. 926; Ker *v.* People, 119 U. S. 436; aff. *S. C.* 110 Ill. 631; 18

kidnapped into the jurisdiction will be set aside.[1] And, in independent proceedings, criminal and civil, his remedy against those who unlawfully arrested him remains open.

V. FUGITIVES.

1. *As between the several United States.*

Under federal Constitution and statute fugitives may be arrested when fleeing from State to State.

§ 28. By the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution of the United States, "a person charged in any State with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice, and be found in another State, shall, on demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, and be removed to the State having jurisdiction."

By the Act of February 12, 1793, § 1,[2] "Whenever the executive authority of any State in the Union, or of either of the territories northwest or south of the river Ohio, shall demand any person as a fugitive from justice of the executive authority of any such State or territory to which such person shall have fled, and shall moreover produce the copy of an indictment found or an affidavit made before a magistrate of any State or territory as aforesaid, charging the person so demanded with having committed treason, felony, or other crime,[3] certified as authentic

Fed. Rep. 167; U. S. *v.* Lawrence, 13 Blatch. 306; Noyes, in re, 17 Alb. L. J. 407; Mahone, in re, 34 Fed. Rep. 525; State *v.* Brewster, 7 Vt. 118; People *v.* Rowe, 4 Park. C. R. 253; Balbo *v.* People, 80 N. Y. 484; Felter, in re, 3 Zab. 311; State *v.* Smith, 1 Bailey, 283; Morrell *v.* Quarrels, 35 Ala. 544; State *v.* Chys, 92 Mo. 395; State *v.* Brooks, 92 Mo. 562; State *v.* Ross, 21 Iowa, 469; State *v.* Stewart, 60 Wis. 587. See Com. *v.* Shaw, 6 Cr. L. Mag. 245.

"I doubt much whether a policeman is not justified in arresting a man without a warrant on reasonable grounds of suspicion of his having done that (abroad) which would be a felony if committed in this country." Brett, J., R. *v.* Weil, 9 Q. B. D. 706.

[1] See Wells *v.* Gurney, 8 B. & C. 769; Adriance *v.* Legreve, 59 N. Y. 116; 14 Abb. (N. Y.) Pr. (N. S.) 343; Compton *v.* Wilder, 40 Ohio St. 139; Fly *v.* Oatley, 6 Wis. 42; Whart. on Ev. § 384. Cf. Wauzer *v.* Bright, 52 Ill. 35; Townsend *v.* Smith, 47 Wis. 623.

[2] U. S. Rev. Stat. § 5278.

[3] Although the act of Congress requires the executive of the demanding State to produce to the governor of the State on which the demand is made "a copy of an indictment found or affidavit made," this has been held not to exclude an information as to the basis of a demand. State *v.* Hufford, 28 Iowa, 391; In re Hooper, 52 Wis. 702.

by the governor or chief magistrate of the State or territory from which the person so charged fled, it shall be the duty of the executive authority of the State or territory to which such person shall have fled, to cause him or her to be arrested and secured, and notice of the arrest to be given to the executive authority making such demand, or to the agent of such authority appointed to receive the fugitive, and to cause the fugitive to be delivered to such agent when he shall appear; but if no such agent shall appear within six months from the time of the arrest, the prisoner may be discharged. And all costs or expenses incurred in the apprehending, securing, and transmitting such fugitive to the State or territory making such demand, shall be paid by such State or territory.

"Sec. 2. Any agent appointed as aforesaid, who shall receive the fugitive into his custody, shall be empowered to transport him or her to the State or territory from which he or she shall have fled. And if any person or persons shall by force set at liberty, or rescue the fugitive from such agent, while transporting as aforesaid, the person or persons so offending shall, on conviction, be fined not exceeding five hundred dollars, and be imprisoned not exceeding one year."[1] By a subsequent statute, the chief justice of the District of Columbia has in this respect the functions of a governor of a

[1] The history of this statute will be found in Spear on Extradition, 226 *et seq.*; Rorer on Inter-State Law, 218; and in article in 13 American Law Rev. 181; 3 Crim. Law Mag. 788; 31 Alb. L. J. 4. See, generally, Briscoe, in re, 51 How. Pr. 422; People *v.* Brady, 56 N. Y. 184; Hibler *v.* State, 43 Tex. 197; Cnbreth, ex parte, 49 Cal. 436; White, ex parte, 49 Cal. 442; Rosenblat, ex parte, 51 Cal. 285. The provision applies to governors of territories, but not to the chief of the Cherokee Nation. Morgan, in re, 20 Fed. Rep. 298.

A requisition may be maintained for an offence in the District of Columbia. Buell, in re, 3 Dill. 116. That the act of Congress is constitutional in respect to territories, see Morgan, ex parte, 20 Fed. Rep. 298.

The rulings in cases of international extradition are not necessarily in point. "The supposed analogy between a surrender under a treaty providing for extradition, and the surrender here in question, has been earnestly pressed upon our attention. There, the act is done by the authorities of the nation—in behalf of the nation—pursuant to a national obligation. That obligation rests alike upon the people of all the States. A national exigency might require prompt affirmative action. In making the order of surrender, all the States, through their constituted agent, the general government, are represented and concur, and it may well be said to be the act of each and all of them. Not so here." Swayne, J., Taylor *v.* Taintor, 16 Wall. 366.

State.[1] It is no defence that the defendant was induced by stratagem to come to a place where he could be arrested.[2]

Arrest may be had in anticipation of requisition.

§ 29. In several States statutes have been passed authorizing the arrest of fugitives in advance of the reception of a requisition. In other States the practice is to sustain, on grounds of comity, such arrests, although there be no local enabling statute.[3]

But in either case, where, instead of an indictment, an affidavit is taken as the basis of application, in proceedings in anticipation of demand, it must be as explicit and full as would justify a magistrate in issuing a warrant of arrest. It must specify the crime, aver its commission and indictability in the requiring State, and state that the party required is a fugitive.[4]

In any view, there can be no technical surrender without a formal requisition.[5]

[1] See Buell *v.* State, 3 Dill. 116; Perry, in re, 2 Crim. Law Mag. 84.

[2] Brown, ex parte, 28 Fed. Rep. 653. See supra, § 27.

[3] Hurd. Hab. Corp. § 636; Ross, ex parte, 2 Bond, 252; People *v.* Schenck, 2 Johns. R. 470; qualified, however, in People *v.* Wright, 2 Caines, 213; Heyward, in re, 1 Sandf. (N. Y.) 701; Leland, in re, 7 Abb. Pr. (N. S.) 64; Fetter, in re, 3 Zabr. 311; Com. *v.* Deacon, 10 S. & R. 125; (where the practice was put on the ground of comity independent of statute); State *v.* Buzine, 4 Harring. 572; State *v.* Howell, R. M. Charlt. 120; Cubreth, ex parte, 49 Cal. 436; Rosenblatt, ex parte, 51 Cal. 285. See *contra*, People *v.* Wright, 2 Caines, 213; Tullis *v.* Fleming, 69 Ind. 15. That such statutes are constitutional see Smith, ex parte, 3 McLean, 121; Com. *v.* Tracy, 5 Met. 536; Com. *v.* Hall, 75 Mass. 262. That an arrest of such a fugitive may be made by a private person without warrant, see Savina *v.* State, 63 Ga. 513; Morrell *v.* Quarrels, 35 Ala. 544; see 3 Crim. Law Mag. 798.

As to "fleeing" from justice, see Roberts *v.* Reilly, 116 U. S. 80; Brown, ex parte, 28 Fed. Rep. 653. Infra, § 31.

[4] See Smith, ex parte, 3 McLean, 121; People *v.* Brady, 56 N. Y. 184; Solomon's case, 1 Abb. Prac. (N. S.) 347; Rutter's case, 7 Ibid. 67; Heyward, in re, 1 Sandf. (N. Y.) 701; Fetter's case, 3 Zabr. 311; Degant *v.* Michael, 2 Carter, 396; Pfitzer's case, 28 Ind. 450; State *v.* Swope, 72 Mo. 399; Romaine, in re, 23 Cal. 585; White, ex parte, 49 Cal. 442.

As to arrests without warrants, see supra, § 27.

[5] Botts *v.* Williams, 17 B. Monr. 687. The practice, however, of permitting extra-territorial arrests, and even of captures and removals, has been permitted in several States.

"It was formerly the practice," says Gibson, C. J. (Dow's case, 18 Penn. St. 37), "of the executive of this State to act in the matter by the instrumentality of the judiciary; and though I have issued many warrants, none of them has ever been followed by an arrest. The consequence of the inefficiency of the constitutional provision has been, that extra-territorial arrests

§ 30. It is sufficient, to sustain a requisition, that the offence is one that is indictable in the State in which it was alleged to have been committed, and from which the requisition proceeds. Nor is it necessary that it should be an offence at common law. It is sufficient if it be such by statute. The constitutional provision includes every offence punishable in the State making the requisition.[1] In matters of formal pleading the indictment is to be construed according to the rules of the demanding State, and is to be determined by the courts of such State.[2]

Sufficient if offence is penal in demanding State.

§ 31. In the requisition the governor must certify that the copy of the indictment or affidavit required by the statute is true, and that the fugitive claimed is charged with the crime therein specified. Either in the requisition or in a separate warrant the name is given of the person to whom the fugitive is to be delivered. It is sometimes argued that unless the party demanded was in the demanding State at the time of the commission of the offence no requisition would lie. If this rule rests on the ground that the place of the commission of a crime is the place where the offender was at the time, it cannot be sustained. Many crimes, as we have elsewhere seen, may be committed by a person at the time in another State; and such person may be made responsible in the State of commission.[3] But the rule may be placed on another ground which is unassailable.

Requisition must be duly proved, and lies only for fugitives.

have been winked at in every State; but an arrest at sufferance would be useless if its illegality could be set up by the culprit." See supra, § 27.

[1] Kentucky *v.* Dennison, 24 How. 66; Reggel, ex parte, 114 U. S. 642; Taylor *v.* Taintor, 16 Wall. 366; Roberts *v.* Reilly, 116 U. S. 80; Opinion of Judges in Maine, 24 Am. Jurist, 233; 18 Alb. L. J. 156; Com. *v.* Green, 17 Mass. 515; Brown's case, 112 Mass. 409; Davis's case, 122 Mass. 324; Clark's case, 9 Wend. 212; People *v.* Brady, 56 N. Y. 182; Fetter's case, 3 Zabr. 311; Voorhees's case, 3 Vroom, 141; Wilcox *v.* Nolze, 34 Oh. St. 520; Morton *v.* Skinner, 48 Ind. 123; State *v.* Stewart, 60 Wis. 584; Hughes, in re, Phill. N. C. (L.) 57; Johnston *v.* Riley, 13 Ga. 97; Opinions of Governor Mifflin and Atty.-Gen. Randolph, 20 State Papers U. S. 39; 13 Am. Law Rev. 192.

As denying the position in the text, see Governor Seward's Opinion, ii. Seward's Works, 452. With the latter opinion coincides the action of Governor Dennison in Lago's case, 18 Alb. L. J. 149; Spear on Extrad. 234.

[2] Reggell, ex parte, 114 U. S. 642; Roberts, ex parte, 24 Fed. Rep. 132. People *v.* Byrnes, 33 Hun, 98.

[3] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 278.

The Constitution provides only for the extradition of persons who "flee" from justice. None can be, therefore, demanded who have not "fled" from or left the demanding State "in flight."[1] It is not necessary, indeed, that the "flight" should have been after indictment found. It is enough if the party left after the commission of the crime.[2] That he was at the time domiciled in the asylum State is no defence.[3] But the law is that he must have "fled," or left, the State after the crime. It is not enough if he was called away by public duty: *e. g.*, attendance on Congress.[4]

The inference to be drawn from a commission of a crime in one State and then a presence in another is not conclusive as to fleeing.[5]

§ 32. We have elsewhere seen that it is a question of grave moment, whether the federal legislature can impose upon State magistrates any duties not assigned to them by the Constitution.[6] In most States, however, the difficulty is obviated by statutes making the performance of the duty

Federal courts cannot compel governor to surrender.

[1] Reggell, in re, 114 U. S. 642; Jackson's case, 12 Am. L. Rev. 602; Greenough, in re, 31 Vt. 279; Adams, in re, 7 N. Y. 386; People *v.* Sonnott, 20 Alb. L. J. 230; 3 Crim. Law Mag. 807; Voorhees, in re, 3 Vroom, 141; Wilcox *v.* Nolze, 34 Oh. St. 520; Gaffigan's case, cited Spear on Extradition, 2d ed. § 385; Jones *v.* Leonard, 50 Iowa, 106; Hughes, in re, Phill. N. C. 57; Mohr, in re, 73 Ala. 503. To this effect is a Pennsylvania statute of 1878.

In Jones *v.* Leonard, 50 Iowa, 106, the court held that "a citizen and resident of one State charged in a requisition with constructive commission of crime in another State from which in fact he has never fled, is not a fugitive from justice, and the determination of the governor as to the sufficiency of the facts alleged is not conclusive."

That the fleeing must be specifically asserted and proved, see Jackson, in re, 2 Flip. 183; Hall's case, 6 Penna. L. J. 412.

[2] Hurd on *Habeas Corpus*, 606; Roberts *v.* Reilly, 116 U. S. 80; Brown, ex parte, 28 Fed. Rep. 653; Mohr, ex parte, 73 Ala. 503; 5 Crim. Law Rep. 539; U. S. *v.* O'Brian, 3 Dill. 381. See remarks of Withey, J., quoted 13 Am. Law Rev. 205; Leary's case, 6 Abb. (N. Y.) N. C. 43.

[3] Kingsbury's case, 106 Mass. 223.

[4] Patterson's case, cited 18 Alb. L. J. 190.

In Brown's case, 8 Crim. Law Mag. 313, it was ruled by Governor Hill that the fact that a fugitive from justice in Pennsylvania was inveigled from Canada into New York, coming, however, voluntarily, was no reason why the Governor of New York should refuse to deliver him on a demand from the Governor of Pennsylvania.

[5] See cases in prior notes to this section. Spear on Extrad. 2d ed. 393.

[6] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 265. See Kentucky *v.* Dennison, 24 How. 66; Taylor *v.* Taintor, 16 Wall. 366; People *v.* Brady, 56 N. Y. 182; Voorhees, in re, 3 Vroom, 146; Hughes, in re, Phill. N. C. 57; Johnston *v.* Riley, 13 Ga. 97.

obligatory on the executive;[1] in other States it is accepted as one of those discretionary courtesies that it is usual for one sovereign to render to another. Were this not the uniform practice, it would be the duty of Congress, as it is indubitably within its power, to provide a distinctively federal agency for the enforcing of the constitutional provision.[2]

No objection that fugitive is amenable to asylum State.

§ 33. It has been said that the executive of the asylum State is not bound to deliver a person amenable to the penal law of such State.[3] But the better opinion is that the mere fact that the offender is so amenable (no proceedings against him having been commenced) is no bar to a requisition.[4] On the other hand, if a prosecution has already commenced in the asylum State, then this State has jurisdiction of the person of the fugitive for this particular purpose, and the proceedings should go on until their judicial determination.[5] If the offence is the same as that for which the requisition has issued, then the first State commencing proceedings, if both have jurisdiction, has precedence.[6]

Governor of asylum State cannot impeach requisition.

§ 34. We have already observed that there is nothing in the Constitution of the United States to require a governor of a State to issue his warrant for the arrest of a fugitive; and that if he does so, it is either in obedience to local law or in the exercise of a discretion which the courts cannot compel. It is otherwise, however, when the governor accepts the office proposed to him by the statute, for in this case he is bound to execute the commission he undertakes. It is, indeed, a prerequisite to his action, that it should be proved to his satisfaction that the person against whom he is asked to issue a warrant is the same as the one charged in the requisition, that

[1] For an analysis of these statutes see 13 Am. L. R. 235 *et seq.*

[2] Kentucky *v.* Dennison, 24 How. 66.

[3] Briscoe, in re, 51 How. Pr. 422; State *v.* Allen, 2 Humph. 258. See Taylor *v.* Taintor, 16 Wall. 366.

[4] Work *v.* Corrington, 34 Oh. St. 64; Ex parte Sheldon, 34 Oh. St. 319. See Roberts *v.* Reilly, 116 U. S. 80; Briscoe, in re, 51 How. Pr. 422; Compton *v.* Wilder, 3 Ohio L. J. 642; aff. 40 Ohio St. 130; cited, supra, § 28.

[5] Taylor *v.* Taintor, 16 Wall. 366; 36 Conn. 242; Briscoe, in re, 51 How. (N. Y.) Pr. 422; Troutman's case, 4 Zab. 634; Work *v.* Corrington, 34 Ohio St. 64; State *v.* Allen, 2 Humph. 258. See 13 Am. Law Rev. 227.

[6] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. 293.

such person is a fugitive from the demanding State, and that the affidavit was authenticated by the demanding governor.[1] But beyond this he cannot go. If the requisition is duly backed by indictment or affidavit, a certified copy of which is attached, he has no right to inquire whether the person demanded was guilty of the offence charged,[2] or whether the object of the requisition was other than it apparently seemed. The only cases in which the requisition, if regular and duly backed, can be assailed, are those in which judgments of sister States, under an analogous provision of the Constitution, can be assailed. It may be shown that the requisition fails from want of jurisdiction,[3] or was fraudulently obtained, and hence void, or was of a character such as stripped it of conclusiveness. But when once its genuineness and its technical conformity to law are ascertained, its averments cannot be disputed.[4] A requisition can no more be impeached on the ground that improper collateral motives coöperated in obtaining it, than can a judgment of a sister State be impeached on the same grounds, supposing there was no fraudulent imposition on or by the executive issuing it.[5] If there was jurisdiction—if the governor in the one case, or the judgment court in the other, were not fraudulently imposed upon—then the averments of the record in either case cannot be assailed in the State in which execution is sought.[6] But the requisition must be accom-

[1] Powell, ex parte, 20 Fla. 806.

[2] Infra, § 35; Clark, in re, 9 Wend. 212; Leary's case, 6 Abb. (N. Y.) N. C. 43; 10 Ben. 197, modifying People *v.* Brady, 56 N. Y. 182; and see article in 31 Alb. L. J. 24.

[3] Supra, § 31.

[4] Ibid.; Leary, in re, 6 Abb. (N. Y.) N. C. 43; 10 Ben. 197; Voorhees, in re, 3 Vroom, 141; Swearingen, ex parte, 13 S. C. 74; see, however, Hartman *v.* Aveline, 63 Ind. 344.

[5] Work *v.* Corrington, 34 Ohio St. 64. See 31 Alb. Law J. 24.

[6] "The executive has no general power to issue warrants of arrest, and when he proceeds to do so in these cases, his whole authority comes from the Constitution and the act of Congress, and he must keep within it." (Judge Cooley, in Princeton Rev., Jan. 1879, p. 165.)

It may be added, that if he accepts the commission he must hold to it. He cannot accept it, and then, on the ground that he is the executive of a sovereign State (he undertaking at the time to act as a federal commissioner), dispute its facts.

In opposition to the text may be noticed Kimpton's case, Aug. 1878 (18 Alb. L. J. 298; Spear on Ex. 434), in which the governor of Massachusetts, on the advice of the attorney-general, held that he was justified in refusing a warrant on the grounds that the prosecution had been long delayed, and that an offer had been made to the defendant to enter a *nolle prosequi* in case he would turn State's evidence. But this cannot

panied by an indictment or affidavit, specifying the crime. A mere statement that the crime has been committed is not enough.[1]

Ordinarily issues warrant of arrest.

§ 34 *a*. The requisition being in due form, and being presented to the governor of the asylum State, the practice is for him to issue a warrant of arrest containing the proper recitals and averments. In several States statutes have been passed prescribing the terms of such warrants; which statutes, so far as they are supplementary to federal legislation, are constitutional.[2] The warrant must set forth facts necessary to jurisdiction.[3]

Habeas corpus cannot go behind warrant.

§ 35. To examine the grounds of imprisonment, in this, as well as in other cases of arrest, a writ of *habeas corpus* may be obtained; this writ being within the jurisdiction of State courts to issue.[4] The points which may be thus raised are as follows:—

be sustained, as the governor of Massachusetts could no more inquire into the motives of the governor of South Carolina than can a State court when acting on a judgment of a sister State, under the parallel constitutional provision as to judgments of other States, hold that it is entitled to inquire what were the motives of the plaintiff in the judgment, or of the court by whom the decision was made. As concurring in this conclusion, see reasoning of Ch. J. Cooley, in Princeton Rev. for Jan. 1879; Cooley's Const. Lim. 16, n. 1; Walker's Am. Law, § 64; and article in 13 Am. Law Rev. 181; Kentucky *v.* Dennison, 24 How. 66; Compton *v.* Wilder, 3 Ohio L. J. 642; 40 Ohio St. 130; cited supra, § 28; Johnston *v.* Riley, 13 Ga. 97; Romaine, in re, 23 Cal. 585. See, however, Perry, in re, 2 Crim. Law Mag. 84, and note thereto.

The question in the text, it should be remembered, is very different from that which arises when it is attempted to use extradition process to enforce the collection of a debt. No doubt the courts will refuse their aid to such a perversion of justice, when the attempt is made to enforce such debt. See supra, § 27. Rorer on Inter-State Law, 222. But such collateral motive, extortionate as it may be, is no more a bar to extradition process than it would be a bar to ordinary proceedings of arrest for a crime.

It should be added that the position in the text is in no respect inconsistent with the position that a governor may revoke his warrant after it has been issued. This he may undoubtedly do, for the reason that he is at liberty to decline to accept the agency in this respect that the Federal government tenders him. See Wyeth *v.* Richardson, 10 Gray, 240; Work *v.* Corrington, 34 Oh. St. 319. But if he undertakes the agency he must execute it according to the terms of the mandate.

[1] Doo Woon, in re, 18 Fed. Rep. 898; 1 West. Coast R. 333; Solomon's case, 1 Abb. Pr. N. S. 347; Pfitzer, ex parte, 28 Ind. 451, and cases cited supra.

[2] Smith, ex parte, 3 McLean, 121; Ammons, ex parte, 34 Ohio St., 518; Robinson *v.* Flanders, 29 Ind. 16.

[3] Infra, § 35; In re Doo Woon, 1 West Coast Rep. 333; 18 Fed. Rep. 898.

[4] Robb *v.* Connolly, 111 U. S. 624; cited infra, § 37 *a*.

Arrest prior to requisition. If there be a local statute authorizing this, and if proper ground be laid, the prisoner will be remanded, and the same course will be taken when the arrest, under the local practice, is sustainable on grounds of comity.[1]

Defects in warrant. The first point is, is there a warrant on which the court can act? To the legality of the warrant there are the following prerequisites:—

(1.) The prisoner must have been a *fugitive.*[2] If not, the governor had no jurisdiction, and on proof that the prisoner was not a "fugitive," and had not been in the State from which the requisition issues, there must be a discharge.[3] But a probable case is enough to sustain the warrant in this relation.[4]

(2.) The identity of the prisoner as the party charged must appear;[5] and this is a matter of parol proof.[6]

(3.) The warrant must be based on an indictment or affidavit, which is essential to the validity of the requisition.[7] But behind indictment or affidavit the court will not go, nor can their averments, except for the purpose of showing fraud or non-identity, be contradicted by parol.[8] And the warrant of the governor is "*primâ facie*

[1] Supra, § 29; see as to practice, Leary, ex parte, 10 Ben. 197; Miles, in re, 52 Vt. 609.

[2] Supra, § 31.

[3] Wilcox *v.* Nolze, 34 Ohio St., 520; Jones *v.* Leonard, 50 Iowa, 106.

Parol evidence is admissible to show where crime was committed. Wilcox *v.* Nolze, supra.

[4] Reggel, ex parte, 114 U. S. 642; People *v.* Byrnes, 33 Hun, 98; infra, § 55.

[5] In Butler, ex parte, Luzerne Co. C. P., it was held that the Pennsylvania statute authorizing examination for identification was not unconstitutional. 18 Alb. L. J. 369.

[6] Leary, ex parte, 10 Ben. 197; 6 Abb. N. Y. (N. C.) 43; see Robb, in re, 64 Cal. 431.

[7] People *v.* Brady, 56 N. Y. 182; People *v.* Donahue, 84 N. Y. 438; Hooper, in re, 52 Wis. 699; Lorraine, ex parte, 16 Nev. 63. That an information is sufficient, see supra, § 28.

[8] Leary's case, 10 Ben. 197–8; 6 Abb. N. C. 441; Kingsbury's case, 106 Mass. 223; Davis's case, 122 Mass. 324; Clark, in re, 9 Wend. 212; People *v.* Pinkerton, 77 N. Y. 245; S. C., 17 Hun, 199; Com. *v.* Daniel, 6 Penn. L. J. 417; 4 Clark, 49; State *v.* Buzine, 4 Harring. 572; State *v.* Schlemm, Ibid. 577; Norris *v.* State, 25 Ohio St. 217; Work *v.* Corrington, 34 Ohio St. 64, 319. See Bull, in re, Cent. L. J. 255; 4 Dill. 323; 4 South. L. Rev. N. S. 676, 702; Sedg. Const. Law, 395; Hurd on Hab. Corp. §§ 327–38, 606; Cooley's Const. Lim. 16. As to *habeas corpus* in such cases, see infra, § 993.

The certificate of the demanding governor, that a copy of a complaint, made before a justice, is authentic, sufficiently authenticates the capacity of the justice to receive the complaint. Kingsbury's case, 106 Mass. 223; Donaghey, ex parte, 2 Pitts. L. J. 166. See Manchester, in re, 5 Cal. 237. "Theft," in

evidence, at least, that all necessary legal prerequisites have been complied with, and, if previous proceedings appear to be regular, is conclusive evidence of the right to remove the prisoner to the State from which he fled."[1] It is enough, therefore, if the return to the writ of *habeas corpus* aver an indictment or affidavit to its legal effect without annexing a copy.[2] When, however, the indictment or affidavit is annexed, it may be examined on *habeas corpus* for the purpose of determining how far it sets forth a crime under the federal statute.[3]

Whether the federal courts can discharge in such cases on *habeas corpus* is elsewhere discussed.[4]

§ 35 *a*. It has been held in Texas that bail cannot be taken in extradition process, even when the State Constitution provides that all prisoners shall be bailable by sufficient sureties.[5] But by title IV., ch. I. of the New York Criminal Code, § 831, a person arrested on State extradition process may be admitted to bail by a judge of the Supreme Court.

Bail not to be taken.

§ 36. We have just seen that a court, on *habeas corpus*, will not inquire as to formal defects of the indictment or other documents on which the requisition is based.[6] It is otherwise when the

the warrant, is synonymous with "larceny." People *v.* Donahue, 84 N. Y. 438.

A fortiori when a warrant of surrender is issued by the governor of the asylum State, upon an indictment found in the demanding State, the courts of the asylum State will not, on *habeas corpus*, inquire into formal defects of the indictment. Davis's case, 122 Mass. 324.

That an information may take the place of an indictment, see Hooper, in re, 52 Wis. 699.

[1] Davis's case, 122 Mass. 324.

[2] People *v.* Pinkerton, 77 N. Y. 245; People *v.* Donahue, 84 N. Y. 438; Robinson *v.* Flanders, 29 Ind. 10; aff., Nichols *v.* Cornelius, 7 Ind. 611.

[3] As an extreme case of such scrutiny, see People *v.* Brady, 56 N. Y. 182. The rules of pleading in such cases are to be such as obtain in the demanding State. Reggel, ex parte, 114 U. S. 642.

[4] Infra, §§ 981, 993; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. 288.

[5] Erwin, ex parte, 7 Tex. ap., 788; citing ex parte Ezell, 40 Texas, 451.

[6] Davis's case, 122 Mass. 324; Briscoe's case, 57 How. (N. Y.) Pr. 422.

Under the New York statute the complaint must be sworn to, and must show that the accused had been duly charged with the crime, and that he had fled to the asylum State. Hayward, in re, 1 Sandf. 701; Leland, in re, 7 Abb. Pr. N. S. 164.

That "crime" is used in its general sense, so as to include such misdemeanors as false pretences, see Reggel, ex parte, 114 U. S. 642; State *v.* Stewart, 60 Wis. 587.

indictment or affidavit fails to set forth a crime in the demanding State,[1] though an indictment duly found or affidavit duly certified is sufficient *primâ facie* proof that the offence was indictable in such State.[2] When the demand is based on affidavits they must have been previously filed in a court of justice as a preliminary to prosecution, since the executive of the demanding State is "not authorized to make the demand unless the party was charged in the regular course of judicial proceedings."[3] The affidavit must be sworn to before a magistrate; a notary not being sufficient.[4] It must be distinctly averred that the fugitive has been guilty of some specific offence against the demanding State.[5]

Indictment or affidavit must set forth a crime, and must be in course of judicial proceedings.

§ 37. It will be noticed[6] that in cases where a fugitive is arrested on a demand from a foreign State, he can only, according to the better view, be tried for the offence for which the demand has been made. It is otherwise under the clause of the Federal Constitution now before us. The Constitution in this respect is supreme over the whole country, and hence when a fugitive is transferred from State to State under its provisions, he is open in the second State to any prosecutions that may be brought against him in such State.[7] And

Fugitive may be tried for other than requisition offence.

[1] Smith, ex parte, 3 McLean, 121; People *v.* Brady, 56 N. Y. 182; People *v.* Brady, 1 Abb. Pr. (N. S.) 347; Rutter's case, 7 Ibid. 67; Heyward, in re, 1 Sandf. (N. Y.) 701; Fetter's case, 3 Zabr. 311; Degant *v.* Michael, 2 Carter, 396; Pfitzer's case, 28 Ind. 450; Romaine, in re, 23 Cal. 585; White, ex parte, 49 Cal. 442.

[2] Opinion of Maine Judges, 24 Am. Jur. 233; 18 Alb. L. J. 150; Brown's case, 112 Mass. 409; Davis's case, 122 Mass. 324; Morton *v.* Skinner, 48 Ind. 123; Clark, in re, 19 Wend. 212; White, ex parte, 49 Cal. 434.

[3] Kentucky *v.* Dennison, 24 How. 66; White, ex parte, 49 Cal. 434.

[4] As to State statutes imposing additional requisites, see Work *v.* Corrington, 34 Ohio St. 64; Jones *v.* Leonard, 50 Iowa, 106. So far as these statutes limit the constitutional process, their constitutionality may be questioned. Moore *v.* People, 14 How. 13.

[5] Snyder, ex parte, 64 Mo. 58; State *v.* Swope, 72 Mo. 99. See Morgan, in re, 20 Fed. Rep. 298.

[6] Infra, § 49.

[7] Noyes, in re, U. S. Dist. Ct. N. J. May, 1878, 17 Alb. L. J. 407; 11 Chic. Leg. News, 9. Supra, § 27; State *v.* Stewart, 60 Wis. 584; Miles, in re, 52 Vt. 609; Ham *v.* State, 4 Tex. App. 645. See also State *v.* Brewster, 7 Vt. 118; Browning *v.* Abrams, 51 How. Pr. 172; Dow's case, 18 Penn. St. 37, cited supra, § 27. Compare, however, *contra*, remarks of Judge Cooley, Princeton Rev. 1879, p. 176; Cannon, in re, 47 Mich. 481.

it has been held that he may be arrested and delivered on a requisition from another State.[1]

Officers executing such process protected by federal courts.

§ 37 *a*. We have already noticed numerous cases in which the action of the officers of a State in arresting alleged fugitives from justice have been reviewed by the judiciary of such State.[2] While this jurisdiction cannot be rightfully disputed, it being now settled that an agent appointed by State authority to receive or deliver a fugitive is not a federal officer,[3] it may also be maintained that an officer who is arrested by State authorities when *bona fide* employed in executing extradition process may be released by federal courts on a writ of *habeas corpus*.[4] But so far as concerns the arrested party, it is now settled by the Supreme Court of the United States that the States have the concurrent right to inquire into the legality of the arrest, notwithstanding the fact that the question arises under the federal Constitution.[5]

For federal offences warrants may be issued in all districts.

§ 37 *b*. Under the Revised Statutes of the United States, it is made the duty of judges, when offences against the United States are charged, to issue, under certain conditions, warrants for the arrest and removal of the offender for trial before such United States court as has cognizance of the offence.[6] In such cases the practice is

[1] People *v*. Senott, 20 Alb. L. J. 230. In this case Judge McAllister's ruling was afterwards approved by Judge Drummond. Chic. Leg. News, Dec. 13, 1879. *Contra*, Daniel's case, cited 1 Brightly's Fed. Dig. 294. See criticism in 20 Alb. L. J. 425; 3 Crim. Law Mag. 808.

[2] Supra, § 35.

[3] See argument of Supreme Court of Alabama in Mohr, in re, 73 Ala. 503; Rorer on Inter-State Law, 221, 222; article by Dr. Spear in 29 Alb. L. J. 206; note to 5 Crim. Law Mag. 548. Cf. Hoyle, in re, 1 Crim. Law Mag. 472.

The point in the text has been finally sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States in Robb *v*. Conolly, 1884, 111 U. S. 624; 16 Chic. Leg. N. 291, affirming S. C. in Sup. Ct. of California. See Robb, in re, 64 Cal. 431, where the United States Circuit Court in California (differing from the action of the Supreme Court of California in the same case, Robb, in re, 1 Pac. Rep. 881; 1 West. Coast Rep. 255) held that a State court had no right to review on *habeas corpus* the action of officers on extradition process.

[4] Bull, in re, 4 Cent. L. J. (1877) 255; 4 Dill. 323. See infra, § 993, for other cases; U. S. *v*. McClay, 23 Int. Rev. Rec, 80. See U. S. *v*. Booth, 21 How. 507; Prigg *v*. Com., 16 Pet. 608; Clark, in re, 9 Wend. 212; People *v*. Pinkerton, 77 N. Y. 245; 17 Hun, 199.

[5] Robb *v*. Conolly, *ut sup*., and see 29 Alb. L. J. 206.

[6] See 2 Burr's Trial, 483; U. S. *v*. Hamilton, 3 Dall. 17; Rhodes, ex

to bring the defendant before a judge or other committing magistrate in the district of arrest, subject to the action of such magistrate, who may discharge or surrender.[1] The order is an exercise of a judicial function, and the court in considering it can go behind the indictment or information, and decide the question on the merits.[2]

State has no power of international extradition.

§ 37 *c*. A State is not authorized, under the Constitution of the United States, to deliver fugitives to a foreign sovereign. The exclusive cognizance of international extradition is given to the government of the United States.[3]

2. *As between the Federal Government and Foreign States.*

Limited to treaty.

§ 38. Extradition, as a general rule, as between foreign States, is limited to cases provided for by treaty;[4] nor, as will hereafter be seen, when there is a treaty, will a requisition be sustained for an offence which the treaty does not include.[5] It has, however, been held by eminent jurists that, independently of the cases provided for by treaty, it is by the law

parte, 2 Wheel. Crim. Cas. 550. See discussion in 17 West. Jur. 209. In a case determined in 1873 (Dana's case, 7 Ben. 1), Judge Blatchford declined to issue in New York a warrant, under the Act of September 24, 1789, for the arrest of Mr. Dana, editor of the Sun, to answer an information filed in the Police Court of Washington, that court being authorized by act of Congress to try without juries, which act the court held unconstitutional.

[1] See Alexander, ex parte, 1 Low. 53; Clark, ex parte, 2 Ben. 240; U. S. *v.* Haskin, 3 Sawyer, 262; 3 Dillon, 116; 1 Woolworth, 422, cited 17 West. L. Jur. 210.

[2] Conk. Tr., 4th ed. 582; Buell, in re, 3 Dill. 116; U. S. *v.* Volz, 14 Blatch. 15; U. S. *v.* Haskins, 3 Sawy. 262; Doig, in re, 4 Fed. Rep. 193; Brawner, in re, 7 Fed. Rep. 86; James, in re, 18 Ibid. 854.

[3] Ex parte Holmes, 12 Vt. 631; People *v.* Curtis, 50 N. Y. 321; and see Holmes *v.* Jennison, 14 Pet. 540; Read *v.* Bertrand, 4 Wash. C. C. 556.

That the clause in the Constitution securing grand juries and "due process of law" in criminal cases does not apply to offences against foreign States, for which extradition is claimed, see 4 Op. Atty.-Gen. 201; Giacomo's case, 12 Blatch. 391.

In Metzger's case, 1 Barb. 248, it was held by Judge Edmonds, on *habeas corpus*, that the French treaty of 1843 was not self-executing, and did not, therefore, without legislation, authorize arrest and extradition. See, however, S. C., 1 Edm. Sel. Ca. 399. This was followed by the act of Congress directing the process of extradition. See Spear on Extradition, 2d ed. 59.

[4] Whart. Confl. of L. § 835; Whart. Dig. Int. Law, § 268, and authorities there cited; Rauscher *v.* U. S., 119 U. S. 407. In the same work the treaties are given.

[5] Infra, § 47.

of nations within the discretion of the executive to surrender a fugitive from another land when there is reasonable proof showing such fugitive to be guilty of any offence regarded *jure gentium* as a gross crime.[1] This jurisdiction was assumed by the President of the United States, in 1864, though without the opportunity of judicial revision.[2] But the weight of authority is against such a course.[3]

[1] Washburn, in re, 4 Johns. Ch. R. 106.

[2] Argnelles' case, Whart. Confl. of L. §§ 835 *et seq.* Whart. Dig. Int. Law, § 268.

[3] See Clarke's Extradition, 2d ed.; Spear on Extradition, 1 *et seq.*; Letters from W. B. Lawrence in 15 Alb. L. J. 44; 16 Alb. L. J. 365; 19 Alb. L. J. 329; Article by Mr. Lawrence in Revue de Droit Inter. x. 285; Letter of Mancini in Lond. Law Mag. Feb. 1882. In Stupp's case, in 1873, the United States refused to surrender to Belgium on the ground of want of treaty stipulation. Infra, § 46. As coinciding with this conclusion, see U. S. *v.* Davis, 2 Sumn. 482; Dos Santo's case, 2 Brock. 493; British Privateers, 1 Wood. & M. 66; Adrian *v.* Lagrave, 59 N. Y. 110; State *v.* Hawes, 13 Bush. 697; 14 Cox C. C. 135. Mr. Jefferson in his correspondence with Mr. Genet, in 1793 (Am. St. Papers, I. 175) denied the right aside from treaty; and he took the same position in his letter to the President of Nov. 7, 1791. To the same effect is the opinion of Atty.-Gen. Lee, in 1797 (1 Op. Atty.-Gen. 68), of Atty.-Gen. Wirt (Ibid. 509), and of Atty.-Gen. Taney (2 Ibid. 559), and of Atty.-Gen. Legaré (3 Ibid. 661), and of Atty.-Gen. Cushing (6 Ibid. 431).

In England, by the third section of the extradition act, a fugitive criminal is not to be surrendered to a foreign State unless provision is made by the law of that State, or by arrangement, that the fugitive criminal shall not, until he has been restored or had an opportunity of returning to the Queen's dominions, be detained or tried in that foreign State for any offence committed prior to his surrender other than the extradition crime proved by the facts on which the surrender is grounded. A clause embodying this principle is contained in the English extradition treaties concluded since 1870 with Germany, Belgium, Austria, Italy, Denmark, Brazil, Switzerland, Honduras, and Hayti. The treaty of 1842 with the United States contains no such restriction. As to extradition treaty between Switzerland and Great Britain, see R. *v.* Wilson, L. R. 3 Q. B. D. 42.

For report of the Royal Commission on Extradition, in 1878, reviewing the position, see a comprehensive review by Mr. Lawrence, 19 Alb. L. J. 329. For English practice see Terraz' case, L. R. 4 Ex. D. 63; 14 Cox C. C. 153.

Compare discussion in 11 Revue de Droit Int. (1879) 88; Ducrocq. Théorie de l'Extradition; Faustin Hélie, t. 1, § 964.

For notice of decision of Mexican Supreme Court, sustaining extradition from Mexico to the United States, see 18 Alb. L. J. 141.

The diplomatic authorities on this topic are given in Whart. Dig. Int. Law, § 268.

§ 39. Even supposing that extradition is to be granted, irrespective of treaty, it only lies for offences *jure gentium*, and which are therefore punishable alike in the country granting the arrest[1] and that making the requisition.[2] The extradition treaties executed by the United States contain generally the provision that the surrender "shall only be done upon such evidence of criminality as, according to the laws of the place where the fugitive or person so charged shall be found, would justify his apprehension and commitment for trial, if the crime or offence had been there committed."[3] Under this provision it has been held that it is sufficient if the offence charged be a crime in the asylum State at the time of its commission, though it was not so at the time of the execution of the treaty.[4] The offence must also be indictable as such in the demanding State; and if the facts do not show such an offence, within the treaty, the defendant will be discharged in the asylum State on *habeas corpus*.[5]

Offence must be one recognized by asylum State.

§ 40. An extradition treaty, it has been held, covers cases of crimes committed before its adoption, so that under it process may issue to arrest fugitives charged with such crimes.[6]

Treaties are retrospective.

§ 41. The sole object of extradition being to secure the due and effective administration of justice, a surrender cannot be rightfully made, apart from treaty obligation, to a State in which a fair trial cannot be had; nor will treaties in this respect be executed when the demanding State proposes to subject the fugitive to an oppressive trial not within the contemplation of the parties at the time of the adoption of the treaty.[7]

Extradition refused when there can be no fair trial.

A surrender will also be refused when the effect is to expose

[1] Tully, in re, 20 Fed. Rep. 812; 22 Blatch, 213.

[2] Whart. Confl. of L. § 836. See Bar, § 149; Berner, p. 188. Sir R. Phillimore speaks positively to this effect. Int. Law, i. 413.

[3] Whart. Confl. of L. § 835 *et seq.*

[4] Müller's case, 5 Phil. Rep. 289; 10 Opin. Atty.-Gen. 501.

[5] See infra, § 47; for cases of discharge because the facts did not constitute forgery, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 667.

[6] Whart. Dig. Int. Law, § 282; Giacomo, *alias* Ciccariello, in re, 12 Blatch. C. C. 391; Müller's case, *ut sup.*

A contrary view is taken by Bar, an eminent German jurist, in an article in the Revue de Droit International for 1877.

[7] Whart. Confl. of L. 838.

the fugitive to a barbarous punishment, or one revolting to a civilized jurisprudence.[1] And the surrendering sovereign may impose conditions as to the way in which the surrendered fugitive is to be tried.[2]

And so for political offences.

§ 42. Notwithstanding the authority of Grotius,[3] there is a general consent of modern jurists to the effect that between independent sovereignties there should be no extradition for political offences.[4]

It is important, however, to remember that there may be cases nominally political, which, nevertheless, are essentially distinguishable from those in which the gist of the offence is opposition to government, and as to which extradition is to be refused.

And so for persons escaping from military service.

§ 43. "The delivering up by one State," says Mr. Wheaton,[5] "of deserters from the military or naval service of another, also depends entirely upon mutual comity, or upon special compact between different nations;" but so far as concerns the extension of such surrender to any cases not provided for by convention, this may now be viewed as too broad a statement of the law. With regard to the extradition of the persons flying from threatened conscription, it is now conceded that no surrender should be made by the State of refuge.[6] So far as concerns deserters, no doubt cartel conventions for mutual extradition may, in some cases, be effective. But without such conventions, such surrenders are not now made; and under any circumstances there should be satisfactory proof that the deserter demanded

[1] Whart. Confl. of L. § 838. See Dana's case, 7 Ben. 1, cited supra, § 37 *b*.

[2] Ibid.

[3] II. c. 21, §§ 4–6.

[4] Whart. Dig. Int. Law, § 272; Lawrence's Wheaton, 245, note; Woolsey, § 79; Lewis, p. 44; Phil. i. 407; Heffter, § 63; Fœlix, ii. No. 609; Mohl, p. 705; Marquardsen, p. 48; Bar, § 150; Geyer, in Holtzendorff's Ency. Leipzig, 1870, p. 540; Kluit, p. 85, cited Whart. Confl. of L. § 948.

In the extradition treaties negotiated by the United States political offences are either implicitly excluded, by non-specification among those for which extradition will be granted, or are excepted in express terms. Nor can an independent extraditionable offence be used as a mask to cover a reserved political prosecution. No government, independent of treaty provisions, should surrender a fugitive without a guarantee that he is to be tried only for the offence specified in the demand. Infra, § 49.

[5] Lawrence's Wheaton, p. 237.

[6] Rotteck, in Staatslex. ii. p. 40; Mohl, die Völkerrechtliche Lehre vom Asyl. cited Whart. Confl. of L. § 951.

was not led to enlist by wrong means, and will not be subjected, on his return, to a barbarous punishment. In the United States, conventions of this kind are rare.[1]

§ 44. The practice in the United States and in England has been not to refuse the extradition of a subject when demanded by the sovereign of a foreign State, for a crime committed in such State.[2] It is otherwise in Germany;[3] and an exception to this effect exists in our treaties with Prussia and the North German States, with Bavaria, with Baden, with Norway and Sweden, with Mexico, and with Hayti. No such exception appears in the treaties with Great Britain, France, Hawaiian Islands, Italy, Nicaragua, or with the Dominican Republic. The true rule is, that wherever, by the jurisprudence of a particular country, it is capable of trying one of its subjects for an offence alleged to have been committed by such subject abroad, the extradition in such case may be refused; the asylum State then having the right of trying its own subject by its own laws. When, however, it does not assume jurisdiction of extra-territorial crimes committed by such subject, then extradition should be granted.

But not because the person demanded is a subject of the asylum State.

§ 45. Supposing that the State in which the defendant has sought an asylum has, with the prosecuting State, admiralty jurisdiction of the offence, as where the offence was committed on the high seas, ought a surrender to be made? For several reasons, to pursue the argument of the last section, it should not.[4] In the first place, by refusing to surrender, a needless circuity of process involving great cost is arrested. In the second place, a defendant's personal rights would be needlessly imperilled by his forcible removal to a foreign

Where asylum State has jurisdiction there should be no surrender.

[1] Dana's Wheaton, § 121, note 79.

[2] Whart. Dig. Int. Law, § 273. See Robbins's case, Wharton's St. Tr. 392; Bee, 266; Jour. Jur. 13; R. v. Ganz, 9 Q. B. D. 93; Kingsbury's case, 106 Mass. 223.

This subject is discussed by the commission on extradition, appointed by the British government in 1877, which concludes as follows:—

"On the whole, the commission unanimously were of opinion that it is inexpedient that the State should make any distinction in this respect between its own subjects and foreigners; and stipulations to the contrary should be omitted from all treaties." Central Law Journal, 1878, 40; 19 Alb. L. J. 329.

[3] Dana's Wheaton, § 120, note; Lawrence's Wheaton, p. 237, note.

[4] See Whart. Dig. Int. Law, § 271.

forum. And again, if a surrender could be made in one case of admiralty jurisdiction, it could be made in another; and if the rule be admitted at all, there would be few admiralty prosecutions that might not, at executive discretion, be removed to a foreign land under a foreign law. Even, therefore, should a surrender of such a party, in a case of admiralty jurisdiction, be granted, a court under the English common law, on a writ of *habeas corpus*, would direct his discharge.[1]

Conflict of opinion as to whether a foreign State can claim a subject who has committed a crime in a third State.

§ 46. A cognate question arises when the offence was committed by a subject of the demanding State in the territory of an independent foreign State. The only admissible interpretation, it has been argued, of the term "jurisdiction," is to treat it as convertible with country, so as to make it necessary for the offence, in order to sustain a requisition, to have been committed within the territory of the demanding State. Such is the view, as has been noticed, of Sir R. Phillimore, and so, also, was it held in England in 1858, by the eminent law officers of the crown, when consulted by the government as to whether the American government could be asked to surrender to England a British subject who had been guilty of homicide in France.[2] In 1873 the question arose in New York whether Prussia could demand the extradition of a prisoner for alleged crimes committed out of the territory of Prussia, but punishable by its laws. The prisoner was remanded by Judge Blatchford to the custody of the marshal, after an opinion by that learned judge in which it was elaborately argued that the term

[1] As sustaining this view, see R. *v.* Tivnan, 5 B. & S. 645; S. C., under name of "Turnan," 12 W. R. 848. On the other hand, in Sheazle, in re, 1 Wood. & Min. 66, it was held that the extradition treaty with England required the surrender by the U. S. of a British subject who committed, on a British ship, on the high seas, piracy which was such by act of parliament, but not by the law of nations. Compare Bennett, in re, 11 Law T. R. 488.

In R. *v.* Nillins, 53 Law Journ. 157 (1858), it was held that extradition would be sustained in a case where the defendant, when in England, sent letters containing false pretences to Hamburg, and then went to Hamburg, where the money was obtained. See, also, R. *v.* Jacobs, 46 L. T. 595.

It is stated by Sir R. Phillimore, that "the country demanding the criminal must be the country in which the crime is committed." 1 Phil. Int. Law, 413.

[2] Allsop's case, cited by Atty.-Gen. Williams, 14 Opin. Atty-Gen. 281; 11 Blatch. 129; given more fully infra. See, also, Whart. Dig. Int. Law, § 271.

"jurisdiction" in the treaty covers cases such as that before the court.[1] When, however, the question of issuing a warrant of surrender came before the Secretary of State, he called upon Attorney-General Williams for an opinion on the question as to whether the surrender could be lawfully made. The question was answered in the negative by the attorney-general, on the ground that, so far as concerns the extradition treaties, "jurisdiction" by the demanding State cannot be held to exist over the territory of an independent civilized State.[2] Restricting the opinion of the attorney-general to this narrow statement, it may be accepted as a suitable rule for the guidance of the federal executive in the delicate question of determining to which of two foreign civilized States a fugitive, in case of conflict, is to be surrendered.[3] But so far as concerns the meaning of the term "jurisdiction" the reasoning of Judge Blatchford is unanswerable. "Jurisdiction" cannot, in our international dealings with other States, be restricted to "territory," without abandonment, not only of our right to punish for offences on the high seas, and in barbarous lands, but of that authority over American citizens in foreign lands which we have uniformly claimed,[4] and which our imperial position as one of the leading powers of Christendom demands.[5]

[1] Stupp, in re, 11 Blatch. 124.

[2] This is the only point necessarily involved, and it is just to the attorney-general to limit his argument to this point, though some expressions used by him have a wider scope.

[3] From the opinion we take the following :—

"Thomas Allsop, a British subject, was charged as an accessory before the facts to the murder of a Frenchman in Paris, in 1858, and escaped to the United States, and as he was punishable therefore by the laws of Great Britain, the question as to whether he could be demanded by Great Britain of the American government, under the extradition treaty of 1842, was submitted to Sir J. D. Harding, the queen's advocate, the attorney and solicitor general, Sir Fitzroy Kelly, since chief baron of the exchequer, and Sir Hugh Cairns, since lord chancellor, and they recorded their judgment as follows :—

"'We are of the opinion that Allsop is not a person charged with the crime of murder committed within the jurisdiction of the British crown, within the meaning of the treaty of 1842, and that his extradition cannot properly be demanded of the United States under that treaty.' Forsyth's case, p. 268." 11 Blatch. 128.

See, also, opinion of Atty.-Gen. Cushing, 8 Opin. Atty.-Gen. 215.

[4] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 273 *et seq.*

[5] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 273 *et seq.*

§ 47. We have already noticed that, as a rule, there can be no extradition without treaty.[1] Where a treaty exists making certain offences the subject of extradition, this must be regarded as declaring that only such offences shall be the subject of extradition between the countries in question, and that consequently extradition is not to be granted for other offences.[2] Thus in Vogt's case, which has been just discussed, the attorney-general, after arguing that the case was not within the treaty with Prussia, properly held that if the claim was not within that treaty, it could not be based generally on the law of nations.[3]

Extradition does not lie for a case not included in a treaty.

Whether there can be extradition under a treaty without legislation has been much discussed. That there can be is plain when the treaty is not conditioned on future legislation.[4]

§ 48. Where the defendant is already in custody, or under recognizances for trial in the State on which the requisition is made, the requisition will be refused, at least until the defendant's discharge.[5]

Nor where the defendant is in custody for another offence.

§ 49. Whether, when a fugitive is demanded to meet a particular offence, included in the treaty under which the proceed-

[1] Supra, § 38. Whart. Dig. Int. Law, § 270.

[2] See Windsor's case, 34 L. J. M. C. 163; 13 W. R. 655; 12 L. T. N. S. 307; Letter of Mr. Bancroft Davis of July 28, 1873, to the Belgian ministry; 10 Cox C. C. 118; 6 B. & S. 552; discussed Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed., § 667; Counhaye, ex parte, L. R. 8 Q. B. 410. See, also, Hall, in re, 8 Ontario App. 31; Eno's case, 30 Alb. L. J. 144, where the restricted sense given by the Canada court to forgery is ably criticised. Cf. Tully, in re, 20 Fed. Rep. 812; 22 Blatch. 213.

[3] On this point the attorney-general said: "Able writers have contended that there was a reciprocal obligation upon nations to surrender fugitives from justice; though now it seems to be generally agreed that this is altogether a matter of courtesy. But it is to be presumed where there are treaties upon the subject that fugitives are to be surrendered only in cases and upon the terms specified in such treaties." Vogt, in re. See supra, § 46, for the other questions arising in this case.

[4] Robbins's case, Whart. St. Tr. 392; Bee's R. 266. This ruling was defended by Judge Marshall, when in the House of Representatives, on reasoning which Mr. Gallatin thought unassailable. Adams's Gallatin, 231–2. See *contra*, Spear on Extrad. 53. But so far as concerns Judge Bee's decision to deliver Robbins to the British consul, this is not sustained by Judge Marshall's argument, which denies this right to the judiciary and asserts it for the president.

[5] Whart. Confl. of L. § 845. Supra, § 33. See Miller, in re, 23 Fed. Rep. 32.

ings take place, he can be tried for another offence, has been the subject of much discussion.[1] It was held by Mr. Fish, when secretary of state, that the government of the United States could give no stipulation to that of Great Britain that a party extradited to the United States under the treaty then in force, would not be tried for any offence other than that for which he was extradited; and it was further maintained by him "that the treaty and the practice between the two countries would allow the prosecution for an offence distinct from that for which he (the fugitive) was surrendered." In December, 1886, the question came before the Supreme Court of the United States on a certificate of division from the Circuit Court of New York on a motion to arrest judgment on a conviction for inflicting cruel and unusual punishment of a sailor, this not being an extraditable defence, the offence for which the defendant was extradited being murder. It was held by the Supreme Court of the United States that the defendant could be tried, under the proceedings, for no other offence than murder, Waite, C. J., dissenting.[2] This ruling, therefore, decides that a party brought into the United States by extradition cannot be convicted of any other crime than that for which he was extradited. This view is sustained by high independent authorities; and is right as a principle of international law. It is an abuse of this high process and an infringement of those rights of asylum which the law of nations rightly sanctions, to permit the charge of an offence for which extradition lies to be used to cover an offence for which extradition does not lie, or which it is not considered politic to introduce in the demand.[3] At the same time when the defendant is brought over on an extraditable offence which contains another extraditable offence (*e. g.*, as murder contains manslaughter), there is no reason why the defendant, the proof failing of the higher crime, should not be convicted of the lower, both being extraditable.[4] But mere irregularities

[1] See Whart. Dig. Int. Law, § 270.

[2] U. S. *v.* Rauscher, 119 U. S. 407.

[3] See Bouvier, ex parte, 12 Cox C. C. 303; 27 L. T. R. 844.

[4] See article by W. B. Lawrence, 14 Alb. L. J. 96; 19 Ibid. 329; Lord Cairns, quoted U. S. For. Rel. 1876, 286, 296; Spear on Extrad. chap. vi.; Lowell, J., in 10 Am. Law J., 617, 620; U. S. *v.* Watts, 8 Sawyer, 370; 14 Fed. Rep. 130; Hibbs, ex parte, 26 Fed. Rep. 421, 431; Com. *v.* Hawes, 13 Bush, 697; State *v.* Vanderpool, 39 Ohio St. 273; Cannon, in re, 47 Mich. 487; Blandford *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 627; London Law Mag. for 1875,

in the extradition process will not be ground of defence in the trial court.[1]

Courts may hear case before mandate.

§ 50. In several treaties it is provided that *after* a requisition made on the President, he may issue a mandate, so that the fugitive may be subjected to judicial examination.[2] But the present practice is that, unless required by treaty or law, an executive mandate is not a condition precedent of a judicial examination.[3]

Complaint and warrant should be special.

§ 51. *The complaint* should set forth the substantial and material features of the offence, though it need not aver personal knowledge on the part of the affiant.[4] It will be sufficient if it plainly set forth an offence under the treaty.[5]

139; Renault, Étude sur l'Extradition; Field's Int. Code, § 237; Clarke on Extrad. 38. See, however, *contra*, Caldwell's case, 8 Blatch. 131; U. S. *v.* Lawrence, 13 Blatch. 295; Adriance *v.* Lagrave, 59 N. Y. 110; Miller, in re, 6 Crim. Law Mag. 511; 9 Rep. 514; Paxton's case, 10 Low. Can. Rep. 212; Von Aernam's case, 11 Ibid. 352; Up. Can. Rep. 4 C. P. 288; House Ex. Doc. 173, 44th Cong. 1st sess. In Ker *v.* People, 110 Ill. 627, aff. Ker *v.* Illinois, 119 U. S. 436, it was held that the principle in the text does not apply where the fugitive was kidnapped and not extradited from the foreign country.

[1] Kelly *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 158.

[2] See 6 Opin. Atty.-Gen. 91; Henrich, in re, 5 Blatch. 425; Farez' case, 7 Blatch. 34; Castro *v.* De Uriarte, 16 Fed. Rep. 93.

[3] Thomas, in re, 12 Blatch. 370; Ross, ex parte, 2 Bond, 252; Herres, in re, 33 Fed. Rep. 165; Calder's case, 6 Opin. Atty.-Gen. 91; and see remarks of Lowell, J., in Kelley's case, 2 Lowell, 339; Dugan, in re, 2 Low. 367; Castro *v.* De Uriarte, 16 Fed. Rep. 93; Spear on Extrad. 211. See Macdonnell, in re, 11 Blatch. 72. As to English practice see R. *v.* Weil, L. R. 9 Q. B. D. 701; 4 Crim. Law Mag. 49.

In Kaine, in re, 14 How. 103, this question came up before the Supreme Court of the United States, and it was held by Catron, Wayne, McLean and Grier, JJ., that the mandate is not a prerequisite to the arrest; Taney, C. J., and Nelson and Daniel, JJ., dissenting, and Curtis, J., giving no opinion. The point, however, was not decided, the case going off on a question of jurisdiction. That the mandate is essential was held by Judge Nelson, in Kaine, ex parte, 3 Blatch. 1; Judge Shipman in Henrich, in re, 5 Blatch. 414, and by Judge Nelson (of the District Court of Minnesota), in Van Hoven, ex parte, 4 Dill. 411.

[4] Farez' case, 2 Abbott, U. S. 346; 7 Blatch. 34. See Macdonnell, in re, 11 Blatch. 79; Whart. Dig. Int. Law, § 276 *a*. As to English practice see Tiot, in re, 46 L. J. N. S. 120.

The complaint "need not be drawn with the formal precision and nicety of an indictment for final trial, but should set forth the substantial and material features of the offence." Henrich, in re, 5 Blatch. 414. But the offence must be substantially stated. Van Hoven, in re, 4 Dill. 411. Nor need the complaint aver prior criminal proceedings against the defendant. Dane, ex parte, 6 Fed. Rep. 34.

[5] Roth, in re, 15 Fed. Rep. 506.

Any person authorized by the demandant government may appear and file complaint.[1] Whether the party making the complaint was authorized is for the commissioner,[2] but such authority must appear to the satisfaction of the commissioner.[3] The warrant must recite the title of the commissioners,[4] and specify the crime,[5] though it is said that this specification need only be in the terms of the treaty.[6]

Warrant may be returnable to commissioner.

§ 52. *The warrant of arrest may be returnable* before the judge issuing it, or before a commissioner previously designated under the act of Congress, by the Circuit Court for that purpose.[7]

Evidence should be duly authenticated.

§ 53. Documentary evidence from abroad "should be accompanied by a certificate of the principal diplomatic or consular officer of the United States resident in the foreign country from which the fugitive shall have escaped, stating clearly that it is properly and legally authenticated, so as to entitle it to be received in evidence in support of the same criminal charge by the tribunals of such foreign country."[8] But in default of such proof, authentication can be made by an expert.[9]

[1] Kelly, in re, 26 Fed. Rep. 852.

[2] Kelly, in re, 26 Fed. Rep. 852.

[3] Ferrelle, in re, 28 Fed. Rep. 878.

[4] Kelly, in re, 25 Fed. Rep. 268.

[5] Hibbs, ex parte, 26 Fed. Rep. 421.

[6] Castro *v.* De Uriarte, 16 Fed. Rep. 93.

[7] Kaine, in re, 14 Howard, 142; though see Farez' case, 2 Abbott U. S. 346; 7 Blatch. U. S. 34. Cf. Macdonnell, in re, 11 Blatch. 79. As to duty of judge in issuing warrant, see Kelley, in re, 2 Low. 339; Dugan, in re, 2 Low. 367. That a warrant to all marshals and deputies can be executed in Wisconsin by a deputy marshal of the southern district of New York, see In re Henrich, 5 Blatch. 414. See, also, Whart. Dig. Int. Law, § 276*a*. In 6 Eng. R. 138, will be found a copy of papers carefully prepared by Mr. Moak to procure the extradition of a fugitive from Canada.

[8] U. S. Rev. Stat. § 5271; Kaine, in re; Farez' case, *ut supra;* and 10 Opin. of Atty.-Gen. 501. See Bahrendt, in re, 22 Fed. Rep. 699. As to English practice see Counhaye, ex parte, L. R. 8 Q. B. 410; Terraz' case, 14 Cox C. C. 161; L. R. 4 Ex. D. 63. The nature of the requisite documentary evidence is considered in Fowler, in re, 18 Blatch. C. C. 430; 4 Fed. Rep. 303; and see Charleston, in re, 34 Fed. Rep. 531; McPhun, in re, 30 Fed. Rep. 57; Herris, in re, 32 Fed. Rep. 583.

Authentication by a vice-consul temporarily in charge is enough. Herres, in re, 33 Fed. Rep. 165.

[9] Benson, in re, 34 Fed. Rep. 649; citing Fowler, in re, 18 Blatch. 437; 4 Fed. Rep. 303; see R. *v.* Ganz, 9 Q. B. D. 93; Whart. Dig. Int. Law, § 277. See, also, Kelly, in re, 26 Fed. Rep. 852.

The commissioner should keep a record of the oral evidence, with the objections made to it or to the documentary evidence, briefly stating the grounds of such objections.

The parties seeking the extradition should be required by the commissioner to furnish an accurate translation of every foreign document, such translation to be verified by affidavit.[1] According to the practice under the United States statute, depositions, on a hearing for extradition, are to be allowed the same weight as if the witness were present at the hearing.[2]

Terms to be construed as in asylum State.

§ 54. When in a treaty a particular crime is specified, this crime must be construed in the general sense in which it is used in the asylum country. Thus, it was held by the English Queen's Bench in 1866, that the term fraudulent bankruptcy, in the French treaty, would be construed according to the rules applicable to fraudulent bankruptcy in England.[3] The same court ruled in 1865 that "forgery," in the treaty with the United States, would not be construed to include embezzlement.[4] And it is admissible for the defence to show that the case is not one included in the treaty.[5] At the same time, if the offence is not one which in the demanding State would be held to be within the treaty, surrender may be refused.[6]

Evidence must show probable cause.

§ 55. The process of extradition being a process of arrest for the purposes of trial, and not a process of trial, the prevalent opinion is that it is enough in order to justify a giving up for trial, that the evidence should show a probable case of guilt.[7]

[1] Henrich, in re, 5 Blatch. 425. See as to translation of foreign terms, Piot, ex parte, 48 L. T. (N. S.) 120.

[2] Farez' case, 7 Blatch. 491; 2 Abb. U. S. 346; see Wadge, in re, 16 Fed. Rep. 332; 21 Blatch. 300.

[3] Widermann's case, 12 Jurist N. S. 536; Clark on Extrad. 87; Whart. Confl. of L. § 972. In Terraz, ex parte, L. R. 4 Ex. D. 63; 14 Cox C. C. 161, the rule as to bankruptcy offences is further discussed.

[4] Windsor's case, 34 L. J. M. C. 163; 13 W. R. 655; 10 Cox, 118; 6 B. & S. 552; supra, § 47.

[5] Supra, § 47.

[6] This was the position taken in Phipp's case, Ontario Q. B. 865; 8 Ontario App. 77; 4 Crim. Law Mag. 685. The court, however, heard the testimony of experts to prove that the offence was forgery in Pennsylvania, the *locus delicti*, and decided accordingly.

[7] Farez, in re, Reggel, ex parte, 114 U. S. 642; 2 Abbot U. S. 351; 7 Blatch. 388, citing 1 Burr's Trial, 11; see infra, § 73. That after discharge for insufficient evidence defendant may be rearrested without a second mandate, see Kelly, in re, 26 Fed. Rep. 852; Whart. Dig.

§ 56. The practice both of England and of the United States, is for the asylum State, through its proper tribunals, to hear evidence for the defence.[1] Where the local laws allow it, he is entitled to be personally examined.[2] If on the whole case, there is probable cause that the defendant was guilty of an offence under the provisions of a treaty, he should be surrendered.[3] Such appears to be the rule in England, under the Extradition Act of 1870.[4]

Evidence may be heard from defence.

§ 57. The Circuit Court has power to review the decision of the commissioner on questions of law, but not of fact;[5] and the court will not reverse the commis-

Circuit Court has power of review.

Int. Law, § 277. See also same case before Judge Woodruff, 7 Blatch. 491; where the requisite evidence is spoken of as *prima facie;* and see infra, § 71; Herres, in re, 33 Fed. Rep. 165.

[1] Macdonnell, in re, 11 Blatch. 79; but see Wadge, in re, 15 Fed. Rep. 864; aff. 16 Fed. Rep. 332; 21 Blatch. 300; where it was said that a continuance would not be granted to enable the defendant to produce depositions; and also as denying the defendant's right to a hearing, see Dugan, in re, 2 Low. 367. In Catlow, in re, 16 Op. 642 (1879), it was held that evidence of the defendant's insanity was admissible. See, also, Woodhall's case, 20 Q. B. D. 883.

[2] Farez' case, 2 Abb. U. S. 346; 7 Blatch. 345; see *contra*, Dugan, in re, 2 Low. 367.

[3] Dugan, in re, 2 Low. 367. The accused is not entitled, under the treaty with England, to be confronted with the adverse witnesses. Ibid.; Whart. Dig. Int. Law, § 278.

[4] 1 Phil. Int. Law, ed. 1871, App. ix. 39; Law Jour. 1870, N. S. Stat. 786; see however, *contra*, Clarke on Extrad. 188; London Law Times, July 23, 1881, p. 206; Whart. Dig. Int. Law, § 277.

[5] In Kaine's case, 3 Blatch. 1; Henrich's case, 5 Blatchf. C. C. 414; Nelson, J., and Shipman, J., overruled Veremaitre's case, 9 N. Y. Leg. Obs. 137, where Judge Judson held that he had no power to revise the judgment of the commissioner on questions of fact; see Heilbronn's case, 12 N. Y. Leg. Obs. 65; and Van Aernam's case, 3 Blatch. C. C. 160, where the latter view was expressed by Judge Betts. Cf. Kelly, in re, 26 Fed. Rep. 852.

On the other hand, in Stupp's case, 12 Blatch. 501, Judge Blatchford held that there could be no reviewal on the *effect* of the evidence when legally admitted. This is affirmed in Vandervelpen's case, 14 Blatch. 137. In Wiegand's case, 14 Blatch. 370, Blatchford, J., said: "In a case of extradition before a commissioner, when he has before him documentary evidence from abroad, properly authenticated under the act of Congress, and such is made evidence by such act, it is the judicial duty of the commissioner to judge of the effect of such evidence, and neither the duty nor the power to review his action thereon is imposed on any judicial officer. This province of the commissioner extended to a determination as to whether the embezzlement was

sioner's action upon trifling grounds or matters of form; and only for substantial error in law, or for such manifest error in procedure as would warrant a court of appeals in reversing.[1] And as was subsequently ruled, it is not enough to charge a conclusion at law, *e. g.*, "forgery." The time and place, and nature of the crime, and it ssubject-matter, should be set out.[2] Nor will the court discharge absolutely on account of an error of the commissioner in admission or rejection of evidence.[3] The practice is, in such case, simply to discharge from the first commitment, leaving the examination to proceed anew.[4]

The practice as to *habeas corpus* in other relations is hereafter discussed.[5]

3. *Final Surrender by Executive.*[6]

Surrender at discretion of executive.

§ 58. Yet, even after the final commitment by the commissioner, and the remanding, in case of a *habeas corpus* before the Circuit Court, of the prisoner to the custody of the marshal, the final warrant of the executive must be obtained before the prisoner is surrendered to the custody of the demanding State. This warrant the executive may refuse to issue, on grounds of law as well as of policy.[7] Such was the course taken by the President in 1873, in Vogt's case.[8] In England, the surrender, after remander on *habeas corpus*, may be made without such final executive warrant.[9]

a continuing embezzlement." See decisions reviewed by Judge Woodruff, in Macdonnell, in re, 11 Blatch. 79. In R. *v.* Maurer, L. R. 10 Q. B. D. 513, it was held that the High Court would not review, in conflicting questions of fact, the ruling of the committing magistrate.

[1] Henrich, in re, 5 Blatch. C. C. 425.

[2] Farez' case, 7 Blatch. 35.

[3] Macdonnell, in re, 11 Blatch. 79. In Fowler, in re, 18 Blatch. 430, it was held that when the commissioner had before him legal and competent evidence relevant to the issue, the circuit court will not on *habeas corpus* review his decision.

[4] Supra, § 55. Farez' case, *ut supra*. See as to *habeas corpus*, Whart. Dig. Int. Law, § 279; Kaine, ex parte, 14 How. 103; 1 Robins. Pr. 430.

[5] Infra, § 993.

[6] See Whart. Dig. Int. Law, § 280.

[7] Stupp, in re, 12 Blatch. 501; 14 Opin. Atty.-Gen. 281.

[8] Supra, § 46; see more fully Whart. Dig. Int. Law, § 280.

[9] A statement of the English practice is given by the London Times of Feb. 17, 1873, and see Terraz' case, 14 Cox C. C. 161.

VI. PRIVILEGE FROM ARREST.

§ 59. The privilege from arrest belonging to certain officers of our own government, in civil proceedings, does not extend to criminal prosecutions.[1] Foreign ministers and their families are, however, privileged from even criminal arrest.[2] But this privilege does not extend to consuls.[3]

Foreign ministers privileged from arrest.

VII. RIGHT TO TAKE MONEY FROM THE PERSON OF THE DEFENDANT.

§ 60. Those arresting a defendant are bound to take from his person any articles which may be of use as proof in the trial of the offence with which the defendant is charged. These articles are properly to be deposited with the committing magistrate, to be retained by him with the other evidence in the case, until the time comes for their return to the prosecuting authorities of the State. Sometimes, however, they are by local usage given at once to the prosecuting authorities. However this may be, they should be carefully preserved for the purpose of the trial; and after its close returned to the person whose property they lawfully are.

Proofs of crime may be taken from person.

§ 61. The right of the arresting officer to remove money from the defendant's person is limited to those cases in which the money is connected with the offence with which the defendant is charged. Any wider license would not only be a violation of his personal rights, but would impair his means for preparing for his defence.[4] When money is taken in violation of this rule, the court will order its restoration to the defendant.[5] That where property is identified as stolen, or is in any way valuable as proof, it may be sequestrated, is nevertheless plain.[6]

But not money unless connected with offence.

[1] See U. S. *v.* Kirby, 7 Wall. 482; Penny *v.* Walker, 64 Mo. 430.

[2] Comte de Garden, Traité complet de diplomatie; Holtzend. Encycl. i. 798; Cabrera, ex parte, 1 Wash. C. C. 232; U. S. *v.* Benner, Bald. 234; U. S. *v.* Lafontaine, 4 Cranch, 173.

[3] U. S. *v.* Ravara, 3 Dall. 299, note.

[4] R. *v.* McKay, 3 Cr. & Dix, 205; R. *v.* O'Donnell, 7 C. & P. 138; R. *v.* Kinsey, 7 C. & P. 447; R. *v.* Jones, 6 C. & P. 343; R. *v.* Burgiss, 7 C. & P. 488; R. *v.* Frost, 9 C. & P. 129.

[5] R. *v.* Bass, 2 C. & K. 822; R. *v.* Coxon, 7 C. & P. 651.

[6] See Houghton *v.* Bachman, 47 Barb. 388.

VIII. RIGHT OF BAIL TO ARREST PRINCIPAL.

Bail may arrest and surrender principal.

§ 62. The bail has the right, at his own discretion, to arrest his principal, and to deliver him to the custody of the magistrate before whom the bail was entered, or to the court to whom the case is returned.[1] It is sometimes the practice for the bail, when he desires to so arrest, to apply to the magistrate, or to any other justice, for a warrant; but the right to arrest exists without such a warrant. The principal is supposed to be in the bail's constant custody, and the former being the latter's jailer, may at any time surrender him to the custody of the law.[2]

[1] Harp *v.* Osgood, 2 Hill N. Y. 216; State *v.* Lazarre, 12 La. An. 166; State *v.* Le Cerf, 1 Bailey, 410; Com. *v.* Bronson, 14 B. Monr. 361. See Milburn, ex parte, 9 Pet. 704. The practice is the same in the Roman law. L. 4. D. de custodia reor. Feuerbach's Pein. Recht, § 533.

"When bail is given the principal is regarded as delivered to the custody of his sureties. Their dominion is a continuance of the original imprisonment. Whenever they choose to do so, they may seize him and deliver him up in their discharge; and if that cannot be done at once, they may imprison him until it can be done. They may exercise their rights in person or by agent. They may pursue him into another State; may arrest him on the Sabbath; and, if necessary, may break and enter his house for that purpose. The seizure is not made by virtue of new process. None is needed. It is likened to the rearrest by the sheriff of an escaping prisoner. 3 Blackstone's Commentaries, 290; Nicolls *v.* Ingersoll, 7 Johnson, 152; Ruggles *v.* Corry, 3 Conn. 84, 421; Respublica *v.* Gaoler, 2 Yeates, 263; 8 Pick. 140; Boardman *v.* Fowler, 1 Johns. Cas. 443; Com. *v.* Riddle, 1 Serg. & R. 311; Wheeler *v.* Wheeler, 7 Mass. 169. In 6 Modern (page 231, case 339, Anon.) it is said: 'The bail have their principal on a string, and may pull the string whenever they please, and render him in their discharge.' The rights of the bail in civil and criminal cases are the same. Harp *v.* Osgood, 2 Hill, 218. They may doubtless permit him to go beyond the limits of the State within which he is to answer, but it is unwise and imprudent to do so; and if any evil ensue, they must bear the burden of the consequences, and cannot cast them upon the obligee. Devine *v.* State, 5 Sneed, 625; U. S. *v.* Van Fossen, 1 Dillon, 410; Resp. *v.* Gaoler, 2 Yeates, 265, cited supra.

"In the case of Devine *v.* State, 5 Sneed, 625, the court, speaking of the principal, say, 'The sureties had the control of his person; they were bound at their peril to keep him within their jurisdiction, and to have his person ready to surrender when demanded. . . . . In the case before us, the failure of the sureties to surrender their principal was, in the view of the law, the result of their own negligence or connivance, in suffering their principal to go beyond the jurisdiction of the court and from under their control.' The other authorities cited are to the same effect." Swayne, J., Tailor *v.* Taintor, 16 Wall. 366.

[2] State *v.* Mahon, 3 Harring. 568.

That a bail can arrest his principal in a foreign State, to which the principal has fled, has been sometimes asserted; but there is no ground for this opinion, as the bail only represents the court from which his authority emanates, and where the court has no power to arrest the bail has no power to arrest. The proper course in such case is to apply for a warrant for extradition. But, as has been seen, the fact of the irregularity of an arrest does not entitle the prisoner, when brought to a court having jurisdiction of the crime, to a release.[1]

A party on bail on a State charge cannot be taken out of the custody of the bail by federal process for an offence against federal law.[2]

[1] See supra, § 27.

[2] James's case, 5 Crim. Law Mag. 216.

CHAPTER II.

HEARING BEFORE MAGISTRATE.

I. Commitment for further Hearing.
Waiver. Hearing may be adjourned from time to time, § 70.
II. Evidence requisite.
Practice not usually to hear witnesses for defence, § 71.
Exception in cases of identity, or of one-sidedness in prosecution's case, § 72.
Probable cause only need be shown, § 73.
III. Final Commitment and Binding Over.
At common law bail to be taken in all but capital cases, § 74.
Excessive bail not to be required, § 75.
Proper course is to require such bail as will secure attendance, § 76.
After continuance bail may be granted, § 77.
And so in cases of sickness, § 78.
Bail to keep the peace may be required, § 79.
IV. Vagrants, Disorderly Persons, and Professional Criminals.
Magistrates have power to hold vagrants, etc., to bail, § 80.
V. Bail after Habeas Corpus.
On *habeas corpus* court may adjust bail, § 81.
VI. Bail after Verdict or Quashing.
In exceptional cases bail permissible after verdict, § 82.
After quashing, bail may be required, § 83.

I. COMMITMENT FOR FURTHER HEARING.

§ 70. The delinquent having been arrested, the next step is to have the case heard before a magistrate or justice of the peace,[1] unless the hearing should be waived;[2] and this hearing should be prompt.[3] It is not essential that the hearing should take place at once. The arresting officer may, if requisite, put the person arrested in the county prison or other place of temporary confinement, until a hearing can

Waiver. Hearing may be adjourned from time to time.

[1] The statute in this respect must be strictly followed. Papineau *v.* Bacon, 110 Mass. 319. As to Virginia, in cases of felony, see Jackson *v.* Com., 23 Grat. 919; and infra, § 339. The "Preliminary Investigation of Crime" is the subject of an article in the London Law Magazine for February, 1882.

[2] As to effect of waiving defects of process, or hearing, see State *v.* Cobb, 71 Me. 198; Stuart *v.* People, 42 Mich. 255; Butler *v.* Com., 81 Va. 159; State *v.* Longton, 35 Kan. 375; People *v.* Villarino, 66 Cal. 228; McCoy *v.* State, 46 Ark. 141; State *v.* Mays, 24 S. C. 190; Gandy *v.* State, 81 Ala. 68.

[3] By § 118 of N. J. Penal Code of 1882, delay in this respect is made a misdemeanor.

be secured. But this should be with all possible dispatch; should there be any undue delay, a justice of the Supreme or of any Superior Court having jurisdiction for the purpose may, by a writ of *habeas corpus*, exact an immediate examination before himself. And the issue of such a writ, on due cause shown, is obligatory.[1] It has been also held that if the commitment be for an indefinite or unreasonable time, the warrant is virtually void, and an action for trespass lies for the imprisonment.[2] If requisite, the hearing, on due cause shown, may be adjourned from day to day.[3] But, in any view, the hearing should be prompt and continuous, and without the consent of the accused, delay should only be granted for strong reasons.[4]

II. EVIDENCE REQUISITE.

§ 71. *Must the magistrate hear the case of the defence as well as for the prosecution, so far as it may be tendered?* The English practice, as stated by Blackstone, was for the justice, "by statute 2 & 3 Ph. & M. c. 10, to take in writing the examination of such prisoner, and the information of those who bring him." This statute was repealed by 7 Geo. 4, which provides that the justices at the preliminary hearing "shall take the examination of such person, and the information upon oath of those who shall know the facts and circumstances of the case, and shall put the same, or so much thereof as shall be material, in writing," etc. In several of the United States, among which Pennsylvania may be mentioned, the statute 2 & 3 Ph. & M. has not been viewed as in force; nor has the practice of taking the prisoner's examination been generally adopted.[5]

Practice not usually to hear witnesses for defence.

§ 72. Yet it must be conceded that there are cases in which, to avoid circuity and oppression, a magistrate should hear evidence for the defence. Suppose, for instance, the prosecution calls only a part of the witnesses to the *res gestae*, and the defendant offers to call the other witnesses, could the magistrate rightfully refuse to require

Exception in cases of identity, or of one-sidedness in prosecution's case.

[1] See State *v.* Kruise, 3 Vroom, N. J. 313.

[2] Davis *v.* Capper, 10 B. & Cr. 28; Cave *v.* Mountain, 1 Man. & Gr. 257; S. C., 1 A. & E. N. S. 18. See Reese *v.* U. S., 9 Wall. 13.

[3] Hamilton *v.* People, 29 Mich. 173.

[4] Peoples, in re, 47 Mich. 626.

[5] As to New York, see 2 R. S. 709, §§ 22-24; Wendell's Black. iv. 296.

the other witnesses of this class to be called?[1] Or suppose the defendant, in a liquor prosecution, tenders a license, would it not be an absurdity as well as an oppression to refuse to receive it? Such a distinction, indeed, has not been unrecognized by the courts;[2] nor is it inconsistent with the principles above stated that it should be definitely accepted. If so, the magistrate may call for such evidence as may enable him to come to a right conclusion, or may receive such evidence when offered, applying to the whole case the test of probable cause.[3] And the same distinction is applicable to questions of identity.[4]

It is within the province of the magistrate, also, when sitting as a justice of the peace, to hear any evidence tending to throw light on the *corpus delicti*.[5]

Probable cause only need be shown.

§ 73. As has already been stated,[6] the better opinion is that on a preliminary hearing the magistrate is to hold the defendant for trial in case there is made out a probable case of guilt; nor is it necessary, at common law, that the binding over shall be for the specific charge for which the warrant issued, if, on the hearing, the offence takes another shape.[7] By Blackstone it is stated,[8] that if "it manifestly appears *either* that no such crime was committed, *or* that the suspicion entertained of the prisoner was wholly groundless, in such cases only is it lawful totally to discharge him. Otherwise he must either be committed to prison or give bail, that is, put in securities to answer the charge against him." By Chief Justice Marshall, on a great historical occasion, in which his judicial sympathies were certainly not enlisted for the prosecution, the doctrine that probable cause is suffi-

[1] See infra, § 565; U. S. *v.* White, 2 Wash. C. C. 29.

[2] See R. *v.* Tivnan, 5 Best & Smith, 645; Whart. Confl. of L. § 967. Supra, §§ 45 *et seq.*

[3] See remarks of Lord Denman, C. J., 2 C. & K. 845.

[4] See, as to the uncertainty of evidence on this point, Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 20, 27, 806.

[5] See infra, § 565.

In New York, as we have just seen, this rule is so far modified as to enable the defendant to have witnesses sworn and examined on his part. The magistrate, however, is required to hold the defendant for trial, if *upon examination of the whole matter* it appears to the magistrate that an offence has been committed, and that there is probable cause to believe the prisoner to be guilty thereof.

[6] See supra, § 54.

[7] See Redmond *v.* State, 12 Kans. 172. *Contra*, under Michigan statute, Yaner *v.* People, 34 Mich. 286.

[8] Vol. iv. p. 296, Wendell's ed.

cient was declared with still greater precision.[1] Nor can it be denied that the view that the case is to be fully heard by the magistrate, and that he is then to decide on its entire merits, would be prejudicial to those personal rights which this view is sometimes supposed to favor. For if we accept this, the defendant, instead of being subject to one trial, would be subject to two. The rule *ne bis idem*—no man to be tried twice for the same offence—would be overridden. The defendant would go to the jury oppressed by the presumption that upon his whole case he had already been condemned. Nor is this all. It is proper, in view of the immense power a government is capable of exercising in the influencing and intimidating of witnesses, as well as of the importance on other grounds to the defendant of keeping his case in reserve until the period of its final disclosure, that he should not be compelled to exhibit it at a preliminary hearing, subject to the mercies of whatever magistrate the prosecution might select. And then, again, it would lead to many complications to adopt at preliminary hearings before magistrates a rule as to the volume of proof different from that which obtains on *habeas corpus* and before grand juries. But both on *habeas corpus* and on hearings before grand juries, it is on all sides agreed, probable cause is the test.[2] And the rule has to the defendant this double advantage. It enables him, first, to inspect and prepare for the case of the prosecution without disclosing his own. It enables him, secondly, when the case comes on to be tried by a jury, to say, "I come before you as an innocent man, against whom no judicial condemnation is on file." For, on this hypothesis, the holding of a defendant to trial by a magistrate is not a decision that he is guilty, but only that on the prosecution's testimony there is probable cause that he should be tried.[3]

[1] Burr's Trial, 11, 15; and to same point U. S. *v.* Walker, 1 Crumr. (Pitts.) 437. See infra, §§ 361–2.

[2] See infra, §§ 360–1.

[3] See Cox *v.* Coleridge, 1 B. & C. 37; State *v.* Hartwell, 35 Me. 129; U. S. *v.* Bloomgart, 2 Benedict, 356; Van Campen, ex parte, Ibid. 419; State *v.* Roth, 17 Iowa, 336; Yaner *v.* People, 34 Mich. 286. That the magistrate's proceedings are presumed to be regular, see infra, § 779 *a*; Boynton *v.* State, 77 Ala. 30.

III. FINAL COMMITTAL AND BINDING OVER.

At common law bail to be taken in all but capital cases.

§ 74. The common law rule is stated by Blackstone to be, that "wherever bail will answer the same intention" (that of safe custody), "it ought to be taken, as in most of the inferior crimes; but in felonies, and other offences of a capital nature, no bail can be a security equivalent to the actual custody of the person. For what is there that a man may not be induced to forfeit to save his own life? And what satisfaction or indemnity is it to the public to seize the effects of those who have bailed a murderer, if the murderer himself be suffered to escape with impunity?"[1] Pushing this rule to its practical consequences, it has been the practice of American courts to take bail in all cases not capital, where the trial is to be in the jurisdiction in which the bail is given. And indeed the enactment of extradition treaties should lead, in all cases of doubt, to a still further liberalization of the rule. For no longer exist those strong temptations to break bail and fly which existed when Blackstone wrote. A fugitive from justice, if his bail bonds are forfeited, is pursued to his place of refuge, not merely by government, which may be languid, but also by his sureties, who may be incensed and determined. At all events, through the ubiquitousness of extradition police, the probabilities of eventual escape are much diminished.

Excessive bail not to be required.

§ 75. By the eighth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, "excessive bail shall not be required;" and by the Act of September 24, 1789, "upon all arrests in criminal cases, bail shall be admitted, except where the punishment may be death, in which cases it shall not be admitted but by the Supreme or a Circuit Court, or by a justice of the Supreme Court or a judge of the District Court, who shall exercise their discretion therein, regarding the nature and circumstances of the offence, and of the evidence, and the usages of law."

Similar provisions exist in most of the several States.[2]

[1] Blackstone, *ut supra*.

[2] See State *v.* James, 37 Conn. 355. The general test is, is the offence with which the defendant is charged punishable with death? If so, and if the proof of guilt is strong, bail will be refused. See U. S. *v.* Stewart, 2 Dall. 343; State *v.* McNab, 20 N. H. 160; Dunlap *v.* Bartlett, 10 Gray, 282; Tayloe, ex parte, 5 Cow. 39; People *v.* Dixson, 4 Parker C. R. 651; People *v.* Godwin, 5 City Hall Rec. (N. Y.) 11;

§ 76. It has been sometimes argued that bail should be arbitrarily graded to meet the heinousness of the offence. But this is a dangerous principle, as it tends to show that on the rich, who can find bail and afford to forfeit it, there is no necessary corporal punishment imposed. Far wiser is it to adopt the principle, that, in determining and adjusting bail, the test to be adopted by the court is the probability of the accused appearing to take his trial.[1] This probability is to be tested in part by the strength of the evidence against the defendant; in part by the nature of the crime charged, and by the severity of the punishment which may be imposed; and in part by the character and means of the defendant. What to one is oppressive bail, to another is light; and of this the court is to judge.[2] As a general rule, the action of the court in this respect, unless great oppression is shown, is not revisable in error.[3] Even

Proper course is to require such bail as will secure attendance.

People *v.* Perry, 8 Abb. (N. Y.) Pr. N. S. 27; State *v.* Rockafellow, 1 Halst. 332; Lynch *v.* People, 38 Ill. 494; Heffren, ex parte, 27 Ind. 87; Beall *v.* State, 39 Miss. 715; Thompson *v.* State, 25 Tex. (Supp.) 395; Zembrod *v.* State, 25 Tex. 519; Mosby, ex parte, 31 Tex. 566; Bird, ex parte, 24 Ark. 275; Carroll, ex parte, 36 Ala. 300; Bryant, ex parte, 34 Ala. 270; R. *v.* Scaife, 9 D. P. C. 553; R. *v.* Williams, 8 D. P. C. 301. In most States the limits as to bail are fixed by Constitution or statute.

Bail was refused in England after a commitment under a coroner's verdict of wilful murder in a duel, although there were strong affidavits to the effect that the "duel was fair," as the question of the capital crime was to be settled, on the ultimate proofs given, by the court and jury alone. Barronet, in re, 1 El. & Bl. 1; Dears. C. C. 51; Barthelemy, in re, Dears. C. C. 60; 1 El. & Bl. 1.

If after protracted trials a jury is unable to agree, the court, at its discretion, may permit the defendant to be discharged on bail. People *v.* Perry, *ut supra*, where there had been two abortive trials. And bail will be taken even in capital cases where there is a well-founded doubt of guilt. Bridewell, ex parte, 56 Miss. 39; People *v.* Perry, *ut supra*.

[1] See Tayloe, ex parte, 5 Cow. 39; People *v.* Dixon, 4 Parker C. R. 651; People *v.* Lohman, 2 Barb. 450; Com. *v.* Keeper of Prison, 2 Ash. 227; Com. *v.* Lemley, 2 Pitts. 362; Bryant, ex parte, 34 Ala. 270; Perry, in re, 19 Wis. 676.

[2] R. *v.* Badger, 4 Q. B. 468. See remarks of Coleridge, J., in Robinson, in re, 23 L. J. Q. B. 286; People *v.* Dixon, 4 Park. C. R. 651; People *v.* Van Horne, 8 Barb. 158; People *v.* Smith, 1 Cal. 9. See article in London Law Times, Nov. 3, 1883, p. 5.

[3] People *v.* Perry, 8 Abb. (N. Y.) Pr. N. S. 27; Lester *v.* State, 33 Ga. 192. See infra, § 777. Otherwise, where there is a constitutional right. Wray, ex parte, 30 Miss. 673. See as to discretion of justice, Burke, ex parte, 58 Miss. 50.

where there can be no question as to facts, there may be capital cases in which the government may consent to discharge on bail. A striking illustration of this is the admission to bail of Jefferson Davis, when under indictment for treason, with the consent of the President of the United States.[1]

After continuance bail may be granted.

§ 77. *Continuances* on the part of the prosecution, especially after two sessions, will lead the court, even in capital cases, to admit to bail.[2] But a single continuance, necessitated by absence of witnesses, does not have this effect.[3]

And so in cases of sickness.

§ 78. *Danger to life* from sickness caused by imprisonment has been held sufficient cause to justify the defendant's release on bail, under proper and peculiar sanctions.[4] But such danger must be serious.[5]

Bail to keep the peace may be required.

§ 79. *After conviction*, and indeed in extraordinary cases of threatened crime, after acquittal, the court may hold the defendant, in addition to other penalties prescribed by law, over to keep the peace, and commit him on default of bail.[6] When an indictment is quashed on technical grounds, the court, *a fortiori*, will direct that the defendant be held on the original charge.[7]

IV. VAGRANTS, DISORDERLY PERSONS, AND PROFESSIONAL CRIMINALS.

Magistrates have power to

§ 80. By statutes which may now be viewed as part of Anglo-American common law, justices of the peace have power to hold to bail for their good behavior, or in default to

[1] See Chase Dec. 124. As to bail after conviction, and before sentence, see infra, § 82.

[2] Fitzpatrick's case, 1 Salk. 103; Crosby's case, 12 Mod. 66; People *v.* Perry, *ut supra*. See State *v.* Hill, 3 Brev. 89.

[3] U. S. *v.* Jones, 3 Wash. C. C. 224; R. *v.* Andrews, 2 D. & L. 10; 1 New Cas. 199.

[4] R. *v.* Wyndham, 1 Strange, 2; R. *v.* Aylesbury, Holt, 84; 1 Salk. 103; Harvey's case, 10 Mod. 334; U. S. *v.* Jones, 3 Wash. C. C. 224.

[5] U. S. *v.* Kie, 1 West. Coast R. 553; Pattison, ex parte, 56 Miss. 161; Thomas *v.* State, 4 Tex. 6; see People *v.* Coles, 6 Park. C. R. 695, 701; 20 Cent. L. J. 103.

[6] Infra, §§ 82, 941; Dunn *v.* R., 12 Q. B. 1031; O'Connell *v.* R., 11 Cl. & F. 155; State *v.* Coughlin, 19 Kans. 537; State *v.* Chandler, 31 Kans. 201.

[7] Nichols *v.* State, 2 South. 539; Young *v.* Com., 1 Robt. Va. 744.

commit, for definite periods, vagrants and disorderly persons.[1] Similar statutes have been adopted in the United States, and have frequently been held constitutional, though with the caution that the defendant should be duly summoned, and should have a fair hearing,[2] and that the statutes should be strictly construed.[3] In several States analogous power has been given in respect to professional thieves and other habitual criminals; and these statutes have been held constitutional. Sureties to keep the peace can also be required at common law from a person against whom oath is made that by him another person is put in fear or danger of life. In all these cases the sureties or commitment must be for a limited time.[4]

bold vagrants, etc., to bail.

V. BAIL AFTER HABEAS CORPUS.

§ 81. The writ of *habeas corpus* may be appealed to for the purpose, not only of determining the liability of the defendant to prosecution at all, but of settling the question of bail, supposing there be probable cause against him.[5] The court, on fixing the amount of bail, is guided by the considerations we have just noticed as governing the practice before magistrates.[6] The question as to the courts which may thus deter-

On *habeas corpus* court may adjust bail.

[1] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 442; Paley on Convictions, chap. 1; Com. *v.* Carter, 108 Mass. 17; Brown *v.* State, 2 Lea, 158; Com. Dig. Just.; Burn's Just. Vagrant. R. *v.* Justices, 10 L. R. Ir. 294. "Idle and disorderly persons, vagrants, are terms often occurring in the old statutes. They have been from time immemorial, in England, subject to the summary jurisdiction of justices of the peace." Earle, J., in State *v.* Maxcy, 1 McMullen, 503. The history of the law is well given in Gneist, Englische Communalverfassung (3d ed. 1871), p. 225, and the power traced to 34 Ed. 3, c. 1. See, also, Blackstone, iv. c. 18.

Arrests are not allowable unless when the vagrancy was in the officer's presence; Shanley *v.* Wells, 71 Ill. 78; see Way, in re, 41 Mich. 299; infra, § 942; unless authorized by statute, State *v.* Newton, 59 Ind. 173. As to what are vagrants see Pointon *v.* Hill, L. R. 12 Q. B. D. 306.

[2] People *v.* Phillips, 1 Park. C. R. 95; People *v.* Gray, 4 Park. C. R. 616; People *v.* Forbes, 4 Park. C. R. 611; State *v.* Maxcy, 1 McMull. 501; Roberts *v.* State, 14 Mo. 138.

[3] R. *v.* Waite, 4 Burr. 780; 2 Ld. Ken. 511, and other cases cited in Fisher's Crim. Dig. tit. "Practice." See infra, § 942.

[4] Prickett *v.* Gratrex, 8 Q. B. 1021; see Com. *v.* Doherty, 137 Mass. 245.

[5] Infra, § 1007.

[6] Mohun's case, 1 Salk. 104; R. *v.* Barronet, Dears. 51; 1 E. & B. 2; Com. *v.* Keeper of Prison, 2 Ashm. 227; Com. *v.* Lemley, 2 Pitts. 362; Com. *v.*

mine bail is a matter of local practice. In England no court that has not jurisdiction to try can thus interpose.[1] In Pennsylvania such is substantially the law as to the adjudication of the merits, though the Supreme Court will, on such a writ, see if the record is right.[2] In New York the judges of the Supreme Court assert the jurisdiction generally.[3] But as a rule no court which has not jurisdiction of the offence can take cognizance of it in this way.[4] At the same time, a court having supreme criminal jurisdiction over a particular State or territory, has, in matters within such jurisdiction, power to release on bail, the amount of which it is entitled to fix.[5]

VI. BAIL AFTER VERDICT OR AFTER QUASHING.

In exceptional case bail may be permitted after verdict.

§ 82. In cases involving no high degree of turpitude, and in cases in which the court has serious doubts as to the question of the rightfulness of the verdict, or of the sufficiency of the proceeding in point of law, bail may be taken after verdict of conviction,[6] or even after sentence, while the case is under review in a superior court.[7]

After quashing bail may be refused.

§ 83. When an indictment has been quashed, or when judgment has been entered for the defendant, the court, when its action has been based on merely technical defects, may hold the defendant to answer further proceedings.[8]

Rutherford, 5 Rand. 646; Com. *v.* Semmes, 11 Leigh, 665; State *v.* Hill, 3 Brev. 89; State *v.* Everett, Dudley S. C. 296; Lumm *v.* State, 3 Ind. 293; Henson, in re, 24 Tex. Ap. 308.

As to the practice of looking into the coroner's or magistrate's depositions see R. *v.* Pepper, Comb. 298; R. *v.* Horner, 1 Leach, 270; People *v.* Beigler, 3 Park. C. R. 316. In this country the practice is for the court to hear the witnesses afresh. Com. *v.* Keeper of Prison, 2 Ashm. 227. See People *v.* Dixon, 4 Park. C. R. 651. For a learned article on this topic by Judge S. D. Thompson, see 14 Cent. L. J. 264.

[1] R. *v.* Platt, 1 Leach C. L. 187; R. *v.* Mackintosh, 1 Stra. 308.

[2] Walton, ex parte, 2 Whart. 501; see, also, Belgard *v.* Morse, 2 Gray, 406.

[3] People *v.* Jefferds, 5 Park. C. R. 518.

[4] People *v.* Harris, 21 How. Pr. 83; Com. *v.* Taylor, 11 Phila. 386; Irwin, ex parte, 7 Tex. Ap. 288.

[5] See cases cited infra, § 1007.

[6] Archb. C. P. 187; R. *v.* Barronet, Dears. 51; 1 E. & B. 2; Com. *v.* Field, 11 Allen, 788; McNiel's case, 1 Caines, 72; Res. *v.* Jacob, 1 Smith's Laws (Penn.), 57; Com. *v.* Lowry, 14 Leg. Int. 332; State *v.* Levy, 24 Minn. 362; Dyson, ex parte, 25 Miss. 356; though see R. *v.* Waddington, 1 East, 143. Supra, § 79.

[7] Supra, § 79; Anon. 3 Salk. 68; though see R. *v.* Bird, 5 Cox C. C. 11; Corbett *v.* State, 24 Ga. 391.

[8] Infra, § 392.

CHAPTER III.

FORM OF INDICTMENT.

I. INDICTMENT AS DISTINGUISHED FROM INFORMATION.
Under federal Constitution trials of all capital or infamous crimes must be by indictment, § 85.
Presentment is an information by grand jury on which indictment may be based, § 86.
Information is *ex officio* proceeding by attorney-general, § 87.
Is not usually permitted as to infamous crimes, § 88.
"Infamous crimes" are such as involve disgrace or expose to penitentiary, § 89.
II. STATUTES OF JEOFAILS AND AMENDMENT.
By statutes formal mistakes may be amended and formal averments made unnecessary, § 90.
III. CAPTION AND COMMENCEMENT.
Caption is no part of indictment, being explanatory prefix, § 91.
Substantial accuracy only required, § 92.
Caption may be amended, § 93.
Commencement must aver office and place of grand jurors and also their oath, § 94.
Each count must contain averment of oath, § 95.
IV. NAME AND ADDITION.
1. *As to Defendant.*
Name of defendant should be specifically given, § 96.
Omission of surname is fatal, § 97.
Mistake as to either surname or Christian name may be met by abatement, § 98.
Surname may be laid as *alias*, § 99.
Inhabitants of parish and corporations may be indicted in corporate name, § 100.
Middle names to be given when essential, § 101.
Initials requisite when used by party, § 102.
Party cannot dispute a name accepted by him, § 103.
Unknown party may be approximately described, § 104.
At common law, addition is necessary, § 105.
Wrong addition to be met by plea in abatement, § 106.
Defendant's residence must be given, § 107.
"Junior" must be alleged when party is known as such, § 108.
2. *As to Parties injured and Third Parties.*
Name, only, of third person need be given, § 109.
Corporate title must be special, § 110.
Third person may be described as unknown, § 111.
But this allegation may be traversed, § 112.
The test is whether the name was unknown to grand jury, § 113.
Immaterial misnomer may be rejected as surplusage, § 114.
Sufficient if description be substantially correct, § 115.

Variance in third party's name is fatal, § 116.
Name may be given by initials, § 117.
Reputative name is sufficient, § 118.
Idem sonans is sufficient, § 119.

V. TIME.

Time must be averred, but not generally material, § 120.
When "Sunday" is essence of offence, day must be specified, § 121.
Videlicet may introduce a date tentatively, § 122.
Blank as to date is fatal, § 123.
Substantial accuracy is enough, § 124.
Double or obscure dates are inadequate, § 125.
Date cannot be laid between two distinct periods, § 126.
Negligence should have time averred, § 127.
Time may be designated by historical epochs, § 128.
Recitals of time need not be accurate, § 129.
Hour not necessary unless required by statute, § 130.
Repetition may be by "then and there," § 131.
Other terms are insufficient, § 132.
"Then and there" cannot cure ambiguities, § 133.
Repugnant, future, or impossible dates are bad, § 134.
Record dates, must be accurate, § 135.
And so of dates of documents, § 136.
Time should be within limitation, § 137.
In homicide death should be within a year and a day, § 138.

VI. PLACE.

Enough to lay venue within jurisdiction, § 139.
When act is by agent, principal to be charged as of place of act, § 140.
When county is divided, jurisdiction is to be laid in court of *locus delicti*, § 141.
When county includes several jurisdictions, jurisdiction must be specified, § 142.
Name of State not necessary to indictment, § 143.
Sub-description in transitory offences immaterial, § 144.
But not in matters of local description, § 145.
"County aforesaid" is enough "then and there," § 146.
Title, when changed by legislature, must be followed, § 147.
Venue must follow fine, § 148.
In larceny venue may be laid in place where goods are taken, § 149.
Omission of venue is fatal, § 150.

VII. STATEMENT OF OFFENCE.

Offence must be set forth with reasonable certainty, § 151.
Omission of essential incidents is fatal, § 152.
Terms must be technically exact, § 153.
Not enough to charge conclusion of law, § 154.
Excepting in cases of "common barrators," "common scolds," and certain nuisances, § 155.
Matters unknown may be proximately described, § 156.
Bill of particulars may be required, § 157.
Surplusage need not be stated, and if stated may be disregarded, § 158.
Videlicet is the pointing out of an averment as a probable specification, § 158 *a*.
Assault may be sustained without specification of object, § 159.

Act of one confederate may be averred as act of the other, § 159 *a*.

Descriptive averment must be proved, § 160.

Alternative statements are inadmissible, § 161.

Disjunctive offences in statute may be conjunctively stated, § 162.

Otherwise as to distinct and substantive offences, § 163.

Intent when necessary must be averred, § 163 *a*.

And so of guilty knowledge, § 164.

Inducement and aggravation need not be detailed, § 165.

Particularity is required for identification and protection, § 166.

VIII. WRITTEN INSTRUMENTS.

1. *Where, as in Forgery and Libel, Instrument must be set forth at full.*

When words of document are material, they should be set forth, § 167.

In such cases the indictment should purport to set forth the words, § 168.

"Purport" means effect; "tenor" means contents, § 169.

"Manner and form," "purport and effect," "substance," do not import verbal accuracy, § 170.

Attaching original paper is not adequate, § 171.

When exact copy is required, mere variance of a letter is immaterial, § 173.

Unnecessary document need not be set forth, § 174.

Quotation marks are not sufficient, § 175.

Document lost or in defendant's hands need not be set forth, § 176.

And so of obscene libel, § 177.

Prosecutor's negligence does not alter the case, § 178.

Production of document alleged to be destroyed is a fatal variance, § 179.

Extraneous parts of document need not be set forth, § 180.

Foreign or insensible document must be explained by averments, § 181.

Innuendoes can explain but cannot enlarge, § 181 *a*.

2. *Where, as in Larceny, general Designation is sufficient.*

Statutory designations must be followed, § 182.

Though general designation be sufficient, yet if indictment purport to give words, variance is fatal, § 183.

3. *What general Designation will suffice.*

If designation is erroneous, variance is fatal, § 184.

"Receipt" includes all signed admissions of payment, § 185.

"Acquittance" includes discharge from duty, § 186.

"Bill of exchange" is to be used in its technical sense, § 187.

"Promissory note" is used in a large sense, § 188.

"Bank notes" include notes issued by bank, § 189.

"Treasury notes and federal currency," § 189 *a*.

"Money" is convertible with currency, § 190.

"Goods and chattels" include personalty exclusive of *choses in action*, § 191.

"Warrant" is an instrument calling for payment or delivery, § 192.

"Order" implies mandatory power, § 193.

"Request" includes mere invitation, § 194.

Terms may be used cumulatively, § 195.

Defects may be explained by averments, § 196.

A "deed" must be a writing

under seal passing a right, § 197.
"Obligation" is a unilateral engagement, § 198.
And so is "undertaking," § 199.
A guarantee and an "I. O. U" are undertakings, § 200.
"Property" is whatever may be appropriated, § 201.
"Piece of paper" is subject of larceny, § 202.
"Challenge to fight" need not be specially set forth, § 202 *a*.

IX. Words spoken.
Words spoken must be set forth exactly, though substantial proof is enough, § 203.
In treason it is enough to set forth substance, § 204.

X. Personal Chattels.
1. *Indefinite, Insensible, or Lumping Descriptions.*
Personal chattels, when subjects of an offence, must be specifically described, § 206.
When notes are stolen in a bunch, denominations may be proximately given, § 207.
Certainty must be such as to individuate offence, § 208.
"Dead" animals must be averred to be such; "living" must be specifically described, § 209.
When only specified members of a class are subjects of offence, then specifications must be given, § 210.
Minerals and vegetables must be averred to be severed from realty, § 211.
Variance in number or value is immaterial, § 212.
Instrument of injury may be approximately stated § 212 *a*.
2. *Value.*
Value must be assigned when larceny is charged, § 213.
Larceny of "piece of paper" may be prosecuted, § 214.
Value essential to restitution, and also to mark grades, § 215.
Legal currency need not be valued, § 216.
When there is lumping valuation, conviction cannot be had for stealing fraction, § 217.
3. *Money and Coin.*
Money must be specifically described, § 218.
When money is given to change and change is kept, indictment cannot aver stealing change, § 219.

XI. Offences created by Statute.
Usually sufficient and necessary to use words of statute, § 220.
Otherwise when statute gives conclusion of law, § 221.
And so if indictment professes but fails to set forth statute, § 222.
Special limitations are to be given, § 223.
Private statute must be pleaded in full, § 224.
Offence must be averred to be within statute, § 225.
Section or title need not be stated, § 226.
Where statute requires two defendants, one is not sufficient, § 227.
When statute states object in plural it may be pleaded in singular, § 227 *a*.
Disjunctions in statute to be averred conjunctively, § 228.
At common law defects in statutory averment not cured by verdict, § 229.
Statutes creating an offence are to be closely followed, § 230.
When common law offence is made penal by title, details must be given, § 231.
When statute is cumulative, common law may be still pursued, § 232.

When statute assigns no penalty, punishment is at common law, § 233.
Exhaustive statute absorbs common law, § 234.
Statutory technical averments to be introduced, § 235.
But equivalent terms may be given, § 236.
Where a statute describes a class of animals by a general term, it is enough to use this term for the whole class; otherwise not, § 237.
Provisos and exceptions not part of definition need not be negatived, § 238.
Otherwise when proviso is in same clause, § 239.
Exception in enacting clause to be negatived, § 240.
Question in such case is whether the statute creates a general or a limited offence, § 241.

XII. DUPLICITY.
Joinder in one count of two offences is bad, § 243.
Exception when larceny is included in burglary or embezzlement, § 244.
And so where fornication is included in major offence, § 245.
When major offence includes minor, conviction may be for either, § 246.
"Assault" is included under "assault with intent," § 247.
On indictment for major there can be conviction of minor, § 248.
Misdemeanor may be inclosed in felony, § 249.
But minor offence must be accurately stated, § 250.
Not duplicity to couple alternate statutory phases, § 251.
Several articles may be joined in larceny, § 252.
And so of cumulative overt acts, intents and agencies, § 253.
And so of double batteries, libels, or sales, § 254.
Duplicity is usually cured by verdict, § 255.

XIII. REPUGNANCY.
Where material averments are repugnant, indictment is bad, § 256.

XIV. TECHNICAL AVERMENTS.
In treason, "traitorously" must be used, § 257.
"Malice aforethought" essential to murder, § 258.
"Struck" essential to wound, § 259.
"Feloniously" essential to felony, § 260.
"Feloniously" can be rejected as surplusage, § 261.
In such cases conviction may be had for attempt, § 262.
"Ravish" and "forcibly" are essential to rape, § 263.
"Falsely" essential to perjury, § 264.
"Burglariously" to burglary, § 265.
"Take and carry away" to larceny, § 266.
"Violently and against the will" to robbery, § 267.
"Piratical" to piracy, § 268.
"Unlawfully" and other aggravative terms not necessary, § 269.
"Forcibly" and with a strong hand essential to forcible entry, § 270.
Vi et armis not essential, § 271.
"Knowingly" always prudent, § 272.

XV. CLERICAL ERRORS.
Verbal inaccuracies not affecting sense are not fatal, § 273.
Question as to abbreviations, § 274.
Omission of formal words may not be fatal, § 275.

Signs cannot be substituted for words, § 276.
Erasures and interlineations not fatal, § 277.
Tearing and defacing not necessarily fatal. Lost indictment, § 278.
Pencil writing may be sufficient, § 278 *a*.

XVI. Conclusion of Indictments.
Conclusions must conform to Constitution, § 279.
Where statute creates or modifies an offence, conclusion must be statutory, § 280.
Otherwise when statute does not create or modify, § 281.
Conclusion does not cure defects, § 282.
Conclusion need not be in plural, § 283.
Statutory conclusion may be rejected as surplusage, § 284.

XVII. Joinder of Offences.
Counts for offences of same character and same mode of trial may be joined, § 285.
Assaults on two persons may be joined, § 286.
Conspiracy and constituent misdemeanor may be joined, and assault with assault with intent, § 287.
And so of common law and statutory offences, § 288.
And so of felony and misdemeanor, § 289.
Cognate felonies may be joined, § 290.
And so of successive grades of offence, § 291.
Joinder of different offences no ground for error, § 292.
Election will not be compelled when offences are connected, § 293.
Object of election is to reduce to a single issue, § 294.
Election is at discretion of court, § 295.
May be at any time before verdict, § 296.
Counts should be varied to suit case, § 297.
Two counts precisely the same are bad, § 298.
One bad count cannot be aided by another, § 299.
Counts may be transposed after verdict, § 300.

XVIII. Joinder of Defendants.
1. *Who may be joined.*
Joint offenders can be jointly indicted, § 301.
But not when offences are several, § 302.
So as to officers with separate duties, § 303.
Principals and accessaries can be joined, § 304.
In conspiracy at least two must be joined, § 305.
In riot three must be joined, § 306.
Husband and wife may be joined, § 306 *a*.
Misjoinder may be excepted to at any time, § 307.
Death need not be suggested on the record, § 308.
2. *Severance.*
Defendants may elect to sever, § 309.
Severance should be granted when defences clash, § 310.
In conspiracy and riot no severance, § 311.
3. *Verdict and Judgment.*
Joint defendants may be convicted of different grades, § 312.
Defendants may be convicted severally, § 313.
Sentence to be several, § 314.
Offence must be joint to justify joint verdict, § 315.

XIX. Statutes of Limitation.
Construction to be liberal to defendant, § 316.
Statute need not be specially pleaded, § 317.
Indictment should aver offence within statute, or exclude exceptions, § 318.

Statute, unless general, operates only on specified offences, § 319.
Statute is retrospective, § 320.
Statute begins to run from commission of crime, § 321.
Indictment or information saves statute, § 322.
In some jurisdictions statute saved by warrant or presentment, § 323.
When flight suspends statute, it is not revived by temporary return, § 324.
Failure of defective indictment does not revive statute, § 325.
Courts look with disfavor on long delays in prosecution, § 326.
Statute not suspended by fraud, § 327.
Under statute indictment unduly delayed may be discharged, § 328.
Statutes have no extra-territorial effects, § 329.

I. INDICTMENT AS DISTINGUISHED FROM INFORMATION.

§ 85. "No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia when in actual service, in time of war, or public danger; nor shall any person be subject, for the same offence, to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall he be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without compensation."[1]

Under federal Constitution trials of all capital or infamous crimes must be by indictment.

§ 86. "The first clause," to adopt the language of Judge Story, in commenting on this article, "requires the interposition of a grand jury, by way of presentment or indictment, before the party accused can be required to answer to any capital or infamous crime charged against him. This is regularly true, at the common law, of all offences above the grade of common misdemeanor. A grand jury, it is well known, are selected in a manner prescribed by law, and duly sworn to make inquiry, and present all offences committed against the authority of the State government within the body of

Presentment is an accusation by grand jury, on which indictment may be based.

[1] Const. U. S. Amend. art. 5. That without either indictment or information a prosecution cannot be maintained, see State *v.* First, 82 Ind. 1. That a *de facto* grand jury satisfies the constitutional rule, see People *v.* Petrea, 92 N.Y. 128; infra, § 350. That "due process of law," in the 14th Amendment, does not necessitate a grand jury, see Hurtado *v.* California, 110 U. S. 516, approving Kalloch *v.* Sup. Ct., 56 Cal. 229; Rowan *v.* State, 30 Wis. 129.

the county for which they are empanelled. In the national courts they are sworn to inquire and present all offences committed against the authority of the national government within the State or district for which they are empanelled, or elsewhere, within the jurisdiction of the national government. A presentment, properly speaking, is an accusation made *ex mero motu* by a grand jury, of an offence, upon their own observation and knowledge, or upon evidence before them, and without any bill of indictment laid before them at the suit of the government. An indictment is a written accusation of an offence preferred to and presented upon oath as true, by a grand jury at the suit of the government. Upon a presentment, the proper officer of the court must frame an indictment, before the party accused can be put to answer to it."[1]

Information is *ex officio* procedure by attorney-general.

§ 87. Informations are official criminal charges presented usually by the prosecuting officers of the State, without the interposition of a grand jury;[2] nor can an affidavit or charge by an unofficial person amount to an information.[3] An information, it is said, resembles not only an indictment, in the correct and technical description of the offence, but also an action *qui tam*, in which the informer must show the forfeiture, and its appropriation, or at least the proportion given him by the statute.[4] So far as the structure of an information is concerned, the same rules apply as obtain in cases of indictment.[5] In respect to *amendment*, however, there is a difference at common law, arising from the fact that an information emanates exclusively from the attorney-general, without the interposition of

[1] Story on the Constitution, § 657.

[2] The district attorney may proceed by information, although an indictment for the same offence has been quashed. U. S. *v.* Nagle, 17 Blatch. 258; 8 Rep. 772.

[3] People *v.* Keim, 79 Mo. 515.

[4] 1 Ch. C. L. 841; Archbold's C. P. by Jervis, 66; Burn's Justice, 20th ed. by Ch. Bears, title Information; Com. *v.* Messenger, 4 Mass. 462, 465; Com. *v.* Cheney, 6 Mass. 347; Hill *v.* Davis, 4 Mass. 137; Brimmer *v.* Long Wharf, 5 Pick. 131; Evans *v.* Com., 3 Met. 453; Welde *v.* Com., 2 Met. Mass. 408. See, also, Vanatta *v.* State, 31 Ind. 220; Vogel *v.* State, 31 Ind. 64.

[5] R. *v.* Steel, L. R. 2 Q. B. D. 40; State *v.* Beebe, 83 Ind. 171; Gallagher *v.* People, 120 Ill. 179; Avery *v.* People, 11 Ill. App. 332; Thomas *v.* State, 58 Ala. 365; State *v.* Anderson, 30 La. Ann. 557; Antle *v.* State, 6 Tex. App. 202; Leatherwood *v.* State, Ibid. 244. An information must conform to the affidavit on which it is based, Dyer *v.* State, 85 Ind. 525. But the special reason why information is adopted instead of indictment need not be stated. Hodge *v.* State, 85 Ind. 561.

a grand jury; and hence he alone, with leave of court, is authorized to amend it, the assent of a grand jury not being required.[1]

§ 88. The limitation in the federal Constitution restricting prosecutions for infamous crimes to presentments or indictments by a grand jury applies distinctively to federal prosecutions.[2] In Pennsylvania there is a constitutional provision against proceeding by information in any case where an indictment lies;[3] and the same restriction exists in several of the other States.[4] In the United States courts, as has been seen,[5] in New York,[6] and in Virginia,[7] the limitation is confined to cases of infamous crime. In New Hampshire, it obtains in all cases where the punishment is death or confinement at hard labor.[8] In Vermont, a distinction of the same character is made.[9] In Indiana,[10] and in California,[11] a larger range is given; and so as to Georgia.[12] It may, in fact, be stated as a general rule, that the provision in the federal Constitution, given at the head of this chapter, applies only to cases in the United States courts.[13] In Massachusetts, it was at one time held that all public misdemeanors which may be prosecuted by indictment may be prosecuted by information on behalf of the Com-

Ie not usually permitted as to infamous crimes.

[1] R. *v.* Seawood, 2 Ld. Ray. 1472; R. *v.* Stedman, Ibid. 1307; State *v.* Rowley, 12 Conn. 101; State *v.* Stebbins, 29 Conn. 463; State *v.* Weare, 38 N. H. 314; Com. *v.* Rodes, 1 Dana, 595. That an information may be granted on the basis of a quashed indictment see U. S. *v.* Ronzone, 14 Blatch. 69. That it does not require either prior hearing or finding see U. S. *v.* Mollor, 16 Ibid. 65. *Contra* in Michigan, Brown *v.* State, 34 Mich. 37.

Under the Texas practice an information must be supported by an affidavit, with which the information must be in substantial conformity, though technical conformity is not required; Pittman *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 576. The information must be in itself sufficient, and cannot be helped out by reference to the affidavit. Ibid.; Lackey *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 164.

[2] Story on Const. § 653.

[3] Const. art. 9, § 10.

[4] State *v.* Mitchell, 1 Bay, 267; Cleary *v.* Deliesseline, 1 McCord, 35.

[5] U. S. *v.* Shepard, 1 Abb. U. S. 431.

[6] Const. art. 7, § 7.

[7] Davis' Cr. Law, 422.

[8] Rev. Stat. N. Hamp. 457.

[9] Rev. Stat. Verm. chap. cii.

[10] As to limitation in Indiana, see Davis *v.* State, 69 Ind. 130; Lindsey *v.* State, 72 Ind. 40; Heanly *v.* State, 74 Ind. 99.

[11] People *v.* Carlton, 57 Cal. 551.

[12] Groves *v.* State, 73 Ga. 205.

[13] State *v.* Keyes, 8 Vt. 57; Rowan *v.* State, 30 Wis. 129; State *v.* Shumpert, 1 Richards (S. C.), N. S. 85; Noles *v.* State, 24 Ala. 672. As to Louisiana, see State *v.* Jackson, 21 La. An. 574; State *v.* Anderson, 30 La. An. 557; State *v.* Woods, 31 La. An. 267. As to Illinois see Parris *v.* People, 76 Ill. 274. As to Michigan, McNamee *v.* People, 31 Mich. 473; Turner *v.* People, 33 Mich. 363.

monwealth, unless the prosecution be restricted by the statute to indictment.[1] But now by the Gen. Stat. c. 158, § 3, all criminal prosecutions must be by indictment, except (1.) When informations are expressly authorized by statute; (2.) In cases before police justices; and (3) In courts-martial. In Connecticut all offences not punished by death or by imprisonment for life are prosecuted by information.[2] In California there is no longer any restriction.[3] In the United States courts, crimes against the elective franchise may be prosecuted by information filed by the district attorney.[4]

"Infamous" crimes are such as involve disgrace or expose to penitentiary.

§ 89. In the United States courts it was once said that, for misdemeanors, which do not, at common law, preclude the person convicted from being a witness, there can be a proceeding by information,[5] and hence that a person may be prosecuted by information for a violation of the revenue laws.[6] Severity of imprisonment, it has been argued, does not by itself create infamy.[7] But where at common law disgrace attaches, then the offence is infamous. On principle, informations, under the federal Constitution, should be restricted to *quasi* civil offences not *mala in re*, or involving moral turpitude.[8] And it may now be held that in all cases in which

[1] Com. *v.* Waterborough, 5 Mass. 257, 259.

[2] 2 Swift's Dig. 371.

[3] People *v.* Campbell, 59 Cal. 243.

[4] Rev. Stat. § 1022.

[5] U. S. *v.* Mann, 1 Gall. C. C. 3; U. S. *v.* Isham, 17 Wall. 496; U. S. *v.* Bozzo, 18 Wall. 125; U. S. *v.* Waller, 1 Sawyer C. C. 701; U. S. *v.* Ebert, 1 Cent. L. J. 205. See also Stockwell *v.* U. S., 13 Wall. 531; U. S. *v.* Maxwell, 3 Dill. 275; U. S. *v.* Block, 15 Bank. Reg. 325; 4 Sawy. 211.

[6] U. S. *v.* Maxwell, 21 Int. Rev. Rec. 148.

[7] R. *v.* Hickman, 1 Mood. C. C. 34; People *v.* Whipple, 9 Cow. 707; Com. *v.* Shaver, 3 W. & S. 338. See Reddick *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 82.

[8] U. S. *v.* Brady, 3 Crim. Law Mag. 69 and note thereto. In conflict with the text may be cited U. S. *v.* Wynn, 3 McCr. 266, where it was held that stealing from the mail was not "infamous;" U. S. *v.* Burgess, 3 McCr. 278, where it was held not "infamous" to conspire to counterfeit coin; U. S. *v.* Field, 21 Blatch. 330; 16 Fed. Rep. 778, where it was held not "infamous" to pass counterfeit coin; U. S. *v.* Black, 4 Sawy. 211; 15 Bank. Reg. 325, where the same was held of secreting goods by bankrupt; U. S. *v.* Reilley, 20 Fed. Rep. 46, where it is held that embezzlement is not "infamous."

In U. S. *v.* Butler, 4 Hughes, 514, conspiracy was held infamous; in U. S. *v.* Cross, 1 McArth. 149, the term was limited to cases where there is a forfeiture of civil rights. S. P., U. S. *v.* Brady, 3 Crim. Law Mag. 69. See also U. S. *v.* Blackburn, 1 N. Y. Week. Dig. 276. In U. S. *v.* Yarborough, 110 U. S. 651, the statute making it indictable to conspire to abridge another's civil rights was held constitutional;

penitentiary imprisonment is imposed, it is within the contemplation of the Constitution that the safeguard of a grand jury should be secured.[1]

II. STATUTES OF JEOFAILS AND AMENDMENT.

§ 90. No inconsiderable portion of the difficulties in the way of the criminal pleader, at common law, have been removed in England by the 7 Geo. 4, c. 64, ss. 20, 21; 11 & 12 Vict. c. 46; and 14 & 15 Vict. c. 100, and in most of the States in the American Union, by statutes containing similar provisions.[2] In some jurisdictions, also, it is provided that as to certain offences certain prescribed forms shall be sufficient.[3] Whether such statutes conflict with constitutional provisions providing that the indictment should notify the defendant of the character of the offence depends in part upon the words of the Constitution, in part upon the degree in which the rights of the defendant are abridged by the indictment as to which the question arises. Supposing that the constitutional provision,

By statutes formal mistakes may be amended, and formal averments made unnecessary.

and in U. S. *v.* Waddell, 112 U. S. 76, it was applied to a conspiracy to drive a citizen of the United States from a homestead entry and was held within the statute, but it was doubted whether the proceeding in such cases could be by information. But now all crimes punishable by imprisonment in the penitentiary are infamous under this clause; Mackin *v.* U. S., 117 U. S. 348; see U. S. *v.* Tod, 25 Fed. Rep. 815. A person, imprisoned on a conviction in such a case on which there has been no presentment by a grand jury, will be discharged on a *habeas corpus*. Wilson, ex parte, 114 U. S. 417.

[1] See Mackin *v.* U. S., 117 U. S. 348.

[2] As English cases may be mentioned R. *v.* Larkin, 1 Dears. C. C. 365; 6 Cox, C. C. 377; R. *v.* Frost, 1 Dears. C. C. 427; R. *v.* Walton, 9 Cox C. C. 297; R. *v.* Sturge, 3 E. & B. 734; R. *v.* Gumble, 12 Cox C. C. 248; R. *v.* Bird, 12 Cox C. C. 257.

As to how far verdict cures, see infra, § 759.

Merely clerical errors, as will be seen, may be disregarded in error, or in motions of arrest of judgment. Infra, § 273. An unauthorized material amendment is fatal; State *v.* Vest, 21 W. Va. 796.

[3] See, as to liquor prosecutions, Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1530; and see State *v.* Comstock, 27 Vt. 553; State *v.* Amidon, 58 Vt. 524; Hewitt *v.* State, 25 Tex. 722.

That after there has been an amendment, imprudently granted, there will be a new trial, see Com. *v.* Foynes, 126 Mass. 267.

As to limits, see State *v.* Doe, 50 Iowa, 541; McCarthy *v.* State, 56 Miss. 294; State *v.* Finn, 31 La. An. 408.

As to waiver of constitutional rights see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 145 *a*. Infra, § 733.

as is sometimes the case, is simply a presentation of the common law rule, that the defendant is entitled to notice in the indictment of the charge against him,[1] we can adopt the following conclusions:—

1. Statutes which merely facilitate the pleading in a case, such as those providing that technical objections are to be taken by demurrer, or that defects of process must be met by motion to quash, or that formal statements as to time, place, tenor, name, and value, are open to amendment on trial, or that a substantial accuracy of statement shall be sufficient, are constitutional.[2] In such cases, however, the court may, if conducive to justice, require additional particulars to be given by the prosecution.[3]

2. Statutes which authorize forms which give no substantial notice of the offence are unconstitutional,[4] and such is also the case, as to all amendments, in jurisdictions in which the Constitution makes

[1] See, to this effect, Com. *v.* Phillips, 16 Pick. 211; Com. *v.* Holley, 3 Gray, 458.

[2] State *v.* Comstock, 27 Vt. 553; Com. *v.* Holley, 3 Gray, 458; People *v.* Conroy, 97 N. Y. 62; Crown *v.* Com., 78 Penn. St. 122; Goersen *v.* Com., 99 Penn. St. 388; Com. *v.* Seymour, 2 Brewst. 567; State *v.* Graves, 45 N. J. L. 347; Cochrane *v.* State, 9 Md. 400; Hawthorne *v.* State, 56 Md. 530; Slymer *v.* State, 62 Md. 237; Trimble *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 143; Lasure *v.* State, 19 Ohio St. 44; People *v.* Cook, 10 Mich. 164; Marvin *v.* People, 26 Mich. 298; McLaughlin *v.* State, 45 Ind. 338; Rowan *v.* State, 30 Wis. 129; State *v.* Hart, 4 Ired. 246; State *v.* Schricker, 29 Mo. 265; State *v.* Craighead, 32 Mo. 561; State *v.* Krull, 5 Mo. Ap. 589; Noles *v.* State, 24 Ala. 672; Thompson *v.* State, 25 Ala. 41; Tatum *v.* State, 66 Ala. 465; Rocco *v.* State, 37 Miss. 357; Peebles *v.* State, 55 Miss. 454; State *v.* Mullen, 14 La. An. 570; State *v.* Christian, 30 La. An. Pt. I. 367; State *v.* Sullivan, 35 La. An. 844; People *v.* Kelly, 6 Cal. 210; State *v.* Manning, 14 Tex. 402; Townsend *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 574; Bates *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 26. A statute making it unnecessary to set forth the means by which the death occurred is constitutional. State *v.* Schnelle, 24 W. Va. 767; Noles *v.* State, 24 Ala. 672; Thompson *v.* State, 25 Ala. 41; Newcomb *v.* State, 37 Miss. 397; Wolf *v.* State, 19 Ohio St. 248; Goerson *v.* Com., 99 Penn. St. 388; Rowan *v.* State, 30 Wis. 129. *Contra*, State *v.* Mott, 29 Ark. 147; Clavy *v.* State, 33 Ark. 561. As amendments sustained as going to form, see State *v.* Freeman, 59 Vt. 661; State *v.* Amidon, 58 Vt. 524; People *v.* Johnson, 104 N. Y. 213; State *v.* Fonsnette, 38 La. An. 61; Huff *v.* State, 23 Tex. Ap. 291. As to amendments of records under Rev. Stat. § 1037, see Kelly *v.* U. S., 27 Fed. Rep. 616. That the statutory simplification of criminal pleading does not abrogate the judicial construction previously attached to the terms ordinarily used in such pleading. People *v.* Conroy, 97 N. Y. 62.

[3] Infra, § 702.

[4] State *v.* Learned, 47 Me. 426; State *v.* Mace, 76 Me. 399; Com. *v.* Harrington, 130 Mass. 135; People *v.* Campbell, 4 Parker C. R. 386; Kilrow *v.* Com. 89 Penn. St. 480; Goerson

a bill found by a grand jury a pre-requisite to a trial.[1] And such is the effect of a ruling, in 1887, of the Supreme Court of the United States.[2]

III. CAPTION AND COMMENCEMENT.

§ 91. The caption is no part of the indictment.[3] It is made up from the record of the court, generally by the clerk or other proper officer of the court, and its office is to state the style of the court, the time and place of its meeting, the time and place where the indictment was found, and the jurors by whom it was found. These particulars it must set forth with reasonable certainty for the use, as will presently be seen, of a superior or appellate court to which it may be removed.[4]

Caption is no part of indictment, being an explanatory prefix.

v. Com., 99 Penn. St. 388; Miller *v.* State, 3 Ohio St. 476; Williams *v.* State, 35 Ohio St. 175; Com. *v.* Buzzard, 5 Grat. 694; Blumenberg *v.* State, 55 Miss. 528; State *v.* Wilburn, 25 Tex. 738; State *v.* Daugherty, 30 Tex. 360; Brinster *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 612; Williams *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 395; Allen *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 28.

[1] See cases cited in last note.

This question, supposing the constitutional provisions are mere expressions of the common law in this respect, will be found elaborately discussed in Bradlaugh *v.* R., L. R. 3 Q. B. D. 607; 14 Cox C. C. 68; cited infra, § 760.

As to effect of verdict in curing formal errors, see infra, §§ 400, 759.

See, however, a Pennsylvania ruling that the name of the owner in larceny can be stricken out, and "persons unknown" inserted. Com. *v.* O'Brien, 2 Brewster, 566. See Phillips *v.* Com., 44 Penn. St. 197; Myers *v.* Com., 79 Penn. St. 308, cited infra, § 120. And see, to same general effect, Mulrooney *v.* State, 26 Ohio St. 326. As to other amendments, see State *v.* Arnold, 50 Vt. 731; People *v.* Mott, 34 Mich. 80; Garvin *v.* State, 52 Miss. 207.

[2] Bain, ex parte, 121 U. S. 1. In this case there was no federal statute authorizing the amendment, but the reasoning of the court strikes at statutory amendments. The constitutional amendment in question does not limit the States, applying only to the national government. Spies *v.* Illinois, 123 U. S. 131. See U. S. *v.* Conant, 9 Rep. 36; 9 Cent. L. J. 2; Abb. Nat. Dig. 686, per Lowell, J.

[3] 1 East P. C. 113; Fost. 2; Ch. C. L. 327; 1 Saund. 250 d, n. 1; 1 Stark. C. P. 238; R. *v.* Marsh, 6 A. & E. 236; State *v.* Gary, 36 N. H. 359; State *v.* Gilbert, 13 Vt. 647; State *v.* Thibeau, 30 Vt. 100; People *v.* Jewett, 3 Wend. 319; People *v.* Bennett, 37 N. Y. 117; State *v.* Price, 6 Halst. 203; Berrian *v.* State, 2 Zab. 9; State *v.* Smith, 2 Harring. 532; State *v.* Brickell, 1 Hawks, 354; State *v.* Haddock, 2 Hawks, 261; Noles *v.* State, 24 Ala. 672; State *v.* Blakely, 83 Mo. 359. See other cases, infra, § 93. In Whart. Prec. vol. i. pp. 1 *et seq.*, several forms of captions are given. See Caldwell *v.* State, 3 Baxter, 429.

[4] U. S. *v.* Thompson, 6 McLean, 56; State *v.* Conley, 39 Me. 78; McClure *v.* State, 1 Yerg. 206, per White, J.;

It must show that the *venire facias* was returned, and from whence the jury came, or it will be fatal on demurrer.[1]

When the indictment is returned from an inferior court, in obedience to a writ of *certiorari*, the statement of the previous proceedings sent with it is termed the *schedule*, and from this instrument the caption is extracted.[2] When taken from the schedule it is entered upon the record, and prefixed to the indictment, of which, however, it forms no part, but is only the preamble which makes the whole more full and explicit.[3] When there has been a removal by *certiorari*, its principal object, as we have seen, is to show that the inferior court had jurisdiction, and, therefore, a certainty in that respect is particularly requisite. Care must be taken duly to set it forth, for if there be no caption, or one that is defective, the error,

English *v.* State, 4 Tex. 125; Reeves *v.* State, 20 Ala. 33.

[1] State *v.* Hunter, Peck's Tenn. R. 166. See State *v.* Fields, Ibid. 140; State *v.* Williams, 2 McCord, 301.

In England, the caption in general does not appear until the return to a writ of *certiorari*, or a writ of error; yet in cases of high treason the defendant is entitled to a copy of it in the first instance after the finding of the indictment, in order that he may be acquainted with the names of the jurors by whom it was presented. 1 East P. C. 113; Fost. 2; Ch. C. L. 327. As it forms no part of the indictment it has been held no ground for arresting judgment that the indictment does not show, in its caption, that it was taken in the State; for, it is said, while it stood on the records of the court below, it appeared to be an indictment of that court, and when sent to the Supreme Court, the caption of the record, of which it is a part, officially certified, renders it sufficiently certain. State *v.* Brickell, 1 Hawks, 354; 1 Saunders, 250 d, n. 1. If wholly omitted in the court below, it is said the indictment may nevertheless be sufficient, as the minute of the clerk upon the bill, at the time of the presentment, and the general records of the term, will supply any defect in such preface. State *v.* Gilbert, 13 Vt. 647; State *v.* Smith, 2 Harring. 532.

In North Carolina, it was held that a caption to an indictment is only necessary where the court acts under a special commission. State *v.* Wasden, N. C. Term, 163.

Giving only the initials of the first names of the grand jurors is no defect. Stone *v.* State, 30 Ind. 115.

In Massachusetts practice, it seems, each indictment is framed with its own special caption, instead of leaving the caption to be made up, as is the usual and better course, from the records of the court, by the clerk, when the record is taken into another court. Yet even in Massachusetts, this "caption," if it is so to be called, is purely formal, and is amendable. See Com. *v.* Edwards, 4 Gray, 1. See also State *v.* Conley, 39 Me. 78.

[2] 1 Saund. 309.

[3] 2 Hale, 165; Bac. Ab. Indictment, J.; Burn, J., Indictment, ix.; Williams, J., Indictment, iv.

in England, may be taken advantage of on arrest.[1] But ordinarily its caption is not vitiated by mere surplusage.[2]

Substantial accuracy only required.

§ 92. A formal statement in the indictment that it was found by the authority of the State is not necessary, if it appear, from the record, that the prosecution was in the name of the State.[3] The caption must set forth the court where the indictment was found, as a "General Session of the Peace," "the Court of Oyer and Terminer," etc., "for N. Y. County," etc., so that it may appear to have jurisdiction.[4] Next to the statement of the court follows the name of the *place* and *county* where it was holden, and which must always be inserted;[5] and though it may be enough, after naming a place, to refer to "the county aforesaid," yet, unless there be such express reference to the county in the margin, or it be repeated in the body of the caption, it will be insufficient.[6] This is necessary in order to show that the place is within the limits of the jurisdiction;[7] and, therefore, whether the caption wholly omit the place, or do not state it with sufficient certainty, the proceedings will be alike invalid, though amendable;[8] as, if it state it to be taken only at the town, without adding "*the county aforesaid*," the omission will vitiate.[9] But though the name of the county be left blank in the margin of an indictment for misdemeanor, it is enough, in Virginia, if the county be stated in the body of the indictment.[10]

[1] 2 Sessions cases, 316; 1 Ch. C. L. 327. See State *v.* Wasden, 2 Taylor N. C. 163; State *v.* Haddock, 2 Hawks, 461.

[2] Winn *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 621.

[3] Greeson *v.* State, 5 Howard's Miss. 33.

[4] 2 Hale, 165; 2 Hawk. c. 25, ss. 16, 17, 118, 119, 120; Burn's Justice, 29th ed. by Chitty & Bears, Indict. ix.; Dean *v.* State, Mart. & Yer. 127; State *v.* Zule, 5 Halst. 348.

[5] Dyer, 69, A.; Cro. Jac. 276; 2 Hale, 166; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 128; Bacon Ab. Indictment, i.

[6] 2 Hale, 180; 3 P. Wms. 439; 1 Saund. 308, n.; Cro. Eliz. 137, 606, 738.

[7] R. *v.* Stanbury, L. & C. 128. As to venue see fully infra, § 139.

[8] Cro. Jac. 276; 2 Hale, 166; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 128; Bac. Ab. Indictment, i.

[9] Cro. Eliz. 137, 606, 738, 751; 2 Hale, 166; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 128; Bac. Ab. Indictment, i.; Williams, J., Indictment, iv.; U. S. *v.* Wood, 2 Wheel. C. C. 336.

[10] Teft *v.* Com., 8 Leigh, 721.

For North Carolina cases see State *v.* Lane, 4 Ired. 113; State *v.* Haddock, 2 Hawks, 461.

In Massachusetts, an indictment, with this caption: "Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Essex, to wit: At the Court of Common Pleas, begun

§ 93. Defects in the caption of the indictment, as not naming the judges, the jurors, and the county, which would be fatal if the

and holden at Salem, within and for the county of Essex," on a certain day, sufficiently shows that it was found at a court held in this Commonwealth. Com. *v.* Fisher, 7 Gray, 492. See also Jeffries *v.* Com., 12 Allen, 145; Com. *v.* Mullen, 13 Allen, 551. In the same State, an indictment which purports by its caption to have been found at a Court of Common Pleas for the county of Hampshire, and in the body of which "the jurors of said Commonwealth on their oath present," sufficiently shows that it was returned by the grand jury for the county of Hampshire. Com. *v.* Edwards, 4 Gray, 1. Infra, § 134. And in Maine, where the record commenced: "State of Maine, Cumberland, ss. At the Supreme Court begun and holden at Portland, within the county of Cumberland," it was held that this was sufficient to show that the court at which the indictment was found was holden for that county in the State of Maine. State *v.* Conley, 39 Me. 78. Infra, § 139. For other rulings on captions see Davis *v.* State, 19 Ohio St. 270; Lovell *v.* State, 45 Ind. 550; Woodsides *v.* State, 2 How. Miss. 655; Reeves *v.* State, 20 Ala. 33. See further, Davis *v.* State, 39 Md. 353.

In England an indictment purporting to be presented by the grand jurors "upon their oath and affirmation" need not state the reasons why any of the jurors affirmed instead of being sworn. Mulcahy *v.* R., 3 L. R. H. L. Cas. 306; Com. *v.* Brady, 7 Gray (Mass.), 320. See, however, *contra*, State *v.* Harris, 2 Halst. 361.

Whether "oath" or "oaths" is averred is immaterial. Com. *v.* Sholes, 11 Allen, 554; State *v.* Dayton, 3 Zab. 49. Infra, § 277.

It must appear on the face of the record, that the bill was found by at least twelve jurors, or it will be insufficient. Cro. Eliz. 654; 2 Hale, 167; 2 Hawk. c. 25, ss. 16, 126; 1 Saund. 248, n. 1; 4 East, 175, 176; Andr. 230; Bac. Ab. Indictment, i.; Burn, J., Indictment, ix.; Williams, J., Indictment, iv. Where the statute requires more than twelve, the requisite number must be averred. Fitzgerald *v.* State, 4 Wis. 395. They are usually described, also, as "good and lawful men," which is sufficient; 2 Hale, 167; Cro. Eliz. 751; 1 Keb. 629; Cro. Jac. 635; State *v.* Price, 6 Halst. 203. See State *v.* Jones, 4 Halst. 357; but this is not in England absolutely essential, especially when the indictment is found in a superior court, because all men shall be so regarded until the contrary appear. 2 Keb. 366; 2 Hawk. c. 25, ss. 16, 126; Bac. Ab. Indictment, i.; Burn, J., Indictment, ix.; Williams, J., Indictment, iv.; Stark. C. P. 236–7; R. *v.* Butterfield, 2 M. & R. 522. See Jerry *v.* State, 1 Blackf. 395; Beauchamp *v.* State, 6 Blackf. 299; Bonds *v.* State, Mart. & Yerg. 143; State *v.* Glasgow, Conf. 38; State *v.* Yancy, 1 Tread. 237. The caption then must state that they are "*of the county aforesaid*," or other vill or precinct for which the court had jurisdiction to inquire; and if these words are omitted the whole will be vicious. Tipton *v.* State, Peck's R. 8; Cornwell *v.* State, Mart. & Yerg. 147; Cro. Eliz. 667; 2 Keb. 160; 2 Hale, 167; 2 Hawk. c. 25, ss. 16, 126; Bac. Ab. Indictment, i.; Burn, J., Indictment, ix.; Williams, J., Indictment, iv. The caption, by implication at least, must show that the grand jury were of the county where the indictment was taken. Tipton *v.*

indictment were removed into a superior court, may be supplied in the court in which it is taken, by reference to other records there,[1] since when the indictment remains in the court of finding a caption is unnecessary.[2] And it is also held that the caption may be amended in the Supreme Court,

Caption may be amended.

State, Peck's Tenn. R. 308; per Haywood and Beck, JJ., *contra*, White, J.; Woodsides *v.* State, 2 How. (Miss.) 655. It is not, under the present practice, requisite to give the names of the grand jurors. R. *v.* Aylett, 6 A. & E. 247; R. *v.* Marsh, 6 A. & E. 236. If the names are given, a variance as to one of them is not fatal. State *v.* Norton, 3 Zab. 33; State *v.* Dayton, Ibid. 49.

Where it appeared by the record that a foreman was appointed, and the indictment was returned, signed by him, and the caption stated that the grand jury returned the bills into court by their foreman, it was held sufficient evidence that the bill was returned by the authority of the grand jury. Greeson *v.* State, 5 How. Miss. R. 33. See infra, § 368.

When an indictment purports to be on the affirmation of some of the grand jurors, it is said, in New Jersey, that it must appear that they were persons entitled by law to take affirmations in lieu of oaths, or it will be fatally defective; State *v.* Harris, 2 Halsted, 361; but such is not the usual practice; the indictment going no further, in most States, than to aver the fact of its being made on the oaths and affirmations of the grand jurors. Com. *v.* Fisher, 7 Gray, 492.

If the caption omit to state the grand jury were sworn, it will be presumed they were sworn; at least the recital in the record that "the grand jury were elected, empanelled, sworn, and charged," will be sufficient. McClure *v.* State, 1 Yerg. 206, per Catron, J.

In New York, it was ruled that an indictment taken at the sessions must, in the caption, state that the grand jury were, then and there, sworn and charged; the omission of the words "then and there" being fatal on motion in arrest of judgment; People *v.* Guernsey, 2 Johns. Cas. 265; but the contrary was held in Mississippi, where it was said that, if it appear from the record that the grand jurors were sworn, it will be presumed that they were then and there sworn. Woodsides *v.* State, 2 How. Miss. R. 655.

[1] Faulkner's case, 1 Saund. 249; R. *v.* Davis, 1 C. & P. 470; Broome *v.* R., 12 Q. B. 838; U. S. *v.* Thompson, 6 McLean, 156; State *v.* Brady, 14 Vt. 353; Com. *v.* Mullen, 13 Allen, 551; Com. *v.* Hines, 101 Mass. 33; Dawson *v.* People, 25 N. Y. 399; State *v.* Useful Man. So., 42 N. J. L. 504; Pennsylvania *v.* Bell, Add. 173; Com. *v.* Bechtell, 1 Am. L. J. 414; Brown *v.* Com., 78 Penn. St. 122; Mackey *v.* State, 3 Ohio St. 362; State *v.* Creight, 1 Brev. 169; State *v.* Murphy, 9 Port. 487; Reeves *v.* State, 20 Ala. 33; Kirk *v.* State, 6 Mo. 469; State *v.* Freeman, 21 Mo. 481; Cornelius *v.* State, 7 Eng. 782; Allen v. State, 5 Wis. 329. As to Massachusetts practice see Com. *v.* Gee, 6 Cush. 174; Com. *v.* Stone, 3 Gray, 453; Com. *v.* Cullon, 11 Gray, 1. As to particularity required in Indiana see State *v.* Connor, 5 Blackf. 325. As to Wisconsin see Fitzgerald *v.* State, 4 Wis. 395; and see cases cited supra, § 91.

[2] Wagner *v.* People, 4 Abb. App. Dec. 509.

on proper evidence of the facts; or the *certiorari* may be returned to the court below, and the amendment made there.[1]

Commencement must aver office and place of grand jurors, and also their oath.

§ 94. It is ordinarily sufficient for the commencement to state that the grand jurors of the State or Commonwealth, inquiring for the particular county or city, as the case may be, on their oaths or affirmations respectively,[2] find the special facts making up the charge.[3] The authority of the sovereign is in this way vouched.[4]

Each count must contain averment of oath.

§ 95. It must appear in the commencement of each count of an indictment that it was found by the jurors of the particular jurisdiction, on their oaths or affirmations,[5] and a want of such allegation in a subsequent count will not be aided by such allegations in a former count, where the word "aforesaid," or other words of reference, are not introduced.[6] It

[1] State *v.* Jones, 4 Halst. 357; State *v.* Norton, 3 Zabr. 33; State *v.* Williams, 2 McCord, 301; Vandyke *v.* Dare, 1 Bailey, 65. See infra, § 368.

[2] This is essential. Vanvickle *v.* State, 22 Tex. Ap. 625.

[3] The commencement of an indictment in these words, "The grand jurors for the people of the State of Vermont, upon their oath, present," etc., is sufficient, on motion, in arrest of judgment. State *v.* Nixon, 18 Vt. 70. So when "oaths" and not "oath" is used. Com. *v.* Sholes, 13 Allen, 554; State *v.* Dayton, 2 Zabr. 49.

In Texas the statutory form of commencement "in the name and by the authority of the State of Texas" is essential, and cannot be varied. Saine *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 144.

[4] Savage *v.* State, 18 Fla. 909.

[5] 2 Hale, 167; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 126; Burn, J., Indictment, ix.; State *v.* Conley, 39 Me. 78; State *v.* Nixon, 18 Vt. 70; Com. *v.* Fisher, 7 Gray, 492; Young *v.* State, 6 Ohio, 435; Burgess *v.* Com. 2 Va. Cas. 483; Clark *v.* State, 1 Carter, Ind. 253; State *v.* Williams, 2 McCord, 301; Morgan *v.* State, 19 Ala. 556; Byrd *v.* State, 1 How. (Miss.) 163; Abram *v.* State, 25 Miss. 589. That this should be shown by caption, see Potsdamer *v.* State, 17 Fla. 895. As to inserting "good and lawful men," see Weinzorpflin *v.* State, 7 Blackf. 186.

The usual form is, "The grand jurors for the State (or Commonwealth) of A., inquiring for the city (or town) of B., upon their oaths and affirmations respectively do present." To this, as a title, is prefixed the statutory name of the court. See, for forms in full, Whart. Prec. vol. i. pp. 8 *et seq.*

"Oath" may supply the place of "oaths." State *v.* Dayton, 3 Zab. 49; Jerry *v.* State, 1 Blackf. 395. That the *commencement* may be amended, see Com. *v.* Colton, 11 Gray, 1; State *v.* Mathis, 21 Ind. 277; State *v.* England, 19 Mo. 481.

The distinction between "caption" and "commencement" is not maintained by some of our courts, both, by such courts, being called "caption." But as both are purely formal, and are open to amendment by the record, they should be so amended when faulty.

[6] R. *v.* Waverton, 17 Q. B. 562; 2

is not necessary that the commencement should use the term "grand" before jurors, when the rest of the record shows that it was "grand jurors" that was meant.[1]

The indorsement upon an indictment is no part of it.[2]

IV. NAME AND ADDITION OF DEFENDANT AND NAME OF PROSECUTOR AND THIRD PARTIES.

1. *As to Defendant.*

§ 96. The indictment must be certain as to the defendant's name.[3] The name should be repeated to every distinct allegation; but it will suffice to mention it once as the nominative case in one continuing sentence.

Name of defendant should be specifically given.

When once given in full, the name need only be repeated by the Christian title as "the said John" or "James," as the case may be.[4] But each count must describe the defendant by his full name.[5]

§ 97. If the surname of the defendant be omitted in the presenting portion of an indictment, the defect is fatal, though the full name be mentioned in subsequent allegations referring to the name as their antecedent.[6]

Omission of surname is fatal.

§ 98. A plea in abatement, in the language of Mr. Chitty, has always been allowed when the Christian name of the defendant is mistaken,[7] but it seems formerly to have been supposed that an error in the surname was not thus pleadable.[8] But it is now the set-

Mistake as to either surname or Christian name may be met in abatement.

Den. C. C. 347; State *v.* McAllister, 26 Me. 374. *Aliter* when the second and subsequent counts refer to the first count by the word "aforesaid." State *v.* Dufour, 63 Ind. 567; Chase *v.* State, 50 Wis. 510.

[1] U. S. *v.* Williams, 1 Cliff. C. C. 5; Com. *v.* Edwards, 4 Gray, 1; State *v.* Pearce, 14 Fla. 153.

[2] Collins *v.* People, 39 Ill. 233.

[3] Bac. Abr. Misn. B.; 2 Hale, 175; Chitty's C. L. 167; Enwright *v.* State, 58 Ind. 567. See 22 Cent. Law J., 220.

[4] State *v.* Pike, 65 Me. 111.

[5] R. *v.* Waters, 1 Den. C. C. 356; Com. *v.* Sullivan, 6 Gray, 478.

An indictment against "Edward Toney Joseph Scott," laborers, intended for Edward Toney and Joseph Scott, is bad. State *v.* Toney, 13 Tex. 74.

[6] State *v.* Hand, 1 Eng. (Ark.) 165.

[7] 2 Hale, 176, 237, 238; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 68; Bac. Ab. Ind. G. 2, Misn. B.; Burn, J., Indict.; Gilb. C. P. 217, Washington *v.* State, 68 Ala. 85; Infra, § 423.

[8] 2 Hale, 176; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 69; Burn, J., Indict.; Williams, J., Misn. Bac. Ab. Misn. B.; Com. *v.* Demain, Brightly R. 441.

tled law that a mistake in the latter is equally fatal with one in the former.[1] A plea in abatement is the only way to meet the misnomer of the defendant; and this plea is too late after the general issue.[2]

When the issue is tried on plea in abatement, if the sound of the name is not affected by the misspellings, the error will not be material.[3] If two names are, in original derivation, the same, and are taken promiscuously in common use though they differ in sound, yet there is no variance.[4]

A *blank* in either Christian name or surname is ground for a motion to quash, or plea in abatement.[5]

§ 99. The surname may be such as the defendant has usually gone by or acknowledged; and if there be a doubt which one of two names is his real surname, the second may be added in the indictment after an *alias dictus*,[6] thus, "Richard Wilson, otherwise called Richard Layer." Proof of either will be enough.[7]

Surname may be laid as an *alias*.

§ 100. The inhabitants of a parish, in England, may be indicted for not repairing a highway, or the inhabitants of a county, for not repairing a bridge, without naming any of them.[8] And in Pennsylvania it was determined,

Inhabitants of parish and corpora-

[1] 10 East, 83; Kel. 11, 12.

[2] Infra, §§ 106, 423, 426; State *v.* Bishop, 15 Me. 122; State *v.* Nelson, 29 Me. 329; Smith *v.* Bowker, 1 Mass. 76; Com. *v.* Lewis, 1 Met. 151; Com. *v.* Fredericks, 119 Mass. 199; State *v.* Drury, 13 R. I. 540; Com. *v.* Cherry, 2 Va. Cas. 20; State *v.* White, 32 Iowa, 17; Miller *v.* State, 54 Ala. 155; Foster *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 531.

[3] 10 East, 84; 16 East, 110; 2 Hawkins, c. 27, s. 81. Infra, § 119; Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 94 *et seq.* As to plea, see infra, § 423.

[4] 2 Rol. Ab. 135; Bac. Ab. Misn., where the instances of this principle are stated at large.

[5] Infra, §§ 385, 425.

[6] Bro. Misn. 37.

[7] State *v.* Graham, 15 Rich. (S. C.) 310. Evans *v.* State, 62 Ala. 6.

It was once doubted whether there could be an *alias* of the Christian name. 1 Ld. Raym. 562; Willes, 554; Burn, J., Indict.; 3 East, 111. This doctrine, Mr. Chitty well argues, is not well founded; for, admitting that a person cannot have two Christian names at the same time, yet he may be *called* by two such names, which is sufficient to support a declaration or indictment, baptism being immaterial. R. T. H. 26; 6 Mod. 116; 1 Camp. 479. And Lord Ellenborough said that for all he knew, on a demurrer, "Jonathan, otherwise John," might be all one Christian name. Scott *v.* Soans, 3 East, 111.

[8] 2 Roll. Abr. 79; Archbold's C. P. 25.

that, where an act of assembly directed "the president, managers, and company" of a certain turnpike road to remove a gate on the road, an indictment would not lie against the president and managers, *individually*, for not removing the gate.[1] In Maine, however, it is said, that where an offence is committed by virtue of corporate authority, the individuals concerned in its commission, in their personal capacity, and not as a corporation, must be indicted;[2] and in Virginia it has been ruled, still more broadly, that a corporation cannot be impleaded *criminaliter* by its artificial name at common law.[3] But for all disobedience to statutes and derelictions of duty, the better opinion is that a corporation aggregate may be indicted by its corporate name; which name must, as a rule, be correctly alleged as it existed at the time of the offence.[4]

tion may be indicted in corporate name for disobedience.

§ 101. In several jurisdictions it has been determined that the law does not recognize more than one Christian name, and, therefore, when the middle names of the defendant are omitted, the omission is right.[5] And the same view is taken in Ohio and Tennessee, with the qualification that if a middle name is nevertheless set out, it must be proved as laid.[6] It was held a misnomer, however, in Massachusetts, when T. H. P. was indicted by the name of T. P.[7] The omission of the first name, giving only the middle, is fatal, unless the party is only

Middle names to be given when essential.

[1] Com. *v.* Demuth, 12 Serg. & Rawle, 389.

[2] State *v.* Great Works, 20 Me. R. 41.

[3] Com. *v.* Swift Run Gap Turnpike Co., 2 Va. Cas. 362. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 91–2.

[4] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 91–2; R. *v.* Great North of England R. R. Co., 9 Q. B. 315; R. *v.* Mayor, etc., of Manchester, 7 El. & Bl. 453; R. *v.* Birm. & Glou. Railway Co., 3 Ad. & El. Q. B. 223; 9 C. & P. 478; State *v.* Vermont C. R. R., 28 Vt. 583; Com. *v.* Phillipsburg, 10 Mass. 78; Com. *v.* Dedham, 16 Ibid. 142; Com. *v.* Demuth, 12 S. & R. 389. See McGarry *v.* People, 45 N. Y. 153, and cases cited Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 91–2.

[5] R. *v.* Newman, 1 Ld. Raym. 562; State *v.* Funy, 13 R. I. 623; Roozevelt *v.* Gardiner, 2 Cow. 463; People *v.* Cook, 14 Barb. 259; Edmondson *v.* State, 17 Ala. 179; State *v.* Manning, 14 Texas, 402; State *v.* Williams, 20 Iowa, 98. See State *v.* Smith, 7 Eng. 622; West *v.* State, 48 Ind. 483; State *v.* Martin, 10 Mo. 391.

[6] Price *v.* State, 19 Ohio, 423; State *v.* Hughes, 1 Swan. (Tenn.) 261; but see *contra*, People *v.* Lockwood, 6 Cal. 205; Miller *v.* People, 39 Ill. 457.

[7] Com. *v.* Perkins, 1 Pick. 388. See to same effect, State *v.* Homer, 40 Me. 438; Com. *v.* Hall, 3 Pick. 362.

known by the middle name.[1] The better view is that when a party is known by a combination of names, by these he should be described; though it is otherwise when he is only known by a single name.[2]

Initials sufficient when used by party himself.

§ 102. Where names are ordinarily written with an abbreviation, this will be sufficient in an indictment.[3] And where a man is in the habit of using initials for his Christian name, and he is so indicted, and the fact whether he was so known is put in issue, and he is convicted, the court will not interfere on that ground.[4] Even a motion to quash will be

[1] State *v.* Hughes, 1 Swan. 266; State *v.* Martin, 10 Mo. 391. See Hardin *v.* State, 26 Tex. 113.

[2] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 100. See Pace *v.* State, 69 Ala. 231.

[3] State *v.* Kean, 10 N. H. 347. See Com. *v.* Kelcher, 3 Metc. (Ky.) 484, where "Mrs. —— Kelcher" was held sufficient on demurrer. See *contra*, Gatty *v.* Field, 9 Ad. & El. (N. S.) 431.

[4] R. *v.* Dale, 17 Q. B. 64; Tweedy *v.* Jarvis, 27 Conn. 42; Vandermark *v.* People, 47 Ill. 122; City Coun. *v.* King, 4 McCord, 487; State *v.* Anderson, 3 Rich. 172; State *v.* Bell, 65 N. C. 313; State *v.* Johnson, 67 N. C. 58; State *v.* Johnson, 93 Mo. 73, 317; State *v.* Black, 31 Tex. 560; and cases cited infra, §§ 115–7. In Texas initials are sufficient under statute. McAfee *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 668.

"Lord Campbell, when an objection was made to a recognizance taken before Lee B. Townshend, Esq., and I. H. Harper, Esq., that only the initials of the Christian names of the justices were mentioned, remarked: 'I do not know that these are initials; I do not know that they (the justices) were not baptized with those names; and I must say that I cannot acquiesce in the distinction that was made in Lomax *v.* Tandels, that a vowel may be a name, but a consonant cannot. I allow that a vowal may be a Christian name, and why may not a consonant? Why might not the parents, for a reason good or bad, say that their child should be baptized by the name of B, C, D, F, or H.? I am just informed, by a person of most credible authority, that within his own knowledge a person has been baptized by the name of T.' And in this opinion of the chief, Justices Patterson, Wightman, and Erle concurred. R. *v.* Dale, 15 Jur. 657; 5 E. L. & E. 360." 18 Alb. L. J. 127; S. P., Tweedy *v.* Jarvis, 27 Conn. 42.

In Kinnersley *v.* Knott, 7 C. B. 980, Mr. Sergeant Talfourd contended that a defendant called "John M. Knott" was not legally and properly designated, saying that the letter M, standing by itself, could not be pronounced and meant nothing, but that in this connection it meant something, and that that something ought to be stated, for the law forbade the use of initials in pleadings. The court, however, held that M was not a name. Maule, J., said that vowels might be names, and that in Sully's Memoirs a Monsieur D'O is spoken of; but that consonants could not be so alone, as they require in pronunciation the aid of vowels; and the chief justice said that the courts had decided that they would not assume that a consonant expresses a name, but that it stood for an initial only, and that the insertion of an initial instead of a name was a ground of demurrer. In this country, as we have seen, single

refused when based simply on the adoption of initials for Christian names.[1]

Party cannot dispute a name accepted by him.

§ 103. If a man, by his own conduct, renders it doubtful what his real name is, he cannot defend himself on the ground of misnomer, if he be indicted by a name commonly accepted by him.[2]

Unknown party may be approximately described.

§ 104. Where the name of the defendant is unknown, and he refuses to disclose it, he may be described as a person whose name is to the jurors unknown, but who is personally brought before them by the keeper of the prison ;[3] but an indictment against him as a person to the jurors unknown, without something to ascertain whom the grand jury meant to designate, will be insufficient.[4] The practice is to indict the defendant by a specific name, such as John No-name, and if he pleads in abatement, to send in a new bill, inserting the real name which he then discloses, by which he is bound. This course is in some States prescribed by statute.[5]

A known party cannot be indicted as unknown,[6] and if it appear that the grand jury knew the name, the indictment may be quashed.[7]

The *Christian* name may, if necessary, be averred to be unknown.[8]

The pleading as to unknown co-conspirators is elsewhere discussed.[9]

consonants may be names. 18 Alb. L. J. 127. See Mead *v.* State, 26 Oh. St. 505; State *v.* Brite, 73 N. C. 26. But if the record show that the initial is not the full name, the variance may be fatal. State *v.* Webster, 30 Ark. 166.

In Gerrish *v.* State, 53 Ala. 476, the defendant was indicted by the name of F. A. Gerrish, and he pleaded that his name was not F. A. Gerrish, but Frank Augustus Gerrish, and that he was generally known as Frank A. Gerrish, and that this was known to the grand jury that indicted him. The plea was held good.

[1] U. S. *v.* Winter, 13 Blatch. 276.

[2] Newton *v.* Maxwell, 2 Crompt. & Jer. 2, 15; State *v.* Bell, supra; People *v.* Leong Quong, 60 Cal. 107; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 95.

[3] State *v.* Angell, 7 Iredell, 27.

[4] R. *v.* ——, R. & R. 489.

[5] See Geiger *v.* State, 5 Iowa, 484, where, under such a statute, it was held necessary to give a fictitious name.

[6] Infra, § 112; Whart. Crim. Ev. 9th ed. § 97. Geiger *v.* State, 5 Iowa, 484. See, as to Christian name, Stone *v.* State, 30 Ind. 115; Wilcox *v.* State, 31 Tex. 586.

[7] Jones *v.* State, 63 Ala. 27.

[8] Kelley *v.* State, 25 Ark. 392; Bryant *v.* State, 36 Ala. 270; Smith *v.* Bayonne, 23 La. An. 78.

[9] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1393.

§ 105. Stat. 1 Henry 5, c. 5, in force in most of the United States, specifies the following additions: "Estate or degree, or mystery;" and also the addition of the "towns, or hamlets, or places, and counties of which they were or be, or in which they be or were conversant."[1] The construction given to the statute in England has been, that the words "estate or degree" have the same signification, and include the titles, dignities, trades, and professions of all ranks and descriptions of men.[2] The omission of the addition is at common law fatal,[3] but in most jurisdictions additions are no longer necessary.[4]

At common law addition is necessary.

§ 106. Though, when there is no addition, the correct course at common law is to quash, yet, when there is a misnomer, the only method of meeting the error is by plea in abatement.[5] The error, however, must be one of substance; hence a plea in abatement that James Baker is a husbandman, and not a laborer, being demurred to, was adjudged bad.[6]

Wrong addition to be met by plea in abatement.

[1] See, as to Pennsylvania, Roberts' Dig. 2d ed. 374.

[2] 2 Inst. 666. This statute is in force in Pennsylvania. Com. v. France, 3 Brewster, 148.

[3] State v. Hughes, 2 Har. & McH. 479; Com. v. Sims, 2 Va. Cases, 374. As to Indiana, see State v. McDowell, 6 Blackf. 49.

[4] Mystery means the defendant's trade or occupation; such as merchant, mercer, tailor, schoolmaster, husbandman, laborer, or the like. 2 Hawk. c. 33, s. 111. Where a man has two trades, he may be named of either. 2 Inst. 658. But if a man who is a "gentleman" in England be a tradesman, he should be named by the addition of gentleman. 2 Inst. 669. In all other cases he may be indicted by his addition of degree or mystery, at the option of his prosecutor. See Mason v. Bushel, 8 Mod. 51, 52; Horspoole v. Harrison, 1 Str. 556; Smith v. Mason, 2 Str. 816; 2 Ld. Raym. 1541.

[5] State v. Bishop, 15 Me. 122; State v. Nelson, 29 Me. 329; Smith v. Bowker, 1 Mass. 76; Com. v. Lewis, 1 Met. 151; Com. v. Demain, Brightly R. 441; Lynes v. State, 5 Port. 236; Com. v. Cherry, 2 Va. Cas. 20; State v. White, 32 Iowa, 17. Infra, §§ 385, 423.

[6] Haught v. Com., 2 Va. Cas. 3. See, however, Com. v. Sims, 2 Va. Cas. 374.

In ordinary cases it has been held sufficient to give the addition of yeoman or laborer. 8 Mod. 51, 52; 1 Str. 556; 2 Str. 816; 2 Ld. Raym. 1541. Or to tradesmen, etc., the addition of the mystery; to widows, the addition of widows; to single women, the addition of spinster or single woman; to married women, usually thus: "Jane, the wife of John Wilson, late of the parish of C., in the county of B., laborer," though "matron" is not fatal. State v. Nelson, 29 Me. (16 Shep.) 329. Laborer (R. v. Franklyn, 2 Ld. Raym. 1179), or yeoman (2 Inst. 668), is not a good addition for a woman. Servant is not a good addition in any case. R. v. Checkets, 6 M. & S. 88.

Any addition calculated to cast contempt or ridicule on the defendant is

§ 107. The defendant must be described as of the town *or* hamlet, *or* place *and* county, of which he was or is, or in which he is or was, conversant.[1] In most States, the forms in common use give the addition of place, as "late of the said county," or "of the county of ——." The place may be averred to be that of the commission of the crime.[2]

Defendant's residence must be given.

§ 108. Where a father and son have the same name, and are both indicted, the English rule was to distinguish them by naming one as the elder, the other as the younger;[3] though such seems no longer requisite;[4] and the general rule in this country is that *junior* is no necessary part of the name,[5] though it has been held that when L. W. and L. W., Junior, being father and son, lived in the same place, and the indictment avers certain acts to be done by L. W., evidence is inadmissible to show that they were done by L. W., *Junior*, it being presumed L. W. in the indictment meant L. W., *Senior*.[6] In New York, in an early case, it was said that if a man be known by the addition of "*junior*" to his name, an indictment against him without that addition is not conclusive that he is the person indicted.[7] The question is one of usage. If a party is commonly known as "Junior" or as "2d," as such he must be indicted; otherwise not.[8]

"Junior" must be alleged when party is known as such.

bad; and it has been held, in Maine, that the addition, "lottery *vender*," when the defendant was, in fact, a lottery *broker*, is bad on abatement. State *v.* Bishop, 15 Me. 122.

Where, in an indictment against a woman, she is described as A. B., "wife of C. D.," these latter words are mere additions, or *descriptio personæ*, and need not be proved on trial. Com. *v.* Lewis, 1 Met. 151.

[1] Arch. C. P. 27.

[2] Com. *v.* Taylor, 113 Mass. 1.

[3] 1 Bulst. 183; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 70; Salk. 7.

[4] Hodgson's case, 1 Lewin C. C. 236; Peace's case, 3 Barn. & Ald. 579; Gevaghty *v.* State, 110 Ind. 103. But see R. *v.* Withers, 4 Cox C. C. 17.

[5] State *v.* Grant, 22 Me. 171; State *v.* Weare, 38 N. H. 314; Allen *v.* Taylor, 26 Vt. 599; Com. *v.* Perkins, 1 Pick. 388; Com. *v.* Parmenter, 101 Mass. 211; People *v.* Cook, 14 Barb. 259; People *v.* Collins, 7 Johns. 549; McKay *v.* State, 8 Tex. 376; San Francisco *v.* Randall, 54 Cal. 408. See Coit *v.* Starkweather, 8 Conn. 289; Com. *v.* East Boston Ferry Co., 13 Allen, 589.

[6] State *v.* Vittum, 9 N. H. 519; R. *v.* Bailey, 7 C. & P. 264; *contra*, R. *v.* Peace, 3 Barn. & Ald. 579. In Com. *v.* Parmenter, 101 Mass. 211, it was held that "W. R., Jr.," might be indicted as "W. R.," the second of that name.

[7] Jackson ex dem. Pell *v.* Provost, 2 Caines, 165.

[8] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 100.

2. *Description of Parties Injured and Third Parties.*

Name only of third person need be given.

§ 109. The statute of additions extends to the defendant alone, and does not at all affect the description either of the prosecutor, or any other individuals whom it may be necessary to name;[1] and therefore no addition is in such case necessary, unless more than two persons are referred to whose names are similar.[2] It is enough to state a party injured, or any person except the defendant, whose name necessarily occurs in the bill, by the Christian and surname; as, for instance, "on John Slycer did make an assault, or, the "goods of John Nokes did steal." The name thus given must be the name by which the person is generally known,[3] including Christian as well as surname.[4]

Corporate title must be special.

§ 110. When the name of a corporation is given, the corporate title must be strictly pursued, unless specification is made unnecessary by local statute.[5]

[1] 2 Leach, 861; 2 Hale, 182; Burn, J., Indictment; Bac. Ab. Indictment, G. 2; R. *v.* Graham, 2 Leach, 547; R. *v.* Ogilvie, 2 C. & P. 230; Com. *v.* Varney, 10 Cush. 402; though see R. *v.* Deeley, 1 Mood. C. C. 303; 4 C. & P. 578.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Infra, §§ 116, 119; R. *v.* Norton, Rus. & Ry. 510; R. *v.* Berriman, 5 C. & P. 601; R. *v.* Williams, 7 C. & P. 298; State *v.* Haddock, 2 Hayw. 162; Walters *v.* People, 6 Park. C. R. 16.

[4] Morningstar *v.* State, 52 Ala. 405; State *v.* Taylor, 15 Kans. 420; Collins *v.* State, 43 Tex. 577. But when an addition is stated descriptively, a variance may be fatal. R. *v.* Deeley, 1 Mood. C. C. 303; 4 C. & P. 579; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 100.

[5] Supra, § 100; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 941; R. *v.* Birmingham R. R. 3 Q. B. 223; State *v.* Vt. R. R., 28 Vt. 583; Fisher *v.* State, 40 N. J. L. 169; McGary *v.* People, 45 N. Y. 153; Lithgow *v.* State, 2 Va. Cas. 296; Smith *v.* State, 28 Ind. 321; Wallace *v.* People, 63 Ill. 481.

Whether at common law, in an indictment for stealing the goods of a corporation, it is requisite to aver that the corporation was incorporated, has been much disputed. That it is necessary is ruled in State *v.* Mead, 27 Vt. 722; Cohen *v.* People, 5 Parker C. R. 330; Fisher *v.* State, 40 N. J. L. 169; Wallace *v.* People, 63 Ill. 451; People *v.* Schwartz, 32 Cal. 160. That it is unnecessary, unless made so by statute, is ruled in R. *v.* Patrick, 1 Leach, 253; Com. *v.* Phillipburg, 10 Mass. 70; Com. *v.* Dedham, 16 Mass. 141; People *v.* McCloskey, 5 Parker C. C. 57, 334; People *v.* Jackson, 8 Barb. 637; McLaughlin *v.* Com., 4 Rawle, 464; Fisher *v.* State, 40 N. J. L. 169; Johnson *v.* State, 65 Ind. 204. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 716. The question depends upon whether the court takes judicial notice of the charter. Whart. on Ev. §§ 292–3.

§ 111. Where a third person cannot be described by name, it is enough to charge him as a "certain person to the jurors aforesaid unknown,"[1] which, as will presently be seen, is correct, if the party was at the time of the indictment unknown to the grand jury, though he became known afterwards.[2] A deceased person may thus be described as "unknown," when the grand jury have no knowledge of his name;[3] and so may the owner of stolen property;[4] or an assaulted

Third persons may be described as "unknown."

[1] 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 71; 2 East P. C. 651, 781; Cro. C. C. 36; Plowd. 85 b; Dyer, 97, 286; 2 Hale, 181; State *v.* Higgins, 53 Vt. 191; Com. *v.* Tompson, 2 Cush. 551; Com. *v.* Hill, 11 Cush. 137; Com. *v.* Stoddard, 9 Allen, 280; Goodrich *v.* People, 3 Parker C. R. 622; Com. *v.* Sherman, 13 Allen, 248; Willis *v.* People, 1 Scam. 399; State *v.* Irvin, 5 Blackf. 343; Brooster *v.* State, 15 Ind. 190; State *v.* McConkey, 20 Iowa, 574; State *v.* Bryant, 14 Mo. 340; Mackey *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 603. See Whart. Prec. (2) n. (*i*).

A Christian name may be averred to be unknown. Bryant *v.* State, 36 Ala. 270; Smith *v.* Bayonne, 23 La. An. 68.

[2] Stra. 186, 497; Com. *v.* Hendrie, 2 Gray, 503; Com. *v.* Intoxicating Liquors, 116 Mass. 21. See, as to vendee in liquor sales, Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1511.

[3] R. *v.* Campbell, 1 Car. & K. 82; State *v.* Haddock, 2 Hayw. 348; Reed *v.* State, 16 Ark. 499. In Wade *v.* State, 23 Tex. Ap. 308, it was held that giving the name of the deceased as "Smutty my Darling," though peculiar, was not bad.

[4] 2 East P. C. 651, 781; 1 Ch. C. L. 212; 1 Hale, 181; 2 B. & Ald. 580; Com. *v.* Morse, 14 Mass. 217; Com. *v.* Manley, 12 Pick. 173; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 949. To support the description of "unknown," remarks Mr. Sergeant Talfourd, "it must appear that the name could not well have been supposed to have been known to the grand jury." R. *v.* Stroud, 1 C. & K. 187. A bastard is sufficiently identified by showing the name of its parent, thus: "A certain illegitimate male child then lately born of the body of A. B. (the mother.)" R. *v.* Hogg, 2 M. & Rob. 380. See R. *v.* Hicks, 2 Ibid. 302, where an indictment for child-murder was held bad for not stating the name of the child, or accounting for its omission. A bastard must not be described by his mother's name till he has acquired it by reputation. R. *v.* Clark, R. & R. 358; Wakefield *v.* Mackey, 1 Phill. R. 134, *contra*. A bastard child, six weeks old, who was baptized on a Sunday, and down to the following Tuesday had been called by its name of baptism and mother's surname, was held by Erskine, J., to be properly described by both those names in an indictment for its murder; R. *v.* Evans, 8 C. & P. 765; but where a bastard was baptized "Eliza," without mentioning any surname at the ceremony, and was afterwards, at three years old, suffocated by the prisoner, an indictment styling it "Eliza *Waters*," that being the mother's surname, was held bad by all the judges, as the deceased had not acquired the name of Waters by reputation. R. *v.* Waters, 1 Mood. C. C. 457; 2 C. & K. 862. (N. B. No baptismal register, or copy of it, was produced at either trial. *Semb.*: "Eliza"

person.[1] Unless there be such an averment, an indictment in which the injured party is not individuated cannot be sustained.[2]

But this allegation may be traversed.

§ 112. But if the third party's name be known to the grand jury, or could have been known by inquiry of witnesses at hand, the allegation will be improper, and the defendant must be acquitted on that indictment, though he may be afterwards tried upon a new one, in which the

would have snfficed. See R. *v.* Strond, 1 C. & K. 187, and cases collected; Williams *v.* Bryant, 5 M. & W. 447.) In the previous case of R. *v.* Clark, R. & R. 358, an indictment stated the murder of "*George Lakeman Clark*, a base-born infant male child, aged three weeks," by the prisoner, its mother. The child had been christened *George Lakeman*, being the name of its reputed father, and was called so, and not by any other name known to the witnesses. Its mother called it so. There was no evidence that it had been called by or obtained its mother's name of *Clark*. The court held that the child was incorrectly described as *Clark*, and as nothing but the name identified him in it, the conviction was held bad. See, also, R. *v.* Sheen, 2 C. & P. 634. However, iu R. *v.* Bliss, 8 C. & P. 773, an indictment against a married woman for murder of a legitimate child, which stated "that she, in and upon a certain *infant male child of tender years*, to wit, of the age of six weeks, and not baptized, feloniously and wilfully, etc., did make an assault," etc., was held insufficient by all the judges, as it neither stated the child's name, nor that it was "to the jurors unknown." It is, however, sufficient to describe the child "as a certain male child, etc., of tender age, that is to say, about the age of six weeks, and not baptized, born of the body of C. B." See 2 C. & P. 635, n.; R. *v.* Willis, 1 C. & K. 722; see, also, R. *v.* Sheen, 2 C. & P. 634; Dickins, Q. S. 6th ed. 213. *Junior* and *Senior*. The law as to defendants on this point has been already stated, § 108. In England, it is said that where the party injnred has a mother or father of the same name, it is better to style the prosecutor "the younger," as it may be presumed that the parent is the party meant; for George Johnson means G. J. the elder, unless the contrary is expressed. Singleton *v.* Johnson, 9 M. & W. 67. But this was held immaterial when it is sufficiently proved who Elizabeth Edwards, the party described assaulted, was, viz., the daughter of another Elizabeth Edwards. R. *v.* Peace, 3 B. & Ald. 579.

Where the defendant was indicted for the murder of her bastard child, whose name was to the jurors unknown, and it appeared that the child had not been baptized, but that the mother had said she would like to have it called Mary Ann, and little Mary, the indictment was held good. R. *v.* Smith, 1 Mood. C. C. 402; 6 C. & P. 151.

An indictment for the murder of "a certain Wyandott Indian, whose name is unknown to the grand jury," is valid, and sufficiently descriptive of the deceased, without an allegation that the words "Wyandott Indian" mean a human being. Reed *v.* State, 16 Ark. 499.

[1] Grogan *v.* State, 63 Miss. 147.

[2] Parker *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 351; Rutherford *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 92.

mistake is corrected.[1] Discovery of the name *subsequently* to the finding of the bill, however, is no ground for acquittal,[2] or arrest of judgment.[3] But the allegation that co-defendants are "unknown" is material, and may be traversed under the plea of not guilty.[4] Thus, an indictment will be bad against an accessary, stating the principal to be unknown to the grand jury, contrary to the truth, and the judge will direct an acquittal.[5]

§ 113. The test is, had the grand jury notice, actual or constructive, of the name; for if so, the name must be averred.[6] But it is not enough to defeat the bill that the same grand jury found another bill specifying the "person unknown" as "J. L.,"[7] and the burden is on the defendant to prove knowledge at the time by the grand jury.[8]

The test is whether the name was unknown to the grand jury.

It is the approved practice, in cases of doubtful ownership, to lay the ownership in one count in persons unknown, and in other counts in several persons tentatively.

[1] 2 East P. C. 561, 781; 3 Camp. 265, note; 1 Hale, 512; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 71; 2 Leach, 578; R. *v.* Robinson, 1 Holt, 595; R. *v.* Stroud, 2 Mood. 270; State *v.* Wilson, 30 Conn. 500; White *v.* State, 35 N.Y. 465; Guthrie *v.* State, 16 Neb. 601; Williamson *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 514. See Buck *v.* State, 1 Ohio St. 61; Jorasco *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 283; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 97. As to unknown conspirators, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1393, 1511. That proof of a "person unknown" will not sustain an averment of "persons unknown," see Moore *v.* State, 65 Ind. 213.

[2] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 97; R. *v.* Campbell, 1 C. & K. 82; R. *v.* Smith, 1 Mood. C. C. 402; Com. *v.* Hill, 11 Cush. 137; Com. *v.* Hendrie, 2 Gray, 503; Zellers *v.* State, 7 Ind. 659; Cheek *v.* State, 38 Ala. 227; State *v.* Bryant, 14 Mo. 340.

[3] People *v.* White, 55 Barb. 606; S. C., 32 N. Y. 465; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 97.

[4] Barkman *v.* State, 8 Eng. (13 Ark.) 703; Cameron *v.* State, Ibid. 712; Reed *v.* State, 16 Ark. 499. See Whart. Crim. Ev. § 97; Whar. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 948.

[5] 3 Camp. 264, 265; 2 East P. C. 781.

[6] R. *v.* Stroud, 1 C. & K. 187; R. *v.* Robinson, Holt N. P. 595; Com. *v.* Sherman, 13 Allen, 249; Com. *v.* Glover, 111 Mass. 401; Blodget *v.* State, 3 Ind. 403. See Atkinson *v.* State, 19 Tex. App. 462.

[7] R. *v.* Bush, R. & R. 372. See 1 Den. C. C. 361; Com. *v.* Sherman, 13 Allen, 250.

[8] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 97; Com. *v.* Hill, 11 Cush. 137; Com. *v.* Gallagher, 126 Mass. 54. As to liquor cases, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1510, 1511.

Immaterial misnomer may be rejected as surplusage.

§ 114. If the allegation in which the misnomer appears is immaterial, it may be rejected as surplusage.[1]

Sufficient if description be substantially correct.

§ 115. A mere statement of the Christian name, without any addition to ascertain the precise individual, is bad, because uncertain.[2] But where the pleader undertakes to set out the names of a firm, a variance in the proof of these names is fatal.[3]

Variance in third party's name is fatal.

§ 116. A variance or an omission in the name of the person aggrieved is much more serious than a mistake in the name or addition of the defendant, as the latter can only be taken advantage of by the plea in abatement, while the former will be ground for arresting the judgment when the error appears on the record, or for acquittal, when a variance arises on the trial.[4]

Name may be given by initials.

§ 117. *Initials*, it seems, are a sufficient designation of the Christian name, if the party uses and is known by such initials;[5] and at all events cannot be excepted to after verdict.[6]

Repntative name is sufficient.

§ 118. As has been already incidentally noticed, a description of a person in legal proceedings by the name acquired by reputation has been held sufficiently certain.[7] Thus

[1] Com. *v.* Hunt, 4 Pick. 252; U. S. *v.* Howard, 3 Sumner, 12; State *v.* Farrow, 48 Ga. 30; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 138. Infra, § 158.

[2] 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 71; Bac. Ab. Indictment, G. 2. But see Starkie, 171, 172; 6 St. Tr. 805; Moore, 466; Dyer, 285 *a*; Keilw. 25; 1 Leach, 248; 2 Leach, 861; 2 East P. C. 990; 2 Hawkins, c. 25, s. 72; Martin *v.* State, 6 Humph. 204. Infra, § 118; Harne *v.* State, 39 Md. 552. See Stockton *v.* State, 25 Tex. 772.

[3] Doane *v.* State, 25 Ind. 495; Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 94 *et seq.*

[4] 1 East P. C. 514, 651, 781; 2 Leach, 774; 1 Ch. C. L. 217; State *v.* Sherrill, 81 N. C. 550; Graham *v.* State, 40 Ala. 659; Haworth *v.* State, Peck. 89; Osborne *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 225. See fully Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 94 *et seq.* That variance as to middle name may be fatal, see Ibid.; Com. *v.* O'Hearn, 132 Mass. 553; Com. *v.* Budeley, 145 Mass. 181.

[5] Mead *v.* State, 26 Ohio St. 505; State *v.* Bell, 65 N. C. 313; State *v.* Brite, 73 N. C. 26; Thompson *v.* State, 48 Ala. 165; State *v.* Seely, 30 Ark. 162; State *v.* Anderson, 3 Rich. 172; State *v.* Black, 31 Tex. 560; Vandermark *v.* People, 47 Ill. 122. See supra, § 102. As to variance see Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 94 *et seq.*

[6] Smith *v.* State, 8 Ohio, 294.

[7] R. *v.* Norton, R. & R. 509; R. *v.* Berriman, 5 C. & P. 601; Anon., 6 C. & P. 408; State *v.* Bundy, 64 Me. 507; Waters *v.* People, 6 Parker C. R. 16; Com. *v.* Trainor, 123 Mass. 414; State *v.* Bell, 65 N. C. 313; Jones *v.* State,

where, in a case of homicide, an indictment charges the name of the person slain as Marie Gardiner, *alias* Maria Bull, and the proof shows her real name to have been Maria Frances Bull, though generally known by the name in the indictment, it is sufficient.[1]

Idem sonans is sufficient.

§ 119. Should the name proved be *idem sonans* with that stated in the indictment, and different in spelling only, the variance will be immaterial.[2] Thus, Segrave for Seagrave;[3] McLauglin for McGloflin;[4] Chambles for Chambless;[5] Usrey for Userry;[6] Authron for Autrum;[7] Benedetto for Beniditto;[8] Whyneard for Winyard, pronounced Winnyard;[9] Petris for Petries, the pronunciation being the same;[10] Hutson for Hudson,[11] form no variance. But it has been decided that when the sound differs, the variance is fatal,[12] and that McCann and McCarn,[13] Shakespear and Shakepear,[14] Tabart and Tarbart,[15] Shutliff and Shirtliff,[16] Comyns and Cummins;[17] are not the same in sound.[18]

What is *idem sonans* is for the jury.[19]

65 Ga. 147; McBeth *v.* State, 50 Miss. 81; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 95.

Hence the omission of an initial middle name is not fatal. People *v.* Ferris, 56 Cal. 142.

[1] State *v.* Gardiner, Wright's Ohio R. 392. See, also, R. *v.* Willis, 1 Car. & K. 722; O'Brien *v.* People, 48 Barb. 274; Kriel *v.* Com., 5 Bush (Ky.), 362; People *v.* McGilver, 67 Cal. 55.

[2] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 96. See R. *v.* Wilson, 2 C. & K. 527; 1 Den. C. C. 284; 2 Cox C. C. 426; State *v.* Bean, 19 Vt. 530; State *v.* Hare, 95 N. C. 682; Point *v.* State, 37 Ala. 148; Donnelly *v.* State, 78 Ala. 453; State *v.* Pullens, 81 Mo. 387; State *v.* Lincoln, 17 Wis. 579; State *v.* Witt, 34 Kan. 488; see 22 Cent. L. J. 247, 249, where a number of illustrations are given.

[3] Williams *v.* Ogle, 2 Str. 889.

[4] McLauglin *v.* State, 52 Ind. 476.

[5] Ward *v.* State, 28 Ala. 53.

[6] Cresham *v.* Walker, 10 Ala. 370.

[7] State *v.* Scurry, 3 Rich. 68.

[8] Ahibol *v.* Beniditto, 2 Taunt. 401.

[9] R. *v.* Foster, R. & R. 412.

[10] Petries *v.* Woodworth, 3 Caines, 219. See State *v.* Upton, 1 Dev. 513.

[11] State *v.* Hutson, 15 Mo. 512.

[12] Clements *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 258; Neiderluck *v.* State, Ibid. 320; McDevro *v.* State, 23 Tex. Ap. 429. See cases in 22 Cent. L. J. 247–8.

[13] R. *v.* Tannett, R. & R. 351.

[14] R. *v.* Shakespear, 10 T. R. 83.

[15] Bingham *v.* Dickie, 5 Taunt. 814.

[16] 1 Chit. C. L. 216; 3 Chit. Burn, 341.

[17] Cruickshank *v.* Comyns, 24 Ill. 602.

[18] See Com. *v.* Gillespie, 7 Serg. & R. 469.

[19] R. *v.* Davis, 2 Den. C. C. 231; T. & M. 557; 5 Cox C. C. 238; Com. *v.* Donovan, 13 Allen, 571; Com. *v.* Jennings, 121 Mass. 47. See People *v.* Cooke, 6 Park, C. R. 31. See fully Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 94 *et seq.*; 22 Cent. L. J. 247.

It may be stated in brief:—

1st. A *variance* in defendant's name

The decisions on the subject of variance will be found fully collated in the treatise on Criminal Evidence with which this work is to be taken in connection.[1]

V. TIME.

1. Time must be averred, but not generally material, § 120.
2. What Precision is necessary in its Statement, § 123.
3. Initials and Numerals, § 124.
4. Double and Obscure Dates; Continuandos, § 125.
5. Historical Epochs, § 128.
6. Hour, § 130.
7. Then and There, § 131.
8. Repugnant Future or Impossible Dates, § 134.
9. Cases where Date is material, § 136.

Time must be averred but not generally material.

§ 120. Time and place must be attached to every material fact averred,[2] but the time of committing an offence (except where the time enters into the nature of the offence, or becomes material under a statute of limitations), may be laid on any day previous to the finding of the bill,[3] during the period within which it may be prosecuted.[4]

or addition can only be taken advantage of by plea in abatement. Supra, § 106.

2d. A *blank* in either Christian name, surname, or addition of defendant can be taken advantage of by plea in abatement, though the proper course is by motion to quash. Ibid.

3d. Any variance in *sound* in the name of material third parties is fatal at common law, it being the duty of the court to order an acquittal, though such acquittal is no bar to a second and correct indictment. Supra, §§ 116, 119.

The court will determine by inspection what is the name as written in the indictment. O'Neil *v.* State, 48 Ga. 66.

[1] Whart. Crim. Ev. 9th ed. § 96.

[2] 1 Chit. on Pleading, 4th ed. Index, tit. Time; R. *v.* Hollond, 5 T. R. 607; R. *v.* Aylett, 1 T. R. 69; Stand. 95 *a*; R. *v.* Haynes, 4 M. & S. 214; State *v.* Baker, 4 Reding. 52; State *v.* Hanson, 39 Me. 337; State *v.* Day, 74 Me. 220; Crichton *v.* People, 6 Park. C. R. 363; State *v.* Lyon, 45 N. J. 272; State *v.* Brown, 24 S. C. 224; Roberts *v.* State, 19 Ala. 526; State *v.* Walker, 14 Mo. 398; State *v.* Beckwith, 1 Stewart, 318; Sanders *v.* State, 26 Tex. 119; State *v.* Slack, 30 Tex. 354; People *v.* Littlefield, 5 Cal. 355; though see State *v.* Barnett, 3 Kans. 250.

[3] Williams *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 226.

[4] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 102; U. S. *v.* Bowman, 2 Wash. C. C. 328; State *v.* Williams, 76 Me. 480; State *v.* Havey, 58 N. H. 377; State *v.* Ingalls, 59 N. H. 88; Com. *v.* Dillane, 1 Gray, 483; Com. *v.* Sego, 125 Mass. 210; People *v.* Van Santvoord, 9 Cow. 660; Turner *v.* People, 33 Mich. 363; State *v.* Swaim, 97 N. C. 462; Cook *v.* State, 11 Ga. 53; State *v.* Gibbs, 6 Baxt. 238; State *v.* Davis, 6 Baxt. 605; State *v.* Bell, 49 Iowa, 440; State *v.* Ferrell, 20 W. Va. 759; Wingard *v.* State, 13 Ga. 396; Shelton *v.* State, 1 Stew. & Por. 208; M'Dade *v.* State, 20 Ala. 81; McBryde *v.* State, 34 Ga. 202; State *v.* Magrath, 19 Mo. 678.

To assign the day as that of the finding of the bill (unless there be a specific averment that the offence was prior to the finding),[1] or subsequent thereto, is bad.[2]

If a day certain be laid before the finding, other insensible dates may be rejected as surplusage.[3]

Where there is a statute authorizing amendments of formal errors, and there is no constitutional impediment, dates when formal may be amended.[4]

When "Sunday" is the essence of offence, the day must be specified.

§ 121. The statement of the day of the month, in an indictment for an offence on Sunday, though the doing of the act on that day is the gist of the offence, is not more material than in other cases; and hence, if the indictment charge the offence to have been committed on Sunday, though it names the day of the month which does not fall on Sunday, it is good, or though the Sunday averred is not the Sunday proved.[5] But "Sunday" or "Sabbath" must be averred.[6]

"Sabbath" for "Sunday" is said to be no variance.[7]

"*Videlicet*" may introduce a date tentatively.

§ 122. A *videlicet* (*i. e.* "that afterwards, to wit," etc.) was used by the old pleaders when they wished to aver a date or other fact tentatively, for information, without binding themselves to it as a matter of essential description, a variance in respect to which would be fatal. Hence it has been held in England (though there is some confusion in the authorities in this respect) that the *videlicet* can, if repugnant, be stricken out as surplusage, when there is enough remaining to make

[1] Com. *v.* Miller, 79 Ky. 451.

[2] State *v.* Munger, 15 Vt. 291; State *v.* Litch, 33 Vt. 67; Com. *v.* Doyle, 110 Mass. 103; Jacobs *v.* Com., 5 S. & R. 316; State *v.* Noland, 29 Ind. 212; Joel *v.* State, 28 Tex. 642; Kincaid *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 465; Lee *v.* State, 22 Tex. Ap. 547; Williams *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 226; Goddard *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 566. Infra, § 134.

[3] Wells *v.* Com., 12 Gray, 326; State *v.* Fletcher, 13 R. I. 522; State *v.* Woodman, 3 Hawks, 384; Cook *v.* State, 11 Ga. 53. Infra, § 125.

[4] Myers *v.* Com., 79 Penn. St. 308. But see supra, § 90.

[5] R. *v.* Trehearne, 1 Mood, C. C. 298; Com. *v.* Harrison, 11 Gray, 308; People *v.* Ball, 42 Barbour, 324; Hoover *v.* State, 56 Md. 584; State *v.* Eskridge, 1 Swan (Tenn.), 413; State *v.* Drake, 64 N. C. 589; State *v.* Wood, 86 N. C. 708; State *v.* Bryson, 90 N. C. 747. But see Werner *v.* State, 51 Ga. 426. For proof see Whart. Crim. Ev. § 106. See Com. *v.* Hoyer, 125 Mass. 209; Pancake *v.* State, 81 Ind. 630.

[6] See R. *v.* Trehearne, 1 Mood. C. C. 298; Com. *v.* Harrison, 11 Gray, 308; McGowan *v.* Com., 2 Metc. (Ky.) 3; Frazier *v.* State, 19 Mo. 678; State *v.* Land, 42 Ind. 311; Robinson *v.* State, 38 Ark. 548.

[7] State *v.* Drake, 64 N. C. 589.

out the charge.[1] And as a rule the *videlicet* relieves the pleader from the necessity of proving a non-essential descriptive averment.[2]

After verdict, to support an indictment, and to show that the provisions of a statute have been complied with, dates laid under a *videlicet* may be taken to be true,[3] and as properly averred.[4]

Before verdict, however, and at common law, dates laid in a *videlicet*, when time is material, may be traversed; and hence, if laid insensibly, will vitiate the context. In other words, when an allegation is material, accuracy in stating it cannot be dispensed with by thrusting it into a *videlicet*.[5]

Blank as to date is fatal.

§ 123. It is requisite, with some exceptions, to name both the day and year. The month without the year is insufficient,[6] and so when the month is given but the day is left blank.[7] If the date be laid in blank the judgment will be arrested.[8] But in Pennsylvania, it has been determined that where the commencement of the indictment was "December Session, 1818," and the offence was charged to have been committed on the twelfth day of August, in *the year aforesaid*, the time was sufficiently expressed.[9] And it was said in another case that it was not fatal to aver the "first March," instead of the first day of March.[10] On the other hand, an indictment, not containing the year, but referring to the caption (which does contain the year) in this manner, "in the year of our Lord aforesaid," has been held to be bad, as the caption is no part of the indictment.[11]

[1] Infra, § 158 *a;* Ryalls *v.* R. (in error), 11 Q. B. 781; 18 L. J. M. C. 69—Exch. Cham. But see People *v.* Jackson, 3 Denio, 101; and Mallett *v.* Stevenson, 26 Conn. 428; where the *videlicet* was held to narrow the preceding averment. Whart. Crim. Ev. § 141.

[2] 1 Green. Ev. § 60; 1 Ch. Pl. 317; State *v.* Heck, 23 Minn. 551.

[3] Infra, § 158 *a;* R. *v.* Scott, D. & B. C. C. 47.

[4] State *v.* Murphey, 55 Vt. 547.

[5] See State *v.* Phinney, 32 Me. 440; Paine *v.* Fox, 16 Mass. 129; State *v.* Haney, 1 Hawks, 460; 2 Saund. 291; 1 Ch. C. L. 226.

[6] Com. Dig. Ind. s. 2; Com. *v.* Griffin, 3 Cush. 523.

[7] Clark *v.* State, 34 Ind. 436.

[8] State *v.* Beckwith, 1 Stew. 318; State *v.* Roache, 2 Hayw. 352; Jane *v.* State, 3 Mo. 45. Under the Tennessee statute a blank as to day of month is not fatal. State *v.* Parker, 5 Lea, 568.

[9] Jacobs *v.* Com., 5 S. & R. 315; though see Com. *v.* Hutton, 5 Gray, 89.

[10] Simmons *v.* Commonwealth, 1 Rawle, 142.

[11] State *v.* Hopkins, 7 Blackf. 494.

§ 124. It has been said that the omission of the phrase, "the year of our Lord," is fatal,[1] though it is ruled that A. D., in initials, will be sufficient;[2] and the better opinion is that both may be dispensed with.[3] The dates may be given in Arabic figures.[4] It should be averred which figures designate the year. It is not enough to say "the fifteenth of June, 1855."[5]

Substantial accuracy is enough.

In Massachusetts, a complaint which charges, in words at length, the time of the commission of an offence, is not affected by the addition, in figures, of the date when the complaint is made.[6]

§ 125. To aver that the defendant, on divers days, committed an offence, is bad; and so where two distinct days are averred;[7] but it is sufficient to state that on a day specified, as well as on certain other days, he kept a gaming-house, a tippling-house, or a common nuisance; the allegation, "certain other days," being rejected as surplusage.[8]

Double or obscure dates are inadequate.

[1] Whitesides *v.* People, 1 Breese, R. 4; though see State *v.* Haddock, 2 Hawks, 461; State *v.* Dickens, 1 Hayw. 406. Infra, § 274.

[2] State *v.* Reed, 35 Me. 489; State *v.* Hodgeden, 3 Vt. 481.

[3] Broome *v.* R., 12 Q. B. 834; State *v.* Gilbert, 13 Vt. 647; Hall *v.* State, 3 Kelley, 18; Engleman *v.* State, 2 Carter (Ind.), 91; State *v.* Munch, 22 Minn. 67. Infra, § 274.

[4] Infra, § 274; State *v.* Reed, 35 Me. 489; State *v.* Hodgeden, 3 Vt. 481; State *v.* Jericho, 40 Vt. 121; Com. *v.* Hagarman, 10 Allen, 401; Com. *v.* Adams, 1 Gray, 48; Lazier *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 708; Cady *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 776; State *v.* Dickens, 1 Hayw. 406; State *v.* Haddock, 2 Hawks, 461; State *v.* Lane, 4 Ired. 113; State *v.* Raiford, 7 Port. 101; State *v.* Smith, Peck, 165; State *v.* Egan, 10 La. An. 699; Kelly *v.* State, 3 Sm. & M. 518; State *v.* Seamons, 1 Iowa, 418; though see *contra*, at common law in New Jersey and Indiana, Berrian *v.* State, 2 Zabriskie, 9; State *v.* Voshall, 4 Ind. 590; Finch *v.* State, 6 Blackf. 533. In both States this is corrected by statute. Johnson *v.* State, 2 Dutch. (N. J.) 313. See, also, as to Indiana, Hizer *v.* State, 12 Ind. 330.

[5] Com. *v.* McLoon, 5 Gray, 91.

[6] Commonwealth *v.* Keefe, 7 Gray, 332.

[7] 1 Ld. Raym. 581; 10 Mod. 249; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 82; Cro. C. C. 36; 4 Mod. 101; Com. *v.* Adams, 1 Gray, 481; State *v.* Brown, 3 Murph. 224; State *v.* Weller, 3 Murph. 229; State *v.* Hayes, 24 Mo. 358; corrected by statute, 1852, p. 368; Hampton *v.* State, 8 Ind. 336; State *v.* Hendricks, Conf. 369. *Aliter* under N. Y. statute. New York *v.* Mason, 4 E. D. Smith, 142. And to aver a series of blows on successive days, resulting in death, is not bad. Com. *v.* Stafford, 12 Cush. 619; and so as to successive adulterous acts, State *v.* Briggs, 68 Iowa, 416. See Hutchinson *v.* State, 62 Ind. 553. In Kansas "on or about" a specified day does not vitiate; State *v.* Harp, 31 Kan. 496; and so in Missouri, State *v.* Findlay, 77 Mo. 338.

[8] Starkie's C. P. 60; U. S. *v.* La

Continuando.

In cases in which it is necessary that a *continuando* should be averred (*e. g.*, in cases of continuous bigamy, or continuous nuisance[1]) the periods between which the offence is charged to continue should be specified.[2] In such cases it is enough to say that the offence was committed on a day named, and on certain other days between two days named, or (when the statute requires) that the offence continued between two named days.[3] And it has been ruled that the offence must be proved to have been committed within the period specified.[4] Nor is a *continuando* necessary unless for an essentially continuous offence.[5]

Without the allegation of a *continuando*, or a tantamount allegation of continuance, there can, on indictments for nuisance, be no abatement.[6]

The *continuando*, if unnecessary, may be rejected as surplusage.[7]

Costa, 2 Mason, 129; State *v.* Cofren, 48 Me. 365; Com. *v.* Pray, 13 Pick. 359; Wells *v.* Com., 12 Gray, 326; People *v.* Adams, 17 Wend. 475; State *v.* Jasper, 4 Dev. 323; State *v.* May, 4 Dev. 328; Cook *v.* State, 11 Ga. 53.

[1] See infra, § 321.

[2] As to effect of one convicted of continuous offence, see infra, §§ 474, 5.

[3] See 2 Hawk. P. C. c. 25, s. 62; U. S. *v.* Fox, 1 Low. 301; U. S. *v.* La Costa, 2 Mason, 140; State *v.* Munger, 15 Vt. 290; State *v.* Temple, 38 Vt. 37; Wells *v.* Com., 12 Gray, 326; Com. *v.* Tower, 8 Met. 527; Com. *v.* Travers, 11 Allen, 260; People *v.* Adams, 17 Wend. 475. The limit may be fixed at the day of finding the bill. Com. *v.* Stone, 3 Gray, 453; but see Com. *v.* Adams, 4 Gray, 27. Cf. State *v.* Nagle, 14 R. I. 331; State *v.* Briggs, 68 Iowa, 416.

[4] Com. *v.* Briggs, 11 Metc. 574.

[5] Swancoat *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 105. As to continuous offences, see infra, § 321.

[6] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1426; R. *v.* Stead, 8 T. R. 142.

An allegation that the offence therein charged was committed on a certain specified "day of September *now passed*," is not stated with sufficient certainty; Com. *v.* Griffin, 3 Cush. 523; and so of an indictment which charges the defendant with being a common seller of spirituous and intoxicating liquors from a day named "to the day of the finding, presentment, and filing of this indictment." Com. *v.* Adams, 4 Gray, 27.

In some jurisdictions, when the offence is stated to have been committed on a particular day, the words "on or about" are treated as mere surplusage. They could have made no difference, it has been argued, in the proof required, and could in no way have prejudiced the defendant's rights. State *v.* Tuller, 34 Conn. 280; Hampton *v.* State, 8 Ind. 336. This, however, cannot be accepted at common law. U. S. *v.* Crittenden, Hemp. 61; U. S. *v.* Winslow, 3 Sawyer, 337; State *v.* O'Keefe, 41 Vt. 691; State *v.* Land, 42 Ind. 311; Effinger *v.* State, 47 Ind. 256; Barnhouse *v.* State, 31 Ohio St. 39; Morgan *v.* State, 13 Florida, 671.

[7] State *v.* Nichols, 58 N. H. 41.

§ 126. As a general rule, in other cases, it is incorrect to lay the offence between two days specified;[1] and, therefore, an indictment for battery, setting forth that the defendant beat so many of the king's subjects between two specified days, is insufficient.[2]

Date cannot be laid between two distinct periods.

§ 127. In alleging a mere neglect or non-performance, it has been held to be unnecessary to specify either time or place.[3] But this, as a general principle, cannot be sustained. The proper course is to aver that the defendant, at an assigned time, had a particular duty imposed on him, and that he, at that time, neglected to discharge that duty.[4]

Negligences should have time averred.

§ 128. In England, it is the practice to specify the year of the king's reign, but it is enough if the time be designated by the calendar date.[5] And by the common law either the year of the reign, or the calendar date, has been sustained.[6] With us the uniform practice is to give the day and year of the Christian era according to the calendar rendering.[7]

Time may be designated by historical epoch.

§ 129. The wrong recital of the date of a statute is immaterial;[8] and such is the case with all erroneous recitals except those of written or printed documents.

Recitals of time need not be accurate.

§ 130. As a rule, it is unnecessary to state the hour at which the act was done, unless rendered so by the statute upon which the indictment is framed.[9] In burglary, indeed, it is usual to state it; but alleging the offence to have been committed "*in the night*," without

Hour not necessary unless required by statute.

[1] 1 Ld. Raym. 581; 10 Mod. 249; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 82; Cro. C. C. 36; Burn, J., Indict.; Williams, J., Indict. iv.; U. S. *v.* Patty, 9 Biss. 429; State *v.* Baker, 34 Me. 52; State *v.* Beaton, 79 Me. 314; State *v.* Temple, 38 Vt. 37.

[2] 4 Mod. 101; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 82; Burn, J., Indict.; Williams, J., Indict. iv.; 1 Chitty's C. L. 216.

[3] 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 79; Starkie's C. P. 61. But see Archbold's C. P. 34; Com. *v.* Sheffield, 11 Cush. 178.

[4] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 125, 329, for cases. State *v.* McDowell, 84 N. C. 798; State *v.* Behm, 72 Iowa, 533; Caldwell *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 127, 171.

[5] Kel. 10, 11; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 8; Burn, J., Indict.; Williams, J., Indict. iv.

[6] Com. Dig. Indict. G. 2; 2 Hawk. cc. 25, 26, s. 78.

[7] Bac. Ab. Indict. G. 4.

[8] People *v.* Reed, 47 Barb. 235.

[9] 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 76. And see Combe *v.* Pitt, 3 Burr. 1434; R. *v.* Clarke, 1 Bulst. 204; 2 Inst. 318.

mentioning the hour, has been held to be sufficient,[1] though at common law the practice is to aver the hour.[2] If an hour in the night be stated, proof of any hour of the night will sustain the allegation.[3] In an indictment upon stat. 9 G. 4, c. 69, for unlawfully entering, or being in a close by night for the purpose of taking game, armed, it is not necessary to state the hour of the night.[4]

Repetition may be by "then and there."

§ 131. When the time has been once named with certainty, it is afterwards sufficient to refer to it by the words *then* and *there*, which have the same effect as if the day and year were actually repeated.[5] The mere conjunction *and*, without adding *then* and *there*, is insufficient to constitute an adequate independent averment, though it may be otherwise when the sense is certain without the repetition.[6] Thus, in an indictment for robbery, the allegation of time must be attached to the robbery, and not merely to the assault;[7] and in a case of murder, it is not sufficient to allege that the defendant on a certain day made an assault and struck the party killed, but the words *then and there* must be introduced before the averment of the stroke, which will suffice.[8]

If the words "then and there" precede every material allegation, it is sufficient, though these words may not precede the conclusions drawn from the facts.[9] But "then and there" have been held only

[1] Com. *v.* Williams, 2 Cush. 582 (under statute); People *v.* Burgess, 35 Cal. 115.

[2] 1 Hale, 549; R. *v.* Waddington, 2 East P. C. 513; 2 Hawk. c. 25, ss. 76, 77; State *v.* G. S., 1 Tyler, 295. And see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 817; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 106.

[3] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 817; State *v.* Padgett, 58 N. H. 377.

[4] R. *v.* Davis, 10 B. & C. 89; Archbold's C. P. 35. When the hour is given "afternoon" is not error, though the hour shows the time to have been night. People *v.* Husted, 52 Mich. 624.

[5] 2 Hale, 178; 2 Stra. 901; Keil. 100; 2 Hawk. c. 23, s. 88; c. 25, s. 78; Bac. Ab. Indict. G. 4; Williams, J., Indict. iv.; Comyns, 480; Stout *v.* Com., 11 S. & R. 177; State *v.* Cotton, 4 Foster, 143; State *v.* Bailey, 21 Mo. 484; State *v.* Williams, 4 Ind. 235; Fisk *v.* State, 9 Neb. 62. "There situate" is a good description. State *v.* Reid, 20 Iowa, 413.

[6] State *v.* Willis, 78 Me. 70.

[7] Ibid.; 2 Hale, 173, 178; 2 Hawk. c. 23, s. 88; Cro. Eliz. 739. See State *v.* Johnson, 12 Minn. 476; State *v.* Slack, 30 Tex. 354.

[8] Though see Com. *v.* Bugbee, infra; Resp. *v.* Houeyman, 2 Dall. 228; State *v.* Price, 6 Halst. 210.

[9] 1 Leach, 529; Dougl. 412; State *v.* Johnson, 1 Walker, Miss. R. 392. See infra, § 146.

If the indictment alleged that the defendant feloniously and of malice aforethought made an assault, and

to relate to the day and place first stated, and not to a *noctanter* afterwards introduced.[1] And "then and there" is insufficient where it is necessary to prove, as part of the description of the offence, an act at some specific portion of a day, as where it is necessary to aver the possession of ten or more counterfeit bills *at one time*.[2]

§ 132. The word *being* (*existens*) will, unless necessarily connected with some other matter, relate to the time of the indictment rather than of the offence; and, therefore, an indictment for a forcible entry, on land *being* the prosecutor's freehold, without saying "then being," was held insufficient.[3] It is otherwise when part of an independent adequate averment.[4]

Other terms insufficient.

Neither "instantly,"[5] nor "immediately,"[6] nor "whilst,"[7] being ambiguous terms, can supply the place of "then and there."

with a certain sword, etc., *then and there* struck, the previous omission will not be material, for the words *feloniously and with malice aforethought*, previously connected with the assault, are by the words *then and there* adequately applied to the murder. See 4 Co. 41, b; Dyer, 69, *a*; 1 East P. C. 346; 1 Ch. C. L. 221; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 529.

In an indictment for breaking a house with intent to ravish, "then and there" is not necessary to the intent. Com. *v.* Doharty, 10 Cush. 52.

An indictment which avers that the defendant, at a time and place named, feloniously assaulted A. B., and being then and there armed with a dangerous weapon, did actually strike him on his head with said weapon, is sufficient, without repeating the words "then and there" before the words "did actually strike;" the court rejecting the English rule above stated requiring such repetition. Com. *v.* Bugbee, 4 Gray, 206. This rule also applies to the averment of wounding. State *v.* Freeman, 21 Mo. 481; State *v.* Bailey, 21 Mo. 484. It is adopted in Indiana by statute. Thayer *v.* State, 11 Ind. 287.

In North Carolina it has been held that an indictment may contain enough to induce the court to proceed to judgment, if the time and place of making the assault be set forth, though they be not repeated as to the final blow. State *v.* Cherry, 3 Murph. 7. See Jackson *v.* People, 18 Ill. 264.

[1] Davis *v.* R., 10 B. & C. 89.

[2] Edwards *v.* Com., 19 Pick. 124.

[3] Bac. Ab. Indict. G. 1; Cro. Jac. 639; 2 Lord Raymond, 1467, 1468; 2 Rol. Rep. 225; Com. Dig. Indict. G. 2.

[4] R. *v.* Boyall, 2 Burr. 832.

[5] 1 Leach, 4th ed. 529; Chitty C. L. 221; R. *v.* Brownlow, 11 A. & E. 119; Lester *v.* State, 9 Mo. 666; State *v.* Lakey, 65 Mo. 217; State *v.* Testerman, 68 Mo. 408. See Com. *v.* Ailstock, 3 Grat. 650; State *v.* Cherry, 3 Murphy, 7; State *v.* Ward, 74 Mo. 253.

[6] R. *v.* Francis, Cunning. 275; 2 Strange, 1015.

[7] R. *v.* Pelham, 8 Q. B. 959.

§ 133. If, however, two times and places have been previously mentioned, and afterwards comes the reference "then and there," or if the antecedent averment is in any way ambiguous as to time or place, the indictment is defective, because it is uncertain to which it refers.[1]

"Then and there" cannot cure ambiguities.

§ 134. If the material facts be stated, as to the time or place, with repugnancy or uncertainty, the indictment will be bad.[2] "The tenth of September last past," as we have seen, is inadequate, where there is nothing in the indictment designating the year.[3] And an indictment charging the offence to have been committed in November, 1801, and in the twenty-fifth year of American Independence, has been held defective, and the judgment arrested, because the offence was charged to have been committed in two different years.[4] And an indictment alleging the offence to have been committed on an impossible day,[5] or a day subsequent to the finding of the bill,[6] is defective. But an indictment may be found for a crime committed after the term commenced to which it is returned.[7]

Repugnant, future, or impossible dates are bad.

§ 135. When, as in case of perjury, the time of the alleged false oath enters into the essence of the offence, and is to be shown by the records of the court where the oath was taken, a variance in the day is fatal ;[8] thus, if the perjury is averred to have been committed at the Circuit Court on the 19th of May, and the record shows the court to have been

Record dates must be accurate.

[1] R. *v.* Devett, 8 C. & P. 639 ; State *v.* Jackson, 39 Me. 291 ; Edwards *v.* Com., 19 Pick. 124 ; Com. *v.* Butterick, 100 Mass. 12 ; Com. *v.* Goldstein, 114 Mass. 272 ; Storrs *v.* State, 3 Mo. 9 ; Jane *v.* State, 3 Mo. 61 ; State *v.* Hayes, 24 Mo. 358.

[2] See Jeffries *v.* Com., 12 Allen, 145 ; Hutchinson *v.* State, 62 Ind. 556 ; Serpentine *v.* State, 1 How. (Miss.) 260 ; McMath *v.* State, 55 Ga. 303.

[3] Com. *v.* Griffin, 3 Cush. 523. Supra, § 123.

[4] State *v.* Hendricks, Con. (N. C.) 369. In Serpentine *v.* State, 1 How. Miss. 260, an indictment giving the date of A. D. 1033 as that of the commission of the offence was held bad in error.

[5] People *v.* Mather, 4 Wend. 229 ; Markley *v.* State, 10 Mo. 291. See Collins *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 37 ; Brewer *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 248.

[6] State *v.* Munger, 15 Vt. 291 ; State *v.* Litch, 33 Vt. 67 ; Com. *v.* Doyle, 110 Mass. 103 ; Penns. *v.* McKee, Add. 36 ; Jacobs *v.* Com., 5 S. & R. 316 ; State *v.* Noland, 29 Ind. 212 ; State *v.* Davidson, 36 Tex. 325. See supra, § 120.

[7] Allen *v.* State, 5 Wis. 329.

[8] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 103 *a* ; Green *v.* Rennett, 1 T. R. 656 ; Freeman *v.* Jacob, 4 Camp. 209 ; Pope *v.* Foster, 4 T. R. 590 ; Woodford *v.* Ashley, 11 East, 508 ; Restall *v.* Stratton, 1 H. Bl. 49.

holden on the 20th day of May, the indictment is bad;[1] and so where the assignment is pointed at an offence on a specific date.[2]

§ 136. *Dates of bills of exchange, and other written instruments*, must be truly stated when necessarily set out.[3]

Dates of documents must be correctly given.

Deeds must be pleaded either according to the date they bear, or to the day on which they were delivered.[4]

Sunday, as a designation, has been already noticed.[5]

§ 137. Where a time is limited by general statute for preferring an indictment, the time laid should ordinarily appear to be within the time so limited, or aver that the case falls within statutory exceptions.[6] Whether, when an exception takes the case out of the statute, this should be averred, will be hereafter discussed.[7]

Time should be within limitation.

§ 138. As is noticed more fully in another work,[8] the death in homicide should be laid on a day within a year and a day from the time at which the stroke is alleged to have been given.

In homicide death should be within a year and a day.

VI. PLACE.

[*As to conflict in cases of venue, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed.* §§ 269 *et seq.; and as to whether the venue is to be in the place where the offence was consummated, or in the place where the offender was at the consummation, see particularly Ibid.*, § 284, *note. As to change of venue, see infra*, § 602.]

§ 139. In England, at common law, it was held necessary to lay as the place of the commission of the offence, beside the county, some particular vicinage, of such dimensions that all living in it might be supposed to have knowledge

Enough to lay venue within jurisdiction of court.

[1] U. S. *v.* M'Neal, 1 Gallis. 387; U. S. *v.* Bowman, 2 Wash. C. C. R. 328.

[2] Com. *v.* Monahan, 9 Gray, 119.

[3] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 103 *a*; Archbold's C. P. 9th ed. § 90.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Supra, § 121.

[6] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 105; see R. *v.* Brown, M. & M. 163; U. S. *v.* Winslow, 3 Sawy. 337; State *v.* Hobbs, 39 Me. 212; State *v.* Ingalls, 59 N. H. 88; State *v.* J. P., 1 Tyler, 283; State *v.* Rust, 8 Black. 195; State *v.* Robinson, 9 Foster, 274; Hatwood *v.* State, 18 Ind. 492; Lamkin *v.* People, 94 Ill. 101; People *v.* Gregory, 30 Mich. 371; People *v.* Miller, 12 Cal. 291; McLane *v.* State, 4 Ga. 335; Shelton *v.* State, 1 St. & P. 208; State *v.* McGrath, 19 Mo. 678; Gill *v.* State, 38 Ark. 524; Anderson *v.* State, 20 Fla. 381; Shoefercater *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 207.

[7] Infra, § 318; see Whart. Crim. Ev. § 105.

[8] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 577.

of the transaction to be inquired into.[1] By statute, however, it is now enough to aver the county as the place of the commission.[2] In the United States, the latter practice is generally accepted wherever the county is conterminous with the jurisdiction of the court,[3] though it is otherwise when the jurisdiction of the court embraces but a fraction of the county.[4]

It is sufficient if the place stated correspond with the jurisdiction of the court.[5] This, however, is essential.[6]

In several jurisdictions, by statute, when an offence is committed near the boundary line between two counties, it may be averred to be in either county.[7]

The jurisdiction of the federal courts, where crimes have been committed at sea or abroad, is discussed at large in another work.[8] The indictment, when the offence is alleged to have been committed on the high seas, must be averred to have been out of the jurisdiction of any State of the United States.[9]

In such cases the trial of the offence is, by Act of April 30, 1790, to be "in the district where the offender is apprehended, *or* into which he may first be brought." Under this statute a person is triable in the Southern District of New York who, on a vessel owned by citizens of the United States, has committed on the high seas an offence made penal by act of Congress; has been then put in irons for safe keeping; has, on the arrival of the vessel at anchorage at the lower quarantine in the Eastern District of New York, been delivered to officers of the State of New York, in order that he may be forthcoming on trial; and has been by them carried into the Southern District, and there delivered to the marshal of the United

[1] 2 Hawk. c. 22.

[2] Stat. 6 Geo. 4; 14 & 15 Vict.

As to venue in caption, see supra, § 92.

[3] Infra, § 146; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 107; Thomas *v.* State, 71 Ga. 44; People *v.* Lafuente, 6 Cal. 202. Supra, §§ 92, 107. That "county" is necessary, see People *v.* Gregory, 30 Mich. 371.

[4] Infra, §§ 141–2; 2 Hale, P. C. 166; McBride *v.* State, 10 Humph. 615. So, *mutatis mutandis*, as to towns. Com. *v.* Springfield, 7 Mass. 9. As to Texas, see Criticism on Chivarrio *v.* State, 15 Tex. Ap. 335.

[5] R. *v.* Stanbury, L. & C. 128; People *v.* Barrett, 1 Johnson R. 66; State *v.* G. S., 1 Tyler, 295; State *v.* Jones, 2 Halsted, 357. Supra, § 92.

[6] Ibid. Cook *v.* State, 20 Fla. 804; State *v.* Hinkle, 27 Kan. 308; Torr *v.* Do, 1 Ariz. 507.

[7] People *v.* Davis, 56 N. Y. 95; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 290.

[8] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 266, 269 *et seq.*

[9] U. S. *v.* Anderson, 17 Blatch. 338.

States for that district, to whom a warrant to apprehend and bring him to justice was first issued.[1] But where the indictment charged that an assault with a dangerous weapon was committed on board a vessel in the harbor of Guantanamo, in the Island of Cuba, but there was no allegation that the place was out of the jurisdiction of any of the States, it was ruled that the omission of such an allegation was fatal, as whether the place of the offence was without the jurisdiction of any State was material in determining the question of jurisdiction, and was a question of fact for the jury.[2] "In Jackelow's case, 1 Black, 484," said Benedict, J., "it was held by the Supreme Court of the United States that the question whether a particular place be out of the jurisdiction of any State, when material in determining the question of the jurisdiction of a court, is a question of fact to be passed on by the jury; and in that case the Supreme Court set aside a special verdict, which found the offence to have been committed in the water adjoining the State of Connecticut, between Norwalk Harbor and Westchester County in the State of New York, at a point five miles eastward of Lyons' Point (which is the boundary between the States of New York and Connecticut), and one mile and a half from the Connecticut shore at low-water mark, on the ground that, in the absence of a finding by the jury that the place so described was out of the jurisdiction of any State, it was impossible for the court to determine such to be the fact."

When act is by agent, principal to be charged as of place of such act.

§ 140. We have discussed, in another volume,[3] the important question whether it is necessary to jurisdiction that the offender, at the time of the offence, should have been within the jurisdiction. We may here notice that where an offence is committed within a State by means of an agent, the employer is guilty as a principal, though he did not personally act in that State, and at the time the offence was committed was in another State. In such case, the *forum delicti commissi* has jurisdiction of the offence, and, if the offender comes within the limits of the State, has also jurisdiction of his person, and he may be arrested and brought to trial.[4] And the better

[1] U. S. *v.* Arwo, 19 Wall. 486.

[2] U. S. *v.* Anderson, 17 Blatch. 238; 8 Reporter, 677 (1879).

[3] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 278, 284.

[4] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 278 *et seq.*, 282.

opinion is that the place of the commission of the offence, as distinguished from the place where the offender at the time stood, is, in cases of conflict, the proper venue.[1]

When county is divided jurisdiction to be laid in court of *locus delicti*.

§ 141. Where an offence is committed within the county of A., and after the commission of the offence the county is divided, and the part of the county in which the offence was committed is created a new county called B., the latter county has jurisdiction over the offence.[2] In such case, however, the indictment may charge the perpetration in the former county while the trial is in the latter.[3]

When county includes several jurisdictions particular jurisdiction must be specified.

§ 142. Where there are distinct judicial districts in the county, it is not sufficient that the indictment names the county. Therefore, where the offence in a District Court in North Carolina was laid to have been committed in Beaufort County, without adding in the District of Newbern, judgment was arrested.[4] And so in all cases where the jurisdiction is less than the county.[5] And when several counties are in the *town*, it is not enough to allege the *town*.[6]

The court will take judicial notice of statutory subdivisions of counties.[7]

Name of State not necessary in indictment.

§ 143. Where the caption gives the name of the State, it need not be repeated in the indictment. And a complaint made "in behalf of the State," alleging an offence in a particular city and county (corresponding in name to a city and county of the State), against a statute the title and date of which are stated, and rightly describing a statute

[1] See this fully discussed, Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 284, note; and see Roberts *v.* People, 9 Col. 458.

[2] State *v.* Jones, 4 Halst. 357; Searcy *v.* State, 4 Tex. 450. See U. S. *v.* Dawson, 15 How. U. S. 467; State *v.* Jackson, 39 Me. 291; State *v.* Fish, 4 Ired. 219. Infra, § 147. As differing from text see McElroy *v.* State, 13 Ark. 708.

[3] Jordan *v.* State, 22 Ga. 545; McElroy *v.* State, 13 Ark. 708. See infra, § 146.

[4] State *v.* Adams, 2 Battle's Dig. 729.

[5] Taylor *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 94; McBride *v.* State, 10 Humph. 615. Supra, § 139.

[6] Com. *v.* Springfield, 7 Mass. 9.

[7] Ibid.; Com. *v.* Springfield, 7 Mass. 9; State *v.* Powers, 25 Conn. 48. But it is said that averring a place to be at "W.," and not at the "city" or "town," of "W.," is not enough. Com. *v.* Barnard, 6 Gray, 488. See, however, Tower *v.* Com., 111 Mass. 117, where it was held that it was enough, in error, to aver the *town;* the court taking notice that the town was in a particular county. Compare comments in Heard's Pleading, 81.

passed by the legislature of the State, sufficiently shows that the offence was committed within the State, without any caption, or venue in the margin.[1] And, generally, as the name of the State is assumed, in all the proceedings, it need not be given in the indictment.[2]

Sub-description in transitory offences immaterial.

§ 144. Of *transitory* offences as they are called (*e. g.*, offences of which the object of the offence is not necessarily attached to a particular spot), a variance as to specification is not fatal if jurisdiction be correctly given.[3]

But not as to matters of local description.

§ 145. But where the case is stated by way of local description and not as a venue merely, a variance in what are called *local* offences (*e. g.*, where the object is necessarily attached to a place) is fatal;[4] as where, in an indictment for arson, the tenement was averred to be in the sixth ward, whereas it was in the fifth.[5] The same particularity is required in cases of stealing in a dwelling-house, of burglary,[6] of forcible entry and detainer, of arson, and in all cases where a statute makes a special locality essential. In such cases, where the situation of the premises is especially laid, the description must be strictly proved.[7] Under the same head are to be included injuries to machinery permanently fixed, and buildings;[8] nuisances, when

[1] Commonwealth *v.* Quin, 5 Gray, 478.

[2] State *v.* Wentworth, 37 N. H. 196; State *v.* Lane, 4 Ired. 113.

[3] In the city of New York, the practice has been to charge the ward as part of the venue, thus: "In the First Ward of the city of New York;" in New Orleans, to name the parish. The same practice obtains elsewhere. If, however, the offence is shown to be within the jurisdiction of the court, the special place averred, if unnecessary, need not, when the offence is transitory, be proved. 2 Hale, 179, 244, 245; 4 Bla. Com. 306; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 84; c. 46, ss. 181, 182; 1 East P. C. 125; Holt, 534; R. *v.* Woodward, 1 Mood. C. C. 323; Com. *v.* Gillon, 2 Allen, 502; Carlisle *v.* State, 32 Ind. 55; Heikes *v.* Com., 26 Penn. St. 531; State *v.* Ruth, 14 Mo. Ap. 226. Whart. Crim. Ev. § 109.

[4] State *v.* Cotton, 4 Foster (N. H.), 143; Moore *v.* State, 12 Ohio St., 387; Dennis *v.* State, 91 Ind. 291; Droneberger *v.* State, 112 Ind. 105; State *v.* Crogan, 8 Iowa, 523; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 109.

[5] Infra, § 148; People *v.* Slater, 5 Hill, N. Y. R. 401.

[6] R. *v.* St. John, 9 C. & P. 40.

[7] R. *v.* Redley, Russ. & R. 515; Archbold's C. P. 38; State *v.* Cotton, 4 Foster (N. H.) 143; Grimme *v.* Com., 5 B. Mon. 263. See Chute *v.* State, 19 Minn. 271; Norris *v.* State, 3 Greene (Iowa), 513.

[8] R. *v.* Richards, 1 M. & R. 177.

emanating from local sites;[1] houses of ill-fame.[2] Such specifications, though unnecessary, must be proved.[3]

"County aforesaid" generally enough. "Then and there."

§ 146. It is sufficient if the place be averred simply as "the county aforesaid," when the county is named in the commencement or caption as that for which the grand jurors were sworn.[4] It is otherwise when two counties are named.[5]

Even "county" may be left out in the statement of place, when it can be presumed from prior averments.[6] Thus it has been held enough, in an indictment against A. B., of the town of C., County of D., to aver that the offence was committed at C.[7]

"County" or "town" or "city," however, must somewhere appear; and it is not enough to aver the offence to have been committed in *C.* The indictment must say, either directly or by reference to the caption, that *C.* is a town or city or county.[8]

The effect of "then and there" has been already noticed. It implies identity of place as well as of time.[9]

§ 147. *A change of local title*, when enacted by the legislature, must be followed by the pleader. Thus in North Carolina, by an

[1] Com. *v.* Heffron, 102 Mass. 148.

[2] State *v.* Nixon, 18 Vt. 70.

[3] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 109.

As to averment of place of death in murder, see Chapman *v.* People, 39 Mich. 549.

[4] Com. *v.* Edwards, 4 Gray, 1; State *v.* Smith, 5 Harring. 490; Wingard *v.* State, 13 Ga. 396; State *v.* Ames, 10 Mo. 743; State *v.* Simon, 50 Mo. 370; State *v.* Shull, 3 Head (Tenn.), 42; Evarts *v.* State, 48 Ind. 422; Noe *v.* People, 39 Ill. 96; Harrahan *v.* State, 91 Ill. 142; State *v.* Lillard, 59 Iowa, 479. See, to same effect, State *v.* Baker, 50 Me. 45; State *v.* Roberts, 26 Me. 263; State *v.* Conley, 39 Me. 78; Haskins *v.* People, 16 N. Y. 344; State *v.* Lamon, 3 Hawks, 175; State *v.* Bell, 3 Ired. 506; State *v.* Tolever, 5 Ired. 452. Compare 1 Wms. Saund. 308.

[5] State *v.* McCracken, 20 Mo. 411.

[6] See State *v.* Walter, 14 Kans. 375. Where it was alleged that the defendant broke and entered "the city hall of the city of Charlestown;" this was held a sufficient averment that the property of the building alleged to be broken and entered is in the city of Charlestown. Com. *v.* Williams, 2 Cush. 583.

[7] Com. *v.* Cummings, 6 Gray, 487.

[8] Com. *v.* Barnard, 6 Gray, 488. Supra, § 142.

An indictment for burning a barn situate at a certain place, which was within the jurisdiction of the court, and alleged to be "within the curtilage of the dwelling-house of A.," need not also aver that the dwelling-house was at that place. Commonwealth *v.* Barney, 10 Cush. 480.

[9] Supra, § 131; State *v.* Hurley, 71 Me. 354; Sullivan *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 462.

act of assembly, passed in 1842, a part of the county of Burke, and a part of the county of Rutherford were constituted a new county, by the name of M'Dowell; and by a supplemental act, jurisdiction of all criminal offences committed in that part of M'Dowell taken from Burke was given to the Superior Court of Burke. It was held that an indictment for a criminal offence, alleging it to have been committed in Burke County, could not be supported by evidence showing the offence to have been committed in M'Dowell, after the establishment of the latter county.[1] By the same rule, it is not error to describe a county within which the offence was committed by the name belonging to it at the time of trial, even though it went by another name at the time when the act was committed.[2]

Title, when changed by legislature, must be followed.

§ 148. *Where a fine is payable, or penalty is special, to a subdivision of county*, it has been said that the pleading should aver such subdivision, so as to guide the court in the application of the fine or penalty.[3] But it has been held in Pennsylvania, with better reason, that in an indictment for adultery, it is not necessary to mention the township in which the defendant resided, though of moment in the sentence, because the court may ascertain the place of the defendant's residence otherwise than by the verdict of the jury.[4]

Venue need not follow fine.

§ 149. *In larceny*, the venue may be laid in any county in which the thief was possessed of the stolen goods.[5]

In larceny venue may be in place where goods are taken.

§ 150. Where an indictment omits to lay a venue or place of the offence charged, this is at common law a fatal defect on demurrer, on motion to quash, in arrest of judgment, or in error.[6]

Omission of venue is fatal.

In another volume the proof of place is discussed at large; and it is shown that the place of the offence must be proved to be within

[1] State *v.* Fish, 4 Ired. 219.

[2] McElroy *v.* State, 8 Eng. (13 Ark.) 708; and see Jordan *v.* State, 22 Ga. 545. Supra, § 141.

[3] Botto *v.* State, 26 Miss. 108. See Legori *v.* State, 8 Sm. & M. 697; State *v.* Smith, 5 Harring. 490, and cases cited supra, § 145.

[4] Duncan *v.* Com., 4 S. & R. 449.

[5] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed., §§ 391, 930; and see R. *v.* Peel, 9 Cox C. C. 220; Whart. Crim. Ev., § 111.

[6] Infra, § 385; State *v.* Hartnett, 75 Mo. 251; State *v.* Burgess, 75 Mo. 541; Thompson *v.* State, 51 Miss. 353; Scarcy *v.* State, 4 Tex. 450; Morgan *v.* State, 13 Flor. 671; People *v.* Craig, 59 Cal. 370.

the jurisdiction of the court,[1] though the proof of this may be inferential.[2] It will also be seen that when a place is stated as matter of description, a variance may be fatal.[3] The venue in homicide may be placed by statute in the place of death;[4] and that of conspiracy in the place of any overt act.[5]

VII. STATEMENT OF OFFENCE.

1. Offence must be made Judicially to appear, § 151.
2. Statement must be Technically Exact, § 153.
3. Not enough to charge a Conclusion of Law, § 154.
4. Common Barrator and Common Scold, etc., § 155.
5. Matters Unknown, § 156.
6. Bill of Particulars, § 157.
7. Surplusage need not be stated, § 158.
8. Alternate or Disjunctive Statements, § 161.
9. Knowledge and Intent, § 164.
10. Inducement and Aggravation, § 165.
11. Objects for which Particularity is required, § 166.

Offence must be set forth with reasonable certainty.

§ 151. It is a general rule that the special matter of of the whole offence should be set forth in the indictment with such certainty, that the offence may judicially appear to the court.[6] When special facts are an essential part of an offence, they must be set out.[7] Thus, in indictments for

[1] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 107.

[2] Ibid. § 108.

[3] Ibid. § 109; see supra, § 145.

[4] Ibid. § 110; see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 292.

[5] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 111; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1397.

[6] U. S. *v.* Cruikshank, 92 U. S. 542; U. S. *v.* Simmons, 96 U. S. 360; Messenger *v.* State, 58 N. H. 348; Com. *v.* Perry, 114 Mass. 263; State *v.* Stiles, 40 Iowa, 148; State *v.* Murray, 41 Iowa, 580; State *v.* Fancher, 71 Mo. 460; Garcia *v.* State, 19 Tex. Ap. 383.

Thus in U. S. *v.* Cruikshank, 92 U. S. 542, it was held that an indictment under the Act of May 31, 1870, prohibiting the intimidation of citizens, must contain the averment that the right hindered was one secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

See, to same effect, People *v.* Taylor, 3 Denio, 91; Biggs *v.* People, 8 Barb. 547; State *v.* Philbrick, 31 Me. 401; Kit *v.* State, 11 Humph. 167.

The doctrine of this branch of pleading is well stated by Judge Kane, in U. S. *v.* Almeida, Wh. Prec. 1061–2.

An indictment for procuring another to do a particular thing must give the name of such other person, or aver that the name was unknown. U. S. *v.* Simmons, 96 U. S. 360.

When, under statute, a general form is substituted for the prior special forms, the court may require the prosecution to give notice of such special matter as is requisite for his information. Infra, §§ 157, 711; see Goersen *v.* Com., 99 Penn. St. 388.

[7] Com. *v.* Washburn, 128 Mass. 421 State *v.* Hodges, 55 Md. 127.

murder or manslaughter, it is necessary to state that the death ensued in consequence of the act of the prisoner,[1] and in perjury it is necessary to set out the oath as an oath taken in a judicial proceeding, and before a proper person, in order to see whether it was an oath which the court had jurisdiction to administer.[2] And in the prosecution of a constable for not serving, it is requisite to set out the mode of his election, because if he was not legally elected to the office, he cannot be guilty of a crime in refusing to execute his duties.[3] Certainty to common intent, it is said, is what is required; perfect certainty is unattainable, and the attempt to secure it would in almost every case lead to a variance.[4] An illustration of the degree of certainty required may be found in indictments for bigamy. In such indictments a variance as to the second wife's name is fatal, it being necessary to individuate her, in order to determine the offence.[5] But the weight of authority is that it is not necessary to set forth the name of the first wife.[6] And if we lean on the analogy of indictments for receiving stolen goods, we should hold that the more general statement is enough. If we are forced to state in detail the marital relations of the parties, it would be necessary to go still further, and aver that the first wife or husband of the defendant was capable of consenting to marriage, and was not bound by other matrimonial ties. As, however, the first marriage in all its relations is simply matter of inducement, it is enough to state it in general terms, without specifying the details. If these are needed for justice, they can be supplied by a bill of particulars.[7] Where, however, the details of the first marriage are given, a variance in the name is fatal.[8] The certainty, in other words, must be such, so far as concerns the substance of the offence, as exhibits the truth according to its ordinary general acceptation; not the truth with its *differentia* scientifically and exhaustively displayed.[9]

[1] State *v.* Wimberly, 3 McCord, 190.

[2] Cro. Eliz. 137; Cowp. 683; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1245 *et seq.*

[3] Cowp. 683; 5 Mod. 196.

[4] See U. S. *v.* Ferro, 18 Fed. Rep. 901.

[5] R. *v.* Deeley, 4 C. & P. 579; 1 Mood. C. C. 303.

[6] Hutchins *v.* State, 28 Ind. 34; Com. *v.* Whaley, 6 Bush, 266; State *v.* Loftin, 2 Dev. & Bat. 31.

[7] *Contra*, State *v.* La Bore, 26 Vt. 265.

[8] R. *v.* Gooding, C. & M. 297.

[9] See Buller, J., R. *v.* Lynne Regis, 1 Doug. 159; State *v.* Nicholson, 77 Md. 1.

§ 152. We may hold it to be a general rule that, where the act is not in itself necessarily unlawful, but becomes so by its peculiar circumstances and relations, all the matters must be set forth in which its illegality consists.[1] Hence, the omission of any fact or circumstance necessary to constitute the offence will be fatal; as, in an indictment for obstructing an officer in the execution of process, without showing that he was an officer of the court out of which the prosecution issued, and the nature of the official duty and of the process.[2] An indictment, also, for contemptuous or disrespectful words to a magistrate is defective without showing that the magistrate was in the execution of his duty at the time;[3] and an indictment against a public officer for nonperformance of a duty without showing that he was such an officer as was bound by law to perform that particular duty;[4] though the title of an officer need not be alleged unless it be at issue; and any unnecessary averments of this class may be rejected as surplusage.[5] It is necessary, also, in an indictment for obtaining money under false pretences, to show whose money it was.[6]

Omission of essential incidents is fatal.

At the same time it is not necessary, when a minor offence is inclosed in a greater, to introduce the averments showing the defendant to have been guilty of the greater offence, though these should be proved by the evidence. The defendant, however, on such an indictment, can be convicted only of the minor offence.[7]

§ 153. Not only must all the circumstances essential to the offence be averred, but these averments must be so shaped as to include the legal characteristics of the offence. Thus, an indictment charging the defendant with forging

Terms must be technically exact.

[1] 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 57; Bac. Ab. Indictment, G. 1; Cowp. 683; People *v.* Martin, 52 Cal. 201.

[2] R. *v.* Osmer, 5 East, 304; see R. *v.* Everett, 8 B. & C. 114; State *v.* Burt, 25 Vt. 373; McQuoid *v.* People, 3 Gilman, 76; Cantrill *v.* People, Ibid. 356.

[3] R. *v.* Lease, Andr. 226.

[4] 5 T. R. 623.

[5] Infra, § 158.

[6] R. *v.* Norton, 8 C. & P. 196.

In New York, where an attorney of the Court of Common Pleas was charged with extortion, and the indictment averred that on ——— he obtained a judgment in favor of one J. R. *v.* A. C., and that he did extort and receive from the said A. C. $11 over and above the fees usually paid for such service, and due in the suit aforesaid, etc., it was held that the indictment was not sufficiently precise, it not specifying how much he received on his own account, and how much on that of the officers and members of the court. People *v.* Rust, 1 Caines's R. 133.

[7] See State *v.* Bowling, 10 Humph. 52; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 27.

a receipt against a book-account is defective when it does not bring the facts up to the definition of forgery.[1] So an indictment for fornication and bastardy must use the technical expressions which the statutes prescribe.[2] The main charges of guilt must be categorically made;[3] and cannot be thrown into a participial form.[4] It is otherwise as to incidental assertions, *e. g.*, *scienter*, which, though material, are in the nature of qualifications of such material charges.[5]

§ 154. As the indictment must contain a specific description of the offence, it is not enough to state a mere conclusion of law.[6] Thus, it would be insufficient to charge the defendant with "stealing" or "murdering."[7] So it is bad to accuse him of being a common defamer, vexor, or oppressor of many men,[8] or a common disturber of the peace, and having stirred up divers quarrels,[9] or a common forestaller,[10] or a common thief,[11] or a common evil-doer,[12] or a common champertor,[13] or a common conspirator, or any other such vague accusation.[14] On the same reasoning, in an indictment for obtaining money by false pretences, it will not suffice merely to state that the defendant falsely pretended certain allegations, but it must also be stated by express averment what parts of the representation were false, for otherwise the defendant will not know to what circumstances the charge of

Not enough to charge conclusion of law.

[1] Infra, §§ 154, 220; State *v.* Dalton, 2 Murph. 379.

[2] Com. *v.* Pintard, 1 Browne, 59; Simmons *v.* Com., 1 Rawle, 142.

[3] That the introduction of popular terms does not vitiate if these terms are surplusage or may be susceptible of a definite meaning, see Began's case, 12 R. I. 309; Baker *v.* People, 105 Ill. 402.

[4] State *v.* Higgins, 53 Vt. 191.

[5] R. *v.* Lawley, 2 Stra. 904; Com. *v.* Daniels, 2 Va. Ca. 402.

[6] Infra, § 230; and see U. S. *v.* Cruikshank, 92 U. S. 544; State *v.* Record, 56 Ind. 107; People *v.* Heffron, 53 Mich. 527; State *v.* Boverlin, 30 Kan. 611; State *v.* Foster, 30 Kan. 365; Insall *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 145, 154; Finch *v.* State, 64 Miss. 461.

[7] 1 Roll. Rep. 79; 2 Roll. Ab. 79; 2 Stra. 699; 2 Hawk, c. 25, s. 59; Com. Dig. Indictment, G. 3; Bac. Ab. Indictment, G. 1. Infra, § 230.

[8] 2 Roll. Ab. 79; 1 Mod. 71; 2 Stra. 848, 1246, 1247; 2 Hale, 182; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 59; Com. Dig. Indict. G. 3; Bac. Ab. Indict. G. 1.

[9] Ibid. Infra, §§ 230, 231.

[10] Moore, 302; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 59; Bac. Ab. Indict. G. 1.

[11] Ibid.; 2 Roll. Ab. 79; 2 Hale, 182; Cro. C. C. 37.

[12] 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 59; Bac. Ab. Indict. G. 1. Infra, §§ 230, 231.

[13] 2 Hale, 182; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 59; Bac. Ab. Indict. G. 1.

[14] Ibid.; Com. *v.* Wise, 110 Mass. 181. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1429, 1442–8.

falsehood is intended to apply.[1] It is also not sufficient, generally, to charge "malicious mischief" or "malicious injury;" the facts of the injury must be given.[2] An indictment, on the same principle, charging a man with being a common cheat, or a common swindler or defrauder, is bad, and is not helped by an averment that, by divers false pretences and false tokens, he deceived and defrauded divers good citizens of the said State.[3] A count, also, in an indictment charging that the defendant sold a lottery ticket, and tickets, in a lottery not authorized by the laws of the Commonwealth, is bad, not being sufficiently certain;[4] and so of a count charging the defendant with voting without having the legal qualifications of a voter;[5] and so of a count which charges the defendant with unlawfully and fraudulently adulterating "a certain substance intended for food, to wit, one pound of confectionery."[6]

Exceptions in case of "common barrators," "common scolds," and certain nuisances.

§ 155. There are, however, several marked exceptions to the rule requiring the offence, in each case, to be specifically set forth. Thus, an indictment charging one with being a "common barrator;"[7] or, a "common scold;"[8] or, a "common night-walker;"[9] is good. The same rule applies to certain lines of nuisance, to describe which generic terms are adequate, as is the case with a "house of ill-fame;" a "disorderly house,"[10] and a "tippling-house."[11] So an indictment for betting at faro bank need not set out the particular nature of the game, nor the name

[1] 2 M. & S. 379. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1213.

[2] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1080; and see Ibid. § 1841.

[3] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1129, 1442–8, 1450; U. S. *v.* Royall, 3 Cranch C. C. R. 618.

[4] Com. *v.* Gillespie, 7 S. & R. 469.

[5] People *v.* Wilber, 4 Parker C. R. 19; Pearce *v.* State, 1 Sneed, 63; Quinn *v.* State, 35 Ind. 485; but see State *v.* Lockbaum, 38 Conn. 400; and see infra, §§ 230, 231.

[6] Com. *v.* Chase, 125 Mass. 202.

[7] 6 Mod. 311; 2 Hale, 182; 1 Russell, 185; 1 Ch. C. L. 230; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1442–8, 1450; State *v.* Dowers, 45 N. H. 543; Com. *v.* Davis, 11 Pick. 432. See Penn. Rev. Act, 1860, tit. ii.

[8] 6 Mod. 311; 9 Stra. 1246; 2 Keb. 409; 1 Russell, 302; U. S. *v.* Royall, 3 Cranch C. C. 618; Com. *v.* Pray, 13 Pick. 362; James *v.* Com., 12 Serg. & Rawle, 220; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1442–8, 1450.

[9] State *v.* Dowers, 45 N. H. 543.

[10] State *v.* Patterson, 7 Ired. 70; Whart. Crim. Law, *ut supra*.

[11] State *v.* Collins, 48 Me. 217. See Com. *v.* Pray, 13 Pick. 359; State *v.* Russell, 14 R. I. 506; 1 Term R. 754; 1 Russell, 301.

of the person with whom the bet was made.[1] But an indictment, as has just been seen, charging the defendant as a common cheat, is bad.[2]

§ 156. If a particular fact, or condition, which is one of the component parts of the offence, cannot be accurately described, the indictment will be good, if it state that such fact or condition is unknown to the grand jury, provided that the fact or condition in question be described as accurately as possible.[3] But "this allegation, that the name or other particular fact is 'unknown to the grand jury,' is not merely formal; on the contrary, if it be shown that it was, in fact, known to them, then, the excuse failing, it has been repeatedly held that the indictment was bad, or that the defendant should be acquitted, or the judgment arrested or reversed."[4]

Matters unknown may be proximately described.

§ 157. As will hereafter be more fully seen, whether a bill of particulars or specification of facts shall be required is exclusively within the discretion of the presiding judge.[5] In many cases of general charges (*e. g.*, conspiracy, where the indictment merely avers a general conspiracy to cheat), such a specification on the part of the prosecution will be

Bill of particulars may be required.

[1] State *v.* Ames, 1 Mo. 372. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1466. Pemberton *v.* State, 85 Ind. 507.

[2] Supra, § 154; infra, §§ 230, 231; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1128, 1129, 1442.

[3] Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 91 *et seq.* State *v.* Wood, 53 N. H. 484; Com. *v.* Ashton, 125 Mass. 384; Com. *v.* Fenno, 125 Mass. 387; Com. *v.* Martin, 125 Mass. 394; Com. *v.* Webster, 5 Cush. 295; People *v.* Taylor, 3 Denio, 91. State *v.* Gray, 29 Minn. 142. As to instrument of death, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 525; Com. *v.* Webster, *ut supra;* Com. *v.* Fox, 7 Gray, 585; Cox *v.* People, 80 N. Y. 500; State *v.* Williams, 7 Jones (N. C.) 446. Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 525. As to lost writings, see infra, § 175; Com. *v.* Martin, 125 Mass. 394. In Winston *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 251, it was held that a certain "currency note to the jurors unknown" was not sufficient without averring the country in which the note was currency. And this holds good in all cases where there were means of ascertaining such country. As to names, see supra, § 104.

[4] Christiancy, J., in Merwin *v.* People, 26 Mich. 298, citing R. *v.* Walker, 3 Camp. 264; 1 Chitty's Cr. Law, 213; R. *v.* Robinson, Holt N. P. 595, 596; Blodget *v.* State, 3 Ind. 403; and see Com. *v.* Hill, 11 Cush. 137; Hays *v.* State, 13 Mo. 246; Reed *v.* State, 16 Ark. 499.

[5] Com. *v.* Snelling, 15 Pick. 321; Com. *v.* Giles, 1 Gray, 466. See Wh. Prec. 615, n. for form. See more fully infra, §§ 702, 711, *et seq.* As to embezzlement, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1048. As to conspiracy see Ibid. § 1386; and see, generally, Com. *v.* Davis, 11 Pick. 432; Com. *v.* Wood, 4 Gray, 11.

exacted.[1] As a general rule, the counsel for the prosecution are to be restricted, after such an order, to proof of the particulars stated in the bill, though this limitation may, in extraordinary cases, be relaxed at the discretion of the court.[2]

Surplusage need not be stated; and if stated may be disregarded.

§ 158. It is not requisite to charge in the indictment anything more than is necessary to accurately and adequately express the offence; and when unnecessary averments or aggravations are introduced, they can be considered as surplusage, and as such disregarded.[3]

The following may be given as illustrations of surplusage:—

The averment of "goods and chattels," when used to describe ownership of *choses in action* when this ownership is independently described;[4]

Ownership when immaterial;[5]

Intent, when unnecessary to the offence;[6]

Conclusions of law, summing up the offence unnecessarily; as where an indictment for taking a voluntary false oath, not amounting to perjury, concludes, and "so the said A. B. did commit perjury," etc.;[7]

Unnecessary aggravation;[8]

Falsity of the charge, in cases where the indictment is for conspiracy to charge with an indictable offence, and when the question of falsity is not at issue;[9]

Unnecessary terms of art, such as "feloniously;"[10]

[1] R. *v.* Kendrick, 5 A. & E. (Q. B.) 49; R. *v.* Hamilton, 7 C. & P. 448; R. *v.* Brown, 8 Cox C. C. 69; Goersen *v.* Com., 99 Penn. St. 388; People *v.* McKinney, 10 Mich. 54.

[2] R. *v.* Esdaile, 1 F. & F. 213; R. *v.* Brown, 8 Cox C. C. 69.

[3] See Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 138 *et seq.*; U. S. *v.* Claflin, 13 Blatch. 178; U. S. *v.* Goodwin, 20 Fed. Rep. 237; State *v.* Murphy, 55 Vt. 547; People *v.* Casey, 72 N. Y. 393; People *v.* Polinsky, 73 N. Y. 65; Kennedy *v.* State, 62 Ind. 136; Feigel *v.* State, 85 Ind. 589; Myers *v.* State, 92 Ind. 390; Trout *v.* State, 111 Ind. 499; Ford *v.* State, 112 Ind. 373; State *v.* Miller, 26 W. Va. 110; State *v.* Belville, 7 Baxt. 548; Rivers *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 177; State *v.* Ballard, 2 Murph. 186; State *v.* Munch, 22 Minn. 67.

[4] R. *v.* Radley, 1 Den. C. C. 450; Com. *v.* Bennett, 118 Mass. 452. Infra, § 191.

[5] Pye's case, East P. C. 983; U. S. *v.* Howard, 3 Sumn. 19.

[6] R. *v.* Jones, 2 B. & Ad. 611.

[7] R. *v.* Hodgkiss, L. R. 1 C. C. 212.

[8] Com. *v.* Randall, 4 Gray, 36; Scott *v.* Com., 6 S. & R. 224; Lacefield *v.* State, 34 Ark. 275; infra, § 159.

[9] R. *v.* Hollingberry, 4 B. & C. 329; 6 D. & R. 345.

[10] Infra, § 261.

Redundant divisible offences, one of which can be discharged, leaving the other sufficient;[1]

Specifications of ways of resisting an officer or of the authority under which he acted;[2]

All but a particular article in larceny, when this is relied on to the exclusion of others stated;[3]

Unnecessary predicates if divisible;[4]

Superfluous assignments in perjury and false pretences;[5]

Cumulative intents;[6]

Cumulative descriptions of a person[7] or a thing;[8]

Cumulative averments of instruments.[9]

Surplusage is not ground for demurrer.[10] But even though an averment is more particular than it need be, yet if it cannot be stricken out without removing an essential part of the case, it cannot be regarded as surplusage; and if there be a variance in proving it, the prosecution fails.[11]

§ 158 *a*. A *videlicet*, in reference to statement of time, has been already considered.[12] The object of the *videlicet*, which may be extended to allegations of quantity, of distance, of localization, of differentiation, is to annex a specification, by way of definition, to a clause immediately preceding, and thus to separate, by a kind of bracketing, this specification from other clauses.[13] This "is a precaution which is totally useless when the statement placed after the

Videlicet is the pointing out of an averment of probable specification.

[1] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 144. Infra, §§ 247, 742 *et seq.* Smith *v.* State, 85 Ind. 183; Dunham *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 330.

[2] State *v.* Copp, 15 N. H. 212; State *v.* Goss, 69 Me. 22; Gunyon *v.* State, 68 Ind. 70.

[3] Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 135, 145. See infra, § 470.

[4] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 134. State *v.* Newson, 13 W. Va. 859; Ferrell *v.* State, 2 Lea, 25; Burke *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 74.

[5] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 131.

[6] R. *v.* Hanson, 1 C. & M. 334.

[7] Supra, §§ 96 *et seq.* McCarney *v.* People, 83 N. Y. 408.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Whart. Cr. Law, 9th ed. § 519. State *v.* Adams, 78 Me. 486; Trout *v.* State, 111 Ind. 554. Infra, § 212 *a*.

[10] Steph. Pl. 376.

[11] R. *v.* Deeley, 1 Mood. C. C. 303; U. S. *v.* Foye, 1 Curt. C. C. 364; State *v.* Noble, 15 Me. 476; Com. *v.* Wellington, 7 Allen, 299; Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 109, 146.

[12] Supra, § 122.

[13] 1 Stark. C. P. 251–2; Ryalls *v.* R., 11 Q. B. 781, 797; Com. *v.* Hart, 10 Gray, 468; People *v.* Jackson, 3 Denio, 101; Crichton *v.* People, 6 Park C. R. 363; State *v.* Heck, 23 Minn. 551. See supra, § 123.

videlicet is material, but which, in other cases, prevents the danger of a variance by separating the description from the material averment, so that the former, if not proved, may be rejected, without mutilating the sentence which contains the latter."[1] But a *videlicet* cannot be admitted to contradict, increase, or diminish the allegations with which it is connected.[2]

Assault may be sustained without specification of object.

§ 159. Where an assault is duly averred, then the intent with which this assault was committed is matter of surplusage, and need not be proved in order to secure a conviction of the assault.[3] Even an assault with intent need not specify the facts necessary to constitute an offence whose actual and complete shape was not at the time matured.[4] Thus, an indictment for an assault with an intent to steal from the pocket, without stating the goods or money intended to be stolen, is good;[5] nor is it necessary to aver that the prosecutor had anything in his pocket to be stolen.[6] In an indictment, also, for an assault with intent to murder, it is not necessary at common law to state the means made use of by the assailant, to effectuate the murderous intent,[7] though when required by statute and when the instrument is

[1] Heard's Pl. 141; citing 1 Smith's Lead. Cas. (16th Eng. ed.) 592.

[2] Gould's Pleading, p. 68. State *v.* Brown, 51 Conn. 1.

[3] R. *v.* Higgins, 2 East, 5; though see R. *v.* Marsh, 1 Den. C. C. 505; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 637. Even the word "assault" is not necessary, but may be supplied by terms by which it is implied. Murdock *v.* State, 65 Ala. 520. See Cole *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 67. But see Hays *v.* State, 77 Ind. 450.

[4] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 644; Cross *v.* State, 55 Wis. 262; State *v.* Montgomery, 7 Baxt. 100; People *v.* Girr, 53 Cal. 629; Morris *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 65.

[5] Com. *v.* Rogers, 5 S. & R. 463; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 637.

[6] Com. *v.* McDonald, 5 Cush. 365; Durand *v.* People, 47 Mich. 332. See Com. *v.* Doherty, 10 Cush. 52.

[7] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 644; U. S. *v.* Herbert, 5 Cranch C. C. 87; State *v.* Daley, 41 Vt. 564; State *v.* Dent, 3 Gill. & John. 8; Rice *v.* People, 15 Mich. 9; Kilkelly *v.* State, 43 Wis. 604; but see State *v.* Johnson, 11 Tex. 22; State *v.* Jordan, 19 Mo. 213; Trexler *v.* State, 19 Ala. 21; State *v.* Chandler, 24 Mo. 371; State *v.* Hubbs, 58 Ind. 415. See cases in Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 644. The question, it is to be observed, depends on the statute constituting the offence. See State *v.* Munch, 22 Minn. 67. In North Carolina it has been held that specification of weapon is necessary. State *v.* Moore, 82 N. C. 659; State *v.* Hooper, 82 N. C. 663; State *v.* Benthall, 82 N. C. 664. But in State *v.* Gainus, 86 N. C. 632, it was held that in an indictment for an assault with intent to murder the weapon need not be averred.

known to the pleader, it should be averred.[1] So in an indictment for breaking and entering a dwelling-house, with intent to commit a rape, it need not be alleged that the defendant "then and there" intended to commit the rape, nor need the offence of rape be fully and technically set forth.[2] The means of effecting the criminal intent, or the circumstances evincive of the design with which the act was done, are considered to be matters of evidence to the jury to demonstrate the intent, and not necessary to be incorporated in an indictment.[3] It is otherwise, however, when the charge is a statutory aggravated assault, in which case the aggravation must be specially averred.[4] When, however, an *attempt* is averred, it is necessary that some act constituting such attempt (*e. g.*, an assault) should be laid,[5] as the *attempt* is not *per se* indictable, and needs extraneous facts to make it the subject of an indictment, while it is otherwise with an *assault.*[6] It is not necessary, however, to aver that which the grand jury could not have known; *e. g.*, what were

[1] See Porter *v.* State, 57 Miss. 300; State *v.* Miller, 25 Kan. 699. In some States this is required by statute.

[2] Com. *v.* Doherty, 10 Cush. 52.

An indictment for an assault with intent to commit a rape need not allege that the intent was to "carnally and unlawfully know." Singer *v.* People, 13 Hun, 418; aff. 75 N. Y. 608.

[3] Mackesey *v.* People, 6 Park. C. R. 114; State *v.* Dent, 3 Gill. & J. 8; approved in U. S. *v.* Simmons, 96 U. S. 360; citing also U. S. *v.* Gooding, 12 Wheat. 473; U. S. *v.* Ulriel, 3 Dillon, 535.

[4] State *v.* Beadon, 17 S. C. 55; Griffin *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 423.

[5] Randolph *v.* Com., 6 S. & R. 398; Clark's case, 6 Grat. 675; State *v.* Womack, 31 La. An. 635. See State *v.* Wilson, 30 Conn. 503. See, as tending to a laxer view, U. S. *v.* Simmons, 96 U. S. 360; People *v.* Bush, 4 Hill N. Y. 132. As to precision necessary in indictments for attempts, etc., see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 173 *et seq.*, 190.

In U. S. *v.* Simmons, 96 U. S. 360, it is held that where a defendant is not charged with using a still, boiler, or other vessel himself, but with causing and procuring some person to use them, the name of such person must be given in the indictment.

The indictment, when for distilling vinegar illegally, must set out that the apparatus was used for that purpose, and in the premises described, and the vinegar manufactured *at the time* the apparatus described was being used. The averment that defendant caused and procured the apparatus to be used for distilling implies with sufficient certainty that it was so used; it is not essential that its actual use shall be set out. See U. S. *v.* Claflin, 13 Blatch. 178.

[6] See U. S. *v.* Wentworth, 11 Fed. Rep. 52; Thompson *v.* People, 96 Ill. 158.

the specific goods the party attempted to steal,[1] or, it may be, particular poison the defendant intended to employ.[2]

Act of one confederate may be averred as act of the other.

§ 159 *a*. As we shall have occasion to see at length when the proof of variance is discussed,[3] the act of an agent may be averred as the act of the principal, and that of one confederate as the act of the other.[4]

Descriptive averment must be proved.

§ 160. When an averment is descriptive, it may so far enter into the designation of the offence that it must be specifically proved.[5]

Alternative statements are inadmissible.

§ 161. The certainty required in an indictment precludes the adoption of an alternative statement.[6] Thus, if the indictment charge the defendant with one or other of two offences, in the disjunctive, as that he murdered *or* caused to be murdered, forged *or* caused to be forged,[7] burned *or* caused to be burned,[8] sold spirituous *or* intoxicating liquors;[9] *levavit*, vel *levari causavit*,[10] conveyed *or* caused to be conveyed, etc., it is bad for uncertainty;[11] and the same, if it charge him in two different characters, in the disjunctive, as *quod* A. *existens servus* sive *deputatus*, took, etc.;[12] and so where the defendant is charged with having broken into a "barn *or* stable,"[13] with having sold "spirituous *or* intoxicating liquors," or with having administered a poison

[1] State *v.* Utley, 82 N. C. 556.

[2] Watson *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 237. In such cases the term feloniously must ordinarily be used when the object is felonious. Infra, § 260.

[3] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 102; State *v.* Basserman, 54 Conn. 89.

[4] Supra, § 140.

[5] Supra, § 158; Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 109, 146; State *v.* Sherburn, 59 N. H. 99; Dennis *v.* State, 91 Ind. 291; Gray *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 411. See Com. *v.* Moriarty, 135 Mass. 540.

[6] See State *v.* Stephenson, 83 Ind. 246; State *v.* Charlton, 11 W. Va. 332; Tompkins *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 161; Hammel *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 326; Thompson *v.* State, 37 Ark. 408. That for this reason disjunctive statements in statutes are to be given conjunctively so. Infra, § 228.

[7] 2 Hawk. c. 35, s. 58; R. *v.* Stocker, 1 Salk. 342, 371; Com. *v.* Perrigo, 3 Metc. (Ky.) 5; People *v.* Tomlinson, 35 Cal. 503. As to averment of such disjunctive allegations, see infra, § 228. That such averments are divisible, see infra, §§ 228, 251.

[8] People *v.* Hood, 6 Cal. 236.

[9] Com. *v.* Grey, 2 Gray, 501. But see Cunningham *v.* State, 5 W. Va. 508.

[10] R. *v.* Stoughton, 2 Str. 900.

[11] R. *v.* Flint, Hardw. 370. See R. *v.* Morley, 1 Y. & J. 221; State *v.* Gary, 36 N. H. 359; State *v.* Naramore, 58 N. H. 273; State *v.* Drake, 1 Vroom, 422; Noble *v.* State, 59 Ala. 73.

[12] Smith *v.* Mall, 2 Roll. Rep. 263.

[13] Horton *v.* State, 60 Ala. 72; see Pickett *v.* State, 60 Ala. 77.

or drug.[1] So, generally, an indictment which may apply to either of two different offences, and does not specify which, is bad.[2] On the other hand, alternatives have been permitted when they qualify an unessential description of the particular offence, and do not touch the offence itself.[3] Thus, in Vermont, it was held not to be a fatal objection, that an indictment charged the defendant with the larceny of a horse, described as being either of a "brown *or* bay color."[4] In Pennsylvania, indictments averring certain trees cut down not to be the property of the defendants "*or* either of them,"[5] and laying a nuisance to be in the "highway *or* road," etc., have been held good, the alternative being rejected as surplusage.[6] In several precedents in Massachusetts, the expression "as an innholder *or* victualler" formally occurs.[7] And in the U. S. Circuit Court for Michigan, it has been held that "cutting *or* causing to be cut" is not fatal.[8] The principle seems to be, that "or" is only fatal when it renders the statement of the offence uncertain, and not so when one term is used only as explaining or illustrating the other.[9] "Or," also, may be introduced in enumerating the negative averments required to exclude the exceptions of a statute.[10] And ordinarily the objections, if good, cannot be taken after verdict.[11]

§ 162. Where a statute disjunctively enumerates offences, or the intent necessary to constitute such offences, the indictment can-

[1] State *v.* Drake, 1 Vroom, 422; Com. *v.* France, 2 Brewst. 568; State *v.* Green, 3 Heisk. 131; Whiteside *v.* State, 4 Cold. 183. See Wingard *v.* State, 13 Ga. 396.

[2] R. *v.* Marshall, 1 Mood. C. C. 158; State *v.* Harper, 64 N. C. 129; Johnson *v.* State, 32 Ala. 583; Horton *v.* State, 60 Ala. 73.

[3] Barnett *v.* State, 54 Ala. 579; State *v.* Newsom, 13 W. Va. 859.

[4] State *v.* Gilbert, 13 Vt. 647. Infra, § 228.

[5] Moyer *v.* Com., 7 Barr, 439. See McGregor *v.* State, 16 Ind. 9.

[6] Res. *v.* Arnold, 3 Yeates, 417; and see State *v.* Corrigan, 24 Conn. 286; Kaisler *v.* State, 55 Ala. 64; State *v.* Ellis, 4 Mo. 474.

[7] Com. *v.* Churchill, 2 Metcalf, 119, 125; Com. *v.* Thayer, 5 Metcalf, 246. The paragraph also, "did cause to be published, etc., in a certain paper *or* publication," seems to have escaped the vigilance of counsel who were concerned in the great case of People *v.* Crosswell, 3 Johnson's cases, 338.

[8] U. S. *v.* Potter, 6 McLean, C. C. 186. See, also, State *v.* Ellis, 4 Mo. 474; State *v.* Richards, 23 La. An. 1294. Infra, § 228.

[9] Com. *v.* Grey, 2 Gray, 501; Brown *v.* Com., 8 Mass. 59; People *v.* Gilkinson, 4 Park. C. C. 26; State *v.* Ellis, 4 Mo. 474. Infra, § 228.

[10] Ibid.; State *v.* Burns, 20 N. H. 550; People *v.* Gilkinson, 4 Park. Cr. 25; Com. *v.* Hadscraft, 6 Bush, 91; State *v.* Sundley, 15 Mo. 513.

[11] Johnson *v.* State, 50 Ala. 456.

not charge them disjunctively.[1] Thus, where a statute against unlawful shooting affixes a penalty when the act is done with intent to maim, disfigure, disable, or kill (in the disjunctive), the disjunctive statement of intent is bad.[2] Under statutes also, describing the several phases of forgery disjunctively, it is held fatal to say that the defendant forged, or caused to be forged, an instrument,[3] or that he carried and conveyed, or caused to be carried and conveyed, two persons having the small-pox, so as to burden a certain parish.[4] It is therefore error to state the successive gradations of statutory offences disjunctively; and to state them conjunctively, when they are not repugnant, is allowable.[5]

Disjunctive offences in statute may be conjunctively stated.

§ 163. When a statute in one clause makes several distinct and substantive offences indictable, neither of which is included in the other, it has been held better to specify the actual offence committed.[6] Thus, where the language of the statute was, "any person who shall presume to keep a tippling-house, or sell rum, brandy, whiskey, tafia, or other spirituous liquors, etc., shall be liable," etc.; and the indictment charged the defendant with selling the particular liquors in the aggregate without a license, it was held that the indictment was deficient in not defining the offence with sufficient precision.[7] Whether different designations of an *object* (*e. g.*, "warrant," "order," "request") can be coupled will be hereafter noticed.[8]

Otherwise as to distinct and substantive offences.

[1] U. S. *v.* Armstrong, 5 Phil. Rep. 273; State *v.* Colwells, 3 R. I. 284; State *v.* Price, 6 Halst. 203; Jones *v.* State, 1 McMullan, 236; Whiteside *v.* State, 4 Colds. 183. Infra, § 228.

[2] Angel *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 231.

[3] 1 Burr. 399; 1 Salk. 342, 371; 8 Mod. 32; 5 Mod. 137.

[4] 1 Sess. Cases, 307.

[5] Infra, § 251; R. *v.* North, 6 D. & R. 143; U. S. *v.* Hull, 4 McCr. 273; U. S. *v.* Armstrong, 5 Phil. Rep. 273; Com. *v.* Grey, 2 Gray, 501; State *v.* Price, 6 Halst. 203; Angel *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 231; Rasnick *v.* Com., Ibid. 356; Jones *v.* State, 1 McMullan, 236; State *v.* Meyor, 1 Speers, 305; Wingard *v.* State, 13 Ga. 396; State *v.* McCollum, 44 Mo. 343; Keefer *v.* State, 4 Ind. 246; State *v.* Stout, 112 Ind. 245; People *v.* Ah Woo, 28 Cal. 205; and cases cited, supra. For other cases see infra, § 251.

[6] But see Com. *v.* Ballou, 124 Mass. 26; State *v.* Locklear, Busbee, 205. Supra, § 151; infra, § 228.

[7] State *v.* Raiford, 7 Porter, 101; and see R. *v.* Middlehurst, 1 Burr. 400; Miller *v.* State, 5 How. (Miss.) 250.

[8] Infra, §§ 195, 251.

§ 163 *a*. The cases in reference to intent may be grouped under the following heads:—

Intent when necessary must be averred.

(1.) Where the intent is to be proved in order to indicate the character of the act, as when there is an attempt or assault to commit an offence, in which cases the intent must be averred;[1] and must be attached to all the material allegations.[2] And so as to the intent in forgery.[3]

(2.) Where the intent is to be *primâ facie* inferred from the facts stated, in which case intent, unless part of the statutory definition, need not be specifically averred.[4] Thus, while intent must be averred in an indictment for an attempt to steal, it need not be averred in an indictment for larceny.[5]

(3.) Where intent is part of the statutory definition of the offence it must be averred, though it is otherwise in cases where it is not part of such statutory definition, and when the offence is punishable, no matter what was the intent.[6]

(4.) In negligent offences, to allege intent is a fatal error, unless the allegation be so stated as to be capable of discharge as surplusage.[7]

§ 164. Where guilty knowledge is not a necessary ingredient of the offence, or, where the statement of the act itself necessarily includes a knowledge of the illegality of the act, no averment of knowledge is necessary.[8] It is

And so of guilty knowledge.

[1] Com. *v.* Hersey, 2 Allen, 173; State *v.* Garvey, 11 Minn. 154; State *v.* Davis, 26 Tex. 201; People *v.* Congleton, 44 Cal. 92. See U. S. *v.* Wentworth, 11 Fed. Rep. 52; Bartlett *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 500.

[2] R. *v.* Rushworth, R. & R. 317; Com. *v.* Boynton, 12 Cush. 500; Com. *v.* Dean, 110 Mass. 64.

[3] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 744; though see State *v.* Lurch, 12 Or. 99.

[4] See State *v.* Hurds, 19 Neb. 316.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Infra, § 220; State *v.* McCarter, 98 N. C. 637. As to indictments for cheats and false pretences, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1226; Stringer *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 520.

[7] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 125 *et seq.* As to surplusage see supra, § 158.

The Ohio statute which declares that it shall be sufficient in any indictment, where it is necessary to allege an intent to defraud, to allege that the party accused did the act with intent to defraud, without alleging an intent to defraud any particular person, is not in conflict with § 10 of the Bill of Rights, which requires the accused, on demand, to be furnished with "the nature and cause of the accusation against him." Turpin *v.* State, 19 Ohio St. 540, 1869. As to similar provision in Pennsylvania statute see McClure *v.* Com., 86 Penn. St. 353. Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 742.

[8] 1 Hale P. C. 561; 2 East P. C. 51; 6 East, 474; 1 B. & P. 86; U. S. *v.*

otherwise where guilty knowledge is not so implied and is a substantive ingredient of the offence.[1] Thus, in an indictment for selling an obscene book, a *scienter* is necessary,[2] and so in indictments for selling unwholesome water;[3] for illegal voting;[4] for subornation of perjury;[5] for passing counterfeit money;[6] and for assaulting officers;[7] though it has not been held necessary in an indictment for adultery.[8]

Under a statute, where the guilty knowledge is part of the statutory definition of the offence, it must be averred.[9] But in the large and important class of cases elsewhere particularly discussed,[10] in which an act is made indictable irrespective of the *scienter*, the *scienter* is not to be averred in the indictment, since if it were it might be regarded as a descriptive allegation, which it is necessary to prove.[11]

Malone, 20 Blatch. 137; Com. *v.* Elwell, 2 Met. (Mass.) 190; Com. *v.* Boynton, 12 Cush. 499; Com. *v.* Stout, 7 B. Monr. 247; Turner *v.* State, 1 Ohio St. 422; State *v.* Freeman, 6 Blackf. 248; State *v.* Burgson, 53 Iowa, 318. See State *v.* Haines, 23 S. C. 170. Infra, § 272.

[1] U. S. *v.* Buzzo, 18 Wall. 125; State *v.* Card, 34 N. H. 510; Com. *v.* Dean, 110 Mass. 64; People *v.* Lohman, 2 Barb. 216; Com. *v.* Blumenthal, Whart. Prec. 528, n.; Powers *v.* State, 87 Ind. 97; Gabe *v.* State, 1 Eng. (Ark.) 519; Norman *v.* State, 24 Miss. 54; Stein *v.* State, 37 Ala. 123. As to counterfeit money, see Whart. Cr. L., 9th ed. § 722.

[2] Com. *v.* McGarrigall, cited 1 Bennett & Heard's Lead. Cas. 551. See, also, State *v.* Carpenter, 20 Vt. 9; Com. *v.* Kirby, 2 Cush. 577; State *v.* Brown, 2 Speers, 129.

[3] Stein *v.* State, 37 Ala. 123.

[4] U. S. *v.* Wadkinds, 7 Sawy. 85; S. C. 11 Rep. 560.

[5] U. S. *v.* Dennee, 3 Woods, 39.

[6] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 722; U. S. *v.* Carll, 105 U. S. 611; Powers *v.* State, 87 Ind. 97.

[7] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 649; State *v.* Maloney, 12 R. I. 251; Horan *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 183. See, however, People *v.* Haley, 48 Mich. 495, a case of doubtful authority.

[8] Com. *v.* Elwell, 2 Met. 190; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1731.

[9] R. *v.* Jukes, 8 Term R. 625; R. *v.* Myddleton, 6 Term R. 739; 1 Starkie C. P. 196; State *v.* Gove, 34 N. H. 510; People *v.* Lohman, 2 Barb. 216; State *v.* Stimson, 4 Zahr. 478; State *v.* Bloedow, 45 Wis. 279. See U. S. *v.* Schuler, 6 McLean, 28. As to receiving stolen goods, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 999. As to false pretences, Ibid. § 1225. As to adultery, Ibid. § 1731. As to incest, etc., Ibid. § 1752. As to poisoning, Ibid. § 524. As to offences on the high seas, Ibid. §§ 1871, 1886. As to perjury, Ibid. § 1286.

[10] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 88.

[11] R. *v.* Gibbons, 12 Cox C. C. 237; R. *v.* Hicklin, L. R. 3 Q. B. 360; R. *v.* Prince, L. R. 1 C. C. R. 154; State *v.* Goodenow, 65 Me. 30; State *v.* Bacon, 7 Vt. 219; Com. *v.* Elwell, 2 Met. 110; Com. *v.* Thompson, 11 Allen, 23; Com. *v.* Smith, 103 Mass. 444; Phillips *v.* State, 17 Ga. 459.

In U. S. *v.* Bayaud (21 Blatch. 217,

Scienter, in case of poisoning, is implied, under the Massachusetts statute, from "wilfully and maliciously" with "intent to injure and kill C."[1]

§ 165. Matters of inducement or aggravation, as a general rule, do not require so much certainty as the statement of the gist of the offence.[2] And where the offence cannot be stated with complete certainty, it is sufficient to state it with such certainty as it is capable of. We have this rule illustrated in cases of assaults already noticed. And in conspiracy to defraud a person of goods, it is not necessary to describe the goods as in an indictment for stealing them; stating them as "divers goods" has been holden sufficient.[3]

Inducement and aggravation need not be detailed.

§ 166. The degree of particularity necessary in setting out the offence can be best determined by examining the objects for which such particularity is required. These objects may be specified as follows:[4]—

Particularity required for identification and protection.

287), it was held that in an indictment for removing revenue stamps from casks without destroying them it is not necessary to aver a *scienter*. "Where a statute," said Benedict, J., "forbids the doing of a certain act under certain circumstances, without reference to knowledge or intent, any person doing the act mentioned is charged with the duty to see that the circumstances attending this act are such as to make it lawful, and under such statutes a conviction may be had upon proof of doing the forbidden act, without proof or knowledge by the accused of the circumstances specified in the statute. The books contain many cases where such a rule has been applied. See Barnes *v.* The State, 19 Conn. 399; Fox *v.* State, 3 Tex. Ct. App. 329, as within the rule; Commonwealth *v.* Waite, 11 Allen, 264, where the act charged was selling adulterated milk; 2 Allen, 160, where selling liquor that was intoxicating was the offence; State *v.* Heck, 23 Minn. 594, where selling liquor to an habitual drunkard was charged; Russell on Crimes, 93, where the crime charged is inducing a soldier to desert; Reg. *v.* Robbins, 1 Car. & K. 456, where the crime was abducting an unmarried girl under sixteen years of age; also Reg. *v.* Olifer, 10 Cox C. C. 402; Fitzpatrick *v.* Kelly, L. R. 8 Q. B. 337, where the charge was selling adulterated butter; Reg. *v.* Woodrow, 15 M. & W. 404, where the offence was having in possession adulterated tobacco, and where it was found as a fact that the accused believed the tobacco to be unadulterated. See, also, Halsted *v.* The State, 12 Vroom, 552." The question in its substantive relations is discussed in Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 88.

[1] Com. *v.* Hobbs, 140 Mass. 443. But see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 524.

[2] R. *v.* Wright, 1 Vent. 170; Com. Dig. Indict. G. 5. As to evidence of surplusage of this kind, see Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 138 *et seq.*

[3] R. *v.* ——, 1 Chit. Rep. 698; R. *v.* Eccles, 1 Leach, 274; R. *v.* Gill, 2 Barn. & Ald. 204; Com. *v.* Judd, 2 Mass. 329; Com. *v.* Collins, 3 S. & R. 220; Com. *v.* Mifflin, 5 Watts & S. 461.

[4] See 1 Starkie's C. P. 73, from which several of these points are taken.

(*a.*) In order to identify the charge, lest the grand jury should find a bill for one offence and the defendant be put upon his trial for another.[1]

(*b.*) That the defendant's conviction or acquittal may enure to his subsequent protection, should he be again questioned on the same grounds.

(*c.*) To warrant the court in granting or refusing any particular right or indulgence, which the defendant claims as incident to the nature of the case.[2]

(*d.*) To enable the defendant to prepare for his defence[3] in particular cases, and to plead in all;[4] or, if he prefer it, to submit to the court by demurrer whether the facts alleged (supposing them to be true) so support the conclusion in law, as to render it necessary for him to make any answer to the charge.[5]

(*e.*) To enable the court, looking at the record after conviction, to decide whether the facts charged are sufficient to support a conviction of the particular crime, and to warrant their judgment.

(*f.*) To instruct the court as to the technical limits of the penalty to be inflicted.[6]

(*g.*) To guide a court of error in its action in revising the record.[7]

[1] Staunf. 181.

[2] 1 Stark. C. P. 73.

[3] R. *v.* Hollond, 5 T. R. 623; Fost. 194; Com. *v.* McAtee, 8 Dana, 29. See, to the same effect, People *v.* Taylor, 3 Denio, 91. "That certainty and precision in an indictment is required, which will enable the defendant to judge whether the facts and circumstances stated constitute an indictable offence, that he may know the nature of the offence against which he is to prepare his defence; that he may plead a conviction or acquittal, in bar of another indictment; and that there may be no doubt as to the nature of the judgment to be given in case of conviction." Biggs *v.* People, 8 Barb. 547 —Edmonds, P. J.

[4] 3 Inst. 41.

[5] Cowper, 672.

[6] Cowper, 672; 5 T. R. 623; 1 Starkie C. P. 73.

[7] This reason was considered the most important in R. *v.* Bradlaugh, 38 L. T. (N. S.) 118; L. R. 3 Q. B. D. 607; 14 Cox C. C. 68; commented on infra, § 177.

VIII. WRITTEN INSTRUMENTS.

1. WHERE THE INSTRUMENT, AS IN FORGERY AND LIBEL, MUST BE SET OUT IN FULL, § 167.
(*a.*) In what case literal exactness is necessary, § 167.
(*b.*) "Tenor," "purport," and "substance," § 168.
(*c.*) What variance is fatal, § 173.
(*d.*) Quotation marks, § 175.
(*e.*) Lost, destroyed, obscene, or suppressed writings, § 176.
(*f.*) When any part may be omitted, § 180.
(*g.*) Where the instrument is in a foreign language, or is on its face insensible, § 181.
2. WHERE THE INSTRUMENT, AS IN LARCENY, ETC., MAY BE DESCRIBED MERELY BY GENERAL DESIGNATION, § 182.
3. WHAT GENERAL LEGAL DESIGNATION WILL SUFFICE, § 184.
"Purporting to be," § 184.
"Receipt," "acquittance," §§ 185, 186.
"Bill of exchange," § 187.
"Promissory note," § 188.
"Bank note," § 189.
"Money," § 190.
"Goods and chattels," § 191.
"Warrant for the payment of money," § 192.
"Order," § 193.
"Request," § 194.
"Deed," "bond," § 196.
"Obligation," § 198.
"Undertaking," § 199.
"Guarantee," § 200.
"Property," § 201.
"Piece of paper," § 202.

1. *Where the Instrument, as in Forgery and Libel, must be set out in full.*[1]

§ 167. Where the words of a document are essential ingredients of the offence, as in forgery, passing counterfeit money, sending threatening letters, libel, etc., the document should be set out in words and figures.[2] The mat- When words of document are mate-

[1] In Massachusetts, by Gen. Stat. 1864, c. 250, § 1, variance in writings or print is immaterial, if the identity of the instrument is manifest.

[2] R. *v.* Mason, 2 East, 238; 2 East P. C. 976; R. *v.* Powell, 1 Leach, 77; R. *v.* Hart, 1 Leach, 145; U. S. *v.* Noelke, 17 Blatch. 554; U. S. *v.* Wentworth, 11 Fed. Rep. 52; U. S. *v.* Warren, 17 Fed. Rep. 145; Com. *v.* Stow, 1 Mass. 54; Com. *v.* Bailey, 1 Mass. 62; Com. *v.* Wright, 1 Cush. 46; Com. *v.* Tarbox, Ibid. 66; State *v.* Farrand, 3 Halst. 333; State *v.* Gustin, 2 South. R. 749; Com. *v.* Gillespie, 7 S. & R. 469; Com. *v.* Sweney, 10 S. & R. 173; State *v.* Stephens, Wright's Ohio R. 73; State *v.* Twitty, 2 Hawks, 248; Rooker *v.* State, 65 Ind. 86; Baker *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 332; Smith *v.* State, 18 Tex. Ap. 399. As to variance, see Whart. Crim. Ev. § 114. As to forgery, see Whart. Crim Law, 9th ed. § 727. As to libel, Ibid. §§ 1156 *et seq.*

In indictment for libel, the alleged libellous matter must be set out accurately, any variance being fatal; Cartwright *v.* Wright, 1 D. & R. 230; Wright *v.* Clements, 3 B. & Ald. 503; Com. *v.* Tarbox, 1 Cush. 66; Com. *v.* Sweney, 10 S. & R. 173; State *v.* Brownlow, 7 Humph. 63; Walsh *v.* State, 2 McCord, 248; though matters not in the libellous passage, or of record, need not be exactly alleged. Thus, an indictment charging that the defendant published

rial they should be set forth.

ter must be set out word for word.[1] Thus, the omission of a word in an indictment for forgery is fatal.[2] In such

a libel on the twenty-first of the month, may be supported by proof of a publication on the nineteenth of the same month. But it is otherwise if the indictment has alleged that the libel was published in a paper dated the twenty-first of the month. Com. *v.* Varney, 10 Cush. 402.

Where parts are selected, they must be set forth thus: "In a certain part of which said," etc., "there were and are contained certain false, wicked, malicious, scandalous, seditious, and libellous matters, of and concerning," etc., "according to the tenor and effect following, that is to say:" "And in a certain other part," etc., etc. See 1 Camp. 350, per Lord Ellenborough; Archbold's C. P. 494; 1 Wms. Notes to Saund. 139. Infra, § 180.

The date at the end of the libel need not be set forth. Com. *v.* Harmon, 2 Gray, 289.

If the indictment does not on its face profess to set forth an accurate copy of the alleged libel in words and figures, it will be held insufficient on demurrer, or in arrest of judgment. State *v.* Twitty, 2 Hawks, 248; State *v.* Goodman, 6 Rich. 387; and cases cited to § 169. It is not sufficient to profess to set it forth according to its substance or effect. Com. *v.* Tarbox, 1 Cush. 66; Com. *v.* Wright, 1 Cush. 46; State *v.* Brownlow, 7 Humph. 63. And where the indictment alleged that the defendant published, etc., an unlawful and malicious libel, *according to the purport and effect, and in substance* as follows, it was ruled that the words between *libel* and *as follows* could not be rejected as surplusage. Com. *v.* Wright, I Cush. 46. Infra, §*170.

Where it does not appear from the paper itself who its author was, nor the persons of and concerning whom it was written, nor the purpose for which it was written, these facts should be explicitly averred, for the consideration of the jury, in all cases in which they are material. State *v.* Henderson, 1 Rich. 179.

Where the persons alleged to have been libelled are alluded to in ambiguous and covert terms, it is not sufficient to aver generally that the paper was composed and published "of and concerning" the persons alleged to have been libelled, with innuendoes accompanying the covert terms, whenever they occur in the paper as set out in the indictment, that they meant those persons, or were allusions to their names. There should be a full and explicit averment that the defendant, under and by the use of the covert terms, wrote of and concerning the persons alleged to be libelled. R. *v.* Marsden, 4 M. & S. 164; State *v.* Henderson, 1 Rich. 179; State *v.* Brownlow, 7 Humph. 63. Infra, § 181 *a*.

The court will regard the use of fictitious names and disguises, in a libel, in the sense that they are commonly understood by the public. State *v.* Chace, Walker, 384.

Under a declaration which alleges the publication of a certain "libel con-

[1] State *v.* Sweny, 10 S. & R. 173; State *v.* Townsend, 86 N. C. 676.

[2] U. S. *v.* Hinman, I Baldwin, 292; U. S. *v.* Britton, 2 Mason, 464; State *v.* Street, Tayl. 158; and see State *v.* Bradley, 1 Hay. 403; State *v.* Coffey, N. C. Term. R. 272.

cases, however, it is not necessary to copy the vignettes, devices, seals, letters, or figures in the margin, as they make no part of the meaning;[1] and so of stamps.[2] But it has been held fatal to omit the name of the State in the upper margin of a copy of a bank note, when such name is not repeated on the body.[3] In prosecutions for selling lottery tickets, in jurisdictions in which all lotteries are illegal, the weight of authority is that the ticket need not be set forth;[4] though, if there be a pretence of setting forth the ticket, a variance is fatal.[5] It has also been held not necessary to set forth, in an indictment for not destroying stamps, the stamps which should have been effaced.[6]

§ 168. When it is necessary to set forth exactly a document,[7] it may be preceded by the words, "to the tenor following," or "in these words," or "as follows," or "in the words and figures following," for though the term "tenor," which imports an accurate copy,[8] has been considered to be the most technical way of introducing the document, yet it has been ruled that "as follows" is equivalent to the words "according to the tenor following," or "in the words and figures following," and that if under such an allegation the prosecutor fails in proving the instrument verbatim, as laid, the variance will be fatal;[9] and where the indictment, by these or

In such case the indictment should claim to set forth the words.

cerning the plaintiff," but contains no innuendoes, colloquiums, or special averments of facts to connect the publication with the plaintiff, if no evidence be offered to connect him therewith, except the publication itself, the question whether the publication refers to the plaintiff is for the court, and not for the jury. Barrows *v.* Bell, 7 Gray, 301. Innuendoes are hereafter discussed. Infra, § 181 *a*.

[1] U. S. *v.* Bennett, 17 Blatch. 357; State *v.* Carr, 5 N. H. 367; Com. *v.* Bailey, 1 Mass. 62; Com. *v.* Stephens, Ibid. 203; Com. *v.* Taylor, 5 Cush. 605; People *v.* Franklin, 3 Johnson's C. 299; Com. *v.* Searle, 2 Binn. 332; Buckland *v.* Com., 8 Leigh, 732; Griffin *v.* State, 14 Ohio St. R. 55; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 731. Infra, § 180.

[2] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 677.

[3] Com. *v.* Wilson, 2 Gray, 70; see Langdale *v.* People, 100 Ill. 263.

[4] People *v.* Taylor, 3 Denio, 99; Freligh *v.* State, 8 Mo. 613; U. S. *v.* Bayaud, Benedict, J., 15 Rep. 520; 21 Blatch. 287; cited supra, § 164; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1493.

[5] Com. *v.* Gillespie, 7 S. & R. 469.

[6] U. S. *v.* Bayaud, *ut supra*.

[7] 1 Ch. C. L. 234; 2 Leach, 661; 6 East, 418–426; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 737.

[8] 2 Leach, 660, 661; 3 Salk. 225; Holt, 347–350, 425; 11 Mod. 96, 97; Douglass, 193, 194; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 737.

[9] 1 Leach, 78; 2 Leach, 660, 961; 2 East P. C. 976; 2 Bla. Rep. 787; Clay *v.* People, 86 Ill. 147; State *v.* Town-

similar averments, fails to claim to set out a copy of the instrument in words and figures, it will be invalid.[1]

"Purport" means effect; "tenor" means contents.

§ 169. Purport, it is said, means the effect of a document as it appears on the face of it in ordinary construction, and is insufficient when literal exactness is required; tenor means an exact copy of it.[2] But if the instrument, in cases where only purport is required, does not "purport" to be what the indictment avers—*i. e.*, if its meaning is not accurately stated, the variance is fatal.[3] Purport may be rejected as surplusage when tenor is accurately given.[4] Nor when the document is set forth, and shows fraud on its face, need its prejudicial character be averred.[5]

"Manner and form," "purport and effect," "substance," do not imply verbal accuracy.

§ 170. The words "in manner and form following, that is to say," do not profess to give more than the substance, and are usual in an indictment for perjury;[6] but the word "aforesaid" binds the party to an exact recital.[7] "According to the purport and effect, and in substance," are bad, in cases where exactness of setting forth is required.[8] And so is "substance and effect."[9]

Attaching original papers is not adequate.

§ 171. The attaching of one of the original printed papers to the indictment, in place of inserting a copy, is not sufficient indication that the paper is set out in the very words.[10]

When exact copy is required mere variance of a letter is immaterial.

§ 173. A mere variance of a letter will not be fatal, even when it is averred that the tenor is set out, provided the meaning be not altered by changing the word misspelt into another of a different meaning;[11] thus,

send, 86 N. C. 676. Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 737.

[1] 2 Leach, 597, 660, 661; State *v.* Bonney, 34 Me. 383; Com. *v.* Wright, 1 Cush. 46; Dana *v.* State, 2 Oh. St. 91; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 737 *et seq.*, 1656.

[2] 2 Leach, 661; State *v.* Bonney, 34 Me. 383; State *v.* Witham, 47 Me. 165; Com. *v.* Wright, 1 Cush. 46; State *v.* Pullens, 81 Mo. 387.

[3] Dougl. 300; State *v.* Molier, 1 Devereux, 263; State *v.* Carter, Conf. (N. C.) R. 210; State *v.* Wimberly, 3 McCord, 190; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 114.

[4] State *v.* Yerger, 86 Mo. 33.

[5] State *v.* Covington, 94 N. C. 91; State *v.* Maas, 37 La. An. 202.

[6] 1 Leach, 192; Dougl. 193, 194.

[7] Ibid.; Doug. 97.

[8] Com. *v.* Wright, 1 Cush. 46; State *v.* Brownlow, 7 Humph. 63; Dana *v.* State, 2 Ohio St. 91.

[9] Com. *v.* Sweney, 10 S. & R. 173. But see Allen *v.* State, 74 Ala. 557.

[10] Com. *v.* Tarbox, 1 Cush. 66; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 736 *et seq.*

[11] Infra, § 273; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 114; R. *v.* Drake, Salk. 660; U. S.

in an indictment for forging a bill of exchange, the tenor was "value received," and the bill as produced in evidence was "value reiceved;" the question being reserved, it was held that the variance was not material, because it did not change one word into another, so as to alter the meaning.[1] On the same principle, where, in an indictment for perjury, it was assigned for perjury that the defendant swore he "understood and believed," instead of "understood," the mistake was held to be immaterial.[2] So "promise" for "promised" was held not a fatal variance.[3] The great rigor of the old English law in this respect was one of the consequences of the barbarous severity of the punishment imposed. A more humane system of punishment was followed by a more rational system of pleading.[4]

Unnecessary document need not be set forth.

§ 174. Where the setting out of the document in an indictment can give no information in the court, it is unnecessary to set it out.[5]

Quotation marks are not sufficient.

§ 175. Quotation marks by themselves are not sufficient to indicate tenor, unless there be something to show that the document within the quotation marks was that on which the indictment rests.[6]

v. Hinman, 1 Bald. 292; U. S. *v.* Burroughs, 3 McL. 405; State *v.* Bean, 19 Vt. 530; State *v.* Weaver, 13 Ired. 491; State *v.* Coffee, 2 Murphey, 320; State *v.* Leake, 80 N. C. 403; State *v.* Bibb, 68 Mo. 286; Ham *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 645; Baker *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 332; People *v.* Phillips, 70 Cal. 61.

[1] 1 Leach, 145.

[2] 1 Leach, 133; Dougl. 193, 194. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1297–8.

[3] Com. *v.* Parmenter, 5 Pick. 279.

[4] See Heard's Crim. Pl. 215, citing 1 Taylor's Ev. § 234 *a*, 6th ed. Infra, §§ 273–4–5; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 114; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 728 *a*.

Where an indictment alleged that a forged certificate was signed by Bowling Starke, but the instrument was signed B. Starke, and the signer's true name was Bolling Starke, the variance was held fatal. Com. *v.* Kearns, 1 Va. Cas. 109; State *v.* Waters, Const. R. 669; Murphy *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 554. *Contra*, State *v.* Bibb, 68 Mo. 286.

Where the name of John McNicoll, signed to a forged instrument, was in the setting out of the forged instrument in the indictment written John McNicole; this was held no variance. R. *v.* Wilson, 2 C. & K. 527; 1 Den. C. C. 284; 2 Cox C. C. 426. But see fully Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 114 *et seq.*

The subject of variance between the indictment and the evidence in this respect is more fully considered in another work. Whart. Crim. Ev. § 114; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 728 *a*.

[5] R. *v.* Coulson, 1 Eng. L. & E. 550; S. C. 1 T. & M. C. C. 332; 4 Cox C. C. 227.

[6] Com. *v.* Wright, 1 Cush. 46.

§ 176. Where the document on which the indictment rests is in the defendant's possession, or is lost or destroyed, it is sufficient to aver such special facts as an excuse for the non-setting out of the document, and then to proceed, either by stating its substance, or by describing it as a document which "the said inquest cannot set forth by reason," etc., of its loss, destruction, or detention, as the case may be,[1] giving, however, the purport of the instrument as near as may be.[2]

Document lost or in defendant's hands need not be set forth.

Thus, where the indictment excused the want of a particular description, by averring that the bond was with the defendant, it was held that this was sufficient.[3] Although it was said, in another case, the note is described as made on the —— day of May, and the proof is that the forged note was dated on a particular day, a conviction will be sustained, notwithstanding the variance, when a satisfactory reason for the omission of a more particular description is given in the indictment.[4]

The allegation of loss, however, will not supply the want of the allegation of such extraneous facts as are essential to constitute indictability.[5]

§ 177. It has also been ruled that if the grand jury declare of an indecent libel, "that the same would be offensive to the court here, and improper to be placed on the records thereof," the non-setting forth of the libel will be thereby sufficiently excused.[6] Thus, in an indictment for publishing an obscene book or picture, it is not necessary that the libel should be set out at large,[7] but in such case it is necessary specifically to aver

And so of obscene libel.

[1] Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 118, 199. See Com. *v.* Sawtelle, 11 Cush. 142; People *v.* Bogart, 36 Cal. 245. Infra, § 218.

[2] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 728 *et seq.*; R. *v.* Watson, 2 T. R. 200; R. *v.* Haworth, 4 C. & P. 254; R. *v.* Hunter, 4 C. & P. 128; U. S. *v.* Britton, 2 Mason, 468; State *v.* Bonney, 34 Me. 223; State *v.* Parker, 1 Chipman, Vt. 294; People *v.* Badgeley, 16 Wend. 531; Wallace *v.* People, 27 Ill. 45; Hart *v.* State, 55 Ind. 599; Munson *v.* State, 79 Ind. 541; Pendleton *v.* Com., 4 Leigh, 694; State *v.* Davis, 69 N. C. 313; Du Bois *v.* State, 50 Ala. 139. See fully Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 118, 199.

[3] People *v.* Kingsley, 2 Cow. 522. See Croxdale *v.* State, 1 Head. 139.

[4] People *v.* Badgeley, 16 Wend. 53. See State *v.* Squire, 1 Tyler, 147.

[5] Com. *v.* Spilman, 124 Mass. 237.

[6] Com. *v.* Holmes, 17 Mass. 336; and see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1609; for other cases, and cases given infra.

[7] State *v.* Brown, 1 Williams (Vt.),

the reason of the omission. And in any view it is proper on principle, that the obscene paper should be in some way individuated.[1]

619; Com. *v.* Holmes, 17 Mass. 336; Com. *v.* Dejardin, 126 Mass. 46; Com. *v.* Sharpless, 2 S. & R. 91; People *v.* Girardin, 1 Mann. (Mich.) 90; Thomas *v.* State, 103 Ind. 419. For form see Whart. Prec. 952, 968. This distinction has been taken in reference to indecent publications sent by mail in violation of statute. Bates *v.* U. S. 11 Biss. 70; U. S. *v.* Kaltmeyer, 16 Fed. Rep. 760; U. S. *v.* Benedict, 16 Blatch. 338; see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1609, 1662, 1831. When the document is set forth, it may be left to speak for itself. Smith *v.* State, 24 Tex. Ap. 1.

[1] Com. *v.* Tarbox, 1 Cush. 66; Com. *v.* Wright, 139 Mass. 382; State *v.* Hayward, 83 Mo. 299; and see U. S. *v.* Kaltmeyer, 16 Fed. Rep. 760; 5 McCr. 260.

The position of the text is accepted in England as to indecent prints. Dugdale *v.* R., Dears. C. C. 64. In R. *v.* Bradlaugh, 38 L. T. (N. S.) 118; L. R. 3 Q. B. D. 607; 14 Cox C. C. 68, it was ruled that an indictment which did not give the words of an alleged obscene libel or excuse their omission was bad. In this case it was noticed by Bramwell, J., that the American authorities excuse the non-setting forth of the libel on the grounds of its obscenity, which allegation was omitted in R. *v.* Bradlaugh. It will not do to say that this excuse is surplusage. An indictment which excuses the non-setting forth of a document on the ground of its loss, or of its destruction by the defendant, is good, though without such an excuse the indictment would be defective. The excuse, therefore, is essential. But, when such an excuse is made, the American cases present an almost unbroken line of authority to the effect that the obscene document need not be copied. Com. *v.* Holmes, 17 Mass. 336; State *v.* Brown, 1 Williams (Vt.), 619; McNair *v.* People, 89 Ill. 441; Fuller *v.* People, 92 Ill. 182; and People *v.* Girardin, 1 Mann. (Mich.) 90, are direct to this effect. Com. *v.* Tarbox, 1 Cush. 66, reaffirms the principle of Com. *v.* Holmes, but holds that to paste the alleged obscene matter to the indictment is a defective mode of pleading. As affirming Com. *v.* Holmes may also be cited Com. *v.* Dejardin, 126 Mass. 46. On the other hand, in State *v.* Hanson, 23 Tex. 232, an indictment for publishing an obscene document, without giving the words, was held bad. In this case, however, there was no excuse offered, as in Com. *v.* Holmes, for not setting out the libel. Com. *v.* Sharpless, 2 S. & R., was the case of an indecent picture, and the Supreme Court held that it was not necessary that the picture should be copied on the indictment. The reason, however, is the same as that given in Com. *v.* Holmes —that the court must preserve the "chastity" of its records, and not permit them to be used to perpetuate obscenities. It may be added to this that if an obscene publication were to be considered as exclusively a libel, it might be difficult to resist the conclusion, that as a libel when indicted as such, it should be spread on the record, supposing that no legitimate excuse be given for the non-setting out. But there is much force in the position that an obscene publication is not so much a libel as an offence against public decency; and if it be the latter, the particularity required in setting forth libels is not necessary. If a mob, for instance, should gather about a relig-

Prosecutor's negligence does not alter the case.

§ 178. Even where the prosecutor's negligence caused the loss, the loss will be an excuse for non-description, unless the misconduct was so gross as to imply fraud.[1]

Production of a document alleged to be "destroyed" is a fatal variance.

§ 179. When there is an allegation that a document is *destroyed*, as an excuse for its non-description, there is a fatal variance between the indictment and the proof if the destroyed instrument is produced on trial.[2]

Extraneous parts of document need not be set forth.

§ 180. Wherever the whole document is essential to the description of the offence, the whole must be set out in the indictment. It is otherwise, however, as to indorsements and other extraneous matter having nothing to do with the part of the document alleged to be forged.[3] And where, upon an indictment for forging a receipt, it appeared that the receipt was written at the foot of an account, and the indictment stated the receipt thus: "8th March, 1773. Received the contents above by me, Stephen Withers," without setting out the account at the foot of which it was written; this was ruled sufficient.[4] In other cases, where part only of a written instrument is included in the offence, that part alone is necessary to be set out. Thus, in cases where portions of publications are libellous and others not, it is only necessary, as is elsewhere noticed, to state those parts containing the libels; and if the libellous passages be in different parts of the publication, distinct from each other, they may be introduced thus: "In a certain part of which said libel there were and are contained the false, scandalous, malicious, and defamatory words and matter following, that is to say," etc. "And in a certain other part of which said libel there were and are contained," etc.[5] Where the indictment is for forging a note or bill,

ious assembly, disturbing its worship by profane and indecent language, it would not be necessary, it may well be argued, that those profane and indecent words should be set out. Nor is this the only illustration to which we may appeal. An indictment against a common scold need not set forth the words the "scold" was accustomed to use. See argument in Southern Law Rev. for 1878, p. 258.

[1] State *v.* Taunt, 16 Minn. 109.

[2] Smith *v.* State, 33 Ind. 159.

[3] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 753. And see Com. *v.* Ward. 2 Mass. 397; Com. *v.* Adams, 7 Met. 50; Perkins *v.* Com., 7 Grat. 651; Buckland *v.* Com., 8 Leigh, 732; State *v.* Gardiner, 1 Ired. 27; Hess. *v.* State, 5 Ohio, 5. Langdale *v.* People, 100 Ill. 263.

[4] R. *v.* Testick, 1 East, 181, n.; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 729 *et seq.*

[5] See Tabart *v.* Tipper, 1 Camp. 350. Whart. Crim. Law, 9th. ed. § 1656, and cases cited to § 167.

the indorsement, though forged, need not be set out.[1] And, as we have seen, it is not necessary to set forth vignettes or other embellishments, though if this be attempted a variance may be fatal.[2]

An altered document, as is elsewhere seen, may be averred to be wholly forged.[3] But, if an alteration be averred, the alteration must be specified,[4] and an addition which is collateral to the document must, if forged, be specially pleaded.[5]

§ 181. A document in a foreign language must be translated and explained by averments.[6] The proper course is to set out, as "of the tenor following," the original, and then to aver the translation in English to be "as follows."[7] And so where initials appear without averment of what they mean;[8] and where there is no averment of who the officer was whose name is copied in a forged instrument, there being no averment of what the instrument purports to be.[9]

Foreign or insensible document must be explained by averments.

In another volume it will be seen more fully that when "tenor" is set out, a variance is fatal;[10] that when the legal effect only of a document is averred, it is sufficient if the proof substantially conforms;[11] that when the variance is doubtful, the question is for the jury;[12] and that a lost or unobtainable document may be proved by parol.[13]

§ 181 *a*. An innuendo is an interpretative parenthesis, thrown into the quoted matter to explain an obscure term. It can explain only where something already appears upon the record to ground the explanation; it cannot, of itself, change, add to, or enlarge the sense of expressions

Innuendo can interpret but not enlarge.

[1] Com. *v.* Ward, 2 Mass. 397; Com. *v.* Adams, 7 Met. 50; Com. *v.* Perkins, 7 Grat. 654; Simmons *v.* State, 7 Ham. 116; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 731–3, and cases cited to § 176.

[2] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 114; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 731. Supra, § 167.

[3] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 735.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Com. *v.* Woods, 10 Gray, 480.

[6] R. *v.* Goldstein, R. & R. 473; 7 Moore, 1; 10 Price, 88. Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 729.

[7] Ibid.; R. *v.* Szudurskie, 1 Moody, 429; R. *v.* Warshaner, 1 Mood. C. C. 466: Wormouth *v.* Cramer, 3 Wend. 394. As to California, see special statute. People *v.* Ah Woo, 28 Cal. 205. If the translation be incorrect the variance is fatal. R. *v.* Goldstein, *ut supra;* and see 20 Wis. 239.

[8] R. *v.* Barton, 1 Moody C. C. 141; R. *v.* Inder, 2 C. & K. 635.

[9] R. *v.* Wilcox, R. & R. C. C. 50.

[10] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 114.

[11] Ibid. § 116.

[12] Ibid. § 117.

[13] Ibid. § 118.

beyond their usual acceptation and meaning. It can interpret, but cannot add.[1] It may serve as an explanation, but not as a substitute.[2] Extrinsic facts, if requisite to the sense, must be averred in the introductory part of the indictment.[3] Thus, in an action for the words "He is a thief," the defendant's meaning in the use of the word "he" cannot be explained by an innuendo "meaning the said plaintiff," or the like, unless something appear previously upon the record to ground that explanation; but if the words had previously been charged to have been spoken of and concerning the plaintiff, then such an innuendo would be correct; for when it is alleged that the defendant said of the plaintiff "He is a thief," this is an evident ground for the explanation given by the innuendo, that the plaintiff was referred to by the word "he."[4]

"When the language is equivocal and uncertain, or is defamatory only because of some latent meaning, or of its allusion to extrinsic facts and circumstances, then an inducement or innuendo or both are indispensable to express and render certain precisely what the libel is of which the defendant is accused."[5] But extrinsic facts need not be averred unless necessary to make out the sense.[6]

[1] See 2 Salk. 512; Cowp. 684; Le Fanu *v.* Malcomson, 1 H. of L. Cas. 637; Solomon *v.* Lawson, 8 Q. B. 825; Goodrich *v.* Hooper, 97 Mass. 1; Mix *v.* Woodward, 12 Conn. 262; Van Vechten *v.* Hopkins, 5 Johns. 211; State *v.* Neese, N. C. T. R. 270; Bradley *v.* State, Walker, 156; State *v.* Henderson, 1 Rich. 179. It was held in Pennsylvania, in 1870, that where no new essential fact is requisite to the frame of an indictment for libel, which requires to be found by the grand jury as the ground of a colloquium, and where the only object of an innuendo is to give point to the meaning of the language, it is not proper to quash the indictment on the ground that the innuendo may be supposed to carry the meaning of the language beyond the customary meaning of the word. If some of the innuendoes in an indictment for libel extend the meaning of parts too far, but there be others sufficient to give point to it, the jury may convict under the latter alone. Com. *v.* Keenan, 67 Penn. St. 203. See, further, note to § 167.

[2] State *v.* Atkins, 42 Vt. 252; State *v.* Spear, 13 R. I. 326; though see Com. *v.* Keenan, 67 Penn. St. 203; Com. *v.* Meeser, 1 Brewst, 492.

[3] 1 Saund, 121, 6th ed. Infra, § 496; Com. *v.* Snelling, 15 Pick. 321.

[4] Archibald's C. P. 494; State *v.* White, 6 Ired. 418.

[5] Durfee, C. J., State *v.* Corbett, 12 R. I. 288, citing State *v.* Henderson, 1 Rich. 179; State *v.* Mott, 45 N. J. 494; People *v.* Isaacs, 1 N. Y. Cr. R. 148.

[6] State *v.* Shelton, 51 Vt. 102.

Where the plaintiff averred, by way of innuendo, that the defendant, in attributing the authorship of a certain article to a "celebrated surgeon of whiskey memory," or to a "noted steam doctor," meant by these appellations the plaintiff, it was held not-

2. *Where the Instrument, as in Larceny, etc., may be described merely by general Designation.*[1]

§ 182. By State as well as by federal legislation, statutes have been enacted making the larceny of bank notes, bonds, and other writings for the payment of money, highly penal. Questions constantly arise whether certain articles alleged to be stolen are included within these statutes. The adjudications are too numerous to be here detailed; and we can only, within the limits assigned to us, fall back upon the general principle that documents stolen, to bring them within the statute, must be described by the statutory terms.[2]

Statutory designations must be followed.

§ 183. When a general designation of a document is all that is required, then it is ordinarily sufficient to give the statutory designation, and it is enough if this is sufficiently accurate to identify the document.[3] But if the pleader

Though general designation is sufficient,

withstanding the innuendo, that the declaration was bad, for want of an averment that the plaintiff was generally known by these appellations, or that the defendant was in the habit of applying them to him, or something to that effect. Miller *v.* Maxwell, 16 Wend. 9. See, also, 2 Hill, 472, and 12 Johns. 474.

When an alleged libel affects the prosecutor only in his business standing, such business must be averred. Com. *v.* Stacey, 8 Phila. 617.

In another case, in an action on the case against a man for saying of another "He has burnt my barn," the plaintiff cannot, by way of innuendo, say, "meaning my barn full of corn;" Barham *v.* Nethersal, 4 Co. 20 *a;* because this is not an explanation derived from anything which preceded it on the record, but is the statement of an extrinsic fact not previously stated. But if in the introductory part of the declaration it had been averred that the defendant had a barn full of corn, and that, in a discourse about that barn, he had spoken the above words of the plaintiff, an innuendo of its being the barn full of corn would have been good; for, by coupling the innuendo with the introductory averment, it would have made it complete. Archbold's C. P. 494; 4 R. Ab. 83, pl. 7; 85, pl. 7; 2 Ro. Rep. 244; Cro. Jac. 126; 1 Sid. 52; 2 Str. 934; 1 Saund. 242, n. 3; Goldstein *v.* Foss, 9 D. & Ry. 197; 6 B. & C. 154; Clement *v.* Fisher, 1 M. & Ry. 281; Alexander *v.* Angle, 1 C. & J. 143; 7 Bing. 119; R. *v.* Tutchin, 5 St. Tr. 532.

The question of the truth of the innuendoes is for the jury; and they must be supported by evidence, unless they go to matters of notoriety or of which the court takes judicial notice. See cases cited supra; State *v.* Atkins, 42 Vt. 252; Com. *v.* Keenan, 67 Penn. St. 203; State v. Perrin, 2 Brev. 474.

[1] As to lumping descriptions of notes in larceny, see infra, § 207.

[2] As to variance in such cases see Whart. Crim. Ev. § 116.

[3] Bonnell *v.* State, 64 Ind. 498.

yet if indictment purports to give words, variance is fatal.

undertakes to give the words of the document, then a variance as to such words is at common law fatal.[1] On the other hand it is said that if the words are accurately given, an erroneous designation may be treated as surplusage.[2] Nor will the indictment be defective for want of accuracy of specification, where this specification is the best the pleader could give. This is eminently the case in prosecutions for larceny of bank bills from the person, when the bank bills have not been recovered.[3]

"Purporting to be" is not a necessary qualification of the designation.[4]

[1] See cases supra; and see R. *v.* Craven, R. & R. 14; U. S. *v.* Keen, 1 McLean, 429; U. S. *v.* Lancaster, 2 McLean, 431; Powers *v.* State, 87 Ind. 97.

[2] Infra, § 184.

In an indictment for falsely pretending a paper to be a valid promissory note, it is sufficient to designate it, setting it forth not being necessary. R. *v.* Coulson, T. & M. 332; 1 Den. C. C. 592; 4 Cox. C. C. 332; Com. *v.* Coe, 115 Mass. 481.

[3] Infra, §§ 188 *et seq.*; Wilson *v.* State, 69 Ga. 591.

[4] R. *v.* Birch, 1 Leach, 79; 2 W. Bl. 790; State *v.* Gardiner, 1 Ired. 27; Whart. Crim Law, 9th ed. § 738. Infra, § 184.

The following references to rulings under statutes may be of value:—

United States Courts.—Money and bank notes, and coin, are "personal goods," within the meaning of the sixteenth section of the Crimes Act of 1790, c. 36, respecting stealing and purloining on the high seas. U. S. *v.* Moulton, 5 Mason, 537. See U. S. *v.* Hinman, 1 Baldw. 292; U. S. *v.* Lancaster, 2 McLean, 431.

Massachusetts.—An indictment under the Act of March 15, 1785, for larceny, alleging that the defendant stole "a bank note of the value of ——, of the goods and chattels of ——," is sufficient, without a more particular description of the note. Com. *v.* Richards, 1 Mass. 337. "Divers bank bills, amounting in the whole to ——, etc., and of the value of, etc., of the goods and chattels," etc., has been held sufficient; Larned *v.* Com., 12 Met. 240; Com. *v.* Sawtelle, 11 Cush. 142. See other cases, infra, §§ 189, 206; and so of "certain moneys, to wit, divers promissory notes, current as money in said Commonwealth." Com. *v.* Ashton, 125 Mass. 384. See, for other cases, infra, § 189 *a*.

"Sundry bank bills and sundry promissory notes issued by the United States, commonly called legal tender notes, all said bills and notes together amounting to ninety dollars, and of the value of ninety dollars," is not an adequate description of United States treasury notes. Com. *v.* Cahill, 12 Allen, 540. See Hamblett *v.* State, 18 N. H. 384.

"For the payment of money," need not be averred of a promissory note. Com. *v.* Brettun, 100 Mass. 206.

Connecticut.—Where an information for theft described the property alleged to be stolen as "thirteen bills against the Hartford Bank, each for the payment and of the value of ten dollars, issued by such bank, being an incorporated bank, in this State," it was

3. *What General Legal Designation will suffice.*

§ 184. "*Purporting to be.*"—The pleader may aver the instrument to be of the class prohibited, or he may aver that it "purports to be," etc.; *e. g.*, he may say that the defendant forged "a certain will," or "a certain false, etc., paper writing *purporting to be* the last will," etc.,[1] though,

If designation be erroneous, variance is fatal.

held that this description was sufficiently certain. Salisbury *v.* State, 6 Conn. 101.

New York.—A contract not under seal is incorrectly described as a bond, and the error is fatal. People *v.* Wiley, 3 Hill, 194.

Where the indictment stated that the defendant stole "four promissory notes, commonly called bank notes, given for the sum of fifty dollars each, by the Mechanics' Bank in the city of New York, which were due and unpaid, of the value of two hundred dollars, the goods and chattels of P. C., then and there found," etc., it was held a sufficient description without saying they were the property of P. C. The word chattels denotes property and ownership. People *v.* Holbrook, 13 Johns. 90. See, also, People *v.* Jackson, 8 Barb. 637.

Pennsylvania.—Under the Act of 15th April, 1790, an indictment for stealing bank notes must lay them as promissory notes for the payment of money (Com. *v.* Boyer, 1 Binn. 201); and, therefore, an indictment for stealing a "ten dollar note of the President, Directors, and Company of the Bank of the United States," is bad. Under the Act of 1810 see Spangler *v.* Com., 3 Binn. 533; Stewart *v.* Com., 4 S. & R. 194; Com. *v.* McLaughlin, 4 Rawle, 464; Com. *v.* McDowell, 1 Browne, 360.

By the revised Act of 1860, Pamph. 435, it is sufficient if the instrument be averred by the name by which it is generally known. See Com. *v.* Henry, 2 Brewst. 566; Com. *v.* Byerly, Ib. 568.

New Jersey.—"Bank notes," pleaded as such, are not goods and chattels under the statute. State *v.* Calvin, 2 Zab. 207.

Maryland. — In an indictment founded upon the Act of 1809, c. 138, for stealing a bank note, it is sufficient to describe the note as a bank note, for the payment of, etc., and of the value of, etc. Nothing more is required than to charge the offence in the language of the act. State *v.* Cassel, *alias* Baker, 2 Har. & G. 407.

North Carolina.—In an indictment for stealing a bank note, a description of the note in the following words: "one twenty dollar bank note on the State Bank of North Carolina, of the value of twenty dollars," is good. State *v.* Rout, 3 Hawks. 618. See, also, State *v.* Williamson, 3 Murph. 216; State *v.* Fulford, 1 Phill. (N. C.) L. 563; and see Sallie *v.* State, 39 Ala. 691.

Georgia.—See State *v.* Allen, Charlton, 518.

Alabama.—See Wilson *v.* State, 1 Port. 118.

Mississippi.—See Damewood *v.* State, 1 How. Miss. 262; Greeson *v.* State, 5 How. (Miss.) 33. National notes are not correctly described as "$150 in United States currency." Merrill *v.* State, 45 Miss. 651. Infra, § 189 *a*.

Missouri.—It is not necessary to allege that the bank is chartered. McDonald *v.* State, 8 Mo. 283.

Tennessee.—See Hite *v.* State, 9 Yerger, 357.

Ohio.—See Grummond *v.* State, Wilcox, 510; McMillan *v.* State, 5 Ohio, 269.

[1] 2 East P. C. 980; R. *v.* Birch, 1

as has just been seen, "purporting to be" may be omitted.[1] At common law, however, great care is necessary in this respect, since, if the document turns out in proof not to be what the indictment declares it purports to be, the variance is fatal.[2] But, as has been already observed, when the tenor is correctly given, the general designation of the document may be rejected as surplusage.[3] In libel, it is not necessary to aver that the publication was in a newspaper.[4]

"Receipt" includes all signed admissions of payment.

§ 185. "*Receipt.*"—"Settled, Sam. Hughes," at the foot of a bill of parcels, was held to support an allegation of a receipt without any explanatory averment.[5] Anything that admits payment, and is signed, is enough to bring the instrument within the term "receipt."[6] But if the fact of payment does not either appear on the instrument or is not averred,[7] or the name of the receiptor is wanting, or is obscure and is not helped out by averments,[8] the term "receipt" is not sustained.[9] And such explanatory matter must not only be averred, but proved.[10]

Leach C. C. 79; State *v.* Gardiner, 1 Ired. 27; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 728 *et seq.*

[1] Supra, § 183.

[2] R. *v.* Jones, Douglass, 300; 1 Leach C. C. 204; R. *v.* Reading, 2 Leach C. C. 590; 2 East P. C. 952; R. *v.* Gilchrist, 2 Leach C. C. 657; R. *v.* Edsall, 2 East P. C. 984; 1 Bennett & Heard's Lead. Cas. 318; People *v.* Holbrook, 13 Johns. 90; Grummond *v.* State, Wilcox, 510; State *v.* Williamson, 3 Murphey, 216; State *v.* Weaver, 94 N. C. 836; Dowing *v.* State, 4 Mo. 572; Conlee *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 222. And see fully Whart. Crim. Ev. § 116; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 728 *et seq.*

[3] R. *v.* Williams, T. & M. 382; 2 Den. C. C. 61; 4 Cox C. C. 356; Com. *v.* Castles, 9 Gray, 123; Com. *v.* Coe, 115 Mass. 481; though see Mr. Greaves's criticism, 2 Rus. on Cr., 4th ed., 811, note; Heard's Cr. Pl. 213.

[4] Rattray *v.* State, 61 Miss. 377.

[5] R. *v.* Martin, 1 Moody C. C. 483; 7 C. & P. 549; R. *v.* Boardman, 2 Moody & R. 147; R. *v.* Rogers, 9 C. & P. 41.

[6] Testick's case, 2 East P. C. 925; R. *v.* Houseman, 8 C. & P. 180; R. *v.* Moody, Leigh & Cave, 173; but see under peculiar Massachusetts statute, Com. *v.* Lawless, 101 Mass. 32.

[7] R. *v.* Goldstein, R. & R. C. C. 473; R. *v.* Harvey, R. & R. 227; R. *v.* West, 2 C. & K. 496; 1 Den. C. C. 258; R. *v.* Pries, 6 Cox C. C. 165; Clark *v.* State, 8 Ohio St. (N. S.) 630; State *v.* Humphreys, 10 Humph. 442; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 740.

[8] R. *v.* Hunter, 2 Leach C. C. 624; 2 East P. C. 977; R. *v.* Boardman, 2 Mood. & R. 147; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. 740.

[9] Com. *v.* Lawless, 101 Mass. 32.

[10] See infra, §§ 192–3; and see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 728 *et seq.*, 740.

§ 186. *Acquittance* is a term used in some statutes as cumulative with receipt, and all receipts may be regarded as acquittances;[1] but all acquittances are not receipts, as an acquittance may consist in an instrument simply discharging another from a particular duty.[2]

"Acquittance" includes discharges from duty.

A certificate by a society that a member has paid up all his dues, and is honorably discharged, is, under the English statute, neither an acquittance nor a receipt;[3] nor is a scrip certificate in a railway company.[4]

§ 187. "*Bill of Exchange.*"—If the drawer's, payee's, or drawee's name be wanting or be insensible; if the engagement is on its face conditional;[5] if the amount be uncertain, or if it be not expressed in money, the instrument will not sustain the technical description.[6] And so if there be an obscurity or error in the "acceptance,"[7] or the indorsement;[8] and so where the instrument was made payable to ——— *or* order.[9] That a bill drawn by a person in his own favor, and by him accepted and indorsed, is a "bill of exchange," is asserted in Massachusetts,[10] though in England the inclination of authority is the other way.[11] It is not necessary, in New York, to aver that there was money due on the bill.[12] A "cheque" is a bill of exchange under the statute.[13]

"Bill of exchange" to be used in its technical sense.

[1] See R. *v.* Atkinson; 2 Moody, 215.

[2] Com. *v.* Ladd, 15 Mass. 526.

[3] R. *v.* French, Law Rep. 1 C. C. R. 217. See Com. *v.* Lawless, 101 Mass. 32.

[4] Clark *v.* Newsam, 1 Exch. 131; R. *v.* West, 1 Den. C. C. 258; 2 Cox C. C. 437.

[5] R. *v.* Harper, 44 L. T. (N. S.) 615.

[6] R. *v.* Curry, 2 Moody, 218; R. *v.* Birkett, R. & R. 251; R. *v.* Smith, 2 Mood. 295; R. *v.* Wicks, R. & R. 149; R. *v.* Hart, 6 C. & P. 106; R. *v.* Butterwick, 2 Mood. & R. 196; R. *v.* Randall, R. & R. 195; R. *v.* Bartlett, 2 Moody & R. 362; R. *v.* Mopsey, 11 Cox C. C. 143; People *v.* Howell, 4 Johns. 296. Whether drawee's name can be dispensed with, if place of payment be given, see R. *v.* Smith, supra; R. *v.* Suelling, Dears. 219; 22 Eng. L. & E. 597. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 739 *et seq.*

[7] R. *v.* Cooke, 8 C. & P. 582; R. *v.* Rogers, 8 C. & P. 629.

[8] R. *v.* Arscott, 6 C. & P. 408. If payable to drawer's own order, neither indorsement nor acceptance is needed. R. *v.* Wicks, R. & R. 149; R. *v.* Smith, 2 Moody, 295.

[9] R. *v.* Randall, R. & R. 195.

[10] Com. *v.* Butterick, 100 Mass. 12.

[11] R. *v.* Smith, supra.

[12] Phelps *v.* People, 13 N. Y. Supreme Ct. 401; S. C., 72 N. Y. 334, 372.

[13] Hawthorn *v.* State, 56 Md. 530; Whart. on Cont. §§ 834, 840; see State *v.* Pierson, 59 Iowa, 271.

§ 188. "*Promissory Note.*"—Great liberality has been shown in the interpretation of this term when used in statutes making the forgery or larceny of "promissory notes" penal. Thus, it has been held to include bank notes,[1] where the statute does not specifically cover "bank notes," though it seems to be otherwise when it does;[2] while it does not include silver certificates.[3] It is not necessary, in prosecutions for larceny, that the note be locally negotiable,[4] or be anything more than a mere due bill.[5] It was at one time ruled in Pennsylvania, that if a note be not averred or implied to be still due and unpaid, it will not be within the statute,[6] though it is enough if on the face of the paper it appears still outstanding.[7] And though an instrument signed by M. and payable to his order is not a promissory note until indorsed, an allegation that D., in forging the indorsement, forged the indorsement of a promissory note, may be sustained.[8]

"Promissory note" used in a larger sense.

§ 189. "*Bank Note.*"—In England, in an indictment under the 2 Geo. 2, c. 25, the instrument stolen must be expressly averred to be a bank note, or a bill of exchange, or some other of the securities specified; and, therefore, it is insufficient to charge the defendant with stealing a certain note, commonly called a bank note, for none such is described in the act.[9] And in the case of a bank note, it is sufficient to describe it generally as a bank note of the Governor and Company of the Bank of England, for the payment of one pound, etc., the property of the prosecutor; the said sum of one pound thereby secured, then being due and unsatisfied to the proprietor.[10] In

"Bank note" includes notes issued by banks.

[1] Com. *v.* Paulus, 11 Gray, 305; Com. *v.* Ashton, 125 Mass. 384; People *v.* Jackson, 8 Barb. 637; Com. *v.* Boyer, 1 Binn. 201; Hobbs *v.* State, 9 Mo. 855; though see Culp *v.* State, 1 Porter, 33.

[2] Spangler *v.* Com., 3 Binn. 533; Damewood *v.* State, 1 How. Miss. 262.

[3] Stewart *v.* State, 62 Md. 413.

[4] Story on Bills, § 60; Sibley *v.* Phelps, 6 Cush. 172; People *v.* Bradley, 4 Park. C. R. 245. For what is not negotiable in one country may be negotiable in another. Whart. Confl. of L. § 447.

[5] People *v.* Finch, 5 Johns. 237.

[6] Com. *v.* M'Laughlin, 4 Rawle, 464; Stewart *v.* Com., 4 S. & R. 194. But see Rev. Stat. supra, § 184, note.

[7] Ibid.; Com. *v.* Richards, 1 Mass. 337; Phelps *v.* People, 72 N. Y. 334; State *v.* Rout, 3 Hawks, 618. See Com. *v.* Brettun, 100 Mass. 206.

[8] Com. *v.* Dallinger, 118 Mass. 439.

[9] Craven's case, 2 East P. C. 601.

[10] Starkie's C. P. 217. See Com. *v.*

Massachusetts, a bank note is sufficiently described as a "bank bill" in an indictment on Rev. Sts. c. 126, § 17, for stealing it.[1] And an indictment charging the larceny of "sundry bank bills of some banks respectively, to the jurors unknown, of the value of," etc., is good.[2]

An unnecessarily minute description of a bank note may be fatal; as where an indictment for stealing a bank note alleged it to be "signed for the Governor and Company of the Bank of England, by J. Booth," and no evidence of Booth's signature was given, the judges held the prisoner entitled to an acquittal.[3]

"Bank bill or note" refers exclusively to bank paper, and does not include an ordinary promissory note.[4] It includes, however, notes redeemed by the bank, and in its agents' hands.[5]

Whether it is necessary to aver the bank to have been incorporated has been already considered.[6] Under the Maine statute it is not necessary to aver either genuineness or the name of the bank.[7]

§ 189 *a*. "National bank currency notes" has been held an adequate description;[8] and so of "two five dollar United States treasury notes, issued by the treasury department of the United States government, for the payment of five dollars each and of the value of five dollars."[9] "One promissory note issued by the treasury department of the United States," has been also held sufficient;[10] and so of "four promissory notes of the United States for the payment of money;"[11] and so of "fifty dollars in national currency of the United States, the exact denomination of which is to the grand jury unknown;"[12] and

Treasury note and United States currency.

Richards, 1 Mass. 337; Larned *v.* Com., 12 Met. 240; Com. *v.* Sawtelle, 11 Cush. 142; People *v.* Holbrook, 13 Johns. 10; State *v.* Williamson, 3 Murphey, 216, and other cases cited Whart. Crim. Ev. § 116 *a*.

[1] Eastman *v.* Com., 4 Gray, 416; Com. *v.* Stebbins, 8 Gray, 493. "Bank note" and "bank bill" are synonymous. State *v.* Hays, 21 Ind. 176.

[2] Com. *v.* Grimes, 10 Gray, 470. See State *v.* Hoppe, 39 Iowa, 468.

[3] R. *v.* Craven, Russ. & Ry. 14; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 116.

[4] State *v.* Stimson, 4 Zab. 9.

[5] Com. *v.* Rand, 7 Met. 475.

[6] Supra, § 110.

[7] State *v.* Stevens, 62 Me. 284.

[8] U. S. *v.* Bennett, 17 Blatch. 357. See Levy *v.* State, 79 Ala. 259.

[9] State *v.* Thomason, 71 N. C. 146.

[10] State *v.* Fulford, 1 Phill. (N. C.) L. 563; and see Sallie *v.* State, 39 Ala. 691; Wells *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 21.

[11] Hummel *v.* State, 17 Ohio St. 628. See State *v.* Liord, 30 La. An. Part II. 867.

[12] Dull *v.* Com., 25 Grat. 965; Du Bois *v.* State, 50 Ala. 139; Grant *v.* State, 55 Ala. 201; but see Merrill *v.* State,

so of —— "dollars in paper currency of the United States of America."[1] In Massachusetts, it is held that "three bonds of the United States, each of the value of ten thousand dollars," is a good description;[2] and so of "divers promissory notes current as money in said Commonwealth, of the amount and value of eighty-seven dollars, a more particular description of which is to the jurors unknown,"[3] nor is it a variance that the notes were "three tens, eleven fives, and one two," and might have been so known by the grand jury.[4] "Divers promissory notes, of the amount and of the value in all of five thousand dollars, a more particular description of which is to the jurors unknown," is sufficient, and is sustained by proof of bank notes.[5] "Divers promissory notes payable to the bearer on demand, current as money in the said Commonwealth, of the amount and of the value of eighty dollars, a more particular description of which is to the jurors unknown," is also good, unless it should appear that the grand jury had at the time of the finding a full description of the notes.[6] But "sundry bank bills," "commonly called legal tenders," has been held insufficient.[7] "Certain money and bank bills," to wit, "six dollars and eighty-five cents in bank bills usually called United States legal tender notes, as follows:

45 Miss. 651; Martinez *v.* State, 41 Tex. 164; Ridgeway *v.* State, 41 Tex. 231. "One five dollar bill circulating medium current as money," has been sustained in Texas. Reside *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 675. See supra, § 176. See as to paper currency, State *v.* Shiver, 20 S. C. 392; Riggs *v.* State, 104 Ind. 261; State *v.* Graham, 65 Iowa, 617.

[1] State *v.* Carro, 26 La. An. 377; State *v.* Shonhausen, 26 La. An. 421.

[2] Com. *v.* White, 123 Mass. 430. See Kearney *v.* State, 48 Md. 16.

[3] Com. *v.* Green, 122 Mass. 333. That "divers promissory notes" sufficiently describes bank notes, see Com. *v.* Jenks, 138 Mass. 484.

[4] Ibid. See Com. *v.* Hussey, 111 Mass. 432.

[5] Com. *v.* Butts, 124 Mass. 449. See McQueen *v.* State, 82 Ind. 72.

[6] Com. *v.* Gallagher, 126 Mass. 54; S. P., Com. *v.* Ashton, 125 Mass. 354. An indictment on the Gen. Sts. c. 160, § 24, charging the robbery of several "promissory notes then and there of the currency current in said Commonwealth," is sustained by proof that the notes stolen were either bank bills or treasury notes. The words "of the currency current in this Commonwealth" are equivalent to "current as money in this Commonwealth." Com. *v.* Griffiths, 126 Mass. 252.

[7] Com. *v.* Cahill, 12 Allen, 540. See Hamblett *v.* State, 18 N. H. 384; Terr *v.* Shipley, 4 Mont. 498.

"Divers United States treasury notes, and national bank notes and fractional currency notes, amounting in the whole to $158.00, and of the value of $158.00," is sufficient. State *v.* Hurst, 11 W. Va. 54.

one bill of the denomination of five dollars, one bill of the value of one dollar, and eighty-five cents in currency, usually known and called postal currency," was held in New York in 1870 not to be an averment sufficiently accurate to sustain a conviction for stealing national bank notes and United States fractional currency.[1] It was conceded that to charge the notes simply as "current bank bills of the value of ——," etc., would have been enough. But it was insisted that when surplus descriptive matter, varying the character of the thing stolen, is introduced, this must be proved.[2] But "$275 in money, lawful money of the United States, and of the value of $275," is now held sufficient.[3]

§ 190. "*Money.*"—Under the general term "money," bank notes, promissory notes, or treasury warrants cannot be included, unless they be made a legal tender.[4] In England, however, it has been held that bank notes, when a legal tender, are properly described in an indictment for larceny as "money," although at the time they were stolen they were not in circulation, but were in the hands of the bankers themselves.[5] Whatever is currency is money.

"Money" is convertible with currency.

§ 191. "*Goods and Chattels.*"—Under "goods and chattels," it has been ruled that bank notes cannot be included,[6] nor bonds

[1] People *v.* Jones, 5 Lansing, 340.

[2] People *v.* Loop, 3 Parker C. R. 559; People *v.* Quinlan, 6 Parker C. R. 9. See Hickey *v.* State, 23 Ind. 21, 334, 340; State *v.* Evans, 15 Rich (S. C.), 31; State *v.* Carson, 20 La. An. 48; Com. *v.* Butterick, 100 Mass. 1; McEntee *v.* State, 24 Wis. 43; State *v.* Anderson, 26 Minn. 66.

[3] People *v.* Reavey, 38 Hun, 418.

[4] R. *v.* Major, 2 East P. C. 118; R. *v.* Hill, R. & R. 190; State *v.* Foster, 3 McC. 442; Williams *v.* State, 12 Sm. & M. 58; State *v.* Jim, 3 Murph. 3; McAuley *v.* State, 7 Yerg. 526; Com. *v.* Swinney, 1 Va. Cas. 146; Johnson *v.* State, 11 Ohio St. 324; Colson *v.* State, 7 Black. 590; Hale *v.* State, 8 Tex. 171. See Davison *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 214.

[5] R. *v.* West, 40 Eng. Law & Eq. 564; 7 Cox C. C. 183; Dears. & B. 109; R. *v.* Godfrey, Dears. & B. 426.

[6] Com. *v.* Eastman, 2 Gray, 76; State *v.* Calvin, 2 Zabr. 207; Com. *v.* Swinney, 1 Va. Cas. 146; State *v.* Jim, 3 Murphey, 3; *contra*, People *v.* Kent, 1 Dougl. (Mich.) 42. As to English practice, see R. *v.* Mead, 4 C. & P. 535; R. *v.* Dean, 2 Leach, 693; R. *v.* Crone, Jebb, 47; Anon. 1 Crawf. & Dix. C. C. 152. In R. *v.* Mead, halves of bank notes sent by mail were held "goods and chattels." R. *v.* Dean only holds notes to be "money." And a railway ticket has been said to be a *chattel*. R. *v.* Boulton, 1 Den. C. C. 508; 2 C. & K. 917. But see R. *v.* Kilham, L. R. 1 C. C. 264; Steph. Dig. C. L. art. 288, doubting. And whenever, in statutes, the terms "goods and chattels" are used as *nomen generalissimum*, and are

and mortgages,[1] nor coin.[2] But, be this as it may, it seems that in such case the words "goods and chattels" may be discharged as surplusage, and a conviction sustained without them.[3] And the tendency is to embrace in the term all *movables*, *e. g.*, poultry and other live stock;[4] and grain in a stable.[5] Indeed, it would seem as if whatever is subject to common law larceny should be embraced in the term unless restricted by statute.[6]

"Goods and chattels" includes personalty, exclusive of *choses in action.*

§ 192. "*Warrant, Order, or Request for Money or Goods.*"—"Warrant" is now held to include any instrument calling for the payment of money or delivery of goods, on which, if genuine, a *primâ facie* case of recovery could be made.[7]

"Warrant" is an instrument calling for payment or delivery.

§ 193. "*Order*" implies beyond this, a mandatory power in the drawer.[8]

"Order" implies mandatory power.

not connected with the terms "money" or "property," they should have this general construction.

[1] R. *v.* Powell, 14 Eng. Law & Eq. 575; 2 Den. C. C. 403.

[2] R. *v.* Radley, 3 Cox C. C. 460; 2 C. & K. 977; 1 Den. C. C. 450; R. *v.* Davison, 1 Leach, 241; though see U. S. *v.* Moulton, 5 Mason, 537; Hall *v.* State, 3 Oh. St. 575.

[3] Ibid.; R. *v.* Morris, 1 Leach C. C. 109; Com. *v.* Eastman, 2 Gray, 76; S. C., 4 Gray, 416; Com. *v.* Bennett, 118 Mass. 452. Supra, §§ 158, 183.

[4] 2 East P. C. 748; R. *v.* Whitney, 1 Moody, 3.

[5] State *v.* Brooks, 4 Conn. 446.

[6] State *v.* Bonwell, 2 Harring. 529.

[7] R. *v.* Vivian, 1 C. & K. 719; 1 Den. C. C. 35; R. *v.* Dawson, 2 Den. C. C. 75; 5 Cox C. C. 220; 1 Eng. Law & Eq. 589. A "dividend" warrant falls under this head. R. *v.* Autey, Dears. & B. 294; 7 Cox C. C. 329; and so does a letter of credit. R. *v.* Raake, 2 Moody, 66; and so, distinctively, of any letters *authorizing* but not *commanding* a particular act; and this constitutes the chief *differentia* between warrant and order. Perhaps the only cases, therefore, to which "order" does not apply, but "warrant" does, are those in which there is a discretionary power reserved to the drawee. An authority to a correspondent to advance funds if he thinks best, is a "warrant" but not an "order." See R. *v.* Williams, infra. But warrants include also (as has been seen) instruments where the drawer assumes mandatory power; *e. g.*, besides the cases just mentioned, post-office drafts (R. *v.* Gilchrist, supra) and bills of exchange. R. *v.* Willoughby, 2 East P. C. 581.

[8] R. *v.* Williams, 2 C. & K. 51; McGuire *v.* State, 37 Ala. 161. *Primâ facie* case is enough; and though the drawer has neither money nor goods in the drawee's hands, and there is no privity between them, yet, as the instrument could be none the less on its face the basis of a suit, it does not, from such latent defects, lose the qualities of a forgeable order. See R. *v.* Carte, 1 C. & K. 741; People *v.* Way, 10 Cal. 336; R. *v.* Lockett, 1 Leach, 110. But a *primâ facie* drawer and drawee are necessary; and the drawer must

§ 194. "*Request*" is wider still, and includes a mere invitation, and is technically proper in cases where the party supposed to draw is without authority to draw;[1] nor is it necessary that a drawer should be specified.[2] Cheques, drafts, and bills of exchange fall under either head.[3]

"Request" includes mere invitation.

occupy, on the face of the instrument, the attitude of "ordering," and the drawee the relation of being "ordered." See cases just cited, and R. *v.* Curry, 2 Moody, 218; C. & M. 652; R. *v.* Cullen, 5 C. & P. 116; R. *v.* Richards, R. & R. 193; People *v.* Farrington, 14 Johns. 348. Yet that there may be cases where a drawee's name can be dispensed with is on reason clear. An order on the keeper of a prison, for instance, or on the sheriff of a county, is no less an order because the drawee's name is not given; and so we can conceive of an order by a factory treasurer on the factory store-keeper, to which the same remark would apply. As sustaining this may be cited R. *v.* Gilchrist, 2 Moody, 233; R. *v.* Snelling, Dears. 219; 22 Eng. L. & Eq. 597; Com. *v.* Butterick, 100 Mass. 12; Noakes *v.* People, 25 N. Y. 380. *Defectiveness*, or elliptical obscurity, does not destroy the forgeable character of the instrument as an "order," if it can be proved to be an order by parol. But if so, the wanting links must be supplied by special averment in the indictment. See supra, § 181; Whart Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 682 *et seq.* Yet when this is done, our courts have not been so fastidious, as appears to have been sometimes the case in England, as to require each "order" to come up to a preconceived legal standard. This, perhaps (besides our emancipation from the numbing effect on old English judges of the consciousness of the death penalty in forgery), may be attributed to the fact that in this country everybody does business in every sort of way, while in England the class is comparatively limited, and restricted to settled forms. As sustaining the American liberalization of the rule, see Com. *v.* Fisher, 17 Mass. 46; Com. *v.* Butterick, 100 Mass. 12; State *v.* Cooper, 5 Day, 250; People *v.* Shaw, 5 Johns. R. 236; People *v.* Farrington, 14 Johns. R. 348; Hoskins *v.* State, 11 Ga. 92; Johnson *v.* State, 62 Ga. 299; McGuire *v.* State, 37 Ala. 361. See Jones *v.* State, 50 Ala. 161. The following was held to be an "order for the payment of money," although the party addressed was not indebted to the supposed drawer, or bound to comply: "Mr. Campbell, please give John Kepper $10, Frank Neff." Com. *v.* Kepper, 114 Mass. 278. Even in England a note from a merchant asking that the bearer should be permitted to test wine in London docks, is an "order" for the delivery of goods. R. *v.* Illedge, 2 C. & K. 871; T. & M. 127; 3 Cox C. C. 552. No American expansion of the rule has exceeded this.

[1] R. *v.* James, 8 C. & P. 292; R. *v.* Thomas, 2 Moody, 16; R. *v.* Newton, 2 Moody, 59; R. *v.* Walters, C. & M. 588; R. *v.* White, 9 C. & P. 282; R. *v.* Evans, 5 C. & P. 553; R. *v.* Kay, L. Rep. 1 C. C. 257.

[2] R. *v.* Pulbrook, 9 C. & P. 37.

[3] R. *v.* Willoughby, 2 East P. C. 944; R. *v.* Shepherd, Ibid.; State *v.* Nevins, 23 Vt. 519; People *v.* Howell, 4 Johns. 296. So is a post-dated check; R. *v.* Taylor, 1 C. & K. 213; but not a warrant for wages. R. *v.* Mitchell, 2 F. & F. 44.

The writing need not be of a business character, nor negotiable.[1]

Terms may be used cumulatively.

§ 195. When the pleader is doubtful as to the class in which the instrument falls, it seems that instead of averring the instrument, as in the case last cited, to be "a certain warrant, order, and request," the better course is to aver the uttering of one warrant, one order, and one request. But it is doubtful whether even this is not duplicity, where the words do not each describe the object;[2] and hence, where there is a question whether the document is an "order," or "request," or "warrant," it is safe to give to each designation a separate count.[3]

[1] 2 Russ. on Crimes, 514.

A forged instrument of writing was in the following terms:—

"Mr. Davis: Wen. 19th.

"pleas let the boy have $6.00 dolers for me. B. W. Earl."

It was held that such instrument is *primâ facie* an "order for the payment of money" within the meaning of the statute. Evans *v.* State, 8 Ohio State Rep. (N. S.) 196.

Many subtleties formerly existed in the English law as to the distinctions between these several designations. The following cases are generally referred to under this head: R. *v.* McIntosh, 2 East P. C. 942; R. *v.* Anderson, 2 Moody & R. 469; R. *v.* Dawson, supra; R. *v.* Williams, 2 C. & K. 51; R. *v.* Hart, 6 C. & P. 106; R. *v.* Roberts, C. & M. 682. The pleader has, however, been relieved from most of these by a more recent case (1850), where it was held that if the instrument be set out *in haec verba*, a misdescription will be immaterial, at least if it fall within *one* of several terms used to designate it. R. *v.* Williams, 2 Den. C. C. 61; 4 Cox C. C. 356; cited supra, §§ 184, 192–3. And the intimation was even thrown out that where the indictment sets forth the forged instrument, the court will see whether it is within the statute (when the indictment is under a statute), and if so, will sustain a conviction, although it was not specifically averred to be an instrument which the statute covered. Thus, where the indictment charged the defendant to have forged a certain warrant, order, and request, in the words and figures following, to wit: "Mr. Bevan, S—— Pleas to send by bearer a quantity of basket nails," etc., the Court of Criminal Appeal, Lord Campbell presiding, sustained the conviction, apparently on the ground that if there was a technical misnomer of the instrument, this was cured by its being fully set forth, and thus speaking for itself. R. *v.* Williams, 2 Den. C. C. 61; 4 Cox C. C. 356; 2 Eng. Law & Eq. 633. See other cases cited supra, §§ 184, 192. But simply "W. Trim, 2*s*.," is insensible and incurable. R. *v.* Ellis, 4 Cox C. C. 258.

[2] R. *v.* Gilchrist, 2 M. C. C. 233; C. & M. 224; R. *v.* Crowther, 5 C. & P. 316, per Bosanquet, J. See Com. *v.* Livermore, 4 Gray, 18; *sed quaere* whether the unnecessary oumulation could not be discharged as surplusage. Compare State *v.* Corrigan, 24 Conn. 286; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 138.

[3] See supra, §§ 162–3; infra, § 251.

§ 196. If the writing, on its face, comes short of being either an order, warrant, request, or other statutory term, averment may be made, and evidence received, bringing it up to the required standard, as where the name of the party addressed is omitted,[1] or where the body of the writing is on its face insensible.[2] And where the fraudulent or illegal character of the document does not appear on its face, this must be helped out by averments.[3]

Defects may be explained by averments.

Innuendoes have been already discussed.[4]

§ 197. "*Deeds.*" "*Bonds.*"—To sustain the averment of a deed, there must be a writing under seal, purporting to pass some legal right from one party to another, either mediately or immediately; and hence a power of attorney to sell stock is a deed under the statutes.[5] Nor is it necessary that a deed should rigorously pursue the statutory form.[6] *Primâ facie* validity is enough. The averment of the "deed" need not give the grantee's name.[7] "Bond" includes a municipal certificate of indebtedness.[8]

A "deed" must be in writing under seal passing a right.

§ 198. "*Obligation.*"—Under statutes based, as those of Louisiana, on the Roman law, an obligation is a unilateral engagement by which one party engages himself to another to do a particular thing. The English common law authorities sometimes speak as if the term is limited to bonds with penalties. But when the term is used in a statute as *nomen generalissimum*, it must be construed in its most liberal sense.[9]

"Obligation" is a unilateral engagement.

[1] R. *v.* Carney, 1 Mood. 351; R. *v.* Pulbrook, 9 C. & P. 37; R. *v.* Rogers, 9 C. & P. 41. See supra, § 185.

[2] R. *v.* Hunter, 2 Leach C. C. 624; R. *v.* Walters, C. & M. 588; R. *v.* Atkinson, C. & M. 325; R. *v.* Cullen, 1 Moody, 300; R. *v.* Pulbrook, 9 C. & P. 37; Com. *v.* Spilman, 124 Mass. 327; Carberry *v.* State, 11 Ohio St. 410; State *v.* Crawford, 13 La. An. 300; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 728 *et seq.*

[3] Ibid.; Com. *v.* Hinds, 101 Mass. 209; Com. *v.* Costello, 120 Mass. 359.

[4] Supra, § 181 *a*.

[5] R. *v.* Fauntleroy, 1 C. & P. 421; 1 Moody, 52.

[6] R. *v.* Lyon, R. & R. C. C. 255.

In R. *v.* Morton, 12 Cox C. C. 456; L. R. 2 C. C. R. 22, it was held that the forging of letters of orders issued by a bishop, certifying that on a day and at a place mentioned therein A. B. was admitted into the holy order of deacons, according to the manner prescribed by the Church of England, and rightly and canonically ordained deacon, in testimony whereof the bishop had caused his episcopal seal to be affixed thereunto, is not the feloniously forging of a deed within the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 98, s. 20.

[7] State *v.* Hall, 85 Mo. 669.

[8] Bishop *v.* State, 55 Md. 138.

[9] See Fogg *v.* State, 9 Yerg. 392.

§ 199. As to "*undertaking*," the same remark is to be made. Where, however, either term is used to represent a subordinate species or class, then the instrument must be proved to belong to this species or class.[1]

And so is "undertaking."

A "guarantee" and an I. O. U. are undertakings.

§ 200. A "*guarantee*" is an undertaking;[2] and so is a bare "I. O. U." without any expressed consideration.[3]

"Property" is whatever may be appropriated.

§ 201. "*Property*," it needs scarcely be said, includes whatever may be appropriated to individual use. Money necessarily falls within this definition.[4]

"Piece of paper" is subject of larceny.

§ 202. "*Piece of Paper*."—It has been sometimes the practice to aver, in larceny, the stealing of "one piece of paper, of the value of one dollar," etc., as the case may be; and it has been thought that in this way the difficulty as to setting out doubtful instruments could be avoided. How far this is the case will be considered hereafter.[5] A "piece of paper," it may be generally said, if of any value, is the subject of larceny.[6]

"Challenges" to fight need not be set forth.

§ 202 *a*. A written letter, if merely the inducement or introduction to an oral communication, conveying a challenge, need not be set forth. Thus, where T., in a letter to N., used expressions implying a challenge, and by a postscript referred N., the challenged party, to one H. (the bearer of the letter), if any further arrangements were necessary, it was held that the letter was only evidence of the challenge, and need not be specially pleaded; and that N. might give testimony of the conversation between H., the bearer of the letter, and himself.[7] Even when a statute makes sending a challenge indictable, it has been held not necessary to set out a copy of the challenge;[8] and if an attempt be made to set out in the indictment a copy, and it

[1] R. *v.* West, 1 Den. C. C. 258; 2 C. & K. 496; S. P., Clark *v.* Newsam, 1 Exch. 131.

[2] R. *v.* Joyce, 10 Cox C. C. 100; L. & C. 576; R. *v.* Reed, 2 Moody, 62.

[3] R. *v.* Chambers, L. R. 1 C. C. 341.

[4] People *v.* Williams, 24 Mich. 156.

[5] Infra, § 213; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 880. See R. *v.* Bingley, 5 C. & P. 602.

[6] R. *v.* Perry, 1 Den. C. C. 69; S. C., 1 C. & K. 727; R. *v.* Clark, R. & R. 181.

[7] State *v.* Taylor, 3 Brev. 243.

[8] Brown *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 516; State *v.* Farrier, 1 Hawks, 487.

varies slightly from the original, as by the addition or omission of a letter, in no way altering the meaning, this is cured by verdict.[1]

IX. WORDS SPOKEN.

§ 203. Where words are the gist of the offence, they must be set forth in the indictment with the same particularity as a libel; as, for instance, in an indictment for scandalous or contemptuous words spoken to a magistrate in the execution of his office;[2] or for blasphemous or seditious or obscene or abusive words,[3] or for perjury.[4] It is not enough, in such case, to lay the substance of the words alleged to have been spoken. The words themselves must be laid, but only the substance need be proved.[5] But the meaning must be evidently and clearly the same, without the help of any implication or anything extrinsic.[6] Should any substantial difference exist between the words proved and those laid, even if laid as spoken in the third person and proved to have been spoken in the second,[7] the defendant must be acquitted. But if some of the words be proved as laid, and the words so proved amount to an indictable offence, it will be sufficient.[8] And when the words do not constitute the gist of the offence, as where the charge is attempt to extort by threats, then it is enough to set forth the substance.[9] When, also, it is not the words but their tendency that is at issue, it is enough to set forth such tendency; and hence an indictment for "threatening to

Words spoken must be set forth exactly, though substantial proof is enough.

[1] See Heffren *v.* Com., 4 Metc. (Ky.) 5; Ivey *v.* State, 12 Ala. 276.

[2] R. *v.* Bagg, 1 Rolle Rep. 79; R. *v.* How, 2 Str. 699. Infra, § 965.

[3] R. *v.* Popplewell, 2 Str. 686; R. *v.* Sparling, Ibid. 498; State *v.* Brewington, 84 N. C. 783; Walton *v.* State, 64 Miss. 207; McMahone *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 220; *contra*, Foley, ex parte, 62 Cal. 508.

[4] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1297; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 120 *a*.

[5] Updegraph *v.* Com., 11 Serg. & Rawle, 394; Com. *v.* Kneeland, 20 Pick. 206; Bell *v.* State, 1 Swan (Tenn.), 42; State *v.* Clarke, 31 Minn. 207; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1603–7, 1615.

In indictments for threatening with intent to extort money the words need not be set out exactly. The substance is enough. Com. *v.* Goodwin, 122 Mass. 19.

[6] People *v.* Warner, 5 Wend. 271; State *v.* Bradley, 1 Hay. 403, 463; State *v.* Coffey, N. C. Term R. 272; State *v.* Ammons, 3 Murph. 123.

[7] R. *v.* Berry, 4 T. R. 217; Com. *v.* Moulton, 108 Mass. 308. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1603–7, 1615.

[8] Com. *v.* Kneeland, 20 Pick. 206.

[9] Com. *v.* Moulton, *ut supra*. See Com. *v.* Goodwin, 122 Mass. 19.

murder" need not set out the words of the threat.[1] But, where slanderous words, spoken in the presence of third parties, are made specifically indictable by statute, they must be substantially set forth and the presence of third parties must be averred.[2]

In treason enough to set forth substance.

§ 204. When words are laid as an overt act of treason, it is sufficient to set forth the substance of them,[3] for they are not the gist of the offence, but proofs or evidences of it merely.

X. PERSONAL CHATTELS.

1. Indefinite, Insensible, or Lumping Descriptions, § 206.
2. Value, § 213.
3. Money or Coin, § 218.

§ 205. In this connection it is proposed to treat the pleading of personal chattels only so far as necessary for the purpose of a demurrer, or a motion in arrest of judgment. The question of variance between the description and the evidence will be considered in a separate volume.[4]

1. *Indefinite, Insensible, or Lumping Descriptions.*

Personal chattels, when subjects of an offence, must be specifically described.

§ 206. When, as in larceny, or receiving stolen goods, personal chattels are the subject of an offence, they must be described specifically by the names usually appropriated to them, and the number and value of each species or particular kind of goods stated;[5] thus, for instance: "one coat of the value of twenty shillings; two pairs of boots, each pair of the value of thirty shillings; two pairs of shoes, each pair of the value of twelve shillings; two sheets, each of the value of thirteen shillings; of the goods and chattels of one J. S.," or "one sheep of the price of twenty shillings," etc., and the like. If the description were "twenty wethers and ewes," the indictment would be bad for uncertainty;

[1] State *v.* O'Mally, 48 Iowa, 501. So as to common scolding, Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1442.

[2] Wiseman *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 7; citing Lagrone *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 426; McMahan *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 220; S. P., Conlee *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 222. And see State *v.* Brewington, 84 N. C. 783.

[3] Fost. 194; R. *v.* Layer, 8 Mod. 93; 6 St. Tr. 328.

[4] Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 121 *et seq.*

[5] See 2 Hale, 182, 183; People *v.* Coon, 45 Cal. 672; Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 121–6.

it should state how many of each;[1] and so of an indictment charging the stealing of "one case of merchandise."[2] But an indictment charging the defendant with feloniously taking three head of cattle has been held sufficiently certain under a statute, without showing the particular species of cattle taken.[3]

When several articles are stated, it is not necessary to separate them by the connecting word "and."[4]

An indictment charging the defendant with the larceny of "six handkerchiefs" is good, though the handkerchiefs were in one piece, the pattern designating each handkerchief;[5] and so of an indictment charging the stealing of a "pair of pants;"[6] or three hundred pair of shoes.[7]

The distinctions as to variance of instruments of death are elsewhere discussed.[8]

When notes are stolen in a bunch, denominations may be proximately given.

§ 207. When several notes are stolen in a bunch, it is rarely that the prosecutor can designate their respective amounts and values. As a matter of necessity, therefore, an indictment charging the larceny of "sundry bank bills, of some banks respectively to the jurors unknown, of the value of $38," etc., is sufficient.[9] And there is even authority to the effect that it is enough to say "divers bank bills, amounting in the whole to, etc., and of the value of, etc., of the goods and chattels," etc.[10]

Certainty must be such as to individuate offence.

§ 208. The common acceptation of property is to govern its description, and there must be such certainty as will enable the jury to say whether the chattel proved to be stolen is the same as that upon which the indictment is

[1] 2 Hale, 183; Archbold's C. P. 45. Otherwise in Texas. State *v.* Murphy, 39 Tex. 46.

[2] State *v.* Dawes, 75 Me. 51.

[3] People *v.* Littlefield, 5 Cal. 355.

[4] State *v.* Bartlett, 55 Me. 200.

[5] 6 Term R. 267; 1 Ld. Raym. 149. Whart. Crim. Ev. § 121.

[6] State *v.* Johnson, 30 La. An. Pt. II. 904.

[7] Com. *v.* Shaw, 145 Mass. 349.

[8] Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 91–4; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 519–20.

[9] Com. *v.* Grimes, 10 Gray, 470; Com. *v.* Sawtelle, 11 Cush. 142.

[10] Larned *v.* Com. 12 Met. 240; Com. *v.* O'Connell, 12 Allen, 451; State *v.* Taunt, 16 Minn. 109; *contra*, Hamblett *v.* State, 18 N. H. 384; Low *v.* People, 2 Park. C. R. 37. See Com. *v.* Cahill, 12 Allen, 540. Other cases are given supra, § 189 *a*.

founded, and will judicially show to the court that it could have been the subject-matter of the offence charged.[1]

"Dead" animals must be averred to be such. "Living" must be intelligently described.

§ 209. When animals are stolen alive, it is not necessary to state them to be alive, because the law will presume them to be so unless the contrary be stated; but if when stolen the animals were dead, that fact must be stated; for, as the law would otherwise presume them to be alive, the variance would be fatal.[2] But if an animal have the same appellation whether it be alive or dead, and it

[1] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 121; Com. *v.* James, 1 Pick. 376; People *v.* Jackson, 8 Barb. S. C. 657; Reed's Case, 2 Rodger's Rec. 168; Com. *v.* Wentz, 1 Ashm. 269.

It is sufficiently certain to describe the article stolen as "one hide, of the value," etc. (State *v.* Dowell, 3 Gill & J. 310), or "one watch," etc. Widner *v.* State, 25 Ind. 234.

An indictment charging A. with stealing a printed book, of the value, etc., is correct, and the title of the book need not be stated. State *v.* Dowell, 3 Gill & J. 310; State *v.* Logan, 1 Mo. 377; Turner *v.* State, 102 Ind. 425.

A count charging manslaughter on the high seas, by casting F. A. from a vessel, whose name was unknown, is sufficiently certain; and so of a count charging the offence to have been committed from a long-boat of the ship W. B., belonging, etc. United States *v.* Holmes, 1 Wall. Jun. 1. See Com. *v.* Strangford, 112 Mass. 289. As to variance in pleading instrument of death see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 519–20. As to variance of goods see Whart. Crim. Ev. § 121.

"*Lot of Lumber*," "*Parcel of Oats*," "*Mixtures*."—In Louisiana judgment was arrested on an indictment which charged the defendant with stealing a "lot of lumber," a "certain lot of furniture," and "certain tools." State *v.* Edson, 10 La. An. R. 229. On the other hand, in North Carolina, a "parcel of oats" was adjudged a sufficient description of the stolen property. State *v.* Brown, 1 Dev. 137. The reason of this distinction is, that in the first case a closer description was possible; in the second, not so. And a general description in larceny is enough. This doctrine is founded partly on the fact that the prosecutor is not considered in possession of the article stolen, and is not, therefore, enabled to give a minute description; and principally, because, notwithstanding the general description, it is made certain to the court, from the face of the indictment, that a crime has been committed, if the facts be true. State *v.* Scribner, 2 Gill & J. 246.

Substances mechanically mixed should not be described in an indictment as a "certain mixture consisting of," etc., but by the names applicable to them before such mixture, though it is otherwise with regard to substances chemically mixed. R. *v.* Bond, 1 Den. C. C. 517.

It has been held in Massachusetts that where brandy was feloniously drawn from a cask, and then bottled, it could not be described in the indictment as "bottles of brandy." Com. *v.* Gavin, 121 Mass. 54.

[2] R. v. Edwards, R. & R. 497; R. *v.* Halloway, 1 C. & P. 128; Com. *v.* Bea-

makes no difference as to the charge whether it were alive or dead, it may be called, when dead, by the appellation applicable to it when alive.[1]

Whether a description is sufficient depends in statutory cases largely on the statute.[2] It has been held that "one sheep" is a sufficiently exact description;[3] and so is "a chestnut sorrel horse,"[4] and "one beef steer,"[5] and "one black pig, white listed, and one white pig, with a blue rump, both without ear-marks, of the value of $2."[6] But "a yearling" is not a sufficient description.[7] A "pig" four months old may be called a "hog,"[8] and "chickens" may be called "hens."[9] But "cattle" do not include "sheep" or "goats."[10]

When a dead animal, or part of an animal, has a distinctive name, it may be described as such. Hence an indictment charging the stealing "one ham," of the value of ten shillings, of the goods and chattels of T. H., was held good, although it did not state the animal of which the ham had formed a part.[11] But an indictment for stealing "meat" is had for generality.[12]

Variance as to animals is discussed in another volume.[13] In a future section it will be seen that the question of specification depends largely on the terms of the statute.[14]

§ 210. Specification is necessary when certain members of a class are subjects of indictment, and certain others not. Thus, an indictment for stealing "three eggs" has been ruled to be bad, because only the eggs of animals

When only certain articles of a class are

man, 8 Gray, 497. See R. *v.* Williams, 1 Mood. C. C. 107. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 871. In State *v.* Donovan, 1 Houst. 43, it was held that an averment of the stealing of "two fishes commonly called shad" was good, though the proof was they were dead.

[1] R. *v.* Puckering, 1 Mood. C. C. 242; Smith *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 382; *contra*, Com. *v.* Beaman, 8 Gray, 497. Infra, § 237; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 124; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 874.

[2] Infra, § 237.

[3] State *v.* Pollard, 53 Me. 124; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 824.

[4] Taylor *v.* State, 44 Ga. 263.

[5] Short *v.* State, 36 Tex. 644.

[6] Brown *v.* State, 44 Ga. 300.

[7] Stollenwerk *v.* State, 55 Ala. 142.

[8] Lavender *v.* State, 60 Ala. 50. See People *v.* Stanford, 64 Cal. 27.

[9] State *v.* Bassett, 34 La. An. 1108.

[10] McIntosh *v.* State, 18 Tex. Ap. 285.

[11] R. *v.* Gallears, 2 C. & K. 981; 1 Den. C. C. 501.

[12] State *v.* Morey, 2 Wis. 494; State *v.* Patrick, 79 N. C. 656.

[13] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 124.

[14] Infra, § 237.

subjects of indictment, then individuals must be described.

domitae naturae are the subject of larceny.[1] But an indictment for bestiality, which described the animal as "a certain bitch," was held sufficiently certain, although the female of foxes and some other animals, as well as of dogs, are so called.[2] In larceny this would be bad, as the term would not indicate whether or no the animal was larcenous.[3] In bestiality this distinction is immaterial.

Minerals and vegetables must be averred to be severed from realty.

§ 211. An indictment charging the stealing of certain "gold-bearing quartz-rocks," is bad. It should appear that the rock was severed from the realty.[4] "A cabbage" or other vegetable must, at common law, be shown not to have been growing on the field.[5]

Variance in number or value immaterial.

§ 212. The prosecutor is bound by the description of the species of goods stated; thus, for instance, an indictment for stealing a pair of shoes cannot be supported by evidence of a larceny of a pair of boots. But a variance in the number of the articles is immaterial, provided the verdict rests on an article which is one of the number averred, and which is sufficient to sustain a conviction.[6] So if there be ten different species of goods enumerated, and the prosecutor prove a larceny of any one or more of a sufficient value, it will be sufficient, although he fail in his proof of the rest.[7] But it was held otherwise where five certificates of stock of a particular number were alleged to be stolen, and it appeared that only one certificate of that number had been issued.[8]

Instrument of injury may be ap-

§ 212 *a*. An instrument of injury must be substantially described; though when the effect produced by the instrument averred and that used is virtually the same, a mere variance

[1] R. *v.* Cox, 1 C. & K. 487; 1 Den. C. C. 502; *sed quaere*. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 870.

[2] R. *v.* Allen, Ibid. 495.

[3] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 869–71.

[4] State *v.* Burt, 64 N. C. 619; People *v.* Williams, 35 Cal. 671; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 865.

[5] State *v.* Foy, 82 N. C. 679.

[6] R. *v.* Forsyth, R. & R. 274; Hope *v.* Com., 9 Met. 134; Com. *v.* Cahill, 12 Allen, 540; State *v.* Fenn, 41 Conn. 590; State *v.* Martin, 82 N. C. 672.

[7] Infra, § 252. Com. *v.* Eastman, 2 Gray, 76; Com. *v.* Williams, 2 Cush. 583; People *v.* Wiley, 3 Hill N. Y. 194; State *v.* Martin, 82 N. C. 672. Infra, §§ 252, 470; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 145. See under Texas statute, Pittman *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 576.

[8] People *v.* Coon, 45 Cal. 672.

in name will not vitiate.[1] The question of the effect of the instrument is one of fact for the jury under the direction and supervision of the court.[2] Such agencies may be cumulatively laid.[3] Ordinarily the adoption of the statutory description is sufficient.[4] If the instrument be unknown, this may be so averred.[5]

proximately stated.

2. *Value.*

§ 213. It is necessary that some specific value should be assigned to whatever articles are charged as the subjects of larceny.[6] An indictment cannot be sustained for stealing a thing of no intrinsic or artificial value.[7]

Value must be assigned when larceny is charged.

§ 214. A count for stealing "one piece of paper, of the value of one cent," may be good, when a count for stealing a bank note fails[8] in consequence of the instrument described being void, but not, it is said, where it is valid.[9]

Larceny of "piece of paper" may be prosecuted.

§ 215. It has been said that the object of inserting value is either to distinguish grand from petit larceny, or to enable the court to be guided as to imposing fines or restitution; and that when neither of these conditions exists (*e. g.*, where a statute punishes horse-stealing, irrespective of value), then value need not be averred.[10] But this is

Value essential to restitution, and also to mark grades.

[1] See Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 91–3.

[2] Ibid. People *v.* Casey, 72 N. Y. 393; State *v.* Townsend, 1 Houst. C. C. 337; State *v.* Gould, 90 N. C. 659; Tatum *v.* State, 59 Ga. 638; McReynolds *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 327; Briggs *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 144; Hunt *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 663.

[3] Supra, § 158; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 519; People *v.* Casey, 72 N. Y. 393; State *v.* McDonald, 67 Mo. 13.

[4] State *v.* Morrissey, 70 Me. 401; State *v.* Chumley, 67 Mo. 41. Infra, § 220.

[5] Supra, § 156.

[6] Roscoe's Crim. Ev. 512; State *v.* Goodrich, 46 N. H. 186; State *v.* Fenn, 41 Conn. 590; People *v.* Payne, 6 Johns. 103; State *v.* Stimson, 4 Zab. 9; State *v.* Smart, 4 Rich. 356; State *v.* Tillery, 1 Nott & McCord, 9; State *v.* Thomas, 2 McCord, 527; State *v.* Wilson, 1 Porter, 118; State *v.* Allen, Charlton, 518; Merwin *v.* People, 26 Mich. 298; Morgan *v.* State, 13 Fla. 671; Sheppard *v.* State, 42 Ala. 531. Supra, § 206; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 126; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 951. See *contra* as to money, State *v.* King, 37 La. An. 91. See State *v.* Pierson, 59 Iowa, 271. The value need not be alleged in current coin. People *v.* Righetti, 66 Cal. 184.

[7] State *v.* Bryant, 2 Car. Law Rep. 617.

[8] R. *v.* Perry, 1 Den. C. C. 69; S. C., 1 Car. & K. 727; R. *v.* Clark, R. & R. 181; 2 Leach, 1039.

[9] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 880.

[10] Ritchey *v.* State, 7 Blackf. 168. See Sheppard *v.* State, 42 Ala. 531; Collins *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 199; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 951, 952.

doubtful law; though the amount of value is only material in those cases in which an offence is graduated in conformity to the value of the thing taken.[1] And where the value of a thing which is the subject of the offence is necessary to fix the grade of the offence, it is a proper mode of stating it to aver that the thing is of or more than the value prescribed by the statute.[2] But where the offence is intent to steal goods, the value of the goods need not ordinarily be given.[3]

Legal currency need not be valued.

§ 216. An averment of the value of bank notes, not legal tender, is always necessary, but not so of government coins, which are values themselves.[4]

When there is lumping valuation, conviction cannot be had for stealing fraction.

§ 217. A collective or lumping valuation, so far as demurrer or arrest of judgment is concerned, is always permissible.[5] And it is said that where several articles, all of one kind, are described, their value may be alleged in the aggregate or collectively, and the defendant may be convicted of stealing a part of less value than the whole, if there be anything on the record to attach to the articles on which the conviction was had a value sufficient to sustain the conviction.[6]

[1] People *v.* Stetson, 4 Barb. 151; People *v.* Higbee, 66 Barb. 131; State *v.* Gillespie, 80 N. C. 396; People *v.* Belcher, 58 Mich. 325; Lunn *v.* State, 44 Tex. 85.

[2] Phelps *v.* People, 72 N. Y. 334.

[3] Green *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 64.

[4] State *v.* Stimson, 4 Zabr. (N. J.) 9; Grant *v.* State, 55 Ala. 201; State *v.* Ziord, 30 La. An. Pt. I. 867. Infra, § 218. Supra, § 189 *a*.

A description in an indictment in these words, "ten five-dollar bank bills of the value of five dollars each," is sufficiently definite. Eyland *v.* State, 4 Sneed, 357. Supra, § 189 *a*.

[5] State *v.* Hood, 51 Me. 363; Com. *v.* Grimes, 10 Gray, 470; Peoples *v.* Robles, 34 Cal. 591.

[6] Com. *v.* O'Connell, 12 Allen, 451; but see Hamblett *v.* State, 18 N. H. 384. In Com. *v.* O'Connell the indictment was for "a quantity of bank notes current within this Commonwealth, amounting together to one hundred and fifty dollars, and of the value of one hundred and fifty dollars." It was said by the court that "it is not perceived that the description of bank bills as 'a quantity,' instead of 'divers and sundry,' constitutes an error. And the statement of the aggregate of the property stolen, where all the articles are of one kind, has been sanctioned by the court." Com. *v.* Sawtelle, 11 Cush. 142. Upon such an indictment, when the articles are all of one class, the defendant may be convicted of stealing a less sum than that charged in the indictment. Com. *v.* O'Connell, 12 Allen, 451. See, further, supra, § 189 *a*.

But when articles of different kinds, *e. g.*, "sundry bank bills, and sundry United States treasury notes," are thus lumped with a common value, the indictment cannot be sustained by proof of stealing only a part of the articles enumerated.[1] Nor can a conviction for stealing a part of the articles charged be sustained unless to such part sufficient value is assigned or implied.[2]

3. *Money and Coin.*

§ 218. Money is described as so many pieces of the current gold or silver coin of the country, called ——. Foreign coin should be specified,[3] but as to our own coin, the better opinion is that it is sufficient to aver "of silver and gold coin of the United States."[4] The subject of variance is elsewhere discussed.[5]

Money must be specifically described.

"Twenty-five dollars in money" is not a sufficiently exact designation.[6]

"Bank notes" have been already noticed.[7]

"United States gold coin" is equivalent to "gold coin of the United States;" such coin being current by law, both court and jury know, without allegation, that a gold coin of the denomination and value of ten dollars is an eagle.[8]

A count charging the conversion of $19,000 of money, and $19,000 of bank notes, is bad for uncertainty.[9] Generality of description,

[1] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 126; Com. *v.* Cahill, 12 Allen, 540; and see Hope *v.* Commonwealth, 9 Met. 134; Com. *v.* Lavery, 101 Mass. 207, cited Whart. Crim. Ev. § 126.

[2] Hamblett *v.* State, 18 N. H. 384; Lord *v.* State, 20 N. H. 404; State *v.* Goodrich, 46 N. H. 186; Com. *v.* Smith, 1 Mass. 245; Low *v.* People, 2 Parker C. R. 37; Collins *v.* People, 39 Ill. 233; Shepard *v.* State, 42 Ala. 531; Meyer *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 121.

[3] R. *v.* Fry, R. & R. 482. See R. *v.* Warshoner, 1 Mood. C. C. 466. As to description in forgery, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 751. That "silver coin of the value of," etc., is sufficient under statute, see State *v.* Jackson, 26 W. Va. 250.

[4] U. S. *v.* Rigsby, 2 Cranch C. C. 364; Jackson *v.* State, 26 W. Va. 250; McKane *v.* State, 11 Ind. 195; Bravo *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 177; see People *v.* Ball, 14 Cal. 100.

[5] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 122.

[6] Smith *v.* State, 33 Ind. 159; Merwin *v.* People, 26 Mich. 298; Lavarre *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 685; and so substantially is State *v.* Longbottoms, 11 Humph. 39. See State *v.* Green, 27 La An. 598.

[7] Supra, § 189.

[8] Daily *v.* State, 10 Ind. 536. See Whart. Crim. Ev. § 122.

[9] State *v.* Stimson, 4 Zabr. 9.

however, may be excused by an averment that the precise character and value of the coin or notes are unknown to the grand jury.[1]

When money is given to change, and change is kept, indictment cannot aver stealing change.

§ 219. It should be kept in mind, that if the indictment charges stealing a particular note or piece of coin and the evidence is that such note or coin was given to the defendant to change, who refused to return the change, the defendant, even under the statutes making such conversion larceny, cannot be convicted of stealing the change; for there is a fatal variance between the description in the indictment and the proof.[2] But an indictment charging the larceny of the note or coin actually given to the defendant may be good.[3]

XI. OFFENCES CREATED BY STATUTE.

1. Generally sufficient and necessary to use Words of Statute, § 220.
2. Common Law Offences made indictable by Statute, § 230.
   (*a.*) Statutory directions must be pursued, § 230.
   (*b.*) Specification must be given, § 231.
   (*c.*) When common law and statutory indictments are cumulative, § 232.
3. Technical Averments in Statutes, § 235.
   Equivalent terms admissible, § 236.
4. Description of Animals in Statute, § 237.
5. Provisos and Exceptions, § 238.

[1] Supra, §§ 156, 189 *et seq.*; State *v.* McAnulty, 26 Kan. 533, citing Com. *v.* Grimes, 10 Gray, 470, and other cases.

An indictment for larceny from the person of "sundry gold coins, current as money in this Commonwealth, of the aggregate value of twenty-nine dollars, but a more particular description of which the jurors cannot give, as they have no means of knowledge," and containing similar allegations as to bank bills and silver coin, is sufficiently specific to warrant a judgment upon a general verdict of guilty. Com. *v.* Sawtelle, 11 Cush. 142; Com. *v.* Butts, 124 Mass. 449; People *v.* Bogart, 36 Cal. 245.

And so *a fortiori* as to an averment of "four hundred and fifty dollars in specie coin of the United States, the denomination and description of which is to the grand jury unknown." Chisholm *v.* State, 45 Ala. 66. As to allegation "unknown," see supra, § 189 *a*; Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 97, 122.

But where practical, the pieces charged to be stolen should be specifically designated. Leftwich *v.* Com., 20 Grat. 716; People *v.* Ball, 14 Cal. 101; Murphy *v.* State, 6 Ala. 845.

"Of the moneys of the said M. N." sufficiently describes ownership. R. *v.* Godfrey, D. & B. 426; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 979.

[2] R. *v.* Jones, 1 Cox C. C. 105; R. *v.* Wast, D. & B. 109; 7 Cox C. C. 183; R. *v.* Bird, 12 Cox C. C. 257; and other cases cited supra; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 123.

It is not necessary, however, to introduce averments in a statute which do not individuate an offence. Helbing, *ex parte*, 66 Cal. 215.

[3] Com. *v.* Barry, 124 Mass. 325.

§ 220. Where a statute prescribes or implies the form of the indictment, it is usually sufficient to describe the offence in the words of the statute,[1] and for this purpose it is essential that these words should be used.[2] In such case the defendant must be specially brought within all the material words of the statute; and nothing can be taken

Usually sufficient and necessary to use words of statute.

[1] U. S. *v.* Batchelder, 2 Gall. 5; U. S. *v.* Jacoby, 12 Blatch. 491; U. S. *v.* Dickey, 1 Morris, 412; U. S. *v.* Britton, 107 U. S. 655; U. S. *v.* Northway, 120 U. S. 327; People *v.* Marseiler, 70 Cal. 98; State *v.* Beckman, 57 N. H. 174; State *v.* Kenester, 59 N. H. 36; State *v.* Perkins, 63 N. H. 368; State *v.* Little, 1 Vt. 331; State *v.* Cocke, 38 Vt. 437; State *v.* Pratt, 54 Vt. 484; Com. *v.* Malloy, 119 Mass. 347; Com. *v.* Burlington, 136 Mass. 438; Com. *v.* Brown, 141 Mass. 78; Whiting *v.* State, 14 Conn. 487; State *v.* Lockwood, 38 Conn. 400; State *v.* Cady, 47 Conn. 44; People *v.* West, 106 N. Y. 293; State *v.* Hickman, 3 Halst. 299; Titus *v.* State, 49 N. J. L. 36; Res. *v.* Tryer, 3 Yeates, 451; Com. *v.* Chapman, 5 Whart. 427; Williams *v.* Com., 91 Penn. St. 493; Bixler *v.* State, 62 Md. 354; Com. *v.* Hampton, 3 Grat. 590; Helfrick *v.* Com., 29 Grat. 844; State *v.* Riffe, 10 W. Va. 794; Camp. *v.* State, 3 Kelly, 419; Lassiter *v.* State, 67 Ga. 739; Allen *v.* People, 82 Ill. 610; Cole *v.* People, 84 Ill. 216; Ker *v.* People, 110 Ill. 627; Thomas *v.* People, 113 Ill. 99; Seacord *v.* People, 121 Ill. 623; People *v.* Murray, 57 Mich. 396; People *v.* O'Brien, 60 Mich. 8; State *v.* Seammons, 1 Greene (Iowa), 418; Buckley *v.* State, 2 Greene, 162; State *v.* Smith, 46 Iowa, 662; State *v.* Bonneville, 53 Wis. 680; State *v.* Comfort, 22 Minn. 271; State *v.* Boverlin, 30 Kan. 611; State *v.* Foster, 30 Kan. 365; Com. *v.* Tanner, 5 Bush, 316; Davis *v.* State, 13 Bush, 318; State *v.* Ladd, 2 Swann, 226; Hall *v.* State, 3 Cold. 125; State *v.* Chumley, 67 Mo. 41; State *v.* Hayward, 83 Mo. 299; State *v.* Rueker, 93 Mo. 88; State *v.* Miller, Ibid. 263; State *v.* Williams, 2 Strobh. 474; State *v.* Blease, 1 McMul. 472; State *v.* Moser, 33 Ark. 140; State *v.* Snyder, 41 Ark. 227; Linney *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 344; People *v.* Lewis, 61 Cal. 366; People *v.* Sheldon, 68 Cal. 634; Cohen *v.* State, 7 Col. 274.

[2] 1 Hale, 517, 526, 535; Fost. 423, 424; R. *v.* Ryan, 7 C. & P. 854; 2 Moody, 15; U. S. *v.* Lancaster, 2 McLean, 431; U. S. *v.* Andrews, 2 Paine, 451; U. S. *v.* Pond, 2 Curtis, C. C. 265; State *v.* Gurney, 37 Me. 149; State *v.* Rust, 35 N. H. 438; Com. *v.* Fenno, 125 Mass. 387; Phelps *v.* People, 72 N. Y. 334; People *v.* Allen, 5 Denio, 76; State *v.* Gibbons, 1 South. 51; Com. *v.* Hampton, 3 Grat. 590; Howell *v.* Com., 5 Grat. 664; State *v.* Hoover, 58 Vt. 496; State *v.* Schuler, 19 S. C. 140; State *v.* Ormond, 1 Dev. & Bat. 119; State *v.* Stanton, 1 Ired. 424; State *v.* Calvin, Charlt. 151; Cook *v.* State, 11 Ga. 53; Sharp *v.* State, 17 Ga. 290; Jackson *v.* State, 76 Ga. 551; State *v.* Click, 2 Ala. 26; Lodono *v.* State, 25 Ala. 64; Mason *v.* State, 42 Ala. 543; State *v.* Pratt, 10 La. An. 191; State *v.* Comfort, 5 Mo. 357; State *v.* Shiflet, 20 Mo. 415; State *v.* Vaughan, 26 Mo. 29; State *v.* Davis, 70 Mo. 460; State *v.* Buster, 90 Mo. 514; Com. *v.* Turner, 8 Bush, 1; People *v.* Martin, 32 Cal. 91; People *v.* Burk, 34 Cal. 661; People *v.* Murray, 67 Cal. 55; Denton *v.* State, 21 Neb. 448; Kinney *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 348.

by intendment.[1] Whether this can be done by a mere transcript of the words of the statute depends in part upon the structure of the statute, in part upon the rules of pleading adopted by statute or otherwise, in the particular jurisdiction. On the general principles of common law pleading, it may be said that it is sufficient to frame the indictment in the words of the statute, in all cases where the statute so far individuates the offence that the offender has proper notice, from the mere adoption of the statutory terms, what the offence he is to be tried for really is. But in no other case is it sufficient to follow the words of the statute. It is no more allowable, under a statutory charge, to put the defendant upon trial without specification of the offence, than it would be under a common law charge. And besides this general principle, there are the following settled exceptions to the rule before us:—

Conclusion of law not enough.

§ 221. (1.) Statutes frequently make indictable common law offences, describing them in short by their technical name, *e. g.*, "burglary," "arson." No one would venture to say that in such cases indictments would be good charging the defendants with committing "burglary" or arson.[2]

[1] U. S. *v.* Lancaster, 2 McLean, 431; Bailey's case, 78 Va. 19; State *v.* Foster, 3 McCord, 442; State *v.* O'Banson, 1 Bail. 144; State *v.* La Creux, 1 McMull. 488; State *v.* Noel, 5 Black. 548; Chambers *v.* People, 4 Scam. 351; State *v.* Duncan, 9 Port. 260; State *v.* Mitchell, 6 Mo. 147; State *v.* Helm, 6 Mo. 263; Ike *v.* State, 23 Miss. 525; State *v.* On Gee How, 15 Neb. 184; Jones *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 424; though see Com. *v.* Fogerty, 8 Gray, 489, and Frazer *v.* People, 54 Barb. 306.

[2] Supra, § 154; R. *v.* Powner, 12 Cox, C. C. 235. See U. S. *v.* Pond, 2 Curt. C. C. 265; U. S. *v.* Staton, 11 Flip. 310; State *v.* Higgins, 53 Vt. 191; U. S. *v.* Crosby, 1 Hughes, 448; Bates *v.* State, 31 Ind. 72; State *v.* Windell, 60 Ind. 300; State *v.* Simmons, 73 N. C. 269; Sikes *v.* State, 66 Ala. 77; Grattan *v.* State, 71 Ala. 344; State *v.* Flint, 33 La. An. 1288; Hoskey *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 202; State *v.* Meschac, 30 Tex. 518; Marshall *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 492; People *v.* Martin, 52 Cal. 201; McCarthy *v.* Torr, 1 Wy. 311.

In U. S. *v.* Simmons, 96 U. S. 360, it was held that where a defendant is not charged with using a still, boiler, or other vessel himself, but with causing and procuring some person to use them, the name of such person must be given in the indictment. It was further ruled that an indictment for distilling vinegar illegally must set out that the apparatus was used for that purpose, and in the premises described, and the vinegar manufactured *at the time* the apparatus described was being used; and further, that the averment that defendant caused and procured the apparatus to be used for distilling implies with sufficient certainty that it was so used; it is not essential that its actual use shall be set out. It was held, also, that it is not necessary, in an indictment for defrauding the revenue, to

(2.) A statute may be one of a system of statutes, from which, as a whole, a description of the offence must be picked out. Thus, a statute makes it indictable to obtain negotiable paper by false pretences. But what are "false pretences?" To learn this we have to go to another statute, and this statute, it may be, refers to another statute, giving the definition of terms. No one of these statutes gives an adequate description of the offence, nor can such description be taken from them in a body. It is inferred from them, not extracted from them. The same may be said of statutes making indictable the use of slanderous words. These words must be set forth.[1]

(3.) A statute on creating a new offence describes it by a popular name. It is made indictable, for instance, to obtain goods by "falsely personating" another. But no one would maintain that it is enough to charge the defendant with "falsely personating another." So far from this being the case, the indictment would not be good unless it stated the kind of personation, and the person on whom the personation took effect.[2] An act of Congress, to take another illustration, makes it indictable to "make a revolt," but under this act it has been held necessary to specify what the revolt is.[3] "Fraud" in elections, in a Pennsylvania statute, is made indictable; but the indictment must set out what the fraud is.[4] It is not enough to say that the defendant "attempted" an offence, though this is all the statute says; the particulars of the attempt must be given.[5] "Not a qualified voter," in a statute, must be expanded in the indictment by showing in what the disqualification consists.[6] And

set out the particular means of the fraud.

An indictment under the Mass. statute, which charges the defendant with adulterating "a certain substance intended for food, to wit, one pound of confectionery," is not sufficiently descriptive of the substance alleged to have been adulterated. Com. *v.* Chase, 125 Mass. 202.

[1] Lagroue *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 436; supra, § 203. And so as to libel, Hartford *v.* State, 96 Ind. 461.

[2] See U. S. *v.* Goggin, 9 Biss. C. C. 269.

[3] U. S. *v.* Almeida, Whart. Prec. 1061.

[4] Com. *v.* Miller, 2 Pars. 197.

[5] R. *v.* Marsh, 1 Den. C. C. 505; R. *v.* Powner, 12 Cox C. C. 235; Com. *v.* Clark, 6 Grat. 675; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 192, where other cases are given. See U. S. *v.* Warner, 26 Fed. Rep. 616.

[6] Pearce *v.* State, 1 Sneed, 63. See U. S. *v.* Crosby, 1 Hughes, 448; People *v.* Wilber, 1 Park. C. R. 19; State *v.* Langford, 3 Hawks, 381; Anthony *v.* State, 29 Ala. 27; Danner *v.* State, 54 Ala. 127; State *v.* Pugh, 15 Mo. 509;

"the accused must be apprised by the indictment, with reasonable certainty, of the nature of the accusation against him, to the end that he may prepare his defence, and plead the judgment as a bar to any subsequent prosecution against him. An indictment not so framed is defective, although it may follow the language of the statute."[1]

(4.) The terms of a statute may be more broad than its intent, in which case the indictment must so differentiate the offence (though this may bring it below the statutory description) as may effectuate the intention of the legislature.[2]

(5.) An offence, when against an individual, must be specified as committed on such an individual, when known, though no such condition is expressed in the statute; though it is otherwise with nuisances, and offences against the public.[3]

Variance if indictment proposes to but fails to set forth statutory words.

§ 222. An indictment, when professing to *recite* a statute, is bad if the statute is not set forth correctly.[4] It is otherwise when the statute is counted on (or appealed to by the conclusion against the form of the statute, etc.), in which case, as is hereafter noticed, terms convertible with those in the statute may be used.[5]

Special limitations to be given.

§ 223. Where a general word is used, and afterwards more special terms, defining an offence, an indictment charging the offence must use the most special terms; and if the general word is used, though it would embrace the special term, it is inadequate.[6]

State *v.* Jackson, 7 Ind. 270; State *v.* Shaw, 35 Iowa, 575; though see State *v.* Dole, 3 Blackf. 298; State *v.* Brougher, 3 Blackf. 307; and as to general rule, see State *v.* McLoon, 78 Me. 420.

[1] Field, J., U. S. *v.* Hess, 124 U. S. 488, citing U. S. *v.* Carll, 105 U. S. 611; U. S. *v.* Simmons, 96 U. S. 360.

[2] U. S. *v.* Pond, 2 Curtis C. C. 268; State *v.* Turnbull, 78 Me. 392; Com. *v.* Slack, 19 Pick. 304; Com. *v.* Collins, 2 Cush. 556; State *v.* Griffin, 89 Mo. 49; Langenotte *v.* State, 22 Tex. Ap. 261.

[3] Com. *v.* Ashley, 2 Gray, 357; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1410 *et seq.*

[4] Infra, § 224; U. S. *v.* Goodwin, 20 Fed. Rep. 237; Com. *v.* Burke, 15 Gray, 408; Com. *v.* Washburn, 128 Mass. 421; Butler *v.* State, 3 McCord, 383; though see, for a more liberal view, R. *v.* Westley, Bell C. C. 193.

[5] See infra, § 236; Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 91 *et seq.*; Com. *v.* Unknown, 6 Gray, 489; State *v.* Petty, Harp. 59; Butler *v.* State, 3 McCord, 383; Hall *v.* State, 3 Kelly, 18.

[6] State *v.* Bryant, 58 N. H. 59; State *v.* Plunkett, 2 Stew. 11; State *v.* Raiford, 7 Port. 101; Archbold C. P. 93.

§ 224. An indictment on a private statute must set out the statute at full.[1] As has been seen, it is otherwise with a public statute.[2]

Private statute must be given in full.

§ 225. The indictment must show what offence has been committed and what penalty incurred by positive averment. It is not sufficient that they appear by inference.[3]

Offence must be averred to be within statute.

§ 226. It is not necessary to indicate the particular section or even the particular statute, upon which the case rests. It is only necessary to set out in the indictment such facts as bring the case within the provisions of some statute which was in force when the act was done, and also when the indictment was found.[4]

Section or designation of statute need not be stated.

§ 227. Where a statute creates an offence, which from its nature requires the participation of more than one person to constitute it, a single individual cannot be charged with its commission unless in connection with persons unknown.[5] Thus, an indictment against one individual unconnected with others, based upon that section of the Vermont statute relative to offences against public policy which inflicts a penalty upon each individual of any company of players or other persons who shall exhibit any tragedies, etc., is insufficient.[6]

Where statute requires two defendants one is not sufficient.

§ 227 *a*. When, however, the *object* (as distinguished from the *actor*) of an offence is stated in the statute in the plural, then, if this be done as a description of a class, the indictment may be in the singular, designating any one of the class. Thus, in a statute prohibiting the stealing of *notes*, an indictment for stealing a *note* was sustained;[7]

When statute states object in plural, it may be pleaded in singular.

[1] State *v.* Cobb, 1 Dev. & Bat. 115; Goshen *v.* Sears, 7 Conn. 92; 1 Sid. 356; 2 Hale, 172; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 103; Bac. Ab. Indict. p. 2. By statute in some states private statutes may be cited by title. See State *v.* Loomis, 27 Minn. 521. These statutes, however, do not apply to cases, such as charters of banks, which it was not necessary to plead at common law.

[2] R. *v.* Sutton, 4 M. & S. 542; U. S. *v.* Rhodes, 1 Abb. U. S. 28; Com. *v.* Colton, 11 Gray, 1; Com. *v.* Hoye, 11 Gray, 462.

[3] Com. *v.* Walters, 6 Dana, 291; State *v.* Briley, 8 Port. 472; Hampton's case, 3 Grat. 590; Com. *v.* Glass, 33 Grat. 827; Graves *v.* State, 63 Ala. 144.

[4] Com. *v.* Griffin, 21 Pick. 523, 525. Com. *v.* Wood, 11 Gray, 85; Com. *v.* Thompson, 108 Mass. 461.

[5] See infra, § 305.

[6] State *v.* Fox, 15 Vt. 22.

[7] Com. *v.* Messenger, 1 Binn. 273.

on a statute prohibiting the living in *houses* of ill-fame, an indictment for living in a *house* of ill-fame is good.[1]

Disjunctive statutory statements to be averred conjunctively.

§ 228. Though the language of the statute be disjunctive, *e. g.*, burned *or* caused to be burned, and the indictment charge the offence in the conjunctive, *e. g.*, burned *and* caused to be burned, the allegation, as has been noticed, is sufficient.[2] The same rule applies where the intent is averred disjunctively. In either case the superfluous term may be rejected as surplusage.[3] And it is held that when the words of the statute are synonymous, it may not be error to charge them alternatively.[4]

At common law defects in statutory indictments are not cured by verdict.

§ 229. Defects in the description of a statutory offence will not at common law be aided by verdict,[5] nor will the conclusion, *contra formam statuti*, cure.[6] But if the indictment describe the offence in the words of the statute, in England, after verdict, by the operation of the 7 Geo. 4, c. 64,[7] it will be sufficient in all offences created or subjected to any greater degree of punishment by any statute.[8] But as a rule, at common law the features of the statute must be enumerated by the indictment with rigid particularity.

Statutes creating an offence are to be closely followed.

§ 230. Where an act not before subject to punishment is declared penal, and a mode is pointed out in which it is to be prosecuted, that mode must be strictly pursued.[9]

[1] State *v.* Nichols, 83 Ind. 228. See Hall *v.* State, 3 Kelly, 18.

[2] Supra, § 162; infra, § 251; U. S. *v.* Armstrong, 5 Phil. Rep. 273 (Grier, J., 1863); Day *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 26; Hammell *v.* State, Ibid. 326.

[3] Supra, §§ 161-3.

[4] State *v.* Ellis, 4 Mo. 474; State *v.* Flint, 62 Mo. 393; Russell *v.* State, 71 Ala. 348; Lancaster *v.* State, 43 Tex. 519. Supra, § 161.

[5] See Lee *v.* Clarke, 2 East, 333.

[6] 2 Hale 170; and see R. *v.* Jukes, 8 T. R. 536; Com. Dig. Inform. D. 3. Stevens *v.* State, 18 Fla. 903.

[7] See supra, § 90.

[8] R. *v.* Warshoner, 1 Mood. C. C. 466.

[9] Atty.-Gen. *v.* Radloff, 10 Exch. 84; Com. *v.* Howes, 15 Pick. 231; McElhinney *v.* Com., 22 Penn. St. 365; Com. *v.* Turnpike, 2 Va. Cas. 361; Journey *v.* State, 1 Mo. 304; State *v.* Helgen, 1 Speers, 310; State *v.* Maze, 6 Humph. 17.

Where an offence is created by statute, or the statute declares a common law offence committed under peculiar circumstances, not necessarily included in the original offence, punishable in a different manner from what it would be without such circumstances; or where the nature of the common law offence is changed by statute from a lower to a higher grade, as where a misdemeanor is changed into a felony;

When common law offence is made penal by title, details of offence must be given.

§ 231. As we have already noticed, where a statute refers to a common law offence by its technical name, and proceeds to impose a penalty on its commission, it is insufficient to charge the defendant with the commission of the offence in the statutory terms alone.[1] The cases are familiar where, notwithstanding the existence of statutes assigning punishments to "murder," "arson," "burglary," etc., by name, with no further definition, it has been held necessary for the pleader to define the offences by stating the common law ingredients necessary to its consummation.[2]

When statute is cumulative, common law may be pursued.

§ 232. Generally where a statute gives a new remedy, either summary or otherwise, for an existing right, the remedy at common law still continues open.[3]

the indictment must be drawn in reference to the provisions of the statute, and conclude *contra formam statuti;* but where the statute is only declaratory of what was previously an offence at common law, without adding to or altering the punishment, the indictment need not so conclude. People *v.* Enoch, 13 Wend. 159; State *v.* Loftin, 2 Dev. & Bat. 31; State *v.* Corwin, 4 Mo. 609. See infra, § 280.

[1] Supra, § 221; Bates *v.* State, 31 Ind. 72; State *v.* Absence, 4 Port. 397; State *v.* Stedman, 7 Port. 495; State *v.* Meshac, 30 Tex. 518. See Erle's case, 2 Lew. 133; Davis *v.* State, 39 Md. 355; see State *v.* Philbin, 38 La. An. 964; Witte *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 88.

[2] See supra, §§ 154, 221; Com. *v.* Stout, 7 B. Monr. 247. When a statute makes official extortions indictable, the indictment must give the facts of the extortion. State *v.* Perham, 4 Oregon, 188.

Where a statute, in defining a crime, makes another crime one of its constituents, this second crime must be specifically averred; *e. g.*, where murder with intent to commit rape is defined as murder in the first degree. Titus *v.* State, 49 N. J. L. 36.

[3] R. *v.* Jackson, Cowp. 297; R. *v.* Wigg, 2 Ld. Raym. 1163; U. S. *v.* Halberstadt, Gilpin, 262; Jennings *v.* Com., 17 Pick. 80; Com. *v.* Rumford Works, 16 Gray, 231; Pitman *v.* Com., 2 Robinson, 800; State *v.* Thompson, 2 Strobh. 12; State *v.* Rutledge, 8 Humph. 32; Simpson *v.* State, 10 Yerg. 525; State *v.* Moffett, 1 Greene (Iowa), 247; People *v.* Craycroft, 2 Cal. 243; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 26–7. As to when offence is to be regarded as statutory, see infra, § 281.

In Pennsylvania, as it has been noticed, it is required by act of assembly, that every act must be followed strictly, and where a statutory penalty is imposed, the common law remedy is forever abrogated. Act 21st March, 1806, § 13; 4 Smith's Laws, 332; Resp. *v.* Tryer, 3 Yeates, 451; Updegraph *v.* Com., 6 S. & R. 5; 3 Ibid. 273; 1 Rawle, 290; 5 Wharton, 357; Evans *v.* Com., 13 S. & R. 426. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 26–7. It has accordingly been held that where a magistrate is guilty of extortion, the common law remedy, by indictment, is abrogated by the act of assembly giving the injured party, in such case, a *qui tam* action for the

§ 233. On the other hand, as has been noticed,[1] where the statute both creates the offence and prescribes the penalty, the statute must be exclusively followed, and no common law penalty can be imposed. But where the statute creates the offence, but assigns no penalty, then the punishment must be by common law.[2]

When statute assigns no penalty punishment is at common law.

§ 234. Wherever a general statute, purporting to be exhaustive, is passed on a particular topic, it absorbs and vacates on that topic the common law.[3]

Exhaustive statute absorbs common law.

§ 235. Whenever a statute attaches to an offence certain technical predicates, these predicates must be used in the indictment.[4] Thus, in an indictment on the statute which makes it high treason to clip, round, or file any of the coin of the realm, "for wicked lucre or gain sake," it was necessary to charge the offence to have been committed for the sake of wicked lucre or gain,[5] otherwise it would be bad. In another case, an indictment on that part of the Black Act (now repealed) which made it felony, "*wilfully and maliciously*" to shoot at any person in a dwelling-house or other place, was ruled bad, because it charged the offence to have been done "*unlawfully and maliciously*," omitting the word "wilfully;"[6] some of the judges thought that "maliciously" included "wilfully," but the greater number held, that as wilfully *and* maliciously were both mentioned in the statute, as descriptive of the offence, both must be stated in the indictment.

Statutory technical averments to be introduced.

penalty. Evans *v.* Com., 13 S. & R. 246. But it must be conceded that the courts have shown great unwillingness to extinguish the common law remedy in many cases where a statutory penalty is created. Thus, nuisances to navigable rivers are still indictable at common law, though the Act of 23d March, 1803, points out a peculiar procednre by which the obstruction is to be abated; Com. *v.* Church, 1 Barr, 107; and a common law indictment is preserved against an interference with the health of the city of Philadelphia, though the legislature has particularly committed that interest to the care of a board of health, with plenary powers to abate or indict. Com. *v.* Vansickle, 1 Brightly, 69. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 25–6.

As to Mississippi statute, see Wile *v.* State, 69 Miss. 260.

[1] Supra, § 230.

[2] R. *v.* Robinson, 2 Burr. 799.

[3] Com. *v.* Dennis, 105 Mass. 162; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 30 *et seq.*

[4] As to particular averments see infra, §§ 257–269; State *v.* Dodge, 78 Me. 439.

[5] 1 Hale, 220.

[6] R. *v.* Davis, 1 Leach, 493; State *v.* Parker, 81 N. C. 548. See, however, State *v.* Thorne, 81 N. C. 555; infra, § 236. And see, also, Davis *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 456.

But in Pennsylvania, an indictment for arson, charging that the defendant did "feloniously, unlawfully, and maliciously set fire," etc., was held to be sufficient without the word "wilfully," though "wilfully" was included in the description of the offence given in the act constituting it.[1] In New Hampshire and North Carolina, the contrary view has been taken.[2]

But equivalent terms may be given.

§ 236. It must be remembered, in qualification of what has been heretofore stated, that as to the *substance*, as distinguished from the technical incidents of an offence, it is the wrongful act that the statute forbids, and that the words used by the statute in describing the act may not be the only words sufficient for this purpose. A statute may include in such description cumulative terms of aggravation for which substitutes may be found without departing from the sense of the statutory definition; or, as in the case of the Pennsylvania and cognate statutes dividing murder into two degrees, the terms used to indicate the *differentia* of the offence may be regarded as so far equivalents of the common law description that the common law description may be held to be proper, and the introduction of the statutory terms unnecessary.[3] Or, another word may be held to be so entirely convertible with one in the statute that it may be substituted without variance. In such case a deviation from the statutory terms may be sustained. We have already seen that these words, when they state a conclusion of law, are not sufficient, but that the unlawful act must be further described. We have further to add that these words, when they describe the substance, are not necessarily exclusive. Hence, where a word not in the statute is substituted in the indictment for one that is, and the word thus substituted is equivalent to the word used in the statute, or is of more

[1] Chapman *v.* Com., 5 Wharton, 427. See State *v.* Pennington, 3 Head (Tenn.), 119.

[2] State *v.* Grove, 34 N. H. 510; State *v.* Massey, 97 N. C. 465; State *v.* Morgan, 98 N. C. 641.

An indictment upon stat. 7 and 8 G. 4, c. 39, s. 2, for feloniously, voluntarily, and maliciously setting fire to a barn, was holden bad, because the words of the statute are "unlawfully and maliciously." R. *v.* Turner, 1 Mood. C. C. 239.

Where an indictment charged in one count that the defendant did break *to get* out, and in another that he did break *and get* out, this was ruled insufficient, because the words of the statute are "break out." R. *v.* Compton, 7 C. & P. 139.

[3] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 393.

extensive signification than it, and includes it, the indictment may be sufficient.[1] Thus, if the word "*knowingly*" be in the statute and the word "*advisedly*" be substituted for it in the indictment, the indictment may be sufficient.[2] In further illustration of this view it may be mentioned that "excite, move, and procure" are held convertible with "command, hire, and counsel" as used in the statute,[3] and "without lawful authority and excuse" with "without lawful excuse."[4] But, as a rule, it is not prudent to substitute other terms for those in the statute.

Where a statute describes a class of animals by a general term, it is enough to use this term for the whole class: otherwise not.

§ 237. We have elsewhere seen that where a statute uses a single general term, this term is to be regarded as comprehending the several species belonging to the *genus;* but that if it specifies each species, then the indictment must designate specifically.[5] Where an indictment on the repealed statutes 15 G. 2, c. 34, and 14 G. 2, c. 6, which made it felony, without benefit of clergy, to steal any cow, ox, heifer, etc., charged the defendant with stealing a cow, and in evidence it was proved to be a heifer, this was determined to be a fatal variance; for the statute having mentioned both cow and heifer, it was presumed that the words were not considered by the legislature as synonymous.[6] It is otherwise when "cow" is used as a *nomen generalissimum*.[7] A "ewe"[8] or "lamb"[9] may be included under the gen-

[1] U. S. *v.* Nunnemacher, 7 Biss. 129; Dewee's case, Chase's Dec. 531; Tully *v.* People, 67 N. Y. 15; Eckhardt *v.* People, 83 N. Y. 452; State *v.* Shaw, 35 Iowa, 575; Williams *v.* State, 64 Ind. 553; Schmidt *v.* State, 78 Ind. 41; McCutcheon *v.* State, 69 Ill. 601; State *v.* Welch, 37 Wis. 196; State *v.* Lawrence, 81 N. C. 521; State *v.* Thorne, 81 N. C. 558; Roberts *v.* State, 55 Miss. 414; State *v.* Watson, 65 Mo. 115; People *v.* Schmidt, 63 Cal. 28; State *v.* George, 34 La. An. 261.

[2] R. *v.* Fuller, 1 B. & P. 180.

[3] R. *v.* Grevil, 1 And. 194.

[4] R. *v.* Harvey, L. R. 1 C. C. 284. It is not essential, on an indictment on the Slave-trade Act of 20th of April, 1818, c. 86, §§ 2 and 3, to aver that the defendant knowingly committed the offence. U. S. *v.* Smith, 2 Mason, 143.

[5] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 124.

[6] R. *v.* Cooke, 2 East P. C. 616; 1 Leach, 123. See, also, R. *v.* Douglas, 1 Camp. 212; Turley *v.* State, 3 Humph. 323; State *v.* Plunket, 2 Stew. 11. See supra, § 209; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 124.

[7] People *v.* Soto, 49 Cal. 69. See Taylor *v.* State, 6 Humphreys, 285.

[8] R. *v.* Barran, Jebb, 245; R. *v.* Barnam, 1 Crawf. & Dix C. C. 147.

[9] R. *v.* Spicer, 1 C. & K. 699; R. *v.* McCully, 2 Moody, 34; State *v.* Tootle, 2 Harring. 541. See, however, R. *v.* Beany, R. & R. 416.

eral term "sheep," when such general term stands alone in the statute, without "ewes" or "lambs" being specified; but not otherwise.[1] On the same conditions, under the term "cattle" may be included "pigs,"[2] "asses,"[3] "horses,"[4] and "geldings,"[5] but not a domesticated buffalo,[6] "sheep," or "goats."[7] As a *nomen generalissimum*, under "swine" may be included "hogs;"[8] under "horses" may be included "mares."[9]

Generally we may state the rule to be that when a statute uses a *nomen generalissimum as such* (*e. g.*, *cattle*), then a particular species can be proved; but that when the statute enumerates certain species, leaving out others, then the latter cannot be proved under the *nomen generalissimum*, unless it appears to have been the intention of the legislature to use it as such.[10]

§ 238. "Provisos" and "exceptions," to whose consideration we next proceed, though usually coupled in this connection, are logically distinct; a "proviso" being a qualification attached to a category, an "exception," the taking of particular cases out of that category. For our present purposes, however, they may be considered together; and the first principle that meets us is that when they are not so expressed in the statute as to be incorporated in the definition of the offence, it is not necessary to state in the indictment that the defendant does not come within the exceptions, or to negative the statutory provisos.[11] Nor is it even necessary to allege that he is

Provisos and exceptions not part of definition need not be stated.

[1] R. *v.* Puddifoot, 1 Moody, 247; R. *v.* Loom, Ibid. 160.

[2] R. *v.* Chapple, R. & R. 77.

[3] R. *v.* Whitney, 1 Moody, 3.

[4] R. *v.* Magle, 3 East P. C. 1076; State *v.* Hambleton, 22 Mo. (1 Jones) 452. So in Texas (under statute) a "gelding" under the term "horse." Jordt *v.* State, 31 Tex. 571. *Contra* in Texas at common law, Valesco *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 76. And see Cameron *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 332.

[5] R. *v.* Mott, 2 East P. C. 1075.

[6] State *v.* Crenshaw, 22 Mo. 457.

[7] McIntosh *v.* State, 18 Tex. Ap. 284.

[8] Rivers *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 177.

[9] People *v.* Pico, 62 Cal. 50.

[10] R. *v.* Welland, R. & R. 494; R. *v.* Chard, R. & R. 488. See State *v.* Abbott, 20 Vt. 537; Taylor *v.* State, 6 Humph. 285; State *v.* Plunket, 2 Stew. 11; State *v.* Godet, 7 Ired. 210; Shubrick *v.* State, 2 S. C. 21; though see State *v.* McLain, 2 Brev. 443. As to machinery, see Whart. Cr. L. 9th ed. § 1052.

[11] 1 Sid. 303; 2 Hale, 171; 1 Lev. 26; Poph. 93, 94; 2 Burr. 1037; 2 Stra. 1101; 1 East R. 646, in notes; 5 T. R. 83; 1 Bla. R. 230; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 112; Bac. Ab. Indict. H. 2; Burn, J., Indict. ix.; 1 Chitty on Pleading, 357; Murray *v.* R., 7 Q. B. 700; U. S. *v.* Cook, 17 Wall. 168; U. S. *v.* Nelson, 29 Fed. Rep. 202; State *v.*

not within the benefit of the provisos, though the purview should expressly notice them; as by saying that none shall do the act prohibited, except in the cases thereinafter excepted.[1] Nor, even when the enacting clause refers to the subsequent excepting clauses, does this necessarily draw such subsequent clause up into the enacting clause.[2] For when such exceptions embrace matters of defence, they are properly to be introduced by the defendant.[3] And extenu-

Gurney, 37 Me. 149; State *v.* Boyington, 56 Me. 512; State *v.* Abbott, 11 Foster, 434; State *v.* Wade, 34 N. H. 495; State *v.* Cassady, 52 N. H. 500; State *v.* Abbot, 29 Vt. 60; State *v.* Ambler, 56 Vt. 672; Com. *v.* R. R., 10 Allen, 189; Com. *v.* Shannahan, 145 Mass. 99; State *v.* Miller, 24 Conn. 522; State *v.* Powers, 25 Conn. 48; State *v.* Rush, 13 R. I. 198; Walter *v.* Com., 6 Weekly Notes, 389; Fleming *v.* People, 27 N. Y. 329; Jefferson *v.* People, 101 N. Y. 19, 238; Becker *v.* State, 8 Ohio St. 391; Stanglein *v.* State, 17 Ohio St. 453; Billingheimer *v.* State, 32 Ohio St. 535; Kopke *v.* People, 43 Mich. 41; Swartzbaugh *v.* People, 85 Ill. 457; Beasley *v.* People, 89 Ill. 571; Colson *v.* State, 7 Blackf. 590; Russell *v.* State, 50 Ind. 174; State *v.* Maddox, 74 Ind. 105; Metzker *v.* State, 14 Ill. 101; Romp *v.* State, 3 Greene (Iowa), 276; State *v.* Williams, 20 Iowa, 98; Worley *v.* State, 11 Humph. 172; State *v.* Jackson, 1 Lea, 680; State *v.* Loftin, 2 Dev. & B. 31; State *v.* Heaton, 81 N. C. 542; Carson *v.* State, 69 Ala. 235; Grattan *v.* State, 71 Ala. 344; Jones *v.* State, 81 Ala. 81; State *v.* O'Gorman, 68 Mo. 179; State *v.* Jaques, 68 Mo. 260; State *v.* O'Brien, 74 Mo. 549; Blasdell *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 263; Logan *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 306; Wilson *v.* State, 33 Ark. 557; State *v.* Ah Chew, 16 Nev. 50. See on this head elaborate and able notes in 1 Benn. & Heard's Leading Cases, 250; 2 Ibid. 7, 11. See, also, as to proof of negative averments, Whart. Crim. Ev. § 321.

[1] State *v.* Adams, 6 N. H. 533; State *v.* Sommers, 3 Vt. 156; State *v.* Abbey, 29 Vt. 60; State *v.* Powers, 25 Conn. 48; Matthews *v.* State, 2 Yerg. 233; People *v.* Nugent, 4 Cal. 341. See Whart. Crim. Law; 9th ed. § 1713.

[2] Ibid.; 2 Hawk. P. C. C. 25; Com. *v.* Hill, 5 Grat. 682.

[3] 1 Bla. Rep. 230; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 113; 2 Ld. Raym. 1378; 2 Leach, 548; People *v.* Nugent, 4 Cal. 341.

The subject is closely allied to that of Burden of Proof, discussed in Whart. Crim. Ev. § 319.

In Com. *v.* Hart, 11 Cush. 130, we have the following from Metcalf, J.:—

"The rule of pleading a statute which contains an exception is usually expressed thus: 'If there be an exception in the enacting clause, the party pleading must show that his adversary is not within the exception; but if there be an exception in a subsequent clause or subsequent statute, that is matter of defence, and is to be shown by the other party.' The same rule is applied in pleading a private instrument of contract. If such instrument contain in it, first, a general clause, and afterwards a separate and distinct clause which has the effect of taking out of the general clause something that would otherwise be included in it, a party, relying upon the general clause, in pleading, may set out that clause only,

ation which comes in by way of subsequent proviso or exception need not be pleaded by the prosecution.[1]

§ 239. But where a proviso adds a qualification to the enactment, so as to bring a case within it, which, but for the proviso, would

without noticing the separate and distinct clause which operates as an exception; but if the exception itself be incorporated in the general clause, then the party relying on it must, in pleading, state it together with the exception. Gould Pl. c. 4, §§ 20, 21; Vavasour *v.* Ormrod, 9 Dowling & Ryland, 597, and 6 Barnewall & Cresswell, 430; 2 Saunders Pl. & Ev. 2d ed. 1025, 1026. The reason of this rule is obvious, and is simply this: Unless the exception in the enacting clause of a statute, or in the general clause in a contract, is negatived in pleading the clause, no offence or no cause of action appears in the indictment or declaration, when compared with the statute or contract. Plowden, 410. But when the exception or proviso is in a subsequent substantive clause, the case provided for in the enacting or general clause may be fully stated without negativing the subsequent exception or proviso. A *prima facie* case is stated, and it is for the party, for whom matter of excuse is furnished by the statute or the contract, to bring it forward in his defence. . . .

"The word 'except' is not necessary in order to constitute an exception within the rule. The words 'unless,' 'other than,' 'not being,' 'not having,' etc., have the same legal effect, and require the same form of pleading. Gill *v.* Scrivens, 7 Term R. 27; Spieres *v.* Parker, 1 Term R. 141; R. *v.* Palmer, 1 Leach C. C. 4th ed. 102; Wells *v.* Iggulden, 5 D. & R. 19; Com. *v.* Maxwell, 2 Pick. 139; State *v.* Butler, 17 Vt. 145; 1 East P. C. 166, 167.

"There is a middle class of cases, namely, where the exception is not, in express terms, introduced into the enacting clause, but only by reference to some subsequent or prior clause, or to some other statute. As when the words 'except as hereinafter mentioned,' or other words referring to matter out of the enacting clause, are used. The rule in these cases is, that all circumstances of exemption and modification, whether applying to the offence or to the person, which are incorporated by reference with the enacting clause, must be distinctly negatived. *Verba relata inesse videntur.* R. *v.* Pratten, 6 Term R. 559; Vavasour *v.* Ormrod, 9 D. & R. 597; 6 B. & Cr. 430."

But in a subsequent case the last distinction was reconsidered in the same court, it being held that an exception not in the enacting clause need not be negatived, unless necessary to the definition of the offence. Com. *v.* Jennings, 121 Mass. 47.

[1] R. *v.* Bryan, 2 Stra. 111.

Where different grades of the same general offence are defined in the statute, certain special circumstances being included as essential elements in the definition of the higher grade and excluded by negative words in the definition of the lower grade, an information charging the lower grade of the offence need not negative the presence of such circumstances. Infra, § 250. State *v.* Kane, 63 Wis. 260.

be without the statute, the indictment must show the case to be within the proviso.[1] This is eminently the case with clauses in statutes prohibiting doing certain acts without a license,[2] and with statutes prohibiting sales to minors without consent of parents.[3] And where a statute forbids the doing of a particular act, without the existence of either one of two conditions, the indictment must negative the existence of both these conditions before it can be supported.[4]

Otherwise when proviso is in same clause.

§ 240. Where exceptions are stated in the enacting clause (under which term are to be understood all parts of the statute which define the offence), unless they be mere matters of extenuation or defence, it will be necessary to negative them, in order that the description of the crime may in all respects correspond with the statute.[5] Thus, where a statute imposes a penalty on the selling of spirituous liquors without a license, it is necessary to aver the want of a license in the indictment;[6] and such negation must squarely meet and traverse the

Exceptions in enacting clause to be negatived.

[1] U. S. *v.* Cook, 17 Wall. 168; State *v.* Godfrey, 24 Me. 232; State *v.* Gurney, 37 Me. 149; State *v.* Boyington, 56 Me. 512; State *v.* Bryant, 58 N. H. 79; State *v.* Barker, 18 Vt. 195; State *v.* Palmer, 18 Vt. 570; State *v.* Stokes, 54 Vt. 179; State *v.* Abbott, 11 Foster, 434; Com. *v.* Jennings, 121 Mass. 47; Com. *v.* Davis, 121 Mass. 352; Barber *v.* State, 50 Md. 161; Gibson *v.* State, 54 Md. 447; Conner *v.* Com., 13 Bush, 714; State *v.* Heaton, 81 N. C. 542; State *v.* Lanier, 88 N. C. 658; Smith *v.* State, 81 Ala. 74; Jones *v.* State, 81 Ala. 79; State *v.* Meek, 70 Mo. 355; Jenson *v.* State, 60 Wis. 577; People *v.* Roderigas, 44 Cal. 9; Leatherwood *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 244; Terr *v.* Scott, 2 Dak. 212; Tallner *v.* State, 15 Tex. Ap. 23; and cases in prior notes.

As to exceptions in bigamy, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1713.

[2] Infra, §§ 240–2. Whart. Cr. Law, 9th ed. § 1499.

[3] Ibid. State *v.* Emerick, 35 Ark. 324. Infra, §§ 240–2.

[4] State *v.* Loftin, 2 Dev. & Bat. 31; Newman *v.* State, 63 Ga. 533. Thus, when either of two licenses is specified, both must be negatived. Neales *v.* State, 10 Mo. 498.

[5] 2 Hale, 170; 1 Burr. 148; Fost. 430; 1 East Rep. 646, in notes; 1 T. R. 144; 1 Ley, 26; Com. Dig. Action, Statute; 1 Chitty on Plead. 357; State *v.* Adams, 16 N. H. 532; State *v.* Munger, 15 Vt. 290; State *v.* Godfrey, 24 Me. 232; Barber *v.* State, 50 Md. 161; see State *v.* Price, 12 Gill & J. 260; Elkins *v.* State, 13 Ga. 435; Metzker *v.* People, 14 Ill. 101; State *v.* Bloodworth, 94 N. C. 918. As to mode of negativing, see Beasley *v.* People, 89 Ill. 571.

[6] Com. *v.* Thurlow, 24 Pick. 374; State *v.* Webster, 5 Halstead, 293; see Surratt *v.* State, 45 Miss. 601; Riley *v.* State, 43 Miss. 397. See fully infra, note to § 241, and compare Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1499, 1713.

That where the statute declares that the license may be from "A. or B.,"

assumption of a license of the character specified in the indictment as an excuse.[1] So, in an indictment under the Mississippi Act of 1830, prohibiting any person, other than Indians, from making settlements within their territory, it is necessary to aver that the defendant is not an Indian.[2] Again, on an indictment under the Massachusetts statute of 1791, c. 58, making it penal to entertain persons not being strangers on the Lord's day, it must appear that the parties entertained were not strangers.[3] So in Vermont, an indictment under the statute which prohibits the exercise on the Sabbath of any "secular business," etc., except "works of necessity and charity," must allege that the acts charged were not acts of "necessity and charity."[4] Even where certain persons were authorized by the legislature to erect a dam, in a certain manner, across a river which was a public highway, it was held that an indictment for causing a nuisance, by erecting the dam, must contain an averment that the dam was beyond the limits prescribed in the charter, and that it was not erected in pursuance of the act of the legislature.[5]

§ 241. Such are the technical tests which are usually applied to determine whether an exception or proviso is or is not to be negatived in an indictment. In many cases we are told that when the exception or proviso is in the "enacting clause," it must be negatived in the indictment, but it is otherwise when it is in "subsequent" clauses. This distinction has sometimes been called rude, and sometimes artificial, yet in point of fact it serves to symbolize a germinal point of discrimination. I prohibit, for instance, all sale of alcohol by a sweeping section; and in a subsequent section I except from this sales for medicinal purposes. Here the very structure of the statute shows my intent, which is to make the sale of alcohol a crime by statute, as is the exploding gunpowder in the streets a crime at common law; and hence a license in the first case need not be negatived in the indictment any more than a license in the second.[6] On

Question in such case is whether statute creates a general or a limited offence.

this is to be negatived by denying a license from either "A. or B.," see State *v.* Burns, 20 N. H. 550; People *v.* Gilkinson, 4 Park C. R. 26; Com. *v.* Hadcraft, 6 Bush, 91; State *v.* Swadley, 15 Mo. 515.

[1] Ibid. Rawlings *v.* State, 2 Md. 236; Goodwin *v.* State, 72 Ind. 113; Davis *v.* State, 39 Ala. 521.

[2] State *v.* Craft, 1 Walker, 409. See Matthews *v.* State, 2 Yerger, 233.

[3] Com. *v.* Maxwell, 2 Pick. 139.

[4] State *v.* Barker, 18 Vt. 195.

[5] State *v.* Godfrey, 24 Me. 232.

[6] See Surratt *v.* State, 45 Miss. 601.

the other hand, I enact that none but licensed persons shall sell alcohol. Here I do not create a general crime, but I say that if certain persons do certain things they shall be liable to indictment; and to maintain an indictment it must be averred that the defendants were of the class named. Hence the test before us is not formal, but essential; it is practically this,—is it the scope of the statute to create a *general* offence, or an offence limited to a particular class of persons or conditions? In other words, is it intended to impose the stamp of criminality on an entire class of actions, or upon only such actions of that class as are committed by particular persons or in a particular way? In the latter case, the defendant must be declared to be within this class; in the former case this is not necessary. We may take as a further illustration a statute defining murder, in which statute are specified the cases in which necessity or self-defence are to be regarded as excusatory. It would make no matter, in such case, whether these excusatory cases be or be not given in the same clause with that prohibiting the general offence; in either case they need not be negatived in the indictment. The same might be said of the defence, that the person killed was an alien enemy, and that the killing was in open war. On the other hand, if the statute should say that an offence is indictable only when perpetrated on a particular class of persons, no matter how many clauses may intervene between the designation of the offence and the limitation of the object, the limitation of the object must be given in the indictment.[1] Of course the question thus involved, whether a crime is general or limited as to persons, may be determined otherwise than by the structure of a statute. If it be clear that an act is only to become a crime when executed by persons of a particular class, or under particular conditions, then this class or those conditions must be set out in the indictment, no matter in what part of the statute they may be expressed. With this view practically coincides that expressed in some of the cases cited above, that mere excusatory defence is not to be negatived in the indictment. For an excusatory defence implies a *crimen generalissimum;* and to a *crimen generalissimum* no exceptions, on the foregoing principles, need be negatived in the indictment.[2]

[1] Com. *v.* Maxwell, 2 Pick. 139.

[2] See 1 Benn. & Heard's Lead. Cas. *ut supra;* State *v.* Abbey, 29 Vt. 60; Com. *v.* Hart, 11 Cush. 130; Com. *v.* Jennings, 121 Mass. 47; State *v.* O'Donnell, 10 R. I. 472; Hill *v.* State, 53 Ga.

XII. DUPLICITY.

1. Generally, Joinder in one Count of two Distinct Offences is bad, § 243.
2. Exceptions to the Rule, § 244.
(a.) Minor offences included in major, Burglary, etc., § 244.
(b.) Assaults with intent, etc., § 247.
(c.) Misdemeanors constituent in felonies, and herein of how far the term "feloniously" may be rejected, § 249.
(d.) Where alternate phases in an offence are united in statute, § 251.
(e.) Double articles in larceny, § 252.
(f.) Double overt acts or intents, § 253.
(g.) Double batteries, libels, or sales, § 254.
3. How Duplicity may be Objected to, § 255.

§ 243. A count in an indictment which charges two distinct offences, each distinctively punishable, is bad, and may be quashed

472; Neales *v.* State, 10 Mo. 498; Surratt *v.* State, 45 Miss. 601; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1713.

It has been said in England a statute casting on the defendant the burden of proving a license does not, by itself, relieve the prosecution from averring the want of license (R. *v.* Harvey, L. R. 1 C. C. 284), though otherwise in Massachusetts. Com. *v.* Edwards, 12 Cush. 187.

In prosecutions for selling liquor without license, the indictment, as a general rule, should negative the license. State *v.* Munger, 15 Vt. 290; Com. *v.* Thurlow, 24 Pick. 374; State *v.* Webster, 5 Halst. 293; Com. *v.* Hampton, 3 Grat. 590; State *v.* Horan, 25 Tex. (Sup.) 271; Com. *v.* Smith, 6 Bush, 303. See Burke *v.* State, 52 Ind. 461. Indictment need not aver defendant not to be a "druggist," etc. Surratt *v.* State, 45 Miss. 601; Riley *v.* State, 43 Miss. 397. See, also, State *v.* Fuller, 33 N. H. 259; State *v.* Blaisdell, 33 Ibid. 388; State *v.* Buford, 10 Mo. 703. As the cases show, the whole question depends on the principle underlying the statute. Where one section of the statute imposes a penalty on selling "in violation of the provisions of this act," it has been held unnecessary to negative exceptions in subsequent sections. Com. *v.* Tuttle, 12 Cush. 502; Com. *v.* Hill, 5 Grat. 682.

In Texas, a statute providing that license need not be negatived has been pronounced unconstitutional. Hewitt *v.* State, 25 Tex. 722; State *v.* Horan, 25 Tex. (Sup.) 271; *contra*, State *v.* Comstock, 27 Vt. 553. And in Maine a statute has been held unconstitutional which prescribes that the vendee need not be named. State *v.* Learned, 47 Me. 426.

"Without" implies a sufficient negation. Com. *v.* Thompson, 2 Allen, 507. "Without lawful excuse" is equivalent to without authority. R. *v.* Harvey, L. R. 1 C. C. 284. If the negation of the license to sell is as to quantity coextensive with the quantity charged to be sold, it is sufficient. The general negation, "not having a license to sell liquors as aforesaid," relates to the time of sale, and not to the time of finding of the bill, and will suffice. State *v.* Munger, 15 Vt. 290. "Without being duly authorized and appointed thereto according to law," is a sufficient negation. Com. *v.* Keefe, 7 Gray, 332; Com. *v.* Conant, 6 Gray, 482; State *v.* Fanning, 38 Mo. 359; Com. *v.* Hoyer, 125 Mass. 209; Rober-

on motion of the defendant, or judgment may be entered for the defence on special demurrer.[1] To constitute duplicity, however, the second or superfluous offence must be sufficiently averred, as otherwise its description can be rejected as surplusage;[2] nor does the objection of duplicity prevail, as will presently be seen, when one of the offences joined is a component part or preliminary stage of the other. The objection, also, cannot be taken on arrest of judgment.[3]

Generally, joinder in one count of two distinct offences is bad.

son *v.* Lambertville, 38 N. J. L. 69. See State *v.* Hornbreak, 15 Mo. 478; State *v.* Andrews, 28 Mo. 17. As to mode of negativing, see Eagan *v.* State, 53 Ind. 162.

In indictments for bigamy, the exceptions in the statute, when not part of the description of the offence, need not be negatived. Murray *v.* R., 7 Q B. 700; State *v.* Abbey, 29 Vt. 60; Com. *v.* Jennings, 121 Mass. 50; Stanglein *v.* State, 17 Ohio St. 453; State *v.* Williams, 20 Iowa, 98; State *v.* Johnson, 12 Minn. 476; State *v.* Loftin, 2 Dev. & Bat. 31. It is otherwise where the exception describes the offence in the enacting clause. Fleming *v.* People, 27 N. Y. 329. Nor is it necessary to allege that the defendant knew at the time of his second marriage that his former wife was then living, or that she was not beyond seas, or to deny her continuous absence for seven years prior to the second marriage. Barber *v.* State, 50 Md. 161, citing Bode *v.* State, 7 Gill, 316.

Where an indictment, under the Massachusetts statute, alleged that the defendant, on a certain day, was lawfully married to A.; and that afterwards, on a certain day, he "did unlawfully marry and take to his wife one B., he, the defendant, then and there being married and the lawful husband of the said A., she, the said A., being his lawful wife, and living, and he, the said defendant, never having been legally divorced from the said A.;" and it was proved that the defendant was lawfully married to A.; that afterwards she was duly divorced from him for misconduct on his part; and that he then married B.; it was ruled, that there was a variance between the allegations and the proof. Com. *v.* Richardson, 126 Mass. 34.

[1] Starkie's C. P. 272; Archbold C. P. 49; U. S. *v.* Nunnemacher, 7 Biss. 129; U. S. *v.* Sharp, 1 Peters C. C. R. 131; State *v.* Smith, 31 Me. 386; State *v.* Nelson, 8 N. H. 163; State *v.* Morton, 27 Vt. 310; Com. *v.* Symonds, 2 Mass. 163; People *v.* Wright, 9 Wend. 193; Com. *v.* Gable, 7 S. & R. 423; State *v.* Lot, 1 Richards. 260; Ellis *v.* Com., 78 Ky. 130; Knopf *v.* State, 84 Ind. 316; Stewart *v.* State, 111 Ind. 554; State *v.* Ferriss, 3 Lea, 700; Hoskins *v.* State, 11 Ga. 92; Long *v.* State, 12 Ga. 293; Miller *v.* State, 5 How. Miss. 250; State *v.* Brewer, 33 Ark. 176; Rasnick *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 356; Heinemann *v.* State, 22 Tex. Ap. 44. See Com. *v.* Colby, 128 Mass. 91; Terr *v.* Duffield, 1 Ariz. 59.

[2] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 138; State *v.* Palmer, 35 Me. 9; Com. *v.* Tuck, 20 Pick. 356; Breese *v.* State, 12 Ohio St. 146; Green *v.* State, 23 Miss. 509. Supra, § 158.

[3] Infra, §§ 255, 759.

§ 244. Prominent exceptions to the rule before us are to be found in indictments for burglary, in which it is correct to charge the defendant with having broken into the house with intent to commit a felony, and also with having committed the felony intended ;[1] in indictments for robbery, in which there can be averments for larceny ;[2] and in indictments in England for embezzlements by persons intrusted with public or private property, which may charge any number of embezzlements, not exceeding three, committed within six months.[3] On the same principle, a count stating that the defendant broke and entered into a shop with intent to commit a larceny, and did then and there commit a larceny, is not bad for duplicity.[4] So when an indictment alleged that the defendant broke and entered into the dwelling-house of one person with intent to steal his goods, and having so entered, stole the goods of another person, etc., it was held there was no misjoinder.[5] So, also, a person may be indicted in one count for breaking and entering a building with intent to steal, and also with stealing, and may be convicted of the larceny simply.[6]

Exception in cases where larceny is included in burglary or embezzlement.

§ 245. Another exception has been recognized in indictments for adultery, in which under some statutes the jury may find the defendants guilty of fornication but not guilty of adultery.[7] And so, on an indictment for

And so where fornication is in-

[1] Infra, §§ 465-7; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 819; State *v.* Depass, 31 La. An. 487; State *v.* Davis, 73 Mo. 129; State *v.* Shaffer, 59 Iowa, 290; Dodd *v.* State, 33 Ark. 517; State *v.* Johnson, 34 La. An. 48; State *v.* Pierre, 38 La. An. 91.

[2] Infra, §§ 246, 465; Allen *v.* State, 68 Ala. 98; McTigue *v.* State, 4 Baxt. 31; People *v.* Jones, 53 Cal. 58.

[3] Archbold's C. P. 49. Infra, §§ 465-6; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 129. As to verdict, see infra, § 736.

[4] Com. *v.* Tuck, 20 Pick. 356; State *v.* Ayer, 3 Foster (N. H.), 301. Infra, § 819. *Contra*, under Iowa Code, State *v.* McFarland, 49 Iowa, 99.

[5] State *v.* Brady, 15 Vt. 353.

[6] See State *v.* Colter, 6 R. I. 195; State *v.* Crocker, 3 Harring. 554; Breese *v.* State, 12 Ohio St. 146; Speers *v.* Com., 17 Grat. 570; Vaughan *v.* Com., 17 Grat. 576; Davis *v.* State, 3 Cold. (Tenn.) 77; State *v.* Brandon, 7 Kans. 106; State *v.* Grisham, 1 Hayw. 12; People *v.* Nelson, 58 Cal. 104; Borum *v.* State, 66 Ala. 468. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 819, and other cases; and see infra, §§ 465-7. So in Ohio, as to "robbery" and "assault." Howard *v.* State, 25 Ohio St. 399. And see Smith *v.* State, 57 Miss. 822.

[7] Com. *v.* Roberts, 1 Yeates, 6; State *v.* Cowell, 4 Ired. 231; but see Maull *v.* State, 37 Ala. 160. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1737. See Barber *v.* State, 39 Ohio St. 660.

cluded in major offence.

seduction,[1] it is not duplicity to charge fornication.[2] It is not duplicity, also, to join "battery" with "rape"[3] or "robbery."[4]

When major crime includes minor, conviction may be for either.

§ 246. Generally speaking, where an accusation (as in the case of the inclusion of manslaughter in murder) includes an offence of an inferior degree, the jury may discharge the defendant of the high crime, and convict him of the less atrocious; and in such case it is sufficient if they find a verdict of guilty of the inferior offence, and take no notice of the higher.[5] And on indictments for riot there can be a conviction of any averred indictable ingredient.[6] Hence, when there is a proper allegation in the indictment for riot, the defendant may be convicted of an assault.[7] Under robbery, also, there may, when there are proper averments, be a conviction of larceny.[8]

"Assault" is included under "assault with intent."

§ 247. Further illustrations are to be found in indictments for assault and battery, or assault with intent to kill or ravish, or assault with intent to do other illegal acts, where the defendant may be convicted of assault alone;[9] or for assault and battery, where a battery is

[1] Dinkey *v.* Com., 17 Penn. St. 126. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1737.

[2] Dinkey *v.* Com., 17 Penn. St. 126. See Shouse *v.* The Commonwealth, 5 Barr, 83, and Com. *v.* Murphey, 2 Allen, 163, cited infra.

[3] Com. *v.* Thompson, 116 Mass. 346.

[4] Hanson *v.* State, 43 Ohio St. 376.

[5] See infra, §§ 465–7, 742; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 542–641 *a*; R. *v.* Dawson, 3 Stark. R. 62; R. *v.* Dungey, 4 F. & F. 99; R. *v.* Oliver, 8 Cox C. C. 384; Bell C. C. 287; R. *v.* Yeadon, 9 Cox C. C. 91; State *v.* Waters, 39 Me. (4 Heath) 54; Com. *v.* Griffin, 21 Pick. 523; Com. *v.* Binney, 133 Mass. 571; People *v.* McDonnell, 92 N. Y. 657; Fahnestock *v.* State, 23 Ind. 231; Davis *v.* State, 100 Ind. 154; Swinney *v.* State, 8 S. & M. 576; Cameron *v.* State, 8 Eng. (13 Ark.) 712; State *v.* Taylor, 3 Oregon, 10; Denman *v.* State, 15 Neb. 138; Packer *v.* People, 8 Col. 361; see as to verdict, State *v.* Flannagan, 6 Md. 167; Johnson *v.* State, 14 Ga. 55; Collins *v.* State, 33 La. An. 162. Infra, § 742.

[6] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1550. See Bradley *v.* State, 20 Fla. 738.

[7] Shouse *v.* Com., 5 Barr, 83; but see Ferguson *v.* People, 90 Ill. 570; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1550.

[8] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 858.

[9] R. *v.* Owen, 20 Q. B. D. 829; R. *v.* Mitchell, 12 Eng. Law & Eq. 588; Robinson, *ex parte*, 3 M'Arthur, 418; State *v.* Waters, 39 Me. 54; State *v.* Dearborn, 54 Me. 442; State *v.* Bean, 77 Me. 486; State *v.* Hardy, 47 N. H. 538; State *v.* Coy, 2 Aiken, 181; State *v.* Burt, 25 Vt. (2 Deane), 373; State *v.* Reed, 40 Vt. 603; State *v.* Johnson, 1 Vroom, 185; Francisco *v.* State, 4 Zabr. 30; Stewart *v.* State, 5 Ohio R. 242; Carpenter *v.* State, 23 Ala. 84; State *v.* Stedman, 7 Port. 495; M'Bride *v.* State, 2 Eng. (Ark.) 374; Reynolds *v.* State, 11 Tex. 20; State *v.* Kennedy,

charged in an indictment for assault with intent to kill.[1] And if the aggravating facts sustaining the intent are imperfectly pleaded, the defendant can be convicted of the assault alone.[2]

On indictment for minor there can only be conviction of minor.

§ 248. Where an offence is, by law, made more highly punishable if committed upon a person of a particular class than if committed upon a person of another class, an indictment for the offence may be maintained, though it does not specify to which of the classes the injured person belongs; and upon a conviction on such an indictment, the milder punishment only will be awarded.[3] And although the evidence prove the major offence, if the indictment charge only the minor, the defendant can only be convicted of minor.[4]

May be conviction of misdemeanor on indictment for felony.

§ 249. At common law, for the reason that a defendant on trial for misdemeanor was entitled to certain privileges (*e.g.*, a special jury, a copy of the indictment, and counsel) which were not allowed to a defendant on trial for a felony, the rule was that a defendant could not be convicted of a misdemeanor on an indictment for a felony. Had such a conviction been permitted, then it would have been within the power of the prosecution to deprive the defendant, in a case of misdemeanor, of these privileges, by indicting him for a felony in which the misdemeanor was inclosed. This, however, could not be tolerated, and hence rose the common law rule prohibiting a conviction of misdemeanor on an indictment for felony.[5] But when these privileges were allowed in felonies as well as misdemeanors, the reason for the rule failed; and the rule ceased to be regarded as

7 Blackf. 233; Foley *v.* State, 9 Ind. 363; Siebert *v.* State, 95 Ind. 471; State *v.* Graham, 51 Iowa, 72; Gillett *v.* State, 56 Iowa, 430; State *v.* Lessing, 16 Minn. 75; State *v.* Robey, 8 Nev. 312; State *v.* Cooper, 31 Kan. 505; State *v.* Perkins, 82 N. C., 681; State *v.* Gaffney, Rice, 431; Clark *v.* State, 12 Ga. 131; Lewis *v.* State, 33 Ga. 131; State *v.* Burk, 89 Mo. 635. For other cases see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 641 *a*, 1550; and see State *v.* Schele, 52 Iowa, 608.

Where one is indicted for an assault with intent to commit murder in the first degree, by the Tennessee Act of 1832, c. 22, this includes an indictment for an assault and battery; and upon failure of proof to warrant a conviction of felony, the defendant may be convicted of the misdemeanor. State *v.* Bowling, 10 Humph. 52.

[1] Com. *v.* Kennedy, 13 Mass. 584; Com. *v.* Blaney, 133 Mass. 571.

[2] State *v.* Schloss, 63 Mo. 361.

[3] State *v.* Fielding, 32 Me. 585.

[4] See infra, §§ 465–6.

[5] See Dearsley's Crim. Proc. 67; London Law Times, Nov. 5, 1881, p. 11; R. *v.* Westbeer, Leech, 14.

peremptory.[1] In some jurisdictions in this country the rule has never been in force, the reason for it not existing,[2] in other jurisdictions the right to so convict is expressly given by statute.[3] Thus, on an indictment for rape, the defendant may now be convicted of assault and battery,[4] or, on the same charge, of incest where the indictment contains the proper averments;[5] or on an indictment for manslaughter or murder there may be a conviction of assault and battery,[6] and on an indictment for murder the defendant may be convicted of an assault with intent to kill.[7] And in New York on an indictment for procuring an abortion of a quick child, which by statute is a felony, the prisoner may be convicted of the statutory misdemeanor of destroying a child not quick.[8] And we may now generally hold that it is not duplicity to inclose a misdemeanor in a felony.[9]

[1] See R. *v.* Bird, 2 Den. 202, 217; Com. *v.* Newall, 7 Mass. 245; Com. *v.* Roby, 12 Pick. 496, overruling Com. *v.* Cooper, 15 Mass. 345.

[2] See Rogers *v.* People, 34 Mich. 345; infra, § 261.

[3] See Com. *v.* Drum, 19 Pick. 479, and cases hereafter cited.

[4] Ibid. So in other states. Prindeville *v.* People, 42 Ill. 217. Hall *v.* People, 47 Mich. 636; State *v.* Pennell, 56 Iowa, 29; State *v.* Jay, 57 Iowa, 164.

[5] Com. *v.* Goodhue, 2 Met. Mass. 193. Com. *v.* Bakeman, 131 Mass. 577; People *v.* Rowle, 2 Mich. N. P. 209; see more fully Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1751.

[6] Com. *v.* Drum, 19 Pick. 479. State *v.* O'Kane, 23 Kan. 244; Scott *v.* State, 60 Miss. 268; Green *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 71; Peterson *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 650. See, also, Com. *v.* Hope, 22 Pick. 1, 7; Com. *v.* Griffin, 21 Pick. 523; Denman *v.* State, 15 Neb. 138. See, also, Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 544. In such case, however, to sustain a conviction, "the assault must be included in the charge on the face of the indictment, and also be part of the very act" presented as a felony. R. *v.* Birch, 1 Den. 185. If we could conceive of a case of murder in which there was no assault (see R. *v.* Walkden, 1 Cox, 282) then there could be no conviction in such a case of an assault. But, in point of fact, there can be no murder without an assault; and this even is the case with homicide by poison taken by the deceased in ignorance of its nature. See Whart. Cr. Law, 9th ed. § 610.

[7] People *v.* M'Donnell, 92 N. Y. 657.

[8] People *v.* Jackson, 3 Hill's N. Y. R. 92. See infra, § 261.

[9] Infra, § 261.

In Pennsylvania there may be a conviction of attempt on indictment for complete offence, Rev. Act. 1860, p. 442.

In Virginia the practice is the same. Code, 1866, chap. ccviii. § 27. And so in Georgia, Hill *v.* State, 53 Ga. 125, and Tennessee, Lacy *v.* State, 8 Baxt. 401; Smith *v.* State, 2 Lea, 614.

What is the general common law rule on this point in the United States will be considered under another head. Infra, § 261. In Massachusetts, "feloniously" is made by statute unnecessary in all cases. Stat. 1852, c. 40, § 3.

§ 250. In every case, however, the minor offence, to sustain a conviction for its commission, must be accurately stated.[1] Thus, on an indictment for rape, there can be no conviction for fornication unless there be an averment that the prosecutrix was not the defendant's wife.[2] So there can be no conviction of an assault on an indictment for murder unless the indictment avers an assault.[3] The minor offence, also, must be an ingredient of the major; if simply collateral to the major, not forming part of it, there can be no conviction of such minor offence.[4]

But minor offence must be accurately stated.

§ 251. Where a statute, as has already been observed,[5] makes two or more distinct acts connected with the same transaction indictable, each one of which may be considered as representing a phase in the same offence, it has in many cases been ruled they may be coupled in one count.[6] Thus, setting up a gaming-table, it has been

Not duplicity to couple successive statutory phases.

[1] See infra, § 965.

[2] Com. v. Murphy, 2 Allen, 163.

In a leading English case, it was ruled that, in order to convict a prisoner of a felony, not a felony primarily charged in the indictment, it is necessary that the minor felony should be substantially included in the indictment. Thus, an indictment for burglary includes an indictment for house-breaking, and generally also for larceny, and the prisoner on this may be found guilty of one or other of these felonies. But in an indictment for burglary, and for breaking and entering a house and stealing, the prisoner cannot be found guilty of breaking and entering a house with intent to steal. R. v. Reid, 2 Den. C. C. 89; 1 Eng. Law & Eq. 599. See Speers v. Com., 17 Grat. 570.

[3] Scott v. State, 60 Miss. 268, see State v. Ryan, 15 Oregon, 512.

[4] R. v. Watkins, 2 Moody, 217.

[5] Supra, § 162.

[6] Supra, § 247; infra, § 742; Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 134, 138; R. v. Bowen, 1 Den. C. C. 21; R. v. Jennings, 1 Cox C. C. 88; State v. Wood, 14 R. I. 151; R. v. Oliver, 8 Cox C. C. 384; Bell C. C. 287; R. v. Yeadon, 9 Cox C. C. 91; U. S. v. Hull, 14 Fed. Rep. 324; 4 McCr. 273; U. S. v. Ferro, 18 Fed. Rep. 901; State v. Nelson, 29 Me. 329; Com. v. Hall, 4 Allen, 305; Com. v. Dolan, 121 Mass. 374; Com. v. Ashton, 125 Mass. 384; State v. Matthews, 42 Vt. 542; Com. v. Atkins, 136 Mass. 160; State v. Fowler, 13 R. I. 661; Barnes v. State, 20 Conn. 232; State v. Teahan, 50 Conn. 92; Read v. People, 86 N. Y. 381; People v. Casey, 72 N. Y. 393; Leath v. Com., 32 Grat. 873; Sprouse v. Com., 81 Va. 374; Com. v. Miller, 107 Penn St. 276; State v. Connor, 30 Ohio St. 405; State v. Smalls, 11 S. C. 262; Hoskins v. State, 11 Ga. 92; Murphy v. State, 47 Mo. 274; State v. Fancher, 71 Mo. 460; State v. Myers, 10 Iowa, 448; State v. Harris, 11 Iowa, 414; State v. Brannon, 50 Iowa, 372; Watson v. State, 39 Ohio St. 123; State v. House, 55 Iowa, 466; State v. Gray, 29 Minn. 142; State v. Bergman, 6 Oregon, 341; State v. Carr, 6 Oregon, 133; State v.

said, may be a distinct offence; keeping a gaming-table and inducing others to bet upon it, may constitute a distinct offence; for either unconnected with the other an indictment will lie;[1] yet when both are perpetrated by the same person at the same time, they may be coupled in one count.[2] An indictment, also, for keeping and maintaining, at a place and time named, "a certain building, to wit: a dwelling-house, used as a house of ill-fame, resorted to for prostitution, lewdness, and for illegal gaming, and used for the illegal sale and keeping of intoxicating liquors, the said building, so used as aforesaid, being then and there a common nuisance," may be sustained,[3] and so of several successive statutory phases of making, forging, and counterfeiting, of causing and procuring to be falsely made, forged and counterfeited, and of willingly aiding and assisting in the said false making, forging, and counterfeiting.[4] It is admissible, also, to charge that the defendant "administered, and caused to be administered," poison, etc.[5] "Obstruct or resist" process may be joined, so as to read "obstruct and resist" in the indictment.[6] It is also not duplicity to charge that the defendant did "offer to vend and to sell, and to cause to be furnished to and for one A. C., a certain paper, being a lottery ticket," etc.;[7] or that he did "torment, maim, beat, and wound" an animal.[8] And in an indictment on the Massachusetts Rev. Stats. c. 58, § 2, by which the setting up or promoting of any of the exhibitions therein men-

Palmer, 32 La. An. 565; Clemons *v.* State, 4 Lea, 23; Thompson *v.* State, 30 Tex. 356; Copping *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 59 See Com. *v.* Nichols, 10 Allen, 199; Ferrell *v.* State, 2 Lea, 25.

[1] See State *v.* Fletcher, 18 Mo. 425.

[2] Hinkle *v.* Com., 4 Dana, 518.

[3] Com. *v.* Ballou, 124 Mass. 26; State *v.* Carver, 2 R. I. 285; State *v.* Adam, 31 La. An. 717. So as to advertising, exposing to sale, and selling lottery tickets. Com. *v.* Gillespie, 7 S. & R. 469; State *v.* McWilliams, 7 Mo. Ap. 99; see Read *v.* People, 86 N. Y. 381.

[4] Supra, § 162; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 727; R. *v.* North, 6 D. & R. 143; U. S. *v.* Armstrong, 5 Phil. R. 273; State *v.* Hastings, 53 N. H. 452; State *v.* Morton, 27 Vt. 310; Com. *v.* Grey, 2 Gray, 501; State *v.* Price, 6 Halst. 203; Angel *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 231; Rasnick *v.* Com., Ibid. 356; Mackey *v.* State, 3 Ohio St. 363; Jones *v.* State, 1 McMull. 236; Hoskins *v.* State, 11 Ga. 92; Wingard *v.* State, 13 Ga. 396; State *v.* McCollum, 44 Mo. 343; People *v.* Tomlinson, 35 Cal. 503. See, as taking a narrower view, State *v.* Haven, 59 Vt. 339; State *v.* McCormack, 56 Iowa, 585.

[5] Ben. *v.* State, 22 Ala. 9.

[6] Slicker *v.* State, 8 Eng. (13 Ark.) 397. See, also, State *v.* Locklear, 1 Busbee, 205. Supra, § 228.

[7] Read *v.* People, 86 N. Y. 381. See Com. *v.* Atkins, 136 Mass. 160.

[8] State *v.* Haskell, 76 Me. 399.

tioned, without license therefor, is prohibited, it is not duplicity to allege that the defendant "did set up and promote" such an exhibition.[1] In such cases the offences are divisible, and a verdict may be had for either.[2]

Where a statute requires a license from A. or B., the indictment following the statute must negative a license from *either* A. or C.[3]

§ 252. In all cases of larceny, and like offences, several articles may be joined in a count, the proof of either of which will sustain the indictment,[4] though where a variety of articles are stolen at the same time and place, and from the same individual, it has been held that the stealing of such articles at the same time and place is only one offence, and must be so charged.[5] It has been even ruled that the same count may join the larceny of several distinct articles, belonging to different owners, where the time and the place of the taking of each are the same.[6] This, however, has been properly denied;[7] and when averred to be at distinct times, the count is unquestionably double.[8]

Several articles can be joined in larceny.

[1] Com. *v.* Twitchell, 4 Cush. 74.

[2] See infra, § 742; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 727; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 154. See, however, State *v.* Bach, 25 Mo. Ap. 554.

A neglect by supervisors of roads both to open and repair roads may be charged in one count of an indictment against them. Edge *v.* Com., 7 Barr, 275.

Under a statute making it an offence to "send *or* convey" an indecent letter, it is duplicity to charge "send *and* convey," the "sending" and "conveying" having different meanings. Larison *v.* State, 49 N. J. L. 259; *sed quaere.*

[3] Supra, § 240.

[4] Supra, § 212; infra, § 470; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 132; State *v.* Cameron, 40 Vt. 555; Com. *v.* Williams, 2 Cush. 583; Com. *v.* Eastman, 2 Gray, 76; Com. *v.* O'Connell, 12 Allen, 451; State *v.* Hennessey, 23 Ohio St. 339; State *v.* Bishop, 98 N. C. 773; Leslie *v.* Com., 82 Ken. 250; State *v.* Williams, 10 Humph. 101; Lorton *v.* State, 7 Mo. 55; State *v.* Johnson, 3 Hill, S. C. 1; State *v.* Evans, 23 S. C. 209; State *v.* McAnulty, 26 Kan. 533.

In Maine it has been ruled that a count charging a larceny of bank bills each of a denomination and value stated, and of a pocket-book and knife, "of the goods, chattels, and money of J. S. K.," etc., contains a sufficient description of the property, and is not bad for duplicity. Stevens *v.* State, 62 Me. 284.

[5] Ibid.; and see, particularly, infra, § 470.

[6] Infra, § 470; see Hoiles *v.* U. S., 3 McArth. 370; Smith *v.* State, 63 Ga. 168; Dodd *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 370.

[7] State *v.* Thurston, 2 McMull. 382; Com. *v.* Andrews, 2 Mass. 409; Casey *v.* People, 72 N. Y. 393; infra, § 740; and see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 931, 948.

[8] State *v.* Newton, 42 Vt. 537.

§ 253. Laying several overt acts in a count for high treason is not duplicity,[1] because the charge consists of the compassing, etc., and the overt acts are merely evidences of it; and the same as to conspiracy. A count in an indictment, charging one endeavor or conspiracy to procure the commission of two offences, is not bad for duplicity, because the endeavor is the offence charged.[2] The same rule exists where assaults and other offences with several intents are charged.[3] It is so, as we have seen, where forging a note and forging an indorsement are joined.[4] It is admissible, also, to state cumulatively several weapons by which a wound has been inflicted;[5] and those not proved may be rejected as surplusage.[6]

And so of cumulative overt acts and intents and agencies.

Various means used in committing the offence may be joined without duplicity.[7]

§ 254. A man may be indicted for the battery of two or more persons in the same count,[8] or for libel upon two or more persons, where the publication is one single act;[9] or for selling liquor to two or more persons,[10] or in several

And so of double batteries,

[1] Kelyng, 8.

[2] R. *v.* Fuller, 1 B. & P. 181; R. *v.* Bykerdike, 1 M. & Rob. 179; People *v.* Milne, 61 Cal. 71.

[3] R. *v.* Dawson, 1 Eng. Law & Eq. 62; R. *v.* Cox, R. & R. 362; R. *v.* Davis, 1 C. & P. 306; R. *v.* Smith, 4 C. & P. 569; R. *v.* Gillow, 1 Moody C. C. 85; R. *v.* Hill, 2 Moody C. C. 30; R. *v.* Balt, 6 C. & P. 329; State *v.* Moore, 12 N. H. 42; Com. *v.* McPike, 3 Cush. 181; People *v.* Curling, 1 Johns. R. 320; State *v.* Dineen, 10 Minn. 407; People *v.* Milne, 61 Cal. 71; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 119; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 135.

[4] Supra, §§ 250 ff. Sprouse *v.* Com., 81 Va. 374.

[5] People *v.* Casey, 72 N. Y. 398; State *v.* Jackson, 39 Ohio St. 37; Williams *v.* State, 59 Ga. 401; Gonzales *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 584; and cases cited supra, § 212*a*.

[6] U. S. *v.* Patty, 9 Biss. 429; State *v.* Blan, 69 Mo. 317. Supra, §§ 158, 212*a*. Infra, § 1297.

[7] Com. *v.* Brown, 14 Gray, 419; State *v.* McDonald, 37 Mo. 13; People *v.* Casey, 72 N. Y. 393. See Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 134, 138.

[8] R. *v.* Benfield, 2 Burr. 983; R. *v.* Giddings, C. & M. 634; Com. *v.* O'Brien, 107 Mass. 208; Kenney *v.* State, 5 R. I. 385; Fowler *v.* State, 3 Heisk. 154. See 2 Str. 890; 2 Ld. Raym. 1572; (State *v.* McClintock, 8 Iowa, 203, *contra*); and so of a double shooting or stabbing. Com. *v.* McLaughlin, 12 Cush. 615; Shaw *v.* State, 18 Ala. 547. See Ben *v.* State, 22 Ala. 9; R. *v.* Scott, 4 B. & S. 368. Infra, §§ 468, 492.

[9] Infra, § 468; R. *v.* Jenour, 7 Mod. 400; 2 Burr. 983; State *v.* Atchison, 3 Lea, 729. See State *v.* Womack, 7 Cold. (Tenn.) 508. So where two horses are overdriven in one team. People *v.* Tindale, 10 Abb. Pr. N. § 374.

[10] State *v.* Anderson, 3 Rich. 172; State *v.* Bielby, 21 Wis. 204. See, for

forms,[1] without rendering the count bad for duplicity. And it is said that burning several houses by one fire can be joined.[2] libels, or sales.

Whether the killing of two persons by one act is one offence is hereafter discussed.[3]

§ 255. Duplicity, in criminal cases, may be objected to by special demurrer,[4] perhaps by general demurrer; or the court, in general, upon application, may quash the indictment; but the better view is that it cannot be made the subject of a motion in arrest of judgment, or of a writ of error;[5] and it is in any view cured by a verdict of guilty as to one of the offences, and not guilty as to the other,[6] and by a *nolle prosequi* as to one member of the count.[7] But when two repugnant offences, requiring different punishments, are introduced in one count, judgment may be arrested.[8] Duplicity is usually cured by verdict.

a cognate case, Walter *v.* Com. 6 Weekly Notes, 389; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1515.

An indictment for selling spirituous liquors without a license charged that the defendant, at his storehouse and dwelling-house in Pennsboro, in said county, did sell, etc.; and it was held on motion to quash, that it was not intended to charge two distinct sales at different places, but rather to describe the store and dwelling-house as constituting one building, and one and the same place; and, therefore, there were not two distinct offences charged in the same count. Conley *v.* State, 5 W. Va. 522. Compare Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1515.

[1] Osgood *v.* People, 39 N. Y. 449.

[2] Woodford *v.* People, 62 N. Y. 117. Infra, § 469.

[3] Infra, § 468.

[4] Ellis *v.* Com., 78 Ky. 130; People *v.* Quoise, 56 Cal. 396; State *v.* Goodwin, 33 Kans. 538.

[5] Nash *v.* R., 9 Cox C. C. 424; 4 B. & S. 935; U. S. *v.* Bayaud, 21 Blatch. 217, 287; 15 Rep. 520; Com. *v.* Tuck, 20 Pick. 356; State *v.* Johnson, 3 Hill S. C. 1; Simons *v.* State, 25 Ind. 331; State *v.* Brown, 8 Humph. 89; Scruggs *v.* State, 7 Baxt. 38; Forrest *v.* State, 13 Lea, 103; People *v.* Shotwell, 27 Cal. 394; Tucker *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 251. Infra, § 777; but see *contra*, when there is a confusion of averments, R. *v.* Cook, 1 R. & R. 176; State *v.* Fowler, 28 N. H. 184; Com. *v.* Powell, 8 Bush. 7; State *v.* Howe, 1 Rich. 260; Terr *v.* Heywood, 2 Wash. Terr. 181, and cases cited supra, § 243. As to curing by verdict, see infra, § 759.

[6] R. *v.* Guthrie, L. R. 1 C. C. 241; State *v.* Miller, 24 Conn. 522; State *v.* Merrill, 44 N. H. 624.

[7] State *v.* Merrill, 44 N. H. 624; State *v.* Buck, 59 Iowa, 382, and cases cited. Infra, § 383.

[8] Cases cited infra, § 256; and see State *v.* Nelson, 8 N. H. 163; modified by State *v.* Snyder, 50 N. H. 150; Com. *v.* Holmes, 119 Mass. 198.

XIII. REPUGNANCY.

Where material averments are repugnant, indictment is bad.

§ 256. When one material averment in an indictment is contradictory to another the whole is bad.[1] Thus, to adopt one of the old illustrations, if an indictment charge the defendant with having forged a certain writing, whereby one person was bound to another, the whole will be vicious, for it is impossible any one can be bound by a forgery.[2]

A relative pronoun, also, referring with equal uncertainty to two antecedents will make the proceedings bad in arrest of judgment. But, as is elsewhere seen, every fact or circumstance laid in an indictment, which is not a necessary ingredient in the offence, may be rejected as surplusage.[3]

That disjunctive statements are inadmissible has been elsewhere seen.[4]

Where counts are repugnant a general verdict cannot be sustained;[5] though it is otherwise when they represent varying phases or stages of the same offence.[6]

[1] 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 62; R. *v.* Harris, 1 Den. C. C. 461; T. & M. 177; State *v.* Haven, 59 Vt. 399; Com. *v.* Lawless, 101 Mass. 32.

[2] 3 Mod. 104; 2 Show. 460. See Mills *v.* Com., 13 Penn. St. 634.

Repugnancy has been held to exist where an indictment charged an offence to have been committed in November, 1801, and in the twenty-fifth year of American Independence (State *v.* Hendricks, Con. R. 369), and where the crime was laid to have been committed A. D. 1830. Serpentine *v.* State, 1 How. Miss. R. 260.

[3] Supra, §§ 158, 253–4; Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 138 *et seq.*; 1 Chitty on Pleading, 334, 335; R. *v.* Craddock, 2 Den. C. C. 31; T. & M. 361; State *v.* Cassety, 1 Richards, 91; State *v.* Smolls, 11 S. C. 262.

Where there was a general verdict of guilty on an indictment for procuring a miscarriage, in which one count averred quickness and the other merely pregnancy, and one count averred the abortion of the mother and the other of the child, the Supreme Court refused to reverse on the ground of repugnancy. Mills *v.* Com., 13 Penn. St. 634.

An indictment charging an assault with three weapons—a pair of tongs, a hammer, and an axe-handle—is not void for repugnancy. State *v.* McDonald, 67 Mo. 13; supra, §§ 158, 212 *a*.

[4] Supra, §§ 161, 228.

Where one count charges the offence to have been committed in one county and another count charges it in another, the general rule is, that the counts are repugnant, and the indictment will be quashed on motion, or the prosecutor be compelled to elect which he will proceed on. State *v.* Johnson, 5 Jones (N. C.), 221.

[5] Infra, § 737.

[6] Ibid.; infra, §§ 285 *et seq.*; State *v.* Mallon, 75 Mo. 355.

XIV. TECHNICAL AVERMENTS.

1. "TRAITOROUSLY," § 257.
2. "FELONIOUSLY DID KILL," "MALICE AFORETHOUGHT," "STRIKE," § 260.
3. "FELONIOUSLY,"—WHEN NECESSARY, AND WHEN IT MAY BE DISCHARGED AS SURPLUSAGE, § 261.
4. "RAVISH," "CARNALLY KNEW," "FORCIBLY," "FALSELY," § 263.
5. "FALSELY," § 264.
6. "BURGLARIOUSLY," § 265.
7. "TAKE AND CARRY AWAY," § 266.
8. "VIOLENTLY AND AGAINST THE WILL," § 267.
9. "UNLAWFULLY," § 269.
10. "FORCIBLY AND WITH A STRONG HAND," § 270.

§ 257. In indictments for treason, the offence must be laid to have been committed traitorously; but if the treason itself be laid to have been so committed, whether it consist in levying war against the supreme authority or otherwise, it is not necessary to allege every overt act to have been traitorously committed.[1]

In treason, "traitorously" must be used.

§ 258. In an indictment for murder, it must be alleged that the offence was committed of the defendant's malice aforethought, words which cannot be supplied by the aid of any other; and if this averment be omitted, or if the defendant be merely charged with killing and slaying the deceased, the offence will amount to no more than manslaughter.[2] But the want of these words in an indictment for an assault with intent to kill will not be fatal on arrest of judgment.[3]

"Malice aforethought" essential to murder.

§ 259. Where the death arises from any wounding, beating, or bruising, it has been said that the word "struck" is essential, and that the wound or bruise must be alleged to have been mortal.[4]

"Struck" usually essential to wound.

§ 260. The word "feloniously" is at common law essential to all indictments for felony, whether at common law or statutory,[5] although

[1] Cranbourn's case, 4 St. Tr. 701; Salk. 633; East P. C. 116.

[2] 1 Hale, 450, 466; East P. C. 345; Whart. Crim Law, 9th ed. §§ 517 *et seq.*; McElroy *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 235. A killing by misadventure, or chance medley, is described to have been done "casually and by misfortune, and against the will of the defendant." See State *v.* Rabon, 4 Rich. 260.

[3] Cross *v.* State, 55 Wis. 262. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 644.

[4] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 518 *et seq.*; 2 Hale, 184; 2 Inst. 319; 2 Hawk. c. 23, s. 82; Cro. J. 635; 5 Co. 122; Lad's case, 1 Leach, 112.

[5] R. *v.* Gray, L. & C. 365; Com. *v.* Weidenhold, 112 Penn. St. 584; Mears *v.* Com., 2 Grant, 385; State *v.* Brister, 1 Houst. 150; Scudder *v.* State, 62 Ind. 13; State *v.* Roper, 88 N. C. 656; State *v.* Murdock, 9 Mo. 730; State *v.* Gilbert, 24 Mo. 380; Bowler *v.* State, 41 Miss. 570; Wile *v.* State, 60 Miss. 260;

the reason for the term being purely arbitrary,[1] it is no longer necessary unless prescribed by statute, or unless describing a common law or statutory felony.[2] But in all common law felonies it is, at common law, essential. Thus, in an indictment for murder, it is at common law requisite to state as a conclusion from the facts previously averred that the said defendant, him, the said C. D., in manner and form aforesaid, feloniously did kill and murder.[3]

"Feloniously" essential to felony.

§ 261. If an act be charged to have been done with a felonious intent to commit a crime, and it appears upon the face of the indictment that the crime, though perpetrated, would not have amounted to a felony, the word felonious, being repugnant to the legal import of the offence charged, may be rejected as surplusage.[4]

Word "feloniously" can be rejected as surplusage.

Edwards *v.* State, 25 Ark. 444. It has, however, been held that when a statute creating a felony does not use the term "feloniously," the latter term may be omitted in the indictment. People *v.* Olivera, 7 Cal. 403; Jane *v.* Com., 3 Metc. (Ky.) 18. The word "feloniously" may be sometimes dispensed with by statute, either expressly or by implication. Peek *v.* State, 2 Humph. 78; Butler *v.* State, 22 Ala. 43.

[1] The term was originally introduced in order to exclude the offender from his clergy; R. *v.* Clerk, Salk. 377; and is not essential to an indictment for manslaughter. See, as to gradual disappearance of distinction, Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 22.

[2] See Steph. Cr. Law, §§ 56, 57 *et seq.*; State *v.* Felch, 58 N. H. 1.

[3] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 518 *et seq.*; 1 Hale, 450, 466; 4 Bl. 307; Yel. 205; Cain *v.* State, 18 Tex. 387.

It has been held that "feloniously" is not essential to an assault and battery with intent to kill; Stout *v.* Com., 11 S. & R. 177; State *v.* Scott, 24 Vt. 27; though elsewhere the omission was held fatal. Mears *v.* Com., 2 Grant, 385; Scudder *v.* State, 62 Ind. 13; Curtis *v.* People, 1 Breese, 199; and see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 644.

In all cases of mayhem, the words feloniously and did maim are requisite; 1 Inst. 118; 2 Hawk. c. 23, ss. 15, 16, etc.; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 55; Com. *v.* Reed, 3 Am. L. Journ. 140; Canada *v.* Com., 22 Grat. 899; State *v.* Brown, 60 Mo. 141; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 586; though it is said in Massachusetts that the offence is not a felony (Com. *v.* Newell, 7 Mass. 244), and in Georgia, to be only so in case of castration. Adams *v.* Barrett, 5 Geo. 404.

[4] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 148; 2 East P. C. 1028; Cald. 397; Hackett *v.* Com., 15 Penn. St. 95; Com. *v.* Gable, 7 S. & R. 423; People *v.* Jackson, 3 Hill (N. Y.), 92; People *v.* White, 22 Wend. 175; Staeger *v.* Com., 103 Penn. St. 469; Lohman *v.* People, 1 Comst. 379; Hess *v.* State, 5 Ohio, 1; State *v.* Sparks, 78 Ind. 166. But see *contra* Starkie's C. P. 169; n. r.; State *v.* Darrah, 1 Houst. 112; Black *v.* State, 2 Md. 376; State *v.* Flint, 33 La. An. 1238; State *v.* Edwards, 90 N. C. 710; cf. State *v.* Fletch, 58 N. H. 1; supra, § 249.

Where, however, a count on its face is for a complete felony, it has been doubted whether a conviction can be had for the constituent misdemeanor. In England, the rule at common law was that such a conviction could not be had, the reason being, that if a misdemeanor be tried under an indictment for a felony, the defendant loses his right to a special jury and a copy of the bill of indictment.[1] In this country, though the reason fails, the principle that under an indictment for a felony there can, at common law, be no conviction for a misdemeanor, has been followed in Massachusetts,[2] in Indiana,[3] in Tennessee,[4] in Maryland,[5] and in Louisiana.[6] In New York,[7] Pennsylvania,[8] Vermont,[9] New Jersey,[10] Ohio,[11] North Carolina,[12] South Carolina,[13] Michigan,[14] and Arkansas,[15] it has been held that the English reason ceasing, the rule itself ceases. In most States this latter position is now established by statute, if not by common law.[16]

[1] R. *v.* Woodhall, 12 Cox C. C. 240; R. *v.* Cross, 1 Ld. Raym. 711; 3 Salk. 193; 2 Hawk. c. 47, s. 6; 1 Chitty C. L. 251, 639; R. *v.* Walker, 6 C. & P. 657; R. *v.* Gisson, 2 C. & K. 781; R. *v.* Reid, 2 Den. C. C. 88; 2 Eng. Law & Eq. 473. See supra, §§ 246–7. Now, however, the statute of 1 Vict. c. 85, s. 11 (Lord Denman's Act) enables conviction to be had for a constituent misdemeanor.

[2] Com. *v.* Newell, 7 Mass. 245. This has been corrected by statute. Com. *v.* Drum, 19 Pick. 479; Com. *v.* Scannel, 11 Cush. 547. See supra, § 249.

[3] State *v.* Kennedy, 7 Blackf. 233; Wright *v.* State, 5 Ind. 527.

[4] State *v.* Valentine, 6 Yerg. 533.

[5] Black *v.* State, 2 Md. 376; aff. in Barber *v.* State, 50 Md. 161; though see Burke *v.* State, 2 Har. & J. 426; State *v.* Sutton, 4 Gill, 494. Supra, § 247.

[6] State *v.* Flint, 33 La. An. 1238.

[7] People *v.* White, 22 Wend. 175; People *v.* Jackson, 3 Hill (N. Y.) 92; Lohman *v.* People, 1 Comst. 379. See supra, § 249.

[8] Hunter *v.* Com., 79 Penn. St. 503. See Com. *v.* Gable, 7 S. & R. 433; and Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 542. That on an indictment triable exclusively in the Oyer and Terminer, in which the defendant cannot be examined as a witness, he cannot be convicted of a misdemeanor, in which he could be examined as a witness, see Com. *v.* Harper, 14 Weekly Notes, 10.

[9] State *v.* Coy, 2 Aiken, 181; State *v.* Wheeler, 3 Vt. 344; State *v.* Scott, 24 Vt. 129.

[10] State *v.* Johnson, 1 Vroom, 185.

[11] State *v.* Hess, 5 Ohio, 1; Stewart *v.* State, 5 Ohio, 242.

[12] State *v.* Watts, 82 N. C. 656; see, however, State *v.* Durham, 72 N. C. 747; State *v.* Upchurch, 9 Ired. 455.

[13] State *v.* Gaffney, Rice, 431; State *v.* Wimberly, 3 McCord, 190.

[14] Rogers *v.* People, 34 Mich. 345.

[15] Cameron *v.* State, 8 Eng. (13 Ark.) 712.

[16] Supra, § 158; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 148; Com. *v.* Squires, 1 Met. 258; Com. *v.* Scannel, 11 Cush. (Mass.) 547. So in Minnesota. State *v.* Crummey, 17 Minn. 72. In North Carolina. State *v.* Purdie, 67 N. C. 26, 326. See

§ 262. *Attempts*, by the statutes of England and most of the United States, are made substantive offences, even where they do not exist as such at common law. And by the same statutes, the jury in most instances — even in indictments for felony — may convict of the attempt.[1]

In such case conviction may be bad of attempt.

§ 263. In indictments of rape, the words "feloniously ravished" are essential, and the word *rapuit* is not supplied by the words *carnaliter cognovit*;[2] and it seems that the latter words are also essential in indictments,[3] though the contrary has been ruled in the case of an appeal.[4] The usual course in an indictment for rape is to aver that it was committed forcibly, and against the will of the female, and therefore it would not be safe to omit the averment,[5] though in Pennsylvania the omission was held not to be fatal, in a case where ravish and carnally know were introduced.[6] In an indictment for an unnatural crime, the descriptive words of the statute taking[7] away clergy, must be used; and it is not sufficient to say *contra naturae ordinem rem habuit veneream et carnaliter cognovit*.[8]

"Ravish" and "forcibly" are essential to rape.

State *v.* Upchurch, 9 Ired. 455. In Iowa. State *v.* McNally, 32 Iowa, 580. And in Texas. Jorasco *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 238.

[1] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 173; and see infra, §§ 742 *et seq.*, as to verdict. Burke *v.* State, 74 Ala. 399.

An indictment for arson charged that the defendants "feloniously, wilfully, and unlawfully" set fire to, burned, and consumed a certain building used as a brewery for the manufacture of beer. It was held that the indictment was defective in not alleging that the burning was malicious. Kellenbeck *v.* State, 10 Md. 431. Supra, § 235.

Where a statute makes criminal the doing of the act "wilfully and maliciously," it is not sufficient for the indictment to charge that it was done "feloniously and unlawfully," or feloniously, unlawfully and wilfully; these latter terms not being synonymous, equivalent, of the same legal import, or substantially the same as "wilfully and maliciously." State *v.* Gove, 34 N. H. 510; though see supra, § 235; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 586.

[2] Gougleman *v.* People, 3 Parker C. R. (N. Y.) 15; 1 Hale, 628; 2 Hale, 184; 1 Inst. 190; 2 Inst. 180. See, however, State *v.* Meinhart, 73 Mo. 562.

[3] 1 Hale, 632; 3 Inst. 60; Co. Lit. 137; 2 Inst. 180.

[4] 11 H. 4, 13; 2 Hawk. c. 23, s. 79; Staun. 81.

[5] State *v.* Jim, 1 Dev. 142; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 573.

[6] Harman *v.* Com., 12 Serg. & R. 69; and see Com. *v.* Fogerty, 8 Gray, 489; and see, for fuller discussion, Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 573.

[7] 5 Eliz. c. 17, 3, 4; W. & M. c. 9, s. 2; Fost. 424; Co. Ent. 351; 3 Inst. 59; 1 Hawk. c. 4, s. 2.

[8] East P. C. 480; 3 Inst. 59.

§ 264. In an indictment for perjury, it is necessary to charge that the defendant wilfully and corruptly swore falsely.[1] But it is not necessary in forgery.[2]

"Falsely" essential to perjury.

§ 265. In burglary the essential words are "feloniously and burglariously broke and entered the dwelling-house, in the night time;" and the felony intended to be committed, or actually perpetrated, must also be stated in technical terms.[3] But "burglariously" is not necessary in statutory housebreaking.[4]

"Burglariously" to burglary.

§ 266. In larceny, the words feloniously took and carried away the goods,[5] or took and led away the cattle, are essential. "The property of" is also essential.[6] These terms are also requisite in statutory indictments for embezzlement.[7]

"Take and carry away" essential to larceny.

§ 267. In an indictment for robbery from the person, the words feloniously, violently,[8] and against the will, are essential; and it is usual, though it is said to be unnecessary, to allege a putting in fear.[9]

"Violently and against the will" essential to robbery.

§ 268. Piracy must be alleged to have been done feloniously and piratically.[10]

"Piratical" to piracy.

§ 269. The phrase "unlawful" is in no case essential, unless it be a part of the description of the offence as defined by some statute; for if the fact, as stated, be illegal, it would be superfluous to allege it to be unlawful; if the facts stated be legal, the word unlawful cannot render it

"Unlawfully," and other aggravative terms, not essential.

[1] See fully Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1286.

[2] State *v.* McKiernan, 17 Nev. 224.

[3] 1 Hale, 549; Portwood *v.* State, 29 Tex. 47. See Lyon *v.* People, 68 Ill. 271; State *v.* Curtis, 30 La. An. Pt. ii. 814; and see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 814.

[4] Tully *v.* Com., 4 Met. 357; State *v.* Meadows, 22 W. Va. 766; Sullivan *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 462.

[5] 1 Hale, 504; 2 Hale, 184; R. *v.* Middleton, L. R. 2 C. C. 41; Com. *v.* Adams, 7 Gray, 43; Rountree *v.* State, 58 Ala. 381; Gregg *v.* State, 64 Ind. 223; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 914. In Green *v.* Com., 111 Mass. 417, it was held that "steal" might be a substitute; though this ruling may be questioned; see State *v.* Johnson, 30 La. An. Pt. i. 305. That "steal" may be omitted see State *v.* Lee Ping, 10 Oreg. 27.

[6] State *v.* Parker, 1 Houst. c. c. 9.

[7] Com. *v.* Pratt, 132 Mass. 246.

[8] 1 Hale, 534; Fost. 128; 3 Inst. 68. But see Smith's case, East P. C. 783, in which it was holden that *violenter* is not an essential term of art. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 857. As to "wilfully," see Woolsey *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 57.

[9] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 857.

[10] 1 Hawk. c. 37, ss. 6, 10.

indictable.[1] The same observation is applicable to the terms "wrongfully," "unjustly," "wickedly," "wilfully," "corruptly," to "the evil example," "falsely," "maliciously," "fraudulently," and such like.[2] Thus, though it is usual to allege that the party falsely forged and counterfeited, it is enough to allege that he forged, because the word implies a false making. In indictment for libels, it is sufficient either to use the word falsely or maliciously,[3] or an equivalent epithet. But when either of these terms is part of the essential definition of the offence, it cannot be dropped.[4] And this is eminently the case when the term is part of a statutory definition.[5]

"Forcibly" and with a strong hand essential to forcible entry.

§ 270. In forcible entry, at common law, the defendants must be charged with having used such a degree of force as amounts to a breach of the peace.[6] The words, "with strong hand," are indispensable. But it is sufficient in such an indictment to aver, that the defendants unlawfully and with a strong hand entered into the prosecutor's mills, etc., and expelled him from the possession thereof.[7] In rape, also, "forcibly" is in most jurisdictions essential.[8]

"*Vi et armis*" not essential.

§ 271. The practice still exists of introducing, in indictments for forcible injuries, the technical words, *vi et armis;* but by the stat. 37 H. 8, c. 8, it is enacted that "inquisitions or indictments lacking the words *vi et armis*, viz., *baculis*, *cultellis*, *arcubus*, *et sagittis*, or any such like words, shall be taken, deemed, and adjudged, to all intents and purposes, to be good and effectual in law, as the same inquisitions and indictments having the same words were theretofore taken, deemed, and adjudged to

[1] U. S. *v.* Driscoll, 1 Low. 305; State *v.* Williams, 3 Foster (N. H.) 321; State *v.* Concord R. R., 59 N. H. 85; State *v.* Vt. R. R., 27 Vt. 103; State *v.* Bray, 1 Mo. 126; Capps *v.* State, 4 Iowa, 502; Stazey *v.* State, 58 Ind. 514; Shinn *v.* State, 68 Ind. 423; State *v.* Mulhisen, 69 Ind. 145; Williams *v.* State, 3 Heisk. 376. See, however, *contra*, under present Indiana statute, State *v.* Smith, 74 Ind. 557. And see Woolsey *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 57.

[2] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 517, 839; State *v.* Hartman, 8 Baxt. 384; U. S. *v.* Caruthers, 15 Fed. Rep. 309.

[3] Sty. 392; 2 Wms. Saund. 242; Starkie C. P. 86.

[4] Com. *v.* Turner, 8 Bush, 1.

[5] Supra, § 235.

[6] R. *v.* Wilsou et al., 8 T. R. 357; 6 Mod. 178; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1107.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Whart. Cr. Law, 9th ed. § 573.

be." These words are therefore superfluous, even where the crime is of a forcible nature, and were unnecessary at common law, where the injury was not forcible.[1] And in case of murder, the force at common law is implied from the very nature of the offence.[2] The stat. 37 H. 8, c. 8, is in force in Pennsylvania,[3] in New Hampshire,[4] in Vermont,[5] in Massachusetts,[6] in North Carolina,[7] in Tennessee,[8] in Indiana,[9] and in Louisiana,[10] and in these States, as well as generally in this country, the term may be properly omitted.[11]

§ 272. "Knowingly" is one of the expletives which, when fraud is charged, it may be useful to insert.[12] For although it may be discharged as surplusage if unnecessary, it may be sometimes employed to help out an otherwise defective allegation of guilty knowledge.[13]

"Knowingly" always prudent.

XV. CLERICAL ERRORS.

§ 273. *Verbal or grammatical inaccuracies*, which do not affect the sense, are not fatal.[14] Mere misspelling will not be fatal, as in

[1] 2 Lev. 221; Cro. Jac. 473; 3 P. Wms. 497; Skinner, 426; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 90.

[2] 2 Hale, 187; 1 Hawk. c. 25, s. 3; 1 Hale, 534; 3 Inst. 68; Pulton, 131 *b*; State *v.* Pratt, 54 Vt. 484.

[3] Roberts's Dig. 34; Com. *v.* Martin, 2 Barr, 244, in which case the omission of the "*vi et armis*" was held immaterial.

[4] State *v.* Kean, 10 N. H. 347.

[5] State *v.* Munger, 15 Vt. 290; 2 Tyler, 166.

[6] Com. *v.* Scannel, 11 Cush. 547.

[7] State *v.* Duncan, 6 Ired. 236.

[8] Tipton *v.* State, 2 Yerg. 542; Taylor *v.* State, 6 Humph. 285.

[9] State *v.* Elliot, 7 Blackf. 280.

[10] Territory *v.* M'Farlane, 1 Martin, 224. See State *v.* Thornton, 2 Rice's Dig. 109.

[11] See also State *v.* Temple, 3 Fairf. 214.

[12] As to *scienter*, see supra, § 164.

[13] 1 Starkie C. P. 390; Com. *v.* Hobbs, 140 Mass. 443.

[14] R. *v.* Stokes, 1 Den. C. C. 307; State *v.* Patterson, 68 Me. 473; State *v.* Shaw, 58 N. H. 74; State *v.* Lockwood, 58 Vt. 378; Com. *v.* Burke, 15 Gray, 408; Shay *v.* People, 22 N. Y. 317; Phelps *v.* People, 72 N. Y. 334, 372; Com. *v.* Moyer, 7 Barr, 439; Perdue *v.* Com., 96 Penn. St. 311; Com. *v.* Ailstock, 3 Grat. 650; Lazier *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 708; State *v.* Gilmore, 9 W. Va. 641; State *v.* Hedge, 6 Ind. 330; Langdale *v.* People, 100 Ill. 263; State *v.* Raymond, 20 Iowa, 582; State *v.* Haney, 2 Dev. & Bat. 400; State *v.* Shepherd, 8 Ired. 195; State *v.* Smith, 63 N. C. 234; State *v.* Davis, 80 N. C. 384; State *v.* Coleman, 8 S. C. 237; State *v.* White, 15 S. C. 381; State *v.* Jefcoat, 20 S. C. 383; Williams *v.* State, 3 Heisk. 376; Fortenberry *v.* State, 55 Miss. 403; Ward *v.* State, 50 Ala. 120; Pickens *v.* State, 58 Ala. 364; State *v.* Karn, 16 La. An. 183; State *v.* Ross, 32 La. An. 854; State *v.* Morgan, 35 La. An. 293; State *v.* Edwards, 19 Mo. 674; State *v.* Lee Ping, 10 Oreg. 27; Witten *v.* State,

writing "*fifty-too*" for "*fifty-two*,"[1] and "*assalt*" for "*assault*,"[2] and "*mair*" for "*mare*."[3] The omission of a letter in the prisoner's name, in the title of a bill found by a grand jury, is not a good ground for a motion in arrest of judgment, as the prisoner had pleaded to it, and had been convicted upon it, especially where the name is properly stated in the body of the bill of indictment itself;[4] and so where "mark," in an indictment for putting a false mark on sheep, was written "make."[5] As a rule we may hold that false spelling, which does not alter the meaning of the words misspelt, is no ground for arresting judgment.[6] It is otherwise when the blunder destroys sense.[7]

Verbal inaccuracies not affecting sense not fatal.

4 Tex. Ap. 70; Stinson *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 31; Snow *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 274; Somerville *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 433; Hutto *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 44; Irvin *v.* State, Ibid. 109; Henry *v.* State, Ibid. 388; Brumley *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 114; and see particularly, as a specimen of how much carelessness can be passed by when the sense is preserved, Hackett *v.* Com., 15 Penn. St. 95. See supra, §§ 167 *et seq.*; infra, § 760; Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 114 *et seq.* As to curing by verdict, see infra, § 759.

Thus, in an indictment for selling spirituous liquors by the small measure, without license, the omission of the auxiliary verb "did," which should have been joined with the words "sell and dispose of," has been held immaterial. State *v.* Whitney, 15 Vt. 298; State *v.* Edwards, 19 Mo. 674. In an indictment, however, which charged that the defendant "feloniously utter and publish, dispose and pass," etc., etc., omitting the word "did" before utter, etc., the court arrested the judgment on the ground of uncertainty, no charge being made that the prisoner did the act. State *v.* Halder, 2 McCord, 377. See State *v.* Hutchinson, 26 Tex. 111; State *v.* Daugherty, 30 Tex. 360; State *v.* Earp. 41 Tex. 487; Koontz *v.* State, 41 Tex. 570.

[1] State *v.* Hedge, 6 Ind. 333.

[2] State *v.* Crane, 4 Wis. 400.

[3] State *v.* Meyers, 85 Tenn. 203.

[4] State *v.* Dustoe, 1 Bay, 377. Infra, §§ 760 *et seq.*

[5] State *v.* Davis, 1 Ired. 125.

[6] State *v.* Molier, 1 Dev. 263. See State *v.* Caspary, 11 Richs. 356; State *v.* Wimberly, 3 McCord, 190; State *v.* Karn, 16 La. An. 183; State *v.* Carter, Conf. Rep. 210; S. C. 2 Hay, 140, Taylor, J., dissenting. People *v.* St. Clair, 55 Cal. 524.

In a bill of indictment with three counts, if in the third count it is omitted to be stated that the grand jury, "on their oath," present (the first two counts being regular in that respect), the objection is obviated by the fact that the record states that the grand jury was sworn in open court. Huffman *v.* Com., 6 Randolph, 685.

The substitution of "an" for "the," in an indictment for perjury, was held immaterial; People *v.* Warner, 5 Wend. 271; and the substitution of "on" for "of," in the expression, "notes on the Bank U. S.," will be disregarded. McLaughlin *v.* Com., 4 Rawle, 464; Harris *v.* State, 3 Lea, 324.

[7] State *v.* Edwards, 70 Mo. 480;

§ 274. Words written at length are not only more certain, but less liable to alteration, than figures; and, therefore, when the year and day of the month are inserted in any part of an indictment, they are more properly inserted in words written at length than in Arabic characters, but a contrary practice will not vitiate an indictment.[1] The terms *anno domini*, in an information or bill of indictment, are equivalent to the year of our Lord. Either is good, and so is the want of either.[2] But some signs ("A. D.," or "in the year") must appear to show what the figures mean.[3] Hence it is not fatal that the date, instead of being written in full, is abbreviated, as A. D. 1830, if the figures are plainly legible.[4] And where a bill was found on the 2d of January, 1839, and the indorsement of the plea of not guilty was dated as of the 2d of January, 1838, this was held to be a mere clerical error, and amendable.[5] But when a written instrument in figures is copied, the figures are to be given.[6]

Questions as to abbreviations.

§ 275. Where an indictment commenced, "the grand jurors within and the body of the county," etc., it was held, that the omission of the word "for" was not fatal.[7] And so of the omission of the word "present," in the commencement.[8] It is otherwise as to dropping an essential word; *e. g.*, "did."[9]

Omission of formal words may not be fatal.

Strader *v.* State, 92 Ind. 376; People *v.* St. Clair, 56 Cal. 406; Haney *v.* State, 2 Tex. Ap. 504; Cox *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 254; Jones *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 349.

[1] Supra, §§ 124, 125; State *v.* Reed, 35 Me. 489; Lazier *v.* Com., 10 Grattan, 708; Kelly *v.* State, 3 Sm. & Marsh. 518; State *v.* Raiford, 7 Porter, 101; State *v.* Seamons, 1 Greene (Iowa), 418; Winfield *v.* State, 3 Greene (Iowa), 339; though see Berrian *v.* State, 2 Zabr. 9; State *v.* Voshal, 4 Ind. 589.

[2] State *v.* Gilbert, 13 Vt. 647; Hall *v.* State, 3 Kelley, 18; but see Whiteside *v.* People, Breese's R. 4; and see fully supra, §§ 124, 125.

[3] Com. *v.* Doran, 14 Gray, 37; Com. *v.* McLoon, 5 Gray, 91; Engleman *v.* State, 2 Ind. 91; though *contra*, Rawson *v.* State, 19 Conn. 292.

[4] State *v.* Hodgeden, 3 Vt. 481; Bouvier's Law Dictionary, "Figures." And see supra, §§ 124, 125. See Engleman *v.* State, 2 Ind. 91.

[5] Com. *v.* Chauncey, 2 Ash. 90.

"First of March," instead of "first day of March," is not fatal. Simmons *v.* Com., 1 Rawle, 142.

[6] See supra, § 167.

[7] State *v.* Brady, 14 Vt. 353.

[8] State *v.* Freeman, 21 Mo. (6 Bennet), 481. See Abernethy *v.* State, 78 Ala. 411.

It is not fatal to omit the word "so," in the passage, "and so the jurors, etc.,

[9] Moore *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 42.

§ 276. Mere signs, however, cannot be substituted for words. Thus in Vermont under the statute requiring indictments to be in English, it was held bad on demurrer for an indictment to use the mathematical signs, (° ′) in place of "degrees" and "minutes."[1] Where the substitution is purely arbitrary this holds good at common law.[2] And scientific abbreviations cannot be used without explanation.[3]

Signs cannot be substituted for words.

§ 277. *Erasures and interlineations* do not, on a motion in arrest of judgment, vitiate an indictment otherwise legible,[4] and interlineations may be read so as to make sense without regard to the *caret*,[5] though the *caret* will ordinarily be regarded as decisive of the point of introduction.[6] Even a *pencil* interlineation has been sustained.[7] But defects of this kind, though not fatal in motions in arrest, may sustain a motion to quash.[8]

Erasures and interlineations are not fatal.

§ 278. That an indictment has been defaced, or even torn into separate parts, does not affect its validity, if the record be preserved in a legible state,[9] and the question of legibility is for the court.[10] And there is authority to

Tearing or defacing not necessarily fatal.

do present;" State *v.* Moses, 2 Dev. 452; nor the word "did," before "assault," in an indictment for an assault. State *v.* Edwards, 19 Mo. 674. Supra, § 273.

It is not a fatal objection to an indictment that the name of a grand juror in the caption does not correspond with his name in the panel, nor that the indictment is stated as found upon the *oaths*, instead of the *oath*, of the inquest. State *v.* Dayton, 3 Zabr. 49. Supra, § 92.

[1] State *v.* Jericho, 40 Vt. 121; though see State *v.* Gilbert, 13 Vt. 647.

[2] A clerk of the court placed on the margin, by several counts, the numbers one, two, and so on, and, by mistake or otherwise, began to number at the second count, and the same error was continued through the whole number of counts; and the jury returned a verdict of guilty on the seventh or eighth count, "as marked." It was held, that it was error for the court to render sentence on the seventh and eighth counts of the indictment as found. Woodford *v.* State, 1 Ohio State R. 427.

[3] U. S. *v.* Peichart, 32 Fed. Rep. 142.

[4] Com. *v.* Fagan, 15 Gray, 194; French *v.* State, 12 Ind. 670. The question of erasure or interlineation is for the court. Ibid.; Com. *v.* Davis, 11 Gray, 4; Com. *v.* Riggs, 14 Gray, 376.

[5] State *v.* Daniels, 44 N. H. 383. But see R. *v.* Davis, 7 C. & P. 319.

[6] R. *v.* Davis, 7 C. & P. 319.

[7] May *v.* State, 14 Ohio, 461. Infra, § 278 *a*.

[8] Com. *v.* Desmarteau, 16 Gray, 16.

[9] Com. *v.* Roland, 97 Mass. 598.

[10] Com. *v.* Davis, 11 Gray, 4; Com. *v.* Riggs, 14 Gray, 376.

Lost indictment.

the effect that a lost indictment may at common law, when it is not practicable to find a new bill, be prosecuted, after plea, on parol proof of its contents, or by a copy.[1]

Pencil writing may be sufficient.

§ 278 *a*. It is seen in another work[2] that a pencil writing may be a valid document, even under the statute of frauds. Objectionable as this mode of writing may be, and strong as may be the reason for quashing an indictment written in pencil in such a way as to be uncertain, it cannot be said that after the jury has passed on the indictment, the fact that it is in whole or in part in pencil is ground for a motion in arrest. "Pencil" writing, in fact, it may be difficult to distinguish from "ink" writing. Some pencils write with what is virtually condensed ink. Some ink may be as pale and evanescent as the lead commonly used in pencils.[3]

XVI. CONCLUSION OF INDICTMENTS.

Conclusion must conform to constitution or statute.

§ 279. The constitutions of most of the States contain a provision that all indictments shall conclude against their peace and dignity, respectively, and when so the conclusion must be thus given in the indictment.[4] In the United States Courts the conclusion is against the form of the

[1] State *v.* Gardner, 13 Lea, 134, overruling State *v.* Harrison, 10 Yerg. 542. In Bradford *v.* State, 54 Ala. 230, it was held that where an indictment was lost *after plea*, it could be supplied by a copy. S. P. State *v.* Simpson, 67 Mo. 647; State *v.* Rivers, 58 Iowa, 102, where a certified copy was received; Buckner *v.* State, 56 Ind. 208; Miller *v.* State, 41 Ark. 489. In Gannaway *v.* State, 22 Ala. 777, this was denied in a case where the indictment was lost before arraignment. In Mount *v.* State, 14 Ohio, 295, it was held that a loss *after conviction* could be so supplied. In Bradshaw *v.* Com., 16 Grat. 507, where an indictment was lost *after plea*, it was held that it could not be supplied. And see Com. *v.* Keger, 1 Duval, 240, and State *v.* Harrison, 10 Yerg. 542, where it was held that a copy not made by judicial authority would not be sustained. As to statutory provisions by which such substitution can be effected, see State *v.* Stevisinger, 61 Iowa, 623; State *v.* Simpson, 67 Mo. 647; State *v.* Elliott, 14 Tex. 423; Magee *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 367; Pierce *v.* State, Ibid. 365; Schultz *v.* State, 15 Tex. Ap. 258.

[2] Whart. on Ev. § 666.

[3] See R. *v.* Warshaner, 1 Mood. C. C. 466; 7 C. & P. 429; May *v.* State, supra.

[4] See, for forms, Whart. Prec. 3, 4, 5, etc.; and see Lemons *v.* State, 4 W. Va. 755; State *v.* Johnson, 35 La. An. 842; Rice *v.* State, 3 Heisk. 215; Holden *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 225. Thompson *v.* State, 15 Tex. Ap. 39. But informations are not bound by the limitation. Nichols *v.* State, 35 Wis. 308.

statute and the peace and dignity of the United States.[1] In the several States the conclusion is sometimes prescribed by statute, sometimes by constitution.[2] As a rule, however, when a particular conclusion is peremptorily imposed by constitution or statute, the conclusion must be given as presented.[3] An interpolation, however, of the words "people of" or other surplusage, does not vitiate.[4]

Where statute creates or modifies an offence, conclusion should be statutory.

§ 280. Where a statute creates an offence, or declares a common law offence, when committed under particular circumstances, not necessarily in the original offence, punishable in a different manner from what it would have been without such circumstances; or where the statute changes the nature of the common law offence to one of a higher degree, as where what was originally a misdemeanor is made a felony, the indictment should conform to the statute creating or changing the nature of the offence, and should, at common law, conclude against the form of the statute.[5] Under a statute revising and absorbing the common law, the conclusion

[1] U. S. *v.* Bader, 4 Woods, 189.

[2] The following cases may be referred to in this connection: New Hampshire, State *v.* Kean, 10 N. H. 347. Pennsylvania, Com. *v.* Rogers, 5 S. & R. 463. North Carolina, State *v.* Parker, 81 N. C. 531; State *v.* Joyner, 81 N. C. 534. South Carolina, State *v.* Washington, 1 Bay, 120; State *v.* Anthony, 10 S. C. 19; State *v.* Yaney, 1 Con. R. 237; State *v.* Strickland, 10 S. C. 19. Illinois, Zareseller *v.* People, 17 Ill. 101. Iowa, Hariman *v.* State, 2 Greene, 270. Kentucky, Com. *v.* Young, 7 B. Mon. 1; Allen *v.* Com., 2 Bidd, 210. Mississippi, State *v.* Johnson, 1 Walk. 392. Colorado, Paebard *v.* People, 8 Col. 361.

[3] Com. *v.* Carney, 4 Grat. 546; Thompson *v.* Com., 20 Grat. 724; Lemons *v.* State, 4 W. Va. 755; State *v.* Allen, 8 W. Va. 680; State *v.* McCoy, 29 La. An. 593; State *v.* Lopez, 19 Mo. 254; State *v.* Reaky, 1 Mo. Ap. 9; State *v.* Durst, 7 Tex. Ap. 74; Cox *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 254; Haren *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 333; Burrard *v.* State, 20 Ark. 106; Anderson *v.* State, 20 Ark. 106.

[4] State *v.* Cadle, 19 Ark. 613.

[5] 1 Hale, 172, 189, 192; Dougl. 441; 1 Salk. 370; 13 East, 258; 5 Mod. 307; 2 Ld. Raym. 1104; 1 Saund. 135 *a*, n. 3, 4; 2 Hawk. c. 23, s. 99; c. 25, s. 116; Bac. Ab. Indictment, H. 4; Burn, J., Indict. ix.; Cro. C. C. 39; 1 Chitty on Pleading, 358; 2 Hale, 189; Browne's case, 3 Greenl. 177; State *v.* Soule, 20 Me. 19; Com. *v.* Springfield, 7 Mass. 9; Com. *v.* Stockbridge, 11 Mass. 279; Com. *v.* Northampton, 2 Mass. 116; Com. *v.* Cooley, 10 Pick. 37; Com. *v.* Searle, 6 Binn. 332; Chapman *v.* Com., 5 Whart. 427; State *v.* Gray, 14 Rich. S. C. 174; State *v.* McKettrick, 14 S. C. 346; Beasley *v.* State, 18 Ala. 535. As to relations of statutes to common law, see supra, § 232.

must be statutory.[1] When the constitution does not forbid, a statutory conclusion may be dispensed with by statute.[2]

Otherwise when statute does not modify offence.

§ 281. It is otherwise where the statute is only declaratory of what was a previous offence at common law, without adding to or altering the punishment.[3] And where a statute only inflicts a punishment on that which was *an offence* before, judgment may be given for the punishment prescribed therein, though the indictment does not conclude *contra formam statuti*, etc.[4] This is clearly the case when the statute only mitigates the common law punishment.[5]

[1] Com. *v.* Cooley, *ut supra;* Com. *v.* Dennis, 105 Mass. 162.

[2] This is the case in England. Castro *v.* R., L. R. 6 App. Ca. 229; 44 L. J. (N. S.) 351; L. R. 5 Q. B. D. 490; 14 Cox C. C. 546.

[3] 1 Deac. Crim. Law, 661; People *v.* Enoch, 13 Wendell, 175, per Walworth, Chanc.; Warner *v.* Com., 1 Barr, 154; State *v.* Evans, 7 Gill & J. 290; State *v.* Jim, 3 Murph. 3. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 25–6.

[4] State *v.* Burt, 25 Vt. 373; Com. *v.* Searle, 2 Binn. 332; Russell *v.* Com., 7 S. & R. 489; White *v.* Com., 6 Binn. 179; Chiles *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 260; State *v.* Ratts, 63 N. C. 503; State *v.* Stedman, 7 Port. 495; 2 Hale, 190; 1 Saund. 135 *a*, n. 3, 6; 2 Roll. Abr. 82. See People *v.* Cook, 2 Parker C. R. 12; State *v.* Jim, 3 Murph. 3. Infra, § 287.

[5] State *v.* Lawrence, 81 N. C. 521; State *v.* Thorne, 81 N. C. 555.

In Massachusetts, a conclusion "against the peace and the statute," is good; Com. *v.* Caldwell, 14 Mass. 330; though in the same State it was held insufficient to charge the offence as committed against the law in such case made and provided. Com. *v.* Stockbridge, 11 Mass. 279.

In Kentucky, by the Code, an indictment is sufficient if it show intelligibly the offence intended to be charged, and need not conclude "against the form of the statute." Com. *v.* Kennedy, 15 B. Mon. (Ky.) 531.

In Arkansas, the omission of the words "contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided," does not vitiate the indictment under the Code (Dig. c. 52, § 98), though the offence be created by statute. State *v.* Cadle, 19 Ark. Rep. 613.

In the United States courts, a conclusion "contrary to the true intent and meaning of the act of Congress, in such case made and provided," has been held sufficient. U. S. *v.* La Costa, 2 Mason, 129; U. S. *v.* Smith, 2 Mason, 143. But see U. S. *v.* Crittenden, 1 Hempst. 61. But an indictment charging A. with having committed an offence, made such by a statute, "in contempt of the laws of the United States of America," is bad. U. S. *v.* Andrews, 2 Paine C. C. 451.

The proper office of the conclusion, *contra formam statuti*, is to show the court the action is founded on the statute, and is not an action at common law. Crain *v.* State, 2 Yerg. 390. One count concluding "*contra formam*," etc., does not cure another without the proper conclusion. State *v.* Soule, 20 Me. 19. But such a conclusion of the final count has been held in Alabama to validate prior counts defective in

The fact that the last averment of an indictment is of a former conviction, does not constitute any objection to giving the indictment the ordinary conclusion.[1]

Such conclusion does not cure defects.

§ 282. An indictment in which the statute is defectively set forth is not cured by a statutory conclusion.[2]

Conclusion need not be in plural.

§ 283. Where the offence is governed or limited by two statutes, there have been various distinctions taken respecting the conclusion against the form of the statutes in the plural or the statute in the singular. The rule given by the older writers is, that where an offence is prohibited by several independent statutes, it was necessary to conclude in the plural; but now the better opinion seems to be, that a conclusion in the singular will suffice.[3] The common practice now is to conclude in the singular in all cases, though in Maryland,[4] and in Indiana,[5] it has been held that when an offence is prohibited by one act of assembly, and the punishment prescribed and affixed by another, the conclusion should be against the acts of assembly.

Though there is but one statute prohibiting an offence, it is not fatal for the indictment to conclude contrary to the "statutes."[6]

§ 284. In a common law indictment, the words *contra formam*

this respect. McGuire *v.* State, 1 Ala. Sel. Ca. 69; 37 Ala. 161.

[1] People *v.* O'Brien, 64 Cal. 53.

[2] 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 110. Supra, § 229.

[3] 1 Hale, 173; Sid. 348; Owen, 135; 2 Leach, 827; 1 Dyer, 347 *a.*; 4 Co. 48; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 117; R. *v.* Pim, R. & R. 425; though see R. *v.* Adams, C. & M. 299; U. S. *v.* Trout, 4 Biss. 105; Butman's case, 8 Greenl. 113; Kane *v.* People, 9 Wend. 203; Townley *v.* State, 3 Harr. N. J. 311; State *v.* Jones, 4 Halst. 357; State *v.* Dayton, 3 Zabr. 49; Bennett *v.* State, 3 Ind. 167; State *v.* Robbins, 1 Strobh. 355; State *v.* Bell, 3 Ired. 506.

[4] State *v.* Cassell, 2 Harr. & Gill, 407. See, also, State *v.* Pool, 2 Dev. 202.

[5] Francisco *v.* State, 1 Carter, 179; King *v.* State, 2 Ibid. 523. See Crawford *v.* State, 2 Ibid. 132. But where an indictment for murder concluded *contra formam statuti*, and by the statute of 1843 the punishment of that crime was death; but by the Act of 1846 the punishment is either death or imprisonment in the State prison at hard labor during life, at the discretion of the jury, it was held that the conclusion of the indictment in the singular, to wit, *contra formam statuti*, was correct. Bennett *v.* State, 3 Ind. 167.

[6] Townley *v.* State, 3 Harr. N. J. 311; Carter *v.* State, 2 Carter (Ind.), 617; but see *contra*, State *v.* Cassel, 2 Harr. & G. 407; State *v.* Abernathy, 1 Busbee, 428.

statuti may be rejected as surplusage.[1] And where an offence, both by statute and common law, is badly laid under the statute, the judgment may be given at common law.[2]

Statutory conclusion may be rejected as surplusage.

XVII. JOINDER OF OFFENCES.

§ 285. A defendant, as has been already seen, cannot generally be charged with two distinct offences in a single count. It is otherwise, however, when we approach the question of the introduction of a series of distinct counts. Offences, it is held, though differing from each other, and varying in the punishments authorized to be inflicted for their perpetration, and though committed at different times, may be included in the same indictment, and the accused tried upon the several charges at the same time, provided that the offences be of the same general character, and provided the mode of trial is the same.[3] In misdemeanors, the joinder of several offences will

Counts for offences of the same character and the same mode of trial may be joined.

[1] State *v.* Schloss, 63 Mo. 361; 2 Hale, 190; Alleyn, 43; 1 Salk. 212, 213; 5 T. R. 162; 2 Leach, 584; 2 Salk. 460; 1 Ld. Raym. 1163; 1 Saund. 135, n. 3; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 115; Bac. Ab. Indict. H. 2; Burn, J., Indict. ix. State *v.* Burt, 25 Vt. 373; State *v.* Gove, 34 N. H. 510; State *v.* Buckman, 8 N. H. 203; Com. *v.* Hoxey, 16 Mass. 385; Knowles *v.* State, 3 Day, 103; Southworth *v.* State, 5 Conn. 325; Com. *v.* Gregory, 2 Dana, 417; Resp. *v.* Newell, 3 Yeates, 407; Penn *v.* Bell, Addison, 171; White *v.* State, 15 S. C. 381; Haslip *v.* State, 4 Hayw. 273.

[2] Com. *v.* Lanigan, 2 Boston Law Rep. 49; State *v.* Phelps, 11 Vt. 117.

[3] R. *v.* Fussell, 3 Cox C. C. 291; U. S. *v.* O'Callahan, 6 McLean, 596; U. S. *v.* Wentworth, 11 Fed. Rep. 52; Charlton *v.* Com., 5 Met. 532; Josslyn *v.* Com., 6 Met. 236; Com. *v.* Costello, 120 Mass. 358; Com. *v.* Brown, 121 Mass. 69 (in Massachusetts the law is not changed by the stat. of 1861; Com. *v.* Costello, supra); People *v.* Dunn, 90 N. Y. 104; People *v.* Rynders, 12 Wend. 425; Edge *v.* Com., 7 Barr, 275; Mills *v.* Com., 13 Penn. St. 631; Nicholson *v.* Com., 96 Penn. St. 503; State *v.* Slagle, 82 N. C. 653; Hoskins *v.* State, 11 Ga. 92; Engleman *v.* State, 2 Carter (Ind.), 91; Johnson *v.* State, 29 Ala. 62; State *v.* Kibby, 7 Mo. 317; Klein *v.* State, 78 Mo. 627; State *v.* Diskin, 35 La. An. 46; State *v.* Sandoz, 37 La. An. 376; Baker *v.* State, 4 Pike, 56; State *v.* Chandler, 31 Kan. 201; Orr *v.* State, 18 Ark. 540; People *v.* Garcia, 58 Cal. 102. See, however, *contra*, when punishments differ in character, Norvell *v.* State, 50 Ala. 174.

The U. S. Revised Stats. § 1024, provides that charges which may be joined in one indictment may be consolidated by order of the court. U. S. *v.* Bennett, 17 Blatch. 357. This, however, does not justify joining incongruous counts. U. S. *v.* Gaston, 28 Fed. Rep. 848. In California it is by statute provided that only one offence is to be included in an indictment. People *v.* De Coursey, 61 Cal. 134.

not vitiate the prosecution in any stage.[1] Hence, it is the constant practice to permit counts for several libels or assaults to be joined in the same indictment.[2] And in a leading case,[3] under several counts for a conspiracy alleging several conspiracies of the same kind, on the same day, the prosecutor was allowed to give in evidence several conspiracies on different days.[4] In what cases election will be compelled will be considered in a future section.[5]

Assaults on two persons can be joined.

§ 286. It was once said that a person could not be prosecuted upon one indictment for assaulting two persons, each assault being a distinct offence.[6] But in a subsequent case,[7] the court held this position not to be law, and said: "Cannot the king call a man to account for a breach of the peace, because he broke two heads instead of one? It is a prosecution in the king's name for the offence charged, and not in the nature of an action, where a person injured is to recover separate damages."[8]

So in conspiracy and assault.

§ 287. So may be joined counts for a misdemeanor with counts for a conspiracy to commit a misdemeanor,[9] and assault with assault with intent.[10]

Common law and statute.

§ 288. An indictment may also contain a count at common law and another under a statute.[11]

[1] Young *v.* R., 3 T. R. 105; R. *v.* Jones, 2 Camp. 132; R. *v.* Benfield, 2 Burr. 984; R. *v.* Kingston, 2 East. 468; U. S. *v.* Peterson, 1 W. & M. 305; U. S. *v.* Porter, 2 Cranch C. C. 60; People *v.* Costello, 1 Denio, 83; Harman *v.* Com., 12 S. & R. 69; Com. *v.* Gillespie, 7 S. & R. 476; Weinzorpflin *v.* State, 7 Blackf. 186; State *v.* Gummer, 22 Wis. 441; State *v.* Schweiter, 27 Kan. 499; Quinn *v.* State, 49 Ala. 353; State *v.* Randle, 41 Tex. 292. Infra, § 293. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 978.

[2] Ibid.

[3] R. *v.* Levy, 2 Stark. N. P. 458. See Res. *v.* Hevice, 2 Yeates, 114; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1387.

[4] See, also, R. *v.* Broughton, 1 Trem. P. C. 111, where the indictment charged no less than twenty distinct acts of extortion. The indictment against Mayor Hall, tried in New York, October, 1872, contained four counts for each of fifty-five different acts, containing two hundred and twenty counts in all.

[5] Infra, § 293.

[6] R. *v.* Clendon, 2 Ld. Raym. 1572; 2 Str. 870.

[7] R. *v.* Benfield, 2 Burr. 984. See supra, § 254, for other cases.

[8] Supra, § 254.

[9] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1387; R. *v.* Murphy, 8 C. & P. 297; Com. *v.* Gillespie, 7 S. & R. 476, 477; 6 P. L. J. 283; Thomas *v.* People, 113 Ill. 531.

[10] People *v.* Sweeny, 55 Mich. 586. Supra, § 247.

[11] Com. *v.* Sylvester, *ut supra;* Com. *v.* Ismahl, 134 Mass. 201; State *v.* Williams, 2 McCord, 301; Brightly R. 331; State *v.* Thompson, 2 Strobh. 12. Infra, § 291.

§ 289. Nor does it vary the case that one offence is a felony and the other a misdemeanor, one being part of the same transaction with the other.[1] Thus in an English case reserved, it was held by Lord Campbell, C. J., Cresswell, J., Coleridge, J., Platt, B., and Williams, J., that it is no ground for arresting a judgment upon conviction of felony that the indictment contained a count for a misdemeanor.[2] And indictments will be sustained which join larceny with conspiracy to defraud, both based on the same transaction;[3] and a felony with a misdemeanor, forming distinct stages in the same offence.[4] It has been held, however, that murder cannot be joined with conspiracy to murder;[5] nor rape with incest;[6] though these rulings are open to doubt.

And so of felony and misdemeanor.

§ 290. Where two or more distinct felonies are contained in the same indictment, it may be quashed, or the prosecutor compelled to elect on which charge he will proceed,[7] but the indictment will not be quashed or set aside on demurrer where several counts are introduced solely for the purpose of meeting the evidence as it may transpire, the charges being substantially for the same offence, or for cognate offences;[8] though when the offences developed in the evidence are distinct, the prosecution, as will presently be seen, will be compelled before verdict to elect that on which it relies.[9] And it is a common practice

Cognate felonies may be joined.

[1] Staeger *v.* Com., 103 Penn. St. 469.

[2] R. *v.* Ferguson, 29 Eng. Law & Eq. 536; 6 Cox C. C. 454. Infra, § 759.

[3] Henwood *v.* Com., 52 Penn. St. 424.

[4] Stevick *v.* Com., 78 Penn. St. 460; Hunter *v.* Com., 79 Penn. St. 503; People *v.* Satterlee, 5 Hun, 167; infra, § 293.

[5] U. S. *v.* Scott, 4 Biss. 29; *sed quaere.* So in Georgia, as to joinder of robbery and assault. Davis *v.* State, 57 Ga. 66. Infra, § 292.

[6] State *v.* Thomas, 53 Iowa, 214, Beck and Day, JJ., dissenting. See supra, § 249 ff; infra, § 291.

[7] Lazier *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 708; State *v.* Reel, 80 N. C. 442; Womack *v.* State, 7 Cold. (Tenn.) 508; McGahahin *v.* State, 17 Fla. 665; People *v.* Garcia, 58 Cal. 102. Infra, §§ 293, 307, 736, 771 *et seq.* That such joinder is not bad on demurrer see State *v.* Smalley, 50 Vt. 736. Infra, §§ 400 *et seq.*

[8] State *v.* Lockwood, 88 Vt. 378; State *v.* Elsham, 70 Iowa, 531.

[9] R. *v.* Trueman, 8 C. & P. 727; State *v.* Nelson, 29 Me. 329; Com. *v.* Hills, 10 Cush. 530; Com. *v.* Sullivan, 104 Mass. 552; State *v.* Tuller, 34 Conn. 281; State *v.* Hazard, 2 R. I. 474; Kane *v.* People, 8 Wend. 203; Donnelly *v.* State, 2 Dutch. (N. J.) 463, 601; Wright *v.* State, 4 Humph. 194; Cash *v.* State, 10 Humph. 111; Weinzorpflin *v.* State, 7 Black. 186; Mershorn *v.* State, 51 Ind. 14; Short *v.* State, 63 Ind. 376; State *v.* Weil, 89 Ind. 286; Hubbard *v.* State, 72 Ala. 164; State *v.* Stricklaud, 10 S. C. 191; State *v.* Scott, 15 S. C. 434; State *v.* Jacob, 10 La. R.

to join counts for distinct felonies, when constructed on different sections of the same statute.[1] Thus, for instance, in indictments under the Massachusetts statute for arson or burglary, where the common law offence is divided into distinct grades, counts may be joined embracing each section.[2]

Successive grades may be joined.

§ 291. Felonies and misdemeanors, forming part of the development of the same transaction, may in like manner be joined.[3] Thus, where an assault is an ingredient of a felony, as in the case of rape, and assault with intent to commit rape; or larceny and conspiracy to steal;[4] or where accessorship is joined to the principal offence;[5] or where the misdemeanor is of the nature of a corollary to the felony, as in forgery and uttering;[6] as in larceny and the receiving of stolen goods;[7] and as in burglary and receiving;[8] a joinder is good. So, by Judge Wood-

141; Ketchingham *v.* State, 6 Wis. 426; People *v.* Thompson, 28 Cal. 214; People *v.* Valencia, 43 Cal. 552; Fisher *v.* State, 33 Tex. 792; Gonzales *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 657. Infra, §§ 308 *et seq.* See Charlton *v.* Com., 5 Met. 532; Com. *v.* Cain, 102 Mass. 487, cited infra, § 910. In People *v.* DeCourcey, 61 Cal. 134, it was held that larceny and embezzlement could not be enjoined.

[1] See Com. *v.* Pratt, 137 Mass. 98.

[2] Com. *v.* Hope, 22 Pick. 1; Com. *v.* Sullivan, 104 Mass. 552.

[3] Hunter *v.* Com., 79 Penn. St. 503; Stevick *v.* Com., 78 Penn. St. 466; Hutchison *v.* Com., 82 Penn. St. 472; see State *v.* Johnson, 5 Jones (N. C.) 221; Campbell *v.* People, 109 Ill. 565.

[4] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1387; Henwood *v.* Com., 52 Penn. St. 424; State *v.* Hood, 51 Me. 363; State *v.* Watts, 82 N. C. 656; Cawley *v.* State, 37 Ala. 152. Supra, §§ 285, 286; infra, §§ 736 *et seq.*

[5] Infra, § 293.

[6] Foute *v.* State, 15 Lea, 712; Boles *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 650, though see State *v.* Henry, 59 Iowa, 391.

[7] R. *v.* Huntley, 8 Cox C. C. 260; R. *v.* Ferguson, 6 Cox C. C. 454; R. *v.* Craddock, 2 Den. C. C. 31; R. *v.* Flower, 3 C. & P. 413; R. *v.* Hilton, Bell, 201; 8 Cox, 87; U. S. *v.* Prior, 5 Cranch C. C. 37; State *v.* Stimpson, 45 Me. 608; Com. *v.* Adams, 7 Gray, 43; Com. *v.* O'Connell, 12 Allen, 451; State *v.* Hazard, 2 R. I. 474; Harman *v.* Com., 12 Serg. & R. 69; Buck *v.* State, 2 Harr. & J. 426; State *v.* Sutton, 4 Gill. 495; Dowdy *v.* Com., 9 Grat. 727; State *v.* Speight, 69 N. C. 72; State *v.* Baker, 70 N. C. 530; State *v.* Lawrence, 81 N. C. 522; State *v.* Gaffney, Rice, 431; State *v.* Boyes, 1 McM. 191; State *v.* Montague, 2 McCord, 257; State *v.* Posey, 7 Richard. 484; Stephen *v.* State, 11 Ga. 225; Johnson *v.* State, 61 Ga. 212; State *v.* Coleman, 5 Port. 32; State *v.* Daubert, 42 Mo. 243; Bennett *v.* People, 96 Ill. 102; Keefer *v.* State, 14 Ind. 246; State *v.* Moultrie, 33 La. An. 1146. As to election, see infra, § 293.

When the offences are cognate, "it matters not that the offences alleged in the several counts are of different grades, and call for different punishments." Earl, J., Hawker *v.* People, 75 N. Y. 496.

[8] Com. *v.* Darling, 129 Mass. 112; State *v.* Strickland, 10 S. C. 191.

bury, it was ruled, that if there be two counts in one indictment for offences committed at the same time and place, and of the same class, but different in degree, as one for a revolt, and another for an attempt to excite it, the judgment will not be arrested, though a verdict of guilty be returned on both.[1] It has also been held that seduction can be joined with fornication and bastardy.[2]

§ 292. It was formerly held, that if the legal judgment on each count would be materially different, as in felony and misdemeanor, then the joinder of several counts would be bad on demurrer, in arrest of judgment, or on error,[3] though this objection could be cured at the trial by taking a verdict on the counts only that can be joined.[4] At present, after a general verdict of guilty, it is considered no objection to an

Joinder of different offences no ground for error.

[1] U. S. *v.* Peterson, 1 W. & M. 305.

In New York, when by statute an offence comprises different degrees, an indictment may contain counts for the different degrees of the same offence, or for any of such degrees. Rev. Stat. part iv. c. 11, tit. 3, art. 2, § 51. And so under U. S. Rev. Stat. U. S. *v.* Jacoby, 12 Blatch. 491. The joinder of embezzlement with larceny has equal sanction. Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1047.

Where an indictment charges in one count a breaking and entering of a building, with intent to steal, and in another count, a stealing in the same building on the same day, and the defendant is found guilty generally, the sentence, whether that which is proper for burglary only, or for burglary and larceny also, cannot be reversed on error, because the record does not show whether one offence only, or two were proved on the trial; and as this must be known by the judge who tried the case, the sentence will be presumed to have been according to the law that was applicable to the facts proved. Crowley *v.* Com., 11 Met. 575; Kite *v.* Com., 11 Met. 581; Com. *v.* Birdsall, 69 Penn. St. 482. See People *v.* Garnett, 29 Cal. 622. *Contra*, Wilson *v.* State, 20 Ohio, 26. A count in an indictment, which charges the breaking and entering in the night-time of a shop adjoining to a dwelling-house, with intent to commit a larceny, may be joined with a count which charges the stealing of goods in the same shop, and the defendant, if found guilty generally, may be sentenced for both offences. But if the breaking and entering, and the actual stealing, are charged in one count, only one offence is charged, and the defendant, on conviction, can be sentenced to one penalty only. Josslyn *v.* Com., 6 Met. 236; Davis *v.* State, 57 Ga. 66; see State *v.* Nelson, 14 Rich. (S. C.) L. 169.

[2] Nicholson *v.* Com., 91 Penn. St. 390.

[3] Young *v.* R., 3 T. R. 103; Hancock *v.* Haywood, Ibid. 435; but see 1 East P. C. 408; 1 Chitty's C. L. 254, 255; State *v.* Merrill, 44 N. H. 624; State *v.* Freels, 3 Humph. 228; Hildebrand *v.* State, 5 Mo. 548; Compare Buck *v.* State, 1 Ohio St. R. 61. Infra, §§ 737, 771, 910.

[4] R. *v.* Jones, 8 C. & P. 776.

indictment, on motion in arrest, that offences of different grades and requiring different punishments are charged in the different counts.[1] If any one of the counts is sufficient, the court, it has been argued, will render judgment upon such count; and if all the counts are sufficient, judgment will be rendered on the count charging the highest offence.[2] There is also high authority, to be hereafter noticed, to the effect that when there is a verdict of guilty on each of a series of counts, there may be a specific sentence imposed on each,[3] though it is otherwise in respect to counts which are defective.[4]

So far as concerns the jury, on the trial of an indictment charging distinct offences in separate counts, the better course is to pass upon each count separately, applying to it the evidence bearing on the question of the defendant's guilt of the offence therein charged.[5] At the same time, where two counts are for successive stages of the same crime, the practice is to take a general verdict, which carries the greater offence; or where good and bad counts are joined, a verdict on the good counts.[6]

§ 293. As a general rule, when two offences charged form parts of one transaction, the one an ingredient or corollary of the other,

[1] R. *v.* Ferguson, 6 Cox C. C. 454; U. S. *v.* Stetson, 3 W. & M. 164; State *v.* Hood, 51 Me. 363; Carlton *v.* Com., 5 Met. 532; Kane *v.* People, 8 Wend. 203; Com. *v.* Birdsall, 69 Penn. St. 482; Stone *v.* State, 1 Spencer, 404; Moody *v.* State, 1 W. Va. 337; State *v.* Speight, 69 N. C. 72; State *v.* Reel, 80 N. C. 442; Covey *v.* State, 4 Port. 186; State *v.* Mallon, 75 Mo. 355. Infra, §§ 737–40, 771, 910.

[2] Infra, §§ 771, 910; State *v.* Hood, 51 Me. 363; State *v.* Hooker, 17 Vt. 658; State *v.* Merwin, 34 Conn. 113; State *v.* Tuller, 34 Conn. 281; Cook *v.* State, 4 Zab. 843; Com. *v.* McKisson, 8 S. & R. 420; Hutchison *v.* Com., 82 Penn. St. 472; Manly *v.* State, 7 Md. 149; State *v.* Nelson, 14 Rich. (S. C.) 169; Dean *v.* State, 43 Ga. 218; Cowley *v.* State, 37 Ala. 152; State *v.* McCue, 39 Mo. 112; State *v.* Core, 70 Mo. 491; Cribbs *v.* State, 9 Fla. 409; People *v.* Shotwell, 27 Cal. 394. So in England. R. *v.* Ferguson, 6 Cox C. C. 454. See, for general verdict in larceny and receiving, State *v.* Baker, 70 N. C. 530. As to how far bad count vitiates verdict, see infra, § 771.

[3] Infra, §§ 908–910.

[4] Infra, § 771; Adams *v.* State, 52 Ga. 565.

[5] Com. *v.* Carey, 103 Mass. 214; but see State *v.* Tuller, 34 Conn. 281. See infra, §§ 737–740, 908, 910.

[6] Infra, §§ 737, 740, 911; and cases cited supra.

Where a count for a misdemeanor in Pennsylvania is joined to a count for felony, the jury cannot, in acquitting the prisoner, impose costs upon him; and though such a verdict be rendered and judgment ordered, the county is liable for the costs. Wayne *v.* Com., 26 Penn. St. 154.

the prosecutor will not be ordinarily called upon to elect upon which charge he will proceed.[1] Between larceny and stolen goods, therefore, an election will not be compelled when the evidence is such that it is doubtful of which offence the defendant was guilty.[2] And the prosecutor will not be compelled to elect where a count, charging a person with being accessary before the fact, is joined with one charging him with being accessary after;[3] nor where the defendant is indicted as a principal in the first degree in one count, and as principal in the second degree or accessary in another count,[4] nor when several defendants in homicide are charged with assaulting with different weapons.[5] On the same principle, where there are counts in an indictment for forging a bill, acceptance, and indorsement, the prosecutor is not driven to elect on which he will proceed.[6]

Election will not be compelled where offences are connected.

[1] R. *v.* Jones, 2 Camp. 132; R. *v.* Austin, 7 C. & P. 796; R. *v.* Hartell, Ibid. 475; R. *v.* Wheeler, Ibid. 170; R. *v.* Pulham, 9 C. & P. 281; U. S. *v.* Neverson, 1 Mackey, 152; State *v.* Flye, 26 Me. 312; Com. *v.* Ismahl, 134 Mass. 201; People *v.* Costello, 1 Denio, 83; People *v.* Satterlee, 5 Hun, 167; People *v.* Reavy, 45 Hun, 418; Armstrong *v.* People, 70 N. Y. 38; Com. *v.* Manson, 2 Ashm. 31; People *v.* Sweney, 55 Mich. 586; State *v.* Manluff, 1 Houst. C. C. 268; State *v.* Bell, 27 Md. 675; Dowdy *v.* Com., 9 Grat. 727; State *v.* McNeill, 93 N. C. 552; State *v.* Nelson, 14 Rich. L. 169; Mayo *v.* State, 30 Ala. 32; State *v.* Hogan, R. M. Charlton, 474; State *v.* Jackson, 17 Mo. 554; State *v.* Mallon, 75 Mo. 355; Sarah *v.* State, 28 Miss. 267; Ker *v.* People, 110 Ill. 627; Miller *v.* State, 51 Ind. 405; Wall *v.* State, 51 Ind. 453; State *v.* Fisher, 37 Kan. 404; Candy *v.* State, 8 Neb. 482; State *v.* Crimmins, 31 Kan. 376; State *v.* Skinner, 34 Kan. 256; State *v.* Jacob, 10 La. An. R. 141. Masterson *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 574.

Between different items of a continuous taking election will not be compelled. R. *v.* Ward, 10 Cox C. C. 42. The offences must be individuated to sustain a demand for an election. Peacher *v.* State, 61 Ala. 22.

[2] State *v.* Hogan, Charlton, 474; Andrews *v.* People, 117 Ill. 195; Engleman *v.* State, 2 Carter (Ind.), 91; Keefer *v.* State, 4 Ind. 246; Glover *v.* State, 109 Ind. 391; Dowdy *v.* Com., 9 Grat. 727; State *v.* Morrison, 85 N. C. 561; State *v.* Daubert, 42 Mo. 242; State *v.* Bell, 27 Md. 675; State *v.* Laque, 37 La. An. 853; and cases cited supra, § 291.

[3] R. *v.* Blackson, 8 C. & P. 43; Tompkins *v.* State, 17 Ga. 356. But in R. *v.* Brannon, Law Times, Feb. 28, 1880, p. 319. Cockburn, C. J., required the prosecution to elect between two counts, one charging the defendant as principal the other as accessary after the fact.

[4] R. *v.* Gray, 7 C. & P. 164; State *v.* Testerman, 68 Mo. 408; Williams *v.* State, 69 Ga. 11; Simms *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 131.

[5] Williams *v.* State, 54 Ga. 401; Gonzales *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 584.

[6] R. *v.* Young, Peake's Add. Cas. 228.

Of course no election will be compelled when the counts vary only in form.[1] But where two assaults at different times are proved an election will be compelled;[2] and where two defendants were indicted for a conspiracy and for a libel, and at the close of the case for the prosecution, there was evidence against both as to the conspiracy, but no evidence against one of them as to the libel, an election was required.[3] The defendant is entitled to an acquittal on the abandoned counts if there be no *nolle prosequi* as to them.[4]

Object of election is to reduce to a single issue.

§ 294. Abandoning the artificial and now in most jurisdictions obsolete distinction between felonies and misdemeanors, we may hold, therefore, summing up what has been already said, the following conclusions:—

(1.) Cognate offences may be joined in separate counts in the same indictment.

(2.) If this is done in such a way as to oppress the defendant, the remedy is a motion to quash.

(3.) It is permissible, in most States, to join several distinct offences, to each of which fine or imprisonment is attachable; and upon a conviction on each count, to impose a sentence on each.[5]

(4.) Yet as to offences of high grade in all States, and in some States as to all offences, the court will not permit more than a single issue to go to the jury, and hence will require an election on the close of the prosecution's case,[6] except in those cases in which offences are so blended that it is eminently for the jury to determine which count it is that the evidence fits.[7]

[1] Stewart *v.* State, 58 Ga. 577.

[2] State *v.* Hutchings, 24 S. C. 142; Williams *v.* State, 77 Ala. 53; see Busby *v.* State, Ibid. 661.

[3] R. *v.* Murphy, 8 C. & P. 297.

[4] Ibid. State *v.* McNeill, 93 N. C. 552; State *v.* Sorrell, 98 N. C. 738.

[5] See infra, § 910.

[6] State *v.* Brown, 58 Iowa, 298.

[7] Supra, §§ 288, 290; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 540, 1047; R. *v.* Vandercomb, 2 Leach, 816; R. *v.* Smith, R. & R. 295; R. *v.* Hart, 7 C. & P. 652; R. *v.* Trueman, 8 C. & P. 727; R. *v.* Hinley, 2 M. & R. 524; U. S. *v.* Dickenson, 2 McLean, 325; State *v.* Nelson, 29 Me. 329; State *v.* Smith, 22 Vt. 74; State *v.* Croteau, 23 Vt. 14; State *v.* Hazard, 2 R. I. 474; Kane *v.* People, 8 Wend. 203; People *v.* Austin, 1 Parker C. R. 154; Lanergan *v.* People, 39 N. Y. 39; State *v.* Early, 3 Harring. 561; Bainbridge *v.* State, 30 Ohio St. 264; State *v.* Haney, 2 Dev. & Bat. 390; State *v.* Sims, 3 Strobh. 137; Tompkins *v.* State, 17 Ga. 356; Gilbert *v.* State, 65 Ga. 449; Elam *v.* State, 26 Ala. 48; Cochrane *v.* State, 30 Ala. 542; People *v.* Jenness, 5 Mich. 305; Long *v.* State, 56 Ind. 182; Kidder *v.* State, 58 Ind. 68; Snyder *v.* State, 59 Ind. 105; Goodhue *v.* People, 94 Ill.

The object of the rule, it may be added, is, *first*, to enable the defendant to prepare properly for his defence; and, *secondly*, to protect him, by an individualization of the issue, in case a second prosecution is brought against him. On the other hand, we must remember that there are a series of minor offences in which a joinder is a benefit to the defendant, even though he should be convicted on each count, as he is thus saved from an accumulation of costs that might have a crushing effect. There are numerous lines of cases in which, where separate indictments are introduced to cover a series of simultaneous or closely consecutive offences (*e. g.*, as in the cases of the famous tea suits before Judge Washington, in which a separate libel was brought for each of a thousand chests of tea alleged to have been smuggled), the court will require, in order to save the defendant from unnecessary vexation, if not ruin, that the cases be consolidated.[1]

§ 295. Whether a court will compel a prosecuting officer to elect which count to proceed on rests in the discretion of the court, and cannot ordinarily be assigned for error.[2] But when two distinct felonies are put in evidence, under separate counts, against protest, this rule, in its rigor, cannot be applied.[3] When, however, several guilty acts (as in case of adultery) are put in evidence to make out a case, it is not error that election is not compelled, when it is not specially asked for.[4]

Election at discretion of court.

§ 296. It has been said in Iowa that when the repugnancy is of record, the time for an application to elect is before plea; and the court has refused to permit a plea to be withdrawn in order to let in a motion to require an election.[5] But, as the repugnancy may not appear until the

Election may be any time before verdict.

37; State *v.* Testerman, 68 Mo. 408; State *v.* Jourdan, 32 Ark. 203; State *v.* Lancaster, 36 Ark. 55.

[1] That indictments may be consolidated in the federal courts under statute has been already seen. Supra, § 285. See, also, State *v.* McNeill, 93 N. C. 552.

[2] Infra, § 778; State *v.* Hood, 51 Me. 363; Com. *v.* Sullivan, 104 Mass. 552; Com. *v.* Pratt, 137 Mass. 98; State *v.* Tuller, 34 Conn. 281; People *v.* Baker, 3 Hill (N. Y.), 159; Nelson *v.* People, 23 N. Y. 293; State *v.* Bell, 27 Md. 675; State *v.* Smith, 24 Va. 814; Bailey *v.* State, 4 Ohio (N. S.), 440; Snyder *v.* State, 59 Ind. 105; Beaty *v.* State, 82 Ind. 228; Beasley *v.* People, 89 Ill. 571; Johnson *v.* State, 29 Ala. 62; George *v.* State, 39 Miss. 570; State *v.* Leonard, 22 Mo. 449; State *v.* Green, 66 Mo. 632.

[3] Womack *v.* State, 7 Cold. 508.

[4] State *v.* Witham, 72 Me. 531. See Whart. Cr. Ev. § 194.

[5] State *v.* Abrahams, 6 Iowa, 117.

evidence is developed, it is not in such case just to compel an election until the prosecutor knows what to elect. Hence, when necessary to justice, the motion has been held in time if made before verdict.[1] To elect a count is virtually to withdraw the others from the consideration of the jury;[2] though ordinarily the motion should be made before the defendant opens his case.[3] *After* verdict, the course is not to elect a particular count, but to enter a *nolle prosequi* as to those on which judgment is not asked.[4] But at any time *before* verdict it is within the power of the prosecution to make the election, though this should ordinarily be done before summing up.[5]

Counts should be varied to suit case.

§ 297. Every cautious pleader will insert as many counts as will be necessary to provide for every possible contingency in the evidence; and this the law permits.[6] Thus, he may vary the ownership of articles stolen, in larceny;[7] of houses burned, in arson;[8] or the fatal instrument and other incidents, in homicide.[9] Hence a verdict of guilty on four

[1] Womack *v.* State, 7 Cold. 508; State *v.* Sims, 3 Strobh. 137; Elam *v.* State, 26 Ala. 48; Johnson *v.* State, 29 Ala. 62; Wash. *v.* State, 14 Sm. & M. 120.

[2] Mills *v.* State, 52 Ind. 187.

[3] State *v.* Smith, 24 W. Va. 814.

[4] Infra, §§ 707, 740, 742, 908–10; State *v.* Reel, 80 N. C. 442.

[5] Woodford *v.* People, 62 N. Y. 117; and see infra, § 874.

[6] Beasley *v.* People, 89 Ill. 571; State *v.* Smith, 24 W. Va. 814; State *v.* Shepard, 33 La. An. 1216; see People *v.* Garcia, 58 Cal. 102. That to counts of this class, Mass. stat. 1861 does not apply, see Com. *v.* Andrews, 132 Mass. 263; Howard *v.* State, 34 Ark. 433.

[7] State *v.* Nelson, 29 Me. 329; Com. *v.* Dobbin, 2 Parsons, 380; Cooper *v.* State, 79 Ind. 206. As to verdict, see infra, § 740.

[8] R. *v.* Trueman, 8 C. & P. 727; Newman *v.* State, 14 Wis. 393.

[9] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 540; Hunter *v.* State, 40 N. J. L. 495. As to averment of weapon, see supra, § 212 *a*.

The reason for this is thus excellently stated by Chief Justice Shaw:—

"To a person unskilled and unpractised in legal proceedings, it may seem strange that several modes of death, inconsistent with each other, should be stated in the same document; but it is often necessary, and the reason for it, when explained, will be obvious. The indictment is but the charge or accusation made by the grand jury, with as much certainty and precision as the evidence before them will warrant. They may be well satisfied that the homicide was committed, and yet the evidence before them leave it somewhat doubtful as to the mode of death; but, in order to meet the evidence as it may finally appear, they are very properly allowed to set out the mode in different counts; and then if any one of them is proved, supposing it to be also legally formal, it is sufficient to support the indictment. Take

counts, charging the murder to have been committed with a knife, a dagger, a dirk, and a dirk-knife, is not double or repugnant, since the same kind of death is charged in all the counts.[1]

the instance of a murder at sea: a man is struck down, lies some time on the deck insensible, and in that condition is thrown overboard. The evidence proves the certainty of a homicide, by the blow or by the drowning, but leaves it uncertain by which. That would be a fit case for several counts, charging a death by a blow, and a death by drowning, and perhaps a third, alleging a death by the joint result of both causes combined." Bemis's Webster case, 471; S. C. 5 Cush. 533. See U. S. *v.* Pirates, 5 Wheat. 184; also Pettes *v.* Com., 126 Mass. 245; State *v.* Johnson, 10 La. An. R. 456.

How generally the same practice exists in England may appear from the very pertinent inquiry of Alderson, B., in a recent case: "Why may there not be as many counts for receiving as there are for stealing—one for each? It is really only one offence, laying the property in different persons. It is one stealing, and one receiving; and because there was some doubt as to the person to whom the property really belonged, the property is laid five different ways. If a late learned judge had drawn the indictment, you would very likely had it laid in fifty more." R. *v.* Beeton, 2 Car. & Kir. 961, Alderson, B. To same effect, see Beasley *v.* People, 89 Ill. 571; People *v.* Thompson, 28 Cal. 214. See, as to verdict to be taken in such cases, infra, § 740.

"In R. *v.* Sillem (2 H. & C. 431), as information (which might have been an indictment) charged certain persons in substance with having equipped for the Confederate States, then at war with the United States, a ship called the Alexandra. The information was framed upon 59 Geo. 3, c. 69, and contained ninety-five counts. The first count charged an equipping with intent that the ship should be employed by certain foreign States, styling themselves the Confederate States, with intent to cruise against the Republic of the United States. The second count, instead of the Republic of the United States, mentioned the citizens of the Republic of the United States. The third count omitted all mention of the Confederate States, and called the United States the Republic of, etc. The fourth count was like the third, with the exception of returning to the expression 'citizens,' etc. After giving various names to the United States and Confederate States in the first eight counts, eight other counts were added substituting 'furnish' for 'equip.' Eight more substituted 'fit out' for 'furnish.' In short, the indictment contained a number of counts obtained by combining every operative verb of the section on which it was founded with all the other operative words." Report of English commissioners of 1879.

Lord Campbell in R. *v.* Rowlands, 2 Den. C. C. 38, and Lord Denman in R. *v.* O'Connell, 11 Cl. & F. 374, censure the undue multiplication of counts; though under common law pleading, this, in complicated cases, cannot be avoided. To split the charge in distinct indictments would unduly accumulate costs, and would expose the prosecution to an application to consolidate.

[1] Donnelly *v.* State, 2 Dutch. (N. J.) 463; affirmed in error, 2 Dutch. (N. J.) 601. Supra, §§ 290 *et seq.*; infra, §§ 736 *et seq.* To same effect, see Merrick *v.* State, 63 Ind. 637; Jones *v.*

§ 298. As both in civil and criminal pleading two counts charging the same thing would be bad on special demurrer for duplicity—though the fault in civil pleading is cured by pleading over—it has been usual, by inserting the word "other" in a second count, to obviate this difficulty, through the fiction that the cause of action thus stated is new and distinct. The rule is clear, that when two counts setting out the same offences occur, judgment will be arrested. "Neither, as we think," says Lord Denman, in a case in 1846, "can one offence, whether felonious or not, be properly charged twice over, when with one indictment or two; and as special demurrers are not necessary in criminal cases, we think that if the two counts in an indictment necessarily appear to be for the same charge, the objection might be taken in arrest of judgment. But still the court would, if possible, hold them not to be for the same offence; and certainly the omission of the word 'other' would not of itself make the same; though the insertion of the word 'other' would make them different."[1] In New Hampshire, however, it is said that where the same offence is described with formal variations in different counts, it is not necessary to allege the offence described in each of the several counts to be other and different from that described in the others.[2]

Two counts precisely alike defective.

Even according to the strictest practice, the omission in an indictment, containing two counts, of an averment that they are for different offences, is cured by a verdict of not guilty on one of the counts, or the entry of a *nolle prosequi* on that count.[3]

The relative "said," used in one of the subsequent counts of an indictment referring to matter in a previous count, is always to be taken to refer to the count immediately preceding where the sense of the whole indictment does not forbid such a reference.[4]

State, 65 Ga. 621. As to duplicity in such averments, see supra, § 253. That the defendant cannot use one count as evidence to disprove another count, see Edmonds *v.* State, 34 Ark. 720.

[1] Campbell *v.* R., 11 Ad. & El., N. S. 800.

[2] State *v.* Rust, 35 N. H. 438.

Where an indictment in the first count charged the defendant with the forging of a certain instrument, and in the second count charged another person with the uttering of the instrument, and then proceeded to charge the defendant with being an accessary before the fact to such uttering, it was ruled in Massachusetts that but two counts were charged. Pettes *v.* Com., 126 Mass. 242.

[3] Com. *v.* Holmes, 103 Mass. 440 (Ames, J., 1869).

[4] Sampson *v.* Com., 5 W. & S. 385; Boles *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 650.

§ 299. Where the first count of an indictment is bad, or is abandoned by the prosecution, a subsequent count may be sustained, even though it refers to the first count for some allegations, and without repeating them.[1] Generally, however, one bad count cannot help another bad count, which is defective in a distinct way.[2]

One bad count cannot be aided by another.

Even in good counts, it is unsafe to attempt to supply a material averment by mere reference to a preceding count. Time and place may be thus implied, but not, it seems, descriptive averments which enter into the vitals of the offence.[3]

§ 300. There may be cases, it seems, in which counts may be transposed after verdict, so as to invest the second with the incidents of the first, or *vice versa*. Thus, in an English case, A. and B. were indicted for the murder of C., by shooting him with a gun. In the first count A. was charged as principal in first degree, B. as present, aiding and abetting him; in the second count B. as principal in first degree, A. as aiding and abetting. The jury convicted both, but said they were not satisfied as to which fired the gun. It was held that the jury were not bound to find the prisoners guilty of one or other of the counts only (Maul. J., *dissentiente*); and that notwithstanding the word "afterward" in the second count, both the counts related substantially to the same person killed, and to one killing, and might have been transposed without any alteration of time or meaning.[4]

Counts may be transposed after verdict.

The effect of a bad count after verdict will be considered hereafter.[5]

XVIII. JOINDER OF DEFENDANTS.

1. *Who may be joined.*

§ 301. When more than one join in the commission of an offence, all, or any number of them, may be jointly indicted for it, or each

[1] Com. *v.* Miller, 2 Parsons, 480. See State *v.* Lea, 1 Cold. (Tenn.) 175.

[2] State *v.* Longley, 10 Ind. 482.

[3] See R. *v.* Dent. 1 C. & K. 249; 2 Cox C. C. 354; R. *v.* Martin, 9 C. & P. 213; State *v.* Nelson, 29 Me. 329; Sampson *v.* Com., 5 W. & S. 385; State *v.* Lyon, 17 Wis. 237; Keech *v.* State, 15 Fla. 591; but see supra, §§ 292 *et seq.*, as to practice in counts for receiving stolen goods.

[4] R. *v.* Downing, 1 Den. C. C. 52.

[5] Infra, §§ 736, 771.

of them may be indicted separately.[1] Thus, if several[2] commit a robbery, burglary, or murder, they may be indicted for it jointly[3] or separately; and the same where two or more commit a battery, or are guilty of extortion;[4] or are concerned in a common violation of the Lord's day;[5] or are engaged in the same boat in unlawfully fishing.[6] And parties to the crime of adultery may be indicted jointly;[7] though where two are jointly indicted for fornication or adultery, and are tried together, and one party is found guilty and the other not guilty, no judgment can be rendered against the former.[8] Where property has been obtained under false pretences, and the false pretences were conveyed by words spoken by one defendant in the presence of others, all of whom acted in concert together, all parties may be indicted jointly.[9] And where two persons are jointly indicted and one only is tried, a separate count charging the latter alone with the crime is unnecessary.[10]

Joint offenders can be jointly indicted.

§ 302. But where the offences are necessarily several there can be no joinder.[11] It is true that where a libellous song was sung by two men, it was held that they might be indicted jointly;[12] and the same view has been taken where two or more persons join in any other kind of publication

But not when offences are several.

[1] U. S. *v.* O'Callahan, 6 McLean, 596; State *v.* Gay, 10 Mo. 440. As to joint punishment see infra, § 940. As to new trial from misjoinder see infra, §§ 873 *et seq.* As to when co-defendants can be witnesses for each other see Whart. Crim. Ev. § 445. As to Michigan practice see Stuart *v.* People, 42 Mich. 455.

[2] Supra, § 293; R. *v.* Giddings, C. & M. 634; Com. *v.* O'Brien, 107 Mass. 208; Com. *v.* McLaughlin, 12 Cush. 615; Fowler *v.* State, 3 Heisk, 154, where the indictment was against two for assault and battery upon three.

[3] 2 Hale, 173; State *v.* Blan, 69 Mo. 317; Rucker *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 549.

[4] R. *v.* Atkinson, 1 Salk. 382; R. *v.* Trafford, 1 B. & Ad. 874; Kane *v.* People, 8 Wend. 203.

[5] Com. *v.* Sampson, 97 Mass. 407.

[6] Com. *v.* Weatherhead, 110 Mass. 175.

[7] Com. *v.* Elwell, 2 Met. 190; State *v.* Mainor, 6 Ired. 340. But see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1339.

[8] State *v.* Mainor, 6 Ired. 340.

[9] R. *v.* Young, 3 T. R. 98. Infra, § 1209.

[10] State *v.* Bradley, 9 Richards. (S. C.) 168. See Weatherford *v.* Com., 10 Bush, 196.

[11] Infra, § 315; Elliott *v.* State, 26 Ala. 78; though see Young *v.* R., 3 T. R. 106; R. *v.* Kingston, 1 East, 468. In State *v.* Deaton, 92 N. C. 788, it was held that two could not be jointly indicted for drunkenness. But suppose two should agree to get drunk together?

[12] R. *v.* Benfield, 2 Burr. 985. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1603.

of a libel; yet if the utterance of each party be distinct, as if two booksellers, not being partners, sell the libel at their respective shops, they must be indicted separately. Two or more cannot be jointly indicted for perjury,[1] or for seditious, obscene, or blasphemous words, or the like, because such offences are in their nature distinct.[2] And if A. and B. are jointly indicted and tried for gaming, and the evidence shows that A. and others played at one time when B. was not present, and B. and others played at another time when A. was not present, no conviction can be had against them.[3] If, also, the offence charged does not wholly arise from the joint act of all the defendants, but from some personal and particular act or omission of each defendant (*e. g.*, as with larceny and receiving, or receiving at distinct times),[4] the indictment must charge them severally and not jointly.[5] And it has been held that when A. strikes B. on one day, and C. strikes B. on another, A. and C. cannot be included jointly in one count.[6]

So as to officers with separate duties.

§ 303. Persons holding different offices with separate duties cannot be jointly indicted for a misdemeanor in office. Thus, an indictment charging such an offence

[1] R. *v.* Phillips, 2 Str. 921; Whart. Cr. L. 9th ed. § 1253.

[2] State *v.* Roulstone, 3 Sneed (Tenn.), 107; Cox *v.* State, 76 Ala. 66.

[3] Elliott *v.* State, 26 Ala. 78; Lindsay *v.* State, 48 Ala. 169; Galbreath *v.* State, 36 Tex. 200; State *v.* Homan, 41 Tex. 155. See *contra*, Com. *v.* McChord, 2 Dana, 242. That for a joint game they can be jointly indicted see Com. *v.* McGuire, 1 Va. Ca. 119; Coog *v.* State, 4 Port. 180; State *v.* Homan, *ut sup.*

[4] R. *v.* Dovy, 2 Den. C. C. 92; 4 Cox C. C. 478; U. S. *v.* Kazinski, 2 Sprague, 7; Horne *v.* State, 37 Ga. 80; Stephens *v.* State, 14 Ohio, 386. Infra, § 315.

[5] R. *v.* Messingham, 1 M. C. C. 257; Com. *v.* Miller, 2 Parsons, 480; People *v.* Hawkins, 34 Cal. 181. See R. *v.* Parr, 2 M. & Rob. 346; Vaughn *v.* State, 4 Mo. 530; Baker *v.* People, 105 Ill. 452. See Com. *v.* Jones, 136 Mass. 173.

[6] R. *v.* Devett, 8 C. & P. 639. Infra, § 315.

Several Receivers.—Although as a rule several receivers cannot be jointly charged in the same count with separate and distinct acts of receiving (R. *v.* Pulham, 9 C. & P. 281), yet it is too late, after verdict, to object that they should have been indicted separately. R. *v.* Hayes, 2 M. & Rob. 156.

Concert justifies Joinder.—Although the acts are several, yet there can be no exception to a joinder if concert be inferred. And this is good, though the only evidence for the prosecution is of separate acts, at separate times and places, done by several persons charged as accessaries, upon which a conviction is had. R. *v.* Barber, 1 Car. & Kir. 442.

against the inspectors, clerks, and judge of an election, was held bad on demurrer.[1]

Principals and accessaries can be joined.

§ 304. Principals in the first and second degree, and accessaries, before and after the fact, may all be joined in the same indictment, and they may be convicted of different degrees;[2] or the principals may be indicted first, and the accessaries after the conviction of the principals.[3] And their relation may be transposed in alternate counts.[4]

In conspiracy at least two must be joined.

§ 305. In conspiracy, where one cannot be indicted for an offence committed by himself alone, the acquittal of all charged in the same indictment with him, as co-defendants, must of course extend to him,[5] nor when the jury fail to agree as to one of two co-conspirators, can there be a conviction of the other?[6] In an indictment for conspiracy, less than two cannot possibly be joined;[7] a wife and husband together not being sufficient. A charge of conspiracy cannot be sustained against two defendants one of whom was at the time of the offence insane.[8] One defendant may be tried alone, when his co-conspirators are alleged to be unknown,[9] or when such conspirators are dead, or absent, or previously convicted.[10]

[1] Com. *v.* Miller, 2 Parsons, 481. Otherwise when officers concur in extortion. R. *v.* Tisdale, 20 Up. Can. Q. B. 272.

[2] 2 Hale, 173; R. *v.* Moland, 2 Mood. C. C. 270; R. *v.* Greenwood, 2 Den. C. C. 453; Com. *v.* Drew, 3 Cush. 384; Com. *v.* Felton, 101 Mass. 14; Klein *v.* People, 31 N. Y. 229; Mask *v.* State, 32 Mass. 405; State *v.* Putnam, 18 S. C. 175; State *v.* Hamlin, 47 Conn. 95. Infra, § 753. That such is the case with principals and accessaries see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 230, 231.

[3] People *v.* Valencia, 45 Cal. 304. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 205 *et seq.*

[4] Supra, § 300. Hawley *v.* Com., 75 Va. 847.

[5] R. *v.* Kinnersley, 1 Stra. 193; R. *v.* Sudbury, 12 Mod. 262; 2 Salk. 593; 1 Lord Raym. 484; People *v.* Howell, 4 John. 296; Turpin *v.* State, 4 Blackf. 72; State *v.* Mainor, 6 Ired. 340; State *v.* Allison, 3 Yerg. 428. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1388 *et seq.*, as to conspiracy; and § 1545, as to riot. As to verdict see infra, § 755.

[6] R. *v.* Manning, L. R. 12; Q. B. D. 241; 51 L. T. N. S. 121.

[7] R. *v.* Gompertz, 9 Q. B. 824; U. S. *v.* Cole, 5 McLean, 513; Com. *v.* Manson, 2 Ashm. R. 31; State *v.* Sam, 2 Dev. 569; State *v.* Covington, 4 Ala. 603; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 82, 1392. Infra, § 755.

[8] See Brackenridge's Miscellanies, 223.

[9] U. S. *v.* Miller, 3 Hughes, 553; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1388.

[10] R. *v.* Kenrick, 5 Q. B. 49; R. *v.* Cooke, 5 B. & C. 538; 7 D. & R. 673; State *v.* Buchanan, 5 Har. & J. 500. Supra, § 104; infra, § 1388.

From the peculiar character of the pleading in conspiracy, a new trial as to one defendant is a new trial as to all.[1]

In riot, three must be joined.

§ 306. In an indictment for riot, when the offence is not charged to have been committed with persons unknown, unless three of the parties named are proved to have been concerned, they must all be acquitted.[2] Where there is an allegation of defendants unknown, or there are co-defendants, dead or absent, or previously convicted, the case is otherwise.[3] The effect of charging the offence to have been committed by persons "unknown" has been further considered under another head.[4]

Husband and wife may be joined.

§ 306 *a*. As has been seen in another volume, there is no technical objection to an indictment joining a married woman with her husband.[5] And this rule has been applied to indictments for assault;[6] for keeping disorderly and gaming houses;[7] for forcible entry and detainer;[8] for murder;[9] for stealing and receiving.[10] The presumptions of law in such cases are elsewhere considered.[11]

Misjoinder may be excepted to at any time.

§ 307. Misjoinder of defendants, when apparent on the record, may be made the subject of a demurrer, a motion in arrest of judgment, or writ of error; or the court will in some cases quash the indictment.[12] When the misjoinder appears in evidence an acquittal may be ordered. If, however, two be improperly found guilty separately on a joint

[1] R. *v.* Gompertz, 9 Q. B. 824. Infra, §§ 850, 875.

[2] Penn. *v.* Hurston, Addis. R. 334; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1545.

[3] R. *v.* Scott, 3 Burr. 1262; Clein *v.* People, 31 N. Y. 229; State *v.* Egan, 10 La. R. 698. As to verdict see infra, § 755.

[4] Supra, §§ 104, 111; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1391, 1847.

[5] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 75; R. *v.* Sergeant, 1 Ry. & M. 352; R. *v.* Hammond, 1 Leach, 499; R. *v.* Matthews, 1 Den. C. C. 596; State *v.* Nelson, 29 Me. 329; Com. *v.* Trimmer, 1 Mass. 476; Com. *v.* Lewis, 1 Met. (Mass.) 151; Com. *v.* Tryon, 99 Mass. 442; State *v.* Collins, 1 McC. 355; Rather *v.* State, 1 Port. 132; State *v.* Bentz, 11 Mo. 27.

[6] R. *v.* Cruse, 8 C. & P. 541; State *v.* Parkerson, 1 Strobh. 169.

[7] R. *v.* Williams, 10 Mod. 63; R. *v.* Dixon, 10 Mod. 335; Com. *v.* Murphy, 2 Gray, 516; Com. *v.* Cheney, 114 Mass. 281; State *v.* Bentz, 11 Mo. 27.

[8] State *v.* Harvey, 3 N. H. 65.

[9] R. *v.* Cruse, 8 C. & P. 541.

[10] R. *v.* M'Athey, 9 Cox C. C. 251.

[11] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 78.

[12] Young *v.* R., 3 T. R. 103–106; 1 Stra. 623; Com. Dig. Ind. H. As to new trial, see infra, § 874. That in such cases error does not lie see State *v.* Underwood, 77 N. C. 502; State *v.* Lindsay, 78 N. C. 499.

indictment, the objection may, in general, be cured by producing a pardon or entering a *nolle prosequi* as to the one of them who stands second on the verdict. During the trial the difficulty may be relieved by a *nolle prosequi*, or an acquittal of a defendant improperly joined. If there be error in this respect a new trial may be granted.[1]

Death need not be suggested on record.

§ 308. Where two persons are indicted for a conspiracy, and one of them dies before the trial, and it proceeds against both, it is no mistrial, and entry of a suggestion of the death on the record is unnecessary.[2]

2. *Severance.*

Defendants may elect to sever.

§ 309. Where several persons are jointly indicted, they may be tried separately, at the election of the prosecution[3] or of the defendants. The prosecution may sever as a matter of right;[4] but the question of severance is usually raised by the defendants themselves, as to whom the matter is left to the discretion of the court.[5] Where they elect to be tried

[1] Infra, §§ 873–4.

When the indictment charges only A. and B. as conspirators, a *nolle prosequi* as to A. has been held to operate as an acquittal of B. State *v.* Jackson, 7 S. C. 283.

[2] R. *v.* Kenrick, 5 Ad. & El. N. S. (5 Q. B.) 49.

[3] Com. *v.* Hughes, 11 Phila. 430.

[4] State *v.* Bradley, 9 Richards, 168; State *v.* McGrew, 13 Richards, 313; Hawkins *v.* State, 9 Ala. 137; State *v.* Thompson, 13 La. An. 515.

[5] Infra, § 755; State *v.* Conley, 39 Me. 78; Com. *v.* Jenks, 138 Mass. 484; State *v.* O'Brien, 7 R. I. 336; Whitehead *v.* State, 10 Ohio St. 449; Curran's case, 7 Grat. 619; Com. *v.* Lewis, 25 Grat. 938; Robinson *v.* State, 1 Lea, 673; Hawkins *v.* State, 9 Ala. 137; U. S. *v.* Collyer et al. Wharton on Homicide, Appendix. See Com. *v.* Manson, 2 Ashm. 31; State *v.* Wise, 7 Richards. 412; State *v.* McGrew, 13 Richards. 316; Wade *v.* State, 40 Ala. 74; Parmer *v.* State, 41 Ala. 416; State *v.* Johnson, 38 La. An. 18; Lawrence *v.* State, 10 Ind. 453; State *v.* McLane, 15 Nev. 345. When the wife of one defendant is a witness for the others, see Com. *v.* Manson, supra; Com. *v.* Easland, 1 Mass. 15; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 445. But at common law, a severance will not be granted to enable one defendant to be a witness for the other; as even on separate trials this result could not be reached. U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumner, 19. When, however, there is no evidence against a particular defendant, or the evidence is but slight, the court may direct an acquittal of such defendant, so as to rehabilitate him as a witness. Com. *v.* Eastman, 1 Cush. 189; State *v.* Roberts, 15 Mo. 28. Infra, §§ 755, 873. See Whart. Crim. Ev. § 445.

In Tennessee this is a statutory right; State *v.* Knight, 3 Baxter, 418; Robinson *v.* State, 1 Lea, 673; and so in Texas. Slawson *v.* State, 7 Tex. 63;

separately, and where the application is granted by the court, the prosecuting officer may elect whom he will try first,[1] which is usually at his discretion.[2] But after the jury have been sworn, and part of the evidence heard, it is usually too late for either defendant to demand a separate trial.[3]

Severance should be granted when defences clash.

§ 310. Where the defences of joint defendants are antagonistic, it is proper to grant a severance.[4] And this is eminently the case where one joint defendant has made a confession implicating both, and which the prosecution intends to offer on trial.[5]

In conspiracy and riot no severance.

§ 311. In conspiracy and riot, though it was once thought otherwise,[6] it is now held the defendants may claim separate trials.[7] And when the case is tried jointly, the court must direct the jury that they are not to permit one defendant to be prejudiced by the other's defence.[8]

3. *Verdict and Judgment.*

§ 312. Joint defendants may be convicted of different grades.[9] Thus, where two or more defendants are jointly charged in the

Rucker *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 549; Krebs *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 15. That a verdict of insanity of one joint defendant works a severance, see Marler *v.* State, 67 Ala. 55.

[1] Com. *v.* Berry, 5 Gray, 93 (riot); People *v.* McIntyre, 1 Park. C. C. 371; People *v.* Stockham, Ibid. 424; Jones *v.* State, 1 Kelly, 610.

[2] Patterson *v.* People, 46 Barb. 625. See, as to misdemeanors, People *v.* White, 55 Barb. 606. As holding that in such cases error does not lie, see State *v.* Lindsay, 78 N. C. 499. As to new trial, see infra, § 874. As to calling one as a witness for the other, see Whart. Crim. Ev. § 445.

[3] McJunkins *v.* State, 10 Ind. 140.

[4] U. S. *v.* Kelly, 4 Wash. C. C. 528; U. S. *v.* Marchant, 12 Wheat. 480; State *v.* Soper, 16 Me. 293; Com. *v.* Robinson, 1 Gray, 555; Maton *v.* People, 15 Ill. 536; Hawkins *v.* State, 9 Ala. 137; Thompson *v.* State, 25 Ala. 41; Mask *v.* State, 32 Miss. 405; Roach *v.* State, 5 Cold. (Tenn.) 39.

In Texas this is by statute. Willey *v.* State, 22 Tex. Ap. 408.

[6] Com. *v.* James, 99 Mass. 438.

[6] Com. *v.* Manson, supra, § 305.

[7] Infra, § 698.

[8] Com. *v.* Robinson, 1 Gray, 555.

See, as to Virginia practice, Acts 1877-8, chap. xvii. § 31. In Ohio, by statute, joint defendants can claim separate trials by right. Crim. Proc. § 153. As to New Hampshire, see State *v.* Doolittle, 58 N. H. 92.

[9] Infra, § 755; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 136; Klein *v.* People, 31 N. Y. 229; White *v.* People, 32 N. Y. 465; Shouse *v.* Com., 5 Barr, 83; State *v.* Arden, 1 Bay, 487; Brown *v.* State, 28 Geo. 209; R. *v.* Butterworth, R. & R. 520. See R. *v.* Dovey, 2 Den. C. C. 86; 4 Cox C. C. 428; 2 Eng. L. & Eq. Rep. 532; 2 Benn. & Heard Lead. Cases, 138.

same indictment with murder, it is competent to the jury to find one guilty of murder, and another of manslaughter, and on such a verdict being rendered it will not be disturbed by the court as irregular.[1] So, also, in assault and battery, one may be found guilty of assault and another of battery.[2] *A fortiori* a verdict is good in ordinary cases where the jury convict one, and acquit or disagree as to the other.[3]

Joint defendants may be convicted of different grades.

§ 313. Where one of several defendants is tried alone, he may be convicted alone;[4] nor is it ground of exception that the others who were jointly indicted were not tried.[5]

Defendants may be convicted severally.

§ 314. In an indictment against two or more, when the charge is several as well as joint, the conviction is several;[6] so that if one is found guilty, judgment may be rendered against him, although one or more may be acquitted. To this rule there are exceptions, as in case of conspiracy or riot, to which the agency of two or more is essential; but violations of the license law, not being within the reason of these exceptions, come under the general rule.[7] Subject to these exceptions when

Sentence is to be several.

[1] U. S. *v.* Harding, 1 Wall. Jnn. 127; Mask. *v.* State, 32 Miss. 406; but see Hall *v.* State, 8 Ind. 439. Infra, § 755.

[2] White *v.* People, 32 N. Y. 465.

[3] See R. *v.* Cooke, supra, § 305; R. *v.* Taggart, 1 C. & P. 201; Com. *v.* Wood, 12 Mass. 313; Com. *v.* Cook, 6 S. & R. 577; State *v.* Vinson, 37 La. An. 792.

On an indictment against three, a joint verdict finding each defendant guilty by name is in substance a distinct verdict against each defendant. Fife *v.* Com., 29 Penn. St. R. 429.

[4] Infra, § 755. This is prescribed in Rev. Stat. U. S. § 1036.

[5] Supra, § 305, and cases cited. Infra, §§ 549, 755. State *v.* Clayton, 11 Richards. 581; Com. *v.* McChord, 2 Dana, 243; Cruce *v.* State, 59 Ga. 84; State *v.* Bradley, 30 La. An., Pt. I. 326.

[6] Infra, § 755; State *v.* Brown, 49 Vt. 437; State *v.* Smith, 2 Ired. 402. See, as to joint receivings, Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 989. That the charge in cases of assault are several, see R. *v.* Carson, R. & R. 303; Com. *v.* Griffin, 21 Pick. 523; Jennings *v.* Com., 105 Mass. 586; Com. *v.* O'Brien, 107 Mass. 208. As to verdict, infra, § 755. As to sentence, infra, § 940.

[7] Com. *v.* Griffin, 3 Cush. 523. As to adultery, see State *v.* Lyerly, 7 Jones (N. C.), 159.

One defendant on an indictment is not liable for the costs of others jointly indicted with him. State *v.* McO'Blenis, 21 Mo. 272; Moody *v.* People, 20 Ill. 315. But in Virginia only one clerk's or attorney's costs are to be collected on a joint verdict. Com. *v.* Sprinkle, 4 Leigh, 650. See Calico *v.* State, 4 Pike, 430; Searight *v.* Com., 13 S. & R. 301.

parties are jointly indicted and convicted, they should be sentenced severally,[1] and the imposition of a joint fine is erroneous.[2]

§ 315. To convict of a joint charge, the act proved must be joint. One offence proved against one defendant, and a subsequent offence against another, cannot justify a conviction, unless the offences are overt acts of treason or conspiracy, which are charged as such.[3] Thus, two defendants cannot be convicted upon proof that each one committed an act constituting an offence similar to the act charged in the indictment.[4] And so a man and a woman cannot be jointly convicted of a single act of adultery upon the admission by one of an act of adultery committed at one time, and an admission by the other of an act of adultery committed at another time.[5]

Offence must be joint to justify joint verdict.

XIX. STATUTES OF LIMITATION.

§ 316. While, as will be hereafter seen, courts look with disfavor on prosecutions that have been unduly delayed,[6] there is, at common law, no absolute limitation which prevents the prosecution of offences after a specified time has arrived. Statutes to this effect have been passed in England and in the United States, which we now proceed to consider. We should at first observe that a mistake is sometimes made in applying to statutes of limitation in criminal suits the construction that has been given to statutes of limitation in civil suits. The two classes of statutes, however, are essentially different. In civil suits the statute is interposed by the legislature as an impartial

Construction to be liberal to defendant.

[1] See cases cited supra in this section; Waltzer *v.* State, 3 Wis. 785; Straughan *v.* State, 16 Ark. 37; Curd *v.* Com., 14 B. Mon. 386. Infra, § 940.

[2] Curd *v.* Com., 14 B. Mon. 386; State *v.* Gay, 10 Mo. 440; State *v.* Berry, 21 Mo. 504; State *v.* Hollenscheik, 61 Mo. 302. Infra, § 940.

[3] Supra, § 302; infra, § 940; R. *v.* Dovey, 2 Den. C. C. 86; R. *v.* Hempstead, R. & R. 344; R. *v.* Pulham, 9 C. & P. 281. But see R. *v.* Barber, supra, § 302.

[4] Stevens *v.* State, 14 Ohio, 386.

[5] Com. *v.* Cobb, 14 Gray, 57.

In gaming, joint indictments have been sustained against parties taking separate parts in the same game. Com. *v.* McChord, 2 Dana, 242. But see *contra*, Elliott *v.* State, 26 Ala. 78; Lindsay *v.* State, 48 Ala. 169; State *v.* Homan, 41 Tex. 155; Johnson *v.* State, 8 Eng. 685.

In England, it is said that when there is a joint conviction for separate acts, the conviction may be sustained as to the party proved to have committed the first felony in order of time. R. *v.* Gray, 2 Den. C. C. 87.

[6] See infra, § 326.

arbiter between two contending parties. In the construction of the statute, therefore, there is no intendment to be made in favor of either party. Neither grants the right to the other; there is therefore no grantor against whom the ordinary presumptions of construction are to be made. But it is otherwise when a statute of limitation is granted by the State. Here the State is the grantor, surrendering by act of grace its rights to prosecute, and declaring the offence to be no longer the subject of prosecution. The statute is not a statute of process, to be scantily and grudgingly applied, but an amnesty, declaring that after a certain time oblivion shall be cast over the offence; that the offender shall be at liberty to return to his country, and resume his immunities as a citizen; and that from henceforth he may cease to preserve the proofs of his innocence, for the proofs of his guilt are blotted out. Hence it is that statutes of limitation are to be liberally construed in favor of the defendant, not only because such liberality of construction belongs to all acts of amnesty and grace, but because the very existence of the statute is a recognition and notification by the legislature of the fact that time, while it gradually wears out proofs of innocence, has assigned to it fixed and positive periods in which it destroys proofs of guilt.[1] Independently of these views, it must be remembered that delay in

[1] This is well exhibited in a famous metaphor by Lord Plunkett, of which it is said by Lord Brougham (Works, etc. Edinb. ed. of 1872, iv. 341) that "it cannot be too much admired for the perfect appropriateness of the figure, its striking and complete resemblance, as well as its raising before us an image previously familiar to the mind in all particulars, except its connection with the subject for which it is so unexpectedly but naturally introduced." "Time," so runs this celebrated passage, "with his scythe in his hand, is ever mowing down the evidences of title; wherefore the wisdom of the law plants in his other hand the hour-glass, by which he metes out the periods of that possession that shall supply the place of the muniments his scythe has destroyed." *In other words, the defence of the statute of limitations is one not merely of technical process, to be grudgingly applied, but of right and wise reason, and, therefore, to be generously dispensed.* The same thought is to be found in another great orator: λαβὲ δέ μοι καὶ τὸν τῆς προθεσμίας νόμον . . . . δοκεῖ γάρ μοι καὶ ὁ Σόλων οὐδενὸς ἄλλου ἕνεκα θεῖναι αὐτὸν, ἢ τοῦ μὴ συκοφαντεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς. τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἀδικουμένοις ἱκανὰ τὰ πέντε ἔτη ἡγήσατο εἶναι εἰσπραξασθαι. κατὰ δὲ τῶν ψευδομένων τὸν χρόνον ἐνόμισε σαφέστατον ἔλεγχον ἔσεσθαι. καὶ ἅμα ἐπειδὴ ἀδύνατον ἦγνω ὂν τούς τε συμβαλόντας καὶ τοὺς μάρτυρας ἀεὶ ζῆν, τὸν νόμον ἀντὶ τούτων ἔθηκεν, ὅπως μάρτυς εἴη τοῦ δικαίου τοῖς ἐρήμοις. Demosthenes, pro Phorm. ed. Reiske, p. 952.

To the same effect may be noticed Woolsey's Polit. Phil. § 123; and see U. S. *v.* Norton, 91 U. S. 566.

instituting prosecutions is not only productive of expense to the State, but of peril to public justice in the attenuation and distortion, even by mere natural lapse of memory, of testimony. It is the policy of the law that prosecutions should be prompt, and that statutes enforcing such promptitude should be vigorously maintained. They are not merely acts of grace, but checks imposed by the State upon itself, to exact vigilant activity from its subalterns, and to secure for criminal trials the best evidence that can be obtained.[1]

Statute need not be specially pleaded.

§ 317. Although at one time it was thought otherwise, the rule is now generally accepted that the plea may be taken advantage of on the general issue.[2] But the defence should be interposed before conviction, and cannot, unless appearing on the indictment, be made subsequently.[3]

Indictment should aver offence within statute, or, if excluded by statute, should, by strict practice, aver facts of exception.

§ 318. Ordinarily, as we have seen,[4] the offence must be laid in the indictment within the time fixed by the statute of limitations. On the other hand, where the statute does not impose an absolute and universal bar, but only a bar in certain lines of cases, the prosecution may lay the offence outside the statute, and may prove, without averring it in the indictment, that the defendant was within the exceptions of the statute.[5] Where this view obtains, the fact that the offence is on the face of the indictment

[1] A *qui tam* action on the act prohibiting the slave-trade is within the limitation of the federal statute. Adams *v.* Woods, 2 Cr. 336. So is an action for a penalty under the Consular Act of 1803. Parsons *v.* Hunter, 2 Sumn. 419. The two years' limitation of suits for penalties is repealed by implication by Act of 28th February, 1839, which extends the time to five years. Stimpson *v.* Pond, 2 Curt. C. C. 502. See for other cases, U. S. *v.* Fehrenback, 2 Woods, 175; People *v.* Haun, 44 Cal. 96.

[2] R. *v.* Phillips, R. & R. 369; U. S. *v.* Cook, 17 Wall. 168; U. S. *v.* Smith, 4 Day, 121; U. S. *v.* Watkins, 3 Cranch C. C. 441; U. S. *v.* White, 5 Cranch C. C. 73; U. S. *v.* Brown, 2 Low. 267; State *v.* Robinson, 9 Fost. 274; Com. *v.* Ruffner, 28 Penn. St. 259; overruling Com. *v.* Hutchinson, 2 Pars. 453; McLane *v.* State, 4 Ga. 335; State *v.* Bowling, 10 Humph. 52; Hackney *v.* State, 8 Ind. 494; Hatwood *v.* State, 18 Ind. 492; State *v.* Hussey, 7 Iowa, 409. *Contra*, People *v.* Roe, 5 Park. C. R. 231; Johnson *v.* U. S., 3 McLean, 89; State *v.* Carpenter, 74 N. C. 230. See, as to duplicity in such pleas, U. S. *v.* Shorey, 9 Int. Rev. Rec. 201.

[3] Supra, § 138; State *v.* Thomas, 30 La. An. Pt. I. 301.

[4] Supra, § 137.

[5] U. S. *v.* Cook, 17 Wall. 168; U. S. *v.* Ballard, 3 McL. 469; and see note thereto in Am. Law Reg. Nov. 1873; U. S. *v.* White, 5 Cranch C. C. 73;

prima facie barred cannot be taken advantage of by demurrer, or motion to quash, nor *a fortiori* by arrest of judgment.[1] But where a statute exists limiting all prosecutions within fixed periods, the more exact course is to state the time correctly in the indictment, and then aver the exception, and this mode of pleading is now generally required.[2] Perhaps the conflict may be reduced by appealing to the tests heretofore asserted,[3] and holding that when the exception is part of the limitation it must be pleaded,[4] but when it is contained in a subsequent clause, and is clearly matter of rebuttal, then such particularity is not needed.[5]

In any view a special averment that the offence was committed within the statute is unnecessary.[6]

Statute, unless general, operates only

§ 319. Statutory words of description must be taken in their technical exclusive sense, when it appears they are used as specifications. Thus, "penalty" has been held to include only civil suits,[7] and "deceit" has been ruled not

State *v.* Hobbs, 39 Me. 212; People *v.* Van Santvoord, 9 Cow. 655; Com. *v.* Hutchinson, 2 Pars. 453; State *v.* Bowling, 10 Humph. 52; State *v.* Rust, 8 Blackf. 195; see Lamkin *v.* People, 94 Ill. 101.

In U. S. *v.* Cook, supra, an indictment charged the accused with the commission, more than two years previously, of certain acts amounting to an offence as defined by an act of Congress; another act limited prosecutions for this and other offences to two years, unless the accused had been a fugitive from justice. On demurrer the indictment was held good, though it did not allege that the accused was within the exception.

[1] See supra, § 137. U. S. *v.* Cook, *ut supra*; People *v.* Van Santvoord, 9 Cow. 655; U. S. *v.* White, *ut supra*; State *v.* Thrasher, 79 Me. 17; State *v.* Howard, 15 Richards. 274; State *v.* Hussey, 7 Iowa, 409; and see R. *v.* Treharne, 1 Moody, 298; Com. *v.* Hutchinson, 2 Pars. 453; Clark *v.* State, 12 Ga. 350; State *v.* Bowling, 10 Humph. 52; State *v.* Thomas, 30 La. An. Pt. I. 301. See *contra*, as to arrest of judgment, White *v.* State, Texas, reported in Cent. L. J. Dec. 13, 1878; 6 Tex. Ap. 476.

[2] State *v.* Hobbs, 39 Me. 212; State *v.* Robinson, 9 Foster, 274; McLane *v.* State, 4 Ga. 335; State *v.* Meyers, 68 Mo. 266; State *v.* Bryan, 19 La. An. 435; State *v.* Bilbo, Ibid. 76; State *v.* Pierce, Ibid. 90; State *v.* English, 2 Mo. 182; see Hatwood *v.* State, 18 Ind. 492; State *v.* Rust, 8 Blackf. 195; People *v.* Miller, 12 Cal. 291.

When plea of limitation is good on the face of the indictment, the burden of proof is on the State to overthrow a plea of the statute. State *v.* Snow, 30 La. An. 401. See State *v.* Williams, 30 La. An. 842.

[3] Supra, § 238.

[4] Church *v.* People, 10 Ill. Ap. 222.

[5] Garrison *v.* State, 87 Ill. 96; see State *v.* Gill, 33 Ark. 129; and also article by Mr. Heard in 1 Crim. Law Mag. 451.

[6] Supra, §§ 162, 238; though see State *v.* Noland, 29 Ind. 212.

[7] State *v.* Thomas, 8 Rich. 295; State *v.* Free, 2 Hill (S. C.), 628.

to include "conspiracy."[1] On the other hand, on reasoning already given, when an offence is described, not as the technical term for a species, distinguished from other specific terms, but as *nomen generalissimum*, then it is to have a wide and popular construction. on offences it specifies.

§ 320. As a rule, statutes of limitation apply to offences perpetrated before the passage of the statute as well as to subsequent offences.[2] Statute is retrospective.

§ 321. The statute begins to run on the day of the commission of the offence.[3] This, as is well said, is to be dated from the period

[1] State *v.* Christianburg, Busbee, 46.

[2] Johnson *v.* U. S., 3 McLean, 89; Adams *v.* Woods, 2 Cr. 342; U. S. *v.* Ballard, 3 McLean, 469; U. S. *v.* White, 5 Cr. C. C. 73; Com. *v.* Hutchinson, 2 Pars. 453; and to common law offences in the District of Columbia; U. S. *v.* Slacum, 1 Cr. C. C. 485; U. S. *v.* Porter, 2 Ibid. 60; U. S. *v.* Watkins, 3 Ibid. 442; though see Martin *v.* State, 24 Tex. 61.

In New York, the Act of 1873, extending the time for finding an indictment from three to five years, has been held not to cover offences committed before its passage. People *v.* Martin, 1 Parker C. R. 187; referring to People *v.* Carnal, 6 N. Y. 463; Sanford *v.* Bennett, 24 Ibid. 20; Shepperd *v.* People, 25 Ibid. 406; Hastings *v.* People, 28 Ibid. 400; Stone *v.* Fowler, 47 Ibid. 566; Palmer *v.* Conway, 4 Den. 375, 376; Watkins *v.* Haight, 18 Johns. 138; Dash *v.* Van Cluck, 7 Ibid. 477; Johnson *v.* Burrell, 2 Hill, 238; Calkins *v.* Calkins, 3 Barb. 305; McMannis *v.* Butler, 49 Ibid. 176, 181; 7 Cow. 252; 10 Wend. 114, 117; 3 Barb. 621; 8 Wend. 861; Hathaway *v.* Johnson, 55 N. Y. 93; Amsbry *v.* Hinds et al., 48 Ibid. 57; Mongeon *v.* People, 55 Ibid. 613; Ely *v.* Holton, 15 N. Y. 595; Moore *v.* Mausert, 49 Ibid. 332. And see N. Y. & Oswego M. R. R. Co. *v.* Van Horn, 57 N. Y. 473; People ex rel. Ryan *v.* Green, 58 Ibid. 295, 303, 304; cited in letter to Alb. L. J. of Sept. 23, 1875.

In Pennsylvania it has been held that an act extending a statute of limitation is not *ex post facto* as to a crime against which the statute had not run at the time of the extension. Com. *v.* Duffy, 96 Penn. St. 506. In New Jersey it was at one time held that where a crime was committed more than two years before the repeal of a statute limiting prosecutions to two years after the commission of a crime prosecuted, the repeal of the statute and extension of the time of prosecution was not *ex post facto* as to such crime. State *v.* Moore, 42 N. J. L. 208. This, however, was subsequently overruled; State *v.* Moore, 43 N. J. L. 203. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 30; cf. criticism in Whart. Com. Am. Law, § 472. And that the repeal of a statute of limitations does not affect prior offences, see Garrison *v.* People, 87 Ill. 96; see People *v.* Martin, I Park. C. R. 187.

[3] State *v.* Asbury, 26 Tex. 82; see McEntie *v.* Sandford, 42 N. J. L. 200. As to federal statutes bearing on revenue and pension offences, see U. S. *v.* Hirsh, 100 U. S. 33; U. S. *v.* Coggin, 10 Rep. 687. In Louisiana the limitation in homicide runs from the death and not from the wound. State *v.* Taylor, 31 La. An. 851.

when the crime is consummated.[1] *Instantaneous* crimes, such as killing and arson, are consummated when they reach the point of completion. When a distinct result is necessary to completion, *i. e.*, death to homicide, it becomes part of the crime, no matter how long it may be delayed, and the offence is fixed in the moment of the killing. *Continuous* offences (such as nuisances, the carrying of concealed weapons, use of false weights, etc.) endure after the period of concoction, and as long as the offence by the defendant's action or permission continues to exist.[2] With instantaneous crimes, therefore, the statute begins with the consummation (*Vollendung*); with continuous crimes, it begins with the ceasing of the criminal act or neglect. In bigamy, the statute runs from the bigamous marriage, unless the offence is made by statute continuous.[3] In the latter case the statute does not begin to run while the bigamous marriage relation continues.[4] The time of the commission of the offence is to be determined by parol proof.[5]

Statute begins to run from commission of crime. Continuous offences.

§ 322. The procedure which must be instituted in order to save the statute is, in the federal statutes, "indictment or information,"[6] and in the statutes of most of the States, "indictment." "Information," in the federal statutes,[7] means not "complaint" by a prosecutor, but the technical *ex officio* information filed by the government. Under such statutes,

Indictment or information saves statute.

[1] Berner, Lehrbuch d. Strafrechts, 1871, p. 301.

[2] As to what is a continuous offence, see supra, § 125; Buckalew *v.* State, 62 Ala. 334. That a nuisance is a continuing offence, see State *v.* Guibert, 73 Mo. 20.

[3] Gise *v.* Com., 81 Penn. St. 428; Scoggins *v.* State, 32 Ark. 205. As to the operation of the statute on continuous offences, see U. S. *v.* Irvine, 98 U. S. 450.

[4] State *v.* Sloan, 55 Iowa, 217. But see *contra*, Gise *v.* Com., 81 Penn. St. 428, overruling S. C. 11 Phil. 655; 33 Leg. Int. 102; Scoggin *v.* State, 32 Ark. 205; see Brewer *v.* State, 59 Ala. 101; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1685.

[5] Smith *v.* State, 62 Ala. 29. Where an indictment found December 13, 1880, charged an offence on December 13, 1878, this was held not to be barred by a two years' limitation. Savage *v.* State, 18 Fla. 909; S. P. State *v.* Beasley, 21 W. Va. 777.

[6] The finding of an informal presentment is not sufficient to take the case out of the statute. U. S. *v.* Slacum, 1 Cr. C. C. 485. Nor will a former indictment on which a *nolle prosequi* was entered. U. S. *v.* Ballard, 3 McLean, 469. But see infra, § 325.

[7] U. S. *v.* Vondersmith, Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 436, note *g*; U. S. *v.* Slacum, 1 Cr. C. C. 485.

though the indictment must be found to prevent the bar of the statute, the defendant need not be sentenced within the limitation.[1]

In some jurisdictions statute saved by warrant or presentment.

§ 323. In England, on the other hand, and in jurisdictions where "indictment" or "information" is not required, the usual warrant issued by a magistrate on a preliminary complaint is enough to save the statute.[2] And that is clearly the case with a *presentment* by a grand jury, though the *indictment* was not found until after the statute expired;[3] and so it is held to be with a commitment or binding over by a magistrate.[4]

When flight suspends statute, it is not renewed by temporary return.

§ 324. Whether the exceptions to the statute must be specially averred in indictment, has been just noticed.

It is not necessary to constitute the exception of a person "fleeing from justice," that the defendant should have been unintermittingly absent from the jurisdiction. If he flies from a prosecution, mere occasional returns

[1] Com. *v.* The Sheriff, 3 Brewster, 394 (Brewster, J. 1869).

[2] R. *v.* Parker, 9 Cox C. C. 475; Leigh & C. 459; State *v.* Howard, 15 Richards. 274; Foster *v.* State, 38 Ala. 425; Ross *v.* State, 55 Ala. 177; *contra*, R. *v.* Hull, 2 F. & F. 16.

[3] Brock *v.* State, 22 Ga. 98; and see R. *v.* Brooks, 1 Den. C. C. 217; 2 C. & K. 402; 2 Cox C. C. 436.

[4] R. *v.* Austin, 1 C. & K. 621. One or two analogous cases under the English statute may not be here out of place. In R. *v.* Willace, 1 East P. C. 186, it was holden upon the repealed statutes relating to coin, that the information and proceeding before the magistrate, upon the defendant's being taken, was to be deemed the "commencement of the prosecution" within the meaning of those acts. See, also, R. *v.* Brooks, 1 Den. C. C. 217; 2 C. & K. 402. But proof by *parol* that the prisoner was apprehended for treason respecting the coin, within three months after the offence was committed, was holden not to be sufficient, where the indictment was after the three months, and the warrant to apprehend or to commit was not produced. R. *v.* Phillips, R. & R. 369. In R. *v.* Killminster, 7 C. & P. 228, an indictment for night poaching was preferred against the defendant within twelve months after the commission of the offence, and was ignored; four years afterward another bill was found against him for the same offence, and upon an objection that the proceeding was out of time, Coleridge, J., doubted whether the first indictment was not a proceeding sufficient to entitle prosecutor to proceed. He reserved the point, but the defendant was acquitted upon the merits. See, also, Tilladam *v.* Inhabitants of Bristol, 4 N. & M. 144.

In a remarkable case in Georgia, it was held that on an indictment for a major offence, to which the statute does not apply, but which includes a minor offence, covered and shielded by the statute, where the jury convicted of the minor offence, the statute may be applied to the major offence. Clark *v.* State, 12 Ga. 350.

will not start the statute afresh.[1] The same rule applies to concealment of guilt.[2]

But to soldiers enlisting in the army and then removing this exception does not apply;[3] and the same reason would be good as to all removals under direction of the State.[4]

Failure of defective indictment does not revive statute.

§ 325. The failure of a defective indictment, and the presentation of a new and correct indictment after the statute has begun to run, does not revive the statute.[5] The statute, as to the particular offence, was put aside by the commencement of legal proceedings against the defendant, and remains inoperative until these legal proceedings terminate. And this termination cannot be until a final judgment is reached on the merits.[6] It is possible, however, to conceive of a statute so couched as to make a judgment on mere technical grounds a termination of the prosecution, so that a new indictment would be regarded as a new prosecution. And it has been held that when an indictment is quashed, the time of its pendency is to be taken out of the statute.[7]

§ 326. In cases of secret offence, where the prosecutor is the sole or principal witness, and where, after a short lapse of time,

[1] U. S. *v.* White, 5 Cr. C. C. 116. See State *v.* Barton, 32 La. An. 278; State *v.* Vines, 34 La. An. 1073.

A fleeing from justice does not necessarily import a fleeing from prosecution begun. U. S. *v.* Smith, 4 Day, 123. A person may flee from justice though no process was issued against him. U. S. *v.* White, 5 Cr. C. C. 39. The defendant is not entitled to the benefit of the limitation, if within the two years he left any place, or concealed himself, to avoid detection or punishment for any offence; Ibid. 73; although he should within the two years have returned openly to the place where the offence was committed, so that, with ordinary diligence and due means, he might have been arrested. Ibid. 116.

[2] Robinson *v.* State, 57 Ind. 113; see State *v.* Hoke, 84 Ind. 137; Watkins *v.* State, 68 Ga. 832.

[3] Graham *v.* Com., 51 Penn. St. 255.

[4] See U. S. *v.* Brown, 2 Lowell, 267.

[5] State *v.* Curtis, 30 La. An. Pt. I. 1166; see State *v.* Baker, Ibid. 1134; Gill *v.* State, 38 Ark. 524; see Bube *v.* State, 76 Ala. 73.

[6] Com. *v.* Sheriff, 3 Brewst. 394; State *v.* Johnston, 5 Jones (N. C.), 221; State *v.* Hailey, 6 Jones (N. C.), 42; Foster *v.* State, 38 Ala. 425.

A prosecution, therefore, continues when an indictment is dismissed, and the matter immediately submitted to a grand jury, and a new indictment found, without releasing the defendant. Tully *v.* Com., 13 Bush, 142. See U. S. *v.* Ballard, supra, § 322.

[7] State *v.* Owen, 78 Mo. 367; see State *v.* Morrison, 31 La. An. 311; Coleman *v.* State, 71 Ala. 312.

the defendant, unless previously notified, must in the nature of things have great difficulty, from the evanescent character of memory, in collecting evidence *aliunde* as to *alibi*, the policy of the law is to compel a speedy prosecution. Eminently is this the case with sexual prosecutions, especially those which are capable of being used for the extortion of money. Hence courts, as will hereafter be seen, look with disfavor on prosecutions for rape in which the prosecutrix does not make immediate complaint. And there are cases when the delay is marked and unexcused, when an acquittal will be directed. This course was taken by a learned English judge (Alderson) in a case of bestiality, where nearly two years (not quite the statutory limitation) was allowed by the prosecutor to pass before institution of proceedings.[1]

Courts look with disfavor at long delay in prosecution.

§ 327. The enumeration of specific exceptions is exhaustive, and the statute cannot be suspended in favor of the prosecution by any allegations of fraud on the part of the defendant. Thus, where it appears that an alleged misdemeanor was committed more than two years before the warrant was issued, and that the defendant was all the time a resident of the State, the prosecution cannot save the bar of the statute by showing that the defendant put the prosecutor on a wrong scent, and concealed the crime until a few weeks before the arrest.[2]

Statute not suspended by fraud.

§ 328. In the federal courts and in the courts of several of the States restrictions exist requiring trials in criminal cases to take place within a specified period after the institution of the prosecution.[3] The power of discharging a

Under statute indictments unduly de-

[1] R. *v.* Robins, 1 Cox C. C. 114.

[2] Com. *v.* The Sheriff, 3 Brewster, 394.

The statute runs in favor of an offender, although it was not known to the officers of the United States that he was the person who committed the offence. U. S. *v.* White, 5 Cr. C. C. 39.

[3] As to Georgia see Roebuck *v.* State, 57 Ga. 154. See Esselborn, in re, 20 Blatch. 1; where it was held that a defendant would be discharged if the grand jury he was bound over to was discharged without acting on his case. Adams *v.* State, 65 Ga. 516. In Nebraska and California the defendant may be discharged at the end of the first term unless the prosecution show reasons why it has not proceeded. Two Calf, ex parte, 11 Neb. 225; Fennessy, ex parte, 54 Cal. 101. That a mere failure to call up a case without good reason will not be ground for a discharge when defendant is out on bail, see U. S. *v.* Thorne, 15 Fed. Rep. 739.

layed may be discharged.

prisoner under the Pennsylvania statute,[1] providing for a discharge if there has been no trial for the first two terms is limited, it is held, to the court in which he was indicted; and the Supreme Court will not interfere if the commitment is unexceptionable on the face of it.[2] A prisoner who stands indicted for aiding and abetting another to commit murder, and who was not tried at the second term, is not entitled to be discharged under the third section of the act if the principal has absconded, and proceedings to outlawry against him were commenced without delay, but sufficient time had not elapsed to complete them.[3] A prisoner, also, is not entitled to demand a trial at the second term if he has a contagious or infectious disease, which may be communicated in the court to the prejudice of those present.[4] Nor does the statute cover

[1] See infra, §§ 583 *et seq.*, where this subject is discussed in connection with the right to a continuance.

[2] Ex parte Walton, 2 Whart. 501. Infra, § 449. The intermediate finding of a second indictment for the same offence does not deprive the defendant of his rights. Brooks *v.* People, 88 Ill. 327.

[3] Com. *v.* Sheriff, etc. of Allegheny, 16 S. & R. 304, Gibson, C. J., dissenting.

[4] Ex parte Phillips, 7 Watts, 363.

In Virginia it was required, "when any prisoner committed for treason or felony shall apply to the court the first day of the term, by petition or motion, and shall desire to be brought to his trial before the end of the term, and shall not be indicted in that term, unless it appear by affidavit that the witnesses against him cannot be produced in time, the court shall set him at liberty, upon his giving bail, in such penalty as they shall think reasonable, to appear before them at a day to be appointed of the succeeding term. Every person charged with such crime, who shall be indicted before or at the second term after he shall have been committed, unless the attendance of the witnesses against him appear to have been prevented by himself, shall be discharged from imprisonment, if he be detained for that cause only, and if he be not tried at or before the third term after his examination before the justices, he shall be forever discharged of the crime, unless such failure proceed from any continuance granted on the motion of the prisoner, or from the inability of the jury to agree on their verdict." R. C. of Va. c. 169, § 28. The excuses above enumerated are not exclusive. Whenever the commonwealth has just ground for delay, discharge will be refused. Adcock's case, 8 Grat. 662. It has been decided that the word term, where it occurs in this act, means, not the prescribed time when the court should be held, but the actual session of the court, 2 Va. Cases, 363. When the accused has been tried and convicted, and a new trial awarded to him, although he should not be again tried till after the third term from his examination, he is not entitled to a discharge. 2 Va. Cas. 162; Davis's Va. Cr. Law, 422; and see Foster *v.* State, 38 Ala, 425; Scrafford, in re, 21 Kan. 735; infra, § 449. An analogous statute exists in Ohio. Rev. Stat. 7309.

the case of a person who has been tried and convicted, but has obtained a new trial.[1] The defendant, also, to avail himself of the statute[2] must have been diligent in pressing for trial.[3] Whether such a discharge is a bar to further prosecution is hereafter discussed.[4]

§ 329. Statutes of limitation, unless the words of the law expressly direct the contrary, are acts of grace, binding only the sovereign enacting them, and have no extra-territorial force.[5] If, to apply this principle to the present question, a foreigner commits an offence in England or the United States, it could never be pretended that he could plead that in his own country the period for prosecution had expired. And so where jurisdiction is based on allegiance, as in case of political offences against the United States committed abroad, the defendant, when put on trial in the country of his allegiance, would not be permitted to set up the limitations of the *forum delicti commissi*. In either case the law as to limitation is that of the court of process. And in this view most foreign jurists coincide.[6] Fœlix, however, seems to think, that in case of a difference in this respect in the codes of States having concurrent jurisdiction, the milder legislation is to be preferred.[7]

Statutes have no extra-territorial effect.

But this statute does not entitle the prisouer to a discharge wheu good ground for continuance is shown by the State, or when the adjournment is necessitated by the court not having time to try the case. Johnson *v.* State, 42 Ohio St. 207.

[1] Com. *v.* Sup. of Prisons, 97 Penn. St. 210.

[2] Gallagher *v.* People, 88 Ill. 335; Edwards, ex parte, 35 Kan. 99. The statute does not apply to fugitives from justice. Com. *v.* Hale, 13 Phila. 452.

[3] Patterson *v.* State, 49 N. J. L. 326.

[4] Infra, § 449.

[5] Whart. Confl. of L. §§ 534–544, 939.

[6] Berner, Wirkungskreis der Strafgesetze, p. 164; Köstlin, Syst. Deutsc. Straf. p. 24; Bar, § 143, p. 568.

[7] II. No. 602.

CHAPTER IV.

OF FINDING INDICTMENTS, AND HEREIN OF GRAND JURIES.

I. Power of Grand Jurors to institute Prosecutions.
Conflict of opinion as to power of grand jury to originate prosecutions, § 332.
Theory that such power belongs to grand jury, § 334.
Theory that grand juries are limited to cases of notoriety, or in their own knowledge, or given to them by court or prosecuting officers, § 338.
Theory that grand juries are restricted to cases returned by magistrates and prosecuting officers, § 339.
Power of grand juries limited to court summoning them, § 340.
II. Constitution of Grand Juries.
Number must be between twelve and twenty-three, § 341.
Foreman usually appointed by court, § 342.
Jurors to be duly sworn, § 343.
Bound to secrecy, § 343 *a*.
III. Disqualifications.
Irregularities in empanelling to be met by challenge to array or motion to quash, § 344.
Disqualified juror may be challenged, § 345.
Preadjudication ground for challenge, § 346.
So of conscientious scruples, § 347.
Personal interest a disqualification, § 348.
"Vigilance membership" no ground, § 349.
Objection to juror to be before general issue, § 350.
Plea should be special, § 351.
Aliens not necessary in prosecutions against aliens, § 352.
As to record jurisdictional objections, there may be arrest of judgment, § 353.
IV. Sanction of Prosecuting Attorney.
Ordinarily bill must be signed by prosecuting officer, § 354.
Name may be signed after finding, § 355.
Prosecuting officer's sanction necessary, § 356.
V. Summoning and Indorsement of Witnesses.
Witnesses for prosecution to be bound to appear, § 357.
Names of witnesses usually placed on bill, § 358.
VI. Evidence.
Witnesses must be duly sworn, § 358 *a*.
Defects in this respect may be met by plea, § 359.
Evidence confined to prosecution, § 360.
Probable cause enough, § 361.
Legal proof only to be received, § 363.
Grand jury may ask advice of court, § 364.
New bill may be found on old testimony, § 365.
VII. Powers of Prosecuting Attorney.
Prosecuting officer usually in attendance, § 366.
Defendant and others not entitled to attend, § 367.

VIII. Finding and attesting Bill.
Twelve must concur in bill, § 368.
Foreman usually attests bill, § 369.
Bill to be brought into court, § 370.
Finding must be recorded, § 371.
Bill may be amended by grand jury, § 372.
Finding may be reconsidered, § 373.
Jury usually cannot find part only of count, § 374.
Insensible finding is bad, § 375.
Grand jury may be polled, or finding tested by bill in abatement, § 376.
IX. Misconduct of Grand Juror.
Grand juror may be punished by court for contempt, but is not otherwise responsible, § 377.
X. Duty to testify.
Grand juror may be examined as to what witness said, § 378.
Cannot be admitted to impeach finding, § 379.
Prosecuting officer or other attendant inadmissible to impeach finding, § 380.
XI. Tampering with an Offence, § 381.

I. POWER TO INSTITUTE PROSECUTIONS.

Conflict of opinion as to power of grand juries to originate prosecutions.

§ 332. The value of grand juries is one of those questions which shift with the political tendencies of the age. When liberty is threatened by excess of authority, then a grand jury, irresponsible as it is, and springing (supposing it to be fairly constituted) from the body of the people, is an important safeguard of liberty. If, on the other hand, public order, and the settled institutions of the land, are in danger from momentary popular excitement, then a grand jury, irresponsible and secret, partaking, without check, of the popular impulse, may, through its inquisitorial powers, become an engine of great mischief to liberty as well as to order. In the time of James II., when Lord Somers's famous tract was written, a barrier was needed against oppressive State prosecutions, and this barrier grand juries presented. In our own times a restraint may be required upon the malice of private prosecutors and the violence of popular excitement; and it is to the adequacy of grand juries for that purpose that public attention has been turned.[1] It is possible to conceive of a third even more perilous contingency: that grand juries, selected in times of high party excitement, may be so organized as to become the unscrupulous political tools of the party which happens to be in power, and may be used by this party to annoy or oppress its political antagonists. Rejecting, however, this hypothesis as one which a free people living under a constitu-

[1] See London Law Times, Oct. 4, 1879.

tional government would not permanently tolerate, we may view the question in its relation to the conditions above first stated. Assuming that of all prosecutions instituted either by government or individuals the grand jury has an absolute veto at the outset, the fundamental question still remains, have grand juries anything more than the power of veto, or, in other words, can they originate prosecutions, and if so, with what qualifications?

§ 333. On this point three views are advanced, which it will be out of the compass of this work to do more than state, with the authorities by which they are respectively supported, leaving the question for that local judicial arbitrament by which alone it can be settled.

These views are:—

Theory that such power belongs to grand jury.

§ 334. That grand juries may on their own motion institute all prosecutions whatsoever is a view which was generally accepted at the institution of the federal government, and was in accordance with the English practice then obtaining.[1]

[1] In the report of the English Commissioners of 1879, we have the following (pp. 32–3):—

"We doubt whether the existence of the power to send up a bill before a grand jury without a preliminary inquiry before a magistrate; the extent of this power, and the facilities which it gives for abuse, are generally known. It is not improbable that many lawyers, and most persons who are not lawyers, would be surprised to hear that theoretically there is nothing to prevent such a transaction as this: Any person might go before a grand jury without giving any notice of his intention to do so. He might there produce witnesses, who would be examined in secret, and of whose evidence no record would be kept, to swear, without a particle of foundation for the charge, that some named person had committed any atrocious crime. If the evidence appeared to raise a *prima facie* case, the grand jury, who cannot adjourn their inquiries, who have not the accused person before them, who have no means of testing in any way the evidence produced, would probably find the bill. The prosecutor would be entitled to a certificate from the officer of the court that the indictment had been found. Upon this he would be entitled to get a warrant for the arrest of the person indicted, who, upon proof of his identity, must be committed to prison till the next assizes. The person so committed would not be entitled as of right to bail, if his alleged offence were felony. Even if he were bailed, he would have no means of discovering upon what evidence he was charged, and no other information as to his alleged offence than he could get from the warrant, as he would not be entitled by law to see the indictment or even to hear it read till he was called upon to plead. He would have no legal means of ob-

The right of a prosecutor to make complaint personally to a grand jury was practically recognized by Mr. Bradford, at the time attorney-general of the United States, in a letter to the secretary of state, dated Philadelphia, February 20, 1794.[1]

§ 335. Such, also, appears to have been the view of the late Judge Wilson of the Supreme Court of the United States.[2]

§ 336. In the works of the first Judge Hopkinson, the right of the grand jury to call such additional witnesses as they desire, not in themselves part of the witnesses for the prosecution, is defended in a tract written with much spirit, though in a style intended at the time more for popular than professional effect.[3] A similar latitude of inquiry is apparently advocated by Judge Addison. "The matters which, whether given in charge or of their own knowledge, are to be presented by the grand jury, are all offences within the county. To grand juries is committed the preservation of the peace of the county, the care of bringing to light for examination, trial, and punishment, all violence, outrages, indecency, and terror; everything that may occasion danger, disturbance, or dismay to the citizens. Grand juries are watchmen stationed by the laws to survey the conduct of their fellow-citizens, and inquire where and by whom public authority has been violated, or our Constitution and laws infringed."[4] As the learned judge, however, in the same charge, intimates an opinion that a grand jury is not to be permitted to summon witnesses before it, except under the supervision of the court, it would seem that the inquisitorial powers which he describes are to be only exercised on subjects which are given in charge to the jurors by the court, or rest in their personal knowledge.

§ 337. Perhaps, however, the broadest exposition is found in an opinion of the Supreme Court of Missouri, where it was held that a grand jury have a right to summon witnesses and start a prosecution

taining the least information as to the nature of the evidence to be given, or (except in cases of treason) even as to the names of the witnesses to be called against him; and he might thus be tried for his life without having the smallest chance of preparing for his defence, or the least information as to the character of the charge."

[1] 1 Opinions of Attorneys-General, 22.

[2] 2 Wilson's Lectures on Law, 361.

[3] 1 Hopkinson's Works, 194.

[4] Addison's Charges, 47.

for themselves; and that the court is bound to give them its aid for this purpose.[1]

The same view has been taken in the Circuit Court of the United States in the District of Columbia.[2]

A similar question was raised in 1851, in the Circuit Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee. The grand jury, it would seem, without the agency of the district attorney, called witnesses before them whom they interrogated as to their knowledge concerning the then late Cuban expedition. The question was brought before the presiding judge (Catron, J., of the Supreme Court of the United States), who sustained the legality of the proceeding, and compelled the witnesses to answer.[3] Perhaps, however, the writer may venture the remark that the learned judge, in citing a former edition of this book, goes too far in assuming that it is there unqualifiedly stated that the general practice is as he lays down.

Theory that grand juries are limited to cases of notoriety, or in their own knowledge, and to cases given to them by court or prosecuting officers.

§ 338. A second view is that the grand jury may act upon and present such offences as are of public notoriety, and within their own knowledge, such as nuisances, seditions, etc., or such as are given to them in charge by the court, or by the prosecuting attorney, but in no other cases without a previous examination of the accused before a magistrate. This is the view which may be now considered as accepted in the United States courts, and in most of the several States.[4] In Pennsylvania the annoyances and disorders attending the unlimited access of private prosecutors to the grand jury room have led a court of great respectability to hold it to be an indictable offence for a private citizen to address the grand jury unless when duly summoned.[5]

[1] Ward *v.* State, 2 Mo. 120. See State *v.* Corson, 12 Mo. 404; State *v.* Terry, 30 Mo. 368.

[2] U. S. *v.* Tompkins, 2 Cranch C. C. R. 46; though see U. S. *v.* Lyles, 4 Cranch C. C. 469. As to informations, see U. S. *v.* Ronzone, 14 Blatch. 69.

[3] For opinion, see 8th ed. of this work, § 337.

[4] Infra, §§ 367, 966.

[5] Com. *v.* Crans, 3 P. L. J. 442. See Ridgeway's case, 2 Ashmead, 247; State *v.* Wolcott, 21 Conn. 272. That such interference is a contempt of court, see Harwell *v.* State, 10 Lea, 544; infra, § 966. That for agents of the government to interfere is ground for quashing, see infra, § 397. And see, also, comments in Hartranft's App., 85 Penn. St. 433.

In accordance with this view, Judge King, in an able decision delivered in 1845, refused to permit the grand jury, on their own motion, to issue process to investigate into alleged misdemeanors in the officers of the board of health, a public institution established in Philadelphia for the preservation of public health and comfort.[1] This conclusion was, in 1870, emphatically sustained by the Supreme Court of the State, by whom it was held that a grand jury cannot indict, without a previous prosecution before a magistrate, except in offences of public notoriety, such as are within their own knowledge, or are given them in charge by the court, or are sent to them by the district attorney.[2] This, however, does not preclude

[1] The opinion of Judge King on this topic, given in prior editions, is now omitted for the purposes of condensation.

See report of English Commissioners, given in the 7th edition of this work, § 458. 4 Cr. Law Mag. 182; Report in 1870 of commis. to revise criminal code of N. Y., p. 116.

In New York a binding over is not necessary if the case is under examination. See People *v.* Hyler, 2 Parker C. R. 566; People *v.* Horton, 4 Parker C. R. 222.

A grand jury, it seems, may of their own knowledge indict a person committing perjury before them. State *v.* Terry, 30 Mo. 368.

[2] McCullough *v.* Com., 67 Penn. St. 30; S. P., Com. *v.* Simons, 6 Phil. R. 167.

In McCulloch *v.* Com. it was said by the chief justice: "It has never been thought that the 9th section of the 9th article of the Constitution, commonly called the Bill of Rights, prohibits all modes of originating a criminal charge against offenders except that by a prosecution before a committing magistrate. Had it been so thought, the court, the attorney-general, and the grand jury would have been stripped of power universally conceded to them. In that event the court could give no offence in charge to the grand jury, the attorney-general could send up no bill, and the grand jury could make no presentment of their own knowledge, but all prosecutions would have to pass through the hands of inferior magistrates."

In Rowand *v.* Com., 82 Penn. St. 405, it was ruled that the district attorney, with the powers of the deputy attorney-general conferred upon him by the Act of May 3, 1850 (P. L. 654), may prefer an indictment before the grand jury without a preliminary hearing or previous commitment of the accused, and this even after a return of *ignoramus* to a previous indictment of the accused for the same offence; but this power is to be exercised under the supervision of the proper court of criminal jurisdiction, and its employment can only be justified by some pressing and adequate necessity. It was further said, that where the exercise of such power by the district attorney has been approved by the Court of Quarter Sessions, it will not be reviewed by the Supreme Court. See infra, § 373. To the same effect see Brown *v.* Com. 76 Penn. St. 319; and compare People *v.* Horton, 4 Parker C. R. 222.

a grand jury, when a bill sent to it by the prosecuting attorney contains a count as to which there was no specific binding over, from finding and returning such count.[1]

In Tennessee a presentment, found not on the knowledge of any of the grand jury, but upon information delivered to the jury by others, will be abated on a plea of the defendant.[2] But this does not preclude the grand jury from exercising inquisitorial power in respect to nuisances such as houses of ill-fame, and other matters of notoriety.[3]

In an authoritative charge of Justice Field, of the Supreme Court of the United States, delivered to a California grand jury, in August, 1872, is the following: "Your oath requires you to diligently inquire, and true presentment make, 'of such articles, matters, and things *as shall be given you in charge, or otherwise come to your knowledge touching the present service.*' The first designation of subjects of inquiry are those which shall *be given you in charge;* this means those matters which shall be called to your attention by the court, or submitted to your consideration by the district attorney. The second designation of subjects of inquiry are those which shall '*otherwise come to your knowledge touching the present service;*' this means those matters within the sphere of and relating to your duties which shall come to your knowledge, other than those to which your attention has been called by the court, or submitted to your consideration by the district attorney. But how come to your knowledge? Not by rumors and reports, but by knowledge acquired from the evidence before you, or from your own observations. Whilst you are inquiring as to one offence, another and a different offence may be proved, or witnesses before you may, in testifying, commit the crime of perjury. Some of you, also, may have personal knowledge of the commission of a public offence against the laws of the United States, or of facts which tend to show that such an offence has been committed, or possibly attempts may be made to influence corruptly or improperly your action as grand jurors. If

[1] Nicholson *v.* Com., 96 Penn. St. 503. In Com. *v.* Lewis, 15 Weekly Notes, 205, it was held that in such a case there could be a continuance, if the defendant was surprised, to the next term.

[2] State *v.* Love, 4 Humph. 255. Infra, § 358, note. See, also, State *v.* Caine, 1 Hawks, 352.

[3] State *v.* Barnes, 5 Lea, 598; supra, § 339; see Com. *v.* Wilson, 2 Chest. Co. Rep. (Penn.) 164.

you are personally possessed of such knowledge, you should disclose it to your associates; and if any attempts to influence your action improperly or corruptly are made, you should inform them of it also, and they will act upon the information thus communicated as if presented to them in the first instance by the district attorney. But, unless knowledge is acquired in one of these ways, it cannot be considered as the basis for any action on your part. We, therefore, instruct you, that your investigations are to be limited: *First.* To such matters as may be called to your attention by the court; or, *Second.* May be submitted to your consideration by the district attorney; or, *Third.* May come to your knowledge in the course of your investigations into the matters brought before you, or from your own observations; or, *Fourth.* May come to your knowledge from the disclosures of your associates. You will not allow private prosecutors to intrude themselves into your presence and present accusations. Generally such parties are actuated by private enmity, and seek merely the gratification of their personal malice. If they possess any information justifying the accusation of the person against whom they complain, they should impart it to the district attorney, who will seldom fail to act in a proper case. But if the district attorney should refuse to act, they can make their complaint to a committing magistrate, before whom the matter can be investigated, and if sufficient evidence be produced of the commission of a public offence by the accused, he can be held to bail to answer to the action of the grand jury."[1]

It has been held in New York, that a grand jury may find a bill against parties who are under arrest on a coroner's warrant, after the coroner's jury has returned an inquest implicating them, and before the examination by the coroner has been completed.[2]

Theory that grand jury are restricted

§ 339. The third view is that the grand jury are in all instances limited in their action to cases in which there has been such a primary hearing as enables the defendant, before he is put on trial, to be confronted with the witnesses

[1] Pamph. Rep. p. 9. See 2 Sawyer, 663–667; S. P. Lewis *v.* Commis., 74 N. C. 194.

[2] People *v.* Hyler, 2 Park. C. R. (N. Y.) 566. The prosecuting attorney, according to the usual practice in the federal courts, may on his official responsibility send a bill to a grand jury without a prior arrest or binding over. U. S. *v.* Fuers, 12 Int. Rev. Rec. 43.

to cases returned by magistrates and prosecuting officer.

against him, and meet his prosecutor face to face.[1] If it should happen, under any contingencies of legislation, that grand juries should be selected by the dominant political party, so as to be used by that party for political ends, then it is important that they should be restricted in the way which this limitation prescribes. An executive should have power, it is true, to institute, at his discretion, prosecutions, even though these prosecutions are aimed at political antagonists. But he should act, when exercising this power, responsibly, taking upon himself the burden, and challenging impeachment or popular condemnation should he do wrong. In this check he will move cautiously, and with due regards to constitutional and legal sanctions. It is otherwise, however, when he is authorized to act through a grand jury selected by himself or his dependents, and ready to execute, in every respect, his will. Such a body, irresponsible, servile to the political party whose creature it is, armed with inquisitorial powers of summoning before it whomsoever it will, examining them in secret, giving whatever interpretation it may choose to their evidence, finding whatever bills it chooses and ignoring all others, may become a dangerous engine of despotism, calculated to disgrace the government which acts through it, and provoke to revolution those on whom it acts. Under a system in which the grand jury is appointed by the executive, it is better that its functions should be limited in the terms here prescribed; and that in all cases in which the executive desires to initiate a prosecution, it should be by information or preliminary arrest before a magistrate. At common law, the right in a grand jury to institute prosecutions on its own motion is based on the assumption that it represents the people at large, and ceases to exist when it is not so constituted.[2]

[1] As advocating this view may be noticed a pamphlet entitled The History and Law of the Writ of Habeas Corpus, with an Essay on the Law of Grand Juries, by E. Ingersoll, of the Philadelphia Bar, 1849. 2 Hale's Pleas of the Crown, by Stokes & Ingersoll, 164. That, as in the old federal practice, any citizen may institute a prosecution, see U. S. *v.* Skinner, 1 Brunf. (U. S.) 446.

In Virginia there must, in felonies, be a prior examination before a justice, or a waiver of such examination. Butler *v.* Com., 81 Va. 159; supra, § 70.

[2] Except where proceedings originate *ex officio* from the attorney-general, or where a grand juror possesses in his own breast sufficient knowledge of the commission of a crime to enable his fellows to find a bill exclusively on his evidence, cases, both in England and this country, are rare where an indict-

§ 340. Under the federal Constitution, Congress has invested the courts of the United States with criminal jurisdiction, and since this jurisdiction is chiefly exercised through the instrumentality of grand juries, the power of Congress to determine their functions results by necessary implication. As a rule, the powers of grand juries are coextensive with, and are limited by, the criminal jurisdiction of the courts of which they are an appendage.[1] Hence, a presentment by a grand jury in the Circuit Court of the United States, of an offence of which that court has no jurisdiction, is *coram non judice*, and is no legal foundation for any prosecution which can only be instituted on the presentment or the indictment of a grand jury.[2]

Power of grand juries limited to court summoning them.

II. CONSTITUTION OF GRAND JURIES.

§ 341. Though twenty-four are usually summoned on grand juries, not more than twenty-three can be empanelled, as, otherwise, a complete jury of twelve might find a bill, when, at the same time, a complete jury of twelve might dissent.[3] If of twenty-four, the finding is void.[4] And it appears that, at common law, a grand jury composed of any number from twelve to twenty-three is a legal grand

Number must be between twelve and twenty-three.

ment is found without a preceding hearing and binding over to answer; and even where the bill is based on the evidence of a member of the grand jury, it has been held in one of the States that public safety required his name to be indorsed on the bill as prosecutor. State *v.* Caine, 1 Hawks, 352.

In Tennessee, the grand jury cannot originate prosecutions except when by statute they have inquisitorial power. State *v.* Robinson, 2 Lea, 114. They have the power in liquor cases. State *v.* Staley, 3 Lea, 565. See supra, § 338. That the prosecuting attorney is not limited by returns, see Com. *v.* Morton, 12 Phila. 595.

In Michigan there must be a preliminary binding over. O'Hara *v.* People, 41 Mich. 623; cf. Shepherd *v.* State, 64 Ind. 43.

[1] See Shepherd *v.* State, 64 Ind. 43.

[2] See U. S. *v.* Hill, 1 Brock. 156; U. S. *v.* Reed, 2 Blatch. 435; U. S. *v.* Tallman, 10 Blatch. 21.

[3] Cro. Eliz. 654; 2 Hale, 121; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 16; Com. *v.* Wood, 2 Cush. 149; Hudson *v.* State, 1 Blackf. 317; State *v.* Copp, 34 Kan. 522; Rev. Stat. N. Y. p. iv. c. 4, § 26. See Ridling *v.* State, 56 Ga. 601. As to statutes limiting number, see U. S. *v.* Reynolds, 1 Utah, 319; 98 U. S. 145. As to *venire facias*, see U. S. *v.* Antz, 16 Fed. Rep. 119; 4 Woods, 174; Jones *v.* State, 18 Fla. 889.

[4] R. *v.* Marsh, 6 Ad. & El. 236; People *v.* Thurston, 5 Cal. 69.

jury.[1] If less than twelve the defect at common law is fatal.[2] A *venire facias* is an essential prerequisite.[3]

Foreman usually appointed by court.

§ 342. After the jury is assembled, the first thing, if no challenges are made, or exceptions taken, is to select a foreman, which, in the United States courts, in New York, in Pennsylvania, and in most of the remaining States, is done by the court; in New England, by the jury themselves.[4]

Jurors to be duly sworn.

§ 343. The oath administered to the foreman is substantially the same in most of the States: "You, as foreman of this inquest, for the body of the county of ——, do swear (or affirm) that you will diligently inquire, and true presentment make, of such articles, matters, and things as shall be given you in charge; the commonwealth's (or State's) counsel, your fellows', and your own, you shall keep secret; you shall present no one for envy, hatred, or malice; neither shall you leave any one unpresented for fear, favor, affection, hope of reward, or gain, but shall present all things truly, as they come to your knowledge, according to the best of your understanding (so help you God)." The rest of the grand jury, three at a time, are then sworn (or affirmed) as follows: "The same oath (or affirmation) which your foreman hath taken, on his part, you and every of you shall well and truly observe, on your part (so help you God)."[5] In Pennsylvania, after the words, "shall be given you in charge," in the foreman's oath occur the words, "or otherwise come to your knowledge, touching the present service." In Virginia the same expression is introduced; but the subsequent clause, enjoining secrecy, is omitted.[6] In Massachusetts the jury are sworn in a body, the foreman being afterwards elected, but the oath is the same as above.[7]

[1] State *v.* Symonds, 36 Me. 128; State *v.* Davis, 2 Iredell, 153; Pybos *v.* State, 3 Humph. 49; Dowling *v.* State, 5 Sm. & M. 664; Norris *v.* State, 3 Greene (Iowa), 513. In Missouri twelve jurors suffice. State *v.* Green, 66 Mo. 631. In other States special limitations exist. See State *v.* Swift, 14 La. An. 827. In Texas the number must be exactly twelve. Rainey *v.* State, 19 Tex. Ap. 479.

[2] Clyncard's case, Cro. Eliz. 654; State *v.* Symonds, 36 Me. 128; Com. *v.* Sayres, 8 Leigh, 722; State *v.* Davis, 2 Ired. 153; Barney *v.* State, 12 Sm. & M. 68; People *v.* Butler, 8 Cal. 435.

[3] U. S. *v.* Antz, 4 Woods, 174; 16 Fed. Rep. 119.

[4] Smith's Laws of Pa. vol. vii. p. 685; Rev. St. N. Y. part iv. c. 2, tit. 4, § 26; Davis's Prec. p. 9.

[5] See Cr. Cir. Com. p. 11, 6th ed.

[6] Tate's Dig. tit. Juries. In the Crimes Act of 1866 the oath is given in full. Pamph. L. 926.

[7] Rev. Stat. Mass. c. 136, § 5. Where, on the first day of the term

The fact that the grand jury were sworn must appear on the record.[1] The terms of the oath, however, need not be set forth.[2]

§ 343 *a*. As has been just seen, grand jurors, according to the form generally used, are bound to secrecy; and this duty is made obligatory by statute in several States.[3] The obligation to secrecy, however, is enforced by the policy of the law, as well as by the terms of this oath; and hence the obligation is binding, though not imposed by the oath locally in force.[4] The reasons for the rule are the importance of sheltering the action of the prosecuting authorities from premature disclosure by which such action could be frustrated; the importance of protecting accused parties from the disclosure, under the shelter of judicial procedure, of charges against them which may have been ignored.[5] How far this obligation is made to yield to the duty of giving testimony in subsequent litigation is hereafter discussed.[6] As will be hereafter seen, only sworn officers are usually permitted to attend the sessions of the grand jury.[7]

Bound to secrecy.

III. DISQUALIFICATION OF GRAND JURORS, AND HOW IT MAY BE EXCEPTED TO.

§ 344. Material irregularities in selecting and empanelling the grand jury, which do not relate to the competency of individual jurors, may usually be objected to by challenge to the array,[8] or by

of a circuit superior court, a grand jury was empanelled and sworn, and proceeded in discharge of its duties, but next day it was discovered that one of the grand jurors wanted legal qualification, upon which the court discharged him and ordered another to be sworn in his place, it was held that this was regular, and the grand jury was duly constituted. Com. *v.* Burton, 4 Leigh, 645. See Jetton *v.* State, 1 Meigs, 192.

[1] Lymau *v.* People, 7 Ill. Ap. 345; Baker *v.* State, 39 Ark. 180.

[2] Brown *v.* State, 74 Ala. 478.

[3] See 16 West. Jur. 5.

[4] Little *v.* Com., 25 Grat. 921. Infra, § 378.

[5] See Com. *v.* Mead, 12 Gray, 167, and cases cited infra, § 378. That the court, in a strong case, may order the prosecution to furnish the defendant with the evidence used before the grand jury, see Eighmy *v.* People, 79 N. Y. 546; People *v.* Naughton, 7 Abb. Pr. (N. S.) 431.

[6] Infra, § 378.

[7] Infra, § 367.

[8] Jewett's case, 3 Wend. 314; U. S. *v.* Blodgett, 35 Ga. 336; James *v.* State, 45 Miss. 572; Chase *v.* State, 46 Miss. 683; Boles *v.* State, 24 Miss. 445; Logan *v.* State, 50 Miss. 269; Barney *v.* State, 12 S. & M. 68; State *v.* Duncan, 7 Yerg. 271; Vanhook *v.* State, 12 Tex. 252; Reed *v.* State,

Irregularities in empanelling to be met by challenge to array or motion to quash or plea.

motion to quash.[1] This must, when possible,[2] be before the general issue.[3] Objections by plea are hereafter noticed.[4] In New York, under the Criminal Procedure Code, there can be no longer a challenge to the body of the grand jury on the ground that it is irregularly or defectively constituted.[5]

Disqualified juror may be challenged.

§ 345. When a person who is disqualified is returned, it is a good cause of challenge to the poll, which may be made by any person who is concerned in the business to come before the grand jury;[6] and in like manner a prejudiced grand juror may be challenged by an accused

1 Tex. Ap. 1; State *v.* Jacobs, 6 Tex. 99; People *v.* Earnest, 45 Cal. 29; U. S. *v.* Tallman, 10 Blatch. 21.

It has been held not to be a good cause of challenge to the array, that the officers whose duty it was to make the original selection were two or three weeks at the work; nor, that one of them was temporarily absent; nor, that they employed a clerk to write the names selected, and put them in the wheels; Com. *v.* Lippard, 6 S. & R. 395; nor that two unqualified persons were inadvertently placed on a list of three hundred. U. S. *v.* Rondean, 4 Woods, 185; 16 Fed. Rep. 109. See State *v.* Glascow, 59 Md. 209; Billingslea *v.* State, 68 Ala. 486; Com. *v.* Lippard, 6 S. & R. 395.

But strong personal bias on the part of the persons employed in drawing the jury may be a cause for challenge of the array. State *v.* McQuaige, 5 S. C. 429.

[1] Infra, §§ 350 *et seq.*, 388. See U. S. *v.* Antz, 16 Fed. Rep. 119; 4 Woods, 174; State *v.* Champeau, 52 Vt. 313; State *v.* Cox, 52 Vt. 471; State *v.* Lawrence, 12 Oregon, 297. Thus, an indictment may be quashed when a juror was personated by a stranger to the panel. Nixon *v.* State, 68 Ala. 535. See, generally, People *v.* Petrea, 92 N. Y. 128; State *v.* Hughes, 58 Iowa, 165.

[2] Infra, § 350.

[3] Infra, § 350; U. S. *v.* Hale, 109 U. S. 65; Brown *v.* Com., 73 Penn. St. 34; State *v.* Easter, 30 Ohio St. 542; Barrows *v.* People, 73 Ill. 256; State *v.* Borroum, 25 Miss. 203; James *v.* State, 45 Miss. 572; State *v.* Whitton, 68 Mo. 91; State *v.* Greenwood, 23 Minn. 104; Dixon *v.* State, 29 Ark. 165; People *v.* Southwell, 46 Cal. 141.

In North Carolina plea is said to be the proper mode of exception. State *v.* Haywood, 73 N. C. 437. For former New York practice as to plea in abatement see Dolan *v.* People, 64 N. Y. 485; People *v.* Tweed, 50 How. Pr. 262, 273, 280, 286. For practice in refusing a challenge to the array, see Carpenter *v.* People, 64 N. Y. 382. See People *v.* Fitzpatrick, 1 N. Y. Cr. Rep. 425; 30 Hun, 493; People *v.* Duff, 1 N. Y. Cr. Rep. 307; 65 N. Y. Prac. 365. As to practice in summoning jury in federal courts, U. S. *v.* Munford, 16 Fed. Rep. 164.

[4] Infra, § 350.

[5] People *v.* Hoogkerk, 96 N. Y. 38. For an examination of the federal statute in this relation see U. S. *v.* Richardson, 28 Fed. Rep. 61. There can be no challenge to array for personal objection to particular jurors, Id.

[6] 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 16; Bac. Ab. Juries, A.; Burn, J., 29th ed. Jurors,

person against whom the prejudice works.[1] Although it is said an *amicus curiae* may be sometimes allowed to intervene,[2] yet generally the right is limited to those who are at the time under a prosecution for an offence about to be submitted to the consideration of the grand jury or against whom a prosecution is threatened.[3] The burden of proof is on the challenger.[4]

Exemption is a personal privilege of the juror. If the exempted person serves, the defendant has no right to complain.[5]

Preadjudication ground for challenge.

§ 346. It is therefore a good cause of exception to a grand juror, that he has formed and expressed an opinion as to the guilt of a party whose case will probably be presented to the consideration of the grand inquest.[6] As will presently be seen, the objection must be made, when there is opportunity to do so, before indictment found.[7]

So of conscientious scruples.

§ 347. A conscientious inability to find a bill for a capital offence is a good ground for challenge.[8]

A.; Mershom *v.* State, 51 Ind. 14; State *v.* Richardson, 28 Fed. Rep. 61. As to time of challenge see People *v.* Geiger, 49 Cal. 643. As to practice see State *v.* Fowler, 52 Iowa, 103. As to plea see Id. Infra, §§ 350, 419.

[1] State *v.* Osborne, 61 Iowa, 330.

[2] Com. *v.* Smith, 9 Mass. 107.

[3] People *v.* Horton, 4 Park. C. R. 222; Hudson *v.* State, 1 Blackf. 318; Ross *v.* State, 1 Blackf. 390; Thayer *v.* People, 2 Dougl. (Mich.) 418; State *v.* Herndon, 5 Blackf. 75; U. S. *v.* Blodgett, 35 Ga. 336; State *v.* Corson, 12 Mo. 404; but see *contra*, Tucker's case, 8 Mass. 286; State *v.* Clarissa, 11 Ala. 57; State *v.* Hughes, 1 Ala. 655.

[4] State *v.* Haynes, 54 Iowa, 109. As to action after bail found see infra, § 350.

[5] Infra, § 692; Green *v.* State, 59 Md. 123; U. S. *v.* Munford, 16 Fed. Rep. 164.

[6] U. S. *v.* White, 5 Cranch C. C. R. 457; People *v.* Jewett, 3 Wend. 314; State *v.* Rickey, 5 Halst. 83; Rolland *v.* Com., 82 Penn. St. 306; Com. *v.* Clark, 2 Browne, 325; State *v.* Gillick, 7 Iowa, 287; State *v.* Osborne, *ut sup.*; State *v.* Quimby, 51 Me. 395; People *v.* Manahan, 32 Cal. 68; State *v.* Holcomb, 86 Mo. 371; Patrick *v.* State, 16 Neb. 330; but see Musick *v.* People, 40 Ill. 268; State *v.* Clarissa, 11 Ala. 57.

[7] Infra, § 350. See Com. *v.* Clarke, 2 Browne, 325.

[8] State *v.* Rockafellow, 1 Halst. (6 N. J. L.) 332; State *v.* Ricey, 5 Halst. 83; Gross *v.* State, 2 Carter (Ind.), 329; Jones *v.* State, 2 Blackf. 477; State *v.* Duncan, 7 Yerg. 271. See State *v.* Greer, 22 W. Va. 800. Infra, § 664.

A challenge to the array, however, will not be allowed on the ground that in the selection of the grand jurors all persons belonging to a particular fraternity were excluded, if those who are returned are unexceptionable, and possess the statutory qualifications. People *v.* Jewett, 3 Wend. 314, *sed quaere*. See Com. *v.* Lippard, 6 S. & R. 395.

§ 348. In Massachusetts it was held, in an early case, that the court would not set aside a grand juror because he has originated a prosecution for a crime against a person whose case was to come under the consideration of the grand jury.[1] In Vermont, a still more extreme doctrine has been maintained, it being held that the court has no power to order a grand juror to withdraw from the panel in any particular case, although it were one of a complaint against himself.[2] But these decisions cannot be reconciled with the general tenor of authority, nor with the analogies of the English common law. It is a serious discredit as well as peril to a man to have a bill found against him; and if this is likely to be done corruptly, or through interested parties, he has a right to apply to arrest the evil at the earliest moment. Besides, it is far less productive of injury to public justice for a jury to be purged, at the outset, of an incompetent member, than for the indictment, after the grand jury adjourns, to be set aside on account of such incompetency.[3] But interest, to sustain a challenge, must be actual and operative, not remote and inoperative.[4]

Personal interest a disqualification.

§ 349. It is no ground for challenge to a grand juror that he belongs to an association whose object is to detect crime.[5]

"Vigilance" membership no ground.

§ 350. The question of the mode in which objections to the organization and constitution of the grand jury are to be taken depends so largely upon local statutes that

Objections, when it can be done,

[1] Com. *v.* Tucker, 8 Mass. 286. See U. S. *v.* Williams, 1 Dillon, 485. In Kock *v.* State, 32 Ohio St. 353, having subscribed funds to put down the liquor traffic does not exclude a grand juror in a liquor case.

[2] Baldwin's case, 2 Tyler, 473.

[3] In New York, by the Revised Statutes, a person held to answer to any criminal charge may object to the competency of a grand juror, *before he is sworn*, on the ground that he is the prosecutor or complainant upon any charge against such person, or that he is a witness on the part of the prosecution, subpœnaed or recognized as such; and if such objection is established, the juror is to be set aside. But no challenge to the array, or to any person summoned on it, shall be allowed in any other cases. 2 R. S. 724, §§ 27, 28.

[4] Com. *v.* Ryan, 9 Mass. 90; Com. *v.* Strother, 1 Va. Cas. 186. Infra, § 662. In State *v.* Brainerd, 56 Vt. 532, which was a prosecution for embezzling from a bank, it was held that a juror was not disqualified because his wife was a depositor.

[5] Musick *v.* People, 40 Ill. 268. See infra, § 660.

must be made before general issue.

it is impracticable to solve it by any tests which would be universally applicable. The following general rules, however, may be regarded as generally applicable:—

1. If the body by whom the indictment was found was neither *de jure* nor *de facto* entitled to act as such, then the proceedings are a nullity, and the defendant, at any period when he is advised of such nullity, is entitled to attack them by motion to quash, or by plea in abatement, or, when the objection is of record, by motion in arrest of judgment. He is, in most jurisdictions, sheltered by constitutional provisions from prosecution except on indictment found by a grand jury; and when the body finding the indictment is not a grand jury either *de jure* or *de facto*, then its prosecution must fall whenever the question is duly raised.[1] But a *de facto* grand jury cannot be deemed a nullity under this provision of the constitution.[2] It is otherwise with a grand jury which has no quorum in attendance.[3]

2. For such irregularities in drawing and constituting the grand jury as do not prejudice the defendant, he has no cause of complaint, and can take no exception.[4]

3. For irregularities of this class by which the defendant is prejudiced he is entitled to redress.[5] The way, however, in which this redress is to be sought depends upon local statute. It may be generally declared that the defendant must take the first opportunity in his power to make the objection. When, however, does this opportunity occur? In this relation the following distinctions may be recognized:—

(*a*) Where the defendant is notified that his case is to be brought before the grand jury, he should proceed at once to take exception to its competency, as hereafter stated.[6] If he lies by until bill is found, then the exception may be too late in all cases where, having prior opportunity and capacity to object, he has made no objection.[7]

[1] Infra, § 353. See 23 Alb. L. J. 324; 4 Cr. Law Mag. 174–5.

[2] People *v.* Petrea, 92 N. Y. 128. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 652, 1572 *d*, 1799.

[3] Doyle *v.* State, 17 Ohio, 222. That an indictment found without evidence will be quashed, the fact being proved by the district attorney, see State *v.* Grady, 84 Mo. 220.

[4] State *v.* Mellor, 13 R. I. 666.

[5] Com. *v.* Barker, 2 Pick. 563, and cases cited infra, in this section.

[6] See Kemp *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 174.

[7] U. S. *v.* White, 3 Cranch C. C. 457; U. S. *v.* Talman, 10 Blatch. 21; State *v.* Quimby, 51 Me. 595; Com. *v.* Smith,

(*b*) Where the defendant has no such opportunity of objecting before bill found, then he may take advantage of the objection by motion to quash, or by plea in abatement, the latter, in all cases of contested fact, being the proper remedy. The objection, unless in extraordinary cases of surprise, is waived by pleading over.[1] But even where the defendant has been notified, by binding over or otherwise, that his case is to come before the grand jury, the courts will permit him, in all cases in which laches are not im-

9 Mass. 107; Com. *v.* Moran, 130 Mass. 281; Gibbs *v.* State, 45 N. J. 379; People *v.* Jewett, 3 Wend. 314; State *v.* Rickey, 5 Halst. 83; Fitzhugh *v.* State, 13 Lea, 258, 350; Com. *v.* Morton, 12 Phila. 595; State *v.* Gilbert, 7 Iowa, 287; State *v.* Ruthven, 58 Iowa, 121; State *v.* Smith, 80 N. C. 410; State *v.* Clifton, 78 Mo. 430; People *v.* Beatty, 14 Cal. 566; Polin *v.* State, 14 Neb. 540; State *v.* Watson, 31 La. An. 379; State *v.* Miles, 31 La. An. 825; State *v.* Wittington, 33 La. An. 1403; Gallaher *v.* State, 17 Fla. 370; Douglass *v.* State, 8. Tex. Ap. 520.

By statute in Pennsylvania, pleading, or even standing mute, waives errors in precept, venire, drawing, summoning, and returning of jurors. Dyott *v.* Com., 5 Whart. 67; Brown *v.* Com., 76 Penn. St. 319; Com. *v.* Chauncey, 2 Ashm. 90. But this does not preclude advantage being taken of such defects by challenge, motion to quash, or plea in abatement, before issue joined.

[1] U. S. *v.* Gale, 109 U. S. 65; U. S. *v.* Rondeau, 4 Woods, 185; 16 Fed. Rep. 109; U. S. *v.* Richardson, 28 Fed. Rep. 61; State *v.* Burlinghame, 15 Me. 104; State *v.* Symonds, 36 Me. 128; State *v.* Carver, 49 Me. 588; State *v.* Wright, 53 Me. 328; State *v.* Flemming, 66 Me. 142; State *v.* Rand, 33 N. H. 216; State *v.* Newfane, 12 Vt. 422; State *v.* Maloney, 12 R. I. 257; State *v.* Davis, 12 R. I. 492; People *v.* Griffin, 2 Barb. 427; People *v.* Harriot, 3 Park. C. R. 112; State *v.* Rockafellow, 1 Halst. (6 N. J. L.) 332; State *v.* Norton, 3 Zab. 33; Com. *v.* Chauncey, 2 Ashm. 90; Com. *v.* Williams, 5 Grat. 702; State *v.* Martin, 2 Ired. 101; State *v.* Duncan, 6 Ired. 98; State *v.* Griffin, 74 N. C. 316; State *v.* Cannon, 90 N. C. 711; State *v.* Lanier, 90 N. C. 714; State *v.* Haywood, 94 N. C. 847; Doyle *v.* State, 17 Ohio, 222; Huling *v.* State, 17 Ohio, 583; Pointer *v.* State, 89 Ind. 255; Henning *v.* State, 106 Ind. 386; State *v.* Duncan, 7 Yerg. 271; State *v.* Bryant, 10 Yerg. 527; Terrill *v.* State, 9 Ga. 58; Thompson *v.* State, 9 Ga. 210; Reich *v.* State, 53 Ga. 73; State *v.* Brooke, 9 Ala. 10; State *v.* Clarissa, 11 Ala. 57; Weston *v.* State, 63 Ala. 155; Barney *v.* State, 12 S. & M. 68; Boles *v.* State, 24 Miss. 445; McQuillan *v.* State, 8 S. & M. 587; Rawls *v.* State, Ibid. 599; State *v.* Borroum, 25 Miss. 728; State *v.* Price, 37 La. An. 215; State *v.* Griffin, 38 La. An. 502; Vanhook *v.* State, 12 Tex. 252; Jackson *v.* State, 11 Tex. 261; Kitrol *v.* State, 9 Fla. 9; Gladen *v.* State, 12 Fla. 562; Wilburn *v.* State, 21 Ark. 198. See Battle *v.* State, 54 Ala. 93; State *v.* Mahan, 12 Tex. 283; State *v.* Collier, 17 Nev. 275. As to New York, see Dolan *v.* People, 64 N. Y. 485, and cases cited supra, § 344; Whart. Prec. § 1158. As to practice on plea, see Bird *v.* State, 53 Ga. 602. That the remedy is exclusively plea in abatement, see Wallace *v.* State, 2 Lea, 29; infra, § 746.

putable to him, or in which the defect is not discovered until after bill found, to raise the objection by plea in abatement or motion to quash.[1]

4. The objection that a grand juror is prejudiced must be made, when there is opportunity, before indictment found, by challenge,[2] though where there is no such opportunity, or where the delay is not caused by the defendant, the defect may be taken advantage of by plea in abatement, or by motion to quash, before general issue pleaded.[3]

5. A question that is reserved when raised before indictment found, can be heard as fully after indictment found as before.[4]

6. Irregularity in selecting and empanelling the grand jury may be met by challenge to the array or motion to quash ;[5] though this, as we have just seen, does not preclude an exception being taken after

[1] Ibid. infra, § 844. In New York the rule as stated by Andrews, J., in Cox *v.* People, 80 N. Y. 500 (1880), is that "mere irregularity in the drawing of grand or petit jurors is not a ground for reversing a conviction, unless it appears that they operated to the injury or prejudice of the prisoner." But as to grand juries, see under Rev. Code, supra.

That the remedy must be by plea, see Ford *v.* State, 112 Ind. 373.

[2] U. S. *v.* Williams, 1 Dillon, 485; State *v.* Hamlin, 47 Conn. 95; State *v.* Rickey, 5 Halst. 83; Rolland *v.* Com., 82 Penn. St. 306; State *v.* Easter, 30 Ohio St. 542; Williams *v.* State, 69 Ga. 11; Lee *v.* State, 69 Ga. 705; Boyington *v.* State, 2 Port. 100; Mackin *v.* People, 115 Ill. 313; State *v.* Washington, 33 La. An. 896; State *v.* McGee, 36 La. An. 207; State *v.* Jackson, Ibid. 96. As to challenge, see supra, § 345.

That objections to the array must be taken by challenge to the array, see supra, § 344; 2 Hale, 155; 3 Inst. 34; Cro. Car. 134, 147; 2 Hawk. c. 25, ss. 18, 26, 29, 30; Bac. Ab. Juries, A.; 1 Ch. C. L. 309; State *v.* Carver, 49 Me. 588; People *v.* Griffin, 2 Barb. 427; Rolland *v.* Com., 82 Penn. St. 306; State *v.* Martin, 2 Ired. 101; State *v.* Ward, 2 Hawks, 443; State *v.* Lamon, 3 Hawks, 175; State *v.* Seaborn, 4 Dev. 305; People *v.* Hidden, 32 Cal. 445. See for form, Whart. Prec. § 1158. In Indiana such is, by statute, no longer the law. Ward *v.* State, 48 Ind. 289; overruling State *v.* Herndon, 5 Blackf. 75; Vattier *v.* State, 4 Blackf. 72.

[3] Infra, § 388; U. S. *v.* Gale, 109 U. S. 65; Com. *v.* Clarke, 2 Browne, Pa. 325; Com. *v.* Cherry, 2 Va. Ca. 20; Com. *v.* St. Clair, 1 Grat. 556; Doyle *v.* State, 17 Ohio, 222; Musick *v.* People, 40 Ill. 268; State *v.* Watson, 86 N. C. 624; Reich *v.* State, 53 Ga. 73; State *v.* Middleton, 5 Port. 484; State *v.* Ligon, 7 Port. 167; State *v.* Clarissa, 11 Ala. 57.

That intoxication of a grand juror cannot be taken advantage of by plea in abatement, see Allen *v.* State, 61 Miss. 627.

[4] People *v.* Duff, 65 N. Y. Pr. 365; 1 N. Y. Cr. R. 307.

[5] Supra, § 344.

bill found when the defendant had no previous opportunity of being heard. But the objection is ordinarily waived by pleading over.[1]

Plea should be special.

§ 351. It is necessary that the plea, in such case, should set forth sufficient to enable the court to give judgment on it on demurrer.[2] Thus where, upon a presentment by a grand jury for gaming, the defendant tendered a plea in abatement, that one of the grand jurors nominated himself to the sheriff to be put on the panel, who summoned him to serve, without alleging that this nomination of himself by the grand juror was corrupt, or that there was a false conspiracy between him and the sheriff for returning him on the panel; it was held that the plea was bad.[3] But that a sufficient number of jurors did not concur in its finding may be tested by plea in abatement.[4]

Aliens not necessary in prosecutions against aliens.

§ 352. It is not necessary, at common law, that any part of a grand jury finding a bill against an alien should be aliens.[5] Such, it has been determined, is also the rule in Pennsylvania.[6] The doctrine, that all the grand jurors should be inhabitants of the county for which they are sworn to inquire, admits, it would seem, of no modification.[7]

As to record jurisdictional objections there may be arrest of judgment.

§ 353. As we have already seen, objections to the grand jury, when such objections are not of record, must be taken before trial of the general issue; and in some States even record defects are cured by verdict.[8] It is otherwise, at common law, as to objections of record showing want of jurisdiction. Here, if there be no statutory impediment, a motion in arrest may be entertained.[9]

[1] Hasley *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 217. That a discharge of a grand jury in one case may operate generally, see People *v.* Fitzpatrick, 30 Hun, 493; 1 N. Y. Cr. R. 425.

[2] U. S. *v.* Tuska, 14 Blatch. 5; State *v.* Emery, 39 Vt. 84; Ward *v.* State, 48 Ind. 289; McClary *v.* State, 75 Ind. 260; Priest *v.* State, 10 Neb. 393; Baldwin *v.* State, 12 Neb. 61.

[3] Com. *v.* Thompson, 4 Leigh, 667.

A plea in abatement, that the grand jurors who found the indictment were selected by the board of commissioners on the 6th of May, 1841, and that they had no authority to make the selection on that day, is bad, for not showing that the said 6th of May was not included in the May session of the board in that year. State *v.* Newer, 7 Blackf. 307.

[4] Infra, § 376.

[5] Hawk. b. 2, c. 43, § 36.

[6] Res. *v.* Mesca, 1 Dall. 73.

[7] Roll. Abr. 82; 2 Inst. 32, 33, 34; Hawk. b. 2, c. 25.

[8] Supra, § 350; infra, § 766.

[9] State *v.* Harden, 2 Richards. 533.

But mere irregularities in summoning the jury cannot be thus excepted to.[1]

Where the error is of record, its existence must be determined by inspection.[2]

IV. INDICTMENT MUST BE SANCTIONED BY THE PROSECUTING ATTORNEY.

§ 354. It is essential to the validity of an indictment that it should be submitted to the grand jury by the prosecuting officer of the State ;[3] and it is even said that his signature is necessary before such submission,[4] though the point has been doubted ;[5] and in several jurisdictions it has been expressly decided that an indictment need not be so signed.[6] In any view, the name of the prosecuting officer need not appear in the body of the indictment.[7]

Ordinarily bill must be signed by prosecuting officer.

See Floyd *v.* State, 30 Ala. 511 ; State *v.* Connell, 49 Mo. 282 ; State *v.* Watson, 34 La. An. 669 ; State *v.* Vahl, 20 Tex. 779. Infra, § 766. That the objection, if not taken before verdict, cannot be taken on motion for new trial, see Potsdamer *v.* State, 17 Fla. 895.

[1] Supra, § 350; U. S. *v.* Gale, 109 U. S. 65.

[2] Smith *v.* State, 28 Miss. 728.

[3] McCullough *v.* Com., 67 Penn. St. 30 ; Com. *v.* Simons, 6 Phil. R. 167 ; Foote *v.* State, 3 Hayw. 98 ; Hite *v.* State, 9 Yerg. 198.

[4] Ibid. ; Teas *v.* State, 7 Humph. 174 ; State *v.* Bruce, 77 Mo. 193.

[5] State *v.* Vincent, 1 Car. Law R. 493 ; Holley *v.* State, 75 Ala. 14 ; Cooper *v.* State, 63 Ga. 515.

[6] State *v.* Reed, 67 Me. 127 ; State *v.* Pratt, 54 Vt. 484 ; State *v.* Ruby, 61 Iowa, 186 (under statute) ; State *v.* Wilmoth, 63 Iowa, 380 ; State *v.* Mace, 86 N. C. 668 ; State *v.* Coleman, 8 S. C. 237 ; Thomas *v.* State, 6 Miss. 20 ; Keithler *v.* State, 10 S. & M. 192 ; Ward *v.* State, 22 Ala. 16 ; Harrall *v.* State, 26 Ala. 53 ; Anderson *v.* State, 5 Pike, 444 ; People *v.* Butler, 1 Idaho, N. S. 271 ; *contra*, Jackson *v.* State, 4 Kans. 150. See U. S. *v.* McAvoy, 4 Blatch. 418. The signature is unnecessary in Texas by statute. Campbell *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 84. In Indiana it would seem now necessary that the bill should come to court signed by the prosecuting attorney. Heacock *v.* State, 42 Ind. 393 ; though see McGregg *v.* State, 4 Blackf. 101.

Mere formal variances in the title of the prosecuting officer, or abbreviations which can be explained by the record, will not be regarded as affecting the validity of the signature. Supra, §§ 273 *et seq.* ; infra, § 354. Vanderkarr *v.* State, 51 Ind. 91 ; State *v.* Brown, 8 Humph. 89 ; State *v.* Evans, 8 Humph. 110 ; Greenfield *v.* State, 7 Baxt. 18 ; State *v.* Myers, 85 Tenn. 203 ; State *v.* Tannahill, 4 Kans. 117 ; State *v.* Salge, 2 Nev. 321 ; People *v.* Ashnauer, 47 Cal. 98 ; see Territory *v.*

[7] State *v.* Pratt, 54 Vt. 484.

§ 355. Even where the signature is necessary, the prosecuting attorney will be ordinarily allowed, at any subsequent period when the objection is made, to sign an indictment found without his signature being appended thereto, and a motion to quash for want of such signature will then be overruled.[1]

Name may be signed after finding.

§ 356. The proceedings in bringing an indictment before the court must be conducted by the prosecuting attorney in person, even where the trial before court and jury may be conducted by other counsel.[2] The indictment being signed and preferred by the attorney-general, it will be presumed, in the absence of anything to the contrary, that an attorney-general *pro tem.*, who conducted the trial, was properly appointed.[3]

Prosecuting officer's sanction necessary.

Harding, 6 Mont. 323. But a title in itself unknown to the laws will be fatal. Teas *v.* State, 7 Humph. 174. The signature of the proper officer may be affixed by his authorized deputy or other official representative. U. S. *v.* Nagle, 17 Blatch. C. C. 258; Com. *v.* McHale, 97 Penn. St. 397; Choen *v.* State, 85 Ind. 209; Stout *v.* State, 93 Ind. 150; State *v.* Nulf, 15 Kan. 404; People *v.* Lyman, 2 Utah, 30; State *v.* Gonzales, 26 Tex. 197; People *v.* Darr, 61 Cal. 588. A variance in the name of the prosecuting officer is not ground for reversal. State *v.* Kinney, 81 Mo. 101. Nor will a variance as to his title be material. State *v.* Myers, 85 Tenn. 203.

[1] Com. *v.* Lenox, 2 Brewst. 249; see Knight *v.* State, 84 Ind. 73; State *v.* Ruby, 61 Iowa, 86.

In Alabama indictments are not usually drawn until the evidence is heard by the grand jury, and the character of the case determined. Banks *v.* State, 78 Ala. 14.

[2] Infra, §§ 554 *et seq.*; Rush *v.* Cavanaugh, 2 Barr, 187; Byrd *v.* State, 1 How. Miss. 247; Jarnagin *v.* State, 10 Yerg. 529. See Bemis's Webster case, where this practice is reported to have been sustained.

The attorney-general may properly assist the circuit attorney at a trial for murder, whether ordered by the governor to do so or not, and the prisoner cannot take just exception. State *v.* Hays, 23 Mo. (2 Jones) 287.

[3] Isham *v.* State, 1 Sneed, 112. (A capital case.) See infra, § 554.

In Pennsylvania, by the first section of the Act of May 3, 1850, providing for the election of district attorney, it is provided that the officer so elected shall sign all bills of indictment, and conduct in court all criminal or other prosecutions in the name of the Commonwealth, which arise in the county for which he is elected. Pamph. 1850, 654; Com. *v.* Lenox, 3 Brewst. 249.

V. SUMMONING OF WITNESSES AND INDORSEMENT OF THEIR NAMES ON BILL.

Witnesses for prosecution to be bound to appear.

§ 357. In every case where there has been a previous examination and binding over, which, as has been seen, is the regular, and with a few guarded exceptions, the sole way of putting an offender on his trial, the prosecutor, if there be any, and the witnesses, are ordinarily put under recognizance to appear and testify. The practice is, immediately at the opening of the court, to call their names; and, in case of non-appearance, to secure their attendance by process. At common law, a justice of the peace, at the hearing of a criminal case, has power to bind over the witnesses, as well as the defendant, to appear at the next court, and in default of bail to commit them.[1] The presence of witnesses not under recognizance to attend is obtained by the ordinary means of a subpœna.[2]

Names of witnesses usually placed on bill.

§ 358. The practice is, for the prosecuting attorney, or, in England, the clerk of the assizes, to mark on the back of each bill the witnesses supporting it; though it has been held both in England and in this country that the omission to make such indorsement is not fatal.[3] Nor,

[1] 2 Hale P. C. 52, 282; 3 M. & S. 1. For cases see Whart. Crim. Ev. § 352.

[2] See Whart. Crim. Ev. § 345.

[3] 4 M. & S. 9; U. S. *v.* Shepard, 12 Int. Rev. Rec. 10; People *v.* Naughton, 7 Abbott (N. Y.) Pr. N. S. 421; 38 How. Pr. 430; State *v.* Scott, 25 Ark. 107; Wyoming Terr. *v.* Anderson, 1 Wy. Terr. 20; State *v.* Johnson, 33 Ark. 174.

In Iowa, witnesses testifying to immaterial facts need not be indorsed. State *v.* Little, 42 Iowa, 51; and see State *v.* Flynn, 42 Iowa, 164.

In Massachusetts, such does not appear to be the course, it being usual for the grand jury to return generally the names of all the witnesses examined by them, without specifying the bills; but in a leading case, where the prisoner's counsel requested that a list of the witnesses before the grand jury should be given, the court granted the application without doubt, it being remarked by Wilde, J., that such a request had never been refused. Com. *v.* Knapp, 9 Pick. 498.

In Pennsylvania, the Act of 1705 provides that no person or persons shall be obliged to answer to any indictment or presentment, unless the prosecutor's name be indorsed thereupon; 1 Smith's Laws, 56; though it has been held by the Supreme Court that the Act does not go so far as to require that a prosecutor should be indorsed in cases where no prosecutor exists. R. *v.* Lukens, 1 Dallas, 5.

Undoubtedly the spirit of the common law requires that the bill itself should afford the defendant the means of knowing who are the witnesses on whose evideuce the accusation against him is based. Arch. C. P. by Jervis,

even when required by statute, is the prosecution afterward precluded, in cases of surprise, from calling non-indorsed witnesses,[1]

13; Barbour's Cr. Treatise, 272. If the grand jury act irregularly in introducing witnesses without the action of the attorney-general, the proper course is to move to quash. The irregularity cannot be pleaded in bar. Jillard *v.* Com., 26 Penn. St. 169.

It is further provided in Pennsylvania by the Revised Act of 1860, that "No person shall be required to answer to an indictment for any offence whatsoever, unless the prosecutor's name, if any there be, is indorsed thereon, and if no person shall avow himself the prosecutor, the court may hear witnesses, and determine whether there is such a private prosecutor, and if they shall be of opinion that there is such a prosecutor, then direct his name to be indorsed on such indictment." § 27, Bright. Supp. 1376.

A similar provision exists in Virginia. Com. *v.* Dever, 10 Leigh, 685.

That the omission cannot be taken advantage of after verdict, see Rodes *v.* State, 10 Lea, 414.

In Illinois, under the statute, it is enough if the names are entered after that of the prosecuting attorney. Scott *v.* People, 63 Ill. 508. See as to practice, Andrews *v.* People, 117 Ill. 195.

In Mississippi, though the want of the name of the prosecutor indorsed on the back of the bill is fatal (Peter *v.* State, 3 How. Miss. 433), it is not necessary that the grand jury should return, with the indictment, the names of the witnesses examined, or the evidence. King *v.* State, 5 How. Miss. 730.

In Missouri, the name of the prosecutor is required to be indorsed upon an indictment for any trespass not amounting to a felony (Rev. Code, 1835, § 451), and under this statute the prosecutor's name must be indorsed upon an indictment for petty larceny (State *v.* Hurt, 7 Mo. 321), or riot (State *v.* McCourtney, 6 Mo. 649; McWaters *v.* State, 10 Mo. 167); but it need only be indorsed in cases of trespass on the person or property of another; State *v.* Goss, 74 Mo. 592; see Lucy *v.* State, 8 Mo. 134; and hence not on an indictment for a disturbance by making loud noises (State *v.* Moles, 9 Mo. 685); and it is a sufficient indorsement if the prosecutor's name be written on the face of the bill. Williams *v.* State, 9 Mo. 270.

In Tennessee, the name of the prosecutor must, by statute, be marked on the back of the bill, and an omission to do so need not be pleaded in abatement, but may be taken advantage of at any time. Medaris *v.* State, 10 Yerg. 239. But if the indictment be founded on a presentment, the name of the prosecutor need not be indorsed on the bill. State *v.* McCann, 1 Meigs, 91.

In Iowa, it is said that although the names of the witnesses should be indorsed on the indictment, they need not be made a part of the record. Harriman *v.* State, 2 Greene, 1270.

In Arkansas, the name of the prosecutor need not be indorsed on a bill for passing counterfeit coin, that

[1] Hill *v.* People, 26 Mich. 496; Bulliner *v.* People, 95 Ill. 394; State *v.* Pagels, 92 Mo. 300; State *v.* Loehr, 93 Mo. 403. See State *v.* Fowler, 52 Iowa, 103. As will be hereafter seen, the prosecution is not required to call all the witnesses so indorsed, though they should be produced in court. Infra, § 565.

and, in some States, they can be indorsed on the bill after finding, or even after trial has begun, if due notice is given.[1]

As a rule, it may be said that whenever by statute such an indorsement is required, its omission can be taken advantage of by motion to quash, demurrer, or plea in abatement.[2] But after verdict the objection, if it could have been previously taken, comes too late.[3]

VI. EVIDENCE.

§ 358 *a*. By the old practice, witnesses to be sent to the grand jury must be previously sworn in open court.[4] If a witness who is sent to a grand jury be thus sworn, though not in the immediate presence of the judge, or even in

Witnesses must be duly sworn.

offence not being a trespass less than felony upon the person or property of another. Gabe *v.* State, 1 Eng. 519.

It is not the practice, it is said, in the courts of the United States, that the name of the prosecutor should be written on the indictment (U. S. *v.* Mundel, 6 Gall. 245; see U. S. *v.* Flanikin, Hemp. 30; State *v.* Lupton, 63 N. C. 483), though this depends on the local practice.

In Virginia, the usual practice is to indorse the names. Haught *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cases, 3; Com. *v.* Dove, Ibid. 29. It is not there essential, however, in an indictment for a trespass or misdemeanor, to insert the name of a prosecutor, if it appears that the indictment was found on the evidence of a witness sent to the grand jury, either at their request, or by direction of the court; and that whether there was a previous presentment or not. Wortham *v.* Com., 5 Randolph, 669.

In Kentucky, it is held that the omission of the name of the prosecutor, his addition, and residence, in cases of trespass, is fatal. Com. *v.* Gore, 3 Dana, 474; Bartlett *v.* Humphreys, Hardin, 513.

[1] People *v.* Hall, 48 Mich. 482; State *v.* Cook, 30 Kan. 82; State *v.* Teissedre, 30 Kan. 476.

[2] People *v.* Quick, 56 Mich. 321; King *v.* State, 5 How. Miss. 730; Moore *v.* State, 13 Sm. & M. 259; State *v.* Courtney, 6 Mo. 649; McWaters *v.* State, 10 Mo. 167; State *v.* Joiner, 19 Mo. 224; Com. *v.* Gore, 3 Dana, 474; Medaris *v.* State, 10 Yerg. 239; State *v.* Roy, 83 Mo. 268; Towle *v.* State, 3 Fla. 262, and cases cited above. See *contra*, State *v.* Hughes, 1 Ala. 655.

In Pennsylvania, as has been seen, the objection cannot be taken after verdict. Jillard *v.* Com., *ut supra;* S. P., Hayden *v.* Com., 10 B. Monroe, 125.

If the only witness indorsed is incompetent, the indictment is defective. State *v.* Tankersly, 6 Lea, 582; see infra, § 363.

In California it is said that a misnomer of a witness is ground for quashing. Kalloch *v.* San Francisco Court, 56 Cal. 229.

[3] Skipworth *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 135; see State *v.* Wilkinson, 76 Me. 317.

[4] So in South Carolina. State *v.* Kilcrease, 6 Rich. 444. In England, the omission is fatal. Middlesex Commis., 6 C. & P. 90; Harriman *v.* State, 2 Greene (Iowa), 270. That when the record avers a swearing this will be presumed to be regular, see Lumpkin *v.* State, 68 Ala. 56.

his momentary absence from the bench, it is good.[1] In Connecticut, witnesses before a grand jury, according to settled and uniform practice, are sworn by a magistrate, in the grand jury room, and not in the court; and this is pronounced a lawful mode of administering the oath.[2] In the United States Circuit Courts, the practice has been to summon a justice of the peace as one of the grand jury, and permit him to swear the witnesses in the jury room.[3] In many of the States power is given to the foreman to swear witnesses whose names are given to him by the prosecuting officer.[4] This power, however, may be viewed as cumulative, not doing away with the right to swear in open court.[5]

Defects in this respect may be met by plea.

§ 359. In England, it has been held that a conviction will not be shaken, although the bill was found on illegal testimony, if on the trial the evidence against the prisoner is sufficient; and in a case where it appeared the witnesses before the grand jury had not been sworn at all, the twelve judges held that the objection, as raised in arrest of judgment, should be overruled,[6] but at the same time unanimously made application for a pardon, recognizing, in fact, the irregularity of the finding, though regarding the plea as a waiver of the technical error. In this country it has been several times determined that a motion in arrest of judgment cannot be sustained on the ground that it does not appear from the indorsement on the indictment that the witnesses were sworn before they were sent to the grand jury; for the judgment can be arrested only for matter appearing, or for the omission of some matter which ought to appear, on the record; and such indorsements form no part of the bill.[7] But where the objection is taken

[1] Jetton *v.* State, 1 Meigs, 192.

[2] State *v.* Fassett, 16 Conn. R. 457.

[3] 7 Smith's Laws, 686.

[4] See Bird *v.* State, 50 Ga. 585; Allen *v.* State, 77 Ill. 484.

In Pennsylvania, by the Act of April 5, 1826, as incorporated in the revised Act of 1860, the foreman of the grand jury, or *any member* thereof, is authorized to administer the oath to witnesses. It will be observed, however, that in the latter State the authority is expressly limited to such witnesses "*whose names are marked by the attorney-general on the bill of indictment;*" and, consequently, all others must be sworn in open court. See Jillard *v.* Com., 26 Penn. St. 169. See *contra*, Ayrs *v.* State, 5 Cold. (Tenn.) 26.

[5] State *v.* Allen, 83 N. C. 680; State *v.* White, 88 N. C. 698.

[6] R. *v.* Dickinson, R. & R. Crown Cases, 401.

[7] State *v.* Roberts, 2 Dev. & Bat. 540; State *v.* McEntire, Car. L. R. 287; State *v.* Sheppard, 97 N. C. 401; King *v.*

before plea, on a motion to quash, it has in England been sustained.[1] It is true that the English practice has varied, and that afterwards it was declared that it would be improper for a court to inquire whether the witnesses were regularly sworn, as the grand jury, supposing such may not have been the case, were competent to have found the bill on their own knowledge ;[2] but this limitation has not been always applied in England,[3] and has not been recognized in this country. Thus, where an irregularity was shown in the swearing, Story, J., exclaimed, with great emphasis, that if such irregularities were allowed to creep into the practice of grand juries, the great object of their institution was destroyed.[4] Where a defendant was called before a grand jury, and required to testify on a prosecution against himself, the indictment found on such testimony was properly quashed.[5] And in a case in North Carolina, the law was pushed still further, it being held that where a bill was found on the information of one of their own body, it was essential that the prosecuting juror should be regularly sworn, and so noted.[6] But a bill will not be quashed when supported by one competent witness.[7]

§ 360. The question before the grand jury being whether a bill is to be found, the general rule is that they should hear no other evidence but that adduced by the prosecution.[8] The practice, however, is, that as they are sworn to "inquire," they may, if the case of the prosecution appear imperfect, call for such witnesses as the evidence they have already heard indicates as necessary to make out the charge.[9] Under such a suggestion, it would become the duty of the prosecuting officer to cause the requisite witnesses to be summoned; and

Evidence confined to the prosecution.

State, 5 How. Miss. R. 730; Gilman *v.* State, 1 Humph. 59. See Jillard *v.* Com., 26 Penn. St. 169.

[1] 6 C. & P. 90.

[2] R. *v.* Russell, 1 C. & M. 247; State *v.* Hatfield, 3 Head, 231.

[3] R. *v.* Dickinson, R. & R. 401. See 6 C. & P. 90.

[4] U. S. *v.* Coolidge, 2 Gall. 364. Infra, § 363.

[5] State *v.* Froiseth, 16 Minn. 296. Infra, § 363.

[6] State *v.* Cain, 1 Hawks, 352.

[7] Washington *v.* State, 63 Ala. 189. That the witnesses will be presumed to be duly sworn, see U. S. *v.* Murphy, 1 McArth. & Mac. 375. See Hope *v.* People, 83 N. Y. 418.

[8] 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 145; 2 Hale, 257; 4 Bla. Com. 303; U. S. *v.* Palmer, 2 Cranch C. C. R. 11; U. S. *v.* Lawrence, 4 Ibid. 514.

[9] 1 Chitty C. L. 318. See Dickenson's Quar. Ses. 174, 175.

it is his duty in any view to bring before the grand jury all competent witnesses to the *res gestae*.[1] But it is not the usage to introduce, in matters of confession and avoidance, witnesses for the defence, unless their testimony becomes incidentally necessary to the prosecution.[2]

Probable cause enough.

§ 361. The question was in former times much considered whether the sole inquiry of a grand juror should not be whether sufficient ground has been adduced by the prosecution to require a defendant to account for himself on a public trial. On the one hand, it has been laid down by high authority that the inquest, as far as in them lies, should be satisfied of the guilt of a defendant;[3] and Judge Wilson, in examining the position that a *primâ facie* case is all that is necessary for a grand juror's purpose, remarked, "It is a doctrine which may be applied to countenance and promote the vilest and most oppressive purposes; it may be used, in pernicious rotation, as a snare in which the innocent may be entrapped, and as a screen under cover of which the guilty may escape."[4] The same position is taken by Professor J. A. G. Davis, in his elaborate examination of criminal law in Virginia.[5] Sir E. Coke, far more humane in the study than on the bench, in speaking of the reign of Edward I., said: "In those days (as yet it ought to be) indictments taken in the absence of the party, were formed on plain and direct proof, and not upon probabilities and inferences."[6] Such, also, was the standard adopted by the first learned editor of the laws of Pennsylvania;[7] of Mr. Daniel Davis, for many years solicitor-general of Massachusetts, to whose excellent treatise on grand juries allusion has more than once been made;[8] and of the first Judge Hopkinson, so far as a tract pub-

[1] Infra, § 565.

[2] Supra, §§ 71–3; 1 B. & C. 37, 51; 3 B. & A. 432; 1 Chit. Rep. 214; Addison's Charges, 42; U. S. *v.* White, 2 Wash. C. C. 29; U. S. *v.* Palmer, 2 Cranch C. C. R. 11; U. S. *v.* Blodgett, 35 Ga. 336; Resp. *v.* Schæffer, 1 Dallas, 235. See infra, §§ 361–2.

[3] 4 St. Tr. 183; 4 Bl. Com. 303; Lord Somers on Grand Juries, etc.; People *v.* Hyler, 2 Park, C. R. 570. This question is examined in relation to the duty of committing magistrates, supra, §§ 71–73.

[4] 2 Wilson's Works, 365.

[5] Davis's C. L. in Va. 426.

[6] 2 Inst. 384. For a specimen of the style in which Coke procured convictions by smuggling in hearsay and declarations of third parties, see Amos's Great Oyer.

[7] Smith's Laws, vol. 7, p. 687.

[8] Davis's Prec. 25. See, also, 1 Ch. C. L. 318.

lished by him anonymously, but afterwards avowed, may be taken as an index of his views.[1] And this rule has been adopted by statute in California,[2] and has been accepted by Field, J., in the practice of the federal Circuit Court in that State.[3]

§ 362. On the other hand, it is said by Sir Matthew Hale that "in case there be *probable* evidence, the grand jury ought to find the bill, because it is but an accusation, and the party is put on his trial afterwards,"[4] and such is the conclusion we may draw from the initiatory proceedings before magistrates.[5] The arguments which lead to such a position were recapitulated with great force by McKean, C. J., in an early charge to a grand jury in Pennsylvania; where he said, among other things, on the question whether witnesses for the defence should be called, that "by the law it is declared that no man should be twice put in jeopardy for the same offence; and yet it is certain that the inquiry now proposed by the grand jury would necessarily introduce the oppression of a double trial.[6] Nor is it merely upon maxims of law, but, I think, likewise upon principles of humanity, that this innovation should be opposed. Considering the bill as an accusation grounded entirely on the testimony in support of the prosecution, the petit jury receive no bias from the sanction which the indorsement of the grand jury has conferred upon it. But, on the other hand, would it not, in some degree, prejudice the most upright mind against the defendant, that on a full hearing of his defence, another tribunal had pronounced it insufficient, which would then be the natural inference from every true bill? Upon the whole, the court is of opinion that it would be improper and illegal to examine the witnesses, on behalf of the defendant, while the charge against him lies before the grand jury." Upon one of the grand inquest remarking, that "there was a clause in the qualification of the jurors, upon which he and some of his brethren wished to hear the interpretation of the judges, to wit: What is the legal acceptation of the words 'diligently inquire'?" The chief justice replied that "the expression meant, diligently to inquire into the circumstances of the charge, the credibility of the

[1] 1 Hopkinson's Works, 194.

[2] People *v.* Tinder, 19 Cal. 539.

[3] See Treason Cases, Pamphlet, 28; 2 Sawyer, 660–7.

[4] 2 Hale, P. C. 157. See supra, § 73; and see, to same effect, R. *v.* Hodges, 8 C. & P. 195.

[5] Supra, § 73.

[6] See supra, § 73.

witnesses who support it, and from the whole to judge whether the person accused ought to be put upon his trial. For," he added, "though it would be improper to determine the merits of the cause, it is incumbent upon the grand jury to satisfy their minds, by a diligent inquiry, that there is a probable ground for the accusation, before they give it their authority, and call upon the defendant to make a public defence."[1] This view derives much countenance from the English rule, that a grand jury has no authority by law to ignore a bill for murder on the ground of insanity, though it appear plainly from the testimony of the witnesses, as examined by them on the part of the prosecution, that the accused was in fact insane; but that if they believe the acts done, if they had been done by a person of sound mind, would have amounted to murder, it is their duty to find the bill.[2]

Legal proof only to be received.

§ 363. Grand jurors are bound to take the best legal proof of which the case admits; and it is the duty of the prosecuting officer of the State to take care that no evidence is submitted to them which would not be admissible at trial.[3] It is impossible, however, to impose on such a body the technical limitations which are only insisted on by courts when required by counsel; and the inquiries of grand jurors, therefore, are analogous more to the examinations of courts sitting without juries than of courts sitting with juries.[4] Hence it has been held

[1] Resp. *v.* Schæffer, 1 Dallas, 237. See, also, remarks of Judge Addison, Addison's Charges, 39; People *v.* Hyler, 2 Park. C. R. 570; S. P., State *v.* Cowan, 1 Head, 280; U. S. *v.* Blodgett, 35 Ga. 336; State *v.* Boyd, 2 Hill S. C. 288; Sparrenberger *v.* State, 53 Ala. 481; Spratt *v.* State, 8 Mo. 247. See Parker *v.* Com., 12 Bush, 191.

[2] R. *v.* Hodges, 8 C. & P. 195.

Such was the course taken in 1879, in Connecticut, in State *v.* Lounsbury, a case in which the wife of a clergyman, in an insane paroxysm, killed him by a pistol shot. The grand jury found the bill for murder in the first degree, on evidence on which the prosecuting officers afterwards advised an acquittal. The evidence made a *prima facie* case of guilt, and the bill was therefore properly found; but this case was one on which no conviction could be based, and on which an acquittal was proper. In no other way could the defendant be protected from subsequent prosecutions, and the case exhibited in such a way as to satisfy the public sense of justice.

[3] 1 Leach, 514; 2 Hawk. c. 25, ss. 138, 139; Davis's Precedents, 25; 1 Chitty, C. L. 318; R. *v.* Willett, 6 T. R. 294; U. S. *v.* Reed, 2 Blatch. 435.

[4] That the mere reception of some evidence that was incompetent does not avoid the finding, see State *v.* Fassett, 16 Conn. 457; State *v.* Wolcott,

that an accomplice, even though uncorroborated, is adequate to the finding of a bill, though he may have been taken from prison by an order altogether surreptitious and illegal.[1] It seems, however, that if a bill is found solely on incompetent testimony it will be quashed before plea, though the objection will be too late after conviction.[2] And so, in a case already noticed, where a defendant was compelled to testify against himself.[3]

On the other hand, the fact that one of several witnesses, who testified to an offence before the grand jury, was incompetent, is not sufficient to sustain a plea in abatement to the indictment, since it is impossible to show that an indictment was found on the testimony of one witness alone.[4] And as a general rule, the court will not inquire into the sufficiency or technical admissibility of the evidence before the grand jury.[5] How far jurors may be examined to impeach their finding is hereafter considered.[6]

The practice where there has been irregularity in swearing of witnesses has been already discussed.[7]

§ 364. The grand jury, if they have any doubts as to the propriety of admitting any part of the evidence submitted to them, may pray the advice of the court to which they are attached;[8] though it is usual to apply to the counsel of the State, who is bound to be at hand, and ready to communicate to them any information that may be required.[9]

Grand jury may ask advice of court.

21 Conn. 272; State *v.* Boyd, 2 Hill, S. C. 509; Turk *v.* State, 7 Ohio, Pt. II. 242; State *v.* Fulker, 20 Iowa, 509; Jones *v.* State, 81 Ala. 79.

[1] 1 Leach, 155.

[2] 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 145, *in notis;* U. S. *v.* Farrington, 5 Fed. Rep. 343; Com. *v.* Knapp, 9 Pick. 496; People *v.* Naughton, 7 Abb. Pr. (N. S.) 421; People *v.* Moore, 65 How. (N. Y.) Pr. 177; People *v.* Briggs, 60 How. (N. Y.) Pr. 17; State *v.* Fellows, 2 Hayw. 340; State *v.* Cain, 1 Hawks, 352; see State *v.* Tankersly, 6 Lea, 582, cited supra, § 358; State *v.* Huston, 50 Iowa, 512.

[3] State *v.* Froiseth, 16 Minn. 296; see People *v.* Singer, 18 Abb. (N. Y.) N. C. 96. Supra, §§ 359–60.

[4] Bloomer *v.* State, 3 Sneed, 66; State *v.* Tucker, 20 Iowa, 508. Supra, §§ 359–60.

[5] U. S. *v.* Reed, 2 Blatch. 435; People *v.* Hulbert, 4 Denio, 133; Hope *v.* People, 83 N. Y. 418; State *v.* Dayton, 3 Zab. 49; Turk *v.* State, 2 Hammond, part 2, 240; Fowler *v.* State, 52 Iowa, 103; State *v.* Cole, 19 Wis. 129; Smith *v.* State, 61 Miss. 754; Terry *v.* State, 15 Tex. Ap. 66; State *v.* Logan, 1 Nev. 509.

[6] Infra, § 379.

[7] Supra, §§ 359–60.

[8] Dalton, J., c. 185, s. 9; 4 Bla. Com. 303, n. 1; 2 Hale, 159, 160. As to their sitting in open court, under direction of the judges, see 5 St. Tr. 771; 3 Camp. 337.

[9] Davis's Precedents, 21; 7 Cowen,

New bill may be found on old testimony.

§ 365. Where a bill has been withdrawn or quashed, a new bill may be found as a substitute, by the same grand jury, without examining witnesses.[1]

VII. POWERS OF PROSECUTING ATTORNEY.

Prosecuting officer usually attends during evidence.

§ 366. In England, as a general rule, the clerk of the assizes is the attendant of the grand jury, and is expected not only to aid them in their examination of evidence, but to place before them each several item of business as it successively arises, retiring when they proceed to their deliberations.[2] In those cases which by the old practice were under the control of private prosecutors, such prosecutors were sometimes permitted to present their cases to the grand jury. This, however, was at the grand jury's option, to be exercised where a case of difficulty requires the marshalling of evidence or the leading of unwilling witnesses.[3] In State prosecutions the attorney-general, or his representative, was sometimes, on special invitation, and by permission of the court, in attendance for the presentation of evidence; but this was at the election of the jury, and was sometimes refused.[4] The practice in Massachusetts, as stated by Mr. Davis, is for the officer having charge of the preparation of the indictments to attend the grand jury, to open each particular case as it arises, to commence the examination of each witness, and to meet any question as to the law of the case which may be given to him. But it is his duty, "during the discussion of the question, to remain perfectly silent, unless his advice or opinion in a matter of law is requested. The least attempt to influence the grand jury in their decision upon the effect of the evidence is an unjustifiable interference, and no fair and honorable officer will ever be guilty of it. It is very common, however, for some one of the grand jury to request the opinion of the public prosecutor as to the

563; Davis's Virg. Crim. Law, 425; Lung's case, 1 Conn. 428; Kel. 8; 1 Ch. C. L. 816.

[1] Com. *v.* Woods, 10 Gray, 477; State *v.* Logan, 1 Nev. 509; State *v.* Clapper, 59 Iowa, 279; Steel *v.* State, 1 Tex. 142; Infra, § 372.

[2] 1 Ch. C. L. 816; R. *v.* Hughes, 1 Car. & K. 519, 526, where it is held also that a police officer may be stationed in the room.

[3] 4 Bl. Com. 126, note by Christian; Dick. Q. S. 6th ed. 1837.

[4] R. *v.* Crossfield, 8 How. St. Tr. 773, note.

propriety of finding the bill. But it is his duty to decline giving it, or even any intimation on the subject; but in all cases to leave the grand jury to decide independently for themselves. It may be thought that this is too great a degree of refinement in official duty. But the experience of thirty years furnishes an answer most honorable to the intelligence and integrity of that body of citizens from which the grand jury are selected; and that is, that they almost universally decide correctly."[1]

This is the uniform practice in Pennsylvania. In the United States courts the same practice obtains,[2] and is thus stated by Justice Field in a charge delivered to a California grand jury in August, 1872:[3] "The district attorney has the right to be present at the taking of testimony before you for the purpose of giving information or advice touching any matter cognizable by you, and may interrogate witnesses before you, but he has no right to be present pending your deliberations on the evidence. When your vote is taken upon the question whether an indictment shall be found or a presentment made, no person beside yourselves should be present."[4] The privilege of attendance should be strictly limited to the prosecuting officer officially clothed with this high trust, and to his permanent deputies,[5] and not extended to mere temporary assistants; and indictments have been properly quashed when attorneys temporarily representing the prosecuting authorities entered the room of the grand jury when they were deliberating as to the bill, and advised them as to their action.[6] It is proper in this connection to keep in mind the fact, already noticed,[7] that the only valid basis on which the institution of grand juries rests is that they are an independent and impartial tribunal between the prosecution and the accused; and it is the duty of the courts to refuse to tolerate any practice which conflicts with this independence and impartiality. The rule

[1] Davis's Precedent, 21. See, also, M'Lellan *v.* Richardson, 13 Me. 82, where it appears that the same usage exists in Maine.

[2] U. S. *v.* Reed, 2 Blatch. 435, 455.

[3] See Pamph. Rep. 9 *et seq.*; 2 Sawyer, 663–7.

[4] See, to same effect, U. S. *v.* Schumann, 7 Sawy. 439, where, however, it is said that he cannot prevent an investigation by saying the government will not prosecute the case. Infra, § 383.

[5] See Crittenden, ex parte, Hemp. 176; Shattuck *v.* State, 11 Ind. 473.

[6] U. S. *v.* Kilpatrick, 16 Fed. Rep. 765; State *v.* Addison, 2 S. C. 356; Durr *v.* State, 53 Miss. 425.

[7] Supra, § 339.

in the text was disastrously departed from in the Star Route cases, tried in Washington in 1883–4, in which private counsel, appointed to assist the district attorney, were permitted to advise the grand jury during their deliberations. The consequences of this course, however, have not been such as to encourage its adoption in other cases. And in any view, the presence of counsel for the prosecution, public or private, during the deliberations of the jury, should be ground for quashing the bill, unless it appear that there was no interference by such counsel in any degree with the freedom of such deliberations.[1] The purpose of the institution of grand juries was, as we have seen, to interpose a check upon the sovereign; and they would cease to answer this purpose, and would increase the danger they were intended to avert, if they should be put under the official direction of the prosecuting authorities of the State.[2]

Defendant and others not entitled to attend.

§ 367. In England, and in the courts of each of the several States, neither the defendant, nor any person representing him, is permitted to attend the examination of the grand jury.[3] And Judge King, in an opinion marked with his usual good sense, held that the sending of an unofficial volunteer communication to the grand jury, inviting them to start on their own authority a prosecution, is a contempt of court, and a misdemeanor at common law.[4] Any volunteer attendance is by the same rule subject to the same law.[5]

[1] Charge of Field, J., *ut sup.*; Lung's case, 1 Conn. 428; Lewis *v.* Wake Co., 74 N. C. 194; State *v.* Addison, 2 S. C. 356; State *v.* McNinch, 12 S. C. 89, 95; State *v.* Kimball, 29 Iowa, 267; Rothschild *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 519. See, however, Shattuck *v.* State, 11 Ind. 473.

[2] The reader is referred to an excellent article on this topic by Mr. Merriam in 16 West. Jurist (January, 1882), pp. 1 *et seq.*

[3] 1 B. & C. 37, 51; 3 B. & A. 432; 1 Ch. R. 217; 1 Ch. C. L. 317; U. S. *v.* Palmer, 2 Cranch. C. C. 11; U. S. *v.* Blodgett, 35 Ga. 336; State *v.* Hamlin, 47 Conn. 95, modifying Lung's case, 1 Conn. 428, State *v.* Fassett, 16 Conn. 458; McCullough *v.* Com., 67 Penn. R. 30; Com. *v.* Simons, 6 Phil. R. 167; supra, § 338. See, however, State *v.* Whitney, 7 Oreg. 386.

[4] Com. *v.* Crans, 3 Penn. L. J. 443. Infra, § 381. "There has hardly been a session," said Justice Field, of the Supreme Court of the United States, in addressing a grand jury in California in 1872 (Pamph. Rep. 2 Sawyer, 663–7), "of the grand jury of this court for years, at which instances have not occurred of personal solicitation to some of its members to obtain or prevent the presentment or indictment

[5] McCullough *v.* Com. *ut supra*; see U. S. *v.* Farrington, 2 Cr. L. Mag. 525; S. C. 5 Fed. Rep. 343.

In Maine, it is said that the presence of a stranger does not vitiate an indictment if he does not interfere,[1] but the better opinion is that such presence is ground for quashing a bill,[2] and, when shown on record, has been held ground for arrest of judgment.[3]

VIII. FINDING AND ATTESTING OF BILL.

§ 368. The examination being over, it becomes the duty of the grand jury to pass upon the bill; and unless *twelve* of their number agree to find a true bill,[4] the return is "*ignoramus*," or, as is more commonly the case, "ignored," or "not found." If the finding be by less than twelve, the indictment may be quashed by motion made before plea.[5] The

Twelve must concur in bill.

of parties. And communications to that end have frequently been addressed to the grand jury, filled with malignant and scandalous imputations upon the conduct and acts of those against whom the writers entertained hostility, and against the conduct and acts of former and present officers of this court, and of previous grand juries of this district.

"All such communications were calculated to prevent and obstruct the due administration of justice, and to bring the proceedings of the grand jury into contempt. 'Let any reflecting man,' says a distinguished judge, 'be he layman or lawyer, consider of the consequences which would follow, if every individual could, at his pleasure, throw his malice or his prejudice into the grand jury room, and he will, of necessity, conclude that the rule of law which forbids all communication with grand juries, engaged in criminal investigations, except through the public instructions of courts and the testimony of sworn witnesses, is a rule of safety to the community. What value could be attached to the doings of a tribunal so to be approached and influenced? How long would a body, so exposed to be misled and abused, be recognized by freemen as among the chosen ministers of liberty and security? The recognition of such a mode of reaching grand juries would introduce a flood of evils, disastrous to the purity of the administration of criminal justice, and subversive of all public confidence in the action of these bodies.' Judge King, in Commonwealth *v.* Crans, in 3 Penn. Law Jour. pp. 459–464." "Eaves-dropping" on a grand jury is said to be indictable at common law. State *v.* Pennington, 3 Head, 299. By an act of Congress, passed in 1872, such solicitations are indictable. Infra, §§ 729, 966.

In New York, such appeal to a grand jury is, under statute, only a contempt when marked by contemptuous action to the court in its presence. Bergh's case, 16 Abb. Pr. N. S. 266.

[1] State *v.* Clough, 49 Me. 573.

[2] Com. *v.* Dorwart, 7 Luz. Bar, 121.

[3] State *v.* Watson, 34 La. An. 669. But see State *v.* Justus, 11 Oregon, 17.

[4] Sayer's case, 8 Leigh, 722. As to U. S. courts see supra, § 340. If twelve jurymen are present and concur, the absence of others is not ground for exception. People *v.* Hunter, 54 Cal. 65. See State *v.* Brainerd, 56 Vt. 532.

[5] People *v.* Shattuck, 6 Abb. New Cas. 33. As to whether juror may be examined to this, see infra, § 379.

objection cannot, it has been said, be taken advantage of by plea in abatement.[1]

Foreman usually attests the bill.

§ 369. In those States in which it is the practice for indictments to be prepared complete by the prosecuting attorney and submitted as such to the grand jury for their action, the assent of the grand jury is signified by the indorsing on the bill of the words "true bill," with the foreman's name attached, while an ignoring of the bill is signified by indorsing of the word "ignoramus," with the foreman's name attached. When this is the practice, or when the foreman's signature is required by statute, the omission of the words "true bill" with the foreman's name, is fatal if the objection is made before verdict.[2] The omission, however, of the word "true" before "bill" has been held not fatal.[3] Nor, *a fortiori*, are clerical mistakes in the indorsement,[4] and in any view exceptions of this class must be taken before verdict.[5] In some States the signature of the foreman is held sufficient without any other indorsement,[6] even though the title "foreman" be left out.[7]

[1] State *v.* Hamlin, 47 Conn. 95.

[2] 1 Ch. C. L. 324; Archibald's C. P. by Jervis, 39; Wankon-Chaw-Neck *v.* U. S., 1 Morris, 332; State *v.* Webster, 5 Greenl. 373; State *v.* Davidson, 12 Vt. 300; Com. *v.* Sargent, Thach. C. C. 116; Com. *v.* Hamilton, 15 Gray, 480; Com. *v.* Gleason, 110 Mass. 66; Hopkins *v.* Com., 50 Penn. St. 9; State *v.* Elkins, 1 Meigs, 109; Com. *v.* Walters, 6 Dana, 290; Bennett *v.* State, 8 Humph. 118; Smith *v.* State, 28 Miss. 728; Spratt *v.* State, 8 Mo. 247; McDonald *v.* State, 8 Mo. 283; Gardner *v.* People, 3 Scan. 83; Nomague *v.* People, Breese, 109; Johnson *v.* State, 23 Ind. 32; Cooper *v.* State, 79 Ind. 206; Strange *v.* State, 110 Ind. 354; Harriman *v.* State, 2 Greene (Iowa), 270; Garraway *v.* State, 23 Ala. 772; State *v.* Onnmacht, 10 La. R. 198; State *v.* Morrison, 30 La. An. Pt. II. 817; Alden *v.* State, 18 Fla. 187; Tilley *v.* State, 21 Fla. 242; the objection is too late after verdict. Benson *v.* State, 68 Ala. 544; People *v.* Johnston, 48 Cal. 549; Weaver *v.* State, 19 Tex. Ap. 547.

[3] Sparks *v.* Com., 9 Barr, 354; State *v.* Mertens, 14 Mo. 94.

[4] White *v.* Com., 29 Grat. 294; State *v.* Chandler, 2 Hawks, 439.

[5] Burgess *v.* Com., 2 Va. Ca. 483; see Com. *v.* Betton, 5 Cush. 427; Cooper *v.* State, 79 Ind. 206.

[6] State *v.* Freeman, 13 N. H. 488; Com. *v.* Smyth, 11 Cush. 473; Brotherton *v.* People, 75 N. Y. 159; Price *v.* Com., 21 Grat. 846; White *v.* Com., 29 Grat. 824; State *v.* Axt, 6 Iowa, 511; State *v.* McCartey, 17 Minn. 76; State *v.* Chandler, 2 Hawks, 439; see State *v.* Heaton, 95 Ind. 773; State *v.* Bowman, 103 Ind. 69.

[7] State *v.* Brown, 31 Vt. 603; Walls *v.* State, 23 Ind. 150; Wassels *v.* State, 26 Ind. 30; State *v.* Chandler, 2 Hawks, 439; McGuffie *v.* State, 17 Ga. 497. That the foreman may sign through a clerk, see Benson *v.* State, 68 Ala. 544.

That it is enough if the words "true bill" be copied into the transcript

In those States, on the other hand, in which the action of the grand jury approving of the principle of a bill is prior to the presentation of the bill to them, then the attestation of the foreman is not the primary proof of approval, and may be omitted.[1] In other States the practice has grown up, there being no statutory prescription, of treating the formal return of the bill into court as a "true bill" as a sufficient verification of its finding.[2]

§ 370. When the bill has been verified, it is brought publicly into court, and the clerk of the court calls all the jurymen by name, who severally answer to signify that they are present; the grand jury attending in a body.[3] Then the clerk proceeds in order to ask the jury whether they have agreed upon any bills, and bids them present them to the court;[4] and then the foreman of the jury hands the indictments to the clerk, who asks them if they agree the court shall amend matter of form, altering no matter of substance, to which they signify their assent.[5] This form is necessary in order to enable the court to alter any

Bill to be brought into court.

immediately after the indictment, see Green *v.* State, 79 Ind. 537. That variances in the foreman's name are not fatal, see State *v.* Collins, 3 Dev. 117; State *v.* Calhoun, 1 Dev. & Bat. 374; State *v.* Stedman, 7 Port. 496; Jackson *v.* State, 74 Ala. 557. That signature by initials is enough, see State *v.* Taggart, 38 Me. 338; Com. *v.* Hamilton, 15 Gray, 480; Com. *v.* Gleason, 110 Mass. 66. That the name may be omitted, see State *v.* Sopher, 35 La. An. 976. That the indorsement of the foreman's name, followed by filing, is sufficient evidence of finding, see Hubbard *v.* State, 72 Ala. 164; State *v.* Gouge, 12 Lea, 132. That surplusage will be disregarded, see Thompson *v.* Com., 20 Grat. 724. That a foreman *pro tem.* will be held to be duly appointed, see State *v.* Collins, 6 Baxt. 151.

[1] See State *v.* McGrath, 44 N. J. L. 227; State *v.* Creighton, 1 N. & McC. 256.

[2] Jones *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 552; Weaver *v.* State, 19 Tex. Ap. 547; see State *v.* Shippey, 10 Minn. 223; State *v.* Tinney, 26 La. An. 460; People *v.* Roberts, 6 Cal. 214; State *v.* Freeman, 13 N. H. 488; Brotherton *v.* People, 75 N. Y. 159; State *v.* Magrath, 44 N. J. L. 227; Com. *v.* Walters, 6 Dana, 290; State *v.* Creighton, 1 N. & McC. 256; State *v.* Cox, 6 Ired. 440; Cherry *v.* State, 6 Fla. 479.

The indorsement of the name of the offence on the indictment is no part of the finding of the grand jury. State *v.* Rohfrischt, 12 La. An. 382.

[3] State *v.* Bordeaux, 93 N. C. 560; but see Danforth *v.* State, 75 Ga. 614. As to polling, see infra, § 376.

[4] 4 Bla. Com. 366; Cro. C. C. 7. See form, Cro. C. C. 7; Clare *v.* State, 68 Ind. 17; State *v.* Heaton, 23 W. Va. 773.

[5] Cro. C. C. 7; Dick. Sess. 158. See form, Cro. C. C. 7; Dick. Sess. 158, last vol. London edition. As to Alabama statutes, see Wesley *v.* State, 52 Ala. 182.

clerical mistake, because they have no authority to change the form of the accusation, without the consent of the accusers.[1] The bringing of the indictment into court may be inferred from the fact of reception with proper indorsements.[2]

Finding must be recorded.

§ 371. The finding should then be recorded by the clerk, *ignoramus*,[3] as well as true bill, and an omission in that respect cannot be supplied by the indorsement of the foreman, nor by the recital in the record that the defendant stands indicted, nor by his arraignment, nor by his plea of not guilty, nor by the minutes of the judge.[4] It cannot be intended that he was indicted; it must be shown by the record of the finding. The recording of the finding of the grand jury, it is said, is as essential as the recording of the verdict of the petit jury.[5]

Bill may be amended by grand jury.

§ 372. It seems that if an existing indictment be altered by the prosecuting officer, and submitted, thus changed, to the grand jury, who again return "true bill" thereon, such informality will not destroy the indictment.[6] The practice in such cases, however, is for a new and more regular bill to be framed, and sent to the grand jury for their finding.[7]

[1] R. T. H. 203; 2 Stra. 1026; 1 Ch. C. L. 324. See Willey *v.* State, 46 Ind. 363. That the return may be inferred, see State *v.* Gratz, 68 Mo. 22.

[2] State *v.* Mason, 32 La. An. 1018; Cooper *v.* State, 59 Miss. 257; State *v.* DeServant, 33 La. An. 979; People *v.* Lee, 2 Utah, 441; Reeves *v.* State, 84 Ind. 116; State *v.* McIntire, 59 Iowa, 267; see Fitzpatrick *v.* People, 98 Ill. 269; Willingham *v.* State, 21 Fla. 761.

[3] State *v.* Brown, 81 N. C. 516.

[4] Heacock *v.* State, 42 Ind. 393; Sattler *v.* People, 59 Ill. 68. See Crookham *v.* State, 5 W. Va. 510; Fitzcox *v.* State, 53 Miss. 585; Terrell *v.* State, 41 Tex. 463; Rasberry *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 664. See, however, State *v.* Gratz, 68 Mo. 22.

[5] Com. *v.* Cawood, 2 Va. Cas. 527; State *v.* Glover, 3 Iowa (Greene), 249; State *v.* Davidson, 2 Cold. (Tenn.) 184; State *v.* Cox, 6 Ired. 440; State *v.* Brown, 81 N. C. 516; State *v.* Shields, 33 La. An. 991.

Where the record did not show that the grand jury returned the indictment into court, it was held that the judgment was erroneous and should be reversed. Rainey *v.* People, 3 Gilm. 71; Chappel *v.* State, 8 Yerg. 166; Brown *v.* State, 7 Humph. 155.

An indictment indorsed as a true bill, and returned by the authority of the whole grand jury, is sufficient, without the special appointment of a foreman. Friar *v.* State, 3 How. Miss. 422; Peter *v.* State, 3 How. Miss. 433.

[6] State *v.* Allen, Charlton's Ga. R. 518.

[7] 1 Ch. C. L. 335. See State *v.* Davidson, 2 Cold. (Tenn.) 184. Supra, § 365.

§ 373. In England, if the grand jury at the assizes or sessions has ignored a bill, they cannot find another bill against the same person for the same offence at the same assizes; and if such other bill is sent them, it has been said that they should take no notice of it.[1] But the better view is that a bill may be sent up if the emergency require, after an *ignoramus*, at the discretion of the court.[2] An *ignoramus* may be reconsidered before, but not after, the return of the bill to the court.[3]

Finding may be reconsidered.

§ 374. Usually the jury cannot find one part of the same count to be true and another false, but they must either pass or reject the whole; and, therefore, if they ignore one part and find another, the finding is bad,[4] though there is no reason why, when a count contains a lower offence inclosed in a higher, the grand jury should not ignore the higher offence and find the lower. Where there are several counts, they can find any one count and ignore the others.[5] So in an indictment against several, they can distinguish among the defendants, and find as to some and reject as to the rest.[6]

Jury cannot usually find part only of a count.

§ 375. If the finding be incomplete or insensible, it is bad.[7]

Insensible finding is bad.

§ 376. When the grand jury are in session, they are under the control of the court, and the court may at any time recommit an

[1] R. *v.* Humphreys, Car. & M. 601—Patteson; S. P., R. *v.* Austin, 4 Cox C. C. 385. See *contra*, R. *v.* Newton, 2 M. & Rob. 506—Wightman. See infra, §§ 390, 452.

[2] Rowand *v.* Com., 82 Penn. St. 405. Supra, § 333; infra, § 446.

[3] State *v.* Brown, 81 N. C. 568.

[4] 2 Hale, 162; Bac. Ab. Indictment, D. 3; Bulst. 206; 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 2; 5 East, 304; 2 Camp. 134, 584; 2 Leach, 708; Com. *v.* Keenan, 67 Penn. St. 203; State *v.* Wilburne, 2 Brev. 296; State *v.* Creighton, 1 Nott & McC. 256; State *v.* Cowan, 1 Head, 280; State *v.* Wilhite, 11 Humph. 602.

[5] 1 Chit. C. Law, 323.

[6] 2 Hale, 158; 1 Ch. C. L. 323.

[7] 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 2; 1 Ch. C. L. 323.

Where the grand jury returned a bill of indictment which contained ten counts for forging and uttering the acceptance of a bill of exchange, with an indorsement, "A true bill on both counts," and the prisoner pleaded to the whole ten counts; and where, after the case for the prosecution had concluded, the prisoner's counsel pointed this out, the finding was held bad, and the grand jury was discharged; in such case the court will not allow one of the grand jurors to be called as a witness to explain their finding. R. *v.* Cooke, 8 C. & P. 582. See People *v.* Hulbut, 4 Denio, 133.

Grand jury may be polled, or finding tested by plea in abatement.

imperfect finding to them,[1] or may poll them, or take any other method, on the suggestion of a defendant, of determining whether twelve assented to the bill.[2] The question of concurrence of sufficient number of the jurors may be tested by plea in abatement.[3]

IX. MISCONDUCT OF GRAND JUROR.

Grand juror may be punished by court for contempt, but is not otherwise responsible.

§ 377. In case of criminal misconduct or neglect of duty on the part of a grand juror, when on duty, an indictment may be maintained against him, or he may be proceeded against by the court for contempt.[4] His official decisions, however, cannot be made the ground of a civil action against him by a party offended; nor can he be subsequently indicted for such decisions.[5]

X. HOW FAR GRAND JURORS MAY BE COMPELLED TO TESTIFY.

Grand juror may be examined as to what witness said.

§ 378. Whatever may have been the old rule,[6] it is now settled that a witness may be indicted for perjury on account of false testimony before a grand jury,[7] and grand jurors are competent witnesses to prove the facts;[8] and so may be the prosecuting attorney.[9] In New Jersey, however, it is said a grand juror is not admissible to prove that a

[1] State *v.* Squire, 10 N. H. 558. See Byers *v.* State, 73 Md. 209.

[2] Lowe's case, 4 Greenl. 448; State *v.* Symonds, 36 Me. 128; *contra*, State *v.* Baker, 20 Mo. 338. Infra, § 379.

[3] State *v.* McNeill, 93 N. C. 552; supra, § 350-1.

[4] Penn. *v.* Keffer, Addison, 290.

[5] 1 Chitty Cr. L. 323, 324; Lloyd *v.* Carpenter, 5 Penn. L. J. 60; 3 Clark, Phil. 196, where it was said by King, J.: "The grand jury are entirely irresponsible, either to the public or to individuals aggrieved—the law giving them the most absolute and unqualified indemnity for such an official act." And again: "When the official existence of a grand jury terminates, they mingle again with the general mass of the citizens, intangible for any of their official acts, either by private action, public prosecution, or legislative impeachment." See, to same effect, Hunter *v.* Mathis, 40 Ind. 357: Turpin *v.* Booth, 56 Cal. 65; also cited in 16 West. Jur. 70.

[6] See 16 West. Jurist, 8.

[7] 4 Black. Com. 126, note; Sykes *v.* Dunbar, 2 Selw. N. P. 1059; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 510; 1 Ch. C. L. 322; State *v.* Fassett, 16 Conn. 457; Huidekoper *v.* Cotton, 3 Watts, 56; Thomas *v.* Com., 2 Robinson, 795; State *v.* Offutt, 4 Blackf. 355; Mackin *v.* People, 115 Ill. 313; People *v.* Young, 31 Cal. 564; and cases cited infra.

[8] Ibid.; Crocker *v.* State, Meigs, 127. See R. *v.* Hughes, 1 C. & K. 519; Com. *v.* Hill, 11 Cush. 137, and cases cited infra, note 6.

[9] State *v.* Van Buskirk, 59 Ind. 384. Infra, § 380.

witness who had been examined swore differently in the grand jury room,[1] though the contrary is now the general and better opinion.[2] And a grand juror may be called to sustain a witness.[3]

§ 379. But the affidavit of a grand juror will not be received to impeach or affect the finding of his fellows,[4] even for the purpose of showing how many jurors were present when the bill was found, which jurors voted in its favor, what were their views,[5] or that the bill was found without evidence.[6] But where a grand juror was guilty of gross intoxication while in the discharge of his duty as such, the court, on a presentment of such fact by the rest of the grand jury, ordered a bill to be preferred against him.[7] And a grand juror may be examined

Cannot be admitted to impeach finding.

[1] Imlay *v.* Rogers, 2 Halsted, 347. See State *v.* Baker, 20 Mo. 338.

[2] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 510; Sykes *v.* Dunbar, 2 Selw. N. P. 1059; R. *v.* Gibson, 1 Car. & M. 672; U. S. *v.* Charles, 2 Cranch C. C. 76; U. S. *v.* Reed, 2 Blatch. 435, 466; State *v.* Benner, 64 Me. 267; State *v.* Wood, 53 N. H. 484; Com. *v.* Hill, 11 Cush. 137; Com. *v.* Mead, 12 Gray, 167; Way *v.* Butterworth, 106 Mass. 75; State *v.* Fassett, 16 Conn. 457; People *v.* Hulbut, 4 Denio, 133; Huidekoper *v.* Cotton, 3 Watts, 56; Gordon *v.* Com., 92 Penn. St. 216; Thomas *v.* Com., 2 Robinson (Va.), 795; Little *v.* Com., 25 Grat. 921; Burnham *v.* Hatfield, 5 Blackf. 21; Granger *v.* Warrington, 3 Gilm. 299; Perkins *v.* State, 4 Ind. 222; Burdick *v.* Hunt, 43 Ind. 384; State *v.* Broughton, 7 Ired. 96; State *v.* Boyd, 2 Hill, S. C. 288; Sands *v.* Robison, 20 Miss. 704; Rocco *v.* State, 37 Miss. 357; Beam *v.* Link, 27 Mo. 261; White *v.* Fox, 1 Bibb, 369; Crocker *v.* State, 1 Meigs, 127; Jones *v.* Turpin, 6 Heisk. 181; People *v.* Young, 31 Cal. 564. In several States, *e. g.*, Missouri, the privilege is regulated by statute.

[3] People *v.* Hulbut, 4 Den. 133; Perkins *v.* State, 4 Ind. 222.

[4] R. *v.* Marsh, 6 Ad. & El. 236; 1 N. & P. 187; State *v.* Doon, R. M. Charl. 1; State *v.* McLeod, 1 Hawks. 344; State *v.* Baker, 20 Mo. (5 Bennett), 338; State *v.* Gibbs, 39 Iowa, 318; State *v.* Davis, 41 Iowa, 311; State *v.* Beebe, 17 Minn. 241. As to jurors generally, see infra, § 847.

[5] State *v.* Fassett, 16 Conn. 457; People *v.* Hulbut, 4 Denio, 133; Huidekoper *v.* Cotton, 3 Watts, 56; Gordon *v.* Com., 92 Penn. St. 216; State *v.* Balt. R. R., 15 W. Va. 362; State *v.* Broughton, 7 Ired. L. 98; State *v.* Baker, 20 Mo. 238; State *v.* Mewherter, 46 Iowa, 88; aff. State *v.* Gibbs, 39 Iowa, 318; *contra*, People *v.* Shattuck, 6 Abb. N. C. 33; Spigener *v.* State, 62 Ala. 383; Compare infra, § 847; supra, § 368; State *v.* Oxford, 30 Tex. 428.

[6] State *v.* Grady, 34 Mo. 220.

[7] Penn. *v.* Keffer, Addis. 390.

Where, on the trial of an indictment for selling liquor without a license, which charged five offences in separate counts, the defendant, in order to limit the proof to a single count, offered to show, by one of the grand jury, that only one offence was sworn to before that body, it was held that the evidence was inadmissible. People *v.*

to prove, on a motion to quash a bill, who were the witnesses on whose evidence it was found;[1] to show who was the prosecutor;[2] and to prove, also, that less than twelve concurred in the finding.[3] Where, also, the allegation is that the bill was found on testimony totally incompetent, and where this is ground for quashing, it would follow that grand jurors should be admitted to prove such fact. But the right of revision in such cases should be exercised within narrow limits, since if the action of grand juries is open to be overhauled and supervised by courts, not only would the secrecy of the grand jury as a protective institution be impaired and the solemnity of its proceedings destroyed by being subjected to the subsequent parol attacks of its members, but its findings would take the place of the verdicts of petit juries, and become not certificates of probable cause, but adjudications under the direction of the court on the merits.[4]

Prosecuting officer or other attendant inadmissible to impeach finding.

§ 380. As a grand juror ought not to be received to testify to any fact which may invalidate the finding of his fellows, a prosecuting attorney is incompetent to testify to the same effect.[5] But, as has been already seen, he should be received to state what was the issue before the jury, and what was testified to by witnesses.[6] The same distinctions apply to clerks and other attendants on the grand jury.[7]

Hulbut, 4 Denio, 133. See R. *v.* Cooke, 8 C. & P. 582.

In Missouri, it is provided by statute that no grand juror shall disclose any evidence given before the grand jury. See State *v.* Baker, 20 Mo. 338. But it has been held that a grand juror is not prohibited by the statute from stating that a certain person, naming him, testified before the grand jury, and the subject-matter upon which he testified. State *v.* Brewer, 8 Mo. 373; Tindle *v.* Nichols, 20 Mo. 326; Beam *v.* Link, 27 Mo. 261.

[1] People *v.* Briggs, 60 How. (N. Y.) Pr. 17.

[2] Sykes *v.* Dunbar, Selwyn, *Nisi Prius*, 1091; Freeman *v.* Arkell, 1 Car. & P. 135.

[3] Low's case, 4 Greenl. 430; People *v.* Shattuck, 6 Abb. N. C. 33; but see *contra*, R. *v.* Marsh, 6 Ad. & El. 236; State *v.* Baker, 20 Mo. 338; State *v.* Womack, 70 Mo. 410; State *v.* Oxford, 30 Tex. 428.

[4] See remarks of Nelson, J., in U. S. *v.* Reed, 2 Blatch. 466; Hulbut *v.* People, *ut supra*.

[5] 1 Bost. Law Rep. 4; McClellan *v.* Richardson, 13 Me. 82; Clark *v.* Field, 12 Vt. 485.

[6] See Whart. Crim. Ev. § 513; White *v.* Fox, 1 Bibb, 369; State *v.* Van Buskirk, 59 Ind. 384.

[7] U. S. *v.* Farrington, 5 Fed. Rep. 343; Knott *v.* Sargent, 125 Mass. 95; State *v.* Fassett, 16 Conn. 470; State *v.* Van Buskirk, 59 Ind. 384; Beam *v.* Link, 27 Mo. 261.

§ 381. It is not only a contempt of court, punishable summarily, but it is a misdemeanor at common law, punishable by indictment, for volunteers to approach a grand jury for the purpose of influencing its action.[1]

To tamper with grand jury is an indictable offence.

[1] Com. *v.* Crans, 3 Penn. L. J. 442; 2 Clark, Phil. 172; Greenl. on Ev. § 252; and see supra, § 338; infra, §§ 729, 966, and charge of Justice Field, cited supra, § 367.

CHAPTER V.

NOLLE PROSEQUI.

Nolle prosequi a prerogative of sovereign, § 383.

Will be granted in vexatious prosecutions, § 384.

§ 383. A NOLLE PROSEQUI is the voluntary withdrawal by the prosecuting authority of present proceedings on a particular bill, and at common law is a prerogative vested in the executive,[1] by whom alone it can be exercised.[2] At common law it may be at any time retracted, and is not only no bar to a subsequent prosecution on another indictment, but it must become a matter of record in order to preclude a revival of proceedings on the original bill.[3] It may, at common law, be entered at any time before judgment;[4] and it may

Nolle prosequi a prerogative of sovereign.

[1] U. S. *v.* Watson, 7 Blatch. 60; Com. *v.* Tuck, 20 Pick. 356; State *v.* Thompson, 3 Hawks, 613. See State *v.* Tufts, 56 N. H. 137; Com. *v.* Smith, 98 Mass. 10. See 5 Crim. Law Mag. 1.

[2] Ibid.; R. *v.* Dunn, 1 C. & K. 730; R. *v.* Colling, 2 Cox, 184. In Campbell's Lives of the Chancellors, II., 173, we are told that Lord Holt having committed some of a party of fanatics, called "Prophets," for seditious language, he was visited by Lacy, one of their friends, when the following conversation took place: "Servant: 'My lord is unwell to-day, and cannot see company.' Lacy (in a very solemn tone): 'Acquaint your master that I must see him, for I bring a message to him from the Lord God.' The Chief Justice, having ordered Lacy in, and demanded his business, was thus addressed: 'I come to you a prophet from the Lord God, who has sent me to thee, and would have thee grant a *nolle prosequi* for John Atkins, his servant, whom thou hast cast into prison.' Chief Justice Holt: 'Thou art a false prophet, and a lying knave. If the Lord God had sent thee it would have been to the Attorney-General, *for He knows that it belongeth not to the Chief Justice to grant a nolle prosequi; but I, as Chief Justice, can grant a warrant to commit thee to bear him company.*'"

[3] U. S. *v.* Shoemaker, 2 McLean, 114; Com. *v.* Wheeler, 2 Mass. 172; Com. *v.* Tuck, 20 Pick. 356; Com. *v.* Miller, 2 Ashm. 61; Wortham *v.* Com., 5 Rand. 669; Com. *v.* Lindsay, 2 Virg. Cas. 345; State *v.* McNeill, 3 Hawks, 183; State *v.* Hasket, 3 Hill S. C. 95; State *v.* Blackwell, 9 Ala. 79; Clark *v.* State, 23 Miss. 261. As to position of attorney-general on trial, see infra, § 554. As to law, see infra, § 447.

[4] East, 307; State *v.* Burke, 38 Me. 574; State *v.* Roe, 12 Vt. 93; State *v.* Smith, 49 N. H. 155; Com. *v.* Briggs,

be entered on objectionable counts so as to confine the verdict to those which are good.[1] It may be entered, also, at common law, on a portion of a divisible count;[2] or as to one of several defendants.[3] Courts have, it is true, frequently held that the prerogative is one subject to their control, while the case is on trial, and that the attorney-general has no right, after the jury is empanelled and witnesses called, to withdraw the case without their sanction.[4] In some States no *nolle prosequi* is operative by statute without such consent.[5] Be this as it may, if the case be withdrawn when on trial, without the defendant's consent, this operates as an acquittal in all cases in which the defendant was in jeopardy at the trial.[6]

7 Pick. 179; Com. *v.* Tuck, 20 Pick. 356; Com. *v.* Jenks, 1 Gray, 490; Levison *v.* State, 54 Ala. 520; 5 Op. At.-Gen. 729.

[1] R. *v.* Rowlands, 2 Den. C. C. 367; 17 Q. B. 671; R. *v.* Hempstead, R. & R. 344; R. *v.* Butterworth, R. & R. 520; U. S. *v.* Peterson, 1 W. & M. 305; U. S. *v.* Shoemaker, 2 McLean, 114; State *v.* Bruce, 24 Me. 71; Anonymous, 31 Me. 592; State *v.* Burke, 38 Me. 524; State *v.* Merrill, 44 N. H. 624; State *v.* Roe, 12 Vt. 93; State *v.* Lockwood, 58 Vt. 378; Com. *v.* Briggs, 7 Pick. 177; Com. *v.* Cain, 102 Mass. 487; Jennings *v.* Com., 105 Mass. 586; Com. *v.* Wallace, 108 Mass. 512; Com. *v.* Dean, 109 Mass. 349; People *v.* Porter, 4 Parker, C. R. 524; State *v.* Fleming, 7 Humph. 152; Com. *v.* Gillespie, 7 S. & R. 469; though see Agnew *v.* Commissioners, 12 S. & R. 94; Mount *v.* State, 14 Ohio, 295; Wright *v.* State, 5 Ind. 290; Barnett *v.* State, 54 Ala. 579; Lacey *v.* State, 58 Ala. 385; Grant *v.* State, 2 Cold. 216.

[2] Ibid.; State *v.* Merrill, 44 N. H. 624; State *v.* Christian, 30 La. An. Pt. I. 367. In U. S. *v.* Keen, 1 M'Lean, 429; Com. *v.* Stedman, 12 Metc. 444; Com. *v.* Briggs, 7 Pick. 179; Lanning *v.* Com., 105 Mass. 586; State *v.* Buck, 59 Iowa, 382, this was allowed after verdict. See infra, § 742.

[3] State *v.* Woulfe, 58 Ind. 17.

[4] U. S. *v.* Shoemaker, 2 McLean, 114; U. S. *v.* Stowell, 2 Curtis, C. C. 153; U. S. *v.* Corrie, 1 Brunf. U. S. 686; State *v.* I. S. S., 1 Tyler, 178; Com. *v.* Tuck, 20 Pick. 356; Com. *v.* Briggs, 7 Pick. 179; Jennings *v.* Com., 103 Mass. 586; Com. *v.* Scott, 121 Mass. 33; Mount *v.* State, 14 Ohio, 295; State *v.* Moody, 69 N. C. 529; Statham *v.* State, 41 Ga. 507; Donaldson, ex parte, 44 Mo. 149; State *v.* McKee, 1 Bailey, 651. See State *v.* Kreps, 8 Ala. 951. See, as to duties of prosecuting attorney, infra, §§ 555 *et seq.* See 5 Crim. Law Mag. 1. That a federal district attorney has not absolute power over a case while pending before a commission or grand jury, is maintained in U. S. *v.* Schumann, 7 Sawy. 439; 2 Abbott U. S. 523. See as to New Jersey, Appar *v.* Woolston, 14 Vroom, 65; State *v.* Hickling, 45 N. J. (16 Vroom) 154.

[5] People *v.* McLeod, 1 Hill, 377; State *v.* Taylor, 84 N. C. 773–5.

[6] Infra, § 447. See McGehee *v.* State, 58 Ala. 360; State *v.* McKee, 1 Bail. (S. C.) 651. This, however, cannot be claimed when the indictment is defective. Infra, § 507. In New Hamp-

Such, also, is the case when part of a divisible charge is withdrawn.[1] On the other hand, the defendant, by not insisting on a verdict, may lose his right to set up the *nolle prosequi* as a bar.[2]

shire, in prosecutions instituted in the name of the State, a general discretionary power exists in the prosecuting officer to enter a *nolle prosequi*. Before a jury is empanelled, or, after a verdict in favor of the State, this power may be exercised without the respondent's consent, and with his consent at any time during the trial, and before the verdict of the jury. State *v.* Smith, 49 N. H. 155 (Nesmith, J., 1869).

In the United States courts, the attorney-general or district attorney has only power to dismiss a prosecution, or enter a *nolle prosequi* after indictment found. U. S. *v.* Schumann, 2 Abbott U. S. 523; 7 Sawy. 437.

In Massachusetts, a *nolle prosequi* may be entered after the empanelling of the jury, against the objection of the defendant, if he does not demand a verdict. Charlton *v.* Com., 5 Met. (Mass.) 532; Com. *v.* Kimball, 7 Gray, 328. See Com. *v.* McMonagle, 1 Mass. 517; Com. *v.* Tuck, 20 Pick. 356; Kite *v.* Com., 11 Met. 581; Com. *v.* Cain, 102 Mass. 214. But if the defendant objects, and demands a verdict, no *nolle prosequi* can be entered. Com. *v.* Scott, 121 Mass. 33.

In Pennsylvania, by the Revised Act of 1860:—

"*Nolle prosequi.*—No district attorney shall, in any criminal case whatsoever, enter a *nolle prosequi*, either before or after bill found, without the assent of the proper court in writing, first had and obtained." Rev. Act, 1860, Pamph. 437. See Com. *v.* Seymour, 2 Brewst. 567. Before the Revised Act it was held permissible, as it still continues to be with leave of court, to enter a *nolle prosequi* even after conviction. Com. *v.* Gillespie, 7 Serg. & R. 469. In this case, a *nolle prosequi* was entered on a particular count of an indictment, after conviction, judgment being rendered on the other counts. Compare Agnew *v.* Commissioners, 12 Serg. & R. 94, where the power of the attorney-general, in case of perjury, under the Act of 29th March, 1819, to enter a *nolle prosequi*, even with leave of court, is doubted. So in New York. People *v.* McLeod, 1 Hill, N. Y. 377. As to Connecticut, see State *v.* Garvey, 42 Conn. 232.

After a *nolle prosequi*, the indictment on which it is entered is extinct. R. *v.* Mitchell, 3 Cox. C. C. 93; R. *v.* Allen, 1 B. & S. 850 (though see State *v.* Thompson, 3 Hawks, 613; State *v.* Howard, 15 Rich. 274). But a new indictment may ordinarily be found for the same offence. Infra, § 447.

No personal agreement by the attorney-general will make a *nolle prosequi* a bar. A circuit attorney, in open court, agreed with a defendant, against whom several indictments were pending, that if he would plead guilty as to some, he should be discharged from the others. The defendant accordingly pleaded guilty to four of the indictments, and a *nolle prosequi* in the ordinary form was entered on the record as to the remainder. It was held that the entering of a *nolle prosequi* could not have the legal effect of a

[1] State *v.* Bean, 77 Me. 486.

[2] Com. *v.* Kimball, 7 Gray, 328; State *v.* Garvey, 42 Conn. 233. Infra, § 487.

§ 384. A *nolle prosequi* may be granted either where in cases of misdemeanor a civil action is depending for the same cause;[1] or where any improper or vexatious attempts are made to oppress the defendant, as by repeatedly preferring defective indictments for the same supposed offence;[2] or if it be clear that an indictment be not sustainable against the defendant;[3] or if the prosecution desire to withdraw a part of a divisible charge.[4] And where an indictment is preferred against a defendant for an assault, and at the same time an action of trespass is commenced in one of the civil courts for identically the same assault, upon affidavit of the facts and hearing the parties, the attorney-general may, if he sees fit, order a *nolle prosequi* to be entered to the indictment, or compel the prosecutor to elect whether he will pursue the criminal or civil remedy.[5] It has been held,

Nolle prosequi granted in vexatious suits.

retraxit by reason of the agreement. State *v.* Lopez, 19 Mo. 254. Infra, § 447.

In Wisconsin, it is said that an agreement by a public prosecutor, without the sanction of the court, for immunity to several defendants, on condition of one of them becoming state's evidence in other cases, is void as against the policy of the law. Wight *v.* Rindskopf, 43 Wis. 344. See infra, § 536.

In Maine, a *nolle prosequi* can be withdrawn during the term when entered. State *v.* Nutting, 39 Me. 359.

In New Jersey the practice has grown up of requiring the assent of court to a *nolle prosequi* on a pending indictment. State *v.* Hickling, 45 N. J. L. 152. As to Georgia, see Doyal *v.* State, 70 Ga. 384.

[1] 1 Bos. & Pul. 191.

[2] 1 Black. Rep. 545.

[3] Com. Rep. 312; 1 Chitty's Crim. Law, 479.

[4] State *v.* Bean, 77 Me. 486; Jackson *v.* State, 76 Ga. 551; supra, §§ 158, 246 ff.

"Where an offence is not without aggravating circumstances, which enlarge the offence, he (the prosecuting officer) may enter a *nolle prosequi* as to the aggravation, and obtain a conviction for the lesser offence, which is well charged." Morton, C. J., Com. *v.* Dunster, 145 Mass. 102. But "the prosecuting officer cannot, by means of a *nolle prosequi*, put the defendant on trial for an offence differing from any offence with which he is formally charged in the complaint or indictment."

[5] 2 Burr. 270; 1 Chitty's Crim. Law, 479. See infra, §§ 453–4.

The following is the form of the affidavit in such a case:—

I, A. B., of the county of ——, etc., make oath and say that I did see the clerk of the peace of the county of —— sign a certificate hereto annexed, on the —— day of ——, at ——, and that since (or before) the time of preferring the indictment, on the said certificate mentioned, I was served with a copy of a writ of summons, issuing out of —— court —— at the suit of C. D., the prosecutor of the said indictment, requiring me within eight days to cause an appearance to be entered for me in the court of ——, in an action

also, that an indictment for adultery should not be pressed against the earnest appeals of the only injured party.[1]

The effect of a *nolle prosequi*, as a bar, is hereafter discussed.[2]

of trespass, at the suit of the said C. D., and that on the —— day of ——, I, this deponent, did receive notice of a declaration being filed against me at the suit of the said C. D., the prosecutor of the said indictment in the —— office of the ——, for assaulting him, the said C. D., which said declaration and indictment, I say, are for the same assault, and not for different offences.

A certificate from the clerk of the peace stating the substance of the indictment, and the time when it was preferred, must be annexed to this affidavit. Cro. C. C. 25. And if the attorney-general think the case a proper one for his interference, he will sign a warrant, under his hand and seal, directed to the clerk of the peace, and if the indictment has been found at sessions, directing him to enter a *stet processus*. R. *v.* Fielding, 2 Burr. 719; Jones *v.* Clay, 1 Bos. & P. 191. If the cause of the applicatiou be the vexatious conduct of the prosecutor, the attorney-general may direct the proceedings to be removed into the Queen's Bench, where the counsel will be heard in support of the *nolle prosequi*. 1 Bla. Rep. 545; Archbold's C. P. (13th ed.) 92, 93.

The following is the form of entering a *nolle prosequi* on record:—

And now, that is to say, on ——, in this said term, before ——, cometh the said C. F. R., attorney-general (as the case may be), who for the said State in this behalf prosecuteth, and saith that the said C. F. R. will not further prosecute the said A. B. on behalf of the said State on the said indictment (or information). Therefore, let all further proceedings be altogether stayed here in court against him, the said A. B., npon the indictment aforesaid. Archbold's C. P. 13th ed. 92. See, as to practice in Massachusetts, infra, § 549.

[1] People *v.* Dalrymple, 55 Mich. 519.

[2] Infra, § 447.

CHAPTER VI.

MOTION TO QUASH.

Indictment will be quashed when no judgment can be entered on it, § 385.
Quashing refused except in clear case, § 386.
Quashing usually matter of discretion, § 387.
Extrinsic facts no ground for quashing, § 388.
Defendants may be severed in quashing, § 389.
When two indictments are pending one may be quashed, § 390.
Quashing ordered in vexatious cases, § 391.
And so where finding is defective, § 391 *a*.
Bail may be demanded after quashing, § 392.
Pending motion *nolle prosequi* may be entered, § 393.
One count may be quashed, § 394.
Quashing may be on motion of prosecution, § 395.
Time usually before plea, § 396.
Motion should state grounds, § 397.

§ 385. THE court will quash an indictment when it is plain no judgment can be rendered in case of conviction.[1] Thus, an indictment found in a court having no jurisdiction will be quashed in a superior court;[2] and so where the finding is on its face bad,[3] or the bill charges an offence excluded by a statute of limitation.[4] The same course will be taken where the offence is charged to have been committed on a day which is yet to come, or where no time is laid; such an error being as fatal as if there were no day laid;[5] and so of indictments alleging time as "on or about."[6] Where there is no Christian name given, or no addition, and no allegation that there is none, or that it is unknown, the defect may be availed of by a

Indictment will be quashed when no judgment can be entered on it.

[1] State *v.* Robinson, 9 Foster (N. H.), 274; State *v.* Sloan, 67 N. C. 357; State *v.* Roach, 2 Hay, 352; State *v.* Williams, 2 Hill (S. C.), 382; State *v.* Albin, 50 Mo. 419. Supra, §§ 99, 106.

[2] R. *v.* Bainton, 2 Str. 1088; R. *v.* Hewitt, R. & R. 158; R. *v.* Heane, 4 B. & S. 947; 9 Cox, 433.

[3] Supra, §§ 350 *et seq.*; State *v.* Kilcrease, 6 Rich. 444.

[4] State *v.* J. P., 1 Tyler, 283; State *v.* Robinson, 9 Foster (N. H.), 274; State *v.* English, 2 Mo. 182; *contra*, State *v.* Howard, 15 Rich. (S. C.) 274. Supra, §§ 136, 318 *et seq.*; and this cannot be regarded as settled law.

[5] State *v.* Sexton, 3 Hawks, 184. Supra, § 134.

[6] U. S. *v.* Crittenden, 1 Hemp. 61.

motion to quash, as well as by a plea in abatement.[1] An information, also, unsupported by oath or affirmation, will be quashed.[2] There are several instances, also, where indictments have been quashed because the facts stated in them did not amount to an offence punishable by law;[3] as, for instance, an indictment for contemptuous words spoken to a justice of the peace, not stating that they were spoken to him whilst in the execution of his office.[4] In cases of this general class, the trial judge may quash the indictment on his own motion.[5]

Quashing refused except in clear case.

§ 386. It is in the discretion of the court to quash an indictment for insufficiency, or put the party to a motion in arrest; but where the question is doubtful, the first remedy must be refused.[6] The court will not quash an indictment except in a very clear case;[7] and this reluctance is peculiarly strong in cases of crimes such as treason, felony,[8] forgery, perjury, or subornation.[9] The courts have also refused to quash indictments for cheats,[10] for selling flour by false weights,[11] for extortion,[12] for not executing a magistrate's warrant[13] against overseers

[1] State *v.* McGregor, 41 N. H. 407; Gardner *v.* State, 4 Ind. 632; Prell *v.* McDonald, 7 Kans. 454. Supra, § 98.

[2] Eichenlaub *v.* State, 36 Ohio St. 140.

[3] R. *v.* Burkett, Andr. 230; R. *v.* Sarmon, 1 Burr. 516; Huff's case, 14 Grat. 648.

[4] R. *v.* Leafe, Andr. 226.

It has been ruled in the United States Circuit Court for Michigan, under the special procedure prescribed in federal courts, that a motion will be sustained to quash on the allegation that no evidence whatever was adduced in support of the application for a warrant of arrest; though the court will not inquire into the sufficiency of such evidence if any was produced. U. S. *v.* Shepard, 1 Abbott U. S. 431; but see infra, § 388.

[5] R. *v.* Wilson, 6 Q. B. 620; R. *v.* James, 12 Cox C. C. 127; U. S. *v.* Pond, 2 Curt. C. C. 268.

[6] U. S. *v.* Stowell, 2 Curtis C. C. 153; State *v.* Burke, 38 Me. 574; State *v.* Putnam, Ibid. 296; Com. *v.* Eastman, 1 Cush. 189; Lambert *v.* People, 7 Cow. 166; People *v.* Eckford, 7 Cow. 535; People *v.* Davis, 56 N. Y. 95; State *v.* Beard, 1 Dutch. 384; State *v.* Rickey, 4 Halst. 293; State *v.* Hageman, 1 Green (N. J.), 314; State *v.* Dayton, 3 Zab. 49; Horne *v.* State, 39 Md. 552; Click *v.* State, 3 Tex. 282; State *v.* Wishon, 15 Mo. 503; see State *v.* Zeigler, 46 N. J. L. 307.

[7] Resp. *v.* Cleaver, 4 Yeates, 69; Resp. *v.* Buffington, 1 Dallas, 61; Bell *v.* Com., 8 Grat. 726; State *v.* Mathis, 3 Pike, 84; State *v.* Baldwin, 1 Dev. & Bat. 198; Stoner *v.* State, 80 Ind. 89.

[8] Com. Dig. Indictment (H.); and see R. *v.* Johnson, 1 Wils. 325; People *v.* Waters, 5 Parker, 661; State *v.* Colbert, 75 N. C. 368.

[9] R. *v.* Belton, 1 Salk. 372; 1 Sid. 54; 1 Vent. 370; R. *v.* Thomas, 3 D. & C. 290.

[10] R. *v.* Orbell, 6 Mod. 42.

[11] R. *v.* Crookes, 3 Burr. 1841.

[12] R. *v.* Wadsworth, 5 Mod. 13.

[13] R. *v.* Bailey, 2 Str. 1211.

for not paying money over to their successors,[1] and the like; and a party in such cases will be left to his demurrer for demurrable defects.[2] An indictment for not repairing highways or bridges, or for other public nuisances, will not be quashed,[3] unless there be a certificate that the nuisance is removed.[4] The same rule applies to indictments for a forcible entry,[5] unless, perhaps, where the possession has been afterwards given up.[6]

§ 387. It has been frequently ruled that as quashing is a discretionary act, error does not lie on its refusal.[7] Even *granting* the motion has been held a matter of discretion as to which there is no revision.[8] But an examination of the cases will show that error has been sustained in numerous instances to such quashing, either directly or indirectly,[9] and that such a rule is usually only applied to quashing on extrinsic proof of an improper finding.[10] And it would be monstrous to assume that an inferior court could defeat revision by putting its judgment in the shape of quashing.[11] And the reason for review is peculiarly strong

Quashing usually matter of discretion.

[1] R. *v.* King, 2 Str. 1268.

[2] Maguire *v.* State, 47 Md. 485.

[3] R. *v.* Belton, 1 Salk. 372; 1 Vent. 370; R. *v.* Bishop, Andr. 220.

[4] R. *v.* Leyton, Cro. Car. 584; R. *v.* Wigg, 2 Salk. 460; 1 Ld. Raymond, 1165.

[5] R. *v.* Dyer, 6 Mod. 96.

[6] R. *v.* Brotherton, 2 Str. 702. See Com. Dig. Indictment (H.); 3 Bac. Abr. 116.

In Massachusetts, it is provided by statute that no indictment shall be quashed or otherwise affected by reason of the omission or misstatement of the title, occupation, estate, or degree of the defendant, or of the name of the city, town, county, or place of residence; nor by reason of the omission of the words "force and arms," or the words "against the statute," etc. Rev. Stat. c. 138, § 14.

[7] State *v.* Putnam, 38 Me. 296; State *v.* Hurley, 54 Me. 562; State *v.* Stewart, 59 Vt. 273; Com. *v.* Eastman, 1 Cush. 189; Stout *v.* State, 96 Ind. 407; State *v.* Shiver, 20 S. C. 392; White *v.* State, 74 Ala. 31; State *v.* Conrad, 21 Mo. (6 Bennett) 271. See infra, § 777. That this is the case after plea, see Richards *v.* Com., 81 Va. 110.

[8] State *v.* Hurley, 54 Me. 562; State *v.* Jones, 5 Ala. 666; State *v.* McWilliams, 7 Mo. Ap. 99. Infra, § 777. That this is so when the quashing is on motion of the prosecution, see State *v.* Cooper, 96 Ind. 33. That the Supreme Court of the United States will not take cognizance of a division of opinion on motion to quash, see U. S. *v.* Avery, 13 Wall. 251; U. S. *v.* Hamilton, 109 U. S. 63.

[9] See, as illustrating revision by mandamus, People *v.* Stone, 9 Wend. 182; and see State *v.* Barnes, 29 Me. 561; State *v.* Maloney, 12 R. I. 251; Com. *v.* Church, 1 Barr, 105; Com. *v.* Wallace, 114 Penn. St. 405; State *v.* Wall, 15 Mo. 208.

[10] Green *v.* State, 73 Ala. 36.

[11] State *v.* McNally, 55 Md. 559.

in those States in which defendants are required to avail themselves of certain formal defects exclusively in motion to quash.[1]

Extrinsic facts usually no ground for quashing.

§ 388. It is error to quash for matter of defence not apparent in the indictment or in the caption.[2] Hence the illegal selection of the grand jurors, when the fact does not appear on record, is no cause for quashing an indictment on motion,[3] and an indictment will not be quashed on the ground of irregularities in the arrest or preliminary hearing,[4] nor for technical irregularities in the conduct of the grand jury.[5] It is otherwise when there is gross impropriety in the action of the grand jury[6] or material defects in its constitution.[7] In such case the burden of proof is on the party making the motion.[8]

Defendants may be severed in quashing.

§ 389. Wherever an indictment is divisible as to defendants, it may be quashed as to one defendant, remaining in force as to the others.[9] It is otherwise where, as in conspiracy, there can be no such severance.[10]

§ 390. If a prior indictment be pending in the same court, the course is to quash one before the party is put to plead on the other.[11]

[1] Com. *v.* McGovern, 10 Allen, 193; Com. *v.* Walton, 11 Allen, 238.

[2] U. S. *v.* Pond, 2 Curtis C. C. 265; Wickwire *v.* State, 19 Conn. 477; State *v.* Rickey, 4 Halst. 293; Com. *v.* Church, 1 Barr, 105; State *v.* Foster, 9 Tex. 65; People *v.* More, 68 Cal. 500; and see, also, U. S. *v.* Shepard, supra, § 385. By consent, however, extraneous matter may be brought in. R. *v.* Heane, 4 B. & S. 947; 9 Cox, 433; State *v.* Cain, 1 Hawks, 352. But affidavits denying material averments cannot be read without the consent of the prosecuting officers. People *v.* Clews, 57 How. (N. Y.) Pr. 245.

[3] State *v.* Hensley, 7 Blackf. 324; but see supra, §§ 344, 350.

[4] People *v.* Rowe, 4 Parker C. R. 253; People *v.* Rodrigo, 69 Cal. 601. Supra, § 27. But see supra, § 385.

[5] State *v.* Tucker, 20 Iowa, 508; State *v.* Cole, 19 Wis. 129; State *v.* Fee, 19 Wis. 562; State *v.* Logan, 1 Nev. 509.

The provision of Massachusetts, in the Rev. Sts. c. 136, § 9, that a list of all witnesses, sworn before the grand jury during the term, shall be returned to the court under the hand of the foreman, is directory merely; and a non-compliance therewith is no ground for quashing an indictment. Com. *v.* Edwards, 4 Gray, 1.

[6] Supra, § 363. Infra, § 391 *a*. Green *v.* State, 73 Ala. 36.

[7] Supra, § 344. Infra, § 391 *a*.

[8] DeOlles *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 145.

[9] Supra, § 301; State *v.* Compton, 13 W. Va. 852.

[10] People *v.* Eckford, 7 Cow. 535.

[11] In New York, if there be at any time pending against the same defendant two indictments for the same offence, or two indictments for the same matter, although charged as different

If in different courts, the defendant may abate the latter, by plea that another court has cognizance of the case by a prior bill.[1] It is said, however, that the finding of a bill does not confine the State to that single bill. Another may be preferred and the party put to trial on it, although the first remains undetermined.[2]

When two indictments are pending one may be quashed.

§ 391. Quashing is also sometimes ordered in vexatious cases, as where an indictment contains an unnecessarily cumbrous combination of counts, or where incongruous offences are improperly joined;[3] or where, after a return of *ignoramus*, a second bill, without special ground laid, is sent in by the prosecution.[4]

Quashing ordered in vexatious case.

§ 391 *a*. When the finding of an indictment is grossly defective and irregular, it may be quashed on motion of the prosecution.[5]

So when bill is defectively found.

§ 392. On quashing an indictment on formal grounds, when no second indictment has been found, the court will continue the defendant on bail to meet the finding of the second.[6]

Bail may be demanded after quashing.

§ 393. After a motion to quash an indictment containing two counts, one of which is defective, the prosecutor may enter a *nolle prosequi* as to the defective count, which will remove the grounds for the motion to quash, and leave the defendant to be tried upon the charge contained in the good count.[7]

Pending motion *nolle prosequi* may be entered.

§ 394. In clear cases, a judge may, at his discretion, quash a defective count in an indictment, without quashing the entire indictment.[8] But if there be one good count, the

One count may be quashed.

offences, the indictment first found shall be deemed to be superseded by such second indictment, and shall be quashed. Rev. Stat. part iv. chap. ii. tit. 4, art. 2, § 42. Infra, § 452.

[1] State *v.* Tisdale, 2 Dev. & Bat. 159. Infra, § 441.

[2] Ibid.; Com. *v.* Drew, 3 Cush. 279; Dutton *v.* State, 5 Ind. 533. Supra, §§ 372–3; infra, § 452.

[3] Supra, § 290; Weinzorplin *v.* State, 7 Blackf. 186.

[4] Rowand *v.* Com., 82 Penn. St. 405.

[5] Supra, §§ 350, 363, 388; Finley *v.* State, 61 Ala. 201; State *v.* Tilleys, 8 Baxt. 381. See, however, McElhanon *v.* People, 92 Ill. 409.

[6] Crumpton *v.* State, 43 Ala. 31; Graves, ex parte, 61 Ala. 381; Smith, in re, 4 Col. 532.

[7] State *v.* Buchanan, 1 Ired. 59. Supra, §§ 383–4.

[8] Scott *v.* Com., 14 Grat. 687; Jones *v.* State, 16 Humph. 435; State *v.* Woodward, 21 Mo. 266.

motion to quash, as a general rule, will not be sustained in those States in which a single good count will sustain a verdict.[1]

Quashing may be on motion of prosecution.

§ 395. The practice is to prefer a new bill against the same defendant, before an application to quash is made on the part of the prosecution;[2] an indictment quashed before jeopardy attaches on trial being no bar.[3] And when the court, upon such an application, orders the former indictment to be quashed, it is usually upon terms, namely, that the prosecutor shall pay to the defendant such costs as he may have incurred by reason of such former indictment;[4] that the second indictment shall stand in the same condition to all intents and purposes that the first would have stood if it were not quashed;[5] and particularly where there has been any vexatious delay upon the part of the prosecutor,[6] that the prosecutor be put on terms.[7] And, at all events, as has been seen, the court, when the exceptions are technical, will hold the defendant to bail to await a second indictment.[8]

Time usually before plea.

§ 396. The application, if made by the defendant, must for formal defects, which would be cured by verdict, be made before plea pleaded and must be prompt.[9] Should the application be made upon the part of the prosecution, it

[1] Com. *v.* Hawkins, 3 Gray, 463; Com. *v.* Pratt, 137 Mass. 98; Kane *v.* People, 3 Wend. 364; State *v.* Wishon, 15 Mo. 503; State *v.* Woodward, 21 Mo. (5 Bennett) 265; State *v.* Mathis, 3 Pike, 84; State *v.* Rutherford, 13 Tex. 24; State *v.* Staker, 3 Ind. 570; Jarrell *v.* State, 58 Ind. 293; Dantz *v.* State, 87 Ind. 398; State *v.* Buchanan, 1 Ired. 59.

[2] R. *v.* Wynn, 2 East, 226.

[3] Infra, § 435.

[4] R. *v.* Webb, 3 Burr. 1469.

[5] R. *v.* Glen, 3 B. & Ald. 373; R. *v.* Webb, 3 Burr. 1468; 1 W. Bl. 460.

[6] 3 Burr. 1468; 1 W. Bl. 460.

[7] R. *v.* Glen, 3 B. & Ald. 372. For exceptions, see Mentor *v.* People, 30 Mich. 91.

[8] Supra, §§ 83, 392; Crumpton *v.* State, 43 Ala. 31.

[9] Fost. 261; R. *v.* Rookwood, Holt, 684; 4 St. T. R. 677; U. S. *v.* Bartow, 20 Blatch. 349, 351; State *v.* Burlingham, 15 Me. 104; Nicholls *v.* State, 5 South. 539; Richards *v.* Com., 81 Va. 110; State *v.* Riffe, 10 W. Va. 794; State *v.* Jarvis, 63 N. C. 556; State *v.* Barbee, 93 N. C. 498; Thomasson *v.* State, 22 Geo. 499; Weinzorpflin *v.* State, 7 Blackf. 186; though see Com. *v.* Chapman, 11 Cush. 422; R. *v.* Heane, 4 B. & S. 947; 9 Cox C. C. 433.

In England, where the indictment had already, upon application of the defendant, been moved into the Court of King's Bench, by *certiorari*, the court refused to entertain a motion by the defendant to quash the indictment, after a forfeiture of his recognizance, by not having carried the record down for trial. Anon. 1 Salk. 380. In State *v.* Morris, 1 Houst. 124, it was said that the motion could be made before the defendant was in court.

would seem that it may be made at any time before the defendant has been actually tried upon the indictment;[1] and the right as to formal defects continues until after arraignment and the empanelling of the jury.[2] After empanelling, for formal defects it may be too late.[3] But in cases where the indictment is plainly bad, as where there is clearly no jurisdiction, or where there are other plain substantial defects, the court will quash at any time, even after plea.[4]

Motion should state grounds.

§ 397. The motion should specifically state the ground of objection.[5]

[1] See R. *v.* Webb, 3 Burr. 1468.

[2] Clark *v.* State, 23 Miss. 261.

[3] Com. *v.* Fitchburg R. R., 126 Mass. 472.

In this case it was held that if a jury has once been empanelled in a criminal case, it is too late, under the St. of 1864, c. 250, § 2, to move to quash the indictment for formal defects apparent on its face, although the motion is made before the empanelling of the jury for a new trial of the case, the former verdict having been set aside.

[4] R. *v.* Heane, 4 B. & S. 433; 9 Cox C. C. 433; R. *v.* Wilson, 6 Q. B. 620; R. *v.* James, 12 Cox C. C. 127; Com. *v.* Chapman, 11 Cush. 422; Nicholls *v.* State, 2 Southard, 539. See Wilder *v.* State, 47 Ga. 522.

[5] State *v.* Van Houten, 37 Mo. 357. See, under statute, State *v.* Berry, 62 Mo. 595.

CHAPTER VII.

DEMURRER.

Demurrer reaches defects of record, § 400.
Demurrer may be to particular counts, but not to parts of counts, § 401.
Demurrer brings up prior pleadings, § 402.
Demurrer admits facts well pleaded, § 403.
In England, judgment for crown on general demurrer is final, § 404.
Otherwise in this country, § 405.
Ordinarily judgment against prosecution not final, § 406.
Demurrer to evidence brings up sufficiency of prosecution's case, § 407.
Joinder in demurrer formal, § 407 *a*.
Demurrer should be prompt, § 407 *b*.

§ 400. DEMURRER, from *demorare*, is a mode by which a defendant may object to an indictment as insufficient in point of law.[1] Wherever an indictment is defective in substance or in form, it may be thus met;[2] but as at common law all errors which can be thus taken advantage of are equally fatal in arrest of judgment, demurrers, as a means of testing indictments, were, in England, but rarely used until the 7 Geo. 4, c. 64, ss. 20, 21, by which all defects, purely technical, must be taken advantage of before verdict.[3] In this country, demurrers, except under similar statutes, are in but little use,[4] and are of little practical use when the offence is set forth with substantial accuracy.[5] When flaws demurred to are merely formal, they are readily cured, if not by amendment, in any view, by finding a new bill.[6]

Demurrer reaches defects of record.

[1] Co. Lit. 71, *b;* 4 Bl. Com. 333; Burn's Just. 29th ed. tit. Demurrer; Ch. C. L. 439. So as to defective averment of jurisdiction. People *v.* Craig, 59 Cal. 370. As to form of demurrer see State *v.* Weeks, 77 Mo. 496.

[2] Lazier *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 708.

[3] Archbold's C. P. 9th ed. 78. Supra, § 90; Com. *v.* Hughes, 11 Phila. 430; People *v.* Markham, 64 Cal. 157. See as to Maryland practice, 6 Md. 410.

[4] See supra, § 90. That a demurrer will not be sustained for defects in indorsing and filing indictment see State *v.* Brandon, 28 Ark. 410. As to limits of Massachusetts statute, see Com. *v.* Kennedy, 131 Mass. 584.

[5] Deckard *v.* State, 38 Md. 186; Harne *v.* State, 39 Md. 352; see U. S. *v.* Moller, 16 Blatch. 65; Minor *v.* State, 63 Ga. 318.

[6] U. S. *v.* Moller, 16 Blatch. 65; Jackson *v.* State, 64 Ga. 344; State *v.* Millsop, 69 Mo. 359.

§ 401. A demurrer may be sustained as to a bad count without in any way affecting a good count in the same indictment;[1] though if a demurrer be *general* to the whole indictment, one good count will prevent a general judgment for the defendant.[2] That a part of a count is defective is, however, no ground for demurrer, if the residue of the count sets forth an indictable offence. Hence, where a count contains two offences, one of which is properly stated, and the other of which can be rejected as surplusage, there must be a judgment on demurrer for the prosecution.[3]

Demurrer may be to particular counts, but not to parts of counts.

§ 402. A demurrer puts the legality of the whole proceedings in issue, and compels the court to examine the validity of the whole record;[4] and, therefore, in an indictment removed from an inferior court, if it appear from the caption that the court before which it was taken had no jurisdiction over it, it will be adjudged to be invalid.[5]

Demurrer brings up the validity of all prior pleadings.

Judgment is to be rendered against the party committing the first error in pleading.[6]

§ 403. Although a demurrer admits the facts demurred to and refers their legal sufficiency to the court,[7] it does not admit allegations of the legal effect of the facts therein pleaded.[8] Nor does it admit any facts that are not well pleaded.

Demurrer admits facts.

§ 404. Whether a judgment for the prosecution, on a demurrer, is final, depends upon whether the demurrer admits the facts charged in the indictment in such a way as to constitute a confession of guilt. If a defendant virtually says: "I did this, but in doing it I did not break the law," then, if the conclusion of the court is that if he did break the law, judgment is to be entered against him.[9]

In England, judgment on general demurrer for prosecution may be final.

[1] Turner *v.* State, 40 Ala. 21.

[2] Ingram *v.* State, 39 Ala. 247. Infra, § 909.

[3] Mulcahy *v.* R. L. R., 3 H. L. 306; Wheeler *v.* State, 42 Md. 563.

In Pennsylvania, by the revised act, objections to indictment must be made before the jury is sworn. Rev. Act, 1860, 433; Com. *v.* Frey, 50 Penn. St. 245.

A similar provision exists in Massachusetts. Gen. Stat. 1864, c. 250, § 2.

[4] Saund. 285, n. 5; Com. *v.* Trimmer, 84 Penn. St. 65.

[5] 1 T. R. 316; 1 Leach, 425; Andr. 137, 138.

[6] State *v.* Sweetsir, 53 Me. 438.

[7] Holmes *v.* State, 17 Neb. 73.

[8] Com. *v.* Trimmer, 84 Penn. St. 18.

[9] Burn's Just. 29th ed. tit. Demurrer; 2 Hale, 225, 257, 315; 2 Inst. 178; 2 Hawk. c. 31, s. 5; 4 Bla. Com. 334; Starkie's C. P. 297; 2 Leach, 603; Ch. C. L. 439.

On the other hand, when the demurrer is special, pointing out particular alleged flaws in the indictment, and not confessing that the facts charged as constituting the offence are true, then, if the judgment is for the prosecution, the defendant is entitled to plead over.[1] In England, it is true, judges at *nisi prius* have held that the defendant was entitled to have judgment of *respondeat ouster*, in every case of felony where his demurrer was adjudged against him; for it was said that where he unwarily discloses to the court the facts of his case, and demands their advice whether it amounts to felony, they will not record or notice the confession;[2] and a demurrer was said to rest on the same principle.[3] In 1850, however, the question was finally put to rest by a judgment of the English Court of Criminal Appeal, that a judgment for the crown on a general (as distinguished from a special) demurrer interposed by the defendant, under such circumstances, is final.[4] At the same time it is within the discretion of the court to permit the defendant to withdraw his demurrer, and to plead as it were *de novo* to the indictment.[5]

Otherwise in this country.

§ 405. In this country the distinction above taken is not recognized, and the practice has been in all cases where there is on the face of the pleading no admission of criminality on the part of the defendant, to give judg-

[1] 1 Salk. 59; Cro. Eliz. 196; Dyer, 38, 39; Hawk. b. 2, c. 31, s. 6; R. *v.* Faderman, 1 Den. C. C. 360; T. & M. 286; 3 C. & K. 359; overruling R. *v.* Duffy, *ut supra;* Foster *v.* Com., 8 Watts & Serg. 77; see People *v.* Biggins, 65 Cal. 564.

[2] Archbold, by Jervis, 9th ed. 429; 2 Hale, 225, 257; 4 Bla. Com. 334.

[3] R. *v.* Duffy, 4 Cox C. C. 326; R. *v.* Phelps, 1 C. & M. 180; R. *v.* Purchase, 1 C. & M. 617; Fost. 21; 4 Bla. Com. 334; 8 East, 112; 2 Leach, 603; 2 Hale, 225, 257; 1 M. & S. 184; Burn, J., Demurrer; Williams, J., Demurrer; but see Starkie's C. P. 297–8; and in R. *v.* Odgers, 2 M. & Rob. 479, and the cases there cited in note, it was held that it is within the discretion of the court, even in felonies, to refuse a *respondeat ouster.*

[4] R. *v.* Faderman, 4 Cox C. C. R. 357; 3 C. &. K. 359; 1 Den. C. C. 565.

[5] R. *v.* Smith, 4 Cox C. C. 42; R. *v.* Brown, 1 Den. C. C. 293; 2 C. & K. 509; R. *v.* Birmingham R. R., 3 Q. B. 233; R. *v.* Houston, 2 Craw. & Dix, 310. See 1 Bennett & Heard's Lead. Cas. 336.

A distinction, however, has been taken between felonies and misdemeanors; for in the latter, if the defendant demur to the indictment, whether in abatement or otherwise, and fail on the argument, it is said that he shall not have judgment to answer over, but the decision will operate as a conviction. 8 East, 112; Hawk. b. 2, c. 31; though see R. *v.* Birmingham R. R., 3 Q. B. 223, where the defendant was allowed to withdraw the demurrer.

ment, *quod respondeat ouster*, and the English distinction does not seem to be recognized.[1] In some jurisdictions, however, it has been held, that when a general demurrer to an indictment for a misdemeanor has been overruled, the defendant will not be permitted to plead to the indictment as a matter of right; he must lay a sufficient ground before the permission will be granted.[2] In New York, where the defendant demurred to an indictment for a misdemeanor in the court below, and judgment was there given *against the People*, which was in the Supreme Court reversed on error, it was held that the court in error must render final judgment for the People on the demurrer, and pass sentence on the defendant; and that he could not be permitted to withdraw the demurrer and plead.[3] But this is now corrected by statute, and the proper course, even independently of statutes, is, in such case, to permit a plea in bar, and a trial by jury.[4] And now, even where the disposition is to treat the judgment on a general demurrer as final, the courts in this country generally agree with those of England in reserving the right to permit the demurrer to be withdrawn at their discretion.[5]

[1] Com. *v.* Goddard, 13 Mass. 456 (*sed quaere*, Com. *v.* Eastman, 1 Cush. 189); Com. *v.* Barge, 3 Pen. & W. 262; Foster *v.* Com., 8 Watts & S. 77; State *v.* Polk, 92 N. C. 652; Ross *v.* State, 9 Mo. 687. See Evans *v.* Com., 3 Met. 453; McGuire *v.* State, 35 Miss. 366; Maeder *v.* State, 11 Mo. 363; Austin *v.* State, Ibid. 366; Lewis *v.* State, Ibid. 366; Fulkner *v.* State, 3 Heisk. 33. See for other cases, infra, §§ 419–421. By act of Congress of May 23, 1872, the judgment is *respondeat ouster*. Rev. Stat. § 1026.

[2] State *v.* Merrill, 37 Me. 329; State *v.* Dresser, 54 Me. 569; State *v.* Wilkins, 17 Vt. 151; Wickwire *v.* State, 19 Conn. 478; Bennett *v.* State, 2 Yerg. 472; State *v.* Rutledge, 8 Humph. 32. See People *v.* King, 28 Cal. 265; People *v.* Jocelyn, 29 Cal. 562; Com. *v.* Foggy, 6 Leigh, 638. See infra, § 419.

[3] People *v.* Taylor, 3 Denio, 91; but see People *v.* Corning, 2 Comst. 1, cited infra, § 773.

"In Stearns *v.* People, 21 Wend. 409, the prisoner was indicted for a felony. He demurred to the indictment, and judgment was given upon the demurrer against him *to answer over*. He refused to do so, when the court directed a plea of not guilty to be entered for him, and a trial upon the plea of not guilty was had. Upon error the court seems to have held, and it seems to us properly, that as he had not voluntarily pleaded over he had not waived the right to review the judgment on his demurrer, but could take advantage of the error, if any, in overruling it. This, it seems to us, is a very proper course for a fair-minded court to take in a case where a demurrer is interposed in good faith." Note to 13 Eng. R. 662. For practice in writ of error in such cases see infra, § 773.

[4] R. *v.* Houston, 2 Crawf. & Dix, 310.

[5] State *v.* Wilkins, 17 Vt. 152;

§ 406. Where the prosecution demurs to the plea of *autrefois convict*, or other special plea of confession and avoidance to an indictment, and the demurrer is overruled, the defendant is not entitled to be discharged, and the prosecution may rejoin.[1] But if the defendant plead in abatement in matter of form, and the plea is demurred to, and the demurrer overruled, the judgment of the court is that the prosecution abate, reserving the right to bring in an amended bill.[2]

Ordinarily judgment against prosecution not final.

Judgment against the prosecution on a special demurrer to the indictment is not final, when the defects are merely formal, but a new bill may be sent in, with the defect cured.[3] And the defendant, in cases of this class, will be held over to await a second indictment.[4] A writ of error lies to a judgment against the prosecution.[5]

But where the demurrer is general, going to the merits of the offence, then a judgment for the defendant relieves him from further prosecution.[6]

§ 407. By the practice of several States, the defendant may demur to the evidence, though it is optional for the prosecutor to join or not.[7] The object is to ascertain the law on an admitted state of facts, the demurrer admitting every fact which the evidence legitimately tends to establish.[8] In such cases a judgment against the defendant is a final judgment for the prosecution.[9]

Demurrer to evidence brings up sufficiency of prosecution's whole case.

Evans *v.* Com., 3 Met. (Mass.) 453; Bennett *v.* State, 2 Yerg. 472. See infra, §§ 419, 477, 478, 773. That when there are several special pleas, two of which are demurred to, there can be no judgment of guilty based on a sustaining of the demurrer to these counts alone, see Sipple *v.* People, 10 Ill. App. 144.

[1] Barge *v.* Com., 2 Pen. & W. 262; State *v.* Barrett, 54 Ind. 434; State *v.* Nelson, 7 Ala. 610.

[2] Rawls *v.* State, 8 Sm. & M. 590.

[3] U. S. *v.* Watkyns, 3 Cranch C. C. R. 441; State *v.* Barrett, 54 Ind. 434. Infra, §§ 425, 487; though see supra, § 404, and State *v.* Dresser, 54 Me. 569.

[4] Crumpton *v.* State, 43 Ala. 31.

[5] Infra, § 773.

[6] Infra, § 457.

[7] Com. *v.* Parr, 5 Watts & S. 345; Com. *v.* Wilson, 9 Weekly Notes, 291; Doss *v.* Com., 1 Grat. 557; Brister *v.* State, 26 Ala. 108.

[8] Bryan *v.* State, 26 Ala. 65. See cautions in Martin *v.* State, 62 Ala. 240; cf. State *v.* Marshall, 37 La. An. 26.

[9] Hutchison *v.* Com., 82 Penn. St. 472.

§ 407 *a*. The omission of the record to show a joinder of issue cannot be objected to after the determination of the issue of law.[1] Joinder in demurrer formal.

§ 407 *b*. A demurrer should be promptly made, and it is too late after plea is entered; though there may be cases of substantial error in which, when a plea has been entered inadvertently, it may in the discretion of the court be withdrawn, in order to enable the question of law to be determined in advance of the trial of the issue on the plea of not guilty.[2] Must be prompt.

[1] 1 Chit. Crim. Law, 481, 482; U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumn. 19, 66; Com. *v.* McKenna, 125 Mass. 397.

[2] R. *v.* Purchase, C. & M. 617; Com. *v.* Chapman, 11 Cush. 422; People *v.* Villarino, 66 Cal. 228; supra, § 396 For Pennsylvania statute see supra, § 401.

CHAPTER VIII.

PLEAS.

I. Guilty or not Guilty.
Plea of not guilty is general issue, § 408.
Plea is essential to issue, § 409.
Omission of *similiter* not fatal, § 410.
In felonies pleas must be in person, § 411.
Pleas must be several, § 412.
Plea of guilty should be solemnly made, and reserves motion in arrest and error, § 413.
May at discretion be withdrawn, § 414.
Mistakes in may be corrected, § 415.
After plea degree of offence may be ascertained by witnesses, § 416.
Plea of not guilty may be entered by order of court, § 417.
Plea of *nolo contendere* equivalent to guilty, § 418.
II. Special Pleas.
Repugnant pleas cannot be pleaded simultaneously, § 419.
In practice special plea is tried first, § 420.
Judgment against defendant on special plea is *respondeat ouster*, § 421.
III. Plea to the Jurisdiction.
Jurisdiction may be excepted to by plea, § 422.
IV. Plea in Abatement.
Error as to defendant's name may be met by plea in abatement, § 423.
And so of error in addition, § 424.
Judgment for defendant no bar to indictment in right name, § 425.
After not guilty plea in abatement is too late, § 426.
Plea to be construed strictly, § 427.
Defendant may plead over, § 428.
V. Other Special Pleas.
Plea of non-identity only allowed in cases of escape, § 429.
Plea of insanity allowed under special statute, § 429 *a*.
Plea to constitution of grand jury must be sustained in fact, § 430.
Pendency of other indictment no bar, § 431.
Plea of law is for court, § 432.
Ruling for prosecution on special plea is equivalent to judgment on demurrer, § 433.
VI. Autrefois Acquit or Convict.
1. *As to Nature of Judgment.*
Acquittal without judgment a bar, but not always conviction, § 435.
Judgment arrested or new trial granted on defendant's application no bar, 435 *a*.
Arbitrary discharge may operate as an acquittal, § 436.
Record of former judgment must have been produced, § 437.
Court must have had jurisdiction, § 438.
Judgment by court-martial no bar, § 439.
And so of police and municipal conviction or acquittal, § 440.
Of courts with concurrent jurisdiction, the court first acting has control, § 441.
Offence having distinct aspects separate governments may prosecute, § 442.

Proceedings for contempt no bar, § 444.
Nor proceedings for *habeas corpus*, § 445.
Ignoramus and quashing no bar, § 446.
Nor is *nolle prosequi* or dismissal, § 447.
After verdict *nolle prosequi* a bar, § 448.
Discharge for want of prosecution not a bar, § 449.
Foreign statutes of limitation when a bar, § 450.
Fraudulent prior judgment no bar, § 451.
Nor is pendency of prior indictment, § 452.
Nor is pendency of civil proceedings, § 453.
New trial after conviction of minor is bar to major, § 455.
Specific penalty imposed by sovereign may be exclusive, § 455 *a*.
2. *As to Form of Indictment.*
If former indictment could have sustained a verdict, judgment is a bar, § 456.
Judgment on defective indictment is no bar, § 457.
Same test applies to acquittal of principal or accessary, § 458.
Acquittal on one count does not affect other counts; but otherwise as to conviction, § 459.
Acquittal from misnomer or misdescription no bar, § 460.
Nor is acquittal from variance as to intent, § 461.
Otherwise as to variance as to time, § 462.
Acquittal on joint indictment a bar if defendant could have been legally convicted, § 463.
Acquittal from merger no bar, § 464.
Where an indictment contains a minor offence inclosed in a major, a conviction or acquittal of minor bars major, § 465.
Conviction of major offence bars minor when on first trial defendant could have been convicted of minor, § 466.
Prosecutor may bar himself by selecting a special grade, § 467.
3. *As to Nature of Offence.*
When one unlawful act operates on separate objects, conviction as to one object does not extinguish prosecution as to other; *e. g.*, when two persons are simultaneously killed, § 468.
Otherwise as to two batteries at one blow, § 469.
As to arson, § 469 *a*.
Where several articles are simultaneously stolen, § 470.
When one act has two or more indictable aspects, if the defendant could have been convicted of either under the first indictment he cannot be convicted of the two successively, § 471.
So in liquor cases, § 472.
Severance of identity by place, § 473.
Severance of identity by time, § 474.
But continuous maintenances of nuisances can be successively indicted, otherwise as to bigamy, § 475.
Conviction of assault no bar (after death of assaulted party) to indictment for murder, § 476.
4. *Practice under Plea.*
Plea must be special, § 477.
Must be pleaded before not guilty, § 478.
Verdict must go to plea, § 479.
Identity of offender and of offence to be established, § 480.
Identity may be proved by parol, § 481.
Plea, if not identical, may be demurred to, § 482.
Burden of proof is on defendant, § 483.
When replication is *nul tiel record* issue is for court, § 484.
Replication of fraud is good on demurrer, § 485.

On judgment against defendant he is usually allowed to plead over, § 486.
Prosecution may rejoin on its demurrer being overruled, § 487.
Issue of fact is for jury, § 488.
Novel assignment not admissible, § 489.
VII. Once in Jeopardy.
Constitutional limitation taken from common law, § 490.
But in some courts held more extensive, § 491.
Rule may extend to all infamous crimes, § 492.
In Pennsylvania, any separation in capital cases except from actual necessity bars further proceedings, § 493.
Rule in Virginia, § 494.
In North Carolina, § 495.
In Tennessee, § 496.
In Alabama, § 497.
In California, § 498.
In the federal courts a discretionary discharge is no bar, § 500.
So in Massachusetts, § 501.
So in New York, § 502.
So in Maryland, § 503.
So in Mississippi and Louisiana, § 504.
So in Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Iowa, Nebraska, Nevada, Texas, and Arkansas, § 505.
So in Kentucky, Georgia, and Missouri, § 506.
So in South Carolina, § 506 *a*.
No jeopardy on defective indictment, § 507.
Illness or death of juror is sufficient excuse for discharge, § 508.
Discharge of jury from intermediately discovered incapacity no bar, § 509.
Conviction no bar when set aside for defective ruling of judge, § 510.
And so of discharge from sickness or escape of defendant, § 511.
Discharge from surprise a bar, § 512.
Discharge from statutory close of court no bar, § 513.
And so from sickness of judge, § 514.
And so from death of judge, § 515.
But not from sickness or incapacity of witness, § 516.
Until jury are "charged," jeopardy does not begin, § 517.
Waiver by motion for new trial, writ of error, and motion in arrest, § 518.
In misdemeanors separation of jury permitted, § 519.
Plea must be special; record must specify facts, § 520.
VIII. Plea of Pardon.
Pardon is a relief from the legal consequences of crime, § 521.
Pardon before conviction to be rigidly construed, § 522.
Pardon after conviction more indulgently construed, § 523.
Rehabilitation is restoration to *status*, § 524.
Amnesty is addressed to class of people, and is in nature of compact, § 525.
Executive pardon must be specially pleaded; otherwise amnesty, § 526.
Pardons cannot be prospective, § 527.
Pardon before sentence remits costs and penalties, § 528.
Limited in impeachments, § 529.
And so as to contempts, § 530.
Must be delivered and accepted, but cannot be revoked, § 531.
Void when fraudulent, § 532.
Conditional pardons are valid, § 533.

Pardon does not reach second convictions, § 534.
Pardon must recite conviction, § 535.
Calling a witness as State's evidence is not pardon, § 536.
Foreign pardons operative as to crimes within sovereign's jurisdiction, § 537.

I. GUILTY AND NOT GUILTY.

§ 408. When brought to the bar, in capital cases, and at strict practice in all offences whatever, the defendant is formally arraigned, by the reading of the indictment, and the calling on him for a plea. The clerk, immediately after the reading, asks, "How say you, A. B., are you guilty or not guilty?"[1] Upon this, if the defendant confess to the charge, the confession is recorded, and nothing is done till judgment.[2] But if he deny it, he answers, "Not guilty," upon which the clerk of assize, or clerk of the arraigns, replies, that the defendant is guilty, and that the State (or Commonwealth) is ready to prove the accusation.[3] After issue is thus joined, the clerk usually proceeds to ask the defendant, "How will you be tried?" to which the defendant replies, "By God and my country;" to which the clerk rejoins, "God send you a good deliverance."[4] The plea of not guilty contests all the material averments of the indictment.[5]

Plea of not guilty is general issue.

§ 409. The right of arraignment on a criminal trial may in some cases be waived, but a plea is always essential.[6] The court cannot at common law[7] supply an issue after verdict

Plea is essential.

[1] 2 Hale, 119; R. *v.* Hensey, 1 Burr. 643; Cro. C. C. 7. Infra, § 545. As to arrangement, see fully infra, § 698.

[2] 4 Harg. St. Trials, 779; Dalt. c. 185. Infra, §§ 545, 698.

[3] 4 Bla. Com. 339; 4 Harg. St. Trials, 779; Whart. Prec. 1138.

[4] 2 Hale, 219; 4 Bla. Com. 341; Cro. C. C. 7. Infra, §§ 545, 698.

Though the defendant persists in saying he will be tried by his king and his country, and refuses to put himself on his trial in the ordinary way, it will not invalidate a conviction. R. *v.* Davis, Gow's R. N. P. 219, and notes there given. When, however, the clerk of the court, upon the arraignment of the defendants, did not further proceed, upon their pleading not guilty, to ask them how they would be tried, so that they did not make the usual reply, "By God and their country," it was held that, under the laws of the United States, the plea of "Not guilty" put the defendants upon the country, by a sufficient issue, without any further express words. U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumn. 20.

[5] Ibid.; People *v.* Aleck, 61 Cal. 137.

[6] See Warren *v.* States, 13 Tex. Ap. 348; Ray *v.* People, 6 Col. 231.

[7] As to *nunc pro tunc* order, see Long *v.* People, 102 Ill. 331.

where there has been no plea, notwithstanding the defendant consented to go to trial.[1] And a failure of the record to show a plea is a fatal defect.[2]

The practice in respect to arraignment will be hereafter more fully detailed.[3]

Omission of *similiter* not fatal.

§ 410. An omission to insert the *similiter*, in joining issue in criminal cases, may be corrected, as it is usually only added when the record is made up.[4] In any view, going to trial without a joinder of issue by the prosecution to a plea in bar waives any objection to such non-joinder.[5]

In felonies, pleas must be in person.

§ 411. A plea by an attorney of a party indicted for a felony is a nullity; the defendant must plead in person.[6] It is otherwise, however, in misdemeanors.[7]

Pleas must be several.

§ 412. The pleas of joint defendants are to be regarded as several; and a general plea of not guilty by all the defendants is, in law, a several plea.[8]

Plea of guilty should be solemnly made, and reserves motion in arrest and error.

§ 413. By a plea of guilty, defendant first confesses himself guilty in manner and form as charged in the indictment; and if the indictment charges no offence against the law, none is confessed.[9] Hence in such cases there may be motions for arrest of judgment or writ of error.[10] But formal defects may be cured by this plea.[11]

[1] Hoskins *v.* State, 84 Ill. 87; Gould *v.* People, 89 Ill. 216; Bowen *v.* State, 108 Ind. 411; Douglass *v.* State, 3 Wis. 820; Lacefield *v.* State, 34 Ark. 275; People *v.* Gaines, 52 Cal. 480; Melton *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 619; Bates *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 139. Infra, § 698. See Spicer *v.* People, 11 Ill. Ap. 294, as to effect of announcing readiness for trial.

[2] Bates *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 139; Huddleston *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 73.

[3] Infra, § 698.

[4] Com. *v.* McCormack, 126 Mass. 258; Berrian *v.* State, 2 Zabr. 9; State *v.* Swepson, 81 N. C. 571. Infra, § 698.

[5] Com. *v.* McCauley, 105 Mass. 69.

[6] State *v.* Conkle, 16 W. Va. 736; McQuillan *v.* State, 8 Sm. & M. 587. See infra, §§ 541, 698.

[7] U. S. *v.* Mayo, 1 Curtis C. C. 433. See fully, infra, §§ 541, 550, 698, 912.

[8] State *v.* Smith, 3 Ired. 402. Supra, § 309.

[9] Com. *v.* Kennedy, 13 Mass. 584; Arbintrode *v.* State, 67 Ind. 267; State *v.* King, 71 Mo. 551; Fletcher *v.* State, 7 Eng. Ark. 169. That a plea of guilty to homicide goes to the lowest grade in homicide, see Garvey *v.* People, 6 Col. 559. But see infra, § 742.

[10] Infra, § 779 *b*.

[11] Carper *v.* State, 27 Ohio St. 572. Supra, § 90. See infra, § 759.

As to Massachusetts practice, see Com. *v.* Chiavaro, 129 Mass. 489.

§ 414. The court may, at its discretion, allow a plea of guilty to be withdrawn,[1] even after the overruling of a motion in arrest of judgment.[2] This is not subject for error,[3] unless by refusal of the application great injustice has been done.[4] Hence a plea of guilty drawn out by the court by telling the defendant that if he do not plead guilty he will be heavily punished, will be treated as a nullity by the court in error.[5] Whether the defendant is to be warned of the consequences of a plea of guilty, is a matter usually of judicial discretion.[6]

Plea of guilty may be at discretion withdrawn.

§ 415. Pleas entered by mistake, in plain cases, can be amended by court. Thus, where a defendant, against whom several indictments have been found, intending to plead guilty to one, by mistake pleaded guilty to another, it was held that the error could be corrected after entry of the plea

Mistakes can be corrected.

[1] R. *v.* Brown, 17 L. J. M. C. 145; U. S. *v.* Bayaud, 21 Blatch. 217; 15 Rep. 200; State *v.* Cotton, 4 Foster, 143; see State *v.* Hubbard, 72 Ala. 176; State *v.* Stephens, 71 Mo. 535; Mastronada *v.* State, 60 Miss. 86; Gardner *v.* People, 106 Ill. 76; State *v.* Buck, 59 Iowa, 382; State *v.* Salge, 2 Nev. 321.

[2] R. *v.* Brown, *ut supra.*

[3] Ibid.

[4] People *v.* Scott, 59 Cal. 341.

[5] O'Hara *v.* People, 41 Mich. 623. Compare article in London Law Times, Dec. 14, 1879.

So, if the plea was made in consequence of any intimation from the judge that the sentence would be more severe in case of conviction upon a trial. It is otherwise, however, if the judge, in answer to importunities, has only shown a disposition to inflict a milder punishment on confession of guilt, and has done so. People *v.* Brown, 54 Mich. 15. In People *v.* Lennox, 67 Cal. 113, the Supreme Court held that where a defendant in a murder trial advisedly pleaded guilty, and was sentenced to be hung, he could not afterwards withdraw the plea. As discussing the points in the text, see 4 Crim. Law Mag. 881; 23 Central Law J. 76.

That a writ of *coram nobis* will lie to vacate a plea of guilty entered into through fear of a mob, see Saunders *v.* State, 85 Ind. 318. Infra, § 779 *b*. That an appellate court will not review the action of the trial court in refusing to allow the withdrawal of a plea of guilty, unless there was an abuse of discretion, see Conover *v.* State, 86 Ind. 99; Mostranda *v.* State, 60 Miss. 87; People *v.* Lewis, 64 Cal. 401.

[6] In Texas this is obligatory in cases of felonies. Berliner *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 181; Saunders *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 336. In Michigan the statute requiring such warning applies to all cases. Edwards *v.* People, 39 Mich. 393; Hunning *v.* People, 40 Mich. 733; Bayliss *v.* People, 46 Mich. 221. The warning in such cases should be private. People *v.* Stickney, 50 Mich. 99. The court must be satisfied that the plea was voluntary. People *v.* Lear, 51 Mich. 172; People *v.* Lepper, 51 Mich. 196. As to federal practice, see U. S. *v.* Hare, 1 Brunf. U. S. 686.

on the minutes of the court.[1] But it is otherwise as to a mistake made as to the nature of the punishment.[2]

Witnesses may prove degree.

§ 416. When there is a plea of guilty the court may ascertain by witnesses the degree of the offence.[3]

Plea of not guilty can be entered by order of court.

§ 417. At common law, when a prisoner stood mute, a jury was called to inquire whether he did so from dumbness *ex visitatione Dei*, or from malice; and unless the former was the case, he was sentenced as on conviction.[4] In England, and in all jurisdictions in this country, however, statutes now exist enabling the court, where the prisoner stands mute, to direct a plea of not guilty to be entered, whereupon the trial proceeds as if he had regularly pleaded not guilty in person.[5] Such a refusal to plead, however, does not admit in any way the jurisdiction of the court.[6]

[1] Davis *v.* State, 20 Ga. 674.

[2] State *v.* Buck, 59 Iowa, 382. See People *v.* Brown, 54 Mich. 415.

[3] Infra, §§ 918, 945.

[4] 1 Ch. C. L. 425; Turner's case, 5 Ohio St. 542; Com. *v.* Moore, 9 Mass. 402.

[5] R. *v.* Schleter, 10 Cox C. C. 409; Dyott *v.* Com., 5 Whart. R. 67; Brown *v.* Com., 76 Penn. St. 319 (where it was held that such course waives jury defects); and see Weaver *v.* State, 83 Ind. 289; People *v.* Bringard, 39 Mich. 22. That such course cures other defects, see Com. *v.* McKenna, 125 Mass. 397. That the order may be made when the defendant refuses to plead either guilty or not guilty unconditionally, see State *v.* Kring, 74 Mo. 612.

In R. *v.* Bernard, 1 F. & F. 240, the finding of the jury that the defendant was mute from nature, was dispensed with. See R. *v.* Whitfield, 3 C. & K. 121. For pleas of lunatics, see Whart. Cr. Law, 9th ed. § 51; U. S. *v.* Hare, 2 Wheel. C. C. 299.

In an English case, where a dumb person was to be tried for a felony, the judge ordered a jury to be empanelled, to try whether he was mute by the visitation of God. The jury found that he was so; they were then sworn to try whether he was able to plead, which they found in the affirmative, and the defendant by a sign pleaded not guilty; the judge then ordered the jury to be empanelled to try whether the defendant was now sane or not, and on this question directed them to say whether the defendant had sufficient intellect to understand the course of the proceedings, to make a proper defence, to challenge the jurors, and to comprehend the details of the evidence, and that if they thought he had not, they should find him of non-sane mind. R. *v.* Pritchard, 7 C. & P. 303; 1 W. & S. Med. J. § 95. See further for English practice, R. *v.* Berry, 13 Cox C. C. 189. In Massachusetts a deaf and dumb prisoner was arraigned through a sworn interpreter, his incapacity having been first suggested to the court by the solicitor-general, and the trial then proceeded as on a plea of not guilty. Com. *v.* Hill, 14 Mass. 207.

[6] People *v.* Gregory, 30 Mich. 371.

A plea may in this way be entered on informations, though the statute is silent as to informations.[1]

The entry must be made before the trial opens,[2] though not necessarily before empanelling of jury.[3]

§ 418. *The plea of nolo contendere* has the same effect as a plea of guilty, so far as regards the proceedings on the indictment; and a defendant who is sentenced upon such a plea to pay a fine is convicted of the offence for which he is indicted.[4]

Plea of *nolo contendere* equivalent to guilty.

The advantage, however, which may attend this plea is, that when accompanied by a protestation of the defendant's innocence, it will not conclude him in a civil action from contesting the facts charged in the indictment.[5]

It is held within the discretion of the court to accept such a plea, or to require a plea of guilty or not guilty.[6]

II. SPECIAL PLEAS.

§ 419. *Can a defendant plead simultaneously the general issue, and one or more special pleas?* At common law this must be answered in the negative, whenever such pleas are repugnant; as at common law all the pleas filed in a case are regarded as one. This is the strict practice in England, where the judges in review have solemnly ruled that special pleas cannot be pleaded in addition to the plea of not guilty.[7] And in this country, in cases where *not guilty* has been

Repugnant pleas cannot be pleaded simultaneously.

[1] U. S. *v.* Borger, 19 Blatch. C. C. 249; Smith, in re (Lowell, J.), 3 Crim. Law Mag. 835.

[2] Davis *v.* State, 38 Wis. 387.

[3] Dillard *v.* State, 58 Miss. 368. But see State *v.* Chenier, 32 La. An. 103.

[4] See Buck *v.* Com., 107 Penn. St. 486.

[5] U. S. *v.* Hartwell, 3 Cliff. 221; Com. *v.* Horton, 9 Pick. 206; Com. *v.* Tilton, 8 Met. Mass. 232. See Whart. Ev. § 783.

[6] Com. *v.* Tower, 8 Met. Mass. 527.

In Massachusetts, under St. 1855, c. 215, § 35, a defendant in a prosecution on that statute cannot be adjudged guilty on a plea of *nolo contendere*, unless it appears by the record that the plea was received with the consent of the prosecutor. Com. *v.* Adams, 6 Gray, 359.

[7] R. *v.* Charlesworth, 9 Cox C. C. 40; R. *v.* Strahan, 7 Cox C. C. 85; R. *v.* Skeen, 8 Cox C. C. 143; Bell C. C. 97; *contra*, 1 Stark. C. P. 339. As to issue of insanity, see article by Prof. Ordronaux, 1 Cr. Law Mag. 438.

The defendant, it should be remembered, is entitled to enter as many pleas as he has matter of defence. The difference noticed in the text relates to the order of their presentation and disposition.

pleaded simultaneously with *autrefois acquit*, the same course has been followed, and the plea of *not guilty* stricken off until the special plea is disposed of.[1] And so has it been ruled when not guilty and the statute of limitations has been pleaded together.[2]

In practice special plea is tried first.

§ 420. In such case after determining the special plea against the defendant, the present practice in the United States is to enter simply a judgment of *respondeat ouster*, in all cases in which the special plea is not equivalent to the general issue. This, which is technically the correct practice, is not, however, always pursued. A short cut is often taken to the same result, by directing when special pleas and the general issue are filed simultaneously, or are found together on the record before trial, that the special pleas should be tried first, and if they are found against the defendant, then the general issue.[3] But, under any circumstances, it is error to try the special pleas and the general issue simultaneously. The special pleas must be always disposed of before the general issue is tried.[4]

Judgment against defendant on special plea is *respondeat ouster*.

§ 421. *If a special plea is determined against the defendant, is the judgment always respondeat ouster?* Unless upon a trial by jury on a special plea which embraces the general issue, this question ought now to be answered in the affirmative. The old distinction taken in this respect between felonies and misdemeanors, being no longer founded in reason, should be rejected in practice. And the only consistent as well as just course is to harmonize the present frag-

[1] Infra, § 479; State *v.* Copeland, 2 Swan, 626; Hill *v.* State, 2 Yerg. 248. As to pleas in abatement, see infra, § 423.

[2] State *v.* Ward, 49 Conn. 429. That both pleas must be disposed of before there can be a conviction, see People *v.* Helding, 59 Cal. 567. That defects and irregularities not apparent on the indictment must be pleaded in abatement, see supra, § 400; Pointer *v.* State, 89 Ind. 255.

[3] State *v.* Inneas, 53 Me. 536; Hartung *v.* People, 26 N. Y. 154; People *v.* Roe, 5 Parker, C. R. 231; People *v.* Gregory, 30 Mich. 371; State *v.* Greenwood, 5 Port. 474; Buzzard *v.* State, 20 Ark. 106. As sanctioning this view see 2 Hawk. P. C. c. 23, ss. 128–9; *contra*, 1 Ch. C. L. 463.

[4] Com. *v.* Merrill, 8 Allen, 545; Solliday *v.* Com., 28 Penn. St. 13; Foster *v.* State, 39 Ala. 229; Henry *v.* State, 33 Ala. 389; Nonemaker *v.* State, 34 Ala. 211; Mountain *v.* State, 40 Ala. 344; Fulkner *v.* State, 3 Heisk. 33; Dyer *v.* State, 11 Lea, 509; Clem *v.* State, 42 Ind. 420. Pointer *v.* State, 89 Ind. 255; Savage *v.* State, 18 Fla. 909. See R. *v.* Charlesworth, *ut supra;* R. *v.* Roche, 1 Leach, 160; infra, §§ 477, 478.

mentary rulings in this relation, by adopting the principle that in all cases the question of guilty or not guilty is one which the defendant is entitled of right, no matter how many technical antecedent points may have been determined against him, to have squarely decided by a jury.[1]

III. PLEA TO THE JURISDICTION.

§ 422. Where an indictment is taken before a court that has no cognizance of the offence, the defendant may plead to the jurisdiction, without answering at all to the crime alleged;[2] as, if a man be indicted for treason at the quarter sessions, or for rape at the sheriff's tourn, or the like;[3] or, if another court have exclusive jurisdiction of the offence;[4] Such pleas are not common, the easier and simpler course being writ of error or arrest of judgment. The want of jurisdiction may also be taken advantage of under the general issue.[5]

Jurisdiction may be excepted to by plea.

[1] Infra, § 486; 2 Hale P. C. 255; U. S. *v.* Williams, 1 Dillon, 485; Barge *v.* Com., 3 Pen. & Watts, 262; Foster *v.* State, 8 W. & S. 77; Harding *v.* State, 22 Ark. 210; Buzzard *v.* State, 20 Ark. 106; Ross *v.* State, 9 Mo. 687. As to demurrer see conflicting decisions, supra, § 406. As to misdemeanors, when the special plea involves facts of general issue, see *contra*, State *v.* Allen, 1 Ala. 442; Guess *v.* State, 1 Eng. 147; and see *dicta* of Gibson, C. J., in Barge *v.* Com., 3 Pen. & W. 262.

[2] 2 Hale, 286. See Blandford *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 627; Kelly *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 158.

[3] 2 Hale, 286.

[4] 4 Bla. Com. 383. See Whart. Prec. 1145, for forms.

A. was indicted in the city of New York for obtaining money from a firm of commission merchants in that city, by exhibiting to them a fictitious receipt signed by a forwarder in Ohio, falsely acknowledging the delivery to him of a quantity of produce, for the use of, and subject to the order of the firm. The defendant pleaded that he was a natural born citizen of Ohio, had always resided there, and had never been within the State of New York; that the receipt was drawn and signed in Ohio, and the offence was committed by the receipt being presented to the firm in New York by an innocent agent of the defendant, employed by him, while he was a resident of and actually within the State of Ohio. It was held that the plea was bad, and that the defendant was properly indicted in the city of New York. Adams *v.* People, 1 Comst. 173; S. C. 1 Denio, 190. See Com. *v.* Gillespie, 7 S. *v.* R. 469; supra, § 119.

[5] State *v.* Mitchell, 83 N. C. 674. But see State *v.* Day, 58 Iowa, 678.

IV. PLEA IN ABATEMENT.

§ 423. When the indictment assigns to the defendant a wrong Christian name or surname, he can only take advantage of the error by a plea in abatement, the burden of proving which is on the defendant.[1] Such a plea should be verified by affidavit,[2] and should expose the defendant's proper name as well as deny that he was known by the name stated in the indictment.[3] What particularity is necessary in setting forth the name and addition of the defendant has been considered in another place.[4] Any misnomer, in general, is matter for abatement;[5] thus, where the indictment charged the defendant as George Lyons, it was held he could abate it by showing his true name was George Lynes.[6] But it has been held that a foreigner may be indicted under a name which is the English equivalent of his name in his native tongue, to which he had assented.[7] A blank instead of a name may be taken advantage of by a motion to quash.[8]

Error in defendant's name may be met by plea in abatement.

§ 424. Want of addition is at common-law ground for abatement,[9] though the proper course is motion to quash.[10] But a wrong addition is only to be met by plea in abatement.[11] And in an indictment on the statute of Maine, prohibiting the sale of lottery tickets, giving the accused the name of lottery vendor when his proper addition was broker, furnishes good cause for abatement.[12]

And so of error in addition.

[1] Scott *v.* Soans, 3 East, 111; Com. *v.* Dedham, 16 Mass. 146; Turns *v.* Com., 6 Met. (Mass.) 225; Com. *v.* Fredericks, 119 Mass. 199; State *v.* Drury, 13 R. I. 540; Lynes *v.* State, 5 Port. 236. See supra, §§ 96, 105, 119, 385; 22 Cent. L. J. 220, 244.

[2] Bohannon *v.* State, 15 Neb. 209. It may be signed by the attorney if verified by affidavit. Ibid.

[3] O'Connell *v.* R., 11 Cl. & Fin. 155; R. *v.* Granger, 3 Burr. 1617; Com. *v.* Sayres, 8 Leigh, 722; State *v.* Farr, 12 Rich. 24; Wren *v.* State, 70 Ala. 1; Bright *v.* State, 76 Ala. 96; cf. Wilson *v.* State, 69 Ga. 225. See Whart. Prec. 1141–2, for forms. Supra, §§ 98 *et seq.*

[4] See supra, §§ 96 *et seq.*

[5] State *v.* Lorey, 2 Brev. 395.

[6] Lynes *v.* State, 5 Port. 236.

[7] Alexander *v.* Com., 105 Penn. St. 1.

[8] Supra, § 385.

[9] State *v.* Hughes, 2 Har. & McH. 479; 1 Chit. C. L. 204. See State *v.* Newman, 2 Car. Law Rep. 74.

[10] Supra, § 119.

[11] Supra, §§ 106, 119; State *v.* Daly, 14 R. I. 510.

[12] State *v.* Bishop, 15 Me. (3 Shepley) 122. See Com. *v.* Clark, 2 Va. Cas. 401. The plea, however, must supply

§ 425. If a plea of misnomer be put in, the usual course is to re-indict the defendant by the new name, without pushing the old bill further.[1] The prosecutor may, however, if he think fit, deny the plea, or reply that the defendant is known as well by one Christian name or surname as another, and, if he succeed, judgment will be given for the prosecution,[2] or the prosecutor may demur to the plea, and in cases of felony, the demurrer and joinder may be *ore tenus*.[3] When the issue is joined upon a plea in abatement or replication thereto,[4] the venire may be returned, and the trial of the point by a jury of the same county proceed *instanter*.[5] If judgment be found for the defendant on the question of misnomer, this is no bar to an indictment for the same offence in his true name.[6]

Judgment for defendant no bar to new indictment in right name.

It is not a good replication that the defendant is the same person mentioned in the indictment.[7]

Two pleas in abatement, when not repugnant, may be pleaded at the same time.[8]

§ 426. Without leave of court, which is granted only in very strong cases, the plea of not guilty cannot be withdrawn to let in a plea in abatement, for on principle a plea of not guilty admits all that a plea in abatement contests, and after a plea of not guilty, a plea in abatement is too late.[9] A plea in abatement, also, cannot, it has been held, be filed after a general continuance.[10]

After not guilty, plea in abatement is too late.

the true addition. R. *v.* Checkets, 6 M. & S. 88.

[1] 2 Hale, 176, 238; Burn, Indictment ix.; Williams, J., Misnomer and Addition, ii.; Dick. Quart. Sess. 167.

[2] 2 Leach, 476; 2 Hale, 237, 238; Cro. C. C. 21. See form, 2 Hale, 237; State *v.* Dresser, 54 Me. 569; Lewis *v.* State, 1 Head, 329. See, as to practice and evidence, Com. *v.* Gale, 11 Gray, 320. Supra, §§ 119, 385.

[3] Foster, 105; 1 Leach, 476; and see supra, § 406.

[4] State *v.* Lashus, 79 Me. 540.

[5] 2 Leach, 478; 2 Hale, 238; 22 Hen. 8, c. 14; 28 Hen. 8, c. 1; 32 Hen. 8, c. 3; 3 Inst. 27; Starkie, 296.

[6] Com. *v.* Farrell, 105 Mass. 189; State *v.* Robinson, 2 Lea, 114.

[7] Com. *v.* Dockham, Thach. C. C. 238.

[8] U. S. *v.* Richardson, 28 Fed. Rep. 61; Gray, J.; Com. *v.* Long, 2 Va. Cases, 318. Supra, § 419.

[9] Supra, § 98; R. *v.* Purchase, C. & M. 617; Com. *v.* Butler, 1 Allen, 4; State *v.* Farr, 12 Rich. 24; State *v.* Drury, 13 R. I. 540; Cooper *v.* State, 64 Md. 40; Dyer *v.* State, 11 Lea, 509.

[10] State *v.* Swafford, 1 Lea, 274. See Dyer *v.* State, 11 Lea, 509.

§ 427. A plea in abatement is a dilatory plea, and must be pleaded with strict exactness.[1] It is consequently essential that it should precisely set forth the facts out of which the defence arises, or that there should be a negation of the facts which are presumed from the existence of a record.[2] It may be demurred to for duplicity.[3]

Plea to be construed strictly.

§ 428. In England, the rule is that on a plea in abatement on ground of misnomer, the judgment, if for the crown, is final, and that the defendant cannot plead over.[4] It seems otherwise, however, where the plea is to matter of law.[5] In this country the practice is to require the defendant to plead over.[6]

Defendant may plead over.

How far errors in the grand jury can be thus noticed has already been considered.[7]

V. OTHER SPECIAL PLEAS.

§ 429. Special pleas, with the exception of pleas to the jurisdiction, pleas of abatement, and pleas of *autrefois acquit*, but rarely occur in practice, as in general they amount in character to the general issue. Thus, the plea of non-identity, which is pleaded *ore tenus*, is never allowed, except in cases where the prisoner has escaped after verdict and before judgment, or after judgment and before execution. On review, to render the plea valid, the record must show an escape.[8]

Plea of non-identity only allowed in cases of escape.

§ 429 *a*. By statutes in several jurisdictions the defendant, by whom insanity at the time of the offence is set up as a defence,

That a plea in abatement must be prompt, see State *v*. Myers, 10 Lea, 717.

[1] O'Connell *v*. R., 11 Cl. & Fin. 155; 9 Jurist, 25; Dolan *v*. People, 64 N. Y. 485; State *v*. Skinner, 34 Kas. 256.

[2] State *v*. Brooks, 9 Ala. 10.

On a trial of fact in a plea in abatement of misnomer, the fact, that to an indictment by the same name the defendant had pleaded not guilty, is proper for the consideration of the jury. State *v*. Homer, 40 Me. 438.

[3] State *v*. Emery, 59 Vt. 84.

[4] R. *v*. Gibson, 8 East, 107.

[5] R. *v*. Duffy, 4 Cox C. C. 190; R. *v*. Johnson, 6 East, 583; 1 Bennett & Heard's Lead. Cases, 340; see supra, § 404; Whart. Prec. 1147, for forms.

[6] U. S. *v*. Williams, 1 Dillon, 485; State *v*. Robinson, 2 Lea, 114. Supra, §§ 404–5; infra, § 477.

[7] Supra, §§ 344, 350, 352, 357, 388 *a*. Infra, § 430.

[8] Thomas *v*. State, 5 How. Mis. R. 20.

is required to plead such insanity separately and as a special plea, to be tried and determined before the plea of not guilty.[1] It is further provided in Winconsin, that if the jury on such issue find the defendant not insane at the time of the commission of the offence, the trial on the plea of not guilty shall at once proceed before the same jury, and the finding on the first trial shall be conclusive on the second on the question of insanity. This statute has been pronounced constitutional by the Supreme Court of Wisconsin.[2] Whether the verdict of sanity on the first issue precludes the defendant on the second trial from offering to prove such predisposition to insanity as lowers the grade of the offence was not decided; but it is hard to see how such evidence could be excluded, or how the issue of intent as thus modified could be kept from the jury.[3] Unless by statute, the defence is made under plea of not guilty.[4]

Plea of insanity allowed by statute.

§ 430. Special pleas as to constitution of grand jury must be good on their face.[5] Thus, where, on a presentment for gaming, the defendant pleaded in abatement that the clerk *de facto*, who administered the oath to the grand jury that made the presentment, was not clerk *de jure* at the time, it was held the plea was bad:[6] How far error in the constitution of the grand jury may be pleaded specially to an indictment has been already considered.[7]

Pleas to constitution of grand jury must be sustained in fact.

§ 431. The pendency of an indictment is no ground for a plea in abatement to another indictment in the same court for the same cause.[8]

Pendency of other indictment no bar.

§ 432. A plea in abatement, or a special plea, not involving a statement of fact, is exclusively for court.[9]

Plea of law is for court.

[1] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 57–8; Sage *v.* State, 89 Ind. 141.

[2] Bennett *v.* State, 57 Wis. 14; Crim. Law Mag. 378.

[3] See Whart. Crim. Law, § 47.

[4] Danforth *v.* State, 75 Ga. 614. See Taylor *v.* Com., 109 Penn. St. 262.

As to practice under plea of insanity, see Darnell *v.* State, 24 Tex. Ap. 6; Messengale *v.* State, 24 Tex. Ap. 181.

[5] Supra, §§ 344, 350, 352, 357, 388 *a*.

As to plea of want of prior examination, see State *v.* Barley, 32 Kan. 83.

[6] Hord *v.* Com., 4 Leigh, 674.

[7] See supra, §§ 344, 350, 352 *et seq.*

[8] Com. *v.* Drew, 3 Cush. 279; Smith *v.* Com., 104 Penn. St. 339; State *v.* Tisdale, 2 Dev. & Bat. 159. Infra, § 452.

[9] Chase *v.* State, 46 Miss. 683. Infra, § 477.

Ruling for prosecution on special plea equivalent to judgment on demurrer.

§ 433. When the prosecution is sustained in an objection to a special plea, on the ground that it is defective, this is equivalent to a judgment for the prosecution on demurrer to the plea.[1]

VI. AUTREFOIS ACQUIT OR CONVICT.

§ 434. It remains to examine what, in this country, form the most important of special pleas, those of *autrefois convict*, *autrefois acquit*, and *once in jeopardy*. The first two may be considered together, the law applicable to *autrefois convict* being generally applicable to *autrefois acquit*.[2]

1. *As to nature of Judgment.*

Acquittal without judgment a bar, but not so always convictions.

§ 435. An acquittal on a good indictment, even without the judgment of the court thereon, is a bar to a second prosecution for the same offence;[3] but such is not necessarily the case with a conviction on which there is no judgment;[4] as where a prosecuting officer, after conviction, concedes the badness of an indictment and proceeds to trial upon a second;[5] where the case is pending on error;[6] where an indictment was stolen after verdict of guilty but before judgment,[7] and where the defendant pleaded a decision against him on a plea to the jurisdiction to a former indictment for the same offence.[8] Where, however, the former proceedings remain uncan-

[1] Com. *v.* Lannan, 13 Allen, 563. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 57–8.

[2] See, for forms of plea of *autrefois acquit*, etc., Whart. Prec. 1150, etc.

[3] Infra, § 785 and cases there cited. R. *v.* Reed, 1 Eng. L. & Eq. R. 595; State *v.* Elden, 41 Me. 165; West *v.* State, 2 Zab. 212. See 2 Russ. on Cr. 4th ed. 64, note. State *v.* Risley, 72 Mo. 609; People *v.* Horn, 70 Cal. 17. The fact that the acquittal was produced by a mistake of law or misconception of fact makes no difference. Infra, § 785; Hines *v.* State, 24 Ohio St. 134; O'Brian *v.* Com., 9 Bush, 333. See infra, §§ 505, 509.

[4] U. S. *v.* Herbert, 5 Cranch C. C. R. 87; Com. *v.* Fraher, 126 Mass. 265; West *v.* State, 2 Zab. 212; Penn. *v.* Huffman, Addis. 140; State *v.* Mount, 14 Ohio, 295; Brennan *v.* People, 15 Ill. 511; State *v.* Norvell, 2 Yerg. 24; State *v.* Spear, 6 Mo. 644; Lewis *v.* State, 1 Tex. App. 323; though see Preston *v.* State, 25 Miss. 383; Ratzky *v.* People, 29 N. Y. 124.

[5] Penn. *v.* Hoffman, Addis. 140. Infra, § 453.

[6] Com. *v.* Fraher, 126 Mass. 265. See R. *v.* Reid, 20 L. J. M. C. 70; Coleman *v.* U. S., 97 U. S. 530; People *v.* Casborus, 13 Johns. 351.

[7] State *v.* Mount, 14 Ohio, 295.

[8] Gardiner *v.* People, 6 Park. C. R. 155. Supra, § 421.

celled and unwithdrawn, a verdict of guilty will sustain the plea;[1] though it is otherwise, as we have seen, where judgment has been arrested.[2] A plea of guilty, if outstanding, need not, to be a bar, have a judgment entered on it.[3]

§ 435 *a*. If a new trial be granted, on the defendant's application, this is in itself no bar to a second trial on the same, or on an amended indictment;[4] nor is a judgment arrested on a defective indictment a bar to a subsequent trial on a good indictment for the same offence.[5] It is otherwise, however, when the judgment was erroneously arrested, or the case erroneously dismissed, by a court having jurisdiction, on a good indictment.[6]

Judgment arrested or new trial granted on defendant's application no bar.

§ 436. How far a court has a right to discharge a jury is hereafter considered more fully. In capital cases, as will be seen,[7] the tendency of opinion is that such discharge, unless necessary, works an acquittal.[8] In misdemeanors, and sometimes in felonies, the court, on strong ground shown, may withdraw a juror or discharge the jury.[9] But an arbitrary discharge, or one without adequate cause, operates as an acquittal.[10]

Arbitrary discharge may operate as acquittal.

[1] State *v.* Parish, 43 Wis. 395.

[2] State *v.* Sherburne, 58 N. H. 535.

[3] People *v.* Goldstein, 32 Cal. 432.

In those States where a defendant is held to be in jeopardy by a conviction, a conviction without judgment is a bar. See infra, §§ 490 *et seq.*

[4] Infra, §§ 465, 466, 510, 790. See State *v.* Blaisdell, 59 N. H. 329; State *v.* Stephens, 13 S. C. 285; Dubose *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 418; People *v.* Hardisson, 61 Cal. 378.

[5] Infra, § 507. And so of quashing, supra, § 395; R. *v.* Houston, 2 Cr. & D. 310; Joy *v.* State, 14 Ind. 139.

[6] State *v.* Elden, 41 Me. 165; State *v.* Parish, 43 Wis. 495; State *v.* Norvell, 2 Yerg. 24. Infra, §§ 456-7.

In New York, in 1862, in the Court of Appeals, it was determined that when judgment is reversed for an illegal sentence, on a conviction where there was no error, there can be no new trial, but that the plea of *autrefois convict* is good. Shepherd *v.* People, 25 N. Y. 407. See, also, Hartung *v.* People, 26 N. Y. 167; S. C., 28 N. Y. 400; Ratzky *v.* People, 29 N. Y. 124.

[7] Infra, §§ 487 *et seq.*

[8] Infra, §§ 490–512.

[9] See Com. *v.* McCormick, 130 Mass. 61.

[10] Infra, §§ 722, 815, 821. See People *v.* Schoeneth, 44 Mich. 489.

In U. S. *v.* Watson, 3 Benedict, 1, Judge Blatchford said: "The illness of the district attorney, it not appearing by the minutes that such illness occurred after the jury was sworn, or that it was impossible for the assistant district attorney to conduct the trial, and the motion to put off the case for the term being made by such assistant,

§ 437. To avail himself of the plea, the defendant should produce an exemplification of the record of his acquittal under the public seal of the State or kingdom where he has been tried and acquitted, there being cases in which an acquittal in a foreign jurisdiction is equally effective for this purpose with one at home.[1]

Record of former judgment to be produced.

cannot be regarded as creating a manifest necessity for withdrawing a juror. So, too, as to the absence of witnesses for the prosecution; it does not appear by the minutes that such absence was first made known to the law officer of the government after the jury was sworn, or that it occurred under such circumstances as to create a plain and manifest necessity justifying the withdrawing of a juror. The mere illness of the district attorney, or the mere absence of witnesses for the prosecution, under the circumstances disclosed by the record in this case, is no ground upon which, in the exercise of a sound discretion, a court can, on the trial of an indictment, properly discharge a jury, without the consent of the defendant, after the jury has been sworn and the trial has thus commenced. . . . The weight of all the authorities on the subject is, that the position of this case, as it stood when the juror was withdrawn, entitled the defendants, in the absence of their express consent to any other course, to a verdict of acquittal, and therefore entitles them to the action of the court, at this time, on their application to the same effect. An order will, therefore, be entered, declaring that the proceedings on the former trial are held to be equivalent to a verdict of not guilty, and discharging the defendants and their bail from further liability in respect of the indictment."

But in England, where, in case of misdemeanor, the jury is improperly, and against the will of a defendant, discharged by the judge from giving a verdict after the trial has begun, this is not equivalent to an acquittal, nor does it entitle the defendant *quod eat sine die*. R. *v.* Charlesworth, 1 B. & S. 460; 9 Cox C. C. 44; S. C. at *nisi prius*, 2 F. & F. 326. Acting on this general principle, where it appeared that in the course of the trial and during the examination of witnesses one of the jurors had, without leave, and without it being noticed by any one, left the jury-box and also the court-house, whereupon the court discharged the jury without giving a verdict, and a fresh jury was empanelled and the prisoner was afterwards tried and convicted before a fresh jury, it was held that the course pursued was right. R. *v.* Ward, 17 L. T. N. S. 220; 10 Cox C. C. 573; 16 W. R. 281, C. C. R. See R. *v.* Winsor, infra, § 722.

When a trial is brought to a standstill before verdict, by the close of the term of the court, this in some jurisdictions is a necessary discharge of the jury, and the trial may be recommenced at a subsequent term. Infra, § 513.

Jury discharged from Sickness or Surprise.—The discussion of this question falls more properly under a subsequent head. Infra, § 508.

[1] Infra, § 481; Hutchinson's case, 3 Keb. 785; and see Beak *v.* Thyrwhit, 3 Mod. 194; 1 Show. 6; Bull. N. P. 245; R. *v.* Roche, 1 Leach, 134; People *v.* King, 64 Cal. 338; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 153.

§ 438. The court, however, must have been competent, having jurisdiction,[1] and the proceedings regular.[2] Thus, a conviction of a breach of the peace before a magistrate, on the confession or information of the offender himself, is no bar to an indictment by the grand jury for the same offence.[3] Again, an acquittal by a jury, in a court of the United States, of a defendant who is there indicted for an offence of which that court has no jurisdiction, is no bar to an indictment against him for the same offence in a State court.[4] It is also no bar that the defendant has before been acquitted or convicted of the same offence before a court of the same State, where the offence is one of which the court has not jurisdiction.[5] Thus, a former examination before a magistrate, and a discharge upon a complaint under the New Hampshire Bastardy Act, do not bar further proceedings, as the magistrate has strictly no power to try, but only to examine and discharge or to bind over.[6] But where a justice has jurisdiction, a conviction or acquittal before him is a bar, although the proceedings before the justice were so defective that they might have been reversed for error.[7]

Court must have had jurisdiction.

§ 439. It has been ruled in Tennessee that an acquittal by a federal court-martial, established by act of Congress for the punish-

[1] R. *v.* Bowman, 6 C. & P. 337; Com. *v.* Meyers, 1 Va. Cas. 188; State *v.* Hodgkins, 42 N. H. 475; Com. *v.* Goddard, 13 Mass. 456; Com. *v.* Peters, 12 Met. 387; Canter *v.* People, 38 How. (N. Y.) Pr. 91; Dunn *v.* State, 2 Pike, 229; Campbell *v.* People, 109 Ill. 438; State *v.* Odell, 4 Blackf. 156; O'Brian *v.* State, 12 Ind. 369; State *v.* Morgan, 62 Ind. 35; Foust *v.* State, 85 Tenn. 362; overruling Foust *v.* State, 12 Lea, 404; State *v.* Nicholson, 72 Ala. 176; State *v.* Nichols, 38 Ark. 550; Norton *v.* State, 14 Tex. 387; State *v.* Payne, 4 Mo. 376; Montross *v.* State, 61 Miss. 421; Thompson *v.* State, 6 Neb. 102. See Mikels *v.* State, 3 Heisk. 321. As to judgment in unauthorized term, see infra, § 513.

[2] See Com. *v.* Bosworth, 113 Mass. 200; Finley *v.* State, 61 Ala. 201.

[3] Com. *v.* Alderman, 4 Mass. 477. See State *v.* Morgan, 62 Ind. 35. Infra, § 440.

[4] Com. *v.* Peters, 12 Met. (Mass.) 387. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 471 *et seq.*

[5] Com. *v.* Goddard, 13 Mass. 455; State *v.* Payne, 4 Mo. 376; State *v.* Odell, 4 Blackf. 156; Rector *v.* State, 1 Eng. (Ark.) 187.

[6] Marston *v.* Jenness, 11 N. H. 156. See Hartley *v.* Hindmarsh, L. R. 1 C. P. 553. Infra, § 440.

[7] Stevens *v.* Fassett, 27 Me. 266; Com. *v.* Loud, 3 Met. (Mass.) 328. See State *v.* Thornton, 37 Mo. 360; Com. *v.* Miller, 5 Dana, 320. Compare cases cited supra, § 435, and infra, § 440.

ment of offences against the United States, is no bar to an indictment for murder under the laws of the State of Tennessee.[1] And it has been said by two eminent attorneys-general (Legare and Cushing), that proceedings by State tribunals are no bar to courts-martial instituted by the military authorities of the United States.[2] The tribunals are coördinate when there is no legislation giving courts-martial exclusive jurisdiction.[3] At the same time the judgment of a court-martial may constitute *res adjudicata*, so far as concerns the government by which it is pronounced.[4] And a judgment of conviction by a military court,[5] established by law in an insurgent State, is a bar to a subsequent prosecution by a State court for the same offence.[6]

Judgment by court-martial no bar.

§ 440. A police summary conviction for breach of a municipal ordinance is not a bar to a prosecution by the State for a breach of the public peace,[7] or for keeping a gaming-house;[8] nor is a conviction in the name of a township, to recover a penalty, a bar to proceedings by indictment

And so of police or municipal conviction or acquittal.

[1] State *v.* Rankin, 4 Cold. (Tenn.) 145. See Whart. Confl. of L. §§ 934, 935; Brown *v.* Wadsworth, 15 Vt. 170. Supra, § 443.

[2] 3 Opin. Atty.-Gen. 750; 6 Ibid. 413.

[3] U. S. *v.* Cashiel, 1 Hugh. 552.

[4] Dynes *v.* Hoover, 20 Howard U. S. 65; Woolley *v.* U. S., 20 Law Rep. 631; U. S *v.* Reiter, 4 Am. Law Reg. N. S. 534; Hefferman *v.* Porter, 6 Cold. 391.

[5] As to distinction between military courts and courts-martial, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 294–5.

[6] Coleman *v.* State, 97 U. S. 509. In this case it was said by Field, J., that while the plea of former conviction was not a proper plea in the case, as it admitted the jurisdiction of the State court to try the offence if it were not for the former conviction, yet such irregularity would not prevent the courts giving effect to the objection attempted to be raised. The judgment of the Supreme Court of Tennessee, sustaining a conviction of the defendant, was therefore reversed, and defendant ordered to be delivered up to the military authorities of the United States, to be dealt with as required by law on the judgment of the court-martial. See, also, Woolley *v.* U. S., 20 Law Rep. 631; U. S. *v.* Reiter, 4 Am. Law Reg. 534. Supra, § 283.

[7] Rogers *v.* Jones, 1 Wend. 261; People *v.* Stevens, 13 Wend. 341; Howe *v.* Plainfield, 8 Vroom, 150; Levy *v.* State, 6 Ind. 281; Greenwood *v.* State, 6 Baxt. 567; Severin *v.* People, 37 Ill. 414; State *v.* Oleson, 26 Minn. 507; State *v.* Lee, 29 Minn. 445; State *v.* Bergman, 6 Oregon, 341. But see *contra*, State *v.* Thornton, 37 Mo. 360; Preston *v.* People, 45 Mich. 486; State *v.* Williams, 11 S. C. 292; State *v.* Hamilton, 3 Tex. Ap. 643.

The distinction between police and State prosecutions is considered in Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 23 *a*. On the topic in the text, see Cooley Const. Lim. 199; 1 Am. Law J. 49.

[8] Robbins *v.* People, 95 Ill. 175; Greenwood *v.* State, 6 Baxt. 507; Johnson *v.* State, 59 Miss. 543; see Com. *v.* Bright, 78 Ky. 238.

in the name of the State.[1] A discharge by such a police magistrate is *a fortiori* no bar to proceedings by the State.[2] The reasons

[1] Wragg *v.* Penn Township, 94 Ill. 23. In this case, Dickey, J., said:—

"The decisions on this subject by the courts of the several States are apparently in hopeless conflict with each other. Dillon on Municipal Corporations, § 301, says: 'Hence the same act comes to be forbidden by general statute and by the ordinance of a municipal corporation, each providing a separate and different punishment. . . . . But can the same act be twice punished, once under the ordinance and once under the statute? The cases on this subject cannot be reconciled. Some hold that the same act may be a double offence, one against the State and one against the corporation. Others regard the same act as constituting a single offence, and hold that it can be punished but once, and may be thus punished by whichever party first acquires jurisdiction.' In Georgia and Louisiana it is held that a municipal corporation has no power to enact an ordinance touching an offence punishable under the general law of the State. Mayor *v.* Hussey, 21 Ga. 80. In Rice *v.* State, 3 Kans. 141, the court say: 'It is not necessary in this case to decide whether both the State and the city can punish for the same act; but we have no doubt that the one which shall first obtain jurisdiction of the person of the accused may punish to the extent of its power.' In Missouri the rule is clearly announced that the same act can be punished but once, and that a conviction under a city ordinance may be pleaded in bar to an indictment under the State law. State *v.* Cowan, 29 Mo. 330." So, also, State *v.* Thornton, 37 Mo. 360. "In Alabama the rule is the other way, and it is held that the same act may be punished under a city ordinance and at the same time under the general law. Mayor *v.* Allaire, 14 Ala. 400. In Indiana the rule used to be the same as it is now in Missouri, but in Ambrose *v.* State, 6 Ind. 351, it was modified, and the court there held that a single act might constitute two offences—one against the State and one against the municipal government. And in Waldo *v.* Wallace, 12 Ind. 582, it was held 'that each might punish in its own mode, by its own officers, the same act as an offence against each.'" S. P. Robbins *v.* People, 95 Ill. 178; Hankins *v.* People, 106 Ill. 628; Purdy *v.* State, 68 Ga. 295; and to same effect McLoughlin *v.* Stevens, 2 Cranch C. C. 149; Polinsky *v.* People, 11 Hun, 393. See S. C., 73 N. Y. 65. Infra, § 158. The position in the text is objected to in 4 Crim. Law Mag. 496.

In any view when a police court has no power to enter a final criminal judgment, such action is a nullity. State *v.* Morgan, 62 Ind. 35; Bigham *v.* State, 59 Miss. 529; see State *v.* Curtis, 29 Kan. 384. The magistrate's judgment is not conclusive to the effect that the crime is one of which he has jurisdiction. Com. *v.* Goddard, 13 Mass. 456; Com. *v.* Curtis, 11 Pick. 134.

Under the Virginia practice, a discharge by an examining court of a prisoner committed on a charge of felony is not a bar to another prosecution for the same offence, except when the record shows that the discharge was upon an examination of the facts charged. McCann's case, 14 Grat. 570.

[2] Garst, in re, 10 Neb. 78; see Com. *v.* Hamilton, 129 Mass. 479; Wolverton *v.* Com., 75 Va. 909; White *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 390.

given for this conclusion are (1) that in the nature of things an offence against a municipality is of a different type from an offence against the State, and subject to a distinct mode of punishment; and (2) that as two distinct sovereignties (*e. g.*, State and Federal) may prosecute successively for different aspects of the same offence, so different aspects may be prosecuted successively by State and municipal authority.[1]

Of courts with concurrent jurisdiction, the court first acting has control.

§ 441. Where a concurrent jurisdiction exists in different tribunals, the one first exercising jurisdiction rightfully acquires the control to the exclusion of the other.[2] Hence where, after indictment and before trial in a court having jurisdiction, the case was brought before a justice of the peace having jurisdiction of the same offence, and before him the offender was tried and sentenced, the court held that the conviction and sentence were no bar to the indictment.[3] The same position applies to prosecutions for piracy, in which the sovereign who first tries the offender absorbs the jurisdiction.[4]

[1] See infra, § 441; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 273; Lewis *v.* State, 21 Ark. 209; State *v.* Sly, 4 Oreg. 277; Hughes *v.* People, 8 Col. 536.

[2] Whart. Confl. of L. § 933; Com. *v.* Cunningham, 13 Mass. 245; Mize *v.* State, 49 Ga. 375; State *v.* Simonds, 3 Mo. 414; Trittipo *v.* State, 10 Ind. 343; 13 Ind. 360. But see State *v.* Tisdale, 2 Dev. & B. 159. As to conflicting pardons, see infra, § 537.

[3] Burdett *v.* State, 9 Tex. 43. And see Com. *v.* Miller, 5 Dana, 320. As to conflicting jurisdiction of Federal and State courts see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 265, 266, 289.

[4] See U. S. *v.* The Pirates, 5 Wheat. 184.

"When two courts have concurrent criminal jurisdiction," so it is elsewhere stated, "the court that first assumes this jurisdiction over a particular person acquires exclusive control, so that its judgments, if regularly rendered, are a bar to subsequent action of all other tribunals. Whart. Confl. of L. § 933; Robinson, ex parte, 6 McLean, 355; Putney *v.* The Celestine, 4 Am. L. J. 164; Com. *v.* Goddard, 13 Mass. 455; State *v.* Davis, 1 South. 311; State *v.* Plunkett, 3 Harrison (N. J.), 5; State *v.* Simonds, 3 Mo. 414; Trittipo *v.* State, 10 Ind. 343; 13 Ind. 360; Marshall *v.* State, 6 Neb. 121. '*Ne bis in idem*,' is the Roman maxim in this relation, having the same meaning as the English doctrine that no man shall be placed twice in jeopardy for the same offence; and though this maxim is based on the Roman theory of the union of all nations under one imperial head, yet it must be allowed now to prevail in all cases where concurrent courts deal with the same subject matter under the same common law. It is here that the difficulties spring up, when the question arises as to the effect of the conviction or acquittal of a defendant in a foreign court, under a distinct jurisprudence.

"Had the foreign court jurisdiction

§ 442. An offence, however, may have two aspects, so that one sovereign may punish it in the first aspect, and another in the sec-

over the offence in question? If it had not, the law undoubtedly is that its action is a nullity. Even an acquittal in a court of the United States has been pronounced by the Supreme Court of Massachusetts to be a nullity in a case where, in the opinion of the latter court, the former had no jurisdiction. Com. *v.* Peters, 12 Met. 387. But who is to judge of the question of jurisdiction? Suppose a German court, in exercise of the cosmopolitan surveillance which is established in some parts of Germany (Whart. Confl. of L. § 885), should try an American in Germany for an assault committed on another American in New York. Would the judgment of the German court in this respect be final? Certainly, by the tests of the English common law, it would not. Neither in England nor in the United States would the assumption of German courts to exercise extra-territorial jurisdiction of this kind be tolerated. And yet this is a different question from that which would arise if an American citizen should be *bona fide* arrested and punished by a German court, exercising a jurisdiction for which it has at least a respectable show of international authority. Could such an offender be a second time punished for this offence? It would seem not, as a legitimate result of the maxim, *Ne bis in idem*. So far as concerns penal international law, this maxim, as to offences of which the prosecuting State has international jurisdiction, may be viewed as at least establishing the position that if a person is tried by a government to which he is corporeally subject, he cannot, after punishment by that government for a particular offence, be punished for this offence elsewhere. This, indeed, seems to be a necessary corollary of the doctrine accepted even by the English common law, that every person is subject to the penal laws of the State in which he is resident, even though he owes allegiance to another country. But it is necessary, to make such a punishment a satisfaction, and a bar to a future trial, that it should be complete, and should have been executed to its full extent. Punishment only partially submitted to is only a defence *pro tanto*. It is certain, also, that in offences against the State's own sovereignty, the judgment of a foreign court would be no bar to a prosecution. Ibid. See Halleck's Int. Law, 175 Woolsey, § 77; Hélie, Traité de l'Instruction Criminelle, p. 621.

"With acquittals, however, another course of reasoning obtains. It is true that an acquittal in the *forum delicti commissi* is viewed, when the proceedings are regular and the issue of fact made, as conclusive on the question of the local criminality of the offence charged (Bar, § 143, p. 560, argues such an acquittal is to be regarded as a *lex generalis* that the case was not penal); though it would not prevent a foreign sovereign from prosecuting for offences against himself. But an acquittal in the *forum domicilii* would only be regarded as conclusive when it should appear to have been rendered by a court having local jurisdiction after a fair trial. Certainly, while a judgment of a court *délicti commissi* would be final, to the effect that the act in question was not penal in that country, no extra-territorial force can be assigned to a decision of the *Judex Domicilii*, unless he has international

ond.[1] Thus, uttering of forged coin may be punished by a State as a cheat,[2] and by the federal government as forgery.[3] In such cases, it is argued by a late able federal judge (Grier, J.), that one judgment cannot be pleaded in bar to the other.[4] But this is to be taken subject to the qualifications hereinbefore expressed. If the charges be identical, then the court first seizing jurisdiction absorbs the offence.[5] If, however, the offence is one capable of being broken into sections, or is in one sense aimed at one sovereign, in another sense against another sovereign, then each sovereign may independently prosecute for the ingredient or phase by which such sovereign is distinctively offended.[6] In such case, however, the second

Offence having distinct aspects separate governments may prosecute.

jurisdiction. The judgment, in such a case, could not be regarded as barring a prosecution in the *forum delicti commissi*." See Whart. Confl. of L. §§ 905, 914, 934, 935, 938.

By the New York Penal Code of 1882, § 679, a foreign conviction or acquittal is a bar to a trial in New York for the same act or omission.

"A person living under two governments or jurisdictions, as does every inhabitant of the States of this Union, may commit two crimes by doing a single act—one against the State and the other against the United States. And in such case the conviction or acquittal of the one crime, in a *forum* of the State, is no bar to a prosecution for the other in a *forum* of the United States." Deady, J., U. S. *v.* Barnhart, 10 Sawyer, 497.

The question of conflict of jurisdiction in such cases is discussed in Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 264–283. Mr. Wheaton tells us that a sentence of acquittal or conviction "pronounced under the municipal law of the State where the supposed crime was committed, *or* to which the supposed offender owed allegiance," is a bar to a prosecution in another State. This, however, leaves the matter unsettled when the conflict is between the court of domicil and the court of the State where the offence was committed.

[1] Whart Crim. Law, §§ 266, 293; U. S. *v.* Wells, 15 Int. Rev. Rec. 56; U. S. *v.* Cashiel, 1 Hughes, 552; see criticism on this position in 4 Cent. L. J. 498.

[2] Fox *v.* Ohio, 5 How. U. S. 410. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 264–283.

That a fraudulent act by a bankrupt is made indictable under the Federal Bankrupt Act does not preclude its prosecution under a State statute as a cheat by false pretences, see Abbott *v.* State, 75 N. Y. 602.

[3] U. S. *v.* Marigold, 9 How. U. S. 560.

[4] Moore *v.* Illinois, 14 How. U. S. 13. See infra, §§ 467–8.

[5] See People *v.* West Chester, 1 Parker C. R. 659. In U. S. *v.* Barnhart, 10 Sawyer, 491; 6 Crim. Law Mag. 201, it was held that a former acquittal in a State court of killing an Indian on an Indian reservation, was not a bar to a prosecution in a Federal court. This, however, can only be sustained on the ground that the State court had no jurisdiction.

[6] Whart. Crim Law, 9th ed. § 293.

prosecuting sovereign should only impose such a punishment as, with that already inflicted, would be an adequate penalty for the aggregate offence.[1] If the punishment imposed by the sovereign first prosecuting be adequate, then the second should interpose a *nolle prosequi* or pardon. Supplementary *jurisdiction* is in such cases to be maintained,[2] but cumulative punishment avoided by interposition of executive clemency. This is the course advised by the German jurists just quoted, and is substantially approved by the late Chief Justice Taney.[3]

§ 443. At the same time, what is here said must be taken in connection with the conflict of opinion heretofore noticed as to the absorptive character of federal statutes.[4]

It should be added, that where a conspiracy is spread over several sovereignties each sovereign may prosecute for the overt act which is an infraction of its own laws.[5]

§ 444. A person may be indicted for an assault committed in view of the court, though previously fined for the contempt.[6] The plea of "*autrefois convict*" shall not avail him, because the same act constitutes two offences: one violates the law which protects courts of justice, and stamps an efficient character on their proceedings; the other is levelled against the general law, which maintains public order and tranquillity.[7] Thus, where General Houston had been punished by the House of Representatives for a contempt and breach of privilege, it was held that the action of the house was no bar to an indictment for an assault growing out of the same transaction.[8]

Proceedings for contempt no bar.

[1] See Hendrich *v.* Com., 6 Leigh, 707; Marshall *v.* State, 6 Neb. 120.

[2] See Phillips *v.* People, 55 Ill. 430; Campbell *v.* People, 109 Ill. 565; Marshall *v.* State, 6 Neb. 121; State *v.* Adams, 14 Ala. 486.

[3] U. S. *v.* Amy, 14 Md. 152, n.; 4 Quart. L. J. 163; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 264–283, 287 *et seq.*, 293.

[4] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 264 *et seq.*

[5] Bloomer *v.* State, 48 Md. 321.

[6] R. *v.* Lord Osulston, 2 Stra. 1107. See People *v.* Mead, 92 N. Y. 415; infra, §§ 948, 973.

[7] State *v.* Yancey, 1 Car. L. R. 519. Infra, § 973; and see State *v.* Woodfin, 5 Ired. 199; State *v.* Williams, 2 Speers, 26.

[8] See Opinion of Mr. Butler, Attorney-General of the United States, 2 Opinions of the Attorneys-General, 958. The details are given in Houston's Life, by Crane (1884), p. 43.

§ 445. Proceedings on *habeas corpus* are not ordinarily a bar. It is true that a person discharged under the *Habeas Corpus* Act of South Carolina, from prison, having been committed on a charge of murder, has been held to be protected thereby from a subsequent prosecution on the same charge.[1] This, however, is not the general rule.[2] *A fortiori* a discharge at a preliminary examination is no bar.[3]

Nor *habeas corpus.*

§ 446. If a man be committed for a crime, and a bill preferred against him is ignored by the grand jury, he is still liable to be indicted for the same offence on new evidence,[4] or even on the same evidence,[5] though the sending up a second bill after an *ignoramus*, is an extreme act of prerogative, subject to the revision of the court.[6] The same is the case with quashing,[7] even after motion for a new trial, when the indictment is defective.[8]

Ignoramus and quashing no bar.

§ 447. The entry of a *nolle prosequi* by the competent authority does not in itself operate as an acquittal of the charge contained in the indictment on which the *nolle prosequi* is entered.[9] The *nolle prosequi*, indeed, unless vacated in the same term by leave of court, destroys the efficiency

Nor is *nolle prosequi* or dismissal.

[1] State *v.* Fley, 2 Brev. 338.

[2] Milburn, ex parte, 9 Pet. 704; Yates *v.* Lansing, 5 Johns. 282; McCann's case, 14 Grat. 570; State *v.* Weatherspoon, 88 N. C. 18.

[3] State *v.* Jones, 16 Kans. 608.

[4] State *v.* Harris, 91 N. C. 656.

[5] 2 Hale, 243–6; 2 Hawk. c. 35, s. 6; R. *v.* Newton, 2 M. & Rob. 503; Com. *v.* Miller, 2 Ash. 61; State *v.* Harris, 91 N. C. 656; Clarke, ex parte, 54 Cal. 412; Job, ex parte, 17 Nev. 184. See supra, § 373; and see Christmas *v.* State, 53 Ga. 81.

[6] Supra, § 373. That a second bill on the same evidence will be quashed, see Richards *v.* State, 22 Neb. 145.

[7] Supra, §§ 385 *et seq.*, 392; U. S. *v.* Nagle, 17 Blatch. 258; Com. *v.* Bressant, 126 Mass. 246; Weston *v.* State, 63 Ala. 155; State *v.* Taylor, 34 La. An. 978; People *v.* Varnum, 53 Cal. 630.

[8] State *v.* Clark, 32 Ark. 231. Infra, § 457.

In a California case, after the defendant had been bound to answer by a justice of the peace for a felony, and the grand jury recommended that it be referred to the next grand jury, and the county court then ordered that the defendant be discharged from custody, this order was held not a bar to another prosecution of the defendant for the same offence. Ex parte Cahill, 52 Cal. 463.

[9] U. S. *v.* Stowell, 2 Curt. C. C. 170; U. S. *v.* Shoemaker, 2 McLean, 114; State *v.* Chapman, 52 Vt. 313; Com. *v.* Wheeler, 2 Mass. 172; Com. *v.* Tuck, 20 Pick. 356; Bacon *v.* Towne, 4 Cush. 234; State *v.* Main, 31 Conn. 572; State *v.* Garvey, 42 Conn. 232; Gardiner *v.* People, 6 Parker C. R. 155; Patterson *v.* State, 70 Ind. 341; Com. *v.* Lindsay,

of the indictment on which it is entered.[1] It does not bar, however, new proceedings, except when it is entered when the jury has been actually empanelled, in which case, if the defendant refuse to consent or if (in some jurisdictions) he be put in jeopardy of his life by the jury being charged, or if the entry be made after the evidence closes, the entry operates as an acquittal;[2] though it may be otherwise in cases where the defendant was not in jeopardy, and where the local law authorizes a *nolle prosequi* during trial,[3] and where the defendant, though entitled to do so, did not demand an acquittal.[4]

2 Va. Cas. 345; Wortham *v.* Com., 5 Rand. 669; State *v.* McNeil, 3 Hawks, 183; State *v.* Thornton, 13 Ired. 256; State *v.* McKee, 1 Bailey, 651; State *v.* Haskett, 3 Hill S. C. 95; State *v.* Blackwell, 9 Ala. 75; Aaron *v.* State, 39 Ala. 75; Winston, ex parte, 52 Ala. 419; Walker *v.* State, 61 Ala. 30; Clarke *v.* State, 23 Miss. 261; Donaldson, ex parte, 44 Mo. 149; State *v.* Patterson, 73 Mo. 695; Com. *v.* Thompson, 3 Litt. 284; State *v.* Ornsby, 8 Rob. La. 583; Williams *v.* State, 57 Ga. 478; Brown *v.* State, 5 English, 607; State *v.* Ingram, 16 Kans. 14; State *v.* McKinney, 31 Kans. 570; State *v.* Hart, 33 Kans. 218; State *v.* Byrd, 31 La. An. 419; Branch *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 594. See R. *v.* Roper, 1 Craw. & Dix. 185; R. *v.* Mitchell, 3 Cox C. C. 93; Walton *v.* People, 3 Sneed. 687.

A *nolle prosequi* applies to the particular indictment only, and not to the offence. Sewell, J., Com. *v.* Wheeler, 2 Mass. 172.

[1] See R. *v.* Mitchell, 3 Cox C. C. 36; R. *v.* Allen, 1 B. & S. 850; R. *v.* Roper, 1 Cr. & D. 85; Com. *v.* Dowdican, 115 Mass. 133; Com. *v.* Wheeler, 2 Mass. 72; State *v.* Primm, 60 Mo. 106; Woodworth *v.* Mills, Wis. 1884; 20 N. W. Rep. 728; Bowden *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 137. Supra, § 383.

[2] U. S. *v.* Farring, 4 Cranch C. C. 465; U. S. *v.* Shoemaker, 2 McLean, 114; State *v.* Roe, 12 Vt. 93; State *v.* Smith, 49 N. H. 155; Com. *v.* Goodenough, Thacher's C. C. 132; Com. *v.* Kimball, 7 Gray, 328; Com. *v.* Tuck, 20 Pick. 356; People *v.* Barrett, 2 Caines, 304; People *v.* Vanhorne, 8 Barb. 158; McFadden *v.* State, 23 Penn. St. 12; Mount *v.* State, 14 Ohio, 295; Baker *v.* State, 12 Ohio St. 214; Weinzorpflin *v.* State, 7 Blackf. 186; Harker *v.* State, 8 Blackf. 545; Wright *v.* State, 5 Ind. 290; Ward *v.* State, 1 Humph. 253; State *v.* Connor, 5 Cold. 311; Gruber *v.* State, 3 W. Va. 700; State *v.* McKee, 1 Bailey, 651; Spier's case, 1 Dev. 491; Durham *v.* State, 9 Ga. 306; Jones *v.* State, 55 Ga. 625; Reynolds *v.* State, 3 Kelly, 53; State *v.* Kreps, 8 Ala. 951; Cobia *v.* State, 16 Ala. 781; Grogan *v.* State, 44 Ala. 9; Battle *v.* State, 54 Ala. 93.

As to *nolle prosequi* generally, see supra, § 383.

As to jeopardy, see infra, § 570.

As to dismissal after a plea of guilty, see Boswell *v.* State, 11 Ind. 47.

[3] Infra, §§ 490 *et seq.*; U. S. *v.* Morris, 1 Curtis C. C. 23; State *v.* Roe, 12 Vt. 93; State *v.* Garvey, 42 Conn. 432; Com. *v.* Seymour, 2 Brewst. 567; Kistler *v.* State, 64 Ind. 371; Taylor *v.*

[4] Com. *v.* Kimball, 7 Gray, 328.

In some jurisdictions the consent of the court is requisite to a *nolle prosequi*;[1] though the fact that such consent is given does not strengthen the effect of the *nolle prosequi* unless the case be before the jury, and the defendant be put in jeopardy according to the local construction of the law.[2]

State, 35 Tex. 98. See U. S. *v.* Kimball, 7 Gray, 328, cited supra, § 383.

It has been held that a discharge from a former indictment upon payment of costs, in consequence of the refusal of the prosecutor to prosecute farther, is no bar. State *v.* Blackwell, 9 Ala. 79.

In Massachusetts, under the provisiou in c. 171, § 28, that in cases of assault, on acknowledgment of satisfaction by party injured, the court may discharge the defendant, the discontinuance of the prosecution is at the discretion of the court. Com. *v.* Dowdican, 115 Mass. 133.

In such cases the dismissal is not technically a bar. "The effect of dismissing a complaint without a trial is like that of quashing or entering a *nolle prosequi* to an indictment. By neither of these is the defendant acquitted of the offence charged against him. Com. *v.* Gould, 12 Gray, 171." Com. *v.* Bressant, 126 Mass. 246.— Morton, J.

There may be cases in which a bar will be interposed where a joint defendant is discharged in order to use him as a witness against his co-defendant. People *v.* Bruzzo, 24 Cal. 41. In such cases it has been held that a stipulation by the prosecuting attorney not to try precludes the prosecuting authorities from proceeding to trial. Ibid. Hardin *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 186. See, however, Whart. Crim. Ev. § 443, where the question is discussed in detail, and cases there cited. See, also, Venters *v.* State, 18 Tex. Ap. 211.

In U. S. *v.* Ford, 99 U. S. 594, it was held that the United States district attorney cannot, as to the informer, bind the government by a contract not to prosecute.

As to jeopardy, when the accomplice is called, and the case against him withdrawn, see U. S. *v.* Morris, 1 Curtis C. C. 23; infra, §§ 490 *et seq.*

[1] See supra, § 383; State *v.* Garvey, 42 Conn. 232; People *v.* McLeod, 1 Hill (N. Y.), 377.

[2] In Maryland, in 1868, pending a motion to quash an indictment for a felony, there was received and filed in the case a *nolle prosequi*, granted by the governor, ordering "that all further proceedings against the accused on the indictment should cease and determine *upon payment of the costs accrued upon said indictment, and that no further prosecution be had or carried on against him for or on account of the said offence.*" On motion of the counsel for the traverser, the Circuit Court ordered a "*stet*" to be entered in the prosecution, and further proceedings therein to be stayed. On a writ of error from the judgment of the Circuit Court, it was held,—

1st. That the discharge of the accused was an end and determination of the suit, and such a final judgment as might be reviewed on writ of error.

2d. That the traverser was not entitled to claim the benefit of the *nolle prosequi*, until he had paid the costs of the prosecution; until that condition was performed the writ was inoperative.

3d. That as the record did not show affirmatively that the costs had not been paid, and in the absence of any objection to the discharge of the ac-

When a count is divisible a surplus averment may be got rid of either by a formal *nolle prosequi* or by a withdrawal equivalent thereto.[1]

§ 448. *After verdict* the entry of a *nolle prosequi*, either with or without consent of court, as the local statutes may prescribe, is a usual method either of recording executive clemency, or of disencumbering the case from embarassing surplus charges. In either case such *nolle prosequi* may be viewed as a pardon.[2] But after a new trial a *nolle prosequi* is no bar.[3]

After verdict *nolle prosequi* a bar.

§ 449. When a defendant is discharged from an indictment for want of prosecution, by virtue of the first section of the New Jersey act relative to indictments, he is discharged only from his imprisonment or recognizance, but is not acquitted of the crime, or discharged from its penalty.[4] It was intimated, however, by the Supreme Court, that if a defendant be "discharged" for want of prosecution upon an indictmemt, he cannot be afterwards arraigned or tried under that indictment.[5] But such discharge, it was said, is no bar to a subsequent indictment for the same offence, or to the trial upon it; and a plea of such former indictment and discharge is bad upon demurrer.[6]

Discharge for want of prosecution not a bar.

Under the Virginia statute a discharge based on arbitrary delays by the State operates as a bar;[7] and so under the Ohio statute.[8]

cnsed on that account having been made in the circuit court, it will be presumed by the appellate court that the conditiou precedent, upon which the *nolle prosequi* was made to depend, was performed by the accused. State *v.* Morgan, 33 Md. 44.

[1] Supra, §§ 158, 243 *et seq.*

[2] State *v.* Whittier, 21 Me. 341; State *v.* Burke, 38 Me. 574; Roe *v.* State, 12 Vt. 93; Com. *v.* Briggs, 7 Pick. 177; Com. *v.* Tuck, 20 Pick. 356; Com. *v.* Jenks, 1 Gray, 490; State *v.* Fleming, 7 Humph. 152; People *v.* Van Horne, 8 Barb. 158. See infra, §§ 737–9, 907–10.

[3] State *v.* Rust, 31 Kan. 509.

[4] State *v.* Garthwaite, 3 Zab. (N. J.) 143.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid. See supra, § 328; Scrafford, in re, 21 Kan. 735.

Where a party was indicted for murder, but found guilty of manslaughter, and the indictment was afterwards quashed; the statute of limitations afterwards becoming a bar to the indictment for manslaughter, the defendant was discharged. Hurt *v.* State, 25 Miss. 378.

[7] Supra, § 328.

[8] Ex parte McGehan, 22 Ohio St. 442; Erwin *v.* State, 29 Ohio St. 186; Johnson *v.* State, 42 Ohio St. 207.

§ 450. The general subject of the construction of limitation statutes has been already noticed.[1] An interesting question may arise as to the effect of a foreign statute of limitations in barring a crime in the *forum deprehensionis*. It may be enough here to say, that in cases of conflict, a liberal interpretation of the law, such as that heretofore vindicated, would require the interposition of the statute most favorable to the defendant. If by the *lex delicti commissi* the statute falls, he should not elsewhere be held responsible. But a foreign statute of limitations will not be regarded by our courts as affecting offences distinctively within our jurisdiction.[2]

Foreign statute of limitations may bar.

§ 451. We shall have hereafter occasion to see that a conviction fraudulently obtained by the prosecution will be set aside by the courts.[3] It has also been held that a former conviction or acquittal procured by the fraud of the defendant is no bar to a subsequent prosecution.[4] The fraud in such prior procedure must be plainly shown, as otherwise it will

Fraudulent prior judgment no bar.

[1] Supra, §§ 316 *et seq.*

[2] Supra, § 329.

[3] Infra, § 849.

[4] R. *v.* Duchess of Kingston, 2 How. St. Tr. 544; Strange R. 707; R. *v.* Furser, Say. 90; State *v.* Little, 1 N. H. 257, per Woodbury J.; Com. *v.* Alderman, 4 Mass. 477; Com. *v.* Dascom, 111 Mass. 404; State *v.* Brown, 16 Conn. 54; State *v.* Reed, 26 Conn. 202; State *v.* Atkinson, 9 Humph. 677; State *v.* Colvin, 11 Humph. 599; State *v.* Clenny, 1 Head, 270; State *v.* Lowry, 1 Swan (Tenn.), 34; State *v.* Jones, 7 Ga. 422; State *v.* Davis, 4 Blackf. 345; Watkins *v.* State, 68 Ind. 427; Halloran *v.* State, 80 Ind. 586; Bulson *v.* People, 31 Ill. 409; State *v.* Green, 16 Iowa, 239; McFarland *v.* State, 69 Wis. 400; State *v.* Simpson, 28 Minn. 269; State *v.* Cole, 48 Mo. 70; Bradley *v.* State, 32 Ark. 722. In North Carolina it is said that an acquittal obtained by fraud may be contested only in cases of misdemeanor. State *v.* Swepson, 79 N. C. 632. In Massachusetts a plea of guilty to an assault, followed by a fine, when the prosecution was fraudulently got up by the defendant, has been held no bar. Com. *v.* Dascom, 111 Mass. 404; S. P., Watson *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 271. See Bigham *v.* State, 59 Miss. 529.

In a case in Virginia, where a person charged with an assault and battery was recognized to appear at the then next Superior Court, to answer an indictment to be then and there preferred against him for the said offence, but in the mean time fraudulently procured himself to be indicted for the same offence in the county court, and there confessed his guilt, and a small amercement was thereupon assessed against him, such fraudulent prosecution and conviction was held to present no bar to the indictment preferred against him in the Superior Court. Com. *v.* Jackson, 2 Va. Cas. 501; and see State *v.* Colvin, 11 Humph. 599; 4 Am. Law Reg. 1.

be a bar.[1] A mere resort to a fraudulent defence cannot shake a verdict of acquittal thereby procured; nor can a conviction under which a full penalty has been imposed be treated as a nullity.[2] And even where the proceedings were fraudulently induced by the defendant himself, yet if he suffers on conviction the full penalty of the law, this is a bar.[3]

Nor prior pending indictment.

§ 452. It has been ruled that though the defendant has pleaded to a former indictment for the same offence, the fact of the former indictment being still pending is no bar to a trial on the second.[4] The more accurate practice, however, is to quash or enter a *nolle prosequi* on the first indictment,[5] which action may be had at any time, and constitutes no bar to further proceedings on the subsequent bill.[6] As will hereafter be seen, a defective verdict does not bar further proceedings on the same indictment,[7] nor does the discharge of a jury from legal necessity.[8] It should be remembered that where two courts have concurrent jurisdiction, the court which first obtains possession of a case absorbs the jurisdiction,[9] and that no second jury can be empanelled in a case until the first is discharged.[10]

Nor do prior civil proceedings.

§ 453. According to a prevalent view in England, a person who, when injured by a felony committed by another, fails to prosecute such other person, cannot proceed in a civil suit to recover damages for his injury. "The policy of

[1] State *v.* Casey, 1 Busbee, 209. See Burdett *v.* State, 9 Tex. 43.

[2] State *v.* Casey, 1 Busbee, 209.

[3] See State *v.* Little, supra; Com. *v.* Alderman, supra; State *v.* Atkinson, 9 Humph. 677. Infra, § 457.

[4] U. S. *v.* Herbert, 5 Cranch C. C. 87; U. S. *v.* Neverson, 1 Mack. 452; Com. *v.* Drew, 3 Cush. 279; Com. *v.* Murphy, 11 Cush. 472; Com. *v.* Berry, 5 Gray, 93; Com. *v.* Golding, 14 Gray, 49; Com. *v.* Fraher, 126 Mass. 265; People *v.* Fisher, 14 Wend. 9; Smith *v.* Com., 14 Weekly Notes, 40; O'Meara *v.* State, 17 Ohio St. 515; Stewart *v.* Com., 28 Grat. 950; State *v.* Tisdale, 2 Dev. & B. 159; State *v.* Nixon, 78 N. C. 558; State *v.* Hastings, 86 N. C. 596; State *v.* Vincent, 91 Mo. 662; State *v.* Webb, 74 Mo. 333; State *v.* Eaton, 75 Mo. 586, overruling State *v.* Smith, 71 Mo. 45; State *v.* Lambert, 9 Nev. 321; Dutton *v.* State, 5 Ind. 532; Hardin *v.* State, 22 Ind. 347; Miazza *v.* State, 36 Miss. 614; Bailey *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 140.

[5] People *v.* Vanhorne, 8 Barb. 160; Perkins *v.* State, 66 Ala. 457; Clinton *v.* State, 6 Baxt. 507; State *v.* Andrew, 76 Mo. 101. See supra, §§ 373–78, 390. State *v.* McKinney, 31 Kan. 70. As to practice under Alabama Code, see Coleman *v.* State, 71 Ala. 312.

[6] R. *v.* Houston, 2 Cr. & D. 310; Com. *v.* Gould, 12 Gray, 171.

[7] Infra, § 756.

[8] Infra, §§ 508–11.

[9] Supra, § 441.

[10] State *v.* Dolan, 51 Mich. 610.

the law requires that, before the party injured by any felonious act can seek civil redress for it, the matter should be heard and disposed of before the proper criminal tribunal, in order that the justice of the country may be first satisfied in respect of the public offence."[1] To this the following qualifications were stated by Baggallay, L. J., in 1879:[2] "It appears to me that the following propositions are affirmed by the authorities, many of which, however, are *dicta*, or enunciations of principle, rather than decisions: (1) That a felonious act may give rise to a maintainable action; (2) That the cause of action arises upon the commission of the offence; (3) That, notwithstanding the existence of the cause of action, the policy of the law will not allow the person injured to seek civil redress if he has failed in his duty of bringing the felon to justice; (4) That this rule has no application to cases in which the offender has been brought to justice at the instance of some other person injured by a similar offence, as in Fauntleroy's case,[3] or in which prosecution is impossible by reason of the death of the offender, or of his escape from the jurisdiction before a prosecution could have been commenced by the exercise of reasonable diligence; (5) That the remedy by proof in bankruptcy is subject to the same principles of public policy as those which affect the seeking of civil redress by action."[4]

To misdemeanors the objection has been held not to apply,[5] and in this country it has been doubted whether the rule holds good even as to felonies.[6] Even where the rule is maintained, it is held

[1] Ellenborough, C. J., Crosby *v.* Lang, 12 East, 409, 413.

[2] Ball, ex parte, 40 L. T. (N. S.) 141; L. R. 10 Ch. D. 667; note 19 Am. Law Reg. 48. In Wells *v.* Abrahams, L. R. 7 Q. B. 554, it was held that the question could only arise when part of the plaintiff's case.

[3] Stone *v.* Marsh, 6 B. & C. 551.

[4] Wellock *v.* Constantine, 2 H. & C. 146; and Elliott, ex parte, 3 Mont. & A. 110, are cited by Bramwell, L. J., in the same case, as the only two cases "in which it (the rule) has operated to prevent the debt being enforced," and as to the latter of these cases he expresses doubts. See discussion of these cases in London Law Times for April 12, 1879.

[5] Ibid.; Fissington *v.* Hutchinson, 15 L. T. R. N. S. 390.

[6] The authorities are thus grouped by Walton, J., in Nowlan *v.* Griffin, 68 Me. 235:—

"In Boody *v.* Keating, 4 Me. 164, and again in Crowell *v.* Merrick, 19 Me. 392, the court say that the rule, that a civil action in behalf of the party injured is suspended until a criminal prosecution has been commenced and disposed of, 'is limited to larcenies and robberies.' The same opinion had

that it does not prevent the bringing suit; the principle being satisfied if the suit be brought, and be continued until the criminal prosecution terminates;[1] and the reason of the rule limits it in any way to cases in which the failure to bring the civil suit is imputable to the plaintiff's negligence or to his desire to compound the offence.

Supposing, therefore, a civil or *quasi* civil suit to be pending, whose object is to obtain compensation for an injury, it is no bar, either in felonies or misdemeanors, to a subsequent criminal prosecution for such injury as a public offence.[2]

before been expressed in Boardman *v.* Gore, 15 Mass. 331, 336. In Boston & Worcester R. R. Co. *v.* Dana, 1 Gray, 83, where the defendant had made himself comparatively rich by stealing from the railroad company, the question was fully examined, and the court held that, while it is undoubtedly the law in England that the civil remedy of the party injured by a felony is suspended till after the termination of a criminal prosecution against the offender, such had never been the law here. And such is the prevailing opinion in this country. Boston & W. R. R. Co. *v.* Dana, 1 Gray, 83; Pettingill *v.* Rideout, 6 N. H. 454; Piscat. Bank *v.* Turnley, 1 Miles, 312; Foster *v.* Com., 8 W. & S. 77; Cross *v.* Guthery, 2 Root, 90; Patton *v.* Freeman, Coxe, 143; Hepburn's case, 3 Bland, 114; Allison *v.* Farmers' Bank, 6 Rand. 223; White *v.* Fort, 3 Hawks, 251; Robinson *v.* Culph, 1 Comst. 231; Story *v.* Hammond, 4 Ohio, 376; Ballew *v.* Alexander, 6 B. Monr. 38; Lofton *v.* Vogles, 17 Ind. 105; Boardman *v.* Gore, 15 Mass. 331, 338; Hawk *v.* Minnick, 19 Ohio St. 462; S. C., 2 Am. R. 413." To same effect is Quimby *v.* Blackey, 63 N. H. 77; aff. Hollis *v.* Davis, 56 N. H. 74, 85; overruling Bank *v.* Flanders, 4 N. H. 239; Short *v.* Baker, 23 Ind. 555; Cannon *v.* Barris, 1 Hill S. C. 372; Mitchell *v.* Mimms, 1 Tex. 8. The English distinction has been sustained at common law in Maine (Crowell *v.* Merrick, 19 Me. 392; Belknap *v.* Milliken, 23 Me. 381; *aliter* by statute; Nowlan *v.* Griffin, 68 Me. 235), in Alabama (Martin *v.* Martin, 25 Ala. 201; Bell *v.* Troy, 35 Ala. 104), and Georgia. Neal *v.* Farmer, 9 Ga. 555. In Connecticut the limitation is as to capital felonies. Cross *v.* Guthery, 2 Root, 90. But the reason for the English rule, that the duty of prosecuting in felonies falls on the party injured, fails in this country where the responsibility is thrown on the prosecuting officer of the State. See Drake *v.* Lowell, 13 Met. 292; Wheatley *v.* Thorn, 23 Miss. 62; Newell *v.* Cowan, 30 Miss. 492. So in New York by statute: Van Duzer *v.* Howe, 21 N. Y. 531; and in Arkansas: Brunson *v.* Martin, 17 Ark. 273.

That under Rev. St., § 3318, a suit and judgment for the United States for the penalty of $100 does not bar a criminal prosecution, see Lesynski, in re, 16 Blatch. 9.

[1] Pettingill *v.* Rideout, *ut sup.*

[2] People *v.* Stevens, 13 Wend. 341; Beatchly *v.* Moser, 15 Wend. 215; Robinson *v.* Culp, 1 Const. R. 231; Buckner *v.* Beek, Dudley S. C. 168; Chiles *v.* Drake, 2 Metc. (Ky.) 147; State *v.* Blennerhasset, 1 Walk. 7. See Jones *v.* Clay, 1 B. & P. 191; R. *v.* Rhodes, 2 Stra. 703; State *v.* Rowley, 12 Conn. 101; Com. *v.* Elliott, 2 Mass. 372; see, *contra*, State *v.* Frost, 1 Brev. 385; State *v.* Blyth, 1 Bay, 166.

It has also been held, that when the statute provides a penalty as well as fine and imprisonment for an offence, a judgment for the amount of the penalty does not bar a criminal prosecution to enforce the fine and imprisonment.[1] Nor is the case varied by the fact that there has been a settlement in the civil suit in favor of the prosecutor.[2] But in each line of procedure the courts will so mould trial and sentence as to prevent injustice from being done by undue cumulation of process.[3] And it has been held that a suit instituted by the government for a penalty for a particular act is barred by either an acquittal or a conviction on an indictment for the same offence.[4]

§ 454. How far a prior civil suit is cause for a *nolle prosequi* is elsewhere considered.[5]

Whether a case will be continued in consequence of the pendency of civil proceedings, is noticed hereafter.[6]

After conviction of minor, indictment is barred as to major.

§ 455. As we shall soon have occasion to see more fully,[7] when there has been a conviction of a minor offence, on an indictment for a major inclosing a minor, the defendant cannot afterwards be put on trial for the major.

Specific penalty inflicted by sovereign may be exclusive.

§ 455 *a*. A sovereign may impose a specific penalty on a particular offence, and when this is done, such penalty may be exclusive. Thus, in Jefferson Davis's case, Chief Justice Chase held that on persons subjected to the penalties imposed in the fourteenth section of the federal constitution no further punishment could be inflicted, and that on this ground the indictment should be quashed.[8] On the other hand, unless the statutory penalty imposed on a common law offence is on its face exclusive, and is in the nature of a police imposition, then,

[1] Lesynski, in re, 16 Blatch. 9; 7 Rep. 358; citing U. S. *v.* Claflin, 25 Int. Rev. Rep. 465. But see Com. *v.* Howard, 13 Mass. 222; Com. *v.* Murphy, 2 Gray, 514; 2 Hawk. P. C. c. 26, s. 63.

[2] Fagnan *v.* Knox, 66 N. Y. 526.

In Massachusetts, under certain circumstances, reparation acknowledged in open court by the prosecutor in a misdemeanor, and a consequent staying of proceedings by the court, bar a civil action. Rev. Stat. Mass. c. 136, § 27; ibid. c. 198, § 1. Supra, § 447.

[3] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed., § 31 *b*.

[4] Coffee *v.* U. S., 116 U. S. 436; U. S. *v.* McKee, 4 Dillon, 128.

[5] Supra, § 447.

[6] Infra, § 599 *a*.

[7] Infra, §§ 465, 896, and cases there cited.

[8] U. S. *v.* Davis, Chase Dec. 124.

even after submission to such penalty, the defendant can be indicted for the offence at common law.[1]

2. *As to Former Indictment.*

§ 456. If the defendant *could* have been legally convicted on the first indictment upon proof of the facts claimed to constitute the offence, his acquittal (or conviction) on that indictment may be successfully pleaded to a second indictment for the same offence;[2] and it is immaterial whether the proper evidence were adduced at the trial of the first indictment or not.[3] In other words, where the evidence necessary to support the second indictment would have been sufficient to procure a legal conviction upon the first, and where the offences are substantially the same, the plea is generally good,[4] but not otherwise.[5] Even where the first trial is for a misdemeanor and the second for a felony, the test holds good that the plea is sufficient if the evidence requisite to support the second indictment must have supported a conviction on the first. Where the doctrine of merger obtains, the evidence of the consummated felony would have secured an acquittal on the first indictment, and such acquittal would be no bar. Thus, it has been said, that where on an indictment for an assault to rob, murder, or ravish, the felony turned out to have

If former indictment could have sustained a verdict the judgment is a bar.

[1] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 20.

[2] See Goode *v.* State, 70 Ga. 752; Hirshfield *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 207; State *v.* Stewart, 11 Oregon, 52.

[3] R. *v.* Vandercomb, 2 Leach C. C. 708; R. *v.* Sheen, 2 C. & P. 634; R. *v.* Clark, 1 Brod. & B. 473; R. *v.* Emden, 9 East, 437; Com. *v.* Clair, 7 Allen, 525; Heikes *v.* Com., 26 Penn. St. R. (2 Casey) 513; Com. *v.* Trimmer, 84 Penn. St. 65; Mitchell *v.* State, 42 Ohio St. 383; and cases cited infra, §§ 465, 471.

[4] Infra, § 471, and cases there cited; Jervis's Archbold, 82; Keeler, 58; 1 Leach, 448; R. *v.* Emden, 9 East, 437; R. *v.* O'Brien, 46 L. J. 177; Com. *v.* Cunningham, 13 Mass. 245; Com. *v.* Wade, 17 Pick. 395; Com. *v.* Tenney, 97 Mass. 50; Com. *v.* Hoffman, 121 Mass. 369; Com. *v.* Trimmer, 84 Penn. St. 65; State *v.* Reed, 12 Md. 263; Price *v.* State, 19 Ohio, 423; Gerard *v.* People, 3 Scam. 363; Guedel *v.* People, 43 Ill. 226; State *v.* Gleason, 56 Iowa, 203; State *v.* Moon, 41 Wis. 684; State *v.* Ellison, 4 Lea, 229; State *v.* Ray, Rice, 1; State *v.* Risher, 1 Richards. 219; State *v.* Birmingham, 1 Busbee, 120; State *v.* Shiver, 20 S. C. 392; State *v.* Kuhuke, 30 Kan. 462; Holt *v.* State, 38 Ga. 187; McElmurray *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 621.

[5] State *v.* Ross, 4 Lea, 442; Justice *v.* Com., 81 Vt. 209; Brewer *v.* State, 59 Ind. 101; State *v.* Helveston, 38 La. An. 314; People *v.* Clark, 67 Cal. 99; Whitford *v.* State, 24 Tex. Ap. 489. Infra, § 457.

been completed, the defendant's acquittal, which the court would have been bound to direct, would have been no bar to an indictment for the felony.[1] On the other hand, where the doctrine of merger is not held, the prior judgment bars; since, as the defendant in such case could have been convicted of the assault on evidence of the felony, the felony cannot be prosecuted after acquittal of the assault.[2] When, however, as will hereafter be more fully seen, a new fact supervenes after the first prosecution, which fact materially changes the character of the offence, then the defendant may be prosecuted for the offence thus evolved.[3]

Judgment on defective indictment no bar.

§ 457. A conviction under a defective indictment is no bar, unless the conviction has been followed by judgment and execution of the sentence.[4] Hence, after judgment has been arrested or reversed on a defective indictment, or after an indictment has been quashed, or a judgment for the defendant has been entered on demurrer,[5] a new indictment may be found, correcting the defects in the prior indictment, and to the second indictment the proceedings under the first are no bar.[6]

[1] State *v.* Murray, 15 Me. 100; Com. *v.* Kingsbury, 5 Mass. 106; Com. *v.* Parr, 5 Watts & Serg. 345; People *v.* Mather, 4 Wend. 265; People *v.* Schmidt, 64 Cal. 260. Infra, §§ 464–5–7.

[2] See infra, §§ 465–6.

[3] Nicholas's case, Fost. Cr. L. 64, and cases cited infra, § 476.

[4] Infra, § 507; U. S. *v.* Jones, 31 Fed. Rep. 725; Com. *v.* Loud, 3 Met. 328; Com. *v.* Keith, 8 Met. 531; Fritz *v.* State, 40 Ind. 18. See Croft *v.* People, 15 Hun, 484; State *v.* Hays, 78 Mo. 603; State *v.* Owen, Ibid. 367.

[5] Supra, § 406. As to California practice on judgment on demurrer, see People *v.* Jordan, 63 Cal. 217; People *v.* Giesea, Ibid. 315.

[6] Infra, § 507; Writhpole's case, Cro. Car. 147; R. *v.* Drury, 3 Cox C. C. 544; R. *v.* Houston, 2 Craw. & D. 310; Campbell *v.* R., 11 Q. B. 799; R. *v.* Wildey, 1 Maule & S. 188; Com. *v.* Fischblatt, 4 Met. (Mass.) 354; Com. *v.* Gould, 12 Gray, 171; Com. *v.* Chesley, 107 Mass. 223; People *v.* Casborus, 13 Johns. R. 351; People *v.* McKay, 18 Johns. 212; Com. *v.* Zepp, 5 Penn. L. J. 256; Cochrane *v.* State, 6 Md. 400; Allen *v.* Com., 2 Leigh, 727; Page *v.* Com., 9 Leigh, 683; Com. *v.* Hatton, 3 Grat. 623; Sutcliffe *v.* State, 18 Ohio, 469; Guedel *v.* People, 43 Ill. 226; State *v.* Elder, 65 Ind. 282; State *v.* Knouse, 33 Iowa, 365; State *v.* Ray, 1 Rice, 1; Oneil *v.* State, 48 Ga. 66; State *v.* Phil., 1 Stew. 31; Cebia *v.* State, 16 Ala. 781; Turner *v.* State, 40 Ala. 21; Jeffries *v.* State, 40 Ala. 381; Robinson *v.* State, 52 Ala. 587; State *v.* Owens, 28 La. An. 5; State *v.* Gill, 33 Ark. 129; Simco *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 338; Grisham *v.* State, 19 Tex. App. 504; State *v.* Priehnow, 16 Neb. 131. See Com. *v.* Gould, 12 Gray, 171; People *v.* Casborus, 13 Johns. 352, as to barring effect of final defective arrest.

A prior indictment, quashed after conviction and motion for new trial on

But an erroneous acquittal (if not fraudulent) is conclusive so that the defendant cannot be retried for any offence of which he could have been convicted under the indictment on which there was an acquittal.[1]

It is otherwise when the acquittal is on an indictment which is so inadequate or defective that under it the offence charged in the second indictment could not have been legally proved.[2] The same rule is held to apply to a new trial on defendant's application.[3]

As we have seen, a defective arrest of judgment on a good indictment is a bar in all cases where the State could have obtained a reversal of the arrest; since there is still pending against the defendant a good indictment, on which he has been put in jeopardy.[4]

§ 458. Whether an acquittal as principal bars an indictment as accessary depends upon the question whether an accessary can be convicted on an indictment charging him as principal. That he cannot, was the common law doctrine;[5] and where this is the law, an acquittal as principal is no bar to an indictment as accessary.[6] And on the same reasoning an acquittal as accessary is no bar, in felonies, to an indictment as principal.[7] It is otherwise under recent codes in which accessaries may be indicted as principals.

Same test applies to acquittal as principal or accessary.

it, is no bar to a subsequent indictment for the same offence. State *v.* Clark, 32 Ark. 231. Supra, § 446.

As to demurrers, see supra, § 406.

[1] 2 Inst. 318; 2 Hale, 274; R. *v.* Sutton, 5 B. & Ad. 52; R. *v.* Praed, 4 Burr. 2257; R. *v.* Mann, 4 M. & S. 337; State *v.* Kittle, 2 Tyler, 471; State *v.* Brown, 16 Conn. 54; People *v.* Maher, 4 Wend. 229; State *v.* Taylor, 1 Hawks, 462; Black *v.* State, 36 Ga. 447; State *v.* Dark, 8 Blackf. 526; State *v.* Norvell, 2 Yerg. 24; Slaughter *v.* State, 6 Humph. 410. Supra, § 435.

[2] Vaux's case, 4 Coke R. 44 *a*; Com. *v.* Clair, 7 Allen, 525; People *v.* Barrett, 1 Johns. R. 66; Com. *v.* Somerville, 1 Va. Cas. 164; State *v.* Ray, 1 Rice, 1; Whitley *v.* State, 38 Ga. 50; Black *v.* State, 36 Ga. 447; Waller *v.* State, 40 Ala. 325; State *v.* McGraw, 1 Walker, 208; Munford *v.* State, 39 Miss. 558; Mount *v.* Com., 2 Duval, 93; People *v.* Clark, 67 Cal. 99. See, however, Berry *v.* State, 65 Ala. 117.

That a former conviction of petit larceny may be no bar to indictment for grand larceny, see Good *v.* State, 61 Ind. 69.

[3] Lawrence *v.* People, 1 Scam. 414; State *v.* Redman, 17 Iowa, 329; State *v.* Walters, 16 La. An. 400. See infra, § 518.

[4] Supra, §§ 405, 435 *a*; State *v.* Norvell, 2 Yerg. 24.

[5] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 238–45.

[6] Supra, §§ 238–245; 2 Hale, 244; Fost. 361; 2 Hawk. c. 35, s. 11; R. *v.* Plant, 7 Car. & P. 575; State *v.* Larkin, 49 N. H. 36; State *v.* Buzzell, 58 N. H. 257; S. C., 59 N. H. 65; Morrow *v.* State, 14 Lea, 475.

[7] Ibid.; Reynolds *v.* People, 83 Ill. 479.

§ 459. Where the counts are for distinct offences, a defendant who has been acquitted upon one of several counts is entirely discharged therefrom, nor can he a second time be put upon his trial upon that count. The new trial can only be had on the count as to which there was a conviction. It is otherwise when the variation between the counts is merely formal.[1] When there is a conviction on one count, and no verdict as to the others, a *nolle prosequi* may be entered as to the others, or the court may regard the action as an acquittal on such counts.[2]

Acquittal on one count does not affect other counts. Conviction on one count may be an acquittal as to others.

§ 460. An acquittal from misnomer or misdescription is no bar.[3] Thus, an acquittal upon an indictment in a wrong county cannot be pleaded to a subsequent indictment for the offence in another county.[4] And, as a general rule, an acquittal on a former indictment on account of a variance between pleading and proof, is no bar.[5] So an acquittal for an attempt to pass a counterfeit note to A. at one time does not bar an indictment for an attempt to pass it to B. at another time.[6] But a conviction, followed by an endurance of punishment, will bar a future prosecution for the same offence.[7]

Acquittal from misnomer or misdescription no bar.

[1] See infra, § 895.

[2] Bonnell *v.* State, 64 Ind. 498; Logg *v.* People, 8 Ill. Ap. 99; infra, § 895.

[3] See State *v.* Sherrill, 82 N. C. 694.

[4] Vaux's case, 4 Co. 45 *a*, 46 *b*; Com. Dig. Indictment, 1; Methard *v.* State, 19 Ohio St. 363.

[5] R. *v.* Green, Dears. & B. 113; R. *v.* O'Brien, 46 L. T. 177; State *v.* Sias, 17 N. H. 558; Com. *v.* Sutherland, 109 Mass. 342; Com. *v.* Trimmer, 84 Penn. St. 65; Burres *v.* Com., 27 Grat. 934; Robinson *v.* Com., 32 Grat. 866; State *v.* Williams, 94 N. C. 891; State *v.* Elder, 65 Ind. 282; McCoy *v.* State, 46 Ark. 141; Martha *v.* State, 26 Ala. 72. But see Williams *v.* Com., 78 Ky. 93; Com. *v.* Bright, 78 Ky. 238; State *v.* Vines, 34 La. An. 1079.

In a case where the prisoner was on his trial for burning the barn of Josiah Thompson, the prosecutor was asked his name, who replied Josias Thompson, on which the prisoner was acquitted without leaving the box; on being indicted for burning the barn of Josias Thompson he cannot plead *autrefois acquit*. Com. *v.* Mortimer, 2 Va. Cas. 325; 2 Hale, 247. Supra, § 456.

Where the defendant was formerly indicted for forging a will, which was set out in the indictment thus: "*I, John Styles,*" etc., and was acquitted for variance, the will given in evidence commencing "*John Styles,*" without the "*I,*" it was ruled that he could not plead this acquittal in bar of another indictment, reciting the will correctly, "*John Styles,*" etc. R. *v.* Cogan, 1 Leach, 448. It is otherwise when the defendant could have been convicted on the first indictment. Com.

[6] Burks *v.* State, 24 Tex. Ap. 526.

[7] See Com. *v.* Loud, 3 Met. 328; Com. *v.* Keith, 8 Met. 531; Fritz *v.* State, 40 Ind. 18. See supra, § 443.

§ 461. When a particular intention is essential to the proof of the case, an acquittal from a variance as to such intention is no bar to a second indictment stating the intention accurately.[1]

Nor is acquittal from variance as to intent.

v. Loud, 3 Met. 328; Com. *v.* Keith, 8 Met. 531; Fritz *v.* State, 40 Ind. 18; Durham *v.* People, 4 Scam. 172.

The following additional illustrations may be here given:—

The defendant was charged with having stolen and carried away one bank note of the Planters' Bank of Tennessee, payable on demand at the Merchants and Traders' Bank of New Orleans. Upon this he was acquitted. The second indictment charged him with having stolen, taken, and carried away one bank note of the Planters' Bank of Tennessee, payable on demand at the Mechanics and Traders' Bank of New Orleans. The former acquittal was pleaded in bar, but it was held to be no bar to the prosecution of the second indictment. Hite *v.* State, 9 Yerg. 357. The same result took place where the defendant had been indicted for stealing the cow of J. G. and acquitted, and was again indicted for stealing the same cow, at the same time and place, and of the same owner, but by the name of J. G. A., which was his proper name; it was held that the acquittal was no bar to the second indictment. State *v.* Risher, 1 Richards. 219. See, also, U. S. *v.* Book, 2 Cranch C. C. 294. In an English case bearing on the same point, the evidence was that the prisoner stole the goods of J. B. from his stall, which at the time was in charge of R. B., his son, a child of fourteen, who lived with his father, and worked for him. The first indictment against him for stealing the goods described them as the property of R. B. The sessions thinking this a wrong description directed an acquittal, and caused a new bill to be sent up laying the property in J. B. To this indictment he pleaded *autrefois acquit*. It was held that the plea could not be sustained, for the prisoner could not, on the evidence, have been convicted on the first indictment, charging the property as that of R. B., and that the court could only look at the first indictment, as it stood, without considering whether the allegation as to the ownership of the goods might not have been amended so as to have warranted a conviction. R. *v.* Green, Dears. & B. C. C. 113; 2 Jur. N. S. 1146; 26 L. J. M. C. 17; 7 Cox C. C. 186.

An acquittal on an indictment charging the defendant with setting fire to the premises of A. and B. is no bar to an indictment charging him with setting fire to the premises of A. and C. Com. *v.* Wade, 17 Pick. 395.

An acquittal upon one indictment for receiving stolen goods is no bar to the prosecution of the same defendant upon another, without further proof of the identity of the offences than that the goods described in the second indictment are such that the averments of the first indictment might describe them. Com. *v.* Sutherland, 109 Mass. 342.

A trial and acquittal on an indictment for stealing a particular article misnamed is no bar to a subsequent prosecution for stealing such article

[1] State *v.* Jesse, 3 Dev. & Bat. 98; State *v.* Hattabaugh, 66 Ind. 223. Whart. Crim. Ev. § 125. See State *v.* Birmingham, 1 Busbee, 120.

§ 462. The variance as to time, between the two indictments, must be in matter of substance to defeat the plea. If the difference be in a point immaterial to be proved, the acquittal on the first is a bar to the second.

Otherwise as to variance as to time.

Thus, as to the point of time, if the defendant be indicted for a murder as committed on a certain day, and acquitted, and afterwards be charged with killing the same person on a different day, he may plead the former acquittal in bar notwithstanding this difference, for the day is not material, and this is an act which could not be twice committed.[1] And the same rule applies to accusations of other felonies, for though it be possible for several acts of the same kind to be committed at different times by the same person, it lies in averment, and the party indicted may show that the same charge is intended.[2]

correctly described. Com. *v.* Clair, 7 Allen, 525; State *v.* McGraw, 1 Walk. 208.

An acquittal on a charge of embezzling cloth and other materials of which overcoats are made is no defence to an indictment for embezzling overcoats, although the same facts which were proved on the trial of the first indictment are relied upon in support of the second. Com. *v.* Clair, 7 Allen, 525.

The court: "The obvious and decisive answer to the defendant's plea in bar of *autrefois acquit* is, that the first indictment charges a different offence from that set ont in the indictment on which the defendant is now held to answer. The principle of law is well settled, that, in order to support a plea of *autrefois acquit*, the *offence* charged in the two indictments must be identical. The test of this identity is, to ascertain whether the defendant *might* have been *convicted* on the first indictment by proof of the *facts* alleged in the second."

An insolvent debtor acquitted on a former indictment for omitting goods from his schedule, may be again indicted for omitting other goods not specified in the former indictment; but such a course ought not to be taken except under very peculiar circumstances. R. *v.* Champneys, 2 M. & R. 26.

What misnomers are a variance is considered more fully in another work. Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 94 *et seq.*

In Virginia, by statute, "a person acquitted of an offence, on the ground of a variance between the allegations and the proof of the indictment or other accusation, or upon an exception to the force or substance thereof, may be arraigned again on a new indictment, or other proper accusation, and tried and convicted for the same offence, notwithstanding such former acquittal." Code, 1860, c. 199, § 16, p. 814; Robinson *v.* Com., 32 Grat. 866.

[1] 2 Hale, 179, 244; 2 Hawk. 35.

[2] Ibid.

On an indictment for keeping a gaming-house, *tempore* G. 4, the defendant pleaded that at the sessions, 4 G. 4, he was indicted for keeping a gaming-house on the 8th of January, 47 Geo. 3, and on divers other days and times between that day and the taking of the

§ 463. When several are jointly indicted for an offence which may be joint or several, and all are acquitted, no one can again be indicted separately for the same offence, since on the former trial any one might have been convicted, and the others acquitted.[1] Where, however, the former joint indictment is erroneous, for joining persons for an offence which could not be committed jointly, as for perjury, an acquittal thereon will be no bar to a subsequent prosecution against each.[2] An acquittal of one defendant in an offence which is necessarily joint (*e. g.*, adultery), acquits the other.[3]

Acquittal on joint indictment a bar if defendant could have been legally convicted.

§ 464. It has been often held in this country, that where, on an indictment for an assault, attempt, or conspiracy, with intent to commit a felony, it appears that the felony was actually consummated, it is the duty of the court to charge the jury that the misdemeanor merges, and that the defendant must be acquitted. It used to be supposed that at common law, whenever a lesser offence met a greater, the former sank into the latter; and hence, in a large class of prosecutions, the defendant would succeed in altogether escaping conviction. The reason for this is the old common law rule that a defendant charged with misdemeanor is entitled to greater privileges as to counsel and to a copy of the indictment than would a defendant charged with felony.[4] Even where this distinction has ceased, the courts of several States[5] have held that at common law where a felony is

Acquittal from merger at common law no bar.

inquisition against the peace of our lord the said king, with an averment that the offence in both indictments was the same; it was holden no bar, because the *contra pacem* tied the prosecutor to proof of an offence in the reign of Geo. 3, the only king named in that indictment. R. *v.* Taylor, 3 B. & C. 502.

[1] R. *v.* Dann, 1 Moody C. C. 424; R. *v.* Parry, 7 C. & P. 836. Infra, § 483.

[2] See Com. *v.* McChord, 2 Dana, 244. Supra, § 313.

[3] Supra, §§ 301, 315; State *v.* Bain, 112 Ind. 335.

[4] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 27*a*, 395, 576, 1343; Hawk. b. 2, c. 47, s. 6; 1 Ch. C. L. 251, 639; R. *v.* Walker, 6 C. & P. 657; R. *v.* Eaton, 8 C. & P. 417; R. *v.* Woodhall, 12 Cox C. C. 240; R. *v.* Cross, 1 Ld. Ray. 711; 3 Salk. 193; though see R. *v.* Carradice, Rus. & R. 205.

[5] State *v.* Murray, 15 Me. 100; Com. *v.* Kingsbury, 5 Mass. 106; Com. *v.* Newell, 7 Mass. 245; Com. *v.* Roby, 12 Pick. 496; People *v.* Mather, 4 Wend. 265; Johnson *v.* State, 2 Dutch. 313; Com. *v.* Parr, 5 Watts & S. 345; Com. *v.* McGowan, 2 Pars. 341; Black *v.* State, 2 Md. 376; Com. *v.* Blackburn, 1 Duvall, 4; Wright *v.* State, 5

proved, the defendant is to be acquitted of the constituent misdemeanor, and though the notion has been sturdily resisted elsewhere,[1] it has taken deep and general root. The result has been the accumulation of pleas of *autrefois acquit*, in which, through the labyrinth of subtleties thus opened, the defendant has frequently escaped; an acquittal being ordered in the first case because there was doubt as to the misdemeanor, and in the second because there was doubt as to the felony. In 1848, however, under the stress of particular statutes, all the judges of England agreed that the doctrine that a misdemeanor, when a constituent part of a felony, merges, is no longer in force; that the statutory misdemeanor of violating a young child does not merge in rape;[2] nor a common law conspiracy to commit a larceny, in the consummated felony.[3] It has also been provided by statute that on an indictment for felony the defendant can be convicted of any constituent misdemeanor duly pleaded.[4] Similar statutes have been enacted in most jurisdictions in this country, and in others the rule is adopted as at common law.[5] These statutes, however, do not apply to cases where the offences are distinct, but only to those where one offence is an ingredient of

Ind. 527; People *v.* Richards, 1 Mann. (Mich.) 216; State *v.* Lewis, 48 Iowa, 578; State *v.* Durham, 72 N. C. 447. Compare comments in § 456.

[1] State *v.* Scott, 24 Vt. 127; State *v.* Shepard, 7 Conn. 54; People *v.* Jackson, 3 Hill, 92; People *v.* White, 22 Wend. 175; Lohman *v.* People, 1 Comst. 379; Hess *v.* State, 5 Ohio, 6; Stewart *v.* State, 5 Ohio, 241; State *v.* Sutton, 4 Gill, 494; Canada *v.* Com., 22 Grat. 899; State *v.* Taylor, 2 Bailey, 49; Laura *v.* State, 26 Miss. 174; Hanna *v.* People, 19 Mich. 316; Cameron *v.* State, 13 Ark. 712.

[2] R. *v.* Neale, 1 Den. C. C. 36. See Siebert *v.* State, 95 Ind. 471; State *v.* Ellis, 74 Mo. 207; State *v.* Woolaver, 77 Mo. 103.

[3] R. *v.* Button, 11 Ad. & El. N. S. 929. See R. *v.* Evans, 5 C. & P. 553; R. *v.* Anderson, 2 M. & R. 469; Com. *v.* Andrews, 132 Mass. 263.

The bearing of these cases on the question of *autrefois acquit* is thus stated by Lord Denman, C. J., 11 Ad. & El. N. S. 946: "The same act may be part of several offences; the same blow may be the subject of inquiry in consecutive charges of murder and robbery. The acquittal on the first charge is no bar to a second inquiry where both are charges of felonies; neither ought it to be when the one charge is of felony and the other of misdemeanor. If a prosecution for a larceny should occur after a conviction for a conspiracy, it would be the duty of the court to apportion the sentence for the felony with reference to such former conviction."

[4] Infra, § 742.

[5] Com. *v.* Dean, 108 Mass. 349; citing Com. *v.* Bakeman, 105 Mass. 53; Morey *v.* Com. 108 Mass. 433; People *v.* Arnold, 46 Mich. 268.

In New York, by the penal code of 1882, § 685, an attempt does not merge in a consummated crime.

another;[1] nor can it be maintained under the statutes that a defendant is to be convicted on proof showing him to be guilty of an offence materially different from that charged.

It is conceded on both sides that a felony of low grade does not merge in a felony of higher;[2] nor does a misdemeanor merge in a

[1] R. *v.* Simpson, 3 C. & K. 207; R. *v.* Shott, Ibid. 206. In other words, the prosecution can say, "We relieve the defendant from the aggravations of the charge, and try him only on one minor offence contained in the indictment;" but it cannot say "We will charge him with one offence and try him for another essentially different." As to whether incest merges in rape, see Whart. Crim. Law (9th ed.), § 1750. See, as generally, infra, § 467; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed., §§ 27, 576. See, more fully, Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed., §§ 576, 1343.

In Pennsylvania, by the Revised Act of 1860, persons tried for misdemeanor are not to be acquitted if the offence turn out to be felony. A similar statute exists in other States. Com. *v.* Squires, 1 Met. 258; Prindeville *v.* People, 42 Ill. 217.

Two were indicted in England for having on the 10th November, 1849, assaulted P. They pleaded *autrefois acquit*, and in their plea set out an indictment for murder, the third count of which alleged that they had murdered the deceased, by beatings on the 5th November and 1st December, 1849, and 1st January, 1850, and on divers other days between the 5th November and 1st January; and the plea averred that the assaults charged in the second indictment were identically the same as those of which they had been acquitted on the trial of the first. The replication was that the prisoners were not acquitted of the felony and murder, including the same identical assaults charged in the indictment. On the first trial the counsel for the crown had stated the assaults as conducing to the death, and had given them in evidence to sustain the charge of murder. It was proved, however, that the cause of death was a blow inflicted shortly before the death of the deceased, which occurred on the 4th January, but there was no evidence to show by whom the blow was struck, and the prisoners were acquitted. The judge, on the second trial, told the jury that if they were satisfied that there were several distinct and independent assaults, some or any one of which did not in any way conduce to the death of the deceased, it would be their duty to find the prisoners guilty. The jury found the prisoners guilty. It was held that the conviction was right, as the prisoners could not, on the trial for murder, have been convicted, under 7 Will. 4 & 1 Vict. c. 83, s. 11, of the assaults for which they were indicted on the second trial. R. *v.* Bird, T. & M. 437; 2 Den. C. C. 94; 5 Cox C. C. 11; 2 Eng. L. & Eq. 448.

The Michigan statute, providing that no person shall be acquitted of a misdemeanor because the proofs show a felony, cannot apply to a statutory offence where the misdemeanor could not be included in any felony, and where the offence proved would be inconsistent with that charged, instead of being an aggravation of it. People *v.* Chappell, 27 Mich. 486. Otherwise when the misdemeanor is part of the felony. People *v.* Arnold, 46 Mich. 268.

[2] Com. *v.* McPike, 3 Cush. 181; People *v.* Smith, 57 Barb. 46; Barnett *v.* People, 54 Ill. 325; Bonsall *v.* State,

misdemeanor.[1] Thus, the intent to commit an injury within the statute under which the prisoner is indicted, as a means to the accomplishment of another ultimate and unlawful object, is not taken out of the operation of the statute by the existence of such ultimate design.[2]

Where an indictment contains a minor offence inclosed in a major, a conviction or acquittal of minor bars major.

§ 465. Most indictable offences comprise two or more grades, of any one of which, either at common law or by statute, a jury may convict.[3] Under an indictment for murder, for instance, a defendant may be convicted of murder in the second degree, of manslaughter, and, in some jurisdictions, of assault and battery. Under an indictment for burglary containing an averment of larceny he may be convicted of larceny.[4] Under an indictment for assault with intent, he may be convicted of a simple assault.[5] Under an indictment for the consummated offence, he may, in several States, be convicted of the attempt. It becomes, therefore, a question of interest to determine how far a conviction or an acquittal on an indictment for an offence comprising several stages affects a subsequent charge for one of these stages. The answer is, that if there could have been a conviction on the first indictment of the offence prosecuted under the second, then the conviction or acquittal under the first indictment bars the second. Where on the first trial the conviction or acquittal is of the minor offence, this rule has been frequently recognized.[6] Thus, where under an indictment for murder the defendant could have been convicted of murder or

35 Ind. 460; People *v.* Bristol, 23 Mich. 118. Infra, § 1344.

[1] Infra, § 1346. See State *v.* Damon, 2 Tyler, 387.

[2] People *v.* Carmichael, 5 Mich. 10; People *v.* Adwards, Ibid. 22; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 119.

[3] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 27.

[4] Infra, §§ 742, 789; Com. *v.* Prewitt, 82 Ky. 240; see Munson *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 329.

[5] Supra, § 247.

[6] Infra, §§ 742, 789, 896; supra, § 244; R. *v.* Oliver, 8 Cox C. C. 384; R. *v.* Yeadon, 9 Cox C. C. 91; R. *v.* Bird, T. & M. 437; 3 Den. C. C. 94; 5 Cox C. C. 11; State *v.* Waters, 39 Me. 54; State *v.* Dearborn, 54 Me. 442; Com. *v.* Griffin, 21 Pick. 523; Com. *v.* Stuart, 28 Grat. 950; Stewart *v.* State, 5 Ohio, 242; Bell *v.* State, 48 Ala. 184; Swinney *v.* State, 8 S. & M. 576; State *v.* Ross, 29 Mo. 32; State *v.* Smith, 53 Mo. 139; State *v.* Brannon, 55 Mo. 63; State *v.* Chaffin, 2 Swan, 493; Conner *v.* Com., 13 Bush, 714; State *v.* Delaney, 28 La. An. 434; State *v.* Byrd, 31 La. An. 419; State *v.* Dennison, 31 La. An. 847; Cameron *v.* State, 8 Eng. 13 Ark. 712; Jones *v.* State, 13 Tex. 168; Grisham *v.* State, 19 Tex. 504; State *v.* Taylor, 3 Oregon, 10.

By the N. Y. Penal Code of 1882, § 36, the position in the text is affirmed.

of manslaughter, then his conviction of manslaughter bars after a new trial a subsequent prosecution for the murder.[1] On the same reasoning a conviction of murder in the second degree is an acquittal

[1] Infra, §§ 789, 896; 2 Hale, 246; Fost. 329; State *v.* Payson, 37 Me. 362; Com. *v.* Herty, 109 Mass. 348; State *v.* Flannigan, 6 Md. 167; Davis *v.* State, 39 Md. 365; Lithgow *v.* Com., 2 Va. Ca. 297; Kirk *v.* Com., 9 Leigh, 627; Wroe *v.* State, 20 Ohio St. 460; Morehead *v.* State, 34 Ohio St. 212; Brennon *v.* People, 15 Ill. 511; Barnett *v.* People, 54 Ill. 325; People *v.* Knapp, 26 Mich. 112; Gordon *v.* State, 3 Iowa, 410; State *v.* Tweedy, 11 Iowa, 350; State *v.* Commis., 3 Hill S. C. 241; Jordan *v.* State, 22 Ga. 545; Miller *v.* State, 58 Ga. 200; Bell *v.* State, 48 Ala. 685; De Armand *v.* State, 71 Ala. 351; Sylvester *v.* State, 72 Ala. 201; Morris *v.* State, 8 Sm. & M. 762; Hurt *v.* State, 25 Miss. 378; Rolls *v.* State, 52 Miss. 391; Watson *v.* State, 5 Mo. 497; State *v.* Ross, 29 Mo. 32; State *v.* Sloan, 47 Mo. 604; State *v.* Smith, 53 Mo. 139; (but now *contra* in Missouri under constitution of 1875; State *v.* Sims, 71 Mo. 538; State *v.* Bruffey, 75 Mo. 389; State *v.* Martin, 76 Mo. 337; State *v.* Anderson, 89 Mo. 300); State *v.* Delaney, 28 La. An. 434; State *v.* Byrd, 31 La. An. 419; State *v.* Dennison, Ibid. 847; Slaughter *v.* State, 6 Humph. 410; State *v.* Lessing, 16 Minn. 80; State *v.* Martin, 30 Wis. 216; State *v.* Belden, 33 Wis. 120; People *v.* Gilmore, 4 Cal. 376; State *v.* McCord, 8 Kans. 232; Wornock *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 450. See, however, as holding that a new trial opens the whole case, U. S *v.* Harding, 1 Wall. Jr. 147; State *v.* Beheimer, 20 Ohio St. 579; State *v.* Morris, 1 Blackf. 37; Veatch *v.* State, 60 Ind. 29; Livingston's Case, 14 Grat. 134; Com. *v.* Arnold (Ky. 1884), 6 Crim. L. Mag. 61; Bohanan *v.* State, 18 Neb. 57.

In R. *v.* Tancock, 13 Cox C. C. 217, the prisoner having been previously convicted for the manslaughter of A., was shortly after his trial indicted for wilful murder upon the same facts. The prisoner pleaded *autrefois convict.* The facts of identity of the prisoner and deceased having been given in evidence, and the judge (Denman, J.) having read the depositions, which, as he thought, disclosed a case of manslaughter, he held the plea to be proved, at the same time stating that, if he thought the case would ultimately have resolved itself into one of murder, he should have tried the prisoner, and, if necessary, reserved the point for the consideration of the court for crown cases reserved. But this last point was merely intimated and cannot be accepted as of authority.

In this case, however, the first indictment was for manslaughter, and the view of Denman, J., is in accordance with the distinction taken infra.

In State *v.* Chumley, 67 Mo. 41, it was held that a conviction on an indictment for an assault with intent to kill, bars an indictment on the same facts for an assault with intent to maim.

As dissenting from the text, see U. S. *v.* Keen, 1 McLean, 429; Bailey *v.* State, 26 Ga. 579; Veatch *v.* State, 60 Ind. 291. The argument in the text is, of course, strengthened when there has been a direct acquittal of the major.

In such cases the conviction of murder in the second degree must be specially pleaded. Jordan *v.* State, 81 Ala. 20. Infra, § 477.

of murder in the first degree;[1] a conviction of larceny, on an indictment for burglary and larceny, is an acquittal of burglary;[2] a conviction of robbery in the second degree bars a subsequent prosecution for robbery in the first degree.[3] A defendant, also, who is convicted of assault with intent to ravish, under an indictment for rape, cannot subsequently be tried for the rape;[4] and a defendant who is convicted of an assault under an indictment for an assault with intent to kill, or for assault and battery, cannot be subsequently tried for the assault with felonious intent, or for the assault and battery.[5] On the same hand, where, under the first indictment there could have been no conviction of the major offence, then a conviction or acquittal of the minor on the first indictment does not bar a second indictment for the major offence.[6] Thus, a

[1] Clem *v.* State, 42 Ind. 420; State *v.* Belden, 33 Wis. 120; Slaughter *v.* Com., 6 Humph. 410; State *v.* Smith, 53 Mo. 139; Johnson *v.* State, 29 Ark. 31; Lewis *v.* State, 51 Ala. 1; Field *v.* State, 52 Ala. 348; Berry *v.* State, 65 Ala. 117. Compare People *v.* Lilly, 38 Mich. 270.

[2] Supra, § 244. Infra, §§ 789, 896; State *v.* Kittle, 2 Tyler, 471; State *v.* Bruffey, 75 Mo. 389; 11 Mo. Ap. 79; State *v.* Martin, 76 Mo. 337; Morris *v.* State, 8 S. & M. 762; Esmon *v.* State, 1 Swan (Tenn.), 14. See Smith *v.* State, 68 Ala. 424.

Compare State *v.* Brannon, 55 Mo. 63, as stated fully infra, § 466, and as to Missouri cases see analysis in prior note.

As to cases where the burglary and the larceny are separately indicted, see Smith *v.* State, 22 Tex. Ap. 350.

[3] State *v.* Brannon, 55 Mo. 63; People *v.* Jones, 53 Cal. 58.

[4] State *v.* Shepard, 7 Conn. 54.

[5] R. *v.* Dawson, 3 Stark. 62; State *v.* Dearborn, 54 Me. 442; State *v.* Handy, 47 N. H. 538; State *v.* Coy, 2 Aiken, 181; State *v.* Reed, 40 Vt. 603; Com. *v.* Fischblatt, 4 Met. 350; State *v.* Johnson, 1 Vroom, 185; Francisco *v.* State, 4 Zabr. 30; State *v.* Townsend, 2 Harring. 543; Stewart *v.* State, 5 Ohio R. 242; White *v.* State, 13 Ohio St. 569; State *v.* Shepard, 10 Iowa, 126; Clark *v.* State, 12 Ga. 350; State *v.* Stedman, 7 Port. 495; Carpenter *v.* State, 23 Ala. 84; Gardenheir *v.* State, 6 Tex. 348; Reynolds *v.* State, 11 Tex. 120; Grisham *v.* State, 19 Tex. 504; Robinson *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 160; McBride *v.* State, 2 Eng. 374; State *v.* Robey, 8 Nev. 312; People *v.* Apgar, 35 Cal. 389.

The reason is, the conviction of the minor is the acquittal of the major. Infra, § 742.

[6] R. *v.* Morris, L. R. 1 C. C. 90; R. *v.* Salvi, 10 Cox C. C. 481, n.; R. *v.* Button, 11 Ad. & El. (N. S.) 929; Josslyn *v.* Com., 6 Met 236; Com. *v.* Evans, 101 Mass. 25; Com. *v.* Herty, 109 Mass. 348; Wilson *v.* State, 24 Conn. 57; People *v.* Saunders, 4 Parker C. R. 197; People *v.* Smith, 57 Barb. 46; State *v.* Nathan, 5 Richards. 213; State *v.* Warner, 14 Ind. 572; Freeland *v.* People, 16 Ill. 380; Severin *v.* People, 37 Ill. 414; Scott *v.* U. S., 1 Morris, 142; People *v.* Knapp, 26 Mich.

conviction or acquittal on an indictment for an assault with intent to kill or ravish (the acquittal being on the ground of merger) will be no bar to an indictment for the consummated offence.[1] And when after a trial for assault the assaulted person dies, a prosecution for the murder is not barred by the prior prosecution of the assault.[2] A conviction of larceny, also, on an indictment for burglary with intent to steal, does not bar a prosecution for the burglary.[3] We must at the same time remember that the prosecution, as will presently be seen more fully,[4] by selecting a minor stage, and prosecuting it with the evidence of the major stage, declining to present an averment of the latter, may preclude itself from afterwards prosecuting for the major offence in a distinct indictment. Otherwise the prosecution might arbitrarily subject a defendant to trials for a series of progressive offences on the same proof tentatively applied until at last a conviction should be reached.

§ 466. Of the rule just expressed the converse is in a large measure true. Thus, whenever, under an indictment containing

112; State *v.* Martin, 30 Wis. 216; Duncan *v.* Com., 6 Dana, 295. See Roberts *v.* State, 14 Ga. 8. See, however, R. *v.* Elrington, 9 Cox C. C. 86; 1 B. & S. 689; 10 W. R. 13; cited infra, § 467; R. *v.* Thompson, 9 W. R. 203; State *v.* Mikesell, 70 Iowa, 176.

In Com. *v.* Curtis, 11 Pick. 134, the rule in the text was held to apply to a case where the court trying the minor case had no jurisdiction of the major.

[1] R. *v.* Morris, L. R. 1 C. C. R. 90; State *v.* Murray, 15 Me. 100; Com. *v.* Kingsbury, 5 Mass. 106; People *v.* Mather, 4 Wend. 265; People *v.* Saunders, 4 Parker C. R. 197; Com. *v.* Parr, 5 W. & S. 345. Supra, § 456.

In State *v.* Hattabough, 66 Ind. 223, it was held that a conviction or acquittal of a simple assault and battery, before a court of competent jurisdiction to try the same, does not bar a subsequent prosecution for the same assault and battery with intent to commit a felony. Citing People *v.* Saunders, 4 Parker C. R. 197; Severin *v.* People, 37 Ill. 414. (Biddle, C. J., diss.) On the other hand, in R. *v.* Walker, 2 M. & R. 457, where it was held that an acquittal of an assault barred a subsequent prosecution for felonious stabbing based on the same transaction, it was said by Coltman, J., "Suppose a party had been acquitted of an assault, and he was afterwards indicted for the felony which involved that assault; it is clear, if he did not make the assault, he could not be guilty of that which includes and depends upon the assault."

[2] R. *v.* Morris, L. R. 1 C. C. 90; R. *v.* Salvi, 10 Cox C. C. 481, n.; Com. *v.* Evans, 101 Mass. 25; Burns *v.* People, 1 Parker C. R. 182; Wright *v.* State, 5 Ind. 527, and other cases cited infra, § 47.

[3] Wilson *v.* State, 24 Conn. 57; Smith *v.* State, 23 Tex. Ap. 350. But see Roberts *v.* State, 14 Ga. 8. Infra, §§ 466, 471.

[4] See infra, § 467.

successive stages of an offence, the defendant could have been convicted on the minor offences at the trial, his conviction of the major offence protects him from a further prosecution of the minor. And the same rule applies to acquittals, whenever the defendant could have been convicted of the minor offence and the acquittal goes to the aggregate charge.[1] It is otherwise when there could have been no conviction of the minor offence under the first indictment.[2] Thus, an acquittal of burglary with intent to steal does not bar a prosecution for larceny ;[3] and an acquittal of

Conviction or acquittal of major offence bars minor when on first trial defendant could have been convicted of minor.

[1] 4 Co. R. 45; 2 Hale, 246; Fost. 339; R. *v.* Gould, 9 C. & P. 64; R. *v.* Barrett, 9 C. & P. 387; State *v.* Smith, 43 Vt. 324; People *v.* McGowan, 17 Wend. 386; People *v.* Loop, 3 Parker C. R 561; People *v.* Smith, 57 Barb. 56; Lohman *v.* People, 1 Comst. 379; State *v.* Cooper, 1 Green, 361; Res. *v.* Roberts, 2 Dall. 124; Dinkey *v.* Com. 17 Penn. St. 126; State *v.* Reed, 12 Md. 263; Murphy *v.* Com., 23 Grat. 460; Fritz *v.* State, 40 Ind. 18; Wilcox *v.* State, 6 Lea, 571; State *v.* Lewis, 2 Hawks, 98; State *v.* Cowell, 4 Ired. 231; Johnson *v.* State, 14 Ga. 55; Bell *v.* State, 48 Ala. 684; State *v.* Smith, 15 Mo. 550; State *v.* Pitts, 57 Mo. 85; State *v.* Keogh, 13 La. An. 243; Wilcox *v.* State, 31 Tex. 586; Thomas *v.* State, 40 Tex. 36.

[2] 2 Hawk. c. 25, s. 5; 1 Leach, 12; R. *v.* Campbell, 3 C. & P. 418; R. *v.* Henderson, 1 C. & M. 328; R. *v.* Taylor, L. R. 1 C. C. 194; 11 Cox C. C. 261; R. *v.* Reid, 15 Jur. 181; Com. *v.* Hudson, 14 Gray, 11; State *v.* Nichols, 8 Conn. 496; Hilands *v.* Com., 114 Penn. St. 372; Reynolds *v.* People, 83 Ill. 479; Heller *v.* State, 23 Ohio St. 582; State *v.* Jesse, 2 Dev. & B. 297; State *v.* Morgan, 95 N. C. 641; Wood *v.* State, 48 Ga. 192; State *v.* Standifer, 5 Port. 523; State *v.* Wightman, 26 Mo. 515; Boswell *v.* State, 20 Fla. 869. See, however, R. *v.* Gould, 9 C. & P. 364. Infra, § 467.

[3] See State *v.* Warner, 14 Ind. 572; Fisher *v.* State, 46 Ala. 717; Roberts *v.* State, 55 Miss. 421; Howard *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 447; People *v.* Helbing, 61 Cal. 620; though see *contra*, State *v.* Lewis, 2 Hawks, 98; Roberts *v.* State, 14 Ga. 8; State *v.* De Graffenried, 9 Baxt. 287; People *v.* Garnett, 20 Cal. 622.

In State *v.* Brannon, 55 Mo. 63, the defendant was indicted "for robbery in the first degree," which was held to be a sufficient indictment for larceny. The conviction was for robbery "in the second degree." The verdict was set aside, as there were no degrees in robbery. When, subsequently, the defendant was again tried upon the same indictment, and convicted of larceny, this was held error; it being held that as the defendant could, upon the first trial, have been convicted of either robbery or larceny, but was lawfully convicted of neither, the verdict was an acquittal.

In Wilson *v.* State, 24 Conn. 57, a conviction for larceny, as we have seen, was held no bar to statutory house-breaking; and see infra, § 471.

But a conviction for larceny has been held a bar to an indictment for subsequently receiving the same goods. U. S. *v.* Harmison, 3 Sawyer, 556.

murder, on the ground that the assaults averred did not contribute to the murder, does not bar a subsequent indictment for the assaults.[1]

Prosecutor may bar himself by selecting a special grade.

§ 467. Upon the doctrines above stated an interesting qualification has been proposed. Suppose the prosecution could, if it chose, have presented the two offences in a single count (*e. g.*, assault, with assault with intent to wound), but did not do so, thereby, as has just been said, virtually, with the whole case before it, entering a *nolle prosequi* on the higher grade. Can a second indictment be maintained for such higher grade? The answer must be in the negative;[2] since the prosecution cannot take advantage of its own negligence in the imperfect pleading of its case, and since such voluntary withdrawal of the aggravated grade, sanctioned by a verdict, operates as an acquittal of the higher grade. Another reason is the annoyance which a contrary rule would capriciously inflict. "The State cannot split up a crime and prosecute it in parts. A prosecution for any part of a single crime" (supposing that at the time the entire crime could be prosecuted) "bars any further prosecution based upon the whole or a part of the same crime."[3]

Should the defendant be *acquitted* on the first trial, the whole case of the second prosecution being before the jury, then, as he has been acquitted of the essential ingredients of the second case, the second case cannot proceed.[4]

[1] R. *v.* Bird. T. & M. 437; 2 Den. C. C. 94; 5 Cox C. C. 11; cited supra, § 464. See Moore *v.* State, 59 Miss. 529.

[2] R. *v.* Elrington, 9 Cox C. C. 86; 1 B. & S. 689; 10 W. R. 13, citing R. *v.* Stanton, 5 Cox C. C. 324; Thompson, in re, 9 W. R. 203; U. S. *v.* Harmison, 3 Sawyer, 556; State *v.* Smith, 43 Vt. 324; Com. *v.* Miller, 5 Dana, 320; State *v.* Chaffin, 2 Swan. 493; State *v.* Stanly, 4 Jones L. (N. C.) 290; Moore *v.* State, 71 Ala. 302; 4 Crim. Law Mag. 429; though see People *v.* Warren, 1 Parker C. R. 338; Smith *v.* Com., 7 Grat. 593; State *v.* Foster, 33 Iowa, 525; Price *v.* State, 41 Tex. 300; see Grisham *v.* State, 19 Tex. Ap. 504; R. *v.* Elrington, and other cases in the same line, may be sustained on the ground that the withdrawal of the higher charge by the prosecution operates, when sanctioned by the verdict, as an acquittal of such charge; see supra, § 464, and cases cited infra.

The English rulings above cited, however, took place under a statute providing that after a trial by justices there should be no further proceedings, civil or criminal, "for the same cause."

[3] Jackson *v.* State, 14 Ind. 327–8; Drake *v.* State, 60 Ala. 42.

[4] To this effect see cases in preceding section, on the question whether a conviction of burglary with intent to steal bars larceny.

3. *As to Nature of Offence.*

§ 468. Concurrent injuries to distinct persons may be classified as follows:—

(1.) *Concurrent Negligent Injuries.*—Suppose a railroad corporation, by negligence in the construction of a bridge, causes the concurrent deaths of a number of passengers, is the responsibility of the corporation, or of its officers to whom the negligence is imputable, limited to a single case of death? It is alleged, by those maintaining the affirmative, that as the injury is but one act, there can be but one indictment and but one punishment. But is there, in such cases, only one act? In civil suits it has been decided in multitudes of cases that there are as many distinct acts, separately cognizable, as there are persons injured; and one of the chief checks we have upon railroad companies is that when a great disaster occurs from their negligence, they have to pay damages for every person hurt; and hence they multiply their precautions against the negligences which should produce such great disasters. If a foot-bridge crossing a brook breaks down under a single traveller, the negligent constructor of the bridge is liable to but a single suit, and this may be a sufficient penalty. If a railway bridge crossing an estuary breaks down, through the negligence of the company constructing it, and a hundred persons are swept into the sea, the company may be liable to a hundred suits; atrocious negligence hereby receiving signal and conspicuous condemnation. In no other way can care in proportion to peril be legally exacted. Why, then, should it be otherwise in criminal issues? In criminal as well as in civil issues, the principle is that the guilt of neglect is in proportion to the greatness of the duty neglected. It may be said, that in cases of injuries arising from the neglect of railroad officers, a gross punishment can be inflicted in the first case tried and that the others can be dropped. But to this it may be answered as follows: (1.) It is no more just when a man is tried for negligent misconduct towards A., to punish him for negligent misconduct to B., than it would be just when he is tried for negligent misconduct towards A., to punish him for malicious acts done subsequently to B. If the acts are separate they are to be punished separately, and that

When one unlawful act operates on separate objects, conviction as to one object does not extinguish prosecution as to other; *e. g.*, when two persons are simultaneously killed.

they are separate the courts, in civil suits, have repeatedly ruled. (2.) Our statutes do not ordinarily permit a series of offences to be thus lumped in their punishment. Punishments are assigned to specific objective acts of negligence. To impose the statutory punishment in such cases, if we stop with the first prosecution, is often a very inadequate penalty for the crime. To this view it may be objected that an offender may be crushed under a load of successive punishments. But this is an objection that goes, not to the responsibility of the party for each offence, but simply to the degree in which he is to be punished for his misconduct. The same objection would apply to successive trials in cases where A., at intervals of a day or a month, assaults murderously B., C., and D. The proper course is not to deny his responsibility for the wrongful acts, but, in cases where his punishment in the first case is adequate, to apply executive clemency. He may, for instance, in the first case, be sentenced to imprisonment for five years, and this may be regarded by the executive as a sufficient penalty to impose on a particular individual. But if he is sentenced in the first case to an imprisonment for one or two years, this may be properly followed by a second prosecution with a similar punishment. If this objection, it may be added, applies to successive criminal prosecutions, it applies still more strongly to successive civil suits, the penalties of which cannot be reduced by the executive.

(2.) *Concurrent Malice and Negligence.*—The characteristics of this concurrence are elsewhere fully discussed.[1] A. aims a pistol at B., but the ball glances and wounds C. Here, as we have seen, there is an attempt to kill B., for which the defendant is indictable, and a negligent wounding of C., for which the defendant is also indictable. The offences are distinct in purpose, in object, in effect, and ordinarily in mode of punishment. They are consequently to be tried separately. And in this way alone can a proper penalty be inflicted. A trial for neither offence would bring with it such a penalty. An attempt has usually a lenient punishment imposed on it; and such is the case with a negligent wounding. But here we have acts which, if we could join them, would present the features of a malicious wounding, and would deserve the punishment imposed on that high offence.

[1] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 120.

But we cannot so join them; and if we prosecute only for the neglect or the attempt singly, the punishment would be inadequate.

(3.) *Concurrent Malicious Acts.*—A., for instance, designing to inflict severe physical injury on B. and C., waits till he finds them together. We may suppose the case of poison administered in such a way as not to kill but to seriously hurt, such being the intention. If he administers the dose to them at intervals of half an hour, there can be no question that the offences are distinct. Do they cease to be distinct, because in this view, he manages to get them to his table together, and then to poison them by soup, for instance, distributed from the same tureen? In the Roman law we have cases in which the idea of unification of such offences is sternly rejected, and in which each poisoning is held to be distinct. The English common law tends to the same effect. There can be no question that each party injured, in such cases, supposing death not to ensue, can maintain a civil suit for the damage he has suffered individually. There can be no question, also, that by the English common law, he is obliged, before bringing the civil suit, to bring a criminal prosecution.[1] Wherever, in such cases, a civil suit lies, there, as a condition precedent, lies a criminal prosecution. It may be said that this also heaps an intolerable burden on the offender. This objection, however, if good, would limit to a single suit all civil retribution sought by the party injured. And the question here also, as in the preceding cases, is one for the executive, if it appear that immoderate penalties are about to be inflicted. The objection does not go to the severance of the offences. This severance is required, (1) because the purpose in each case is distinct; and (2) because the object in each case is distinct.

The question before us, as it presents itself to us in the concrete, may be treated in a series of cases, of which the following is the first to be discussed:—

If A. in shooting at B. kills both B. and C., is his conviction under an indictment for killing B. a bar to a prosecution against him for killing C.? In answering this question let us remember that to join the killing of B. and C. in the same count would be a

[1] See supra, § 453.

duplicity that would not be tolerated; and that if joined in the same indictment, in separate counts, the court would compel an election between the offences. It would be necessary, therefore, to prosecute the cases separately; and if so, it is hard to see how a conviction or acquittal of the one could bar a prosecution of the other. To the indictment for killing B., for instance, A. might set up self-defence, and be acquitted, but this might be plausibly argued to be an issue different from that which would be presented on his trial for killing B., should it appear that the killing of B. was an unprovoked or a negligent act. The killing of B. also may be malicious, as where A. designs to shoot B., while the concurrent killing of C. may be negligent; as where the ball, after striking B., glances and strikes C., whom A. has no possible reason to expect to be at the spot, and whose death may be to him peculiarly abhorrent.[1] An acquittal or conviction, therefore, for killing C. ought not, on principle, to bar a subsequent indictment for killing B., though the killings were by the same act.[2]

[1] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 120.

[2] See R. *v.* Champneys, 2 M. & R. 26; R. *v.* Jennings, R. & R. 368; State *v.* Benham, 7 Conn. 414; People *v.* Warren, 1 Parker C. R. 338; Vaughan *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 273; Smith *v.* Com., 7 Grat. 593; State *v.* Fife, 1 Bailey, 1; State *v.* Fayetteville, 2 Murphey, 371; Kannon *v.* State, 10 Lea, 386; State *v.* Standifer, 5 Port. 523; Teat *v.* State, 53 Miss. 439; People *v.* Alibez, 49 Cal. 452; People *v.* Majors, 65 Cal. 138; and see State *v.* Horneman, 16 Kans. 452. See, however, State *v.* Womack, 7 Cold. 508. In Whart. Crim. Ev. § 587, other points are noticed; and, as disputing the conclusion of the text, see State *v.* Damon, 2 Tyler, 370; Ber *v.* State, 22 Ala. 9; Clem *v.* State, 42 Ind. 420. In Whart. on Hom. §§ 28–48, will be found a discussion of whether the grade in all cases of double killing is identical. See Forrest *v.* State, 13 Lea, 103.

The following supposed cases may strengthen the argument in the text:—

A. when shooting at B. with intent to kill, by the same shot negligently, as it is alleged, injures C. An acquittal on an indictment for the negligent injury to C. is no bar to an indictment for the malicious shooting of B.

A., an officer, with a warrant to arrest B., shoots B., the shooting being the only means of preventing B.'s escape. By the same shot, however, he (either negligently or maliciously) injures C. An acquittal in the former case is no bar to a prosecution in the latter.

A public executioner, when discharging his office, withdraws the platform in such a way as not only to cause the death of the convict, which he is appointed to effect, but to inflict a serious wound on a by-stander, such wound being maliciously intended by the executioner. An acquittal on an indictment for the killing is no bar to an indictment for the malicious wounding.

An artilleryman aims his gun in such a way as to kill not only soldiers of the hostile force, but persons attend-

§ 469. Where the rule is that there can be batteries of two or more persons, introduced in the same count,[1] it follows on technical grounds, that a conviction or acquittal on an indictment charging a battery of A. and B. is a bar to a subsequent prosecution for a battery of B., though on the first trial the verdict went simply to the battery of A. But where the first indictment charges only the battery of A., this, for the reasons stated in the last section, does not bar a subsequent indictment for a battery of B.[2] And where the defendant fired a revolver twice in rapid succession at a crowd, the first shot wounding A. and the second wounding B., it was held that a conviction for assault on A. was no bar to an indictment for an assault on B.[3]

Otherwise as to two batteries at one time.

§ 469 *a*. The exception above given is extended in a New York case where it is held that an indictment charging as a single act the burning of a number of designated dwelling-houses is not bad for duplicity. The criminal act, it was said, is kindling the fire with felonious intent to burn the houses specified, and is consummated when the burning is effected; and the fact that the houses did not burn at the same time, and that but one was

So of arson.

ing a hospital, whom he knows to be non-combatants. An acquittal on an indictment for killing the former is no bar to an indictment for killing the latter.

A. attacked by B., and driven to the wall, seizes the opportunity when he can kill B. in self-defence to wound C. An acquittal in the first case is no bar to an indictment in the second.

[1] R. *v.* Benfield, 2 Bur. 984; R. *v.* Giddings, C. & M. 634; Com. *v.* McLoughlin, 12 Cush. 615; Com. *v.* O'Brien, 107 Mass. 208; Kinney *v.* State, 5 R. I. 385; State *v.* McClintock, 8 Iowa, 203; Shaw *v.* State, 18 Ala. 547; Fowler *v.* State, 3 Heisk. 154; though see R. *v.* Scott, 4 B. & S. 368, where it was held that one conviction for several curses on the same day, with a cumulative penalty at the rate of so much per curse, was good. 1 Smith, L. C. 8th Eng. ed. 712. In Hartley, in re, 31 L. J. M. C. 232, it was held that there could be several convictions for selling pieces of bad meat at the same stall on one day. See Beal, ex parte, L. R. 3 Q. B. 382; State *v.* Hopkins, 56 Vt. 250.

In Ben *v.* State, 22 Ala. 9, it was held that it was not duplicity to include in one count the administering poison to *three* persons; but see *contra*, People *v.* Warren, 1 Parker C. R. 338.

[2] People *v.* Warren, 1 Parker C. R. 338; Vaughan *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 273; Smith *v.* Com., 7 Grat. 593; Greenwood *v.* State, 64 Ind. 250; State *v.* Nash, 86 N. C. 650; State *v.* Standifer, 5 Port. 523; see Olathe *v.* Thomas, 26 Kan. 233.

[3] State *v.* Nash, 86 N. C. 650. As to Mississippi statute in this relation, see Pope *v.* State, 63 Miss. 53.

set on fire, the fire communicating therefrom to the others, does not make the burning of each a separate offence. It was further argued that if the indictment charges as a distinct offence the burning of each house, it is subject to the objection of duplicity, and the defect is not cured by a withdrawal, upon the trial, of all claim to convict the prisoner for burning any house but one.[1]

§ 470. Where several articles belonging to the same owner are stolen by the same person simultaneously, they may be grouped in the same count, and a conviction or acquittal on such count, or on any divisible allegation thereof, bars a future indictment for the stealing of any of the articles enumerated in the count.[2] But in States in which it is held that there can be no joinder of larcenies of articles belonging to distinct owners,[3] it follows that a conviction or acquit-

So when several articles are simultaneously stolen.

[1] Woodford *v.* People, 62 N. Y. 117, affirming 3 Hun, 310, 5 Thomp. & Cooke, 539. See Squires *v.* Com., 1 Met. 258. The houses in this case, it should be observed, were burned in a block. In State *v.* Colgate, 31 Kan. 511, it was held that an acquittal for burning a building was a bar to a prosecution for burning some account-books in the building, the act of ignition being in both cases the same; citing R. *v.* Cooper, 5 C. & P. 535; Com. *v.* Wade, 34 Mass. 395; Hennessy *v.* People, 21 How. Pr. 239.

[2] R. *v.* Carson, R. & R. 303; Furneaux's case, R. & R. 335; State *v.* Snyder, 50 N. H. 150; State *v.* Cameron, 40 Vt. 555; Com. *v.* Williams, 2 Cush. 583; Com. *v.* O'Connell, 12 Allen, 451; Com. *v.* Eastman, 2 Gray, 76; People *v.* Wiley, 3 Hill (N. Y.), 194; Jackson *v.* State, 14 Ind. 327; Fisher *v.* Com., 1 Bush, 211; Nichols *v.* Com., 78 Ky. 180; 9 Rep. 114; State *v.* Williams, 10 Humph. 101; Lorton *v.* State, 7 Mo. 55; State *v.* Augustine, 29 La. An. 119; State *v.* Faulkner, 32 La. An. 725; Quitzow *v.* State, 1 Tex. App. 47; Hatch *v.* State, 6 Tex. App. 384; State *v.* Clark, 32 Ark. 231; though see 1 Hale, 241; State *v.* Thurston, 2 McMul. 382. See, also, Woodward *v.* People, 62 N. Y. 117; State *v.* Egglesht, 41 Iowa, 574; State *v.* McCormack, 8 Or. 236.

Compare People *v.* McGowan, 17 Wend. 386; Woodward *v.* People, 62 N. Y. 117, supra.

In Fontaine *v.* State, 6 Bax. 514, it was held that selling several lottery tickets in one sheet was a single offence. The same view was taken in U. S. *v.* Miner, 11 Blatch. 511, as to possessing in one block two connected plates for counterfeiting.

[3] Com. *v.* Andrews, 2 Mass. 409; State *v.* Thurston, 2 McMull. 382; Morton *v.* State, 1 Lea, 498; Phillips *v.* State, 85 Tenn. 551. As ruling that stealing simultaneously several articles belonging to different owners may be treated as one offence, see R. *v.* Bleasdale, 2 C. & K. 765; Hoiles *v.* U. S., 3 MacArth. 370; Com. *v.* Williams, Thach. C. C. 84; State *v.* Nelson, 29 Me. 329; State *v.* Merrill, 44 N. H. 624; State *v.* Newton, 42 Vt. 537; Com. *v.* Dobbin, 2 Pars. 380; Fulmer *v.* Com., 97 Penn. St. 503; State *v.* Egglesht, 41 Iowa, 574; Fisher *v.* Com., 1 Bush, 212;

tal for stealing or feloniously receiving the goods of B. does not bar a prosecution for stealing or receiving the goods of C., though the acts were simultaneous. Indeed, though the offences were nominally the same, they may be substantially different, since one article may be taken under a claim of right and the other with felonious intent, the only point in common being concurrence in time.[1]

Another reason for the conclusion just given is, that if, in those jurisdictions which hold the joinder of articles belonging to different owners to be duplicity, we should bar a subsequent indictment for goods stolen from an owner different from the owner named in the first indictment, we would deprive the owner in the second case of his right to a restoration of the goods by sentence of court, when it might be that he had no notice of the first prosecution. But whatever may be the force of this reasoning, the weight of authority now is that the prosecution, wherever it is at liberty to join in one indictment all articles simultaneously stolen, may be treated, when it selects only one of them, for trial, as barring itself from indicting for the others.[2]

Nichols *v.* Com., 78 Ky. 180; Ben *v.* State, 22 Ala. 9; Lorton *v.* State, 7 Mo. 55; State *v.* Daniels, 32 Mo. 558; State *v.* Morphin, 37 Mo. 373; Wilson *v.* State, 45 Tex. 76; Dodd *v.* State, 10 Tex. App. 370; see Kilrow *v.* Com., 89 Penn. St. 480.

That there is the same rule in embezzlement, see Com. *v.* Pratt, 137 Mass. 245. In Nichols *v.* Com., *ut sup.*, it was said that there was a severance when the larceny was of two parcels of poultry 200 yards apart, though on the same night.

[1] R. *v.* Knight, L. & C. 378; 9 Cox C. C. 439; R. *v.* Brettel, C. & M. 609; Com. *v.* Andrews, 2 Mass. 409; Com. *v.* Sullivan, 104 Mass. 552; People *v.* Warren, 1 Parker, C. R. 338; State *v.* Thurston, 2 McMul. 382; Fisher *v.* Com., 1 Bush, 211; see State *v.* Lambert, 9 Nev. 321. As to divisibility in this respect, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 27, 931. See Phillips *v.* State, 85 Tenn. 551; Alexander *v.* State, 21 Tex. App. 406; infra, § 473.

[2] U. S. *v.* Beerman, 5 Cranch C. C. 412; State *v.* Nelson, 29 Me. 329; State *v.* Merrill, 44 N. H. 624; State *v.* Hennessy, 23 Ohio St. 339; Bell *v.* State, 42 Ind. 335; State *v.* Egglesht, 41 Iowa, 574; State *v.* Lambert, 9 Nev. 321; Lowe *v.* State, 57 Ga. 171; Ben *v.* State, 22 Ala. 9; State *v.* Morphin, 37 Mo. 373; Wilson *v.* State, 45 Tex. 170; Fulmer *v.* Com., 97 Penn. St. 503; Shubert *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 551; Willis *v.* State, 24 Tex. Ap. 586; Hudson *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 151. See supra, § 252. That a prosecutor may be estopped by selecting a particular phase of an offence, see infra, § 471; and see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 931–948.

In State *v.* Clark, 32 Ark. 231, it was

What has just been said applies to the sale of lottery tickets. When tickets are sold singly, no matter how short may be the interval of time between the sales, such sales may be prosecuted singly. When, however, a bunch of them is sold in a block, this constitutes but one offence.[1]

When one act has two or more indictable aspects, if the defendant could have been convicted of either under the first indictment he cannot be convicted of the two successively.

§ 471. We have heretofore noticed cases in which a minor offence, being a stage in the consummation of a major offence, is united in the same count with the major. We have now to approach another class of cases,—those in which one particular act has two or more indictable aspects. Although the question has been the subject of much difference of opinion, we may venture to hold that when one act has two or more aspects, if the defendant could have been convicted of either under the first indictment he cannot be convicted of the two on the two indictments tried successively. In other words, where the evidence necessary to support the second indictment would have been sufficient to procure a legal conviction on the first, the second is barred by a conviction or acquittal on the first.[2] If, for instance, the defendant is indicted for holding and uttering forged paper, a conviction for holding, the acts being simultaneous, bars a subsequent prosecution for uttering the same paper, or the

held that stealing several articles simultaneously from the same owner forms but one offence, and after one conviction for stealing a part no further prosecution can be pursued for the rest.

[1] Fontaine *v.* State, 6 Baxt. 514; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1494. See U. S. *v.* Patty, 9 Biss. 429.

[2] Archbold's C. P. by Jervis, 82; 1 Leach, 448; R. *v.* Emden, 9 East, 437; 2 N. Y. Rev. Stat. 1856; State *v.* Inness, 53 Me. 536; Com. *v.* Cunningham, 13 Mass. 245; Com. *v.* Wade, 17 Pick. 395; Com. *v.* Trickey, 13 Allen, 559; Morey *v.* Com., 108 Mass. 433; Com. *v.* Tenney, 97 Mass. 50; People *v.* Barrett, 1 Johns. R. 66; Canter *v.* People, 38 How. N. Y. Pr. 91; State *v.* Reed, 12 Md. 263; Price *v.* State, 19 Ohio, 423; Clem *v.* State, 42 Ind. 420; Gerard *v.* People, 3 Scam. 363; Durham *v.* People, 4 Scam. 172; Guedel *v.* People, 43 Ill. 226; State *v.* Egglesht, 41 Iowa, 574; State *v.* Murray, 55 Iowa, 120; State *v.* Gleason, 56 Iowa, 203; Wilcox *v.* State, 6 Lea, 571; State *v.* Ray, 1 Rice, 1; State *v.* Risher, 1 Richards. 219; State *v.* Revels, 1 Busbee, 200; Holt *v.* State, 38 Ga. 187; Hinkle *v.* Com., 4 Dana, 518; Hite *v.* State, 9 Yerger, 357; State *v.* Keogh, 13 La. An. 243; State *v.* Vines, 34 La. An. 1073. See State *v.* Inness, 53 Me. 536; Buell *v.* People, 18 Hun, 487. In Texas it has been held that a conviction of swindling by forgery bars a subsequent prosecution for the forgery. State *v.* Hirshfield, 11 Tex. Ap. 207.

converse.[1] If he is indicted for a riot, of which the overt act is an assault, and if on the trial of the riot the assault is put in evidence, and he is convicted and sentenced on the basis of the assault, the assault cannot afterwards be made the basis of an independent prosecution;[2] nor when a riot consists in breaking up a religious meeting can the defendant be prosecuted for the two offences successively.[3] Nor can there be a prosecution for an assault when the defendant has been already convicted of a breach of the peace which constituted the assault.[4] But where he is convicted of an assault, this does not, for the reasons already given, bar a subsequent prosecution for a riot of which the assault was one of the overt acts, as he could not, under the indictment for the assault, have been convicted of the riot.[5] Nor does an acquittal for obstructing a steam-engine, by putting a rail across the track, bar a prosecution for putting the rail across the track with intent to obstruct, if the defendant could not have been convicted of the latter offence on the indictment for the former;[6] nor does an acquittal for arson bar a prosecution for burning an untenanted house, the indictment for the former not including the latter offence;[7] nor does a conviction for disturbing a religious meeting by firing a pistol bar a prosecution for homicide by the same shot;[8] nor does an acquittal of bigamy bar a prosecution for adultery;[9] nor does a prosecution for threatening to kill bar an indictment for assault with intent to murder, being part of the same transaction;[10] nor does a conviction for larceny, on an indictment for larceny, bar a prosecution for the burglary

[1] State *v.* Benham, 7 Conn. 414; People *v.* Van Keuren, 5 Parker, C. R. 66. See State *v.* Egglesht, 41 Iowa, 574, where the defendant was held guilty of but one offence in passing four checks at the same time to the same person. But an acquittal for forging does not bar a prosecution for uttering. Harrison *v.* State, 36 Ala. 248; Foster *v.* State, 39 Ala. 229. And an acquittal of forging a certificate of deposit on one bank does not bar a prosecution for obtaining money from another bank, by forwarding the certificate in a forged letter. See People *v.* Ward, 15 Wend. 231.

[2] R. *v.* Champneys, 2 Mood & R. 26; State *v.* Locklin, 59 Vt. 654; Com. *v.* Kinney, 2 Va. Cas. 139; Smith *v.* Com., 7 Grat. 593; State *v.* Stanly, 4 Jones L. (N. C.) 290; Price *v.* People, 9 Ill. Ap. 36; State *v.* Fife, 1 Bailey, 1; State *v.* Standifer, 5 Port. 523; though see Scott *v.* U. S., 1 Morris, 142; Duncan *v.* Com., 6 Dana, 295.

[3] State *v.* Townsend, 2 Harring. (Del.) 543.

[4] Com. *v.* Hawkins, 11 Bush, 603. See Com. *v.* Miller, 5 Dana, 320.

[5] Freeland *v.* People, 16 Ill. 380; M'Rea *v.* Americanus, 59 Ga. 168.

[6] Com. *v.* Bakeman, 105 Mass. 53.

[7] State *v.* Jenkins, 20 S. C. 351.

[8] State *v.* Ross, 4 Lea, 442.

[9] Swancoat *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 105.

[10] Lewis *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 323.

to which the larceny was an incident.[1] It may be, however, that where the prosecution elects to prosecute to conviction a particular phase of a crime (*e. g.*, larceny in a case of robbery,[2] or arson in a case where killing was an incident to the arson[3]), it may be regarded as entering a *nolle prosequi* as to the other phases. But so far as the strict rule of law is concerned, the proceedings on the first trial cannot bar a prosecution for an offence on which there could be no conviction on the first trial.[4] An acquittal for larceny, for instance, does not bar an indictment for obtaining the same goods by false pretences, or by conspiracy to cheat,[5] nor, at common law, for being an accessary before or after the fact to the stealing.[6] Whether a conviction for burglary with intent to steal bars an indictment for larceny has been already considered.[7]

§ 472. In liquor cases we have the rules before us abundantly illustrated. Where, under an indictment for a nuisance, the defendant could not be convicted of keeping or selling intoxicating liquors, a conviction or acquittal of the former offence will not bar a prosecution for the latter.[8] Under

So in liquor cases.

[1] See Wilson *v.* State, 24 Conn. 57; State *v.* Warner, 14 Ind. 572. Supra, § 465. See Price *v.* People, 9 Ill. Ap. 36.

[2] State *v.* Lewis, 2 Hawks, 98, where it was held that a conviction for larceny on an indictment for burglary and larceny barred a subsequent prosecution for robbery on the same facts. See Roberts *v.* State, 14 Ga. 8; Copenhaven *v.* State, 15 Ga. 264; though see *contra*, § 466.

[3] People *v.* Smith, 3 Weekly Digest, 162; State *v.* Cooper, 1 Green (N. J.), 361. See, however, R. *v.* Greenwood, 23 Up. Can. Q. B. 250; and see, as justly criticising State *v.* Cooper, note to R. *v.* Tancock, 13 English R. 659; S. C., 13 Cox C. C. 217.

[4] Supra, § 456. State *v.* Ross, 4 Lea, 442. See, however, State *v.* Lewis, State *v.* Cooper, *ut supra;* State *v.* Fayetteville, 2 Murph. 371; Fiddler *v.* State, 7 Humph. 508; in which cases the courts departed from the strict rule of law, and took ground more properly belonging to the executive, namely, that when a defendant has been adequately punished for one of a series of offences, further prosecutions may be stopped.

[5] R. *v.* Henderson, 1 C. & M. 328; State *v.* Sias, 17 N. H. 558; Dominick *v.* State, 40 Ala. 680.

[6] State *v.* Larkin, 49 N. H. 36; Foster *v.* State, 39 Ala. 229. Supra, § 458.

[7] Supra, § 466.

An acquittal of fornication with A. has been held no bar to a prosecution for refusal to support bastard child begotten with A. Davis *v.* State, 58 Ga. 173.

An acquittal on a charge of killing an unborn child, when attempting to produce a miscarriage of the mother, is no bar to an indictment for attempting the miscarriage. State *v.* Elder, 65 Ind. 282.

[8] State *v.* Inness, 53 Me. 536; Com. *v.* McCauley, 105 Mass. 69; Com. *v.*

the same circumstances, an indictment for a specific sale under one statute is not barred by a conviction under another statute of being a common seller, or of keeping a tippling-house.[1] But where the conviction is of being a "common seller of liquor," and on the trial, to prove this, several sales are put in evidence, and the defendant is sentenced on the aggregate case, he cannot be subsequently convicted on an indictment charging a sale within the period covered by the first trial.[2] But for distinct successive sales there may be distinct indictments, if the evidence in the subsequent cases is not part of the proof of the first.[3] This is eminently the case when the sales are to distinct persons.[4] It is otherwise, however, when the first indictment is for a continuous offence of which the second indictment presents an ingredient.[5]

Hardiman, 9 Allen, 487; Com. *v.* Cutler, 9 Allen, 586; State *v.* Williams, 1 Vroom, 102; Martin *v.* State, 59 Ala. 34. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1508; State *v.* Moriarty, 50 Conn. 415; State *v.* Kuhuke, 30 Kan. 462.

[1] State *v.* Coombs, 32 Me. 527; State *v.* Maher, 35 Me. 225; State *v.* Inness, 53 Me. 536; Com. *v.* Cutler, 9 Allen, 486; State *v.* Moriarty, 50 Conn. 415; State *v.* Johnson, 3 R. I. 94; Heikes *v.* Com., 26 Penn. St. 513; Roberts *v.* State, 14 Ga. 8; Morman *v.* State, 24 Miss. 54. See *contra*, under varying statutes, State *v.* Nutt, 28 Vt. 598; Miller *v.* State, 3 Ohio St. 475.

In Com. *v.* Jenks, 1 Gray, 490, it was held that after a conviction of being a common seller the defendant could not be charged with particular sales at the same time; but in Com. *v.* Hudson, 14 Gray, 11, it was held that an acquittal as a common seller did not bar a prosecution for single sales. See Com. *v.* Kennedy, 97 Mass. 224.

[2] State *v.* Nutt, 28 Vt. 598; and see Com. *v.* Welch, 97 Mass. 593; Com. *v.* Connors, 116 Mass. 35; State *v.* Andrews, 27 Mo. 267. As to continuous offences, see infra, §§ 473 ff. A conviction for keeping a tenement for sale of intoxicating liquors from Aug. 1 to Oct. 4 bars a complaint for keeping the same tenement for the same purpose from May 1 to Nov. 17 of same year. Com. *v.* Dunster, 145 Mass. 101.

[3] State *v.* Brown, 49 Vt. 437; State *v.* Cassety, 1 Rich. 90. See Com. *v.* Mead, 10 Allen, 396.

[4] Ibid.; State *v.* Ainsworth, 11 Vt. 91. See Com. *v.* Mead, 10 Allen, 396.

[5] Infra, §§ 474 ff. Com. *v.* Robinson, 126 Mass. 259.

In this case, Lord, J., said: "In Morey *v.* Com. 108 Mass. 433, Gray, C. J., says 'a conviction or acquittal upon one indictment is no bar to a subsequent conviction and sentence upon another, unless the evidence required to support a conviction upon one of them would have been sufficient to warrant a conviction upon the other.' In Com. *v.* Armstrong, 7 Gray, 49, as well as in several other cases, it is decided that an indictment for being a common seller of intoxicating liquors, from a day named to the day of the finding of the indictment, is supported by proof of three sales made on any one day between the days named in the indictment. That case further decides that, although where the offence con-

§ 473. When the performance of a continuous act runs through successive jurisdictions, then it is broken into separate offences cognizable in each jurisdiction.[1] And where horses belonging to different owners were stolen by the defendant at places a mile apart, it was held that a conviction in one case did not bar the other.[2] This distinction has been applied to goods of different owners stolen in different parts of the same room.[3]

Severance of identity by place.

§ 474. The mere passage of time does not by itself break up into parts an offence otherwise continuous.[4] If the transaction is set on foot by a single impulse, and operated by an unintermittent force, it forms a continuous act, no matter how long a time it may occupy.[5] So has it been held in reference to gas abstracted continuously for a long period from the prosecutor's pipes,[6] and to ore fraudulently quarried for several years through

Severance of identity by time.

sists of but a single act, the day on which the act is alleged to have been committed is immaterial if it appears to have been a day on which the offence charged might have been committed; but when, on the other hand, the offence charged is continuous in its nature and requires a series of acts for its commission, the time within which the offence is alleged to have been committed is material, and must be proved as alleged. So when a person is charged with an offence continuous in its nature and requiring for its commission a series of acts, and such offence is alleged to have been committed upon a single day, evidence of any facts tending to establish the offence at any other time than upon the day named is inadmissible. Applying these principles to the case at bar, the same evidence which would have warranted a conviction upon the first complaint would have warranted a conviction upon the present complaint, for upon the second complaint the jury would have been required to convict the defendant if it should appear that he committed the acts complained of at any time between the first day of January and the first day of June, 1878."

In Com. *v.* McShane, 110 Mass. 502, it was held that a conviction may be had on an indictment upon the Gen. Stats. c. 87, §§ 6, 7, for maintaining a tenement for the illegal keeping and sale of intoxicating liquors, although the only evidence is as to liquors for keeping which with intent to sell the defendant has been already indicted, and punished.

[1] Whart. Confl. of L. § 931; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 27, 287. Supra, § 442; infra, § 475, note; Moore *v.* Ill., 14 How. U. S. 13; State *v.* Rankin, 4 Cold. 145. See Campbell *v.* People, 109 Ill. 565.

[2] Alexander *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 406. Supra, § 470.

[3] Phillips *v.* State, 85 Tenn. 551.

[4] "All offences involving continuous action, and which may be continued from day to day, may be so alleged." Carpenter, J., State *v.* Bosworth, 54 Conn. 1.

[5] Smith *v.* State, 79 Ala. 257. See, as to separate stealings, State *v.* Martin, 82 N. C. 672; Ricord *v.* R. R., 15 Nev. 167.

[6] R. *v.* Firth, L. R. 1 C. C. 172; 11 Cox C. C. 234. See R. *v.* Jones, 4 C. & P. 217.

innocent agents by means of one orifice in the defendant's quarry, such orifice being made at one specific time.[1] And when inculpatory facts rapidly succeeding each other are put in evidence in one case by the prosecution, it cannot bring a second indictment for a part of these facts, relying on evidence which was introduced at the first trial.[2] But a series of illegal acts following each other with time for specific thought between debauch are separately indictable.[3] It is said to be otherwise as to acts of gambling at one sitting.[4] But this cannot be sustained unless the acts were part of one transaction.

§ 475. Where, therefore, there is each day new action on the part of the inculpated parties, adding to the offence, then for each day's increment there can be a new indictment.[5] Thus, an acquittal for a prior stage of the same nuisance is no bar to an indictment for a nuisance at the present time, though the offences on the record are identically the same, each day's continuation of the nuisance being a repetition of the offence.[6] And a conviction of selling illegally at one time is no bar to a conviction for selling illegally at another time.[7] But the periods of time in which the offence is charged must not in any point coincide, or the second prosecution fails.[8] And a

But continuous maintenance of nuisances can be successively indicted, *aliter* as to bigamy.

[1] R. *v.* Bleasdale, 2 C. & K. 765.

[2] Com. *v.* Robinson, 126 Mass. 259; cited supra, § 472. But see Brewer *v.* State, 5 Ind. 501. Com. *v.* Robinson is adopted as law by Blatchford, J., in Snow, in re, 120 U. S. 274; citing, also, Whart. Cr. Law, 9th ed. §§ 27, 931; Huffman *v.* State, 23 Tex. Ap. 461.

[3] See infra, § 475. Supra, § 472.

[4] Wingard *v.* State, 13 Ga. 396.

[5] See Campbell *v.* State, 22 Tex. Ap. 262.

[6] R. *v.* Fairie, 8 E. & B. 466; 8 Cox C. C. 66; People *v.* Townsend, 3 Hill (N. Y.), 479; Gormley *v.* State, 37 Ohio St. 120; though see U. S. *v.* McCormick, 5 Cranch C. C. R. 104; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 37, 931, 1419; and see State *v.* Ainsworth, 11 Vt. 91; State *v.* Cassety, 1 Rich. 90.

[7] State *v.* Derichs, 42 Iowa, 196. Supra, §§ 462, 472.

[8] Com. *v.* Robinson, 126 Mass. 259; cited supra, §§ 472–4.

The several theories on this topic are thus given by Berner, Lehrbuch, § 140:—

Formal concurrence, which exists when a particular act has several criminal aspects. A particular sexual transaction, for instance, may be both rape and incest. A stealing may be both larceny and an attempt.

Material concurrence, where several successive acts form part of the same apparently continuous transaction.

In cases of formal concurrence, the rule, as has been seen, is, that there should be a conviction only of the crime to which the higher penalty is attached, though the minor crime may be taken into consideration in adjusting punishment.

In cases of material concurrence

conviction under the act of congress, of cohabiting with more than one woman, precludes another conviction for the same offence at a different time.[1]

Conviction of assault no bar to murder, when death is after conviction.

§ 476. Where, after a conviction of assault, the assaulted person dies, the conviction of assault is no bar to a conviction for murder or manslaughter.[2] The reason is that as at the time of the conviction of assault there could have been no conviction of the homicide, the prosecution for the homicide is not barred by the conviction of the assault.

4. *Practice Under Plea.*

§ 477. A former conviction for the same offence, even though in the same court, should be specially pleaded;[3] the plea, when there

the following theories have been propounded.

1. *Absorption or Merger.*—In this case the lesser offence is lost sight of in the greater. *Poena major absorbet minorem.* Only the most heinous of the concurrent crimes is to be punished, and the others are only to be considered as affording grounds for the adjustment of the sentence. Against this view it is argued that it violates the public sense of justice that any crime, proved in a court of justice, should go unpunished, and that the commission of a greater crime should not be a free pass to the commission of a lesser crime.

2. *Cumulation.*—Each distinct offence, though several follow each other in rapid succession as part of the same transaction, is to be punished separately, and for this is invoked the maxim, *Quot delicta, tot poenae.* To this the objection is made that public justice is sufficiently satisfied if the criminal has applied to him in his sentence such an increase of punishment as the aggravation of the transaction requires, and that this is one of the objects of giving to the judges discretion in the dispensing of punishment.

3. *Intermediate View.*—By this view the cumulation of the entire penalties of the several concurrent crimes is rejected, while the theory of the merger of the lesser in the greater is repudiated. The criminal is sentenced on the heaviest of the imputed crimes (*poena major*), while in the sentence due consideration is taken of the lesser crimes, provided they appear in evidence as part of the aggravating circumstances of the case.

[1] Snow, in re, 120 U. S. 274. See People *v.* Otto, 70 Cal. 523.

[2] R. *v.* Salvi, 10 Cox C. C. 481, n.; Nicholas's case, Foster Cr. L. 64; State *v.* Littlefield, 70 Me. 452; Com. *v.* Evans, 101 Mass. 25. See R. *v.* Morris, L. R. 1 C. C. 90; Com. *v.* Roby, 12 Pick. 496; Burns *v.* People, 1 Park. C. R. 182; Wright *v.* People, 5 Ind. 527; State *v.* Hattabough, 66 Ind. 223; Curtis *v.* State, 22 Tex. Ap. 227. See supra, §§ 465, 466, and cf. criticism in 17 Am. Law Reg. 746.

[3] State *v.* Buzzell, 58 N. H. 257; S. C., 59 N. H. 65; Justice *v.* Com., 81 Va. 209; DeArman *v.* State, 77 Ala. 10; Wilson *v.* State, 68 Ga. 827; Zachary *v.* State, 7 Baxt. 1; Williams *v.*

are several counts, designating the count it meets.[1] It cannot be put in evidence under the general issue,[2] or avail in arrest of judgment,[3] or on *habeas corpus*,[4] or on demurrer.[5] The plea may go only to part of a divisible count.[6]

Plea must be special.

§ 478. When *autrefois acquit* and *not guilty* are pleaded together, the former must be tried first.[7] In strict practice, the two pleas cannot be concurrently pleaded.[8] *Autrefois acquit* comes first; and if determined against the defendant, he then pleads over.[9] But the verdict must be special.[10] When the justice of the case requires, as when the ground of the plea arises after plea, the plea may be filed when such defence is first presented.[11]

Autrefois acquit must be pleaded first.

§ 479. A verdict of guilty on the two is bad,[12] and so, when tried together, of a verdict upon one plea alone.[13]

Verdict must go to the plea.

§ 480. The plea must consist of two matters: first, matter of record, to wit, the former indictment and acquittal, or conviction for the count; second, of matters of fact, to wit, the identity of the person acquitted, and of the offence of which he was acquitted, which is for the jury.[14]

Identity of offender and offence to be established.

State, 13 Tex. Ap. 285. That the prior record should be set out, see Grisham *v.* State, 19 Tex. Ap. 504.

[1] Campbell *v.* People, 109 Ill. 565.

[2] Com. *v.* Chesley, 107 Mass. 223; Rickles *v.* State, 68 Ala. 538; State *v.* Washington, 28 La. An. 129; though see Clem *v.* State, 42 Ind. 420. *Aliter* in Illinois, Hankins *v.* People, 94 Ill. 628.

[3] State *v.* Barnes, 32 Me. 530; Com. *v.* Maher (Pa.), 4 Crim. Law Mag. 477; State *v.* Salge, 2 Nev. 321.

[4] Pitner *v.* State, 44 Tex. 578.

[5] U. S. *v.* Moller, 16 Blatch. 65.

[6] State *v.* Littlefield, supra; Com. *v.* Curtis, 11 Pick. 133.

[7] Supra, § 420; Com. *v.* Merrill, 8 Allen, 545; Foster *v.* State, 39 Ala. 229; Solliday *v.* Com., 28 Penn. St. 13; Clem *v.* State, 42 Ind. 421; Davis *v.* State, 42 Tex. 494; and cases cited supra, § 420. But see Faulk *v.* State, 52 Ala. 415.

[8] R. *v.* Roche, 1 Leach. C. C. 135. See People *v.* Briggs, 1 Dak. Terr. 302.

[9] Supra, § 421; infra, § 486.

[10] People *v.* Helbing, 59 Cal. 567.

[11] People *v.* Stewart, 64 Cal. 60.

[12] Mountain *v.* State, 40 Ala. 344.

[13] Solliday *v.* Com., 28 Penn. St. 13; Nonemaker *v.* State, 34 Ala. 211; Moody *v.* State, 60 Ala. 78; People *v.* Helbing, 59 Cal. 567; People *v.* Fuqua, 61 Cal. 377. See, as to waiver, Dominic *v.* State, 40 Ala. 680.

[14] 2 Hale P. C. 241; Hawk. b. 2, c. 35, s. 3; Burn, J., Indictment, xi.; 1 M. & S. 188; 9 East, 438; 2 Leach, 712; 4 Co. Rep. 44; Com. *v.* Myers, 3 Wheel. C. C. 550; Smith *v.* State, 52 Ala. 407; Rocco *v.* State, 37 Miss. 357.

That such a plea is sufficient, see Austin *v.* State, 2 Mo. 393; State *v.* Cheek, 63 Mo. 364.

To support the first matter, it is necessary to show by the record that the defendant was legally acquitted or convicted on an indictment free from error in a court having jurisdiction.[1]

§ 481. The prosecution, however, may tender an issue as to the identity of the defendant, or the identity of the offence, as well as to the existence of the record.[2] When such issue is tendered, the burden of proof (the plea being one of confession and avoidance) is on the defendant.[3] To prove it, he has, first, to produce the record;[4] and, secondly, to prove, orally or otherwise, the averment of identity contained in his plea.[5] Hence, in cases of dispute, parol testimony is admissible to prove (what the record cannot sufficiently show) that the offences are or are not identical, or that the party charged is or is not the party tried on the former procedure.[6]

Identity may be proved by parol.

§ 482. If the plea on its face exhibits a variance between itself and the record, the plea may be demurred to when defective on

[1] 4 Black. Com. 335; 2 Hawk. c. 35, s. 1; Com. *v.* Sutherland, 109 Mass. 342; Com. *v.* Handley, 140 Mass. 457; Jacobs *v.* State, 4 Lea, 196; Com. *v.* Maher (Pa.), 4 Crim. Law Mag. 411. Supra, §§ 435 *et seq.* See, for forms of replication and rejoinder, Whart. Prec. 1155, 1156; Burk *v.* State, 81 Ind. 128.

[2] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 593; Buhler *v.* State, 64 Ga. 504; State *v.* Vines, 34 La. An. 1079. As to identity of defendant, see R. *v.* Crofts, 9 C. & P. 219; as to identity of offence, infra, §§ 481, 483. See, for forms of pleas, Whart. Prec. 1150 *et seq.*

[3] Infra, § 483; Com. *v.* Daley, 4 Gray, 209; Bainbridge *v.* State, 30 Ohio St. 264; Cooper *v.* State, 47 Ind. 61; Dunn *v.* State, 70 Ind. 47; State *v.* Small, 31 Mo. 197; State *v.* Moore, 66 Mo. 372; though see State *v.* Smith, 22 Vt. 74.

[4] Supra, § 437.

Where the second indictment is preferred at the same term, the original indictment and minutes of the verdict are receivable in evidence in support of the plea of *autrefois acquit*, without a record being drawn up. R. *v.* Parry, 7 C. & P. 836. But where the previous acquittal was at a previous term in the same jurisdiction or in a different jurisdiction, it can only be proved by the entire record. R. *v.* Bowman, 6 C. & P. 101, 337.

[5] See 2 Russ. 721, n.; Faulk *v.* State, 52 Ala. 415; State *v.* Thornton, 37 Mo. 360.

[6] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 693. Supra, § 480; R. *v.* Bird, 2 Den. C. C. 94; 5 Cox C. C. 20; Flitters *v.* Allfrey, L. R. 10 C. P. 29; Com. *v.* Dillane, 11 Gray, 67; Porter *v.* State, 17 Ind. 415; Duncan *v.* Com., 6 Dana, 295; State *v.* Andrews, 27 Mo. 267; State *v.* Small, 31 Mo. 197. That the defendant is entitled to have the issue determined as one of fact, see Troy *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 319. That name may be *prima facie* proof of identity, see State *v.* Kelso, 11 Mo. Ap. 91; 76 Mo. 505; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 802.

Plea if not identical may be demurred to.

its face,[1] or, when otherwise, advantage may be taken of the variance upon a replication of *nul tiel record*.[2] But if the variance be non-essential, demurrer will not be sustained.[3]

Where the only issue is the identity of the offences, a technical difference between the description of property in the first indictment and the second will be disregarded, when no proof is offered to show the offence was the same.[4]

§ 483. The burden of proving a prior conviction of the offence charged against a defendant being upon him,[5] must be sustained by a preponderance of proof.[6]

Burden of proof is on defendant.

If there be a replication of fraud, the burden of such replication is on the prosecution.[7]

[1] State *v.* Locklin, 59 Vt. 654.

[2] R. *v.* Bowman, 6 C. & P. 101, 337; Hite *v.* State, 9 Yerg. 357; McQuoid *v.* People, 3 Gilm. 76. See Shubert *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 406.

[3] Goode *v.* State, 70 Ga. 752; see Buhler's case, 64 Ga. 504.

[4] People *v.* McGowan, 17 Wend. 386. See Whart. Crim. Ev. § 593.

[5] Jenkins *v.* State, 78 Ind. 133; Hozier *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 501; Willis *v.* State, 24 Tex. Ap. 586.

[6] Supra, § 481; R. *v.* Parry, 7 C. & P. 836; Com. *v.* Daley, 4 Gray (Mass.), 209. See 2 Hale, 241; Rake *v.* Pope, 7 Ala. 161; Page *v.* Com., 27 Grat. 954; State *v.* Small, 31 Mo. 197; State *v.* Thornton, 37 Mo. 360. See Whart. Cr. Law, 9th ed. § 62.

Where four persons were tried for rape, upon an indictment containing counts charging each as principal and the others as aiders and abettors, they were acquitted; and it being proposed on the following day to try three of them for another rape upon the same person (the second indictment being exactly the same as the first, with the omission only of the fourth prisoner), they pleaded *autrefois acquit* to the second indictment, averring the identity of the offences, and to this plea there was a replication that the offences were different. The prisoners' counsel put in the commitment and the former indictment, and also the minutes of the former acquittal written on the indictment. On this evidence the jury found that the offences were the same; and it being referred for the opinion of the judges whether there was any evidence to justify and support the verdict, and if not, whether such verdict was final, and operated as a bar to any further proceedings by the crown upon the second indictment, the court held that the verdict of the jury was final, and the prisoners were discharged. R. *v.* Parry, 7 C. & P. 836. Supra, § 463.

[7] State *v.* Buzzell, 58 N. H. 257. In this case, Allen, J., said: "It (a plea of *autrefois acquit*) being new affirmative matter, and not a denial of any allegation of the indictment, the burden of proof, on a traverse of the plea, is on the defendant; Com. *v.* Daley, 4 Gray, 209, 210; State *v.* Small, 31 Mo. 197; R. *v.* Parry, 7 C. & P. 836, 839; 1 Arch. Cr. Pr. & Pl. 113, n.; and he has the opening and close. R. *v.* Sheen, 2 C. & P. 634, 638, 639. But if the State replies fraud (State *v.* Little,

If there be no replication, the *similiter* will be assumed if not at the time formally filed, or may be filed *nunc pro tunc*.[1]

When replication is *nul tiel record* issue is for court.

§ 484. Wherever the offences charged in the two indictments are capable of being legally identified as the same offence by averments, it is a question of fact for a jury to determine whether the averments be supported and the offences be the same. In such cases the replication ought to conclude to the country. But when the plea of *autrefois acquit* upon its face shows that the offences are legally distinct, and incapable of identification by averments, as they must be in all material points, the replication of *nul tiel record* may conclude with a verification. In the latter case, the court, without the intervention of a jury, may decide the issue.[2]

A replication of fraud is good on demurrer.

§ 485. Where the former conviction was effected by fraud, the plea of *autrefois convict*, in such case, being replied to specially, the replication, which sets forth such fraudulent prosecution and conviction being well drawn, is a sufficient answer to the defendant's plea, and should be adjudged good on demurrer.[3] The demurrer admits the allegation of fraud.

1 N. H. 257), or other new affirmative matter, the burden of proof on the latter issue is on the State. In some jurisdictions, when, after an acquittal on part of an indictment, there is a new trial of the rest, a special plea in bar of the further maintenance of so much of the charge as has been disposed of is not required. State *v.* Martin, 30 Wis. 216, 222, 223; S. C., 11 Am. Rep. 567." See State *v.* Buzzell, 59 N. H. 65.

[1] Supra, § 411; Swepson *v.* State, 81 N. C. 571.

[2] Hite *v.* State, 9 Yerger, 357. It is the duty of the court to declare the legal effect of a record which is offered to sustain the plea of *autrefois acquit* or discontinuance, and the record itself cannot be gainsaid by parol evidence; therefore, the court may charge the jury that the pleas are not sustained by the proof when that is the fact. Martha *v.* State, 26 Ala. 72. See State *v.* Haynes, 36 Vt. 667.

On the general question of pleading, see Foster *v.* State, 39 Ala. 229.

[3] State *v.* Little, 1 N. H. 257; State *v.* Brown, 16 Conn. 54; State *v.* Reed, 26 Conn. 202; Com. *v.* Jackson, 2 Va. Cas. 501; State *v.* Clenny, 1 Head. 270. Supra, § 451.

As cases of practice under plea and replication, see Com. *v.* Curtis, 11 Pick. 134; Dacy *v.* State, 17 Ga. 439.

In other States, similar provisions exist.

In Massachusetts, by Gen. Stat. 1864, c. 250, § 4, it is sufficient in *autrefois acquit* or *convict* to set forth simply a prior lawful acquittal or conviction.

On judgment against defendant he is usually allowed to plead over.

§ 486. When the plea of *autrefois acquit* or *convict* is determined against the defendant, in this country, in most cases, he is allowed to plead over, and to have his trial for the offence itself.[1] In England, however, though this is allowed in felonies, it is not in misdemeanors.[2] Of the injustice of this distinction a pregnant illustration is found in a case which, in 1850, attracted great attention in England.[3] On the plea of *autrefois acquit* to an assault, issue was taken by the crown, and after verdict, judgment entered against the prisoners, who were thereupon sentenced to hard labor for two years. In pronouncing sentence, Martin, B., did not hesitate to express his compunctions at sentencing a man for an offence for which he was never tried. "I cannot but feel," he said, addressing the prisoners, "that you stand in the condition of persons whose case has not been heard. If you wish me to postpone the sentence, I will do so. I feel it to be a great hardship that the prisoners should be punished without a trial, and with no opportunity given to them of answering or explaining the charge laid against them."[4] It was the hardship of a judge thus sentencing a man of whose guilt he knew nothing, that led Judge Grier and Judge Kane, in the U. S. Circuit Court in Philadelphia, to decline sentencing a man who had been convicted capitally before Judge Randall, the district judge, who since the conviction and the application for sentence had died.[5] This difficulty, however, has not deterred the Supreme Court of New York from holding that where, in an inferior tribunal, judgment against the People had been entered on a demurrer, on reversing the judgment, they would not permit the defendant to withdraw his demurrer, but would sentence him themselves.[6]

[1] Com. *v.* Goddard, 13 Mass. 455; McFarland *v.* State, 68 Wis. 400; Com. *v.* Golding, 14 Gray, 49; Barge *v.* Com., 3 Pen. & W. 262; Foster *v.* Com., 8 Watts & S. 77; Hirn *v.* State, 1 Ohio St. R. 16; Falkner *v.* State, 3 Heisk. 33. See supra, §§ 404–5, 421.

[2] R. *v.* Gibson, 8 East, 107; R. *v.* Taylor, 3 B. & C. 502; S. C., 5 Dow. & R. 422. See fully, supra, § 421.

[3] R. *v.* Bird, 15 Jur. 193; 2 Eng. L. & E. R. 448; 2 Den. C. C. 94; 5 Cox C. C. 11. For a fuller report of this case, see supra, § 464. Compare, as to pleading over, supra, §§ 404–7, 421.

[4] Supra, §§ 420–1.

[5] U. S. *v.* Harding, 6 P. L. J. 14; 1 Wall. Jr., 127; and see People *v.* Shaw, 63 N. Y. 36; State *v.* Abram, 4 Ala. 272. Infra, § 898.

[6] People *v.* Taylor, 3 Denio, 91. See State *v.* Green, 16 Iowa, 239; and see supra, §§ 408–11–12.

Prosecution may rejoin on its demurrer being overruled.

§ 487. Where the prosecution demurs to the plea of *autrefois convict* to an indictment for a capital felony, and the demurrer is overruled, the defendant is not entitled to be discharged, and the State may rejoin.[1]

Issue of fact for jury.

§ 488. In cases where the defendant pleads over to the felony at the same time with the issue in the plea of *autrefois acquit*, the jury are charged again to inquire of the second issue, and the trial proceeds as if no plea in bar had been pleaded.[2] But when both pleas are submitted to the jury at the same time, there must be a verdict on each, and it is error to take a verdict on the plea of not guilty alone.[3] An arbitrary discharge of the jury before verdict may bar future prosecutions.[4]

Novel assignment not admissible.

§ 489. A *novel assignment* is not admissible in a criminal case, and the proper mode of replying to a plea of a former conviction is to traverse the alleged identity.[5]

VII. ONCE IN JEOPARDY.[6]

Constitutional limitation taken from common law.

§ 490. By the Constitution of the United States it is provided: "Nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life and limb;"[7] and although this restriction does not affect cases arising distinctively in the States,[8] yet the same restriction, taken from the federal Constitution, exists in most of the State constitutions. Whether this amounts to anything more than the common law doctrine involved in the plea of *autrefois acquit* has been much doubted. What that doctrine is has been already stated. It is founded, to adopt the summary of Mr. Chitty, upon the prin-

[1] State *v.* Nelson, 7 Ala. 610. Supra, § 406.

[2] R. *v.* Vandercomb, 2 Leach, 708; R. *v.* Cogan, 1 Leach, 448; R. *v.* Sheen, 2 C. & P. 635. Supra, §§ 420–1. See Burks *v.* State, 24 Tex. Ap. 326.

[3] Soliday *v.* Com., 28 Penn. St. 14. See People *v.* Kinstrey, 51 Cal. 278. Supra, § 479.

[4] People *v.* Jones, 48 Mich. 554.

[5] Duncan *v.* Com., 6 Dana, 295.

[6] See, for plea of "Once in Jeopardy," Wharton's Prec. 1157. See, also, this subject further examined, infra, §§ 712, 821.

[7] Const. U. S. Amend. art. 5.

[8] See Fox *v.* Ohio, 5 Howard, 410; U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumner, 19; Colt *v.* Ives, 12 Conn. 243; Barker *v.* People, 3 Cow. 686; qualifying People *v.* Goodwin, 18 Johns. 187; Com. *v.* Cook, 6 S. & R. 577; State *v.* Shivers, 20 S. C. 392. See State *v.* Sutphin, 22 W. Va. 490. As doubting this position, see Com. *v.* Purchase, 2 Pick. 521.

ciple that no man shall be placed in peril of legal penalties more than once upon the same accusation.[1] It has, therefore, been generally agreed, that after a verdict of either acquittal or conviction on a valid indictment or appeal, the party indicted cannot afterwards be indicted again upon a charge of having committed the same supposed offence.[2] In other words, at common law, as the rule is applied in England, when there has been a final verdict, either of acquittal or conviction, on an adequate indictment, the defendant cannot a second time be placed in jeopardy for the particular offence; and at the first glance the constitutional provision appears nothing more than a solemn asseveration of the common law maxim.[3]

"Thus we see," says Mr. Justice Story, in commenting on the rule, "that the maxim is imbedded in the very elements of the common law; and has been uniformly construed to present an insurmountable bar to a second prosecution where there has once been a verdict of acquittal or conviction regularly had upon a sufficient indictment.[4]

[1] 4 Co. Rep. 40; 4 Bla. Com. 335; 2 Hawk. c. 35, s. 1. Infra, §§ 518, 712, 821.

[2] 2 Hawk. c. 35, s. 1; 4 Bla. Com. 335. For English rule, see supra, §§ 835 *et seq.*; infra, § 518.

[3] Ned *v.* State, 7 Porter, 188; U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumner, 41.

In the leading case of Richard and William Vaux, reported in 4 Coke, 44, it was held, "that the reason of *autrefois acquit* was because the maxim of the common law is, that the life of a man shall not be twice put in jeopardy for one and the same offence; and that is the reason and cause why autrefois acquitted or convicted of the same offence is a good plea; yet it is intended of a lawful acquittal or conviction, for if the conviction or acquittal is not lawful, his life was never in jeopardy; and because the indictment in this case was insufficient, for this reason, he was not *legitimo modo acquietatus*," etc. And in England it is settled that the maxim, that a man cannot be put in peril twice for the same offence, means that a man cannot be tried again for an offence upon which a verdict of acquittal or conviction has been given, and not that a man cannot be tried again for the same offence where the first trial has proved abortive, and no verdict was given. Hence, as a judge has, by the English law, a discretionary power, in cases of necessity, to discharge the jury, even without the prisoner's consent, this discharge is no bar to a second trial. And such necessity exists when the jury have shown themselves unable to agree. The exercise of this discretion cannot be renewed on error affirmed on appeal. R. *v.* Winsor, 6 B. & S. 143; 1 L. R. Q. B. 289; 1 L. R. Q. B. 390; S. C., in Ex. Ch. 7 B. & S. 490. See, also, R. *v.* Ward, 10 Cox C. C. 573; R. *v.* Charlesworth, 1 B. & S. 460; S. C., 9 Cox C. C. 44.

[4] U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumn. 42. See, for a learned article on this head, 4 West, L. J. 97.

§ 491. In this country the constitutional provision has, in some instances, been construed to mean more than the common law maxim, and in several of the States it has been held that where a jury in a capital case has been discharged without consent before verdict, after having been sworn and charged with the offence, the defendant, under certain limitations, may bar a second prosecution by a special plea setting forth the fact that his life has already been put in jeopardy for the same offence.[1] But between the pleas of *autrefois acquit* or *convict*, and *once in jeopardy*, there is this important distinction, that the former presupposes a verdict, the latter, the discharge of the jury without verdict, and is in the nature of a plea *puis darrein continuance*. The cases in this respect may be placed in two general classes: First. Where any separation of the jury, except in case of such overruling necessity as may be considered the act of God, is held a bar to all subsequent proceedings. Secondly. Where it is held that the discharge of the jury is a matter of sound discretion for the court, and that when, in the exercise of a sound discretion, it takes place, it presents no impediment to a second trial.[2]

But in some courts held more extensive.

§ 492. In Pennsylvania the rule is now held to be applicable only to such cases as are capital in that State.[3] In other States it has been extended to all infamous crimes.[4] And there are authorities in States holding the first view, which apply to all cases except misdemeanors.[5]

Extended to all infamous crimes.

§ 493. In 1822 the question was brought before the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania (a State whose Constitution contains a pro-

[1] Williams's case, 2 Grat. 567; Com. *v.* Cook, 6 S. & R. 577; Com. *v.* Clue, 3 Rawle, 498; State *v.* Garrigues, 1 Hayw. 241; Spier's case, 1 Dev. 491; Ned *v.* State, 7 Port. 187; Powell's case, 17 Tex. Ap. 345; Pizano *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 139.

[2] For a discussion of the general question how far a jury may be allowed to separate, see infra, §§ 722, 729, 784, 814, 821, 831, 836, 956, etc.

[3] Infra, §§ 493 *et seq.*

[4] State *v.* Connor, 5 Coldw. 315; Williams *v.* Com., 78 Ky. 93.

[5] Infra, § 519.

In Lange, ex parte, 18 Wall. 163, it was held that under the constitutional provision, when a court has imposed a fine *and* imprisonment, where the statute only conferred power to punish by fine *or* imprisonment, and the fine has been paid, it cannot, even during the same term, modify the judgment by imposing imprisonment instead of the former sentence. And Miller, J., in the opinion of the court, argues that the provision is applicable to misdemeanors where corporal punishment is inflicted.

vision precisely the same as that in the Constitution of the United States), in a capital case where the defendant pleaded specially, that the jury had been discharged on a former trial because they were unable to agree. The Court held, that the discharge of the jury because they could not agree was unlawful, and was not a case of necessity within the meaning of the rule on the subject. Chief Justice Tilghman said, where a party is "tried and acquitted on a bad indictment he may be tried again, because his life was not in jeopardy. The court could not have given judgment against him, if he had been convicted. But where the indictment is good, and the jury are charged with the prisoner, his life is undoubtedly in jeopardy during their deliberation. I grant that in case of necessity they (the jury) may be discharged; but if there be anything short of absolute necessity, how can the court, without violating the Constitution, take from the prisoner his right to have the jury kept together until they have agreed, so that he may not be put in jeopardy a second time?"[1] It was accordingly held that in that case, the jury having been discharged without giving any verdict, without absolute necessity, the prisoner was not liable to be tried again.[2] In 1831, in a case where the defendant interposed a similar plea, the doctrine was pushed by the same court still further. It was argued by Gibson, C. J., with his usual

In Pennsylvania any separation in capital cases, except from actual necessity, bars further proceedings.

[1] Duncan, J., in this case, in commenting on the position taken in People *v.* Goodwin, hereafter to be cited, said: "I feel a strong conviction that the construction here [there] given to this provision of the Constitution of the United States, engrafted into the constitutions of Delaware, Kentucky, and Tennessee, and made an article in the Bill of Rights of this State, is not the true one; and that the provision, that no person can be put twice in jeopardy of life and limb, means something more than that he shall not be twice tried for the same offence. It is borrowed from the common law, and a solemn construction it had received in the courts of common law ought to be given it. This is not the signification of the words in their common use, nor in their grammatical or legal sense. 'Twice put in jeopardy,' and 'twice put on trial,' convey to the plainest understanding different ideas. There is a wide difference between a verdict given and a jeopardy of a verdict. Hazard, peril, danger of a verdict cannot mean a verdict given. Whenever the jury are charged with a prisoner, where the offence is punishable by death, and the indictment is not defective, he is in jeopardy of life."

[2] Com. *v.* Cook, 6 Serg. & Rawle, 577; but see Com. *v.* McFadden, 23 Penn. St. 12. Infra, §§ 517, 722, 814, 824.

vigor, that "no discretionary power whatever exists with the court in such a case to discharge."[1]

In a later case (April, 1851), however, where the jury were allowed to separate by consent, *after* being sworn, but *before* the case was opened, the court, while reversing the judgment, remanded the prisoner for another trial.[2] "The law is undoubtedly settled," says Gibson, C. J., "that a prisoner's consent to the discharge of a previous jury is an answer to a plea of a former acquittal."

But in a capital case, where there is no consent, the record must show absolute necessity to justify a discharge.[3]

It has since been held that the plea of "once in jeopardy for the same offence" will not avail where the jury were discharged on account of disagreement, in a case of burglary.[4]

§ 494. In Virginia, mere inability to agree is not such a necessity as will justify the court in discharging a jury, and in such case the defendant cannot be again put in jeopardy;[5] though where, after nine days' confinement, one of the jurors suffered materially in health, it was held the jury were properly discharged, and the second trial was regular.[6] By the code of 1873 the court may discharge in all cases whenever the jury, in its opinion, cannot agree, or whenever there is a manifest necessity for such discharge. But in such case the action of the trial court is reviewable in error.[7]

Rule in Virginia.

§ 495. The same question came before the Supreme Court of North Carolina in a very early case,[8] and again at a later period,[9] where it was alleged that the jury in a capital case had been discharged without legal necessity, having given no verdict. The court held that the prisoner could not be again tried. On the last occasion the cases in the Supreme Courts of Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania were cited; and the court adopted that of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, and affirmed the exposition of the clause given by that court, that no man shall be twice put in jeopardy, etc., for the

In North Carolina.

[1] Com. *v.* Clue, 3 Rawle, 498.

[2] Peiffer *v.* Com., 15 Penn. St. 468.

[3] Hilands *v.* Com., 111 Penn. St. 1.

[4] McCreary *v.* Com., 29 Penn. St. 323.

[5] Williams *v.* Com., 2 Grat. 568.

[6] Com. *v.* Fells, 9 Leigh, 613. As to West Virginia, *contra* by statute, Crookham *v.* State, 5 W. Va. 510.

[7] Wright *v.* Com., 75 Va. 914.

[8] State *v.* Garrigues, 1 Hayw. 241.

[9] Spier's case, 1 Dev. 491.

same offence, holding, therefore, where a jury were charged with the trial of a prisoner for murder, and before they returned their verdict the term of the court expired, and the jury separated, that the prisoner could not be tried again.[1] In a still later case in the same State, it was held that a jury, charged in a capital case, cannot be discharged before returning the verdict, at the discretion of the court; they cannot be discharged without the prisoner's consent, but for evident, urgent, overruling necessity, arising from some matter occurring during the trial which was beyond human foresight and control; and, generally speaking, such necessity must be set forth in the record.[2] Honest inability to agree, for six days, however, is ground for discharge.[3] And when one of the jurors procured himself to be fraudulently empanelled on a jury, in a capital case, in order to secure an acquittal, the jury should be discharged; nor is the defendant put in jeopardy by such act;[4] nor is he put in jeopardy by fraudulent conduct on the part of a juror necessitating a discharge.[5] A new trial granted, also, in a capital case, at request of the prisoner during the first trial, upon a juror being withdrawn, does not vitiate the procedure.[6]

In Tennessee.

§ 496. In Tennessee, on the first examination of the subject, it appears to have been held, Peck, J., dissenting, that it was discretionary in the court, even in capital cases, to discharge the jury;[7] but that opinion was subsequently reviewed in a case of great deliberation. In the latter case,[8] the jury were empanelled on Thursday evening at two o'clock; they came in once or twice during the same evening, and declared that they could not agree; they were, however, kept together all night by the court, and at nine o'clock the next morning, upon their

[1] Spier's case, 1 Dev. 491; State *v.* McGimpsey, 80 N. C. 377. The general rule, however, is the contrary. Infra, § 513.

[2] State *v.* Ephraim, 2 Dev. & Bat. 162. See, to same effect, State *v.* Prince, 63 N. C. 528; State *v.* Alman, 64 N. C. 364; State *v.* Jefferson, 66 N. C. 309; State *v.* Wiseman, 68 N. C. 203; State *v.* McGimpsey, 80 N. C. 397.

[3] State *v.* Honeycutt, 74 N. C. 391; State *v.* Carland, 90 N. C. 668.

[4] State *v.* Bell, 81 N. C. 591. Infra, § 844.

[5] State *v.* Washington, 89 N. C. 535; State *v.* Washington, 89 N. C. 664.

[6] State *v.* Davis, 80 N. C. 384.

[7] State *v.* Waterhouse, 1 Mart. & Y. 278.

[8] Mahala *v.* State, 10 Yerg. 532. See State *v.* Rankin, 4 Cold. (Tenn.) 145, cited supra, § 439.

declaring they could not agree, the court discharged them. The term was not concluded until the next day (Saturday). It was held, that this was not such a case of necessity as authorized the court to discharge them. It was out of the power of the court, it was said, to discharge them without consent, *except in case of sickness, insanity, or exhaustion, among themselves.* But it is now held lawful to discharge, even without defendant's consent, whenever the court concludes that agreement is impossible.[1]

In Alabama.

§ 497. In Alabama, after a careful review of the subject, the following points were made: 1. That courts have not in capital cases a discretionary authority to discharge a jury after evidence given. 2. That a jury is, *ipso facto*, discharged by the determination of the authority of the court to which it is attached. 3. That a court does possess the power to discharge in any case of pressing necessity, and should exercise it whenever such a case is made to appear. 4. That sudden illnesses of a prisoner or juror, so that the trial cannot proceed, are ascertained cases of necessity, and that many others exist, which can only be defined when particular cases arise. 5. That a court does not possess the power, in a capital case, to discharge a jury because it cannot or will not agree.[2] 6. That therefore the unwarrantable discharge of a jury, after the evidence is closed, in a capital case, is equivalent to an acquittal.[3] In the same State where, after a trial is commenced, the judge withdraws and the trial is completed by another judge, and the judgment is reversed for that cause, the prisoner cannot be said to have been in jeopardy, and he may be tried again; and this although the judgment of reversal does not award a *venire de novo*.[4]

And in California.

§ 498. In California it is held that a discharge, without the prisoner's consent, unless from a legal necessity, or from cause beyond the control of the court, such as death, sickness, or insanity of some one of the jury, of the prisoner, or of the court, protects the defendant from a re-trial.[5] But absolute inability to agree is such a necessity.[6] A discharge on

[1] State *v.* Hays, 2 Lea, 156; State *v.* Pool, 4 Lea, 363.

[2] Ned *v.* State, 7 Porter, 188.

[3] Ibid. 187. See infra, §§ 722, 821.

[4] State *v.* Abram, 4 Ala. 272. See infra, §§ 896–8, as to judge sitting in a case in which he heard only part of the evidence.

[5] People *v.* Webb, 38 Cal. 467.

[6] People *v.* Cage, 48 Cal. 324.

the ground that the defendant, on a trial for manslaughter, was guilty of murder, is a bar.[1]

§ 499. On the other hand, we have a series of courts holding that the separation of the jury, when it takes place in the exercise of a sound discretion, is no bar to a second trial. This is substantially the view of the Supreme Court of the United States, of Washington, J., Story, J., and McLean, J., sitting in their several circuits; and of the courts of Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Iowa, Maryland, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, Georgia, Missouri, Illinois, Kentucky, Texas, and Mississippi.

In the federal courts a discretionary discharge is no bar.

§ 500. "It is contended," said Washington, J., in a case where the jury on a homicide trial had been discharged in consequence of the alleged insanity of one of them, "that although the court may discharge in cases of misdemeanor, they had no such authority in capital cases; and the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States is relied upon as justifying the distinction. We think otherwise; because we are clearly of opinion that the jeopardy spoken of in this article can be interpreted to mean nothing short of the acquittal or conviction of the prisoner, and the judgment of the court thereupon. This was the meaning affixed to the expression by the common law, notwithstanding some loose expressions to be found in some elementary treatises on the opinions of some judges, which would seem to intimate a different opinion. Upon this subject we concur in the opinion expressed by the Supreme Court of New York in Goodwin's case, although the opinion of the Supreme Court of this State in Cook's case is otherwise. We are, in short, of opinion that the moment it is admitted, that in cases of necessity the court is authorized to discharge the jury, the whole argument for applying this article of the Constitution to a discharge of the jury before conviction and judgment is abandoned, because the exception of necessity is not to be found in any part of the Constitution; and I should consider this court as stepping beyond its duty in interpolating it into that instrument, if the article of the Constitution is applicable to a case of this kind. We admit the exception, but we do it because that article does not apply to a jeopardy short of conviction. If we are correct in this view of the subject,

[1] People *v.* Hunckeler, 48 Cal. 331.

then there can be no difference between misdemeanors and capital cases, in respect to the discretion possessed by the court to discharge the jury in cases of necessity; and, indeed, the reasoning before urged in relation to a plea of this kind, if sound, is equally applicable to capital cases as to misdemeanors. By reprobating this plea, we do not deny to a prisoner the opportunity to avail himself of the improper discharge of the jury as equivalent to an acquittal, since he may have all the benefit of the error, if committed, by a motion for the discharge, or upon a motion in arrest of judgment."[1]

In the Supreme Court of the United States, the subject was brought up in 1824, upon a certificate of division in the opinions of the judges of the Circuit Court for the Southern District of New York. The jury were discharged in the court below on account of mere disagreement. "The question arises," was the language of the court, "whether the discharge of the jury by the court from giving any verdict upon the indictment with which they were charged, without the consent of the prisoner, is a bar to any future trial for the same offence. If it be, then he is entitled to be discharged from custody; if not, then he ought to be held in imprisonment until such trial can be had. We are of opinion, that the facts constitute no legal bar to a future trial. The prisoner has not been convicted or acquitted, and may again be put upon his defence. We think that in all cases of this nature, the law has invested courts of justice with the authority to discharge a jury from giving any verdict, whenever, in their opinion, taking all the circumstances into consideration, there is a manifest necessity for the act, or the ends of public justice would otherwise be defeated. They are to exercise a sound discretion on the subject; and it is impossible to define all the circumstances which would render it impossible to interfere. To be sure, the power ought to be used with the greatest caution, under urgent circumstances, and for very plain and obvious causes; and, in capital cases, especially, courts should be extremely careful how they interfere with any of the chances of life, in favor of the prisoner. But after all they have the right to

[1] U. S. *v.* Haskell, 4 Wash. C. C. 409. See, also, U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumner, 19; U. S. *v.* Coolidge, 2 Gall. 364; U. S. *v.* Shoemaker, 2 McLean, 114; U. S. *v.* Watson, 3 Ben. 1 (cited supra, § 436); Kelly *v.* U. S., 27 Fed. Rep. 616. Compare infra, §§ 722, 814, 821.

order the discharge; and the security which the public have for the faithful, sound, and conscientious exercise of this discretion rests in this, as in other cases, upon the responsibility of the judges, under their oaths of office. We are aware that there is some diversity of opinion and practice on this subject in the American courts; but after weighing the question with due deliberation, we are of opinion that such a discharge constitutes no bar to further proceedings, and gives no right of exemption to the prisoner from being again put on trial." [1]

It has been held in the United States Circuit Court for New York, that a man is not put in jeopardy by the empanelling and swearing of a jury by inadvertence, when it was dismissed before he is arraigned.[2]

So in Massachusetts and Connecticut.

§ 501. In Massachusetts the practice, from an early period, was to discharge juries at the discretion of the court, in cases both capital and otherwise.[3] But in 1823 a case came up where a jury, in a capital trial, having been out eighteen hours, were discharged on account of inability to agree. The defendant was tried again, and convicted of manslaughter, and the point was argued on arrest of judgment. Parker, C. J., in delivering the opinion of the court, after maintaining that there was no jeopardy till verdict, said: "By necessity cannot be intended that which is physical only; the cases cited are not of that sort, for there is no application of force upon the court or the jury which produced the result. It is a moral necessity, arising from the impossibility of proceeding with the cause without producing evils which ought not to be sustained." [4] And the practice in this State is to regard the constitutional provision as a mere expression of the common-law rule.[5] In Connecticut a discharge, in a murder case, in consequence of the incompetency of a juror, which incompetency was not discovered until after the trial began, does not bar a subsequent trial.[6]

[1] U. S. *v.* Perez, 9 Wheaton, 579. But see, as qualifying this case, Lang, ex parte, 18 Wall. 163, supra, § 492; infra, §§ 780, 913, 981.

[2] U. S. *v.* Riley, 5 Blatch. C. C. 204.

[3] Com. *v.* Bowden, 9 Mass. 494. See Com. *v.* Sholes, 13 Allen, 554; and infra, §§ 722, 814, 821.

[4] Com. *v.* Purchase, 2 Pick. 521. Infra, §§ 722, 821.

[5] See as to peculiar practice in this State, infra, § 719.

[6] State *v.* Allen, 46 Conn. 531.

§ 502. In New York the point arose and was elaborately argued on an indictment for manslaughter, where the jury, after the whole cause was heard, being unable to agree, were discharged by the court without the consent of the prisoner. The question was whether, under these circumstances, the defendant could be again put on his trial. On the part of the defendant it was contended that he could not, among other reasons, because the Constitution of the United States had declared, "nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb;" and that putting the party upon trial was putting him in jeopardy of life and limb. The argument on the other side was, that this clause did not apply to State courts; and, if it did, it was inapplicable to the cause, for if the cause was sent to another jury, the defendant would not be twice in jeopardy, nor twice tried, for there never had been a trial in which the merits had been decided on. The court inclined to the opinion that the clause was operative upon the State courts; and, at all events, that it was a sound and fundamental principle of the common law; that the true meaning of the clause was that no man shall be twice tried for the same offence; that the true test by which to decide the point whether tried or not, is by the plea of *autrefois acquit* or *autrefois convict;* and, finally, that a "defendant is not once put in jeopardy until the verdict is rendered for or against him, and if for or against him, he can never be drawn in question again for the same offence." And the court accordingly held, that the discharge of the jury before giving a verdict was no bar to another trial of the defendant.[1]

So in New York.

In 1862, however, in the Court of Errors, it was held, that when the defendant had been once put in jeopardy and convicted, and the judgment reversed *for an error in the sentence*, the other proceedings being regular, he could not afterwards be tried.[2] And in 1863, in the same court, the same rule was applied to a case of murder, and in aid of the rule the constitutional provision was expressly invoked.[3] But as a general rule, under the statute, a discharge of the jury without rendering a verdict is

[1] People *v.* Goodwin, 18 Johns. R. 187. See, also, People *v.* Olcott, 2 John. Cas. 301.

[2] Shepherd *v.* People, 25 N. Y. 407. Supra, § 435.

[3] People *v.* Hartung, 26 N. Y. 167; S. C., 28 N. Y. 400; 23 How. Pr. 314.

no bar to a second trial.[1] Under the Constitution of New Jersey the same view obtains.[2]

So in Maryland.

§ 503. In Maryland, in 1862, the view of the Supreme Court of the United States was expressly adopted.[3]

So in Mississippi, Missouri, and Louisiana.

§ 504. In Mississippi, after a cursory review of the authorities, the same result was reached.[4] In 1860 it was held, that though a discharge, merely because the jury were "unable to agree on a verdict," there being no evidence as to the length of deliberation, worked an acquittal, yet it is otherwise when the term of the court is about to expire, and there is no possibility of agreement.[5] An illegal or improper discharge is in any view a bar;[6] but this is not the case when the discharge is on account of the inability of the jury, after deliberation sufficiently protracted, to agree. But a deliberation of three and a half hours is not sufficient.[7] In Missouri[8] and Louisiana[9] the question is largely left to the discretion of the court.

So in Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Iowa, Nebraska, Michigan, Nevada, Arkansas, and Texas.

§ 505. In Illinois, the same view was taken, and in this State the rule laid down by the federal courts must be considered as obtaining.[10]

In Ohio, in 1863, it was determined that when the jury had been long enough together "to leave very little doubt that their opinions must have been inflexibly

[1] Canter *v.* People, 38 How. Pr. 91 (1867).

Where the jury, after the cause was committed to them, and before they had rendered or agreed upon a verdict, had separated without having been legally discharged; it was held in 1871, that, as any verdict in the case, to be afterwards rendered by that jury, would have been invalid and set aside, there was a necessity for the exercise of the power of the court in its discretion, and in furtherance of justice, to discharge the jury. And that such power having been exercised by a competent court, the discharge constituted no bar to a new trial of the prisoner. People *v.* Reagle, 60 Barb. 527. See, also, S. P., M'Kenzie *v.* State, 26 Ark. 334.

[2] Smith *v.* State, 41 N. J. L. 598.

[3] Hoffman *v.* State, 20 Md. 425. In this case the court treated the provision in the State Constitution as convertible with that in the Federal Constitution.

[4] Moore *v.* State, 1 Walker, 134; Price *v.* State, 36 Miss. 533.

[5] Josephine *v.* State, 39 Miss. 613; Woods *v.* State, 43 Miss. 364.

[6] Finch *v.* State, 53 Miss. 363; Teat *v.* State, 53 Miss. 439.

[7] Whitten *v.* State, 61 Miss. 717.

[8] See supra, § 506. State *v.* Jeffers, 64 Mo. 376; State *v.* Copeland, 65 Mo. 497; State *v.* Dunn, 80 Mo. 681.

[9] In Louisiana it is held that when there is a trial not imputable to the prosecution there is no jeopardy. State *v.* Blackman, 35 La. An. 483.

[10] State *v.* Stone, 2 Scam. 326.

formed," and were unable to agree, the court, at its discretion, could discharge.[1] And now, by the Code of Criminal Procedure, this is established by statute. But the record should set forth the necessity of the discharge.[2]

The same test is now adopted in Indiana, though after some vacillation in the earlier cases.[3] But there should be no discharge as long as the court thinks agreement possible; and a discharge without good cause shown on record operates as an acquittal.[4] And an arbitrary and capricious separation of the jury, however, on their own motion, may be a bar.[5]

In Michigan,[6] Iowa,[7] Nebraska,[8] Nevada,[9] and Texas,[10] the same views prevail. In Arkansas, while a capricious discharge is a bar,[11] it is otherwise when the discharge is from settled inability to agree.[12]

§ 506. In Kentucky it was originally ruled that it is not possible to support the defence of a former acquittal by anything short

[1] Dobbins *v.* State, 14 Ohio St. R. 493.

[2] Hines *v.* State, 24 Ohio St. 134; and see infra, § 815.

In Mitchell *v.* State, 42 Ohio St. 383, it was held that a discharge is only to be sustained where the defendaut has consented to the discharge, or been guilty of such fraud iu respect to the conduct of the trial as that he was in no real peril, or where there is urgent necessity for the discharge, such as the death or serious illness of the presiding judge or a juror, the serious illness of the prisoner, the ending of term before verdict, or the inability of the jury to agree, after spending such length of time in deliberation as, in the opinion of the judge, sustained by the facts disclosed in the record, renders it unreasonable and improbable that there can be an agreement.

[3] State *v.* Nelson, 26 Ind. 366; Shaffer *v.* State, 27 Ind. 131. But allowing the jury to go unattended to a public square, operates as a discharge. State *v.* Leunig, 42 Ind. 541. Infra, §§ 727, 814.

[4] State *v.* Walker, 26 Ind. 346; Shaffer *v.* State, 27 Ind. 131.

[5] Maden *v.* Emmons, 83 Ind. 331.

[6] People *v.* Halding, 53 Mich. 482.

[7] State *v.* Redman, 17 Iowa, 329; State *v.* Vaughan, 29 Iowa, 286. See State *v.* Parker, 66 Iowa, 386, where it was held that a discharge agreed to by defendant was no bar.

[8] Card *v.* People, 2 Neb. 357.

[9] Maxwell, ex parte, 11 Nev. 428. The record, however, must show the necessity.

[10] Moseley *v.* State, 33 Tex. 671; Parchman *v.* State, 2 Tex. Ap. 228, where it is held that there is no jeopardy until verdict. In Varnes *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 107, it is held that under the code the discharge may be at discretion of court. Brady *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 659. See Powell's case, 17 Tex. Ap. 345; Pizano *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 129.

[11] Williams *v.* State, 42 Ark. 35.

[12] Potter *v.* State, 42 Ark. 29.

So in Kentucky and Georgia.

of a final judgment or verdict, on a second indictment for the same offence.[1] But recently this view has been recalled, and it is now held that an arbitrary discharge may be a bar.[2]

A discharge, in Georgia, on account of disability to agree, does not necessarily work an acquittal.[3]

So in South Carolina.

§ 506 *a*. In South Carolina the rule is regarded simply as an expression of the common law doctrine of *autrefois acquit*.[4]

Judge Story, in his treatise on the Constitution, mentions that the question of discharge of a jury from inability to agree is largely at the discretion of the trial court.[5] Judge Tucker, an eminent Virginia jurist, distinguished for his general tendency to give a strict interpretation to all constitutional limitations, takes substantially the same ground, advising, however, that the question of discharge should become a matter of record, so as to be the subject of revision.[6]

No jeopardy on defective indictment or process.

§ 507. Where, however, there is no jurisdiction,[7] or where the indictment is defective, even in a capital case, it is agreed on all sides the defendant has never been in jeopardy, and consequently, if judgment be arrested, a new indictment can be preferred, and a new trial instituted, without violation of the constitutional limitation.[8] Even partial endurance

[1] Com. *v.* Olds, 5 Little, 140; S. P., O'Brian *v.* Com., 6 Bush, 563, overruled in Wilson *v.* Com., 3 Bush, 105.

[2] O'Brian *v.* Com., 9 Bush, 333.

In Williams *v.* Com., 78 Ky. 93, the court was called on to act on § 243 of the Criminal Code, which provides that "the attorney of the Commonwealth, with permission of the court, may, at any time before the case is finally submitted to the jury, dismiss the indictment as to all or a part of the defendants, and such dismissal shall not bar a future prosecution for the same offence." This was held to be unconstitutional so far as it attempts to authorize, after jeopardy attaches, dismissal of an indictment for felony so that it may not operate as a bar to a future prosecution for the same offence. It was, however, conceded that even after jeopardy has attached, and in cases of necessity, an indictment may be dismissed or a prosecution discontinued without operating as a bar to a future prosecution for the same offence.

[3] Lester *v.* State, 33 Ga. 329.

[4] State *v.* Shiver, 20 S. C. 392.

[5] 3 Story on the Const. 660.

[6] 1 Tuck. Black. App. 305.

[7] Supra, § 438; Montross *v.* State, 61 Miss. 429.

[8] Supra, § 457; infra, §§ 722, 821; Com. *v.* Purchase, 2 Pick. 521; Com. *v.* Loud, 3 Met. 328; Com. *v.* Keith, 8 Met. 531; State *v.* Woodruff, 2 Day,

of punishment under a defective indictment will be no bar when the proceedings are reversed on the defendant's motion;[1] though it is otherwise when the judgment is unreversed.[2] But a judgment erroneously arrested on a good indictment may be a bar.[3]

Whether a judgment is necessary to the plea is elsewhere discussed.[4]

A trial in which the indictment has been dismissed for variance has been held not to constitute jeopardy.[5]

A defendant is not in jeopardy who has had leave to withdraw a plea in law, and to plead in abatement, which plea is found for him; and he may be indicted a second time in his true name.[6]

It has been held that when the jury has been discharged in consequence of the verdict being taken in the defendant's absence, there is no jeopardy.[7]

504; People *v.* Barrett, 1 Johns. R. 66; Com. *v.* Cook, S. & R. 577; Com. *v.* Clue, 3 Rawle, 498; State *v.* Crutch, 1 Houst. 204; State *v.* Williams, 5 Md. 62; Robinson *v.* Com., 32 Grat. 866; Gerard *v.* People, 3 Scam. 363; State *v.* Garrigues, 1 Hayw. 241; State *v.* England, 78 N. C. 552; Pritchett *v.* State, 3 Sneed. 285; State *v.* Sherborn, 58 N. H. 535; White *v.* State, 49 Ala. 344; Kohlheimer *v.* State, 39 Miss. 548; Bedee *v.* People, 73 Ill. 320; Phillips *v.* People, 88 Ill. 160; State *v.* Hays, 78 Mo. 600; State *v.* Owen, 78 Mo. 367; State *v.* Cheek, 25 Ark. 206; People *v.* March, 6 Cal. 543; People *v.* McNealy, 17 Cal. 333; State *v.* Priebnow, 16 Neb. 131. As English rulings to same effect, see Vaux's case, 4 Co. 44; R. *v.* Richmond, 1 C. & K. 240. So where the indictment was found by an unqualified grand jury. Finley *v.* State, 61 Ala. 201; Kohlheimer *v.* State, *ut sup.* Even a judgment arrested on motion of the prosecution is no bar when indictment is defective. R. *v.* Houston, 2 Craw. & D. 311; People *v.* Larson, 68 Cal. 18. See People *v.* Corning, 2 Comst. 9. The logical accuracy of the statement that there is no jeopardy on a defective indictment is disputed in an ingenious article in 4 Crim. Law Mag. 489 (July, 1883), though the fact that the courts unite in sustaining the position taken is not disputed. It is argued that as there is punishment inflicted on a defective indictment, therefore there is *pro tanto* jeopardy. If this be true, however, it would follow that there is jeopardy in a trial before an unauthorized court, and if so, jeopardy in a mob attack, and if so, jeopardy in the discipline inflicted by private revenge.

[1] Jeffries *v.* State, 40 Ala. 382.

[2] Supra, § 435. See Cochrane *v.* State, 6 Md. 406.

[3] Supra, § 435 *a*.

[4] See Gardiner *v.* People, 6 Park. C. R. 155, and cases cited supra, § 435.

[5] Rogers, ex parte, 10 Tex. Ap. 655. Supra, § 461.

[6] Com. *v.* Farrell, 105 Mass. 189. See Com. *v.* Sholes, 13 Allen, 554. Supra, § 425.

[7] Infra, § 549; Ford *v.* State, 34 Ark. 649.

§ 508. It is submitted, in conclusion, that the two classes of opinions which have been the subject of discussion may be reconciled, should it be conceded that the "discretion," in exercise of which a court, when intrusted with it, is justified in discharging a prisoner, must be a "legal necessity," such as would, if spread on the record, enable a court of error to say that the discharge was correct. The cases are clear that the term "legal necessity" is not confined to cases such as death, etc., when the discharge becomes inevitable.[1] Thus, if a juryman, during the trial, be taken so ill as to be unable to attend to the evidence or deliberate on the verdict, the jury must be discharged, and the prisoner tried afresh; and even in those States where the law of "once in jeopardy" is most stringent, "serious illness" is enough.[2] The escape of a juryman,[3] the sickness of the judge,[4] or that of a party,[5] and the closing of the term of the court,[6] have been said to have the same effect.[7] In such

Generally, illness or death of juror forms sufficient ground for discharge.

[1] People *v.* Webb, 38 Cal. 467.

[2] R. *v.* Scalbert, 2 Leach, 620; R. *v.* Barrett, Jebb, 106; R. *v.* Leary, 3 Crawford & Dix, 212; R. *v.* Edwards, R. & R. 224; State *v.* Emery, 59 Vt. 84; U. S. *v.* Haskell, 4 Wash. C. C. 402; Com. *v.* Fells, 9 Leigh, 613; Mahala *v.* State, 10 Yerg. 532; State *v.* Curtis, 5 Humph. 601; Fletcher *v.* State, 6 Humph. 249; Mixon *v.* State, 55 Ala. 129; Hector *v.* State, 2 Mo. 135; People *v.* Webb, 38 Cal. 467. Infra, §§ 712, 821, 953.

[3] State *v.* Hall, 4 Halst. 256; State *v.* McKee, 1 Bailey, 651; Hanscom's case, 2 Hale P. C. 295.

[4] Infra, § 514.

[5] Infra, § 511.

[6] Infra, § 513.

[7] Powell *v.* State, 19 Ala. 577.

According to the English practice, a sick juror may be attended by another juror, or a surgeon, accompanied by a bailiff, sworn to remain constantly with him. The juror or surgeon, on his return, may be questioned on oath, to make true answer to such questions as the court shall demand of him respecting the state of the absent juror. If it appear that he will in all probability speedily recover, he is to have whatever refreshment may be beneficial (see Com. *v.* Clue, 3 Rawle, 498; Rulo *v.* State, 19 Ind. 298); but if not, or if he die, the eleven jurors must be discharged from giving any verdict. Their names should then be called over again *instanter*, and another person on the panel of jurors called into the box. The prisoner must then be offered his challenges to all twelve, after which each of them, or of those substituted for them on challenge, must be sworn *de novo*, and be charged with the prisoner. The trial must then begin again. See, by eleven judges, in R. *v.* Edwards, 3 Camp. 207. See R. *v.* Scalbert, Leach, 620; 1 Chit. Cr. L. 1st ed. 414, 655; 2 Hale, 216; 1 Shower, 131; How's case, 1 Vent. 210; R. *v.* Woodfall, 5 Burr. 2667; R. *v.* Beere, 2 M. & Rob. 472. See infra, §§ 722, 821. In an English case where the eleven were all resworn without

cases it is not necessary to say, as is said in some of the cases, that the defendant was not in jeopardy. He certainly was in jeopardy, if the court was one legally authorized to inflict punishment. But, on the other hand, it cannot be said, on the second trial, that he has been put *twice* in jeopardy, since the jeopardy in which he was put on the first trial has never ceased to exist.[1]

What has been said of sickness of a juror applies to the misconduct of a juror breaking up the trial. Were it not so, it would be in the power of any one juror, by misconduct, to work an acquittal.[2] This is *a fortiori* the case where the juror's misconduct is imputable to the defendant.[3]

§ 509. Judge Curtis, on a trial for a misdemeanor (in which, however, according to the doctrine of the federal courts, the same restriction applies as in capital felonies), held that it was no bar that a juror had been withdrawn and the jury discharged on a prior trial, on the motion of the prosecuting attorney, on the ground of the then discovered evidence of the juror's bias.[4] The same rule has been extended to other cases of incapacity.[5] But it has been elsewhere held that the court has no power to discharge the jury on such grounds, unless upon application of the defendant, or unless the defect was such that the defendant was really never in jeopardy.[6]

Discharge of jury from intermediately discovered incapacity of juror no bar.

challenge, the evidence which had been given was read by consent, from the judge's notes, before them and the twelfth juror; and each witness was asked whether it was true. See R. *v.* Edwards, R. & Ry. 224; 2 Leach, 621, n.; 3 Camp. 207, n.; 4 Taunt. 309; 1 Ch. Cr. L. 629; Foster 31.

[1] On this point I accept the reasoning of the criticism in the article in 4 Crim. Law Mag. 487, already noticed.

[2] R. *v.* Ward, 10 Cox C. C. 574; State *v.* Hall, 4 Halst. 256.

[3] State *v.* Bell, 81 N. C. 591.

[4] U. S. *v.* Morris, 1 Curtis, 23. See, also, People *v.* Damon, 13 Wend. 351; Stone *v.* People, 2 Scam. 326; Watkins *v.* People, 60 Ga. 601; and cases cited infra, § 517. See infra, § 844.

[5] R. *v.* Phillips, 11 Cox C. C. 142; U. S. *v.* Haskell, 4 Wash. C. C. 402.

[6] R. *v.* Wardle, C. & M. 647; R. *v.* Sullivan, 8 Ad. & El. 831; R. *v.* Sutton, 8 B. & C. 417; Poage *v.* State, 3 Ohio St. 239; Stone *v.* People, 2 Scam. 327; Com. *v.* Jones, 1 Leigh, 399; State *v.* McKee, 1 Bailey S. C. 651; O'Brian *v.* Com., 9 Bush, 333; McClure *v.* State, 1 Yerg. 219; Johnson *v.* State, 29 Ark. 31. Infra, § 793.

In O'Brian *v.* Com., 9 Bush, 333, after the jury had been sworn, and while the evidence was being taken, one of the jurors arose and said that he had formed one of the grand jury which found the indictment, and thereupon the court, of its own motion and against the objection of the prisoner,

If the defendant has been really in jeopardy, and the discharge is not necessitated by misconduct of a juror or of the defendant, such discharge is a bar to a subsequent trial.

Conviction no bar when set aside on defendant's motion.

§ 510. A conviction set aside, on the defendant's motion, on account of erroneous ruling by the judge, is no bar to a second trial. The defendant, by setting up the position that the ruling was erroneous, is afterwards estopped from disputing this. He affirms that he never was in legal jeopardy, and that the ruling of the judge against him, putting him in jeopardy, was not law. When he gains his point he cannot afterwards plead jeopardy.[1] And he waives jeopardy by a motion for new trial.[2]

And so of discharge from sickness of defendant.

§ 511. *Sickness of* defendant has been sometimes held a sufficient ground, on the defendant's request, to discharge a jury; and this consent may, it seems, be implied from sudden incapacitating illness. In such case, the first trial is no bar to the second.[3] Nor when the jury is discharged in consequence of the defendant's escape from the court during trial can he set up the trial as a bar.[4]

Discharge from surprise a bar.

§ 512. *Surprise in sudden breaking down of case of prosecution*, in New York and North Carolina, has been held, in *misdemeanors*, to be ground for withdrawing a juror.[5] But

discharged the juror and had another summoned. The court held that this amounted to an acquittal, and that the plea of *autrefois acquit* to a further trial was good.

[1] See infra, § 793; Morrisette *v.* State, 77 Ala. 71; Thompson *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 649.

[2] Infra, § 518.

[3] R. *v.* Stevenson, 2 Leach, 546; R. *v.* Streek, 2 C. & P. 413; R. *v.* Kell, 1 Craw. & Dix, 151; People *v.* Goodwin, 18 Johns. 187; Smith *v.* State, 41 N. J. L. 598; State *v.* McKee, 1 Bailey, 651; Lee *v.* State, 26 Ark. 260. See, also, Sperry *v.* Com., 9 Leigh, 623; State *v.* Wiseman, 68 N. C. 204. See infra, §§ 724, 821.

Mr. Justice Talfourd (Dickins. Quar. Sess. 570) thus states the law on this point: "Where, after the jury have been charged, a prisoner indicted for felony becomes, from sudden illness, incapable of remaining at the bar during the trial, the jury must be discharged. If he recovers during the session, he may be retried, the whole of the proceedings in his trial being commenced *de novo;* R. *v.* Stevenson, 2 Leach C. C. 546; R. *v.* Streek, 2 C. & P. 413. See R. *v.* Fitzgerald, 1 C. & K. 201;—Cresswell, J.; Foster's Crown Law, 22, Wedderburn's case; if not, the recognizances must be respited till the next session."

[4] People *v.* Higgins, 59 Cal. 357.

[5] People *v.* Ellis, 15 Wend. 371 (though see Klock *v.* People, 2 Park. C. R. 676); State *v.* Weaver, 13 Iredell, 203. See infra, §§ 516, 724, 821.

this is contrary to the better opinion, which is that in no criminal trial can such a power be exercised.[1]

Discharge from statutory close of court no bar.

§ 513. *Statutory close of term of court*, except in North Carolina,[2] has been held to justify a discharge, which is no bar to a second trial.[3] A court, however, can adjourn beyond the term to receive a verdict.[4]

And so from sickness of judge.

§ 514. *Sickness of judge*, as has been already noticed, is a sufficient ground, under the same limitation, as the sickness of a juror.[5]

And so from death of judge.

§ 515. The death of a judge, to whom a case was submitted by consent, for decision without a jury, such death being before decision rendered, does not relieve a defendant, in an indictment for misdemeanor, from a second trial.[6] And the same rule exists as to the death of a judge during a trial before a jury.[7]

But not from sickness or incapacity of witness.

§ 516. The sickness of a witness is held not to constitute ground to discharge the jury, even though the witness was essential to the prosecution; and when a discharge was made in such case, it was held that the defendant could not be tried again.[8] Such sickness has been held in America ground for *postponing* a trial, but not, unless misconduct of defendant be shown, for *discharging* a *jury*.[9]

[1] Supra, § 436; Kinlock's case, Fost. 16; R. *v.* Jeffs, 2 Strange, 984; U. S. *v.* Shoemaker, 2 McLean, 114; People *v.* Barrett, 2 Caines, 305; Klock *v.* People, 2 Park. C. R. 676.

[2] Spier's case, 1 Devereux, 491; State *v.* McGimpsey, 80 N. C. 377; though see State *v.* Tillotson, 7 Jones, 114.

[3] R. *v.* Newton, 13 Q. B. 716; S. C., 3 Cox C. C. 489; R. *v.* Davison, 2 F. & F. 250; People *v.* Thompson, 2 Wheel. C. C. 473; Com. *v.* Thompson, 1 Va. Cas. 319; State *v.* McLemore, 2 Hill S. C. 680; Ned *v.* State, 7 Porter, 187; State *v.* Battle, 7 Ala. 259; Powell *v.* State, 19 Ala. 577; State *v.* Moor, 1 Walker, Miss. 134; Josephine *v.* State, 39 Miss. 613; Mahala *v.* State, 10 Yerg. 132; State *v.* Brooks, 2 Humph. 70; Hines *v.* State, 8 Humph. 597; Wright *v.* State, 5 Ind. 290; State *v.* Jeffers, 64 Mo. 376; People *v.* Cage, 48 Cal. 323. See R. *v.* Bowman, 9 C. & P. 438.

[4] Briceland *v.* Com., 74 Penn. St. 463.

[5] Nugent *v.* State, 4 Stew. & P. 72; State *v.* Tatman, 59 Iowa, 471.

[6] Bescher *v.* State, 32 Ind. 480. See People *v.* Webb, 38 Cal. 467. Infra, §§ 898, 929.

[7] People *v.* Webb, 38 Cal. 467. Infra, §§ 898, 929.

[8] R. *v.* Kell, 1 Crawford & Dix, 151. See R. *v.* Wade, 1 Mood. C. C. 86; R. *v.* Oulaghan, Jebb's C. C. 270. Supra, § 512.

[9] U. S. *v.* Coolidge, 2 Gallis, 364; Com. *v.* Wade, 17 Pick. 397. See infra, §§ 722, 821–4.

Whether the court will adjourn a trial on account of the incapacity of a witness is hereafter discussed.[1]

Until jury are "charged" jeopardy does not begin.

§ 517. However discordant the cases may be as to what legal necessity justifies a discharge, they unite in the position that until the jury are "charged" with the offence, on an issue duly framed, that is to say, until the jury is sworn, and the case committed to them, the jeopardy does not begin.[2] Until this period the defendant is not technically "in jeopardy."[3] Even a juror who is found to be incompetent after swearing, but before opening the case, may be set aside without vitiating the procedure.[4] *A fortiori*, therefore, neither a *nolle prosequi*, when entered before empanelling a jury,[5] nor an ignoring by a grand jury,[6] nor a discharge on *habeas corpus*,[7] has the effect of relieving the defendant from further prosecution.

"Charging" the jury is addressing the jury as follows:—

"Gentlemen of the jury, look upon the prisoner and hearken to his charge; he stands indicted by the name of A. B., late of the parish of, etc., laborer, for that he, on, etc. [*reading the indictment to the end*]. Upon this indictment he hath been arraigned; upon his arraignment he hath pleaded not guilty; your charge, therefore, is to inquire whether he be guilty or not guilty, and hearken to the evidence."[8]

[1] Infra, §§ 722, 821, and cases in this section.

[2] See Alexander *v.* Com. 105 Penn. St. 1; Nolan *v.* State, 55 Ga. 521; Watkins *v.* State, 60 Ga. 601; Atchison R. R. *v.* Franklin, 23 Kan. 74; Taylor *v.* State, 11 Lea, 708; People *v.* Horn, 70 Cal. 17.

Where, upon an indictment for murder, there is a preliminary trial, on a plea in abatement of misnomer, the defendant is not, on such preliminary trial, in jeopardy of his life or liberty, though the indictment was for murder; and it is discretionary with the court whether or not to keep the jury secluded during the trial of such issue. Alexander *v.* Com., *ut supra*.

[3] Com. *v.* Myers, 1 Va. Cas. 188; Epes's case, 5 Grat. 676; Com. *v.* Drew, 3 Cush. 379; People *v.* Fisher, 14 Wend. 9; Com. *v.* Miller, 2 Ashm. 611; Hines *v.* State, 8 Humph. 597; State *v.* Clifford, 58 Wis. 477; infra, § 821.

[4] Stone *v.* State, 2 Scam. 326; Com. *v.* McFadden, 23 Penn. St. 12. As further rulings to same effect, see People *v.* Damon, 13 Wend. 351; State *v.* Redman, 17 Ind. 329; Bell *v.* State, 44 Ala. 10; Watkins *v.* State, 60 Ga. 601, and cases cited supra, § 508.

[5] Supra, § 447.

[6] Supra, § 446.

[7] Supra, § 445.

[8] See, for a shorter form, trial of R. Smith, Philadelphia, 1816, Wharton on Homicide, App.

This does not take place until after the jury are sworn,[1] and is not usual in misdemeanors.[2]

A plea duly entered on arraignment is an essential prerequisite to "charging."[3]

The subject of the seclusion of the jury is hereafter discussed.[4]

§ 518. It has been frequently ruled that the defendant may waive his constitutional privilege by a consent to the discharge of the jury,[5] or to their separation,[6] and that this may be by a motion in arrest or vacation of judgment.[7] It is conceded that this may be done by a motion for a new trial, which pervades the whole case, asking that it may begin *de novo*,[8] and also by writs of error.[9] It is true that it

Waiver by motion for new trial, writ of error, and motion in arrest.

[1] 1 Ch. C. L. 555; Dicken. Q. Sess. 493; Alexander *v.* Com., 105 Penn. St. 1; Mitchell *v.* State, 42 Ohio St. 383.

[2] Ibid. Infra, § 817.

[3] U. S. *v.* Riley, 6 Blatch. 204; Weaver *v.* State, 83 Ind. 289; 4 Crim. Law Mag. 27, and note thereto; Davis *v.* State, 38 Wis. 487; Grogan *v.* State, 44 Ala. 9; Bell *v.* State, 44 Ala. 393; Lee *v.* State, 26 Ark. 260.

[4] Infra, §§ 727, 814.

[5] See infra, § 817; R. *v.* Deane, 5 Cox C. C. 501; State *v.* Gurney, 37 Me. 156; Com. *v.* Andrews, 3 Mass. 126; People *v.* Rathbun, 21 Wend. 509; Stewart *v.* State, 15 Ohio St. R. 161; People *v.* Webb, 38 Cal. 467; but see State *v.* Tuller, 34 Conn. 280.

A defendant not excepting to the irregular discharge of a juror, *after* swearing, but before case opened, is deemed to consent to the discharge, and cannot after conviction except. Kingen *v.* State, 46 Ind. 132. And this has been extended to all cases of non-objection to discharge. State *v.* Sutfin, 22 W. Va. 771.

[6] R. *v.* Stokes, 6 C. & P. 151; Com. *v.* Sholes, 13 Allen, 555; Stephens *v.* People, 19 N. Y. (5 Smith) 549; Dye *v.* Com., 7 Grat. 662; Williams *v.* Com., 2 Grat. 567; State *v.* Falconer, 70 Iowa, 416; Spencer *v.* State, 15 Ga. 562; Nolan *v.* State, 55 Ga. 521; Morrisette *v.* State, 77 Ala. 71; Friar *v.* State, 3 How. Miss. 422; Loper *v.* State, 3 How. Miss. 429; State *v.* Mix, 15 Mo. 153; Quinn *v.* State, 14 Ind. 589; Elijah *v.* State, 1 Humph. 102; Murphy *v.* State, 7 Cold. 516; State *v.* McMahon, 17 Nev. 365.

When a jury gives in its verdict in the defendant's absence a motion to set aside this verdict is not such a waiver as will preclude the defendant from setting up on a second trial the plea of once in jeopardy. Nolan *v.* State, 55 Ga. 521.

[7] Supra, §§ 457, 510; Com. *v.* Fishblatt, 4 Met. 354; Page *v.* Com., 9 Leigh, 683; State *v.* Arrington, 3 Murph. 571; Sipple *v.* People, 10 Ill. App. 144; State *v.* Clark, 69 Iowa, 196.

[8] U. S. *v.* Perez, 9 Wheat. 579; Com. *v.* Clue, 3 Rawle, 500; Com. *v.* Brown, 3 Rawle, 207; Com. *v.* Murray, 2 Ashm. 41; Ball's case, 8 Leigh, 726; State *v.* Greenwood, 1 Hayw. 141; State *v.* Jeffreys, 3 Murph. 480; State *v.* Lipsey, 3 Dev. 485; State *v.* Davis, 80 N. C. 384; State *v.* Sims, 2 Bailey, 29; State *v.* Patterson, 88 Mo. 88; State

[9] Infra, §§ 770 *et seq.*

has been held that there can be no waiver of rights in capital cases,[1] and that as a general rule consent will not justify the taking of life or liberty.[2] Yet we must not forget that there are a multitude of cases in which a defendant may receive much benefit by arrangements between counsel, as well as by motions for revision. To say that in capital cases such agreements on his behalf are not binding would prevent any such agreements from being made.[3] And such agreements may be eminently beneficial when the object of the waiver is to save life or liberty.

Whether on a new trial being granted after a conviction for manslaughter the offence of murder is re-opened is elsewhere considered.[4]

In misdemeanors separation of jury permitted.

§ 519. It is settled law, as we will see hereafter, that *in misdemeanors the jury may be allowed to separate at any time.*[5] That it is in some States extended to felonies has been already seen.[6]

Plea must be special. Record must specify facts.

§ 520. It has been held that an allegation "that the said defendant had once before been put in jeopardy of his life for said offence, upon said indictment," is demurrable, if it does not show how or in what manner;[7] though it is otherwise if the facts constituting the jeopardy are alleged.[8] And when the record shows, in a case in which jeopardy attaches, that the jury was discharged, the record must also spe-

v. Hart, 33 Kan. 218; People *v.* Keefer, 65 Cal. 232. Infra, §§ 729–31, 818, 821. Supra, § 510.

That a new trial granted on defendant's motion in consequence of a defective verdict is such a bar, see State *v.* Jenkins, 84 N. C. 812; Kendall *v.* State, 65 Ala. 492.

[1] R. *v.* Perkins, Holt, 403; R. *v.* Kell, 1 Craw. & Dix, 151; Peiffer *v.* Com., 15 Penn. St. 468; Nolan *v.* State, 55 Ga. 521; Wesley *v.* State, 11 Humph. 502; Wiley *v.* State, 1 Swan, 256; State *v.* Populus, 12 La. An. 710; Woods *v.* State, 43 Miss. 364; People *v.* Backus, 5 Cal. 275; People *v.* Shafer, 1 Utah, 260; but see infra, §§ 821-30.

In State *v.* Parish, 43 Wis. 395, it was held that an arrest of judgment on defendant's motion leaving the verdict unassailed, was not a waiver on which a new indictment could be sustained, citing State *v.* Norvell, 2 Yerg. 24.

[2] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 143 *et seq.*

[3] See infra, § 733.

[4] Supra, § 465; infra, §§ 788, 896. See, as to the alleged erroneous use of the word "waiver" in such cases, 4 Crim. Law Mag. 493.

[5] This subject will be considered more fully under a future head. Infra, §§ 722, 816, 821, 823.

[6] Supra, § 492.

[7] See forms of pleas in Whart. Prec. 1157.

[8] Atkins *v.* State, 16 Ark. 568; Wilson *v.* State, 16 Ark. 60.

cially state the ground of discharge, so that the court in error may understand such ground of discharge.[1] The defendant, on proper application, is entitled to have such special facts incorporated in the record.[2] Whatever the record avers is subject of revision in an appellate court,[3] though in those jurisdictions where the whole matter is left to the discretion of the judge trying the case, a record of the discharge will not be ordinarily ground for reversal.[4]

VIII. PLEA OF PARDON.

§ 521. Pardon, in its narrower sense, is a declaration on record by the sovereign that a particular individual is to be relieved from the legal incidents of a particular crime.[5] When used, as is the case under the Constitution of the

Pardon is a relief from legal consequences of crime.

[1] See Com. *v.* Purchase, 2 Pick. 521; Com. *v.* Townsend, 5 Allen, 216; People *v.* Goodwin, 18 Johns. 187; Poage *v.* State, 3 Ohio St. 230; Dobbins *v.* State, 14 Ohio St. 494; Hines *v.* State, 24 Ohio St. 134; State *v.* Walker, 26 Ind. 347; State *v.* Nelson, 26 Ind. 366; State *v.* Bullock, 63 N. C. 571; State *v.* Almon, 64 N. C. 364; State *v.* Jefferson, 66 N. C. 309; Avery *v.* State, 26 Ga. 233; Powell *v.* State, 19 Ala. 577; Barrett *v.* State, 35 Ala. 406; McLaughlin, ex parte, 41 Cal. 211; Cage, ex parte, 45 Cal. 248; People *v.* Cage, 48 Cal. 323; People *v.* Lightfoot, 49 Cal. 226; Moseley *v.* State, 33 Tex. 67.

[2] R. *v.* Middlesex Justices, 3 Nev. & Man. 110; R. *v.* Bowman, 6 C. & P. 101. As to English practice, see Winsor *v.* R. L. R. 1 Q. B. 289. Former jeopardy is a constitutional plea which may be interposed at any time. Pizano *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 139.

[3] See cases cited supra, §§ 490 *et seq.* Infra, § 779.

[4] See Winsor *v.* R. L. R. 1 Q. B. 289; U. S. *v.* Perez, 9 Wheat. 579; People *v.* Green, 13 Wend. 55.

[5] U. S. *v.* Wilson, 7 Pet. 150; Osborn *v.* U. S., 91 U. S. 474; Knote *v.* U. S., 95 U. S. 149. As to constitutional questions involved, see Whart. Com. Am. Law, §§ 507 *et seq.* That a pardon suspends proceedings in error, see Levien *v.* R. L. R., 1 P. C. C. Ap. 536; but see *contra*, Eighmy *v.* People, 78 N. Y. 330.

A pardon by the executive having jurisdiction restores the right to vote, which the conviction forfeited. Jones *v.* Board, 56 Miss. 766. And also the right to hold office. Hildreth *v.* Hunt, 1 Ill. Ap. 82; Fugate's case, 2 Leigh, 724. Infra, § 939 *a*. Though it is otherwise when the pardon is by the President and the disfranchisement is by a State court, Ridley *v.* Sherbrook, 3 Coldw. 569, or when the State Constitution makes the disfranchisement indelible. Opinion of Judges, 4 R. I. 583.

In Legmon *v.* Latimer, 3 Exch. D. 15, it was held that a pardon so obliterates the offence that it is defamatory to call a person pardoned of felony a "convicted felon." But see Baum *v.* Clause, 5 Hill (N. Y.), 196; Deming, in re, 10 Johns. (N. Y.) 232, 483. One part of a sentence can be remitted at one time and another part at another. 3 Op. 418. That Congress cannot limit the President's pardoning power, see Garland, ex parte, 4 Wallace, 333.

United States, as including amnesty, it is an extinction of the crime itself, so that the offender is to be treated as if it had never occurred.[1]

Pardon is susceptible of being viewed in three distinct relations:—

Pardon before conviction to be exactly construed.

§ 522. *First.* Pardon before conviction, or *abolitio*, as it is called by the old writers, while it is included in a general grant of power to pardon,[2] is prohibited by the constitutions of several of the United States and of several European States. To enable such a pardon to operate it is necessary that the offence should be specifically described.[3] When such a pardon takes the place of an amnesty or act of grace, it should be construed with especial liberality.[4] It has been held that where the executive is precluded by the Constitution from pardoning before conviction, this function may be assumed by the legislature.[5] A legislative repeal of a statute making a particular act penal operates as a pardon of the parties committing such act when the statute was in force.[6]

Pardon after conviction more indulgently construed.

§ 523. *Second.* Pardon after conviction, which is either full or conditional—*plena vel minus plena.* This is the ordinary form of pardon, and is granted sometimes because the sentence requires revision, sometimes from the good conduct of the defendant since conviction, sometimes from general motives of clemency. To this, as well

[1] Infra, § 525; Jones *v.* Board, 56 Miss. 766. In U. S. *v.* Klein, 13 Wall. 128, 147 (adopted in Knote *v.* U. S., 95 U. S. 149), it was said that a "pardon includes amnesty. It blots out the offence pardoned and removes all its penal consequences." That a pardon does not reverse the conviction, though depriving it of legal effect, see Cook *v.* Freeholders, 26 N. J. L. 326, 340.

[2] Com. *v.* Bush, 2 Duv. 264; State *v.* Woolery, 29 Mo. 300; Rivers *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 177.

[3] See Birch, ex parte, 3 Gilm. 449; 6 Cr. Law Mag. 476.

In Carlisle *v.* U. S., 16 Wall. 147, it was said that "a pardon reaches both the punishment prescribed for the offence and the guilt of the offender." In the case of Gen. Lawton, in May, 1885, it was held by Attorney-General Garland that a pardon took the pardoned party absolutely out of the category of an offender in respect to the offence pardoned.

[4] Supra, § 525. For cases of pardon before sentence, see Garland, ex parte, 4 Wall. 333; Armstrong's case, 13 Wall. 154; Pargoud's case, 13 Wall. 156; 6 Op. Att.-Gen. 20; 9 Id. 478; Duncan *v.* Com., 4 S. & R. 449; Com. *v.* Hitchman, 46 Penn. St. 357; Blair *v.* Com., 25 Grat. 850; Com. *v.* Bush, 2 Duvall, 264; U. S. *v.* Athens, 35 Ga. 354; State *v.* Benoit, 16 La. An. 273; State *v.* Dyches, 28 Tex. 535.

[5] State *v.* Nichols, 26 Ark. 74. See Butler *v.* State, 97 Ind. 373.

[6] Whart. Cr. Law, 9th ed. §§ 29 *et seq.*; Com. *v.* Rollins, 8 N. H. 550; Com. *v.* Mott, 21 Pick. 492.

as in other cases of grants, applies the position that in cases of doubt the presumption is to be in favor of the grantee.[1] Conviction, in this sense, exists as soon as a verdict of guilty is rendered.[2] After endurance of punishment, pardon removes any remaining disability.[3] In the construction of such a pardon the usual rules as to application of parol evidence are in force.[4] An order by the executive to release from prison is equivalent to a pardon;[5] and so is an order to remit a sentence.[6]

§ 524. *Third.* Rehabilitation—*Restitutio ex capite gratiae.* This consists in a restoration to the pardoned person of the *status* and rights he possessed before his pardon. In our own practice this is illustrated by the removal of the technical infamy which incapacitates him as a witness, and the restoration of confiscated effects not vested in others.[7] But a pardon has been held not to rehabilitate so as to entitle an alien to naturalization[8] nor to confer special rights.[9]

Rehabilitation is restoration to *status*.

[1] Wyrral's case, 5 Co. 49; Com. *v.* Roby, 12 Pick. 196; State *v.* Blaisdell, 33 N. H. 388; Com. *v.* R. R., 1 Grant, 301; Lee *v.* Murphy, 22 Grat. 789; State *v.* Shelton, 64 N. C. 294; Jones *v.* Harris, 1 Strobh. 160. See Leyman *v.* Latimer, 3 Exch. D. 352; 14 Cox C. C. 51; Hawkins *v.* State, 1 Port. 475. That the pardon must recite the conviction, see infra, § 535; U. S. *v.* Stetter, reported in 7th ed. of this work, § 766; People *v.* Brown, 43 Cal. 439.

[2] Com. *v.* Lockwood, 109 Mass. 323. See Blair *v.* Com., 25 Grat. 850; State *v.* Alexander, 76 N. C. 231; State *v.* Fuller, 1 McCord, 178, and cases cited infra, § 527.

Thus, in Massachusetts, the governor, with the advice of the council, may grant a pardon of an offence after a verdict of guilty and before sentence, and while exceptions are pending in the Supreme Court for argument; and the convict, upon pleading the pardon, is entitled to be discharged. Com. *v.* Lockwood, 109 Mass. 323. See Com. *v.* Mash, 7 Met. 472; Duncan *v.* Com., 4 S. & R. 449; State *v.* Alexander, 76 N. C. 231.

[3] Whart. Cr. Ev. § 525; State *v.* Foley, 15 Nev. 64.

[4] Greathouse's case, 2 Abb. U. S. 382.

[5] Jones *v.* Harris, 1 Strobh. 160.

[6] Hoffman *v.* Coster, 2 Whart. R. 453.

[7] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 525. An officer pardoned after court-martial is restored to former rank. 12 Op. Att.-Gen. 547.

[8] Spencer, in re, 18 Alb. L. J. 153; 5 Sawyer, 195, where Deady, J., held that where an alien has, during the time of his residence here, been convicted of perjury, he is not entitled to naturalization; and a pardon being only prospective, and not doing away with the fact of his conviction, does not relieve him from his disability. The pardon of the President, whether granted by general proclamation or by special letters, relieves claimants, under the captured and abandoned property act, from the consequences of participation in the rebellion. Carlisle *v.* United States, 16 Wallace, 147.

[9] See Hart *v.* U. S., 15 Ct. of Cl. 414.

§ 525. *Amnesty* differs from pardon in some essential particulars.[1] It is addressed not to an individual, but to a population; and it is as much in the nature of a compact as of a grant.[2] It says, "Lay down your arms, and your rebellion shall be treated as if it did not exist." Nor is this altered by the fact that the party addressed is at the time conquered. No State that retains within its borders a perpetual revolt can last; and it is to close the revolt, and to transmute enemies into willing subjects, that an amnesty is issued. Another point of distinction between pardon at common law and amnesty is, that the former relieves from the legal incidents of the offence, while the amnesty cancels the guilty act itself. It is an extinction even of the *memory* of the past—an *amnestia*—an act of oblivion.[3] Hence amnesties are always construed indulgently towards those by whom they are accepted.[4] *In dubio mitius*, is a maxim which applies to them as well as to pardons. But to amnesties belongs the additional consideration that no government, without forfeiting all confidence in its faith, can prosecute those whom it induces to surrender themselves to it on the plea that the offence prosecuted should be treated as if it did not exist.[5] Such is the distinction taken at common law. Under the Constitution of the United States this distinction is not noticed, amnesty being included in pardon, and all pardon being amnesty.[6] As under the Constitution of the United States the President's right to declare an amnesty

Amnesty is addressed to a class of people, and is more in nature of compact.

[1] See 6 Cr. Law Mag. 457.

[2] Brown *v.* U. S., McCahon (U. S.), 229.

[3] Knote *v.* U. S., 10 Ct. of Cl. 397; 95 U. S. 149.

[4] The President's amnesty proclamation of December 8, 1863, extended to persons who, prior to the date of the proclamation, had been convicted and sentenced for offences described in the proclamation. Greathouse's case, 2 Abbott U. S. 382 (1864); S. C., 4 Sawyer, 487. See Lapeyre *v.* U. S., 17 Wall. 191. But the amnesty acts do not, in general, apply to crimes not growing out of the war. State *v.* Haney, 67 N. C. 467; State *v.* Blalock, Phil. N. C. 242; State *v.* Shelton, 65 N. C. 294.

A plea setting up an amnesty proclamation containing exceptions must aver that the respondent is not within the exceptions. St. Louis Street Foundry, 6 Wall. 770.

[5] See Herrman, de abolitionibus criminum; Bentham, Rat. *in loco;* Mittermaier, note to Feuerbach, § 63; and, for construction of federal amnesty acts, Armstrong *v.* U. S., 13 Wal. 154; Hamilton *v.* U. S., 7 Ct. of Cl. 444; Brown *v.* U. S., McCahon, 229; State *v.* Keith, 63 N. C. 140; Law, ex parte, 35 Ga. 285; Haddix *v.* Wilson, 3 Bush, 523. Infra, §§ 535 *et seq.*

[6] Knote *v.* U. S., 95 U. S. 149, 153.

is included in his right to pardon, his right to declare an amnesty cannot be amplified or diminished by congress.

§ 526. Pardons may be viewed as either statutory or executive. A statutory pardon;[1] or act of grace or amnesty, need not, it is said, be pleaded, but may be put in evidence under the general issue.[2] If a public act, the courts, under such circumstances, are bound to take notice of it.[3] But it is more prudent specially to plead an act of amnesty, since, if the court should refuse to receive it under the general issue, the error might be too late to be repaired.[4] And it is also to be remembered that when the function of pardon (which, as has been seen, includes amnesty) is vested in the executive, it cannot be modified or restrained by legislative act. But a legislative pardon by being signed by the executive becomes an executive act.[5]

Executive pardon must be specially pleaded, otherwise amnesty.

An *executive* pardon should be specially pleaded, and should be produced under the great seal.[6] It is said that it may be orally pleaded,[7] but it is better that it should be pleaded formally in writing. Unless specially pleaded, it will not be noticed by the court.[8] And it may be pleaded at any period of the case, whenever it is received;[9] though, if not pleaded, it will not, as has been seen, be noticed in arrest of judgment.[10]

When the pardon is set up in bar, evidence is admisible to show the non-identity of the offence pardoned with the offence on trial.[11]

§ 527. Pardons are not applicable to offences committed *after* the proclamation of pardon. That no sovereign in a State where the law-making power is distinct from the executive can dispense with a penal statute was established in England by the overthrow of James II., and the subsequent refusal of the courts to recognize his dispensations as valid.

Pardons cannot be prospective.

[1] See People *v.* Stewart, 1 Idaho, N. S. 546.

[2] 2 Hawk. P. C. 37, s. 58.

[3] See State *v.* Keith, 63 N. C. 140; State *v.* Blalock, Phill. N. C. 242.

[4] As to statutes of amnesty, see State *v.* Cook, Phill. N. C. 535; and State *v.* Shelton, 65 N. C. 294.

[5] People *v.* Stewart, 1 Idaho, 546.

[6] 1 Chit. Cr. L. 468; R. *v.* Harrod, 2 C. & K. 294; Bullock *v.* Dodds, 2 Barn. & Ald. 258; Whart. Cr. Ev. § 153.

[7] R. *v.* Garside, 4 Nev. & M. 33; 2 Ad. & El. 266.

[8] U. S. *v.* Wilson, 7 Pet. 150; S. C., Bald. 78; State *v.* Blalock, *ut supra;* Com. *v.* Shisler, 2 Phila. 256; Whart. Prec. 1457.

[9] R. *v.* Morris, L. R. 1 C. C. 92.

[10] U. S. *v.* Wilson, *ut supra;* Com. *v.* Lockwood, 100 Mass. 339.

[11] Weimer, ex parte, 8 Biss. 321; State *v.* McCarty, 1 Bay S. C. 334. Infra, § 481.

It is true that an executive may say, "under certain circumstances, I will decline to prosecute." This has been sometimes done in England by order of council. But this is not a *pardon*, *i. e.*, it could not be pleaded in bar. It is simply a promise by a particular executive, that for a certain time, under the stress of a particular public exigency, he will decline to prosecute. He may at any time revoke such promise; and at the best, it is the exercise of a high and questionable prerogative, which the courts, should the matter come before them, would hold to be superseded by a prosecution subsequently brought.[1]

But when an offence has been committed, a pardon may be at common law interposed at any period of time, before prosecution, during trial, and after conviction;[2] though by the constitutions of some States pardons prior to conviction are prohibited.

Pardon before sentence remits costs and penalties.

§ 528. Even in indictments partaking of the nature of civil process, a pardon before sentence, by the executive having jurisdiction, is a bar to costs and penalties, as well as to corporal punishment.[3] Thus, a pardon by the governor of Pennsylvania of a person convicted of fornication and bastardy, when pleaded before sentence, discharges, in Pennsylvania, the defendant from liability for costs, as well as from the maintenance of the child.[4] *After* judgment, however, a pardon does not discharge costs due elsewhere than to the State,[5] or a penalty

[1] See 12 Coke, 29; 2 Hawk. P. C. 540; R. *v.* Williams, Comb. 18; R. *v.* Wilcox *v.* Salk. 458; R. *v.* Garside, 4 N. & M. 33; 2 Ad. & El. 266.

[2] R. *v.* Reilly, 1 Leach, 454; R. *v.* Crosby, 1 Ld. Raym. 39; Com. *v.* Mash, 7 Met. 472; Com. *v.* Lockwood, 109 Mass. 323; U. S. *v.* Wilson, 7 Pet. 150; Garland, ex parte, 4 Wall. 333; Duncan *v.* Com., 4 S. & R. 449; Woollery *v.* State, 29 Mo. 300. Compare supra, § 522.

[3] Armstrong's case, 13 Wall. 154; Pargoud's case, 13 Wall. 156; U. S. *v.* Thomasson, 4 Biss. 336; U. S. *v.* McKee, 4 Dillon, 1, 128; Com. *v.* Ahl, 43 Penn. St. 53; State *v.* Underwood, 64 N. C. 600; Com. *v.* Bush, 2 Duvall, 264; White *v.* State, 42 Miss. 635; Gregory, ex parte, 56 Miss. 164; State *v.* Dyches, 28 Tex. 535.

[4] Com. *v.* Ahl, 43 Penn. St. 53. See Com. *v.* Hitchman, 46 Penn. St. 357; U. S. *v.* Athens Armory, 35 Ga. 344. But a pardon *after* sentence discharges penalties due to the county. Cope *v.* Com., 28 Penn. St. 297. See Com. *v.* Shisler, 2 Phila. 256

[5] Pool *v.* Trumbal, 3 Mod. 56; Brown *v.* U. S., McCahon, 229; Garland, ex parte, 4 Wall. 334; Osborn *v.* U. S., 91 U. S. 471; Deming, in re, 10 Johns. R. 232; Duncan *v.* Com., 4 S. & R. 449; McDonald, ex parte, 2 Whart. 440; Schuylkill *v.* Reifsnyder, 46 Penn. St. 445; Libby *v.* Nicola, 21 Ohio St. 414; Smith *v.* State, 6 Lea, 637; Estep *v.*

vested in an individual.[1] Even costs due the State must be specially remitted by such pardon, or they will remain due.[2] This, however, does not apply to *qui tam* actions, or to cases where the informer's interest attaches *in limine*, by proceedings *in rem*. To these cases pardons, issued after commencement of suit, though before conviction, do not reach;[3] though it is otherwise when the informer has an indeterminate interest.[4] But, under the United States statutes, a pardon operates to bar confiscation before seizure,[5] and in such case the pardon relieves from forfeiture as much of the property as would have accrued to the United States.[6] It is otherwise as to pardon after judgment of forfeiture and delivery.[7] Unless money already paid to the public authorities is by the express terms of the pardon to be refunded, such a limitation being within the power of the executive, such money cannot be refunded unless by legislative act.[8]

Lacy, 35 Iowa, 419; Anglea *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 698; State *v.* Underwood, 64 N. C. 599; State *v.* Mooney, 74 N. C. 98; State *v.* Williams, 1 Nott & McC. 27; Phillips *v.* State, 58 Miss. 578; State *v.* McO'Blemis, 21 Mo. 272; though see U. S. *v.* Thomasson, 4 Biss. 336; Cope *v.* Com., 28 Penn. St. 297; and as to revenue forfeiture, U. S. *v.* Morris, 10 Wheat. 246.

In U. S. *v.* Harris, 1 Abb. U. S. 110, it was held that the pardoning power of the President does not extend to the remission of moieties adjudged to informers. This is disapproved in U. S. *v.* Thomasson, 4 Biss. 336. And the general rule is that the President's pardoning power extends to the remission of all fines, penalties, and forfeitures accruing to the United States for offences against the United States. U. S. *v.* Lancaster, 4 Wash. C. C. 64; U. S. *v.* Morris, 10 Wheat. 246; Pollock *v.* The Laura, 12 Rep. 453; 1 Op. Atty.-Gen. 418; 4 Op. Atty.-Gen. 593; 6 Op. Atty.-Gen. 393, 488.

[1] Ibid.; Shoop *v.* Com., 3 Barr, 126; State *v.* Williams, *ut sup.*; Frazier *v.* Com., 12 B. Mon. 369.

[2] See Libby *v.* Nicola, 21 Ohio St. 415, and cases cited above.

[3] Grosset *v.* Ogilvie, 5 Bro. C. C. 527; 2 Hawk. P. C. 543–4; McLane *v.* U. S., 6 Pet. 405; Osborn *v.* U. S., 91 U. S. 479; Knote *v.* U. S., 95 U. S. 149; U. S. *v.* Lancaster, 4 Wash. C. C. 64; U. S. *v.* Harris, 1 Abb. U. S. 110; Code *v.* Freeholders, etc., 26 N. J. L. 329, 341; State *v.* Youmans, 5 Ind. 280; Shoop *v.* Com., 3 Barr, 126; Frazier *v.* Com., 12 B. Mon. 369; State *v.* Williams, 1 Nott & McC. 26.

[4] U. S. *v.* Thomasson, 4 Biss. 336; The Laura, 19 Blatch. 562.

[5] Brown *v.* U. S., McCahon, 229; U. S. *v.* Fifteen Hundred Bales, etc., 16 Pitts. L. J. 130; U. S. *v.* Padelford, 9 Wall. 531; U. S. *v.* Armory, 35 Ga. 344.

[6] Armstrong's Foundry, 6 Wall. 766; U. S. Padelford, *ut sup.*

[7] See Confiscation Cases, 20 Wall. 92.

[8] See Tombes *v.* Ethrington, 1 Lev. 120; Cook *v.* Board, etc., 26 N. J. L. 326; 27 N. J. L. 657; 2 Dutch. 326; 3 Dutch. 637; but see Flournoy *v.* Atty.-Gen., 1 Kelly (Ga.) 606. See, gene-

Limited in impeachments.

§ 529. In *impeachments*, the pardoning power of the executive is usually restrained by constitutional limitation.[1]

And so as to contempts.

§ 530. *Commitments for contempt*, whether legislative or judicial, have been said in England to be out of the reach of the crown; though so far as concerns parliamentary contempt, imprisonment may be relieved by prorogation. There is a strong reason for this limitation in the fact that if the executive could discharge from imprisonment witnesses imprisoned for contempt, no trial, legislative or judicial, could proceed without executive consent.[2] In our American practice, however, the right of executive pardon in cases of contempt has been asserted,[3] and there are English intimations to the same effect.[4]

Must be delivered and accepted, but cannot be revoked.

§ 531. To give effect to a pardon, it must be delivered either to the pardoned party or his agent,[5] or the officer having him in charge,[6] and must be accepted.[7] After such delivery and acceptance it cannot be revoked.[8] But a delivery to the marshal has been held not to be a delivery to the prisoner,[9] though it has been held otherwise as to a delivery by a warden of the prison.[10] And a conditional or other pardon, not delivered, may be revoked by the successor in office of

rally, 2 Op. Atty.-Gen. 329; 3 Id. 418; 5 Id. 43; 5 Id. 532; 5 Id. 579; 6 Id. 293, 488; 8 Id. 291; 10 Id. 1, 452; 11 Id. 35, 445. See Mullee, in re, 7 Blatch. 23–25, where the court went so far as to held that the executive can even remit fines going to private persons. This, however, may be questioned. See infra, § 975. 4 Op. Atty.-Gen. 458; 5 Id. 579.

[1] See R. *v.* Boyes, 1 B. & S. 311; Story Const. §§ 782, 1496; 1 Johnson's Trial, 14; 2 Id. 497.

[2] That this should be so as to contempts to legislature, see Story Const. § 1503.

[3] Rhodes, in re, 65 N. C. 518; Hickey, ex parte, 4 Sm. & Mar. 751; State *v.* Sauvenet, 24 La. An. 119; 4 Op. Atty.-Gen. U. S. 458.

[4] See R. *v.* Watson, 2 Ld. Raym. 818.

[5] DePuy, in re, 3 Ben. 307, 316; Knapp *v.* Thomas, 39 Ohio St. 377; Lockhart, in re, 1 Disney, 185; Reno, ex parte, 66 Mo. 260; State *v.* Nichels, 26 Ark. 24.

[6] Com. *v.* Halleway, 44 Penn. St. 210; Powell, ex parte, 73 Ala. 577. See State *v.* Baptiste, 26 La. An. 134; otherwise as to amnesties. Lapeyre *v.* U. S., 17 Wall. 191; U. S. *v.* Hughes, 1 Bond. 574.

[7] U. S. *v.* Wilson, 7 Pet. 151; Callicott, in re, 8 Blatch. 89.

[8] Reno, ex parte, 66 Mo. 260.

[9] De Puy, ex parte, 10 Int. Rev. Rec. 34.

[10] Com. *v.* Halloway; Powell, ex parte, *ut sup.*

the executive by whom it was granted.[1] Personal delivery is not requisite in cases of amnesties or general pardon by proclamation.[2] *Acceptance* may be inferred from all the circumstances of the case; and ordinarily to show acceptance it is enough to prove that the party availed himself of any of the advantages of the pardon.[3]

§ 532. A pardon fraudulently procured will, it has been held, be treated by the courts as void.[4] And this fraud may be by suppression of the truth as well as by direct affirmation of falsehood.[5] Yet this test should be cautiously applied by the courts, for there are few applications for pardon in which some suppression or falsification may not be detected. It is natural that it should be so, when we view the condition of persons languishing in prison, or under sentence of death; and if departure from rigid accuracy in appealing for pardon be a reason for cancelling a pardon, there would be scarcely a single pardon that would stand. The proper course is to permit fraud to be set up to vacate a pardon only when it reaches the extent in which it would be admissible to vacate a judgment.[6] And an erroneous recital is no proof of fraud.[7]

Void when fraudulent.

§ 533. Whether an executive can impose conditions in pardons has been doubted. It may now, however, be considered as settled that such conditions may, at common law, be made, and that on their violation the pardon does not take final effect, and the original sentence remains in force.[8] This is eminently the case when the offender, after being

Conditional pardons are valid.

[1] Ibid. See cases cited in prior notes to this section.

[2] State *v.* Blalock, Phil. N. C. 242.

[3] Callicot, in re, 8 Blatch. 89, 96; Edymoin, in re, 8 How. N. Y. Pr. 478; Reno, ex parte, 66 Mo. 266. That a party claiming the benefit of a pardon must show that he complied with its conditions, see Haym *v.* U. S., 7 Ct. Claims, 443; Waring *v.* U. S., Id. 501; Scott *v.* U. S., 8 Id. 457.

[4] 2 Hawk. P. C. ss. 9, 10, p. 535; R. *v.* Maddocks, 1 Sid. 430; Com. *v.* Halloway, 44 Penn. St. 210; Com. *v.* Kelly, 9 Phila. 586; State *v.* Leak, 5 Ind. 359; State *v.* McIntire, 1 Jones N. C. 1; Dominick *v.* Bowdoin, 44 Ga. 357. That the motives of the executive cannot be inquired into, see State *v.* Ward, 9 Heisk. 100. As to analogy of fraudulent acquittals, see supra, § 451.

[5] State *v.* Leak, 5 Ind. 359.

[6] See Edymoin, in re, 8 How. Pr. 478. In Knapp *v.* Thomas, 39 Ohio St. 377, it was held, after careful argument, that the court would release on *habeas corpus* a person convicted who has received a full pardon, though such pardon was obtained by false representations.

[7] Com. *v.* Ahl, 43 Penn. St. 53.

[8] 4 Bl. Com. 401; Bac. Abr. tit.

released on condition he leaves the country, refuses to go, or surreptitiously returns.[1] But allowance in calculating departure will be made for sickness or incapacity.[2]

By the Massachusetts statute of 1867, c. 301, convicts violating the conditions of conditional pardons may be rearrested, but the rearrest does not prolong the sentence.[3]

When a pardon is granted with a condition annexed, the fact that the person pardoned is in prison, and must accept the condition before availing himself of the pardon, does not constitute such

"Pardon" E.; Co. Lit. 274 *b*; R. *v.* Foxworthy, 7 Mod. 153; R. *v.* Thorpe, 1 Leach, 391; R. *v.* Madan, 1 Leach, 224; R. *v.* Aickless, 1 Leach, 294; Wells, ex parte, 18 How. U. S. 307; Osborn *v.* U. S., 91 U. S. 474; U. S. *v.* Six Lots of Ground, 1 Woods, 234; Haym *v.* U. S., 7 Ct. of Cl. 443; Ruhl, in re, 5 Sawyer, 186; Scott *v.* U. S., 7 Ct. of Cl. 457; Parker *v.* Stevens, 24 Pick. 277; West, in re, 111 Mass. 443; People *v.* Potter, 1 Parker C. R. 47; S. C., 1 Edm. Sel. Cas. 235; Flavel's case, 8 W. & S. 197; Com. *v.* Philadelphia, 4 Brewst. 320; Com. *v.* Fowler, 4 Call, 35; Com. *v.* Haggerty, 4 Brewst. 329; Lee *v.* Murphy, 22 Grat. 789; State *v.* Twitty, 4 Hawks, 248; State *v.* Smith, 1 Bailey, 283; State *v.* Addington, 2 Bailey, 516; State *v.* Chancellor, 1 Strobh. 347; State *v.* Fuller, 1 McCord, 178; Arthur *v.* Craig, 48 Iowa, 264; Roberts *v.* State, 14 Mo. 138; Marks, ex parte, 64 Cal. 29; Rivers *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 177; 5 J. Q. Adams's Memoirs, 392; see, however, Com. *v.* Fowler, 4 Call (Va.), 35. As to Ohio Constitution see Libby *v.* Nicola, 21 Ohio St. 414; Sterling *v.* Drake, 29 Ohio St. 457. The Arkansas Constitution authorizes such pardons. Hunt, ex parte, 5 Eng. Ark. 284; Terr. *v.* Webb, 2 New Mex. 147. For a case of rejection of conditional pardon, see O'Brien's case, 1 Towns. St. Tr. 469. For federal statute, see Rev. St. § 5330.

That on refusal to comply with pardon the original sentence revives, see, further, Madon's case, Leach C. C. 220; Watson's case, 9 Ad. & E. 731; Waring *v.* U. S. 7 Ct. of Cl., 504. But inability at the time to perform the condition will be an excuse. Ely *v.* Hallett, 2 Caines, 57.

That no new prosecution is necessary, but that defendant may be summarily arrested on execution, see Arthur *v.* Craig, supra, and so on judicial warrant. Com. *v.* Superintendent, 4 Brews. 320; State *v.* Smith, 1 Bailey, S. C. 283.

As affirming the power in the President of the United States to impose conditions on pardons and to substitute a milder punishment for death, see 1 Op. 327, 342, 482 (Wirt); 5 Op. 43; (Tousey, a case of court-martial) 5 Op. 368 (Crittenden); 14 Op. 599 (Williams). See Wells, ex parte, 18 How. 307; U. S. *v.* Wilson, 7 Pet. 150.

[1] Ibid. Such condition, however, will be strictly construed in favor of liberty, and here it has been held that the condition, "depart without delay," is satisfied by leaving the State, although after the lapse of some time the party returned. Hunt, ex parte, 5 Eng. Ark. 284.

[2] People *v.* James, 2 Caines, 57.

[3] West's case, 111 Mass. 443.

duress as will vacate his acceptance of the condition.[1] When the condition is for the defendant's benefit, acceptance may be inferred from acceptance of any of the privileges of the pardon.[2]

An inoperative or illegal condition is worthless, and the pardon to which it is attached is unconditional.[3] But a condition that the party (convicted of larceny) should abstain from the use of intoxicating liquors is not inoperative or illegal;[4] nor is a condition that the party will not by virtue of it claim confiscated property;[5] nor a condition that the party will leave the State permanently.[6]

Pardons do not reach second conviction.

§ 534. A person convicted for the second time of a felony, and liable to be sentenced to a cumulative statutory punishment, cannot plead, in exoneration of the increased punishment, an executive pardon of the former conviction.[7]

Pardon must recite conviction.

§ 535. As we have already seen, retrospective pardons are construed indulgently, and if the offence pardoned be substantially described this will be enough. Yet when it is sought to rehabilitate a convict, or to otherwise cancel a conviction by means of a pardon, the pardon must accurately recite the conviction,[8] and it covers only the offence recited.[9] But a mere technical variance will not make the pardon inoperative.[10]

Calling a witness as

§ 536. That an accomplice was called as a witness by the prosecution is not a ground for a plea in bar.[11] The

[1] Greathouse's case, 2 Abbott U. S. 383; Wells, ex parte, 18 Wall. 307.

[2] Victor, in re, 31 Ohio St. 206.

[3] See People *v.* Pease, 3 Johns. Ca. 333; People *v.* Potter, 1 Parker C. R. 47; S. C., 1 Edm. S. C. 235; Com. *v.* Fowler, 4 Call, 35.

[4] Arthur *v.* Craig, 48 Iowa, 264. To same effect is a pardon by Governor Cleveland, noticed in 27 Alb. L. J. 241.

[5] Osborn *v.* U. S., 91 U. S. 474; Lee *v.* Murphy, 22 Grat. 789.

[6] Lockhart, ex parte, 1 Disney, 105; State *v.* Smith, 1 Bailey S. C. 283. But, as we have seen, leaving the State instantly is satisfied by leaving and coming back. Hunt, ex parte, 5 Eng. (Ark.) 84.

[7] Mount *v.* Com., 2 Duvall, 93.

[8] R. *v.* Gillis, 11 Cox C. C. 69; R. *v.* Harrod, 2 C. & K. 294; 2 Cox C. C. 242; People *v.* Bowen, 43 Cal. 439; Stetter's case, reported in 7th ed. of this work, § 766.

[9] Weimer, ex parte, 8 Biss. 321; State *v.* Foley, 15 Nev. 64.

[10] Com. *v.* Ohio, etc. R. R., 1 Grant, 329. This is in conformity with the practice in respect to records of prior conviction or acquittal where set up in bar, in which cases identity may be proved by parol. Supra, § 481.

[11] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 439; U. S. *v.* Ford, 99 U. S. 594; U. S. *v.* Lee, 4 McL.

State's evidence is not a pardon.

practice is in such case to grant a pardon; but this is solely for the discretion of the executive.[1]

Foreign pardons operative as to crimes within sovereign's jurisdiction.

§ 537. To *foreign* pardons, the analogy of foreign convictions may be applied:[2] "Was the defendant within the jurisdiction of the pardoning sovereign at the time of the pardon? Was the offence committed within the territory of such sovereign? In the latter case, a pardon, based on the ground that no offence was committed, is a *lex generalis*, declaring that the act is not in that land to be made liable to criminal punishment. But in the former case it should appear, to give extra-territorial force to such pardon, first, that the offender was in the territory of the pardoning prince to such effect that he could there be prosecuted by the laws of such territory for the particular offence; secondly, that by the law of the country of the second trial the courts of the country of the first trial had jurisdiction; and thirdly, that the pardon should have been regular and fair, and after a due examination of the facts. Should these conditions exist, the tendency is, in municipal prosecutions, to regard a foreign pardon as conclusive. In prosecutions political, or semi-political, however, the case would be reversed. It would be preposterous, for instance, to suppose that a prosecution in the United States for treasonable offences against the United States committed in Germany, or for perjury in Germany before a United States consul, could be barred by a pardon by the German sovereign within whose territory the offence was committed. The true issue, both here and in respect to acquittals, is, had the sovereign thus intervening the jurisdiction to pronounce a *lex generalis* as to the particular case? If so, his action is final. If otherwise, it is not."[3]

103; Com. *v.* Brown, 103 Mass. 422; Dabney's case, 1 Robinson (Va.), 696; Newton *v.* State, 15 Fla. 610. See Com. *v.* Woodside, 105 Mass. 594; Lindsay *v.* People, 63 N. Y. 143; State *v.* Graham, 41 N. J. 15; State *v.* Lyon, 81 N. C. 600; People *v.* Bruzzo, 24 Cal. 41.

[1] See fully Whart. Crim. Ev. § 443.

In Wright *v.* Riudskoff, 43 Wis. 344, it was said that it would be a fraud upon the court and an obstruction of public justice, if the public prosecutor should enter into an agreement, unsanctioned by the court (if such sanction could be given in such a case), offering immunity or clemency to several defendants, in several indictments, upon the condition that one of them become a witness for the prosecution upon still other indictments.

[2] Supra, § 441.

[3] Whart. Confl. of L. § 938.

A federal pardon, therefore, cannot remove penalties imposed by a State court.[1]

The question of removal of disability of witnesses by pardon is discussed in another volume.[2]

[1] See Hunter, ex parte, 2 W. Va. 122; Ridley *v.* Sherbrook, 3 Cold. (Tenn.) 569. But see Jones *v.* Board, 56 Miss. 766.

[2] Whart. Crim Ev. § 365.

CHAPTER IX.

PRESENCE OF DEFENDANT IN COURT.

Defendant's appearance must be in person, § 540.
In felonies must be in custody, § 540 *a*.
Right may be waived in misdemeanors of nature of civil process, § 541.
In such cases waiver may be by attorney, § 542.
Removal of defendant for turbulent conduct does not militate against rule, § 543.
Involuntary illness not a waiver, § 544.
Presence essential at arraignment and empanelling, § 545.
Also at reception of testimony, § 546.
Also at charge of court, § 547.
But not at making and arguing of motions, § 548.
Presence essential at reception of verdict, § 549.
And at sentence, § 550.
Presence presumed to be continuous, § 551.

§ 540. In trials for cases in which corporal punishment is assigned, the defendant's appearance must ordinarily be in person, and must so appear on record.[1] There can be no judgment of conviction taken by default.[2] Nor does the necessity for the defendant's presence cease with the opening of the case. Absence on his part during the trial, unless the absence be necessary and temporary,[3] will be ground for a new trial; and the fact that the presence does not appear on record is ground for writ of error.[4]

Defendant's appearance must be in person.

[1] That a court may amend its record during term to show this, see Johnson *v.* Com., 115 Penn. St. 369.

[2] Dunn *v.* Com., 6 Barr, 387; Hamilton *v.* Com., 16 Penn. St. 121; Sperry *v.* Com., 9 Leigh, 623; Brooks *v.* People, 88 Ill. 327; Scaggs *v.* State, 8 S. & M. 722; State *v.* Cross, 27 Mo. 332; Gladden *v.* State, 12 Fla. 562; and other cases cited, § 875.

[3] Absence by a prisoner for five minutes in answering a telegram while his counsel was cross-examining a witness is held not to vitiate the trial. People *v.* Bragle, 88 N. Y. 585.

[4] See infra, §§ 540 *a*, *et seq.*, 875; State *v.* Johnson, 35 La. An. 208; Martin *v.* State, 41 Ark. 364. But a formal averment of defendant's presence during trial is not necessary, when it can be inferred from the record. Lawrence *v.* Com., 30 Grat. 845.

"Never has there heretofore been a prisoner tried for felony," said a late eminent judge, "in his absence. No precedent can be found in which his presence is not a postulate of every part of the record. He is arraigned at the bar; he pleads in person at the bar; and if he is convicted, he is asked at the bar what he has to say why judgment should not be pronounced

In misdemeanors, as will presently be seen, this right may be waived in cases in which no corporal punishment is imposed. In felonies, or cases involving corporal punishment, it can ordinarily neither be waived nor dispensed with.[1]

Defendant to be in custody at trial.

§ 540 *a*. In felonies and high misdemeanors, the defendant, though previously on bail, is in custody when the trial opens. His bail bring him to court, and their duty is then discharged;[2] though in offences of a lighter grade, where the punishment is not necessarily corporal, this strictness is not exacted.[3] If violent and obstreperous, or if escape be threatened, a defendant may be placed in shackles during trial.[4] Such restraint, however, should not be imposed except in cases of immediate necessity,[5] and where it appears, without such necessity, by the record, there will be a reversal.[6] The usual position of a prisoner is at the bar, or in the "dock," as it is sometimes called.[7]

against him. These things are matters of substance, and not peculiar to trials for murder; they belong to every trial for felony at the common law, because the mitigation of the punishment does not change the character of the crime." Gibson, C. J., in Prine *v.* Com., 18 Penn. St. 104, as quoted and adopted by Williams, J., in Dougherty *v.* Com., 69 Penn. St. 286. See, to same effect, Hooker *v.* Com., 13 Grat. 763; State *v.* Craton, 6 Ired. 164; Dyson *v.* State, 26 Miss. 362; Rolls *v.* State, 52 Miss. 391.

In Massachusetts, by statute, "no person indicted for a felony shall be tried unless personally present during the trial; persons indicted for smaller offences may, at their own request, by leave of the court, be put on trial in their absence, by an attorney duly authorized for the purpose." Gen. Stat. c. 172, § 8.

In Ohio, by statute, "no person indicted for a felony shall be tried unless personally present during the trial. Persons indicted for misdemeanor may, at their own request, by leave of court, be put on trial in their absence. The request shall be in writing, and entered on the journal of the court." See Rose *v.* State, 20 Ohio, 31; Laws, vol. 66, p. 307. In Arkansas a similar statutory provision exists. Sweeden *v.* State, 19 Ark. 205.

[1] Reardon *v.* State, 44 Ark. 331; Smith *v.* People, 8 Col. 457.

[2] R. *v.* Simpson, 10 Mod. 248; R. *v.* Douglass, C. & M. 193; People *v.* Beauchamp, 49 Cal. 41; People *v.* Williams, 59 Cal. 674.

[3] Infra, § 541; R. *v.* Carlile, 6 C. & P. 636.

[4] See Burn's Just. tit. Arraignment, Talf. ed.; Kel. 8; Cent. L. J. Aug. 16, 1878; 13 Cent. L. J. 426; Poe *v.* State, 10 Lea, 673; Faire *v.* State, 58 Ala. 74; Lee *v.* State, 51 Miss. 566.

[5] State *v.* Kring, 1 Mo. Ap. 438; S. C., 64 Mo. 591. See R. *v.* Rogers, 3 Burr, 1812; People *v.* Harington, 42 Cal. 165.

[6] Torr *v.* Kelly, 2 New Mexico, 297; though see Poe *v.* State, 10 Lea, 673.

[7] R. *v.* Egan, 9 C. & P. 485; R. *v.* Suletta, 1 C. & K. 225; 1 Cox C. C. 20.

§ 541. As to arraignment and plea, the defendant can waive the right to be present, it has been ruled, in such misdemeanors as partake of the nature of civil process, or in which the punishment is not necessarily corporal, in which cases he can appear and plead by attorney, and even be absent during trial.[1] But this privilege will not be allowed in cases where the court is not satisfied that imprisonment will not in any case be part of the sentence.[2] And so far as concerns presence in court during trial, there is a strong line of authority to the effect that such a waiver will not be held good in capital cases.[3]

Right may be waived in misdemeanors of the nature of civil process.

[1] Infra, § 701; U. S. *v.* Shepherd, 1 Hugh, 520; U. S. *v.* Mayo, 1 Curt. C. C. 433; U. S. *v.* Sanlos, 5 Blatch. U. S. 104; Tracy, ex parte, 25 Vt. 93; Lynch *v.* Com., 88 Penn. St. 189; Price *v.* Com., 33 Grat. 819; Turpin *v.* State, 80 Ind. 148; Bloomington *v.* Heiland, 67 Ill. 278; People *v.* Ebner, 23 Cal. 158; Martin *v.* State, 40 Ark. 364; and see, as indicating a wider range, Sahlinger *v.* People 102 Ill. 241. In People *v.* Higgins, 59 Cal. 557, the court held that such a flight was ground for discharging the jury. On the general question of waiver by misconduct, see, also, State *v.* Reckards, 21 Minn. 47; Douglass *v.* State, 3 Wis. 820; State *v.* Epps, 76 N. C. 55; Cook *v.* State, 26 Ga. 593; State *v.* Hughes, 1 Ala. (N. S.) 657; Dixon *v.* State, 13 Fla. 744; State *v.* White, 19 Kansas, 445; People *v.* Corbett, 28 Cal. 330; Owen *v.* State, 38 Ark. 572.

As to the constitutional question involved, see infra, § 733.

That the court may refuse to sanction a waiver, see Bridges *v.* State, 38 Ark. 510.

[2] U. S. *v.* Mayo, 1 Curt. C. C. 433; Tracy, ex parte, 25 Vt. 93; State *v.* Mann, 27 Conn. 281; Maurer *v.* People, 43 N. Y. 1; People *v.* Taylor, 3 Denio, 98, note; Com. *v.* Shaw, 1 Crumrine (Pitts.) 492; Rose *v.* State, 20 Ohio St. 31; State *v.* Jenkins, 84 N. C. 812; Prine *v.* Com., 18 Penn. St. 103; Jackson *v.* Com., 19 Grat. 656; Com. *v.* Crump, 1 Va. Cas. 172; People *v.* Ebner, 23 Cal. 158; Warren *v.* State, 19 Ark. 214; Bridges *v.* State, 38 Ark. 510; Owen *v.* State, 38 Ark. 512; Nomaque *v.* People, Breese, 109. Infra, § 876. See Martin *v.* State, 41 Ark. 364.

[3] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 144, citing Smith *v.* Com., 14 S. & R. 69. Under Kansas statutes there can be generally no waiver, State *v.* Myrick, 38 Kan. 238. In Hopt *v.* Utah, 110 U. S. 574. Harlan, J. gave the opinion of the court as follows:—

"We are of opinion that it was not within the power of the accused or his counsel to dispense with the statutory requirements as to his personal presence at the trial. The argument to the contrary necessarily proceeds upon the ground that he alone is concerned as to the mode by which he may be deprived of his life or liberty, and that the chief object of the prosecution is to punish him for the crime charged. But this is a mistaken view as well of the relations which the accused holds to the public as of the end of human punishment. The natural life, says Blackstone, 'cannot legally be disposed of or destroyed by any individual,

§ 542. On principle, the better practice would be for the defendant to appear in court and there make the waiver.[1] But it has been held that it is sufficient if he execute, in the excepted cases of *quasi* civil prosecutions, a special power of attorney for this purpose, filing it in court.[2] In other cases the waiver must be by defendant personally.[3]

In such cases may be waiver by attorney.

§ 543. That a waiver may be so implied, was held in a trial for perjury, in the United States Circuit Court for New York, where the defendant's conduct during a portion of the trial was so violent that it was necessary to remove him from the court-room, and place him in sequestration.[4] And unless such a check be applied, the defendant, by violent and turbulent conduct, could at any time either bring his trial to an end, or compel its extension under circumstances destructive of public decorum. On the same reasoning rests a case already noticed, in which it was held in Ohio that a defendant in a case of counterfeiting, in which he was under bail, could not stop a trial by running away from the court.[5] And it was held in Illinois, in 1882, that where a prisoner, on trial for burglary, escaped from the court-room, this was a waiver of the privilege, after which the court might proceed to final judgment in his absence.[6]

Removal of defendant for turbulent conduct does not militate against rule.

§ 544. Involuntary illness is not to be regarded as a waiver; and hence, in an English trial for misdemeanor, where the defendant was taken ill, and was necessarily removed from the court-house, the judge discharged the jury, though the defendants' counsel consented to going on in

Involuntary illness not a waiver.

neither by the person himself, nor by any other of his fellow-creatures, merely upon their own authority.' 1 Bl. Com. 133." See Elick *v.* Torr, 1 Wash. Ter. 136.

On general doctrine of waiver see infra, § 595, and see, also, Mirick *v.* People, 8 Col. 440.

That temporary absence during argument in non-capital cases (counsel being present), does not vitiate, see State *v.* Paylor, 89 N. C. 539; State *v.* Sheets, 89 N. C. 544.

[1] See People *v.* Petry, 2 Hilt. 523.

[2] U. S. *v.* Mayo, 1 Curt. C. C. 433. The right of the court to remove the defendant from the court-room under such circumstances was discussed by me in a note to Guiteau's case, 10 Fed. Rep. 161.

[3] Shipp *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 46.

[4] U. S. *v.* Davis, 6 Blatch. C. C. 464.

[5] Fight *v.* State, 7 Ohio, 180.

[6] Sahlinger *v.* People, 102 Ill. 241, citing Wilson *v.* State, 2 Ohio St. 319; Rose *v.* State, 20 Ohio St. 33; Holliday *v.* People, 4 Gilm. 111; Hill *v.* State, 17 Wis. 697. See, also, Barton *v.* State, 67 Ga. 653.

his absence.[1] It is otherwise as to temporary voluntary absence during one of the speeches of counsel.[2]

Presence essential at arraignment and empanelling.

§ 545. By the old common law form, each juror is required to look on the prisoner and the prisoner on the juryman, before the juryman is sworn. Nor can the prisoner's presence at this period be dispensed with or waived in any cases in which corporal punishment may be inflicted.[3] Hence in felonies the record must show defendant to have been present at the arraignment,[4] and also at the calling and testing of the jurors.[5]

Also at reception of testimony.

§ 546. The constitutions of most of the United States, incorporating in this an old common law principle, provide that the accused, in criminal cases, shall have a right to meet the witnesses against him face to face. Even where this rule is not a part of the fundamental law of the land, it is held obligatory by the courts.[6] This rule, even in capital cases, however, does not exclude dying declarations; nor the testimony of deceased witnesses previously taken on a trial of the same issue.[7] The defendant, also, as has been seen, may in misdemeanors waive this privilege either expressly or by implication; and in California, even in a murder case, it has been held that a defendant's absence from necessity or other strong reasons, during part of a trial, was no ground for reversing the sentence, if no prejudice arose to him from his absence.[8] A defendant, also, may, to defeat

[1] R. *v.* Streek, 2 C. & P. 413.

[2] State *v.* Grate, 68 Mo. 22.

[3] Dougherty *v.* Com., 69 Penn. St. 286; Dunn *v.* Com., 6 Barr, 385; Rolls *v.* State, 52 Miss. 391.

[4] Jacobs *v.* Com., 5 S. & R. 315; Hall *v.* State, 40 Ala. 698; State *v.* Jones, 61 Mo. 232; Dodge *v.* People, 4 Neb. 220. See, however, Tuttle *v.* State, 6 Baxt. 556. In Texas this is limited to capital cases. Nolan *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 585; Grisham *v.* State, 19 Tex. Ap. 504.

[5] Hopt *v.* Utah, 110 U. S. 545; State *v.* Sutfin, 22 W. Va. 771. As to pleading not guilty in defendant's absence by his attorney, see State *v.* Jones, 70 Iowa, 505.

[6] See People *v.* Perkins, 1 Wend. 91; Dougherty *v.* Com., 69 Penn. St. 286; Dunn *v.* Com., 6 Barr, 385; Jackson *v.* Com., 19 Grat. 656; Andrews *v.* State, 2 Sneed, 550; State *v.* Hughes, 2 Ala. 102; State *v.* Cross, 27 Mo. 332; State *v.* Smith, 90 Mo. 57; People *v.* Kohler, 5 Cal. 72. In State *v.* Greer, 22 W. Va. 546, it was held that such absence was not made less fatal by reading the testimony to him and telling the jury to disregard all done in his absence.

[7] Whart. Cr. Ev. §§ 227, 277.

[8] People *v.* Bealoba, 17 Cal. 389. And see U. S. *v.* Santos, 5 Blatch. C. C. 104; Rutherford *v.* Com., 78 Ky. 639.

The defendant's absence from the

a motion for a continuance, agree to accept the statement of an absent witness as if it were proved.[1] But ordinarily no testimony should be taken in the defendant's absence. Even if the jury go to view the place of the crime, he should be present.[2]

Also at charge of court.

§ 547. It is clear that the defendant must be present at the charge of the court.[3] Even where, after the jury had retired to deliberate upon their verdict, they returned into court and asked certain questions of the court as to what had been the evidence on particular points, to which the court replied, giving the information requested in the defendant's absence, it was held that this was error, for which the conviction must be reversed,[4] and this though defendant's counsel were present.[5]

Presence not necessary during making and arguing of motions.

§ 548. Presence at the making and arguing of motions cannot be exacted as an absolute rule, as there are some cases—*e. g.*, motions to bring the prisoner into court—which presuppose his absence, and other cases, such as motions of course, in which to require his presence would be productive of great inconvenience, and might work sometimes prejudicially to himself.[6] In misdemeanors in which the punishment is not corporal, it is clear that such presence, even as to motions for new trial, is not necessary.[7] And in the higher order

court-room for a few moments on business does not, under the New York statute, vitiate the proceedings. People *v.* Bragle, 88 N. Y. 585; S. C., 26 Hun, 378. As to temporary absence of defendant during argument, see State *v.* Paylor, 89 N. C. 539.

[1] Infra, § 595. See State *v.* Polson, 29 Iowa, 133, as to consent curing reception of evidence from a former trial, and People *v.* Murray, 52 Mich. 288, as to consent to receiving depositions. And see Mirick *v.* People, 8 Col. 440.

[2] Infra, § 707. See Rutherford *v.* Com., 78 Ky. 639.

[3] Jackson *v.* Com., 19 Grat. 656; State *v.* Blackwelder, 1 Phillips (N. C.), 38; Wade *v.* State, 12 Ga. 25; Wilt *v.* State, 5 Cold. 11; People *v.* Kohler, 5 Cal. 72. See infra, §§ 799, 830. In Meece *v.* Com., 78 Ky. 586, it was held that absence at part of charge was not error where no prejudice was shown.

[4] Maurer *v.* People, 43 N. Y. 1; Wade *v.* State, 12 Ga. 25; State *v.* Davenport, 33 La. An. 231; though see Jackson *v.* Com., 19 Grat. 656. Infra, § 830.

In Ohio, however, it has been ruled not to be ground for new trial that the court, in the absence of the parties, sent a copy of the statutes of the State to the jury, calling their attention to particular sections. Gandolfo *v.* State, 11 Ohio St. 114; and see State *v.* Pike, 65 Me. 111; and cases cited infra, § 830.

[5] Bonner *v.* State, 67 Ga. 510.

[6] See Godfreidson *v.* People, 88 Ill. 284; State *v.* Elkins, 63 Mo. 159; Hall *v.* State, 40 Ala. 698; State *v.* Outs, 30 La. An. 1155.

[7] R. *v.* Parkinson, 2 Den. C. C. 459.

of misdemeanors, and in felonies, the courts are not now disposed, on the hearing of motions, to insist on the defendant's presence.[1] Hence his absence will not invalidate such proceedings,[2] unless in matters where his identification or assent is required.[3] On the making of a motion for new trial the defendant need not be present.[4]

In motions for arrest of judgment, and in error, the old practice was to require the attendance of the defendant.[5] In the United States, this presence has not been generally required;[6] nor is it usual to exact it in proceedings in error;[7] and in England, at least in misdemeanors, appearance on proceedings in error will not be required, where it appears that the defendant, who is plaintiff in error, cannot attend without great inconvenience and risk of health.[8] But at the decision, at least, of motions for new trial, the defendant should be present.[9]

Presence essential at reception of verdict.

§ 549. In felonies, presence at verdict is essential; and there have been cases where the courts have refused to permit this right to be waived.[10] Thus, a verdict of burglary was set aside in Pennsylvania, when it was taken in the defendant's absence, although his counsel waived his right to be

[1] Jewell *v.* Com., 22 Penn. St. 94; R. *v.* Boltz, 8 D. & R. 65; 5 B. & C. 334; R. *v.* Hollingberry, 6 D. & R. 344; 4 B. & C. 329; People *v.* Van Wyck, 2 Caines, 333; though see R. *v.* Caudwell, 17 Q. B. 503; R. *v.* Scully, 1 Alc. & Napier, 262; Epps *v.* State, 102 Ind. 539; State *v.* Clark, 32 La. An. 558; infra, § 892.

[2] Com. *v.* Costello, 121 Mass. 371; State *v.* Harris, 34 La. An. 118; and see Com. *v.* Andrews, 97 Mass. 543; Anon., 31 Me. 592. But see, *contra*, Hooker *v.* Com., 13 Grat. 763; Long *v.* State, 52 Miss. 23.

[3] See Simpson *v.* State, 56 Miss. 295; Rothschild *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 519.

[4] State *v.* Lewis, 80 Mo. 110.

[5] R. *v.* Spragg, 2 Burr. 930; 1 W. Black. 209.

[6] See People *v.* Ormsby, 48 Mich. 494; Territory *v.* Young, 2 New Mexico, 93; but see, as requiring presence, State *v.* Hoffman, 78 Mo. 250.

[7] Clark *v.* People, 1 Park. C. R. 360; Donelly *v.* State, 2 Dutch. 464, 601; State *v.* Buhs, 18 Mo. 319. Waiver will be presumed from attendance of counsel without objection to the defendant's absence. State *v.* David, 14 S. C. 428.

[8] Murray *v.* R., 3 D. & L. 100; 7 Q. B. 700. That the defendant need not be required to be present on the argument of motions for new trials and in arrest, see People *v.* Vail, 6 Abb. (N. Y.) Sel. Ca. 206; 57 How. Pr. 81; State *v.* Jefcoat, 20 S. C. 383.

[9] Berkley *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 122; see Griffin *v.* State, 34 Ohio St. 299. That this is necessary in capital cases, see Simpson *v.* State, 56 Miss. 267. That the right may be waived, see State *v.* Somnier, 33 La. An. 237.

[10] Supra, § 541; infra, §§ 733, 747; Green *v.* People, 3 Col. 68.

present.[1] Where, however, the defendant, being out on bail, happens to be voluntarily absent for a few moments, during which time the jury come in and render their verdict, his counsel being present, it has been held, and not without reason, that such inadvertence is not ground for a new trial;[2] and so where the defendant escapes as the jury is coming in.[3] On the other hand, when the defendant is a prisoner in custody of the court, absence during rendition of the verdict, without waiver, vitiates the proceedings, since his absence is not under such circumstances to be regarded as voluntary.[4] And in fact this, as we have seen, is exacted by the common law form, which requires the jury to look on the prisoner and the prisoner to look on the jury, when the verdict is rendered. If the verdict in a case of felony is taken in the defendant's absence this is a mistrial, but does not, in felonies not capital, entitle the defendant to a

[1] Prine *v.* Com., 18 Penn. St. 103; Dougherty *v.* Com., 63 Penn. St., 386; Jackson *v.* Com., 19 Grat. 656; Andrew *v.* State, 2 Sneed, 550; Smith *v.* State, 51 Wis. 615.

[2] U. S. *v.* Santos, 5 Blatch. C. C. 104 (see, as to misdemeanors, Sawyer *v.* Joiner, 16 Vt. 497); People *v.* Stephen, 19 N. Y. 549; Holmes *v.* Com., 25 Penn. St. 221; Barton *v.* State, 67 Ga. 653; Hill *v.* State, 17 Wis. 675; State *v.* Vaughan, 29 Iowa, 286. As doubting, see R. *v.* Streek, 2 C. & P. 413; and see supra, § 540.

In Lynch *v.* Com., 88 Penn. St. 189, it was held that where a prisoner on trial for larceny who is out upon bail has been present during the entire trial, but voluntarily absents himself just before the bringing in of the verdict, it is not error for the court, having had the prisoner called, to receive the verdict and sentence the prisoner without first having him brought in.

It has been held in Virginia that presence is not necessary when the jury is brought into court, during its deliberation, as a mere matter of form. Lawrence *v.* Com., 30 Grat. 845.

In Georgia it is held that ordinarily the record need not show presence. Smith *v.* State, 59 Ga. 514; Smith *v.* State, 60 Ga. 430.

[3] State *v.* Kelly, 97 N. C. 404. See supra, § 540.

[4] R. *v.* Duke, Holt, 299; 1 Salk. 400; State *v.* Hurlbut, 1 Root, 90; People *v.* Winchell, 7 Cow. 521; Tabler *v.* State, 34 Ohio St. 127 (but see Fight *v.* State, 7 Ohio, 180); State *v.* Hughes, 2 Ala. 102; Cook *v.* State, 60 Ala. 39; Stubbs *v.* State, 49 Miss. 716; State *v.* Cross, 27 Mo. 332; State *v.* Braunschwieg, 36 Mo. 397 (under statute); State *v.* Muir, 32 Kan. 481; State *v.* Ford, 30 La. An. 311; State *v.* Bailey, 30 La. An. 326; Clark *v.* State, 4 Humph. 254; State *v.* France, 1 Tenn. 434.

That the absence of one defendant does not preclude a verdict against a defendant who is present, see supra, § 313; State *v.* Bradley, 30 La. An. Pt. I. 326.

As to absence of counsel, see Lassiter *v.* State, 67 Ga. 739.

As to sealed verdict, see infra, § 740; and see, also, supra, § 540.

discharge.[1] And in some States this is the case even in capital cases.[2]

The better view is that in capital, if not in all felonies, the record must show that the defendant was present at trial, verdict, and sentence,[3] though as to misdemeanors less strictness is insisted on.[4]

§ 550. Absence of the defendant is not permitted at sentence in any case punishable corporally.[5] Where, however, the offence is a misdemeanor, partaking of the nature of a civil process, and where the punishment is simply a fine, such absence, the defendant being under recognizance to submit to the sentence of the court, has been allowed.[6]

And at sentence.

[1] State *v.* Jenkins, 84 N. C. 812; supra, § 518.

[2] Supra, § 507; State *v.* Conkle, 16 W. Va. 736.

[3] Dunn *v.* Com., 6 Barr, 385; Dougherty *v.* Com., 69 Penn. St. 286; Nolan *v.* State, 55 Ga. 521; Sylvester *v.* State, 71 Ala. 17; Stubbs *v.* State, 49 Miss. 716; Rolls *v.* State, 52 Miss. 391; State *v.* Davenport, 33 La. An. 231; Hartigan *v.* Terri., 1 Wash. Terr. 447. Infra, §§ 741, 906. See, however, Smith *v.* State, 60 Ga. 430; State *v.* Collins, 33 La. An. 152.

[4] Stephens *v.* People, 19 N. Y. 549; Holmes *v.* Co., 25 Penn. St. 221; State *v.* Craton, 6 Ired. 164; Grimm *v.* People, 14 Mich. 300.

In those States and in those cases in which there is no constitutional bar, the setting aside the verdict for this cause does not interfere with a retrial. People *v.* Perkins, 1 Wend. 91; State *v.* Hughes, 2 Ala. 102; Younger *v.* State, 2 W. Va. 579.

But a verdict rendered in a felony when prisoner is not in court, and a consequent discharge of jury, works in capital cases an acquittal of the defendant. Cook *v.* State, 60 Ala. 39.

In Texas, defendant's presence is by statute not necessary in misdemeanors. Gage *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 259; see Mapes *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 85. And in Illinois, if a prisoner escapes just before verdict, this does not interfere with the verdict being taken. Sahlinger *v.* People, 102 Ill. 241. See, also, Barton *v.* State, 67 Ga. 633.

[5] State *v.* Hurlbut, 1 Root, 90; Dougherty *v.* Com., 69 Penn. St. 286; Peters *v.* State, 39 Ala. 681; Stubbs *v.* State, 49 Miss. 716; Rolls *v.* State, 52 Miss. 391; see Waterman, ex parte, 33 Fed. Rep. 29. See People *v.* Sprague, 54 Cal. 92; and apparently *contra*, Price *v.* Com., 33 Grat. 819.

But if present when the verdict is returned, but absent when sentence is pronounced, he is not entitled to a new trial, but only to a new *sentence*. If the former judgment is reversed on error for the prisoner's absence, he is simply remanded for sentence according to law. Cole *v.* State, 5 Eng. 318; Kelly *v.* State, 3 Sm. & Mar. 518; Cent. L. J. Jan. 25, 1878. And see Lynch *v.* Com., 88 Penn. St. 189, cited supra.

[6] R. *v.* Templeman, 1 Salk. 55; Duke's case, Holt, 399; R. *v.* Constable, 7 D. & R. 663; R. *v.* Boltz, 8 D. & R. 663; 5 B. & C. 334; U. S. *v.* Mayo, 1 Curt. C. C. 435; Son *v.* People, 12 Wend. 344; People *v.* Winchell, 7 Cow. 525; Hamilton *v.* Com., 16 Penn. St. 129; Hughes *v.* State, 4 Iowa, 354; Price *v.* State, 36 Miss. 531; Canada *v.*

§ 551. When the record shows that the defendant was in court at the opening of the session, the presumption is that he continued in court during the entire day.[1] And this presumption has been extended to the whole trial.[2]

Presence presumed to be continuous.

Com., 9 Dana, 304; Holliday *v.* People, 4 Gilm. 111; Warren *v.* State, 19 Ark. 214.

[1] Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 816, 829; Kie *v.* U. S., 27 Fed. Rep. 351; State *v.* Lewis, 69 Mo. 92.

[2] Cluverius *v.* Com., 81 Va. 787; Speer *v.* State, 69 Ala. 159; Folden *v.* State, 13 Neb. 328; Irvin *v.* State, 19 Fla. 872; State *v.* Cartwright, 13 R. I. 193; People *v.* Sing Lum, 61 Cal. 538; People *v.* Sing Jung, 70 Cal. 469; Territory *v.* Yarberry, 2 New Mex. 391. See infra, § 875. That presence may be inferred from the averment that the prisoner was remanded, see Cluverius *v.* Com., 81 Va. 787.

CHAPTER X.

COUNSEL.

I. Counsel for Prosecution.
Prosecuting attorneys may employ associates, § 555.
Prosecuting attorney occupies semi-judicial post, § 556.
II. Counsel for Defence.
Defendants entitled to counsel by Constitution, § 557.
Counsel, if necessary, may be assigned by court, § 558.
Such counsel may sue county for their fees, § 559.
III. Duties of Counsel.
Order and length of speeches at discretion of court, § 560.
Prosecuting attorney not to open confessions or matter of doubtful admissibility, § 561.
Counsel on both sides should be candid in opening, § 562.
Opening speeches not to sum up, § 563.
Examination of witnesses at discretion of court, § 564.
Prosecution should call all the witnesses to the guilty act, § 565.
When notice of, must be given to defendant, § 565 *a*.
Order of testimony discretionary with court, § 566.
Impeaching testimony may be restricted, § 567.
Witness to see writings before cross-examination, § 568.
Witnesses may be secluded from court-room, § 569.
Defendant's opening to be restricted to admissible evidence, § 570.
Reading books is at discretion of court, § 571.
Counsel may exhibit mechanical evidence in proof, § 572.
If defendant offers no evidence, his counsel closes, § 573.
Otherwise when he offers evidence, § 574.
Defendants may sever, § 575.
Priority of speeches to be determined by court, § 576.
Misstatements not ground for new trial if not objected to at time, § 577.
Ordinarily counsel are not to argue law to jury, § 578.
Party may make statement to jury, § 579.

I. COUNSEL FOR THE PROSECUTION.

§ 554. The position of the prosecuting attorney, in reference to the inception and direction of prosecutions, has been already noticed.[1] It has been seen that his sanction is essential, either expressly or by implication, to the inception of all prosecutions.

His power as to a *nolle prosequi* has also been previously discussed.[2]

[1] See supra, §§ 354, 355.

[2] Supra, §§ 383 *et seq.*

§ 555. The right of the prosecuting officer to avail himself of the assistance of associates cannot, under ordinary circumstances, be questioned. To impose such a restriction would be an absurdity, since there are few cases in which counsel, with practice as large as that of most prosecuting attorneys, are not compelled to avail themselves, at least in the preparation of briefs, of extrinsic professional aid. We have, in addition, to observe that most prosecutions represent complex interests, to each of which may be properly awarded a distinct representative, provided always that such representative acts in subordination to the constituted officer of the law. According to the prevalent American practice, the prosecuting attorney for a county is appointed by the county; but there are many cases in which the attorney-general of the State may properly apply for permission to attend, to watch the interests of the State; and others in which a like privilege may be claimed by the legal representative of the United States. It is hard also to see how, where there is a distinct prosecutor, with his own particular injuries to redress or future protection to secure, the prosecuting attorney can refuse to permit such prosecutor to be represented by counsel at the trial, however strictly it may be necessary to lay down the rules by which such counsel are to be governed. Of course this is not of right, but by the courtesy of the prosecuting attorney; yet cases can well be imagined in which a prosecuting attorney might incur heavy responsibility by rejecting such aid. In the practice of the courts, however, this aid is rarely declined, though the prosecuting attorney always, as a public officer, reserves to himself the direction of the case. And this practice has been repeatedly sanctioned by the courts.[1]

Prosecuting officers may employ associates.

[1] U. S. *v.* Hanway, 2 Wall. Jr. 139; Com. *v.* Scott, 123 Mass. 122; Com. *v.* Williams, 2 Cush. 582; Com. *v.* R. R., 15 Gray, 447; Webster's case, Bemis's report; Rush *v.* Cavenaugh, 2 Barr, 187; Hopper *v.* Com., 6 Grat. 684; Griffin *v.* State, 15 Ga. 476; Williams *v.* State, 69 Ga. 11; Ward *v.* State, 92 Ind. 269; Engle *v.* Chipman, 51 Mich. 525; Byrd *v.* State, 1 How. (Miss.) 247; State *v.* Mays, 28 Miss. 706; Edwards *v.* State, 47 Miss. 581; State *v.* Mangrun, 35 La. An. 619; State *v.* Hayes, 23 Mo. 287; State *v.* Shark, 72 Mo. 37 (under statute); Jarnagin *v.* State, 10 Yerg, 529; Siebert *v.* State, 95 Ind. 471; State *v.* Fitzgerald, 49 Iowa, 260; State *v.* Montgomery, 65 Iowa, 483; Bradshaw *v.* People, 17 Neb. 147; Rounds *v.* State, 57 Wis. 45; People *v.* Blackwell, 27 Cal. 65; People *v.* Strong, 46 Cal. 302; People *v.* Murphy, 47 Cal. 103; State *v.* Harris, 12 Nev. 414; see Lawrence *v.* State, 50

§ 556. A prosecuting attorney is a sworn officer of the government, required not merely to execute justice, but to preserve intact all the great sanctions of public law and liberty. No matter how guilty a defendant may in his opinion be, he is bound to see that no conviction shall take place except in strict conformity to law.[1] It is the

Prosecuting attorney occupies semi-judicial post.

Wis. 507. Burkhead *v.* State, 18 Tex. Ap. 599; McInturf *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 336. In People *v.* Stokes, N. Y. Sup. Ct. 1872, the appearance of "private" counsel assisting the district attorney was sustained by Judge Ingraham. Even a statute forbidding county attorneys from receiving fees from prosecutors does not preclude such an attorney receiving as professional assistants counsel paid by the prosecution. State *v.* Wilson, 24 Kan. 189.

In Maine, the practice is for the court, on application, to appoint any counsellor of the court it may deem suitable and proper, to assist the attorney for the State; and the fact that such counsellor may expect compensation from private persons for services thus rendered will not deprive the court of the power to appoint him. State *v.* Bartlett, 55 Me. 200.

In Com. *v.* Scott, 123 Mass. 122, the Massachusetts practice was stated to be, "that while, as a general rule, the district attorney, or other prosecuting officer, should conduct the trial of criminal cases, yet it is within the power of the court in particular cases, in which from peculiar circumstances the interests of public justice seem to require it, to appoint a counsellor of the court to assist the public officer in the trial. Com. *v.* Williams, 2 Cush. 582; Com. *v.* Knapp, 10 Pick. 477; Com. *v.* Gibbs, 4 Gray, 146; Com. *v.* King, 8 Gray, 501. And the question whether the circumstances require such appointment, and whether the person recommended by the public officer is a fit and proper person, are, in a large degree, within the sound discretion of the court below, by which they must, in the first instance, be decided."

In some jurisdictions the court is applied to for the sanction of such assistance. Bradshaw *v.* State, 17 Neb. 147; Shular *v.* State, 105 Ind. 290; see State *v.* Griffin, 87 Mo. 668.

In Pennsylvania, under the Act of March 12, 1868, private counsel may be employed as substitutes for the prosecuting attorney, if the latter fails in his duty. As *assistants* to the prosecuting attorney, private counsel are constantly employed.

In Texas it is held that the court may appoint any competent person to assist or represent the prosecuting attorney, during the latter's temporary disability. State *v.* Gonzales, 26 Tex. 197. The post to be assigned to such counsel is for the prosecuting attorney to determine, though the order of precedence is subject to the discretion of the court. Jarnagin *v.* State, *ut supra*. Infra, §§ 560 *et seq.*

In Michigan private counsel are not admissible on behalf of the prosecution when acting in the interest of a client. People *v.* Hurst, 41 Mich. 328. Evidence may be offered to show prosecuting counsel to be specially retained. Sneed *v.* People, 38 Mich. 248. And such person may be precluded from acting as counsel. Merster *v.* People, 31 Mich. 99; see People *v.* Hendryx, 56 Mich. 319.

[1] See infra, § 561; State *v.* Sanford, 1 Nott & McC. 512; State *v.* Ruby, 61

duty, indeed, of all counsel to repudiate all chicanery and all appeal to unworthy prejudice in the discharge of their high office; but eminently is this the case with public officers, elected as representing the people at large, and invested with the power which belongs to official rank, to comparative superiority in experience, and to the very presumption here spoken of, that they are independent officers of state.[1] Such officers are bound to open carefully all the material facts bearing on the case, and to call all material witnesses of the litigated facts;[2] and to scrupulously avoid all unfairness in the presentation of the law.[3]

II. COUNSEL FOR DEFENCE.

§ 557. In England, until recently, the right of defendants in criminal cases to be represented by counsel on trial was denied or abridged. At present in that country, these restrictions are removed. In the United States they never existed. And the right to appear by counsel is

Defendants entitled to counsel by the Constitution.

Iowa, 817; State *v.* Maynes, Id. 119; Ingle *v.* Chapman, 51 Mich. 525; People *v.* Quick, 56 Mich. 321; State *v.* Pagels, 92 Mo. 300; State *v.* Brooks, 92 Mo. 542.

[1] Talfourd, in his review of Twiss's Eldon, thus speaks: "In deciding on the charges to be preferred against the parties accused of treason, for their share in the English combination of 1794, he manifested a nobleness of determination beyond the suggestions of expediency, as, in the conduct of the prosecutions, he maintained a courtesy of demeanor which won the respect of his most ardent opponents. He believed the offence to be treason; and although a conviction for that crime was more than doubtful, while a conviction for seditious conspiracy might have been regarded as almost certain, he rejected the safer and baser course, and acted on the severe judgment of his reason. The analysis of these trials by Mr. Twiss—one of the most masterly and striking passages of his work—while it may leave the prudence of the attorney-general open to question, must satisfy every impartial mind of the elevation of the motive by which he was impelled. While he dreaded any relaxation of the criminal law—as if all its old 'terrors to evil-doers' would vanish in air if its most awful penalty were removed from crimes against which it had long been threatened—he endured the most anxious labor to prevent its falling on an innocent sufferer, or one who, however guilty, was not subjected to its infliction by the plainest construction of law." See, also, remarks of Gurney, B., in R. *v.* Thursfield, 8 C. & P. 269.

The duties of prosecuting attorneys are discussed in 1 Steph. Hist. Cr. L., chap. XI., and in an excellent article in 17 Am. Law Rev. 529.

[2] Infra, §§ 561, 562, 565; State *v.* Sanford, 1 Nott & McC. 512; Hurd *v.* People, 25 Mich. 405.

[3] That unfairness in this respect may be ground for a new trial, see infra, §§ 577, 852.

guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, and by the constitutions of most of the States. A prisoner under arrest is entitled to be visited by his counsel at all stages of the procedure.[1]

Counsel, if necessary, will be assigned by court.

§ 558. By the usual practice a defendant has a right to be represented on a trial by any counsel admitted to practice in the court in which the trial is had. There are, however, cases in which the defendant is too poor to employ counsel; and in such cases counsel are assigned him by the court. And as officers of the court, counsel thus assigned cannot, if at the time capable of the work, and not otherwise engaged, refuse the trust. It has been said that the court will assign and compel the services of any counsel whom the defendant may suggest. But this view is incompatible with the fact that the obligatory nature of such assignment rests on the power of the court over its officers, a power which the court will not exercise in such a way that any particular officer shall be overburdened by compulsory work. The court, therefore, will not, simply because the defendant requests it, compel any one particular counsel to undertake a duty incompatible with his other engagements. The defendant has a right to *some* counsel, not to any particular counsel.[2] If he fails to request the appointment of counsel, he cannot afterwards complain of being unrepresented.[3]

Such counsel may sue county for their fees.

§ 559. *Can counsel thus assigned sustain an action against the county for their fees?* The first impression is in the negative. Counsel are officers of the court, and are obliged as such to render to the court any services that may be necessary to the maintenance of public justice. Counsel, with the emoluments, must take the burdens of their profession. Among the burdens is the gratuitous defence of the poor; and the remuneration for this, in those cases in which no remuneration can be had from the State, must be found, it is urged, in the general income of a profession of which such service is one of the incidents, as well as in the consciousness of duty performed. For these and other reasons it has been held that counsel cannot recover

[1] People *v.* Risley, 1 N. Y. Cr. R. 492.

[2] See Com. *v.* Knapp, 9 Pick. 496; Burton *v.* State, 75 Ind. 477; People *v.* Moice, 15 Cal. 329; Pennington *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 44.

[3] State *v.* De Serrant, 33 La. An. 979.

from the county compensation for such services.[1] Yet a more careful examination teaches us that this view is not consistent either with English precedent or sound public policy.[2] Counsel for the defence are as essential to the due examination of the case as are counsel for the prosecution; and to leave the services of the one unremunerated is as impolitic as it would be to leave the services of the other unremunerated. If the State pays to convict its guilty subjects, it should also pay counsel to acquit such as are innocent.

III. DUTIES OF COUNSEL ON TRIAL.

§ 560. We may here, departing somewhat from chronological sequence, state at the outset that, so far as concerns the order in which counsel shall speak, the number and duration of their speeches, and the mode in which they shall examine witnesses, the discretion of the court is to rule.[3] Thus, the court is authorized to limit the time of speeches within reasonable bounds,[4] and to stop an argument to the jury which either con-

Order and length of speeches at discretion of court.

[1] Wayne Co. *v.* Waller, 7 Weekly Notes, 377; Vise *v.* Hamilton, 19 Ill. 78; Rowe *v.* Yuba, 17 Cal. 61.

[2] R. *v.* Fogarty, 5 Cox C. C. 161. See, to same effect, Blythe *v.* State, 4 Ind. 525; Dane *v.* Smith, 13 Wis. 585; Hall *v.* Washington, 2 Greene (Iowa), 473. See Davis *v.* Linn, 24 Iowa, 508.

[3] R. *v.* Bernard, 1 F. & F. 240; R. *v.* Hasell, 2 Cox C. C. 220; R. *v.* Martin, 3 Cox C. C. 56. See State *v.* Waltham, 48 Mo. 55; Dobbins *v.* Oswalt, 20 Ark. 619; Hull *v.* Alexander, 26 Iowa, 569; State *v.* Beebe, 17 Minn. 241. In California, the practice is regulated by statute. People *v.* Fair, 43 Cal. 137; People *v.* Haun, 44 Cal. 96; People *v.* Ah Wee, 48 Cal. 236.

[4] Weaver *v.* State, 24 Ohio St. 584; State *v.* Collins, 70 N. C. 241; Lee *v.* State, 51 Miss. 566; State *v.* Linney, 52 Mo. 40; State *v.* Collins, 81 Mo. 652; Williams *v.* Com., 82 Ky. 640; State *v.* Riddle, 20 Kans. 711; Hoffman *v.* State, 65 Wis. 46; Hart *v.* State, 14 Neb. 572. See, however, Hunt *v.* State, 49 Ga. 255, where it was held that a limitation to forty minutes, against the protest of counsel, in a complicated homicide case, is ground for reversal. In State *v.* Hoyt, 47 Conn. 518, it was held that a limitation of four hours on a side in a homicide case was not unreasonable. That an arbitrary limitation is reason for reversal, see, further, People *v.* Keenan, 13 Cal. 581; Dills *v.* State, 34 Ohio St. 617; Williams *v.* State, 60 Ga. 367. As denying right, see State *v.* Miller, 75 N. C. 73, qualifying State *v.* Collins, *ut supra*. In White *v.* People, 90 Ill. 17, it was held that a limitation of five minutes to counsel to address the jury on an indictment for grand larceny, where the evidence is conflicting, is an unreasonable exercise of the discretion of the court, citing Word's case, 3 Leigh, 744; People *v.* Keenan, 13 Cal. 581. To same effect, see Proffatt on Jury Trial, § 254. The subject is discussed at large in 1 Alabama L. J., pp. 345 *et seq.* As to division of time under Connecticut statute, see State *v.* Nyman, 55 Conn. 17.

troverts the law laid down by the court,[1] or introduces facts unproved on the trial.[2] All this is an inherent function of the judge, as the presiding officer of the court-room, charged with the preservation of order,[3] and is a subject for his particular discretion. If, however, he goes further, and in his interference abridges the fundamental legal rights of the parties, this is ground for revision by an appellate court.[4]

Prosecuting attorney not to open confessions or matters of doubtful admissibility, nor unfairly prejudice jury.

§ 561. The prosecuting attorney opens the case, stating the facts he proposes to prove, and the law he expects to maintain.[5] If the defendant have no counsel, it is better for the prosecuting attorney simply to submit the facts without an address, or, if he speak, to limit himself to a fair and brief statement.[6] In the preannouncement of his case his duty is to be eminently cautious and exact.[7] He has no right, either directly or indirectly, to appeal to any popular prejudice which may exist against the defendant.[8] He has no right to refer to the defendant's prior character, no matter how flagrant that may have been; because character can only be put in issue by the defence.[9] While he must open declarations as well as facts,[10] it is indecorous for him to open confessions, evidence of which it is for the court to first weigh before it is admitted, and

[1] See infra, § 573.

[2] Hatcher *v.* State, 18 Ga. 460. See R. *v.* Courvoisier, 9 C. & P. 362; Fry *v.* Bennett, 3 Bosw. 200; Thompson *v.* Barkley, 27 Penn. St. 263; Cluck *v.* State, 40 Ind. 263; State *v.* Caveness, 78 N. C. 484; State *v.* Lee, 66 Mo. 165; infra, § 577. See 3 Crim. Law Mag. 621; Shars. Leg. Ethics, 97.

[3] See Cobb *v.* State, 27 Ga. 648; Morris *v.* State, 104 Ind. 457; Wartena *v.* State, 105 Ind. 445; Brooks *v.* Perry, 23 Ark. 32.

[4] See, as illustrating this, U. S. *v.* Fries, Pamph. 1800; Whart. St. Trials, 598; and the evidence on this point in Judge Chase's impeachment. See, also, Sullivan *v.* State, 47 N. J. L. 151; Stewart *v.* Com., 117 Penn. St. 239; State *v.* Bryant, 55 Mo. 75; Willey *v.* State, 52 Ind. 421; Williams *v.* State, 60 Ga. 367; Kizer *v.* State, 12 Lea, 564; Wings *v.* State, 62 Miss. 311; Brooks *v.* Perry, 23 Ark. 32. Infra, §§ 847, 881.

[5] See 18 Cent. L. J. 363.

[6] R. *v.* Gascoine, 7 C. & P. 772. If he fail to open he may lose the right to reply. Infra, § 561.

[7] See State *v.* Meshek, 61 Iowa, 316; State *v.* Schnelle, 24 W. Va. 767.

[8] Ferguson *v.* State, 49 Ind. 33; Coble *v.* Coble, 79 N. C. 589; Pierson *v.* State, 18 Tex. Ap. 524.

[9] Cluck *v.* State, 40 Ind. 265; Brow *v.* State, 103 Ind. 133; State *v.* Smith, 75 N. C. 306; People *v.* Dane, 59 Mich. 550; Martin *v.* State, 63 Miss. 505; Moore *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 666. Infra, § 853.

[10] R. *v.* Orrell, 1 Moo. & R. 467; R. *v.* Davis, 7 C. & P. 785.

which only in strong cases can be made the basis of conviction.[1] If the prosecuting officer violates these rules, the court may order a juror to be withdrawn, or, in case of conviction, a new trial may be granted when an unfair attempt to prejudice the jury has been successfully made.[2] In general, counsel for the prosecution should consider themselves not as advocates for a party on the record, struggling for a verdict, but as ministers of public justice, called upon to develop evidence for the adjudication of the court; and any attempt on their part to pervert or misstate evidence, or to insinuate facts not capable of being put in testimony, should meet with judicial rebuke,[3] and a new trial will be granted if by such misconduct a verdict was in part obtained.[4] Except, however, in flagrant cases of surprise or fraud, objection to such misconduct in the prosecuting attorney must be made at the time.[5] After verdict it will be too late.[6]

§ 562. The opening speeches for both prosecution and defence should be full and candid.[7] Neither party has a right to take the other by surprise by reserving the disclosure of material facts or points of law until it is too late for them to be duly weighed and examined.[8] If by such surprise a conviction is unfairly obtained, a new trial will be granted.[9] And the court, in proper cases, will compel counsel to open in advance what they expect to prove by each particular witness offered, and will confine the witness to the evidence thus opened.[10]

Counsel on both sides should be candid in opening.

[1] R. *v.* Davis, 7 C. & P. 785; R. *v.* Hartel, 7 C. & P. 773. See R. *v.* Deering, 5 C. & P. 165.

[2] See infra, §§ 577, 849, 853; State *v.* Smith, 75 N. C. 306; State *v.* Mahly, 68 Mo. 315; Ferguson *v.* State, 49 Ind. 33; Shepherd *v.* State, 64 Ind. 43; Brown *v.* State, 103 Ind. 133; Laubach *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 583, 592.

[3] R. *v.* Berens, 4 F. & F. 842; and cases cited infra, §§ 847, 881. In People *v.* Benson, 52 Cal. 381, it was said that prosecuting counsel should avoid merely technical objections to evidence. See Com. *v.* Baldwin, 129 Mass. 481.

[4] Infra, §§ 577, 853.

[5] See, as to effect of this, Epps *v.* State, 102 Ind. 539; Petite *v.* People, 8 Col. 518.

[6] Infra, §§ 577, 853; and see next section.

[7] See State *v.* Sheets, 89 N. C. 543; State *v.* Meshek, 61 Iowa, 316.

[8] See R. *v.* Hartel, 7 C. & P. 773; R. *v.* Orrell, 1 Mood. & R. 467; Morales *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 494. In State *v.* Honig, 78 Mo. 249, it was decided that under the criminal code the counsel for the prosecution cannot reply unless he open.

[9] Infra, §§ 847, 881.

[10] People *v.* White, 14 Wend. 111. See State *v.* Waltham, 48 Mo. 55.

Opening speeches not to sum up.

§ 563. Ordinarily speaking, it is not permissible for counsel to argue a case when opening it. A stratagem not unknown at the bar is to break this rule by fully arguing the case in an opening, and then, by declining to address the jury in summing up, deprive the opposite party of a final reply. But where this is attempted, the court may either restrict in his opening the counsel thus proceeding, or may give to the counsel on the other side full rights to reply at the close.[1] And while counsel, in opening, may refer hypothetically to points that may possibly be made by the defence, and answer such points,[2] yet, if this is done, counsel for the defence should be permitted to reply. But openings will not be interrupted except in clear cases of abuse.[3]

The order of speaking, as has just been seen, is at the discretion of the court.[4]

[1] See U. S. *v.* Mingo, 2 Curt. C. C. 1. See State *v.* Williams, 63 Iowa, 135.

[2] R. *v.* Courvoisier, 9 C. & P. 362.

[3] People *v.* Wilson, 55 Mich. 506.

[4] Supra, § 560. The English practice, as stated in 1871, in the 17th ed. of Archbold's C. P., is as follows: "When the prisoner is given in charge to the jury, the counsel for the prosecution, or, if there be more than one, the senior counsel, opens the case to the jury, stating the leading facts upon which the prosecution rely. In doing so, he ought to state *all* that it is proposed to prove, as well declarations of the prisoner's as facts, so that the jury may see if there be a discrepancy between the opening statements of counsel and the evidence afterwards adduced in support of them (per Parke, B., R. *v.* Hartel, 7 C. & P. 773; R. *v.* Davis, Ibid. 785); unless such declarations should amount to a *confession*, where it would be improper for counsel to open them to the jury. Per Bosanquet, J., and Patteson, J., 4 C. & P. 548; per Parke, B., 7 C. & P. 786; per Bolland, B., Ibid. 775. The reason for this rule is, that the circumstances under which the confession was made may render it inadmissible in evidence.

"The *general effect* only of any confession said to have been made by a prisoner ought, therefore, to be mentioned in the opening address of the prosecuting counsel. When any additional evidence, not mentioned in the opening speech of counsel, is discovered in the course of a trial, counsel is not allowed to state it in a second address to the jury. R. *v.* Courvoisier, 9 C. & P. 362. It may further be remarked, that, in opening a case for murder, the counsel for the prosecution may put hypothetically the case of an attack upon the character of any particular witness for the crown, and say that should any such attack be made he shall be prepared to meet it. Per Tindal, C. J., and Parke, B., Ibid. 362. He may, also, as it was ruled by the same learned judges, read to the jury the observations of a judge in a former case, as to the nature and effect of circumstantial evidence, provided he adopts them as his own opinions, and makes them part of his address to the jury.

"And in R. *v.* Dowling, Central

§ 564. The opening of the prosecution is followed by the introduction of the prosecution's testimony.[1] Whether more than one counsel can take part in the examining of witnesses is a matter regulated either by local usage, or by rules of court. Unless limited, the usual course is for the junior counsel, who is supposed to be more familiar with the testimony, to begin the examination of each particular witness, and for the examination to be taken up by the senior counsel on the same side.[2] It is scarcely necessary to say that it is incumbent on the prosecution to prove, either expressly or by implication, all the essential ingredients of its case.[3]

Examination of witnesses at discretion of court.

§ 565. The prosecution is not at liberty to put in part of the evidence making out its case, and then rest. It is bound, under ordinary circumstances, and when this can be done without undue cumulation of testimony,[4] to call the witnesses present at the commission of the act which is the subject of the indictment,[5] and it is a breach of official duty for a

Prosecution must call all witnesses to guilty act.

Criminal Court, 1848, the attorney-general having, in his opening address to the jury, made reference to disturbances in Ireland, Erle, J., held, on objection made, that such reference was not irregular, it being laid down in books of evidence that allusion might be made in courts of justice to notorious matters, even of contemporaneous history."

[1] See Willey *v.* State, 52 Ind. 421, where a case was reversed because the court below required the defence to open immediately after the opening of the prosecution.

[2] That the court may limit the number of impeaching witnesses, see Wh. Cr. Ev. § 487.

In State *v.* Bryant, 55 Mo. 75, where two defendants in a criminal trial were represented each by separate counsel, and required different defences, it was ruled, that a rule of court forbidding more than one counsel on either side to examine witnesses, in so far as it deprived either of said attorneys of the right to cross-examine witnesses, was null and void.

[3] Wh. Cr. Ev. § 319. The modes in which witnesses may be attacked and supported are elsewhere discussed. See Wh. Cr. Ev. §§ 481–495.

[4] That this is unnecessary, see R. *v.* Ritson, 50 L. T. (N. S.) 727; Winsett *v.* State, 56 Ind. 26; Bowker *v.* People, 37 Mich. 5.

[5] See cases cited in Wh. Cr. Ev. § 448. See, also, R. *v.* Holden, 8 C. & P. 609; R. *v.* Stroner, 1 C. & K. 650; State *v.* Magoon, 50 Vt. 338; State *v.* Smallwood, 75 N. C. 109; State *v.* Johnston, 76 Mo. 121. In Donaldson *v.* Com., 95 Penn. St. 21, it was held that it was the duty of the prosecuting attorney, in a rape case, to call the physician by whom the prosecutrix was examined immediately after the assault. And see Terr *v.* Hanna, 5 Mont. 245.

"The prosecution," such is the opinion of the court in Hurd *v.* People, 25

prosecuting officer not to open and present all material evidence of this class.[1] In any view, all witnesses on the back of the indictment must be summoned by the prosecution,[2] so that, when not called by the prosecution,[3] they can be called for the defence; but, if so called, they become the defendant's witnesses.[4] The practice as to indorsing witnesses has been already discussed.[5]

§ 565 *a*. The Revised Statutes of the United States, § 1033, provide for the delivery to the defendant of a copy of the indictment and of a list of the witnesses two days before the trial begins.

Mich. 405, "can never, in a criminal case, claim a conviction upon evidence which expressly or by implication shows but a part of the *res gestae*, or whole transaction, if it appear that the evidence of the rest of the transaction is attainable. This would be to deprive the defendant of the benefit of the presumption of innocence, and to throw upon him the burden of proving his innocence. . . . According to the well established rules of the English courts, all the witnesses present at the transaction should be called by the prosecution before the prisoner is put to his defence, if such witnesses be present or clearly attainable. See Maher *v*. People, 10 Mich. 225, 226. The English rule goes so far as to require the prosecutor to produce all present at the transaction, though they may be the near relatives of the prisoner. See Chapman's case, 8 C. & P. 559; Orchard's case, Ibid. note; Roscoe's Crim. Ev. 164. Doubtless, where the number present has been very great, the production of a part of them might be dispensed with, after so many had been sworn as to lead to the inference, that the rest would be merely cumulative, and there is no ground to suspect an intent to conceal a part of the transaction. Whether the rule should be enforced in all cases, as where those not called are near relatives of the prisoner, or some other special cause for not calling exists, we need not determine; but certainly, if the facts stated by those who are called to show *primâ facie*, or even probable, reason for believing that there are other parts of the transaction to which they have not testified, and which are likely to be known by other witnesses present at the transaction, then such other witnesses should be called by the prosecution, if attainable, however nearly related to the prisoner." See, also, R. *v*. Holden, 8 C. & P. 609; Thomas *v*. People, 39 Mich. 309; People *v*. Gordon, 40 Mich. 716.

[1] See R. *v*. Thursfield, 8 C. & P. 269.

[2] See Whart. Crim. Ev. § 448; and see to this effect, R. *v*. Simmonds, 1 C. & P. 84; R. *v*. Whittread, Ibid. If the prosecutor does not call any witnesses so indorsed, the judge may. Ibid. R. *v*. Bodle, 6 C. & P. 186.

[3] That this is not obligatory, see State *v*. Cain, 20 W. Va. 679; State *v*. Eaton, 75 Mo. 586.

[4] R. *v*. Woodhead, 2 C. & K. 520; R. *v*. Cassidy, 1 F. & F. 79. See R. *v*. Gordon, 2 Dowl. 417; Morrow *v*. State, 57 Miss. 836. As to the duty of the prosecution to call all the witnesses to the act, see Harrison *v*. Bank, cited London Law Times, July 5, 1844, p. 174, where Lord Coleridge maintained that it was the duty of the prosecution to make a candid exposition of all relevant evidence in their possession.

[5] Supra, § 358.

Under this statute the delivery must be made two days prior to the swearing of the jury; and a delivery is not in time if made after the trial begins, though the court should adjourn three days so as to prevent a surprise to the defendants.[1]

When notice of must be given by prosecution.

§ 566. The order of testimony is for counsel to arrange, subject to the discretion of the court.[2] The general rules prescribed (*e. g.*, that each party must make out its case in its evidence in chief) are founded on right reason, and will be usually maintained. But it is within the discre-

Order of testimony discretionary with court.

[1] U. S. *v.* Neverson, 1 Mack. 152.

[2] Archbold's C. P. 17th ed. 296; Creevy *v.* Carr, 7 C. & P. 64; R. *v.* Burdett, Dears. 431; R. *v.* Wood, 6 Cox C. C. 224; State *v.* Blodgett, 50 Vt. 142; State *v.* Magoon, 50 Vt. 333; Wilke *v.* People, 53 N. Y. 525; McCarney *v.* People, 83 N. Y. 408; Webb *v.* State, 29 Ohio St. 351; Herring *v.* State, 1 Clarke (Iowa), 205; State *v.* Ruhl, 8 Clarke (Iowa), 447; State *v.* Porter, 34 Iowa, 241; State *v.* Bruce, 48 Iowa, 330; State *v.* Haynes, 71 N. C. 79; State *v.* Laxton, 78 N. C. 564; State *v.* Linney, 52 Mo. 40; State *v.* Colbert, 29 La. An. 715; People *v.* Cotta, 49 Cal. 166; and see, fully, Whart. Crim. Ev. § 493. See Dove *v.* State, 3 Heisk. 348; Queen's case, 2 Brod. & B. 302; Doe *v.* Roe, 2 Camp. 280.

Formerly, in English practice, it was held that the objection for incompetency must have been made before the witness was sworn in chief; but it has been generally allowed to be made at any time during the trial. Stone *v.* Blackburn, 1 Esp. 37; Turner *v.* Pearte, 1 T. R. 717. See, as to English practice in this relation, Hartshorne *v.* Watson, 5 Bing. N. C. 477; Wollaston *v.* Hakewills, 3 Scott N. R. 593; Dewdney *v.* Palmer, 4 M. & W. 664; Yardley *v.* Arnold, 10 M. & W. 141; Jacobs *v.* Layborn, 11 M. & W. 685.

As to competency of witnesses, see Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 357 *et seq.*

In England, if a judge has admitted a witness as competent to give evidence, but upon proof of subsequent facts affecting the capacity of the witness, and upon observation of his subsequent demeanor, the judge changes his opinion as to his competency, the judge may stop the examination of the witness, strike his evidence out of his notes, and direct the jury to consider the case exclusively upon the evidence of the other witnesses. R. *v.* Whitehead, L. R. 1 C. C. 33; 35 L. T. (M. C.) 186. Archbold's C. P. *ut supra.*

See further, as to English practice, R. *v.* Parkins, Ry. & M. 168; R. *v.* White, 3 Camp. 98; Parker *v.* Moon, 7 C. & P. 408; R. *v.* Hardy, 24 How. St. Tr. 755; infra, § 579.

It is not usual to cross-examine witnesses to character, unless the counsel cross-examining have some distinct charge on which to cross-examine them (see R. *v.* Hodgkiss, 7 C. & P. 298); and if the only evidence called on the prisoner's part is evidence as to character, though the counsel for the prosecution is in strictness entitled to a reply, it is not usual to exercise it, except in extreme cases. See R. *v.* Stannard, 7 C. & P. 673; R. *v.* Whiting, Ibid. 771. Archbold's C. P. *ut supra.* Infra, § 573. For American authorities as to cross-examination, see Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 481 *et seq.*

tion of the court trying the case to permit these rules to be suspended for the purpose of justice; and a deviation in this respect from the usual practice is not a subject for revision by an appellate court.[1] Even after a case is closed, evidence will be received, if the party was not able to produce it in due time.[2] But, though ordinarily this is not the subject of error,[3] it is otherwise when the decision of the court invades fundamental rules of law.[4] Thus, it is error to suffer to go to the jury any evidence given by a witness on direct examination, where by sudden illness or by death of such witness, or other cause without the fault of and beyond the control of the opposing party, he is deprived of his right of cross-examination.[5]

Impeaching testimony may be restricted.

§ 567. When a party introduces witnesses to impeach a witness produced by the opposing party, it is within the discretion of the court to limit the number of impeaching witnesses to be produced.[6]

Witness to see writings before cross-examination.

§ 568. When a witness is to be impeached by written statements alleged to have been made by him, the writing, at common law, should be submitted to him for examination.[7]

Witnesses may be excluded from court-room.

§ 569. It is within the power of the court to order that the witnesses should be excluded from the court-room, with the exception of a particular witness under examination, and witnesses by whom this demand is disobeyed may be, as to credibility, open to grave criticism, and punished

[1] U. S. *v.* Noelke, 17 Blatch. 554; Mudge *v.* Pierce, 32 Me. 165; Day *v.* Moore, 13 Gray, 522; Chadbourn *v.* Franklin, 5 Gray, 312; Com. *v.* Moulton, 4 Gray, 39; Com. *v.* Dam, 107 Mass. 210; State *v.* Alford, 31 Conn. 40; State *v.* Hoyt, 47 Conn. 518; Bedell *v.* Powell, 13 Barb. 184; Finlay *v.* Stewart, 56 Penn. St. 183; Webb *v.* State, 29 Ohio St. 351; Bulliner *v.* People, 95 Ill. 394; State *v.* Clyburn, 16 S. C. 375. As to Texas statute, see Donahoe *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 297. Infra, § 777.

[2] See infra, § 861; Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 446, 493 *et seq.*; Com. *v.* Blair, 126 Mass. 40.

[3] See Whart. Crim. Ev. § 495. See infra, § 779.

[4] Thompson *v.* State, 37 Tex. 121.

[5] People *v.* Cole, 43 N. Y. 508. As to negligence of counsel in this respect, see infra, § 801.

[5] People *v.* Murray, 41 Cal. 66. See Whart. on Ev. § 505; supra, § 560.

[7] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 156; Roscoe's Crim. Ev. § 13; Gaffney *v.* People, 50 N. Y. 416; People *v.* Finnegan, 1 Park. C. R. 147. See State *v.* George, 8 Ired. 324; Smith *v.* People, 2 Manning (Mich.) 415; Stamper *v.* Griffin, 12 Ga. 450; Cavanah *v.* State, 56 Miss. 299. *Contra*, Randolph *v.* Woodstock, 35 Vt. 291.

for contempt.[1] At the same time, the action of the court trying the case will not be revised in this respect in error, unless it appear that manifest injustice has been done.[2] And the disobedience of a witness in this respect, unless promoted by the successful party, is not ground for a new trial.[3]

Defendant's opening to be restricted to admissible evidence.

§ 570. The opening of the defence is, by the usual American practice, assigned, when there are two counsel, to the junior. In two respects, greater liberty is allowed to counsel in this opening than is usual in the opening for the prosecution. (1.) Counsel, in opening for the defence, may comment on the prosecution's case.[4] (2.) As the defendant is at liberty to put his character in issue, so his counsel may open on the subject of character. But it was formerly held irregular for counsel to introduce into an opening the defendant's own statement of his case, except so far as this statement can be supported by testimony *aliunde*;[5] and although this restriction cannot be maintained in those States in which defendants can be examined as witnesses in their own behalf, yet the opening must, even in those States, be limited to what the defendant expects to swear to. Nor is it proper for counsel, in any stage of the case, to state their personal conviction of their client's innocence. To do so is a breach of professional privilege, well deserving the rebuke of the court. On legal evidence alone can the case be tried; and that which would be considered a high misdemeanor in third parties cannot be permitted to counsel.[6] And where any undue or irregular comment by counsel cannot be stopped at the time by the court, the mischief may be corrected by the court when charging the jury, or on a motion for a new trial.[7]

[1] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 446; R. *v.* Wylde, 6 C. & P. 380; People *v.* Sprague, 53 Cal. 422.

[2] Laughlin *v.* State, 18 Ohio St. 99. See R. *v.* Colley, M. & M. 329; R. *v.* Murphy, 8 C. & P. 297; R. *v.* Brown, 4 C. & P. 588, n. Infra, § 777.

[3] See Whart. Crim. Ev. § 446, for cases.

[4] Such is the English practice; otherwise in New York, in civil cases. Ayrault *v.* Chamberlain, 33 Barb. 229.

[5] R. *v.* Butcher, 2 Mood. & R. 229; R. *v.* Beard, 8 C. & P. 142.

[6] See infra, §§ 577, 829, 847–52.

[7] R. *v.* Berens, 4 F. & F. 842; State *v.* Cameron, 40 Vt. 555; Com. *v.* Smith, 10 Phila. 189; Dailey *v.* State, 28 Ind. 285; State *v.* O'Neal, 7 Ired. 251; State *v.* Whit, 5 Jones, N. C. 224; Northington *v.* State, 14 Lea, 424; People *v.* Tyler, 36 Cal. 522; State *v.* Mahly, 68 Mo. 315; Collins *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 255; McInturf *v.* State, Ibid. 336; Bend *v.* State, Ibid. 422. Infra, § 577.

Reading books at discretion of court.

§ 571. Whether counsel, in argument, will be allowed to read books to the jury, is a matter resting within the discretion of the court;[1] but a court should not permit the reading law to a jury when the effect would be to mislead.[2] As a general rule, books of inductive science are *per se* inadmissible;[3] and permission should not be given to read extracts from such books (*e. g.*, medical treatises) to the jury.[4] This rule, however, has been relaxed where the court has received evidence to show that the book in question was recognized as authority,[5] and where the passage was read as a hypothetical illustration.[6] But when such extracts are read the court should instruct the jury they are mere speculations of scientists.[7] And even when this has been done it may be doubted whether the admission is validated.[8]

Counsel may exhibit mechanical evidence in proof.

§ 572. Counsel have the right to handle, exhibit, and comment on any of the mechanical indicatory evidence produced in the case; *e. g.*, a stick or weapon proved to have been used.[9]

If defendant has no evidence his counsel close.

§ 573. Should the defence offer no evidence, the defendant's counsel, by the usual practice, open and close the summing up; and the same rule may be accepted where the defendant only calls witnesses to character.[10]

[1] Smith *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 277. See question generally discussed in Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 537–9; Collins *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 400. That a prosecuting attorney, on a homicide case, read part of an essay of his own on the subject of duelling, was held in Mississippi no ground for reversal. Cavanah *v.* State, 56 Miss. 99. That if a book is read on one side it may be freely criticised on the other, see Jones *v.* State, 65 Ga. 506; and see Lott *v.* State, 18 Tex. Ap. 627.

[2] See infra, §§ 578, 805, 813; State *v.* Klinger, 46 Mo. 224; Earll *v.* People, 99 Ill. 123.

[3] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 538. See 9 Crim. Law. Mag. 768.

[4] R. *v.* Taylor, 13 Cox C. C. 77; Com. *v.* Sturtevant, 117 Mass. 139; Melvin *v.* Easley, 1 Jones N. C. L. 386; Gale *v.* Rector, 5 Bradw. 481; People *v.* Wheeler, 60 Cal. 580.

[5] Merkle *v.* State, 37 Ala. 139.

[6] Union Ins. Co. *v.* Cheever, 36 Ohio St. 201.

[7] Harvey *v.* State, 40 Ind. 516; Yoe *v.* People, 49 Ill. 410.

[8] People *v.* Wheeler, *ut supra;* see infra, § 802.

[9] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 312. As to presumptions in such cases, see Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 764–80; see State *v.* Smith, 49 Conn. 376; Polin *v.* State, 14 Neb. 540.

[10] R. *v.* Dowse, 4 F. & F. 492; Pateson's case, 2 Lew. C. C. 262. See, as recommending this, and yet as holding that in strict law the distinction cannot be enforced, R. *v.* Jordan, 9 C. & P.

§ 574. If the defendant has evidence to offer, this must be specifically opened, as has been just seen; and when the evidence on both sides is closed, the counsel for the prosecution begin the summing up, are followed by the counsel for the defence, and then reply, closing the argument of the case.

Otherwise when there is evidence.

§ 575. When there are several defendants, and they sever in their defences, if one calls witnesses and the other does not, the right of reply, where the defences are distinct, is confined to the case against the defendant who has called witnesses;[1] though it is otherwise where the offences are identical.[2]

Defendants may sever.

§ 576. Where there are two or more counsel, the order in which they speak is determined by the court,[3] reserving always, when evi-

118; and, also, see R. *v.* Stannard, 7 C. & P. 673; R. *v.* Christie, 1 F. & F. 75; R. *v.* Toakley, 10 Cox C. C. 406; and supra, §§ 563, 566; Farrow *v.* State, 48 Ga. 30; Cruce *v.* State, 59 Ga. 83. A contrary practice, giving the prosecution the reply in all cases, seems to be sanctioned in some jurisdictions. See Doss *v.* Com., 1 Grat. 557.

[1] R. *v.* Burton, 2 F. & F. 788. See supra, §§ 301–9.

[2] R. *v.* Blackburn, 3 C. & K. 330; 6 Cox C. C. 333.

[3] Supra, § 560.

"In exercising this right of summing up evidence, it is not proper for the counsel for the prosecution to comment on the absence of witnesses for the defence, unless it might be fairly expected that witnesses should be called, or to urge on a trial for rape, as an argument for conviction, that otherwise the character of the prosecutrix would be blasted. R. *v.* Rudland, 4 F. & F. 495; R. *v.* Puddick, Ibid. 497. Nor is it the duty of counsel for the prosecution to sum up in every case in which the prisoner's counsel does not call witnesses. The statute gives him the right to do so, but that right ought only to be exercised in exceptional cases, such as where erroneous statements have been made and ought to be corrected, or where the evidence differs from the instructions. The counsel for the prosecution is to state his case before he calls the witnesses; then, when the evidence has been given, either to say simply, 'I say nothing,' or 'I have already told you what would be the substance of the evidence, and you see the statement which I made is correct;' or, in exceptional cases, to say, 'something is proved different to what I expected,' and add any suitable explanation which is required. R. *v.* Holchester, 10 Cox C. C. 226, per Blackburn, J.; R. *v.* Berens, 4 F. & F. 842, S. C. See also R. *v.* Webb, 4 F. & F. 862."

"Where two prisoners are jointly indicted, and are defended by different counsel, each counsel cross-examines and addresses the jury for his client, in the order of seniority at the bar; but where the judge thinks it desirable, he will permit the counsel to cross-

dence has been introduced on both sides, to the counsel for the prosecution to open and close the summing up,[1] though it may be otherwise as we have seen, when no testimony (an unsworn statement not being testimony) is given for the defence.[2] One rule in this respect is particularly to be observed. Counsel for the prosecution, in the closing speech, can take no points of which notice was not given prior to the speech of the counsel for the defence. If such new points be taken, then counsel for the defence may specially reply.[3]

Priority of speeches at discretion of court.

§ 577. A new trial will not be granted because the prosecuting attorney in his argument states matters not in evidence, or makes improper comments, the court not at the time being called upon to interfere,[4] or when the court tells the jury not to be influenced by such remarks.[5] If the opposing counsel let the matter pass at the time without objection, after verdict objection is too late.[6] But it is otherwise when such misconduct, being calculated to prevent justice, is sanc-

Misstatements not ground for new trial if not objected to at time.

examine and address the jury, not in the order of seniority, but in that in which the names stand on the indictment. Per Rolfe, B., 2 M. & Rob. 417; and this course was allowed by Creswell, J., York Spr. Ass. 1852, MS.; and see R. *v.* Barber, 1 C. & K. 434." Archbold, C. P., *ut sup.*

[1] State *v.* Smith, 10 Neb. 106.

[2] Farrow *v.* State, 48 Ga. 30. Supra, § 573.

[3] R. *v.* Madden, 12 Cox C. C. 239.

[4] Com. *v.* Hanlon, 3 Brewst. 461; Gilloolly *v.* State, 58 Ind. 182; Richie *v.* State, 59 Ind. 121; Choen *v.* State, 85 Ind. 209; Mayes *v.* People, 106 Ill. 306; State *v.* Sheets, 89 N. C. 543; State *v.* Lewis, 93 N. C. 581; Davis *v.* State, 33 Ga. 98; Scarborough *v.* State, 46 Ga. 26. State *v.* Banks, 10 Mo. Ap. 111; People *v.* Barhart, 58 Cal. 402. Supra, § 561; infra, § 853.

[5] State *v.* Braswell, 82 N. C. 693; State *v.* Sheets, 89 N. C. 543; State *v.* Wilson, 89 N. C. 736; State *v.* Degonia, 69 Mo. 485. A party who, by his misconduct, provokes the opposing counsel to a denunciatory reply, cannot be heard to complain of such reply. Eames *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 421.

[6] Ibid. Supra, § 561; State *v.* Adams, 11 Oregon, 169; infra, § 853; see State *v.* Degonia, 69 Mo. 486; State *v.* Mallon, 75 Mo. 355.

See State *v.* Graham, 62 Iowa, 108; Turner *v.* State, 70 Ga. 767; State *v.* Suggs, 89 N. C. 527; State *v.* Bryan, 89 N. C. 531; State *v.* Sheets, 89 N. C. 544; Bessette *v.* State, 101 Ind. 86; Garrity *v.* People, 107 Ill. 162; State *v.* Lee Ping Bow, 10 Oregon, 27; Crawford *v.* State, 15 Tex. Ap. 501; Mason *v.* State, 15 Tex. Ap. 534. See, on this topic generally, articles in 16 Cent. L. J. 506; 18 Cent. L. J. 363 *et seq.*; 27 Cent. L. J. 82; 9 Crim. Law Mag. 741. State *v.* Mosley, 31 Kan. 355. As to latitude to be allowed to counsel, see State *v.* Zumbunson, 86 Mo. 111; Proffatt on Jury Trials, § 250.

tioned by the court on trial,[1] or when the court has not had the opportunity of correcting the wrong impression.[2]

Ordinarily counsel not to argue law to jury.

§ 578. A new trial, it has been held in Louisiana, a State in which the jury are held to be judges of the law, will not be granted because the court refused to permit counsel to argue to the jury a question of irrelevant law.[3] And *a fortiori* is this the case where counsel, after asking the judge to charge on the law, attempt to argue against the charge.[4] But though, in such jurisdictions, counsel may argue the law under the direction of the court,[5] in those jurisdictions where the jury are bound to take the law from the court it is plainly within the power

[1] State *v.* Smith, 75 N. C. 306; State *v.* Underwood, 77 N. C. 502; State *v.* Matthews, 80 N. C. 417; infra, § 853; Ferguson *v.* State, 49 Ind. 33; Combs *v.* State, 75 Ind. 215; State *v.* Noland, 85 N. C. 576; Fox *v.* People, 95 Ill. 71. See Sullivan *v.* People, 31 Mich. 1; State *v.* Ford, 71 Mo. 200; State *v.* Emory, 79 Mo. 461; Turner *v.* State, 4 Lea, 206; Bradshaw *v.* State, 17 Neb. 147; Ford *v.* State, 34 Ark. 649; State *v.* Cason, 28 La. An. 40; Grosse *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 364; Conn *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 390; Laubach *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 583.

That the court has the right to prevent counsel from making unwarranted statements, see infra, §§ 853, 953; State *v.* Dodson, 16 S. C. 453; Northington *v.* State, 14 Lea, 424; Cross *v.* State, 68 Ala. 476. See Hanson *v.* State, 78 Ala. 5, as to interruptions generally.

That any unfairness by the prosecution may be ground for a new trial, see infra, § 853; and see Young *v.* State, 19 Tex. Ap. 537; Kennedy *v.* State, Ibid. 620.

[2] Com. *v.* Smith, 10 Phila. 189; State *v.* Gay, 69 Mo. 430; State *v.* Zumbunson, 9 Mo. Ap. 526; though see same case in error, 86 Mo. 111; Hatch *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 416. In Arnold *v.* People, 75 N. Y. 603, it was said by the Court of Appeals that that court did not sit as an *arbiter morum* in respect to the manners of counsel in trial courts.

A Utah statute provided that on a new trial the "former verdict can not be used or referred to," etc. An allusion by the prosecuting counsel to the case having been many times brought before the tribunal, does not conflict with the statute. Hopt *v.* Utah, 120 U. S. 430.

That the court may, in some jurisdictions, interfere without waiting for counsel to object, see Berry *v.* State, 10 Ga. 511; Willis *v.* McNeill, 57 Tex. 465; 9 Cr. Law Mag. 744.

That mere vituperative declamation, sustainable as a probable argument from the facts in the case, and not in itself introducing any new facts, is not by itself ground for new trial, see State *v.* Hamilton, 55 Mo. 37; State *v.* Estes, 70 Mo. 428; State *v.* Stark, 72 Mo. 37; Pierson *v.* State, 18 Tex. Ap. 524; 9 Cr. Law Mag. 762. As taking a dangerously lax view of judicial duty in this respect, see Hall *v.* Wolff, 61 Iowa, 559, 562.

[3] State *v.* McCort, 23 La. An. 326.

[4] Edwards *v.* State, 22 Ark. 253. See fully infra, §§ 810–813.

[5] McMath *v.* State, 55 Ga. 303.

of the court to stop counsel when appealing to the jury to decide the law in opposition to the court.[1] And in the latter jurisdictions, the court will stop counsel attempting to argue questions of law, or to read legal rulings to the jury, and will require them to address the argument to the court.[2] But while this is the case, there may nevertheless be exceptional instances in which it is permissible for counsel, by way of illustration, to read to the jury reported cases or extracts from text-books, subject to the sound discretion of the court, whose duty at the same time is to check promptly any effort on the part of counsel to induce the jury to disregard the instructions, or to take the law of the case from the books rather than from the court.[3] But there will be no reversal for an error that did no harm.[4]

Party may make statement to jury.

§ 579. At common law a defendant has a right to make a statement to the jury.[5] It was at one time held in England that when he is defended by counsel he should not, unless under peculiar circumstances, be allowed to make such statement to the jury before his counsel addresses them.[6] It has been also said that where two defendants are

[1] See infra, § 810.

[2] U. S. *v.* Riley, 5 Blatch. 204; U. S. *v.* Shive, 1 Bald. 512; where counsel were stopped when arguing the constitutionality of a law; and, generally, Davenport *v.* Com., 1 Leigh, 589; People *v.* Anderson, 44 Cal. 65; and other cases cited infra, § 810. So, in State *v.* Klinger, 46 Mo. 224, it was held that counsel could not read law books to jury, when the effect was to mislead. Nor can counsel read the opinion of the appellate court on the former trial of the same case. Bangs *v.* State, 61 Miss. 363.

[3] People *v.* Anderson, 44 Cal. 65.

That the jury may be required to retire when counsel are arguing as to admissibility of evidence, see Krance *v.* State, 61 Miss. 158; Allison *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 402.

In this case Crockett, J., said:—

"As a general rule, the practice of allowing counsel, in either a civil or criminal action, to read law to the jury, is objectionable, and ought not to be tolerated. Its usual effect is to confuse rather than to enlighten the jury. There are cases, however, in which it is permissible for counsel, by way of illustration, to read to the jury reported cases, or extracts from text-books, subject to the sound discretion of the court, whose duty it is to check promptly any effort on the part of counsel to induce the jury to disregard the instructions, or to take the law of the case from the books rather than from the court."

[4] House *v.* State, 19 Tex. Ap. 227.

[5] See Wh. Cr. Ev. § 427, where the cases are discussed; R. *v.* Malings, 8 C. & P. 242; De Foe *v.* People, 22 Mich. 224; Farlow *v.* State, 48 Ga. 30.

[6] R. *v.* Rider, 8 C. & P. 539; R. *v.* Malings, Ibid. 242; R. *v.* Manzano, 2 F. & F. 64. Compare R. *v.* White, 3 Camp. 98, cited supra, § 566.

indicted together, and one of them only is defended by counsel, it is in the discretion of the judge whether he will allow the defendant who is undefended to make his statement to the jury before or after the address of counsel.[1] But the prevalent opinion in England now is that he is at common law entitled in all cases to address the jury on the facts, if he desire,[2] and that when he has counsel, this address may be made after his counsel has closed.[3]

In jurisdictions, however, in which the defendant is entitled to be examined under oath, such unsworn statements are secondary, and cannot be received.[4]

[1] Archbold's C. P. 17th ed. (1871), p. 159. That he may cross-examine witnesses, availing himself of the suggestions of his counsel as to the proper course, see R. *v.* Parkins, Ry. & M. 168, cited supra, § 566.

[2] Whart. Cr. Ev. § 427. Higginbotham *v.* State, 19 Fla. 557. See Lond. Law Times, Feb. 21, 1880, for review of cases, *contra*, Ford *v.* State, 34 Ark. 649.

[3] R. *v.* Shimmir, London Law Times, May 13, 1882, p. 29.

[4] Com. *v.* Scott, 123 Mass. 222.

CHAPTER XI.

MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE AND CHANGE OF VENUE.

I. On Application of Prosecution.
By statute in some States trial must be prompt, § 583.
II. On Application of Defendant.
1. *Absence of Material Witness.*
Such absence ground for continuance if due diligence is shown, § 585.
And so on unauthorized withdrawal of witness, § 586.
Continuance not granted when witness was out of jurisdiction of court, § 587.
Not granted when there has been laches, § 588.
Or unless there was due diligence, § 589.
Not granted when testimony is immaterial, § 590.
Affidavit must be special, § 591.
Impeaching witnesses, and witnesses to character, not "material," § 592.
If object be delay, reason ceases, § 593.
Refusal cured by subsequent examination of witness, § 594.
Usually continuance is refused when opposite party concedes facts, § 595.
Not granted when witness had notice, unless he secretes himself, § 596.
2. *Inability of Defendant or Counsel to attend.*
Inability to attend may be a ground for continuance, § 597.
3. *Improper Prejudice of Case or Surprise.*
Continuance granted when there has been undue prejudice of case, § 598.
Treachery of counsel, § 598 *a*.
4. *Inability of Witness to understand Oath.*
In such case continuance may be granted, § 599.
5. *Pendency of Civil Proceedings*, § 599 *a*.
III. New Trial.
For refusal to give continuance new trial may be granted, § 600.
IV. Question in Error.
Refusal to continue not usually subject of error, § 601.
V. Change of Venue.
On due cause shown venue may be changed, § 602.

I. ON APPLICATION OF THE PROSECUTION.

By statute in some States trial must be prompt.

§ 583. Provisions exist, as has been noticed, in several of the States, requiring trials in criminal cases to take place within a specified period from the institution of the prosecution.[1] An arbitrary refusal on the part of the

[1] See supra, § 328. As to Massachusetts, see Glover's case, 109 Mass. 340.

In South Carolina it is at the discretion of the court to continue a cause on the part of the State. State *v.* Patterson, 1 McCord, 177.

Where a trial for a capital crime, in Massachusetts, had been continued one

State to prosecute may, under these statutes, not only release but bar further prosecution.[1]

II. ON APPLICATION OF THE DEFENDANT.

§ 584. Continuances on motion of the defendant, may be granted on three principal grounds:—

1. On affidavit setting forth the fact that a material witness is absent, that his presence will be procured by the next court, and that due diligence has been used to obtain his attendance.

2. On affidavit setting forth the inability of the defendant, and, in certain extreme cases, of his counsel, to attend the trial.

3. On affidavit, showing that means had been improperly taken to influence the jury and the public at large, so as to prevent, at the time in question, the chance of an impartial trial.

Continuing as to one defendant does not involve continuing as to others, when the trial may be several.[2]

1. *Absence of Material Witness.*

§ 585. 1. The general rule is, that a continuance will be granted on an affidavit setting forth the absence of a material witness for the defence, and alleging that his attendance will be procured at the next court, and that due diligence has been used in attempting to procure his attendance.[3]

Such absence ground for continuance if due diligence has been shown.

term and the government was not then prepared, the court, on continuing it further, took the prisoner's single recognizance for his appearance at the next term. Com. *v.* Phillips, 16 Mass. 426. But where, at the first term after the finding of a capital indictment, it appeared that a material witness on the part of the government, duly put under recognizance to appear, had fraudulently avoided the court, though without any connivance of the prisoner, the indictment was continued. Com. *v.* Carter, 11 Pick. 277.

[1] Supra, § 449.

[2] White *v.* State, 31 Ind. 262. See State *v.* Ford, 37 La. An. 444.

[3] See Kennedy *v.* State, 81 Ind. 379; Morgan *v.* Com., 14 Bush, 106; Whitley *v.* State, 38 Ga. 50; State *v.* Wood, 68 Mo. 444; Jones *v.* State, 10 Lea, 585; Ratliff *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 330; State *v.* Burwell, 34 Kas. 312.

Thus in England a trial for murder was put off until the next assizes, upon an application on the part of the prosecution, on the ground of the inability of a material witness to attend, although the witness was not examined before the magistrates, there being an affidavit of a medical man as to an injury to the witness, rendering it, in his opinion, unsafe that he should travel, and this even after the trial had

§ 586. Where a party is surprised by the unauthorized withdrawal of his witnesses after the trial has commenced, the practice is to apply for a continuance or postponement of the trial; and should the court unadvisedly refuse the application, such refusal may be made the ground of application for a new trial.[1]

And so on unauthorized withdrawal of witness.

There are, however, the following qualifications to the rule admitting continuance on the ground of absence of witnesses.

§ 587. A continuance will not be granted, where the absent testimony is out of the process of the court.[2] Thus it was held by Story, J., in a leading case, not to be a sufficient ground for a delay of trial that the party wishes it in order to procure papers from a foreign country, since the court could not issue process which will be effectual in procuring such papers.[3] But in a strong case, and when there is a reasonable ground for expecting to receive the testimony, a continuance will be granted to secure such foreign testimony, if it be admissible.[4]

Continuance not granted when witness is out of process of court or of uncertain attendance.

There must, in any case, in order to sustain the motion, be a reasonable prospect of obtaining the attendance of the witness at the period asked for.[5]

§ 588. A continuance will not be granted on such an affidavit when the prisoner has been guilty of laches or delay,[6] or of any

been appointed for a particular day. R. *v.* Lawrence, 4 F. & F. 901.

And so it has been held that the court will postpone until the next assizes the trial of a prisoner charged with murder, on an affidavit by his mother that she would be enabled to prove by several witnesses that he was of unsound mind, and that she and her family were in extreme poverty, and had been unable to procure the means to produce such witnesses, and that she had reason to believe that if time were given her the requisite funds would be provided. R. *v.* Langhurst, 10 Cox C. C. 353; 4 F. & F. 969.

[1] Cotton *v.* State, 4 Tex. 260. See Lynes *v.* State, 46 Ga. 208.

[2] Com. *v.* Millard, 1 Mass. 6; State *v.* Zellers, 2 Halst. 220; Mull's case, 8 Grat. 695; State *v.* Files, 3 Brevard, 304; 1 Const. R. 234; People *v.* Cleveland, 49 Cal. 578; Guoganden *v.* State, 41 Tex. 626.

[3] U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumner, 19. See R. *v.* D'Eon, 1 W. Bl. 510; Hurd *v.* Com., 5 Leigh. 715; infra, § 589; Mull's case, 8 Grat. 695; State *v.* Files, 3 Brev. 304; State *v.* Lewis, 1 Bay, 1.

[4] White *v.* Com., 80 Ky. 480; McDermott *v.* State, 89 Ind. 187; State *v.* Klinger, 43 Mo. 127.

[5] People *v.* Lewis, 64 Cal. 401.

[6] 8 East, 37; 1 Blackstone, 514; Com. *v.* Millard, 1 Mass. 9; Com. *v.* Gross, 1 Ashm. 281; Holt *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 156; Bledsoe *v.* Com., 6 Rand. 673; Fiott *v.* Com., 12 Grat. 564;

connivance.[1] Thus in a case in the Court of Errors of Virginia, it was held that where, after one continuance obtained by the prisoner, who was charged with uttering a forged note, he asked for another, the court below was right in compelling him to disclose what the absent witness would prove; and was justified in refusing the continuance, though the witness was shown to be material, due diligence not having been used to procure his attendance.[2] And where a continuance was asked on account of the absence of witnesses, but the evidence of one of them, according to the affidavit, would have been entitled to but little influence, and the others were merely to impeach the principal witness for the prosecution, the case having been continued before, and it not appearing why the witnesses were not attached, nor that they would attend at the next term, it was held that the application was properly refused.[3]

Not granted when there have been laches.

§ 589. The affidavit must itself show due diligence in summoning the absent witnesses,[4] or good grounds for expecting their attendance at a future court.[5] Thus where a prisoner indicted for felony made affidavit that he had four material witnesses who were absent, and resident in another State, without naming them, or stating that he had made any effort to procure their attendance, or that he expected to be able to procure their attendance, and thereupon prayed a continuance, it was

Or unless there was due diligence.

Rousell's case, 28 Grat. 930; Brown *v.* State, 65 Ga. 332; State *v.* Taylor, 11 La. 709; Gibson *v.* State, 59 Miss. 341; Fletcher *v.* State, 60 Miss. 675; Thomas *v.* State, 61 Miss. 60; State *v.* Burns, 54 Mo. 274; State *v.* Simms, 68 Mo. 305; Gladden *v.* State, 12 Fla. 562; Anderson *v.* State, 28 Ind. 22; Earp *v.* Com., 9 Dana, 302; Dingman *v.* State, 46 Wis. 485; Coward *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 59; Cardova *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 445; Gaston *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 143; Evans *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 225; Walker *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 618; Mapes *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 129; Hart *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 657; O'Neal *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 582; People *v.* Jocelyn, 29 Cal. 562.

[1] Wormley *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 658.

[2] Holt *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 156.

[3] Earp *v.* Com., 9 Dana, 302. See Holden *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 601.

[4] State *v.* Fox, 79 Mo. 109; McDermott *v.* State, 89 Ind. 187; People *v.* Lampson, 70 Cal. 204; Atkins *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 8; Pullen *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 89. See Taylor *v.* State, 11 Lea, 708; Davis *v.* State, 85 Tenn. 522.

[5] State *v.* Whitton, 68 Mo. 91; Murray *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 417; Strickland *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 364, and cases cited to last section. See, also, Mapes *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 129; O'Neal *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 582.

held the motion for a continuance was properly overruled.[1] The court may examine the party as to the grounds of his affidavit.[2]

Not granted when testimony is immaterial.

§ 590. A continuance will not be granted on such an affidavit, where, on the court's requiring such particularity (which, at least when the application is made for the second time, it is usual for it to do),[3] it appears on the face of the defendant's application that the object for which the absent witness is to be called is not material to the issue,[4] or would not, if granted, have an appreciable effect.[5]

Affidavit must be special.

§ 591. The affidavit must be sworn a sufficient period before trial, to give notice to the opposite side, unless the facts affecting the witness were not known in time, when it may be sworn in court, and from the proof offered the judge will decide if the witness is material.[6] The affidavit must, as a rule, be made by the party on whose behalf the postponement is sought; but his absence, age, sickness, or other sufficient cause will let in his attorney, or even a third person, to swear it.[7] The illness of the absent witness, or of a child of which she is the nursing mother, is best established by the affidavit of the medical attendant. The name and place of abode of the expected witness, his continued absence or actual incapacity to attend at any time during the session, and the use of every reasonable effort to compel such attendance, must be distinctly specified, and the materiality of his evidence in the case shown.[8] Nor will these facts suffice to post-

[1] Hurd *v.* Com., 5 Leigh, 715.

[2] State *v.* Betsall, 11 W. Va. 703.

[3] Nelson *v.* State, 2 Swan, 482.

[4] Steel *v.* People, 45 Ill. 152; State *v.* Pagels, 92 Mo. 300; Bledsoe *v.* Com., 6 Randolph, 673; Hurd *v.* Com., 5 Leigh, 715; Earp *v.* Com., 9 Dana, 302; Davis *v.* State, 85 Tenn. 522; State *v.* Files, 3 Brev. 304; Dacy *v.* State, 17 Ga. 439; Jones *v.* State, 60 Miss. 117; People *v.* Thompson, 4 Cal. 238; Bruton *v.* State, 21 Tex. 337. See Pinckford *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 468; Nolan *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 474; Phelps *v.* State, 15 Tex. Ap. 45; Irvine *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 12; Henning *v.* State, 24 Tex. Ap. 315.

[5] People *v.* Anderson, 53 Mich. 60; Varnadoe *v.* State, 67 Ga. 768; Allison *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 402.

[6] Adams *v.* People, 109 Ill. 444; Dunn *v.* People, 109 Ill. 635.

[7] Moody *v.* People, 20 Ill. 315. But see R. *v.* Langhurst, 10 Cox C. C. 353; 4 F. & F. 969, where the affidavit of the attorney was refused.

[8] Beavers *v.* State, 58 Ind. 530; Moody *v.* People, 20 Ill. 315; Crews *v.* People, 120 Ill. 317; State *v.* Underwood, 76 Mo. 630; Comstock *v.* State, 14 Neb. 205; Polin *v.* State, 14 Neb. 540.

pone the trial, unless the affidavit is positive in its verification of them.[1] Thus, it must state that the absent person is a material witness, without whose evidence the applicant cannot safely proceed to trial, and that he has endeavored, without effect, to serve on him a subpœna; specifying the exertions used. It should then state in plain terms that there is reasonable ground for believing that the delay sought for will tend to the furtherance of justice, and that the testimony of the witness may be obtained at the time to which the trial is proposed to be deferred.[2] Unless there be such exactness, a continuance will not be granted.[3] In proper cases, counter-affidavits may be presented.[4]

Impeaching witnesses and witnesses to character not generally "material."

§ 592. Unless there be auxiliary grounds, a continuance will not be granted on account of the absence of impeaching witnesses. Thus, where it appeared that two witnesses out of three, on the ground of whose absence a continuance was asked, were merely to impeach the chief witnesses for the prosecution, and that the third was immaterial, a continuance was refused.[5] On account of the absence of witnesses to character, a continuance will rarely be granted.[6] *A fortiori* the continuance will be refused in such case where the prosecution admits that to which the absent witness is to testify. Thus where in a New York case it was proved on the part of the government, and was not disputed by the accused, that no living person save the prisoner was present at the alleged murder, nor was there claim of an alibi, and it appeared by the affidavits that the absent witnesses were expected to testify to the defendant's good character before the alleged murder, which the prosecution admitted; the motion was denied.[7]

[1] See Pullen *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 89.

[2] Dick. Q. S. 6th ed. 469; Foster, 40; 1 Wheel. C. C. 30; Com. *v.* Fuller, 2 Ibid. 323; Holt *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 156; Mull's case, 8 Grat. 695. See, as to requisites of affidavit, Cutler *v.* State, 42 Ind. 244; Miller *v.* State, 42 Ind. 544; Jim *v.* State, 15 Ga. 535; State *v.* Lange, 59 Mo. 418; People *v.* Francis, 38 Cal. 183; People *v.* McCrory, 41 Cal. 458.

[3] Williams *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 114; People *v.* Garns, 2 Utah, 260.

[4] State *v.* Simien, 30 La. An. Pt. I. 296. See Johnson *v.* State, 65 Ga. 74; State *v.* Williams, 69 Ga. 11.

[5] Earp *v.* Com., 9 Dana, 302.

[6] R. *v.* Jones, 8 East, 34, Lawrence, J.; Rhea *v.* State, 10 Yerger, 258; State *v.* Klinger, 43 Mo. 127; but see *contra*, State *v.* Nash, 7 Iowa, 347.

[7] People *v.* Wilson, 3 Park. C. R. 199.

If object be delay, reason ceases.

§ 593. It is in the discretion of the court, even where the materiality of the absent evidence is exposed on affidavit, to refuse a continuance, if it should appear that the defendant's sole object was delay.[1]

Refusal cured by subsequent examination of witness.

§ 594. Refusal by the court to continue a capital trial because of a witness's absence, on the ground of want of diligence on the part of the defendant, is, whether erroneous or not, no ground for a new trial, if the witness was brought in and testified before the end of the trial.[2]

Usually continuance is refused when opposite party concedes facts.

§ 595. A continuance, according to the general practice, may be refused, if the adverse party will admit that such witness would testify as is supposed by the party moving for a continuance.[3] It has, however, been said that it is not sufficient that the opposite party should admit that the witness would have testified to the specific facts; there must be an admission that those facts are absolutely true.[4] But the better view is that contradictory evidence may be introduced by a party who has admitted statements made in an affidavit for continuance, and that the same questions of competency may be raised as would be allowed if the witness were sworn in court.[5] Such an admission is a waiver of the defendant's constitutional right to hear the witnesses produced against him.[6] Circumstances, however, may exist, when, upon the defendant making an affidavit for a continuance, it will be held that the prosecution cannot force him into a trial by admitting the truth of what the alleged absent witness would depose to, such witness being attainable at a

[1] Vance *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 162; Bledsoe *v.* People, 6 Randolph, 674; State *v.* Duncan, 6 Ire. 98; People *v.* Thompson, 4 Cal. 238.

[2] Mitchell *v.* State, 22 Ga. 211.

[3] People *v.* Wilson, 3 Parker C. R. 199; Van Meter *v.* People, 60 Ill. 168; Wise *v.* State, 34 Ga. 348; Browning *v.* State, 33 Miss. 48; People *v.* Brown, 59 Cal. 345. That Missouri statute making this obligatory is unconstitutional, see State *v.* Hickman, 75 Mo. 416; State *v.* Berkeley, 92 Mo. 41.

[4] See People *v.* Vermilyea, 7 Cow. 369; Brill *v.* Lord, 14 Johns. 341; but see cases in last note.

[5] Olds *v.* Com., 3 Marsh. 467; State *v.* Geddis, 42 Iowa, 164. Upon the witness turning up he may be examined, notwithstanding the agreement to take his testimony as offered in advance. Hackett *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 406.

[6] State *v.* Wagner, 78 Mo. 644; Hancock *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 392.

future trial.[1] And in any view the admission must be as broad as the offer.[2]

Not granted when witness had notice, unless he secretes himself.

§ 596. A continuance will not be granted on such an affidavit, where it appears that the absent witness had notice of the time of trial, and was duly summoned, unless he had secreted himself, or had been spirited away by the opposite party.[3]

2. *Inability of Defendant or his Counsel to attend.*

Inability to attend may be a ground.

§ 597. On affidavit setting forth the inability of the defendant,[4] and in certain extreme cases, *e. g.*, sickness,[5] of his counsel to attend the trial, the motion may be granted,[6] and the same indulgence will be granted when the defendant has been suddenly and without notice abandoned by his counsel, so that he cannot properly prepare for trial.[7] Death or sickness of counsel, occurring so suddenly as to prevent the engagment of others, is generally good ground;[8] but mere absence of counsel is rarely received as in itself adequate,[9] and this is eminently the case when the absent counsel is one of two or more employed.[10] Certainly such excuse cannot be made available more than once in the same case.[11]

3. *Improper Means to prejudice Case.*

§ 598. A continuance may also be granted on affidavit showing that means had been improperly taken to influence the jury and

[1] Goodman *v.* State, 1 Meigs, 195; State *v.* Baker, 13 Lea, 326; Wassels *v.* State, 26 Ind. 30; De Warren *v.* State, 29 Tex. 464; People *v.* Dodge, 28 Cal. 445. *Aliter* where witness is out of jurisdiction. Petty *v.* State, 4 Lea, 328.

[2] People *v.* Brown, 54 Cal. 243.

[3] Barnes, 442.

[4] See Hays *v.* State, 68 Ga. 833.

[5] Loyd *v.* State, 45 Ga. 57; Brown *v.* State, 38 Tex. 482; People *v.* Logan, 4 Cal. 188. But see Harvey *v.* State, 67 Ga. 639; State *v.* Stegner, 72 Iowa, 13. Sickness of prosecuting officer is ground for continuance, People *v.* Shufelt, 61 Mich. 237.

[6] Say. Rep. 63.

[7] Wray *v.* People, 78 Ill. 212.

[8] Hunter *v.* Fairfax, 3 Dall. 305.

[9] M'Kay *v.* Ins. Co., 2 Caines, 384; Hammond *v.* Haws, Wallace C. C. 1; but see Rhode Island *v.* Massachusetts, 11 Peters, 226; Long *v.* State, 38 Ga. 49; State *v.* Ferris, 16 La. An. 424; Roberts *v.* State, 9 Col. 458.

[10] Turner *v.* State, 70 Ga. 769; Walker *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 618.

[11] State *v.* Dubois, 24 La. An. 309.

the public at large, so as to prevent, at that time, an impartial trial,[1] and that the public excitement was such as to intimidate and swerve the jury.[2] But the fact of ordinary newspaper paragraphs existing on the subject is not enough.[3] Where the excitement is the result of the defendant's own action, the application will be refused;[4] and it is not a good ground for a new trial, that at the time of trial there was a great excitement in the public mind against the accused.[5] A continuance also may be granted in cases of non-culpable surprise.[6]

And so when opposite party takes improper means to prejudice case. And so of surprise.

§ 598 *a*. A continuance, also, may be granted when by the treachery or misconduct of counsel, due preparation for trial is prevented.[7]

Treachery of counsel.

4. *Inability of Witness to understand the Obligation of an Oath.*

§ 599. A continuance, also, will sometimes be granted where a witness, whose evidence is material to the case, has no sense of the obligation of an oath; in such a case, the trial may be adjourned until the witness is instructed in the principles of moral duty.[8]

And so of inability of witness to understand oath.

5. *Pendency of Civil Proceedings.*

§ 599 *a*. The court will not continue a prosecution because a civil suit is pending when the prosecution is the proper remedy for the wrong.[9] It is otherwise, however, when the prosecutor resorts to civil proceedings as a means of redress for which they are peculiarly suited.[10]

[1] 1 Burrow, 510.

[2] Com. *v.* Dunham, Thach. C. C. 516.

[3] Com. *v.* Carson, Mayor's Court of Philadelphia, June, 1823, per Reed, Recorder; 1 Wheel. C. C. 488.

[4] U. S. *v.* Porter, 1 Baldwin, 78.

[5] Infra, § 889. See State *v.* Ford, 37 La. An. 444.

[6] Lutton *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 518.

[7] State *v.* Lewis, 74 Mo. 222; infra, § 878.

[8] 1 Leach's Cases, 430. See Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 366, 370.

[9] Taylor *v.* Com., 29 Grat. 780. See Foster *v.* Com., 8 W. & S. 77; Drake *v.* Lowell, 13 Metc. 292; supra, § 453.

[10] See Fielding's case, 2 Burr. 719; R. *v.* Simmons, 8 C. & P. 50; Com. *v.* Bliss, 1 Mass. 32; Com. *v.* Elliot, 2 Mass. 372; Resp. *v.* Gross, 2 Yeates, 479; Com. *v.* Dickinson, 3 Clark, Phil. 365; Com. *v.* Dickerson, 7 Weekly Notes, 433. Supra, § 453. Compare Buckner *v.* Beek, Dudley (S. C.), 168; Richardson *v.* Luntz, 26 La. An. 313; State *v.* Wilson, 33 La. An. 261; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 618.

III. NEW TRIAL.

§ 600. If, on a motion for new trial, the court is convinced, after hearing all of the evidence, that the continuance should have been allowed, the motion should be granted;[1] and if it be refused, the party excepting may, in those jurisdictions where a bill of exceptions lies in such cases, obtain, in a strong case, a revision in error.[2]

For refusal to give continuance new trial may be granted.

IV. QUESTION IN ERROR.

§ 601. As a general rule, error does not lie to the action of the court on a motion for continuance, which is in the discretion of the court;[3] though when a bill of exceptions is taken, the decision, in a strong case, may be reviewed.[4]

But refusal not usually subject of error.

V. CHANGE OF VENUE.

§ 602. In some jurisdictions at common law, in others by local statute, the venue of a case may be changed on the defendant's application,[5] at the discretion of the court, on due cause shown.[6]

[1] See cases cited infra, § 793, and in next note, and see Heath *v.* State, 68 Ga. 287.

[2] Infra, §§ 777, 882–3; McDaniel *v.* State, 8 S. & M. 401. See Malone *v.* State, 49 Ga. 212; Moody *v.* State, 54 Ga. 660; Jones *v.* State, 10 Lea, 585.

[3] Infra, §§ 777, 883; Com. *v.* Donovan, 99 Mass. 425; De Arman *v.* State, 77 Ala. 10; Eighmy *v.* People, 79 N. Y. 546; Webster *v.* People, 92 N. Y. 422; State *v.* Dodson, 16 S. C. 453; Cox *v.* State, 64 Ga. 374; Strauss *v.* State, 58 Miss. 53; Jones *v.* State, 60 Miss. 117; State *v.* Lewis, 74 Mo. 222; State *v.* Shreve, 39 Mo. 90; State *v.* Wilson, 23 La. An. 558; Morgan *v.* State, 13 Fl. 671; State *v.* Chevalier, 36 La. An. 81; Eldridge *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 208; Edmonds *v.* State, 34 Ark. 720.

[4] Johnson *v.* State, 42 Ohio St. 207; Taylor *v.* Com., 77 Va. 692; Wassels *v.* State, 26 Ind. 30; Hurt *v.* State, 26 Ind. 106; Sturm *v.* State, 74 Ind. 335; State *v.* Rorabacher, 19 Iowa, 154; State *v.* Painter, 40 Iowa, 298; Salisbury *v.* State, 79 Ky. 425; State *v.* Scott, 78 N. C. 465; Long *v.* State, 38 Ga. 491; Whitely *v.* State, 38 Ga. 50; Monday *v.* State, 32 Ga. 672; Brown *v.* State, 65 Ga. 332; Williams *v.* State, 69 Ga. 11; Barber *v.* State, 13 Fla. 675; State *v.* Moultrie, 33 La. An. 1146; State *v.* Horton, 33 La. An. 289; State *v.* Briggs, 34 La. An. 69; State *v.* Boyd, 37 La. An. 81; Williams *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 528; Garrold *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 219; Bohannon *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 271. Infra, § 771.

[5] See State *v.* Green, 22 W. Va. 800.

[6] 1 Ch. C. L. 201; R. *v.* Hunt, 3 B.

The application is too late when made after empanelling the jury,[1] and the burden is on the petitioner to make out a case.[2]

On due cause venue may be changed.

If the ground laid be incapacity of the judge, it has been ruled the court has no discretion, and that the application must be granted;[3] though this view must be limited to cases where such incapacity is established.[4] The ground for a change should be fully spread on the record, so that it can be examined by a court of error;[5] and that facts must be set forth showing that the party could not have a fair trial in the district or town in which the arraignment is proposed.[6] The arraignment once made, in the place where the indictment is found, need not be repeated in the place to

& Ald. 444; R. *v.* Cowle, 2 Burr. 834; R. *v.* Holden, 5 B. & Ad. 347; People *v.* Harris, 4 Denio, 150; People *v.* Webb, 1 Hill N. Y. 179; Davis *v.* State, 39 Md. 355; State *v.* Spurbeck, 44 Iowa, 667; Dunn *v.* People, 109 Ill. 635; Manly *v.* State, 52 Ind. 215; Bissot *v.* State, 53 Ind. 408; Leslie *v.* State, 83 Ind. 180; Shular *v.* Shular, 105 Ind. 290; Hopkins *v.* State, 10 Lea, 204; Martin *v.* State, 35 Wis. 294; State *v.* Rowan, 35 Wis. 303; State *v.* Coleman, 8 S. C. 237; Brinkley *v.* State, 54 Ga. 371; Williams *v.* State, 48 Ala. 85; Taylor *v.* State, 48 Ala. 180; Holton, ex parte, 69 Ala. 164; State *v.* Ford, 37 La. An. 443; State *v.* O'Rourke, 55 Mo. 440; State *v.* Shipman, 63 Mo. 147; State *v.* Lawthew, 65 Mo. 454; State *v.* Burgess, 68 Mo. 334; State *v.* Hayes, 14 Mo. Ap. 173; State *v.* Bohan, 15 Kans. 407; McPherson *v.* State, 29 Ark. 225; People *v.* Congleton, 44 Cal. 92; People *v.* Perdue, 49 Cal. 425; Burris *v.* State, 38 Ark. 221; Anshicks *v.* State, 45 Tex. 148; Davis *v.* State, 19 Tex. Ap. 201; Labbaite *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 257; State *v.* Adams, 20 Kans. 311.

[1] People *v.* Cotta, 49 Cal. 169.

[2] People *v.* Sammis, 3 Hun, 560.

[3] Mershon *v.* State, 44 Ind. 598; Curtis, ex parte, 3 Minn. 274; State *v.* Gates, 20 Mo. 400; a case where the judge had been counsel. See People *v.* Reed, 49 Iowa, 85; State *v.* Foley, 65 Iowa, 51; infra, § 605.

[4] People *v.* Shuler, 28 Cal. 490.

[5] Wormeley *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 658; State *v.* Barrett, 8 Iowa, 536; Emporia *v.* Volmer, 12 Kans. 622. See State *v.* Daniels, 66 Mo. 103; Poe *v.* State, 10 Lea, 673. There will be no reversal if substantial justice is done. Posey *v.* State, 73 Ala. 490; Magee *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 367.

[6] R. *v.* Holden, 5 B. & Ad. 347; People *v.* Bodine, 7 Hill N. Y. 147; Wormeley *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 658; State *v.* Williams, 2 McCord, 302; People *v.* Graham, 21 Cal. 261. As refusing change of venue on statutory grounds, see State *v.* Howard, 31 Vt. 414. That the right to a change of venue is not absolute, see Dulany *v.* State, 45 Md. 100. As to its limitations, see State *v.* Flynn, 31 Ark. 35. That defendant, after change on his petition, cannot object to jurisdiction, see Perteet *v.* People, 70 Ill. 71. In this State the petitioner has a statutory right to the change, on making the prescribed affidavit. Brennan *v.* People, 15 Ill. 511.

which the trial is removed,[1] though a double arraignment would not be error.[2] Venue may be changed as to one of several defendants, leaving the others to be tried in the place of the finding of the bill.[3] With regard to the constitutional questions involved, it may be noticed that the provision, as it exists in most constitutions, that the defendant is to be tried by an "*impartial* jury of the *vicinage*," would forbid, if the term "vicinage" be regarded as imperative, any trial when no impartial jury of the vicinage is to be found. The term "vicinage," therefore, is to be regarded as indicatory rather than mandatory; and it is the vicinage of the place of the offence rather than that of the corporeal position of the offender.[4] And even where the guarantee is specifically given, it can be waived.[5]

A trial court may be compelled by mandamus from an appellate court to try a case removed to it on change of venue.[6]

In determining whether a judge of a United States district court is to remove a criminal trial from one district to another, he must exercise a sound discretion in view of the whole case, this being a question of discretion.[7]

[1] Davis *v.* State, 39 Md. 355; Price *v.* State, 8 Gill, 295; Vance *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 162; Hayes *v.* State, 58 Ga. 35; Paris *v.* State, 36 Ala. 232.

[2] Gardner *v.* People, 3 Scam. 83. See infra, §§ 699 *et seq.*

[3] State *v.* Carothers, 1 C. G. Greene (Iowa), 464; State *v.* Martin, 2 Ired. 101; State *v.* Wetherford, 25 Mo. 439; though see People *v.* Baker, 3 Parker C. R. 181.

[4] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 284, note.

As to Texas practice, see Cox, ex parte, 12 Tex. Ap. 605; Hoffman *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 406.

As to federal statute, see Burkhardt, in re, 33 Fed. Rep. 25.

[5] See Gut *v.* State, 9 Wall. 35. Infra, § 733.

[6] People *v.* Lane, 105 Ill. 662.

[7] Wolf, in re, 27 Fed. Rep. 606. See State *v.* Perigo, 70 Iowa, 657.

CHAPTER XII.

CHALLENGES.

I. CHALLENGES TO COURT.
Judges not open to challenge, § 605.
II. CHALLENGES TO JURY.
1. *To the Array.*
Principal challenge to array is based on irregularity of selection, § 608.
Burden is on challenger, § 609.
After plea too late, § 610.
Challenge to array for favor is where the question is disputed fact, § 611.
2. *To the Polls.*
Peremptory.
Prosecution has no peremptory challenge, but may set aside juror, § 612.
Practice is under direction of court, and so order of challenge, § 613.
Defendant may peremptorily challenge at common law, § 614.
Rule as to joint defendants and several counts, § 614 *a*.
On preliminary issues no challenge, § 615.
Nor on collateral issues, § 616.
Right ceases when panel is complete, § 617.
In misdemeanors no peremptory challenges at common law, § 618.
Matured challenge cannot ordinarily be recalled, § 619.
Right is to reject, not select, § 620.
Principal.
Principal challenge is where case does not rest on disputed fact, § 621.
Preadjudication of Case.
Preadjudication of case is ground for challenge, § 622.
But opinions thrown out as jest, or as vague, loose talk, do not ordinarily disqualify, § 623.
Nor does a general bias against crime, § 624.
In United States courts a deliberate opinion as to defendant's guilt disqualifies, § 625.
And so in Maine, § 626.
And in New Hampshire, § 627.
In Vermont prior expression of opinion disqualifies, § 628.
In Massachusetts prejudice must go to particular issue, § 629.
So in Connecticut, § 630.
In New York, at common law, opinion, but not impression, disqualifies, § 631.
But by statute no disqualification of witness not under bias, § 632.
In New Jersey hypothesis does not exclude, § 633.
In Pennsylvania, opinion, but not impression, disqualifies, § 634.
So in Delaware and Maryland, § 635.
So in Virginia, § 636.
So in North and South Carolina, § 637.
So in Ohio, § 638.
So in Alabama, § 639.
So in Mississippi, § 640.
So in Missouri, § 641.
So in Tennessee, § 642.
So in Indiana, § 643.
So in Illinois, § 644.
So in Arkansas, § 645.

So in Georgia, § 646.
So in Iowa, § 647.
Rule in Wisconsin and Nebraska, § 648.
In Michigan opinion must be unqualified, § 649.
So in California, § 650.
So in Louisiana, § 651.
So in Kansas, Florida, Texas, and Colorado, § 652.
General Propositions as to Prejudice.
Opinion must go to whole case, § 653.
Juror must answer questions, though not to inculpate himself, § 654.
Must first be sworn on *voir dire*, § 655.
Court may ask questions, § 656.
Only party prejudiced may challenge, § 657.
Juror may be examined as to details, § 658.
Bias must go to immediate issue, § 659.
Relationship and business association cause for challenge, § 660.
And so of prior connection with case, § 661.
And so of participation in cognate offence, § 661 *a*.
And so of pecuniary interest in result, § 662.
And so of irreligion, infamy, and incapacity, § 663.
And so of conscientious scruples as to capital punishment, § 664.
And so of other conscientious scruples, § 665.
And so of belief that statute is unconstitutional, § 666.
"Free-masonry" does not exclude, § 667.
Membership of specific "vigilance" associations, or prospective organizations, may disqualify, but not of general association to put down crime, § 668.
Alienage, non-residence, or ignorance of language.
This may be a disqualification, § 669.
Challenges to Polls for Favor.
Challenges for favor are those involving disputed questions of fact, § 670.
Challenges cannot moot privileges of juror, § 671.
III. MODE AND TIME OF TAKING CHALLENGE.
Challenge must be prior to oath, § 672.
When for favor must specify reasons, § 673.
Juror to be sworn on *voir dire*, § 674.
Passing over to court no waiver, § 675.
After principal challenge, may be challenge for favor, § 676.
Peremptory challenge may be after challenge for cause, § 677.
Challenge may be made by counsel, § 678.
In cases of surprise may be recalled, § 679.
One defendant cannot object to co-defendant's challenges, § 680.
Juror passed by one side may be challenged by other, § 681.
Juror may be cross-examiued and contradicted, § 682.
Court may of its own motion examine and excuse, § 683.
IV. HOW CHALLENGES ARE TO BE TRIED.
At common law at discretion of court, § 684.
As to array, triers are appointed on issues of fact; otherwise when there is demurrer, § 685.
At common law, on challenges to the polls, triers are appointed by court, § 686.
No challenge to triers, § 687.
When triers are not asked for, parties are bound by decision of court, § 688.
All evidence tending to show bias is admissible, § 689.
But bias must be shown to set aside juror, § 690.
V. JUROR'S PERSONAL PRIVILEGE NOT GROUND FOR CHALLENGE, § 692.

VI. Revision by Appellate Court.
Defendant not exhausting peremptory challenges cannot except to overruling challenge to favor, § 693.
Otherwise where he has exhausted his personal challenges, § 694.
Error lies when challenge is on record, § 695.

I. CHALLENGES TO COURT.

Judges not open to challenge.

§ 605. The Roman common law extends the right of challenge *for cause*—no peremptory challenges being allowed—to the judge as well as to the juror; and the great inclination of authority is that the causes which disqualify the one disqualify the other.[1] Where the judge, like the chancellor, sits to try both facts and law, as is the case with the civilians, there is peculiar reason for the application to him of a jealous test; and the cases where he may be challenged are placed in two classes: (1.) Where he is disqualified by circumstances beyond his control; *e. g.*, relationship or previous connection with the subject-matter. (2.) Where he is disqualified by misconduct; *e. g.*, partiality or prejudice.[2] But by the common law of England and America, where the judge is a stationary officer, subject to impeachment, and where the jury is unimpeachable, and from its character is peculiarly susceptible to those influences which produce incompetency, it would be impracticable to treat each as subject to the same rule. A juryman, again, when challenged, may be readily replaced; but as a judge could not sit to try his own competency, every challenge would involve an appeal. It would also be necessary to establish a reserve court to sit subsequently in case a disqualification were found to exist; and since, as to such reserve court, there might be challenges, a trial might be indefinitely suspended for want of an ultimate arbiter. For these and other reasons, we have, in English and American practice, no case of the challenge of a judge, it being left to the sense of delicacy and of duty in such high functionaries to retire when interested in an issue brought before them for trial. Should a judge decline to retire in such cases, the remedy is a motion for a new trial,[3] or change of venue.[4] The proper course, if

[1] Mittermaier Deutsch. Str. 1, s. 30; Hopfner ueber Anklage Process, p. 257; Wildvogel de Recusat. Jud. Ejusque usu et abusu; Granz Defens. Reor. p. 381; Seuffert von dem Rechte de Peinl. augeklagten Seinen Richter Auszuschliessen.

[2] Bentham on Judicial Organization, c. 16; Jousse, traité i. p. 555.

[3] See infra, §§ 798 *a*, 844.

[4] Supra, § 602.

such interest or prejudice is claimed, is to make the objection at the outset. If the judge persist after this in sitting in the case, this lays ground for a new trial,[1] or for impeachment of the judge.[2]

[1] See as to writ of error, Sale *v.* State, 68 Ala. 530.

[2] In an article in 1877, in the Solicitors' Journal, transferred to the Alb. L. Journal, we are told that Lord Holt, on the hearing of any question in which he was personally interested, left the bench and sat by the counsel. See 21 L. J. M. C. 171. Cf. remarks of Lord Hobart in Day *v.* Savage, Hob. 87, and of Blackburn, J., in Mersey Dock Trustees *v.* Gibbs, L. R. 1 H. L. 110. And Lord Holt tells of a mayor of Hereford, who was laid by the heels for sitting in judgment in a cause where he himself was lessor of the plaintiff in ejectment, though he, by the charter, was sole judge of the court. 1 Salk. 395. Lord Coke furnishes, as a ground for the rule, the curious reason that men are generally more foolish in their own concerns than in those of other people; 1 Inst. 377; but the real reason for its stringency is that given by Lord Campbell, in Dimes *v.* Canal Co., 3 H. L. 759, 793, that tribunals should "take care, not only that in their decree they are not influenced by their personal interest, but to avoid the appearance of laboring under such an influence."

On the second trial of Tweed, in New York, 1875, the counsel for the defendant, before the trial began, filed with Judge Noah Davis, then on the bench, a paper, taking exception to his sitting on the trial, because, among other reasons, on a former trial he had "expressed a most unqualified and decided opinion unfavorable to the defendant upon the facts of the case, and declined to charge the jury that they were not to be influenced by such expression of his opinion." Judge Davis was one of several judges, any one of which could have held the court. On receiving this paper Judge Davis, after consulting with some of his associates, proceeded to try the case, which resulted in the defendant's conviction, on a number of counts, and on a sentence on each count, which was afterwards reversed as to all but the first count. (See infra, §§ 910, 994, 996 *b*.) When the trial was over, Judge Davis took the extraordinary course of announcing that the counsel offering the protest were guilty of contempt, and "imposing" on the three seniors "a fine of two hundred and fifty dollars each, and order that they stand committed until the fine be paid." See Works of David Dudley Field, Vol. II., p. 323. In the London Law Times of November 1, 1884, p. 6, the action of Judge Davis in this respect is assailed as inconsistent with all traditions of English law. (See 30 Alb. L. J. 401.) Nor, so far as the commitment for contempt is concerned, can it be relied on as a precedent. Aside from the cases mentioned by Mr. Field, where similar objections have been made to judges sitting after expressing an opinion in a case, may be noticed that of Fries's trial (supra, § 560; infra, § 798 *a*), in which, upon Judge Chase giving in advance an opinion on the law, Messrs. Dallas & Lewis withdrew from the defence. Their protest against the action of the court was far more vehement than that of Tweed's counsel in the trial now commented on. Judge Chase was arbitrary enough, but the committal of Messrs. Dallas & Lewis for contempt did not occur to him, and his

II. CHALLENGES TO JURY.

§ 606. In our own practice the two principal kinds of challenge are, first, to the *array*, by which is meant the whole jury, as it stands *arrayed* in the *panel*, or little square *panes* of parchment, on which the jurors' names are written; or to the *polls*, by which is meant the several particular persons or *heads* in the array.

1. *To the Array.*

§ 607. Challenge to the array is based on the partiality or default of the sheriff, coroner, or other officer that made the return, and must be made in writing.[1] This may be considered under two heads.

Principal challenge to array is based on irregularity of selection.

§ 608. *Principal challenge to the array*, which, if it be made good, is cause for exemption, without resort to triers.[2] Principal challenges to the array are only granted on proof of relationship, partiality, fraud, gross irregularity, or corruption on the part of the officers charged with the selection.[3] Challenges of this class will be allowed: If the sheriff be the actual prosecutor or the party aggrieved;[4] if he be related to either of the parties, and the relationship be exist-

action in pre-announcing his opinion in the case was afterwards one of the grounds on which he was impeached.

In R. *v.* Rand, L. R. 1 Q. B. 230, it was held that though any pecuniary interest, however small, in the subject-matter, disqualifies a justice, the mere possibility of bias does not render void his judicial decision. See London Law Times, August 11, 1877; State *v.* Mewherter, 46 Iowa, 85.

It has been held that for a member of a court to absent himself for a day during the trial disqualifies him for further sitting in the case. People *v.* Shaw, 63 N. Y. 36. See Abram *v.* State, 4 Ala. 277; Turbeville *v.* State, 56 Miss. 793; supra, § 486.

In 1879 one of the judges of the Kentucky Court of Appeal was shot dead in the court-room by Buford, a party against whom the court had ruled. Buford was convicted of this murder, and the surviving judges, by whom the original case was decided, declined to sit on his appeal after his conviction. The disqualification was put by the judges on the ground (1) that they were witnesses; and (2) that they concurred in the act for which the deceased judge had lost his life. 20 Alb. L. J. 361. A special court became necessary under the Kentucky Constitution.

[1] People *v.* Doe, 1 Mann. (Mich.) 451.

[2] See, however, infra, § 685. That objections of this class may be waived by withdrawing the charge, see Pierson *v.* People, 79 N. Y. 424. As to Texas, see Williams *v.* State, 24 Tex. Ap. 32.

[3] State *v.* Bradley, 48 Conn. 535.

[4] 1 Leach, 101; Williams's J., Juries, v. Infra, § 684. See Williams *v.* Com., 91 Penn. St. 493; State *v.* Dale, 8 Or. 229.

ing at the time of the return;[1] if he return any individual at the request of the prosecutor or the defendant;[2] or any person whom he believes to be more favorable to one side than to the other;[3] if he belong at the time to an association for the prosecution of offenders of whom the defendant is claimed to be one;[4] if an action of battery be depending between him and the defendant, or if the latter have an action of debt against the former;[5] if the statutory requisitions are not complied with;[6] in each of these cases the array will be quashed on the presumption of partiality in making up the return.[7] But mere negligence in making up a list

[1] Co. Lit. 156 *a;* Williams's Justice, Juries, v.; Burn's, J., Jurors, iv. 1; Dick. Sess. 183, 184. That the officer drawing had married the fourth cousin of the deceased is no ground for challenge of the jury or quashing the indictment. State *v.* McNinch, 12 S. C. 89.

[2] Co. Lit. 156 *a;* Bac. Abr. Juries, E. 1; Burn's, J., Juries, iv. 1; Williams's J., Juries, v.; Dickinson's Sess. 184.

[3] Co. Lit. 156 *a;* Bac. Abr. Juries, E. 1.

[4] R. *v.* Dolby, 2 B. & C. 104. Infra, § 686.

[5] Co. Lit. 156 *a;* Bac. Abr. Juries, E. 1; Burn's J., Jurors, iv. 1; Williams's J., Juries, v.; Dick. Sess. 184.

[6] State *v.* Da Rocha, 20 La. An. 356; State *v.* Gut, 13 Minn. 341. See State *v.* Degonia, 68 Mo. 485; State *v.* Bradley, 32 La. An. 402.

[7] Under the provisions of 3d and 4th Will. 4, c. 91, it is the duty of the recorder of Dublin annually to revise the list of jurors of the county of that city, and to cause a general list of jurors to be made out and delivered over to the clerk of the peace of the said city for the purposes of the ensuing year. In 1844, upon a conspicuous trial at the bar of the Court of Queen's Bench of Ireland, the defendant challenged the array of the panel on the following grounds, namely: that there had been a fraudulent omission by some person or persons unknown, in the general list of jurors for that year, of the names of sixty persons, who, on the revision of the lists, had been adjudged by the recorder to be qualified to act as special jurors; that from the said list the jurors' book had been made out and framed, and that from the said book the special jurors' list had been made up, the said names being omitted in the said book and list respectively, and that from the said special jury list the panel had been returned; that the said names had been omitted fraudulently, and not only without the privity of the defendant, or of any person on his behalf, but to his wrong and damage, and contrary to his will and desire; and that such list had been so made up with the intent of prejudicing the defendant on the said trial; and that the plaintiff had due notice of the premises before the panel was arrayed. A general demurrer to the challenge was put in by the plaintiff, which, after argument, was allowed by the court, and the trial having proceeded, judgment was given against the defendant, who sued out a writ of error in parliament thereon. The fifteen judges, being consulted, held unanimously that there was no error; but Lord Denman, C. J., Lord Cotten-

of jurors in one precinct of a county is not ground for such a challenge.[1]

A challenge to the array will be sustained when the sheriff, or his bailiff who makes the return, is under the distress of the party indicting or indicted, or has any pecuniary interest in the event, or is counsel, attorney, servant, or arbitrator in the same cause.[2]

But a challenge to the array will not be allowed on the ground that all persons of a particular fraternity have been excluded from the jury, or because certain classes of the community, *e. g.*, persons under thirty were excluded;[3] or because the number of colored persons was proportionally small;[4] if those who are returned possess the requisite qualifications;[5] nor because a member of the jury was prejudiced;[6] nor because certain other members were incompetent, there being an abundance of competent persons on the list, and no wrongful motive being shown.[7] Nor is such irregularity in drawing a jury as is productive of no prejudice to the defendant usually ground for reversal.[8] Nor will mistakes in jurors' names be ground for quashing the *venire*.[9]

Burden is on challenger.

§ 609. The burden of proof is on the person challenging the array, who must be strictly prepared to prove the cause.[10] The mode of proof is to be determined by the Court.[11]

ham and Lord Campbell in the House of Lords, held that the challenge should have been allowed. R. *v.* O'Connell, 11 Cl. & Fin. 155; 9 Jurist, 30. See Denman's Life, ii. 172.

[1] Com. *v.* Walsh, 124 Mass. 33. See State *v.* Dozier, 33 La. An. 1362.

[2] Co. Lit. 156 *a*; Munshower *v.* Patton, 10 S. & R. 334; Bac. Abr. Juries, E. 1; Burn's J., Jurors, iv. 1; Williams's J., Juries, v.; Dick. Sess. 184; Vanauken *v.* Beemer, 1 Southard, 364.

In New York, since the statute authorizing the clerk to array the jury, a challenge to the array lies for partiality or default in the clerk in the same manner as it formerly lay against the sheriff. Pringle *v.* Huse, 1 Cow. 435, 436, n. 1; Gardner *v.* Turner, 9 Johns. R. 261. As to rule in Texas, see Woodard *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 412.

[3] State *v.* Bradley, 48 Conn. 535.

[4] Thomas *v.* State, 67 Ga. 460.

[5] People *v.* Jewett, 3 Wend. 314.

[6] Birdsong *v.* State, 47 Ala. 68.

In New York, it is no ground for challenging the array that the deputy clerk, in the clerk's absence, drew the jury and certified the panel. People *v.* Fuller, 2 Park. C. R. (N. Y.) 16. As to Pennsylvania, under the old practice, see Com. *v.* Liffard, 6 S. & R. 395.

[7] State *v.* Foster, 32 La. An. 34. See People *v.* Darr, 61 Cal. 460.

[8] Cox *v.* People, 80 N. Y. 500, citing Dolan *v.* People, 64 N. Y. 485; McHugh *v.* State, 38 Ohio St. 153; 42 Id. 54.

[9] Hubbard *v.* State, 72 Ala. 164.

[10] R. *v.* Savage, 1 Mood. C. C. 51; see Cox *v.* State, 64 Ga. 374. Infra, § 684.

[11] State *v.* Linde, 54 Iowa, 139. As to practice, see Cox *v.* People, 80 N. Y. 500.

§ 610. A party who neglects before plea to challenge the array cannot take advantage of the alleged defect afterwards.[1] After plea too late.

The practice in challenging the array is hereafter discussed.[2]

§ 611. *Challenges to the array for favor* being not a principal challenge are left to the discretion of the triers.[3] Challenges of this class are based on supposed partiality of the sheriff, when such partiality rests upon a disputed or doubtful question of fact. Thus, when the defendant is the sheriff's tenant, or where there is affinity, but no relationship between the sheriff and one of the parties, or where they are united in the same office,[4] in these cases there may be a challenge for favor. Challenge to array for favor is when the question is disputed fact.

2. *To the Polls.*

Challenges to the poll are threefold.

(*a*) *Peremptory*, where the challenge is absolute, no cause being shown.

§ 612. *By Prosecution.*—At common law the crown had an unlimited right to unlimited peremptory challenge.[5] This was taken away by the statute 33 Edw. I. c. 4;[6] but it was held that under the common law, as modified by that statute, the prosecution possesses the power of setting aside individual jurors till the panel is exhausted, when, if the jury box be not then filled, the set aside jurors will be severally called, and unless adequate cause is shown against them will be chosen.[7] Such is the practice in those jurisdictions in which Prosecution has no peremptory challenge, but may set aside jurors.

[1] R. *v.* Sutton, 8 B. & C. 417; 2 M. & R. 406; Mikall *v.* State, 62 Ga. 368.

[2] Infra, § 684.

[3] 1 Inst. 155; Burn's Justice, Jurors, viii. See infra, §§ 684–5.

[4] Dyer, 367 *a*; Bac. Abr. Jur. E. 1; Co. Lit. 156 *a*; 1 Cowen, 436, n. 1.

[5] Proffatt on Jury Trials, § 150.

[6] R. *v.* Frost, 9 C. & P. 129; Henries *v.* People, 1 Park. C. R. 579; People *v.* Aichinson, 7 How. Prac. Rep. 241.

[7] Mansell *v.* R. (in error) 8 El. & Bl. 54; Dears. & B. 375; R. *v.* Parry, 7 C. & P. 836; R. *v.* Geach, 9 C. & P. 499; 3 Harg. St. Tr. 519; 4 Ibid. 740; 2 Hale, 271; Bac. Abr. Juries, E. 10; 2 Hawk. c. 43, s. 3.

"On the trial of O'Coigley and others, for high treason, before Mr. Justice Buller, at Maidstone, in 1798," says Mr. Townsend (1 Mod. State Trials, 99, n.), "the leading counsel for the prisoner, Mr. Plumer, Mr. Dallas, and Mr. Gurney, declined to interpose, when the crown were exercising their peremptory right of challenge to different jurymen. At length the junior counsel, Mr. W. Scott, jumped up: 'I

there is not a different statutory rule.[1] The right may be exercised by the prosecution at any period before the jury is elected;[2] and it was held no error where the prosecution, from excessive caution, set aside a juror who had been before ineffectually challenged by the prisoner.[3]

In Ireland, the right of ordering jurors to stand by, in cases of misdemeanor, may be exercised by a private prosecutor equally with the crown.[4]

Practice under direction of court and so as to order of challenge.

§ 613. The practice, however, of permitting the prosecution to defer, showing cause of challenge until the panel be gone through, it was said in a case in North Carolina, must be exercised under the supervision of the court, who will restrain it, if applied to an unreasonable number;[5] and in Georgia, since the adoption of the Penal Code, it is abandoned altogether.[6]

must be chained down to the ground, my lords, before I can sit here, engaged as I am for the life of one of the gentlemen at the bar, and submit to these challenges of the crown without cause. The crown has now challenged eleven jurors without cause; a greater number, I believe, than was ever known before.' (In Ireland it is usual to challenge fifty at least.)

"'If I had not been restrained by a reason too mighty for me to oppose, I should have resisted these challenges in the beginning.' He was then permitted to argue the point, which he did with great spirit, but at too great length, when Mr. J. Buller interposed, with the not very encouraging remark —'In every case you have quoted, you cannot help seeing a decision against you.' The judgment of the court was of course most prompt and decided. 'The construction of the statute is in favor of the right to challenge, and there is no case, no period, in which a different determination has been made. It appears to me one of the clearest points that can be.'" See, also, Townsend's narrative of the proceedings in Frost's case, 1 Mod. State Trials, 99, n.

[1] U. S. *v.* Wilson, 1 Bald. C. C. 81; U. S. *v.* Douglass, 2 Blatch. 207; U. S. *v.* Harding, 2 Wall. Jr. 143; Pamph. Phil. 1852, p. 22; Com. *v.* Joliffe, 7 Watts, 585; Jewell *v.* Com., 22 Penn. St. 94; Com. *v.* Keenan, 10 Phila. 194; Haines *v.* Com., 100 Penn. St. 317; Smith *v.* Com., Id. 324; Turpin *v.* State, 55 Md. 462; State *v.* Arthur, 2 Devereux, 217; State *v.* Craton, 6 Ired. 164; State *v.* Boue, 7 Jones (N. C.), 121; State *v.* Stalmaker, 2 Brev. 1; Robert's Dig. 328. In U. S. *v.* Butler, 1 Hugh. 457, it is said that this right ceases to exist where the prosecution has the right of peremptory challenge.

[2] Otherwise under statute. State *v.* Steeley, 65 Mo. 210. See Savage *v.* State, 18 Fla. 909.

[3] Wormeley *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 658.

[4] R. *v.* McCartie, 11 Ir. C. L. R. 207.

[5] State *v.* Benton, 2 Dev. & Bat. 196; though see State *v.* Craton, 6 Ired. 164.

[6] Sealy *v.* State, 1 Kally, 213; Reynolds *v.* State, Ibid. 222.

In Pennsylvania, by the revised acts

The *order* of challenge is at the discretion of the court; though in most jurisdictions the defendant is required to make his challenges first.[1]

§ 614. *By Defendant.*—At common law peremptory challenges by the defendant are taken without assigning any reason, and when made must necessarily be allowed. In cases of felony, the defendant was permitted, at common law, peremptorily to challenge thirty-five, or one under the number of three full juries.[2] But by 22 Hen. 8, c. 14, s. 7, made perpetual by 32 Hen. 8, c. 3, no person arraigned for petit treason, high treason, murder, or felony, can be admitted peremptorily to challenge more than twenty of the jurors; and by 33 Hen. 8, c. 23, s. 3, the same restriction is extended to cases of high treason. As far, however, as these statutes respect either high or petit treason, it is agreed that they were repealed by the 1 & 2 Ph. & M. c. 10, which, by enacting that all trials for treason shall be carried on as at common law, has revived the original number as far as it respects those offences.[3] At the present day, therefore, in cases of high and petit treason, the defendant has thirty-five peremptory challenges; and in murders and all other felonies, twenty.[4]

In felonies peremptory challenges allowed to defendant at common law.

of 1860, the Commonwealth shall have the right, in all cases, to challenge peremptorily four persons, and every peremptory challenge beyond the number allowed by law in any of the said cases shall be entirely void, and the trial of such person shall proceed as if no such challenge had been made. See infra, § 614, note. This act is constitutional. Warren *v.* Com., 37 Penn. St. 45; Hartzell *v.* Com., 40 Penn. St. 463. See Com. *v.* Frazier, 2 Brewst. 490.

This act does not deprive the Commonwealth of its right to set aside. Warren *v.* Com., 37 Penn. St. 45.

In Ohio, the "prosecuting attorney and every defendant may peremptorily challenge two of the panel, and any of the panel for cause, of which the court shall try." Code Cr. Proc. § 133; Warren's Ohio C. L. (1870) p. 131.

The statutes regulating practice are noticed under the next head.

[1] Brandreth's case, 32 St. Tr. 771, 774; Turpin *v.* State, 55 Md. 462; State *v.* Bone, 7 Jones N. C. L. 121; *aliter* under Missouri statute, State *v.* Steely, 65 Mo. 219; see Spigener *v.* State, 62 Ala. 383.

[2] Co. Lit. 156; Bro. Abr. Challenge, 70, 75, 217; 2 Hale, 268; 2 Hawk. c. 43, s. 7; Com. Dig. Challenge, C. 1; Bac. Abr. E. 9; 4 Bla. Com. 354; 2 Woodes. 498; Burn's, J., Jurors, iv.; Williams's, J., Juries, v.; Dick. Sess. 185.

[3] Co. Lit. 156; Bro. Abr. Challenge, 217; 3 Inst. 227; Fost. 106–7; 2 Hale, 269; 2 Hawk. c. 43, s. 8; Bac. Abr. Juries, E. 9; Burn's, J., Jurors, iv.; Williams's, J., Juries, v.; Dick. Sess. 185.

[4] 4 Mason 159; Fost. 106–7; 4 Bla.

§ 614 *a*. Whether each of several joint defendants, when the trial is joint, is entitled to his full number of challenges is a point

Com. 354; 2 Hawk. c. 43, s. 8; 1 Ch. C. L. 535.

Practice in Federal Courts.—The Act of Congress passed on the 20th July, 1840 (5 Stats. at Large, 394), confers upon the courts of the United States the power to make all necessary rules and regulations for conformiug the empanelling of juries to the laws and usages in force in the States. U. S. *v.* Shackleford, 18 Howard, 588. This power includes that of regulating the challenges of jurors, whether peremptory or for cause, and in cases both civil and criminal, with the exception, in criminal cases, of treason or other crimes, of which the punishment is declared to be death. Ibid. See U. S. *v.* Johns, 1 Wash. C. C. 363. The Act of 1790 recognizes the right of peremptory challenge in those cases, and therefore it cannot be taken away. Ibid. See U. S. *v.* Johns, *ut supra*. The Act of July 20, 1840, does not confer, in misdemeanors, the right to a peremptory challenge iu the Circuit Courts. U. S. *v.* Devlin, 6 Blatch. C. C. 71. See, however, U. S. *v.* Coppersmith, 2 Flip. 546.

Under the Act of Congress, July 20, 1825 (5 Stats. at Large, 394), the courts of the United States have the power to adopt the statutes of the several States respecting the empanelling, etc., of jurors, the right of challenge, etc., except in respect to treason, and other crimes specified in § 30, Act of 1790 (1 Stats. at Large, 119), and where these statutes have been adopted, the right of peremptory challenge, either by the prisoner or the government, must depend on them. U. S. *v.* Shackleford, 18 How. U. S. 588.

By the Act of March 3, 1865, when the offence charged be treason or a capital offence, the defendant shall be entitled to twenty and the United States to five peremptory challenges. On a trial for any other offence in which the right of peremptory challenge now exists, the defendant shall be entitled to ten and the United States to two peremptory challenges. All challenges, whether to the array or panel, or to individual jurors for cause or favor, shall be tried by the court without the aid of triers. Act of March 3, 1865, § 2. 13 Stat. 500.

Challenges above the number allowed by law shall be disallowed by court. Rev. Stat. § 1031.

Under the New York Revised Statutes it has been held that the people are entitled to two peremptory challenges in a criminal prosecution. People *v.* Caniff, 2 Park. C. R. (N. Y.) 586.

Where a statute gives the right to a prisoner on trial "for an offence punishable with death, or imprisonment in a state prison ten years or any longer time," a person indicted for burglary in the second degree, which is punishable "by imprisonment in a state prison for a term not more than ten years, nor less than five years," is entitled to peremptory challenges. Dull *v.* People, 4 Denio, 91. See further Granger *v.* State, 5 Yerger, 459.

Under the Pennsylvania Revised Statutes, if the Commonwealth waives the right to challenge, and the defendant exhausts his challenges, the Commonwealth cannot resume its right. Com. *v.* Frazier, 2 Brewst. 490.

It has been held the prosecution must announce its peremptory challenges before the defendant can be

usually determined by local statute.[1] The right unquestionably exists at common law when not given by statute;[2] though its difficulties may be obviated by the prosecution obtaining an order for severance in cases where the defendants persist in separate sets of challenges.[3] But where the trial is joint, a peremptory challenge from one defendant excludes a juror, though against the protest of the other defendant.[4] Where offences of a kindred character are joined, the defendant is not ordinarily entitled to his allotment of peremptory challenges upon each count or separate offence on the indictment or information.[5] But it is otherwise, so it has been held, when a series of distinct charges are tried together.[6]

Rule as to joint defendants and several counts.

§ 615. On the preliminary trial of a prisoner's insanity, before the trial of the indictment against him, he has not the privilege of peremptory challenges; but he may challenge for cause.[7]

On preliminary issues no challenge.

§ 616. Peremptory challenges are not allowable on the trial of any collateral issue.[8]

Not allowed on collateral issues.

compelled to announce his. State *v.* Steely, 65 Mo. 218. As to practice in this respect, see infra, § 672.

[1] In several States when defendants elect to be tried jointly, they are restricted to a single set of challenges. State *v.* Sutton, 10 R. I. 159; People *v.* McCalla, 8 Cal. 301. See Mahan *v.* State, 10 Ohio, 232; Brister *v.* State, 26 Ala. 107. *Aliter* in Mississippi, Smith *v.* State, 57 Miss. 822. That one defendant cannot, when separate challenges are permitted, object to his co-defendants' challenges, see infra, § 680.

[2] 2 Hale P. C. 263; 1 Ch. C. L. 536; U. S. *v.* Marchant, 4 Mason, 160; 12 Wheat. 480; State *v.* Stoughton, 51 Vt. 362; State *v.* Sutton, 10 R. I. 159; Cruce *v.* State, 59 Ga. 83; State *v.* Durein, 29 Kan. 688; Smith *v.* State, 57 Miss. 822, and cases cited infra, § 680.

[3] Fost. 106. "Where two are jointly indicted and tried for a capital offence, each prisoner is allowed twenty peremptory challenges, but the law does not allow more than five to the State as to both." Randall, C. J., Savage *v.* State, 18 Fla. 951, citing Schoeffler *v.* State, 3 Wis. 823; Mahan *v.* State, 10 Ohio, 232; State *v.* Earle, 24 La. An. 38. The State cannot extend its challenges in such cases beyond the statutory limit. Goodin, in re, 67 Mo. 637. In Maryland joint defendants by statute have only one set of challenges. Hamlin *v.* State, 77 Md. 383.

[4] Infra, § 680; State *v.* Meaker, 54 Vt. 112.

[5] State *v.* Skinner, 34 Kan. 256.

[6] State *v.* McNeill, 93 N. C. 552. See People *v.* Sweeny, 55 Mich. 586.

[7] Freeman *v.* People, 4 Denio, 9, 35.

[8] Fost. 42; Burn's Justice, Jurors, viii.

§ 617. It has been said that the defendant's right to a peremptory challenge is waived when the juror is passed over to the court or the prosecution;[1] but this opinion cannot be maintained as a binding rule, since it has been repeatedly held that the court, at any moment before the juror in question is sworn, may permit the challenge.[2] But in any view the right ceases when the panel is complete and accepted.[3]

Right ceases when panel is complete.

§ 618. Peremptory challenges are not allowed at common law in trial for a misdemeanor.[4]

No challenges on misdemeanors.

§ 619. A defendant who, in case of felony, has challenged twenty jurors peremptorily, cannot ordinarily withdraw one of those challenges to challenge another juror, instead of one whom he had previously challenged;[5] nor for the purpose of challenging for cause.[6] But in case of a mistake, not negligent or capricious, made in challenging, permission should be given to rectify.[7]

Matured challenge cannot ordinarily be recalled.

§ 620. The right of peremptory challenge is a right not to select, but to reject.[8]

Right is to reject, not select.

The practice as to peremptory challenges is discussed in a future head.[9]

[1] U. S. *v.* Hanway, 2 Wall. Jr. 143; Com. *v.* Rogers, 7 Met. 500; though see Com. *v.* Knapp, 9 Pick. 496; State *v.* Potter, 18 Conn. 166; Stewart *v.* State, 50 Miss. 587. Infra, §§ 675–7.

[2] Infra, § 677; State *v.* Potter, 18 Conn. 166; McFadden *v.* Com., 23 Penn. St. 12; Zell *v.* Com., 94 Penn. St. 258; Turpin *v.* State, 55 Md. 462; Hooker *v.* State, 4 Ohio, 350; Hendrick *v.* Com., 5 Leigh, 708; Drake *v.* State, 51 Ala. 30; People *v.* Carrier, 46 Mich. 442; State *v.* Durein, 29 Kan. 688; Savage *v.* State, 18 Fla. 909; People *v.* McCarthy, 49 Cal. 241; People *v.* Iams, 57 Cal. 115, and cases infra, §§ 673–7.

[3] State *v.* Cameron, 2 Chandler (Wis.) 172. See State *v.* Pritchard, 15 Nev. 7; infra, §§ 672, 679.

[4] Reading's case, 7 Howell's State Trials, 265; Oates's case, 10 Howell's State Trials, 1079; 4 Bl. Com. 353, note by Mr. Christian. See U. S. *v.* Devlin, 6 Blatch. C. C. 71; Freeman *v.* People, 4 Den. 9, 35. Supra, § 614, note.

[5] R. *v.* Parry, 7 C. & P. 836. See infra, § 679.

[6] Infra, § 679.

[7] Infra, § 679.

[8] U. S. *v.* Marchant, 4 Mason, 160; 12 Wheaton, 480; Turpin *v.* State, 55 Md. 462; State *v.* Smith, 2 Ired. 402; State *v.* Wise, 7 Richards, 412; State *v.* McQuaige, 5 S. C. 429. See, however, People *v.* Bodine, 1 Denio, 281. See infra, § 680.

[9] Infra, §§ 676 *et seq.*

(*b.*) *Principal.*

§ 621. Principal challenge to the polls is where a cause is shown, which, if found true, stands sufficient of itself, without leaving anything to be tried by the triers.[1] The theory is that in such case the presumption of partiality is too strong to be rebutted.[2] As in our American practice challenges for favor, and those for principal cause, are frequently blended,[3] the various incidents of the two will be here considered.[4] It may be noticed that in New York the distinction between the two classes is retained.[5]

Principal challenge is where the case does not rest on disputed fact.

Causes of principal challenge to the polls are such as these —

(*a.*[1]) *Preadjudication of Case.*

§ 622. In England it is a good cause for challenge, on the part of the defendant, that the juror has declared his opinion beforehand that the party is guilty, or will be hanged;[6] but it is said that expressions used by a juryman previous to the trial are not a cause of challenge, unless they can be referred to something of personal ill-will towards the party challenging.[7] In this country, as will presently be seen, the great preponderance of authority is that the holding by a juror of any opinions which may prevent him from rendering a verdict in accordance with the laws of the land is a disqualification.[8]

Preadjudication of case ground for challenge.

§ 623. Mere opinions thrown out as a jest, however, or as a vague and loose talk, or to avoid being empanelled, will not so operate.[9]

Vague and loose talk does not disqualify.

[1] Burn's Justice, Jurors, viii. Infra, § 670.

[2] State *v.* Howard, 17 N. H. 171.

[3] Infra, § 670.

[4] Infra, § 670.

[5] Greenfield *v.* People, 6 Abb. New Cas. 1.

[6] 2 Hawk. c. 43, s. 28.

[7] R. *v.* Edmonds, 4 B. & Ald. 472; 2 Hawk. c. 43, s. 28.

[8] See cases cited infra. See, also, Pierce *v.* State, 13 N. H. 536; People *v.* Reyes, 5 Cal. 347.

[9] Infra, §§ 629, 630; Com. *v.* Thrasher, 11 Gray, 57; State *v.* Potter, 18 Conn. 166; State *v.* Wilson, 38 Conn. 140; Com. *v.* Lenox, 3 Brewst. 247; Com. *v.* Flanagan, 7 W. & S. 68, 415; Com. *v.* Gross, 1 Ashm. 261; Ortwein *v.* Com., 76 Penn. St. 414; Hailstock's case, 2 Grat. 564; Clore's case, 8 Grat. 606; Montague *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 767; State *v.* Ellington, 7 Ired. 61; State *v.* Bone, 7 Jones, 121; State *v.* Williams, 3 Stew. 454; Johns *v.* State, 16 Ga. 200; and see cases cited infra, §§ 640, 652. No matter how extravagant the remarks may be they will not ex-

Nor does a general bias against crime.

§ 624. A juror, also, will not be incapable because of the general bias and prejudice against crime,[1] or against the particular line of offences, one of which is on trial.[2]

Analysis of Rulings as to Preadjudication.

In U. S. courts a deliberate opinion as to defendant's guilt incapacitates, but otherwise as to mere impression.

§ 625. *United States Courts.*—"The court has considered," declared Marshall, C. J., in Burr's trial, "those who have deliberately formed *and delivered* an opinion on the guilt of the prisoner as not being in a state of mind to weigh the testimony, and therefore as being disqualified to sit as jurors in the case."[3] The question was accordingly sanctioned by the court: "Have you formed and expressed an opinion about the guilt of Colonel Burr?"[4] The qualification "and delivered," or, as it is sometimes put, "and expressed," has more recently been dropped, and rightly, since while forming an opinion as to guilt without expressing it ought to incapacitate, this is not necessarily the case with expressing such an opinion without forming it.[5]

Taney, C. J., in 1854, laid down the following test in a criminal trial in Baltimore:—

"If the juror had formed an opinion that the prisoners are guilty and entertains that opinion now, without waiting to hear the testimony, then he is incompetent.[6] But if, from reading the newspapers or hearing reports, he has impressions on his mind unfavorable to the prisoners, but has no opinion or prejudice which will prevent him from doing impartial justice when he hears the testimony, then he is competent."

The same view has been expressed in the United States Circuit Court in New York.[7]

In 1879, it was held by the Supreme Court that a juror who

clude, if uttered for the purpose of producing an exclusion. Moughon *v.* State, 59 Ga. 308. But see Territory *v.* Kennedy, 3 Mont. 520; 8 Crim. Law Mag. 559.

[1] Williams *v.* State, 3 Kelly, 453. See infra, § 668.

[2] U. S. *v.* Noelke, 17 Blatch. C. C. 554; Elliott *v.* State, 73 Ind. 10.

[3] Marshall, C. J., 1 Burr's Trial, 416. See, also, U. S. *v.* Woods, 4 Cranch C. C. 484.

[4] Marshall, C. J., 1 Burr's Trial, 367.

[5] Hanway's case, 2 Wall. Jr. 143; see supra, § 623; U. S. *v.* Wilson, 1 Bald. 78.

[6] See infra, § 844.

[7] U. S. *v.* McHenry, 6 Blatch. C. C. 503.

states he has formed an opinion, and does not think it will influence his verdict, is not incompetent.[1]

§ 626. In *Maine*, to be a sufficient ground for disqualifying a juror from sitting in the trial of a criminal prosecution, the opinion formed by him must be fixed and unconditional.[2]

So in Maine.

§ 627. In *New Hampshire*, where jurors heard the prisoner tried upon another indictment, before another jury, and found guilty, and answered upon inquiry that they had formed an opinion of his guilt upon the second indictment, which was pending at the same time, from the evidence which they had heard on the other trial, they were held to be incompetent.[3] But "hearing" without "opinion" does not incapacitate.[4]

So in New Hampshire.

§ 628. In *Vermont*, the prior expression of an opinion has been held to disqualify, notwithstanding the juror declares, when challenged, that he has no opinion, and could try the case impartially.[5] But it is now the law in that State that an opinion, to disqualify, must be an abiding bias produced by substantial facts, the truth of which the juror believes.[6]

In Vermont prior expression of opinion disqualifies.

§ 629. In *Massachusetts*, a juror having said upon the *voir dire* that he had formed an opinion from what he had heard, but that he did not know how much he might be influenced by it, was allowed to be challenged for cause.[7] A juror, however, it is said, cannot be asked whether he considers that the facts set forth in the indictment constitute a proper subject for punishment.[8] And a person indicted is not entitled to have the jury asked, before they are empanelled,

In Massachusetts prejudice must go to particular issue.

[1] Reynolds *v.* U. S., 98 U. S. 145.

[2] State *v.* Kingsbury, 58 Me. 239 (Appleton, C. J., 1871). See State *v.* Jewell, 33 Me. 583.

[3] State *v.* Webster, 13 N. H. 491.

[4] State *v.* Howard, 17 N. H. 171. The question of indifference is a fact to be decided by the court at the trial. State *v.* Pike, 49 N. H. 399, citing Com. *v.* Webster, 5 Cush. 295. See Rollings *v.* Aimes, 2 N. H. 350; State *v.* Howard, 17 N. H. 171, 191-2; March *v.* R. R., 19 N. H. 372.

[5] State *v.* Clark, 42 Vt. 629; see State *v.* Phair, 48 Vt. 366.

[6] State *v.* Meaker, 54 Vt. 112; Wade *v.* State, 54 Vt. 358; State *v.* Meyer, 58 Vt. 457.

[7] Com. *v.* Knapp, 9 Pick. 496. See, for practice in detail, Mr. Bemis's Report of the Webster case, p. 8.

[8] Com. *v.* Buzzell, 16 Pick. 153. The shaping and propounding of the interrogatories are within the discretion of the court. Com. *v.* Gee, 6 Cushing, 177. See infra, § 683.

whether they have formed or expressed an opinion as to the credibility of a witness, whose testimony is to be relied on in support of the prosecution, and who testified, and whose credibility was in question, in another case before them.[1]

A fixed opinion of the unconstitutionality of the statute on which the prosecution is founded, which if persisted in would preclude concurrence in a conviction, disqualifies.[2]

A juror having convicted the defendant of a similar offence at the same term is not, it has been ruled in the same State, though without good reason, thereby incapacitated.[3]

"Hearing" as to a case does not incapacitate, when there is no opinion formed.[4]

So in Connecticut.

§ 630. In *Connecticut*, merely having read newspaper reports of a case, by a juror who "had not any settled opinion on the subject, and felt that he could render an impartial verdict," does not disqualify.[5]

In New York at common law opinion though not impression disqualifies.

§ 631. In *New York*, it was held in the earlier cases that an opinion as to the defendant's guilt, no matter from what sources it was drawn, disqualifies.[6] The mere forming of an opinion, also, without its expression, is considered a sufficient ground of exclusion.[7] An *impression*, however, does not disqualify.[8] Nor does a hypothet-

[1] Com. *v.* Porter, 1 Gray, 476.

[2] Com. *v.* Austin, 7 Gray, 51. Infra, § 666.

[3] Com. *v.* Hill, 4 Allen, 591. See criticism, infra, § 661.

[4] Com. *v.* Thrasher, 11 Gray, 57.

[5] State *v.* Potter, 18 Conn. 166.

"The opinion," said Butler, C. J., in 1871, "must be formed in such a way, or be of such a character, that hostility or prejudice toward the prisoner may be inferred from its existence or expression. But hostility or prejudice cannot, as a rule, be inferred from an opinion formed and expressed simply from reading, or hearing stated, as current news of the day, the fact of a homicide and the circumstances attending it. There should be found some other circumstances of relationship, partiality, prejudice, hostility, or ill-will, acting at the same time upon the mind and giving it a bias, or the juror should be accepted." Butler, C. J., State *v.* Wilson, 38 Conn. 140. See, also, State *v.* Hoyt, 47 Conn. 518.

[6] People *v.* Mather, 4 Wend. 229; People *v.* Bodine, 1 Denio, 281; Freeman *v.* People, 4 Denio, 9, 35; Blake *v.* Millspaugh, 1 Johnson, 316; Pringle *v.* Huse, 1 Cowen, 432; ex parte Vermilyea, 6 Cowen, 555.

[7] People *v.* Rathbun, 21 Wend. 509. See supra, § 625; Armstead *v.* Com., 11 Leigh, 657; Heath *v.* Com., 1 Robinson, 735.

[8] People *v.* Honeyman, 3 Denio, 121; People *v.* Hayes, 1 Edm. Sel. Ca. 582; O'Brien *v.* People, 36 N. Y. 276; S. C., 48 Barb. 274; People *v.* Balbo, 19 Hun,

ical[1] or indecisive opinion.[2] But it is otherwise as to an opinion formed by reading a report, no matter how incomplete, of a former trial, when this opinion is so settled as to make a change difficult.[3]

§ 632. By the New York Criminal Code, § 376, a juror is not disqualified by the fact that he has formed and expressed an opinion in respect to the case on trial, if he shall declare on oath that he verily believes that he can render an impartial verdict according to the evidence submitted to the jury on such trial, and that such previously formed opinion or impression will not bias or influence his verdict, and provided the court shall be satisfied that the person so proposed as a juror does not entertain such a present opinion as would influence his verdict as a juror.[4]

But by statute no disqualification if witness be not under bias.

The statute, however, does not prevent such opinion from being ground of a challenge for favor.[5]

By an act passed May 7, 1853, all challenges are to be determined by the trial court, without the interposition of triers,[6] though the decision of such court is open to review on appeal.[7]

§ 633. In *New Jersey*, a hypothetical opinion, which is based on

424; 80 N. Y. 484; Cox *v.* People, 80 N. Y. 500; People *v.* Oyer and Terminer Court, 83 N. Y. 436.

[1] People *v.* Fuller, 2 Park. C. R. 16; Stout *v.* People, 4 Park. C. R. 71; Lohman *v.* People, 1 Comst. 379.

[2] People *v.* Mallon, 3 Lansing, 225 (Mullin, P. J.), 1870; Thomas *v.* People, 67 N. Y. 218.

[3] Greenfield *v.* People, 74 N. Y. 277; 6 Abb. New Cas. 1; as explained by Andrews, J., in People *v.* Balbo, *ut supra;* see Thomas *v.* People, 67 N. Y. 218; Ponder *v.* People, 18 Hun, 560.

[4] See People *v.* Cornetti, 92 N. Y. 85; People *v.* Casey, 93 N. Y. 115. See Stokes *v.* People, 53 N. Y. 164; Cox *v.* People, 80 N. Y. 500; Balbo *v.* People, *ut supra.*

In Phelps *v.* People, 72 N. Y. 334 (S. C., 13 N. Y. Sup. Ct. 6 Hun, 44), it was held that a juror who says he has formed and expressed an opinion, but that he believes he can render an impartial verdict, according to the evidence, unbiased and uninfluenced by the previously formed opinion, is competent.

The above section of the Criminal Code is considered in Young *v.* Johnson, 53 N. Y. Sup. Ct. (46 Hun), 167, where it is held, following People *v.* Casey, *ut supra*, that, to make a juror who has formed an opinion competent, he must declare (1) that such an opinion will not influence his verdict; (2) that he can render an impartial verdict; and (3) the court must be satisfied as to his freedom from such bias. In People *v.* Beckwith, 108 N. Y. 67, it is ruled that mere difficulty in procuring a juror is no evidence that the jurors chosen were under bias.

[5] Thomas *v.* People, 67 N. Y. 218.

[6] See infra, § 684, note.

[7] Greenfield *v.* People, *ut supra;* Balbo *v.* People, *ut supra.*

In New Jersey hypothetical opinion does not exclude.

the supposition that certain facts are true, does not by itself exclude.[1]

In Pennsylvania opinion (though not impressions) disqualifies.

§ 634. In *Pennsylvania*, if a juror forms an opinion without waiting to hear the testimony, he is incompetent. But an impression from reading a newspaper or hearing reports, without any opinion or prejudice which will prevent him from doing impartial justice when he hears the testimony, will not disqualify.[2] And the opinion must be founded on the evidence to be given, or must be a fixed belief.[3] If he swears that he would act impartially, and decide according to the evidence, he is competent, no matter how strong his impression may have been.[4]

So in Delaware and Maryland.

§ 635. In *Delaware*, the test adopted by Marshall, C. J., in Burr's case, appears to have been received.[5] In *Maryland*, the view of Chief Justice Taney, as given above, is adopted, impressions derived from newspapers being held no disqualification. "The newspaper is now read by every one, and the press is ever ready and eager to furnish the details of crime, and although persons may, upon such statements, form an opinion, yet it is one in most cases liable to qualification, according to the real facts of the case. . . . . The opinion which should exclude a juror must be a fixed and deliberate one, partaking, in fact, of the nature of a pre-judgment."[6]

[1] State *v.* Spencer, 1 Zabr. 196; citing Mann *v.* Glover, 2 Green, 195. See State *v.* Fox, 1 Dutch, 566.

[2] Irvine *v.* Kean, 14 Serg. & R. 292; Com. *v.* Lenox, 3 Brewst. 249; see Com. *v.* Flanagan, 7 W. & S. 415; Com. *v.* Gross, 1 Ashm. 281; Com. *v.* Work, 4 Crumrine, 493; Shevlin *v.* Com., 106 Penn. St. 362; Weston *v.* Com., 111 Penn. St. 257.

[3] Curley *v.* Com., 84 Penn. St. 151; 4 Weekly Notes, 141.

In this case a juror testifies on his *voir dire* that he had a fixed opinion from what he had read, but that it was not such an opinion as would influence him in any degree as a juror to give undue weight to evidence against the prisoner, and that he felt certain he could divest his mind of all prejudice, and be controlled only by the evidence. It was held by the Supreme Court that he was competent, inasmuch as he had no fixed belief of the guilt of the prisoner, and had no opinion founded upon the evidence to be given. S. P., Ortwein *v.* Com., 76 Penn. St. 414; O'Mara *v.* Com., 75 Penn. St. 424. Otherwise where the witness said he had an opinion from reading a former trial, which opinion "it would take some evidence to remove." Staup *v.* Com., 74 Penn. St. 458.

[4] Allison *v.* Com., 99 Penn. St. 17.

[5] State *v.* Bonwell, 2 Harring. 529. See State *v.* Anderson, 5 Harring. 493.

[6] Waters *v.* State, 51 Md. 430; Zimmerman *v.* State, 56 Md. 536—Robinson, J.

§ 636. In *Virginia*, decided prejudice or bias excludes, though not mere hypothetical opinion,[1] which would not prevent the juror from giving the defendant a fair trial.[2]

So in Virginia.

§ 637. In *North Carolina*, the rule is that an opinion fully made up and expressed against either party, on the subject-matter of the issue to be tried, is good cause of principal challenge; but an opinion imperfectly formed, or one merely hypothetical, that is, founded on the supposition that facts are as they have been represented or assumed to be, does not constitute a cause of principal challenge, but may be urged by way of challenge to the favor, which is to be allowed or disallowed, as the triers may find the fact of favor or indifferency.[3] In the same State on a challenge for cause, the juror stated "that he had formed and expressed an opinion adverse to the prisoner, upon rumors which he had heard; but that he had not heard a full statement of the case,

So in North and South Carolina.

[1] Lithgow *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 297; Clore's case, 8 Grat. 606; Jackson *v.* Com., 23 Grat. 919.

[2] Spronce *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 375; Brown *v.* Com., 2 Leigh, 769; Osiander *v.* Com., 3 Leigh, 780; Hendrick *v.* Com., 5 Leigh, 708; Cluverius *v.* Com., 81 Va. 789; Armistead *v.* Com., 11 Leigh, 357; Heath *v.* Com., 1 Robinson, 735; Hailstock's case, 2 Grat. 564; Page *v.* Com., 27 Grat. 954; Pollard *v.* Com., 5 Randolph, 659. In Wright *v.* Com., 32 Grat. 941, it was held that the juror's statement that he did not think he could do the defendant justice, was ground for challenge, though the juror modified this by saying that if the evidence was different from what he had heard he believed he would be unprejudiced.

In Dejarnette *v.* Com., 75 Va. 867, a juror was held disqualified who stated that he had formed an opinion which he could not say whether evidence would remove, though he believed he could give the defendant a fair trial.

See Com. *v.* Buzzell, 16 Pick. 158.

In West Virginia an adverse opinion, which the juror cannot say will be removed by evidence, disqualifies. State *v.* Schnelle, 24 W. Va. 767.

It is not enough to disqualify a juror, according to the view of Leigh, J., "that if the facts and circumstances proved on the trial should be the same with those which the jurors had heard, then they had a decided opinion." Epes's case, 5 Grat. 676. An opinion founded on mere rumor ought *primâ facie* to be regarded as a mere hypothetical opinion, forming no ground for challenge, unless it appear that the opinion formed is a decided one, likely to influence the juror in his decision. Armistead's case, 11 Leigh, 657; Epes's case, 5 Grat. 681. See Wormeley *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 658; Montague *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 767, 768; and see Page *v.* Com., 27 Grat. 954; Bristow *v.* Com., 15 Grat. 634; Dilworth *v.* Com., 12 Grat. 689.

[3] State *v.* Benton, 2 Dev. & Bat. 196; State *v.* Bone, 7 Jones, 121; see State *v.* Cockman, 2 Wins. (N. C.) No. 2, 95. Triers are now dispensed with in this State. State *v.* Kilgore, 93 N. C. 533.

and that his mind was not so made up as to prevent the doing of impartial justice to the prisoner." The court found the juror indifferent, and the Supreme Court refused to reverse the decision.[1] And in *South Carolina* the mere contingent opinion of the juror that if the defendant is guilty he should be punished, does not exclude.[2]

So in Ohio.

§ 638. In Ohio, under § 7278 of the Revised Statutes, a juror whose opinion is formed, not from the testimony of witnesses, but from newspaper reports, is not incompetent, if he testify that if selected he could render an impartial verdict, the court agreeing with him in this conclusion.[3] But it is otherwise where the juror's opinion is formed from reading the testimony at the coroner's inquest.[4]

So in Alabama.

§ 639. In *Alabama*, in a capital case, it is held not to be ground of challenge of a juror that upon common report he has formed and expressed an opinion of the guilt of the prisoner, if the juror believes that such opinion would have no influence in the formation of his verdict, should the evidence on the trial be different from the report of the facts.[5] Under the statute of Alabama of 1831, which provides that if a juror, in a capital case, has formed and expressed an opinion founded upon rumor, he shall be sworn in chief, it must appear that such opinion was founded upon mere rumor. Where it appears that a fixed opinion was formed, it is good ground for challenge for cause.[6] But a hypothetical opinion based on rumor does not disqualify.[7]

So in Mississippi.

§ 640. In *Mississippi* the rule is, that while it is not necessary to exclude a juror, that he should have formed and expressed his opinion against the accused with malice or

[1] State *v.* Ellington, 7 Ired. 61; State *v.* Kilgore, 93 N. C. 533; see State *v.* Efler, 85 N. C. 585, to the effect that the prejudice must be against the challenging party.

[2] State *v.* Coleman, 20 S. C. 441.

[3] Cooper *v.* State, 16 Ohio St. 328; Frazier *v.* State, 23 Ohio St. 551; McHugh *v.* State, 38 Ohio St. 153; see Fonts *v.* State, 70 Ohio St. 471.

[4] Frazier *v.* State, 23 Ohio St. 551; Erwin *v.* State, 29 Ohio St. 186; M'Hugh *v.* State, 38 Ohio St. 153; (S. C.) 40 Ohio St. 154.

[5] State *v.* Williams, 3 Stewart, 454; State *v.* Morea, 2 Ala. 275; Carson *v.* State, 50 Ala. 134; Hall *v.* State, 51 Ala. 9; De Arman *v.* State, 71 Ala. 351; Jackson *v.* State, 77 Ala. 18.

[6] Quesenbury *v.* State, 3 Stew. & P. 308. See Ned *v.* State, 7 Port. 187; Bales *v.* State, 63 Ala. 30.

[7] Beason *v.* State, 72 Ala. 191.

ill-will, a mere hypothetical opinion, from rumor only, and subject to be changed by the testimony, does not disqualify.[1] If a juror, however, has formed a settled opinion, as distinguished from a mere hypothetical conception based on rumor, he ought to be excluded,[2] though he may never have expressed that opinion.[3] It is otherwise, however, as to a juror who has formed an opinion from what he has heard had been said by some of the witnesses in the case, though he himself had not heard any of the witnesses say anything on the subject, and though he states that his opinions are not such as would influence his verdict, but that he would be governed by the evidence. *A fortiori* the formation of an opinion by one who had heard all the testimony is a disqualification. And while absolute freedom from preconceived opinion should be required where it can be had, yet where, from the notoriety of the transaction or other cause, that cannot be obtained, as near an approximation to it as possible should be had.[4]

§ 641. In *Missouri*, by statute, opinion formed only on rumors or newspaper reports, and producing no bias which evidence cannot remove, does not disqualify.[5] It is otherwise with an opinion formed on evidence before the coroner.[6] A juror may be asked whether he could give an impartial verdict.[7]

So in Missouri.

§ 642. In *Tennessee*, it has been declared that loose impressions and conversations of a juror, as to the prisoner's guilt or innocence, founded upon rumor, would not have the effect to set him aside as incompetent; nor, if disclosed

So in Tennessee.

[1] Ogle *v.* State, 33 Miss. 383; Noe *v.* State, 4 How. (Miss.) 330; Lee *v.* State, 45 Miss. 114.

[2] Logan *v.* State, 50 Miss. 269; Brown *v.* State, 57 Miss. 424.

[3] State *v.* Johnson, 1 Walk. 392; State *v.* Flower, Ibid. 318; see King *v.* State, 5 Howard's Miss. R. 730; White *v.* State, 52 Miss. 216; Sam. *v.* State, 13 Sm. & M. 189; Nelms *v.* State, 13 Sm. & Marsh. 500.

[4] Cotton *v.* State, 31 Miss. 504; Ogle *v.* State, 33 Miss. 383; Alfred *v.* State, 37 Miss. 296; Parker *v.* State, 55 Miss. 414.

[5] State *v.* Rose, 32 Mo. 560; State *v.* Burnside, 37 Mo. 343; State *v.* Davis, 29 Mo. 391; State *v.* Core, 70 Mo. 491; State *v.* Barton, 71 Mo. 491. This statute is constitutional, Hayes *v.* Missouri, 120 U. S. 68; Spier *v.* Missouri, 123 U. S. 131; see Hayes *v.* State, 78 Mo. 307; State *v.* Wilson, 85 Mo. 135; State *v.* Hopkirk, 84 Mo. 278; State *v.* Walton, 74 Mo. 270; State *v.* Baber, 74 Mo. 292; State *v.* Farrow, 74 Mo. 531; State *v.* Snell, 78 Mo. 243.

[6] State *v.* Cullen, 82 Mo. 323; State *v.* Bryant, 92 Mo. 273.

[7] State *v.* Brooks, 92 Mo. 273.

after verdict, be a cause of new trial.[1] But an emphatic opinion of guilt excludes.[2] The statute, however, providing that no opinion formed on published reports shall be ground for challenge, has been held unconstitutional.[3] But mere opinion that the defendant should be punished does not exclude, when such opinion was not founded on evidence to be introduced on trial.[4]

So in Indiana.

§ 643. In *Indiana* it is ruled that when the juror answers that he has formed or expressed an opinion of the defendant's guilt, the nature and cause of the opinion must be inquired into; and, if it appear that the juror has formed or expressed an opinion of the defendant's guilt out of ill-will to the prisoner, or that he has such a fixed opinion of the defendant's guilt as would probably prevent him from giving an impartial verdict, the challenge ought to be sustained.[5] If, however, it was said, the opinion be hypothetical, or of that transient character formed when we hear any reports of the commission of an offence—such an opinion merely as would probably be changed by the relation of the next person met with—it is not a sufficient cause of challenge.[6]

So in Illinois.

§ 644. In *Illinois*, the rule is said to be that a juror is disqualified if he has formed or expressed a decided opinion upon the merits of the case.[7] If, on the contrary, he says he has no prejudice or bias of any kind for or against either party; that he has heard rumors in relation to the case, but has no personal knowledge of the facts, and from the rumors has formed and expressed an opinion in a particular way, if they are true, without expressing any belief in their truth; he would not be disqualified.[8]

[1] Howerton *v.* State, Meigs, 262; Alfred *v.* State, 2 Swan, 581; Major *v.* State, 4 Sneed, 597; Moses *v.* State, 11 Humph. 232; Cartwright *v.* State, 12 Lea, 620; but see M'Gowan *v.* State, 9 Yerg. 154.

[2] Brakefield *v.* State, 1 Sneed, 215; see Norfleet *v.* State, 4 Sneed, 340.

[3] Eason *v.* State, 6 Baxt. 466.

[4] Johnson *v.* State, 11 Lea, 47.

[5] McGregg *v.* State, 4 Blackford, 101; Brown *v.* State, 70 Ind. 576; but see Heacock *v.* State, 42 Ind. 393.

[6] Ibid.; Rice *v.* State, 7 Ind. 332. See Fleming *v.* State, 11 Ind. 234; Bradford *v.* State, 15 Ind. 347; Morgan *v.* State, 31 Ind. 193; Fahnestock *v.* State, 23 Ind. 231; Clem *v.* State, 33 Ind. 419; Cluck *v.* State, 40 Ind. 263; Hart *v.* State, 57 Ind. 102; Gillooley *v.* State, 58 Ind. 182; Guetig *v.* State, 66 Ind. 94; Noe *v.* State, 92 Ind. 92; see Elliott *v.* State, 73 Ind. 10, cited supra, § 624.

[7] Gates *v.* People, 14 Ill. 433; Neely *v.* People, 13 Ill. 685; Gray *v.* People, 26 Ill. 344.

[8] Smith *v.* Eames, 3 Scam. 78; Gard-

It is held, also, the formation of a vague unformulated opinion[1] is not good cause for a challenge.[2] A juror was held incompetent who declared that no amount of circumstantial evidence would induce him to convict a defendant.[3] And the same ruling was had with another who declared that he would not convict, even if convinced of the prisoner's guilt.[4]

The statute of Illinois, providing that rumor shall not disqualify if the juror testifies he could give a fair verdict, is interpreted by the courts of that State to mean that the juror is to give his verdict on the evidence produced on trial, and in this sense is not unconstitutional.[5]

§ 645. In *Arkansas*, if a juror in a criminal case state upon his *voir dire* that he has formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the prisoner from rumor, he should be required to state, also, that the opinion was not such as to bias or prejudice his mind, in order to render him competent; and if he state that he has conversed with persons about the case, and formed his opinion from such conversations, he should be required to state further, that such persons did not profess to have a personal knowledge of the matters stated by them; but it is not necessary that he should know or be able to state whether such persons were witnesses in the case.[6] In any view a hypothetical opinion does not exclude.[7] But if there be a fixed opinion, the juror's belief that he could fairly try the case does not qualify him.[8]

So in Arkansas.

§ 646. In *Georgia*, it is said, that while a juror who states that he has formed and expressed an opinion in a particular case, upon the guilt or innocence of the prisoner, is not competent to sit in such case;[9] and that while the opinion which disqualifies depends upon the nature and strength of the opinion, and not upon its source or origin,[10] yet the mere formation of an opinion by a juror, from rumor, without having expressed that

So in Georgia.

ner *v.* People, 3 Scam. 83; Thomson *v.* People, 24 Ill. 60; and to the same effect, Baxter *v.* People, 3 Gilm. 386; Leach *v.* People, 53 Ill. 311.

[1] Supra, §§ 628 *et seq.*

[2] Noble *v.* People, Breese, 54. See supra, § 625.

[3] Gates *v.* People, 14 Ill. 433. Infra, § 665.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Spies *v.* Illinois, 123 U. S. 131.

[6] Meyer *v.* State, 19 Ark. 156.

[7] Dolan *v.* State, 40 Ark. 454.

[8] Chiles *v.* State, 45 Ark. 165.

[9] Reynolds *v.* State, 1 Kelly, 222; Anderson *v.* State, 14 Ga. 709.

[10] Boon *v.* State, 1 Kelly, 631.

opinion, or expressed it otherwise than jocularly,[1] is not good cause of challenge.[2] The opinion must be settled and abiding.[3] And an opinion on one fact in the prosecution's case does not disqualify.[4]

So in Iowa.

§ 647. In *Iowa*, an unqualified opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the prisoner, formed from rumor, is sufficient to exclude a juror.[5] But the opinion must be absolute, and not such as, in the judgment of the juror, would leave him without bias in the case.[6] Nor does it exclude that such a qualified opinion is formed on reading partial reports of the case.[7] And a conditional or hypothetical opinion does not exclude.[8]

When the opinion is as to the *killing*, and not as to the defendant's *guilt*, it does not exclude.[9]

In Wisconsin opinion may be ground for challenge for favor. Rule in Nebraska.

§ 648. In *Wisconsin*, a juror on his examination stated that he had an opinion on the question of the defendant's guilt or innocence if what he had heard was true; that he had heard the story talked about, but had not read the report of the examination before the coroner, or heard the story from witnesses, or those who had heard the testimony, and that his opinion would not prevent his hearing testimony impartially. It was held that this was cause for challenge to the favor, but not for principal cause.[10]

[1] John *v.* State, 16 Ga. 200; Baker *v.* State, 15 Ga. 498.

[2] Hudgins *v.* State, 2 Kelly, 173; Baker *v.* State, 15 Ga. 498; Griffin *v.* State, Ibid. 476. See Anderson *v.* State, 14 Ga. 709.

[3] Wright *v.* State, 18 Ga. 383.

[4] Lloyd *v.* State, 45 Ga. 57. Infra, § 653.

One formed from mere report will not exclude. Thompson *v.* State, 24 Ga. 297; Maddox *v.* State, 32 Ga. 581; Westmoreland *v.* State, 45 Ga. 228; qualifying Boon *v.* State, 1 Kelly, 618; Ray *v.* State, 15 Ga. 223; Jim *v.* State, 15 Ga. 535. The words, "If that is so, the prisoner deserves to be hung," used before a trial by a juror, in reply to a statement by a third person, does not show a fixed opinion of guilt that would be sufficient ground for a new trial. Mercer *v.* State, 17 Ga. 146. On the other hand, it has been held a sufficient disqualification of a juror, on a trial for murder, that he was heard to say before the trial, "that from what he knew, he would stretch the prisoner." Monroe *v.* State, 5 Ga. 85. See, as to practice in this State in reference to triers, Willis *v.* State, 12 Ga. 444; Copenhaven *v.* State, 14 Ga. 22.

[5] Wau-kon-chau-neek-kaw *v.* U. S., 1 Morris, 332; State *v.* Shelledy, 8 Iowa, 477.

[6] State *v.* Sater, 8 Iowa, 420; S. P., State *v.* Nelson, 58 Iowa, 208.

[7] State *v.* Bruce, 48 Iowa, 530; State *v.* Shelton, 64 Iowa, 333.

[8] State *v.* George, 62 Iowa, 682.

[9] State *v.* Thompson, 9 Iowa, 188; State *v.* Ostrander, 18 Iowa, 434. But see State *v.* Bryan, 40 Iowa, 379. Infra, § 652.

[10] Schœffler *v.* State, 3 Wis. 823.

In *Nebraska* mere impression or hypothetical opinion does not exclude.[1] It is otherwise as to a firm belief.[2]

§ 649. In *Michigan*, an opinion "partial" but not "positive" does not disqualify.[3] Hence mere vague impression does not disqualify.[4] But it is otherwise when evidence would be required to overcome the prepossession.[5]

In Michigan opinion must be unqualified.

§ 650. In *California*, having formed and expressed an opinion from report does not disqualify a person to sit as a juror if he declares he can sit on the jury without bias, that evidence can change his opinion, and that he will be governed by the evidence.[6] It was formerly otherwise when the opinion was unqualified,[7] but now by statute such an opinion does not exclude if the juror believes he can decide according to the evidence.[8] The challenge must specify the particular cause.[9] It is not material that the juror did not state whether his opinion was for or against the prisoner. The courts will not permit the juror to be questioned on that point.[10]

And so in California.

§ 651. In *Louisiana*, opinion based on common rumor, such opinion being without any prejudice or bias against the accused, does not disqualify.[11] If the juror believes he could render an impartial verdict, he is not on this ground open to challenge.[12] But a fixed opinion disqualifies,[13] and so of ascertained prejudice.[14]

And so in Louisiana.

[1] Curry *v.* State, 4 Neb. 545; S. C., 5 Neb. 412; Carroll *v.* State, 5 Neb. 3; Smith *v.* State, 5 Neb. 183; Murphy *v.* State, 15 Neb. 383; though see Carroll *v.* State, 5 Neb. 31. As to construction of Nebraska statute (similar to that of New York), see Palmer *v.* State, 4 Neb. 68.

[2] Olive *v.* State, 11 Neb. 1.

[3] Holt *v.* People, 13 Mich. 224. See Burden *v.* People, 26 Mich. 162.

[4] Holt *v.* People, 13 Mich. 224; Stewart *v.* People, 23 Mich. 63; Cargan *v.* People, 39 Mich. 540; People *v.* Barker, 60 Mich. 277; People *v.* Shufelt, 61 Mich. 237.

[5] Stephens *v.* People, 38 Mich. 156. See Ulrich *v.* People, 39 Mich. 245; Stephens *v.* People, 38 Mich. 739.

[6] People *v.* Mahony, 48 Cal. 180; People *v.* Murphy, 45 Cal. 137; People *v.* Johnston, 46 Cal. 78.

[7] People *v.* Edwards, 41 Cal. 640; People *v.* Brotherton, 43 Cal. 530; People *v.* Johnston, 46 Cal. 80; People *v.* Brown, 48 Cal. 253.

[8] People *v.* Cochran, 61 Cal. 548; see People *v.* Macauley, 1 Cal. 379.

[9] People *v.* Walsh, 43 Cal. 447.

[10] People *v.* Williams, 6 Cal. 206.

[11] State *v.* Ward, 14 La. An. 673; State *v.* Caulfield, 23 La. An. 148; State *v.* Birdwell, 36 La. An. 857; State *v.* Ford, 37 La. An. 444.

[12] State *v.* Hugel, 27 La. An. 375; State *v.* Coleman, 27 La. An. 691. See State *v.* Guidry, 28 La. An. 630;

[13] State *v.* Ricks, 32 La. An. 1098; State *v.* Jackson, 37 La. An. 768.

[14] State *v.* Barnes, 34 La. An. 395.

§ 652. In *Kansas* a mere hypothetical opinion or floating impression does not exclude,[1] nor an impression received from newspaper reports,[2] though it is otherwise as to a settled belief.[3] In *Florida* the same rule obtains in all cases where the juror states he can give a fair verdict;[4] and in *Texas*,[5] and in *Colorado*.[6]

And so in Kansas, Florida, Texas, and Colorado.

(*b*[1].) *General Propositions as to Prejudice.*

§ 653. The opinion, to disqualify, must go to the whole case. If it touches merely insulated portions, it may not be ground for challenge.[7] Thus, a juror will not be set aside because he believes that there was an offence committed;[8] because he believes that if certain facts be true the defendant is guilty;[9] because he has drawn an inference from a single inculpatory fact;[10] or because he even holds that the *fact* of homicide, though not its *malice*, is to be traced to defendant, the issue being on *malice*.[11] But a fixed opinion of a principal's guilt may disqualify on trial of the accessary.[12]

Opinion must go to whole case.

§ 654. The prevailing opinion, in this country, is that a juror must answer, under oath, any question asked him with regard to his competency as a juror, providing such question does not tend to degrade him, or make him infamous.[13] Hence, he will not be excused from stating

Juror must answer questions, but not to inculpate himself.

State *v.* Johnson, 33 La. An. 889; State *v.* De Rance, 34 La. An. 186; State *v.* Diskins, 35 La. An. 46; State *v.* Revells, Id. 302.

[1] Roy *v.* State, 2 Kans. 405.

[2] State *v.* Medlicott, 9 Kans. 257; State *v.* Crawford, 11 Kans. 32.

[3] State *v.* Brown, 15 Kans. 400. See State *v.* Bancroft, 22 Kan. 170; State *v.* Spaulding, 24 Kan. 1; State *v.* Miller, 29 Kan. 43; State *v.* Paterson, 28 Kan. 204.

[4] O'Connor *v.* State, 9 Fla. 215; Montague *v.* State, 17 Fla. 662; Metzger *v.* State, 18 Fla. 481.

[5] Grissom *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 374; Rothschild *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 519; Post *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 579; Thompson *v.* State, 19 Tex. Ap. 594.

[6] Jones *v.* People, 6 Col. 452.

[7] State *v.* Thompson, 9 Iowa, 18; State *v.* Ostrander, 18 Iowa, 434; Holt *v.* People, 13 Mich. 224.

[8] Holt *v.* People, 13 Mich. 224; Stewart *v.* People, 23 Mich. 63; State *v.* Ostrander, 18 Iowa, 434.

[9] Lee *v.* State, 45 Miss. 114.

[10] Lloyd *v.* State, 45 Ga. 57.

[11] Lowenberg *v.* People, 27 N. Y. 336; S. C., 5 Park. C. R. 414; Wright *v.* State, 18 Ga. 383; State *v.* Thompson, 9 Iowa, 188; State *v.* Ostrander, 18 Iowa, 434. See Conatser *v.* State, 12 Lea, 436.

[12] Arnold *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 435. This is required by statute. Stagner *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 440; Lewis *v.* State, 15 Tex. Ap. 647.

[13] Infra, §§ 674, 682; 7 Dane's Abridgment, 334; Edward's Juryman's

whether he has any prejudice against a religious sect, on the ground that the answer would tend to disgrace him.[1] But questions that would disgrace or criminate him he will not be compelled to answer.[2]

Must first be sworn on *voir dire*.

§ 655. He must, of course, be sworn on his *voir dire* before he can be interrogated.[3] And this is the usual practice.[4] But the question may be determined, without examining him, on extrinsic proof.[5]

Court may ask questions not statutory.

§ 656. As it is the duty of the court to empanel, for the trial of each case, a competent and impartial jury, the courts may propound to the jurors returned other interrogatories than those which they are required to put by statute.[6]

Only party prejudiced may challenge.

§ 657. A challenge of a juror, because of his having formed and expressed an opinion on the question to be tried, can be made, at common law, only by that party against whom it was so formed and expressed. In such case the other party cannot interpose.[7]

Juror may be examined as to details.

§ 658. If the juror answers that he has not formed or expressed an opinion on the merits, the examination is not closed, but either party[8] may proceed to ask him such questions as may further test his competency, and in case of suffi-

Guide, 85; Com. *v.* Knapp, 9 Pick. 496; People *v.* Bodine, 1 Denio, 281; State *v.* Zellers, 2 Halst. 220; Howser *v.* Com., 51 Penn. St. 333; Staup *v.* Com., 74 Penn. St. 458; State *v.* Bonwell, 2 Harring. 529; Lithgow *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 297; Heath *v.* Com., 1 Robinson, 735; Epps *v.* State, 19 Ga. 102; State *v.* Crank, 2 Bailey, 66; State *v.* Benton, 2 Dev. & B. 196; Fletcher *v.* State, 6 Humph. 249; State *v.* Mann, 83 Mo. 589. In England the practice is not accepted. R. *v.* Edmonds, 4 B. & A. 471; and see State *v.* Baldwin, 3 Brevard, 309; Const. R. 289. See, *contra*, State *v.* Spencer, 1 Zabr. 196; and, as doubting, see Dilworth *v.* Com., 12 Grat. 689. Numerous cases where the right is exercised will be cited hereafter.

[1] People *v.* Christie, 2 Parker C. R. 579.

[2] Ibid.; Burt *v.* Panjand, 99 U. S. 180; Hudson *v.* State, 1 Blackf. 317.

[3] King *v.* State, 5 How. Miss. 730; State *v.* Flower, 1 Walk. 518; Com. *v.* Jones, 1 Leigh, 598. See infra, § 682. The right extends to cross-examination. Infra, § 682.

[4] O'Mara *v.* Com., 75 Penn. St. 424; Staup *v.* Com., 74 Penn. St. 458.

[5] State *v.* Hoyt, 47 Conn. 518.

[6] Infra, §§ 683, 684, note; Pierce *v.* State, 3 N. H. 536; Com. *v.* Gee, 6 Cush. 177; Montague *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 767; Stephens *v.* Com., 38 Mich. 739. See infra, §§ 672, 683, 684, as to manner of putting questions.

[7] State *v.* Benton, 2 Dev. & Bat. 196.

[8] Howser *v.* Com., 50 Penn. St. 333; State *v.* Brown, 35 La. An. 340; Hardin *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 355; Ray *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 450.

cient reason appearing on the *voir dire* to form cause for challenge, he may be challenged for favor, and at common law the question of his bias, as will be seen more fully hereafter, submitted to triers.[1]

[1] People *v.* Bodine, 1 Denio, 281; Heath *v.* Com., 1 Robinson, 735. Infra, §§ 670, 684.

Questions which have been allowed by the courts.—The following questions, in the several cases in which they occur, were adopted as determining the competency of the juror:—

"Have you formed and expressed an opinion about the guilt of Colonel Burr?" Marshall, C. J., Burr's Trial. 1 Burr's Trial, 367.

"Have you formed and delivered an opinion on the subject-matter of this indictment?" Chase, J., in U. S. *v.* Callender, Callender's Trial, Pamphlet, 19–21.

"Have you heard anything of this case, so as to make up your mind?" "Do you feel any bias or prejudice for or against the prisoner at the bar?" Parker, J., Selfridge's Trial. Pamphlet, p. 9.

"Have you formed and expressed an opinion of the guilt or innocence of the prisoner?" Marshall, C. J., in U. S. *v.* Hare, etc., U. S. Circuit Court for Baltimore, May T. 1818, Pamphlet.

"Have you formed and expressed an opinion as to the general guilt or innocence of all concerned in the commission of the offence?" (namely, the burning of the convent in Charlestown, Mass.) Supreme Court of Mass., on trial of the Charlestown rioters. Com. *v.* Buzzell, 16 Pick. 153.

"Have you made up your minds as to which of the two parties was in the wrong in the Kensington riots?" Rogers, J., Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, April 29, 1845, in Com. *v.* Sherry, one of the Kensington rioters, MSS.

1. "Have you, at any time, formed or expressed an opinion, or even entertained an impression, which may influence your conduct as a juror?"

2. "Have you any bias or prejudice on your mind for or against the prisoner?" Ogden, J., on a homicide trial. People *v.* Johnson, 2 Wheel. C. C. 367.

1. "Have you expressed or formed any opinion relative to the matter now to be tried?"

2. "Are you sensible of any prejudice or bias therein?"

3. "Had you formed an opinion that the law of the United States, known as the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850, is unconstitutional—so that you cannot convict a person indicted under it for that reason, if the facts alleged in the indictment are proved and the court held the statute to be constitutional?"

4. "Do you hold any opinion upon the subject of the Fugitive Slave Law, so called, which would induce you to refuse to convict a person indicted under it, if the facts set forth in the indictment and constituting the offence are proved against him, and the court direct you that the law is constitutional?" Curtis, J., in U. S. *v.* Morris, charged with attempting to rescue a fugitive slave, Boston, 1851, and approved by Grier, J., and Kane, J., in Phila., 1852, U. S. *v.* Hanway, 2 Wall. Jr. 139.

On the trial of Dorr, the following questions asked by the attorney-general were rejected by the court:—

"Did you vote for the Dorr constitution?"

"Do you believe the defendant to

But after the court has approved a juror the right to question is closed.[1]

§ 659. The bias, however, must go to the particular issue; and on *autrefois acquit* the question is not opinion as to guilt, but general bias for or against the defendant.[2] Prejudice as to a particular kind of evidence, however, on which the case depends, may exclude.[3] An opinion that the defendant killed the deceased does not exclude, when the killing is conceded, and the question is self-defence, as to which the juror had formed no opinion.[4] That a bias against crime does not disqualify we have already seen.[5]

Bias must go to immediate issue.

§ 660. There are other causes of challenge, which, though less common in this country than that which has been just noticed, have been frequently acted on. Thus, a principal challenge will be allowed if the juror be within the age of twenty-one ;[6] if a female ;[7] if he be of blood or kindred to either party,[8] within the prohibited degrees ;[9] if he be intimately connected by affinity with either party,[10] though if the relationship be remote, as where the juror's sister was the

Relationship and business association a cause for challenge.

have been governor of Rhode Island ?" 7 Bost. Law Rep. 347.

A juror may be asked whether he belongs to an association for punishing crime. State *v.* Mann, 83 Mo. 581. Infra, § 668.

[1] Bales *v.* State, 63 Ala. 30.

[2] Supra, § 623 ; Josephine *v.* State, 39 Miss. 613. And see State *v.* Carrick, 16 Nev. 120.

[3] Infra, § 665.

[4] State *v.* Wells, 28 Kan. 321.

[5] Supra, § 624.

[6] I Inst. 157. See infra, § 846.

[7] Burn's Justice, tit. Jurors, viii. p. 965.

In State *v.* Ketchey, 70 N. C. 621, it was ruled that because of a juror's being first cousin to the prisoner is no good cause of challenge by the prisoner, unless it be shown that ill-feeling or bad blood exists between the juror and the prisoner.

[8] I Inst. 157 ; State *v.* Baldwin, 80 N. C. 390.

[9] Jacques *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 690 ; State *v.* Perry, 1 Busbee, 330 ; Smith *v.* State, 61 Miss. 754 ; Parrish *v.* State, 12 Lea, 655 ; O'Connor *v.* State, 9 Fla. 215.

Under the Missouri statute a juror who said that his father was second cousin to the defendant's mother was excluded. State *v.* Walton, 74 Mo. 270. See, also, Wirebach *v.* Bank, 97 Penn. St. 543. See infra, § 846. But see Todd *v.* Gray, 16 S. C. 635.

[10] Bank *v.* Hart, 3 Day, 491 ; Hinchman *v.* Clark, Coxe, 446 ; Stevenson *v.* Stiles, 2 Pen. (N. J.) 543. But if the affinity is ruptured by the death of the intermediate link (*e. g.*, where the prisoner's wife, who was cousin to the juror, is dead without issue), then the rule does not apply. State *v.* Shaw, 3 Ired. 532. See infra, § 846.

wife of the nephew of one of the parties, the rule is otherwise.[1] By the old English common law it was held a disqualification that the juror was godfather to the child of the defendant, or the defendant to his child.[2] It is cause for challenge that the juror is in the employment of one of the parties.[3]

And so of prior connection with case.

§ 661. It is no ground of challenge that the juror on a prior case had found a verdict against the defendant on a prosecution for a distinct offence.[4] This has been pushed so far that in Massachusetts[5] jurors who had just convicted the defendant for keeping a liquor nuisance at one date, were held competent to sit on a prosecution against him for keeping the same kind of nuisance at a subsequent date. But this is a hard decision. The quality of proof in the two cases was the same, the question of date being merely technical; and the jurors in the first case must be viewed as having in the most solemn way formed and expressed an opinion on the second. But it is good ground for challenge that the juror has given a prior verdict on the same subject-matter, though against another defendant;[6] that he was one of the grand jury who found the particular bill;[7] that he was counsel,

[1] Rank *v.* Shewey, 4 Watts, 218. If, during the trial of a case of felony, it is discovered that the prisoner has a relation on the jury, this is no ground for discharging the jury, and the case must proceed. R. *v.* Wardle, 1 C. & M. 647. See, also, Moses *v.* State, 11 Humph. 232; and see infra, §§ 845, 846.

[2] 1 Inst. 157.

[3] Hubbard *v.* Rutledge, 57 Miss. 7; Central R. R. *v.* Mitchell, 63 Ga. 173; Springer *v.* State, 34 Ga. 379. See other cases cited iufra, § 661.

[4] Sawdon's case, 2 Lewin C. C. 117; U. S. *v.* Shackelford, 3 Cranch C. C. 178.

[5] Com. *v.* Hill, 4 Allen, 591. See supra, § 629.

[6] 1 Inst. 157. Jacobs *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 278. Merely having been sworn as a juror, in a prior trial, however, on which there was a *nolle prosequi* before testimony received, is not a disqualification. Reed *v.* State, 50 Ga. 556.

[7] R. *v.* Percival, 1 Sid. 243; R. *v.* Cook, 13 St. Tr. 334; 2 Rev. Stat. N. Y. 734, § 8; Rev. Stat. Mass. c. 137, § 2; Stewart *v.* State, 15 Ohio St. 155; Rice *v.* State, 16 Ind. 298; Barlow *v.* State, 2 Blackford, 115; Rogers *v.* Lamb, 3 Blackford, 155; Birdsong *v.* State, 47 Ala. 68; Finch *v.* State, 81 Ala. 41; State *v.* McDonald 9 W. Va. 456. But being on the *list* of a grand jury without sitting on the case does not disqualify. Rafe *v.* State, 20 Ga. 60. And it has been ruled too late to take the objection after the juror has been accepted. Davis *v.* State, 54 Ala. 93. In Florida, serving on a coroner's inquest, without forming an opinion, is said not to disqualify, when the question of the guilt of the defendant did not come up. O'Connor *v.* State, 9 Fla. 215; State *v.* Madoil, 12 Fla. 151.

servant of, or under close obligations to either party;[1] that he was concerned in getting up the prosecution;[2] though it is no cause of challenge that he is brother of one of the counsel of the opposite party;[3] that he is client of the prisoner, who is a member of the bar;[4] that, being a clergyman, he had preached the funeral sermon of the deceased, the prosecution being for murder;[5] or that he lodges as a pay boarder with the defendant.[6] But he is incompetent if he has been *bonâ fide* summoned as a witness for either of the parties;[7] if he be bail for the defendant;[8] and if, on an indictment for riot, he be an inhabitant of the town where the riot occurred, and had taken an active part in the matter which led to it.[9]

§ 661 *a*. A juror is incompetent who is indicted for an offence of the same character as that charged against the defendant, the offences being grouped under the same general law, *e. g.*, in cases of liquor selling.[10] Living in polygamy disqualifies a juror from sitting on a prosecution for polygamy;[11] and so, under the Act of March 22, 1882, does the belief that polygamy is right.[12]

And so of participation in cognate offence.

§ 662. A pecuniary interest merely as a member of the town or county to whose treasury a fine is to be paid or from which ex-

[1] 1 Inst. 157; Springer *v.* State, 34 Ga. 379; and cases cited supra, § 660.

[2] Dumas *v.* State, 62 Ga. 58.

[3] Pipher *v.* Lodge, 16 Serg. & R. 214.

[4] R. *v.* Geach, 9 C. & P. 499.

[5] State *v.* Stokeley, 16 Minn. 282 (1871). "Searching questions were put by the defendant's counsel as to his state of mind in reference to the case, and the guilt or innocence of the defendant; and he emphatically declared himself entirely impartial in the case. The presumption is that he told the truth. That he officiated at the funeral in his capacity as a clergyman had, of itself, no more tendency to prove a mental bias against defendant, than a performance by the undertaker of the duties of *his* calling on the same occasion would tend to prove such a bias on *his* part." Ripley, C. J. Ibid.

[6] Cummings *v.* Gann, 52 Penn. St. 484.

Mere business relationship, or even social intimacy, does not, *per se*, disqualify. Ibid.

[7] Com. *v.* Joliffe, 7 Watts, 585.

[8] 1 Wheeler's C. C. 391; Com. *v.* M'Cormick, 130 Mass. 61; Anderson *v.* State, 63 Ga. 675; Brazleton *v.* State, 66 Ala. 96.

[9] R. *v.* Swain, 2 M. & Rob. 112; see infra, § 668.

[10] McGuire *v.* State, 37 Miss. 369.

[11] Reynolds *v.* U. S., 98 U. S. 145; aff. S. C., 1 Utah, 226.

[12] Clawson *v.* U. S., 114 U. S. 477.

penses are to be taken does not incapacitate,[1] nor does a mere speculative or inoperative interest in an institution or corporation which claims to have been injured by the defendants.[2] It is otherwise, however, when the juror has an individual claim to a fine or forfeiture which a conviction would produce.

And so of pecuniary interest in the result.

§ 663. Where a juror said, when on a jury in another cause in the same term, "that he was a Tom Paine man, and would as lief swear on a spelling-book as on a Bible," this was held a good ground for challenge;[3] and so is a conviction of an infamous crime.[4] Mental incapacity also disqualifies.[5]

And so of irreligion, infamy, incapacity.

§ 664. Where a juror, on being called in a capital case, declared "that he had conscientious scruples on the subject of capital punishment, and that he would not, because he conscientiously could not, consent or agree to a verdict of murder in the first degree, death being the punishment, though the evidence required such a verdict;" it was held by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania a principal cause of challenging by the prosecution; Gibson, C. J., dissenting.[6] The same opinion is adopted in New York;[7] even though the juror does not belong to a religious denomination scrupulous on the subject, which seems to have been the qualification of the revised statute;[8] in Maine;[9] in New Hampshire;[10] in Vermont;[11] in Indiana;[12] in Ohio;[13] in Massachusetts;[14] in Virginia;[15]

And so of conscientious scruples as to capital punishment.

[1] Middletown *v.* Ames, 7 Vt. 166. Doyal *v.* State, 70 Ga. 134. This is the uniform practice in Pennsylvania. But see State *v.* Williams, 30 Me. 484.

[2] Supra, § 348.

[3] Com. *v.* McFadden, 23 Penn St. 12.

[4] 1 Inst. 158; Brown *v.* Crashaw, 2 Bulstr. 154; 2 Hale, 277.

[5] State *v.* Rountree, 32 La. An. 1144; infra, § 669.

[6] Com. *v.* Lesher, 17 S. & R. 155.

[7] People *v.* Damon, 13 Wend. 351; Lowenberg *v.* People, 5 Park. C. R. 414; 27 N. Y. 336; O'Brien *v.* People, 36 N. Y. 276.

[8] Walter *v.* People, 32 N. Y. 147; People *v.* Damon, 13 Wend. 351; People *v.* Wilson, 3 Parker C. R. 199.

[9] State *v.* Jewell, 33 Me. 583.

[10] State *v.* Howard, 17 N. H. 171.

[11] State *v.* Ward, 39 Vt. 226.

[12] Jones *v.* State, 2 Blackf. 475; Gross *v.* State, 2 Carter (Ind.) 329; Driskill *v.* State, 7 Ind. 338; Fahnestock *v.* State, 23 Ind. 231; Greenley *v.* State, 60 Ind. 141.

[13] State *v.* Town, Wright's R. 75; Martin *v.* State, 16 Ohio, 364. By the Ohio Code of Cr. Proc. this is made a statutory cause of challenge, § 134. Warren's Ohio Cr. Law, 1870, p. 131.

[14] Rev. Stat. c. 137, § 6; Gen. Stat. c. 172, § 5.

[15] Clore's case, 8 Grat. 606.

in West Virginia;[1] in North Carolina;[2] in Georgia;[3] in Alabama;[4] in Louisiana;[5] in Mississippi;[6] in Texas;[7] in California;[8] in Florida;[9] in Nevada;[10] in Nebraska;[11] in Colorado;[12] and in the United States Circuit Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, by Baldwin, J.[13] Nor is the disqualification in such cases removed by the fact that the jurors have by statute the option of reducing the punishment to imprisonment for life.[14] But when, notwithstanding objections to capital punishment, the juror thinks he could do justice in the case, he may be competent.[15]

In Arkansas, jurors are not rejected because they are opposed to capital punishment, unless they go further, and bring themselves under the disqualifications prescribed by the statute.[16]

In Alabama, the exclusion is extended to scruples as to penitentiary punishment.[17] The *defendant* has no ground of complaint if a juror having such conscientious scruples should not be set aside.[18]

In Indiana, the rule in the text is prescribed by statute.[19]

§ 665. Any other conscientious scruples which will prevent a just verdict may be ground for challenge. Thus, a juror is incompetent who declares that no amount of circumstantial evidence would induce him to find a verdict of guilty,[20] and so of a juror called in a polygamy case,

So of other conscientious scruples.

[1] State *v.* Greer, 22 W. Va. 546.

[2] State *v.* Bowman, 80 N. C. 432.

[3] Williams *v.* State, 3 Kelly, 453.

[4] Stalls *v.* State, 28 Ala. 25; Jackson *v.* State, 74 Ala. 26.

[5] State *v.* Nolan, 13 La. An. 376; State *v.* Baker, 30 La. An. 1134; State *v.* Diskin, 34 La. An. 919; State *v.* Alphonse, 34 La. An. 9.

[6] Lewis *v.* State, 9 S. & M. 115; Williams *v.* State, 32 Miss. 389; Fortenberry *v.* State, 55 Miss. 403; Spain *v.* State, 55 Miss. 19; Cooper *v.* State, 55 Miss. 207; see Smith *v.* State, 55 Miss. 410.

[7] Burrell *v.* State, 18 Tex. 713; Clanton *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 139; Thompson *v.* State, 19 Tex. Ap. 594; Kennedy *v.* State, 19 Tex. Ap. 618.

[8] People *v.* Tanner, 2 Cal. 257.

[9] Melzgar *v.* State, 18 Fla. 481.

[10] State *v.* Hing, 16 Nev. 307; State *v.* Pritchard, 16 Nev. 101.

[11] Bradshaw *v.* State, 17 Neb. 147.

[12] Jones *v.* People, 6 Col. 452.

[13] U. S. *v.* Wilson, 1 Baldwin, 78.

[14] Spain *v.* State, 55 Miss. 191.

[15] Com. *v.* Webster, 5 Cush. 295; Williams *v.* State, 32 Miss. 389; People *v.* Stewart, 7 Cal. 140; Stratton *v.* People, 5 Col. 276.

[16] Dig. § 158, c. 2; Atkins *v.* State, 16 Ark. 568.

[17] Stalls *v.* State, 28 Ala. 25.

[18] Murphy *v.* State, 37 Ala. 25.

[19] Greenley *v.* State, 60 Ind. 141.

[20] Gates *v.* People, 14 Ill. 433; Smith *v.* State, 55 Ala. 1; Coleman *v.* State, 59 Miss. 484; Jones *v.* State, 57 Miss. 424; State *v.* Pritchard, 15 Nev. 74; People *v.* Ah Chung, 54 Cal. 398. But mere prejudice against circumstantial

who believes that polygamy is divinely prescribed.[1] And on the trial of a nuisance for erecting a mill-dam, a juror is incompetent who conscientiously believes all mill-dams to be nuisances, though he swears that as to such particular mill-dam he knows nothing, and has formed no opinion.[2]

It has been also ruled that it is a good ground for challenge that the juror held that the offence for which the accused was to be tried (burning a convent) is no crime,[3] and so in Pennsylvania, as to a juror who declared in a prior case that he would acquit any one the judge wanted him to convict.[4]

The prosecuting officer may inquire of a person presented as a juror in the trial of a case of counterfeiting, whether he has taken an oath to acquit all persons of counterfeiting, but the person may refuse to answer;[5] and in a case in which a Chinese is defendant, a juror may be asked whether he has a prejudice against Chinese witnesses.[6]

§ 666. Belief that a statute is unconstitutional, so as to preclude assent to a conviction under it, disqualifies;[7] but the converse is not true, for a statute is presumed to be constitutional until otherwise determined by the court.[8]

So of belief that statute is unconstitutional.

§ 667. In New York it has been held to be no cause of challenging a juror that he is a freemason, where one of the parties to a suit is a freemason, and the other is not.[9] In the obligation, it was observed, assumed by a royal arch mason, and said to be in these words: "I promise and swear that I will aid and assist a companion royal arch mason when engaged in any difficulty, and espouse his cause so far as to extricate him from the same, if in my power, whether he be right or wrong," there is a discrepancy in the relation given of it by masons; while some say that such is the form of

But not in case where a mason is concerned that juror was a freemason.

evidence does not disqualify. State *v.* Shields, 33 La. An. 991.

In Garrett *v.* State, 76 Ala. 18, a juror was held incompetent who said he would convict, but would not hang on circumstantial evidence.

[1] U. S. *v.* Miles, 103 U. S. 304.

[2] Crippin *v.* State, 8 Mich. 117.

[3] Com. *v.* Buzzell, 16 Pick. 153.

[4] Com. *v.* McFadden, 23 Penn. St. 12.

[5] Fletcher *v.* State, 6 Humph. 249; see Com. *v.* Eagan, 4 Gray, 18; supra, § 653.

[6] People *v.* Car Soy, 57 Cal. 102.

[7] Com. *v.* Austin, 7 Gray, 51.

[8] Com. *v.* Abbott, 13 Met. 120.

[9] People *v.* Horton, 13 Wend. 9; see Burdine *v.* Grand, 37 Ala. (N. S.) 478.

the oath, others deny it; but all concur in stating that the obligation is always accompanied with an explanation as to its meaning, which is, that if a royal arch mason sees a brother mason engaged in a quarrel with another person, it is his duty to take his brother mason by the arm and extricate him, without inquiring into the merits of the controversy. On such an interpretation, the oath taken by a master mason, or a royal arch mason, on his admission, it was ruled, does not disqualify him from serving as a juror in an action between a mason and a person not a mason.[1]

§ 668. The members of any association of men, combining for the purpose of enforcing or withstanding the execution of a particular law, and binding themselves to contribute money for that purpose, are incompetent to sit as jurors on the trial of an indictment for violating that law,[2] and it has been held error in Illinois to refuse, on a prosecution for selling spirituous liquor, to permit the following questions to be put: "Are you a member of a temperance society?" "Are you connected with any society or league organized for the purpose of prosecuting a certain class of people under what is called the new temperance law of the State, or have you ever contributed any funds for such a purpose?"[3] It has also been held error to refuse to permit a juror to be asked whether he belonged to any secret society binding its members by oath not to give a fair trial to foreigners.[4] But members of an association to prosecute offences against certain laws, who have each, by subscribing a certain sum to the funds of the association, rendered themselves liable to pay, to the extent of their subscriptions, their proportion of expenses incurred in such prosecutions, are not incompetent to sit as jurors on the trial of such a prosecution, commenced by the agent of the association, and carried on at its expense, if it appear that they paid their subscriptions before the prosecution was commenced.[5]

Membership of specific vigilance associations or proscriptive organizations may disqualify, but not of general associations to put down crime.

[1] People *v.* Horton, *ut sup.*

[2] Com. *v.* Eagan, 4 Gray, 18. See supra, § 624.

[3] Lavin *v.* People, 69 Ill. 303. These rulings may be harmonized with the following by the distinction suggested by the Illinois court, that such questions are proper at least to enable the defendant to exercise his right of peremptory challenge.

[4] People *v.* Reyes, 5 Cal. 347.

[5] Com. *v.* O'Neil, 6 Gray, 343. See Com. *v.* Thrasher, 11 Gray, 55; Williams *v.* State, 3 Kelly, 453; Heacock *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 97.

And it has been held that a juror is not rendered incompetent by the fact that he belongs to an association for prosecution of crimes of the same class as that under trial.[1]

Connection with the police is by itself no disqualification.[2]

To a grand juror it is no cause for challenge that he belongs to an association for the prosecution of crime.[3]

A bias or prejudice against crime generally, or against the crime on trial, is no disqualification.[4]

Alienage, or non-residence, or ignorance of language.

Alienage and non-residence may be disqualification. And so may ignorance of language and drunkenness.

§ 669. In those jurisdictions where alienage or non-residence is a disqualification, the objection is good if made by way of challenge. After verdict it may be too late to state such objection when the disqualification is one which due diligence would have discovered, and which is not moral but technical.[5] Ignorance of the English language is a ground for challenge when the jury can be made up of persons familiar with the language.[6]

Drunkenness, also, may be ground for challenge.[7]

[1] State *v.* Wilson, 8 Clarke (Iowa), 407; Boyle *v.* People, 4 Col. 176.

[2] People *v.* Reynolds, 16 Cal. 128.

[3] Musick *v.* People, 40 Ill. 268. See R. *v.* Swain, 2 M. & R. 112.

[4] Williams *v.* State, 3 Kelly, 453; State *v.* Burns, 85 Mo. 47. Supra, § 624.

As to conscientious objections to polygamy, see U. S. *v.* Reynolds, 1 Utah, 226; 98 U. S. 145.

[5] See infra, § 846; R. *v.* Sutton, 8 B. & C. 417; R. *v.* Despard, 2 Man. & R. 406; Sweeney *v.* Baker, 13 W. Va. 156; Presbury *v.* Com., 9 Dana, 203; Raganthall *v.* Com., 14 Bush, 457; State *v.* Nolan, 13 La. An. 276; Seal *v.* State, 13 Sm. & M. 286; Schumaker *v.* State, 5 Wis. 324; State *v.* Hinkle, 27 Kan. 308; Yanez *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 429.

[6] Fisher *v.* Phil., 4 Brewst. 375; Com. *v.* Jones, 12 Phila. 550; Sutton *v.* Fox, 55 Wis. 531; State *v.* Ring, 29 Minn. 78; State *v.* Marshall, 8 Ala. (N. S.) 302; Lyles *v.* State, 41 Tex. 172; Dunn *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 600; Wright *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 163; Garcia *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 335; Bonneville *v.* State, 53 Wis. 680.

That the court may take notice of such disqualification, see infra, § 683.

In Trinidad *v.* Simpson, 5 Col. 65, we have the following from Elbert, J.:—

"We are not unmindful that there are many serious objections to the

[7] Supra, § 663; infra, § 841; Guice *v.* State, 60 Miss. 714. That the court may in such cases excuse, see infra, § 683.

(*c.*) *Challenges to Polls for Favor.*

§ 670. Challenges to the polls for favor take place when, though the juror is not so evidently partial as to amount to a principal challenge, there are reasonable grounds to suspect that he will act under some undue influence or prejudice, and when these grounds involve disputed questions of fact, such challenges, according to the old practice, being submitted to triers on the questions of disputed fact.[1] The distinction, however, between challenges for favor and those for principal cause is in many jurisdictions disregarded. Thus, in the federal courts, it is settled law that when a challenge for favor would be sustained, a court of error will not reverse because the challenge was in form for cause.[2] Consequently, what has been already said under the head of challenges for principal cause is to be examined as connected with challenges for favor.[3]

Challenges for favor are those involving disputed questions of fact.

The fact, however, that in some jurisdictions *all* challenges are decided by the court, without the intervention of triers, does not do away with the distinction between the two classes.[4] The question,

interposition of interpreters in judicial proceedings, and while we hold it within the power of the court to appoint an interpreter under the circumstances of this case, it was also within its discretion to exclude the jurors named from the cause assigned. People *v.* Arceo, 32 Cal. 49; Atlas M. Co. *v.* Johnson, 23 Mich. 37; State *v.* Marshall, 8 Ala. (N. S.) 302. Such persons are not disqualified, but whenever it is practicable to secure a full panel of English-speaking jurors, a wise discretion would excuse from jury duty persons ignorant of that language. The cases of Fisher *v.* Philadelphia, 4 Brewst. 375, and Lyles *v.* State, 41 Tex. 172, are cited against the conclusion arrived at in this opinion. The first authority we have been unable to obtain. With the reasoning of the last we are not satisfied. If our conclusion as to the power of the court to appoint an interpreter be correct, the foundation upon which the conclusions in that case appear to rest disappears."

This, however, can only hold good in cases where the panel can in no other way be constituted; and even in such cases it is hard to see how the deliberations can be conducted of a jury who have no common language. To put an interpreter in with them would be to make the interpreter the arbiter.

[1] Infra, § 686; supra, § 621; Co. Lit. 157 *b*; Bac. Abr. Juries, E. 5; Williams's J., Juries, v.; Dick. Sess. 188; People *v.* Bodine, 1 Denio, 9, 35, 281; Schoeffler *v.* State, 3 Wis. 823; Freeman *v.* People, 4 Denio, 39; State *v.* Benton, 2 Dev. & B. 212.

[2] Reynolds *v.* U. S., 98 U. S. 145.

[3] See supra, § 621.

[4] State *v.* Howard, 17 N. H. 171; Greenfield *v.* People, 6 Abb. New Cas. 1, reversing S. C., 1 Hun, 212.

in challenges for favor, is, whether the juryman is altogether indifferent as he stands unsworn,[1] because he may be, even unconsciously to himself, swayed to one side, and indulge his own feelings when he considers himself influenced entirely by the weight of evidence;[2] or may be under such influences, indirect or direct, as to create in him a bias to one or the other side.[3]

Challenges cannot moot questions of mere personal privilege to juror.

§ 671. As will hereafter be more fully seen,[4] persons to be affected by the finding of jurors may object to their fitness, but have nothing to do with the question whether the juror is privileged from acting as such. Whether a person is privileged on account of his age comes under the latter class of questions.[5]

The Court may excuse a juror on ground of exemption without the prisoner's consent.[6]

III. MODE AND TIME OF TAKING CHALLENGES.

Challenge must be prior to oath.

§ 672. The order in which challenges are to be made is, as we have seen, a matter of local practice, sometimes settled by statute.[7] The challenge, either by the prosecution or the defence, must be before the oath is commenced, down to which period the right exists;[8] and the usual

[1] People *v.* Horton, 13 Wend. 8.

[2] Ibid.

[3] See, fully, supra, § 621; and see Co. Lit. 157; Bac. Abr. Juries, E. 5; Burn's, J., Juror, iv. 1; Williams's J., Juries, v.; State *v.* Mann, 83 Mo. 589.

Properly speaking, challenges for "bias," in the English practice, fall under the present head, though they have necessarily been considered, from circumstances connected with our distinctive American practice, under the title of Principal Challenges. The reason of this confusion of nomenclature is to be traced to the circumstance that the question of preconceived opinion or prejudice on the juror's part, as a mere matter of opinion, is examined into in England as a conclusion of law, to be drawn from certain conditions (*e. g.*, that the juror and the defendant are intimate friends), while with us it is treated as an independent objective fact, capable of determination by a personal examination of the juror under oath. See supra, § 621.

[4] Infra, § 692.

[5] Breeding *v.* State, 11 Tex. 257; and cases cited infra, § 692.

[6] Jesse *v.* State, 20 Ga. 156; Spigener *v.* State, 62 Ala. 383.

[7] Supra, § 613; see State *v.* Steely, 65 Mo. 218; Spigener *v.* State, 62 Ala. 383.

[8] Supra, § 617; Munly *v.* State, 7 Blackf. 593; Morris *v.* State, Ibid. 607; Williams *v.* State, 3 Kelly, 453; State *v.* Patrick, 3 Jones N. C. (L.) 443; State *v.* Vestal, 82 N. C. 563; State *v.* Varn, Ibid. 631; Powell *v.* State, 48 Ala. 154; Murray *v.* State, 48 Ala.

course is to make the challenges separately, as the jurors are called and appear.[1] The moment the oath is begun it is, in ordinary cases, too late.[2] The oath is begun by the juror taking the book, having been directed by the officer of the court to do so; but if he take the book without authority, neither party wishing to challenge is prejudiced thereby.[3] The rule, however, rests on the supposition that the defendant, when the objection is raised by him, had the opportunity of discovering the juror's bias before the oath was administered. If he has no such opportunity, the objection may be taken after the oath;[4] and when such bias is discovered after verdict, it is, as will presently be seen, ground for new trial.[5] Such being the case, when the party discovers such disqualification subsequent to oath but before opening the case, the objection should be allowed by the court. Hence it has been ruled that after a juror has been sworn in chief, and taken his seat, if it be discovered that he is incompetent to serve, he may, in the exercise of a sound discretion, be set aside by the court at any time before evidence is given,[6] and this may be done even in a capital case, and as well for cause existing before as after the juror was sworn;[7] though as a general rule it is

675; Drake *v.* State, 51 Ala. 30; Battle *v.* State, 54 Ala. 93; State *v.* Harris, 30 La. An. Pt. 90; State *v.* Armingron, 25 Minn. 29; People *v.* Kohle, 4 Cal. 198; People *v.* Jenks, 24 Cal. 11; People *v.* Coffman, 24 Cal. 230; People *v.* Sanford, 43 Cal. 29; People *v.* Samsels, 66 Cal. 99; Williams *v.* State, 81 Ala. 20; State *v.* Larkin, 11 Nev. 314; Clarke *v.* Terr., 1 Wash. T. 82; Henry *v.* State, 77 Ala. 75. Even if the juror has been accepted, this does not preclude his challenge. People *v.* Montgomery, 53 Cal. 576. But see Drake *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 649. A rule by the trial court that the State should exercise one of its peremptory challenges, and then the defendant should exercise two of his, and so on alternately, was held not error (the State having by statute six peremptory challenges and the defendant twelve), State *v.* Bailey, 32 Kan. 83.

[1] Smith *v.* State, 61 Miss. 754.

[2] People *v.* Dolan, 51 Mich. 610.

[3] R. *v.* Giorgetti, 4 F. & F. 546; R. *v.* Frost, 7 C. & P. 129; Com. *v.* Knapp, 10 Pick. 477; McClure *v.* State, 1 Yerg. 206; Rash *v.* State, 61 Ala. 89. See State *v.* Pritchard, 16 Nev. 101.

[4] Supra, § 617; Com. *v.* Twombly, 10 Pick. 480; State *v.* Allen, 46 Conn. 531; Hendrick *v.* Com., 5 Leigh, 708; McFadden *v.* Com., 23 Penn. St. 12; Evans *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 513.

[5] Infra, § 844.

[6] Infra, §§ 683, 722; Wesley *v.* State, 65 Ga. 731; State *v.* Diskins, 34 La. An. 919; but see Ellison *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 557.

[7] U. S. *v.* Morris, 1 Curtis C. C. 23; People *v.* Damon, 13 Wend. 351; People *v.* Bodine, 1 Edm. (N. Y.) Sel. Cas. 36; Tooel *v.* Com., 11 Leigh, 714; Com. *v.* McFadden, 23 Penn. St. 12; Bristow *v.* Com., 15 Grat. 634; Dilworth *v.* Com.,

too late, after the jury is empanelled, to inquire into the impartiality of a juror.[1]

When for favor must specify reasons.

§ 673. A challenge for favor or bias must specify the specific reasons of objection. It is not enough to challenge for "bias." The kind of bias must be stated.[2]

Juror must be sworn on *voir dire*.

§ 674. The correct practice is, immediately after the juror is challenged, to swear him on his *voir dire*, as a condition precedent to his examination.[3] The form of oath to the juror on the *voir dire* is as follows: "You shall true answer make to all such questions as the court shall demand of you. So help you God." The questions to be put to the juror have been already noticed.[4] In some jurisdictions the examination is by the court.[5] The answers are not final, but may be traversed.[6]

Passing over to court no waiver.

§ 675. It is no waiver of the right to challenge for cause for the defendant to pass the juror over to the court, or to the opposite side for examination.[7]

After principal challenge is disallowed, there may be challenge for favor.

§ 676. The mere fact of a juror purging himself from disqualification on his *voir dire* does not preclude the party questioning him from challenging him for favor, and producing evidence before the court or the triers, as the practice may be, to disprove his testimony. Otherwise, an incompetent juror could qualify himself by adding perjury to his other disqualifications.[8]

12 Grat. 689; McGuire *v.* State, 37 Miss. 369. See §§ 820, 844, etc., as to the withdrawal of jurors.

[1] Com. *v.* Knapp, 10 Pick. 477; Gillooley *v.* State, 58 Ind. 182; Ward *v.* State, 1 Humph. 253. See State *v.* Harris, 30 La. An. 90.

[2] People *v.* Renfrow, 41 Cal. 37; People *v.* McGungill, 41 Cal. 429; People *v.* Buckly, 49 Cal. 241.

[3] Supra, §§ 654–5; infra, § 682.

[4] Supra, § 685. When, under a local statute, a sick juror may be discharged and a new juror called in his place, this revives the defendant's right of challenge, although previously exhausted. People *v.* Stewart, 64 Cal. 60.

[5] Ibid. State *v.* Coleman, 20 S. C. 441.

[6] Infra, § 688; State *v.* Barnes, 34 La. An. 395.

[7] McFadden *v.* Com., 23 Penn. St. 12; Hendrick *v.* Com., 5 Leigh, 708; and see supra, §§ 617–18.

[8] Carnal *v.* People, 1 Parker C. R. 273; Freeman *v.* People, 4 Denio, 9; People *v.* Bodine, 1 Denio, 281; Com. *v.* Heath, 1 Robinson, 735; State *v.* Mann, 83 Mo. 589; though see Com. *v.* Wade, 17 Pick. 395.

A juror's answers on a challenge for favor are not admissible on a challenge for principal cause; but when a challenge for principal cause and that for favor are tried successively by the

§ 667. We have already seen,[1] that it is doubted whether a defendant can make a peremptory challenge after he has passed the juror over to the court or to the prosecution; though the better opinion is that on due cause shown the right may be exercised at any period down to the completion of the panel. But the better opinion is that the defendant has the right of peremptory challenge to a juror after he has made such answers on the *voir dire* as do not authorize a challenge for cause,[2] though by high authority this has been questioned.[3]

Peremptory challenge may be made after challenge for cause.

§ 678. It has been said that the defendant must personally, and not through counsel, make such challenges as are peremptory.[4] This, however, is a mere arbitrary and forced extension of the fiction of the juryman and prisoner looking on each other, to see if there is any personal reminiscence which would touch the question of indifference. The usual practice is for this kind of challenge, as is the case with all others, to be made by counsel.

Challenges may be made by counsel.

§ 679. It is said that the court, in its discretion, will not permit a peremptory challenge to be recalled, after the juryman is set aside, in order merely to admit a challenge for cause.[5] But in case of surprise such discretion may be properly invoked.

In cases of surprise peremptory challenge may be recalled.

court, the answers on the trial for principal cause may be referred to on the trial of the challenge for favor. Greenfield *v.* People, 6 Abbott's New Cas. (N. S.) 1; 74 N. Y. 277.

[1] Supra, § 617.

[2] See cases cited supra, §§ 617, 673; and see 6 T. R. 531; Co. Lit. 158 *a*; 4 Black. Com. 363; 2 Hawk. c. 43, s. 10; Bac. Abr. Juries, E. 11; State *v.* Potter, 18 Conn. 166; Hooker *v.* State, 4 Ohio, 350. See People *v.* Bodine, 1 Denio, 281; Hoobach *v.* State, 43 Tex. 242.

[3] Com. *v.* Rogers, 7 Met. (Mass.) 500.

[4] State *v.* Price, 10 Rich. L. 351.

[5] State *v.* Price, 10 Rich. L. 351; State *v.* Coleman, 8 S. C. 237. See R. *v.* Parry, 7 C. & P. 836; State *v.* Lautenschlager, 22 Minn. 514. Supra, § 619.

In Connecticut, B., having been called as a talesman, and examined as to his bias, and no reason to except to him appearing, the counsel for the prisoner were informed by the court that they could then challenge B. peremptorily if they desired to do so. They declined to exercise the right at that time, as the panel was not then full; and B. was directed to take his seat as one of the jurors. After the panel was full, and but six peremptory challenges had been made, the prisoner's counsel claimed the right to challenge B. peremptorily. It was held that in the absence of any reason for a peremptory challenge then, which did

§ 680. While in some jurisdictions joint defendants are limited to a single set of challenges,[1] yet where this limitation does not obtain, the right to challenge a juror, as has been observed, is a right to reject, not to select; and therefore neither of two defendants in an indictment on a joint trial has cause to complain of a challenge by the other.[2]

One defendant cannot object to challenge of co-defendant.

§ 681. If a juror be challenged on one side and be found indifferent, he may still be challenged on the other side.[3]

Juror indifferent on one side may be challenged by other.

§ 682. The juror, as has been seen, may be examined under oath as to his qualifications; though he is not to be so examined when the question involves disgrace.[4] He is of course subject to cross-examination by the party opposing the challenge,[5] and to traverse.[6]

Juror may be cross-examined and contradicted.

§ 683. As has been already seen, the court, of its own motion, without the suggestion of either party, may examine upon oath all who have been summoned to serve upon the jury, touching any disability, such as infancy, infamy, want of freehold or property qualifications, or, in a capital case, conscientious scruples on the subject of capital punishment, or similar incapacity, and upon any such disability being thus made to appear, may set aside any such juror of its own action, without

Court may of its own motion examine and excuse.

not exist before, when the exercise of the right was declined, it was too late to challenge B. peremptorily. State *v.* Potter, 18 Conn. 166. See supra, § 617; State *v.* Cameron, 2 Chandler (Wis.), 172; but see Hendrick *v.* Com., 5 Leigh, 708.

[1] Supra, § 614 *a*.

[2] U. S. *v.* Marchant, 4 Mason, 160; 12 Wheaton, 480; State *v.* Doolittle, 58 N. H. 92; State *v.* Meaker, 54 Vt. 112; Bixbe *v.* State, 6 Ohio, 86; Matow *v.* State, 15 Ill. 536; Brister *v.* State, 26 Ala. 107; State *v.* Smith, 2 Ired. 402. See supra, § 620.

[3] Co. Lit. 158 *a*; Bac. Abr. Juries, E. 16; 1 Ch. C. L. 545. Where the prosecution, without challenge, passes the jury to the defendant, declining to exercise any challenge, and the defendant exercises his right of peremptory challenge by objecting to one juror, the action of the court in subsequently permitting the prosecution to peremptorily challenge a juror is not ground for reversal. People *v.* Majors, 65 Cal. 138.

[4] Supra, § 654.

[5] Cook's case, 13 How. St. Tr. 312; People *v.* Bodine, 1 Denio, 281; People *v.* Knickerbocker, 1 Parker C. R. 302; Howser *v.* Com., 51 Penn. St. 333; Heath *v.* Com., 1 Robinson, 735.

[6] Infra, §§ 686 *et seq.*; State *v.* Barnes, 34 La. An. 395.

objection made by either party.[1] And the court, of its own motion, without the suggestion or consent of either party, may excuse or set aside a juror who, though in all other respects competent, is disabled physically or mentally by disease, domestic affliction, ignorance of the vernacular tongue, loss of hearing, or other like cause, from properly performing the duties of a juror.[2] But the erroneous exercise of this power is a matter of exception by the defendant, for which, in an extreme case of abuse, the judgment of the court may be reversed.[3] And when both parties accept a juror he cannot be stricken off by the court, except on grounds of absolute unfitness or incompetency.[4]

IV. HOW CHALLENGES ARE TO BE TRIED.

§ 684. If the array be challenged, the mode of trial is at common law at the discretion of the court.[5] The trial sometimes is by two coroners, and sometimes by two of the jury; with this difference, that if the challenge be for kindred in the sheriff, it is most fit to be tried by two of the jurors returned; if the challenge be for favor or partiality, then by any other two assigned thereunto by the court.[6] Upon a challenge to the array, the persons making the challenge must be prepared strictly to prove the cause.[7]

At common law at discretion of court.

[1] Infra, § 692; supra, § 671; State *v.* Howard, 17 N. H. 171; People *v.* Christie, 2 Park C. R. 579; U. S. *v.* Blodgett, 35 Ga. 336; McCarty *v.* State, 26 Miss. 299; Coleman *v.* State, 59 Miss. 484; State *v.* Guice, 60 Miss. 714; State *v.* Diskins, 34 La. An. 919. See State *v.* Henderson, 29 W. Va. 147; State *v.* Boone, 80 N. C. 461.

In Massachusetts the right of propounding questions is for the court exclusively, and not for parties.

[2] Whenever this incompetency is exhibited to the court, no matter how far the case may have progressed, the court may set aside the juror. Supra, §§ 669, 675; infra, § 722; Montague *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 767; State *v.* Baber, 74 Mo. 292. See Com. *v.* Hayden, 4 Gray, 18; Stewart *v.* State, 1 Ohio St. 66; Stephen *v.* People, 38 Mich. 739; People *v.* Carrier, 46 Mich. 442; Jesse *v.* State, 20 Ga. 156; Breeding *v.* State, 11 Tex. 257; State *v.* Marshall, 8 Ala. 302. Supra, §§ 669, 671; infra, §§ 692–3.

[3] Montague *v.* Com., *ut supra*. But the case, to reverse, must be one of oppression to the defendant. State *v.* Ostrander, 18 Iowa, 435; People *v.* Lee, 17 Cal. 76; Stratton *v.* People, 5 Cal. 276. Infra, §§ 692–3.

[4] Greer *v.* People, 14 Tex. Ap. 149, citing People *v.* Mather, 4 Wend. 231.

[5] As limiting this discretion, see People *v.* Neilson, 22 Hun, 1.

[6] 2 Hale, 275. Supra, § 609.

[7] R. *v.* Savage, 1 Mood. C. C. 51. Supra, § 611.

The trial in Pennsylvania is by sta-

§ 685. When the array is thus challenged, the opposite party may either plead to it, or demur to its sufficiency in law.[1] If he plead, then the triers are sworn and charged to inquire "whether it be an impartial array or a favorable one;" if they affirm it, the clerk enters under it, "*affirmatur;*" but if they find it to be partial, the words "*calumnia vera*" are entered on record.[2] The court may either decide the demurrer at once, or adjourn its consideration to a future period.[3] Where the judges, upon hearing the arguments, overrule the challenge, the decision is entered on the original record, and at *nisi prius* appears on the *postea;* but if it is overruled without demurrer on being debated, the objections may afterwards be made the subject of a bill of exceptions.[4] Should the challenge be admitted, and the array be quashed, a new *venire* is awarded the coroners or elisors, in the same manner as if it had been prayed by one of the parties to be so directed, to prevent the delay at an earlier stage of the proceedings.[5]

As to array triers are appointed on issues of fact; otherwise when there is demurrer.

tute assigned to the court. Rev. Act, Bill II. § 39. In New York, by the Act of May 7th, 1873, "all challenges of jurors, both in civil and criminal cases, shall be tried and determined by the court only," but to the action of the court exceptions may be taken by writ of error or certiorari. See supra, § 632.

In Ohio, by the Code of Criminal Procedure, "all challenges for cause shall be tried by the court on the oath of the person challenged, or on other evidence, and such challenge shall be made before the jury is sworn and not afterward."

A challenge to the array should be in writing, so that it may be put upon the record, and the other party may plead or demur to it; and the cause of challenge must be stated specifically. R. *v.* Hughes, 1 C. & K. 235, 519; 47 E. C. L. R.

"When the opposite party pleads to the challenge, two triers are appointed by the court; either two coroners, two attorneys, or two of the jury, or indeed any two indifferent persons. If the array be quashed against the sheriff, a *venire facias* is then directed *instanter* to the coroner; if it be further quashed against the coroner, it is then awarded to two persons, called *elisors*, chosen at the discretion of the court, and it cannot be afterwards quashed. Co. Lit. 158 *a*." Roscoe's Cr. Ev. p. 208.

In the United States courts, triers are dispensed with. Act of March 3, 1865, § 2. See Rev. Stat. U. S., § 1031.

[1] See forms, 10 Wentw. 474.

[2] 4 Black. Com., 353, n. 8; Bac. Abr. Juries, E. 12; 1 Ch. C. L. 549. In the New England States challenges to the array are usually tried by the court. Com. *v.* Walsh, 124 Mass. 32.

[3] Ibid.

[4] 1 Ch. C. L. 549; Bac. Abr. Juries, E. 12.

[5] Co. Lit. 158 *a*.

§ 686. In many States, as has been seen, challenges to the polls are tried by the court.[1] In others statutory provisions exist allowing triers. In others, the court, at common law, chooses the triers; if two are sworn, they then try;[2] and if they try one indifferent, and he be sworn, then he and the two triers try another; and if another be tried indifferent, and he be sworn, then the two triers cease, and the two that be sworn on the jury try the rest.[3]

At common law, on challenges to the poll, triers are appointed by court.

[1] This is the case in North Carolina. State *v.* Kilgore, 93 N. C. 533.

[2] McGuffie *v.* State, 17 Ga. 497.

[3] Supra, § 670; Finch. 112; 1 Inst. 158; Co. Lit. 158 *a*; 2 Hale, 275; Bac. Abr. Juries, E. 12; Burn's J., Jurors, iv. 3; Williams's J., Juries, v.; Dick. Sess. 190. "If the party pleads to the challenge" (Archbold's C. P. 17th ed. (1871) p. 154), "two *triers* are (in the case, at least, of a challenge for favor, and also, it would seem, in the case of a principal challenge, unless the fact be admitted or apparent) appointed by the court, who are sworn, and charged to try whether the array be an impartial or favorable one. See O'Brien *v.* R., 2 Ho. Lords Cas. 465. These triers are generally two of the jurymen returned. The court may, however, in its discretion, refer the trial to the two coroners, or to two attorneys, or to any other two indifferent persons. 2 Hale, 275; 4 Blk. Com. 353; 2 Roll. Rep. 363. If they find in favor of the challenge, a new *venire* is awarded to the coroners, or, if they be interested, to the elisors. See 1 Inst. 158; R. *v.* Dolby, 2 B. & C. 104. There the defendant, being indicted for a seditious libel, challenged the array on the ground that the prosecution was instituted by an association called the Constitutional Association, and that one of the sheriffs who returned the jury was one of the association. The counsel for the prosecution thereupon took issue; the chief justice then appointed two triers to try the issue, who were accordingly sworn; the counsel for the defendant first addressed these triers, and called a witness, who proved that the sheriff named was one of the subscribers to the association. The counsel for the prosecution then addressed the triers, and called a witness to prove that the sheriff had ceased to be a subscriber to or member of the association before the return of the jury process, but failed in proving it for want of the letter by which the sheriff had withdrawn himself from it. The triers were then addressed by the counsel for the defendant in reply. The chief justice summed up. The triers found in favor of the challenge, and the cause was adjourned. If the triers find against the challenge, the trial proceeds as if no such challenge had been made. The improper disallowance of a challenge is ground, not for a new trial, but for a *venire de novo*. R. *v.* Edmonds, 4 B. & Ald. 471."

"If the challenge is to the first juror called, the court may select any two indifferent persons as triers; if they find against the challenge, the juror will be sworn, and be joined with the triers in determining the next challenge; but as soon as two jurors have been found indifferent, and have been sworn, every subsequent challenge will be referred to their decision. 2 Hale, 275; Co. Lit. 158 *a*; Bac. Abr. Juries, E. 12."

Where, on a trial for murder, a juror

No challenge to triers.

§ 687. From the necessities of the case, no challenge of triers is admissible.[1]

When triers are not asked for, parties are bound by decision of court.

§ 688. When the facts on which a challenge rests are disputed,[2] the proper course is to submit the question to triers; but if neither of the parties ask for triers to settle the issue of the fact, and submit their evidence, whether consisting of the juror's *voir dire* or of extraneous evidence, to the judge, and take his determination thereon, they cannot afterwards object to his competence to decide that issue.[3] The production of evidence to the judge without asking for triers will be considered as the substitution of him in the place of triers; and his decision will be treated in like manner as would the decision of triers; and, therefore, although the determination of the judge should be against the weight of evidence, a new trial will not be granted for that cause when the defendant is acquitted, in analogy to the principle, that if on a main question in a criminal case the defendant was found not guilty, there cannot be a new trial.[4] The same distinction has been applied by the Supreme Court of the United States on a writ of error to the decision of the trial court upon a challenge for principal cause.[5]

was challenged for favor, and the first two jurors sworn having been appointed triers, sworn as such, and on hearing the evidence, arguments, and charge, could not agree, it was held that the next two (the third and fourth) should be selected to rehear the matter as triers; and they were so sworn. People *v.* Dewick, 2 Park. C. R. (N. Y.) 230.

Triers' Oath.—The oath of the triers, as given in the 17th edition of Archbold's Criminal Pleading, published in 1871, pp. 154, 155, is: "*You shall well and truly try whether A. B., one of the jurors, stands indifferently to try the prisoner at the bar, and a true verdict give according to the evidence. So help you God.*" It has been ruled in New York to be error to swear the triers simply to find whether the juror is indifferent "upon the issue joined." Freeman *v.* People, 4 Denio, 9.

[1] Archbold's C. P. 17th ed. 154, 155.

Oath of Witness before Triers.—The form of oath to be administered to a witness sworn to give evidence before the triers is as follows: "*The evidence which you shall give to the court and triers upon this inquest shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. So help you God.*" The topic of examination of the challenged juror has been already noticed. Supra, § 682.

[2] See supra, §§ 611, 670.

[3] People *v.* Rathbun, 21 Wend. 509; People *v.* Mather, 4 Wend. 229; People *v.* Doe, 1 Mann. (Mich.) 451; Stewart *v.* State, 8 Eng. (13 Ark.) 720.

[4] People *v.* Mather, 4 Wend. 229.

[5] U. S. *v.* Reynolds, 98 U. S. 145. It was further held that the finding of the trial court upon the question of fact ought not to be set aside in a re-

§ 689. Upon the trial of a challenge for favor, it is erroneous to limit the evidence to such as goes to establish a fixed and absolute opinion touching the guilt or innocence of the prisoner. A fixed opinion of the guilt or innocence of the prisoner, though it may be necessary to sustain a challenge for principal cause, need not be proved where the challenge is for favor. A less decided opinion may be shown and exhibited to the triers, who must determine upon its effect. Thus, when the question is submitted to the triers, a juror challenged for favor, if examined, may be asked whether he ever thought the prisoner guilty; or what impressions statements which he had heard or read respecting the evidence had made upon his mind; and, on the same reasoning, an opinion imperfectly formed, or one based upon the supposition that facts are as they have been represented, may be proved before the triers upon such a challenge.[1] The question is to be submitted as a question of fact, upon all the evidence, to the conscience and discretion of the triers, whether the juror is indifferent or not, and any fact or circumstance from which bias or prejudice may justly be inferred, although weak in degree, is admissible evidence.[2]

Evidence tending to show bias admissible on trial.

viewing court, unless the error is manifest. No less stringent rules should be applied by the reviewing court in such a case than those which govern in the consideration of motions for new trials because the verdict is against the evidence. If a juror is challenged for principal cause, and the challenge sustained, the judgment, it was ruled, will not be reversed upon error if it appears that, although the challenge was not good for cause, it was for favor. Ibid.

[1] People *v.* Puller, 2 Parker C. R. 16; Barber *v.* State, 13 Fla. 675.

[2] People *v.* Bodine, 1 Denio, 281; Moon *v.* State, 68 Ga. 687. In New York, under the old practice, it is said that the court should not instruct the triers how to find. People *v.* McMahon, 2 Parker C. R. (N. Y.) 663.

Upon a challenge for favor, if the court err in admitting or rejecting the evidence, or instructing the triers upon matters of law, a bill of exceptions lies. The remedy would be the same if the court should overrule such a challenge when properly made, or refuse to appoint triers. Per Beardsley, J. The fact that a prisoner did not avail himself, as he might, of a peremptory challenge to exclude a juror, who was found indifferent upon a challenge for cause, may not, as we will soon see more fully, prevent him from taking advantage of an error committed on the trial of the challenge for cause, though it appears that his peremptory challenges were not exhausted when the empanelling of the jury was completed. See infra, § 693.

In Georgia, where a juror is put upon the triers to ascertain his competency, the trial should be conducted

§ 690. Though it is not a good ground of challenge to a juror for principal cause that he has an impression as to the defendant's guilt or innocence,[1] yet, upon a challenge for favor, evidence as to such impression is admissible; but the juror should not be set aside unless it is found that he has formed a settled opinion.[2] And when he has denied such bias on the *voir dire*, it must be proved by a preponderance of proof.[3]

But bias must be shown to set aside juror.

V. PERSONAL PRIVILEGE OF JUROR TO BE EXCUSED, WHICH, HOWEVER, A PARTY CANNOT ADVANCE AS GROUND OF CHALLENGE.

§ 692. Independently of the reasons heretofore specified, there are cases in which a juryman may be privileged from serving, but in which, as we have already seen, the privilege must be set up by himself or by the court,[4] and cannot be technically regarded as a ground of challenge,[5] and, *a fortiori*, not for error or motion in arrest.[6] Thus, a juror may be excused from serving on ground of old age;[7] of deafness or other infirmity incapacitating him from proper discharge of duty;[8] and of holding excusatory offices.[9] And the excusing of the juror for reasons of this class is always within the discretion of the court, irrespective of the statutes relating to challenges.[10] Allowing such excuses, therefore, is not ordinarily ground for exception.[11]

in the presence of the court; but it is not error if the triers are allowed to retire with the juror and question him in private. Epps *v.* State, 19 Ga. 102.

[1] People *v.* Honeyman, 3 Denio, 121.

[2] People *v.* Lohman, 2 Barb. 216.

Where a challenge for principal cause is overruled by the court, and the juror is then challenged for favor, it is erroneous to instruct the triers that the latter challenge is in the nature of an appeal from the judgment of the court upon the facts ruled on by the court. Freeman *v.* People, 4 Denio, 9, 35.

[3] Davison *v.* People, 90 Ill. 221; Goree *v.* State, 71 Ala. 7.

[4] Supra, § 671.

[5] Supra, § 671.

[6] State *v.* Quimby, 51 Me. 395; State *v.* Wright, 53 Me. 328; Munroe *v.* Brigham, 19 Pick. 368; State *v.* Forshner, 43 N. H. 89; Green *v.* State, 59 Md. 123; State *v.* Gillick, 7 Clarke, Iowa, 287; State *v.* Adams, 20 Iowa, 486; see Proffatt on Jury Trials, § 130.

[7] Davis *v.* People, 19 Ill. 74; Breeding *v.* State, 11 Texas, 257.

[8] Jesse *v.* State, 20 Ga. 156; Green *v.* State, 59 Md. 123. See Mulcaby *v.* R. L. R., 3 H. L. Cas. 306. Supra, § 671.

[9] State *v.* Quimby, 51 Me. 395; Burns *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 269.

[10] State *v.* Marshall, 8 Ala. 302. See Doyal *v.* State, 70 Ga. 134; Ladd *v.* State, 17 Fla. 215. Supra, § 671.

[11] State *v.* Gill, 14 S. C. 410.

VI. REVISION BY APPELLATE COURT.

§ 693. Can a defendant, who has not exhausted his peremptory challenges, object in error to the action of the court below in deciding against him a challenge for favor? There is good authority for holding that in ordinary cases he cannot. He is bound, it is argued, if he objects to the juror, and his objection is overruled by the court to challenge such juror peremptorily, supposing the case ultimately shows that he has challenges to spare.[1] But if it appear that the defendant was misled by the action of the court, or that he was in any way excluded from making a peremptory challenge of the juror in question, then he should be allowed to review the decision in error.[2] And we may also hold that where the defendant peremptorily challenges the juror after admission by the court, without exhausting his peremptory challenges, no error lies.[3] But error lies when the defendant's peremptory challenges have been exhausted so that he has been unable to correct the misruling by challenge.[4]

Defendant not exhausting his peremptory challenges cannot except in error to court overruling challenge for favor.

§ 694. Where the defendant exhausts his peremptory challenges on trial, if in such case the statute gives a writ of error to rulings of

[1] Hopt *v.* Utah, 120 U. S. 430; see Spies *v.* Illinois, 123 U. S. 90, 644; Burt *v.* Panjaud, 99 U. S. 180; State *v.* Gaffney, 56 Vt. 451; State *v.* Hoyt, 47 Conn. 518; People *v.* Knickerbocker, 1 Park. C. R. 302; Wilson *v.* People, 90 Ill. 229; Collins *v.* People, 103 Ill. 21; State *v.* Winter, 79 Iowa, 627; State *v.* George, 62 Iowa, 682; State *v.* Benton, 2 Dev. & B. 196; State *v.* McQuaige, 5 S. C. 429; State *v.* Anderson, 26 S. C. 599; McGowan *v.* State, 9 Yerg. 154; Norfleet *v.* State, 4 Sneed, 340; Taylor *v.* State, 11 Lea, 708; People *v.* Stonecifer, 6 Cal. 405; People *v.* McGungill, 41 Cal. 429; Bohannon *v.* State, 15 Nev. 209. See Burt *v.* Panjaud, 99 U. S. 180; Capehart *v.* Stewart, 80 N. C. 101; Iverson *v.* State, 52 Ala. 170; State *v.* Farrer, 35 La. An. 315; Grissom *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 386; Holt *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 571; Lum *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 483. But see Brown *v.* State, 70 Ind. 576. Cf. Johns *v.* State, 55 Md. 350; Sullings *v.* Shakespeare, 46 Mich. 408.

[2] See Lithgow *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 297; Baxter *v.* People, 3 Gilm. 386; People *v.* Bodine, 1 Denio, 282; People *v.* Freeman, 1 Denio, 9, 35; State *v.* Clyburn, 16 S. C. 375; Moriarity *v.* State, 62 Miss. 655; State *v.* Melton, 37 La. An. 77; State *v.* Redmond, Id. 774; Birdsong *v.* State, 47 Ala. 68; Loggins *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 65; Wright *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 163.

[3] U. S. *v.* Neverson, 1 Mackay, 152; State *v.* Lawlor, 28 Minn. 216; Ogle *v.* State, 33 Miss. 383; Stewart *v.* State, 8 Eng. (Ark.) 720; Burrell *v.* State, 18 Tex. 713; Sharp *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 650. See cases cited supra, § 617. Stephenson *v.* State, 110 Ind. 358.

[4] People *v.* Casey, 93 N. Y. 38.

courts on challenges, there can be no question that an erroneous action of the court below, on admitting a juror after challenge for favor, is ground for reversal.[1] In some jurisdictions, however, the action of the court on challenges for favor is exclusively a matter of judicial discretion, and not ground for error.[2]

Otherwise when he exhausted his peremptory challenges.

§ 695. When the action of the court, as in cases of challenges to the array and peremptory challenges, is placed on record, and there is a regular issue and joinder, and judgment on this issue, then error lies to this at common law.[3]

Error lies when challenge is on record.

[1] See Wright *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 163; Loggins *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 65; Wade *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 358.

[2] See R. *v.* Edmonds, 4 B. & Ald. 471; Heath *v.* Com., 1 Robinson, 735; Costly *v.* State, 19 Ga. 614; Buchanau *v.* State, 24 Ga. 282. Infra, §§ 777 *et seq.*

[3] Infra, § 777; and see Thomas *v.* People, 67 N. Y. 218; People *v.* Vasquez, 49 Cal. 860; People *v.* Colson, 49 Cal. 679; see Phillips *v.* State, 68 Ala. 469.

CHAPTER XIII.

CERTAIN SPECIAL INCIDENTS OF TRIAL.

I. Furnishing Copy of Indictment.
This sometimes prescribed by statute, § 696.
II. Concurrent Trial of Separate Indictments, § 697.
III. Severance of Defendants on Trial, § 698.
IV. Arraignment.
Defendant usually required to hold up the hand, 699.
Failure to arraign may be fatal, § 700.
Defendant may waive right, § 701.
V. Bill of Particulars.
May be required when indictment is general, § 702.
Affidavit should be made, § 703.
Particulars may be ordered on general pleas, § 704.
Action on particulars not usually subject of error, § 705.
VI. Demurrer to Evidence.
Demurrer to evidence brings up whole case, § 706.
VII. View of Premises.
Such view may be directed when conducive to justice, § 707.
VIII. Charge of Court.
Questions of law are for court, § 708.
Defendant has a right to full statement of law, § 709.
Misdirection a cause for new trial, § 710.
Judge may give his opinion on evidence, § 711.
Must, if required, give distinct answer as to law, § 712.
Error to exclude point from jury unless there be no evidence, § 713.
Charge must be in open court, and before parties, § 714.
When required must be in writing, § 715.

I. FURNISHING COPY OF INDICTMENT.

§ 696. In some jurisdictions, adopting in this respect English statutes, passed at a time when but for such a provision a defendant might have been precluded from learning the actual charge against him, the defendant is entitled to have delivered to him a copy of the indictment, duly certified,[1] and in some jurisdictions, also, he is entitled to a list of the wit-

May be required by statute.

[1] U. S. *v.* Curtis, 4 Mason, 232; State *v.* Fuller, 39 Vt. 74; Fouts *v.* State, 8 Ohio St. 75; Ben *v.* State, 22 Ala. 9; Brister *v.* State, 26 Ala. 107; Robertson *v.* State, 43 Ala. 325; Bain *v.* State, 70 Ala. 4; Tidwell *v.* State, 70 Ala. 33; Hubbard *v.* State, 72 Ala. 164; Wright *v.* State, 42 Ark. 94. As to English practice, see R. *v.* Burke, 10 Cox, 519; R. *v.* Hughes, 4 Cox, 519.

nesses against him.[1] But this practice does not preclude the prosecution from calling, in cases of surprise, other witnesses on trial.[2]

II. CONCURRENT TRIAL OF SEPARATE INDICTMENTS.

When separate indictments can be concurrently tried.

§ 697. As we have elsewhere seen, it is no objection to the joinder of several counts in an indictment, and their concurrent trial, that they contain distinct offences if such offences relate to the same general transaction.[3] For the same reason it has been held that two indictments against the same defendant, embracing different phases of a conspiracy, can be tried together, against the defendant's objection.[4] But, unless the offences are such as could properly be joined in one indictment, they ought not to be thus concurrently tried.[5]

When cross prosecutions of assault and battery are simultaneously pending, the practice is for them to be tried together, as by this process the ends of justice are subserved.[6]

III. SEVERANCE OF DEFENDANTS ON TRIAL.

Joint defendants may sever on trial.

§ 698. As a general rule, joint defendants are entitled to a severance on trial.[7] Whether, as has been seen, there can be severance in indictments for conspiracy and riot, has been doubted, though the preponderance of authority is in favor of the right even in these cases.[8]

[1] U. S. *v.* Wood, 3 Wash. C. C. 440; Com. *v.* Knapp, 9 Pick. 496; Com. *v.* Edwards, 4 Gray, 1; Scott *v.* People, 63 Ill. 508; State *v.* Gillick, 10 Iowa, 98; State *v.* Stanley, 33 Iowa, 526; Hill *v.* People, 26 Mich. 496. As to English practice, see R. *v.* Vincent, 9 C. & P. 22; R. *v.* Bull, 9 C. & P. 22.

[2] Supra, § 358.

The privilege in each case is one which may be waived, either expressly or by going to trial without objection. Infra, § 733; R. *v.* Frost, 9 C. & P. 162; Lord *v.* State, 18 N. H. 173; State *v.* Norton, 45 Vt. 258; Fouts *v.* State, 8 Ohio St. 98; Bird *v.* State, 50 Ga. 585; Lisle *v.* State, 6 Mo. 426; State *v.* Jackson, 12 La. An. 679; Taylor *v.* State, 11 Lea, 709.

That a material variance between copy and original may be ground for continuance, see Tidwell *v.* State, 70 Ala. 33.

As to proceedings on lost indictment, see supra, § 278. That the service need not be affirmatively shown in error, see Shelton *v.* State, 73 Ala. 8.

[3] Supra, § 285.

[4] Withers *v.* Com., 5 S. & R. 59; Brightly's Dig. Penn. Rep. 498.

[5] State *v.* Devlin, 25 Mo. 175.

[6] See R. *v.* Wanklyn, 8 C. & P. 290.

[7] Supra, §§ 310, 311, where the authorities are given.

[8] In Casper *v.* State, 47 Wis. 535, we have the following on this point:—

"Although the practice may work

IV. ARRAIGNMENT.

§ 699. The defendant being brought into court for trial, the first step is to call upon him by name to answer the matter charged on him in the indictment.[1] By the old law, he was required to stand up and hold up his hand, the object being to compel the full extension of his person,

Defendant usually required to hold up the hand.

inconvenience, and even difficulty, separate trials may be had upon indictment or information for conspiracy. R. *v.* Kinnersley, 1 Str. 193; R. *v.* Scott, 3 Burr, 1262; R. *v.* Cooke, 5 B. & C. 538; R. *v.* Kendrick, 5 Ad. & E. 49; R. *v.* Ahearne, 6 Cox C. C. 6; People *v.* Olcott, 2 Johns. 301; State *v.* Buchanan, 5 H. & J. 317, 500. The case of Commonwealth *v.* Manson, 2 Ashm. 31, holds otherwise, but cites no authorities. Informations for conspiracy are therefore within §§ 4680, 4685, Rev. Stat. When the venue is changed for some only of the defendants in indictment or information for conspiracy, separate trials must be had. The plaintiff in error was therefore properly tried alone in the municipal court. When several are prosecuted together for crime, which one, or other limited number only, cannot commit, like conspiracy or riot, and are taken and may be brought to trial, and on separate trials verdicts go against a number incapable in law of committing the crime, judgment against those found guilty should be suspended until the number necessary to the crime are convicted. Failing that, those against whom verdicts have been found should be discharged. When the verdicts are found against the number necessary to the crime, then judgment should go against them."

[1] See supra, §§ 408 *et seq.*; 1 Chitty C. L. 351; 4 Bl. Com. ch. xxv. "The *arraignment* of prisoners, against whom true bills for indictable offences have been found by the grand jury, consists of three parts: first, calling the prisoner to the bar by name; secondly, reading the indictment to him; thirdly, asking him whether he be guilty or not of the offence charged.

"It was formerly the practice to require the prisoner to hold up his hand, the more completely to identify him as the person named in the indictment, but the ceremony, which was never essentially necessary, is now disused; and the ancient form of asking him how he will be tried is also obsolete. The prisoner is to be brought to the bar without irons, shackles, or other restraint, unless there be danger of escape; and ought to be used with all the humanity and gentleness which is consistent with the nature of the thing, and under no terror or uneasiness other than what proceeds from a sense of his guilt or the misfortune of his present circumstances." See supra, § 540 *a*; 2 Hawk. c. 28, s. 1; Layer's case, 6 St. Tr. 230; 1 East P. C. 371.

As to English practice, see further Archbold's Pl. & Ev. 17th ed. 1871, p. 110. Supra, § 408.

The arraignment may take place immediately on finding of bill. State *v.* Chenier, 32 La. An. 103; State *v.* Shields, 33 La. An. 410; supra, § 417.

When a case in which the defendant is arraigned is removed to another court, there is to be no fresh arraignment. Supra, § 602; Davis *v.* State, 39 Md. 355.

and in this way to determine identity. One or two cases, in fact, are recorded in which, on the prisoner thus rising and extending his hand, peculiarities were brought out (*e. g.*, as in left-handedness) touching the question of identity. But in England the form is no longer obligatory,[1] though it is still maintained in some parts of the United States, with the qualification that if the defendant refuses to hold up his hand, but confesses that he is the person named, this is enough.

Failure to arraign may be fatal.

§ 700. Wherever the duty to arraign is imperative, failure in the performance of this duty is fatal, when the record shows the failure, in an appellate court,[2] though arraignment may be inferred from the averments that the defendant was in court and was duly called on to plead.[3] The arraignment need not be repeated after a mistrial.[4]

Defendant may waive right.

§ 701. Where there is evidence on record of the defendant's presence, the reading to him of the demand of guilty or not guilty may in some jurisdictions be waived by plea,[5] or by equivalent action on the part of the defendant.[6]

[1] 4 Black. Com. 323.

[2] R. *v.* Fox, 10 Cox C. C. 502; Hanson *v.* State, 43 Ohio St. 376; Graeter *v.* State, 54 Ind. 159; Griggs *v.* People, 31 Mich. 471; Anderson *v.* State, 3 Pinn. (Wis.) 367; State *v.* Thompson, 32 Minn. 144; State *v.* Vanhook, 88 Mo. 105; Smith *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 408; People *v.* Gaines, 52 Cal. 480. In Missouri, see State *v.* Saunders, 53 Mo. 234. See, as differing from text, Turpin *v.* State, 80 Ind. 148; People *v.* Ousterhout, 34 Hun, 261; State *v.* Cassaday, 12 Kan. 550; People *v.* Ah Hop, 1 Idaho, N. S. 698. That an arraignment which was accidentally omitted at the proper time, may be made after the jury was sworn and the jury re-sworn, but before the reception of evidence, see Weaver *v.* State, 83 Ind. 289. But an order for a *nunc pro tunc* arraignment must be made in the defendant's presence. Baker *v.* State, 39 Ark. 180.

[3] Fitzpatrick *v.* People, 98 Ill. 259. That failure to show arraignment in a misdemeanor is not under U. S. stat., § 1025, ground to reverse, see U. S. *v.* Molloy, 31 Fed. Rep. 19.

[4] State *v.* Stewart, 26 S. C. 125; Hayes *v.* State, 58 Ga. 35; Atkins *v.* State, 69 Ga. 595; State *v.* Boyd, 38 La. An. 374; State *v.* Simms, 71 Mo. 538.

Whether arraignment is necessary has become almost exclusively a subject of statutory enactment. In Pennsylvania, by the Act of January 8, 1867, arraignment is only required in cases triable exclusively in oyer and terminer. In such cases it is obligatory. Dougherty *v.* Com., 69 Penn. St. 286. It is not necessary that a prisoner should be arraigned and plead at a preceding regular term to the special term at which he is tried. State *v.* Ketchey, 70 N. C. 621.

[5] See fully supra, § 541.

[6] Pierson *v.* People, 79 N. Y. 424; People *v.* Osterhout, 41 N. Y. 261.

The plea of guilty should be given by the defendant personally.[1]

V. BILL OF PARTICULARS.

When indictment is general, bill of particulars may be required.

§ 702. Wherever the indictment is so general as to give the defendant inadequate notice of the charge he is expected to meet, the court, on his application, will require the prosecution to furnish him with a bill of particulars of the specific charge to be pressed, or the evidence intended to be relied on.[2] That indictments may be thus general, and yet in entire conformity with precedent, has been heretofore abundantly shown. It is allowable to indict a man as a common barrator, or as a common seller of intoxicating liquors, or as assaulting a person unknown, or as conspiring with persons unknown to cheat and defraud the prosecutor by "divers false tokens and pretences;" and in none of these cases is the allegation of time material, so that the defendant is obliged to meet a charge of an offence comparatively undesignated, committed at a time which is not designated at all. Hence has arisen the practice of requiring, in such cases, bills of particulars; and the adoption of such bills, instead of the exacting of increased particularity in indictments, is productive of several advantages. It prevents much cumbrous special pleading, and consequently failure of justice, as no demurrer lies to bills of particulars.[3] And it gives the defendant, in plain, unartificial language, notice of the charge he is to meet.

[1] People *v.* McCrory, 41 Cal. 459. Supra, §§ 408 *et seq.*

As to the Indiana practice in respect to reading the indictment to the defendant, and the terms of the arraignment, see Clare *v.* State, 68 Ind. 17.

[2] Williams *v.* Com., 91 Penn. St. 493; Goersen *v.* Com., 99 Penn. St. 388. As to specification of place of nuisance, see State *v.* Hill, 13 R. I. 314.

[3] See Com. *v.* Davis, 11 Pick. 432. In People *v.* Davis, 52 Mich. 569, such a bill was granted on a prosecution for adultery.

"It seems that the proper course is for the defendant to apply to the prosecutor, in the first instance, for particulars of the offence; and, if they are refused, to apply to the court or a judge, upon an affidavit of that fact, and that the accused is unable to understand the precise charge intended. R. *v.* Bootyman, 5 C. & P. 300; R. *v.* Hodgson, 3 C. & P. 422; R. *v.* Downshire, 4 A. & E. 699. The application may be made to the judge at the assizes. R. *v.* Hodgson, supra, where Vaughn, B., said he would, if necessary, put off the trial in order that

§ 703. As has been already seen, bills of particulars may be ordered under the usual general count in conspiracy,[1] under indictments for being a common seller of liquor,[2] and under indictments for embezzlement,[3] and for being a common barrator or common scold.[4] But it is proper, in order to justify the ordering by the court of such a bill, that the defendant should make affidavit that he is, from the generality of the indictment, unable to duly prepare himself for his defence.

Affidavit should be made.

§ 704. Of course the same reasoning applies when the defendant sets up, by way of confession and avoidance, a defence which is substantially a new case. In such instances (*e. g.*, where the defence, to an indictment for libel charging general official misconduct, is the truth of the charge), the defendant may be, on due cause shown, compelled to state the particulars of his defence.[5]

Particulars may be ordered on general pleas.

§ 705. It is said that the allowance of bills of particulars is within the discretion of the presiding judge, and is not subject of error.[6] Yet whenever a bill of particulars is a substitute for special averments in an indictment, error should be entertained. The same right of exception allowed to the defendant in the one case should be allowed, unless there be a statutory impediment, in the other. The appellate court should have the power of determining whether there is enough filed against the defendant to put him on his trial.

Not usually subject of error.

particulars might be delivered. In barratry, however, it seems to be necessary to give particulars without any demand. 1 Curw. Hawk. 476, s. 13.

"If particulars have been delivered, the prosecutor will not be allowed to go into other charges than those contained therein. If particulars have been ordered, but not delivered, it seems that the prosecutor cannot be precluded from giving evidence on that account. R. *v.* Esdaile, 1 F. & F. 213–227. The proper course is to apply to put off the trial." Rosc. Cr. Ev. p. 192.

[1] Supra, § 157; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1386.

[2] State *v.* Bacon, 41 Vt. 526; Com. *v.* Giles, 1 Gray, 466; Com. *v.* Wood, 4 Gray, 11.

[3] R. *v.* Bootyman, 5 C. & P. 301; R. *v.* Hogdson, 3 C. & P. 422; State *v.* Cushing, 11 R. I. 314; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1048.

[4] R. *v.* Urlyn, 2 Saund R. (Williams's ed.) 308.

[5] Com. *v.* Snelling, 15 Pick. 322.

[6] Com *v.* Giles, 1 Gray, 466; Com. *v.* Wood, 4 Gray, 11; Gardner *v.* Gardner, 2 Gray, 434; Harrington *v.* Harrington, 107 Mass. 329.

VI. DEMURRER TO EVIDENCE.

§ 706. In several of the United States it has been held, as has been seen, that the defendant may demur to the evidence; though when this is done, the prosecution is not compelled to join in the demurrer, but may, at its election, go to the jury.[1] In Massachusetts, the court, when there is no evidence to convict, will take the case from the jury;[2] and in New York, under similar circumstances, the court advises and virtually directs an acquittal.[3] Unless there be statutes prohibiting this course, this is a necessary prerogative of the judge trying the case.[4]

Demurrer to evidence brings up whole case.

VII. VIEW OF PREMISES.

§ 707. The practice which obtains in civil suits, of permitting, when authorized by local statute, the jury to visit the scene of the *res gestae*, is adopted in criminal issues whenever such a visit appears to the court important for the elucidation of the evidence.[5] The visit, however, should be jealously guarded, so as to exclude interference by or conversation with third parties,[6] and should be made under sworn officers.[7] Such view may be granted after the

View may be directed to premises when necessary to case.

[1] Supra, § 407.

[2] Com. *v.* Fitchburg R. R., 10 Allen, 189.

[3] People *v.* Bennet, 49 N. Y. 137; People *v.* Harris, 1 Edm. Sel. Ca. 453. See fully infra, § 812.

[4] Infra, § 812.

[5] State *v.* Lewis, 14 Mo. Ap. 197; Batewell, J. See Massachusetts Gen. Stat. c. 172, § 9; and 5 Cush. 298; see Chute *v.* State, 19 Minn. 271.

[6] People *v.* Green, 53 Cal. 60.

[7] See 36 Cent. Law Jour. 436. In what cases views can be granted, see Whart. Crim. Ev. § 312; R. *v.* Martin, L. R. 1 C. C. 378; R. *v.* McNamara, 14 Cox C. C. 229; State *v.* Knapp, 45 N. H. 148; Ruloff *v.* People, 18 N. Y. 179; Eastwood *v.* People, 3 Parker C. R. 25; Fleming *v.* State, 11 Ind. 234—a case of arson.

In Bostock *v.* State, 61 Ga. 635, it was held error for the trial court to ask the defendant's counsel whether he objected to the jury viewing the premises, and then, on a negative answer, sending them to the view.

In Chute *v.* State, 19 Minn. 271, the court below charged the jury as follows: "You must weigh the evidence given in court, coupled with your own examination, and if you are satisfied therefrom, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the building is a nuisance, and dangerous to the public, you should so find." The Supreme Court said: "Defendant's exception to this instruction was, we think, well taken. We think the court below misconceived the proper purpose of a view by a jury. The view is not allowed for the purpose of furnishing evidence upon which a ver-

judge has summed up the case.[1] But where only a part of the jury visited the premises, and this, after the case was committed to the jury for their final deliberation, this was held ground for new trial.[2] The visit, also, must be made under the supervision of officers appointed by the court,[3] duly sworn,[4] and in the presence of the accused, who is entitled to have all evidence received by the jury taken in his presence,[5] though a refusal to attend by the defendant, he being duly requested and empowered to do so, may not vitiate the proceedings.[6] But during the view no stranger is permitted to talk with the jury,[7] nor can anything in the way of oral evidence be received.[8]

VIII. CHARGE OF COURT.

Questions of law for the court.

§ 708. Several branches of this subject are elsewhere distinctively considered. It has been shown that the admissibility of evidence is exclusively for the court ;[9] that it is for the court alone to determine when there shall be a severance of defendants on trial ;[10] that the court is to judge of the validity of challenges ;[11] that it is the duty of the court, in case any material charge of the indictment is not supported in law, so to

dict is to be found, but for the purpose of enabling the jury better to understand and apply the evidence which is given in court. Com. *v.* Knapp, 9 Pick. 515." As to irregular views, see infra, § 836.

[1] R. *v.* Martin, Law Rep. 1 C. C. 378.

[2] Ruloff *v.* People, 18 N. N. Y. (4 E. P. Smith) 179 ; Eastwood *v.* People, 3 Hark. C. R. 25.

[3] Patchin *v.* Brooklyn, 2 Wend. 377. See infra, § 836.

[4] People *v.* Queen, 53 Cal. 60.

[5] State *v.* Bertin, 24 La. An. 46; State *v.* Sanders, 68 Mo. 202; Rutherford *v.* Com., 78 Ky. 639 ; State *v.* Graham, 74 N. C. 646 ; Smith *v.* State, 42 Tex. 444 ; Benton *v.* State, 30 Ark. 328 ; Carroll *v.* State, 5 Neb. 31 ; People *v.* Bush, 68 Cal. 622 ; People *v.* Lowry, 70 Cal. 193 ; aff. People *v.* Bush, 68 Cal. 622 ; though see Shular *v.* State, 105 Ind. 289 ; State *v.* Adams, 20 Kans. 311.

Counsel are not allowed to address the jury when on the view, Sasse *v.* State, 68 Wis. 530. In State *v.* Ah Lee, 8 Or. 214, it was held not error to direct a view without providing for the presence of the defendant or his counsel. That defendant may waive his right, see State *v.* Congdon, 14 R. I. 506.

[6] State *v.* Buzzell, 58 N. H. 257; Shular *v.* State, 105 Ind. 289; see State *v.* Buzzell, 59 N. H. 65. That in such cases a waiver is presumed, see State *v.* Congdon, 14 R. I. 506.

[7] People *v.* Green, 53 Cal. 60.

[8] Hayward *v.* Knapp, 22 Minn. 5; Sasse *v.* State, 68 Wis. 530 ; People *v.* Green, 53 Cal. 60 ; State *v.* Lopez, 15 Nev. 407.

[9] Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 23 *et seq.*

[10] Supra, § 309.

[11] Supra, §§ 583 *et seq.*

tell the jury, directing an acquittal, and, in case of a conviction, to give a new trial;[1] and, in fine, that all matters of law belong exclusively to the court, and that unless there are local statutory or constitutional provisions to the contrary, the jury is bound to take the law from the court.[2]

Defendant has a right to full statement of law.

§ 709. But here comes up the question, in what way the views of the court as to the law are to be made known. At common law, and by the practice, until a recent period, of England and of the United States, no bill of exceptions could be taken in criminal cases, and there could be no writ of error, except to so much of the case as was on record. No provisions existed for filing the charge of the court, or for requiring the court to charge on particular points, or for eliciting the opinion of the court either in the affirmative or negative of a particular proposition. The only way in which the law expressed on a trial could be overhauled was by a motion for a new trial; and on such a motion the parties had to depend, as to what had taken place, upon the recollection and notes of the judge trying the case. This is still the usage in England, as well as in several of the United States; and this will account for the meagreness of the judicial literature of this branch of the law. This much, however, is clear. The law is to come from the court, and the court is bound to give the law. And it has been repeatedly declared that the defendant has a right to a full statement of the law from the judge; and that a neglect to give such full statement, when the jury consequently fall into error, is sufficient reason for reversal.[3] Where, under statute, points are given to him by coun-

[1] Infra, §§ 805, 812, 813.

[2] See as to province of court, article in 8 South. Law Rev. (N. S.) 401.

[3] Infra, § 796; State *v.* McDonnell, 32 Vt. 491; People *v.* Rego, 43 Hun, 127; Longnecker *v.* State, 22 Ind. 247; State *v.* Braintree, 25 Iowa, 572; State *v.* Meshek, 51 Iowa, 308; State *v.* Glyndon, 51 Iowa, 463; People *v.* Dunn, 1 Idaho, 75; Lancaster *v.* State, 3 Cold. 339; Phipps *v.* State, 3 Cold. 344; Strady *v.* State, 5 Cold. 300; Souey *v.* State, 13 Lea, 472; State *v.* Hendricks, 32 Kan. 559; Hinch *v.* State, 25 Ga. 699; Cox *v.* State, 32 Ga. 515; Farris *v.* State 35 Ga. 241; Aaron *v.* State, 39 Ala. 684; Armstead *v.* State, 43 Ala. 340; Clements *v.* State, 50 Ala. 117; Woodbury *v.* State, 69 Ala. 12; State Daubert, 42 Mo. 242; State *v.* Mitchell, 64 Mo. 191.

In Pennsylvania, it is not usual for the Commonwealth to give points to the court. Murray *v.* Com., 79 Penn. St. 311. See, generally, State *v.* Carlton, 48 Vt. 636; Com. *v.* Pemberton, 118 Mass. 36; Meyers *v.* Com., 83 Penn. St. 131; Roach *v.* People, 77 Ill. 25;

sel to charge, he must, if he affirms those points, state them specifically, and it is error to fail so to do.[1] And so to leave an inference of *fact* to the jury, as a rule of *law*, is error,[2] and so to leave to the jury a question as to which there is no evidence,[3] and so to give undue and unfair prominence to a particular side of the case.[4]

Misdirection cause for new trial.

§ 710. Of the fidelity thus exacted in the discharge of this particular duty repeated illustrations are given in a succeeding chapter.[5] As is there shown, any misdirection by the court, in point of law, on matters material to the issue, is a ground for a new trial; nor is such misdirection, unless expressly recalled,[6] or unlikely to prejudice, cured by subsequent contradictory instructions,[7] nor by the fact that the jury founded their verdict mainly on distinct grounds.[8]

Judge may give his opinion on the evidence.

§ 711. Unless there are conflicting statutory provisions,[9] the judge is entitled to give his opinion on the evidence, commenting as much thereon as he deems conducive to the interests of justice;[10] and he may also state

Roman *v.* State, 41 Wis. 312; State *v.* Lautenschlager, 22 Minn. 514; Edwards *v.* State, 53 Ga. 428; Cicero *v.* State, 54 Ga. 156; Moody *v.* State, 54 Ga. 660; Habersham *v.* State, 56 Ga. 61; McBeth *v.* State, 50 Miss. 81; State *v.* Foster, 61 Mo. 549; Bethel *v.* Com., 80 Ky. 526; Clare *v.* People, 9 Col. 122; Hudson *v.* State, 40 Tex. 12; Pefferling *v.* State, 40 Tex. 487; Taliaferro *v.* State, 40 Tex. 523; Cole *v.* State, 40 Tex. 147; Ferrell *v.* State, 43 Tex. 523; Cady *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 238; Coffee *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 545.

In Virginia it is not the practice for the trial judge to charge the law except on the points requested. Dejarnette *v.* Com., 75 Va. 867.

In State *v.* Mahly, 68 Mo. 315, it is held to be the duty of the court, in cases of cruel homicide, to charge that the offence is murder in the first degree.

[1] State *v.* Roe, 16 Vroom, 49.

[2] Infra, § 798.

[3] Infra, § 794; Smith *v.* State, 41 N. J. L. 370; State *v.* Carter, 76 N. C. 20; Goldsmith *v.* State, 63 Ga. 85.

[4] Campbell *v.* People, 109 Ell. 565.

[5] Infra, §§ 793 *et seq.*; see People *v.* Biggins, 65 Cal. 564.

[6] State *v.* Morris, 47 Conn. 546; State *v.* Williams, 69 Mo. 110; Nelson *v.* State, 61 Miss. 212; Smurr *v.* State, 88 Ind. 504.

[7] Murray *v.* People, 79 Penn St. 311; Rice *v.* Com., 100 Penn. St. 28; State *v.* Hopper, 71 Mo. 425; State *v.* Hartzell, 58 Iowa, 520; McDougal *v.* State, 88 Ind. 24; People *v.* Valencia, 43 Cal. 553.

[8] Infra, § 793.

[9] Infra, § 798; see White *v.* State, 19 Tex. Ap. 343.

[10] Infra, § 798. *Contra*, in Illinois by statute, Weyrich *v.* People, 89 Ill. 90; so in W. Virginia, State *v.* Thompson, 21 W. Va. 741; State *v.* Sutfin, 22 W. Va. 771; so in North Carolina, by statute, State *v.* Locke, 77 N. C. 480; State *v.* Daney, 78 N. C. 437; though see State *v.* Boon, 80 N. C. 461;

the presumptions of law to which the evidence gives rise.[1] He is not, however, required to give his opinion as to whether certain facts are proved,[2] and when there is a conflict of fact, he has no right to adjudicate on such conflict, and thus take it from the jury;[3] nor has he a right to throw an unfair discredit on a legitimate defence, (*e.g.*, alibi, or good character);[4] nor unfairly to discriminate between special witnesses;[5] nor unfairly to present the strong

and such comments, also, are forbidden by statute in Missouri, State *v.* Munson, 76 Mo. 109; and in Indiana, Pancake *v.* State, 81 Ind. 93; Moore *v.* State, 85 Ind. 90; so as to California, People *v.* Ah. Sing, 59 Cal. 400.

In U. S. *v.* Reynolds, 98 U. S. 145, exception was taken to the following clause of the charge of the trial judge: "I think it not improper, in the discharge of your duties in this case, that you should consider what are to be the consequences to the innocent victims of this delusion. As this contest goes on they multiply, and there are pure-minded women and there are innocent children—innocent in a sense even beyond the degree of the innocence of childhood itself. These are to be the sufferers; and as jurors fail to do their duty, and as these cases come up in the Territory of Utah, just so do these victims multiply and spread themselves over the land."

It was held by the Supreme Court, Waite, C. J., giving the opinion that this was no error. While every appeal of the court, so it was ruled, "to the passions or the prejudices of a jury should be promptly rebuked, and while it is the imperative duty of every reviewing court to take care that wrong is not done in this way, we see no just cause for complaint in this case. Congress, in 1862, 12 Stat. 501, saw fit to make bigamy a crime in the territories. This was done because of the evil consequences that were supposed to flow from plural marriages. All the court did was to call the attention of the jury to the peculiar character of the crime for which the accused was on trial, and to remind them of the duty they had to perform."

"Whether there be any evidence or not is a question for the judge; whether it is sufficient evidence is a question for the jury." Griffin *v.* State, 76 Ala. 32, citing 1 Green. Ev. § 49; S. P., State *v.* Atkinson, 75 N. C. 519.

[1] Infra, § 794.

[2] Com. *v.* Broadbeck, 124 Mass. 319; People *v.* Jones, 24 Mich. 216; People *v.* Messersmith, 61 Cal. 246.

[3] Watson *v.* People, 64 Barb. 130. Infra, § 794-798; State *v.* Byers, 80 N. C. 426; Hughes *v.* State, 75 Ala. 31; Scott *v.* State, 64 Ind. 600; People *v.* Arnold, 40 Mich. 710.

[4] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 333; infra, § 794; U. S. *v.* Gunnell, 5 Mackey, 196; People *v.* Clements, 42 Hun, 353; Turner *v.* Com., 86 Penn. St. 54; Albin *v.* State, 63 Ind. 599; Davis *v.* State, 5 Baxt. 612; State *v.* Byers, 80 N. C. 426; Hoge *v.* People, 117 Ill. 35; Nelms *v.* State, 58 Miss. 362; State *v.* Lewis, 69 Mo. 92; Long *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 381; Ayres *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 368; Bond *v.* State, 23 Tex. Ap. 180; People *v.* Malaspina, 57 Cal. 628. See, however, Reynolds *v.* U. S., 98 U. S. 145, as cited above.

[5] Hoge *v.* People, 117 Ill. 35; People *v.* Lyons, 49 Miss. 78; Landrum *v.* State, 63 Miss. 107; Owens *v.* State, 63 Miss. 450; Boyd *v.* State, 16 Lea, 148; Smith *v.* State, 22 Tex. Ap. 196; Maines *v.* State, 23 Tex. Ap. 568.

features of the prosecution ignoring those of the defence;[1] nor to treat inferences of fact as if they were presumptions of law.[2] Whether he can absolutely direct an acquittal or conviction is elsewhere considered.[3]

Must, if required, give distinct answers to law.

§ 712. When statutory provisions exist requiring the judge at *nisi prius* to give his opinion affirming or negativing particular propositions, these provisions must be strictly followed, nor is it permissible for him to evade this duty by merely general statements of the law;[4] nor by statements which, though theoretically accurate, may mislead.[5] He is not bound, it is true, to expatiate on abstract and irrelevant themes,[6] though these were correctly propounded to him by counsel;[7] nor is he forced to adopt the language in which counsel may couch instructions prayed for, but may recast the propositions, and submit them in his own terms;[8] nor is he, when an instruction asked for is partly correct and partly erroneous, bound either to affirm or

[1] Goerson *v.* Com. 99 Penn. St. 388; see Jackson *v.* State, 69 Ala. 242.

[2] Infra, § 794; People *v.* Carrillo, 70 Cal. 643.

[3] Infra, § 812; supra, § 706.

[4] State *v.* Christmas, 6 Jones N. C. 471; Terry *v.* State, 17 Ga. 204. See Cook *v.* Brown, 39 Me. 443; Foster *v.* People, 50 N. Y. 598; State *v.* Jones, 52 Iowa, 284; People *v.* Sanford, 43 Cal. 29; Dixon *v.* State, 13 Fla. 631, 636; Palmore *v.* State, 29 Ark. 248; see State *v.* Melton, 37 La. An. 82; Heath *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 464; Myers *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 157; Scott *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 112; Irvine *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 12; Riley *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 100.

[5] State *v.* Grear, 28 Minn. 426.

[6] Jones *v.* People, 6 Col. 452.

[7] Infra, § 797; State *v.* Pike, 65 Me. 111; State *v.* McDonald, 65 Me. 465; State *v.* Wilkinson, 76 Me. 317; People *v.* Cunningham, 1 Denio, 524; People *v.* Jones, 24 Mich. 216; Lewis *v.* State, 4 Ham. 389; Tabler *v.* State, 34 Ohio St. 127; Honeycutt *v.* State, 8 Baxt. 371; Parrish *v.* State, 14 Neb. 60; McCoy *v.* State, 15 Ga. 205; Bird *v.* State, 55 Ga. 317; King *v.* State, 71 Ala. 712; State *v.* Ware, 62 Mo. 597; State *v.* Glass, 5 Oregon, 73; People *v.* Walsh, 43 Cal. 447; Wilson *v.* State, 3 Heisk. 278; Harris *v.* State, 34 Ark. 469; and see Garlick *v.* State, 79 Ala. 265; Humbree *v.* State, 81 Ala. 67; State *v.* Riculfi, 35 La. An. 770; State *v.* Hamilton, Id. 1043.

[8] State *v.* Williams, 76 Me. 480; Pistorius *v.* Com., 84 Penn. St. 158; Long *v.* State, 12 Ga. 293; Dougherty *v.* People, 1 Col. 514; Boles *v.* State, 9 S. & Mar. 284; Mask *v.* State, 36 Miss. 77; Wilson *v.* State, 2 Scam. 226; State *v.* Wilson, 8 Iowa, 407; Ulrich *v.* People, 39 Mich. 245; Casper *v.* State, 47 Wis. 535; People *v.* Marble, 38 Mich. 117; Needham *v.* People, 98 Ill. 275; Devlin *v.* People, 104 Ill. 504; State *v.* Shaw, 4 Jones N. C. Law, 440; State *v.* Wissmark, 36 Mo. 592; State *v.* Schlagel, 19 Iowa, 169; People *v.* Cleveland, 49 Cal. 578; People *v.* Hope, 62 Cal. 291.

repudiate it as a whole; but, as has been seen, he may restate, unless precluded by statute, the law in his own terms.[1] Nor is he bound to leave to the jury a point incidentally made on the trial, if his attention be not specifically called to it by a prayer for instructions, and if he substantially covers the whole case in his charge.[2]

§ 713. It is error for the judge, unless there be an entire absence of evidence to prove a particular grade of murder, to exclude such grade from the consideration of the jury.[3] But it is not error for him to express his opinion as to the grade of the offence reached by the case, provided the question of grade properly arises;[4] though the omission or refusal of the court to charge the jury upon a grade of homicide not authorized by the pleadings and proof is not error.[5] But it is error to refuse to define the degrees when required, and the case invokes such definition.[6]

Error for judge to exclude point from jury unless there is no evidence.

§ 714. It must, however, be kept in mind that all communications from judge to jury must be made in open court, and in presence of the parties. If any statements, material to the issue, be made by the judge to the jury, in the absence of the defendant and his counsel, and to the defendant's prejudice,[7] they will be ground for a new trial or reversal.[8] And it is error for the judge to alter his charge after the

Charge must be in open court and before parties.

[1] See State *v.* Benner, 51 Me. 267; Com. *v.* Costley, 118 Mass. 1; Keithler *v.* State, 10 S. & Mar. 192; State *v.* Stonum, 62 Mo. 596; Kennedy *v.* People, 40 Ill. 488; State *v.* Downer, 21 Wis. 275; State *v.* Wilson, 8 Iowa, 407; Stanton *v.* State, 13 Ark. 318; Dixon *v.* State, 13 Fla. 636; People *v.* Silvera, 59 Cal. 592.

[2] Infra, § 794; Com. *v.* Costley, 118 Mass. 1; State *v.* O'Neal, 7 Ired. 251; Dave *v.* State, 22 Ala. 23; McKleroy *v.* State, 77 Ala. 95; Davis *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 645. A statute requiring a charge to be in writing must be strictly followed. Smurr *v.* State, 88 Ind. 504.

[3] McNevins *v.* People, 61 Barb. 307; Burdick *v.* People, 58 Barb. 51; Adams *v.* State, 29 Ohio St. 412; Harris *v.* State, 47 Miss. 318. See Lane *v.* Com., 59 Penn. St. 371. As to taking a case absolutely from jury, see infra, § 812.

[4] Johnston *v.* Com., 85 Penn. St. 54; but see State *v.* Dixon, 75 N. C. 275. That such is his duty, unless forbidden by statute, see Mahly *v.* State, 68 Mo. 315.

[5] Choice *v.* State, 31 Ga. 424; Williams *v.* State, 3 Heisk. 376.

[6] Ibid.; Wynne *v.* State, 56 Ga. 113; State *v.* Burnside, 37 Mo. 343; State *v.* Wyatt, 50 Mo. 309.

[7] That this is a requisite, see Doyle *v.* U. S., 10 Fed. Rep. 269; 11 Biss. 106.

[8] Infra, § 830. See Roberts *v.* People, 111 Ill. 340.

jury has retired, unless in open court, in the presence of the parties, in explanation of mistake.[1]

Other points relating to this topic will be hereafter discussed.[2]

When statute requires must be written.

§ 715. When a statute requires a charge to be in writing when delivered, and to be filed as delivered, the entire charge as filed must be in writing. An omission on the part of the court to comply with this requisite is fatal; nor is the defect supplied by reading to the jury part of a printed book, and noting the reference to such book on the charge as filed.[3] But where the statute only requires that the charge when made should be in writing, the court may read extracts from printed volumes without first copying them.[4] It has been held, however, too late to put the charge in writing after it is delivered;[5] though the defendant may on trial waive the right to have the charge prewritten.[6]

[1] Gross *v.* State, 40 Tex. 520. See Hulse *v.* State, 35 Ohio St. 421.

[2] Infra, §§ 795 *et seq.*

[3] Hopt *v.* People, 104 U. S. 631. See Stephenson *v.* State, 110 Ind. 358.

[4] State *v.* Thomas, 34 La. An. 1084. In this case Manning, J., in the Supreme Court, said: "The judge wrote his charge as requested, and read from the manuscript, but he had occasion to quote from Wharton, and read the passage from the book. He says he could see no difference between reading from the printed pages of Wharton and copying and reading the copy. Nor can we."

[5] People *v.* Ah Fong, 12 Cal. 345; People *v.* Gertrude, 1 Ariz. 74.

[6] People *v.* Duffield, 1 Ariz. 59

CHAPTER XIV.

CONDUCT OF JURY.

I. Swearing.
Jury must appear to have been sworn, § 716.
II. Conduct during Trial; Adjournment and Discharge.
Misconduct of jury is a contempt, § 717.
In England juries may be discharged at discretion of court, § 718.
In this country separations and discharges allowed in cases less than capital, § 719.
Otherwise as to capital cases, § 720.
Tampering with jury to be punished, § 721.
Court can discharge jury in cases of surprise, when gross injustice would otherwise be done, § 722.
Adjournment of court is ground for discharge, § 723.
And so is sickness or eminent disqualification of juror, § 724.
In non-capital cases jury may be discharged at discretion of court, § 725.
Conflict of opinion in capital cases, § 726.
III. Deliberations of Jury.
Jury must be secluded during deliberations, § 727.
1. *Swearing Officer.*
Officer must be duly sworn, § 728.
2. *Communications by Third Parties.*
Illegal communication with jury is indictable, § 729.
Such communications ground for new trial, § 730.
3. *Food and Drink.*
Food and drink may be supplied to jury, § 731.
4. *Casting Lots.*
May be ground for new trial, § 732.
IV. Curing Irregularities by Consent.
How far consent will cure irregularities, § 733.

I. SWEARING.

Jury must be shown to have been sworn.

§ 716. It must appear from the record that the jury was duly sworn, such swearing being essential to empanelling.[1]

[1] Carey *v.* State, 76 Ala. 78; Barlow *v.* State, 37 Ark. 61; Dresch *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 175. In an Alabama case we have the following:—

"That oath requires the jurors to be sworn, not only to well and truly try the issue joined between the State of Alabama and the defendant, but also *a true verdict to render according to the evidence.* The record in this case states, the jury 'were duly sworn to well and truly try the issue joined between the State of Alabama and the defendant, Joe Johnson.' If it were stated that the jury were duly sworn according to law, it might, perhaps, be presumed they were sworn in the form required by the statute, but as the oath administered is stated we cannot presume that they were otherwise sworn. The oath stated leaves out an essential and substantive part of the

§ 717. The jury, after being empanelled, is under the control of the court; and it is usual for the judge to caution its members to hold no conversation and receive no information with regard to the case on trial. Any misconduct in this or other respects will be immediately corrected, and if necessary punished, by the court, which possesses plenary powers for such a purpose.[1]

Misconduct of jury is a contempt.

II. CONDUCT DURING TRIAL: ADJOURNMENT AND DISCHARGE.

§ 718. "If the trial is not concluded on the same day on which it began," it is stated in the edition of Archbold's Pleading, published in 1871, "the judge has authority to adjourn it from day to day, without the defendant's consent.[2] In such case the jury, on a trial for treason or felony, are (and in all criminal cases may be) kept together during the night, under the charge of officers of the court;

In England juries may be discharged at discretion of court.

oath required to be administered, to wit: 'and a true verdict render according to the evidence, so help you God.' Thus we see not only an essential, but the most impressive, part of the oath was omitted: that part that directs the jurors to look to God for help in the discharge of their important and solemn duty—a duty in which the life of a human being was involved. This omission must necessarily render the verdict illegal, and insufficient to justify the fearful and terrible punishment to which the defendant is consigned by the sentence and judgment of the court. Harriman *v.* State, 2 Green (Iowa), 270-283; Bivens *v.* State, 6 Eng. 455, 465; Jones *v.* State, 5 Ala. 666, 673."—Peck, C. J., in Johnson *v.* State, 47 Ala. 62; S. P., Allen *v.* State, 71 Ala. 5; Storey *v.* State, Ibid. 329; Walker *v.* State, 72 Ala. 218. "Duly sworn," or "sworn according to law," however, is good, though if there be an erroneous specification of what this consists in, this is ground for reversal. Peterson *v.* State, 74 Ala. 34; Johnson *v.* State, Ibid. 537. See further as to exactness of oath, Commander *v.* State, 60 Ala. 1.

As to form of oath, see, further, State *v.* Owen, 72 N. C. 605; State *v.* Paylor, 89 N. C. 539, where it was held that the omission of "so help me God" was not fatal.

Mere formal inaccuracies in the oath cannot be objected to after the case is closed; Smith *v.* State, 63 Ga. 168; Fitzhugh *v.* State, 13 Lea, 258; State *v.* Hargrove, 13 Lea, 178; though it is otherwise with substantial defects; State *v.* Davis, 52 Vt. 376.

The rule may be regarded as settled that if the statement "duly sworn" is given, the oath will be presumed to be regular, People *v.* Darr, 61 Cal. 554; Anderson *v.* State, 34 Ark. 257; Hollaud *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 182. In Virginia it is held that it is not necessary that the form of oath should appear on the record. Lawrence *v.* Com., 30 Grat. 845.

[1] See infra, §§ 840 *et seq.*, as to misconduct as ground for new trial.

[2] R. *v.* Stone, 6 T. R. 530; R. *v.* Hardy, 24 St. Tr. 418.

but in misdemeanors they are generally allowed to return to their homes for the night, being charged not to converse with any person on the subject of the trial.[1] Where the witnesses for the prosecution have all been examined, the court may order the case to be adjourned, and direct another trial to be proceeded with, in order to give time for the production of a thing essential to the proof deposited at a distance.[2] And on a trial for murder, before Maule, J., at York, December, 1848, where, after the opening address of the counsel, it was discovered that in consequence of the detention of the railway train, the witnesses for the prosecution had not arrived in the city, the trial was adjourned, the jury were locked up, a fresh jury was called into the jury box, and another case was proceeded with.[3] Where a juror was sworn in a wrong name, and the objection was taken before the verdict, the same learned judge, at the same assizes, intimated that the proper course was to *discharge* the jury, and try the prisoners again; although there being in that case a second indictment against the prisoners, such a course was there not necessary.[4] It has been held that the trial must proceed, although in the course of the proceedings it is discovered that one of the jurors is related to the prisoner on trial, as that fact was a ground of challenge.[5] Where a prisoner, indicted for felony, with whom the jury were charged, was by sudden illness rendered incapable of remaining at the bar, the jury were discharged, and the prisoner, on recovering, was tried before another jury;[6] and in a case of misdemeanor, where the prisoner became ill and was carried out of court, the judge discharged the jury, being of the opinion that the consent of his counsel, that the case should proceed in the absence of the defendant, was not, under such circumstances, sufficient; and if a prisoner so taken ill recovers during the assizes, he may be put on his trial again—the proceeding being, of course, begun *de novo*."[7]

§ 719. In this country, in misdemeanors, the unquestioned usage is for the jury, if the case cannot be concluded in one session, to be allowed to separate, repairing for the recess to their respective homes, cautioned, however, not

In this country separation is allowed

[1] See R. *v.* Kinnear, 2 B. & Ald. 462.
[2] R. *v.* Wenborn, 6 Jur. 267.
[3] R. *v.* Foster, 3 C. & K. 201.
[4] R. *v.* Metcalf, MS.
[5] R. *v.* Wardle, C. & Mar. 647.
[6] R. *v.* Stevenson, 2 Leach, 546.
[7] R. *v.* Streek, 2 C. & P. 413; Jervis's Archbold, 17th ed. (1871), p. 162.

in cases less than capital.

to communicate with others as to the trial.[1] In felonies, while the English practice is to refuse to permit such separation during recesses,[2] in the United States the practice is to permit such separation in cases less than capital.[3] Under what circumstances the jury may be discharged in consequence of inability to agree upon a verdict has been already considered.[4]

Otherwise as to capital cases.

§ 720. As to capital cases, there is great diversity of opinion; but while the weight of authority is that such separation should not be permitted, there is a growing tendency towards relaxation of this rule.[5]

Tampering with jury to be summarily punished.

§ 721. Tampering with the jury is not only a misdemeanor, but a contempt. It is, as will presently be more fully seen, a misdemeanor to submit, to jurymen sworn in a case, any information as to the case except with the sanction of the court, in the presence of both parties.[6] It is a misdemeanor in a juryman knowingly to permit such communications.[7] The offence may be punished by indictment; or summarily, by attachment and imprisonment as for a contempt.[8] If a verdict has been attained by the party in whose interest the communication was made, then, as will hereafter be fully seen, a new trial will be granted.[9]

Court can discharge jury in cases of surprise, when gross injustice would otherwise result.

§ 722. *Can a jury be discharged or a juryman withdrawn during the trial of a case, if from any unexpected incident the case be brought to a stand-still?* Here again we impinge on topics elsewhere abundantly discussed, and as to which opinions of courts are in irreconcilable conflict. First, it will be remembered, we meet the constitutional provision that no man shall be placed twice in jeopardy for the same offence; and on this the question arises whether there is any "jeopardy" until the verdict of the jury is

[1] Infra, §§ 815–8.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Infra, § 818.

[4] Supra, §§ 436, 490, 500. In Massachusetts it is the practice for the court to direct an officer, in case the jury has not agreed after a certain number of hours, to discharge them if they say they are unable to agree. Com. *v.* Townsend, 5 Allen, 218.

[5] Infra, § 819–21.

[6] Infra, § 960.

[7] Infra, § 729.

[8] Infra, § 956.

[9] See fully infra, §§ 823, 831, 836–7; and see, as to plea of once in jeopardy, supra, § 490.

given.[1] Next, as to cases not capital, in all jurisdictions, and even as to capital cases in those jurisdictions where the "jeopardy" is not considered to take place until verdict, we are arrested by the question whether the court, upon either party being surprised by sickness, or sudden failure of evidence, or other material casualty, can withdraw a juror, or discharge the jury. That such is the usual practice is elsewhere seen;[2] but in all such cases it must appear, to justify a discharge, that the party applying for it was really *surprised*—that no ordinary diligence and caution could have guarded against the surprise—and that, unless the court so interfere, a grossly unjust verdict might ensue. But the grounds of the necessity should, for the sake of caution, be spread on the record.[3]

Adjournment of court good ground for discharge.

§ 723. Under any circumstances, the closing of a term of court before verdict is a good ground for discharge in States where no verdict can afterwards be taken.[4]

[1] See this point discussed at large, supra, §§ 490, 510.

"It would seem to be the better opinion that the discharge of the jury without giving a verdict is a matter of practice in the discretion of the judge at the trial, and that although the power with which he is thus invested ought not to be exercised without very strong reasons, yet that it may be exercised without any absolute 'necessity.'" Archbold's C. P. 17th ed. 169; see R. *v.* Charlesworth, 2 F. & F. 326; 1 B. & B. 25.

In the English practice a defence, founded on the improper discharge of the jury, cannot be taken by *plea*, for the only pleas known to the law founded upon a former trial are pleas of a former conviction or a former acquittal for the same offence; but if the former trial has been abortive without a verdict, there has been neither a conviction nor an acquittal. Winsor *v.* R. L. R. 1 Q. B. 395; 35 L. T. (M. C.) 161 (Exch. Chamb.). And the discretion exercised by the judge in this respect, at all events where he discharges the jury on the ground of *necessity*, of the existence of which necessity it is for him alone to determine, cannot be reviewed in any way. Winsor *v.* R., *ubi supra*. See supra, §§ 470, 508, *et seq.*; infra, §§ 814, 821.

[2] Supra, §§ 508 *et seq.*; infra, § 820.

[3] See People *v.* Reagle, 60 Barb. 529; State *v.* Ephraim, 2 Dev. & B. 162; State *v.* Lytle, 5 Ired. 58; Vincent, ex parte, 43 Ala. 402; State *v.* Evans, 21 La. An. 321; State *v.* Redman, 17 Iowa, 329; State *v.* Vaughan, 29 Iowa, 286; State *v.* Pritchard, 16 Nev. 101; O'Brien *v.* Com., 9 Bush, 333; McKenzie *v.* State, 26 Ark. 334; Moseley *v.* State, 33 Tex. 671. As to discharging juror for incompetency, see further, supra, § 672.

In Washington *v.* State, 89 N. C. 535, it was held good ground to discharge a jury that a juror had fraudulently procured his admission on the panel in order to acquit the defendant.

[4] Supra, § 513.

§ 724. Even by those courts where the constitutional provision is construed most strictly, such sickness of a juror as incapacitates him for further attention to the case is ground for withdrawing a juror, or, to put the motion in the shape which it now generally takes, for the jury's discharge.[1] The same course is taken when a juror becomes deranged;[2] and when the court and parties are surprised by the transpiring of some gross and eminent disqualification of a juror, *e. g.*, that he is an alien, in those States in which this is an absolute statutory disqualification;[3] or that he is unequivocally interested in the case, having improperly concealed this interest at the time of empanelling.[4]

And so is sickness or eminent disqualification of juror.

§ 725. *Can a jury be discharged on failure to agree?* It will be sufficient, in answer to this question, to state the points already established in other relations.

In non-capital casee jury may be discharged at discretion of court.

(*a*) *In misdemeanors, and in all felonies less than capital, it is in the discretion of the court to discharge the jury, when there is no reasonable prospect of their agreement, if they have been together a sufficient time to enable a just conclusion in this respect to be reached.*[5]

§ 726. (*b.*) *In capital cases the same view is adopted in the federal courts and in the courts of most of the States; while in others such discharge is a bar to a second trial, unless it appear from the record that such discharge was necessary, e. g., caused by dangerous sickness of juror.*[6]

Conflict of opinion in capital cases.

Whether the prisoner can by consent cure the irregularity in such cases is elsewhere discussed.[7] Whether there was jeopardy is a

[1] See supra, §§ 508 *et seq.*; and see also Kinloch's case, Fost. 28; U. S. *v.* Haskell, 4 Wash. C. C. 402; Com. *v.* Fells, 9 Leigh, 613; Mahala *v.* State, 10 Yerger, 532; State *v.* Curtis, 5 Humph. 601; Hector *v.* State, 2 Mo. 166. Infra, §§ 820–1.

[2] U. S. *v.* Haskell, 4 Wash. C. C. 402.

[3] Stone *v.* People, 2 Scam. 326. Infra, §§ 845 *et seq.*

[4] See U. S. *v.* Coolidge, 2 Gall. 364; Com. *v.* McFadden, 23 Penn. St. 12. Infra, § 844.

[5] Winsor *v.* R., 6 B. & S. 143; L. R. 1 Q. B. 289, 390; Com. *v.* Bowden, 9 Mass. 494; Com. *v.* Purchase, 2 Pick. 521; Com. *v.* Eastman, 1 Cush. 189; State *v.* Woodruff, 2 Day, 504; People *v.* Goodwin, 18 Johns. R. 187; People *v.* Green, 13 Wend. 55; Sutcliffe *v.* State, 18 Ohio, 469; Dobbins *v.* State, 14 Ohio St. 493; State *v.* Bass, 82 N. C. 570; State *v.* Chase, Id. 575; Williams *v.* State, 45 Ala. 57; Mosely *v.* State, 33 Tex. 671; and see cases cited supra, §§ 436, 490.

[6] Supra, §§ 490–519.

[7] Supra, §§ 518, 541; infra, §§ 733, 786, 787.

question of law as to which error lies, though it is as a rule otherwise as to the question whether the fact of disagreement or other incapacitation was duly proved.[1]

III. DELIBERATIONS OF JURY.

§ 727. As soon as the case is submitted to the jury, they are to be kept together, under the charge of an officer, in such a way as to be secluded from all communication with other parties, until they have agreed on a verdict, or it appear that it is impossible for them to agree.[2]

Jury must be secluded in deliberation.

What books or other instruments of proof the jury may take with them is hereafter discussed.[3]

It is the duty of the court to see that the jury are provided with medicine and other conveniences or necessaries.[4]

1. *Swearing of Officer.*

§ 728. The officer should be a sworn officer of the court, or if not, must be sworn specially to faithfully discharge the office imposed on him in the particular case. When the jury have been out with an unsworn officer, this is ground for a new trial, unless it appear affirmatively that no prejudice to the defendant resulted thereby.[5] And the better practice in all cases is to swear the officer "well and truly to keep the jury in some convenient and private place (or in certain rooms prescribed by the court), and not to suffer any person to speak to them, nor to speak to them yourself on the subject of the case, without leave of court."[6]

Officer must be duly sworn.

[1] See cases cited to § 725, and also U. S. *v.* Haskell, 4 Wash. C. C. 402; U. S. *v.* Peres, 9 Wheat. 578; Com. *v.* Olds, 5 Lit. 137; U. S. *v.* Morris, 1 Curt. C. C. 23. But see Com. *v.* Cook, 6 S. & R. 577; State *v.* Leunig, 42 Ind. 541; Williams *v.* Com., 2 Grat. 567; State *v.* Alman, 64 N. C. 309; see §§ 494 *et seq.*

[2] Supra, §§ 725–6; infra, § 814; State *v.* Leunig, 42 Ind. 541. See criticisms by Sir J. F. Stephens in his Treatise on Criminal Law, p. 223. See, also, R. *v.* Newton, 13 Q. B. 716.

[3] Infra, § 829.

[4] O'Shields *v.* State, 55 Ga. 696. Infra, § 731.

[5] See infra, § 827.

[6] See Philips *v.* Com., 19 Grat. 485; McCann *v.* State, 9 S. & M. 465. See

2. *Communications by Third Parties.*

§ 729. For third parties to communicate with a jury, when engaged in its deliberations, is an indictable offence, when such communication touches the subject-matter of the trial,[1] or it may be treated as a contempt of court.[2]

Illegal communication with jury is indictable.

Even irregular communications from the judge may vitiate the verdict.[3]

supra, §§ 338, 721; infra, § 966. This is substantially the oath approved by Lord Kenyon, in R. *v.* Stone, 6 I. R. 527.

[1] "At its last session," said Judge Field, of the Supreme Court of the United States, in charging a grand jury in California, in August, 1872 (Pamph. Rep. p. 12), "Congress passed a stringent act to prevent the continuance of this pernicious practice, as well as to prevent any attempt to influence the administration of justice corruptly, or by the intimidation of jurors. It is entitled, 'An act to prevent and punish the obstruction of the administration of justice in the courts of the United States.' It enacts 'that if any person or persons shall corruptly, or by threats or force, or by threatening letters, or any threatening communications, endeavor to influence, intimidate, or impede any grand or petit jury or juror of any court of the United States in the discharge of his or their duty, or shall corruptly, or by threats or force, or by threatening letters, or any threatening communications, influence, obstruct, or impede, or endeavor to influence, obstruct, or impede the due administration of justice therein, such person or persons so offending shall be liable to prosecution therefor by indictment, and shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by fine not exceeding one thousand dollars, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both, according to the aggregation of the offence.' And it also enacts that 'if any person or persons shall attempt to influence the action or decision of any grand or petit juror upon any issue or matter pending before such juror, or before the jury of which he is a member, or pertaining to his or their duties *by writing or sending to him any letter or letters, or any communication in print or in writing, in relation to such issue or matter, without the order previously obtained of the court before which the said juror is summoned*, such person or persons so offending shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be liable to prosecution therefor by indictment or information, and shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by fine not exceeding one thousand dollars, or by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment, according to the aggravation of the offence.' You thus perceive that Congress intends that in the investigation of public offences you shall be secure from intimidation or personal influence of every kind."

[2] Infra, § 956.

[3] Supra, § 714; infra, § 830.

§ 730. It is doubted whether the reception of communications as to the case by itself avoids the verdict, in case of conviction, or whether it is necessary to prove prejudice to the defendant. The former is the better opinion,[1] as it cannot be presumed that such communication was without influence in securing the result.

Such communications ground for new trial.

It is otherwise, however, when the communications do not touch the subject-matter of the trial. In such case the verdict will not be disturbed.[2] But if the jury are allowed to disperse, when deliberating, or are left without guard in the society of other persons, this is *per se* ground for a new trial.[3]

3. *Food and Drink.*

§ 731. The old rule used to be that the jury, when the charge is committed to them, should be kept together without food.[4] This, however, no longer obtains, and the only point as to which doubt is expressed is as to whether the use of spirituous liquors at this period vitiates the verdict. It may indeed be a contempt to permit juries to take liquor without consent of court; but the preponderance of opinion is that, unless intoxication result, this is not ground for new trial.[5] As has been seen, the jury is to be provided with proper necessaries and comforts.[6]

Food and drink may be supplied to jury.

4. *Casting Lots.*

§ 732. Misconduct of this character is usually the subject of examination on motion for a new trial, under which head it is discussed.[7]

Casting lots may be ground for new trial.

IV. CURING IRREGULARITIES BY CONSENT.

§ 733. In England,[8] and in several American courts,[9] there has been a tendency to hold the defendant incapable of assenting to

[1] See infra, §§ 831–838, 952.

[2] Infra, §§ 836, 837. State *v.* Bailey, 32 Kan. 83.

[3] Infra, §§ 821–832.

[4] Ibid. See, on the question of consent of court, State *v.* Bailey, 32 Kan. 83.

[5] Infra, § 821.

[6] Supra, § 727; O'Shields *v.* State, 55 Ga. 696.

[7] Infra, § 842.

[8] R. *v.* Woolf, 1 Chit. 402. See supra, § 518.

[9] Peiffer *v.* Com., 15 Penn. St. 468;

How far consent may cure irregularities.

separation or similar indulgences of jurors during trial, sometimes because of the peculiar attitude of the defendant, which makes it improper to compel him to decide such delicate questions, and sometimes because the separation of a jury is so gross a violation of a fundamental law that no consent can legitimate it. It is difficult, however, to sustain either of these propositions to their full extent.[1] No hesitation has been expressed as to requiring defendants to decide as to questions of consent, some of which are at least as delicate as that under consideration.[2] Thus, it has been held that a defendant is permitted to waive a preliminary examination before a magistrate, no matter how much this may subsequently prejudice him;[3] to waive, under statutory authority, a grand jury, even in felonies;[4] to waive even the unconstitutionality of the law under which the grand jury was summoned;[5] to waive the right to a copy of the indictment;[6] to waive technical objections to jurors, though here, too, by a refusal his case may be prejudiced;[7] to waive, in certain minor misdemeanors, his right to be present during trial;[8] and to waive objections to evidence, under circumstances in which it might be in like manner forcibly urged that the election to which he is put is unfair, as to decline would exhibit him in an ungracious light before the jurors.[9] It has also been seen that the defendant, even in the view of those courts which attach the most stringent construction to the constitutional limitation as to jeopardy, is permitted to waive this right by a motion for a new trial, if not by a motion in arrest of judgment.[10] If we confine the question of separa-

Wesley *v.* State, 1 Humph. 502; Berry *v.* State, 10 Ga. 511; Woods *v.* State, 43 Miss. 364; State *v.* Populus, 12 La. An. 710; all, however, capital cases, except the first. See, as to jeopardy, supra, § 518; as to separation of jury, infra, § 821.

[1] See generally Johnson *v.* Com., 115 Penn. St. 361.

[2] See Perteet *v.* People, 70 Ill. 171; Bulliner *v.* People, 95 Ill. 394; State *v.* Waters, 1 Mo. Ap. 7; People *v.* Alviso, 55 Cal. 230. On the general question of consent, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 44 *et seq.* As to question of jeopardy, see supra, § 518; and see State *v.* Potter, 16 Kans. 80; People *v.* Granice, 50 Cal. 447.

[3] See supra, §§ 70 *et seq.*

[4] Edwards *v.* State, 45 N. J. 419.

[5] U. S. *v.* Gale, 109 U. S. 65; supra, § 350; infra, § 760.

[6] Supra, § 696.

[7] See supra, § 351; infra, §§ 845, 886–9; State *v.* Waters, 62 Mo. 196.

[8] Supra, § 541.

[9] Infra, § 804. See, as a strong case of this, State *v.* Polson, 29 Iowa, 133.

[10] See supra, § 518; infra, §§ 759, 767; and see, as to scope of maxim, *Volenti non fit injuria*, Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 144–5.

tion to the period between the charge of the judge and the rendering of the verdict, and if we treat "separation" as convertible with "dispersion," then, no doubt, "separation" cannot be legalized by consent, so as to permit a jury thus dispersed to reunite and return a verdict. But it is otherwise when we come to the question of separation during trial, but before the judge's charge, and are asked to decide that while such separation is allowable in misdemeanors, and even in non-capital felonies, it cannot be cured even by consent in felonies that are capital. If, in a high felony, this privilege is not likely to be abused, it certainly will not be in capital cases, in which the jury are under peculiarly solemn sanctions. If the defendant is anxious to conciliate in a capital case, so is he also in a high felony. To refuse to defendants this privilege of consenting to separation during trial will, in the long run, be oppressive rather than protective, for it will tend to force trials on with undue speed, and introduce into the jury box an inferior grade of jurymen.[1] Hence it is that the weight of authority is that the defendant, even in capital cases, can legalize the separation of the jury during the recesses of the court, down to the period when the case is given to them for deliberation by the charge of the court.[2] But such consent does not, unless as to minor offences, under statutory authority, operate to legalize a trial by *eleven* instead of *twelve* jurors,[3] nor

[1] See infra, § 819. As to effect of consent, see supra, § 518.

[2] See supra, § 518; infra, § 819; and see Smith *v.* Com., 14 S. & R. 70. In State *v.* Brown, 75 Mo. 317; S. P., Henning *v.* State, 106 Ind. 386, it was held that where the record was silent as to defendant's consent to separation, such consent would be presumed. But see Wesley *v.* State, 11 Humph. 502; Grisom *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 374.

[3] Cancemi *v.* People, 18 N. Y. 128; Allen *v.* State, 54 Ind. 461; People *v.* O'Neil, 48 Cal. 257; Bell *v.* State, 44 Ala. 393; Hunt *v.* State, 61 Miss. 577; State *v.* Davis, 66 Mo. 684; though see *aliter*, as to misdemeanors; Com. *v.* Dailey, 12 Cush. 80; State *v.* Van Matre, 49 Mo. 268; State *v.* Barowsky, 11 Nev. 119; Murphy *v.* Com., 1 Metc. (Ky.) 365; Tyra *v.* Com., 1 Metc. (Ky.) 1; Sarah *v.* State, 28 Ga. 576; Stell *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 59. In State *v.* Kauffman, 51 Iowa, 578, such an agreement was sustained in a trial for felony; and so in Texas as to misdemeanors. Jones *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 85. Chief Justice Shaw, in Com. *v.* Dailey, 12 Cush. 83, where the court held that on a trial for assault and escape the defendant might agree to be tried by a jury of eleven, said, after citing R. *v.* Sullivan, 8 A. & E. 831: "It is asked, if consent will authorize a trial before eleven jurors, why not before ten, six, or one? It appears to us that it is a good answer to say that no departure from established forms of trial can take place without permission of the judge, and no discreet judge would permit any

can a defendant, according to the preponderance of authority, waive, even where there is an enabling statute, his right to a trial by jury on a plea of not guilty.[1] And supposing it to be a fundamental principle of the common law that a jury, when its deliberations once commence, must be kept together in seclusion until they terminate, it must on like reasoning be held that consent does not validate a separation of the jury between the charge of the court and the verdict.[2] The question as to separation during trial is one more open

such extravagant or wide departure from those salutary forms as the question supposes, nor any departure unless upon some unforeseen or urgent emergency."

The guarantee in the federal constitution of "a public trial by an impartial jury" does not, it has been held, control State procedure. U. S. *v.* Cooledge, 1 Wheat. 415; Fox *v.* Ohio, 5 How. 410; U. S. *v.* Cook, 17 Wall. 168. It is otherwise as to the fourteenth amendment, providing that a State shall not "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." Sarah *v.* State, 28 Ga. 576; Murphy *v.* State, 97 Ind. 579; Connolly *v.* State, 60 Ala. 89.

[1] U. S. *v.* Taylor, 11 Fed. Rep. 470; Opinion of Justices, 41 N. H. 550; State *v.* Maine, 27 Conn. 281; League *v.* State, 36 Md. 259; Dillingham *v.* State, 5 Ohio St. 283; Williams *v.* State, 12 Ohio St. 622; People *v.* Smith, 9 Mich. 193; Hill *v.* People, 16 Mich. 351; State *v.* Lockwood, 43 Wis. 403; State *v.* Stewart, 89 N. C. 563; State *v.* Holt, 90 N. C. 749; Neales *v.* State, 10 Mo. 498; Wilson *v.* State, 6 Ark. 601; Bond *v.* State, 17 Ark. 290. See State *v.* Mansfield, 41 Mo. 470; Cooper *v.* State, 21 Ark. 228.

In State *v.* White, 33 La. An. 1218, the right to waive such trial, under statute, was affirmed; and so in Alabama, Wren *v.* State, 70 Ala. 1; Summens *v.* State, 70 Ala. 16; and in Texas. Stell *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 59. See further, State *v.* Carman, 63 Iowa, 130; State *v.* Larrigan, 66 Iowa, 436 (cases of felony); Bullard *v.* State, 38 Tex. 504.

In State *v.* Worden, 46 Conn. 349, it was held that a statute was constitutional which provided that in all prosecutions the defendant could elect to be tried by the court instead of by the jury. To the same effect see Daily *v.* State, 4 Ohio St. 57; Dillingham *v.* State, 5 Ohio St. 280; Ward *v.* People, 30 Mich. 116; Murphy *v.* State, 97 Ind. 579 (except in capital cases); Connelly *v.* State, 60 Ala. 39. In State *v.* Conlin, 27 Vt. 318, it was intimated that the constitutional restriction applies only to high crimes. For an examination of the cases, see note in 1 Am. Crim. Law Mag. 193.

In Dacre's case, Kel. 59, where Lord Dacre was tried for treason, one question was whether the prisoner might waive a trial by his peers and be tried by the country, but the judges of the Court of King's Bench agreed that he could not, for the statute of Magna Charta was in the negative, and the prosecution was at the king's suit. See, also, 1 Wooddesson's Lect. 346; 3 Inst. 30; 8 Alb. L. J. 262; and see supra, § 518.

Failure to take technical objections at an earlier period does not waive right to writ of error. Infra, § 775.

[2] Supra, § 518. See, however, Smith *v.* State, 59 Ga. 513. As to general

to doubt, and is hereafter independently discussed.[1] But even a separation during trial, if improper on other grounds, cannot be cured by an assent obtained from the defendant by solicitation. A party should not be forced into a choice between surrendering a right or exciting a prejudice in those by whom the case is to be tried.[2] It is otherwise when the separation is at the defendant's request and for his benefit.[3]

How far the defendant may waive his right to be present at trial has been already considered.[4]

doctrine of consent, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 144–6.

In Lavery *v.* Com., 101 Penn. St. 560, it was held that the statute of 1861, providing that assaults and other minor cases may be tried before a justice of the peace and six jurors, is not unconstitutional. See Com. *v.* Saal, 10 Phila. 496.

In Edwards *v.* State, 45 N. J. L. 469, it w s held that a statute was constitutional which permitted defendants to waive grand and petit juries in cases triable before certain courts. S. P., Staff, in re, 63 Wisc. 285; Moore *v.* State, 22 Tex. Ap. 117, as to misdemeanors. That in any view a statute taking away trial by jury without consent is unconstitutional, see Whart. Com. Am. Law, §§ 579, 581.

In State *v.* Lockwood, 43 Wis. 405, it was said by Ryan, C. J.: "The right of trial by jury, upon information or indictment for crime, is secured by the constitution, upon a principle of public policy, and cannot be waived." "The current of authority appears to apply it (its rule) to both classes of crime, felonies, and misdemeanors; and this point holds that to be safer and better alike in principle and practice." S. P., State *v.* Stewart, 89 N. C. 563, affirming State *v.* Moss, 2 Jones, 66.

[1] Infra, §§ 819 *et seq.*

[2] See cases cited supra, § 518; R. *v.* Kinnear, 2 B. & Ald. 462; Peiffer *v.* Com., 15 Penn. St. 468; Wesley *v.* State, 10 Humph. 502.

[3] Bebee *v.* People, 5 Hill, 32.

[4] Supra, § 541 *et seq.*

CHAPTER XV.

VERDICT.

I. WHERE THERE ARE SEVERAL COUNTS.
Prosecutions may withdraw superfluous or bad counts, § 737.
General verdict when there is one bad count, or what counts are repugnant, § 738.
New trial may be on single count, § 739.
Verdict of guilty on one count equivalent to not guilty on others, § 740.
(Informalities cured by verdict, § 760.)
II. DEFENDANT MUST BE PRESENT, § 741.
III. DOUBLE OR DIVISIBLE COUNT.
Verdict may go to part of divisible count, § 742.
IV. ADJOURNMENT OF COURT PRIOR TO.
Court may adjourn during deliberations of jury, § 744.
V. SPECIAL VERDICT.
Jury may find special verdict, § 745.
Such verdict must be full and exact, § 746.
VI. HOW VERDICT IS RENDERED.
General verdict is by word of mouth, § 747.
Verdict must be recorded, § 748.
VII. SEALED VEEDICT.
In misdemeanors sealed verdict may be rendered, § 749.
VIII. POLLING JURY.
Jury may be polled at common law, § 750.
IX. AMENDING VERDICT.
Verdict may be amended before discharge of jury, § 751.
X. DESIGNATION OF DEGREE OR OF PUNISHMENT.
Such designation must be specific, § 752.
XI. VALUATION OF PROPERTY.
Jury may find a special valuation, § 753.
XII. WHEN COURT MAY REFUSE TO RECEIVE VERDICT.
Palpably wrong verdict may be rejected by court, § 754.
XIII. WHEN THERE ARE SEVERAL DEFENDANTS.
Defendants may be severed in finding, § 755.
XIV. DEFECTIVE VERDICT.
May be inoperative, § 756.
XV. RECOMMENDATION TO MERCY.
Such recommendation not obligatory, § 757.
XVI. EFFECT OF SUNDAY OR LEGAL HOLIDAY RENDERING, § 758.

I. WHERE THERE ARE SEVERAL COUNTS.

§ 736. THE accurate practice in such case is for the jury to find specially on each count.[1] But as this, from carelessness or other cause, is often neglected, it becomes frequently incumbent on the

[1] Day *v.* People, 76 Ill. 380; supra, § 292. That in such case there may be a sentence on each count, see infra, § 910.

courts to determine what course to take when a general verdict of guilty is rendered on the whole indictment. This subject has been heretofore generally discussed. It may be sufficient here to recapitulate the following rules:—

§ 737. When counts are joined for offences which are different, but not positively repugnant,[1] and there is a general verdict of guilty, the practice is to sentence on the count of the highest grade, the prosecution either expressly or tacitly withdrawing the other counts;[2] and in such case, it appearing that the offences were distinct aspects or successive stages of the same transaction, a sentence on the count for the highest grade is proper.[3] But it is not irregular in most jurisdictions, when the offences are distinct and there are separate verdicts, to sentence specifically on each count.[4] And it has been held that a *nolle prosequi*, after verdict, on one of two repugnant counts on which the verdict is general, does not cure the defect.[5]

Prosecution may withdraw bad or superfluous counts.

§ 738. When there is a good count and a bad count, and a general verdict of guilty, it has been held that a valid judgment can be entered on the verdict, which will be presumed in error to have been entered on the good count.[6] In some jurisdictions, however, a judgment entered on such a verdict will be reversed, as logically

General verdict when one count is bad or counts are repugnant.

[1] Kilgore *v.* State, 74 Ala. 34; Jackson *v.* State, Ibid. 26. *Aliter* in cases of repugnancy, when there is nothing to indicate on what the verdict went. Tobin *v.* People, 104 Ill. 565.

[2] Supra, §§ 291–2, 383; infra, §§ 910–11. Com. *v.* Holmes, 137 Mass. 248; State *v.* Rounds, 76 Me. 123; Com. *v.* Flagg, 135 Mass. 545; Cook *v.* State, 4 Zab. 843; Manly *v.* State, 7 Md. 135; State *v.* Speight, 69 N. C. 72; Campbell *v.* People, 109 Ill. 565; State *v.* Scott, 15 S. C. 434; State *v.* Smith, 18 S. C. 149; Estes *v.* State, 55 Ga. 131; see Com. *v.* Adams, 127 Mass. 15, and cases cited infra, § 911.

"The judgment may be granted upon the other count and restricted thereto, or a *nolle prosequi* may be entered as to one of the counts or more." Peters, C. J. State *v.* Rounds, 76 Me. 127; see State *v.* Thompson, 95 N. C. 596. And when, in a homicide case, the instrument of death is stated differently in different counts, the verdict need not specify which instrument was fatal. Brown *v.* State, 105 Ind. 385; State *v.* Jackson, 90 Mo. 156.

[3] Hawker *v.* People, 75 N. Y. 487; see Merrick *v.* State, 13 Ind. 327; Dohme *v.* State, 68 Ga. 339.

[4] Infra, § 910.

[5] Com. *v.* Haskins, 128 Mass. 60.

[6] See cases cited supra, § 292; infra, §§ 771, 907; supra, § 291; see Ridenour *v.* State, 38 Ohio St. 272; Williams *v.* State, 60 Ga. 88; Duffy *v.* State, 107 Ill. 113; Dalrymple *v.* State, 55 Mich. 519; Boren *v.* State, 23 Tex. Ap. 28.

erroneous.[1] And there must in any view be a reversal when evidence is admitted which is admissible only under the bad count.[2] But when the counts are repugnant, a general verdict cannot be sustained.[3]

New trial may be on a single count.

§ 739. When there is a new trial on one count alone, this leaves the other in full force. When there has been an acquittal on one count and a conviction on another, and the counts are for distinct offences,[4] a new trial can only be granted on the count on which there has been a conviction.[5]

Verdict of guilty on

§ 740. A verdict of guilty on one count, saying nothing as to other counts, is equivalent to a verdict of not guilty as to such other counts;[6] and when the jury fail to

[1] Ibid.

In Massachusetts it was ruled in 1869 that if, on the trial of an indictment charging distinct offences, in separate counts, the jury return a general verdict of guilty, and, in answer to an inquiry of the court, reply that they did not pass upon the counts separately, and the verdict is thereupon ordered to be affirmed and recorded, the defendant has good ground for exception, even if the case was submitted to the jury with suitable instructions as to the several counts. Com. *v.* Carey, 103 Mass. 214 (see People *v.* Lilly, 38 Mich. 270). In 1876 it was ruled in the same State that where the same offence is charged in several counts in inconsistent ways, a general verdict should be entered on the whole case, or a special verdict on the count proved, but that a special verdict of guilty on each count was bad. Com. *v.* Fitchburg R. R., 120 Mass. 372. In Massachusetts, "where a complaint contains several counts, whether for the same or for different similar offences, the plea, conviction, and sentence may be general, upon the complaint as a whole, and not upon each count separately." Com. *v.* Holmes, 137 Mass. 248. In Connecticut, in 1867, it was ruled (supra, § 292), that while it is in the discretion of a judge, in order to insure a fair trial, where there are several counts in an information, to direct the attorney for the State to elect upon which counts he will claim a conviction, and to withdraw the others; or to direct the jury, when they return their verdict, to say upon which count or counts they find the prisoner guilty, yet this is a matter of discretion; and if the court do not take this course, the omission cannot be revised, as matter of right, on motion in arrest or for a new trial; nor will the court interfere to grant a new trial, unless they see that injustice has been done. State *v.* Tuller, 34 Conn. 281.

[2] Com. *v.* Boston R. R. 133 Mass. 383; see Com. *v.* Andrews, 132 Mass. 263.

[3] Com. *v.* Haskins, 128 Mass. 60; infra, § 909 *a*. See U. S. *v.* Malone, 20 Blatch. 137.

[4] See U. S. *v.* Malone, 20 Blatch. 137.

[5] Infra, § 895.

[6] U. S. *v.* Davenport, Deady, 264; State *v.* Phinney, 42 Me. 384; State *v.* Watson, 63 Me. 128; Edgerton *v.* Com., 5 Allen, 514; Guenther *v.* People, 24

agree on a second count, but convict on the first, the defendant may be sentenced on the first.[1] But the better course is for the court to require a verdict on each count.[2]

one count equivalent to not guilty on others.

II. DEFENDANT MUST BE PRESENT.

§ 741. At the time of the rendition of the verdict, as a general rule, the defendant must be present in open court,[3] and in capital cases to take the verdict in his absence is a fatal error.[4]

III. DOUBLE OR DIVISIBLE COUNT.

§ 742. When two offences are joined in one count (*e. g.*, burglary with larceny, and assault and battery with assault), the verdict may be not guilty of the greater offence, and guilty of the less;[5] and so of a conviction of assault on a count charging a riot and an assault committed riotously.[6] It should be remembered, however, that at common law it has been held in some States that there can be no conviction of a misdemeanor on an indictment for a felony.[7] Nor can there be ordinarily a con-

Verdict may go to part of divisible count.

N. Y. 100; People *v.* Dowling, 84 N. Y. 478; Girtz *v.* Com., 22 Penn. St. 351; Henwood *v.* State, 52 Penn. St. 424; Redenour *v.* State, 38 Ohio St. 272; Com. *v.* Bennett, 2 Va. Cas. 235; Kirk *v.* Com., 9 Leigh, 627; Weinzorpflin *v.* State, 7 Blackf. 186; Bittings *v.* State, 56 Ind. 101; Bonnell *v.* State, 64 Ind. 498; Dawson *v.* State, 65 Ind. 445; Short *v.* State, 63 Ind. 376; Youndt *v.* State, 64 Ind. 443; Keeling *v.* State, 107 Ind. 563; Stoltz *v.* People, 4 Scam. 168; State *v.* Taylor, 84 N. C. 773; Trowbridge *v.* State, 74 Ga. 431; Nabors *v.* State, 6 Ala. 200; Morris *v.* State, 8 Sm. & M. 762; State *v.* Coffee, 68 Mo. 120; State *v.* Gannon, 11 Mo. Ap. 502; State *v.* Hays, 78 Mo. 600; State *v.* Owen, 1bid. 367; Green *v.* State, 17 Fla. 669; though see Latham *v.* R., 5 B. & S. 635; 9 Cox C. C. 516; R. *v.* Craddock, 2 Den. C. C. 31. That a verdict of guilty on all the counts, and a sentence on one count, though erroneous, disposes of the case as to the other counts, see Com. *v.* Foster, 122 Mass. 317. But *contra* as to special verdict. Infra, § 745.

[1] State *v.* Hill, 30 Wis. 416; State *v.* Martin, 30 Wis. 216. See infra, § 910.

[2] State *v.* Jackson, 39 Ohio St. 37.

[3] Supra, § 549; Longfellow *v.* State, 10 Neb. 105; as to exceptions, see supra, § 549.

[4] Nolan *v.* State, 55 Ga. 521; Cook *v.* State, 60 Ala. 39. See State *v.* Chumley, 67 Mo. 41; supra, § 518.

[5] Supra, § 244; McCall *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 353. As to murder, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 541 *et seq.* As to rape, ibid. § 575; supra, §§ 247, 249. Under mayhem there may be conviction of assault. State *v.* Fisher, 103 Ind. 530.

[6] Com. *v.* Hall, 142 Mass. 454.

[7] Supra, §§ 249, 261. See R. *v.* Woodhall, 12 Cox C. C. 240; Hall *v.* State, 7 Lea, 685. A verdict may, under the present Virginia practice, be taken for an assault, on an indict-

viction of a minor offence on an indictment in which it is not contained.[1]

But as a general rule, when an offence is divisible, the jury may convict the defendant of part of the charge, and acquit as to the rest;[2] or, after a general verdict of conviction, the attorney-general may enter a *nolle prosequi* as to one branch of the case, and the court may sentence on the other.[3]

ment for feloniously and maliciously cutting, etc., though the latter is a felony and the former a misdemeanor. Canada's case, 22 Grat. 899. See Hunter *v.* Com., 79 Penn. St. 503.

[1] Supra, §§ 249, 261; Reynolds *v.* People, 83 Ill. 479; Barber *v.* State, 39 Ohio St. 660; Com. *v.* Moore, 99 Penn. St. 570; State *v.* Kegan, 62 Iowa, 106; Terr *v.* Dooley, 4 Mont. 295.

That there can be no conviction of an assault on an indictment for riot unless the indictment avers the assault, see Price *v.* People, 9 Ill. App. 36; supra, § 471. But it is otherwise as to affray alleging an assault. Thompson *v.* State, 70 Ala. 26.

Nor can there be a conviction of receiving stolen goods on an indictment for larceny. State *v.* Moultrie, 33 La. An. 1146.

[2] See supra, §§ 158, 246, 247, 251, 261; U. S. *v.* Leonard, 18 Blatch. 187; State *v.* Wilson, 59 N. H. 139; Com. *v.* Morgan, 107 Mass. 199; Com. *v.* Keenan, 67 Penn. St. 203; Richie *v.* State, 58 Ind. 355; Smith *v.* State, 85 Ind. 553; Kegan *v.* State, 52 Iowa, 106; Hanna *v.* People, 19 Mich. 316; Fanning *v.* State, 12 Lea, 651; State *v.* Chumley, 67 Mo. 41; State *v.* McCort, 23 La. An. 326; State *v.* Gilkies, 35 La. An. 53; State *v.* Watson, 30 Kan. 281; State *v.* Griffin, 34 La. An. 37; People *v.* Odell, 1 Dak. 197. Under statutes verdicts may be taken for attempts in all cases of substantive crime. R. *v.* Bird, 2 Den. C. C. 94; R. *v.* Reid, 2 Den. C. C. 89; R. *v.* Hapgood, L. R. 1 C. C. 221; State *v.* Wilson, 30 Conn. 500; Hill *v.* State, 53 Ga. 125; Wolf *v.* State, 41 Ala. 412; State *v.* Bryant, 41 Ark. 359. But at common law this cannot be, unless the attempt be averred in the indictment. See supra, §§ 245–250, 465. In the United States courts the defendant may be found guilty of an attempt, "when itself a separate offence," contained in a greater offence charged. Rev. Stat. § 1035. As to verdicts in homicide, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 541.

Where an indictment alleged the production of an abortion, and the consequent death of the victim, the jury found a verdict of guilty of the abortion, but did not agree as to the death proceeding therefrom, the prosecution offered to enter a *nolle prosequi* to that part of the indictment, upon which the jury afterwards acquitted on that averment. It was held that no exception could be taken to the receiving and recording the verdict. Com. *v.* Adams, 127 Mass. 15.

See, further, supra, §§ 465, 472; infra, § 896.

[3] Supra, § 383; Jennings *v.* Com., 105 Mass. 586. In California, a verdict, "guilty as charged in the indictment," when an indictment is for an offence, containing two or more grades, was once held to be void for uncertainty. People *v.* Baza, 53 Cal. 690.

But, as sustaining such a verdict for the higher grade, see People *v.* Gilbert, 60 Cal. 108; People *v.* Whiteley, 64 Cal. 211.

On a count for burglary and larceny, a general verdict of guilty has been held to apply only to the burglary.[1]

The proper course, on such a trial, is for the jury, if they convict of the minor offence alone, to find a verdict of guilty of the minor, and not guilty of the major, but a verdict of guilty of the minor is treated as involving an acquittal of the major.[2]

In what case, on a count for a felony or other consummated offence, the jury can convict of an assault or attempt, is elsewhere considered.[3]

When several articles are joined in the same count for larceny, the verdict may go to either.[4] In libel, on a count charging composing and publishing, the defendant may be found guilty of publishing.[5] In mayhem, the defendant, if an assault be averred, may be convicted of an assault.[6] A conviction for assault may be had on an indictment for assaulting an officer.[7]

IV. ADJOURNMENT OF COURT PRIOR TO.

§ 743. In addition to the points thus recapitulated, the following may now be noticed:—

§ 744. Even where the jury are to be kept together, without intercourse with third parties, until they agree, this is not the case with the judges, who may adjourn, and return to receive the verdict in open court.[8] Such is the necessary practice in cases where the trial continues over a day.[9] It would seem, also, that the court, in minor offences, may order the clerk to discharge the jury if they do not agree by a specific hour; and that a verdict subsequent to such hour will be set aside.[10]

Court may adjourn during deliberation of jury.

In some States a verdict may be received after the close of the term.[11]

[1] Roberts *v.* State, 55 Miss. 421. See, however, Watkins *v.* State, 37 Ark. 370.

[2] See supra, § 465.

[3] Supra, §§ 249, 261, and cases cited in prior notes to this section.

[4] Supra, §§ 252, 470; Bell *v.* State, 48 Ala. 684.

[5] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 134.

[6] Com. *v.* Blaney, 133 Mass. 371.

[7] People *v.* Warren, 53 Mich. 78. Supra, § 158.

[8] See infra, §§ 818–20.

[9] 4 Black. Com. 361.

[10] Com. *v.* Townsend, 5 Allen, 216; Mass. Law Reg. October, 1863, cited Hilliard on New Tr. (1873) 238.

[11] Supra, § 513.

V. SPECIAL VERDICT.

Jury may find special verdict.

§ 745. The jury are not confined to finding a verdict of "guilty" or "not guilty" on the general issue. They may find a special verdict setting forth the facts, and finding the defendant guilty or not guilty, as the court may decide.[1] "This," says Blackstone, "is where they *doubt* the matter of the law, and therefore *choose* to leave it to the determination of the court, though they have an unquestioned right of determining upon all the circumstances and finding a general verdict, if they think proper so to hazard a breach of their oaths." But this admonition fell without much effect on English practice; and now special verdicts are very rare.[2] The right to find such a verdict, however, continues to be recognized.[3]

[1] State *v.* Stewart, 91 N. C. 566; see article in 10 Cr. L. Mag. 11.

[2] See R. *v.* Suffolk, 5 N. & M. 139; R. *v.* Hughes, 1 H. & W. 313; compare R. *v.* Francis, 2 Stra. 1015; Peterson *v.* U. S., 2 Wash. C. C. 36; Com. *v.* Squires, 97 Mass. 59; McGuffie *v.* State, 17 Ga. 497. "The jury have a right in all criminal cases to find a special verdict. Such verdict must state positively the facts themselves, and not merely the *evidence* adduced to prove them, and all the facts necessary to enable the court to give judgment must be found; for the court cannot supply by intendment or implication any defect in the statement. 2 Hawk. c. 47, s. 9; 2 East P. C. 708, 784. See R. *v.* Francis, 2 Stra. 1015; R. *v.* Royce, 4 Burr. 2073; 1 Chit. Crim. L. 643; State *v.* Fooks, 65 Iowa, 196; People *v.* Antonis, 27 Cal. 404.

"Thus where the indictment alleged that the defendant discharged a gun against the deceased, and thereby gave him a mortal wound, and the special verdict stated only that the defendant discharged a gun and thereby killed the deceased, not stating in terms that it was discharged *against* him; it was held that the court could not give any judgment *against* the defendant. R. *v.* Plummer, Kel. 111." Archbold's C. P. 17th ed. 164. As to other cases of special verdicts, see R. *v.* Dawson, 1 Stra. 19; R. *v.* Francis, 2 Stra. 1015; R. *v.* Morgan, 1 Bulst. 87; R. *v.* Keite, 1 Ld. Ray, 142.

"A special verdict is not amendable as to matters of fact; but a mere error of form may be amended, even as it seems, in capital cases, in order to fulfil the evident intention of the jury, where there is any note or minute to amend by. 2 Hawk. c. 47, s. 9; R. *v.* Hayes, 2 Stra. 844; R. *v.* Hazel, 1 Leach, 382; R. *v.* Woodfall, 5 Burr. 2661. If three offences are charged in the indictment, and the special verdict state evidence which applies to two of them only, the court may adjudge the defendant guilty of those two, and enter

[3] Com. *v.* Call, 21 Pick. 509; Lewer *v.* Com., 15 S. & R. 93; Com. *v.* Chathams, 50 Penn. St. 181. As to Louisiana practice, see State *v.* Jessie, 30 La. An. Pt. II. 1170. That verdict must conform to statute, see State *v.* Smith, 46 N. J. L. 491.

§ 746. In stating a special verdict the facts must be summed up fully and exactly as on a special plea, and the omission of any fact (*e. g.*, venue or intent) necessary to constitute the offence is fatal,[1] since the court cannot supply from its own knowledge any material fact which the jury should find;[2] and the practice is, when the verdict is in violent antagonism to the evidence, to set it aside and grant a new trial, if applied for by the defendant.[3] If, however, the verdict

Verdict must be full and exact.

an acquittal as to the residue. R. *v.* Hayes, supra. The court cannot, however, on an indictment for felony, adjudge the defendant guilty of a misdemeanor. R. *v.* Westbeer, 2 Stra. 1133. But where it appears clearly from the facts stated in the special verdict, that the defendant has been guilty of a crime, though not of the degree charged upon him in the indictment, the court will not discharge him, but direct a fresh indictment to be preferred. R. *v.* Francis, 2 Stra. 1015. Where the verdict is so imperfect that no judgment can be given upon it, a *venire de novo* may, in misdemeanor, be awarded. R. *v.* Woodfall, 5 Burr. 2661; and also, notwithstanding previous doubts upon the subject, in felonies. Campbell *v.* R., 11 Q. B. 799; 17 L. J. (M. C.) 89; in which case, says Blackburn, J., delivering judgment in Winsor *v.* R., 35 L. J. (M. C.) 133, 'there is a solemn decision of the Queen's Bench, not reversed or questioned, that a *venire de novo* will lie in a felony on an imperfect verdict.'

"In cases of felony, the court may enter a judgment of acquittal, where the facts found by the special verdict do not warrant a judgment *against* the defendant. See R. *v.* Huggins, 2 Ld. Raym. 1585; but this will be no bar to another prosecution for the same felony. R. *v.* Burridge, 3 P. Wms. 480; Com. Dig. Indictment (N.)," Jervis's Archbold, 17th ed. (1871) 164. See, also, article in the London Law Times of Dec. 6, 1884, p. 92.

Upon an indictment for stealing a watch, the jury returned the following verdict: "We find the prisoner not guilty of stealing the watch, but guilty of keeping it, in the hope of reward, from the time he first had the watch." It was ruled by the Court of Criminal Appeal, that this finding amounted to a verdict of "not guilty." R. *v.* York, 1 Den. C. C. R. 335; S. C., 18 L. J. (M. C.) 38.

[1] Com. *v.* Call, 21 Pick. 509; State *v.* Blue, 84 N. C. 807; Clay *v.* State, 43 Ala. 350. See R. *v.* Dawson, 1 Stra. 19, and cases cited infra, § 756. As to form, see 1 Chit. C. L. 645; State *v.* Newby, 64 N. C. 23; State *v.* Curtis, 71 N. C. 56.

[2] This applies even to averment of negatives. Com. *v.* Dooly, 6 Gray, 360. That the verdict must be confined to the facts proved, see further R. *v.* Huggins, 2 Ld. Raym. 1574; Wall, ex parte, 73 Ind. 95; Gaunt *v.* State, 81 Ind. 137.

[3] R. *v.* Maloney, 9 Cox C. C. 6; R. *v.* Meaney, L. & C. 213; 9 Cox C. C. 231; Com. *v.* Call, 21 Pick. 509; Com. *v.* Lewer, 15 S. & R. 93; Arthur *v.* State, 21 Iowa, 322; State *v.* Izard, 14 Richards. 209. In R. *v.* Woodfall, 5 Burr. 2661, it was held that a new trial would be granted on a defective verdict, and this was followed in the cases cited above. See infra, §§ 754–6.

in itself does not find facts from which guilt can be inferred, this is equivalent to a verdict of not guilty.[1] Where a special verdict substantially avers facts constituting guilt, the court can pronounce upon the guilt of the defendant as a question of law; but if the facts found are equivocal, and are consistent with innocence, then the court cannot determine as a question of law the guilt or innocence of the defendant.[2] Thus in an information under the ninth section of the Internal Revenue Act, which enacts that any person who shall issue any instrument, etc., for the payment of money, without the same being duly stamped, with intent to evade the provisions of this act, shall forfeit and pay, etc., an intent to evade is of the essence of the offence, and no judgment can be entered on a special verdict which does not find such intent.[3]

Surplusage in a special verdict may be disregarded.[4]

When a special verdict is defective, a *venire de novo* will be ordered.[5]

In Louisiana the only verdicts can be "guilty" or "not guilty."[6]

VI. HOW VERDICT IS RENDERED.

General verdict is by word of mouth.

§ 747. The usual mode of rendering a general verdict is by word of mouth. A *written* general verdict is irregular, and the court may reject it, and require it to be made orally.[7] In cases of felony, at least, an oral rendering by the foreman is essential.[8] The jury, when they have agreed, signify the fact by the foreman, and the clerk, directing the defendant to stand up, or to lift up his hand, addresses the jury and the defendant as follows: "Prisoner, look on the jury; jury, look on the prisoner: How say ye; is the prisoner guilty of the felony (or offence) whereof he stands indicted, or not guilty?"

[1] State *v.* Custer, 65 N. C. 339; Short *v.* State, 7 Yerg. 339; see People *v.* Piper, 50 Mich. 390.

[2] R. *v.* Francis, 2 Stra. 1015; State *v.* Curtis, 71 N. C. 56; State *v.* Bray, 89 N. C. 480.

[3] U. S. *v.* Buzzo, 18 Wall. 125.

[4] U. S. *v.* Stereoscopic Shades, Sprague, 467; Wallace *v.* State, 2 Lea, 29.

[5] State *v.* Bray, 89 N. C. 480.

[6] State *v.* Jurche, 17 La. An. 71.

[7] Lord *v.* State, 16 N. H. 325; Traube *v.* State, 56 Miss. 154; Timmons *v.* State, 56 Miss. 786. As to Ohio statute requiring written verdicts, see Hardy *v.* State, 19 Ohio St. 579. As to Wisconsin, see State *v.* Glass, 50 Wis. 218. As to Louisiana, see State v. Ross, 32 La. An. 854.

[8] Com. *v.* Tobin, 125 Mass. 203.

The foreman, if there be a special verdict, reads it, or if the verdict be general, states it, "guilty," or "not guilty," as the case may be.[1] The clerk then records the verdict, and again addresses the jury: "Hearken to your verdict as the court hath recorded it: You say that A. B. is guilty (or not guilty) of the felony (or offence) whereof he stands indicted, and so you say all." This last declaration of the clerk is important, as fixing the character of the verdict, and preventing misconception.[2]

The verdict "guilty" is assumed to refer to the indictment to which it is a response.[3]

The procedure must be in open court, and in defendant's presence.[4]

§ 748. That the verdict should be recorded is essential; but this may be done *nunc pro tunc* at a subsequent term.[5] That it was entered after the jury was discharged, at least in minor offences, gives no ground for exception if they gave it in and assented to it before discharge.[6] If the record shows that less than twelve jurors assented, this is fatal.[7]

Must be recorded.

VII. SEALED VERDICT.

§ 749. In misdemeanors, and in some States in felonies not capital,[8] the court may, with (and in some States without) the defendant's consent, permit the jury, after rendering a written verdict, to separate, and bring in such verdict when sealed into the court when it reassembles.[9] But though in such case the defendant may agree to a

In misdemeanors sealed verdict may be rendered.

[1] Rollins *v.* State, 62 Ind. 46. In Louisiana the verdict may be rendered by any one of the jury without the appointment of a foreman. State *v.* Faulk, 30 La. An. Pt. II. 831.

[2] Com. *v.* Gibson, 2 Va. Cas. 70.

[3] Bond *v.* People, 39 Ill. 26.

[4] Supra, § 549; Com. *v.* Tobin, 125 Mass. 203; State *v.* Epps, 76 N. C. 55; Stubbs *v.* State, 49 Miss. 716; Finch *v.* State, 53 Miss. 363; State *v.* Mills, 19 Ark. 476.

[5] Hall *v.* State, 3 Kelly, 18. See State *v.* Levy, 24 Minn. 362; People *v.* Smith, 59 Cal. 601.

[6] State *v.* Levy, 24 Minn. 362. See People *v.* Gilbert, 57 Cal. 96.

[7] State *v.* Meyers, 68 Mo. 266. Supra, § 733.

[8] See Sanders *v.* State, 2 Iowa, 230, 278.

[9] Anonymous, 63 Me. 590; Com. *v.* Carrington, 116 Mass. 37; Com. *v.* Costello, 128 Mass. 88; Com. *v.* Boyle, 9 Phila. 592; Barlow *v.* State, 2 Blackf. 114; Bradley *v.* State, 31 Ind. 492; Reins *v.* People, 30 Ill. 256; U. S. *v.* Potter, 6 McLean, 186. That defendant's consent is necessary, see People *v.* Kelly, 46 Cal. 357. As to separation, see infra, § 818.

As to form of sealed verdict, see Com. *v.* Carrington, 116 Mass. 37.

sealed verdict, it is error to permit the jury to leave such verdict with the clerk.[1] The defendant is entitled to have them present at its rendition.[2] The verdict must be written and sealed before the separation.[3] If informal, it may be returned to the jury for correction.[4]

That a verdict is not signed, its genuineness being undisputed, is no ground for new trial.[5]

VIII. POLLING THE JURY.

Jury may be polled by either party.

§ 750. Either party may require that the jury, after announcing their verdict,[6] shall be polled, *i. e.*, that the name of each juryman shall be specially called, and the question as to the defendant's guilt or innocence propounded to him individually; though in some jurisdictions the question proposed simply is, "Is this your verdict?"[7] The same power resides in the court of its own motion.[8] If any juryman dissent from

[1] In Com. *v.* Tobin, 125 Mass. 203, the jury upon a trial for manslaughter, being still out when the court adjourned for the day, were told by the court that they seal up their verdict and separate when they should agree, and bring it into court the next morning. This they did, and the sealed verdict was handed by the foreman of the jury to the clerk of the court, the prisoner being present. The clerk stated to them in the usual form that they found the prisoner guilty, and that this was their verdict. No response was made to this by the jury or their foreman, and nothing more was said. The proceedings were held by the Supreme Court to be erroneous. S. P., State *v.* Hornsby, 32 La. An. 1268. See R. *v.* Parkin, 1 Moody, 45; R. *v.* Vodden, 6 Cox C. C. 226; Com. *v.* Durfee, 100 Mass. 146; Com. *v.* Carrington, 116 Mass. 37.

[2] U. S. *v.* Potter, 6 McLean, 186; Doyle *v.* U. S., 10 Fed. Rep. 269; 11 Biss. 100; Wright *v.* State, 11 Ind. 569. See Martin *v.* Morelock, 32 Ill. 485; Fisher *v.* People, 23 Ill. 283; Stewart *v.* People, 32 Mich. 63. Supra, § 549.

[3] Com. *v.* Doremus, 108 Mass. 488.

[4] Sargent *v.* State, 11 Ohio, 472.

[5] Roberts *v.* State, 14 Ga. 8. See U. S. *v.* Bennett, 16 Blatch. C. C. 338.

[6] State *v.* Sheets, 89 N. C. 543.

[7] U. S. *v.* Potter, 6 McLean, 182; People *v.* Perkins, 1 Wend. 91; Williams *v.* State, 60 Md. 402; Sargent *v.* State, 11 Ohio, 472; Wright *v.* State, 11 Ind. 569; State *v.* Callahan, 55 Iowa, 364; John *v.* State, 8 Ired. 330; State *v.* Young, 77 N. C. 498; Tilton *v.* State, 52 Ga. 478; James *v.* State, 55 Miss. 57; State *v.* Austin, 6 Wis. 205. As to mode of polling, see Williams *v.* State, 60 Md. 402; Russell *v.* State, 68 Ga. 785; Prior *v.* State, 77 Ala. 750.

[8] Harris *v.* State, 31 Ark. 196.

How far the question of polling the jury relates to that of grades of offence, see Williams *v.* State, 60 Md. 402, and cases cited infra, § 752.

the verdict previously expressed, then it is a nullity, and the jury must again retire for deliberation,[1] though it is otherwise if the dissent be withdrawn,[2] or if it consists in a mere expression of prior doubt not inconsistent with acquiescence.[3]

In Maine, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, under the practice by which the jury are asked orally whether each assents to the verdict, polling is held not to be a matter of right;[4] and such is the view now taken in South Carolina.[5] And this distinction is applicable to all States in which the practice is for the clerk to call upon the jurors individually as well as collectively for their verdict.

The better view is that when a sealed verdict is rendered the jury may be polled.[6] The right continues until the jury is finally dismissed.[7]

IX. AMENDING VERDICT.

§ 751. Until the jury are discharged, the verdict may be amended. After they are discharged and separate, however, it is too late.[8] And if there is any informality, Verdict may be

[1] 2 Hale P. C. 299; R. *v.* Vodden, Dears. C. C. 229; 6 Cox C. C. 226; R. *v.* Parkin, 1 Moody C. C. 45; Nomaque *v.* People, Breese, 109; State *v.* Hardin, 1 Bailey, 3; State *v.* Brister, 26 Ala. 107; Burk *v.* Com., 5 J. J. Marshall, 676; Hilliard on New Trials (1873), 242.

[2] Gose *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 121. See supra, § 749; State *v.* Sheets, *ut sup.*

[3] State *v.* McKinney, 31 Kan. 571; Gose *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 121.

[4] Fellow's case, 5 Greenl. 333; Com. *v.* Roby, 12 Pick. 496; Com. *v.* Costley, 118 Mass. 1; State *v.* Hoyt, 47 Conn. 518.

[5] State *v.* Wise, 7 Richards. 412.

[6] U. S. *v.* Potter, 6 McLean, 86; Wright *v.* State, 11 Ind. 569; Stewart *v.* People, 23 Mich. 63; James *v.* State, 55 Miss. 57.

For criticisms, see 1 Crim. Law Mag. 7; 1 South. Law Jour. (N. S.) 9, and 10 Cent. L. J. 1. In Brown *v.* State, 63 Ala. 97, it was held that a defendant by agreeing to a sealed verdict waives his right to poll. See to same effect, U. S. *v.* Bridges, U. S. Cir. Ct. Ala. 1879; 1 South. Law Jour. (N. S.) 8; 10 Cent. L. J. 7. As to allowance of polling after sealed verdict, see U. S. *v.* Bennett, 16 Blatch. C. C. 338. And see Doyle *v.* U. S., 10 Fed. Rep. 269; 11 Biss. 100. Absence of counsel does not vitiate. People *v.* Bennett, 65 Cal. 267.

[7] Williams *v.* State, 63 Ga. 306. See Russell *v.* State, 68 Ga. 785. But see U. S. *v.* Bridges; Brown *v.* State, supra.

[8] R. *v.* Vodden, 6 Cox C. C. 226; Dears. C. C. 229; Sargent *v.* State, 11 Ohio, 473. See Com. *v.* Lang, 10 Gray, 11; Nemo *v.* Com., 2 Grat. 558; Mitchell *v.* State, 22 Ga. 211; Burk *v.* Com., 5 J. J. Marsh. 675; People *v.* Ah Ye, 31 Cal. 451. As transcending the rule above given, see Price *v.* Com., 33 Grat. 819. And see State *v.* Disch, 34 La. An. 1032.

amended before discharge of jury.

uncertainty, or impropriety about a verdict, the court may require the jury to amend it before they separate.[1] Even where a verdict of "not guilty" was pronounced by one of the jurors, which was entered by the clerk in the minute-book, and the prisoner discharged, it was held that upon it appearing that the verdict the jury intended was "guilty," the record could be immediately amended, the verdict "guilty" recorded, and the prisoner committed.[2] Mere formal incompleteness of verdict may be supplied by record.[3] We will presently see that a defective verdict is no bar to further proceedings.[4]

X. DESIGNATION OF DEGREE OR OF PUNISHMENT.

§ 752. Where a statute requires in the verdict a designation of a degree, or the specific assessment of a punishment, a general verdict, without such designation or assessment, will be a nullity, and if the jury are discharged, a second trial may be instituted, except in those jurisdictions where constitutional limitations are held to stand in the way.[5] The designation must be specific and in conformity with statute.[6] But

Such designation must be specific.

[1] R. *v.* Meany, L. & C. 213; 9 Cox, 231; Com. *v.* Chauncy, 2 Ashm. 91; Nemo *v.* Com., 2 Grat. 558; Cook *v.* State, 26 Ga. 593; State *v.* Waterman, 1 Nev. 543; People *v.* Bonney, 19 Cal. 426; Gibson *v.* State, 38 Miss. 295; Ford *v.* State, 34 Ark. 649; Stell *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 59. "The practice of directing a jury to reconsider their verdict, or ordering a *venire de novo*, is a harsh rule of the common law, which has been so far relaxed as not to apply to cases where the verdict in terms or effect amounts to an acquittal." Ashe, J., State *v.* Whitaker, 89 N. C. 473.

[2] R. *v.* Vodden, Dears. C. C. 229; 6 Cox C. C. 226.

To recall a jury immediately after rendering a verdict, to amend it, is not causing such a separation as avoids the verdict, though the jury were told they were discharged, and though the defendant objected to the recalling. Lovells *v.* State, 32 Ark. 585; Mitchell *v.* State, 22 Ga. 211. To same effect, R. *v.* Parkin, 1 Mood. C. C. 45. The verdict, as amended, is that which is to be recorded. R. *v.* Parkin, 1 Moody C. C. 45; Com. *v.* Dowling, 114 Mass. 259.

[3] McInturf *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 230.

[4] Infra, §§ 756, 763.

[5] Cropper *v.* U. S., Morris, 259; Com. *v.* McGrath, 115 Mass. 150; Williams *v.* State, 60 Md. 402; Dick *v.* State, 3 Ohio St. 89; Parks *v.* State, 3 Ohio St. 101; Com. *v.* Hatton, 3 Grat. 623; Com. *v.* Scott, 5 Grat. 697; Robertson *v.* State, 42 Ala. 509; State *v.* McCue, 39 Mo. 112; People *v.* Littlefield, 5 Cal. 356; People *v.* Welsh, 49 Cal. 174; People *v.* Brickley, 49 Cal. 241. See Eastman *v.* State, 54 Ind. 441; State *v.* Bean, 21 Mo. 269; Dubois *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 418; and cases cited infra, § 756.

[6] Hughes *v.* State, 65 Ind. 39; Wil-

when the indictment is for a single degree, a verdict of guilty as charged is a sufficient designation.[1] A verdict imposing a greater punishment than that authorized by law is void;[2] nor can the court ordinarily reduce a punishment so assessed,[3] unless the assessment be divisible, in which case the illegal branch of the assessment may be stricken off.[4] A punishment less than the statutory will ordinarily be sustained on error.[5]

A verdict for an "attempt" will not support a judgment for "assault."[6]

Where two defendants are jointly convicted and a fine imposed for the offence, this is a finding for the whole amount against each defendant.[7]

The designation of degrees in homicide is elsewhere noticed.[8]

Joint defendants may be convicted of different degrees.[9]

XI. VALUATION OF PROPERTY.

§ 753. It has elsewhere been seen[10] that wherever the sentence is affected by the value of property stolen, it is in the power of the jury, if they find the valuation in the indictment erroneous, to find a special valuation, which will bind the court. But it is not necessary, at common law for the jury in any case to value the chattels in larceny; and though they have undoubtedly the power to do so if they choose, yet a general verdict of guilty is an affirmation of the value stated in the indictment, and is therefore, for this purpose, sufficient.[11] In some States, it is true, the practice prevails for the jury, in

Jury may find a special valuation.

liams *v.* State, 60 Md. 402; People *v.* Travers, 73 Cal. 580. See Timmons *v.* State, 56 Miss. 786. That presumption is for lower degree, see Martin *v.* State, 46 Ark. 38.

[1] Anderson *v.* State, 65 Ala. 553.

[2] Cropper *v.* U. S., Morris, 259; Allen *v.* Com., 2 Leigh, 737; Ah Cha, ex parte, 40 Cal. 426.

[3] Cole *v.* People, 84 Ill. 216.

[4] Infra, §§ 780, 918, 927. So in Michigan. Wilson *v.* People, 24 Mich. 410. Infra, § 927.

[5] Infra, § 918.

[6] Fox *v.* State, 34 Ohio St. 377.

[7] Infra, § 940; Bennett *v.* State, 30 Tex. 521.

[8] Infra, § 914; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 543.

[9] Klein *v.* People, 31 N. Y. 229; Mickey *v.* Com., 9 Bush, 593. Supra, § 304; infra, § 755; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 236, 541.

[10] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 953.

[11] See as to Texas practice, Collins *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 647.

larceny and the kindred offences, to value the chattels;[1] but unless this is required by statute valuation is superfluous.

XII. WHEN COURT MAY REFUSE TO RECEIVE VERDICT.

Palpably wrong verdict may be rejected by court.

§ 754. In England the practice has been for the court, when a verdict plainly contradicts the evidence, or is founded on mistake of law, to refuse to receive it, and to direct the jury to take it back and reconsider it with renewed instructions. This course, for instance, has been followed in cases where the evidence required a verdict of either murder or of not guilty, but where the jury found manslaughter.[2] The course of refusing to receive a verdict, under such circumstances, may be traced to the fact that in England it is not the practice to revise verdicts by motions for new trial. In this country, however, where new trials are granted in all cases where a defendant is wronged by a verdict, it is unusual for a judge thus peremptorily to interfere.[3] But where a statute requires the jury to find the degree, then a general verdict will be refused by the court, and a verdict finding the degree directed.[4] And so where the verdict is insensible, and an amendment is required,[5] or where the verdict is not as to the offence charged.[6] In such case the jury is to be sent back, and directed to return a responsive verdict.[7]

XIII. WHEN THERE ARE SEVERAL DEFENDANTS.

Defendants may be severed in finding.

§ 755. The law in this respect, as has been already stated,[8] may be thus recapitulated. When the charge is for a *single* offence, one defendant cannot be found guilty of one part of the charge, and the other defendant of another part. It is otherwise, however, when the offence is

[1] Locke *v.* State, 32 N. H. 106; Highland *v.* People, 1 Scam. 392; Case *v.* State, 26 Ala. 17; State *v.* Redman, 17 Iowa, 329. As to Mississippi, see Shines *v.* State, 42 Miss. 331.

[2] R. *v.* Meany, 1 Leigh & C. 213; 9 Cox C. C. 231. See, for other cases, supra, § 746. As to directing acquittal or conviction, see infra, § 805.

[3] Supra, §§ 751, 752; State *v.* Shule, 10 Ired. 153; but compare State *v.* Underwood, 2 Ala. 745; State *v.* McGregg, 4 Blackf. 101; Heacock *v.* State, 42 Ind. 393; Arnold *v.* State, 51 Ga. 144; Alston *v.* State, 41 Tex. 39.

[4] People *v.* Bonney, 19 Cal. 426. Supra, §§ 751, 752.

[5] Supra, §§ 751, 752.

[6] State *v.* Bishop, 73 N. C. 44.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Supra, §§ 313, 314.

capable of being divided into stages, as where the charge is burglary and larceny, in which case one defendant may be convicted of the larceny and the other of the burglary.[1]

In riot and conspiracy, as has been seen, there cannot be a conviction of a single defendant, coupled with an acquittal of co-defendants, unless there is an allegation and proof of the coöperation of parties not indicted.[2]

A conviction of a joint offence, it must also be kept in mind, can only be on evidence of joint guilt.[3] Adultery, however, when the woman was unconscious, is not a joint offence in this sense.[4]

Convictions of co-defendants are several,[5] and the verdicts may be separate.[6]

The non-trial of one defendant cannot be excepted to by another.[7]

XIV. DEFECTIVE VERDICT.

§ 756. A verdict defective in omitting an essential ingredient is a nullity,[8] and is no bar, as we have already seen, to a second trial on the same indictment, if there be no constitutional prohibition.[9] It was in the power of the defendant to have it corrected at the time it was rendered; and if he fail to do this, he cannot afterwards take advantage of his own laches.[10] An insensible verdict, also, can be arrested on appli-

Defective verdict may be inoperative.

[1] Supra, §§ 312–15; infra, § 874; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 136.

[2] Supra, §§ 305, 312; Whart. on Ev. § 131; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 82, 1388 *et seq.*

[3] Supra, § 315.

[4] Com. *v.* Bakeman, 131 Mass. 577.

[5] Supra, § 314; Mask *v.* State, 32 Miss. 406. As to defective verdict, see People *v.* Sepulveda, 59 Cal. 342; infra, § 756.

[6] Supra, § 313; Cruce *v.* State, 59 Ga. 84; State *v.* Bradley, 30 La. An. Pt. I. 326.

[7] Supra, § 313.

[8] Supra, §§ 746, 752; Com. *v.* Walsh, 132 Mass. 8; Thedge *v.* State, 83 Ind. 126; State *v.* Whitaker, 89 N. C. 472; State *v.* Bray, 89 N. C. 480; State *v.* Newson, 13 W. Va. 859; Doran *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 385.

[9] R. *v.* Woodfall, 5 Burr. 2661; Campbell *v.* R., 11 Q. B. 799; State *v.* Scannel, 39 Me. 68; Com. *v.* Call, 21 Pick. 509; Wilson *v.* State, 20 Ohio, 26; Marshall *v.* Com., 5 Grat. 663; State *v.* Ragsdale, 10 Lea, 671 (cited infra, § 785); Webber *v.* State, 10 Mo. 5; Gipson *v.* State, 38 Miss. 295; and cases cited to §§ 518, 752. Mere clerical errors will not make a verdict insensible. Kellum *v.* State, 64 Miss. 226; People *v.* Boggs, 20 Cal. 432; Stewart *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 527; Williams *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 226; Tayler *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 569.

[10] Supra, § 751; State *v.* Balk, 76 N. C. 10; State *v.* Blue, 84 N. C. 807; Clay *v.* State, 43 Ala. 350; supra, § 746. As to arresting judgment, see infra, § 762.

cation of the defendant.[1] But mere redundancy or surplusage does not vitiate[2] provided the verdict be responsive;[3] nor does misspelling, so long as the sense can be ascertained.[4] But it has been held that a verdict of "murder in the *fist* degree," when the statute requires the degree to be specified, is a nullity.[5] And so when on an indictment against two defendants the verdict found simply "the defendant" guilty.[6] A prisoner, after conviction, is not entitled to be discharged on *habeas corpus* on the ground that the verdict was defective. His relief must be by motion to set aside the verdict, or for arrest of judgment, or, afterwards, by writ of error.[7]

[1] Supra, § 752; infra, §§ 754, 763; State *v.* Whitaker, 89 N. C. 473. David *v.* State, 40 Ala. 69. See Westbrook *v.* State, 52 Miss. 777. As to statutory prescriptions, see Harwell *v.* State, 22 Tex. Ap. 251; People *v.* Coch, 53 Cal. 607. As to *venire de novo* in such cases, see State *v.* Bray, 89 N. C. 480.

A special verdict, finding the defendant guilty of the same facts as those charged in the indictment, but not finding him guilty in the county where the offence was laid, cannot be supported, and the defendant must again be put on his trial. Com. *v.* Call, 21 Pick. 509; supra, § 745. On the other hand, on an indictment for receiving goods, knowing them to be burglariously stolen, etc., a verdict of guilty of receiving the goods, knowing them to have been stolen, but not burglariously stolen, was held sufficient to sustain a sentence. Dyer *v.* Com., 23 Pick. 402; supra, §§ 255, 746.

It is no ground for arrest of judgment that the defendants were convicted of different degrees of homicide (supra, § 755); but otherwise when the verdict is for an offence not being necessarily included in the indictment. State *v.* Scannel, 39 Me. 68. But for a wrong verdict the remedy is to move to set aside or to move for a new trial. State *v.* Snow, 74 Me. 354; State *v.* Watts, 10 Ired. 369; State *v.* Curtis, 71 N. C. 56.

Judgment will not be arrested under the Massachusetts act on an indictment for larceny of "sundry bank bills, of the aggregate value of $367," merely because the verdict was "guilty of stealing sundry bank bills of the value of $317," and not guilty as to the residue. Com. *v.* Duffy, 11 Cush. 145.

[2] Veatch *v.* State, 60 Ind. 291; Traube *v.* State, 56 Miss. 153.

[3] State *v.* Disch, 34 La. An. 1134; State *v.* Murdock, 35 La. An. 729; Terr. *v.* Do., 1 Ariz. 507.

[4] Supra, §§ 273 *et seq.*; State *v.* Smith, 35 La. An. 1414; Koontz *v.* State, 41 Tex. 570; Haney *v.* State, 2 Tex. Ap. 504; Hoy *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 32; Wilson *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 481; Walker *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 618.

[5] Wooldridge *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 443.

[6] People *v.* Sepulveda, 59 Cal. 342.

[7] Infra, § 763; Waller *v.* State, 40 Ala. 325, 333; Dover *v.* State, 75 Ala. 40. As to waiver of formal defects, see State *v.* Fenlason, 78 Me. 495.

XV. RECOMMENDATION TO MERCY.

§ 757. The recommendation for mercy, when added to a verdict of guilty of an offence whose punishment is at the discretion of the court, is an appeal, in the first place, to the court,[1] and afterwards to the pardoning authorities. But the recommendation is no part of the verdict, either in capital or non-capital offences.[2] When, however, the court, as in capital cases, has no discretion as to the degree of punishment, the recommendation, as a mere collateral petition from the jury, is sent to the pardoning authorities direct.[3]

Such recommendation not obligatory.

[1] Infra, § 942.

[2] Stephens *v.* State, 51 Ga. 328. See State *v.* Vasquez, 16 Nev. 42.

[3] In Com. *v.* Pomeroy, 117 Mass. 143, the jury returned with their verdict of guilty, this paper, signed by all the jurors: "The jury recommend that the sentence be commuted to imprisonment for life on account of his youth." A general verdict of guilty was entered, and the defendant alleged exceptions to other rulings at the trial, but not to this, which on argument to the full court were subsequently overruled (117 Mass. 143), and the defendant sentenced to death. Application was then made to the governor and council for a pardon. A certified copy of the record of the conviction and sentence was transmitted to the governor, and the *original* return of the jury, given above, with another paper also, returned at the same time, giving the grounds of the verdict. The justices of the court were then inquired of by the governor and council whether "the papers so transmitted were a part of the judicial proceedings in said case, or of the record thereof, and what is their legal relation thereto." To which they unanimously answered: "A memorandum of the ground of the verdict, or of a recommendation to mercy, presented by the jury to the judges, cannot affect the manner of returning, recording, or affirming the verdict, or the form of the sentence; and, in law, forms no part of the judicial proceedings in the case, or of the record thereof, and has no legal relation to the judicial proceedings or record." "See Opinion of the Justices, 120 Mass. 600 (1876). In the Park Lane Murder case, Ann. Reg. 1872, p. 209, the defendant was convicted of murder, but 'strongly recommended to mercy on the ground that there was no premeditation in the act.' But Baron Channell said, 'it would be his duty to send the recommendation to mercy to the proper quarter, but at present all he had to do was to pass upon her the sentence of the law,' and she was sentenced to death in the usual form. In People *v.* Lee, 17 Cal. 76, the defendant was convicted of murder in the first degree, with a recommendation to mercy. The court directed the verdict to be entered without the recommendation, which, on appeal, was sustained, the court saying: 'The recommendation was addressed solely to the court, and constituted no part of the verdict.' See, also, State *v.* O'Brien, 22 La. An. 27; State *v.* Bradley, 6 Ibid. 560. In State *v.* Potter, 15 Kans. 303, the verdict as returned was 'guilty of murder in the

Not vitiated by being rendered on Sunday or holiday.

§ 758. The mere fact of a verdict being found and rendered on Sunday will not vitiate it when it is received and recorded on the next day.[1] Holding court on a legal holiday is a matter of discretion in the trial court.[2]

second degree,' and with it these words, 'and we recommend his punishment to be the least amount allowed by law.' The court declined to receive the verdict in that form, and handed the jury another blank, which was duly signed and returned by them without those words. This was held no error." See note to Eason *v.* State, 17 Am. Law Reg. 313; S. C., 6 Baxt. 466; from which the above is condensed.

In Eason *v.* State, the Supreme Court of Tennessee ruled that the finding by one jury in a murder case of "guilty, with mitigating circumstances," where the court disregards the finding, and sentences the prisoner to the extreme penalty, does not bind a different jury in a subsequent trial, which may, on the contrary, find a verdict of "guilty" without mitigation.

[1] Meece *v.* Com., 78 Ky. 586; Chamblee *v.* State, 78 Ala. 466; State *v.* Ford, 37 La. An. 344.

[2] State *v.* Sorenson, 32 Minn. 109.

CHAPTER XVI.

MOTION IN ARREST OF JUDGMENT.

At common law most demurrable exceptions may be taken on motion in arrest, § 759.
Informalities are cured by verdict, § 760.
Misnomer no ground, § 761.
Under statute right is restricted, § 762.
Insensible verdict will be arrested, § 763.
Pendency of prior indictment no ground for arrest, § 764.
Otherwise as to statute of limitations, § 765.
But not irregularities of jury, § 766.
Time and mode of motion is limited, § 767.
Sentencing defendant is equivalent to discharge of motion, § 768.

§ 759. At common law, and until 7th Geo. 4, c. 64, ss. 20, 21, and the corresponding statutes in this country,[1] any objection which would have been fatal in demurrer was (with exceptions to be presently noticed) equally fatal on motion in arrest of judgment.[2] Judgment, however, can only be arrested for matter appearing on the record;[3] though the motion is not confined to the indictment alone, as it obtains if any part of the record is imperfect, repugnant,

At common law, most demurrable exceptions can be taken on motion in arrest.

[1] See supra, §§ 90 *et seq.*

[2] 4 Bl. Com. 324; Burn's J., Indict. xi.; 1 Ch. C. L. 442, 663; State *v.* Putnam, 38 Me. 296; State *v.* Bangor, 38 Me. 592; Com. *v.* Morse, 2 Mass. 128, 130; Brown *v.* Com., 8 Mass. 59, 65; Com. *v.* Child, 13 Pick. 198; State *v.* Doyle, 11 R. I. 574; Francois *v.* State, 20 Ala. 83; Martin *v.* State, 28 Ala. 71; Tipper *v.* Com., 1 Metc. (Ky.) 6. A defective indictment is not cured by a plea of *nolo contendere*. Com. *v.* Northampton, 2 Mass. 116. Supra, § 418. Defective description of the offence is not one of the points in which an indictment is cured by a verdict, but the same is equally fatal on a motion in arrest of judgment as upon demurrer, or a motion to quash. State *v.* Gove, 34 N. H. 510; Rice *v.* State, 3 Kans. 141.

[3] 1 Ld. Raym. 281; 1 Salk. 77, 315; Com. Dig. Indict. v.; State *v.* Carver, 49 Me. 588; State *v.* Thornton, 56 Vt. 35; Com. *v.* Donahue, 126 Mass. 51; Horsey *v.* State, 3 Har. & J. 2; Byers *v.* State, 73 Md. 207; Com. *v.* Linton, 2 Va. Cas. 476; Com. *v.* Watts, 4 Leigh, 672; Hall *v.* Com., 80 Va. 562; State *v.* Craig, 89 N. C. 475; State *v.* Allen, Charlt. 518; Sparks *v.* State, 59 Ala. 82; State *v.* Connell, 49 Mo. 282; Shepherd *v.* State, 64 Ind. 43; State *v.* Conway, 23 Minn. 291; State *v.* Frey, 35 La. An. 106; Walker *v.* State, 35 Ark. 386; Johnson *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 306; Walker *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 609; Williams *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 357.

or vicious.[1] Thus judgment will be arrested where no indictable offence is set forth ;[2] where the statute creating the offence has been intermediately repealed ;[3] where the case has been tried by more or less than twelve jurors ;[4] where no issue was averred to have been joined ;[5] and where the verdict is insensible ;[6] though as the court possesses the power of amending its own records at any time during the term in which they are entered,[7] it seems that clerical errors, such as the false entering of a plea on an impossible day, may be corrected.[8]

Informalities are cured by verdict.

§ 760. Errors as to form, not going to the description of the offence, which might have been taken advantage of at a previous stage, are not sufficient cause to arrest judgment.[9] Thus, while duplicity is fatal on motion to quash, or demurrer, the better opinion is, that it will not be ground for arrest ;[10] and the same position is undoubtedly good when there has been a misjoinder of counts, but where the defendant has gone to trial without a motion to quash, or on application for election.[11] So the verdict will cure the omission to connect necessary and dependent members of the same sentence by their appropriate copulatives,[12] and also merely formal or clerical errors.[13] So is it with essential averments, of which the verdict implies the

[1] 1 Ch. C. L. 662; 2 Stra. 901; 2 Taylor, 93; State *v.* Fort, 1 Car. Law Rep. 510; Whltehurst *v.* Davis, 2 Hay. 113. See State *v.* O'Connor, 11 Nev. 416.

[2] Com. *v.* Hinds, 101 Mass. 209.

[3] R. *v.* McKenzie, R. & R. 429; R. *v.* Denton, Dears. 3; 18 Q. B. 761. See U. S. *v.* Goodwin, 20 Fed. Rep. 237; Brennan *v.* People, 110 Ill. 55; Com. *v.* Kimball, 21 Pick. 373; Com. *v.* McDonough, 13 Allen, 581.

[4] Supra, § 733. See State *v.* Meyers, 68 Mo. 266.

[5] State *v.* Fort, 1 Car. Law Rep. 510.

[6] Com. *v.* Call, 21 Pick. 509. Supra, § 756. Infra, § 762.

[7] Supra, § 751.

[8] Com. *v.* Chauncy, 2 Ashm. 91.

[9] Supra, § 293; R. *v.* Strowlger, 17 Q. B. D. 327; U. S. *v.* Gale, 109 U. S. 65; People *v.* Keely, 94 N. Y. 526; Coleman *v.* State, 111 Ind. 563; State *v.* Craige, 89 N. C. 475; Com. *v.* McMahon, 133 Mass. 394; Com. *v.* Flannigan, 137 Mass. 560; State *v.* Walker, 87 N. C. 541; Greene *v.* State, 59 Ga. 859; West *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 485.

[10] Com. *v.* Tuck, 20 Pick. 356; State *v.* Johnson, 3 Hill S. C. 1. See supra, § 255.

[11] See supra, §§ 245, 299; Com. *v.* Gillespie, 7 S. & R. 476; State *v.* Watts, 82 N. C. 656; Guykowski *v.* People, 1 Scam. 476. But where two counts set forth the same offence judgment will be arrested. Supra, § 299.

[12] Lutz *v.* Com., 29 Penn. St. 441; People *v.* Swenson, 49 Cal. 388.

[13] Supra, §§ 90, 273; West *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 485.

truth, but which are imperfectly stated. "There is a general rule as to pleading at common law, and I think it is right to say that there is no distinction, where questions of this kind arise, between the pleadings in civil and criminal proceedings," said Blackburn, J., in 1873; "that where an averment which is necessary to support a particular part of the pleading has been imperfectly stated, and a verdict on an issue involving that averment is found, and it appears to the court after verdict that unless this averment were true the verdict could not be sustained, in such case the verdict cures the defective averment, which might have been bad on demurrer. The authorities upon this subject are all stated in 1 Williams' Saund. 260, n. I. (last ed.)."[1]

§ 761. It is clear that if misnomer of the defendant be not met by plea in abatement, it is too late for objection after trial.[2]

Misnomer no ground.

§ 762. The rigor of the common law in this respect has been so greatly and so variously modified by statutes, that, so far as the pleading is concerned, few formal errors remain which motions in arrest of judgment can reach.[3] Errors of substance, however, are not cured by verdict.[4]

Under statute right is restricted.

[1] Blackburn, J., Queen's Bench, Jan. 1873, in R. *v.* Heymann, 28 Law T. 163; S. C., 12 Cox C. C. 383; L. R. 8 Q. B. D. 102. See, also, R. *v.* Bradlaugh (Ct. of Appeal), 38 L. T. (N. S.) 118; L. R. 3 Q. B. D. 607; 14 Cox C. C. 68. Cited supra, § 177.

In Massachusetts it was once held that as a rule the verdict does not cure defects that would be fatal in demurrer. Com. *v.* Child, 13 Pick. 200 (see Com. *v.* Bean, 14 Gray, 54; State *v.* Barrett, 42 N. H. 466); though this view has been modified by recent statutes. See Com. *v.* Tuck, 20 Pick. 356; Com. *v.* Adams, 127 Mass. 15.

[2] Com. *v.* Beckley, 3 Met. 330. See supra, §§ 120 *et seq.*; Com. *v.* Chauncy, 2 Ashm. 90.

[3] Under 7 & 8 Geo. 4, which enacts that "where the offence charged has been created by any statute, the indictment shall, after verdict, be held sufficient if it describe the offence in the words of the statute," it was held that after verdict there could be no objection to an indictment which charged that defendant "unlawfully did receive goods which had been unlawfully and knowingly and fraudulently obtained by false pretences with intent to defraud, well knowing that the goods had been obtained by false pretences with intent to defraud, as in this count before mentioned," but omitting to set out what the particular false pretences were. R. *v.* Goldsmith, 12 Cox C. C. 594; L. R. 2 C. C. 760;

[4] Supra, § 400; Com. *v.* Moore, 99 Penn. St. 570; State *v.* Palmer, 32 La. An. 565.

Insensible verdict will be arrested.

§ 763. Where the verdict itself is on its face insensible, the judgment may be arrested or set aside.[1]

Prior indictment no ground for arrest.

§ 764. After a verdict of guilty on an indictment for murder, judgment will not be arrested because it appears on record that there was, at the time of the trial, another indictment against the defendant for the same offence, pending in the same court.[2]

R. *v.* Knight, 14 Cox C. C. 31; and see Com. *v.* Pettes, 126 Mass. 242; People *v.* Cox, 9 Cal. 32.

Under § 1025, U. S. Rev. Stat., a technical defect in an indictment, not prejudicing the defendant, is no ground for arrest of judgment under plea of guilty. U. S. *v.* Chase, 27 Fed. Rep. 807.

In most jurisdictions statutes exist providing that technical irregularities in pleading can no longer be considered ground for motions in arrest. State *v.* Snow, 74 Me. 354; Gray *v.* People, 21 Hun, 140; Lynch *v.* Com., 88 Penn. St. 189; Cowman *v.* State, 12 Md. 250; Maguire *v.* State, 47 Md. 485; Dawson *v.* State, 65 Ind. 442; Rataree *v.* State, 62 Ga. 245; State *v.* Pemberton, 30 Mo. 376; State *v.* Boudreaux, 14 La. An. 88; State *v.* Millican, 15 La. An. 557; Wise *v.* State, 24 Ga. 31; Camp *v.* State, 35 Ga. 689; Bostock *v.* State, 61 Ga. 635; Walston *v.* State, 16 B. Monr. 15; Com. *v.* Hadcraft, 6 Bush, 91; Perkins *v.* State, 8 Baxt. 559; Dillon *v.* State, 9 Ind. 408; State *v.* Raymond, 20 Iowa, 582; State *v.* Knowles, 34 Kans. 393; Friedlander *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 204.

In Ohio, the motion is only allowable where the grand jury had no jurisdiction, and where the facts stated by the indictment constitute no offence. Code Crim. Prac. § 195; Warren's C. L. (1870), § 195.

In Massachusetts, matters concerning the jurisdiction of the court can be overhauled by this motion. Gen. Stat. 1864, c. 250, § 3.

With these statutes are blended in practice the various statutes of jeofails and amendment, which have heretofore been examined. Supra, §§ 90 *et seq.*

In Pennsylvania, by the Revised Acts of 1860:—

Cure of Defects in Jury Process by Verdict.—No verdict in any criminal court shall be set aside, nor shall any judgment be arrested or reversed, nor sentence delayed, for any defect or error in the precept issued from any court, or in the *venire* issued for the summoning and returning of jurors, or for any defect or error in drawing, summoning, or returning any juror or panel of jurors; but a trial, or an agreement to try on the merits, or pleading guilty, or the general issue, in any case, shall be a waiver of all errors and defects in or relative or appertaining to the said precept, *venire*, drawing, summoning, or returning of jurors. Rev. Acts, 1860, p. 443. See, as applying this act, Com. *v.* Frey, 14 Wright, 245.

In Indiana the range of this motion is still further limited. Shepherd *v.* State, 64 Ind. 43.

As to distinctions in cases of error, see infra, §§ 770 ff.

[1] Supra, § 756.

[2] Com. *v.* Murphy, 11 Cush. 472. Supra, § 452.

§ 765. Whether where it appears on the face of an indictment that the offence charged is barred by the statute of limitations, and none of the exceptions in the statute to prevent its operation are alleged therein, judgment will be arrested, is elsewhere considered.[1]

Statute of limitations ground for arrest.

§ 766. Irregularities in respect to grand juries, unless matter of record, are not ground for arrest.[2] And where it appears from the statement on the face of the indictment that the grand jury were sworn, it is not competent on a motion in arrest of judgment, to disprove the recital by testimony *aliunde*.[3] Nor can errors not of record, in drawing of petit jury, be taken advantage of by such motion.[4] Nor is it ground for arrest that exempted persons served on the jury.[5]

But not irregularities of jury.

§ 767. At common law the motion may be made at any time before sentence ;[6] but rules of court are adopted in most jurisdictions, requiring the motion to be made within four days after verdict. These rules, however, it is within the discretion of the court, in strong cases, to extend or vacate. The motion must point out the specific defects.[7]

Time and mode of motion are limited.

§ 768. The correct course is to enter on the record the judgment of the court in declaring that the rule is either discharged or made absolute. But this is not imperatively necessary, as the sentencing of a prisoner, on the face of a motion in arrest, will be regarded by a court in error as a discharge of the rule.[8]

Sentencing defendant equivalent to discharge of rule.

[1] Supra, §§ 316 *et seq.*

[2] Supra, §§ 345, 350, 353 ; U. S. *v.* Gale, supra, § 350.

[3] Terrell *v.* State, 9 Ga. 58.

[4] Munshower *v.* State, 56 Md. 514 ; State *v.* Beasley, 32 La. An. 1162 ; infra, § 886.

[5] Supra, § 692.

[6] 1 Chitty Cr. L. 662–3, citing 5 T. R. 445 ; 2 Burr. 801 ; 2 Stra. 845.

[7] State *v.* Bryan, 89 N. C. 531.

[8] Weaver *v.* Com., 29 Penn. St. 445.

CHAPTER XVII.

WRIT OF ERROR.

I. To what Courts, § 770.
Practice in federal courts, § 770 *a*.
II. How one bad Count affects Conviction.
When bad count may vitiate judgment, § 771.
III. Bill of Exceptions.
At common law bill of exceptions cannot be tendered, § 772.
IV. In whose Behalf Writ of Error lies.
At common law no writ of error lies for prosecution; otherwise by statute, § 773.
For defendant a special *allocatur* is usually necessary, § 774.
Fugitive cannot be heard on writ, § 774 *a*.
V. At what Time.
Error does not lie till after judgment, § 775.
Failure to demur, etc., does not affect right, § 776.
VI. For what Errors.
At common law only to matter of record, § 777.
Otherwise by statute, § 778.
Error does not lie to matters of discretion, § 779.
Action of trial court presumed to be regular, § 779 *a*.
For errors of fact error *coram nobis* lies, § 779 *b*.
VII. Error in Sentence.
Appellate court reversing for error in sentence must at common law discharge, § 780.
VIII. Assignment of Errors.
Error must be assigned, § 781.
IX. Joinder in Error.
This is necessary, § 782.
X. Supersedeas.
At common law, a writ of error is a supersedeas in capital cases, § 783.
XI. Removal to Federal Courts.
Such removal provided for by statute, § 783 *a*.

I. TO WHAT COURTS.

§ 770. A WRIT OF ERROR is a writ issuing from an appellate court commanding a subordinate court of record to send up to such appellate court the entire record of a contested procedure. A court not of record cannot be reached by writ of error. The mode of revising the procedure of such courts is by *certiorari*,[1] which, however, only brings up the record.[2]

Must be to a court of record.

[1] 1 Wms. Saunders, 101, note; R. *v.* Paty, 2 Salk. 503; Wilde *v.* Com., 2 Met. 408; Com. *v.* Morey, 30 Leg. Int. 141; Tarleton, ex parte, 2 Ala. 35. Snell, in re, 31 Minn. 110. A court of equity has no jurisdiction to stay or enjoin criminal proceedings. Sawyer, in re, 124 U. S. 201; 1 Spence

[2] See State *v.* Kennedy, 89 N. C. 589; People *v.* Blake, 54 Mich. 239; Com. *v.* Kryder, 1 Pennyp. 143.

§ 770 *a*. By the judiciary act of 1798, the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States was limited to civil cases; and this exclusion of revision by the Supreme Court of criminal cases is explained by Judge Story, on the ground that "if every party had a right to bring before this (the Supreme) court every case in which judgment had passed against him for a crime, or misdemeanor, or felony, the course of justice might be materially delayed and in some cases frustrated."[1] Practice in federal courts.

Until 1879, no revisory jurisdiction over the district courts was given to the circuit courts; but by the act of 1879, a writ of error lies to the circuit courts to revise all criminal trials in the district courts where the sentence is imprisonment or fine exceeding three hundred dollars. In such cases the decision of the circuit court is final.[2] It is true that, as we will see, a writ of *habeas corpus* may issue from the Supreme Court in all cases in which the court imposing sentence is without jurisdiction;[3] but otherwise the Supreme Court cannot revise the decision of a circuit court except in the single case in which the judges of this court are divided in opinion, and even in this case, only on the points as to which the division of opinion exists.[4]

Under § 709 of the Revised Statutes, an application may be made to the Supreme Court of the United States for writ of error to a State Court, in cases where the action of the latter court conflicts with the federal Constitution.[5]

II. HOW FAR ONE BAD COUNT AFFECTS A GENERAL CONVICTION ON ERROR.

§ 771. For years it was the prevailing practice in England and this country, where there was a general verdict of guilty on an indictment containing several When bad count may vitiate judgment.

Eq. Jur. 689; 2 Hall, P. C. 147. For history of writ of error in Pennsylvania, see remarks of Paxson, J., in Sayres *v.* Com., 88 Penn. St. 291; compare Brightly's Troubat & Haly's Practice, § 885. No writ of error lies in criminal cases from the United States Supreme Court to the Circuit Courts; the only mode of appeal being on a certificate of division, writ of *habeas corpus* or *certiorari*. See discussion in Lange, ex parte, 18 Wall. 163. Infra, §§ 773, 981, 986.

[1] Kearuey, ex parte, 7 Wheat. 39. See infra, § 996 *b*.

[2] Gordon, ex parte, 1 Black. 503. Infra, § 774.

[3] Infra, § 981.

[4] See West. Jurist, 201 *et seq*.

[5] See Spies *v.* Illinois, 123 U. S. 131; Coy, in re, 127 U. S. 731.

counts, some bad and some good, to pass judgment on the counts that were good, on the presumption that it was to them that the verdict of the jury attached, and upon the withdrawal by the prosecution of the bad counts.[1] On the same reasoning, where one of two counts was bad, and the defendant was found guilty, and sentenced generally, courts of error presumed that the trial court awarded sentence on the good count; and the sentence would be held not erroneous, if it was warranted by the law applicable to the offence charged in that count.[2] This practice has been shaken in

[1] See cases cited supra, §§ 292, 738; and as ruling point in text, see U. S. *v.* Potter, 6 McLean, 186; U. S. *v.* Furlong, 5 Wheat. 184; State *v.* Burke, 38 Me. 374; Arlen *v.* State, 18 N. H. 563; State *v.* Davidson, 12 Vt. 300; State *v.* Bean, 19 Vt. 530; Com. *v.* Holmes, 17 Mass. 339; Edgerton *v.* Com., 5 Allen, 514; Com. *v.* Nickerson, 5 Allen, 519; Com. *v.* Hawkins, 3 Gray, 463; Com. *v.* Howe, 14 Gray, 26; State *v.* Stebbins, 29 Conn. 463; People *v.* Curling, 1 Johns. 320; Guenther *v.* People, 24 N. Y. 100; Baron *v.* People, 1 Parker C. R. 246; Kane *v.* People, 3 Wend. 363; Hope *v.* People, 83 N. Y. 418; West *v.* State, 2 Zab. 212; Hunter *v.* State, 40 N. J. L. 495; Com. *v.* McKisson, 8 S. & R. 430; Hazen *v.* Com., 23 Penn. St. 355; Hutchison *v.* Com., 82 Penn. St. 472; Gibson *v.* State, 54 Md. 447; Buck *v.* State, 1 Ohio St. 61; Ridenour *v.* State, 38 Ohio St. 292; Sahlinger *v.* People, 102 Ill. 241; Duffy *v.* State, 107 Ill. 113; Mayes *v.* People, 106 Ill. 306; Dantz *v.* State, 87 Ind. 398; Myers *v.* State, 92 Ind. 390; Dalrymple *v.* People, 55 Mich. 519; State *v.* Kube, 20 Wis. 217; Murphy *v.* Com., 23 Grat. 960; State *v.* Speight, 69 N. C. 72; State *v.* Pace, 9 Rich. 355; State *v.* Shelledy, 8 Iowa, 477; Parker *v.* Com., 8 B. Mon. 30; Brice *v.* State, 2 Tenn. 254; Isham *v.* State, 1 Sneed, 111; Bulloch *v.* State, 10 Ga. 47; Williams *v.* State, 60 Ga. 88; Jackson *v.* State, 76 Ga. 551; Shaw *v.* State, 18 Ala. 547; Baker *v.* State, 30 Ala. 521; Montgomery *v.* State, 40 Ala. 684; Chappell *v.* State, 52 Ala. 359; Toney *v.* State, 60 Ala. 97; State *v.* Jennings, 18 Mo. 435; State *v.* Testerman, 68 Mo. 408; State *v.* Blan, 69 Mo. 317; State *v.* Brooks, 92 Mo. 542; Brown *v.* State, 5 Eng. (Ark.) 607; Howard *v.* State, 34 Ark. 433; Boren *v.* State, 23 Tex. Ap. 28.

It has, however, been ruled that when the counts cover offences as to which there are several punishments, a general verdict of guilty is bad. State *v.* Montague, 2 McCord, 257. In Virginia it has been said that the rule is not applicable in cases of penitentiary crimes, where the jury is to ascertain the term of imprisonment, since the evidence on the bad counts may aggravate the punishment imposed by the verdict. Mowbray *v.* Com., 11 Leigh, 643. Compare Clere *v.* Com., 3 Grat. 615; Murphey *v.* Com., 23 Grat. 960; Richards *v.* Com., 81 Va. 110. The English practice, down to O'Connell's case, was to consider one count as sufficient after verdict for all necessary purposes. Grant *v.* Astley, Dougl. 730; Peake *v.* Oldham, Cowp. 275; 2 Burr. 986. See fully supra, §§ 707, 736.

[2] U. S. *v.* Burroughs, 3 McLean, 405; U. S. *v.* Plumer, 3 Cliff. 28; Josselyn *v.* Com., 6 Met. 236; Jennings *v.* Com., 17 Pick. 80 (though see Com. *v.* Carey, 103 Mass. 214); People *v.* Davis, 45

England in a case of great professional interest, as well as of high political importance, where a judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench of Ireland, on an indictment containing some good counts and some bad, as to each of which there was a verdict of guilty, was reversed, because the judgment was entered generally on the verdict, instead of severally on the good counts.[1] It will be noticed, however, that, in the opinion of the great majority of the judges, the judgment of the court below was sustained, and that in the House of Lords the reversal was carried by a bare majority—Lord Denman, C. J., Lord Cottenham, and Lord Campbell voting for reversal; Lord Lyndhurst and Lord Brougham for affirmance. Of course a judgment on a bad count must be reversed on error; and when on error one count in several is held to be bad, it is illogical, when there is a lumping judgment, to say that the judgment in the court below went only on the counts that were good. But the logical difficulty is overcome by counter presumptions which it is the duty of a court of error to supply. Suppose a count for a felony is joined to a count for an attempt to commit the same felony, which latter count is defectively pleaded; and suppose there be a general judgment on the indictment and sentence for the felony; would not a court of error be bound to presume that the court below treated the count for the attempt as a nullity? Or suppose that the pleader, as is usually the case in complicated trials, states the same offence in several different ways; and suppose that after a verdict of guilty, either generally or on each count severally, the court below should say, "These counts are alternative; one of the bunch is good; the offence they describe is the same; we sentence the defendant generally on the offence as proved, and which one of these counts fits:"—ought not a court of error to hold that the judgment attaches to the good count, and, if the sentence is no more than the law prescribes for such a count, to sustain the judgment? Strictly logical such a conclusion may not be, yet, not only

Barb. 494; Hartmann *v.* Com., 5 Barr, 60; State *v.* Miller, 7 Ired. 275; State *v.* Conolly, 3 Richards. 337; Rowland *v.* State, 55 Ala. 210; Wash *v.* State, 14 Sm. & M. 126; Hiner *v.* People, 34 Ill. 297; Parker *v.* Com., 8 B. Monr. 30; Bennett *v.* State, 8 Humph. 118; Rice *v.* State, 3 Heisk. 215; Powers *v.* State, 87 Ind. 97. But there must be a reversal if the punishment is greater than the law awards to the good count. State *v.* Bean, 21 Mo. 269. Infra, §§ 780, 918.

[1] R. *v.* O'Connell, 11 Cl. & F. 15; Pamphlet Report, Arm. & T. See Lord Denman's Life, ii. 172.

would the greatest practical inconveniences follow if it be not accepted, but presumptions such as those we state are within the notice of a court of error, and if applied would, in all proper cases, remove the logical difficulty. At all events, to apply such presumptions was the uniform English practice, until O'Connell's case, and in the United States, with but few exceptions, the courts have united in sustaining general judgments on an indictment in which there are several counts stating cognate offences, irrespective of the question whether one of these counts is bad.[1] On the other hand there are cases in which no such presumption can be made. Suppose that the bad count is for an offence substantially different from the good count. Suppose that evidence, calculated to influence the jury on the good count, but inadmissible under that count, was admitted

[1] In England, O'Connell's case was in some measure followed in Campbell *v.* R., 11 Q. B. 799, and Gregory *v.* R., 15 Q. B. 957. It was held in Latham *v.* R., infra, that where the record omits to set forth the finding or judgment on the first count of an indictment, but gives the finding and judgment on the second count, each count, for the purpose of the verdict, is a distinct indictment, and that, as there was a good finding upon a good count, the defendant might be convicted upon it. Latham *v.* R., 9 Cox C. C. 516; 5 B. & S. 635; 33 L. J. M. C. 197.

The difficulty, it is said in Roscoe's Cr. Ev. p. 222, may now be frequently got over by the power conferred by the 11 & 12 Vict. c. 78, s. 5, which provides that "whenever any writ of error shall be brought upon any judgment on any indictment, information, presentment, or inquisition, in any criminal case, and the Court of Error shall reverse the judgment, it shall be competent for such Court of Error either to pronounce the proper judgment, or to remit the record to the court below, in order that such court may pronounce the proper judgment upon such indictment, information, presentment, or inquisition." Under this statute, where the prisoner is convicted on good and bad counts, and judgment is entered generally on all or on a bad count, the court of error may arrest the judgment on the bad counts, and enter judgment, or direct it to be entered, on the good ones. Holloway *v.* R., 2 Den. C. C. 287; 17 Q. B. 319. It is added that the form in which sentence was passed in Gregory *v.* R., supra, was said by Lord Denman to be that which the judges had adopted in order to avoid the objection raised in O'Connell *v.* R. And the best plan in making up the record will be to state a separate judgment for each count. See Gregory *v.* R., p. 973 of the report.

In U. S. *v.* Plumer, 3 Cliff. 68, Clifford, J., said: "Special attention is called to the case of O'Connell *v.* Queen, 11 Cl. & Fin. 155, but it is impossible to adopt that rule, as a different rule prevailed in the courts of that country, prior to the decision, for nearly two centuries; and when our ancestors immigrated here, they brought that rule with them as part of the common law, which cannot now be changed by the federal courts." See U. S. *v.* Jenson, 15 Fed. Rep. 138.

under the bad count. In such case, after a general verdict of guilty, there should be a new trial, or after a judgment on such verdict, there should be a reversal; the reason for such action being that the result was reached by the introduction of a wrongful element.[1]

[1] The distinction in the text is illustrated in Phelps *v.* People, 72 N. Y. 372. In this case, to adopt a summary of the opinion of Rapallo, J., exception was taken on the trial to the form of the first forty-eight counts of the indictment, on the ground that the false entry was not set out in words and figures in those counts. . . . . The allegation in the first count is "a false entry in a book of accounts called a ledger, kept in the office of the treasurer of the State of New York, by which a demand in favor of the People of the State of New York against the Mechanics and Farmers' Bank of Albany was created for the sum of $200,000." In the succeeding forty-seven counts the language is varied so as to include the several terms used in the statute, namely: demand, obligation, claim, right, interest, increased, affected, etc., and to vary the party intended to be defrauded, etc. These other counts set forth a copy of the false entry. "The counsel for the People claims that the counts objected to are good, being in the words of the statute upon which the indictment is founded, but whether this position be sound or not he contends that the conviction being general on all the counts, which are based on the same offence, if there is any one good count it is sufficient to sustain the conviction. This proposition was regarded as settled law. There being evidence in support of the good counts, and the jury having convicted upon them, as well as upon those claimed to be defective, it is clear that it was quite immaterial that the court held these latter to be good, and admitted evidence to sustain them, and refused to direct an acquittal under them, as those rulings could not have varied the result, and even if erroneous are not ground of reversal. People *v.* Gonzales, 35 N. Y. 100; Real *v.* People, 42 Ibid. 270." The case of Wood *v.* People, 59 Ibid. 117, it was argued, does not conflict with this rule, inasmuch as in that case the several assignments of perjury charged distinct offences, and the jury might have based their verdict of guilty on assignments insufficiently alleged, or unsustained by proof of the materiality of the matter falsely sworn to.

It has been held in Ohio that the rule that a judgment on a verdict of guilty, on an indictment containing several counts, some of which are good and some bad, will be sustained, is not varied by the circumstance that a demurrer of the defendant to the bad counts was overruled, after which the defendant pleaded not guilty to the whole indictment, it not appearing from the record that the defendant was prejudiced by the introduction of evidence under the bad counts, which was not competent under the good counts. Robbins *v.* State, 8 Oh. St. R. 131.

Where a *special* verdict only applies to a portion of the counts, leaving others undisposed of, and sentence is awarded on the whole indictment, it seems the judgment will be reversed. Baron *v.* People, 1 Park. C. R. 246. But see supra, § 740.

To subsequent chapters the reader

Whether the defendant can object to an imprisonment for less than the legal minimum is hereafter noticed.[1]

III. BILL OF EXCEPTIONS.

§ 772. The practice concerning bills of exception, so far as it is settled by statute, does not fall within the compass of this work. So far as concerns criminal cases at common law, it has always been held in this country that bills of exception do not lie. In England, the same view was generally taken by the older authorities;[2] but now it seems to be the better opinion that they may be tendered in cases of *misdemeanor*.[3] Where, in a case of obtaining money by false pretences, and for a conspiracy to defraud, a bill of exceptions was tendered to the admissibility of certain documents in evidence, Lord Campbell, C. J., said that it was the first time he had ever known a bill of exceptions in a criminal case; but after hearing arguments at chambers, he sealed the bill of exceptions, leaving the question whether it would lie to be argued in the Court of Error.[4] It is, however, agreed, that if a challenge, whether to the array or to the polls, be overruled without demurrer, the ruling of the judge may be made the subject of a bill of exceptions.[5] On the other hand, in treason and felony a bill of exceptions has never been allowed at common law.[6] In most jurisdictions, bills of ex-

At common law bill of exceptions cannot be tendered.

is referred for a discussion of the question of errors in sentences on indictments containing two or more counts. Infra, §§ 907, 918.

[1] Infra, § 918.

[2] Sir Harry Vane's case, 1 Sid. 85; 1 Keble, 384; 1 Lev. 68; Kelynge, 15.

[3] R. *v.* Paget, 1 Leon. 5; R. *v.* Higgins, 1 Vent. 366; R. *v.* Nutt, 1 Barnard, 307; R. *v.* Preston (Inhab.), 2 Str. 1040; R. *v.* Alleyne, infra.

[4] R. *v.* Alleyne, cited Archbold's C. P. 17th ed. 160. For the form of a bill of exceptions, on an information in *quo warranto*, see 2 Gude's Crim. Prac. 2117.

[5] Bac. Abr. Juries (E.), 12; Skin. 101; 2 Inst. 427.

[6] St. Tr. f. 938; 2 Hawkins, c. 46, s. 1; Bac. Abr. Bill of Exceptions.

In a case of felony (In re Hayes and Rice, 3 Jones & La Touche, 568), Sir E. Sugden, Lord Chancellor of Ireland, 1846, refused a writ for a bill of exceptions; saying that, "having regard to the terms of the 13 Edw. 1, and of the Irish Act 28 Geo. 3, c. 31, and the authorities, that a bill of exceptions cannot be taken in a case like this, particularly (Vane's case, 2 Harg. St. Tr. 450; and R. *v.* M'Donnell, 1 Hud. & Br. 439); and having regard to the circumstance that there is no authority in favor of the statute of Westminster applying to a criminal case like this, he was of opinion, on a review of all the circum-

ception are now allowed by statute in criminal prosecutions, the practice being under the direction of the trial courts.[1] The record and the bill of exceptions form the only evidence of the action of the trial court.[2]

In preparing the bill of exceptions, it is usually necessary, in criminal as well as in civil issues, to show that the objection taken to the action excepted to was made clearly and reasonably before the action of the court complained of; that the objection was overruled; and that the court was called upon to note an exception at the time. When specific instructions are excepted to, they must be stated in the bill of exceptions; when a charge as a whole is excepted to as defective it must be given at large; when the exception is that the evidence does not sustain the verdict, the evidence must be given in full.[3]

In England, bills of exception are now, under the judicature system, abolished, the remedy, in civil cases, being motion for a new trial and appeal; in criminal cases, in which alone writs of error now lie, the remedy being application to reserve the points in dispute.[4]

IV. IN WHOSE BEHALF A WRIT OF ERROR LIES.

§ 773. At common law, as accepted in most jurisdictions in this country, a writ of error cannot be taken by

At common law error does

stances, that the application should not be granted." Archbold's Crim. Pl. 17th ed. 160.

In Pennsylvania, the extent to which the Supreme Court may review errors in certain criminal cases was limited, by the Act of November 6, 1856, to the decisions of the court below on the trial, on points of evidence or law, excepted to by the defendant, and noted and filed of record by the court. Fife *v.* Commonwealth, 29 Penn. St. 429.

By the Revised Acts of 1860, bills of exception are under specified conditions allowed, and may be taken to the charge of the court, as well as to admission or exclusion of evidence. Goerseu *v.* Com., 99 Penn. St. 388.

A bill of exceptions cannot be attacked on affidavit. Beavers *v.* State, 58 Ind. 530.

The Virginia practice is detailed in Reed *v.* Com., 22 Grat. 924.

[1] Infra, § 778; U. S. *v.* Bicksler, 1 Mackay, 341; Haines *v.* Com., 99 Penn. St., 410; 100 Penn. St., 317; Baker *v.* People, 105 Ill. 452; Bush. *v.* State, 21 Fla. 761; State *v.* Vincent, 91 Mo. 662.

[2] State *v.* Wheeler, 15 Vroom, 88; Fulmer *v.* Com., 97 Penn. St. 503; Green *v.* State, 59 Ind. 123.

[3] See Haines *v.* Com., 100 Penn. St. 317; Wood *v.* State, 68 Ga. 296; Clark *v.* State, 68 Ga. 784; Luttrell *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 772.

[4] See Archbold's Practice, 121.

not lie for prosecution: otherwise by statute.

the prosecution to review an adverse judgment on demurrer or other procedure before the trial court.[1] In most States this is now permitted by statute.[2]

[1] U. S. *v.* Moore, 3 Cranch, 159; Com. *v.* Cummings, 3 Cush. 212; People *v.* Corning, 2 N. Y. 9, overruling several prior cases; Com. *v.* Harrison, 2 Va. Cas. 202; People *v.* Dill, 1 Scam. 257; Martin *v.* People, 13 Ill. 341; People *v.* Glodo, 12 Ill. Ap. 348; State *v.* Kemp, 17 Wis. 669; Com. *v.* Sanford, 5 Litt. 289; Com. *v.* Cain, 14 Bush. 525; State *v.* Solomon, 6 Yerg. 360; State *v.* Phillips, 66 N. C. 647; State *v.* West, 71 N. C. 263; State *v.* Powell, 86 N. C. 640; State *v.* Jones, 7 Ga. 422; State *v.* Copeland, 65 Mo. 497 (reversing State *v.* Peck, 51 Mo. 111); State *v.* Daugherty, 5 Tex. 1; State *v.* Burns, 18 Fla. 185. See *contra*, State *v.* Buchanan, 5 Har. & J. 317.

[2] People *v.* Nestle, 19 N. Y. 583; State *v.* Graham, 1 Pike, 428; State *v.* Hicklin, 5 Pike, 190; State *v.* Taylor, 34 La. An. 978; State *v.* Manning, 14 Tex. 402. For exceptional cases, see Com. *v.* Scott, 10 Grat. 750; Com. *v.* Anthony, 2 Metc. (Ky.) 400; State *v.* Douglass, 1 Greene (Iowa), 550; State *v.* Ross, 14 La. An. 364. Other cases are noticed infra, § 785. By the recent English practice writs of error are allowed in criminal cases. O'Connell's case, supra, § 771; R. *v.* Millis, 10 C. & F. 534; R. *v.* Chadwick, 11 Q. B. 205; R. *v.* Houston, 2 Cr. & Dix. 310.

In New York, under the statute, the prosecution has been held not entitled to a writ of error to review the order of the Supreme Court, granting a new trial in a criminal case, where there had been a conviction and *certiorari* with stay of judgment in the court below. People *v.* Nestle, 19 N. Y. 583. It was at one time held that the writ only lies where there has been final judgment for the prisoner upon the indictment. Ibid. See infra, §§ 927–8; supra, § 404. For errors in charge, see supra, § 712.

In People *v.* Bork, 78 N. Y. 346, it appeared that after conviction of defendant for embezzlement at the Oyer and Terminer, a case with exceptions was settled, a motion for a new trial thereon denied, and a motion to quash the indictment made, entertained by the court, and denied. Sentence was suspended, and there was no judgment in the Oyer and Terminer. Thereafter a writ of *certiorari* was issued and allowed and the proceedings removed to the Supreme Court. After hearing both parties the General Term made an order that "the conviction be reversed," and subsequently at another general term, upon motion of the district attorney, the first order was modified by striking out the words therein, "proceedings remitted to the Erie Oyer and Terminer," and inserting, "the defendant discharged." It was ruled that the district attorney could not have the proceedings reviewed by the Court of Appeals upon writ of error. At common law such writ lies only to review a final judgment (Hartung *v.* People, 26 N. Y. 154), nor then in behalf of the People (People *v.* Corning, 2 N. Y. 9; People *v.* Merrill, 14 N. Y. 74); and a writ by the People in such a case as this is not allowed by any statute. See People *v.* Clark, 3 Seld. 385.

In Pennsylvania, a writ of error was sustained when taken by the Commonwealth to a judgment for the defendant, on a demurrer to the evidence, and the Supreme Court directed the record to be remitted to the court below so that the latter might give judgment

§ 774. In England, no writ of error issues at common law for the defendant as a matter of right. To this the allowance of the attorney-general is necessary; though in this respect he has been accustomed to take the opinion of the appellate court as to the propriety of issuing the writ.[1]

At common law special *allocatur* usually necessary.

The same practice exists at common law in most of the United States;[2] with the exception that generally a writ may be allowed on the special *allocatur* of a single judge.[3] Such was the rule in Pennsylvania at common law, and under the old practice the court refused to allow a writ to correct merely technical errors.[4]

A refusal to grant an *allocatur* does not bar a subsequent application for an *allocatur* to issue.[5]

In Maryland and Missouri, it would seem that a writ can issue without a special *allocatur*.[6]

One of several defendants convicted may bring a writ of error alone.[7]

The practice as to revision in the federal courts has been already considered.[8]

§ 774 *a*. A writ of error will not be heard when the party suing it out has escaped from the jurisdiction of the court.[9]

Fugitive cannot be heard on such writ.

in accordance with the former's decree. This case, however, it should be observed, was one of fornication and bastardy, which may be treated as *quasi* civil. Com. *v.* Parr, 5 Watts & Serg. 345.

[1] Ch. Cr. Law, 749.

[2] Lavett *v.* People, 7 Cow. 339; Com. *v.* Profit, 4 Binn. 424; Baker *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 353; Loftin *v.* State, 11 Sm. & M. 358.

[3] Compare Webster *v.* Com., 5 Cush. 386, 394; Farris *v.* State, 1 Ohio St. 188.

[4] Com. *v.* Martin, 2 Barr, 244. For statutory practice in Pennsylvania, see Brightly's Troubat & Haly's Pr. §§ 886, 887–8; Huntzinger *v.* Com., 97 Penn. St. 336.

[5] Huntzinger *v.* Com., 97 Penn. St. 336.

[6] State *v.* Buchanan, 5 Har. & J. 317; Mitchell *v.* State, 3 Mo. 283.

[7] Wright *v.* R., 14 Q. B. 148.

[8] Supra, § 770 *a*.

[9] Smith *v.* U. S., 94 U. S. 97; Bonahan *v.* Nebraska, 125 U. S. 692; Anon. 31 Me. 592; Com. *v.* Andrews, 97 Mass. 544; People *v.* Genet, 59 N. Y. 80; Sherman *v.* Com., 14 Grat. 677; Leftwich's case, 20 Grat, 723; McGowan *v.* People, 104 Ill. 100; Sargeant *v.* State, 96 Ind. 63; State *v.* Conners, 20 W. Va. 1; State *v.* Sites, 20 W. Va. 13; Madden *v.* State, 70 Ga. 383; Warwick *v.* State, 73 Ala. 489 (overruling Parsons *v.* State, 22 Ala. 50); Woodson *v.* State, 19 Fla. 549; State *v.* Williams,

V. AT WHAT TIME.

Error does not lie till after judgment.

§ 775. Error can only be taken after final judgment has been entered in the court trying the case.[1] On the importance of adhering positively to this rule it is scarcely necessary to enlarge. It is essential to the just administration of penal law. But it is not necessary, in case of judgment on demurrer, that sentence should be pronounced.[2]

Failure to demur, etc., does not waive right.

§ 776. After final judgment the right is one which it is equally necessary to maintain intact. And in accordance with this view, failure to demur, or move in arrest of judgment, cannot be held to waive the right to make objections to the indictment in the appellate court; the right being constitutional and not personal.[3]

VI. FOR WHAT ERRORS.

1. *At Common Law.*

At common law error only lies to matter of record.

§ 777. At common law, as has been already noticed, error lies only to matters of record.[4] Of the errors of record which may thus be reviewed at common law, the following are given as illustrations in the 17th edition (1871) of Archbold's Criminal Pleading: "If in an indictment

32 La. An. 235; State *v.* Wilson, 36 La. An. 863; Brown *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 126, 546; Loyd *v.* State, 19 Tex. Ap. 137. So under California Constitution. People *v.* Redinger, 55 Cal. 280. And see R. *v.* Caldwell, 17 Q. B. 503. See 9 Crim. Law Mag. 439.

[1] See R. *v.* Kenworthy, 3 D. & R. 173; 1 B. & C. 711; U. S. *v.* Norton, 91 U. S. 566; People *v.* Merrill, 14 N. Y. 75; People *v.* Nestle, 19 N. Y. 583; Tabor *v.* People, 90 N. Y. 248; S. C., 25 Hun, 638; Miles *v.* Rem, 4 Yeates, 319; Grant *v.* Com., 71 Penn. St. 495; Staup *v.* Com., 74 Penn St. 458: Com. *v.* Ruth, 104 Penn St. 294; Neff *v.* State, 57 Md. 385; Kinsley *v.* State, 3 Ohio St. 508; Cochrane *v.* State, 30 Ohio St. 61; Mirelles *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 346; Green *v.* State, 10 Neb. 102. Thus error does not lie to an interlocutory decision as to sanity. Inskeep *v.* State, 35 Ohio St. 482.

[2] Com. *v.* McCormick, 126 Mass. 258.

[3] Lemons *v.* State, 4 W. Va. 755. See supra, § 733, as to consent in curing irregularities; and on the general question, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 144–6.

[4] Nash *v.* R., 9 Cox. C. C. 424; Brand *v.* U. S., 18 Blatch. 384; Turns *v.* Com., 6 Met. 224; Gaffney *v.* People, 50 N. Y. 416; Casey *v.* People, 72 N. Y. 393; Sampson *v.* Com., 5 W. & S. 385; McCue *v.* Com., 78 Penn. St. 185; Davis *v.* State, 39 Md. 355; Campbell *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 314; State *v.* Lawrence, 81 N. C. 522; State *v.* Branch, 25 La. An. 115; Smith *v.* People, 1 Col. 121. Hence evidence can only come up on bill of exceptions; Allen *v.* State, 46 Wis. 383. See Knight, ex parte, 61 Ala. 482.

for perjury on which judgment has been given, it does not appear that the oath upon which the perjury has been assigned has been taken in a judicial proceeding;[1] or that the court had competent authority to administer the oath;[2] or that the defendant swore 'falsely;'[3] a writ of error may be brought. So if an indictment be preferred for libellous words and they are not indictable,[4] and judgment be given thereon. And an indictment charging the defendant with obtaining money by false pretences, without showing what the pretences were, is insufficient, and such a defect would be ground for reversing the judgment;[5] so before it was unnecessary for indictments for false pretences to allege any ownership of the money or goods obtained, if such an indictment did not show whose were the money or goods obtained by means of the false pretences.[6] If in an indictment for burglary it appeared that the prisoner broke and entered the dwelling-house with intent to commit a trespass or misdemeanor, and not a felony, error would lie.[7] So where value is of the *essence* of the offence, as in embezzlement, to the value of £10 or upwards by bankrupts (24 & 25 Vict. c. 134, s. 221), the omission of a statement of the value would render the indictment bad on error. In the same way, where local description is necessary, its omission would be fatal.[8] So, also, where time is of the essence of the offence, as in burglary. An indictment charging a conspiracy to cheat and defraud certain tradesmen of divers quantities of their goods and chattels was held insufficient, on error, for not setting out the names or designating the class of persons intended to be defrauded.[9] Where the defendant challenges a juror

[1] R. *v.* Overton, 4 Q. B. 90; 12 L. J. (M. C.) 61.

[2] R. *v.* Hallett, 2 Den. 237; 20 L. J. (M. C.) 197; R. *v.* Chapman, 1 Den. 432; 18 L. J. (M. C.) 152; Lavey *v.* R., 2 Den. 504; 17 Q. B. 496; 21 L. J. (M. C.) 10.

[3] R. *v.* Oxley, 3 C. & K. 317.

[4] As in R. *v.* Penny, 1 Ld. Raym. 153.

[5] R. *v.* Mason, 2 T. R. 581; and per Lord Campbell, C. J., Holloway *v.* R., 2 Den. 296.

[6] Sill *v.* R., Dears. 132; 1 E. & B. 553; 22 L. J. (M. C.) 41.

[7] R. *v.* Powell, 2 Den. 403.

[8] See 14 & 15 Vict. c. 100, s. 23; as in nuisance to highways (4 Chitty's Crim. L. 423), keeping disorderly houses, arson, burglary, housebreaking, stealing in a dwelling-house, being armed at night on land for the purpose of killing game, etc.

[9] King *v.* R., 7 Q. B. 798; 14 L. J. (M. C.) 172; cited at large in Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1348; and see Lord Hale's Com. F. N. B. tit. Error.

peremptorily, and the crown demurs, and judgment is wrongly given by the court in which the trial is proceeding against the defendant's right to a peremptory challenge, a court of error will reverse the whole proceedings.[1] But *semble*, there must be a regular *judgment* on an issue joined in law or in fact to found the writ of error on, and the mere order by the court that the juror challenged by the crown shall stand by, though irregular, is not ground of error.[2] So, also, where a challenge to the array is improperly overruled, it is error.[3] If the verdict of the jury were returned during the absence of one of the jurors, it would be error. So, also, where it does not appear upon the record that the jurors were *boni et legales homines*. But where the record set out an award of *venire* to the sheriff which required him to empanel and return a jury of good and lawful men of the county, and then proceeded to state that the sheriff, for the purpose aforesaid, empanelled and returned certain persons named, and arrayed them in one panel; it was held that by reasonable intendment the record showed that the persons named in the panel were good and lawful men of the county.[4] Error may also be assigned on a special verdict, where judgment has been passed on the defendant;[5] and on the omission of the *allocatur*, or demand of the defendant what he has to say why judgment should not proceed against him. So, also, if sentence of death be passed against a prisoner not present in court.[6] If an indictment be preferred at the quarter sessions for an offence not cognizable by justices of the peace, and the defendant be convicted and judgment passed upon him, the proceedings will be reversed on error: such as an indictment on a penal statute, where jurisdiction is not given to sessions;[7] or an indictment for perjury, which would be wholly void;[8] or for forgery;[9] or an indictment for conspiracy, not within the exceptions of 5 & 6 Vict. c. 38, s. 1. A writ of error also lies

[1] Gray *v.* R., 11 Cla. & Fin. 427.

[2] Ibid.; Mansell *v.* R., 8 E. & B. 54; Dears. & B. 375; 27 L. J. (M. C.) 4.

[3] O'Connell *v.* R., 11 Cla. & Fin. 155. See supra, §§ 693–5.

[4] Mansell *v.* R., 8 E. & B. 54; Dears. & B. 375; 27 L. J. (M. C.) 4.

[5] 2 Ld. Raym. 1514; R. *v.* Chadwick, 11 Q. B. 205; 17 L. J. (M. C.) 33; see supra, § 746.

[6] 1 Ld. Raym. 48, 267. See infra, § 906. That defendant must be present at all the proceedings, see supra, § 540.

[7] 4 Mod. 379; 3 Salk. 188.

[8] R. *v.* Haynes, Ry. & M. 298.

[9] R. *v.* Rigby, 8 C. & P. 770.

to reverse an outlawry.[1] Duplicity in pleading is not ground of error,"[2] but it is otherwise with the omission of any essential averment.[3] "If the judge, in the exercise of his discretion, discharge the jury on the ground of necessity, such exercise of his discretion cannot be reviewed in a court of error.[4] No writ of error lies on a summary conviction;[5] it only lies on judgments in courts of record acting according to the course of common law."[6] Refusing a motion to quash is no ground for error.[7] Nor does error lie for matters subsequent to final judgment.[8]

A *certiorari* lies to bring up points of record which are required in the appellate court.[9] Errors in reference to grand jury have been already considered.[10]

2. *By Statute.*

§ 778. By statutes of comparatively recent adoption, exceptions may be taken to the rulings of the court at trial, and these exceptions removed by writ of error to the appellate court.[11] Where such a practice is established to the extent of putting criminal cases on the same basis with civil, all matters which are thus excepted to below may be the subject of revision in the court above. But, unless duly excepted to, errors will not be so noticed.[12]

By statute exceptions may be taken for which error lies.

§ 779. There is, however, this distinction to be kept in mind. There are some questions, such as those relating to continuance,[1]

[1] R. *v.* Wilkes, 4 Burr. 2537; 2 Hawk. c. 50, s. 11; Hand's Cr. Prac. 487, n.

[2] Nash *v.* R., 9 Cox C. C. 444; 4 B. & S. 935. Supra, § 256.

[3] R. *v.* Cook, 1 R. & R. 176; Robinson *v.* Com., 101 Mass. 27; Lemons *v.* State, 4 W. Va. 755. The history of practice as to bills of exception is elaborately considered in Raymond on Bills of Except. State *v.* Clifford, 58 Wis. 113; 4 Cr. L. Mag. 704.

[4] Winsor *v.* R., L. R. 1 Q. B. 289; Ibid. 390 (Exch. Cham.).

[5] Per Holt, C. J., Ld. Raym. 469.

[6] Jerv. Archbold, 17th ed. (1871), p. 187; Com. Dig. Pleader, 3 B. 7.

[7] Supra, § 387.

[8] Hunt *v.* People, 78 N. Y. 330.

[9] Graves *v.* State, 45 N. J. L. 379.

[10] Supra, § 353.

[11] See Wiggins *v.* People, 93 U. S. 465; Stokes *v.* People, 53 N. Y. 164. As to exceptions to charge of court, see supra, §§ 793 *et seq.*

[12] Supra, § 772; Joan *v.* Com., 136 Mass. 162.

[13] Supra, § 601; Shebane *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 533.

to severance on trial, to election,[1] to the order of procedure in examination of witnesses,[2] to the speeches of counsel,[3] to the management of the jury which eminently belongs to the discretion of the judge trying the case,[4] and which in many jurisdictions can only, except in extreme cases of injustice, be revised by the judge himself, or by a court of which he is a member.[5] The same rule applies at common law to the action of the court below in refusing a new trial,[6] though it is otherwise in some jurisdictions by statute.[7] The law in this respect is specifically noticed in the chapters in which these particular topics are discussed.[8] And error does not lie for rudeness of manner to a

Error does not usually lie to matters of discretion.

[1] Supra, § 295.

[2] Com. *v.* Blair, 126 Mass. 40; Arnold *v.* People, 75 N. Y. 613; Dubose *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 418.

[3] Supra, § 560.

[4] State *v.* Want, 51 Iowa, 587.

[5] See Tarbox *v.* State, 38 Ohio St. 581, where this was extended to the decision of the trial court on questions of immaterial variance. Infra, § 802.

[6] Infra, §§ 813, 902; Lester *v.* State, 11 Conn. 897; People *v.* Francis, 52 Mich. 575; State *v.* Lowe, 63 Mo. 541; Donohue *v.* People, 56 N. Y. 208; King *v.* People, 5 Hun, 297; McManus *v.* Com., 91 Penn. St. 57; Bull's case, 14 Grat. 613; Read *v.* Com., 22 Grat. 924.

[7] Infra, § 902; Ridenour *v.* State, 38 Ohio St. 272.

[8] Discretion is thus defined in an able opinion delivered in Ohio: "In the conduct of a trial, very many matters must rest in the discretion of the court of original jurisdiction. If the matter complained of infringes upon no rule of law, and merely affects the mode and manner of arriving at a determination, and not the right or merits to be decided, it is generally considered a matter of practice within the discretion of the court, with which t would not be proper for a court in rror to interfere. Upon a motion for a new trial, and upon a review of the action upon that motion of the court in which the case was tried, which we permit by bill of exceptions and on proceeding in error, the range of action in reference to such matters is undoubtedly enlarged. But in such a case we suppose that it must appear that there has been an abuse of discretion, resulting in injustice. A difference of opinion as to the proper course of proceeding would not be sufficient; the appellate court must be able to say that the course pursued was not only improper, but that it operated unjustly and injuriously to the parties." Gandolfo *v.* State, 11 Ohio St. 114; cited and adopted in Powell on App. Jur. 321. To the same effect, see People *v.* Cole, cited supra, § 566.

See, for discretion as to order of addresses by counsel and examining witness, supra, §§ 560 *et seq.*; as to continuances, §§ 584 *et seq.*; as to charge of court, § 708; as to bail, § 76; as to joinder of defendants, §§ 305, 755; as to new trial, infra, § 902; as to challenges, supra, § 693.

Hence the commitment for perjury during trial of a witness for the defendant is not ground for a reversal on error, however operative it might be in obtaining a new trial. Lindsay *v.* People, 63 N. Y. 145.

defendant by a trial judge, unless it is capable of being put on record and results in injury to the defendant.[1] Nor does error lie for admission of evidence to which no exception was taken at the admission.[2]

§ 779 *a*. As is shown fully in accompanying volume,[3] the doctrine that in error regularity is presumed in judicial procedure applies to the criminal as well as to the civil side of the law. Thus when the record shows empanelling and swearing it will be presumed in error that the swearing was in conformity with law,[4] and the empanelling was regular.[5] But this presumption does not apply to material and incurable defects.[6]

Regularity presumed.

§ 779 *b*. For an error of fact, a writ of error *coram nobis* may be maintained.[7] In this way it has been held in Indiana that a court can take cognizance of and reverse a judgment entered on a plea of guilty extorted from the defendant by duress and intimidation.[8]

For errors of fact error *coram nobis* lies.

VII. ERROR IN SENTENCE.

§ 780. In England,[9] and in some portions of the United States,[10] it has been held that at common law a court in error, when it

[1] Arnold *v.* State, 75 N. Y. 603.

[2] Gallaher *v.* State, 17 Fla. 370.

And generally error does not lie for mistakes by which the party appellant was not injured. Infra, § 918; Swann *v.* State, 64 Md. 424; McHugh *v.* State, 42 Ohio St. 154.

[3] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 828, and cases there cited. People *v.* Osterhaut, 34 Hun, 261; Garlington *v.* State, 68 Ga. 837; State *v.* English, 34 Kan. 629; Green *v.* State, 66 Ala. 40.

[4] Potsdamer *v.* State, 17 Fla. 895.

[5] Rash *v.* State, 61 Ala. 89.

[6] Perdue *v.* Com., 96 Penn. St. 311.

[7] 7 Robins. Pr. 149; Stephen's Pl. 118; Tidd's Prac. 1136; Cooley, note to Blackst. tit. "Error;" Evans *v.* Roberts, 3 Salk. 147; O'Connell *v.* R., 11 Cl. & F. 155; U. S. *v.* Plumer, 3 Cliff. 1; Taney, ex parte, 11 Mo. 661; Gray, ex parte, 74 Mo. 160; Adler *v.* State, 35 Ark. 517.

[8] Saunders *v.* State, 81 Ind. 318 (supra, § 414), where an able opinion by Elliott, J., sustains the position in the text. See, also, note to the same in 4 Crim. Law Mag. 372, where the practice is discussed in detail.

[9] 1 Ch. Cr. L. 755; Silversides *v.* R., 2 G. & D. 617; 3 Q. B. 406; R. *v.* Ellis, 5 B. & C. 395; R. *v.* Bourne, 7 A. & E. 58; Holt *v.* R., 2 D. & L. 774; Holland *v.* R., 2 Jebb. & S. 358.

[10] Christian *v.* Com., 5 Met. 530; Ratzky *v.* People, 29 N. Y. 124; McDonald *v.* State, 45 Md. 90; Howell *v.* State, 1 Oregon, 241. See *contra*, Kelly *v.* State, 3 Sm. & M. 518. In Lange, ex parte, 18 Wal. 163, the Supreme Court of the United States assumed the jurisdiction of discharging in such cases on *habeas corpus*. But see infra, § 996 *b*.

reverses on account of error in the sentence, must discharge the defendant, for it cannot remit the case, or impose a new sentence itself. But, as will hereafter be more fully explained,[1] this proposition has been by no means universally received; and even at common law it has been argued, with strong reason, that where an appellate court is authorized to review, it is authorized to correct. In many States it is expressly provided by statute that when there is an error in the sentence requiring reversal, the appellate court is to render such judgment as the court below should have rendered,[2] or to remand the record to the court below for an amended sentence.[3] The whole of a sentence may be reversed for an error in part,[4] or a sentence, if divisible, may be affirmed in part and reversed in part.[5] But where the case is one on which no conviction could, on any contingencies, be sustained, the appellate court will reverse absolutely, and order the defendant to be discharged.[6]

Appellate court reversing sentence at common law must discharge.

Whether a sentence will be reversed because one count is bad has been already discussed.[7]

[1] Infra, § 927.

[2] See Powell on Appellate Juris. 341; Graham *v.* People, 63 Barb. 468; Messner *v.* People, 45 N. Y. 1.

As to English practice, see R. *v.* Browne, 7 A. & E. 58; Holloway *v.* R., 2 Den. 287; 17 Q. B. 317; R. *v.* Drury, 3 C. & K. 193; Archbold's C. P. 17th ed. 195.

For statutes correcting common law in this respect see Jacquins *v.* Com., 9 Cush. 279; Ratzky *v.* People, supra; Beale *v.* Com., 25 Penn. St. 11. As to sentence for imprisonment see infra, § 918. For a reversal on ground of excessive sentence, see State *v.* Driver, 78 N. C. 423. In Pennsylvania, a defective sentence may be remoulded, and the defendant sentenced *de novo*. Drew *v.* Com., 1 Whart. 279; Daniels *v.* Com., 7 Penn. St. 371. But the more recent practice is to remand to the court below. Beale *v.* Com., 25 Penn. St. 11.

[3] Infra, § 928; Harris *v.* People, 59 N. Y. 599; Dodge *v.* People, 4 Neb. 220; De Bardelaben *v.* State, 50 Ala. 179. See McCue *v.* Com., 78 Penn. St. 185.

[4] Picket *v.* State, 22 Oh. St. 405.

[5] Christian *v.* Com., 5 Met. 530; People *v.* Phillips, 42 N. Y. 200; Montgomery *v.* State, 7 Ohio St. 107. Infra, §§ 918, 927; supra, § 752.

The record itself is not sent up to the Superior Court in proceedings in error, but only a transcript; and for the purposes of amendment, the record remains in the court below. Graham *v.* People, 63 Barb. 468. See Cancemi *v.* People, 18 N. Y. 128.

As to making up the record, see Bolen *v.* State, 26 Ohio St. 371; Bartlett *v.* State, 28 Ohio St. 669; Earll *v.* People, 73 Ill. 329; Filian *v.* State, 5 Neb. 351; State *v.* Coleman, 27 La. An. 691.

[6] Miller *v.* People, 90 Ill. 409.

[7] Supra, § 771.

VIII. ASSIGNMENT OF ERRORS.

§ 781. "The writ having been duly returned, the next proceeding is the assignment of errors. On a charge of felony, the party suing out the writ must appear in person to assign errors;[1] and it is said[2] that if the party be in custody, in the prison of the county or city in which the trial has taken place, he must be brought up by *habeas corpus* for the purpose of this formality, which writ must be moved for on affidavit.[3] So, where a person convicted of felony brings error from the Queen's Bench into the Exchequer Chamber, the general rules for governing the proceedings in error in civil cases under the Reg. Gen. Hil. T. 2 W. 4, and under the Common Law Procedure Act, do not apply; but the prisoner must be brought to the Court of Exchequer Chamber, and must there pray oyer of the record, and assign errors by delivering them in writing to the officer of that court, and must be present during the argument and the delivery of the judgment." To enable errors not of record to be acted on by the appellate court, they must not only be excepted to at the time of occurrence, but the exception must be sealed and the error duly and specially assigned.[4]

Error must be assigned.

IX. JOINDER IN ERROR.

§ 782. According to the English practice, the attorney-general, on the delivery of the assignment of errors, may join in error, *ore tenus*.[5] If there be no joinder in error in some form by the prosecution, the plaintiff in error is entitled to judgment.[6]

Must be joinder in error.

[1] 8 Rep. Crim. L. 173.

[2] Corner's Cr. Prac. 102. As to where error may be returnable, see Hazen *v.* Com., 23 Penn. St. 355.

[3] See Holloway *v.* R., 2 Den. 287; 17 Q. B. 317; Mansell *v.* R., 8 E. & B. 54; Dears. & B. 375; 27 L. J. (M. C.) 4.

[4] State *v.* Savage, 69 Me. 112; State *v.* Stoyell, 70 Me. 560; People *v.* Guidici, 100 N. Y. 503; Knouff *v.* People, 6 Ill. Ap. 154; Potsdamer *v.* State, 17 Fla. 895; Hemanus *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 372.

[5] Jervis's Archbold, 17th ed. 192; 19th ed. 211.

[6] In R. *v.* Howes, 7 A. & E. 60, n.; 3 N. & M. 462, "the crown not having joined in error, the court granted a peremptory rule (a previous rule having been made to the like effect) that judgment should be entered for the defendants, unless the coroner and attorney of the King's Bench should join in error within four days after notice of that rule, to be given to the prosecutor and the solicitor for the treasury; and the coroner not having joined in error, judgment was given for the defendants, and they were discharged." Archbold's C. P. 17th ed. 193.

X. SUPERSEDEAS.

§ 783. At common law, a writ of error, though duly allowed by the appellate court, is not a supersedeas so as to discharge from custody;[1] but in capital cases it operates to stay execution.[2]

XI. REMOVAL TO FEDERAL COURTS.[3]

§ 783 *a*. By the Revised Statutes of the United States provision is made for the removal to the Circuit Court of the United States of criminal prosecutions in which a party indicted is denied by local law his "equal civil rights," or in which the party indicted is a federal officer, and the act charged is alleged to have been done in obedience to federal authority.[4]

The right, however, when based on the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, cannot extend to individual infringements of the sanctions of that amendment. A removal to the federal courts can only be claimed when the alleged impediments to justice arise from State statute or regulation, which the applicant must show.[5] Mere local prejudice against a person of color is not ground for removal.[6] It is otherwise when a State statute works the deprivation of rights.[7] And the right to remove is ruled to exist in all cases in which the defendant is charged in a State court for a crime consisting in the performance of his duty as a federal officer.[8]

[1] R. *v.* Wilkes, 4 Burr. 2527.

[2] Brightly's Troub. & Haly's Pr. 885.

[3] See Dillon on Removal of Causes from State to Federal Courts, 3d ed. 1884.

[4] See Rev. Stat. U. S. § 641; 1 Cr. Law Mag. 139.

[5] Neal *v.* Delaware, 103 U. S. 370.

[6] Wells, in re, 17 Alb. L. J. 111; Texas *v.* Gaines, 2 Woods, 342; Virginia *v.* Rives, 100 U. S. 313.

[7] Strauder *v.* West Virginia, 100 U. S. 303, reversing S. C., 11 W. Va. 745.

[8] Tennessee *v.* Davis, 100 U. S. 257, Clifford and Field, JJ., dissenting; State *v.* Post, 4 Woods, 513; see Mayor *v.* Cooper, 6 Wall. 247; Georgia *v.* O'Grady, 3 Woods, 496; Com. *v.* Ashmun, 3 Grant, 416, 436; State *v.* Hoskins, 77 N. C. 530.

The removal, when the ground is prejudicial State legislation, cannot, it is said, take place until indictment found; Georgia *v.* O'Grady, 3 Woods, 496; though, when the prosecution is against a federal officer for his official acts, the removal may be had when warrant issues and arrest is made. Georgia *v.* Port, 4 Woods, 513; Georgia *v.* Bolton, 11 Fed. Rep. 217. Under Rev. Stat. § 639, a removal may be had after a new trial in State court. Dart *v.* McKinney, 9 Blatch. 359. Quashing a removed indictment restores State jurisdiction. Bush *v.* Kentucky, 107 U. S. 110. As to amendments of statute, see Baltimore R. R. *v.* Bates, 118 U. S. 464; Act of Aug. 13, 1888, 25 Stat. at Large, 434.

CHAPTER XVIII.

NEW TRIAL.

I. In what New Trials Consist.
A new trial is a reëxamination after verdict of facts and law not of record, § 784.
II. In what Cases Courts have Authority to grant.
1. *After Acquittal.*
No new trial after acquittal, § 785.
Otherwise when verdict was fraudulent, § 786.
So in *quasi* civil cases, § 787.
Motion for new trial only applicable to counts where there has been a conviction, § 788.
Conviction of minor offence is acquittal of major, § 789.
2. *After Conviction.*
Generally new trial can be granted at discretion of court, § 790.
III. For what Reasons.
1. *Misdirection of Court.*
Any material misruling ground for new trial, § 793.
And so as to mistaken ruling as to presumption of facts, § 794.
Omission to charge cumulatively is no error, § 795.
Judge not required to charge as to undisputed law, when no points are tendered, § 796.
Otherwise when jury fall into error from lack of instruction, § 796 *a*.
Abstract dissertations by judge are not required, § 797.
Judge may give opinion as to weight of evidence, § 798.
Preadjudication by judge may be ground, § 798 *a*.
Judge may give supplementary charge, but not in absence of defendant, § 799.
Erroneous instruction on one count vitiates when there is a general verdict, § 800.
2. *Mistake as to Admission or Rejection of Evidence.*
Such error ground for new trial, § 801.
Usually court will not presume that illegal evidence had no effect, § 802.
When erroneous ruling is rescinded no ground for a new trial, § 803.
Objection to avail must have been made at time, § 804.
3. *Verdict against Law.*
Jury bound to receive law from court, § 805.
Earlier doctrine in this respect to the contrary, § 806.
Early cases no longer authoritative, § 807.
Jury are at common law not judges of law, § 810.
Court bound to hear counsel as to law, § 811.
Court may direct acquittal or conviction, § 812.
4. *Verdict against Evidence.*
Verdict against evidence may be set aside, § 813.
5. *Irregularity in Conduct of Jury.*
Mere inadvertent and innoxious separation not generally ground for new trial, § 814.
In some courts this view is not accepted, § 815.
Separation before case is open is always permissible, § 816.
In misdemeanors jury may separate during trial, § 817.
And so as to felonies less than capital, § 818.

But not generally as to capital felonies, § 819.
Court in such cases may adjourn from day to day, § 820.
Conflict of opinion as to whether separation after committal of case is permissible, § 821.
Courts holding such separation absolutely fatal, § 822.
Courts holding such separation only *prima facie* ground for new trial, § 823.
Courts holding such separation fatal only when there has been proof of tampering, § 824.
The latter is the prevailing view as to misdemeanors, § 825.
Prevailing view is that such irregularities may be cured by consent, § 826.
Unsworn or improper officer in charge is ground for new trial; intrusion of officer during deliberations, § 827.
And so of improper reception of materials of proof, § 828.
And so of irregular reception of books, § 829.
And so of reception of reports of trial, § 829 *a*.
And so of irregular communications of court, § 830.
And so of conversing with others as to case, § 831.
And so of presence of party, § 832.
And so of material testimony submitted by jury or others, § 833.
And so of visiting scene of offence, § 834.
But not accidental or necessary visit of stranger, § 835.
Mere casual exhibition of evidence not fatal, § 836.
And so of the mere approach of strangers, and trivial conversation, § 837.
But presumption is against communications, § 838.
Inattention of juror not ordinarily ground, but otherwise as to ignorance of language, § 839.
But otherwise as to disobedience to court, resulting in injury, § 840.
Intoxication ground for new trial, § 841.
So of casting lots by jurors, when decisive, § 842.
Otherwise as to mere collateral indecorum, § 843.
Absolute preadjudication by juror ground for new trial when a surprise, § 844.
Otherwise when party could have known of prejudice in time to challenge, § 845.
Absolute incapacity of juror a ground, § 846.
Juror inadmissible to impeach verdict, § 847.
And so are affidavits attacking jury, § 848.
6. *Misconduct of Prevailing Party.*
Such misconduct ground for new trial, § 849.
And so of undue influence on jury, § 850.
And so of tampering with evidence, § 851.
And so of tricks when operative, § 852.
But not of remarks of opposite counsel unless objected to at time, § 853.
7. *After-discovered Evidence.*
Motion must be special, § 855.
Must be supported by affidavits, § 856.
May be contested, § 857.
Must be usually moved before judgment, § 858.
Evidence must be newly discovered, § 859.
Acquittal of co-defendant as a witness is no ground, § 860.
Rule as to acquittal of co-defendant of a divisible charge under which he was excluded as a witness, § 860 *a*.
Evidence discovered before ver-

dict should be given to jury, § 861.
If evidence could have been secured at trial, ground fails, § 862.
And so of withholding papers which due diligence could have secured, § 863.
Otherwise in cases of surprise, § 864.
Party disabled who neglects to obtain evidence on trial, § 865.
Evidence must be material and not cumulative, § 866.
Surprise is an exception, § 867.
And so when evidence is of a distinct class, § 868.
New trial not granted merely to discredit opposing witness, § 869.
Subsequent indictment for perjury no ground, § 870.
Evidence should be such as to change result on merits, § 871.
New defence must not be merely technical, § 872.
Acquittal of co-defendant no ground, § 873.
Otherwise as to refusal to sever defendants, § 874.
8. *Absence of Defendant on Trial.*
Such absence may be ground for new trial, § 875.
9. *Mistake in Conduct of Cause.*
Mistake may be ground if there was due diligence, § 876.
Mistake of law no ground, § 877.
Nor is negligence of counsel, § 878.
Otherwise as to blunder or confusion of witness, § 879.
But not mistake of jury as to punishment, § 880.
10. *Surprise.*
Surprise, when genuine and productive of injustice, ground for new trial, § 881.
So of undue haste in hurrying on trial, § 882.
But absence of witness no ground when evidence is cumulative, § 883.
Ordinary surprise at evidence no ground, § 884.
Nor is unexpected bias of witness, § 885.
11. *Irregularity in Summoning of Jury.*
Ordinarily defects in jury process no ground, § 886.
And so of irregularity in finding bill, § 887.
Otherwise as to after-discovery of incompetency of juror, § 888.
And so of prejudice of jury, and popular excitement, § 889.
IV. At what Time Motion must be Made.
Motion must be prompt, § 890.
When verdict is set aside new trial is at once ordered, § 891.
V. To whom Motion applies.
Any defendant may move, § 892.
Defendant must be personally in court, § 893.
New trial may be granted as to one of several, § 894.
VI. When Conviction is for only Part of Indictment.
New trial goes only to convicted counts, § 895.
Conviction of minor offence is acquittal of major, § 896.
VII. By what Courts.
Appellate court may revise evidence from notes, § 897.
Conflict of opinion as to whether successor of judge can hear motion, § 898.
VIII. In what Form.
Rule to show cause first granted, § 899.
Motion must state reasons, § 900.
IX. Costs.
Costs may await second trial, § 901.
X. Error.
Error does not usually lie to action of court, § 902.

I. IN WHAT NEW TRIALS CONSIST.

§ 784. A NEW TRIAL is a reëxamination by jury, according to the forms of the common law, of the facts and legal rights of the parties upon disputed facts, which it is in the discretion of the court to grant or refuse, but which is claimable as a right when evidence has been improperly received or rejected, or incorrect directions in law have been given.[1] No error, however, which is apparent on the record, and which can be noticed in arrest of judgment, will ordinarily be ground for a new trial.[2] Thus, a new trial will not be granted because a letter was omitted in the prisoner's name, in the title on the back of the bill found by the grand jury.[3]

A new trial is a reëxamination after verdict of facts and law not of record.

II. IN WHAT CASES COURTS HAVE AUTHORITY TO GRANT NEW TRIALS.

1. *After Acquittal.*

§ 785. After an acquittal of the defendant, on an indictment for either felony or misdemeanor, for which imprisonment or other personal discipline can be imposed, there can in general be no new trial, though the result be produced by error of law or misconception of fact.[4]

No new trial after acquittal.

[1] 4 Chitty's Gen. Practice, 31; 1 Stark. Ev. 468; Bernasconi *v.* Farebrother, 3 B. & Ad. 372; New Castle *v.* Broxtowe, 4 Bar. & Adol. 273; Roberts *v.* State, 3 Kelly, 310.

[2] Minor *v.* Mead, 3 Conn. 289; Price *v.* State, 67 Ga. 723.

[3] State *v.* Duestoe, 1 Bay. 377.

[4] 4 Black. Com. 361; Back. Ab. Trial, L. 9; 2 Hawk. c. 47, s. 12; R. *v.* Duncan, 44 L. T. N. S. 521; R. *v.* Sutton, 2 N. & M. 57; 5 B. & Ad. 52; R. *v.* Bortrand, L. R. 1 P. C. 520; overruling R. *v.* Scaife, L. R. 17 Q. B. 238; 18 Q. B. 773; cited infra, § 790; U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumn. 20; Com. *v.* Cunningham, 13 Mass. 245; State *v.* Lee, 10 R. I. 494; State *v.* Kanouse, 1 Spencer, 115; Guffy *v.* Com., 6 Grant, 66; State *v.* Shields, 40 Md. 301; State *v.* McCory, 2 Blackf. 5; State *v.* Reiley, 2 Brev. 126; State *v.* West, 71 N. C. 263; State *v.* Padgett, 82 N. C. 544; State *v.* Anderson, 3 S. & M. 751; State *v.* Baker, 19 Mo. 683; State *v.* Norvelle, 2 Yerg. 24; Campbell *v.* State, 9 Yerg. 333; People *v.* Webb, 38 Cal. 467; People *v.* Bangenenaur, 40 Cal. 613; People *v.* Horn, 70 Cal. 17; see supra, § 435. In a prominent case in New York, where the defendants had been acquitted on an indictment for conspiracy, a motion for a new trial on behalf of the public prosecutor was entertained by the Supreme Court. "The right of a court to grant a new trial in case the defendant has been acquitted," said Marcy, J., after refusing a new trial on the merits, "is called in question by the defendant. That such right does not exist, where the ground of the application is that

§ 786. In cases, however, where the verdict has been obtained by fraud of the defendant, such, for instance, as the collusive or forcible keeping back witnesses for the prosecution, or the submitting the case by trick without evidence, the verdict may be treated as a nullity.[1]

Otherwise when verdict was fraudulent.

§ 787. Another exception is to be found in cases where the object of the proceeding is substantially to try a right, and the verdict would bind the right, as in cases of indictment for non-repair of a highway or a bridge. In such case a new trial may be had after verdict for the defendant, if evidence have been improperly received, or there have been misdirection, or a verdict contrary to the evidence.[2] But an indictment for obstructing a navigation has been regarded as not within this second exception, inasmuch as in such a case the defendant is liable on conviction to fine and imprisonment, and the verdict of acquittal does not bind any right.[3] The test seems to be this:

So in *quasi* civil cases.

the finding is against evidence, is conceded; but whether a new trial can be granted where the acquittal has resulted from the error of the judge in stating the law to the jury, seems to be involved in much doubt. It is a very important question, and not necessary to be now settled; the court have, therefore, deemed it discreet to forbear expressing an opinion on it till a case shall arise requiring them to do so." People *v.* Mather, 4 Wendell, 266. In a subsequent case, however, the point seems to have been decided substantially in accordance with the settled practice. People *v.* Comstock, 8 Wendell, 549. As ruling that no error of law by the judge will sustain a revision, see Hines *v.* State, 24 Ohio St. 134; Black *v.* State, 36 Ga. 447. Compare supra, § 773. In State *v.* Ragsdale, 10 Lea, 671, a new trial was granted on motion of the State in a case where the jury imposed in their verdict a fine instead of imprisonment as the law required; see supra, § 756 and cases there cited.

[1] Supra, § 451.

Where the complaint was made to a justice by a person employed to do so by the defendant, and the warrant was served, and witnesses summoned by the defendant's direction, and an attorney retained and paid by him to appear on the part of the State, and the circumstances of the case were so represented to the justice that he imposed a lighter fine than he otherwise would have done, the case was held open to another trial. State *v.* Little, 1 N. H. 257. See Com. *v.* Jackson, 2 Va. Cas. 501. Supra, § 451.

[2] R. *v.* Inhabitants of West Riding, 2 East, 362, n.; R. *v.* Chorley, 12 Q. B. 515 (in which case, however, proceedings were subsequently stayed); R. *v.* Crickdale, 3 E. & B. 947, n.; R. *v.* Russell, 3 E. & B. 942. But the present tendency is to refuse new trials even in this class of acquittals. R. *v.* Duncan, 7 Q. B. D. 198; R. *v.* Southampton, 19 Q. B. D. 590; aff. R. *v.* Wandsworth, 1 B. & Ald. 63.

[3] R. *v.* Russell, supra. As to cases in the courts where new trials have been granted on ground of fraud or by acquittal, see supra, § 451.

where the issue goes to civil rights, and where only a fine can be imposed, there can be a new trial after an acquittal. Where the punishment involves imprisonment, or other personal discipline, the acquittal is final, unless fraudulently obtained.[1]

Motion for new trial only applicable to counts where there has been a conviction.

§ 788. It has been held in some jurisdictions, that where a defendant is acquitted upon one count and convicted on another, a new trial goes to the whole case;[2] but by the general practice, where a defendant has been acquitted on some counts and convicted upon others, and the counts are for distinct offences, a motion for a new trial made by him generally is only applicable to the counts upon which he was convicted.[3] It may well, indeed, be argued, that when the counts are simply several formal variations in stating the same offence, then a new trial opens the whole case;[4] though it is otherwise when the counts are for separate offences.[5] But an acquittal on a particular count, unless in cases of fraud or mistake, must ordinarily be regarded as final.

Conviction of minor offence is acquittal of major.

§ 789. Where a defendant, being indicted for burglary and larceny, is acquitted of burglary, but convicted of larceny, it has been held that the revision of the case pervades the whole indictment, and that on the second trial he is to be arraigned on the burglary as well as the larceny portion of the count.[6] But the sounder conclusion is, that when the jury has the whole case before them, a conviction on the minor offence alone is virtually an acquittal of the major.[7] And for this reason a conviction of manslaughter, on an indictment for murder, is an acquittal of murder.[8]

[1] Jones *v.* State, 15 Ark. 261. This is expressly stated by Lord Coleridge in R. *v.* Duncan, 44 L. T. N. S. 522.

[2] State *v.* Stanton, 1 Ired. 424; State *v.* Commissioners, 3 Hill S. C. 239; Leslie *v.* State, 18 Ohio St. 390; Jarvis *v.* State, 19 Ohio St. 585. See infra, § 895.

[3] Infra, § 896; U. S. *v.* Davenport, Deady, 264; State *v.* Kittle, 2 Tyler, 471; Com. *v.* Stuart, 28 Grat. 950; State *v.* Malling, 11 Iowa, 239; Jarvis *v.* State, 19 Ohio St. 585; Campbell *v.* State, 9 Yerger, 333; Esmon *v.* State, 1 Swan, 14; State *v.* Kettleman, 35 Mo. 105; State *v.* Fritz, 27 La. An. 360.

[4] Leslie *v.* State, 18 Ohio St. 390.

[5] See infra, § 895.

[6] State *v.* Morris, 1 Blackf. 37.

[7] Supra, § 465; infra, § 896.

[8] Supra, § 465; infra, § 896, and cases there cited.

2. *After Conviction.*[1]

§ 790. In England, as well as in this country, a defendant may have a new trial at the discretion of the court, after a verdict of conviction of a misdemeanor.[2] In cases of felony or treason, the former understanding in England was that no new trial in any case could be granted where the proceedings have been regular;[3] but if the conviction appeared to the judge to be improper, he might respite the execution to enable the defendant to apply for a pardon.[4] In England an inferior court cannot grant a new trial in a criminal case, on the merits, though it can do so where there has been some irregularity in the proceedings.[5] And where a court of quarter sessions had ordered a new trial after a verdict of guilty against two prisoners, on the ground that, after the jury had retired, one of them had separated from his fellows and had conversed with a stranger respecting his verdict, and that therefore the verdict was bad, on a writ of error brought, it was held that the new trial had been properly ordered.[6]

Generally new trial may be granted at discretion of court.

§ 791. In this country the uniform and unquestioned practice, down to a comparatively late period, has been to extend to criminal cases, so far as the revision of verdicts is concerned, the same principles which have been established in civil actions; and though, except in cases of fraud, no instance exists where an acquittal has been disturbed, new trials in cases of conviction will be granted, as will be presently shown more fully, whenever it appears there was

In this country this applies to all classes of crime.

[1] For Ohio statute, see Code of Criminal Procedure, § 192; Warren's Ohio Criminal Law, 1870, p. 135.

[2] 1 Ch. C. L. 653; U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumn. 19; State *v.* Prescott, 7 N. H. 287; Com. *v.* Green, 17 Mass. 513; People *v.* Comstock, 8 Wend. 549; People *v.* Vermilyea, 7 Cow. 369; State *v.* Slack, 1 Bailey, 330.

[3] 1 Ch. C. L. 653, referring to 6 Term R. 525, 638; East, 416, n. *b;* 4 B. & A. 275.

[4] As a departure from this rule may be noticed R. *v.* Scaife, 2 Den. C. C. 281; 17 Q. B. 238; 18 Q. B. 773; 2 D. P. C. 553. In R. *v.* Scaife, there were three defendants, two of whom were convicted and one acquitted. There was a new trial as to all three defendants. This case, however, is overruled by R. *v.* Bertrand, L. R. 1 P. C. 520.

[5] 2 Tidd's Prac. 905; 13 East, 418, n. *b;* Burn's J., New Trial; R. *v.* Day, Sayer Rep. 203; R. *v.* Peters, 1 Burr. 568; Bac. Abr. Trial (L.); R. *v.* Mayor of Oxford, 3 Nev. & M. 2.

[6] R. *v.* Fowler, 4 B. & Ald. 273.

misconduct of the jury, misdirection by the judge, or injustice in the procedure. In 1832, however, the supposed English rule was pronounced by the Supreme Court of New York in force as part of the common law of the land;[1] and in 1833, in a case of great interest, it was declared by Judge Story,[2] that not only was there no case in this country where a new trial, in a capital case, had been granted on the merits, where the authority of the court on the subject-matter had been agitated, but that after a verdict of a jury regularly rendered on the facts in such case, it was out of the power of a common-law court to interpose, except by the recommendation of pardon. The common-law doctrine, it was held, so far from being of imperfect application to this country, was invested with additional strength, not only by the federal Constitution, but by the constitutions of most of the individual States. "Nor shall any person be subject, for the same offence, to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb;" and, "No fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise re-examined in any court of the United States than according to the rules of the common law."[3] But plausibly as the position was sustained by Judge Story, it was afterwards abandoned in the court in which it was uttered, and is now so universally rejected that its extended discussion is no longer necessary. It is sufficient to say that neither in federal nor State courts are there now any doubts expressed as to the right of the proper court to grant a new trial in any case in which it considers the verdict to be unjust.[4]

[1] People *v.* Comstock, 8 Wend. 549.

[2] U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumn. 51.

[3] Whether these prohibitions bear on the State courts has been doubted (People *v.* Goodwin, 18 Johnson, 187; U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumner, 51), though the inclination of practice seems to be to regard them as limited to the federal tribunals (State *v.* Keyes, 8 Vermont, 57); and it is clear, that in the two leading cases in Massachusetts and New York, where the subject was disposed of, the result was placed on common-law reasoning exclusively. Com. *v.* Green, 17 Mass. 515; People *v.* Comstock, 8 Wendell, 549. There are, however, in most of the States, similar limitations; and even where no such constitutional restriction exists, it is doubtful whether equal force is not applied by the doctrines of the common law. U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumner, 41, 42; People *v.* Comstock, 8 Wend. 549. See supra, § 490.

[4] See 7th edition of this work, where the above conclusion is argued at length. To the same effect may be cited the following cases: U. S. *v.* Williams, 1 Cliff. 5; U. S. *v.* Fries, 3 Dall. 515; Whart. St. Tr. 598; U. S. *v.* Harding, 1 Wall. Jr. 127; U. S. *v.* Conner, 3 McLean, 386; Com. *v.* Hardy,

III. FOR WHAT REASONS NEW TRIALS WILL BE GRANTED.

§ 792. Assuming it to be law that in all cases where the application comes from the defendant, it is discretionary in the courts to grant new trials, the cases in which that discretion may be exercised will be considered under the following heads:—

1. *Misdirection by the Court trying the Case.*

§ 793. Any misdirection by the court trying the case, in point of law, on matters material to the issue, is a good ground for a new trial;[1] and such misdirection, even upon one point, is sufficient, although the jury might have properly found their verdict upon another point, as to which there was no misdirection;[2] while if the error was immaterial, irrelevant,[3] or trivial,[4] and justice has been done, the court will not set aside the verdict, nor enter into a discussion of the question of law.[5]

Any material misruling ground for new trial.

2 Mass. 303; People *v.* Comstock, 8 Wend. 549; People *v.* Williams, 4 Hill N. Y. 10; People *v.* Bush, Ibid. 134; People *v.* Newman, 5 Hill (N. Y.), 295; People *v.* Bodine, 1 Denio, 281; People *v.* Morrison, 1 Parker C. R. 624; People *v.* Judges of Duchess County, 2 Barb. 282; Com. *v.* Brown, 3 Rawle, 207; Com. *v.* Clue, 3 Rawle, 500; Com. *v.* Flanigan, 7 W. & S. 415; Com. *v.* Jones, 1 Leigh. 598; Grayson *v.* Com., 6 Grat. 712; Ball's case, 8 Leigh. 726; M'Cune *v.* Com., 2 Robinson, 790; State *v.* Sparrow, 3 Murph. 487; State *v.* Lipsey, 3 Dev. 485; State *v.* Miller, 1 Dev. & B. 500; State *v.* Benton, 2 Dev. & B. 196; State *v.* Douglass, 63 N. C. 500; State *v.* Fisher, 2 Nott & McC. 261; State *v.* Sims, 2 Bailey, 29; State *v.* Anderson, 2 Bailey, 565; State *v.* Hooper, 2 Bailey, 37; State *v.* Crawford, 2 Yerg. 66; Cassels *v.* State, 4 Yerg. 152; and see State *v.* Jim, 4 Humph. 289, and cases hereafter cited.

As to English practice, see remarks of Chief Justice Tindal in Melin *v.* Taylor, 2 Hodges, 126, 127; and see, also, Levi *v.* Milne, 4 Bing. 198.

[1] People *v.* Cogdell, 1 Hill (N. Y.), 95; People *v.* Thomas, 3 Hill (N. Y.), 169; People *v.* Townsend, Ibid. 479; People *v.* Bodine, 1 Denio, 282; Com. *v.* Parr, 5 Watts & S. 345; McDonald *v.* State, 63 Ind. 544; State *v.* Meshek, 51 Iowa, 308; Maddox *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 429.

[2] State *v.* McCluer, 5 Nev. 132; People *v.* Bodine, 1 Denio, 280. See Harris *v.* State, 47 Miss. 318; Ballew *v.* State, 36 Tex. 98.

In Parnell *v.* Com., 86 Penn. St. 260, it was said that in a capital case the Supreme Court will reverse when the charge is doubtful and liable to be misunderstood.

[3] Hayes *v.* U. S., 32 Fed. Rep. 662; State *v.* Grady, 83 N. C. 643; State *v.* Lewis, 14 Mo. Ap. 197; Williams *v.* State, 24 Tex. Ap. 17.

[4] People *v.* Dimick, 107 N. Y. 13; Leigh *v.* People, 113 Ill. 372; State *v.* George, 62 Iowa, 682; Heard *v.* State, 15 Lea, 318; Hendricks *v.* State, 73 Ga. 577.

[5] U. S. *v.* Smith, 3 Blatch. 255; State *v.* Tudor, 5 Day, 329; Stewart *v.* State,

Material error in one instruction calculated to mislead, however, is not cured by subsequent contradictory instruction,[1] unless the prior erroneous instruction be expressly recalled,[2] or no prejudice to the defendant resulted.[3] Error committed by the court in the allowance or refusal of challenges,[4] or the allowance or refusal of a motion, either for continuance,[5] or for compelling the prosecutor to elect,[6] or of any other peremptory motion,[7] or even in making incidental remarks injurious to the defendant;[8] is ground for a new trial. Other questions as to the structure of the charge have been already discussed.[9] It should be here observed, that a mistaken exercise of discretion, which cannot be reached in error, may be reached by a motion for a new trial.[10]

And so as to error as to presumption of fact.

§ 794. The due degree of weight to be given to presumptions of law which legitimately arise in the case, it is for the court to determine,[11] though if the court instruct a jury that an inference of fact is a presumption of law, a new trial will be awarded.[12] Thus where the judge charged

1 Ohio St. 66; Kennedy *v.* People, 40 Ill. 488; State *v.* McIntire, 58 Iowa, 572; State *v.* Downer, 21 Wis. 275; Lewis *v.* State, 33 Ga. 131; Tate *v.* State, 46 Ga. 148; State *v.* Underwood, 76 Mo. 630; State *v.* Johnson, 31 La. 368. See Upstone *v.* People, 109 Ill. 169. Supra, § 708.

For a new trial granted in a case where the judge unduly pressed an agreement of jury, see State *v.* Bybee, 17 Kans. 462.

A new trial will not be granted because the judge charged the grand jury in the presence of the traverse jury, on the general question of the law bearing on the particular issue. Johnson *v.* State, 59 Ga. 189.

[1] Clem *v.* State, 31 Ind. 480; Stowell *v.* State, 60 Iowa, 535; Howard *v.* State, 50 Ind. 190. Supra, § 708.

[2] State *v.* Morris, 47 Conn. 546; State *v.* Williams, 69 Mo. 110.

[3] State *v.* Hopper, 71 Mo. 423.

[4] Supra, §§ 693–5, 777; People *v.* Mather, 4 Wend. 229; People *v.* Rathbun, 21 Wend. 509; People *v.* Bodine, 1 Denio, 281; Com. *v.* Lesher, 17 S. & R. 155; Com. *v.* Heath, 1 Robinson, 135; Armstead *v.* Com., 11 Leigh, 657; State *v.* Horn, 34 La. An. 100; Vaughan *v.* State, 21 Tex. 452; Casinoca *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 554; Laubach *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 583; though see Henry *v.* State, 4 Humph. 270.

[5] People *v.* Vermilyea, 7 Cowen, 369; Vance *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 162; Com. *v.* Gwatkin, 10 Leigh, 687; Bledsoe *v.* Com., 6 Rand. 674; State *v.* Files, 3 Brevard, 304. Supra, § 600.

[6] People *v.* Costello, 1 Denio, 83. Supra, §§ 301 *et seq.*

[7] Com. *v.* Church, 1 Barr, 105.

[8] State *v.* Donavan, 61 Iowa, 369.

[9] Supra, § 708.

[10] See supra, § 779.

[11] Attorney-General *v.* Good, McClel. & Y. 286; 4 Ch. Gen. Practice, 42; People *v.* Genung, 11 Wend. 18; Watson *v.* People, 64 Barb. 130; Cross *v.* State, 55 Wis. 262; Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 707 *et seq.* See infra, § 798.

[12] Supra, § 709; Hendricks *v.* State, 26 Ind. 493; Moore *v.* State, 85 Ind.

that the non-production, by the defendant, of evidence of good character should weigh against the defence, it was held error;[1] and where there was evidence that a murder had been committed, and that the house in which the dead body was had been subsequently set on fire under such circumstances as to raise a suspicion that the same was done by the perpetrator of the murder to conceal that offence, and the evidence left it doubtful as to whether the prisoner was in the vicinity of the house when the fire was set, and the court charged the jury, that if the prisoner might have been at the scene of the fire, "the *onus* was cast upon her to get rid of the suspicion which thus attached to her," and that she was bound to show where she was at the time of the fire, it was held that the ruling was erroneous, and ground for a new trial.[2] The same conclusion is reached where a judge takes it upon himself to declare a witness to be untrustworthy.[3] And it has been held error in a judge to say, without qualification, that an *alibi* is a defence which should be offered at the preliminary hearing,[4] or that an *alibi* is to be regarded with suspicion.[5]

§ 795. The omission by the judge, in summing up specifically, to leave to the jury a point made in the course of the trial (his attention not being expressly called to it) is no ground for a motion for a new trial, if the whole of the case was substantially left to them.[6]

Omission to charge cumulatively no error.

§ 796. Where there is no dispute as to the law, the judge cannot be required, where no points are tendered under the statute, to charge generally on the law.[7]

Judge not required to charge as to undisputed law.

90; State *v.* Bailey, 1 Wins. N. C. (No. 1) 137; State *v.* Whitney, 7 Oreg. 386; People *v.* Messersmith, 61 Cal. 246. On this point the reader is particularly referred to Whart. Crim Ev. §§ 707 *et seq.*; and see supra, §§ 712, 713.

[1] People *v.* Bodine, 1 Denio, 283; but see People *v.* White, 22 Wend. 167. As to burden of proof, see Whart. Crim. Ev. § 319. As to presumptions, Ibid. § 707.

[2] People *v.* Bodine, 1 Denio, 282. See Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 707 *et seq.*

[3] Bishop *v.* State, 43 Tex. 390.

[4] Sullivan *v.* People, 31 Mich. 1; Spencer *v.* State, 50 Ala. 124.

[5] Supra, § 711.

[6] Supra, § 710; Robinson *v.* Gleadow, 2 Scott, 250; 2 Bing. N. C. 156.

[7] Thus, a new trial was refused when the complaint was that the judge, although requested, declined to charge the jury, there being no dispnte as to the law of the case; the trial closing so late on Saturday night that, had the jury been charged, they must either have been dismissed or kept over during Sunday; and the verdict being fully supported by the evidence. People *v.* Gray, 5 Wend. 289. Supra, § 709.

§ 796 *a*. Where, however, from the absence of proper instructions, the jury fall into error, a new trial will be granted.[1] Thus, the court is bound, if required, to instruct the jury that unless they are satisfied beyond reasonable doubt, the defendant must be acquitted.[2] And any other failure on the part of the court to state the law, which failure results in an erroneous verdict, will exact a new trial.[3]

Otherwise when jury fall into error from want of instructions.

§ 797. It is not the duty of a court, in conducting a trial, to determine abstract propositions submitted by counsel (*e. g.*, whether certain testimony, which had been given, bore upon the issue, or only on the credit of witnesses); it is enough if the court respond to all objections to testimony taken by either party, and give the proper instructions to the jury.[4] "Courts," said the Supreme Court of New York, "are under no obligation to listen to abstract propositions from counsel, and are not bound to explain them on the trial of causes."[5] If, however, incorrect abstract propositions are laid down, and the jury are misled by them, the verdict will be avoided.[6]

Yet abstract dissertations by judge are not required.

§ 798. A judge has a right to express his opinion to the jury on the weight of evidence, and to comment thereon as much as he deems necessary for the course of justice;[7] and an

Judge may give opinion as to

[1] Supra, § 709; State *v.* Jones, 87 N. C. 547; Thomas *v.* State, 67 Ga. 764; Armistead *v.* State, 43 Ala. 340; Hilliard on New Trials (1873), 258. See supra, §§ 708 *et seq.*

[2] Ibid. See supra, §§ 710 *et seq.*

[3] Supra, §§ 712, 713.

[4] People *v.* Cunningham, 1 Denio, 524; Crabtree *v.* State, 1 Lea, 267; State *v.* Melton, 37 La. An. 82; People *v.* Walsh, 43 Cal. 447; Hilliard on New Trials (1873), pp. 45, 261; Proffit *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 51. Supra, §§ 710–715.

[5] People *v.* Cunningham, *ut supra;* Etting *v.* U. S. Bank, 11 Wheaton, 59; Com. *v.* Tarr, 4 Allen, 315; People *v.* Robinson, 2 Park. C. R. 285; McCoy *v.* State, 15 Ga. 205.

[6] Supra, § 793.

[7] Supra, § 711. See Am. Law Reg. Jan. 1853; Com. *v.* Child, 10 Pick. 252; State *v.* Smith, 10 Rich. 341; Peters *v.* State, 67 Ga. 29; Tidwell *v.* State, 70 Ala. 33; though see *contra*, State *v.* Thompson, 21 W. Va. 741; State *v.* Dick, 2 Wins. N. C. 798; Perkins *v.* State, 50 Ala. 154. "I cannot, for my part, see how the jury can hesitate a moment to convict the prisoner on the third count," was held in Pennsylvania not to be, on the facts, too strong in instruction. Johnston *v.* Com., 85 Penn. St. 54. "A judge," says Strong, J. (Kilpatrick *v.* Com., 31 Penn. St. 198), "may rightfully express his opinion respecting the evidence, yet not so as to withdraw it from the consideration and decision of the jury." Adopted 85 Penn. St. 65. As to adverse statute in California, see supra, § 711. So in Illinois and Vir-

weight of evidence.

erroneous opinion on matter of fact, it is said, expressed by the judge in his charge, is no ground for new trial, unless the jury are thereby led to believe that such fact was withdrawn from their consideration.[1] But it is ground for a new trial that a judge expresses himself as to inferences of fact, so that the jury understand him to be stating principles of law.[2] And this is eminently the case when a question of fact is taken from the consideration of the jury,[3] or a detrimental fact is assumed without proof.[4]

There are States, however, in which by statute the court is prohibited from expressing an opinion as to whether the facts prove a particular crime.[5]

That in some jurisdictions there may be an absolute direction to acquit or convict will be hereafter seen.[6]

ginia, supra, § 711. So in Indiana, Barker *v.* State, 48 Ind. 163; State *v.* Banks, 48 Ind. 197, and cases cited supra, § 711. So in Missouri, State *v.* Jones, 61 Mo. 232, and cases cited supra, § 711.

[1] People *v.* Rathbun, 21 Wend. 509; Com. *v.* Gallagher, 4 Penn. Law Jour. 517; 2 Clark, 798; Griffin *v.* State, 76 Ala. 32; State *v.* Smith, 12 Rich. 430. *Contra*, Smith *v.* State, 43 Tex. 103; supra, §§ 709–711; see Layton *v.* State, 56 Miss. 791.

[2] Supra, § 794; State *v.* Williamson, 42 Conn. 261; State *v.* Lynott, 2 Ames (R. I.), 295; Woodin *v.* People, 1 Parker C. R. 164; Watson *v.* People, 64 Barb. 130; Nolan *v.* State, 19 Ohio, 131; Bill *v.* People, 14 Ill. 432; Cicero *v.* State, 54 Ga. 156; Lovett *v.* State, 60 Ga. 257; Holt *v.* State, 62 Ga. 314; Blackwell *v.* State, 67 Ga. 76; Spencer *v.* State, 50 Ala. 124; McAdory *v.* State, 62 Ala. 154; State *v.* Ross, 29 Mo. 32; Brown *v.* State, 9 Neb. 157; People *v.* Casey, 53 Cal. 360; People *v.* Carrillo, 54 Cal. 63; People *v.* Wong, 54 Cal. 151; State *v.* Rigg, 10 Nev. 284; Skidmore *v.* State, 43 Tex. 93; Collins *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 38; Warren *v.* State, 22 Tex. Ap. 383; Barron *v.* State, 23 Ibid. 462; and see fully, as to error in charging presumptions of fact as presumptions of law, supra, § 794; Whart. Crim Ev. §§ 707 *et seq.* Supra, § 710.

[3] Com. *v.* Davis, 11 Gray, 4; State *v.* Williamson, 42 Conn. 401; Roach *v.* State, 77 Ill. 25; State *v.* McKinsey, 80 N. C. 458; Wilbanks *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 642. In Pannell *v.* Com., 86 Penn. St. 260, a sweeping condemnation of expert testimony was held error.

[4] Chambers *v.* People, 105 Ill. 409; State *v.* Rothschild, 68 Mo. 52; State *v.* Ticket, 13 Nev. 502.

[5] See Edgar *v.* State, 43 Ala. 312; State *v.* Dick, 2 Wins. N. C. 45; State *v.* Dancy, 78 N. C. 437. In Massachusetts, see Com. *v.* Foran, 110 Mass. 179. The California Constitution of 1879 precludes all opinions on facts; and so in Texas, Hill *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 379. In Texas error of this class must be excepted to at the time, White *v.* State, 19 Tex. Ap. 343.

[6] Infra, § 812.

Any side remark by the judge calculated to unjustly prejudice the defendant, may be ground for new trial,[1] but ordinarily, such remarks must be excepted to before the jury retire.[2]

Preadjudication by judge may be ground for new trial.

§ 798 *a*. It has already been incidentally observed that preadjudication by a judge is not ground for challenge, the only remedies being motion for new trial or impeachment.[3] Should the judge either preadjudicate, in the presence of the jury, the case in advance of the reception of the evidence,[4] or throw out during the trial unjust remarks prejudicial to the defendant, a new trial may be granted.[5] But this is not the case when the remarks complained of were part of a charge to the grand jury, in the presence of the traverse jury, discussing generally crimes of the character of that which was involved in the litigated issue.[6]

Judge may give supplementary charge, but not in absence of defendant.

§ 799. Where the jury returned into court without having agreed, and the judge instructed them a second time on the evidence as to matters about which they had made no inquiries, and had stated no difficulties or doubts as to the law, this was held not a sufficient ground for a new trial,[7] though the case is different when the judge communicates his views of the law and facts in writing, without having the jury brought into open court for the purpose, and without procuring the attendance of the parties.[8]

[1] Cartwright *v.* State, 12 Lee, 620; People *v.* Hare, 57 Mich. 505.

[2] State *v.* Wilkinson, 76 Me. 317.

[3] Supra, § 605. See Foreman *v.* Hunter, 59 Iowa, 550.

[4] See U. S. *v.* Fries, Whart. St. Tr. 606 (cited, supra, § 560; infra, §§ 844, 847), in which case the pre-announcement by Judge Chase of his views as to the law of the case was one of the grounds of impeachment.

[5] As allowing great latitude in this respect, see Reynolds *v.* U. S., 98 U. S. 145; People *v.* Arnold, 40 Mich. 716; Albin *v.* State, 63 Ind. 599; Scott *v.* State, 64 Ind. 400; State *v.* Reed, 49 Iowa, 85; Hatch *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 416; see Phillips *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 44.

[6] Johnson *v.* State, 59 Ga. 189. And see comments in Tweed's case, supra, § 605.

A new trial will not be granted because the judge was the author of an account of a former trial of the defendant, containing severe reflections on him, it appearing that such fact was not known in sufficient time to have influenced the jury in their deliberations. Vance *v.* Com., 2 Va. Ca. 162.

[7] Com. *v.* Snelling, 15 Pick. 321. Infra, § 830.

[8] Infra, § 830; supra, § 547.

§ 800. When there are two good counts in an indictment, and the court gives erroneous instructions to the jury as to one of the counts, and there is a general verdict against the defendants, and judgment thereon, a *venire de novo* will be awarded.[1]

Erroneous instructions on one count vitiate when there is general verdict.

2. *Mistake in the Admission or Rejection of Evidence.*

§ 801. In any case where illegal testimony has been admitted, or legal testimony rejected, a new trial may be had,[2] if objection was duly taken at the trial.[3] In civil cases the practice is, that though there be exceptionable testimony, yet if there be sufficient legal evidence to support the verdict, and justice appears to have been done, the verdict will not be set aside,[4] and the same rule applies where legal evidence has been excluded, but where, had it been admitted, it would have produced no variation in the result.[5] In the former case, however, the court must see that the evidence did not weigh with the jury in forming their opinion, or that an opposite verdict, given upon the remainder of the evidence, would have been set aside as against evidence.[6] And Denman, C. J., once observed to the counsel who had put in such inadmissible evidence: "It is not enough for you to say that the

Such error ground for new trial.

[1] State *v.* McCanless, 9 Ired. 375. That material error in a charge vitiates even where not proved to have produced erroneous result, see Mitchell *v.* State, 60 Ala. 26.

[2] Com. *v.* Green, 17 Mass. 515; Com. *v.* Edgerly, 10 Allen, 184; People *v.* White, 14 Wend. 111; Carter *v.* People, 2 Hill (N. Y.), 317; People *v.* Restell, 3 Hill (N. Y.), 289; People *v.* Spooner, 1 Denio, 343; People *v.* McGee, 1 Denio, 21; Stokes *v.* People, 53 N. Y. 164; Com. *v.* Parr, 5 Watts & S. 345; Lutrell *v.* State, 85 Tenn. 232; People *v.* Dayley, 59 Cal. 600; People *v.* McNutt, 64 Cal. 116; Maines *v.* State, 23 Tex. Ap. 468; Montgomery *v.* State, Ibid. 650.

When material illegal evidence has been admitted, this can only be cured by the judge distinctly withdrawing the matter from the jury. Marx *v.* People, 63 Barb. 618. Infra, § 803.

[3] Ibid.; Evans *v.* State, 33 Ga. 4; Haiman *v.* State, 39 Ga. 708; Adams *v.* People, 109 Ill. 444; State *v.* Blare, 69 Mo. 317; State *v.* Williams, 3 Heisk. 76; People *v.* Ah Who, 49 Cal. 32; Williams *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 265; Gallaher *v.* State, 17 Fla. 370. Infra, §§ 804, 877.

[4] Horford *v.* Wilson, 1 Taunt. 12; Doe *v.* Tyler, 6 Bingham, 561; Prince *v.* Shepherd, 9 Pick. 176; Stiles *v.* Tilford, 10 Wend. 338.

[5] Edwards *v.* Evans, 3 East, 451; Fitch *v.* Chapman, 10 Conn. 8.

[6] Rutzen *v.* Farr, 5 Nev. & Man. 617; S. P., People *v.* Greenwall, 108 N. Y. 296; State *v.* Stroble, 71 Iowa, 11; State *v.* McCahill, 72 Iowa, 111; Somerville *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 433.

reception of this evidence could have made no difference; you should have taken care not to put in bad evidence. The alleged unimportance of a piece of evidence improperly rejected or admitted is no ground for refusing to send a case down for a new trial."[1]

Usually court will not presume that illegal evidence had no effect.

§ 802. In criminal cases, however, courts will rarely presume that the particular evidence which was wrongfully admitted could, if material, have had no influence on the deliberations of the jury.[2] Where, however, the exceptant does not make it appear that he was, or might have been, prejudiced by the admission of the evidence excepted to, a new trial will not usually be granted.[3]

[1] Ibid. 618.

[2] In England, however, by the present practice, if there is any illegal evidence admitted, the conviction is bad, notwithstanding there was enough legal evidence admitted to sustain the conviction. R. *v.* Gibson, 18 Q. B. D. 542, by all the judges, in which it was said by Sutton, J., that the last paragraph in the report in R. *v.* Ball, R. & R. 132, was introduced by the reporter without authority. The illegal evidence in this case was not at the time of its admission objected to by defendant's counsel.

[3] R. *v.* Teal, 11 East, 307; U. S. *v.* Jones, 32 Fed. Rep. 569; Com. *v.* Bosworth, 22 Pick. 397; Com. *v.* Sumner, 124 Mass. 321; Stephens *v.* People, 4 Park. C. R. 396; S. C., 19 N. Y. 549; People *v.* Gonzales, 35 N. Y. 49; Hunter *v.* State, 40 N. J. L. 495; Com. *v.* Eberle, 3 Serg. & R. 14; Com. *v.* Gallagher, 4 Penn. Law Jour. 516; 2 Clark, 297; Tarbox *v.* State, 38 Ohio St. 581; Powers *v.* State, 87 Ind. 144; State *v.* Kinney, 26 W. Va. 141; State *v.* Yates, 21 W. Va. 761; State *v.* Spaulding, 34 Minn. 361; Bird *v.* State, 14 Ga. 43; Mathis *v.* State, 33 Ga. 24; Wise *v.* State, 2 Kans. 419; Clark *v.* People, 31 Ill. 479; Jackson *v.* Sharff, 1 Oreg. 246; State *v.* Watson, 30 Kans. 281; People *v.* Owens, 79 Mo. 619; Lynes *v.* State, 36 Miss. 617; Evans *v.* State, 44 Miss. 762; Ganard *v.* State. 50 Miss. 147; Boon *v.* State, 42 Tex. 237; Evans *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 225; Terr. *v.* Gay, 2 Dak. 125; though see Com. *v.* McGowan, 2 Pars. 347, where it is said that after a court has rejected competent and material testimony offered by a defendant charged with an infamous crime, the court will not refuse relief on the assumption that the rejected evidence would not have availed the accused, if it had been received. Per King, P. J. To the same effect may be cited State *v.* Meader, 54 Vt. 126; DePhue *v.* State, 44 Ala. 32; Peek *v.* State, 2 Humph. 78; Stokes *v.* State, 4 Baxt. 47; State *v.* Turner, 6 Baxt. 201; U. S. *v.* De Quilfeldt, 11 Rep. 455; 2 Cr. Law Mag. 214, where this is said to be the rule in Tennessee. But see Links *v.* State, 13 Lea, 70.

Where a witness, called for the defence, was so much intoxicated at the time as to be incapable of comprehending the obligation of an oath, and the court refused to permit him to testify, but told the prisoner that he might recall him afterwards, but he was not so recalled, it was held that this was not ground in law for granting a new trial, the granting or refusing a new trial in such case being in the discretion of the judge. State *v.* Underwood, 6 Ired. 96.

§ 803. The illegal reception of evidence is no ground for revision when the evidence was subsequently ruled out, and the jury directed to disregard it.[1] So the converse is true, that a new trial will not be granted on account of the exclusion of particular evidence, when the objection to such evidence is withdrawn after its exclusion, and the defendant has had an opportunity to offer it.[2]

When erroneous ruling is rescinded, no ground for new trial.

§ 804. Except under extraordinary circumstances of surprise,[3] a verdict will not be set aside because improper evidence was admitted, if no objection to its admission was made on trial.[4] And where a party neglects, at the proper time, to state for what purpose particular evidence is offered, and it is rejected for irrelevancy, he cannot afterwards obtain a new trial by showing that it might have been applied to a point material to the issue.[5] So when there is a special objection to the admission of testimony, which objection could be obviated if mentioned at the trial, a party cannot keep such objection back at the trial, and then, when the mistake becomes one which it will be too late to remedy, use it in error under a general exception to the admissibility of such evidence.[6] Nor can a party who waives

Objection, to avail, must have been made at time.

Supra, § 566; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 384 *a*. See State *v.* Meader, 54 Vt. 126, 651, where it was held that it must appear in such cases that no injury was wrought to the defendant.

A new trial was granted where proof of the violent temper of the prisoner, who was charged with homicide, was introduced by the government, where it had not been put in issue by him. State *v.* Merill, 2 Dev. 269.

[1] State *v.* Lawrence, 57 Me. 574; Com. *v.* Johnson, 137 Mass. 562; Mimms *v.* State, 16 Ohio St. 221. See Marx *v.* People, 63 Barb. 618. That it is the duty of the court so to direct, see State *v.* Brantley, 84 N. C. 766. Supra, § 564.

[2] State *v.* McCurry, 63 N. C. 33. See Stephens *v.* People, 19 N. Y. 549; People *v.* Henderson, 28 Cal. 468; Hilliard on New Trials (1873), 48.

[3] See supra, § 796. Infra, §§ 810, 881; Walker *v.* State, 39 Ark. 221.

[4] Com. *v.* Sullivan, 13 Phila. 410; Evans *v.* State, 33 Ga. 4; Haiman *v.* Moses, 39 Ga. 708; State *v.* Williams, 3 Heisk. 376; People *v.* Collins, 48 Cal. 277; People *v.* Ah Ton, 53 Cal. 741; Robinson *v.* State, 33 Ark. 180; Daffin *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 46. Infra, § 878. As to surprises, see § 884. That a defendant may agree that the testimony of a witness for the prosecution may be read in his absence, see State *v.* Fooks, 65 Iowa, 452. See supra, §§ 70, 351, 759.

[5] State *v.* Wadsworth, 30 Conn. 56; State *v.* Neville, 6 Jones (N. C.), 423; Barksdale *v.* Toomer, 2 Bailey, 180. Supra, §§ 564 *et seq.*

[6] Height *v.* People, 50 N. Y. 392; Bishop *v.* State, 9 Ga. 121. Supra, §§ 564 *et seq.*

objection to a deposition be admitted to subsequently object to its reception.[1]

A court, on its own motion, may refuse to admit evidence plainly irrelevant, though agreed to on both sides.[2]

3. *Verdict against law.*

Jury bound to receive law from court.

§ 805. Wherever and as often as the finding of a jury is in point of law against the charge of the court, a due regard to public justice requires that the verdict should be set aside. On this principle, it is true, the doctrine of *autrefois acquit* grafts an important exception, but this exception arises, not from the doctrine sometimes broached that the jury are the judges of law in criminal cases, but from the fundamental policy of the common law, which forbids a man when once acquitted to be put on a second trial for the same offence. When a case is on trial, the great weight of authority now is that the jury are to receive as binding the law laid down by the court; and after a conviction it is hardly doubted in any quarter that if the verdict be against instruction it will be set aside,[3] unless it should appear that the instruction in question was erroneous in law.[4]

Earlier doctrine in this respect to the contrary.

§ 806. For some time after the adoption of the federal Constitution, a contrary doctrine, it is true, was generally received. In many of the States, the arbitrary temper of the colonial judges, holding office directly from the crown, had made the independence of the jury in law as well as in fact of much political importance. Thus, John Adams, in his Diary for February 12, 1771,[5] in a passage which is probably either an extract from or memorandum of a speech before the colo-

[1] People *v.* Murray, 52 Mich. 288; Hancock *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 392.

[2] Durrett *v.* State, 62 Ala. 434.

[3] U. S. *v.* Shive, 1 Bald. 512; U. S. *v.* Battiste, 2 Sumner, 243; Com. *v.* Knapp, 10 Pick. 477; Com. *v.* Porter, 10 Met. 286; Carpenter *v.* People, 8 Barb. 610; People *v.* Pine, 2 Barb. 571; Duffy *v.* People, 26 N. Y. 589; Guffy *v.* Com., 2 Grant, 66; Davenport *v.* Com., 1 Leigh, 588; Hardy *v.* State, 7 Mo. 607; Montee *v.* Com., 3 J. J. Marsh. 150; Carter *v.* State, 48 Ga. 43; Robinson *v.* State, 33 Ark. 180. As to right of counsel to argue law to jury, see supra, § 578. That a momentary absence of the judge in an ante-room is not ground, see State *v.* Smith, 49 Conn. 376. As to English practice, see R. *v.* Goas, London Law Times, Feb. 18, 1882.

[4] Loew *v.* State, 60 Wis. 559.

[5] John Adams's Life and Works, 252.

nial legislature, urges that in the then state of things public policy demanded that not only in criminal but in civil cases juries should be at liberty to take the law in their own hands. It was natural, therefore, that the early judges, both of the federal and state courts, should have continued for some time to assert a doctrine which, before the Revolution, they had found so necessary for protection against oppression and persecution. To this may be added that the federal Supreme Court in particular, for reasons elsewhere more fully given, was unwilling to assert any prerogative which might draw odium on itself, or expose the new Constitution to any additional shock.[1] Hence it was that Judge Chase not only broadly denied that the courts had any power to pronounce on the unconstitutionality of statutes, but over and over again declared that the Supreme Court was to be treated as possessed only of such powers as the legislature might from time to time impart to it. At the very time that this eminent but arbitrary judge was keeping the bar in an uproar by his assaults on counsel and witnesses, he was prompt in conceding to the jury as good a right to judge of the law as he had himself. Thus in Fries's case he said, "The jury are to decide on the present and in all criminal cases both the law and the facts, on their consideration of the whole case." "If, on consideration of the whole matter, *law as well as fact*, you are convinced that the prisoner is guilty, etc., you will find him guilty." No better illustration of Judge Chase's character can be found than in the fact that, in the very case where he thus recognized the power of the jury over the law, he succeeded, by stopping counsel when they undertook to dispute the law he laid down, in raising a turmoil which ended in his own impeachment.[2]

[1] As to the tendency of the older judges to mix in politics, and its bad effects, see Wharton's State Trials, preliminary notes, 46–48.

[2] That Judge Chase was not peculiar in his views, appears from the testimony taken during his impeachment. Thus, Mr. Edward Tilghman, a lawyer not only of great eminence, but of political sympathies which would have kept him from any ultra democratic tendencies, testified: "The court generally hear the counsel at large on the law, and they are permitted to address the jury on the law and on the fact, after which the counsel for the State concludes; the court then states the evidence to the jury, and their opinion of the law, but leaves the decision of both law and fact to the jury." Chase's Trial, 143. See supra, § 578. To the same effect, also, is Mr. Hay's evidence as to the state of practice at the time in Virginia. Ibid. 175.

§ 807. But it was not long before it was found necessary, if not entirely to abandon the rule, at least practically to ignore it. If juries have any moral right to construe the law, it becomes essential to know what is the construction they adopt; and the most strenuous advocates for the abstract doctrine soon confessed that the notions of juries, even on fundamental questions, vary so much that it was difficult to report, much more to systematize them. And yet, if it be settled that a jury's view of the law of a case is conclusive, it is vital to the community to know what that view is. Take, for instance, the statutory cheats growing out of the laws abolishing imprisonment for debt. The tendency of legislation in late years has been to relieve a debtor from imprisonment, except in cases where a wilful false pretence is the consideration for the debt, or where there has been a subsequent fraudulent disposal of the acquired property. The tendency of judicial decision is to construe these exceptions strictly, and to hold that, to entitle a creditor to avail himself of them, he must show that he had not the opportunity of detecting the false pretence at the time, that it related to an alleged existing fact, or that the property secreted was actually and fraudulently detached from an honest and vigilant execution. These views are well known to the community; they enter into every contract, and are binding upon the courts. But what would a jury say? At one time a broken promise would be held indictable, and thus the old days of imprisonment for debt would be recalled. At another time not even frauds clearly within the statute would be held indictable, and hence imprisonment for fraud would cease *in toto*. Or take, as another illustration, malicious mischief at common law, about which even among the courts there is already sufficient diversity of opinion. Certainly from juries, no settled rule could be had as to what the offence is, and if there could be, no one could undertake to classify their decisions. Or again, when the question arises whether the uncorroborated evidence of an accomplice is enough to convict in a particular case, a question in which the judiciary of almost each State holds a distinct shade of opinion, where would be the chances of uniformity of adjudication, if juries, acting on the particular circumstances at hand, are to be the arbiters?

Early cases no longer authoritative.

§ 808. But a practical illustration of such point is found in a case to which may be attributed the change of sentiment on this

question of the late Mr. Justice Baldwin, a judge who, it is well known, was not disposed on light grounds to surrender any long-cherished opinions. On several occasions, in his early judicial history, he was unequivocal in his commitment of the whole law to the jury; and in one instance, after counsel had directly appealed from the court to the jury on a legal point, he went so far as to say that, in so doing, they had but "acted in the strict line of their duty."[1] But when, some time afterwards, counsel, profiting by this encouragement, undertook to open to the jury, on an indictment for counterfeiting United States bank notes, the unconstitutionality of the bank's charter, this learned judge paused. He felt that however legitimate a result of his own reasoning this course was, if permitted, it would defeat all prosecutions for the particular offence on trial. "Should you assume and exercise this power," he said, in language which applies with equal force to all questions of law whatever, "your opinion does not become a supreme law, no one is bound by it, other juries will decide for themselves, and you could not expect that courts would look to your verdict for the construction of the Constitution, as to the acts of the legislative or judicial departments of the government; nor that you have the power of declaring what the law is, what acts are criminal, what are innocent, as a rule of action for your fellow-citizens or for the court. If one jury exercises this power, we are without a constitution or laws. One jury has the same power as another; you cannot bind those who may take your places; what you declare constitutional to-day, another jury may declare unconstitutional to-morrow. We shall cease to have a government of law, when what is the law depends on the arbitrary and fluctuating opinions of judges and jurors, instead of the standard of the Constitution, expounded by the tribunal to which has been referred all cases arising under the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States."[2]

[1] U. S. *v.* Wilson, 1 Bald. 99.

[2] Supra, § 573; U. S. *v.* Shive, 1 Baldwin, 512. To same effect may be cited U. S. *v.* Riley, 5 Blatch. C. C. 204; U. S. *v.* Greathouse, 4 Sawyer, 457. Compare 2 Curtis's Life and Works, 176.

The question in the text I have examined in greater detail in an article in the Southern Law Review for August–September, 1877, reprinted in 1 Crim. Law Mag. 51 *et seq.* An essay, on the same topic, by Chief Justice Wade, of Montana, will be found in 3 Crim. Law Mag. 484.

§ 809. But in practice, however speciously the doctrine may be asserted, it is, except so far as it may sometimes lead a jury to acquit in a case where the facts demand a conviction, practically repudiated, and since its only operation now is mischievous, it is time it should be rejected in theory as well as reality. For, independently of the reasons already mentioned, an attempt to carry it out in practice would involve a trial in endless absurdity. Thus, for instance, what questions of law are of more vital interest to a prisoner on trial than those of the admissibility of dying declarations, or of confessions? If the jury are to judge of the law, what grosser invasions of their rights, and those of the prisoner could be, than to take from the jury the decision of questions thus distinctly within their province, and which, so far from being collateral to, as has been urged, are in most instances direct to, the matter of guilt? And yet there is no judge sitting with a jury on the trial of a criminal case, who does not take to himself alone the hearing of the preliminary evidence as to whether the declarations were uttered under a consciousness of approaching dissolution, or whether the confession was extorted by duress or solicitation. The line of authority here and in England is unbroken, that in such and in kindred cases the court alone is to determine.[1] But if such be the law, as a matter of principle the jury have no more moral right to convict or acquit a man against the charge of the court that such evidence was to be stricken out, if improvidently let in, than they would to convict or acquit him on the evidence if actually excluded. And this view is strengthened by the fact, that in England and this country the statutory or constitutional provisions giving juries the power of determining as to whether a written document is unlawful or not go no further than the particular instance of indictment for libel.

Jury are at common law not judges of law.

§ 810. The conclusion we must therefore accept is that the jury are no more the judges of law in criminal than in civil cases, with the qualification that, owing to the peculiar doctrine of *autrefois acquit*, a criminal *acquittal* cannot be overhauled by the court.[2] In the federal courts such is now the established rule.[3]

[1] See Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 297, 523 *et seq.*

[2] As to law of *autrefois acquit*, see supra, §§ 435 *et seq.*

[3] U. S. *v.* Fenwick, 4 Cranch C. C. 675; Stettinius *v.* U. S., 5 Cranch C. C. 573; U. S. *v.* Battiste, 2 Sumner, 243; U. S. *v.* Morris, 1 Curt. C. C. 43.

Independently of the federal courts, which have been already

See, as to same case, 2 Curtis's Life and Works, 176; U. S. *v.* Riley, 5 Blatch. 204; U. S. *v.* Greathouse, 4 Sawyer, 457; 2 Abbott U. S. 364; U. S. *v.* Keller, 19 Fed. Rep. 633.

To the same effect is the reply of the late Judge Thompson, while presiding in the United States Circuit Court, in the city of New York, on the trial of a criminal case, when requested by one of the counsel to charge the jury that they were judges both of the law and the fact. His answer was: "I sha'n't; they ain't."

Equally emphatic was the direction of Mr. Justice Hunt, on the trial of Miss Anthony, in 1873. U. S. *v.* Anthony, 11 Blatch. 200. Infra, § 812.

On this principle can be sustained the action of Judge Curtis, and that of Judge Grier and Judge Kane, in Philadelphia, in prosecutions where they held that it was a good cause of challenge that a juryman differed from the court in his view of the constitutionality of the statute on which the prosecution rested. Certainly, if the jury were the judges of the law, this would have been as arbitrary an act as was that of James II., who polled the Court of King's Bench as to the dispensing power, and dismissed the judges who refused beforehand to pledge themselves to hold the prerogative constitutional. On the assumption that the jury are judges of the law as well as the court, there is no more reason, *a priori*, that the court should set aside a juror, than that the jury should set aside the judge. See supra, § 666.

"It is the duty of the court," said Chief Justice Shaw, of Massachusetts, in 1845, "to instruct the jury on all questions of law which appear to arise in the cause, and also upon all questions pertinent to the issue, upon which either party may request the direction of the court upon matters of law. And it is the duty of the jury to receive the law from the court, and to conform their judgment and decision to such instructions as far as they understand them, in applying the law to the facts to be found by them; and it is not within the legitimate province of the jury to revise, reconsider, or decide, contrary to such opinion or direction of the court in matter of law. To this duty jurors are bound by a strong social and moral obligation, enforced by the sanction of an oath, to the same extent, and in the same manner, as they are conscientiously bound to decide on all questions of fact according to the evidence." See Com. *v.* Anthes, 5 Gray, 185. It seems, however, that the same court will not prevent counsel addressing the jury on the law. Com. *v.* Porter, 10 Met. (Mass.) 286. See Com. *v.* White, Ibid. 14.

In Massachusetts the following statute was subsequently passed:—

In all trials for criminal offences, it shall be the duty of the jury to try, according to established forms and principles of law, all causes which shall be committed to them, and after having received the instructions of the court, to decide at their discretion, by a general verdict, both the fact and the law involved in the issue, or to find a special verdict at their election; but it shall be the duty of the court to superintend the course of the trials, to decide upon the admission and rejection of evidence, and upon all questions of law raised during the trials, and upon all collateral and incidental proceedings, and also to charge the jury, and to allow bills of exception; and the court may grant a new trial in cases of conviction. Supplement to Rev. Stat. 1855, c. 153.

Under this act it was held that the

noticed, it may now be considered that the courts of Maine,[1]

jury have no rightful power to determine questions of law involved in the issue against the instructions of the court. Com. *v.* Anthes, 5 Gray, 185 — Dewey and Thomas, JJ., dissenting. See Com. *v.* Rock, 10 Gray, 4.

It was also held that the legislature cannot, consistently with the Constitution of the Commonwealth, confer on the jury, in criminal trials, the rightful power to determine questions of law involved in the issue, against the instructions of the court, even by a statute which also provides that the jury shall try the cases according to established forms and principles of law, and that the court shall superintend the course of the trials, decide upon the admission and rejection of evidence, and upon all questions of law raised during the trials, and upon collateral and incidental proceedings, and charge the jury, and allow bills of exception, and may grant a new trial in cases of conviction. By Shaw, C. J., Metcalf, Bigelow, and Merrick, JJ.; *contra*, Dewey and Thomas, JJ. Com. *v.* Anthes, 5 Gray, 185; S. P., Com. *v.* Rock, 10 Gray, 4.

It has also been ruled that a refusal of the presiding judge to allow the defendant's counsel in a criminal case to read to the jury the whole of the statute, upon one section of which the prosecution is founded, is no ground of exception, if he is allowed to read all those parts which he contends affect the construction of that section, and to comment to the jury upon the whole of the statute. Com. *v.* Austin, 7 Gray, 51.

In Connecticut, a statute making juries judges of the law does not relieve them, it is said, from the duty of obeying the law as it actually is. State *v.* Buckley, 40 Conn. 246. And

---

[1] State *v.* Wright, 53 Me. 336.

In this case, Appleton, C. J., in the course of his opinion, said:—

The question seems never to have been directly before the Supreme Court of the United States sitting in banc; but several of the judges of that court, namely, Baldwin, Thompson, Story, and Curtis, as we have already seen, have emphatically denied the right of the jury to decide the law in any case, civil or criminal; and we cannot doubt that such will be the decision of the full court if the question ever comes before them.

"The following States unite in the doctrine that it is the duty of the jury to be governed by the law as it is laid down by the court: N. Hampshire, in Pierce *v.* State, 13 N. H. 536; Massachusetts, in Com. *v.* Porter, 10 Met. 263; Com. *v.* Anthes, 5 Gray, 185; Rhode Island, in Dorr's Trial, 121; New York, in People *v.* Pine, 2 Barb. 566; Carpenter *v.* People, 8 Barb. 610; Stafford *v.* People, 1 Parker, 474; Duffy *v.* People, 26 N. Y. (Smith), 588; Pennsylvania, in Penn. *v.* Bell, Addison, 160; 2 Whart. Crim. Law, § 3106; Virginia, in Davenport *v.* Com., 1 Leigh, 588; Com. *v.* Garth, 3 Leigh, 761; Howel *v.* Com., 5 Grat. 664; North Carolina, in State *v.* Peace, 1 Jones (Law), 251; Ohio, in Montgomery *v.* State, 11 Ohio, 424; Robbins *v.* State, 8 Ohio St. R. (N. S.) 131; Kentucky, in Montee *v.* Com., 3 J. J. Marsh. 150; Com. *v.* Van Tuyl, 1 Metc. (Ky.) 1; Alabama, in Pierson *v.* State, 12 Ala. 153; Batre *v.* State, 18 Ala. 119; Missouri, in Hardy *v.* State, 7 Mo. 607; Mississippi, in Williams *v.* State, 32 Miss. (3 George), 389; Arkansas, in Pleas-

New Hampshire,[1] Massachusetts,[2] Rhode Island,[3] New York,[4] Vir-

in State *v.* Thomas, 47 Conn. 546, it was held that it was not error for the court to tell the jury that it was absurd for them to hold an act unconstitutional which had been sustained by the court.

In New York, though before the recent Constitution the inclination was otherwise, the same view has been solemnly held in more than one case of recent date. Bennett *v.* People, 49 N. Y. 141; cited infra, § 812; People *v.* Pine, 2 Barb. 566 — Barculo, J. See Carpenter *v.* People, 8 Barb. 610; Duffy *v.* People, 26 N. Y. 588. Compare People *v.* Finnegan, 1 Park. C. R. 147; 1 Park. C. R. 453; S. C., 26 How. Pr. 195; *contra*, People *v.* Thayers, Ibid. 595; People *v.* Videto, Ibid. 603. See, to the same effect, a valuable article in 5 Bost. Law Rep. N. S. 2 (May, 1852).

In Pennsylvania, though till 1879 there was no reported decision on the express point from the Supreme Court in banc, it has not been usual to leave to the jury the law to decide. A very strong leaning to the contrary is shown by Gibson, C. J., in closing a charge in a capital case: "If the evidence on these points fail the prisoner, the conclusion of his guilt will be irresistible, and it will be your duty to draw it." Com. *v.* Harman, 4 Barr, 269. The

---

ant *v.* State; 8 Eng. (13 Ark.) 360; Texas, in Nels *v.* State, 2 Texas, 280; Tennessee, in McGowan *v.* State, 9 Yerger, 184.

"In Indiana the decisions are influenced by local legislation, and are therefore unimportant. There are, however, two well-considered decisions in that State in which the right of the jury to determine the law is denied. 2 Black. 156; 2 Carter, 617; *contra*, 4 Black, 150, 247; 10 Ind. 503. State *v.* Holder, 5 Geo. 441, and some other cases in that State (Georgia), have been supposed by some to be in favor of the doctrine. But this is an error. In that State the subject is regulated by express statutory law, and their decisions have no bearing upon the question as a common law right.

"In Vermont, in State *v.* Croteau, 23 Vt. 14, a majority of the court held that, in criminal cases, the jury are judges of the law as well as the facts, but the doctrine was resisted in a very able dissenting opinion by Judge Bennett; and in a later case (State *v.* McDonnell, 32 Vt. 523), the presiding judge declared to the jury that to him such a doctrine was 'most absurd and nonsensical,' and the full court held the remark unexceptionable.

"In Maine, in State *v.* Snow, 18 Me. 346, the court seems to have taken it for granted that the law was settled in favor of the right of the jury to determine the law in criminal cases, and gave the question apparently very little consideration. Two cases only are cited. One of them (Croswell's case, 3 Johns. Cases, 337) establishes no such doctrine; and the other (Com. *v.* Knapp, 10 Pick. 497) has been emphatically overruled by the same court which made the decision."

[1] Pierce *v.* State, 13 N. H. 536.

[2] Com. *v.* Porter, 10 Met. 286; Com. *v.* White, Ibid. 14; Com. *v.* Abbott, 13 Met. 120; though now modified by statute given in a prior note to this section.

[3] Dorr's Trial, 121; 7 Bost. L. R. 347.

[4] See cases given above.

ginia,[1] North Carolina,[2] Ohio,[3] Kentucky,[4] Michigan,[5] Alabama,[6]

same position was taken by Rogers, J., in Com. *v.* Sherry, reported in Appendix to Wharton on Homicide.

Not varying much from this is the language of Sergeant, J., in a charge in a case of misdemeanor: "The point, if you believe the evidence on both sides, is one of law, on which it is your duty to receive the instructions of the court. If you believe the evidence in the whole case, you must find the defendant guilty." Com. *v.* Vansickle, Brightly R. 73. Infra, § 812.

In 1879, however, in Kane *v.* Com., 89 Penn. St. 522, Ch. Just. Sharswood, speaking for the court, declared it error for a judge to say to the jury, "The law is for the court, and you will be governed by it, or you will not, as you have sworn to do, try the case by the law and by the evidence." "The distinction," says Ch. Just. Sharswood, "between power and right, whatever may be its value in ethics, in law is very shadowy and unsubstantial. He who has legal power to do anything has the legal right. No court should give a binding instruction to a jury, which they are powerless to enforce, by granting a new trial if it should be disregarded. They may present to them the obvious considerations which should induce them to receive and follow their instructions, but beyond this they have no right to go. The argument in favor of their taking the law from the court is addressed, very properly, *ad verecundiam*. The court is appointed to instruct them, and their opinion is the best evidence of what the law is." For a discussion of this opinion, see South. Law Jour. for 1879, p. 352 *et seq.*; 1 Crim. Law Mag. 47. But this is greatly modified in a subsequent case (Com. *v.* Nicholson, 96 Penn. St. 503), where the Supreme Court say: "The court below had an undoubted right to instruct the jury as to the law, and to warn them, as they did, against finding contrary to it. This is very different from telling them that they must find the defendant guilty, *which is what is meant by a binding instruction in a criminal case.*" This may be considered as virtually recalling the points in which the opinion on Kane *v.* Com. differs from prior opinions in the same court. See Johnston *v.* Com., 85 Penn. St. 54; cited supra, § 798; 1 Crim. Law Mag. 242.

In Virginia, not only is it held that the jury has no right to take the law except from the court, but it has been ruled expressly, that counsel will not be permitted to address an argument on the law except to the court. Davenport *v.* Com., 1 Leigh, 588; Com. *v.* Garth, 3 Leigh, 761; Howell *v.* Com., 5 Grat. 664. See, on these decisions, a learned article in 6 Am. Jurist, 237; and see fully supra, §§ 573 *et seq.*

[1] Howel *v.* Com., 5 Grat. 664; and cases cited supra.

[2] State *v.* Peace, 1 Jones (Law), 251.

[3] Montgomery *v.* State, 11 Ohio, 424; Robbins *v.* State, 8 Ohio St. 131; Adams *v.* State, 29 Ohio St. 412.

[4] Montee *v.* Com., 3 J. J. Marsh. 150; Com. *v.* Van Tuyl, 1 Metc. (Ky.) 1.

[5] People *v.* Mortimer, 48 Mich. 37.

[6] Pierson *v.* State, 12 Ala. 153; Batre *v.* State, 18 Ala. 119, reviewing State *v.* Jones, 5 Ala. 666; Washington *v.* State, 63 Ala. 135; Sullivan *v.* State, 66 Ala. 48; Tidwell *v.* State, 70 Ala. 33; Amos *v.* State, 73 Ala. 498.

Mississippi,[1] Missouri,[2] Arkansas,[3] California,[4] Nebraska,[5] South Carolina,[6] and Texas,[7] unite in the doctrine that the jury must take the law from the court; while the right of the jury to determine the law seems in some sense to be held, under the stress of constitutional or legislative provisions, in Vermont,[8] Tennessee,[9] Georgia,[10] Maryland,[11]

[1] Cothran *v.* State, 39 Miss. 541; Bangs *v.* State, 61 Miss. 363.

[2] Hardy *v.* State, 7 Mo. 607. See State *v.* Jones, 64 Mo. 391.

[3] Pleasant *v.* State, 2 Eng. (13 Ark.) 360. By the Constitution, however, the jury are judges of the law. See Patterson *v.* State, 2 Eng. 59. In Sweeney *v.* State, 35 Ark. 585, it was held that it was the duty of the court to declare the law and of the jury to apply it, and see Robinson *v.* State, 33 Ark. 180.

[4] People *v.* Stewart, 7 Cal. 140; People *v.* Anderson, 44 Cal. 65.

[5] Parrish *v.* State, 14 Neb. 60.

[6] State *v.* Drawdy, 14 Richards, 87.

[7] Nels *v.* State, 2 Tex. 280; Pharr *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 472.

[8] State *v.* Croteau, 23 Vt. 14; but see State *v.* McDonnell, 32 Vt. 523.

The adhesion of the Vermont courts to the doctrine is by no means hearty. Thus, in a case decided in 1884, we have the following:—

"It does not follow that because the jury are judges of the law, counsel can read what they please to them. The rule that the jurors are judges of the law does not affect the course or order of procedure of the trial in the least; it is the result of the *power* of the jury rather than of any inherent right, and the trial should be conducted in the usual course of proceedings," citing State *v.* McDonnell, 32 Vt. 491. "My own impression is that counsel are not at liberty to insist to the jury that the law is different from that given by the court; as well might they argue to them the questions of the admission or rejection of evidence and many other legal ones arising on the trial; and this view is not at all inconsistent with the fact that, by the power of the jury to render a general verdict, they virtually become judges of the law." Taft, J., giving opinion of court in State *v.* Hopkins, 56 Vt. 263. See, however, State *v.* Meyer, 58 Vt. 457.

[9] Nelson *v.* State, 2 Swan, 237. See, however, Harris *v.* State, 7 Lea, 538. In Hannah *v.* State, 11 Lea, 201, it was held that the court ought not to refuse to permit counsel to argue the law to the jury.

[10] Holder *v.* State, 5 Ga. 441; Ricks *v.* State, 16 Ga. 600; McGuffie *v.* State, 17 Ga. 497; McPherson *v.* State, 22 Ga. 478; McDaniel *v.* State, 30 Ga. 853; Clarke *v.* State, 35 Ga. 75; McMath *v.* State, 55 Ga. 303. See O'Neil *v.* State, 48 Ga. 66. But in Habersham *v.* State, 56 Ga. 61, it was said that it was the duty of the jury to take the law from the court; and so in Powell *v.* State, 65 Ga. 707, and Robinson *v.* State, 66 Ga. 517; Mahone *v.* State, 66 Ga. 539; Ridenhour *v.* State, 75 Ga. 382; Danforth *v.* State, Ibid. 614.

[11] Franklin *v.* State, 12 Md. 236; Forwood *v.* State, 49 Md. 531. This was in obedience to a constitutional provision that the jury are to be judges of the law. But at the same time it was held that, on the question of the *constitutionality* of laws, the jury were to take the law from the court. See Wheeler *v.* State, 42 Md. 563. And in Bell *v.* State, 57 Md. 108, it was held that the court "has the right to instruct the jury in a criminal

Louisiana,[1] Illinois,[2] and Indiana.[3] So far as concerns the question immediately in discussion, it is not disputed that if a jury, whatever may be its supposed elementary rights, finds against the court's charge, the verdict should be set aside, and a new trial granted, unless it be made to appear that the verdict would not have been sustained if in accordance with the charge of the court.[4]

Court bound to hear counsel as to law.

§ 811. It has been ruled in Virginia, that upon a question of law addressed to the court at *nisi prius*, the judge is not bound to hear an argument from the prisoner's counsel, if his opinion is already formed.[5] The same point was made in Fries' case by Judge Chase. But in the latter case the ruling of the court in this respect was the subject of an impeachment in which a conviction was barely escaped.[6] The proper view is that on all questions of law, the court, before decision, is bound to hear counsel, with proper limits as to time. But after

case as to the legal effect of the evidence," and having such right it has the right to prevent counsel from arguing against such an instruction.

[1] State *v.* Jurche, 17 La. An. 71; State *v.* Saliba, 18 La. An. 35; State *v.* Ford, 37 La. An. 444. But in subsequent cases this is qualified by declaring that though the jury have the *power*, they have not the moral right to reject the law of the court. State *v.* Tally, 23 La. An. 677; State *v.* Ford, 37 La. An. 449.

[2] Falk *v.* People, 42 Ill. 331. See, however, Mullinix *v.* People, 76 Ill. 211, in which the defendant asked the court below to charge the jury that they were "sole judges of the law." The court, however, told the jury that it was "their duty to accept and act upon the law, as laid down to you by the court, unless you can say, upon your oaths, that you are better judges of the law than the court." The Supreme Court held that this was eminently proper. To the same effect, see Davidson *v.* People, 90 Ill. 221.

[3] This is required by the State constitution. Warren *v.* State, 4 Blackf. 150; Williams *v.* State, 10 Ind. 503; Anderson *v.* State, 104 Ind. 467. See, also, 5 Law Rep. (N. S.) 6; Clem *v.* State, 31 Ind. 480; McCarthey *v.* State, 56 Ind. 203; Fowler *v.* State, 85 Ind. 538, where it was held that under the bill of rights the jury were not bound by even the decisions of the Supreme Court.

In this State counsel can argue the law at large to the jury. Stout *v.* State, 96 Ind. 407.

[4] See supra, §§ 805, ff. As to Indiana, see Daily *v.* State, 10 Ind. 536; Thetge *v.* State, 83 Ind. 126. See supra, § 548. In applying the constitutional provision of this State that the jury are to determine the law, the Supreme Court has held that instructions from the court on the law are only advisory and do not bind. Nuzum *v.* State, 88 Ind. 599; Powers *v.* State, 87 Ind. 144; though if erroneous there will be a reversal. Clem *v.* State, 42 Ind. 447. See Hudelson *v.* State, 94 Ind. 426; 5 Crim. Law Mag. 524, and note.

[5] Howel *v.* Com., 5 Grat. 664. See Amos *v.* State, 73 Ala. 498.

[6] Supra, §§ 560, 605, 798 *a*.

argument has been heard and the point decided, counsel cannot, ordinarily, be permitted to appeal from court to jury on the law.[1]

Court may direct acquittal or conviction.

§ 812. Can a judge direct a jury peremptorily to acquit or convict, if in his opinion this is required by the evidence? Unless there is a conflicting statutory provision this is within the province of the court, supposing that there is no disputed fact on which it is essential for the jury to pass.[2] A remarkable illustration of a conviction thus directed has been already noticed.[3] Where the whole case, leaving out disputed facts, requires an acquittal, a direction to acquit is not only proper, but right;[4] and there are instances of unfounded prosecutions pressed by popular prejudice when such a course is the peremptory duty of the judge.[5] Where a demurrer to evidence is allowed, the opinion of the court to this effect may be compelled by the defendant by

[1] Dejarnette *v.* Com., 75 Va. 867.

[2] Gerbracht *v.* Com., 1 Pennyp. 471; Com. *v.* Magee, 10 Phila. 201. See, however, *contra*, U. S. *v.* Taylor, 3 McCrar. 500; 3 Crim. Law Mag. 552; Hudelson *v.* State, 94 Ind. 426; 5 Crim. Law Mag. 524; State *v.* Dixon, 75 N. C. 275; Tucker *v.* State, 57 Ga. 503; Perkins *v.* State, 50 Ala. 154; Lunsford *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 217; Nuzum *v.* State, 88 Ind. 599. In Amos *v.* State, 73 Ala. 498, a direction to convict was held justifiable only in very strong cases.

[3] U. S. *v.* Anthony, 11 Blatch. 200, by Hunt, J., 1873. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 88. But in Hopt *v.* People, 110 U. S. 574, it was held that where a statute leaves it to the jury to determine the degree, it is error for the court to charge that the offence is murder in the first degree. And so by other courts. Abernethy *v.* State, 101 Penn. St. 322; Diesbach *v.* State, 38 Ohio St. 369; aff.; Pauli *v.* Com., 89 Penn. St. 432.

[4] In State *v.* Irvin, 19 Fla. 672, a direction that if certain facts were true the case was murder in the first degree was sustained. State *v.* Gustave, 27 La. An. 395. See State *v.* Bowen, 16 Kan. 475.

[5] See Com. *v.* Fitchburg R. R., 10 Allen, 189; State *v.* Jaeger, 66 Mo. 208. That a judge has not this right is intimated in Howell *v.* People, 5 Hun, 620; S. C., 69 N. Y. 607.

"It has been a disputed question whether the court has power to direct an acquittal, or whether its power is advisory merely, which might or might not be acquiesced in by the prosecuting attorney or by the jury. Practically the result is the same. It is very rare that the prosecuting officer will not accede to the opinion of the court, and still more rare to convict against the advice of the court that it would be improper." . . . . "I can see no reason, therefore, why the court may not, in a case presenting a question of law only, instruct the jury to acquit the prisoner, or to direct an acquittal and enforce the direction; nor why it is not the duty of the court to do so." People *v.* Bennett, 49 N. Y. 141 (1872)—Church, C. J. See, also, People *v.* Harris, 1 Edm. Sel. Cas. 453.

A charge that if the jury believe the

filing such a demurrer.[1] And even where the rule is that the court cannot direct a verdict, a palpable mistake in a verdict may be remitted to the jury for correction.[2]

4. *Verdict against Evidence.*

Verdict against evidence may be set aside.

§ 813. A conviction contrary to the weight of evidence will be set aside when any of the essential allegations of the indictment remain unproved.[3] Thus, where the defendant was charged with burning the shop of B. & C., and no evidence was offered as to ownership;[4] where the evidence on a charge of passing an altered note failed to show that the prisoner knew of the alteration at the time of the passing;[5] where there was a variance on any material incident of the offence;[6] where, on a charge of receiving stolen goods, no evidence existed as to the *scienter*;[7] where, on the same charge, the indictment averred a former conviction for the same offence, but no proof was offered on trial to prove the identity of the defendant with the former defendant;[8] where the *corpus delicti* was not proved;[9] in each of these cases a conviction was set aside on account of the insufficiency of the testimony to support the verdict. If, however, there was conflicting evidence, and the question of fact was left fairly and

witnesses the case is one of manslaughter is not erroneous. State *v.* Vines, 93 N. C. 493. But a bald direction to convict is error. State *v.* Dixon, 75 N. C. 275.

[1] Supra, §§ 407, 706.

[2] Supra, §§ 751 ff.; State *v.* Gilkie, 35 La. An. 53; State *v.* White, Ibid. 96.

[3] U. S. *v.* Duval, Gilpin, 356; Com. *v.* Briggs, 5 Pick. 429; State *v.* Lyon, 12 Conn. 487; Resp. *v.* Lacaze, 2 Dall. 118; Ball *v.* Com., 8 Leigh, 726; Falk *v.* People, 42 Ill. 331; Bruce *v.* State, 87 Ind. 450; Dunn *v.* People, 109 Ill. 635; People *v.* Parkhurst, 49 Mich. 22; People *v.* Kohler, 49 Mich. 324; People *v.* Howard, 50 Mich. 241; State *v.* Atkinson, 93 N. C. 519; State *v.* Anderson, 2 Bailey, 565; State *v.* Fisher, 2 N. & M. 261; Bedford *v.* State, 5 Humph. 553; State *v.* Bird, 1 Mo. 417; see State *v.* Hopper, 71 Mo. 425; State *v.* Leffere, 66 Wis. 355; King *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 256; Satterwhite *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 609; Ellis *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 540; Adams *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 777; Pogue *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 283; Pease *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 18; Hardin *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 192; Walker *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 509; State *v.* Ah Kung, 17 Nev. 361; see Ohms *v.* State, 49 Wis. 415.

[4] State *v.* Lyon, 12 Conn. 487.

[5] State *v.* Anderson, 2 Bailey, 565.

[6] State *v.* Hamilton, 17 S. C. 462; State *v.* Bird, 1 Mo. 417.

[7] Bedford *v.* State, 5 Humph. 553.

[8] Com. *v.* Briggs, 5 Pick. 429.

[9] Ball *v.* Com., 8 Leigh, 726; Hatchett *v.* Com., 76 Va. 1026; State *v.* Hogard, 12 Minn. 293.

fully to the jury, the verdict will generally be permitted to stand,[1] even though the judges may not be able to say that they would have agreed personally to the verdict had the question been left to their exclusive determination.[2] Nor will a new trial be granted for a variance which was not excepted to on the trial.[3]

5. *Irregularity in Conduct of Jury.*

§ 814. The general rule is that the verdict will not be set aside on account of inadvertent irregularity in a jury, even in a capital

[1] U. S. *v.* Daubner, 17 Fed. Rep. 793; Com. *v.* Pease, 137 Mass. 576; Com. *v.* Flanigan, 7 W. & S. 415, 422; Com. *v.* Gallagher, 4 Penn. L. J. 514; 2 Clark, 297; Dearis's case, 32 Grat. 912; Russell's case, 78 Va. 400; Lewis *v.* Com., 81 Va. 416; Jerry *v.* State, 1 Blackf. 395; Taylor *v.* State, 4 Ind. 540; Williams *v.* State, 45 Ind. 157; Weaver *v.* State, 83 Ind. 289; Davis *v.* State, 88 Ind. 145; Garrity *v.* People, 107 Ill. 162; Mooney *v.* People, 111 Ill. 388; Graham *v.* People, 115 Ill. 566; Winfield *v.* State, 3 Iowa, 339; State *v.* Elliott, 15 Iowa, 72; State *v.* Coffee, 60 Iowa, 748; State *v.* Buckley, 60 Iowa, 471; State *v.* Henshaw, 52 Mich. 564; Kirby *v.* State, 3 Humph. 289; Leake *v.* State, 10 Humph. 144; Cassels *v.* State, 4 Yerger, 152; State *v.* Sims, 2 Bailey, 291; Matthis *v.* State, 33 Ga. 24; Davis *v.* State, 33 Ga. 98; Thompson *v.* State, 55 Ga. 47; Mitchell *v.* State, 55 Ga. 556; Russell *v.* State, 68 Ga. 785; State *v.* Shiver, 20 S. C. 392; State *v.* Burnside, 37 Mo. 343; State *v.* Connell, 49 Mo. 282; State *v.* Hicks, 92 Mo. 431; State *v.* Preston, 77 Mo. 496; State *v.* Thomas, 78 Mo. 813; State *v.* Kinney, 81 Mo. 101; State *v.* White, 35 La. An. 96; Bennett *v.* State, 13 Ark. 694; Pleasants *v.* State, 15 Ark. 624; Craft *v.* State, 3 Kans. 450; State *v.* Tatlow, 34 Kans. 80; People *v.* Simpson, 50 Cal. 304; Palmer *v.* People, 4 Neb. 68; Sherman *v.* State, 17 Fla. 888; Jones *v.* People, 6 Cal. 352; Walker *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 609; Territory *v.* Webb, 2 New Mex. 147; Murphy *v.* State, 15 Neb. 383; see, however, People *v.* Gordon, 39 Mich. 508.

[2] Ibid.; Aholtz *v.* People, 121 Ill. 563; State *v.* McCahill, 72 Iowa, 111; see Lander *v.* People, 104 Ill. 248; McLane *v.* State, 4 Ga. 335; Smith *v.* State, 63 Ga. 90; State *v.* Connell, 49 Mo. 282; People *v.* Ah-Loy, 10 Cal. 301; People *v.* Williams, 59 Cal. 674; Monroe *v.* State, 23 Tex. 210; Walker *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 609; Pleasants *v.* State, 15 Ark. 624; State *v.* Crozier, 12 Nev. 300; Murphy *v.* State, 15 Neb. 383; see, however, Rafferty *v.* People, 72 Ill. 37; Marlatt *v.* People, 104 Ill. 364.

The general court in Virginia will only set aside a verdict, because it is contrary to the evidence, in a case where the jury has plainly decided against the evidence, or without evidence. Hill's case, 2 Grattan, 594. Where the evidence is contradictory, and the verdict is against the weight of evidence, though a new trial may be granted by the court trying the case at their discretion, their decision is not examinable by an appellate court. See Grayson *v.* Com., 6 Grat. 712; State *v.* Cruise, 16 Mo. 391; Herber *v.* State, 7 Tex. 69; Brite *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 368.

[3] State *v.* Craige, 89 N. C. 475.

case, unless it be such as might affect their impartiality, or disqualify them for the proper exercise of their functions.[1] An exception, however, formerly existed in England, and is still recognized in several of the United States, in felonies, where the jury separate after the opening of the evidence. While on the one hand the present practice in England, and in a portion of the American courts, is to sustain the verdict when such separation has been inadvertent or necessary, and no abuse has resulted from it; on the other hand, it has been considered in several instances that the mere separation, after the case is committed to the jury, is in itself reason for a new trial.[2]

Mere inadvertent and innoxious separation not generally ground for new trial.

§ 815. The latter doctrine was pressed with great rigor by the early common law authorities in all cases, both civil and criminal; it being agreed that by "the law of England, a jury, after the evidence given upon the issue, ought to be kept together in some convenient place, without meat or drink, fire or candle, which some books call an imprisonment, and without speech with any, unless it be the bailiff, and with him only if they be agreed."[3] A more humane system has since been recognized; and in all cases not capital juries are permitted to separate, until the case is finally committed to them, at the discretion of the court.[4] In capital cases, however, in some States, under no circumstances will separation be permitted until a verdict is agreed on;[5] and so far, as has been already seen,[6] has this doctrine been pushed in several instances in this country, that it has been held

In some courts this view is not accepted.

[1] State *v.* Prescott, 7 N. H. 290; Com. *v.* Roby, 12 Pick. 496, 519; State *v.* Babcock, 1 Conn. 401; People *v.* Douglass, 4 Cowen, 26; Bebee *v.* People, 5 Hill, 32; Martin *v.* Com., 2 Leigh, 745; Tooel *v.* Com., 11 Leigh, 714; McCarter *v.* Com., 11 Leigh, 633; Stone *v.* State, 4 Humph. 27; State *v.* Fox, Geo. Decis. part i. 35; State *v.* Peter, Ibid. 46; Whitney *v.* State, 8 Mo. 165; State *v.* Barton, 19 Mo. 227; State *v.* Igo, 21 Mo. 459; May *v.* People, 8 Col. 210. For English practice see R. *v.* Woolf, 1 Chitty R. 401. For other cases see infra, § 821.

[2] See this examined, in reference to the plea of once in jeopardy, supra, §§ 490 *et seq.*; and, as to general conduct of jury, supra, §§ 720, 721.

[3] Co. Lit. 227. See Bac. Ab. Verdicts, pl. 19; Com. Dig. Inquest, F. Supra, §§ 720 *et seq.*, 814.

[4] R. *v.* Woolf, 1 Chitty R. 401; 1 Ch. C. L. 664.

[5] Cochran *v.* State, 7 Humph. 544. See supra, §§ 508–11, 720 *et seq.*; Bac. Abr. Juries, G.

[6] See supra, §§ 490, 511.

that if a jury when once charged and sworn be discharged, except in case of such necessity as may be considered as the act of God, such discharge in capital cases is a bar to a second trial.[1] But, as will be seen, this rule is now much relaxed.[2]

[1] *Pennsylvania.*—In a capital case before the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in 1851, it appeared by the record that, "on the 15th of March, 1851, after the jury were sworn, it was agreed by the counsel of the Commonwealth and the counsel of the defendant, and agreed by the court, that the jurors sworn in this case be permitted to separate and return to their respective homes, and return to the jury box on Tuesday morning next, March 18th," when they all attended, and a verdict of murder in the first degree was rendered. The judgment was reversed, and the prisoner ordered back for another trial. Peiffer *v.* Com., 15 Penn. St. 471. See supra, § 733.

Subsequently, on the trial of a party, charged with burglary, the jury, after being cautioned by the court to avoid all conversation with any person about the case, were allowed to separate at the usual times of adjournment. McCreary *v.* Com., 29 Penn. St. 323.

Virginia.—In Virginia, the weight of authority is, that in cases of felony it is not necessary, in order to set aside the verdict, to show actual tampering, or conversation on the subject of the trial, with a juryman, but that the mere fact of the separation from the custody of the officer is usually sufficient. See Com. *v.* McCaul, 1 Va. Ca. 271; Philips *v.* Com., 19 Grat. 485; Overbee *v.* Com., 1 Robins. 756. But the bare possibility of tampering, it is conceded, is not adequate reason for a new trial. Sprouce *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 375; Kennedy *v.* Com., 2 Va. Ca. 510; McCarter *v.* Com., 11 Leigh, 633; Tooel *v.* Com., Ibid. 714; Martin *v.* Com., 2 Leigh, 743; Thompson's case, 8 Grat. 638; see State *v.* Cucuel, 2 Vroom, 31 N. J. L. 249; supra, §§ 718, 719.

In *Tennessee*, it has been determined that where there is an unauthorized separation of a jury for fifteen or twenty minutes, it is not necessary for the prisoner to prove that they were during their absence tampered with; it is sufficient if they might have been. M'Lain *v.* State, 10 Yerg. 241; Jarnagin *v.* State, 10 Yerg. 529; though see Stone *v.* State, 4 Humph. 27. Where, however, it was affirmatively shown that no communication with other persons was had, a new trial was refused. Hines *v.* State, 8 Humph. 597. In felonies, however, a separation from day to day, even with the prisoner's consent, vitiates the verdict. Wiley *v.* State, 1 Swan (Tenn.), 256.

In *Louisiana*, it is said that in all criminal cases, the separation of the jury, though by leave of the court, and with the consent of the accused and his counsel, will vitiate the verdict, if such separation take place after the evidence has been closed, and the charge given. State *v.* Populus, 12 La. An. 710. See State *v.* Evans, 21 La. An. 321.

In *Minnesota*, when the court, after charging the jury, gave them a recess of five minutes, in which they were allowed to leave the court-room and go at large, without being in charge of an officer, and without objection from

[2] Infra, § 819. See 7 South. Law Rev. 501 *et seq.*

§ 816. Separation before the case is opened and the jury charged does not seem, even in the strictest practice, to be considered cause

either side, this was held to be ground for a new trial. State *v.* Parrant, 16 Minn. 178.

New York. — Irregular Reception of Evidence, or Conversing with Strangers on the Case fatal, but mere Separation not by itself sufficient Ground.—In New York, mere separation, without permission, appears formerly to have been considered *primâ facie* evidence of misbehavior. See Spencer, Ch. J., 18 Johnson, 218. But the better opinion now is, that to vitiate the verdict, reasonable suspicion of abuse must exist. Horton *v.* Horton, 2 Cowen, 589; People *v.* Douglass, 4 Cowen, 26; Oliver *v.* Trustees, 5 Cowen, 284; People *v.* Ransom, 7 Wend. 423; People *v.* Bebee, 5 Hill (N. Y.), 32. "The conclusion from these cases," said Sutherland, J., "appears to me to be this: that any mere informality or mistake of an officer in drawing a jury, or any irregularity or misconduct in the jury themselves, will not be sufficient ground for setting aside a verdict, either in a criminal or civil case, where the court are satisfied that the party complaining has not, and could not, have sustained any injury from it." People *v.* Ransom, 7 Wend. 423. But where a jury, empanelled to try a prisoner upon an indictment for murder, were allowed to leave the court-house during the trial, under the charge of two sworn constables, and having left the court-house two of them separated from their fellows, went to their lodgings, a distance of thirty rods, ate cakes, took some with them on their return, and drank spirituous liquor, though not enough to affect them in the least, and one of them conversed with strangers on the subject of the trial; it was held, that though the mere separation was not, in itself, fatal, the drinking of spirituous liquor, and the conversing on the case, were sufficient reasons for a new trial. People *v.* Douglass, 4 Cowen, 26. After the evidence in a trial for murder had all been submitted, six of the jurors leaving their fellows, went, under the charge of an officer, on a walk for exercise, in the course of which they visited and viewed the premises where the homicide was alleged to have been committed, and returned after an absence of an hour. No person had been permitted to speak to them, and no improper conduct had taken place. But after conviction and sentence this was ruled to be good ground for a new trial. Eastwood *v.* People, 3 Parker C. R. 25; S. C., 14 N. Y. 562. See supra, § 707.

In the same State it has been held by a majority of the court, that on the record alone, it is not error in law, in a capital trial, for the judge, with the unsolicited assent of the prisoner, to permit the jury to separate from time to time before the charge is given to them, and they retire to deliberate upon their verdict. Stephens *v.* People, 19 N. Y. 549. But the consent of a prisoner to his trial by less than a full jury of twelve is a nullity, and a conviction thereby produced is illegal. Ruloff *v.* People, 18 N. Y. 179. See supra, § 733.

In New Hampshire, Connecticut, North Carolina, Indiana, and Missouri, something beyond mere Separation must be shown.—In New Hampshire, after a review of the authorities, the more liberal rule was adopted; it being determined that it is necessary to show something more than mere separation to set aside the verdict (State *v.* Prescott, 7 N. H. 290); the same course appears to be pursued in Connecticut (State *v.* Babcock, 1

for setting aside a verdict.[1] Thus, where the jury had been empanelled and sworn, and where, before any evidence was given,

Conn. 401), in North Carolina (State *v.* Miller, 1 Dev. & Bat. 500; see 1 Hayw. 238) such separation on misdemeanors being at the discretion of the court. State *v.* Barber, 89 N. C. 524. In Indiana (see Wyatt *v.* State, 1 Blackf. 257; Porter *v.* State, 2 Carter, 435; Creek *v.* State, 24 Ind. 151), a statute exists permitting separation during trial and before submission of the case. Evans *v.* State, 7 Ind. 271. The same view is taken in Missouri. State *v.* Brannon, 45 Mo. 329; State *v.* Dougherty, 55 Mo. 69.

In South Carolina Separation is at Discretion of Court.—In South Carolina, the jury, it is said, are not required to remain together even after they are charged, though the case be capital (State *v.* McKee, 1 Bailey, 651); and it is ruled that it is within the sound discretion of the presiding judge to allow a juror to leave the jury-box for a brief time, even during the trial of a capital case. State *v.* McElmurray, 3 Strobh. 33.

In Mississippi, Burden on Prosecution to disprove Impropriety.—In Mississippi the tendency of authority is to set aside a verdict after separation, unless it affirmatively appear there was nothing communicated to the jury on the subject of the trial. McCann *v.* State, 9 Sm. & Mars. 465; Nelms *v.* State, 13 Ibid. 500; Boles *v.* State, 13 Ibid. 398; Hare *v.* State, 4 How. (Miss.) 194; Browning *v.* State, 33 Miss. 48; Ned. *v.* State, Ibid. 364.

In *Ohio*, by the Code of Criminal Procedure, §§ 164, 165, "in the trial of felonies the jury shall not be permitted to separate, after being sworn, until discharged by the court. In the trial of misdemeanors, they shall not be permitted to separate after receiving the charge of the court, until discharged." See Davis *v.* State, 15 Ohio, 72; Hurley *v.* State, 6 Ohio, 399; Poage *v.* State, 3 Ohio St. 229; Dobbins *v.* State, 14 Ohio St. 493. Supra, § 505.

In *Illinois* and *Arkansas*, in case of separation, the burden is said to be on the prosecution to show that the defendant was not prejudiced by the separation. Jumpertz *v.* State, 21 Ill. 375; Russell *v.* People, 44 Ill. 508; Adams *v.* People, 47 Ill. 376; Cornelius *v.* State, 7 Eng. (Ark.) 782.

In *California*, it was once said that if a juror, in a criminal trial, separate without leave of the court, though with the prisoner's consent, and if the separation was such that he might have been improperly influenced by others, the verdict will be set aside. People *v.* Backus, 5 Cal. 275. This decision, however, was declared in 1861 to go "to the verge of the true rule, if not beyond;" and where the jurors separated for the purposes of nature, and it was in evidence that no one communicated with them during this momentary separation, the Supreme Court refused to set aside the verdict. People *v.* Bonney, 19 Cal. 426. And subsequently it was decided that separation without permission does not vitiate a verdict, if it be shown that no injury resulted thereby to the defendant. People *v.* Symonds, 22 Cal. 348.

In *Georgia*, mere exposure to intrusion, intrusion not being proved, does not vitiate a verdict. Roberts *v.* State, 14 Ga. 8; Burtine *v.* State, 18 Ga. 534; Epps *v.* State, 19 Ga. 102; Mitchell *v.* State, 22 Ga. 211. See State *v.* Perry, 1 Busbee, 330; supra, § 751.

[1] State *v.* Cucuel, 2 Vroom, 249; McFadden *v.* Com., 23 Penn. St. 12;

Separation before case is opened always permissible.

three of the jurors separated from their fellows for a brief space of time, it was ruled that such separation, before any evidence given, was no cause for setting aside a verdict of conviction; especially in the case at bar, where the separation was so momentary that any tampering with the jurors was hardly possible.[1] In another case, in empanelling a jury for trial on an indictment for felony, eight were elected and sworn, and three elected but not sworn; one, who had been sworn, separated from the rest, went some miles off and stayed some hours; the other ten were put in charge of the sheriff, to be kept together and separate from other persons, till the ensuing morning; the absconding juryman was taken the same night, and placed in the same room with the other jurymen till next morning; but there appeared to have been no conversation on the subject of the prosecution; the next morning, by allowance of the court, this juryman was challenged by the prisoner for cause, and set aside, and the jury was then completed. On a motion for a new trial, after conviction, it was held that the separation of the absconding juryman from his fellows, and his subsequent association with them, though he was afterwards struck from the panel, did not vitiate the verdict, and was no good reason for a new trial.[2] Yet in all cases jurors, after being sworn, should be directed by the court to hear or read nothing on the subject of the case.

In misdemeanors jury may separate during trial.

§ 817. In misdemeanors it is the practice to permit the jury to separate during the trial. Thus, in a case which has been generally followed in this country, on a motion for a new trial, after conviction for conspiracy, it appeared that the trial had lasted two days; that on the first day the court sat from the morning till eleven o'clock at night; and that on the adjournment the jury separated, going to their several homes, and returned the next morning. The separation was without the knowledge of the defendant and his counsel, and without the consent of the court. It was held, however, not to constitute ground for disturbing the verdict of guilty which the jury rendered.[3]

Martin *v.* Com., 2 Leigh, 745; Cohron *v.* State, 20 Ga. 752; supra, §§ 517, 718.

[1] McFadden *v.* Com., 23 Penn. St. 12.

[2] Tooel *v.* Com., 11 Leigh, 714. Supra, § 518.

[3] R. *v.* Woolf, 1 Ch. R. 401. To same effect see Ex parte Hill, 3 Cowan,

§ 818. Even in felonies less than capital the jury are generally permitted to separate at the adjournments of the court until the period when, at the close of the trial, the case is finally committed to their charge. After this, they must remain together until they agree, or until they are discharged by the court.[1] When a sealed verdict is permitted, there may be a separation after giving the verdict to the foreman.[2]

And so in felonies less than capital.

§ 819. Separation, after the jury are sworn and the case opened,[3] has in capital cases been considered a ground for new trial, even without any evidence that the jury were communicated with concerning the case;[4] and if the object is to exclude tampering, such a precaution is as necessary *before* as *after* the final committal of the case. Yet lately a more liberal practice has arisen, based on the difficulty of keeping juries together, without sickness or great business inconvenience, during protracted trials; and cases are not unfrequent in which, even in capital issues, juries have been permitted to separate at the adjournments of the court, down to the period in which the case is finally committed to their deliberation.[5] Nor can it be

But not generally in capital felonies.

355; Wyatt *v.* State, 1 Blackf. 25; State *v.* Miller, 1 Dev. & Bat. 500; State *v.* Carstaphen, 2 Hayw. 238; State *v.* Barber, 89 N. C. 524, and cases in prior note. In Indiana such separation is allowed in all cases by statute. Evans *v.* State, 7 Ind. 271.

[1] Com. *v.* Tobin, 125 Mass. 203; M'Creary *v.* Com., 29 Penn. St. 323; State *v.* M'Kinley, 31 Kan. 571; Dallas *v.* State, 35 La. An. 899. Otherwise in Ohio by statute. See supra, § 815, note. State *v.* Clifford, 58 Wis. 477.

[2] Silvey *v.* State, 71 Ga. 553; supra, § 749.

[3] State *v.* Burns, 33 Mo. 483. That until this period the defendant is not supposed to be in jeopardy, see supra, § 517. But see McQuillen *v.* State, 8 Sm. & M. 587.

[4] See cases cited supra, §§ 518, 733; Peiffer *v.* Com., 15 Penn. St. 468; Wesley *v.* State, 11 Humph. 502; where it was said that the irregularity could not be cured by the prisoner's consent. S. P., in Texas, Grissom *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 374. Compare Quinn *v.* State, 14 Ind. 589; Jumpertz *v.* People, 21 Ill. 375; Woods *v.* State, 43 Miss. 364; McLean *v.* State, 8 Mo. 153; State *v.* Frank, 23 La. An. 213. Poage *v.* State, 3 Ohio St. 229, may be cited under Ohio statute.

[5] Infra, § 824; State *v.* Babcock, 1 Conn. 401; People *v.* Douglass, 4 Cow. 26, 28; Adams *v.* People, 47 Ill. 376; State *v.* Feller, 25 Iowa, 67; State *v.* Anderson, 2 Bailey, 565; State *v.* McKee, 1 Bailey, 651; State *v.* Miller, 1 Dev. & B. 500; State *v.* Belcher, 13 S. C. 459; State *v.* Brannon, 45 Mo. 329; State *v.* Hendricks, 32 Kan. 559; State *v.* Ryan, 13 Minn. 370. Coker *v.* State, 20 Ark. 53; People *v.* Bonney, 19 Cal. 426; Card *v.* People, 3 Neb. 357; see Eastwood *v.* People, 3 Park. C. R. 25; Stephens *v.* People, 19 N.

denied that there is growing reason for the acceptance of this view. No juries composed of right materials can be kept together day and night during the trial of a case which lasts for days if not for weeks, without great discomfort and risk to themselves, and positive damage to the business community. We have, therefore, to decide between one of three courses. We must go on with a case, according to the old English fashion, day and night, until it terminates; or we must make up our juries from idlers, if not vagrants, whose seclusion will be no public loss, and perhaps not much inconvenience to themselves; or, if we summon business and family men charged with other duties, and thus competent to decide difficult issues, we must permit such adjournments and separations during trial as will preserve the health and protect the business relations of the jurors. If such men be obtained on a jury, there is no more reason for their confinement and seclusion than there is for the confinement and seclusion of the judges trying the case. Of course stringent charge should be made in any view to the jurors to listen to nothing out of court on the subject of the case; and these admonitions should be followed, not only by new trials, but by severe punishment of the offending jurors, if the injunction be not obeyed.[1]

Court in such cases may adjourn from day to day.

§ 820. In cases of such sickness or temporary incapacities as do not permanently touch the competency of the jury, the court may adjourn the jury from day to day, until the incapacity is removed; nor is there any reason to doubt that, with the limitations hereinafter expressed, the jury, due caution being given them by the court, may be permitted to separate. On this point may be accepted the remarks of Judge Story, in a case where the principal witness for the prosecution refusing to testify, the case was brought to a stand-still, whereupon the court, on motion of the district-attorney, discharged the jury, and remanded the case for another trial.[2] From the printed report it does not appear that the order of the court was that the jury should be *dis-*

Y. 549; State *v.* McElmurray, 3 Strobh. 33. Polin *v.* State, 14 Neb. 540. The question of consent is discussed supra, § 733.

[1] Striking remarks on this point of Strong, J., are reported in Stephens *v.* People, 19 N. Y. 550.

[2] U. S. *v.* Coolidge, 2 Gallison, 364. See, also, U. S. *v.* Haskell, 4 Wash. C. C. 402; State *v.* Bullock, 63 N. C. 570; and see supra, §§ 508, 723 *et seq.*

charged, but merely that the case should be *postponed*. And what has just been quoted applies to a mere motion to adjourn the trial.

In England short adjournments have been permitted to enable a witness to be instructed as to the nature of an oath ;[1] but in felonies it is said that the judge has no power even to order an adjournment from day to day on account of absence of prosecutor or witnesses.[2] It is otherwise, however, when a juror or prisoner is taken so ill as to be unable to proceed with the trial.[3]

§ 821. *Summary of Law as to Separation of Jurors after the Final Commitment to them of the Case.*—1. Separation of the jury, in a capital case, after they have been sworn and empanelled, in such a way as to expose them to tampering, may be ground for a new trial.[4] The authorities, however, differ as to whether, (1) This ground is absolute ; or, (2) *Prima facie*, subject to be rebutted by proof from the prosecution that no improper influence reached the jury ; or, (3) Merely contingent, upon proof to be offered by the defence that a tampering really took place.

Conflict of opinion as to whether separation after commitment of case is permissible.

§ 822. (1) Among those holding the *first* view, the courts of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Tennessee take, at least in capital cases, the most extreme position, they maintaining that even consent of prisoner cannot, in such cases, cure a separation.[5]

Courts holding such separation fatal.

[1] See Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 371 *et seq.*

[2] R. *v.* Tempest, 1 F. & F. 381 ; R. *v.* Parr, 2 F. & F. 861 ; R. *v.* Robson, 4 F. & F. 360 ; R. *v.* Perkins, Ld. Raym. 64.

[3] Supra, § 508.

[4] A juror retiring in case of necessity with a bailiff is no separation. Neal *v.* State, 64 Ga. 272 ; State *v.* Collins, 86 Mo. 245 ; State *v.* Payton, 90 Mo. 220; State *v.* Washburn, 91 Mo. 571 ; Skates *v.* State, 64 Miss. 644.

[5] State *v.* Cucuel, 2 Vroom (31 N. J. L.), 249 ; Peiffer *v.* Com., 15 Penn. St. 469 ; Wesley *v.* State, 11 Humph. 502 ; Odle *v.* State, 6 Baxt. 159 ; Wiley *v.* State, 1 Swan, 256 ; Woods *v.* State, 43 Miss. 364 ; State *v.* Crosby, 4 La. An. 434 ; State *v.* Populus, 12 La. An. 710. See supra, §§ 518, 783. In Mississippi, however, a more liberal view has been subsequently taken. Coleman *v.* State, 59 Miss. 484. Compare Com. *v.* McCaul, 1 Va. Cas. 271 ; Overbee *v.* Com., 1 Robins. Va. 756 ; McLean *v.* State, 8 Mo. 153 ; State *v.* Murray, 91 Mo. 95. In Early *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 248, it was held that even a separation (without consent) caused by a fire burning the hotel where the jury were confined, vitiates the verdict, though the jurymen all swore that they heard nothing from outside as to the case. Bare separation under statute is ground for reversal in capital cases. State *v.* Collins, 81 Mo. 652. In Louisiana, however, the separation must appear of record to be ground for reversal. State *v.* Populus, *ut sup.*

Courts holding such separation only *prima facie* ground.

§ 823. (2) That such separation, in a capital case, is *prima facie* ground for a new trial, subject to be rebutted by proof from the prosecution that no improper influence reached the jury, is the position generally taken by the American courts.[1]

Courts holding such separation fatal only where there is proof of tampering.

§ 824. (3) There are, however, cases in which it has been held that separation of the jury is only ground for new trial when sustained by proof of tampering, the burden of which is on the defendant.[2] In some courts, also, it is held that the question of the rightfulness of such separation is within the discretion of the judge trying the case, not subject to revision on error;[3] but this only holds in cases in which there has been no manifest injustice exhibited on the record.[4]

The latter view held as to misdemeanors.

§ 825. 2. In felonies not capital, and misdemeanors, it is for the defendant to prove tampering; and separation is within the discretion of the court.[5]

[1] State *v.* Prescott, 7 N. H. 291; Com. *v.* Roby, 12 Pick. 496; State *v.* Babcock, 1 Conn. 401; State *v.* O'Brien, 7 R. I. 337; People *v.* Douglass, 1 Cow. 26; Eastwood *v.* People, 3 Park. C. R. 25; S. C., 14 N. Y. 562; Philips *v.* Com., 19 Grat. 485; State *v.* Tilghman, 11 Ired. 514; Cohron *v.* State, 20 Ga. 752; Caleb *v.* State, 39 Miss. 721; Skates *v.* State, 64 Miss. 644; Jumpertz *v.* People, 21 Ill. 373; Reins *v.* State, 30 Ill. 256; Creek *v.* State, 24 Ind. 151; Maher *v.* State, 3 Minn. 444; Rowan *v.* State, 30 Wis. 132; State *v.* Dolling, 37 Wis. 396; Hines *v.* State, 8 Humph. 597; Cornelius *v.* State, 7 Eng. (Ark.) 732; Binns *v.* State, 35 Ark. 118; Wright *v.* State, 35 Ark. 639; Madden *v.* State, 1 Kans. 340; People *v.* Symonds, 22 Cal. 348; reviewing People *v.* Backus, 5 Cal. 275; Coleman *v.* State, 17 Fla. 206; People *v.* Bush, 68 Cal. 623; Cox *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 1; West *v.* State, Id. 150; Elkin *v.* People, 5 Col. 508.

After a conviction of manslaughter it is no ground for a reversal that one of the jurors had been absent, during an adjournment of the case, for ten days, in the custody of a sworn officer, under suitable instructions; though it would have been otherwise had the conviction been for a capital offence. Moss *v.* Com., 107 Penn. St. 267.

[2] Supra, § 819; State *v.* Camp, 23 Vt. 551. See People *v.* Reagle, 60 Barb. 527; State *v.* Stewart, 26 S. C. 125; Medler *v.* State, 26 Ind. 171; Riley *v.* State, 95 Ind. 446; Crockett *v.* State, 52 Wis. 211; State *v.* Hendricks, 32 Kan. 559; Mann *v.* State, 3 Head (Tenn.), 373; Cartwright *v.* State, 12 Lea, 620; State *v.* Jones, 7 Nev. 408; Russell *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 288; Bird *v.* State, 18 Fla. 493.

[3] Sargent *v.* State, 11 Ohio, 472; State *v.* Engle, 13 Ohio, 490; Davis *v.* State, 15 Ohio, 72; State *v.* Anderson, 2 Bailey, 565; State *v.* McElmurray, 3 Strobh. 34. Supra, §§ 500 *et seq.*, 733, 814.

[4] See supra, §§ 494 *et seq.*

[5] See cases cited supra, §§ 814, 815; State *v.* Madoil, 12 Fla. 151.

§ 826. 3. Even should separation, prior to charge of court, irregularly take place, without tampering, this, according to the preponderance of authority, may be cured by the defendant's consent.[1]

When irregularities may be cured by consent.

Until the panel is complete, separation may in any view take place.[2]

§ 827. As has been already noticed,[3] the officer having charge of the jury should be duly sworn to keep them "in some convenient and private place," etc., "and not suffer any person to speak with them, nor to speak to them yourself on the subject of the case, without leave of court." Should the jury be accompanied by an unsworn officer, the verdict will be set aside unless it appear affirmatively that it was not in any way influenced by the inadvertence.[4] A series of officers may be successively sworn for this purpose, to keep up the chain of attendance.[5] But it is not, in all jurisdictions, necessary that the officer should have a special jurat.[6] Nor is it ground for new trial that among the deputy sheriffs who had general custody of the jury was one who was a witness on the trial for the prosecution,[7] though it has been held otherwise when the officer actually in close attendance was such a witness.[8]

Unsworn officer; intrusion of officer during deliberations.

The intrusion even of a legally qualified officer on the deliberations of the jury may be a ground for new trial,[9] though there is good

[1] Supra, §§ 351, 518, 733.

[2] Supra, § 517.

[3] Supra, § 728.

[4] McIntyre *v.* People, 38 Ill. 514; Wilhelm *v.* People, 72 Ill. 468; Brucker *v.* State, 16 Wis. 333; Luster *v.* State, 11 Humph. 169; Hare *v.* State, 4 How. (Miss.) 187; McCann *v.* State, 9 S. & M. 465; though see Trim *v.* Com., 18 Grat. 983. That the officer's oath must be specific, see Spain *v.* State, 8 Baxt. 514. If the record avers that the jury were in charge of the proper officer, the presumption is that he was sworn. Clark *v.* State, 8 Baxt. 591.

[5] Wormeley's case, 8 Grat. 712. See Com. *v.* Jenkins, Thach. C. C. 118.

[6] Davis *v.* State, 15 Ohio, 72; Stone *v.* State, 4 Humph. 27. See Doyal *v.* State, 70 Ga. 134. That in Missouri the officer must be sworn when the jury pass into his charge, see State *v.* Underwood, 76 Mo. 630. And this is the better view.

[7] Read *v.* Com., 22 Grat. 924. See infra, § 835.

[8] State *v.* Snyder, 20 Kans. 306; McElrath *v.* State, 2 Swan, 378. Infra, § 850.

[9] People *v.* Knapp, 42 Mich. 267.

There are, however, many cases in which officers in charge are necessarily in attendance during the jury's deliberations. Such attendance should only be ground to set aside the verdict when it amounts to presence during

reason as well as high authority to hold that when the officer is shown to have in no way interfered with the deliberations, such presence being for the comfort and security of the jury, and in no way acting as a restraint or pressure on them, this does not vitiate the verdict.[1]

It is a violation of duty, which is ground for a new trial, for the officer to speak to the jury on the case, unless to ask whether they have agreed on a verdict;[2] or to treat them, he hoping for a reward in case of conviction.[3]

Improper reception of materials of proof ground for new trial.

§ 828. The jury are entitled to take out with them such papers and instruments of evidence as have been admitted in the case, provided all asked for are sent out, and the action of the court in this respect be at the close of the trial, in open court and before the parties.[4] Should the jury receive any material paper, book, or other article, likely to affect their deliberations, which has not been put in evidence, this, if leading to a conviction, will be a cause for setting aside the verdict,[5] unless the reception was not objected to at the time by defendant's counsel, though then cognizant of the fact.[6]

In another volume[7] will be found an enumeration of the cases in which the jury are permitted to inspect articles material to the issue. If this be done out of court, in the absence of the defendant, it is a fatal irregularity. Hence, experiments by a jury with old boots to see whether they would make tracks of a particular kind, such experiments being out of court, and without leave of court, will vitiate a conviction.[8] But it is otherwise when the court grant leave, in the presence of parties, to take out the articles in question.[9] Thus

the jury's discussions, or when it interferes with freedom of deliberation, or when the officer is shown to have a bias in the case, or, as has been seen, not to have been duly qualified.

[1] State *v.* Hopkins, 35 Vt. 250; People *v.* Hartung, 4 Park. 216, 256; People *v.* Wilson, 4 Park. 619; Gainey *v.* People, 97 Ill. 270; State *v.* Hopper, 71 Mo. 425; Read *v.* Com., 22 Grat. 924; Crockett *v.* State, 52 Wis. 211; Com. *v.* Shields, 2 Bush, 81; Jones *v.* State, 68 Ga. 760.

[2] Rickard *v.* State, 74 Ind. 275; State *v.* Dallas, 35 La. An. 899.

[3] People *v.* Myers, 70 Cal. 582.

[4] Rainforth *v.* State, 61 Ill. 365; see State *v.* Tompkins, 71 Mo. 613.

[5] Supra, § 729; Co. Lit. 227; 2 Hale P. C. 306; R. *v.* Sutton, 4 M. & S. 532; Whitney *v.* Whitman, 5 Mass. 405; Com. *v.* Edgerly, 10 Allen, 184; Yates *v.* People, 38 Ill. 527; Atkins *v.* State, 16 Ark. 568; People *v.* Page, 1 Idaho, 114; see Jones *v.* State, 89 Ind. 82.

[6] State *v.* Nichols, 29 Minn. 357; Jackson *v.* State, 76 Ga. 551.

[7] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 312.

[8] State *v.* Saunders, 68 Mo. 120.

[9] Powell *v.* State, 61 Miss. 319.

it is no ground for a new trial that the court permitted the jury to take out a bottle of ale which was a part of the ale whose manufacture was the subject of the trial.[1] But it is settled that a verdict will be set aside when the jury, during their deliberations, receive a paper of any character, not in evidence, calculated to lead them to the verdict they render,[2] there being no proof offered that the jury were not prejudiced by the paper.[3] It is otherwise where a paper, without the action of the successful party, finds its way into the jury-box, but is not read by the jury.[4]

§ 829. The old rule was that if a jury send for a book, on their own motion, after they have retired, and read it, their verdict is avoided ;[5] and this distrust has been extended so far as to withhold from the jury treatises on law which both parties consent to permit the jury to read. Thus, on one occasion, Lord Tenterden, though the counsel on both sides consented, refused to send out to the jury, on their request, a copy of Selwyn's Law of Nisi Prius, observing that the proper course for the jury to adopt was for them to come into court, state their

So of irregular reception of books.

[1] State *v.* McCafferty, 64 Me. 223. As to what papers go out, see Udderzook *v.* Com., 76 Penn. St. 340.

Where the solicitor for the plaintiffs, after the evidence was concluded, delivered a bundle of depositions to the jury, a portion of which were not in evidence, the verdict for the plaintiffs was set aside, though the jury swore that they had not opened the bundle. 2 Hale P. C. 308.

[2] Vicary *v.* Farthing, Cro. Eliz. 411; Lonsdale *v.* Brown, 4 Wash. C. C. 148; Hackley *v.* Hastee, 3 Johns. 252; Sheaff *v.* Gray, 2 Yeates, 273; Alexander *v.* Jamieson, 5 Binn. 238; Com. *v.* Landis, 12 Phila. 576; 34 Leg. Int. 204; State *v.* Tindall, 10 Richards, 212; State *v.* Taylor, 20 Kans. 643.

[3] Com. *v.* Landis, 12 Phila. 576; State *v.* Lantz, 23 Kan. 728; Carter *v.* State, 9 Lea, 440.

[4] Hix *v.* Drury, 5 Pick. 296; Com. *v.* Edgerton, 10 Allen, 184.

It has been held that a new trial will not be granted after conviction in a capital case merely because the jury, during their deliberations, became possessed of and read a newspaper, containing a report of the trial, but no comments thereon which could prejudice the prisoner; nor because they had the statute defining the offence under trial before them during their deliberations. People *v.* Gaffney, 14 Abb. Pr. (N. S.) 36. It is otherwise where the reports are imperfect. Walker *v.* State, 37 Tex. 366. See Wilson *v.* People, 4 Park. C. R. 619.

In Farrar *v.* State, 2 Ohio St. 54, where a jury, without the knowledge or aid of any one, procured a part of a newspaper containing the charge of the judge in the cause, and used it to guide their deliberations, although the report was accurate, the verdict was set aside.

[5] Vin. Abr. pl. 18; Co. Lit. 227. See Farrar *v.* State, 2 Ohio St. 54.

question, and receive the law from the court.[1] The reception by the jury, also, without application to and consent of the court, of the statutes bearing on the case, has been ruled ground for setting aside a verdict of conviction;[2] but it has been held to be no such ground that the jury during their deliberations had the opportunity of access to a set of State reports;[3] or that they obtained a copy of the code in order to frame their verdict.[4]

So of reception of reports of evidence.

§ 829 *a*. Does the reception by the jury of a report of the evidence avoid the verdict? It certainly does not when the jury do not read the paper, or read only collateral matters from the same paper not relative to the case. Thus, where the officers attending upon the jury, under a mistake of duty, permitted them to read the newspapers, the officers first inspecting them, and cutting out everything that in any manner related to the trial; and it appeared that, in point of fact, the jurors never saw anything in any newspaper relative to the trial, and after the charge from the court were not allowed to see any until after they had delivered their verdict; it was held, by Judge Story, that this was an irregularity in the officers, but not sufficient to justify the court in setting aside a verdict and granting a new trial,

[1] Burrows *v*. Unwin, 3 C. & P. 310. See Hunnicut *v*. State, 18 Tex. Ap. 523.

In a case of treason, before Wilson, Blair, and Patterson, justices, in the U. S. Circuit Court, the jury, as is stated by Mr. Dallas, were permitted, with consent of parties, to take with them Foster's Crown Law, and the Acts of Congress. U. S. *v*. Vigol, 2 Dallas, 347; Whart. State Tr. 176.

The Supreme Court of Louisiana, in 1871, in a case where the allegation was that the jury, in considering their verdict, were allowed by the trial judge "to have in their room Wharton's Crim. Law, to consult in relation to their verdict," declared "that we see no force in the point." State *v*. Tally, 23 La. An. 678.

In Durham *v*. State, 70 Ga. 264, it was held that assent by defendant's counsel to the jury deliberating in the court-room, though counsel was advised that the court-room contained law books bearing on the case, precluded an objection being taken to the jury reading the books.

[2] State *v*. Kimball, 50 Me. 509. See State *v*. Patterson, 45 Vt. 308; State *v*. Smith, 6 R. I. 33; Merrill *v*. Navy, 6 R. I. 33; but see *contra*, Loew *v*. State, 60 Wis. 559; People *v*. Gaffney, 14 Abb. Pr. (N. S.) 36.

[3] State *v*. Hopper, 71 Mo. 425. See State *v*. Harris, 34 La. An. 118.

[4] Graves *v*. State, 63 Ga. 740. See People *v*. Draper, 28 Hun, 1; State *v*. Tanner, 38 La. An. 307. In State *v*. Robinson, 20 W. Va. 713, it was held that permission to the jury to receive sealed letters was ground for new trial.

or treating the matter as a mistrial.[1] But where the jury, on their own motion, obtain, after they retire, a report of the judge's charge, which they use to guide their deliberations, this, as has been seen, has been held ground to set aside a verdict of conviction.[2] But it has been ruled that the mere fact of a jury becoming possessed, after retiring, of an accurate newspaper report of the evidence, without any comments thereon, is not ground to set aside the verdict;[3] though it is otherwise when the report is imperfect,[4] or when the paper received is a review of the case.[5] And it is not ground for a reversal that a report of the evidence at the coroner's inquest was in the jury-room, it not appearing that they read it.[6]

§ 830. It is irregular even for the trial judge, after the jury have retired, to confer with them except in the presence of the parties; and if any communication is so made by him to them, in any way calculated to prejudice the defendant, this will avoid the verdict.[7] Whatever, as to the merits, passes from the judge to the jury, should be in the presence of the parties, open to their correction at the time, and to exception, so that it may be open to a revisory court. It has therefore been held that the sending in by the judge of a prior written charge to a grand jury will avoid the verdict;[8] and the same result was reached where the judge, after the jury had retired, and had declared that they were unable to agree, told the jury that the case was a peculiar one, and that he had reason to believe they had been tampered with;[9] and where, as we have seen, the jury obtained

And so of irregular communication of court.

[1] U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumn. 21.

[2] Farrar *v.* State, 2 Ohio St. 54.

[3] People *v.* Gaffney, 14 Abb. Pr. R. (N. S.) 36. See Gilson *v.* People, 4 Park. C. R. 619.

[4] Walker *v.* State, 37 Tex. 366.

[5] Carter *v.* State, 9 Lea, 440.

[6] State *v.* Harris, 34 La. An. 118.

[7] See supra, § 547; Sargent *v.* Roberts, 1 Pick. 337; Com. *v.* Ricketson, 5 Met. (Mass.) 412; Hall *v.* State, 8 Ind. 439; Fisher *v.* People, 23 Ill. 283; O'Connor *v.* Guthrie, 11 Iowa, 180; Hoberg *v.* State, 3 Minn. 262; Crawford *v.* State, 12 Ga. 142; State *v.* Frisby, 19 La. An. 143; State *v.* Alexander, 66 Mo. 148; Witt *v.* State, 5 Cold. (Tenn.) 11; Taylor *v.* State, 42 Tex. 504.

[8] Holton *v.* State, 2 Fla. 476. Judge Edmonds, on a trial for murder, sent word to a jury, who had applied to him for a law book on manslaughter, that they "had nothing to do with manslaughter." This was communicated to them by the officer in the absence of counsel, but was held not sufficient ground for a new trial. But see People *v.* Carnal, 1 Park. C. R. 256, 262, 676; S. C., 2 Park. C. R. 777–9.

[9] State *v.* Ladd, 10 La. An. 271.

possession of a fragment of a newspaper containing the charge or part of the charge of the judge on the issue before them.[1] It has also been held ground for new trial that the court took testimony, in the presence of the jury, on preliminary questions calculated to prejudice the defendant;[2] or ordered during the trial arrest of defendant's witnesses for perjury.[3] It is not, however, ground to set aside the verdict that the judge, in presence of counsel on both sides, charged the jury a second time upon matters of evidence, after they returned to court, stating they could not agree, but without request for further instructions;[4] and so where, after the jury had retired to consult on their verdict they sent a note in writing to the court, in absence of parties and counsel, requesting advice on certain points in the case, and the judge returned the writing without reply, and directed the officer to hand a volume of reports to the foreman, and to request him to read a part of a decision, to the effect that a jury in such circumstances could not communicate with the judge except in open court;[5] and so where the judge, in answer to a note from a juryman, gave an answer not calculated to prejudice the defendant;[6] and where the evidence merely was that the judge received a note from the jury which he answered, there being no proof of the contents of the note or answer.[7] And a new trial was refused when the court, after the jury had returned for instructions, read evidence to them in the absence of the prisoner and his counsel;[8] and where, under similar circumstances, the judge, in presence of the defendant but in the absence of defendant's counsel, made to the jury a statement not touching the merits.[9] But such precedents should not be extended so as to permit an opinion bearing on the merits to be given by the judge to the jury in the absence of the defendant.[10]

[1] Farrar *v.* State, 2 Ohio St. 54.

In Florida (Dixon *v.* State, 13 Fla. 636) it is held not to be error to permit the jury to take out the whole (otherwise as to part) of the written charge of the court.

[2] Hull *v.* State, 65 Ga. 36.

[3] Burke *v.* State, 66 Ga. 157.

[4] Com. *v.* Snelling, 15 Pick. 321. See Crawford *v.* State, 12 Ga. 142; State *v.* Connolly, 7 Mo. Ap. 40.

[5] Com. *v.* Jenkins, Thacher's C. C. 118.

[6] Doyle *v.* U. S., 10 Fed. Rep. 269; 11 Biss. 100.

[7] People *v.* Keeley, 44 N. Y. 526.

[8] Jackson *v.* Com., 19 Grat. 656; *contra*, Wade *v.* State, 12 Ga. 25.

[9] State *v.* Pike, 65 Me. 111; but see People *v.* Cessiano, 1 N. J. Cr. R. 505; 31 Hun, 388. Cf. Hunnicutt *v.* State, 18 Tex. Ap. 523.

[10] Supra, § 547; State *v.* Davenport, 33 La. An. 231.

§ 831. It is well settled that if a jury, after they are sworn in a case, and before its sealing for rendition, hear other testimony than that rendered in the case, or converse with strangers on the subject of the case, it will vitiate the whole procedure.[1] But overhearing by the jury of the casual remark of a bystander as to the merits is not ground for a new trial.[2] Nor does overhearing any conversation after the verdict has been rendered but before discharge, vitiate.[3]

And so of conversing with others, and reception of information as to the case.

§ 832. It is sufficient ground for a new trial that a party interested in the prosecution visited the jury during their deliberations.[4] Thus, where it appeared that the prosecutor had been in the room with the jury during their deliberations, it was held ground for new trial, though he was acting officially as high sheriff, and though there was no misconduct shown.[5] But this is not to be stretched so far as to require a new trial, because one of the deputy sheriffs, having charge of the jury, has been called as a witness in the case.[6] Where, however, a part of the jury were permitted to take their meals with some of the witnesses of the

And so of presence of party.

[1] Perkins *v.* Knight, 2 N. H. 474; Knight *v.* Freeport, 13 Mass. 218; State *v.* Tilghman, 11 Ired. 513. Hudson *v.* State, 9 Yerg. 408; see State *v.* Noblett, 2 Jones L. (N. C.) 418. Infra, § 851. As to English practice, see R. *v.* Martin, L. R. 1 C. C. 378; and see supra, §§ 721–9.

[2] People *v.* Reavy, 45 Hun, 418; Brake *v.* State, 4 Baxt. 161.

[3] James *v.* State, 55 Miss. 57.

Where a medical witness for the Commonwealth, being accidentally present at the hotel when the jury were brought there by the sheriff to be lodged for the night, invited the jury in the presence of the sheriff to drink with him, and some of them accepted the invitation, it was ruled that as this act was inadvertent, but intended only as an act of courtesy, and as it was all in the presence of the sheriff, it was not sufficient to set aside the verdict. Thompson's case, 8 Grat. 638. Nor is it any ground for a new trial that the jury passed through crowds of people going to the hotel where they dined, or that they dined at the public table at the hotel, under the charge of their officer, no one speaking to or tampering with them. Jumpertz *v.* People, 21 Ill. 275; Adams *v.* People, 47 Ill. 376; Howe *v.* State, 1 Humph. 491; Browning *v.* State, 33 Miss. 47. Nor does the visiting of the jury by a stranger, with reasonable refreshments, under the supervision of the officer in charge, vitiate the verdict, no conversation as to the case having taken place. Com. *v.* Roby, 12 Pick. 496.

[4] Odle *v.* State, 6 Baxt. 159. See Love *v.* State, 6 Baxt. 154.

[5] McElrath *v.* State, 2 Swan, 378.

[6] Reed *v.* Com., 22 Grat. 924. But see State *v.* Snyder, 20 Kans. 306; cited supra, § 827.

prosecution, no officer being present, this was held to vitiate the verdict.[1]

And so of testimony submitted by juror or others.

§ 833. If any testimony material to the issue be acted on by the jury, without having been previously submitted in evidence, but be communicated to the jury by one of their number, it will avoid the verdict.[2] Thus, verdicts have been set aside where an unsworn bystander, during the trial, stated to one of the jury that the testimony of a witness under examination was true,[3] and where the sheriff handed to the jury, while deliberating, loose papers purporting to be the evidence in the case, not knowing what the papers consisted of.[4] But it does not follow that a new trial will be ordered because the jury take into consideration general knowledge of the character of the transaction. Thus, in an indictment for a seditious libel, tending to excite public outrages, the judge referred to the personal knowledge of the jury for proof of the fact that serious riots had for some time back been occurring in the particular neighborhood, and it was held that such a reference was right, such riot forming part of the history of the country;[5] and where one of the jury communicated to his fellows mere opinions as to witnesses in the case, this has been ruled to be no ground for a new trial.[6] But the case is different where the issue is affected by the irregular submission, by one juror to the others, of material facts, connected with the merits.[7] Thus, where one of the jurymen stated to his fellows, after they had retired, that he had heard a witness, whose credibility was attacked at the trial, sworn before the grand jury, and that his statement was the same as he had made on the trial, and it appeared that this statement had much influence in producing the verdict of guilty, it was held that this proceeding was illegal, and vitiated the verdict.[8]

[1] Odle *v.* State, 6 Baxt. 150, though see Wilson *v.* State, 6 Baxt. 206.

[2] R. *v.* Rosser, 7 C. & P. 648; R. *v.* Heath, 18 How. St. Tr. 123; R. *v.* Sutton, 1 M. & Sel. 532, 541; State *v.* Powell, 2 Halst. 244; Howser *v.* Com., 51 Penn. St. 332; Kent *v.* State, 42 Ohio St. 426; Sam *v.* State, 1 Swan (Tenn.), 61; Morton *v.* State, 1 Lea, 498; Anschicks *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 524.

[3] Dempsey *v.* People, 47 Ill. 323.

[4] Pound *v.* State, 43 Ga. 88.

[5] R. *v.* Sutton, 4 M. & S. 532.

[6] Nolen *v.* State, 2 Head, 520; see Purinton *v.* Humphreys, 6 Greenl. 379; Price *v.* Warren, 1 Hen. & Munf. 385.

[7] Talmadge *v.* Northrop, 1 Root, 522; State *v.* Andrews, 29 Com. 100; Martin *v.* State, 25 Ga. 494.

[8] Donston *v.* State, 6 Humph. 275.

How far jurors are admissible to prove such misconduct is hereafter discussed.[1]

§ 834. *Visiting the scene of the res gestae*, by a part of a jury, under an officer's charge, after the case is committed to them, is ground for a new trial.[2] It is otherwise, however, if the visit is merely casual, and without influence on the jury;[3] *e. g.*, as where the jury, when taking exercise under the custody of an officer, walk by such scene.[4]

And so of visiting scene of offence.

§ 835. The inadvertent or necessary intrusion of strangers will not be cause for a new trial, unless coupled with proof of communication made as to the case under trial.[5] *A fortiori* is this the case when the visitor is a qualified officer, present casually, though unsworn as to the particular issue; no interference being proved.[6] Nor is it ground for new trial that the jury were left for a short time unattended, no intrusion by other persons being shown,[7] or that they took meals in the house of one interested in the case, there being no communication as to the case,[8] or that a juror, with permission of court, went out with an officer to consult a physician.[9] But where, on a trial for an assault with intent to kill, a person who was concerned in the "fight," of which the assault was part, was permitted to "fiddle for the jury" at their request, during their deliberations, this, though there was no conversation on the subject of the trial, was held ground for a new trial.[10]

But not accidental or necessary visit of stranger.

§ 836. It may happen that instruments of evidence may inadvertently be seen by the jury, or remarks overheard by them, not,

[1] Infra, § 847.

[2] Eastwood *v.* People, 3 Park. C. R. 25; S. C., 14 N. Y. 562; Ruloff *v.* People, 18 N. Y. 179. As to formal view, see supra, § 707.

[3] State *v.* Brown, 64 Mo. 368; State *v.* Adams, 20 Kans. 311. See People *v.* Hope, 62 Cal. 291.

[4] Ibid. Luck *v.* State, 96 Ind. 63.

[5] Supra, § 831; Luster *v.* State, 11 Humph. 169; State *v.* Degonia, 69 Mo. 485; Hair *v.* State, 16 Neb. 601. But see Love *v.* State, 6 Baxt. 154.

[6] Supra, §§ 729, 821 *et seq.*; Trim *v.* Com. 18 Grat. 983; Kirk *v.* State, 73 Ga. 620. The fact that in a capital case a physician was called in to visit a juror who was seriously ill, after the jury had the case committed to them, is not by itself ground for reversal, the conversation between them being exclusively as to the juror's illness. Goersen *v.* Com., 106 Penn. St. 477.

[7] People *v.* Kelly, 46 Cal. 337; State *v.* Turner, 25 La. An. 573.

[8] Dumas *v.* State, 63 Ga. 600.

[9] State *v.* Vines, 34 La. An. 1073.

[10] State *v.* Cartright, 20 W. Va. 32.

however, through any design on the part of the prosecution to obtain an unfair advantage, or with any effect on the jury. If on such grounds verdicts should be set aside, few verdicts would stand. In such cases, therefore, the information being communicated casually, and no effect on the jury being produced, sufficient ground for a new trial is not laid. Thus, where during the trial and before verdict inadvertent remarks to the prejudice of the defendant are made by strangers in the hearing of jurymen, this will not operate to disturb the verdict if it be shown that such remarks were not promoted by the prosecution, or voluntarily entertained and weighed by the jurymen.[1] The same rule has been applied to the casual exhibition of a material paper,[2] and to other fortuitous exhibition of facts bearing on the case, but coming from strangers, and not influencing the result.[3] And there is sound reason for this distinction. If jurors are allowed voluntarily to receive and weigh evidence not rendered on trial, no case could be decided fairly. On the other hand, if casual remarks as to the case made in the presence of a juror, not in any way influencing him, should require a new trial, no case would be decided at all; for there is no case in which one of the parties could not manage to have such remarks made.[4]

Nor casual exhibition of evidence.

§ 837. It is at all events clear that, as a general rule, the accidental approach of strangers, and collateral communication with them, unless improper conversation as to the case is entertained, will not avoid the verdict.[5] Thus, handing

And so of the mere approach of strangers,

[1] State *v.* Ayre, 3 Foster (N. H.), 301; State *v.* Andrews, 29 Conn. 100; State *v.* Cucuel, 31 N. J. L. (2 Vroom) 249; Hall's case, 6 Leigh, 615; Nance *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 457.

[2] State *v.* Taylor, 20 Kans. 643. Supra, § 825.

[3] State *v.* Cucuel, 31 N. J. L. 249, 262; Barlow *v.* State, 2 Blackf. 114; Rowe *v.* State, 11 Humph. 491; Eppes *v.* State, 19 Ga. 102; Chase *v.* State, 46 Miss. 683; State *v.* Fruge, 28 La. An. 657; Stanton *v.* State, 13 Ark. 319; State *v.* Brown, 7 Oreg. 186; March *v.* State, 44 Tex. 64. As to writ of error in such cases, see State *v.* Wart, 51 Iowa, 587.

Where burglars' tools, found on the defendant, were, during a recess of the court, while the cause was on the trial, exhibited, and their use explained in the presence of one of the jurors, with the knowledge of the defendant and his counsel, and no objection was made until after verdict, it was held that the objection was to be regarded as waived. State *v.* Rand, 33 N. H. 216.

[4] State *v.* Schnelle, 24 W. Va. 767; State *v.* Nance, 25 S. C. 168; State *v.* Cook, 30 Kans. 82; People *v.* McCurdy, 68 Cal. 576.

[5] Supra, § 821; State *v.* Miller, 24 W. Va. 802; State *v.* Smith, Ibid. 815; State *v.* Flanagan, 26 Ibid. 117; State

five dollars casually to a juror, in payment of a debt, by a bystander, without any reference or connection with the case under trial, is no ground for a new trial.[1] Nor is the mere fact that the jury were for a short time without attendants fatal.[2] And that the jury were taken to divine service during the trial, and heard a sermon on the text "Thou shalt not kill," does not by itself vitiate the proceedings, there being nothing in the sermon calculated to bias the jury.[3]

and trivial conversation.

§ 838. When, however, a communication, not on its face trivial, is shown to have been made to the jury, during their deliberations, from outside, it will be ground for disturbing the verdict unless it be shown to have in no way touched the merits of the case on trial.[4] Nor can a stranger, even by the action of the court, be permitted to address the jury as to the merits of the pending trial, without throwing on the prosecution the burden of showing that the jury was not thereby influenced.[5]

Presumption against such communications.

§ 839. The fact that a juror was asleep or otherwise inattentive during the trial is not ground for a new trial, where it could have been a matter of exception at the time and was passed over.[6] Ignorance of the English language, when not known at the time of challenge, is ground for new trial.[7]

Inattention or ignorance of juror must be excepted to at time.

§ 840. Cases may occur in which a juror, by his contumacious disregard of the directions of the court, may make a new trial

v. Tilghman, 11 Ired. 513; State *v.* Baker, 63 N. C. 276; Rowe *v.* State, 11 Humph. 491; Doyal *v.* State, 70 Ga. 134; McCann *v.* State, 9 S. & M. 465; Ned *v.* State, 33 Miss. 364; Stanton *v.* State, 13 Ark. 317; Coker *v.* State, 20 Ark. 51; Nance *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 457.

[1] Martin *v.* People, 54 Ill. 225.

[2] Hoover *v.* State, 5 Baxter, 672. See Love *v.* State, 6 Baxt. 154.

[3] Alexander *v.* Com., 105 Penn. St. 1.

[4] Ibid.; Pope *v.* State, 36 Miss. 122; State *v.* Anderson, 4 Nev. 265; State *v.* Harris, 12 Nev. 414; Defriend *v.* State, 22 Tex. Ap. 570. See Hartung *v.* People, 4 Park. C. R. 256, 319, as reversed in 22 N. Y. 95.

[5] People *v.* Green, 53 Cal. 90.

[6] U. S. *v.* Boyden, 1 Low. 266; Baxter *v.* People, 3 Gilm. 386; Cogswell *v.* State, 49 Ga. 103. That the burden of proving that there was no influence exercised is on the prosecution, see Nile *v.* State, 11 Lea, 694.

[7] Com. *v.* Jones, 12 Phila. 550. See, however, Bonneville *v.* State, 53 Wis. 680; Terr. *v.* Romaine, 2 New Mex. 114. As to removal of this objection by employment of an interpreter, see supra, § 669.

But otherwise as to disobedience to court, resulting in injury.

necessary.[1] This has been ruled to be the case where a juror, in disobedience to the repeated directions of the court, took notes of the evidence, which notes he retained.[2] But the mere taking of notes by a juror, without objection, is no ground for revision.[3]

Intoxication, when ground for new trial.

§ 841. In New York any indulgence in spirituous liquors, during trial, by the old rule, avoided the verdict.[4] "We cannot," declared the Supreme Court, "allow jurors thus of their own accord to drink spirituous liquor while thus engaged in the course of a cause. We are satisfied that there has been no mischief, but the rule is absolute, and does not meddle with consequences, nor should exceptions be multiplied. We have set aside verdicts in error for this cause, where the parties consented that the jury should drink."[5] This, however, is no longer held in New York,[6] though in other States verdicts have been set aside because spirituous liquor was given to the jury during their deliberation.[7] On the other hand, Judge Story, in a capital case, held it would not avoid a verdict to show that some of the jurors drank ardent spirits during the trial, when the prisoner's counsel consented in open court to this indulgence to those whose health might require it, unless it was also shown that the indulgence was grossly abused and operated injuriously to the defendant;[8] and this view is now generally accepted,[9] and with good reason, since there

[1] See supra, § 717.

[2] Cheek *v.* State, 35 Ind. 492. See supra, § 956.

[3] Cluck *v.* State, 40 Ind. 263.

[4] Dennison *v.* Collins, 1 Cow. 111; Rose *v.* Smith, 4 Cow. 17.

[5] Brant *v.* Fowler, 7 Cow. 562.

[6] Wilson *v.* Abrahams, 1 Hill, 207.

[7] State *v.* Bullard, 16 N. H. 139; Davis *v.* State, 35 Ind. 496; State *v.* Baldy, 17 Iowa, 39; Ryan *v.* Harrow, 27 Iowa, 494; Jones *v.* State, 13 Tex. 166; People *v.* Gray, 61 Cal. 164, a case in which large quantities of beer and whiskey were sent to the jury without permission of court or knowledge of defendant, but there was no proof of drunkenness. But see State *v.* McLaughlin, 44 Iowa, 82; Williamson *v.* Reddish, 45 Iowa, 550; State *v.* Bruce, 48 Iowa, 530, overruling State *v.* Baldy, supra.

[8] U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumner, 21; S. P., State *v.* Greer, 22 W. Va. 803; Dolan *v.* State, 40 Ark. 454; and see Coleman *v.* Moody, 4 H. & M. 1; Stone *v.* State, 4 Humphreys, 37. "Cider" is at all events unexceptionable. Com. *v.* Roby, 12 Pick. 496. See notes in 21 Alb. L. J. 40.

[9] Nichols *v.* Nichols, 138 Mass. 256 (citing text); State *v.* Cucuel, 31 N. J. L. (2 Vroom) 549; Com. *v.* Beale, reported Whart. Crim. Law, 7th ed. § 3320; Thompson's case, 8 Grat. 638; Creek *v.* State, 24 Ind. 151; Davis *v.* People, 19 Ill. 74; State *v.* Bruce, 48 Iowa, 530; Roman *v.* State, 41 Wis.

are many men, fully capable to act as jurors, who, from old age or other reasons, are dependent for their health on a moderate use of tonics of this class.[1] It is agreed, however, that incapacitating intoxication by any of the jury during their deliberations is ground for setting aside the verdict.[2] And it has been held in Ohio, that the separation of a juror from his fellows, after the case has been finally submitted and before they have agreed upon a verdict, for the purpose of obtaining and drinking intoxicating liquors, when not explained or shown to be excusable, is such misconduct of the juror as will entitle the prisoner to a new trial.[3]

Casting lots by jurors, or other irregularity in their consultations.

§ 842. Where the jury have cast lots, or resorted to chance in any way whatever, to determine their verdict, a new trial will be ordered in all cases in which the jurors bound themselves, before the lot, to abide by the result.[4] Where, however, such a method of determining the views of the particular jurors as to the degree is taken without any previous agreement by which the jurors bind themselves individually to adopt a mean result, but where each juror reserves to himself the right of dissenting, and where all, after consideration, agree to a compromise based on their individual estimates, the finding will rarely be disturbed.[5] And where one of the jury, through a mistaken sense of duty, thought he ought to assent to the views

312; Joyce *v.* State, 7 Baxt. 273; State *v.* Caulfield, 23 La. An. 148; Pope *v.* State, 36 Miss. 121; Russell *v.* State, 53 Miss. 368; Green *v.* State, 59 Miss. 501; State *v.* Upton, 20 Mo. 397; State *v.* West, 69 Mo. 401; Kee *v.* State, 28 Ark. 155; Tuttle *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 556; State *v.* Jones, 7 Nev. 408, 414; Jones *v.* People, 6 Col. 452; though see in Texas, as to capital cases, Jones *v.* State, 13 Tex. 168. A new trial, however, will be granted if a juror is "treated" by the prosecutor. Infra, §§ 849 *et seq.* See supra, § 730; 7 South. Law Rev. 526.

[1] See State *v.* Livingston, 64 Iowa, 560; May *v.* People, 8 Col. 210.

[2] Hogshead *v.* State, 6 Humph. 59. This is conceded in most of the cases cited; and see Pelham *v.* Page, 1 Eng. (Ark.) 535.

[3] Weis *v.* State, 22 Ohio St. 486.

[4] Hale *v.* Cove, 1 Strange, 642; Parr *v.* Seames, Barnes, 438; Mellish *v.* Arnold, Bunb. 51; Thompson *v.* Com., 8 Grat. 637; State *v.* Barnstetter, 65 Mo. 149; Crabtree *v.* State, 3 Sneed (Tenn.), 302; Williams *v.* State, 15 Lea, 129; Leverett *v.* State, 1 Tex. L. J. 113; Hunter *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 75; Wood *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 135; Birchard *v.* Booth, 4 Wis. 67. See Monroe *v.* State, 5 Ga. 85; Hilliard on New Trials (1873), 160; and compare supra, §§ 731–2; 14 Cent. L. J. 341.

[5] Thompson *v.* Com., 8 Grat. 637; Dooley *v.* State, 28 Ind. 239; Glidewell *v.* State, 15 Lea, 133; Batterson *v.* State, 63 Ind. 231; Cochlin *v.* People, 93 Ill. 410; Leverett *v.* State, 1 Tex. L. J. 113; Warren *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 619.

of a majority, and thereby concurred in a verdict of murder, such mistake was held no ground for a new trial.[1] The same conclusion was reached where the jury concurred in opinion as to the guilt of the prisoner, but differed as to the length of the time for which he should be sentenced to the penitentiary; and they agreed that each one should state the time for which he would send him to the penitentiary, and that the aggregate of these periods, divided by twelve, should be the verdict, and after it was done they struck off the odd months, and all agreed to the verdict, understanding what it was.[2] Nor will mistake by a juror as to the nature of the punishment, nor as to the action of the court, be ordinarily ground for revision;[3] nor is it ground that the juror believed that the sentence would be commuted, or the defendant promptly pardoned.[4]

Otherwise as to mere collateral indecorum.

§ 843. Mere collateral indecorum on the part of the jury will be no ground to set aside a verdict, unless it appeared that such levity interfered with their deliberations.[5] And it has been held in Colorado that the fact that a jury

[1] Com. v. Drew, 4 Mass. 391. See Galvin v. State, 6 Cold. 283.

[2] Thompson v. Com., 8 Grat. 638.

[3] State v. McConkey, 49 Iowa, 499; State v. Shock, 68 Mo. 552.

[4] State v. Wallman, 31 La. An. 176; Montgomery v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 74. See State v. Turner, 6 Baxt. 201; State v. Rhea, 25 Kan. 576.

Where, however, a juror was not satisfied of the guilt of the prisoner, but assented to a verdict of guilty under an impression (suggested by his fellow-jurors) that the governor would pardon the defendant if the jury by their verdict recommended it; it was held, in Tennessee, that this was sufficient cause to set aside the verdict. Crawford v. State, 2 Yerger, 60.

A juror's affidavit that he believed the prisoner was innocent, and that he assented to a verdict of guilty under the belief, induced by the assertions of his fellow-jurors, that there were fatal defects in the proceedings which would prevent the prisoner from being sent to the penitentiary, and that the governor would pardon the defendant if recommended to mercy in the verdict, was held in the same State sufficient to set aside the verdict. Cochran v. State, 7 Humph. 544. In this case, the case of Crawford v. State, 2 Yerg. 60, was referred to and approved. And so where the juror's affidavit was that he yielded against his judgment and conscience, because a great majority of the jury favored the verdict. Galvin v. State, 6 Cold. 283. But these cases cannot be sustained without making jury trials inoperative in all cases of serious disagreement between jurors. Infra, § 847.

[5] Jack v. State, 20 Tex. Ap. 656; Com. v. Beale, Phila. 1854, quoted on this point in 8th edition of this book, citing Com. v. Flanigan, 7 W. & S. 421. See on other points S. C., supra, § 842. Cf. Taylor v. California Stage Co., 6 Cal. 228. See, however, Jim v. State, 4 Humph. 289. As to irregular action of jury in experimenting with alleged instruments of crime, see Whart. Cr. Ev. § 314.

were allowed to attend a "theatrical exhibition" by leave of court after being empanelled, they being under the charge of a sworn officer, is no ground for a new trial, they not communicating with any one out of their own body, nor being shown to have been in any way influenced by the diversion.[1]

Absolute preadjudication by juror ground for new trial when a surprise.

§ 844. When it appears after trial that a juror had beforehand prejudged the case, but had improperly withheld this fact before acceptance, or when asked as to opinion on *voir dire* had given false answers, and such formation of opinion was unknown to the party at the time, a new trial will be granted.[2] And it was held a suffi-

[1] Jones *v.* People, 6 Cal. 452.

[2] U. S. *v.* Fries, 1 Whart. St. Tr. 606; People *v.* Bodine, 1 Denio, 281; People *v.* Vermilyea, 7 Cow. 108; Heath *v.* Com., 1 Robbins. Va. 735; Com. *v.* Jones, 1 Leigh, 598; State *v.* McDonald, 9 W. Va. 456; State *v.* Strauder, 11 W. Va. 745; Parks *v.* State, 4 Ohio St. 234; Sellers *v.* People, 3 Scam. 412; Barlow *v.* State, 2 Blackf. 114; Romaine *v.* State, 7 Ind. 63; State *v.* Gillick, 7 Clarke (Iowa), 289; Presbury *v.* Com., 9 Dana, 263; Norfleet *v.* State, 4 Sneed, 340; State *v.* Hopkins, 1 Bay, 373; State *v.* Duncan, 6 Ired. 98; State *v.* Patrick, 3 Jones L. 443; State *v.* Davis, 80 N. C. 412; State *v.* Lambert, 93 N. C. 619; Wade *v.* State, 12 Ga. 25; Ray *v.* State, 15 Ga. 223; Keener *v.* State, 18 Ga. 194; Burroughs *v.* State, 33 Ga. 403; Moncrieff *v.* State, 59 Ga. 470; Cody *v.* State, 3 How. Miss. 27; Cannon *v.* State, 27 Miss. 147; Lisle *v.* State, 6 Mo. 426; State *v.* Taylor, 64 Mo. 358; State *v.* Gonce, 87 Mo. 627; State *v.* Parks, 21 La. An. 251; Henrie *v.* State, 41 Tex. 573; Austin *v.* State, 42 Tex. 355; Long *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 186; Hilliard on New Trials (1873), 174, 175. And see for other cases infra, § 845; cf. Lamar *v.* State, 64 Miss. 687. This is eminently the case when the juror procured himself to be fraudulently inserted in the panel. State *v.* Bell, 81 N. C. 591; supra, § 495. As to challenges, see supra, §§ 611 *et seq.* Where a juror, during the progress of the cause, after the evidence was opened, expressed a decided opinion as to the guilt of the defendant in the hearing of bystanders, it was held that though in so doing he was guilty of gross misconduct, it was no cause to set aside the verdict. Com. *v.* Gallagher, 4 Penn. L. J. 512; 2 Clark, 297, per Bell, President J. See State *v.* Ayer, 3 Foster (N. H.), 301; Brakefield *v.* State, 1 Sneed, 215. If the prisoner has neglected to avail himself before the trial of any of the means provided by law for ascertaining the incompetency of a juror, on account of prejudice, he will not be entitled to a new trial on the ground of such prejudice. State *v.* Daniels, 44 N. H. 383; Meyer *v.* State, 19 Ark. 156; State *v.* Anderson, 4 Nev. 265. It is enough if the defendant's counsel knew of the incapacity. State *v.* Tuller, 34 Conn. 280; but see, for a less stringent rule, Willis *v.* People, 32 N. Y. 715; cf. Heath *v.* Com., 1 Robins. 735. As to discharging jury upon discovery, during trial, of such prejudice or incompetency, see supra, §§ 509, 725.

That such motion can be made in the

cient reason for a new trial that one of the jurors, some time before the trial, declared "such a man as Fries (the defendant) ought to be hung, who brings on such a disturbance," of which fact, until after the trial, the defendant had no notice.[1] The same ruling under the same limitations took place where the foreman had declared that the plaintiff should never have a verdict, whatever witnesses he produced;[2] and where a juror had stated on the morning of trial that he had come from home for the purpose of hanging every counterfeiting rascal, and that he was determined to hang the prisoner at all events.[3] A qualified opinion, however, dependent on a particular state of facts, will be no ground for new trial;[4] and where a juror stated that if it was true the prisoner had made the attempt to commit the crime charged upon him, he would go to the penitentiary; it was held sufficient ground was not laid.[5] The defendant, also, by omitting to examine the juryman as to bias, ordinarily is precluded from taking subsequent exceptions.[6] And a new trial will not be granted because of vague opinions against the prisoner existing in the mind of a juror;[7] nor because of prior loose talk by a juror showing prejudice in matters collateral;[8] nor because of off-hand remarks made by the juror in order to avoid

trial court even after the appellate court had overruled exceptions of record, see State *v.* Gilman, 70 Me. 329.

[1] U. S. *v.* Fries, 1 Whart. St. Tr. 606. See State *v.* Williams, 14 W. Va. 851; Hoard *v.* State. 15 Lea, 318. Whether the juror was so prejudiced is a question of fact to be determined by the court. Dumas *v.* State, 63 Ga. 600. That the juror can be examined as to such bias, see infra, § 847; Rader *v.* State, 5 Lea, 610.

[2] 2 Salk. 645.

[3] State *v.* Hopkins, 1 Bay, 373. See Ibid. 377.

[4] State *v.* Benner, 64 Me. 267; State *v.* Ayer, 8 Fost. (N. H.) 301; State *v.* Hayden, 51 Vt. 296; Com. *v.* Flanagan, 7 Watts & S. 415, 421; Kennedy *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 510; Poore *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 474; Brown *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 516; Com. *v.* Hughes, 5 Rand. 655; Mitchum *v.* State, 11 Ga. 616; Anderson *v.* State, 14 Ga. 709; Jim *v.* State, 15 Ga. 535; O'Shields *v.* State, 55 Ga. 656; Howerton *v.* State, 1 Meigs, 262; State *v.* Davis, 20 Mo. 391; State *v.* Ward, 14 La. An. 673.

[5] Kennedy *v.* State, 2 Va. Cas. 510. Under the California statute, the objection must be made before verdict. People *v.* Fair, 43 Cal. 137; People *v.* Mortimer, 46 Cal. 114; overruling People *v.* Plummer, 9 Cal. 298.

[6] Ibid.; Yanez *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 429. See State *v.* Marks, 15 Nev. 33. Infra, § 845.

[7] Com. *v.* Flanagan, 7 Watts & S. 422; Poore *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 474. See State *v.* Howard, 17 N. H. 171; State *v.* Fox, 1 Dutch. 566; Hughes *v.* People, 116 Ill. 330; Wright *v.* State, 18 Ga. 383; Rice *v.* State, 7 Ind. 332; People *v.* King, 27 Cal. 507.

[8] State *v.* Hayden, 51 Vt. 296.

service ;[1] nor because of a general excitement against the defendant at the time of trial, in the community at large.[2] In such cases, however, a new trial will not be granted unless the reception of the juror was prejudicial to the defendant.[3] Any unfair bias on part of the judge, which is prejudicial to the defendant, is ground for revision.[4]

Error of the court on the allowance or rejection of challenges belongs to a distinct branch of law previously discussed.[5]

§ 845. A new trial will not be granted on the ground that a juror was liable to be challenged, if the party had an opportunity of making his challenge, and knew, or might have known, in the exercise of due care, the facts beforehand.[6]

Otherwise when party could have known of objection in time to challenge.

§ 846. Where it turns out after verdict that one of the jurors was absolutely incapable of acting as such, and that this fact was unknown to the defendant at the time, and could not, with due diligence, have been known to him, this is a ground for a new trial. This

Absolute incapacity of juror ground for new trial, but not qualified.

[1] Simms *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 230.

[2] Com. *v.* Flanagan, 7 Watts & S. 422; though if such excitement pervade the jury-box, and work an unjust result, the verdict should be set aside. People *v.* Acosta, 10 Cal. 195.

[3] State *v.* Williams, 14 W. Va. 851; State *v.* Bancroft, 22 Kan. 170.

[4] Supra, §§ 605, 798 *a*.

[5] Supra, §§ 605 *et seq.*

[6] R. *v.* Sutton, 8 B. & C. 417; 2 M. & R. 406; State *v.* Bowden, 71 Me. 89; Achey *v.* State, 64 Ind. 56; State *v.* Underwood, 6 Ired. 96; Moon *v.* State, 68 Ga. 687; Durham *v.* State, 70 Ga. 264; McAllister *v.* State, 17 Ala. 434; George *v.* State, 39 Miss. 570; Brown *v.* State, 60 Miss. 447; Wood *v.* State, 62 Miss. 220; State *v.* Taylor, 64 Mo. 358; Harris *v.* State, 61 Miss. 304; State *v.* Wood, 74 Mo. 253; Ogden *v.* State, 13 Neb. 436; State *v.* Casat, 40 Ark. 511; Givens *v.* State, 6 Tex. 344; Baker *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 243; Yanez *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 429, and cases supra, § 844.

Where bystanders were called as jurors in a capital case, and, at the instance of the prisoner, sworn and examined touching their indifferency, and then elected by the prisoner and sworn of the jury; upon objections to the indifferency of these jurors, discovered after the trial, not inconsistent with what was disclosed by the jurors themselves on their examination touching their indifferency, it was held that the court ought not to set aside a verdict of guilty, just in itself, though the objections be such, that if known and disclosed before the jurors were elected and sworn, there might have been good cause to challenge the jurors; much less, if the objections be such as would not have been good cause of challenge. Com. *v.* Jones, 1 Leigh, 598; Presbury *v.* Com., 9 Dana, 203. Supra, § 844, note. See State *v.* Greer, 22 W. Va. 800; State *v.* Belcher, 13 S. C. 459.

has been held in a case where it appeared that one of the jurors was not a freeholder, this being a statutory necessity ;[1] or was an infant ;[2] or was not the person actually summoned on the jury, though bearing the same name.[3] But disqualifications not absolute, which are ground for challenge, may not be ground for a new trial.[4] This is the case with alienage,[5] when such alienage is not a statutory disqualification ;[6] with conviction years back of an infamous offence ;[7] with non-residence ;[8] with irreligion ;[9] with relationship with the prosecutor ;[10] with membership of the grand jury which found the bill ;[11] with partial ignorance of the language.[12] The defendant, in any view, to avail himself of such a defect must have been, without negligence, ignorant of it until after verdict; and if he neglects to use proper diligence in inquiry, or to question the juror at the proper time, disqualification cannot be set up as ground for new trial.[13]

[1] Supra, §§ 344–45, 845; infra, § 886; State *v.* Babcock, 1 Conn. 401; Dowdy *v.* Com., 9 Grat. 727. See Stanton *v.* Beadle, 4 T. R. 473.

[2] Russell *v.* Barn, Barnes, 455; R. *v.* Tremaine, 7 D. & R. 684; 5 B. & C. 254.

[3] McGill *v.* State, 34 Ohio St. 328. Compare R. *v.* Sullivan, 8 Ad. & E. 831; People *v.* Ransom, 7 Wend. 417.

[4] State *v.* Fisher, 3 N. & Mc. 261; Ash *v.* State, 56 Ga. 583.

[5] State *v.* Quarrel, 2 Bay, 150. See Hollingsworth *v.* Duane, 4 Dall. 353; though see Chase *v.* People, 40 Ill. 352; Brown *v.* La Crosse, 21 Wis. 51; Hill *v.* People, 16 Mich. 351. See State *v.* Jackson, 27 Kan. 581; Hickey *v.* State, 12 Neb. 490. Supra, § 699; infra, § 886. The question depends on the applicatory statute.

Whether a colored person can claim colored jurymen, see supra, § 783 *a*.

[6] In this case, if there be a surprise, there can be a new trial. Lamphier *v.* State, 70 Ind. 317; Armendares *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 44. See other cases, supra, § 669.

[7] State *v.* Powers, 10 Oreg. 145.

[8] Costly *v.* State, 19 Ga. 614. See People *v.* Mortier, 58 Cal. 262.

[9] McClure *v.* State, 1 Yerg. 206. See R. *v.* Tremaine, supra.

[10] Supra, § 660; McLellan *v.* Crofton, 6 Greenl. 307; Eggleton *v.* Smiley, 17 Johns. 133; Edwards *v.* State, 53 Ga. 428; McDonald *v.* Beall, 55 Ga. 288; Cartwright *v.* State, 12 Lea, 620; Harley *v.* State, 29 Ark. 17; Jones *v.* People, 2 Col. T. 351; Jones *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 85. As to what consanguinity is a disqualification, see State *v.* Congdon, 14 R. I. 458; State *v.* Williams, 14 W. Va. 851; supra, § 660.

[11] Supra, § 661; Barlow *v.* State, 2 Blackf. 114; Bennett *v.* State, 24 Wis. 24; Davis *v.* State, 54 Ala. 39; McGehee *v.* Shafer, 9 Tex. 20; State *v.* Madoil, 12 Fla. 151.

[12] Bonneville *v.* State, 53 Wis. 680. Supra, § 669, and cases supra, § 839.

[13] Supra, §§ 351, 733, 844; infra, §§ 886–89; R. *v.* Sutton, 8 B. & C. 417; Poindexter *v.* Com., 33 Grat. 766; Parks *v.* State, 4 Ohio St. 234; Becker *v.* State, 20 Ohio St. 228; Gillooley *v.* State, 58 Ind. 182; Patterson *v.* State, 70 Ind. 341; State *v.*

§ 847. Though the former practice was different, it is now settled in England, that a juror is inadmissible to impeach the verdict of his fellows.[1] "It would open each juror," declared Mansfield, C. J., "to great temptation, and would unsettle every verdict in which there could be found upon the jury a man who could be induced to throw discredit on their common deliberations."[2] Nor are subsequent declarations of jurymen, after a general verdict, admissible to explain or qualify it,[3] though the affidavits of bystanders, as to what passed within their knowledge touching the delivery of the verdict, may be received.[4] In this country the modern English rule has generally been adopted,[5] though the affidavits of jurors will be entertained for the purpose of explaining, correcting, or enforcing their verdict.[6] Thus, where a doubt existed, in consequence of confusion in the

Juror inadmissible to impeach verdict.

Quarrel, 2 Bay, 150; McAllister *v.* State, 17 Ga. 434; Osgood *v.* State, 63 Ga. 791; Hickey *v.* State, 12 Neb. 490.

[1] See Whart. Crim. Ev. § 510.

[2] Owen *v.* Warburton, 1 N. R. 326; Hindle *v.* Birch, 1 Moore, 455; Aylett *v.* Jewel, 1 W. Black. 1299; Vaise *v.* Delaval, 1 Term Rep. 11; Straker *v.* Graham, 4 M. & W. 721. See Hilliard on New Trials (1873), 241.

[3] Clark *v.* Stevenson, 2 W. Black. 803.

[4] R. *v.* Wooller, 6 M. & S. 366.

[5] Supra, § 379; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 510; State *v.* Pike, 65 Me. 111; State *v.* Ayer, 3 Fost. 301; Com. *v.* Drew, 4 Mass. 391; State *v.* Freeman, 5 Conn. 348; Dan *v.* Tucker, 4 Johns. 487; People *v.* Columbia, 1 Wend. 297; People *v.* Carnal, 1 Parker C. R. 256, 262, 676; S. C., 2 Park. C. R. 777; Cluggage *v.* Swan, 4 Binn. 150; Reed *v.* Com., 22 Grat. 924; State *v.* Godwin, 5 Ired. 401; Bellamy *v.* Pippin, 74 N. C. 46; State *v.* Smallwood, 78 N. C. 560; State *v.* Brittain, 89 N. C. 481; State *v.* Royal, 90 N. C. 755; State *v.* Doon, Charlton, 1; State *v.* Coupenhaver, 39 Mo. 320; State *v.* Branstetter, 65 Mo. 149; State *v.* Alexander, 66 Mo. 148; State *v.* Cooper, 85 Mo. 256; Bennett *v.* State, 3 Ind. 167; Stanley *v.* Sutherland, 54 Ind. 339; State *v.* Millecan, 15 La. An. 557; State *v.* Fruge, 28 La. An. 657; State *v.* Nelson, 32 La. An. 842; State *v.* Price, 37 La. An. 215; Hudson *v.* State, 9 Yerg. 408; State *v.* Horne, 9 Kans. 119; People *v.* Baker, 1 Cal. 403; People *v.* Doyall, 48 Cal. 85; Johnson *v.* State, 27 Tex. 758. As to grand jurors, see supra, § 379.

In Iowa, it is said that an affidavit as to a fellow-juror drinking intoxicating liquors is only to be received when no other evidence is obtainable, and ought to be explicit. State *v.* McLaughlin, 44 Iowa, 82.

[6] Cogan *v.* Ebden, 1 Burr. 383; R. *v.* Woodfall, 5 Burr. 2667; State *v.* Ayer, 3 Foster, N. H. 301; State *v.* Howard, 17 N. H. 171; Dana *v.* Tucker, 4 Johns. 487; Jackson *v.* Dickenson, 15 Johns. 309; Cochran *v.* Street, 1 Wash. R. 79; Jones *v.* State, 89 Ind. 82; State *v.* Rush, 95 Mo. 199.

In California such evidence is now admissible by statute. Donner *v.* Palmer, 23 Cal. 40.

court-room, as to what the exact verdict was, the affidavits of jurors and bystanders were received for the purpose of showing the facts of the case, though all reference was excluded as to the motives or intentions with which such verdict was agreed to, or the circumstances attending the deliberations which led to it.[1] In Tennessee the English rule appears to be rejected altogether,[2] though it is proper to observe that in that State, in one instance at least, a disposition has been shown to conform more closely to the general practice, it having been held that affidavits by jurors that they founded their verdict upon particular parts of the testimony given in court, which particular testimony might abstractly be illegal, are not sufficient to authorize a new trial.[3] Nor is such testimony admissible to show that certain jurors were influenced by the belief that a pardon would be granted after conviction.[4]

Yet, at the same time, there is danger of construing the rule in such a way as to work great wrong, by so shielding with secrecy the deliberations of the jury as to permit these deliberations to be irresponsibly conducted in such a way as to outrage public and private rights. The true view is this: Jurors cannot be received to qualify by parol testimony matters of record; nor can they be permitted to state matters concerning their deliberations which may be proved *aliunde*, nor the processes of reasoning which led to their conclusion.[5] From necessity, however, when gross injustice has been wrought from misconduct or misapprehension in their deliberations, they may be permitted to prove such misconduct or misapprehension. Thus, it has been held that they may prove that the case was decided by lot;[6] or that the instructions of the court were utterly misunderstood;[7] and a distinction has been taken to the effect that though a juror cannot be admitted to stultify his own

[1] R. *v.* Woodfall, 5 Burr. 2667; R. *v.* Simons, Sayer, 35.

[2] Crawford *v.* State, 2 Yerg. 60; Cochran *v.* State, 7 Humph. 544. Supra, § 842.

[3] Hudson *v.* State, 9 Yerg. 408. In Nile *v.* State, 11 Lea, 694, the practice is spoken of as "dangerous," and to be followed with "caution." And see, also, as still more restrictive, Cartwright *v.* State, 12 Lea, 620. See, as to grand jurors, supra, § 379; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 510.

[4] See cases supra, and at end of § 842.

[5] State *v.* Shock, 58 Mo. 552; State *v.* Wallman, 31 La. An. 146.

[6] Wright *v.* Illinois Tel. Co., 20 Iowa, 19. See People *v.* Hughes, 29 Cal. 257; State *v.* Horne, 9 Kans. 718. Supra, § 842.

[7] Packard *v.* U. S., 1 Iowa, 225; R. *v.* Simons, Sayer, 35.

action, yet he may be permitted to prove gross misconduct in his fellows,[1] should such misconduct be first shown *aliunde*.[2]

Whether jurors may be received as witnesses to purge their conduct from the imputation of impropriety has been doubted.[3] In exceptional cases, however, such testimony has been received;[4] and it has been held that a juror may be examined to disprove the charge of preadjudication.[5]

§ 848. The court, also, will not permit affidavits to be read imputing improper motives to the jury, or tending to impeach their integrity.[6] And where a juror has denied, on oath, before the triers, having formed and expressed an opinion in a criminal case, the affidavit of a single witness to the contrary has been held insufficient to disturb the verdict.[7]

And so are affidavits attacking jury.

6. *Misconduct by the Prevailing Party.*

§ 849. Any misconduct by the prevailing party, intended to affect the jury, and tending so to do will be cause for a new trial,[8] and even an acquittal obtained by fraud or embracery will be no bar to a subsequent indictment.[9] Nor need such misconduct be traced directly to the party prevailing. Any perversion of justice by means *dehors* the trial, against which ordinary care could not guard, will justify the court in setting the verdict aside.[10] A party, also, who undertakes thus to tamper with a jury is indictable for embracery.[11]

Such misconduct ground for new trial.

[1] Deacon *v.* Shreve, 2 Zab. N. J. 176; and see Com. *v.* Meade, 12 Gray, 167; and the remarks of Taney, C. J., in U. S. *v.* Reid, 12 How. 361. As to Texas statute, see Hodges *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 615.

[2] Kent *v.* State, 42 Ohio St. 426.

[3] French *v.* Smith, 4 Vt. 363; Ray *v.* State, 15 Ga. 223; McGuffie *v.* State, 17 Ga. 497; Sawyer *v.* Hannibal R. R., 37 Mo. 240; Organ *v.* State, 26 Miss. 78; People *v.* Backus, 5 Cal. 275; People *v.* Hughes, 29 Cal. 257. See Hilliard on New Trials (1873), 247.

[4] Taylor *v.* Greely, 3 Greenl. 204; Fries's case, 1 Wh. St. Tr. 605; Moffett *v.* Bowman, 6 Grat. 219.

[5] Supra, § 844; Rader *v.* State, 5 Lea, 610.

[6] Onions *v.* Naish, 7 Price, 203; Hartwright *v.* Badham, 11 Price, 383; Cooke *v.* Green, 11 Price, 736; Graham on New Trials, 126.

[7] Epps *v.* State, 19 Ga. 102.

[8] 2 Hale P. C. 308; State *v.* Hascall, 6 N. H. 352; Knight *v.* Inhabitants, etc., 13 Mass. 218; Jeffries *v.* Randall, 14 Mass. 205; Wood *v.* State, 34 Ark. 341.

[9] See supra, §§ 451, 784 *et seq.*; Hylliard *v.* Nichols, 2 Root, 176. See Ohio Code Cr. Proc. § 192.

[10] Willis *v.* People, 32 N. Y. 715.

[11] Infra, § 966.

§ 850. Evidence that the prosecutor, by exhibiting papers at places where the jury boarded, had been attempting to bias and influence them, will be sufficient to sustain a motion for new trial;[1] and so where it appeared that the prosecutor spent a night in a room with the jury during their deliberations, the conviction being for manslaughter, and the prosecutor having acted officially as high sheriff both when prosecuting the suit and attending the jury.[2] Wherever, in fine, undue influence is shown, a new trial will be granted.[3]

And so of undue influence on jury.

§ 851. Where papers, as has already been seen, not in evidence, are surreptitiously handed to the jury, the verdict will be avoided;[4] and the same result will take place where it appears that a witness on one side has been spirited away by the opposite party,[5] and where an attempt to bribe a witness is shown.[6] Such efforts, however, must be traced to a party or his agents; for the mere absenting of himself by a witness will not be sufficient ground.[7]

And so of tampering with evidence.

§ 852. A new trial will be granted when it appears any unfair trick or artifice had been employed, resulting in a verdict in favor of the party using it.[8] Thus, a new trial was granted where the defendant, by the artifice of the prosecuting attorney, went to trial without countervailing testimony, under the belief that certain witnesses of the State were absent, when they are present, and concealed by the prosecution.[9] But a new trial will not be granted in a liquor case because the prosecution brought into court a number of female members of a local temperance society who might be supposed to exert an influence on the jury.[10]

And so of trick of opposite side.

[1] State *v.* Hascall, 6 N. H. 352. Compare Coster *v.* Merest, 3 Brod. & B. 272; 7 Moore, 87; Spenceley *v.* De Willot, 7 East, 108.

[2] McElrath *v.* State, 2 Swan, 378. See supra, § 827.

[3] Ibid. See State *v.* Brittain, 89 N. C. 481; State *v.* Gould, 90 N. C. 659.

[4] Co. Lit. 227; Graves *v.* Short, Cro. Eliz. 616; Palmer, 325. Supra, §§ 831 *et seq.*

[5] Bull. N. P. 328.

[6] Bostock *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 705.

[7] Grovenor *v.* Fenwick, 7 Mod. 156.

[8] Anderson *v.* George, 1 Burr. 352; Graham on New Trials, 56; Bodington *v.* Harris, 1 Bing. 187; Niles *v.* Brackett, 15 Mass. 378; Jackson *v.* Warford, 7 Wend. 62; Marsh *v.* State, 44 Tex. 64; People *v.* Bennett, 52 Cal. 380.

[9] Curtis *v.* State, 6 Cold. (Tenn.) 9. See Shepherd *v.* State, 64 Ind. 43.

[10] Nuzum *v.* State, 88 Ind. 599.

§ 853. A new trial will not be granted simply because counsel, in their addresses, travelled beyond the evidence, or used improper language, unless the court was called upon to interpose, and, on a case requiring it, refused to do so.[1] But it is otherwise where the court allows the prosecuting counsel to charge the defendant with other offences beside that on trial, or to take any other unfair advantage of his position.[2]

But not for remarks of opposite counsel unless objected to at time.

7. *After-discovered Evidence.*

§ 854. After-discovered evidence, in order to afford a proper ground for the granting of a new trial, must possess the following qualifications:—

It must have been discovered since the former trial.

It must be such as reasonable diligence on the part of the defendant could not have secured at the former trial.

It must be material in its object, and not merely cumulative and corroborative, or collateral.

It must be such as ought to produce, on another trial, an opposite result on the merits.

It must go to the merits, and not rest on merely a technical defence.[3]

[1] Supra, §§ 562, 577, and cases there cited; Davis *v.* State, 33 Ga. 98. See Com. *v.* Hanlon, 3 Brewst. 461; State *v.* Braswell, 82 N. C. 693; State *v.* Barhem, 82 Mo. 67; State *v.* Hicks, 92 Mo. 431; State *v.* West, 95 Mo. 141; Bohanan *v.* State, 18 Neb. 57; Coleman *v.* State, 111 Ind. 563; State *v.* Johnson, 72 Iowa, 393; 9 Crim. Law Mag. 742.

[2] Supra, § 561; State *v.* Smith, 75 N. C. 306; State *v.* Rogers, 94 N. C. 860; Sasse *v.* State, 68 Wis. 530; State *v.* Mahly, 68 Mo. 315; State *v.* Jackson, 95 Mo. 623; Thomas *v.* State, 61 Miss. 60; Martin *v.* State, 63 Miss. 505; Newton *v.* State, 21 Fla. 53. See, also, supra, §§ 569, 570, 577. See State *v.* Cluck, 40 Ind. 265; Long *v.* State, 56 Ind. 182; Shepherd *v.* State, 64 Ind. 43.

[3] State *v.* Carr, 1 Foster (N. H.), 166; Com. *v.* Murray, 2 Ashm. 41; Com. *v.* Williams, 2 Ashm. 69; Thompson *v.* Com., 8 Grat. 637; Read *v.* Com., 22 Grat. 924; Carter *v.* State, 46 Ga. 637; Childers *v.* State, 68 Ga. 837; State *v.* Burnside, 37 Mo. 343; State *v.* Wyatt, 50 Mo. 309. In Pennsylvania (Moore *v.* The Phila. Bank, 5 Serg. & Rawle, 41) it was said by the court that it is incumbent on the party who asks for a new trial, on the ground of newly-discovered testimony, to satisfy the court: 1st. That the evidence has come to his knowledge since the trial; 2d. That it was not owing to the want of diligence that it did not come sooner; and 3d. That it would probably produce a different verdict if a new trial were granted. The same distinctions were afterwards adopted by Judge

§ 855. There are, in addition, one or two preliminary points of practice which must be conformed to before a motion on this ground will be entertained. It is necessary that the party should mention in his affidavit the witnesses by name, and what he expects to prove by them; and that either the witnesses themselves should state, on oath, the evidence they can give, or that the party should give his own belief in the statement to be made by the witnesses.[1]

Motion must be special.

§ 856. But the rule will not ordinarily be granted, if supported only by the affidavit of the party. The motion, if practicable, must be accompanied by the affidavit of the newly-discovered witnesses,[2] taken on notice.[3] And these affidavits must express the party's belief as well as his information.[4]

Must be supported by affidavits.

§ 857. The adverse party may show, by affidavits, that the witnesses whose testimony is stated to be material are wholly unworthy of credit.[5]

May be contested.

§ 858. A motion for a new trial will not ordinarily be heard after a judgment has been regularly perfected, although it be on the ground of evidence newly discovered since the judgment.[6]

Must be usually moved before judgment.

§ 859. The evidence must have been discovered since the former trial.[7] In a Georgia case, for instance, where it appeared that the prisoner's attorney had made diligent inquiries as to the prisoner's participation in the *corpus delicti*, but had been misled, it was held that a new trial would be granted on evidence, newly discovered, being offered to the

Evidence must be newly discovered.

King. Com. *v.* Murray, 2 Ashm. 41. See Ohio Code Cr. Proc. § 192; People *v.* Stanford, 64 Cal. 27.

[1] Hollingsworth *v.* Napier, 3 Caines, 182; State *v.* Williams, 14 W. Va. 851; Gavignan *v.* State, 55 Miss. 533; Polser *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 510. Infra, § 900.

[2] State *v.* Kellerman, 14 Kans. 135; Farrow *v.* State, 48 Ga. 30; Runnels *v.* State, 28 Ark. 121; Robinson *v.* State, 33 Ark. 180; State *v.* Edwards, 34 La. An. 142; State *v.* Sweeney, 37 La. An. 1; Evans *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 513; Tuttle *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 556, and cases in last note.

[3] Shields *v.* State, 45 Conn. 266.

[4] Taylor *v.* State, 11 Lea, 708.

[5] Parker *v.* Hardy, 24 Pick. 246; Williams *v.* Baldwin, 18 Johns. 489.

[6] Infra, § 890.

[7] Hudgins *v.* State, 61 Ga. 182; Lee *v.* State, 69 Ga. 705; State *v.* Curtis, 77 Mo. 267; Williams *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 163; Heskew *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 606.

effect that the prisoner did not make the assault charged.[1] But unless newly discovered, the existence of such testimony is not adequate ground.[2] There may, however, be cases, if duly sustained by affidavit, when supposed knowledge of the testimony at the time of the trial may be explained and avoided by proof that the defendant was at the time mentally incapable of taking cognizance of facts.[3]

Acquitted co-defendant as a witness no ground.

§ 860. A new trial will not at common law be granted on the ground that a co-defendant, tried at the same time and acquitted, was a material witness for the convicted defendant, such testimony not being newly discovered, and there having been at the trial no application for a severance; though the acquitted defendant was then, for the first time, a competent witness.[4] Where, however, after an application for severance, in order to admit the wife of one party as a witness for the other, the former party was acquitted, but the latter convicted, and the wife of the former swore in an affidavit to a complete *alibi* as to the latter, it was held that as she herself was not on the record, but was excluded merely by policy of law on the joint trial, and as she had been made competent by the verdict of a jury, a new trial would be granted.[5] But where co-defendants can be witnesses for each other on trial this ground cannot be laid.

Nor is acquittal of defendant of a part of count on which he

§ 860 *a*. A cognate question arises under the peculiar provisions of the Pennsylvania statute which permits persons charged with crimes not exclusively cognizable in the Oyer and Terminer to testify in their own behalf. It has been held that when the defendant is charged with a

[1] Thomas *v.* State, 52 Ga. 509.

[2] Vernon *v.* Hankey, 2 T. R. 113; Com. *v.* Murray, 2 Ashm. 41; Com. *v.* Williams, 2 Ashm. 69; Read *v.* Com., 22 Grat. 924; Roach *v.* State, 34 Ga. 78; Carter *v.* State, 46 Ga. 637; State *v.* Lamothe, 37 La. An. 43; State *v.* Price, Id. 215.

[3] Thompson *v.* State, 54 Ga. 577.

[4] State *v.* Bean, 36 N. H. 122; People *v.* Vermilyea, 7 Cow. 369; Sawyer *v.* Merrill, 10 Pick. 16. But see Rich *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 206; Lyles *v.* State, 41 Tex. 172. Compare infra, § 873.

[5] Com. *v.* Manson, 2 Ashm. 31. See Com. *v.* Toland, 11 Phila. 433; Anderson *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 542.

Where an accessory was acquitted after conviction of his principal, and the accessory's evidence was material, a new trial was held properly granted to let it in. Helm *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 41.

was excluded as a witness.

divisible offence, part of which is so cognizable in the Oyer and Terminer, where the trial is, and after exclusion as a witness, is acquitted of the offence so cognizable in Oyer and Terminer, this does not by itself entitle him to a new trial for the minor offence of which he was convicted.[1]

Evidence discovered before verdict should be given at once to jury.

§ 861. If new evidence be discovered before the verdict is rendered, it should be submitted to the jury; and if this duty is neglected, unless there is clear proof of mistake, a new trial will not be granted.[2] The judge at the trial has discretion as to the admission of evidence out of the regular and usual course, and must exercise such discretion when necessary to promote justice.[3]

If evidence could have been secured at former trial ground fails.

§ 862. The evidence must be such as could not have been secured at the former trial by a reasonable diligence on part of the defendant, which fact should appear on the affidavit.[4]

Thus, where it appeared that the witness, on whose testimony was sought a new trial, after a conviction of murder, was with the prisoner until a late hour of the evening on which the murder was committed, was in court while the trial was progressing, and had gone to a relative of the prisoner and told him what she was able to testify to; the motion was refused.[5]

§ 863. Nor will a new trial be granted because the district attorney withheld in his hands papers important to the defendant,

[1] Hunter *v.* Com., 79 Penn. St. 505; Com. *v.* Solby, 15 Weekly Notes, 392.

[2] Supra, §§ 564 *et seq.*; U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumner, 19; People *v.* Vermilyea, 7 Cow. 369; Com. *v.* Haulon, 3 Brewster, 461; State *v.* Porter, 26 Mo. 201; Higden *v.* Higden, 2 A. K. Marsh. 42; Cavanah *v.* State, 56 Miss. 300. See Keenan *v.* People, 104 Ill. 385, a case of much interest.

[3] See supra, § 566.

[4] Com. *v.* Drew, 4 Mass. 399; Lester *v.* State, 11 Conn. 415; People *v.* Vermilyea, 7 Cow. 369; Com. *v.* Williams, 2 Ashm. 69; Roberts *v.* State, 3 Kelly, 310; O'Dea *v.* State, 57 Ind. 31; Bennett *v.* Com., 8 Leigh, 745; Read *v.* Com., 22 Grat. 723; State *v.* Harding, 2 Bay, 267; Wright *v.* State, 34 Ga. 110; McAfee *v.* State, 31 Ga. 411; Carter *v.* State, 46 Ga. 637; Williams *v.* State, 67 Ga. 260; Hanvey *v.* State, 68 Ga. 612; Gilbert *v.* State, 7 Humph. 524; Friar *v.* State, 3 How. (Miss.) 422; Holeman *v.* State, 13 Ark. 105; Shaw *v.* State, 27 Tex. 750; Williams *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 55; Hasselmeyer *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 21; Collins *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 72; Hutchinson *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 468; White *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 167. As to affidavit, see State *v.* Williams, 14 W. Va. 851.

[5] Com. *v.* Williams, 2 Ashm. 69.

unless the latter used due diligence to obtain them. Thus, where the district attorney told the defendant that certain papers were in the hands of C., who, being applied to, answered they were in the possession of the district attorney, but the defendant did not explain the mistake and apply to the district attorney again, a new trial was refused.[1]

Nor for withholding of papers which due diligence could have secured.

§ 864. A new trial will sometimes be granted on the affidavit of a witness, that he was mistaken or surprised at his examination.[2]

Otherwise in cases of surprise.

§ 865. A party who seeks for a new trial on the ground of newly-discovered evidence is chargeable with laches, if, previous to the trial, he knew that the witness, whose testimony he seeks to introduce as newly discovered, must, probably, from his occupation and employment at the time of the transaction, the subject of the controversy, be conversant with the facts in relation to the transaction,[3] and especially where, previous to the trial, the party knew, as the witness himself testifies to, what the witness could prove, although at the time of the trial, and while preparing therefor, the party had forgotten the facts.[4] It is not such newly-discovered evidence as will entitle him to a new trial, that the party applying for a new trial could not procure in time the witness whom he seeks to introduce. He should have applied to the court for a postponement; and if without doing this he went to trial without the testimony, a new trial will not be granted for the purpose of letting in such evidence.[5] Nor is the absence of a witness who had not been subpœnaed a good cause for granting a new trial;[6] though it is otherwise with the sudden illness of a witness in cases where the deposition of the witness cannot be taken, and the witness is material.[7] Nor will a new trial be granted on account of the want of recollection of a fact, which by due attention might have been remembered;

Party disabled who neglects to obtain evidence on trial.

[1] People *v.* Vermilyea, 7 Cowen, 369. See infra, § 881.

[2] Infra, § 879.

[3] State *v.* Bell, 49 Iowa, 440; State *v.* Adams, 31 La. An. 717; Collins *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 72.

[4] People *v.* Superior Court of New York, 10 Wend. 285; Richie *v.* State, 58 Ind. 355.

[5] Jackson *v.* Malin, 15 Johns. 293; Gordon *v.* Harvey, 4 Call, 450. See State *v.* Frittener, 65 Mo. 422; State *v.* Smith, 65 Mo. 314; S. P., Tobin *v.* People, 101 Ill. 121.

[6] Kelly *v.* Holdship, 1 Browne, Pa. 36; Lester *v.* Goode, 2 Murph. 37.

[7] Infra, § 881.

"want of recollection being easy to be pretended and hard to be disproved."[1]

Evidence must be material and not cumulative.

§ 866. The evidence offered must be material in its object, and not merely cumulative and corroborative.[2] Cumulative evidence, in this sense, is such as goes to support the facts principally controverted on the former trial, and respecting which the party asking for a new trial, as well as the adverse party, produced testimony.[3] Where the defence was epileptic insanity, the alleged fact that the defendant, subsequent to the trial and conviction, had an epileptic fit, is cumulative in this sense, and hence no ground.[4] But it is otherwise if such new evidence consists of a strong mass of proof previously unknown to the party.[5]

Surprise an exception.

§ 867. But though a new trial is not usually granted for the discovery of new evidence to a point which was presented on the former trial, yet a case of surprise will form an exception to the rule.[6]

And so evidence of a distinct class.

§ 868. Nor can it be objected to granting a motion for a new trial, on the ground of newly-discovered evidence, that such evidence is cumulative, if it is of a different kind or character from that adduced on the trial.[7] This is peculiarly the case when strong independent proof of insanity is offered.[8]

[1] Bond *v.* Cutler, 7 Mass. 205; Duignan *v.* Wyatt, 3 Blackf. 385.

[2] U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumn. 97; Williams *v.* People, 45 Barb. 201; Com. *v.* Flanigan, 7 Watts & S. 415; Com. *v.* Williams, 2 Ashm. 69; Com. *v.* Kane, 12 Phila. 630; 89 Penn. St. 552; Adams *v.* People, 47 Ill. 376; Collins *v.* People, 103 Ill. 21; State *v.* Starness, 97 N. C. 423; State *v.* Johnson, 72 Iowa, 393; McAfee *v.* State, 31 Ga. 411; Hoye *v.* State, 39 Ga. 718; Holmes *v.* State, 54 Ga. 303; O'Shields *v.* State, 55 Ga. 696; State *v.* Blennerhassett, Walker, 7; Sahlinger *v.* People, 102 Ill. 241; State *v.* Larrimore, 20 Mo. 425; State *v.* Stumbo, 26 Mo. 306; State *v.* Evans, 65 Mo. 574; State *v.* Butler, 67 Mo. 59; State *v.* Woodward, 95 Mo. 866; State *v.* Fahey, 35 La. An. 9; State *v.* Clande, Id. 7; St. Louis *v.* State, 8 Neb. 406; State *v.* Rockett, 87 Mo. 666; People *v.* McDonnell, 47 Cal. 134; Bixby *v.* State, 15 Ark. 395; White *v.* State, 17 Ark. 404; Murray *v.* State, 36 Tex. 642; Lewis *v.* State, 15 Tex. Ap. 648; Piela *v.* People, 6 Col. 343; People *v.* Long, 70 Cal. 8; Terr. *v.* Yarberry, 2 New Mex. 391; McAdam *v.* State, 24 Tex. Ap. 86.

[3] State *v.* Kinney, 108 Ill. 519; Klein *v.* People, 113 Ill. 596; State *v.* Redemeier, 71 Mo. 173.

[4] People *v.* Montgomery, 13 Abbott, Pr. Rep. N. S. 207.

[5] Anderson *v.* State, 43 Conn. 514.

[6] Infra, § 881.

[7] Long *v.* State, 54 Ga. 564; Guyott *v.* Butts, 4 Wend. 579.

[8] Anderson *v.* State, 43 Conn. 514.

§ 869. Where the object is to discredit a witness on the opposite side, the general rule is that a new trial will not be granted.[1] Thus, where the defendant was convicted of forgery, chiefly on the evidence of B. R., and on a motion for a new trial evidence was produced to show the bias of B. R., it was held by the Supreme Court of Massachusetts that such evidence was no ground for the motion.[2] And a new trial was refused where, after a verdict of guilty upon an indictment for perjury, the defendant applied for a new trial on account of newly-discovered evidence, and furnished proof that a material witness for the prosecution had, subsequently to his examination upon the stand, expressed strong feelings of hostility toward the prisoner;[3] and the same position has been taken in a case in which it was alleged that a prosecutrix in rape had made a statement inconsistent with her evidence on the trial.[4] But it is otherwise where a principal witness declares that his statement on trial was a mistake.[5]

New trial not granted merely to discredit opposing witness.

§ 870. An indictment for perjury against a witness on whose testimony the verdict was obtained, unless the case was so gross as to make it probable that the verdict was obtained by perjury, or that the false testimony occasioned a surprise to the opposite party, will not be in itself sufficient cause for new trial.[6] Where there has been a surprise, how-

Subsequent indictment for perjury no ground.

[1] Com. *v.* Drew, 4 Mass. 399; Com. *v.* Waite, 5 Mass. 261; Com. *v.* Green, 17 Mass. 515; Com. *v.* Williams, 2 Ashm. 69; Thompson *v.* Com., 8 Grat. 637; State *v.* Williams, 14 W. Va. 851; Parham *v.* State, 10 Lea, 498; Bland *v.* State, 2 Carter (Ind.), 608; Morel *v.* State, 89 Ind. 275; Friedburg *v.* People, 102 Ill. 190; Tobin *v.* People, 101 Ill. 121; Levining *v.* State, 13 Ga. 513; Brown *v.* State, 55 Ga. 169; Beck *v.* State, 65 Ga. 766; Partee *v.* State, 67 Ga. 570; State *v.* Young, 34 La. An. 346; Ogden *v.* State, 13 Neb. 436; Wallace *v.* State, 28 Ark. 531; Campbell *v.* State, 38 Ark. 498; Redman *v.* State, 40 Ark. 445; State *v.* Lou Young, 34 La. An. 346; State *v.* Diskin, 35 La. An. 46; Herber *v.* State, 7 Tex. 69; Brown *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 286; Hutchinson *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 468; Polser *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 510; Atkins *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 89; Grate *v.* State, 23 Tex. Ap. 458.

[2] Com. *v.* Waite, 5 Mass. 261. See Hammond *v.* Wadhams, 5 Mass. 353.

[3] State *v.* Carr, 1 Foster, 166; Com. *v.* Drew, 4 Mass. 391.

[4] Shields *v.* State, 45 Conn. 266; see Leighton *v.* People, 10 Abb. (N. Y.) N. C. 261; Arwood *v.* State, 59 Ga. 391; Doyal *v.* State, 70 Ga. 134.

[5] Mann *v.* State, 44 Tex. Ap. 642; see Fisher *v.* People, 103 Ill. 101; Fletcher *v.* People, 117 Ill. 184.

[6] R. *v.* Heydon, 1 W. Black. 351; Benfield *v.* Petrie, 3 Douglas, 24; Warwick *v.* Bruce, 4 M. & S. 140; 9

ever, arising from the unexpected introduction of the alleged perjured witness, a new trial has been granted.[1]

The evidence offered must be such as ought to produce, on another trial, an opposite result on the merits.

§ 871. "After the verdict," said Rogers, J., on a motion for a new trial, after a capital conviction, in Pennsylvania, "when the motion for a new trial is considered, the court must judge not only of the competency but of the effect of evidence. If, with the newly-discovered evidence before them, the jury ought not to come to the same conclusion, then a new trial may be granted; otherwise we are bound to refuse the application."[2] And when the evidence produced is clearly immaterial, this limitation should be strictly enforced.[3] But a reasonable doubt as to the effect of the testimony should inure in favor of the defendant.[4]

New defence must not be merely technical.

§ 872. *Another essential is that the after-discovered evidence should go to the merits, and not rest on a merely technical defence.* Thus, after a conviction on an indictment for selling *spirituous* liquors, etc., "without being duly licensed as an innholder or common victualler," a new trial will not be granted for the purpose of allowing the defendant to give in evidence a license, which he had omitted to produce, to sell *fermented* liquor, and thus raise a question as to the mere form of the indictment.[5] And in larceny a new trial will not be granted on ground of evidence that the goods did not technically belong to the owner charged in the indictment.[6]

Price, 89; Resp. *v.* Newell, 2 Yeates, 479. That perjury should not be prosecuted during pendency of civil proceedings, see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1324.

[1] Morrell *v.* Kimball, 1 Greenl. 322; Thurtell *v.* Beaumont, 1 Bing. 339.

[2] Com. *v.* Flanigan, 7 W. & S. 423. The same point is affirmed in Hamlin *v.* State, 48 Conn. 92; Com. *v.* Mason, 2 Ashm. 31; Thompson *v.* Com., 8 Grat. 637; State *v.* Greenwood, 1 Hayw. 141; Carr *v.* State, 14 Ga. 358; Roach *v.* State, 34 Ga. 78; Jones *v.* State, 48 Ga. 163; Young *v.* State, 56 Ga. 403; Meeks *v.* State, 57 Ga. 329; Rainey *v.* State, 53 Ind. 278; Hauck *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 357.

[3] State *v.* O'Grady, 31 La. An. 378; Jackson *v.* State, 18 Tex. Ap. 586; see Whitehurst's case, 79 Va. 556.

Hence the confession of a wife that she herself had committed the offence without her husband's privity, after the conviction of the husband of forgery, was held not sufficient, when taken in connection with the evidence given on trial, to justify a new trial being granted. State *v.* J. W., 1 Tyler, 417. And so when the after-discovered witness was incompetent. Williams *v.* State, 62 Ga. 260.

[4] Lindley *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 283.

[5] Com. *v.* Churchill, 2 Met. 118.

[6] Foster *v.* State, 52 Miss. 595.

§ 873. We have already seen that under the old practice, excluding defendants as witnesses, new trials were not granted because a co-defendant, tried at the same time and acquitted, was a material witness for the convicted defendant.[1] Of course, under statutes rehabilitating parties as witnesses, where such co-defendants could have been called on trial, their acquittal is in no sense a reason for a new trial.

Acquittal of co-defendant no ground.

§ 874. Though the misjoinder of the defendants, where it appears on record, is subject of demurrer or arrest,[2] and though when it is developed on evidence, it is properly to be reached by a motion for severance, it not unfrequently becomes the ground of a motion for a new trial, and when wrongfully allowed by the court is a legitimate reason for setting aside the verdict.[3]

Refusal to sever defendants may be ground.

[1] U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumn. 20; State *v.* Bean, 36 N. H. 122; People *v.* Vermilyea, 7 Cowen, 367; Com. *v.* Manson, 2 Ashm. 32; Com. *v.* Chauncey, 2 Ash. 90; Cavanah *v.* State, 56 Miss. 300; Brackenridge's Law Miscellanies, 220. But see *contra*, Rich *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 206; Lyles *v.* State, 41 Tex. 172; Brown *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 286; Voight *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 21; Jackson *v.* State, 18 Tex. Ap. 586. Compare supra, §§ 305–6, 860.

[2] See supra, § 307.

[3] People *v.* Vermilyea, 7 Cowen, 383. Supra, § 860.

As has been already stated in an indictment against several, where the offence is such that it may have been committed by several, they are not of right entitled to be tried separately, but are to be tried in that manner only when the court, on sufficient cause, may think proper. Supra, §§ 295, 755; U. S. *v.* Wilson, 1 Bald. 78; U. S. *v.* Gibert, 2 Sumner, 20; State *v.* Soper, 16 Me. 293; People *v.* Howell, 4 Johns. R. 296; People *v.* Vermilyea, 7 Cowen, 108, 383; Com. *v.* Manson, 2 Ashm. 32; State *v.* Smith, 2 Iredell, 402; State *v.* Wise, 7 Richards. 412. See, *per contra*, U. S. *v.* Sharp, Peters C. C. 118; Campbell *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 314. At the same time, where several defendants, entirely disconnected in the transactions through which they are sought to be convicted, are jointly indicted, it would be sound exercise of discretion to grant them separate trials. People *v.* Vermilyea, 7 Cowen, 108. See supra, § 295.

How far one may be a witness for the other, is elsewhere discussed. Whart. Crim. Ev. § 445.

When one co-defendant, by the local law, is inadmissible as a witness for the others, if no evidence be given against him, he is entitled to his discharge as soon as the case of the prosecutor is closed, and may then be examined on behalf of the other defendants. Where there is any evidence against him, he cannot be sworn, but the whole must be submitted together to the jury. Bul. N. P. 285; Peake's Evid. 168; Phil. Evid. 36; 1 East, 312, 313; 6 T. R. 627; 1 Sid. 237; 1 Hale, 303; Com. *v.* Manson, 2 Ashm. 32. On the same principle, where one of the defendants, on an indictment for an assault, submits to a small fine and is discharged, he may be called on the

8. *Absence of Defendant at Trial.*

Such absence a ground.

§ 875. Where, through necessity or mistake, a defendant, in ordinary prosecutions for crime, is absent during the trial, there should be a new trial.[1] Nor is the fact that the counsel of the accused is present during the trial, and at the rendering of the verdict, without making objection to the prisoner's absence, a waiver of his right to be present. Some misdemeanors there indeed are, partaking of the nature of civil process, where, as has been seen, appearance by attorney is permissible,[2] but in all trials in which corporal punishment may be assigned the defendant must personally be present;[3] and this right is so inherent and inalienable, that a judgment will be reversed where it appears that the defendant was absent at the rendition of the verdict, though his presence was at the time waived by his counsel.[4] In crimes of high grade, the record must show the prisoner's presence at trial, verdict, and sentence, *affirmatively*, or else the error will be fatal.[5] But the presence may be inferred from the record, and need not be explicitly stated at each stage of the procedure.[6]

Yet to this rule two exceptions must be expressed. The first is, that it is not to be stretched so as to include occasional voluntary absence for a few moments from the court-room by the defendant, though it should happen that during such brief absence the verdict should happen to be brought in;[7] though in all cases of high crime

part of others, with whom he was jointly indicted. And where one defendant has actually pleaded misnomer, he may be received as a witness, because the indictment, as against him, is abated. Ibid. But if he suffers judgment by default, he cannot afterwards become a witness against or in favor of his associates; 5 Esp. Rep. 154; 2 Campb. 333, 334, n.; Bul. N. P. 285; Phil. Ev. 36; since no sentence can be constitutionally imposed on a verdict so obtained. Supra, § 550. See R. *v.* Roberts, 2 Strange, 1208; Jackson *v.* Com., 19 Grat. 656; Rose *v.* State, 20 Ohio, 31; Andrews *v.* State, 2 Sneed (Tenn.) 550.

[1] Supra, §§ 541–551.

[2] Supra, § 541.

[3] Supra, §§ 541 *et seq.*; 1 Chitty's C. L. 413; 2 Hale, 216; Jacobs *v.* Com., 5 Serg. & R. 315; Gladden *v.* State, 12 Fla. 562; Leschi *v.* Terr., 1 Wash. Terr. 23; Shapoonmash *v.* Terr., Ibid. 219.

[4] Supra, §§ 541 *et seq.*, 733. See Prine *v.* Com., 18 Penn. St. 103.

[5] Supra, §§ 541 *et seq.*; Dunn *v.* Com., 6 Barr, 387; Hamilton *v.* Com., 16 Penn. St. 121; State *v.* Smith, 31 La. An. 406.

[6] Lawrence *v.* Com., 30 Grat., 845.

[7] Hill *v.* State, 17 Wis. 675.

it would be necessary in such case for the jury to be kept back from formally rendering their verdict until the defendant returns.[1] The second is, that when the defendant behaves so obstreperously that his temporary compulsory removal from the court-room is necessary, he cannot complain of the trial proceeding for a short time in his absence, he losing the privilege of objecting by his conduct.[2]

Waiver, so far as concerns this particular right, has been already discussed.[3]

9. *Mistake in Conduct of Case.*

§ 876. Where the cause has been prejudiced from some misconception of the judge, or mistake of the party or his counsel, which could not have been cured by ordinary prudence and care, a new trial will be allowed.[4] Thus, where the counsel were misled by a positive intimation from the court, and refrained from offering evidence,[5] and where the judge misapprehended a material fact, and misdirected the jury,[6] a new trial has been granted. But, if due diligence could have corrected the mistake, the rule will be refused. Thus, a new trial will not be granted because a juror was taken from the panel, on the erroneous supposition that there was good ground to challenge him, when the defendant did not at the time object.[7]

Mistake may be ground if there was due diligence.

§ 877. Mistake by counsel of law will be no excuse, whether made generally in the conduct of a cause, or in the neglect to object to testimony when offered which might have been excluded.[8] But, if objection is made to the introduction of testimony at the proper time, no objection to the judge's charge upon that evidence is afterwards necessary.[9] If an objection to evidence, which objection could have been obviated by further proof, be not made, it will not be received as the ground of a motion for a new trial.[10] Where, however, evidence is not sufficient

Mistake of law no ground.

[1] Supra, § 550.

[2] See cases cited supra, §§ 543 *et seq.*; U. S. *v.* Davis, 6 Blatch. C. C. 464; Fight *v.* State, 7 Ohio, 180.

[3] Supra, §§ 541, 733.

[4] See Ohms *v.* State, 49 Wis. 415; Heskew *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 606.

[5] Le Flemming *v.* Simpson, 1 M. & Ryl. 269; Dunham *v.* Baxter, 4 Mass. 79.

[6] Supra, §§ 794, 798.

[7] Com. *v.* Stowell, 9 Met. 572.

[8] See cases cited supra, §§ 801 *et seq.*; and infra, § 878.

[9] Supra, §§ 801 *et seq.*; People *v.* Holmes, 5 Wend. 192.

[10] Supra, § 804.

in law to authorize a verdict, a new trial will be granted, even though no objection be made at the trial.[1] But as a rule there is no new trial because counsel ignorantly neglect to present proper points of law to the court.[2]

§ 878. Mere ordinary negligence of counsel is no ground.[3] Thus, as has been already seen, a new trial will not be granted because the district attorney, by mistake, withholds important papers, unless the defendant uses due diligence to sustain them.[4] But a new trial has been granted where the defendant, having otherwise a good case, which would have resulted in an acquittal, was advised by his counsel that certain evidence which was admitted was not admissible against him, and was so taken by surprise,[5] and where the counsel neglected to summon the witnesses whose names were given him by his client.[6]

Nor is negligence of counsel.

§ 879. Where, as sometimes occurs, witnesses are mistaken in their testimony from temporary incapacity, new trials have been granted.[7] Relief, however, will only be afforded on clear proof of mistake by the witness, not where the party was in error as to what the witness would prove;[8] nor will the court hear evidence to show that a witness used expressions after trial contradicting his testimony in court.[9] At the same time, when a party has been surprised by mistakes in testimony at the trial which he had no reason to expect, and which, if he had had time, he could readily have corrected, justice requires that a verdict obtained in this way, if manifestly unfair, should be revised.[10]

New trial from unexpected blunder or confusion of witness.

[1] Supra, § 813.

[2] Supra, §§ 708 *et seq.*

[3] See on this topic an article in 16 West. Jur. 281 (May, 1882); Wray *v.* People, 78 Ill. 212; Augustine *v.* State, 20 Tex. 450. That it is no ground that the counsel assigned by the court was not acceptable to defendant, see People *v.* Murry, 52 Mich. 288.

[4] Supra, § 863.

[5] State *v.* Williams, 27 Vt. 824. See State *v.* Bonge, 61 Iowa, 658; State *v.* Gunter, 30 La. An. Pt. I. 536; Babb *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 173; supra, § 598*a*.

[6] State *v.* Lewis, 9 Mo. Ap. 321. As to treachery of counsel, see supra, § 598*a*.

[7] Supra, § 864; Scofield *v.* State, 54 Ga. 635. See Richardson *v.* Fisher, 1 Bing. 145; De Gion *v.* Dover, 2 Ans. 517.

[8] Hewlett *v.* Cruchley, 5 Taunt. 277.

[9] R. *v.* Whitehouse, 18 Eng. L. & Eq. Rep. 105; 1 Dears. C. C. 1; Com. *v.* Randall, Thach. C. C. 500; supra, § 869.

[10] See supra, § 864.

§ 880. If the error is not attributable to misconduct of themselves, or to misdirection of court, it is no ground that the jury rendered their verdict under a mistake as to the degree of punishment the court could inflict.[1]

But not mistake of jury as to punishment.

10. *Surprise.*

§ 881. Where a party or his counsel has been taken by surprise, in the course of a cause, by some accidental circumstance, which could not have been foreseen, in which no laches could be ascribed to either of them, a new trial will be awarded, if the court think the verdict against the weight of evidence properly admissible.[2] Thus, a new trial will be granted where the plaintiff is surprised by the testimony of his own witnesses, who appear to have been tampered with;[3] where a witness has been so much disconcerted as to be unable to testify at the trial;[4] where a material witness, regularly subpœnaed and in attendance, absents himself shortly before the case is called;[5] and where, in a case of seduction, the principal witness lays the seduction on a day which the defendant has no reason to anticipate, being at a time when he was absent from the place, and could easily prove an *alibi*.[6]

When genuine and productive of injustice, good ground.

§ 882. New trials will also be granted in cases where the trial was hurried on in such haste as to give the defendant no time to prepare for his defence, provided in the motion for the new trial a substantial defence be disclosed.[7] But mere want of preparation, arising from the defendant having been in prison, is no ground for a new trial.[8]

So of undue haste in hurrying on trial.

[1] People *v.* Lee, 17 Cal. 656. But see supra, §§ 842–8.

[2] See State *v.* Williams, 27 Vt. 724; State *v.* Simien, 36 La. An. 923; Hodde *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 382; Hilliard on New Trials (1873), 51; and cases cited § 879.

[3] Todd *v.* State, 25 Ind. 212. See supra, § 804; Peterson *v.* Barry, 4 Binn. 481.

[4] Ainsworth *v.* Sessions, 1 Root, 175. See supra, §§ 804, 879.

[5] Ruggles *v.* Hall, 14 Johns. 112.

[6] Sargent *v.* ——, 5 Cowen, 106. See supra, §§ 855 *et seq.*, as to what cases the defendant can be relieved in, on the ground of after-discovered evidence of the incompetency or bias of witnesses.

[7] See State *v.* Boyd, 37 La. An. 781; Valle *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 57. An indictment was found November 21, for a murder committed on the 11th of October previous. The defendant was put

[8] Yanez *v.* State, 20 Tex. 656.

But absence of witness no ground when testimony is cumulative.

§ 883. Sudden sickness, and consequent absence of a material witness, is no ground for a new trial when the testimony to be established by such witness was proved by other parties.[1]

Ordinary surprise at evidence no ground.

§ 884. The mere fact of a party being surprised by the introduction of unexpected evidence, however, is no ground for a new trial,[2] especially when the affidavit does not show that the "surprising" evidence was not true,[3] and that no effort was made on trial for continuance to meet the surprise.[4]

Nor is unexpected bias of witness.

§ 885. In general, as has been seen, the production of unexpected evidence impeaching the character of a witness is no reason to set aside the verdict.[5]

11. *Irregularity in Summoning of Jury.*

Ordinarily defects in jury process no ground.

§ 886. Generally speaking, under the statutes, the mistake or informality of the officers charged with summoning, returning, and empanelling the jury, will be no ground for a new trial, unless there has been fraud or collusion, or material injury to the defendant.[6] Unless matter of

upon trial immediately and convicted, and sentenced for murder in the second degree. The case did not appear to be an aggravated one. The defendant made affidavit that he had been surprised by the evidence, and had had no time for a proper defence. It was held, in Indiana, that under these and other circumstances of the case, a new trial should have been granted. Rosencrants *v.* State, 6 Ind. 407. Supra, § 600.

[1] Supra, §§ 590, 600; Young *v.* Com., 4 Grat. 550.

[2] Supra, § 804; R. *v.* Hollinberry, 6 D. & R. 345; 4 B. & C. 329; Willard *v.* Wetherbee, 4 N. H. 118; Wholford *v.* Com., 4 Grat. 553; State *v.* Schnelle, 24 W. Va. 802; State *v.* Smith, Ibid. 814.

[3] People *v.* Jocelyn, 29 Cal. 562.

[4] Hanoey *v.* State, 68 Ga. 612; Webb *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 490; Childs *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 183; Cunningham *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 162.

[6] Supra, §§ 802, 869; Com. *v.* Drew, 4 Mass. 391; Com. *v.* Green, 17 Mass. 515.

[6] R. *v.* Hunt, 4 Barn. & Ald. 430; Amherst *v.* Hadley, 1 Pick. 38; People *v.* Ransom, 7 Wend. 417; Dewar *v.* Spence, 2 Whart. 211; Com. *v.* Chauncey, 2 Ashm. 90; Com. *v.* Gallagher, 4 Penn. Law Jour. 511; 2 Clark, 86. See, as to grand jury, supra, §§ 344 *et seq.*, 350.

As to Pennsylvania, by the Act of 21st February, 1814, see Com. *v.* Chauncey, 2 Ashmead, 90; Com. *v.* Gallagher, 4 Penn. Law. Jour. 511; 2 Clark, 86. It has been held, under this act, that standing mute is as much a waiver as pleading to the issue. Com. *v.* Dyot, 5 Whart. 67. In New York, under the

record, such defects cannot be noticed in error[1] or in arrest of judgment.[2] But it is a good ground for new trial at common law that jurors have been improperly chosen, or chosen by an unauthorized officer, or that the officers in attendance had permitted irregularities.[3] Where one who had been challenged on the principal panel was afterwards sworn in under another name as a talesman;[4] and where talesmen who were incompetent, or who had not been drawn according to the statute, were summoned and returned, and placed on the trial, new trials have been ordered.[5] If the party, however, is aware, or could by due diligence have been aware, of the objections to a juror or talesman, and neglects his challenge, no new trial will be granted;[6] as formal objection that the juror had not been drawn and returned according to law comes too late after the verdict.[7] Thus, where one of the jury had been drawn more than twenty days before the time when the *venire* was made returnable, exception not having been made until after verdict, a new trial was refused.[8] And a new trial will not be granted because the clerk, in calling over the jury, pursued the order in which they were empanelled, instead of that in which their names appeared in the *venire*.[9] Nor is it ground for new trial that jurors and witnesses in a criminal case are sworn by an acting deputy clerk, who has not been appointed regularly or sworn in.[10]

§ 887. After the verdict, irregularities in the summoning of

Revised Statutes, it was held that a non-compliance of the clerk to put the names of all the persons returned as jurors in a box, from which juries are to be drawn, is not fatal. People *v.* Ransom, 7 Wend. 417.

[1] Cross *v.* State, 63 Ala. 40; State *v.* Degonia, 69 Mo. 485; Hollis *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 620. That error lies in such case for illegal summoning of jury, see R. *v.* O'Connell, 11 Cl. & F. 155; Bach *v.* State, 38 Ohio St. 664.

[2] Supra, § 766.

[3] As a signal illustration of this, see R. *v.* O'Connell, 11 Cl. & F. 155; Pamph. R. Arm. & T.; Lord Denman's Life, ii. 172. As to challenging and quashing in such cases, see supra, § 608.

[4] Parker *v.* Thornton, 2 Lord Raymond, 1410; though see R. *v.* Hunt, 4 B. & A. 430. See supra, § 846.

[5] R. *v.* Tremaine, 7 D. & R. 684; 5 B. & C. 254; Kennedy *v.* Williams, 2 Nott & McC. 79. See Com. *v.* Gallagher, 4 Penn. L. J. 520. Supra, § 846.

[6] Supra, § 845. See R. *v.* Sullivan, 1 P. & D. 96; 8 Ad. & L. 831; Howland *v.* Gifford, 1 Pick. 43; State *v.* Jackson, 27 Kans. 581.

[7] See supra, § 845.

[8] State *v.* Hascall, 6 N. H. 352.

[9] State *v.* Slack, 1 Bailey, 330.

[10] Mobley *v.* State, 46 Miss. 501.

And so of irregularities in finding bill.

the grand jury, or in the finding of the bill, not appearing on the record, cannot be noticed on a motion for a new trial.[1]

§ 888. The question of subsequent discovery of incompetency of a juror has been already discussed.[2]

§ 889. It is also settled, as we have already seen, that objections to the competency of jurors, on the ground of preadjudication, must be taken before empanelling, or at the time when the party becomes first acquainted with the objection.[3] Nor is popular excitement at the time of the trial in itself a ground for new trial,[4] unless the jury be swept away by it into an unjust verdict.[5]

Prejudice in jury. Popular excitement.

IV. AT WHAT TIME MOTION FOR NEW TRIALS MUST BE MADE.

§ 890. An application for a new trial cannot, in general, be made after an application for arrest in the judgment;[6] though there are cases in which, if it appear that manifest injustice will ensue from a strict observance of the rule, the court will waive the formality, and admit the defendant to a rehearing;[7] and now the Court of Queen's Bench, in its discretion, hears motions in arrest of judgment before applications for a new trial.[8] In extreme cases, the court, especially if the punishment be capital, will hear the motion even after sentence imposed.[9] But the ordinary practice requires notice of the motion to be given

Motion must be prompt.

[1] Supra, § 350.

[2] Supra, §§ 846 *et seq.* Where the clerk, in drawing a juror, called a name which was answered by mistake by a juror in attendance, who afterwards, *bona fide*, took his seat and served, it was held that the defendant not being injured by the mistake had no ground for new trial. Com. *v.* Parsons, 139 Mass. 381.

[3] Supra, § 844.

[4] Com. *v.* Flanigan, 7. W. & S. 418; Brinkley *v.* State, 54 Ga. 71. Supra, § 844.

[5] People *v.* Acosta, 10 Cal. 195.

[6] 1 Ch. C. L. 658; Resp. *v.* Lacaze, 2 Dall. 118.

[7] R. *v.* Gough, 2 Dougl. 791; Bac. Abr. Trial (L.), 1; Chitty C. L. 658; R. *v.* Holt, 5 T. R. 436; People *v.* McKay, 18 Johns. 212.

[8] R. *v.* Rowlands, 2 Den. C. C. 386. See 6 T. R. 627; Bac. Abr. Trial (L.), 1.

[9] See U. S. *v.* Malone, 20 Blatch. 137; Com. *v.* McElhaney, 111 Mass. 439. See, however, Willis *v.* State, 62 Ind. 391.

within four days after verdict.[1] This, however, may be at discretion enlarged,[2] unless otherwise prescribed by statute.[3]

Whether the defendant's presence is essential to the arguing of the motion has been already considered.[4]

When verdict set aside new trial at once ordered.

§ 891. Where a verdict has been set aside in a criminal case as imperfect, a *venire facias de novo* may at once be awarded, and a new trial had, either on the same indictment or another.[5]

V. AS TO WHOM MOTION APPLIES.

Any defendant may move.

§ 892. Any defendant, within the proper time, may apply for a new trial.

Defendant must be personally in court.

§ 893. The defendant, according to the old practice, must be personally in court at the application;[6] and where there are several defendants, all of them who have been convicted must be actually present, unless a special ground be laid for dispensing with the general rule.[7] But such presence, even in felonies, is not always regarded as essential.[8]

New trial may be granted as to one of several.

§ 894. Where some of the defendants have been convicted and others acquitted, a new trial may be granted to the former, without impeaching the verdict so far as it relates to the latter.[9] It is otherwise, however, when the conviction of the one is an essential condition of the conviction of the other.[10]

[1] R. *v.* Newman, 1 El. & Bl. 268; Dears C. C. 85. In Com. *v.* Cannon, 10 Phila. 456, it was said that the motion must be made immediately after verdict.

[2] Com. *v.* Gibson, 2 Va. Cas. 70. See Burk *v.* State, 72 Ind. 392; Smith *v.* State, 64 Ga. 439; Ross *v.* State, 65 Ga. 127; Bullock *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 42; Hart *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 163. That a rule cannot be granted after expiration of the term, see State *v.* Alphin, 81 N. C. 566.

[3] Holmes, ex parte, 21 Neb. 324.

[4] Supra, § 548.

[5] Com. *v.* Gibson, 2 Va. Cas. 70.

[6] Supra, § 548; 2 Burr. 930; 2 Stra. 844, 1227; 1 W. Black. 209.

[7] R. *v.* Teal, 11 East, 307; 1 Sess. Cas. 428; Com. Dig. Indictment, N.; 1 Chit. C. L. 659; R. *v.* Fielder, 2 D. & R. 46.

[8] Supra, § 548.

[9] R. *v.* Mawbey, 6 T. R. 638; Com. *v.* Roby, 12 Pick. 496; Kemp *v.* Com., 18 Grat. 969; Seborn *v.* State, 51 Ga. 164.

[10] Jackson *v.* State, 54 Ga. 439; Dutcher *v.* State, 16 Neb. 30 (a case of riot). See supra, § 755.

VI. WHEN THE CONVICTION IS FOR ONLY PART OF THE INDICTMENT.

1. *Acquittal on One of Two Counts.*

§ 895. When there has been an acquittal on one count and a conviction on another, and the counts are for distinct offences, a new trial can only be granted on the count on which there has been a conviction; and it is error, on a second trial, to put the defendant on trial on the former.[1] It has been, however, ruled that where an indictment is for but one offence, charged in various ways, and the defendant is convicted upon some counts and acquitted as to others, the granting of a new trial on his motion opens the whole merits;[2] though this view can only be sustained in cases in which the verdict on the counts on which there was an acquittal was directed in consequence of formal defects.

New trial only on convicted counts.

2. *Conviction of Minor Offence included in Major.*

§ 896. Where two offences are included in one count, there has been a distiction taken which though specious is unsound. It has been held that where one count includes burglary and larceny, after acquittal of the greater offence but conviction of the less, and when a new trial is obtained, the whole case is reopened, and the defendant exposed on the second trial to the double charge.[3] But the true view is, that a conviction of the *minor* offence operates as an acquittal of the *major*.[4]

Conviction of minor is acquittal of major.

[1] Supra, §§ 459, 788; U. S. *v.* Davenport, 1 Deady, 264; Stuart *v.* Com., 28 Grat. 950; Reynolds *v.* State, 64 Ind. 498; Logg *v.* People, 8 Ill. App. 99; State *v.* Malling, 11 Iowa, 239; Campbell *v.* State, 9 Yerg. 333; Esmon *v.* State, 1 Swan, 14; Morris *v.* State, 8 S. & M. 762; State *v.* Kettleman, 35 Mo. 105; State *v.* Fritz, 27 La. An. 360; State *v.* McNaught, 36 Kan. 624. But see State *v.* Stanton, 1 Ired. 424; State *v.* Commis., 3 Hill S. C. 239. Compare remarks supra, § 788.

[2] Leslie *v.* State, 18 Ohio St. 390; Jarvis *v.* State, 19 Ohio St. 585. But see supra, § 788.

[3] See supra, §§ 465, 742, 789.

[4] Supra, §§ 465, 789; Com. *v.* Herty, 109 Mass. 348; People *v.* Knapp, 26 Mich. 112; Bell *v.* State, 48 Ala. 684; Lewis *v.* State, 51 Ala. 1, and other cases cited supra, § 465; State *v.* Martin, 30 Wis. 216.

Under the Missouri constitution it has been held that after setting aside a conviction of murder in the second degree on an indictment for murder in the first degree, the defendant can be held for murder in the first degree. State *v.* Simms, 71 Mo. 538; State *v.* Anderson, 89 Mo. 312; supra, § 465; and so as to burglary and larceny, State *v.* Bruffey, 75 Mo. 389. See State *v.* Martin, 76 Mo. 337.

But to enable this defence to be interposed, it must be specially pleaded.[1]

The law in reference to new trials after convictions for manslaughter, or murder in the second degree, has already been stated.[2]

VII. BY WHAT COURT NEW TRIAL MAY BE GRANTED.

1. *Appellate Courts.*

§ 897. At common law the court trying the case is the sole tribunal by which a new trial can be granted; and its refusal so to do, being matter of discretion, is no ground for a writ of error.[3] In most of the States, however, provision is made for obtaining revision by an appellate court.[4] When such a rehearing is had, the appellate court is not bound to reëxamine the witness and hear the evidence *verbatim*, but, when there is no official stenographer, may hear the material facts proved, and the evidence adduced at the trial, from the trial court notes, aided by those of the counsel on both sides.[5]

Appellate court may revise evidence from notes.

2. *When Judge trying Case dies or leaves Office.*

§ 898. In the Circuit Court of the United States sitting in Philadelphia, it has been held that where the judge trying a case died pending a motion for a new trial, his successor will decline hearing the case, and will grant a new trial.[6] But in Wisconsin it is said that a defendant can be sentenced by a judge succeeding in office the judge before whom the trial was had.[7]

Conflict of opinion on this point.

VIII. IN WHAT FORM.

§ 899. Upon ground *primâ facie* sufficient, the court, on application, will award a rule to show cause why a new trial should not be

[1] Supra, §§ 465, 477; Jordan *v.* State, 81 Ala. 20.

[2] Supra, §§ 465–8, 789. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 541.

[3] Supra, § 779; infra, § 902; Lester *v.* State, 11 Conn. 415.

[4] See infra, §§ 902, 927–8.

[5] Jones's case, 1 Leigh, 598. Infra, § 899.

[6] U. S. *v.* Harding, 1 Wall. Jr. 127; see, also, State *v.* O'Kelly, 88 N. C. 600; State *v.* Randall, 88 N. C. 611. Supra, § 515; infra, § 929.

[7] Pegalow *v.* State, 20 Wis. 61; see Moett *v.* People, 85 N. Y. 67; State *v.* Abram, 4 Ala. 272; State *v.* Shea, 95 Mo. 85. Compare infra, § 929.

granted.[1] On this, in England, the puisne judge of the court applies to the judge who tried the case, unless he be one of the judges of the court hearing the motion, for a report of the trial, and a statement of his opinion respecting its merits.[2] If he signify his dissatisfaction, the remedy prayed for is usually allowed; if he declare his concurrence with the verdict, it is commonly refused; but if he merely report the evidence, without giving any decided and satisfactory opinion, the court will admit the question to be argued before them.[3] If they find there is no ground for the application, they will discharge the rule; but if solid ground be shown, they make it absolute.[4]

Rule to show cause to be first granted.

§ 900. The motion should state specifically the reasons relied on by the party making it.[5] To simply say that the court erred in refusing to admit, or in admitting competent or incompetent evidence, is insufficient. The evidence in question must be specified, and the name of the witness, when the evidence is given, stated.[6] When the ground is after-discovered evidence, the motion must be supported by affidavits of the witnesses to be produced.[7]

Motion must state reasons.

IX. COSTS.

§ 901. The practice as to the imposition of costs is the same in criminal cases as in civil.[8] And the court, even when an indictment after verdict is removed by *certiorari* to a higher court on ground of surprise, may direct that the costs shall await the result of the second trial.[9]

Costs may await second trial.

X. ERROR.

§ 902. We have seen that at common law refusing a new trial is not ground for error.[10] When, however, by statute, error in such

[1] Bul. N. P. 327; Tidd, 884; Hand. Prac. 12. As to Texas practice, see Ayers *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 450; Bullock *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 42.

[2] Bul. N. P. 327; Tidd, 884.

[3] R. T. H. 23; Barnes, 439; see Simpson *v.* Norton, 45 Me. 281.

[4] 1 Chitty's C. L. 660.

[5] Hilliard on New Trials (1873), 28. Supra, § 855.

[6] Cheek *v.* State, 37 Ind. 533; People *v.* Ah Sam, 41 Cal. 645; State *v.* Kellerman, 14 Kans. 135; Runnels *v.* State, 28 Ark. 121. Supra, § 855.

[7] Supra, § 855.

[8] R. *v.* Ford, 1 N. & M. 776; Hilliard on New Trials (1873), 65.

[9] R. *v.* Whitehouse, Dears. C. C. 1.

[10] Supra, § 779, where the cases are given; and, also, supra, § 897. State *v.* Mackay, 12 Or. 154.

case lies, the refusal of the court below will not be reversed unless it should affirmatively and plainly appear to the appellate court that the decision of the court below was wrong.[1]

Error does not usually lie to action of court.

Granting a motion for a new trial will not be reversed in error in any but extreme cases.[2]

[1] Grayson's case, 6 Grat. 723; Read *v.* Com., 22 Grat. 924; State *v.* Collins, 15 Lea, 434. Supra, §§ 779, 897. See U. S. *v.* Bicksler, 1 Mack. (U. S.) 341; U. S. *v.* Lewis, 2 New Mex. 459; Smith *v.* State, 67 Ga. 769; see Bachman *v.* People, 8 Col. 472; Petite *v.* People, Ibid. 225.

In Pennsylvania, it is said that refusal of a new trial is not subject of error except in capital cases. McConkey *v.* Com., 101 Penn. St. 416. But see, qualifying this, McGinnis *v.* Com., 102 Penn. St. 66.

[2] People *v.* Conroy, 97 N. Y. 62.

CHAPTER XIX.

SENTENCE.

I. Defendant to be asked if he has anything to say.
In felonies this is essential, § 906.
II. Distribution of Punishment as to Counts.
On general verdict, superfluous counts may be got rid of by *nolle prosequi*, § 907.
And so even as to bad count, § 908.
Conflict as to general sentence when some counts are bad, § 909.
A verdict and judgment as to one count disposes of the others, § 909 *a*.
Successive punishments may be given on successive counts, § 910.
But not where counts are not for distinct offences, § 911.
III. Defendant's Presence Essential, § 912.
IV. Amendment or Stay.
Court may amend during term, § 913.
V. Capital Punishment.
On verdict of guilty on indictment for murder, court will sentence for second degree, § 914.
Defendant to be asked as to sentence, and may reply, § 915.
As to form of sentence, practice varies, § 916.
Pregnancy is ground for respite, § 917.
VI. Corporal Punishment.
Limits to be determined by statute. Discretion of court. Sentence less than minimum. Restitution, § 918.
Fine and imprisonment are the usual common law penalties, § 919.
"Cruel and unusual" punishments unlawful, § 920.
"Whipping" not cruel and unusual, § 921.
VII. Fines.
May be collected by execution, § 922.
VIII. Form of Sentence.
Must be definite, § 923.
How far may be alternative, § 924.
Day of sentence is first day of imprisonment, § 925.
Expiration without endurance is not execution, § 925 *a*.
Prison need not at common law be specified, § 926.
IX. Sentence by Appellate Court.
Appellate court may sentence or may reverse for error, § 927.
In capital and other cases record remanded to court below for execution, § 928.
X. Sentence by succeeding Judge.
Such sentence may be regular, § 929.
XI. Successive Imprisonments.
Prisoner may be brought up for second trial by *habeas corpus*, § 931.
A second imprisonment begins at the former's termination, § 932.
An escaped prisoner may be sentenced for escape in like manner, § 933.

XII. When Severer Punishment is Assigned to Second Offence.
Such statutes constitutional, § 934.
In such cases, prior conviction should be averred, § 935.
Former conviction must be legal. *Foreign* conviction insufficient, § 936.
Conviction to be proved by record and identification, § 937.
Prosecution may waive first conviction, § 937 *a*.
Prior conviction not to be put in evidence until main issue is found against defendant, § 938.
XIII. Disfranchisement and Incapacitation.
Conviction a prerequisite, § 939.
Loss of office, 939 *a*.
And so of capacity as witness, § 939 *b*.
XIV. Joint Sentences.
Joint defendants may each be punished to full amount, § 940.
XV. Bindings to keep the Peace.
Defendant, after verdict, may be bound over to keep the peace, § 941.
XVI. Considerations in Adjusting Sentence.
Courts have usually large discretion, § 942.
Primary object is retribution; but example and reform to be incidental, § 943.
Evidence may be received in aggravation or mitigation of guilt, § 945.
XVII. Ex Post Facto Penalties.
How far unconstitutional, § 946.
XVIII. Benefit of Clergy.
Now obsolete, § 946 *a*.

§ 905. By the ordinary rules of court a defendant is allowed four days in which to move in arrest of judgment or for a new trial. To previous chapters the reader is referred for a discussion of these motions: it is proposed at present, on the supposition, either that they have been made and refused, or that a final judgment has been entered against the defendant on demurrer, to consider the law bearing on the subject of sentence.

I. DEFENDANT TO BE ASKED IF HE HAS ANYTHING TO SAY, ETC.

§ 906. At common law, in all capital felonies, the practice has been for the clerk, before sentence is pronounced, to ask the defendant if he has anything to say why sentence should not be pronounced; and it is essential that it should appear on record that this was done.[1] In several States the

In felonies this is essential.

[1] Supra, § 550; 1 Ch. C. L. 709; 2 Ld. Raym. 1409; R. *v.* Geary, 2 Salk. 630; R. *v.* Speke, 3 Salk. 358; Safford *v.* People, 1 Park. C. R. 474; Graham *v.* People, 63 Barb. 468; Messner *v.* People, 45 N. Y. 1; West *v.* State, 2 Zab. 212; Hamilton *v.* Com., 16 Penn. St. 121; Dougherty *v.* Com., 69 Penn. St. 286; McCue *v.* Com., 78 Penn. St. 185; Mullen *v.* State, 45 Ala. 43; Crocker *v.* State, 47 Ala. 53; James *v.* State, 45 Miss. 572. Infra, § 915.

In New York, where the exemplifi-

rule is that in all cases of felony the absence of such an averment will require the remittal by a court of error of the record to the trial court for a new sentence.[1] In other States the failure of the record in this respect has been held not to be ground for a reversal, though it is held that the form is one proper to be used.[2] In some States the practice is dispensed with as an unnecessary formality.[3] But this address is not to be viewed as an invitation to the defendant to bring forward additional motions in arrest of judgment, or for a new trial. These motions have, according to the usual practice, been already made and disposed of. The object of the address is to give the defendant the opportunity to personally lay before the court, statements which, by the strict rules of law, could not have been admitted when urged by his counsel in the due course of legal procedure; but which, when thus informally offered from man to man, may be used to extenuate guilt and to mitigate punishment.

II. DISTRIBUTION OF PUNISHMENT AS TO COUNTS.

§ 907. The more exact course, as has been stated, is for the jury, when the indictment contains several counts, to find sepa-

cation that comes to the court in error does not show that the question was asked, a *certiorari* may be granted to the oyer and terminer to bring up the whole record. Graham *v.* People, 6 Lansing, 149.

In Edwards *v.* State, 47 Miss. 581, it was said that it was sufficient in error when the record averred that the court, "after hearing the defendant," proceeded to pass sentence. See State *v.* Fritz, 27 La. An. 360; State *v.* Hugel, 27 La. An. 375. That the defendant must have been present in court during sentence, see supra, § 550.

[1] McCue *v.* Com., 78 Penn. St. 185; State *v.* Trezevant, 20 S. C. 363; State *v.* Jefcoat, 20 S. C. 383; Dodge *v.* People, 4 Neb. 220; State *v.* Jennings, 24 Kan. 642; Perry *v.* State, 43 Ala. 21; but see Spigner *v.* State, 58 Ala. 421; Keech *v.* State, 15 Fla. 591; Kinsler *v.* Terr., 1 Wy. 112. See supra, § 780.

[2] Supra, § 550; Jeffries *v.* Com., 5 Allen, 145; Grady *v.* State, 11 Ga. 253; Sarah *v.* State, 28 Ga. 576; State *v.* Ball, 27 Mo. 324; Jones *v.* State, 51 Miss. 718; State *v.* Taylor, 27 La. An. 393; State *v.* Shields, 33 La. An. 991. That the question is not necessary in misdemeanors, see State *v.* Bradley, 30 La. An. Pt. I. 326. That omission can be cured by shortly afterwards calling the defendant up, putting the question, and re-sentencing, see Reynolds *v.* State, 68 Ala. 502.

[3] State *v.* Hoyt, 47 Conn. 318; State *v.* Johnson, 67 N. C. 59; capital cases; Bresler *v.* People, 117 Ill. 422, a "minor felony."

rately on each count.[1] Should, however, the verdict be general, the prosecuting officer may enter a *nolle prosequi* on the counts which are superfluous, or the court may disregard them, treating their abandonment by the prosecuting officer as virtually a *nolle prosequi*.[2] On the count that remains judgment may be entered.[3]

On general verdict superfluous counts can be got rid of by *nolle prosequi*.

§ 908. Suppose, however, one of the counts on which there has been a general verdict is bad. Here we have a conflict of opinion. Does such bad count vitiate the verdict? So it has been held.[4] But the prevalent and sounder opinion is that in such case the bad count can be got rid of by a *nolle prosequi*, or passed over by the sentencing court, if the record does not show that evidence, inadmissible under the good count, was admitted under the bad.[5] Logically, it is true, a single bad count vitiates the verdict, since it is impossible to exclude the hypothesis, on the bare record, that it was on that count that the verdict may have been based. But in cases of this class we are not limited to the bare record. The court trying the case knows to which counts the evidence was applicable, and to which the verdict was attached; and a court of error may well presume that the court below, in sentencing on the good counts, sentenced on counts to which the verdict was properly to be assigned.[6] And, as a general rule, the presumption of regularity may be invoked to sustain the conclusion that the verdict went to the good counts; and this presumption is eminently applicable to cases in which the counts vary only in matters of form, or in which they are for successive stages of the same offence.[7] But it will be error in such cases to impose a sentence exceeding that which could have been given on the good counts;[8] though in some jurisdictions this is not ground for reversal, when the appellate court may by statute reduce the sentence.[9] And

And so even if there be a bad count.

[1] Supra, § 736.

[2] Supra, §§ 292, 738, 740, 771.

[3] Ibid. See Young *v.* R., 3 T. R. 98; State *v.* McDonald, 85 Mo. 539.

[4] Supra, § 771.

[5] Ibid. Compare supra, §§ 292, 737–48.

[6] Supra, § 771.

[7] As sustaining the view in the text, see Kane *v.* People, 8 Wend. 203; People *v.* Gates, 13 Wend. 311; People *v.* Costello, 1 Denio, 83. To the effect that the presumption in error is that the evidence in the court below sustained the verdict, see Slack *v.* People, 80 Ill. 32; Brennan *v.* Shinkle, 89 Ill. 604; Doll *v.* Anderson, 27 Cal. 248.

[8] Infra, § 927.

[9] Infra, §§ 927–8; Com. *v.* Kirby, 2 Cush. 577.

it is not error when the sentence is less than could have been legally imposed.[1]

Conflict as to general sentence when one count is bad.

§ 909. Another contingency arises when the jury find a verdict of guilty on each count, but on this verdict there is a general judgment and sentence in the court below. Should this judgment be reversed in error, if one of the counts turns out, on examination in the court of error, to be defective? The conflict of opinion on this point has been already noticed.[2]

A verdict and judgment as to one count disposes of the others.

§ 909 *a*. Where there are several counts, a judgment and sentence upon one of these counts, no action being taken as to the others, disposes of the whole indictment, and operates as an acquittal upon or discontinuance of the other counts.[3] The effect of a general verdict on repugnant counts, or in cases where one count is defective, has been already considered.[4]

Successive imprisonments may be given on successive counts.

§ 910. Next have we to consider whether, when there is a series of counts, all good, on which there have been separate verdicts, the court trying the case can impose a separate sentence on each count. That this can be done we have numerous authoritative rulings.[5] Nor, when the offences

[1] Infra, § 918.

[2] Supra, § 771.

Whether, when two distinct offences are joined, and the defendant is found guilty on each count, there can be a lumping sentence on the whole, has been doubted. In England the negative has been held. R. *v.* Robinson, 1 Moody, 413.

In Massachusetts it has been said that where there is a verdict of guilty on each of several inconsistent counts, this is a mistrial, and there can be no *nolle prosequi*. Com. *v.* Fitchburg R. R., 120 Mass. 372. But usually when a greater and a less offence are joined in two counts, and there is a general verdict, the court sentences for the greater. Supra, § 292.

[3] See cases, supra, § 740.

Where a general verdict of guilty has been rendered upon an indictment containing several counts for distinct offences, and a sentence of imprisonment has been awarded upon some of the counts, under which sentence he has been imprisoned, the defendant cannot, at a subsequent term, be brought up and sentenced over upon another count in the same indictment. Com. *v.* Foster, 122 Mass. 317. As to this point, see infra, § 913; Com. *v.* Haskins, 128 Mass. 60.

[4] Supra, § 738; see Com. *v.* Haskins, 128 Mass. 60. As to Virginia practice, see Richards *v.* Com., 81 Va. 110.

[5] 1 Ch. Cr. L. 718; Russ. on Cr. 4th Eng. ed. 1030; Archbold's C. P. 17th ed. 173; R. *v.* Wilkes, 4 Burr. 2527; 19 Howell St. Tr. 1133; R. *v.* Jones, 2 Camp. 121; Douglass *v.* R., 13 Q. B. 42; R. *v.* O'Connell, 11 Cl. & F. 241, Tindal, C. J.; Lord Denman, C. J.; Gregory *v.* R., 15 Q. B. 974; R. *v.*

are distinct, is there any reason why, on convictions on each count, such convictions should not, in all cases where the counts are for a chain of cognate offences, be treated as would be convictions on separate indictments. To require each distinct though cognate offence to be placed in a distinct indictment is to oppress the defendant, by loading him with unnecessary costs, and exposing him to the exhaustion of a series of trials, which the prosecution would encounter with unwaning strength, and with the benefit derived from a knowledge of its own case, and that of the defendant.[1] Vexatiously splitting civil actions into a multitude of independent suits has been held an indictable offence;[2] and in suits for penalties, when the suits are unduly multiplied, rules for consolidation are granted as a matter of course.[3] In criminal cases, from the peculiar degree of oppressiveness which would result from a splitting of prosecutions, the practice of uniting counts for cognate offences has always been encouraged, not merely because in this way the labor of the courts and the expenses of prosecution are greatly diminished, but because the interests of defendants are

Castro, L. R. 9 Q. B. D. 350; S. C., L. R. 5 Q. B. D. 490; 14 Cox C. C. 436; 6 App. Ca. 229; 14 Cox C. C. 546; 44 L. T. N. S. 350; Peters, ex parte, 2 McCrary, 403; Com. *v.* Gillespie, 7 S. & R. 476; Com. *v.* Sylvester, Brightly R. 331; Com. *v.* Birdsall, 69 Penn. St. 482 (though see Com. *v.* Hartman, 5 Barr, 60; Henwood *v.* Com., 52 Penn. St. 424); Kroer *v.* People, 78 Ill. 294; Fletcher *v.* People, 81 Ill. 116; State *v.* Gummer, 22 Wis. 441; State *v.* Thomas, 14 Richards. 163; Storrs *v.* State, 3 Mo. 9; State *v.* Chandler, 31 Kans. 201; Dodd *v.* State, 33 Ark. 517.

In Massachusetts it has been determined that when there has been such a conviction of distinct offences, the court may impose a lumping sentence, consisting of a term of imprisonment such as could have been imposed had there been convictions on separate indictments. Charlton *v.* Com., 5 Met. 532; Booth *v.* Com., 5 Met. 535. See Com. *v.* Hills, 10 Cush. 530. "It is not necessary," said Shaw, C. J. (5 Met. 533), "in such cases, to award separate sentences, where they (the offences) are so far alike that the whole of the judgment is but the sum of the several sentences to which the convict is liable." See Com. *v.* Cain, 102 Mass. 487; Com. *v.* Carey, 103 Mass. 214; Am. Law Rev. October, 1875, p. 172.

In Ohio it is said that on a general verdict of guilty on an indictment containing two counts for distinct misdemeanors, there may be a sentence on each count, Eldredge *v.* State, 37 Ohio St. 191.

In State *v.* Williams, 11 S. C. 288, it was held that where an offence was against two statutes it might be punished under each.

[1] Supra, § 294.

[2] Com. *v.* McCulloch, 15 Mass. 247.

[3] See supra, §§ 285, 294 *et seq.* As to practice under Rev. Stat., § 1024, see Hibbs, ex parte, 26 Fed. Rep. 421.

thereby subserved.[1] In New York, however, in 1875, it was ruled by the Court of Appeal, that even where there are separate verdicts of guilty on each of several cognate counts, the defendant can only be sentenced on a single count.[2] This, however, can only be sustained in jurisdictions in which by statute all imprisonments are to commence immediately on sentence.[3]

But not where counts are for not distinct offences.

§ 911. What has just been said supposes that the counts describe separate offences of each of which the jury convicted.[4] Otherwise, there can be properly no sentence except for the punishment proper for a single count, for it would be monstrous to say that the judge can impose on the defendant the aggregate penalties of two offences when the offences are virtually identical.[5] We may illustrate this by noticing the effect of a general verdict of guilty on an indictment containing a count for an assault, and a count for assault and battery, supposing the offences to have been committed by the same act. The law imposes certain penalties for assault and battery, which penalties are designed to cover the assault as well as the battery. To sentence the defendant to the penalties for an assault, as averred in the first count, and then again for an assault *and* battery, as averred

[1] That rules to consolidate in such cases are granted in the federal courts we have seen, supra, §§ 285 *et seq.*

[2] People ex rel. Tweed *v.* Liscomb, 60 N. Y. 559; a case, according to Lord Selborne, Castro *v.* R., 44 L. T. R. N. S. 354; L. R. 6 App. Ca. 241, based on an erroneous assumption. Lord Watson, in discussing People *v.* Lipscomb (44 L. T. 357; L. R. 6 App. Ca. 249), says that according to that case "you can proceed against a defendant for several offences in several indictments, but that if there be several offences in one indictment, and a conviction on each, there can be but one punishment inflicted." For other exceptions to People *v.* Liscomb, see infra, § 996 *b*.

[3] Infra, § 932. See U. S. *v.* O'Callahan, 6 McLean, 598, and cases cited above.

In Illinois it is said that on a conviction on a series of counts, separate imprisonment may be imposed on each count, but the sentence is not to fix the day and hour on which each successive imprisonment is to begin. The sentence should specify the length of time on each count, and provide that the imprisonment on each count after the first shall begin with the imprisonment on the count before it terminated. Johnson *v.* People, 83 Ill. 431. See Peters, ex parte, 4 Dillon, 169.

In Polinsky *v.* People, 73 N. Y. 65, it was held that where a defendant was convicted on an indictment in which he is charged with an offence punishable by fine, and also with one punishable by imprisonment, there is no legal objection to a sentence of fine and imprisonment.

[4] See Hibbs, ex parte, 26 Fed. Rep. 421.

[5] See Buck *v.* State, 1 Ohio St. 61; Nelson *v.* State, 52 Wis. 534.

in the second count, would expose him to a double punishment for the same offence. The only legitimate course, when the several counts are simply successive stages of one offence, is, in accordance with the view already given, to impose the sentence on the count containing the highest offence, dropping the rest.[1] This, to repeat once more a distinction important to keep in mind in cases of this class, is on the supposition that the several counts are simply for separate stages or modifications of the same offence.

III. DEFENDANT'S PRESENCE ESSENTIAL.

§ 912. This point has been already discussed, and it has been shown that in all cases of corporal punishment the defendant's presence at the sentence is requisite.[2]

IV. AMENDMENT OR STAY.

§ 913. As a general practice, the sentence, when imposed by a court of record, is within the power of the court during the session in which it is entered, and may be amended at any time during such session, provided a punishment already partly suffered be not increased.[3] It has even

Court may amend or stay during term.

[1] See cases cited supra, §§ 292, 737, 908–9; State *v.* Hood, 51 Me. 363; State *v.* Hooker, 17 Vt. 658; State *v.* Merwin, 34 Conn. 113; State *v.* Tuller, 34 Conn. 280; Conkey *v.* People, 1 Abb. N. Y. App. Dec. 418; Cook *v.* State, 4 Zabr. 843; Manley *v.* State, 7 Md. 149; State *v.* Speight, 69 N. C. 72; State *v.* Scott, 15 S. C. 434; Estes *v.* State, 55 Ga. 131; State *v.* Dougherty, 70 Iowa, 439; Cawley *v.* State, 37 Ala. 152; State *v.* McCue, 39 Mo. 112; State *v.* Core, 70 Mo. 491; Parker *v.* People, 97 Ill. 32. That this does not apply to *distinct* offences, see Charlton *v.* Com., 5 Met. (Mass.) 532; Booth *v.* Com., 5 Met. (Mass.) 535; Kite *v.* Com., 11 Met. (Mass.) 581. That a sentence may be amended within a month, see State *v.* Bemis, 51 Mich. 423.

[2] Supra, § 550.

[3] R. *v.* Fitzgerald, 1 Salk. 400; Bank *v.* Withers, 6 Wheat. 106; Casey, ex parte, 18 Fed. Rep. 86; U. S. *v.* May, 2 McArth. 512. See Greenfield *v.* State, 7 Baxt. 18; Com. *v.* Weymouth, 2 Allen, 144; Hazlett, in re, 1 Crumrine (Pitts.), 169; Com. *v.* Brown, 12 Phila. 600; Price *v.* Com., 33 Grat. 819; State *v.* Warren, 92 N. C. 825; Lee *v.* State, 32 Ohio St. 113; State *v.* Hess, 91 Ind. 424; Mason, in re, 8 Mich. 70; People *v.* Thompson, 4 Cal. 238. That a judgment of conviction may be entered at a term subsequent to that of verdict, see State *v.* Miller, 6 Baxt. 513.

In Basse *v.* U. S., 9 Wall. 39, the court held that after a sentence to jail upon plea of guilty, and after the prisoner was committed and was serving out his sentence, the court might for good cause, at the same term, set the sentence aside. See, also, Cheang-Kee *v.* U. S., 3 Wall. 320; People *v.* Duffy, 5 Barb. 205; Jobe *v.* State, 28 Ga. 235.

been said that, during subsequent sessions, down to the period of the execution of the sentence, the court may further amend, or stay proceedings, or respite.[1] This prerogative, however, may properly be denied in all cases in which the term of sentence has in part expired, or in which the sentence has been in part executed;[2] and the better opinion is that the mere entry of a rule to reconsider, at the term when the sentence was imposed, does not give the court the right, after execution of the sentence has substantially begun, to revise the sentence at future terms.[3] And when cumulative penalties are given by a statute, and one of these, a fine, is imposed and satisfied, the sentence cannot, after such satisfaction, be amended, even during the term of its imposition, by adding the other penalty.[4] Nor, as we have seen, after a sentence on one count, can the court, at a subsequent term, sentence on another.[5] Nor when a court suspends sentence, in a case of nuisance, on abatement and payment of costs, can it on a subsequent term impose sentence of imprisonment.[6] But the court may temporarily suspend sentence *in toto*.[7]

[1] 4 Bl. Com. 394; 1 Ch. C. L. 617; Com. *v.* Dowdican, 115 Mass. 136; Morrisette *v.* People, 20 How. Pr. 118; State *v.* Addy, 43 N. J. L. 113; State *v.* Cockerham, 2 Ired. 204; Allen *v.* State, Mart. & Y. 297; Fults *v.* State, 2 Sneed, 232. But see McCarthy *v.* State, 56 Miss. 295.

That a court may suspend sentence, even in a capital case, was maintained, though against the protest of Governor De Witt Clinton, in Miller's case, 9 Cow. 730.

But an indefinite suspension of sentence cannot be sustained, as it is an invasion of the prerogative of pardon. People *v.* Brown, 54 Mich. 16; see People *v.* Kennedy, 58 Mich. 372. Nor can a sentence be suspended in part and executed in part. People *v.* Falker, 61 Mich. 110.

[2] Brown *v.* Price, 37 Me. 56; Com. *v.* Wyman, 2 Allen, 144; People *v.* Duffy, 5 Barb. 205; People *v.* Whitson, 74 Ill. 20; State *v.* Cannon, 11 Oregon, 312; see, however, Casey, ex parte, 18 Fed. Rep. 86; Com. *v.* Brown, 12 Phila. 600; Johnston *v.* Com., 85 Penn. St. 54.

[3] Com. *v.* Malloy, 57 Penn. St. 291.

[4] Lange, ex parte, 18 Wal. 163; see as to process in this case, infra, § 996 *b*. Scott *v.* Davis, 31 La. An. 249.

[5] Com. *v.* Foster, 122 Mass. 317; cited supra, § 909 *a*; see U. S. *v.* Malone, 9 Fed. Rep. 897; State *v.* Davis, 31 La. An. 249.

[6] State *v.* Addy, 43 N. J. L. 113; Whitney *v.* State, 6 Lea, 247.

[7] Ibid.; Com. *v.* Dowdican, 115 Mass. 133; Allen *v.* State, Mart. & Yerg. 294; though see People *v.* Morrisette, 20 How. Pr. 118.

V. CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

On verdict of guilty on indictment for murder court will sentence for second degree.

§ 914. When the indictment is so drawn as to sustain a verdict of either murder in the first or murder in the second degree, and there is a general verdict of guilty, it has been held error to sentence for murder in the first degree; and a court of error may reverse on this ground, and impose a sentence of murder in the second degree.[1] In Wisconsin, under such circumstances, a new trial is granted.[2] But in most jurisdictions, by statute, if not at common law, the verdict must specify the degree.[3]

Defendant to be asked as to sentence and may reply.

§ 915. Before imposing sentence of death, it is eminently the duty of the court patiently and considerately to hear whatever final remarks may be made by the prisoner in reference to his guilt. Nor is it possible, on such conspicuous occasions, for a humane and conscientious judge to avoid preceding the sentence by such observations as may tend to give a public moral force to this last and most terrible judgment of the law. Whether he shall say anything at this time, however, and what he shall say, is wholly at the discretion of the judge. The question put to the prisoner has been already specifically discussed.[4]

Sentence depends on statute.

§ 916. The form of sentence depends mainly on the local statutory law. By the English common law, as followed in several of our States, it is not the function of the court to fix the time and place of execution in the original sentence.[5] This in some jurisdictions is done by the chief magistrate of the State, in signing the warrant;[6] in some by the court,

[1] Johnson *v.* Com., 24 Penn. St. 386; State *v.* McCormick, 27 Iowa, 402.

In New York such a verdict has been held to be for the first degree. Kennedy *v.* People, 39 N. Y. 245. See fully Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 543.

[2] Hogan *v.* State, 30 Wis. 437.

[3] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 543. A person may be tried for the crime of murder, notwithstanding he is at the time serving a sentence of life imprisonment for another offence. People *v.* Majors, 65 Cal. 138.

[4] Supra, § 906.

[5] R. *v.* Doyle, 4 Leach, 67; R. *v.* Wyatt, R. & R. 230; Weed *v.* People, 31 N. Y. 465; Gray *v.* State, 55 Ala. 81; People *v.* Murphy, 45 Cal. 137. See Waterman, ex parte, 33 Fed. Rep. 29. A certified copy of the record of a sentence is sufficient to authorize detention of a prisoner without warrant. Wilson, ex parte, 114 U. S. 417.

[6] 2 Hale P. C. 399; R. *v.* King, 3 Burr. 1812; Howard, ex parte, 17 N. H. 545; Webster *v.* Com., 5 Cush. 386;

on subsequent motion. And if the time designated for execution elapses without such execution, by stay of execution or otherwise, a new time for execution is to be assigned, the judgment still remaining in force.[1] The mode of punishment is hereafter noticed.[2]

Pregnancy is ground of respite.

§ 917. In the frequency of capital punishments in the old English practice, it was not uncommon for female prisoners to claim the benefit of the law that no woman should be executed while she was quick with child. The practice, under such circumstances, is for the woman when called prior to sentence to say whether she has anything to allege why sentence of death should not be passed upon her, to plead orally her pregnancy, upon which the sheriff is forthwith directed to empanel a jury of matrons. This jury being sworn to inquire as to whether the prisoner is "quick with child," they retire with the prisoner; and the court is governed by their verdict to the same extent that it would be by the verdict of a jury empanelled to try any issue of fact. In the hearing before the jury, surgeons may be called to testify as experts.[3] If the verdict be found in the defendant's

Lowenberg *v.* People, 27 N. Y. 336; Cathcart *v.* Com., 37 Penn. St. 108. In Alabama the sentence specifies the day. Aaron *v.* State, 40 Ala. 308. See People *v.* Murphy, 45 Cal. 137.

[1] R. *v.* Harris, 1 Ld. Ray. 482; Howard, ex parte, 17 N. H. 545; Lowenberg *v.* People, 27 N. Y. 336; State *v.* Oscar, 13 La. An. 297. Compare Bland *v.* State, 2 Ind. 608. In case of escape, the court may direct the sentence to be carried out when the defendant is caught. State *v.* Cardwell, 95 N. C. 643. Infra, § 928. That the defendant cannot waive the right to an interval fixed by statute between sentence and execution, see Koerner *v.* State, 96 Ind. 243.

It is not error for the trial court to pronounce sentence of death upon a conviction of murder, before determining a motion for a new trial filed prior to sentence. State *v.* Hoyt, 46 Conn. 330.

[2] Infra, §§ 918 *et seq.*

[3] In R. *v.* Webster, London, 1879, an application of this character was made to Denman, J., sitting at the Old Bailey. The law, as stated by the judge, was that the woman must be "quick with child." A jury was empanelled from women in the gallery of the court-room. The judge, in summing up, said: "This is a very unusual inquiry, ladies of the jury, and it has never happened to me before. The law is that, if it be established to the satisfaction of the jury that the prisoner is quick with child, then the execution must be respited. If you feel that it would be desirable, before deciding that issue, that you should retire into the jury-room, you are warranted in doing so—and I should desire you to do it. At the same time, as women who are married, I feel sure that you will be of opinion that the judgment of a person who has for years practised as an accoucheur, who appears to be a fair-minded, clear-minded, and skilful man in medical matters, is entitled to be taken—not that the pris-

favor, she is respited from session to session until the delivery of the child.[1] In New York this right is prescribed by statute.[2] But when no statute exists, it without question obtains at common law.[3]

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT.

§ 918. The moulding of sentences of imprisonment is in the discretion of the court, provided the statutory bounds be not exceeded.[4] Even a statute providing that sentence shall be pronounced within a certain time after judgment is directory, though delay in this respect is not to operate to the prejudice of the prisoner.[5] The power of amendment of sentence reserved to the court has been already discussed.[6] The court cannot go beyond the limits, as to mode of punishment, imposed by the legislature.[7]

Limits of sentence to be determined by statute. Sentence less than minimum. Discretion allowed to courts. Restitution.

The place of imprisonment need not at common law be designated in the sentence.[8]

Under the federal code, as at common law, the designation of a place of imprisonment is no part of the sentence.[9]

The revision in error of sentences of imprisonment has also been already noticed.[10] Judgment, it has been held, will not be reversed

oner is in a condition of pregnancy, but whether she is or is not quick with child."

The jury occupied two or three minutes in deliberation in the box.

Mr. Avory: Have you agreed upon your verdict?

The Forewoman: Yes.

Mr. Avory: Do you find that the prisoner is with child—quick child—or not?

The Forewoman: Not.

Mr. Avory: You say she is not.

The prisoner was then removed from the dock.

[1] See 4 Black. Comm. 295 (though Blackstone maintains that a *second* pregnancy cannot be consecutively pleaded to the same sentence, to which Christian demurs); 1 Hale P. C. 369, 370; 1 Ch. C. L. 759. A form will be found in R. *v.* Wycherly, 8 C. & P. 262.

[2] 2 R. S. 658, § 20.

[3] State *v.* Arden, 1 Bay, 487. In Holeman *v.* State, 13 Ark. 105, which was a case of larceny, the plea was overruled.

[4] Supra, § 913; McCulley *v.* State, 62 Ind. 428.

[5] R. *v.* Wyatt, R. & R. 230; John *v.* State, 2 Ala. 290. See infra, § 923.

[6] Supra, § 913.

[7] See Hodge *v.* R., 5 Crim. Law Mag. 391, and note thereto; Karstendick *v.* U. S., 93 U. S. 396; Daniels *v.* Com., 7 Penn. St. 339 (which last two cases conflict, though with the better reason in the latter case); Ryan, in re, 45 Mich. 173; State *v.* Norwood, 93 N. C. 578.

[8] Infra, § 926; supra, § 916.

[9] Waterman, ex parte, 33 Fed. Rep. 29. Supra, § 916.

[10] Supra, §§ 750, 771, 906; infra, § 927.

for a sentence of imprisonment *less* than that permitted by law, if the statutory character of the punishment be not changed ;[1] and this has been sustained in a case where, in a statute allowing fine and imprisonment, only one of the two is imposed.[2] But it is hard to see, if there are reasons why the punishment which is nominally less may be actually greater, as where under such punishment, the prisoner is discharged at an inclement season, or without bounties given at a particular time, why in such case he should not be permitted to take advantage of the error.[3]

It is agreed that where a sentence is divisible, the defective part may be stricken out in review.[4] But, although a cumulative penalty, affixed to a sentence, may, when illegal, be stricken off as surplusage by a court of error, it is otherwise when such penalty is a qualification of the whole sentence. In such case there must be a reversal.[5]

The punishments, *e. g.*, fine and imprisonment, may be cumulatively imposed when the statute permits ;[6] but where a statute prescribes alternative penalties, one only can be inflicted.[7]

The practice when the jury graduate the imprisonment in their verdict has been treated in a prior chapter.[8]

[1] Infra, § 927 ; People *v.* Bauer, 37 Hun, 407 ; Rawlins *v.* State, 2 Md. 201 ; Dillon *v.* State, 30 Ohio St. 586 ; Behler *v.* State, 22 Ind. 345 ; McQuoid *v.* People, 3 Gilm. 76 ; Haney *v.* State, 5 Wis. 529 ; Com. *v.* Shanks, 10 B. Mon. 304 ; Wattingham *v.* State, 5 Sneed, 64 ; Ooton *v.* State, 5 Ala. 463 ; Campbell *v.* State, 16 Ala. 144 ; Barada *v.* State, 13 Mo. 94 ; State *v.* Evans, 23 La. An. 525. Supra, §§ 780, 907 ; though see Rice *v.* Com., 12 Met. (Mass.) 246 ; Taff *v.* State, 39 Conn. 82 ; Brown *v.* State, 47 Ala. 53.

[2] Dillon *v.* State, 38 Ohio St. 587 ; Dodge *v.* State, 4 Zab. 455. But see U. S. *v.* Vickery, 1 Hun & J. 421.

[3] See Bourne *v.* R., 7 Ad. & E. 58 ; 7 Nev. & P. 248 ; Whitehead *v.* R., 7 Q. B. 583 ; 1 Cox, 199.

[4] Supra, § 780, and cases there cited ; Chuston *v.* Com., 5 Metc. 530 ; Taff *v.* Com., 39 Conn. 82 ; People *v.* Phillips, 42 N. Y. 200 ; Kane *v.* People, 8 Wend. 205 ; Dodge *v.* State, 4 Zab. 455 ; Beck *v.* Com., 25 Penn. St. 11 ; Weaver *v.* Com., 29 Penn. St. 445 ; McQuoid *v.* People, 3 Gilm. 76 ; Murphy *v.* McMillan, 59 Iowa, 515 ; Kennedy *v.* State, 62 Ind. 136 ; David *v.* State, 40 Ala. 69 ; State *v.* Evans, 23 La. An. 525 ; Baldwin, ex parte, 60 Cal. 432. See State *v.* Brannan, 34 La. An. 942 ; State *v.* Ragsdale, 10 Lea, 671, cited supra, § 785.

[5] Bradley *v.* State, 69 Ala. 318 ; Kanouse *v.* Lexington, 12 Ill. App. 318. See State *v.* Brannan, 34 La. An. 942.

[6] Polinsky *v.* People, 73 N. Y. 65.

[7] Dodge *v.* State, 4 Zab. 455 ; Dillon *v.* State, 38 Ohio St. 589 ; State *v.* Kearney, 1 Hawks, 53. Infra, § 924.

[8] Supra, § 752.

It is within the discretion of the court, on application, to hear affidavits in aggravation or mitigation of sentence.[1]

Restitution of goods cannot be awarded unless the indictment avers a taking.[2]

§ 919. By the common law, as now modified in American practice, fine and imprisonment, in cases not capital, are the usual punishments;[3] and when a statute creates an offence without assigning a penalty, fine and imprisonment are the penalties to be imposed.[4] At one time it was maintained by a Pennsylvania judge, zealous of common law traditions, that on common scolds ducking could be inflicted, but this view was rejected by the Supreme Court, and now no longer is countenanced.[5] "Whipping" will be presently considered. A sentence of forfeiture of the weapon used has been held in Texas to be unconstitutional.[6]

Fine and imprisonment usual common law penalties.

§ 920. The constitutional provision in this respect has been held not to apply to State courts.[7] Its principle, however, must be considered as part of the common law of each State, and is incorporated in most State constitutions.[8] But in 1879, an ordinance in San Francisco, providing for the cutting off the queues of Chinese as a mode of special punishment, was held by Field, J., of the Supreme Court of the United States, to conflict with the federal Constitution, on the ground that hostile and discriminating legislation by a State against persons of any class, sect, creed, or nation, in whatever form it may be expressed, is forbidden by the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution.[9] But this ruling does not touch the question of general

"Cruel and unusual punishment" is unlawful.

[1] Infra, § 945.

[2] Huntzinger *v.* Com., 97 Penn. St. 336.

[3] State *v.* Dewer, 65 N. C. 572; Conner *v.* Com., 13 Bush, 718.

[4] U. S. *v.* Coolidge, 1 Gall. 488; Res. *v.* De Longchamps, 1 Dall. 111. See State *v.* Danforth, 3 Conn. 112. When a party is sentenced to a fine, the court is at liberty to imprison him until the fine is paid. Jackson, ex parte, 96 U. S. 727. Infra, § 924.

[5] James *v.* Com., 12 S. & R. 220. See U. S. *v.* Royall, 3 Cranch C. C. 620.

[6] Leatherwood *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 244.

[7] U. S. *v.* Cruikshanks, 92 U. S. 542; Barker *v.* People, 3 Cow. 686; James *v.* Com., 12 S. & R. 220.

[8] Pervear *v.* Com., 5 Wall. 476; Barker *v.* People, 3 Cow. 688; James *v.* Com., 12 S. & R. 220. To work in the public streets in payment of a fine is not cruel or unusual. Bedell, ex parte, 20 Mo. Ap. 125.

[9] Ah Kow *v.* Nunan, 5 Saw. 552; 20 Alb. L. J. 250.

In China, however, if we can trust

legislation or prison regulation requiring all convicts to be shaved. Such legislation or regulation is undoubtedly constitutional.[1]

"Whipping" not cruel and unusual.

§ 921. What are "cruel and unusual?" Certainly not solitary imprisonment at hard labor, when not flagrantly excessive, though, when introduced, such penalties were unusual, and by eminent philanthropists were held to be cruel.[2] Nor can whipping be so pronounced.[3] It has been found to be the most efficacious of penalties in checking certain classes of brutal crimes;[4] it may be far less cruel than certain durations and kinds of imprisonment; and so far from being "unusual" at the time the term was used in the constitution, it was then in general use as a penal discipline. It cannot be rejected, therefore, as conflicting with the principle embodied in the constitutional sanction above given; though in some jurisdictions it may be forbidden by statute.[5]

Shooting, as a method of death, may be inflicted under the Utah statute.[6]

Jules Verne's Chinaman in China, the cutting away of queues is a customary punishment.

[1] See notice of New Jersey ruling to this effect in San Francisco Call, Aug. 16, 1883; 3 Crim. Law Mag. 742.

[2] See State *v.* Pettie, 80 N. C. 367; Whitten *v.* State. 47 Ga. 497; State *v.* Williams, 77 Mo. 310.

The question of duration of punishment is usually at the discretion of the court. Infra, § 943; Hester *v.* State, 17 Ga. 132. See State *v.* Driver, 78 N. C. 423. That twenty years for arson is not excessive, see Davis *v.* State, 15 Tex. Ap. 594.

[3] See U. S. *v.* Collins, 2 Curtis C. C. 194; Foote *v.* State, 59 Md. 264; Com. *v.* Wyatt, 6 Rand. 694; State *v.* Kearney, 1 Hawks, 54; Garcia *v.* Terr., 1 New Mex. 415. Compare Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 872; 27 Cent. L. J. 157. As to flogging as a punishment, see Lord Macaulay's Report on Indian Code and other authorities, cited in the 8th ed. of this work, § 921. See, also, 15 Am. Law Rev. § 127.

In State *v.* Williams, *ut supra*, the court cited with approval the following from the opinion of the court in James *v.* Com., 12 S. & R. 220: "It must be a very glaring and extreme case to justify the court in pronouncing a punishment unconstitutional on account of its cruelty."

[4] See 1 Wh. & St. Med. Jur. §§ 170, 539, note *s*, and notes given infra. See, also, to same effect, 1 Steph. Hist. Cr. Law, 91, article in London Law Times, July 1, 1882.

[5] By act of Congress, it is forbidden in military and naval discipline. See R. Stat. U. S. § 5328.

[6] Wilkerson *v.* Utah, 99 U. S. 130. S. C., under name of Wilkinson *v.* U. S., 2 Utah, 158.

VII. FINES AND ABATEMENT.

§ 922. By a statute of the United States, a fine or penalty imposed as "a judgment or sentence" against any person in criminal cases "shall be declared a judgment debt, and (unless pardoned or remitted by the President) may be collected on execution in the common form of law."[1] In several of the States similar statutes are in force, and it has also been held that the same practice exists at common law.[2] Process of this kind is supplementary to that specified by the sentence, of imprisonment until the fine be paid. For, by the sentence, the defendant stands committed until the fine and costs shall be paid;[3] and this commitment is technically, when the sentence is simply a fine, to the sheriff, though in practice, and under statute, it usually is to the keeper of the county prison.[4] When the imprisonment is simply auxiliary to the collection of the fine, it is not such an imprisonment as to fall within the constitutional guarantees respecting imprisonments for crimes.[5] But when the statute prescribes fine *or* imprisonment the two cannot be cumulatively attached, though imprisonment may be imposed until the payment of the fine.[6]

Fines may be collected by execution.

Joint fines are hereafter discussed.[7]

§ 922 *a*. Abatement, as a form of execution, is considered in another volume.[8]

Abatement a form of execution.

VIII. FORM OF SENTENCE.

§ 923. The sentence must be definite, exact, and peremptory.[9] Hence it has been held error for the sentence to recite that the court is "of *opinion*" that the defendant should pay a fine, etc., the true form being, "it is considered" that he shall,[10] etc.; and also to incorporate a condition of

Must be definite.

[1] Act of Feb. 20, 1863; Rev. Stat. U. S. § 1041.

[2] Kane *v.* People, 8 Wend. 203; Tongate, ex parte, 31 Ind. 370; Beasley *v.* State, 2 Yerg. 481. See Strafford *v.* Jackson, 14 N. H. 16.

[3] Infra, § 924; R. *v.* Layton, 1 Salk. 353; Harris *v.* Com., 23 Pick. 280.

[4] R. *v.* Bethel, 5 Mod. 20; R. *v.* Layton, 1 Salk. 353; Harris *v.* Com., 23 Pick. 280; Hill *v.* State, 2 Yerg. 247. See Kane *v.* People, 8 Wend. 203.

[5] Bollig, ex parte, 31 Ill. 88.

[6] Supra, § 918. Infra, § 924.

[7] Infra, § 940.

[8] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1426.

[9] U. S. *v.* Patterson, 29 Fed. Rep. 775; Bradley *v.* State, 69 Ala. 318.

[10] R. *v.* King, 7 Q. B. 782; Knowles *v.* State, 2 Root, 282. See State *v.* Lake, 34 La. An. 1069.

remission,[1] and also when instead of a definite an indefinite termination is assigned.[2] Nor can indefiniteness be cured by an appeal to other records.[3] But, as has been seen, it is not necessary in the sentence to fix the time and place of execution.[4] Nor will there be a reversal for a merely formal error in the record of sentence.[5]

How far alternative sentence permitted.

§ 924. Where a statute prescribes a punishment in default of payment of a fine, the practice is to sentence to imprisonment until the fine be paid; and at common law imprisonment may be imposed until payment of fine.[6] But a sentence prescribing alternative penalties is defective;[7] nor can alternative punishments be cumulatively attached.[8] And two distinct punishments cannot at different times be inflicted on one verdict.[9] Thus, when the defendant under one verdict is twice sentenced by the court to two punishments, to be inflicted at different places and of different duration, the last sentence is void.[10]

Day of sentence is first day of imprisonment.

§ 925. The day of sentence is reckoned as the first day of imprisonment, supposing the defendant to be put actually in custody on that day.[11] It is enough to specify that the imprisonment shall continue "for the term of three years" from the date of incarceration or imprisonment.[12]

[1] State *v.* Bennett, 4 Dev. & B. 44.

[2] R. *v.* Rainer, 1 Sid. 214.

[3] Picket *v.* State, 22 Ohio St. 405; State *v.* Huber, 8 Kans. 447.

[4] Supra, § 916.

[5] People *v.* Murback, 64 Cal. 369.

[6] Supra, § 722; Jackson, ex parte, 96 U. S. 727; State *v.* Shattuck, 45 N. H. 205; Harris *v.* Com., 23 Pick. 280; Brownbridge *v.* People, 38 Mich. 751; Johnson, ex parte, 15 Neb. 512; Morgan *v.* State, 47 Ala. 34. But see, apparently *contra*, State *v.* Perkins, 82 N. C. 681.

[7] State *v.* Perkins, 82 N. C. 681. As to what is alternative, see Brownbridge *v.* People, 38 Mich. 751; Potsdamer *v.* State, 17 Fla. 895.

[8] State *v.* Kearney, 1 Hawks, 53; State *v.* Walters, 97 N. C. 489; Montgomery, ex parte, 79 Ala. 275; State *v.* Davis, 31 La. An. 249. See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1871–73; Piper *v.* Com., 14 Grat. 710; Hannahan *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 664.

[9] Supra, § 913.

[10] State *v.* Davis, 31 La. An. 249.

[11] People *v.* McEwen, 62 How. (N. Y.) Pr. 412; Meyers, ex parte, 44 Mo. 279. See People *v.* Warden, 66 N. Y. 343. See Jackson, in re, 3 Mac Arth. 24; Duckett, ex parte, 15 S. C. 210. As to statutory power to jury to impose alternative penalties, see Herron *v.* Com., 79 Ky. 38.

[12] People *v.* Hughes, 29 Cal. 257; State *v.* Smith, 10 Nev. 107; Hollon *v.* Hopkins, 21 Kans. 638.

In Migotti *v.* Colville, 14 Cox C. C. 263; L. R. 4 C. P. D. 233, a sentence of one calendar month's imprisonment is held to expire on the day preceding that day which corresponds numerically in the next succeeding month

Until, however, the imprisonment commences, the sentence does not begin to run.[1]

Expiration without endurance not execution.

§ 925 *a*. Expiration of the time of a sentence without actual imprisonment is not a satisfaction of the sentence. Hence a prisoner who is recaptured after an escape must serve an imprisonment equal in length to that to which he was sentenced, not deducting the time when he was at large.[2]

Prison need not at common law be specified.

§ 926. It is not error to omit to specify in a sentence the prison in which the prisoner is to be confined,[3] nor to use "penitentiary" as convertible with "prison."[4]

[*For form in capital cases see supra*, § 914.]

IX. SENTENCE BY APPELLATE COURT.

By statute appellate court may sentence, or may reverse for error.

§ 927. It has already been observed that at common law an appellate court, on reversing a judgment for error in the sentence, is held in England and in some parts of the United States to be incapable of re-imposing sentence, and to be obliged to discharge the prisoner.[5] This proposition, however, is not universally accepted, and now, under statutes, if not at common law, the practice is for the appellate court to correct and review sentences even in capital cases,[5] or

with the day on which the sentence was passed. If there is no such corresponding day in the next month, then the sentence expires on the last day of that month. Hence, where the plaintiff was sentenced by a magistrate to be imprisoned for one calendar month, and was taken into custody during the afternoon of the 31st of October, it was held that the sentence did not expire till midnight on the 30th November.

[1] Infra, §§ 925 *a*, 933.

[2] Dolan's case, 101 Mass. 219; Edwards, in re, 43 N. J. L. 555; Clifford, ex parte, 29 Ind. 106; Hollon *v.* Hopkins, 21 Kans. 638; Bell, ex parte, 56 Miss. 282. See infra, § 933.

[3] Weed *v.* People, 31 N. Y. 465. See Atkinson *v.* R., 3 Bro. P. C. 517, and cases cited supra, §§ 916, 918.

[4] Millar *v.* State, 2 Kans. 174. But see Wilson *v.* People, infra, § 927.

Where a case has been removed for revision, the sentence must be executed by the sheriff of the county in which the trial was had. State *v.* Twiggs, 1 Wins. N. C. 142.

[5] Supra, § 780. As to *habeas corpus* in such cases, see infra, § 994.

[5] People *v.* Phillips, 42 N. Y. 200; Drew *v.* Com., 1 Whart. 279; Daniels *v.* Com., 7 Penn. St. 371; White *v.* Com., 3 Brewst. 30; Mills *v.* Com., 13 Penn. St. 631; Montgomery *v.* State, 7 Oh. St. 107; Finley *v.* State, 61 Ala. 201; Kelly *v.* State, 7 Baxt. 323; Kelly *v.* State, 3 Sm. & M. 518; State

the court may remit the record to the court of trial, with directions to impose the proper sentence.[1] Nor is it necessary that the judges imposing the sentence should be the judges who tried the case, though all are members of the same court.[2] Yet in jurisdictions where no common law right in this respect is recognized, the statutes are to be construed as giving only that authority which they nakedly convey. Thus in Michigan a statute exists which requires, when an excessive punishment is given by the court below, that the judgment shall only be reversed for the excess. This statute has been ruled not to apply to a sentence to the "state prison," for an offence only punishable in the county jail. In this case, it has been held, judgment must be reversed *in toto* and the prisoner discharged.[3] And ordinarily a sentence exceeding that allowable on the good counts of an indictment will be reversed,[4] or modified if such be the local practice.[5]

For a sentence *less* than that permitted by law, it has been held, there will be no reversal.[6]

The affirming of a conviction leaves the conviction in its original force.[7]

In capital and other cases record remanded to court below for execution.

§ 928. A repetition by an appellate court of sentence of death on a prisoner, while the judgment of the court on which he is tried is still valid, is an informality which does not vitiate the proceedings.[8] But it seems that the usual course in a capital case is for the appellate court to remit the record, after revising the same, for proper sentence to the court where the conviction was had.[9] And

v. Thompson, 46 Iowa, 699; and cases cited supra, § 780.

[1] Moett *v.* People, 85 N. Y. 353; Beale *v.* Com., 25 Penn. St. 11; State *v.* Lawrence, 81 N. C. 521; State *v.* Thorne, 81 N. C. 555. Infra, § 928.

[2] Moett *v.* People, 85 N. Y. 67; supra, § 888. See State *v.* Shea, 95 Mo. 85.

[3] Wilson *v.* People, 24 Mich. 410; but see Millar *v.* State, 2 Kans. 174.

[4] Brown *v.* State, 47 Ala. 47; State *v.* Bean, 21 Mo. 269. In People *v.* Parkhurst, 50 Mich. 389, it was held that the reversal was to be as to the excess, but that if the legal extent of the punishment had been reached the prisoner was to be discharged.

[5] Com. *v.* Kirby, 2 Cush. 577; Com. *v.* Kennedy, 131 Mass. 584; Johnston *v.* Com., 85 Penn. St. 54.

[6] Supra, § 918. As to *habeas corpus* see infra, § 994.

[7] Hanrahan *v.* People, 95 Ill. 165.

[8] Ferris, in re, 35 N. Y. 262.

[9] McKee *v.* People, 32 N. Y. 239; McCue *v.* Com., 78 Penn. St. 185; Elliott *v.* People, 13 Mich. 365; Picket *v.* State, 22 Ohio St. 405; Terr. *v.* Conrad, 1 Dak. 363; see cases cited supra, §§ 780, 927.

certainly an appellate court will not modify the sentence of the court below, except for matters merely technical, when the record does not show the circumstances attending the commission of the offence.[1]

The practice of appellate courts, when the sentence of the court below has varied from the statutory limits of imprisonment, has been already discussed.[2]

X. SENTENCE BY SUCCEEDING JUDGE.

§ 929. It has been ruled in Wisconsin that a judge of the Circuit Court may pronounce sentence on a prisoner convicted before his predecessor in office.[3] It was held, however, in Philadelphia, by the United States Circuit Court, that this does not hold when the judge trying the case dies pending a motion for a new trial; but that under such circumstances a new trial will be granted.[4] But it is clear that a circuit court of the United States, though held by only one of the two judges that tried the case, may pass sentence.[5]

Such sentence may be regular.

XI. SUCCESSIVE IMPRISONMENTS.

§ 930. By statutes in England and in most of the United States, as well as at common law, successive imprisonments may be assigned

[1] State *v.* Patton, 19 Iowa, 458.

[2] Supra, §§ 780, 918.

Where, after conviction in New York in 1869, on error to the general term, the judgment of conviction was reversed and the defendant discharged, on error to the Court of Appeals it was held that the conviction was properly reversed; but as a small portion only of the defendant's term of sentence had expired, and it did not appear that a conviction would not be had upon a new trial, it was error to discharge absolutely; and a new trial was ordered. People *v.* Phillips, 42 N. Y. 200 (Foster, J.; 1870). See supra, § 773. In the same State it was held in 1873, that when there is a reversal for error in sentence, the prisoner will not be discharged, but the Supreme Court will examine the record of the errors alleged to have been committed on trial, and will grant a new trial if any of these errors are sustained. Graham *v.* People, 63 Barb. 468; Messner *v.* People, 45 N. Y. 1. Supra, § 773.

Under the Code of Criminal Procedure (1884) the Court of Appeals may remit a case to the inferior court with instructions as to the sentence to be pronounced. People *v.* Bork, 96 N. Y. 188.

[3] Pegalow *v.* State, 20 Wis. 61. Supra, §§ 898, 927.

[4] U. S. *v.* Harding, 1 Wall. Jr. 127. See Bescher *v.* State, 32 Ind. 480. Supra, §§ 515, 898.

[5] U. S. *v.* Gordon, 5 Blatch. C. C. 18.

to successive convictions, the defendant being in prison at the time of the second or subsequent trials.

Prisoner may be brought up for second trial by *habeas corpus*.

§ 931. The proper process for obtaining jurisdiction of the person of a prisoner under sentence,[1] in order to try him for another crime, is by *habeas corpus* directed to the keeper of the prison.[2]

Second imprisonment begins at termination of first.

§ 932. When a term of imprisonment is still unexpired, the prisoner being in custody, the proper course at common law is to appoint the second imprisonment to begin at the expiration of the first, to be specifically referred to in the sentence ;[3] and a sentence to this effect, when the prior imprisonment is specified, is sufficiently exact.[4] The

[1] The fact that a prisoner, committing a murder while serving a sentence in the penitentiary, has some years still to serve, does not prevent his being sentenced to be hung before the expiration of his term. Thomas *v.* People, 67 N. Y. 218.

A defendant imprisoned for life may be brought into court and convicted on an indictment for murder, and sentenced to be hung. Peri *v.* People, 65 Ill. 17.

[2] State *v.* Wilson, 36 Conn. 126.

[3] Wilkes *v.* R., 4 Bro. P. C. 361; R. *v.* Cuthbush, L. R. 2 Q. B. 379; Peters, ex parte, 4 Dill. 169; Kite *v.* Com., 11 Met. 584; State *v.* Smith, 5 Day, 175; Brown *v.* Com., 4 Rawle, 259; Mills *v.* Com., 13 Penn. St. 631, 634; Williams *v.* State, 18 Ohio St. 46; Com. *v.* Leath, 1 Va. Cas. 151; see Mieir *v.* McMillan, 51 Iowa, 540; Mims *v.* State, 26 Minn. 498; Dalton, ex parte, 49 Cal. 463. See Bryan, ex parte, 76 Mo. 253; though see cases cited at close of this section, *contra*. That after judgment and sentence on one count defendant, on a subsequent term, cannot be sentenced on another count, see supra, § 909 *a*.

In Missouri, both convictions, to sustain successive imprisonments, must take place before sentence is pronounced in either case. Meyers, ex parte, 44 Mo. 279. See Turner, ex parte, 45 Mo. 331; Kennedy *v.* Howard, 74 Ind. 87.

As to Texas statute, see Shumaker *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 117; Sartain *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 651.

[4] State *v.* Hood, 51 Me. 363; Kite *v.* Com., 11 Met. 581; Williams *v.* State, 18 Ohio St. 46; Com. *v.* Leath, 1 Va. Cas. 151; People *v.* Forbes, 22 Cal. 135. See supra, § 910, as to distinctive practice in New York. But a sentence of imprisonment to commence after the expiration of former sentences is too indefinite. Larney *v.* Cleveland, 34 Ohio St. 599.

In a Pennsylvania case, the prisoner having been found guilty, under two counts charging a higher and a lesser crime, but for the same offence, the court below sentenced him to imprisonment for six years and four months under one count, and to imprisonment, at labor, for three years and ten months under the other count, both terms of imprisonment to commence from the date of the sentence. It was held that so much of the judgment as imposed the shorter term of imprisonment was to be reversed. Johnston *v.* Com., 85 Penn. St. 54. See Miller *v.* Com., 23

same order is taken when permitted by statute, on simultaneous convictions, the sentence then prescribing that the term on the second offence is to begin on the expiration of the term assigned to the first offence.[1] In such cases, if the prisoner is pardoned for the first offence, the imprisonment for the second begins at the date of the pardon;[2] and when the judgment is reversed for either offence, the sentence will be remodelled so as to correspond.[3] But, where it is provided by statute that imprisonment on conviction is to commence on the imposition of the sentence, it has been held that when there are several convictions, and several terms of imprisonment adjudged, such imprisonments run concurrently.[4] But, if this view be extended to cases in which the offences are charged in separate indictments, the effect would be that no matter how many offences a man might commit he could only be tried for one; and if it be limited to cases where the offences are joined in one indictment, this would compel the prosecution to place each offence in a separate indictment, which would often oppressively and vexatiously increase the defendant's expenses and costs.[6] But, whatever we may think on this point, it is settled that when the second conviction is for an offence committed during the first imprisonment, the imprisonments do not run concurrently.[6]

§ 933. A prisoner who escapes before the expiration of his term may be convicted of such escape and sentenced, while still imprisoned for his first offence, to a second imprisonment commencing on the expiration of the first.[7] When an escaped prisoner commits a second felony before the term of his imprisonment has expired, but during his

An escaped prisoner may be sentenced for escape in like manner.

Penn. St. 631, as further defining the practice. And see Haskins *v.* Com., supra, § 909 *a*.

[1] R. *v.* Cutbush, L. R. 2 Q. B. 379; Fry, in re, 12 Wash. L. R. 388; People *v.* Forbes, 22 Cal. 135.

[2] Kite *v.* Com., 11 Met. 581; Brown *v.* Com., 4 Rawle, 259.

[3] Ibid.; Mills *v.* Com., 23 Penn. St. 631. See Opinions of Justices, 13 Gray, 618.

[4] Miller *v.* Allen, 11 Ind. 389; Kennedy *v.* Howard, 74 Ind. 87; Roberts, ex parte, 9 Nev. 44; see Meyers, ex parte, 44 Mo. 279; People ex rel. Tweed *v.* Liscomb, 60 N. Y. 559, discussed supra, § 910, note. Infra, § 996 *b*.

[5] Supra, § 910.

[6] Kennedy *v.* Howard, *ut supra*. See Jones *v.* Ward, 2 Metc. (Ky.) 271. In Michigan it is held that a sentence of imprisonment to commence after expiration of prior sentence cannot be sustained in the absence of a statute. Bloom's case, 53 Mich. 597; Lamphere's case, 61 Mich. 105. And so in England as to felonies. R. *v.* Cutbush, L. R. 2 Q. B. 379.

[7] Brunding, ex parte, 47 Mo. 255.

escape, he may be put on trial for the second felony; and be sentenced, on conviction, to a term to commence at the expiration of the term for which he was imprisoned.[1] In any view, the imprisonment is not imputed until it actually commences.[2]

XII. WHEN SEVERER PUNISHMENT IS ASSIGNED TO SECOND OFFENCE.

§ 934. Statutes are in force in several States providing that when a party is convicted of a second offence he is to be subjected to an aggravated penalty. Such statutes are not in conflict with the constitutional provision as to jeopardy.[3]

§ 935. The indictment to sustain such second prosecution must specially aver the prior conviction or convictions;[4] and when the court of the first prosecution is one of oyer and terminer, or general jurisdiction, an allegation of the fact of general jurisdiction is enough.[5] When, however, "the conviction is alleged to have taken place before a court of special and limited jurisdiction, the indictment should aver such facts as would show that the justice holding such court had jurisdiction, as well of the subject-matter as of the person of the prisoner."[6] And

In such cases prior conviction should be averred.

[1] Haggerty *v.* People, 6 Lansing, 32.

When a prisoner escapes from prison, and is retaken after his term expires, it is not necessary that there should be a new award of execution. He may be retaken and confined without any additional suggestion on behalf of the State, or trial of the question of his identity and escape. Haggerty *v.* People, 53 N. Y. 76, reversing 6 Lansing, *ut sup.* See cases, supra, § 925 *a*.

[2] Supra, § 925.

[3] Ingalls *v.* State, 48 Wis. 647; People *v.* Stanley, 47 Cal. 113; People *v.* Lewis, 64 Cal. 401; Boyle, in re, 64 Cal. 153; see Com. *v.* Hughes, 133 Mass. 496. For discussion of statutes, see Com. *v.* Morrow, 9 Phila. 583.

[4] R. *v.* Page, 9 C. & P. 756; R. *v.* Willis, L. R. 1 C. C. 363; R. *v.* Allen, R. & R. 513; Plumbly *v.* Com., 2 Met. (Mass.) 413; Garvey *v.* Com., 8 Gray, 382; Rauch *v.* Com., 78 Penn. St. 490; Maguire *v.* State, 47 Md. 485; Rand *v.* Com., 9 Grat. 938; Larney *v.* Cleveland, 34 Ohio St. 599; People *v.* Carlton, 57 Cal. 559; State *v.* Freeman, 27 Vt. 523, apparently *contra*, was under a special statute. In New York it is unnecessary to aver, in the second indictment, the prior conviction. Johnson *v.* People, 65 Barb. 342; 55 N. Y. 512; but see Gibson *v.* People, 5 Hun, 542. In Louisiana it is held improper to aver the previous conviction; and this is consistent with the position advocated in the text that the previous conviction should be kept out of the case. State *v.* Hudson, 32 La. An. 1052.

The verdict for a second offence, in order to sustain the cumulative punishment, must aver the offence to be a second offence. Maguire *v.* State, 47 Md. 485.

[5] People *v.* Golden, 3 Park. C. R. 330. See State *v.* Volmer, 6 Kans. 379.

[6] Jewell, J., People *v.* Powers, 2 Seld. 50, citing 1 Chit. C. L. 138.

where a prior "conviction" is requisite to sustain the second indictment, it is said that not only conviction, but the sentence imposed, should be averred, as conviction in its full sense, and within the scope of the statute, is not complete without the judgment of the court.[1] Under some statutes there must be a special verdict as to the former conviction.[2]

§ 936. To sustain the averment of the first conviction it must appear that such conviction was legal,[3] and in a court having jurisdiction.[4]

Former conviction must be legal.

A *foreign* conviction will not sustain the averment, and cannot be made the basis of an aggravated penalty.[5]

Foreign conviction insufficient.

Under local statutes the former conviction need not be a conviction of the same character as that under trial.[6]

§ 937. The averment of prior conviction is to be proved by the record,[7] sustained by proof of the identity of the person on trial with the one described in the former procedure,[8] as in cases of pleas of former conviction.

Conviction to be proved by record and identification.

§ 937 *a*. The prosecution may elect, if it choose, to ignore the first conviction, and proceed exclusively on the offence under trial, as if it stood alone.[9]

Prosecution may waive first conviction.

§ 938. On the trial of cases in which prior convictions are alleged, is the prosecution to put in evidence, as part of its case, such prior conviction? To do so, it is argued, would be to violate the established principle that a man's character and his previous bad acts are not to be put in

Prior conviction not to be put in evidence until main issue is

[1] Smith *v.* Com., 14 S. & R. 69; but see *contra*, Stevens *v.* People, 1 Hill (N. Y.) 261.

As to averment in homicide cases, see Kane *v.* Com., 109 Penn. St. 541.

[2] Rector *v.* Com., 80 Ky. 468.

[3] That the former proceeding cannot be overhauled for technical errors, see Kelly *v.* People, 115 Ill. 583.

[4] People *v.* Butler, 3 Cow. 347; Rand *v.* Com., 9 Grat. 738. See State *v.* Dolan, 69 Me. 573.

[5] People *v.* Cæsar, 1 Park. C. R. 345.

[6] People *v.* Raymond, 93 N. Y. 38.

[7] R. *v.* Willis, L. R. 1 C. C. 363; Tuttle *v.* Com., 2 Gray, 502. See Johnson *v.* People, 65 Barb. 342; 55 N. Y. 512.

[8] Supra, § 481; R. *v.* Clark, 6 Cox C. C. 210; Smith *v.* Com., 14 S. & R. 69; Hines *v.* State, 26 Ga. 614.

An averment of prior conviction of C. D. and D. H. may be sustained by proof of their conviction severally at different times more than six years previously. Dolan *v.* State, 69 Me. 573. When there is a variance in the names oral evidence of identity is admissible. Ibid. Supra, § 481.

[9] R. *v.* Summers, L. R. 1. C. C. 182.

found against defendant.

evidence unless at his own instance,[1] as well as to invade another well settled safeguard of justice, that the defendant is to be tried, not for being generally bad, but only for the one particular bad act. A majority of the English judges having held, however, in 1834, that it was admissible for the crown to put the prior conviction before the jury as part of its evidence in chief;[2] an act of parliament was passed directing that the prior conviction should not be committed to the jury until they had found the defendant guilty of the subsequent charge, unless he himself puts his character in evidence.[3] In several of the American States similar restrictions exist. Where they do not, it would be well for courts in charging juries to direct them to scrupulously avoid considering the conviction in the prior case as in any way affecting the question of guilt in the case on trial. It should also be remembered that it is much more important to society that the issues of guilt should be single, than that in any one particular case a cumulative sentence should be imposed. On the other hand, as it is necessary, according to the prevailing opinion, that the former conviction should be averred in the indictment, it is hard to see how it can be kept from the jury. The indictment goes to the jury as part of the record. And not only must it thus communicate its contents to the jury, but its essential allegations, of which this is one, must be sustained by proof. And part of this proof, as we have just seen, goes to the fact of identity of person, on which the jury has to pass.[4]

[1] See Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 59–61.

[2] R. *v.* Jones, 6 C. & P. 391. See Johnson *v.* People, 65 Barb. 342; 55 N. Y. 512; Long *v.* State, 36 Tex. 6. Cf. Wood *v.* People, 53 N. Y. 511. If the defendant pleads guilty to the indictment the averment of the prior conviction need not be proved. People *v.* Delany, 49 Cal. 394.

[3] R. *v.* Martin, Law Rep. 1 C. C. 214; R. *v.* Key, 5 Cox C. C. 369; 2 Den. C. C. 347.

[4] Supra, § 937. In Maguire *v.* State, 47 Md. 497, it is said by Alvey, J.:— "Such being the import of the averment, and the nature of the inquiry before the jury, there can be no good reason for adopting the mode of procedure contended for by the appellant; and the practice in England, until changed by statute, was, as it is here, to allow the prosecution to put the prior conviction before the jury as part of its evidence in chief, and before the accused commenced his evidence in defence. R. *v.* Jones, 6 C. & P. 391." To same effect, see Thomas's case, 22 Grat. 912.

XIII. DISFRANCHISEMENT.

§ 939. By the Act of Congress of July 17, 1862, it is provided that all persons guilty of engaging in rebellion shall be incapable of holding office. It has been ruled that as a penalty for crime it is within the power of Congress to impose upon a convicted person disfranchisement of this class.[1] But to attach the disqualification, under this or under similar State enactments, there must be a conviction in due course of law,[2] and the conviction must go to an offence to which the penalty of disfranchisement is attached.[3] Disfranchisement is not a cruel and unusual punishment.[4]

Conviction a prerequisite.

§ 939 *a*. A conviction for felony necessarily works a forfeiture of an office the holding of which is incompatible with the endurance of the disgrace and of the punishment imposed on the conviction.[5]

And so of forfeiture of office.

§ 939 *b*. At common law, a person convicted of an infamous offence is incapacitated as a witness. What is "infamous" under the federal Constitution has been discussed in a prior section.[6] As will be seen in another volume, incapacitation of witnesses by infamy is now generally removed by statute.[7]

And so of capacity as a witness.

XIV. JOINT SENTENCES.

§ 940. Where two or more persons are sentenced jointly to pay a fine, each may be fined up to the full statutory limit. That limit is not that a certain lumping sum is to be paid to the State by *all* the defendants together; but it is that each wrongdoer is to be made liable to pay such amount in full for his own particular violation of the law.[8] The fact that he is joined with others in the conviction and sentence

Punishment of each may be to full amount.

[1] Huber *v.* Riley, 53 Penn. St. 112.

[2] See The Amy Warwick, 2 Spr. 143; S. C., 2 Black, 635; U. S. *v.* Watkinds, 11 Rep. 560; S. C. under name of U. S. *v.* Wadkins, 7 Sawyer, 85.

[3] State *v.* Lynch, 5 Crim. Law Mag. 379; see Wilson *v.* State, 28 Ind. 393.

[4] Huber *v.* Riley, 53 Penn. St. 112.

[5] See Com. *v.* Fugate, 2 Leigh, 725; State *v.* Carson, 27 Ark. 470; see supra, § 521, as to pardons in such cases.

[6] Supra, § 89.

[7] Whart. Cr. Ev. § 363.

[8] It is otherwise in actions civil or *quasi* civil, when the object is to obtain redress for a private person. See Boutelle *v.* Nourse, 4 Mass. 431.

does not lessen his liability.[1] The same rule applies to the distribution of imprisonment. Each defendant is to be singly sentenced according to his personal deserts, and, if necessary, to the full limit of the law.[2] When, however, the verdict, under statute, is for a gross sum by way of full satisfaction, it is error to impose the whole fine separately on each defendant.[3]

Sentences several.

The subject of costs has been already discussed.[4]

XV. BINDINGS TO KEEP THE PEACE.

§ 941. There are cases when, in addition to, or as an alternate for, fine and imprisonment, the court will hold over the defendant in bonds to keep the peace,[5] or to abate or discontinue the offence for which he was tried.[5] And this holds good even after acquittals, whenever the judge trying the case has sufficient reason, from the evidence before him, to judge such course necessary to prevent a violation of public peace and law. This power is inherent in all justices of the peace. But unless necessary to protect the public from notorious crime, the court, after acquittal, will not direct the defendant to be detained until articles of peace against him are prepared.[7]

Defendant after verdict may be bound over to keep the peace.

XVI. CONSIDERATIONS IN ADJUSTING SENTENCE.

§ 942. The polity of England and of the United States commits largely to the court the practical determination of the grade of punishment.[8] In England, and in several of our States, until a very recent period, the court, in mis-

Courts have usually large discretion.

[1] Supra, § 314; 2 Hawk. P. C. 635; R. *v.* Atkinson, 2 Ld. Ray. 1248; 11 Mod. 80; Com. *v.* Tower, 8 Met. (Mass.) 527; Com. *v.* Ray, 1 Va. Cas. 262; Com. *v.* Harris, 7 Grat. 600; Caldwell *v.* Com. 7 Dana, 229; State *v.* Smith, 1 Nott & McC. 13; McLeod *v.* State, 35 Ala. 395; State *v.* Gay, 10 Mo. 440; State *v.* Hopkins, 7 Blackf. 494; Waltzer *v.* State, 3 Wis. 785.

[2] Supra, § 314; 2 East P. C. 740; R. *v.* King, 1 Salk. 182; U. S. *v.* Babson, 1 Ware, 450; State *v.* Hunter, 33 Iowa, 361; State *v.* Smith, 1 N. & McC. 13; State *v.* Berry, 21 Mo. 504; Sturgeon *v.* Gray, 96 Ind. 166; Calico *v.* State, 3 Pike, 431. As to joinder of defendants, see supra, § 301.

[3] Flynn *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 398; overruling Bennett *v.* State, 30 Tex. 523.

[4] Supra, §§ 314–5.

[5] O'Connell *v.* R., 11 Cl. & F. 155; Dunn *v.* R., 12 Q. B. 1031. See Estes *v.* State, 2 Humph. 496. Supra, § 80.

[6] See Whart. Cr. Law, 9th ed. §§ 97, 1426, 1498 *b*.

[7] R. *v.* Holt, 7 C. & P. 518. Supra, § 80.

[8] That the court may take testimony on this point see Dick *v.* State, 3 Ohio St. 89. On the question of character,

demeanors, was left without any limit as to the term of imprisonment to be imposed, provided that a maximum, in some cases of seven years, in others of ten years, should not be exceeded. Even now we find frequently such limitations as these: imprisonment from "two to fifteen years," or from "two to ten," or "one to seven years." In such cases the question of determining what penalty is to be assigned to a particular offence rests mainly on the discretion of the court.[1] It becomes important, therefore, to consider on what principles this discretion is to be exercised. What object is the judge to have before him in adjusting punishment to

as well as on that of the grade of the crime, affidavits may be received in mitigation or aggravation. Infra, § 945.

As to recommendation to mercy, see supra, § 757.

Three theories have been propounded as to the discretion of the judge in criminal prosecutions. See Berner, § 124.

(1.) By the first his duties are to be prescribed in every respect by statute. Statute is to define the offence; statute is arbitrarily to specify the punishment. It is obvious that this theory is both despotic and illogical. Cases, nominally of the same offence, as defined in the statute book, *e. g.*, larceny, are so various that it would be gross injustice to apply to each the same uniform penalty. Hence there is no code which does not leave a margin, as to the term of punishment, within which the discretion of the judge may range. Nor, so far as concerns the definition of an offence, is it possible for the theory here contested to be logically executed. A statute, for instance, makes "burglary" indictable. But what is burglary? This has to be determined by the courts. Even if the definition is given by statute, the points of discrimination, in accordance with the well-known logical rule, increase with the minuteness of the specification.

(2.) By the second view the statute declares a particular offence to be punishable, but leaves the punishment absolutely to the discretion of the judge. But this theory, in not imposing at least a maximum of punishment, leaves too much to the caprice of the judge.

(3.) The offence is defined by statute, and the discretion of the judge is allowed to work within a specified margin of punishment. This is a system now almost universally prevalent in the United States.

Whether a minimum as well as a maximum should be attached has been much discussed. Berner, § 124, argues that to leave the limits open is an abdication of duty by the legislature, and leads to despotic and wayward caprice on the part of the judge. Rossi (Traité, vol. ii. 405) says: "La loi perdrait une grande partie de son influence préventive sur l'esprit des citoyens. La jurisprudence des tribunaux serait incertaine, variable; elle ne tarderait pas à offrir des disparates choquantes. Le juge aurait un moyen trop facile de céder, sans trop aventuré sa responsabilité morale, à la prière, a l'intrigue, aux séductions de toute espèce."

[1] Supra, §§ 314–5. See cases in prior notes to this section. People *v.* Warden, 66 N. Y. 342.

crime? What public exigencies has he to satisfy? In answering these inquiries we are met by several conflicting theories.

Primary object retribution; but example and reform to be incidental.

§ 943. It has been shown elsewhere,[1] that the primary object of punishment is the execution of retributory justice; and that unless such justice be shown in a sentence, it is calculated neither to deter others from crime nor to reform the sentenced criminal. At the same time, as is there noticed, example and reform, as well as retribution, are to be kept in view in adjusting a sentence. On these points the following observations may be made:—

1. *Example.* An excessive punishment, so far from being an example, as sometimes judges conceive it to be, operates in the contrary direction; first, because the public mind revolts at the undue severity, and an angry contempt of justice is thereby engendered; and, secondly, because excessive punishments are apt to be revoked by the executive, and there is the feeling about them, "This cannot last." Even supposing certain crimes are so prevalent, that at the first glance it would seem politic to signalize convictions by extreme and conspicuous penalties, it must be remembered, in addition to the considerations already given, that the public mind soon adapts itself to a harder grade of punishment, and that the immediate effect is to require increased punishment for all crimes, not simply an exceptional punishment for the particular crime complained of. Aside from this, there is a sense of unfairness about punishment so inflicted that defeats the very end it is claimed to promote. Men will not be prevented from committing crime by seeing punishment inflicted merely to work such prevention. If the person punished is guilty, and is punished because he is guilty, this acts as a deterrent. But if he is innocent, and is punished, without his consent, in order to produce a docile and law-loving temper in himself and others, the effect is far from being reached. Such an outrage inflicted on him, so far from making him docile and law-loving, will be likely to breed in him a determination to resist, to elude, and, if possible, to trample upon, the sovereign from whom the outrage proceeds; and the temper thus generated in him will be generated in those who are witnesses of the wrong done him. Such, in fact, has been the case where this system has been carried out. At no

[1] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1 *et seq.* Hawkins *v.* People, 106 Ill. 628.

times have crimes been more rife, and schemes to defy or elude the law more rampant, than in those in which punishments for the sake of example were made most conspicuous and horrible. Nor is this all. To assign this power to the sovereign is to invest him with absolutism. If the object is merely to deter others by a fearful spectacle of torture or death, then innocent as well as guilty may be seized upon as the victims by whom the spectacle is to be exhibited; and the pain inflicted will be measured, not by its relation to the alleged offence, but by the effect it is likely to produce on the public mind. When there is no logical relation between wrong and punishment, justice will be a matter of mere arbitrary, sensational display. The object will be to inflict a conspicuous and horrible penalty arbitrarily, and thus to terrify into submission. But this can only be sustained by the ascription to the sovereign of absolute power.

2. *Reform.* The object of reform is to arouse, by moral and religious influences, the torpid moral sense of the convict, and to form in him habits of honesty, self-control, and obedience to the law; and so far it is an important auxiliary in penal discipline. But reform should not be carried to such a degree as to diminish the necessary painfulness of punishment, since a punishment which does not inflict pain in some degree proportionate to the crime committed, so far from reforming the criminal, will lead him to regard the wrong done by him as a light thing, so viewed by the public, and tend rather to encourage than to check him in a lawless career. And independent of this moral mischief, a home in which board, lodging, and education are given without expense, will, to the idle and destitute, be a refuge rather to be sought than shunned. To invest, also, the sovereign with the power of compulsory reformation, irrespective of conviction of crime, requires the cession to him of despotic prerogatives. If susceptibility to reformation is the condition of penal discipline, there is no one on whom penal discipline may not be inflicted, as there is no one who may not be more or less reformed. Not only would this make the sovereign the master of the persons of all his subjects, but he would be relieved from fixed restrictions as to the nature of the punishment to be imposed, since the only question in such cases would be, "What kind of punishment would work reformation in a person of this particular type?" And, once more, no obdurate and irreclaimable criminal could, on this view, be punished, for the reason that no

such criminal could be reformed. Reformation, therefore, if it be adopted as the sole ground and object of punishment, would confer an entire immunity from restraint or punishment on the desperate and incorrigible criminal, while over all others it would establish the surveillance of despotism.

3. *Retribution.* This, so far as concerns public justice, is the primary object of punishment. When, however, an individual, as well as the body politic, is aggrieved, then it is proper, in cases of pecuniary loss, that there should be a pecuniary satisfaction ordered to the party injured. When the offence is one which assails the honor of an individual (as in cases of libel), it is the practice in some jurisdictions to require of the convict an apology, and withdrawal of the charge. And, incidentally, in the application of retribution, prevention and reformation should be subserved.[1]

§ 944. In adjusting sentence, therefore, under our American system, which allows so wide a discretion to the court, not only the simplest but the wisest course for the court is to adapt the duration of imprisonment to the defendant's guilt, keeping at the same time in view, as forming part of the elements of this guilt, his character, of which susceptibility to reformatory influences is an ingredient.[2] By so doing, if guilt be estimated according to its inveterateness and heinousness, and its sentence moulded accordingly, the objects of the preventive and reformatory systems will be best promoted. And if such a policy be firmly executed, the advantages of what has been called the exemplary theory will be best brought out. The criminal himself will receive the punishment which in justice belongs to his crime. And the example of such punishment, based, not on any capricious or speculative schemes, but on the plain principle that crime is punished because it is crime, will act as a deterrent just in proportion as it is justly imposed and firmly executed.

Evidence may be received as to defendant's character.

§ 945. Although, when the punishment is to be assessed by the jury, it is improper, in order to keep the issue single, to receive evidence of other offences than that charged in the indictment, or part of a system of which such offence is part,[3] it is otherwise when, after a verdict of guilty, the court is called upon to sentence. In such case the

[1] See, for a full discussion, Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1 *et seq.*, and see, also, 15 Am. Law Rev. 127.

[2] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 12, 13.

[3] See Whart. Crim. Ev. §§ 23 *et seq.*

court may, of its own motion, take notice of a prior conviction of the defendant on its own records, or will hear proof of his character and antecedents, either to aggravate or extenuate his guilt.[1] The proof in the latter relation is taken usually by affidavits.[2] Such evidence, however, is only receivable in matters as to which the court has discretion.[3]

XVII. EX POST FACTO PUNISHMENT.

§ 946. In other volumes is considered the question how far *ex post facto* legislation is constitutional in respect to crime,[4] and it is there shown that a statute imposing an increase of punishment does not apply to crimes committed before its passage. It is otherwise in respect to statutes lessening the penalty, which may be applied to prior offences.[5] What are to be considered lesser penalties is elsewhere discussed.[6]

How far constitutional.

[1] R. *v.* Templeman, 1 Salk. 55; R. *v.* Wilson, 4 T. R. 487; R. *v.* Morgan, 11 East, 457; R. *v.* Mahon, 4 A. & E. 475; R. *v.* Dignam, 7 A. & E. 593; R. *v.* Gregory, 1 C. & K. 228; Com. *v.* Horton, 9 Pick. 206; People *v.* Cochran, 2 Johns. 73; Dick *v.* State, 3 Ohio St. 89; Robbins *v.* State, 20 Ala. 36; Sarah *v.* State, 18 Ark. 114; People *v.* Jefferson, 52 Cal. 453.

The common law rule that such evidence cannot be received in cases of felony applies only to such felonies as are capital. See R. *v.* Ellis, 6 B. & C. 145.

[2] Roscoe's Crim. Ev. § 222.

[3] R. *v.* Ellis, 6 B. & C. 145; Burn's Just. 29th ed. § 933. In Ingraham *v.* State, 39 Ala. 247, and Skains *v.* State, 21 Ala. 218, it was held that the court would not hear proof of utterly distinct offences.

The English practice is thus stated in Roscoe's Crim. Ev. pp. 222-23:—

"Where the defendant has been convicted of a misdemeanor in the Queen's Bench, the prosecutor, upon the motion for judgment, may produce affidavits to be read in aggravation of the offence, and the defence may also produce affidavits to be read in mitigation. Affidavits in aggravation are not allowed in felonies, although the record has been removed into the Court of Queen's Bench by *certiorari*. R. *v.* Ellis, 6 B. & C. 145; 3 Burn's Justice, 29th ed. 933. Where a prisoner pleaded guilty at the Central Criminal Court to a misdemeanor, and affidavits were filed both in mitigation and aggravation, the judges refused to hear the speeches of counsel on either side, but formed their judgment of the case by reading the affidavits. R. *v.* Gregory, 1 C. & K. 228; but it is usual to hear counsel in mitigation. See also the same case as to removing from the files of the court affidavits in mitigation containing scandalous and irrelevant matter, such being a contempt of court; and also as to allowing the opposite party to deny by counter-affidavits the affidavits filed in mitigation." See supra, § 416.

[4] Whart. Crim. Law, § 31; Whart. Com. Am. Law, § 473.

[5] Com. *v.* Wyman, 12 Cush. 237; Veal *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 474; Perez *v.* State, Ibid. 610.

[6] Whart. Crim. Law, § 30.

XVIII. BENEFIT OF CLERGY.

§ 946 *a*. By the old English common law, persons who were in clerk's orders, and afterwards all persons whatsoever, were entitled to be relieved from capital punishment, unless otherwise ordered by statute, on being burned in the hand. The object was to mitigate the ferocity of the then penal system by which to all felonies death was assigned. With the subsequent reduction and amelioration of punishments the reason ceased; and benefit of clergy by act of Parliament ceased to exist in 1828. In this country, although in some States recognized as part of the common law,[1] it has been now universally abolished either by express enactment or by implication.

Now abolished.

[1] It was abolished in federal process in 1790. U. S. *v.* Ballard, 3 McLean, 469. As to State courts, see State *v.* Carroll, 2 Ired. 257; State *v.* Gray, 1 Murph. 147; State *v.* Sutcliffe, 4 Strobh. 372. That benefit of clergy was recognized in Kentucky until abolished by statute in 1847, see Shaler's Kentucky, 407.

CHAPTER XX.

CONTEMPT.

I. When the only Method of Suppression is by Summary Commitment.
In such cases attachment may issue, § 948.
Attachments may issue to enforce process, § 949.
And so as a penalty on disobedience, § 950.
And so on physical interference with parties, § 951.
And so on publication of proceedings ordered not to be published, § 952.
And so as to misconduct of officers of court, § 953.
And so as to obstruction to trial, § 954.
And so as to disorder in presence of court, § 955.
And so as to misconduct of or tampering with jurymen, § 956.
II. When the Contempt can be suppressed otherwise than by Commitment.
Criticisms on cases before court constitute contempt, § 957.
And so as to other publications interfering with due course of justice, § 958.
But summary commitment only to be used when necessary, § 959.
In cases of this class an ordinary prosecution is the better course, § 960.
Danger of depositing such power in courts, § 961.
III. By whom such Commitments may be issued.
Superior Courts have power to issue common-law commitments, § 962.
Other courts are limited to contempt in their presence; practice as to commissioners and notaries, § 963.
So as to legislatures, § 964.
IV. Indictability of Contempts: Embracery.
Interference with public justice indictable, § 965.
So with embracery, or improper interference with jury, § 966.
V. Practice.
In cases in face of court rule may be made instantly returnable, § 967.
Otherwise as to contempts not in face of court, § 968.
Hearing may be inquisitorial, § 969.
VI. Punishment.
Court may fine and imprison, § 970.
Commitment must be for fixed period, § 971.
Fine goes to State, § 972.
VII. Conviction no Bar to other Proceedings.
Contempt not barred by other procedure, and the converse, § 973.
VIII. Appeal, Error, and Pardon.
When on record, proceedings may be revised in error, § 974.
Pardon does not usually release, § 975.

§ 947. Contempt is such disrespect or disobedience to a court or legislature as interferes with the due administration of law.[1]

[1] See Field, Fed. Courts, 435.

So far as concerns our first inquiry, contempts may be divided as follows:—

I. WHEN THE ONLY METHOD OF SUPPRESSION IS BY SUMMARY COMMITMENT.

II. WHEN THERE ARE OTHER METHODS OF SUPPRESSION.

I. WHEN THE ONLY METHOD OF SUPPRESSION IS BY SUMMARY COMMITMENT.

In such case attachment may issue.

§ 948. In such cases there is no question that an attachment, on due cause shown, may issue, and the defendant be committed.

Attachment proper to enforce process.

§ 949. If process be impeded, no case can be tried. Hence it is a contempt, punishable by summary commitment, to interfere with process;[1] to disobey rules or orders, obedience to which is essential to the progress of the case;[2] to abuse process;[3] to rescue a prisoner under process;[4] and to serve a writ (the offender being the sheriff) improperly, or to refuse to serve it at all, or to make a false return.[5]

And so as a penalty on disobeying process.

§ 950. The same remedy is applicable to disobedience to an injunction, because unless attachment and commitment in such case be granted, irreparable injury might ensue;[6] to disobedience to an order of court for summary payment, which payment cannot be otherwise enforced;[7] and to disobedience to an order for specific conveyance.[8]

[1] Daniell's Chancery Prac. (1871) 387, note, 411–427, 936; Price *v.* Hutchison, L. R. 9 Eq. 534; Buck *v.* Buck, 60 Ill. 115; People *v.* Bradley, 60 Ill. 390; State *v.* Sparks, 27 Tex. 627.

[2] Daniell's Ch. Prac. (1871) 937; Day's Com. Law Pr. (1872) 313; Archbold's Q. B. Practice (12th ed.), 1711.

[3] Archbold's Q. B. Prac. *ut supra*, 1715.

[4] Archbold's Q. B. Prac. *ut supra*, 1710.

[5] Archbold's Q. B. Prac. *ut supra*, 1710; State *v.* Tipton, 1 Black. 166; People *v.* Marsh, 2 Cow. 493; Summers, ex parte, 5 Ired. 149; Pitman *v.* Clarke, 1 McMullen, 316.

[6] 2 Wait's Prac. (1873) 108, 112; Day's Common Law Prac. (1872) 327; Daniell's Ch. Prac. (1871) 1533; People *v.* Compton, 1 Duer, 512; Woodworth *v.* Rogers, 3 Wood. & M. 135; Potter *v.* Muller, 1 Bond. 601; Rogers Man. Co. *v.* Rogers, 38 Conn. 121; Mead *v.* Norris, 21 Wis. 310.

[7] 2 Wait's Prac. (1873) 249; Ford

[8] Daniell's Ch. Prac. *ut supra;* so as to alimony, Bissell, in re, 40 Mich. 63.

§ 951. It is also a contempt summarily punishable to prevent a party from bringing suit, because in such case it would beg the question to turn the plaintiff back to a common-law suit for redress;[1] and to carry off a ward in chancery, attachment being the only mode of enforcing obedience.[2] It has also been held to be a contempt to resist the action of the receivers of a railroad corporation, such receivers being duly appointed by the court.[3]

And so on physical interference with parties and receivers.

§ 952. It is a contempt, also, to publish testimony which the court has ordered not to be published, when the injury cannot be otherwise redressed.[4]

And so on wrongful publication of proceedings.

§ 953. An officer of the court may so conduct himself during the trial of a cause, as to inflict, if not stopped, irreparable injury; and in such case attachment for contempt is the proper, because the only, remedy. This rule is applied to all misbehavior, in the presence of the court, of attorneys or other officers of the court.[5] And it has been justly extended (not only because such misconduct, consistently with prompt justice, cannot be otherwise properly corrected, but because such offi-

And so as to misconduct of officers of court.

v. Ford, 10 Abb. Pr. N. S. (N. Y.) 74; 41 How. Pr. 169; Remley *v.* De Wall, 41 Ga. 466; see Fischer *v.* Raub, 56 How. Pr. 218.

[1] Jones, ex parte, 13 Ves. 237; Littler *v.* Thomson, 2 Beav. 129. See Whittem *v.* State, 36 Ind. 196.

[2] Wellesley, in re, 2 Rus. & M. 639.

[3] Doolittle, in re, 23 Fed. Rep. 550; U. S. *v.* Kane, 6 Cr. L. Mag. 530; Higgins, in re, 27 Fed. Rep. 443.

[4] R. *v.* Clement, 4 B. & Ald. 218.

[5] Archbold's Q. B. Pract. *ut supra*, 1710; Pitman's case, 1 Curtis, 186; Robinson, ex parte, 19 Wall. 505; Woolley, in re, 11 Bush, 95. As illustrating the necessity of this check, see supra, §§ 561 *et seq.* Resignation of officer does not divest power. The Laurens, 1 Abbott U. S. 302. But a publication by an attorney, after a case is ended, reflecting on the court, will not be punished as a contempt. State *v.* Anderson, 40 Iowa, 207. Otherwise, if the case be still pending. Woolley, in re, *ut supra*. As an extraordinary instance of exercise of this power, see proceedings in Tweed's case, supra, § 605; 20 Cent. L. J. 23. That it is a contempt to charge a judge with prejudice in deciding a motion for a new trial, see Harrison *v.* State, 35 Ark. 458; but *aliter* on motion for change of venue. Curtis, ex parte, 3 Minn. 274.

It was ruled in Robinson, ex parte, 19 Wall. 805, that the power to disbar an attorney is possessed by all courts which have authority to admit attorneys to practice. But the power can only be exercised when there has been such conduct on the part of the party complained of as shows him to be unfit to be a member of the profession; and before judgment disbarring him can be rendered, he should have notice of the grounds of complaint against him and opportunity of defence.

cers are the court's confidential servants, trusted by[1] third parties as its representatives) to malpractice of attorneys, as in withholding papers or money from clients,[2] and to clerks, masters, and referees, for any improper conduct or disobedience to the court.[3]

And so as to obstruction to trial.

§ 954. If obstruction to the rendering of testimony can only be punished by indictment, then even an indictment for such misconduct could, by continuance of the misconduct, be defeated, and no redress could be obtained. Hence, it is a contempt, punishable by commitment, for a witness not to attend when subpœnaed, or when under recognizance to attend;[4] for a witness, when attending, to refuse to be sworn;[5] for a witness, when sworn, to refuse to answer;[6] for a third party to induce another to take a false oath;[7] for a third party to endeavor to keep a witness from testifying,[8] supposing such witness to have been subpœnaed;[9] for a witness, when ordered to leave the court during the examination of other witnesses, to remain in;[10] and for a

[1] See Freston, in re, 49 L. T. (N. S.) 290. As to misconduct of counsel, see supra, § 577.

[2] Willand, ex parte, 11 C. B. 544; Newberry, in re, 4 Ad. & E. 100; People *v.* Nevins, 1 Hill (N. Y.), 154; Smith, ex parte, 28 Ind. 47. This has been held in North Carolina to apply to publications by attorneys derogatory to court. Biggs, ex parte, 64 N. C. 202; Moore, ex parte, Ibid. 398.

[3] R. *v.* Harland, 8 Dowl. P. C. 328; Yates *v.* Lansing, 9 Johns. 395; Smith *v.* McLendon, 59 Ga. 523; see Yates *v.* People, 6 Johns. 337.

[4] Whart. Crim. Ev. § 349; Archbold's Cr. Pl. (17th ed.) 291; 2 Wait's Prac. (1873) 722; Conkling's Prac. (6th ed.) 410; Day's Common Law Prac. (1872) 293, 311; Roelker, ex parte, 1 Sprague, 276; Burr's Trial, 354; Judson, ex parte, 3 Blatch. C. C. 89, 148; Peck, ex parte, 3 Blatch. C. C. 113; Ellerbe, in re, 4 McCr. 449; 4 Crim. Law Mag. 60 (where it was held that an arrest might be made by order of a district judge in any part of the United States beside that in which the suit was pending); Langdon, ex parte, 25 Vt. 680; Walker, ex parte, 25 Ala. 81.

[5] U. S. *v.* Coolidge, 2 Gall. 364.

[6] U. S. *v.* Caton, 1 Cranch, 150; Day's Prac. (1872) 305, 311; People *v.* Kelley, 24 N. Y. 74; People *v.* Phelps, 4 Thomp. & C. 467; Hirsch *v.* State, 8 Baxt. 89; Renshaw, ex parte, 6 Mo. Ap. 474; Holman *v.* Austin, 34 Tex. 668. This applies to justices of the peace. Paley on Convictions (1866), 329. *Aliter* as to notary public, Krieger, ex parte, 7 Mo. Ap. 367.

[7] Hull *v.* L'Eplattimer, 49 How. Pr. 500.

[8] Infra, § 965; Whittem *v.* State, 36 Ind. 196; see Burke *v.* State, 47 Ind. 528; Haskett *v.* State, 51 Ind. 176; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1333.

[9] McConnell *v.* State, 46 Ind. 298.

[10] People *v.* Boscowitch, 20 Cal. 436. See supra, § 564, note.

party to obtain postponement by a false pretence of sickness.[1] A justice of the peace, in some States, however, has no such power.[2]

§ 955. If it would be necessary to prevent disorder in court that an indictment should be tried against the offender, no indictment could be tried against the offender on account of the disorder in court. Hence any disturbance in court is punishable by attachment and commitment.[3] So it is an attachable contempt for an acquitted prisoner to swear vengeance on the prosecuting witnesses within the precincts of the court;[4] for a person to use insulting language to another in the hearing of the officers of the court, and in its presence;[5] or to write an insulting letter to a grand jury as to their action;[6] for the defendant to address the jury when ordered not to do so by the court;[7] for persons in court to apply insulting language to the court, or, in presence of the court, to its process;[8] for persisting in performing military evolutions with music and firing of guns in the immediate neighborhood of the court during its session.[9] But not so of an affray at a tavern where a judge was staying, the court not being in session.[10] So it is a contempt to assault a judge, during a recess of the court, for words said or action taken by him when sitting as judge.[11] But hasty language of counsel, not conveying direct insults to the court, will not be regarded as contempt.[12]

And so as to disorder in the presence of court.

[1] Welch *v.* Barber, 52 Conn. 147.

[2] Rutherford *v.* Holmes, 5 Hun, 317; 66 N. Y. 368. Infra, § 963.

[3] Archbold's Q. B. Prac. (12th ed.) 1710; 6 Robinson's Practice, 698; U. S. *v.* Emerson, 4 Cranch, 188; Com. *v.* Wilson, 1 Phila. 83; Smith, ex parte, 28 Ind. 47; Redman *v.* State, 28 Ind. 205; Whitten *v.* State, 36 Ind. 196.

[4] U. S. *v.* Carter, 3 Cranch C. C. 423. See U. S. *v.* Patterson, 26 Fed. Rep. 509.

[5] U. S. *v.* Emerson, 4 Cranch C. C. 188.

[6] Tyler, ex parte, 64 Cal. 434.

[7] Tidd's Prac. (Phil. 1856) 860.

[8] Daniell's Chancery Prac. (1871) 387, note *i*, 936; R. *v.* Davison, 1 B. & Ald. 329; Wilson's case, 7 Q. B. 955; Price *v.* Hutchinson, Law Rep. 9 Eq. 534; Robinson *v.* McElhane, 2 How. N. Y. Prac. 454; Hill *v.* Crandall, 52 Ill. 70; Little *v.* State, 90 Ind. 338; Holman *v.* State, 105 Ind. 513. See, however, Neel *v.* State, 9 Ark. 259.

In New York, under Rev. Stat., such act, to be a contempt, must involve contemptuous behavior during session of court. Bergh's case, 16 Abb. Pr. N. S. 266. But this is expanded by § 143 of Penal Code of 1882.

[9] State *v.* Coulter, Wright, 421; State *v.* Goff, Wright, 78.

[10] Com. *v.* Stuart, 2 Va. Ca. 329.

[11] State *v.* Garland, 25 La. An. 532. See Com. *v.* Dandridge, 2 Va. Ca. 405.

[12] St. Clair *v.* Pratt, Wright, 532. Supra, § 577.

§ 956. From the necessities of the case, it is a contempt, punishable by commitment, for a juryman to wilfully misconduct himself, when empanelled during the trial of a case, in such a way as to prevent a fair and decorous trial.[1] And it has been held to be a contempt of court to solicit a juror to give a signal after the jury have retired, to indicate whether they are likely to agree, so as to enable the party soliciting to make a successful bet on the question of agreement,[2] or in any way to tamper with the jury.[3] The same rule has been applied to sending volunteer information to a grand jury.[4] It is also a contempt to attempt to induce an officer of the court to summon certain jurors in preference to others.[5]

And so as to misconduct of, or tampering with, juryman.

II. WHERE THE CONTEMPT CAN BE SUPPRESSED OTHERWISE THAN BY COMMITMENT.

§ 957. This brings us to what is called constructive contempt; embracing partisan publications or speeches on a litigated issue; whether consisting in comments on the case, or remarks reflecting on judge, jury, or parties.

Criticisms on case before court constitute contempt.

By the English law, for proceedings such as these an attachment for contempt may issue. "It is a special contempt, punishable by the committal of the contemner, to misrepresent the proceedings of the court, to abuse the parties to the cause, or to attempt to prejudice the mind of the public against them before its cause is decided, or to publish anything the evident result of which would be to affect the administration of justice."[6] Even a threat to publish papers calculated to prejudice a case on trial may be contempt.[7]

[1] See supra, §§ 814–837; Offutt *v.* Parrott, 1 Cranch, 154; State *v.* Helvenston, R. M. Charlt. 48.

[2] State *v.* Doty, 32 N. J. L. (3 Vroom) 403.

[3] Supra, § 729. In State *v.* Blackwell, 10 S. C. 35, it was held that attempts to influence a jury, when made a statutory indictable offence, cannot be punished summarily as a contempt. See State *v.* Doty, 3 Vroom, 956.

[4] Supra, § 367.

[5] Sinnott *v.* State, 11 Lea, 281.

[6] Dan. Chan. Pr. 836. See Cheadle *v.* State, 110 Ind. 310; Henry *v.* Ellis, 49 Iowa, 205; Buckley, in re, 69 Cal. 1. As sustaining this we have an argu-

[7] Kitoat *v.* Sharp, 48 L. T. (N. S.) 64. In North Carolina it has even been held to be a contempt for an attorney to publish a paper charging the judge with indecent conduct in a political campaign. Moore, in re, 63 N. C. 397.

§ 958. In harmony with this view it has been held a contempt to publish *ex parte* extracts from evidence or pleadings;[1] and for a

ment by Blackburn, J., delivered in 1873, in a conspicuous trial in the Queen's Bench. "Any case which is pending," said this learned judge (R. *v.* Skipworth, 12 Cox C. C. 377–8), "when in a civil or criminal court, ought to be tried by the ordinary means of justice, and in the present case there is an indictment against one of the persons before us which is now standing for trial. That case ought to be fairly tried, but it may happen that proceedings may occur such as have now called upon us to interfere. Sometimes the course is by attacking the judge; sometimes by attempting to induce him to alter his opinion, or to take a course different from that which he would otherwise take; more commonly, there is an attempt to influence the trial by attacking the witnesses or appealing to public justice, so as to prejudice the trial. In all these ways, great mischief may be done, interfering with the due and ordinary course of justice. When the attempt is by an act which is itself punishable, as conspiracy, libel, or assault, the party might, of course, be indicted for it; but the prosecution, though sufficient for the purpose of punishment, might be made greater (better?) for the purpose of prevention; the mischief might be done, and the administration of justice would be prevented or prejudiced. For that reason, from the earliest times, the superior courts of law and equity have exercised the jurisdiction of prosecuting such attempts by summary proceedings for contempt, and having that power, it is our duty, when the occasion comes, to exercise it." Hence, in a case closely related to that in which the opinion just quoted was delivered, after the Tichborne claimant, who had elected to be nonsuited in the ejectment brought by him to establish his right to the Tichborne estates, had been bound over for perjury, he united with some of his supporters in holding public meetings for the obtaining funds to support him in the trial for the latter offence. At these meetings, Messrs. Onslow and Whalley, members of parliament, made speeches imputing perjury and conspiracy to the witnesses for the defence on the trial of the ejectment, and prejudice and partiality to Chief Justice Cockburn, who they said had proved himself unfit to preside at the coming trial. The innocence of the claimant, and the injustice of the treatment to which he had been subjected, were also asserted. It was held by the Queen's Bench, in January, 1873, that this was a contempt subjecting the defendants to fine and imprisonment, but the defendants, disclaiming contempt, were merely fined. R. *v.* Onslow, 12 Cox C. C. 358. And see article in 2 London Law Mag. N. S. (1873) 164. Hence, in the case in which the above opinion of Blackburn, J., was delivered, and in which was adduced language strongly vituperative of the chief justice, and charging him with premeditating injustice in the then approaching Tichborne trial for perjury, the offender, declining to purge himself of the contempt, was imprisoned as well as fined. R. *v.* Skipworth, 12 Cox C. C. 371; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1853.

See, also, State *v.* Anderson, 30 La. An. 557; 1 Southern Law Journal, 183, where an interesting opinion is given as to publication by federal officers as to a case depending in a State court.

[1] Cheltenham, etc., Railway Co. in

party to an issue in chancery to write to a master in chancery a grossly insulting letter in reference to the master's conduct in the case.[1] And the rule has been applied to publications out of court affecting not only questions to come before juries, but issues pending before judges sitting without juries.[2] The same doctrine has been not infrequently held in the United States,[3] though in most of the States statutes have been enacted divesting the courts of such power.[4] But in any view, to justify a committal, it must plainly appear that the effect of the publication is to interfere with the due administration of justice.[5]

And so as to other publications interfering with due course of justice.

re, L. R. 8 Eq. 580; in which case a petition in a suit for winding up a company, on ground of fraud, was published by a newspaper before the hearing of the petition, and this was held by Vice-Chancellor Malins to be a contempt. But it is not a contempt publicly to solicit subscriptions for the defence of a defendant on a pending criminal charge. R. *v.* Skipworth, 12 Cox C. C. 371.

[1] Charlton's case, 2 My. & Cr. 316.

[2] Daw *v.* Eley, L. Rep. 7 Eq. 49; Tichborne *v.* Mostyn, Law Rep. 7 Eq. 55; Macartney *v.* Corry, Irish R. 7 C. L. 242.

[3] Hollingsworth *v.* Duane, Wall. C. C. 77; U. S. *v.* Duane, Wall. C. C. 102; Tenney, ex parte, 23 N. H. 162; Moore, in re, 63 N. C. 397. See 1 Hawley's Cr. R. 143; Sturoc, matter of, 48 N. H. 428; State *v.* Matthews, 37 N. H. 450; People *v.* Freer, 1 Caines, 518; Res. *v.* Passmore, 3 Yeates, 441; Oswald's case, 1 Dall. 319; Biggs, ex parte, 64 N. C. 202; State *v.* Morrill, 16 Ark. 384; Stuart *v.* People, 3 Scammon, 405. As disputing the power, see Dunham *v.* State, 6 Iowa, 245; Hickery, ex parte, 12 Miss. 751.

[4] See Poulson, ex parte, 15 Haz. Pa. Reg. 380.

In a remarkable case before the Supreme Court of Illinois, sitting in Ottawa, Illinois, in November, 1872, a majority of that court held that it was a contempt to publish in a Chicago newspaper an article which, in speaking of a criminal case then pending in error before that court, said that the defendant would be granted a new trial, sentenced to imprisonment, and then pardoned, "because the sum of $1400 is enough, nowadays, to enable a man to purchase immunity from the consequences of any crime." People *v.* Wilson, 64 Ill. 195. Ably, however, as is the question argued by Lawrence, C. J., and by the majority of the court, and great as is the respect due to Lawrence, C. J., for the independent and bold stand taken by him in this and other points regarding the dignity of the judiciary, the conclusion reached cannot be here accepted for the reasons stated in the text. In the same State, since the repeal of the statute defining the power, it has been held that the courts continue to hold the usual common-law powers, but will not exercise them as to publications which do not obstruct courts in the exercise of their functions. Storey *v.* People, 79 Ill. 45.

[5] Plating Co. *v.* Faquharson, 44 L. T. (N. S.) 389.

§ 959. We should remember, however, that summary commitment is a process only to be used when no other remedy can protect public justice from obstruction.[1] For a judge, who supposes himself insulted, to fine and imprison his supposed insulter, may be necessary, as where the insult is in open court, and is of such a character that unless it is summarily stopped and punished the court cannot proceed with its duties; but to enable a judge to punish by summary procedure contempts other than those just mentioned is to set at naught, without adequate reason, some of our highest constitutional sanctions. Such a process dispenses with a grand jury. It inflicts punishment without conviction of a petit jury. It permits the party who supposes himself to be injured to be the tribunal which binds over, finds the bill, decides both law and fact, convicts, and sentences. We are also told, though as will be seen erroneously, by those who advocate the prerogative to its full extent, that the process is subject neither to writ of error, nor to revision by *habeas corpus*, nor pardon.[2] But the prerogative rests on a vicious line of reasoning. The supposed contempt is such that the judge will or will not be intimidated or swerved by it in the discharge of his duty. If not, then there is no reason for such an extraordinary remedy. If otherwise, then for the judge to confess his weakness in this respect, and to make this confession in so conspicuous a way, is at least as injurious to public justice as is the publication in which the objectionable matter is contained. But there is another view beyond this. We can conceive not only of a weak judge who dreads intimidation, but of a corrupt judge who dreads exposure. To give a bad and bold man of this class an engine so potent as this, is to take away one of the few means by which he can be exposed. Certainly a prerogative so violent and so damaging should not be exercised except in case of necessity.[3]

But summary commitment only to be used when necessary.

[1] See Hirst, in re, 9 Phila. 216; State *v.* Anderson, 40 Iowa, 207.

[2] See supra, § 530; infra, §§ 974, 999.

[3] By Rev. Stat. § 725, "such power to punish contempts shall not be construed to extend to any cases except the misbehavior of any person in their (the courts') presence, or so near thereto as to obstruct the administration of justice, the misbehavior of any of the officers of said courts, in their official transactions, and the disobedience or resistance by any such officer, or by any party, juror, witness, or other person, to any lawful writ," etc.

§ 960. But is such engine, in cases such as those we now contemplate, necessary? Would not a binding over for trial, or a binding over to keep the peace, in each of the above-mentioned cases, afford a sufficient remedy? Suppose the case to be one of such criticism on a pending case as is calculated to interfere with a due discharge by court or jury of their respective duties or to prevent, by fanning a public excitement on the subject, a fair trial. In such case the law of libel may be invoked; and by that law it is indictable not only to comment on a pending case, but to publish *ex parte* extracts from the record or evidence.[1] Our ordinary constitutional remedies are, therefore, sufficient to punish and silence such offenders. The defendant can be arrested and held to bail, or, in default of bail, committed to prison; and if the offence be repeated, and he be at large, the bail can be increased. Or suppose the offence to consist in attempts, out of court, to influence the jury. Here the offender is indictable for embracery, and can be arrested and bailed or committed for this offence.[2] Or suppose the case to consist in slanderous words addressed to the court. If this is during a trial, then a commitment for contempt is necessary, for otherwise no trial, not even that for instituting criminal proceedings to prevent such misconduct, could go on. But if the slanderous language be not used during trial, nor in the court-room or its approaches, then it can be sufficiently punished, and its repetition sufficiently guarded against, by an arrest and binding over for trial, or an arrest and binding over to keep the peace. For it is an indictable offence to address slanderous words to a magistrate;[3] and independently of this, an offender of this class may be bound over to keep the peace, and placed under bonds sufficiently heavy, if not to compel good behavior, at least to incarcerate him as completely as if he were imprisoned for contempt. But a binding over to keep the peace has none of the distinctive objections by which commitments for contempt are beset. In such a binding over, the State is the prosecutor, and not the offended judge. The proceedings are not inquisitorial, as is the case with contempt, but the defendant meets the witnesses against

In cases of this class an ordinary prosecution is the better course.

[1] See Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 1637 *et seq.*, and extracts from Livingston's Report on the Louisiana Code, given in the 8th ed. of this work, § 960.

[2] Infra, § 966.

[3] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1614.

him face to face. The writ of *habeas corpus* is open in such case as a remedy, while its application to commitments for contempt is contested where the committing court has jurisdiction.[1] The remedy by binding over, while equally efficacious, is less harsh, and not likely to awaken that public sympathy which often, unconsciously, arises for one who is summarily punished by high prerogative.[2] And while the common law process of binding over gives all due protection to the citizen, that of commitment for constructive contempt may be pleaded, as will presently be seen, as a precedent for incarceration, unrelievable by *habeas corpus*, of those whose criticisms may be deemed contemptuous by legislature if not by executive.

Danger of depositing such power in courts.

§ 961. It may well be asked why, if such an extreme remedy is necessary in case of the judiciary, is it not in case of the executive? The executive, in cases of application for pardon, exercises a semi-judicial function, in which, equally with the judge trying the case, it is important that he should be kept free from the influences of fear, favor, or affection. The executive, when dealing with great questions of war, or almost equally great questions of currency expansion or contraction, should be in an eminent degree superior to the clamor of ignorant or timid or fanatical declaimers, and to the false public sentiment generated by desperate speculators, and even to the true public sentiment generated by a real but baseless panic. Who, however, would consider it consistent with either law or liberty for the executive to summarily arrest and imprison, without the relief of bail, without the interposition of a responsible prosecutor, without examination of witnesses, without the right of subsequent revision by *habeas corpus*, those from whom such publications should issue? Or, to take an alternative still more applicable, is such a prerogative safely to be claimed for the legislature? The legislature is coördinate in power and dignity with the judiciary. The legislature, either federal or State, has no doubt power to punish

[1] See infra, § 999.

[2] In In re Clements (36 L. T. Rep. N. S. 332), Sir George Jessel said: "This jurisdiction of committing for contempt, being practically arbitrary and unlimited, should be most jealously and carefully watched, and exercised with the greatest anxiety on the part of the judge to see that there is no other mode which is not open to the objection of arbitrariness, and, to a certain extent, unlimited power, which can be brought to bear upon the subject."

summarily for contempts by which the exercise of its distinctive functions is physically impeded; but can we rightfully claim for the legislature power to commit summarily persons criticising, no matter how unfairly or corruptly, measures over which it is still deliberating? But if the exercise of such a power is not permitted to executive or legislature, why should it be conceded to the judiciary? Or, if so conceded to the judiciary, why should we withdraw from the prerogative those general considerations of policy already noticed,[1] which, while retaining for libels common law prosecutions, invoke, in the institution of such prosecutions, peculiar caution, tenderness, and reserve? But however these questions may be determined, two points remain: first, the doctrine of constructive contempt is of recent introduction, not being part of the common law brought with them to this country by our colonists;[2] and, sec-

[1] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1611.

[2] No English case for constructive contempt is reported prior to the American Revolution. The earliest case in which the question arose was that of the printer Almon, proceeded against in 1765, for contempt of court, in publishing an attack on the chief justice, imputing improper and corrupt conduct in his office, and in whose case Sir E. Wilmot, one of the judges, prepared an elaborate judgment vindicating the punishment of the printer by fine and imprisonment —a judgment, however, never delivered, the proceedings being abandoned, and the publication of the proposed judgment, in Sir E. Wilmot's opinion, being, as is stated, without his sanction. So far as concerns inferior courts, the jurisdiction, as will presently be seen, is now expressly denied by the English Queen's Bench, and so far as concerns superior courts, it is justified by Cockburn, Ch. J., only on the fiction of the presence of the sovereign in such courts. "The power of committing for contempts committed in the face of the court is given to inferior courts, but they had not power so to punish contempts committed out of court. There is an obvious distinction between inferior courts created by statute and superior courts of law or equity. In these superior courts the power is inherent in their constitution, has been coeval with their original institution, and has been always exercised. The origin can be traced to the time when all the courts arose as divisions of the *curia regis*—the Supreme Court of the sovereign, in which he personally, or by his immediate representative, sat to administer justice. The power of the courts in this respect was an emanation from the royal authority, which, when exercised personally, or in the presence of the sovereign, made a contempt of the crown punishable summarily, and hence the power passed to the superior courts when they were created. It is a very different thing when we come to the inferior courts, which have never exercised this power, or have never been recognized as possessing it, and we think in those courts it does not exist." R. *v.* Lefroy, L. R. 8 Q. B. 134, as stated in the London Times of February 1, 1873. A

ondly, it is a violent remedy, justifiable only in cases not reached by bindings over to keep the peace, or bindings over for trial.[1]

Where, however, the case is one in which summary proceedings for contempt afford a suitable redress, the jurisdiction is not ousted by the fact that the offence might be prosecuted by indictment or information.[2]

III. BY WHOM SUMMARY COMMITMENTS FOR CONTEMPT MAY BE ISSUED.

Superior courts have power to issue common law commitments.

§ 962. That superior courts have the usual common law power in this respect has been already seen. However this power may be limited, in courts of this class when acting judicially it unquestionably resides.[3] It is otherwise as to courts when acting ministerially.[4]

late writer in Notes and Queries gives an interesting sketch of the early history of the offence: "In the collection of laws of Henry I. it is called *contemptus brevium*, or contempt of the king's legal writs. At that time contempt of court was punished with a fine. A remarkable fact in connection with the subject is, that the method of the punishment has become more summary in the later times. In the reign of Henry II., mere disrespect or disturbance was not visited with immediate severity, but the offender was formally indicted. A case has come down to us in which one of the king's judges was insulted, and this method was pursued. The present process of attachment or arrest was only employed in cases where there had been disregard of the legal writs of the court. An early, although scarcely an authentic case of contempt of court, is afforded by the commitment of the Prince of Wales, by Chief Justice Gascoigne, in the reign of Henry IV. As a point of special interest at the present time it may be remarked that efforts to influence jurors were never deemed contempt, but were indictable as a common law offence, known as 'embracery of jurors.'"

[1] As sustaining this view, but in marked conflict with other English cases, see R. *v.* Gilham, M. & M. 165, where it was held by Littledale and Gaselee, JJ., that it was not a contempt, which the judge could interfere to stop, to exhibit in an assize town an inflammatory publication respecting a crime about to be tried in the assizes.

[2] See 5 Crim. Law Mag. 166; supra, § 444; Arnold *v.* Com., 80 Ky. 300.

[3] See People *v.* Phelps, 4 Thomp. & C. 467; as to Connecticut, see Middlebrook *v.* State, 43 Conn. 257.

In Robinson, ex parte, 19 Wall. 505, it was held that the power is inherent in the courts of the United States; but that the Act of Congress of March 2, 1831, entitled "An Act Declaratory of the Law concerning Contempts of Court," limits the power of the Circuit

[4] See Gorham *v.* Luckett, 6 B. Mon. 638; Clark *v.* People, Breese, 266; Smith, ex parte, 28 Ind. 47.

§ 963. Inferior courts, justices, and commissioners are limited, in the issue of summary commitments, to contempts committed in their presence, unless ampler powers be given them by the legislature.[1] Commissioners in the United States Circuit or Territorial courts have not, unless in cases where the statute gives that power to officers of this class, even the power to commit a non-answering witness for contempt. The process must be asked for from the circuit or territorial judge;[2] though it has been held that commissioners may exercise the powers belonging to local justices of the peace.[3] Nor has a notary public this power.[4] When necessary under a commission in chancery procedure, the course is to apply to the court from whom the commission issues.[5]

Other courts limited to contempts in their presence.

No power in commissioners and notaries.

In New York, by the Penal Code of 1884, § 143, disorderly conduct in presence of courts not of record, as well as of record,

and District Courts of the United States to three classes of cases: 1st. Where there has been misbehavior of a person in the presence of the courts, or so near thereto as to obstruct the administration of justice; 2d. Where there has been misbehavior of any officer of the courts in his official transactions; and, 3d. Where there has been disobedience or resistance by any officer, party, juror, witness, or other person, to any lawful writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command of the courts. It was further ruled that the 17th section of the Judiciary Act of 1789, in prescribing fine or imprisonment as the punishment which may be inflicted by the courts of the United States for contempts, operates as a limitation upon the manner in which their power in this respect may be exercised, and is a negation of all other modes of punishment.

The legislature while it can limit the exercise of this power, cannot absolutely deprive the courts of its exercise. Wolley, in re, 11 Bush. 95; State *v.* Morrill, 16 Ark. 384; Millington, in re, 24 Kans. 214.

[1] R. *v.* Lefroy, L. R. 8 Q. B. 134; Hollingsworth *v.* Duane, Wall. C. C. 79; Clark *v.* May, 2 Gray, 410; Noyes *v.* Byxbee, 45 Conn. 382; Cartwright's case, 114 Mass. 230; Watson, in re, 3 Lans. 408; Kerrigan, in re, 4 Vroom, (33 N. J. L.) 344; State *v.* Galloway, 5 Cold. 326; State *v.* Applegate, 2 McCord, 110; Batcheldor *v.* Moore, 42 Cal. 412.

[2] Judson, in re, 3 Blatch. 148. At common law referees and commissioners have not the power unless by statute. La Fontaine *v.* Underwriters, 83 N. C. 132; Stewart *v.* Allen, 45 Wis. 100.

[3] U. S. *v.* Schumanu, 2 Abb. C. C. 41. See Doll, ex parte, 27 Leg. Int. 20; S. C., 11 Int. Rev. Rec. 36; 7 Phila. Rep. 595; Shaffer's case, Sup. Ct. Utah, 1883; cf. Gorman, ex parte, 4 Cranch, 572; U. S. *v.* Rundlett, 2 Curtis C. C. 41; U. S. *v.* Horton, 2 Dill. 94.

[4] Rapalje on Contempts, p. 10, Kreiger, ex parte, 7 Mo. Ap. 367; Burtt *v.* Pyle, 89 Ind. 398. But see *contra*, Abel's case, 12 Kans. 451.

[5] 2 Dan. Ch. Pr. 1178 *et seq.*

and in the presence of referees when acting under order of court, is made a criminal contempt.

In Pennsylvania, a justice of the peace, at common law, has not power to commit even for direct contempt. His course, if there be such contempt, is to remit the case to the proper court, in order to obtain the action of such court.[1] A similar view is maintained in New Jersey, where the power is denied to a recorder of a city who is invested with the powers of a justice of the peace;[2] and to a justice of the peace sitting for the trial of minor civil issues.[3] In England, however, the right to commit for contempts in *facie curiae* is reserved to justices;[4] and such is the practice in several of our own States.[5]

§ 964. It has been held that it is within the power of the houses of congress and of the State legislatures to commit for contempt, not only for disorder during their sessions, but for a refusal to testify in any inquiry they may institute.[6] That both these functions reside in each of the houses of the

So as to legislatures.

[1] Brooker *v.* Com., 12 S. & R. 175; Albright *v.* Lapp, 26 Penn. St. 99; though by statute (Brightly, 273) the power is given to the justices in Allegheny County.

[2] Kerrigan, in re, 4 Vroom (33 N. J. L.) 344.

[3] Rhinehart *v.* Lance, 43 N. J. L. (14 Vroom) 317.

[4] Paley on Convictions (1866), 329. That they have no such power at common law, when sitting singly, is argued with much acuteness by Depue, J., in Rhinehart *v.* Lance, 43 N. J. L. (14 Vroom) 317.

[5] State *v.* Towle, 42 N. H. 540; Cooper, in re, 32 Vt. 253; Hill *v.* Crandall, 52 Ill. 70; Robb *v.* McDonald, 29 Iowa, 330. As to New York, the power is said to exist in justices at common law. Cowen's Treatise, § 1334. For this Mr. Cowen cites Mather *v.* Hood, 8 Johns. R. 44; and Richmond *v.* Dayton, 10 Johns. R. 393—cases, however, which only go to the justices' right to convict of forcible entry, and to bind over for good behavior in case of disorder. The right can now only be exercised in the cases specified by statute. People *v.* Webster, 3 Parker C. R. 503. The statute gives the power to justices in cases where witnesses refuse to answer questions, and when there is a prior oath as to the materiality of the question. Rutherford *v.* Holmes, 66 N. Y. 368; S. C., 5 Hun, 317.

In Illinois neither police magistrates nor justices have this power. Newton *v.* Locklin, 77 Ill. 103; and so in Alabama, State *v.* McDuffie, 52 Ala. 4.

[6] 6 Robinson's Practice, 694; Anderson *v.* Dunn, 6 Wheat. 204; Stewart *v.* Blaine, 1 McArthur, 453; Falvey, in re, 7 Wis. 630; Nugent, ex parte, 4 Clark (Phila.) 107; 1 Am. L. J. 107.

A curious question, as to the right of the legislature to punish for contempt, arose in Pennsylvania in 1758. Dr. William Smith, provost of the University of Pennsylvania, gave great offence to the provincial assembly by taking

British parliament cannot be questioned.[1] But it is now held by the Supreme Court of the United States that the House of Representatives of the United States has no power to commit for contempt witnesses refusing to answer questions in inquiries instituted by it not connected with the election of its members or with impeachment procedure.[2] The same reasoning applies to the legislatures of the particular States. And it is clear that in any view that the power of committal for contempt does not belong to inferior legislatures, such as town councils or town meetings.[3] The remedy for disturbance in such case is binding over to keep the peace, or indictment for disturbing a meeting.

IV. INDICTABILITY OF CONTEMPTS: EMBRACERY.

Interference with public justice indictable.

§ 965. It has been already noticed that attempts to interfere with the production of evidence in a case are indictable at common law.[4] It is also clear that all disorder in a court-room, and all attempts, forcible or fraudulent, to interfere with or prevent the due course of public justice,

part in the publication of a petition to the assembly which that body deemed libellous. He was committed for contempt, and this commitment was renewed by a succeeding assembly. The assembly, in the commitment, directed the sheriff to refuse to obey all writs of *habeas corpus*. An appeal was taken to England; and the law officers of the crown gave it as their opinion that though the paper in question was a libel, it could not be treated as a contempt by a legislature elected after its publication. It was further held that the direction to the sheriff not to obey a writ of *habeas corpus* was unwarrantable. The latter points were affirmed by the privy council. See Life of Rev. William Smith, D.D., by H. W. Smith, Phila. 1879, chaps. xii., xiv.

See on this topic, article in 21 Cent. L. J. 43.

[1] 1 Kent Com. 236; 1 Story on Const. § 847; Shaftsbury's case, 1 Mod. 144, 157; Burdett *v.* Abbott, 14 East, 1–131; Crosby's case, 1 Wils. 188; People *v.* Keeler, 99 N. Y. 463.

[2] Kilbourne *v.* Thompson, 103 U. S. 168. The reason given is that the omnipotence assigned to the British parliament, which creates the British constitution, cannot be assigned to either congress or State legislatures in this country which are the creatures of the constitutions by which they are limited.

[3] Thus it has been held in Massachusetts that an act of the legislature giving to municipal corporations power to punish for contempt is unconstitutional. Whitcomb's case, 120 Mass. 118; see Maulsby, ex parte, 13 Md. 642.

[4] Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1333. See Ellerbe, in re, 4 McCr. 449; 4 Crim. Law Mag. 60, under federal revised statutes. People *v.* Mead, 1 N. Y. Cr. R. 417.

are in like manner indictable. So, by the better opinion, is insolent, or abusive, or corrupt language addressed to a justice of the peace when in the execution of his office.[1] Whether attempt to intimidate or cajole a judge is indictable has been doubted; though it is clearly ground, on reasoning already given, for a binding over to good behavior.

So with *embracery* or improper interference with jury.

§ 966. By the common law it is an indictable offence to approach jurymen for the purpose of intimidating or influencing them.[2] Under the title of *embracery*, such attempts have been treated as forming a substantive offence, independent of the question of success.[3] By a statute of the United States the offence has in the federal courts a specific penalty.[4] And such misconduct is in any view a contempt.[5]

V. PRACTICE.

In cases in face of court rule may be made instantly returnable.

§ 967. When a contempt, punishable by summary commitment, takes place in the face of the court, the court may order a rule on the offender, returnable instanter, to show cause why he should not be committed; though sometimes the rule to show cause is dispensed with, and the offender simply required to purge himself or stand committed.[6] No evidence need in such case be taken,[7] the matter being within the judicial notice of the court.[8] And in case of the offender absconding, the court may sentence him at any time during the term when he is brought back.[9]

[1] Supra, § 203; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1616; see R. *v.* Lefroy, cited supra, § 953, in which case Mellor, J., said, "that judges of inferior courts have protection by way of criminal information, in cases of imputations upon their character or conduct calculated to affect the administration of justice. And it was not thought necessary to give them greater power." To same effect see remarks of Woodward, J., in Albright *v.* Lapp, 26 Penn. St. 99.

[2] Thomp. & Mer. on Jur. § 364; supra, §§ 72, 338, 381; Com. *v.* Kauffman, 1 Phila. 534.

[3] Supra, §§ 367, 729; Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 1858; 1 Hawk. b. i. c. 85; Whart. Prec. 1022; State *v.* Sales, 2 Nev. 268.

[4] Supra, § 729.

[5] Harwell *v.* State, 10 Lea, 544; Gandy *v.* State, 13 Neb. 445.

[6] See 5 Crim Law Mag. 484.

[7] 4 Bl. Com. (Wend. ed.) 283 *et seq.*; U. S. *v.* Wayne, Wall. C. C. 134; Smethurst, in re, 2 Sandf. 724; see Durant *v.* Wash. Co., 1 Woolw. 377; Com. *v.* Snowdon, 1 Brewst. 218.

[8] People *v.* Kelly, 24 N. Y. 75.

[9] See Middlebrook *v.* State, 43 Conn. 257.

§ 968. For contempts not in *facie curiae* a rule to show cause is necessary ;[1] and affidavits must be produced[2] to prove the inculpatory facts, in all cases in which the proceeding is not based on a return of record by the proper officer.[3] The defendant then, and not till then, is called upon to purge himself from the contempt.[4]

Otherwise as to contempts not in face of court.

§ 969. The process, in the hearing, on the question of purging, is inquisitorial, in so far that it calls upon the defendant to purge himself from the contempt. If disrespect is disavowed or apologized for, and reparation, in proper cases, made, then the punishment is mitigated, or made nominal, on payment of costs.[5] Evidence contradicting that of the party purging himself cannot at common law be received, his answers being conclusive ;[6] though he may in such evidence expose himself to an indictment for perjury.[7] In equity process, however, the answers so made may be contested.

Hearing may be inquisitorial.

[1] That notice is essential, see State *v.* Matthews, 37 N. H. 450 ; Langdon, ex parte, 25 Vt. 680 ; Sommersett *v.* Lellers, 2 Halst. 31. This question is elaborately discussed in 5 Crim. Law Mag. 472 *et seq.*

[2] Judson, in re, 3 Blatch. 148 ; Daves, in re, 81 N. C. 72 ; State *v.* Blackwell, 10 S. C. 35 ; see 5 Crim. Law Mag. 485. In some States an affidavit is an essential prerequisite. Batchelder *v.* Moore, 42 Cal. 412 ; Phillips *v.* Welch, 13 Nev. 158.

[3] R. *v.* Elkins, 4 Burr. 2129 ; State *v.* Ackerson, 25 N. J. L. 209 ; Wright, ex parte, 65 Ind. 504, 508.

[4] R. *v.* Onslow, 12 Cox C. C. 358 ; R. *v.* Skipworth, 12 Cox C. C. 371 ; R. *v.* Lefroy, L. R. 8 Q. B. 134 ; Judson, in re, 3 Blatch. 148 ; Lee *v.* Chadwick, 11 Int. Rev. Rec. 133 ; Stanwood *v.* Green, Ibid. 134 ; 3 Am. Law T. Rep. 133 ; Hollingsworth *v.* Duane, Wall. C. C. 141 ; Whittem *v.* State, 36 Ind. 196 ; McConnell *v.* State, 46 Ind. 298 ; Burke *v.* State, 47 Ind. 528 ; Batchelder *v.* Moore, 42 Cal. 412 ; see Whart. Crim. Ev. § 350. That the party accused is entitled to be heard, see, further, 5 Crim. Law Mag. 514 ; State *v.* Judges, 32 La. An. 1256 ; Kilgore, ex parte, 3 Tex. Ap. 247.

[5] See, as illustrating practice, R. *v.* Onslow, 12 Cox C. C. 358 ; Beebee, ex parte, 2 Wall. Jr. 127 ; U. S. *v.* Scholfield, 1 Cranch, 130 ; Davis *v.* Sherron, 1 Cranch, 287 ; People *v.* Few, 2 Johns. R. 290 ; McDermott *v.* State, 10 N. J. L. 63.

[6] R. *v.* Vaughan, Dougl. 516 ; Pitman, in re, 1 Curt C. C. 186 ; Buck *v.* Buck, 60 Ill. 105 ; Haskett *v.* State, 51 Ind. 176. Biggs, ex parte, 64 N. C. 202 ; though see *contra*, State *v.* Matthews, 37 N. H. 450 ; Henry *v.* Ellis, 49 Iowa, 205. As to the rule of evidence, see Bates's case, 55 N. H. 325 ; U. S. *v.* Dodge, 2 Gall. 313.

[7] U. S. *v.* Dodge, *ut sup.*

VI. PUNISHMENT.

§ 970. Where, as in the case of a witness not attending through inadvertence, no contempt is intended, and the offence is purged, the court may sentence simply to payment of costs, and require recognizances for good behavior.[1] The court has power, however, as has been seen, to fine and imprison, and to imprison until the fine be paid;[2] and in case of attorneys, to strike their names from the roll, or suspend them for a fixed period.[3] No bail, after commitment, it has been said, can be received;[4] but this must be qualified by the position that the court can order bail for good behavior as a substitute for commitment.[5]

Court may fine and imprison.

§ 971. A commitment for contempt, when imposed as a punishment, must be for a fixed period; otherwise it is void. It is otherwise, however, when the commitment is to enforce a particular duty (*e. g.*, to testify), in which case the imprisonment may be directed to continue until the duty be performed.[6]

Commitment must be for fixed period.

§ 972. The *fine* goes to the State; not to any party injured.[7] But it seems that to the fine may be added to the plaintiff's counsel fees and costs incurred in resistance of the application.[8]

Fine goes to State.

[1] U. S. *v.* Caton, 1 Cranch, 150. As to practice in respect to perjury, see Brinkley *v.* Brinkley, 47 N. Y. 40; Wells *v.* Com., 21 Grat. 500.

[2] Crittenden, ex parte, 62 Cal. 534.

[3] Stephens *v.* Hill, 10 M. & W. 28; Smith *v.* Matham, 4 D. & R. 738. See supra, § 953.

[4] Kearney, ex parte, 7 Wheat. 38; but this rests on the limited appellate power of the U. S. Supreme Court.

[5] See U. S. *v.* Caton, *ut supra;* People *v.* Bennett, 4 Paige, 282. See U. S. *v.* Atchison, etc. R. R., 16 Fed. Rep. 853; Childrens *v.* Saaby, 1 Vernon, 207; Magennis *v.* Parkhurst, 4 N. J. Eq. 433.

[6] Supra, §§ 70 *et seq.;* Williamson's case, 26 Penn. St. 23; Com. *v.* Small, Ibid. 42.

[7] Mullee, in re, 7 Blatch. C. C. 23; Rhodes, in re, 65 N. C. 518; Morris *v.* Whitehead, 65 N. C. 637.

[8] Doubleday *v.* Sherman, 8 Blatch. C. C. 45.

Under the federal statutes the court imposing a fine for contempt will not remit it, this being solely a matter belonging to the pardoning power, until the executive, on being appealed to, finally refuses to exercise jurisdiction over the matter. Mullee, in re, 7 Blatch. 23; 3 Op. Atty.-Gen. 622; 4 Ibid. 458; 5 Ibid. 579. See Kearney, ex parte, 7 Wheat. 38.

VII. CONVICTION ON SAME FACTS NO BAR TO PROCEEDINGS FOR CONTEMPT, AND SO OF CONVERSE.

Contempt not barred by other procedure.

§ 973. Contempt is not barred by other procedure, based on injuries inflicted by the contemptuous act on third parties,[1] the reason being that the personal injury and the contempt having different juridical relations, each with a distinct penalty, have distinct punishments.[2]

VIII. APPEAL, ERROR, AND PARDON.

When on record process may be revised in error.

§ 974. From the high and extreme prerogative that commitment for contempt involves, it is right that when exercised by an inferior court it should be the subject of revision by a superior court, whenever the record can be removed or the issue in any way transferred, either in the way of appeal, or by writ of error. Such is the sound opinion;[3] though where there is no statutory mode of revisal, and the record does not show the facts, the attempt thus to review must necessarily fail.[4] Yet, where there is no process of appeal, the inferior court may be restrained from proceeding by injunction or prohibition.[5]

[1] Supra, § 444.

[2] See State *v.* Woodfin, 5 Ired. 199; State *v.* Williams, 2 Speers, 26; and see Middlebrook *v.* State, 43 Conn. 257, for case of modification of sentence.

[3] Langdon, ex parte, 25 Vt. 680; Clarke *v.* May, 2 Gray, 410; Yates, ex parte, 6 Johns. R. 337; Albany Bk. *v.* Schermerhorn, 9 Paige, 372; People *v.* Kelly, 24 N. Y. 74; Pitt *v.* Davison, 37 N. Y. 235; Hummell, in re, 9 Watts, 416; Com. *v.* Newton, 1 Grant, 453; Balt. & O. R. R. *v.* Wheeling, 13 Grat. 40; Summers, ex parte, 5 Ired. 149; Cabot *v.* Yarborough, 27 Ga. 476; Bickley *v.* Com., 2 J. J. Marsh. 572; Stuart *v.* People, 3 Scam. 395; Jilz, ex parte, 64 Mo. 205; Rowe, ex parte, 7 Cal. 175; Jordan *v.* State, 14 Texas, 436; Gandy *v.* State, 13 Neb. 445. Compare Whittem *v.* State, 36 Ind. 196, where this view is ably vindicated (though see Burke *v.* State, 47 Ind. 528); Stokely *v.* Com., 1 Va. Cas. 330; Howard *v.* Durand, 36 Ga. 346, where it is said there is an appeal for abuse of discretion. In People *v.* O'Neill, 47 Cal. 109, it was held that the action of the court below was always reversible for want of jurisdiction.

[4] See, for cases of this, Kearney, ex parte, 7 Wheat. 38; Cooper, in re, 32 Vt. 258; Maulsby, ex parte, 13 Md. 625; Gates *v.* McDaniel, 4 Stew. & P. 69; Adams, ex parte, 25 Miss. 883; State *v.* Thurmond, 37 Tex. 340.

[5] R. *v.* Lefroy, L. R. 8 Q. B. 134, cited fully supra, § 963, note.

§ 974 *a*. Commitments for contempt cannot ordinarily be reviewed by a coördinate court on *habeas corpus*;[1] though it is held that a federal court may review on *habeas corpus* such a commitment by a State court, when in violation of a federal statute or constitutional sanction.[2]

When by *habeas corpus*.

§ 975. *Pardon*, it has been already noticed, has been held not to release from imprisonment for contempt, though the better opinion is to the contrary.[3] It should be added that the right to pardon and remit has been claimed, in contempts committed in the federal courts, by the President of the United States.[4]

Pardon does not usually release.

[1] People *v.* Jacobs, 66 N. Y. 8; Haines *v.* Haines, 35 Mich. 138; Shattuck *v.* State, 51 Miss. 50; State *v.* Seaton, 61 Iowa, 563. But see more fully, infra, § 999.

[2] Infra, §§ 981, 991.

[3] Supra, § 530.

[4] See remarks of Blatchford, J., 7 Blatch. 25; and see State *v.* Sauvinet, 24 La. An. 119. Supra, § 530.

CHAPTER XXI.

HABEAS CORPUS.

Writ available at any stage of imprisonment, § 978.
Cannot be suspended by President or governor, § 979.
State court cannot discharge from federal arrest, § 980.
Federal courts may review State arrests, § 981.
Petition to be verified by affidavit, § 982.
May be applied for by next friend, § 983.
To be directed to custodian and to be served personally, § 984.
Notice to be given to prosecution, § 985.
Writ not granted when relator should be remanded, § 986.
Relator, if in custody, must be produced immediately in court, § 987.
Causes of detention must be returned, § 988.
Return must not be evasive, § 989.
Writ to be enforced by attachment, § 990.
Return may be controverted, § 991.
Discharge from defects of process; and so in cases of oppression, § 992.
Writ may test extradition process, § 993.
Writ may obtain redress from void sentence, § 994.
but cannot overhaul indictment or matters within province of trial court, § 995.
cannot collaterally correct errors, § 996.
nor interrupt hearings, § 996 *a*.
Military judgments cannot be thus reviewed, § 997.
Nor summary police convictions, § 998.
Nor committals for contempt, § 999.
Court determines questions of fact, § 1000.
Probable cause enough, § 1001.
Evidence not excluded on technical grounds, § 1002.
Remitting evidence and record by *certiorari*, § 1003.
Affidavits may be received, § 1004.
No discharge for technical defects or variance, § 1005.
Discharge from pardon or limitation, § 1006.
Discharge from want of probable cause: adjustment of bail, § 1007.
Judgment must be discharge or remander, § 1008.
During hearing custody is in court, § 1009.
No writ of error at common law; proceedings in error, § 1010.
How far discharge affects subsequent arrest, § 1011.

Writ available at any stage of imprisonment.

§ 978. THE writ of *habeas corpus*, while the first, is also the last process to which an arrested person can resort for the purpose of having his case tested by a court of justice; and a brief summary of the law in this relation may not improperly close the present volume. The writ is one of the high prerogatives of the people as a sovereign, and its object is to enable any person within the territorial limits of the State, alien or subject, no matter what may be the disabilities or infamy under

which he labors, to obtain at any period the judgment of a judicial tribunal as to the legality of an imprisonment in which he may be detained. The origin and history of the statute providing this writ, however, are beyond our present province; and it is equally out of our range to discuss the cases in which the writ may be used to obtain adjudications on the lawfulness of custody other than that imposed by criminal process. To the writ as a mode of obtaining relief from an arrest under a criminal charge our attention must be confined.[1]

Writ cannot be suspended by President or governor.

§ 979. It is not within the constitutional power of the President of the United States to suspend the operation of the writ, or to authorize such suspension by a military officer. The prerogative of suspending the writ belongs exclusively to Congress.[2] Nor is this function vested in the

[1] That the right is by common law see Besset, in re, 6 Q. B. 481. To the same effect is Lord Mansfield's speech in the House of Lords, June, 1758; Campbell's Chief Justices, ii. 453; and Taney, C. J., in Merryman's case, infra. Merryman's case is reviewed in 9 Am. Law Reg. 705. Compare 1 Pomeroy's Archbold, 199 *et seq.*; 22 Am. Law Rev. 149. That the petitioner must be in custody, see Cole, ex parte, 14 Tex. Ap. 579.

[2] Merryman, ex parte, Taney, 246; Benedict, in re, Hall, J., Pamph. N. Y. 1862; McCall *v.* McDowell, 1 Abb. U. S. 212; McQuillon, ex parte, 1 West. L. Month. 440; 9 Pitts. L. J. 29; Griffin *v.* Wilcox, 21 Ind. 370; Kemp *v.* State, 16 Wis. 359. See Field, ex parte, 5 Blatch. 63; Dunn, in re, 25 How. Pr. 467. That the writ is not barred, though proceedings on it are stayed by the suspension, see Milligan, ex parte, 4 Wall. 2.

The suspension in any view is not affected by an order of the war department. Field, ex parte, *ut sup.*

On the topic in the text the following pamphlets may be consulted:—

(1.) The Opinion of U. S. Atty.-Gen. on the Suspension of the Writ of Habeas Corpus. Wash. 1861.

(2.) Habeas Corpus and Martial Law. By Joel Parker. 1861. Judge Parker here argues that in times of war, "whether foreign or domestic, there may be justifiable refusals to obey the command of the writ, without any act of Congress, or any order or authorization of the President, or any State legislation for that purpose." This, however, does not arise from the President's power to suspend the writ, which he cannot constitutionally do, but from the coördinate jurisdiction of the military authorities.

(3.) The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus under the Constitution. By Horace Binney. Second edition. Philadelphia: C. Sherman & Son. 1862. In this pamphlet Mr. Binney holds that there is nothing in the constitutional clause "which either directly or by any fair or reasonable implication gives or confines this authority (that of suspension of the writ) to Congress, or takes it from the executive" (p. 31); and an elaborate reply is attempted to Chief Justice Taney's opinion in Merryman's case.

governor of a State, under a constitution giving the governor power to suppress insurrections.[1]

A "second part" to the same pamphlet was published by Mr. Binney in the same year, the object of this publication being to "confront a doctrine of certain writers that the *habeas corpus* clause in the Constitution does not give power to anybody to suspend the privilege of the writ, but is only restrictive of the otherwise plenary power of Congress." This pamphlet is a reply to the answers which Mr. Binney's first pamphlet drew forth.

(4.) The Law of War and Confiscation. By S. S. Nicholas. Louisville, 1862.

(5.) Review of Binney on the Habeas Corpus. By J. C. Bullitt. Philadelphia, 1862.

(6.) Remarks on Mr. Binney's Treatise. By George M. Wharton. Philadelphia, 1862.

(7.) Reply by Mr. Wharton to Mr. Binney's Criticisms. In these pamphlets the position that the President has no right, on his own motion, to suspend the writ, is sustained with great force. It is not, at the same time, claimed that a return by a military officer in time of war, that the relator is in military custody, is not a sufficient discharge.

(8.) Personal Liberty and Martial Law. Philadelphia, 1862. By Edward Ingersoll.

(9.) Habeas Corpus. By D. A. Mahonsy, Prisoner of State, 1863.

(10.) The Suspending Power and the Writ of Habeas Corpus. By James F. Johnson. Philadelphia, 1862.

(11.) Martial Law: What is it, and who can declare it? By Tatlow Jackson. Philadelphia, 1862.

(12.) Authorities cited Antagonistic to Mr. Binney's Conclusions. By Tatlow Jackson. Philadelphia, 1862.

(13.) Judge Curtis on Executive Power; reprinted 2 Curtis's Works, 309. Compare 1 Curtis's Life, 240, 349.

(14.) Judge Leavitt's Decision in Vallandingham's case. Pamph. Philadelphia, 1863.

(15.) Opinions of Founders of Republic on Habeas Corpus, etc. Washington, 1864.

(16.) Facts and Authorities on the Suspension of the Writ of Habeas Corpus, 1864. Anon.

The following conclusions may now be ventured on the topics discussed in the foregoing publications:—

First. The President of the United States has no constitutional power to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus*.

Second. On the return by a general military officer, in time of war, that he holds the relator either as a military subordinate, or as a spy, or as a deserter, or as a prisoner of war, an attachment should be refused. Infra, § 996.

Third. When a person, not in military service, or a prisoner of war, or charged with being a spy or deserter, is arrested by any authority whatsoever, he should be discharged by a federal judge on *habeas corpus*, unless there is evidence produced against him at the hearing sufficient to justify an indictment to be found against him by a grand jury. See Milligan, ex parte, 4 Wall. 3.

Fourth. If the return be that the relator is held under federal authority,

[1] Moore, ex parte, 64 N. C. 802. As to restoration of writ by proclamation, see Martin, in re, 45 Barb. 142.

§ 980. The writ cannot be used by a State court for the purpose of revising arrests under federal process.[1] Hence, it is the duty of

the revision by a writ of *habeas corpus* is vested exclusively in the federal courts. Infra, §§ 980, 990.

According to Judge Curtis, "Military law is that system of laws enacted by the legislative power for the government of the army and navy of the United States, and of the militia when called into the actual service of the United States. It has no control whatever over any person or any property of any citizen. It could not even apply to the teamsters of an army save by force of express provisions of the laws of Congress making such persons amenable thereto. The persons and property of private citizens of the United States are as absolutely exempted from the control of military law as they are exempted from the control of the laws of Great Britain. But there is also martial law. What is this? It is the will of a military commander operating without any restraint, save his judgment, upon the lives, upon the property, upon the entire social and individual condition of all over whom this law extends. . . . . In time of war, without any special legislation, not the commander-in-chief only, but every commander of an expedition or of a military post, is lawfully empowered by the Constitution and laws of the United States to do whatsoever is necessary to accomplish the lawful objects of his command. . . . . But when the military commander controls the persons or property of citizens who are beyond the sphere of his actual operations in the field, when he makes laws to govern their conduct, he becomes a legislator. . . . . He has no more lawful authority to hold all the citizens of the entire country, outside of the sphere of his actual operations in the field, amenable to his military edicts, than he has to hold all the property of the country subject to his military requisitions." 2 Curtis's Life and Works, 327. Compare authorities cited in Lawrence's Wheaton, 516–520, as to distinction between martial and military law, and the right to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus*. Between martial law and military law the distinction is this: Martial law is the law adopted by civilized belligerents in matters connected with army discipline; military law is the law a conqueror imposes in a subjugated province to determine matters of State. See Whart. Com. Am. Law, §§ 37, 38; Mason, ex parte, 105 U. S. 696. Infra, § 979. See, also, Waters *v.* Campbell, 5 Sawyer, 17.

Mr. Sumner, in his speech of June 27, 1862, took the ground that the power of Congress in this relation was supreme.

[1] Ableman *v.* Booth, 21 How. 506; Tarble, in re, 13 Wal. 397 (Chase, C. J., diss.); Farrand, in re, 1 Abb. U. S. 140; Farrand *v.* Fowler, 2 Am. L. T. (U. S. Ct.) 4; Ferguson, in re, 9 Johns. 239; State *v.* Zalich, 29 N. J. L. 409; State *v.* Plime, T. U. P. Charlt. 142; Spangler, in re, 11 Mich. 298; Tarble, in re, 25 Wis. 390; Hill, ex parte, 5 Nev. 154; Kelly, ex parte, 37 Ala. 474; see Church on Habeas Corpus, §§ 83 ff. for a discussion of Booth's case.

That it is for the State court to determine whether the federal arrest is legal has been ruled in State *v.* Dimick, 12 N. H. 194; Com. *v.* Downes, 24 Pick. 227; Sims, in re, 7 Cush. 285; Barrett, in re, 42 Barb. 479; Com. *v.* Fox, 7 Penn. St. 336; Dougherty *v.* Biddle, Bright. 4; Lockington, in re, Bright. 269; Collier, in re, 6 Ohio St. 55; Bushnell, ex parte, 9 Ohio St. 78; Com.

State court cannot discharge person under federal arrest.

a federal marshal, in whose custody may be a person arrested under federal process, to refuse obedience to any writ commanding him to bring the prisoner before a State court; and he is authorized to call to his aid any force necessary for this purpose.[1] At the same time, in order to justify a refusal of an attachment on this ground, it must appear on the return that the prisoner is held under an arrest duly authorized by the proper federal authority. But the mere fact that a party is arrested ostensibly under the Constitution and laws of the United States—*e. g.*, as in cases of interstate fugitives—does not necessarily oust the jurisdiction of the State courts when the prisoner is found in such jurisdiction.[2]

v. Wright, 3 Grant's Cas. 437; Com. *v.* Gane, 3 Grant's Cas. 447.

In New York, the jurisdiction is maintained in People *v.* Gaul, 44 Barb. 106; Martin, in re, 45 Barb. 143; Webb, in re, 24 How. Pr. 247; Bennett, in re, 25 How. Pr. 149; but is denied in Hobson, in re, 40 Barb. 62; O'Connell, in re, 48 Barb. 259; People *v.* Fiske, 45 How. Pr. 294.

Concurrent jurisdiction in State courts is asserted in McConologue, in re, 107 Mass. 172; McRoberts, ex parte, 16 Iowa, 600; Holman, ex parte, 28 Iowa, 89; Ohio, etc., R. R. *v.* Fitch, 20 Ind. 505.

But in a note to McConologue, in re, which was decided prior to the report of Tarble's case, it is stated by the reporter that the Massachusetts practice now conforms to the rule in Tarble's case, ousting the State courts of their jurisdiction. The same course was taken in New York in Macdonnell's case in 1873 (11 Blatch. 79). See remarks of Davis, J., quoted in the 8th ed. of this work, § 980; People *v.* Fiske, 45 How. Pr. 294.

For a discussion of this topic see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 267.

The relation of federal and State courts as coördinate powers is discussed supra, §§ 441 *et seq.*, and more fully in Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. §§ 264–283, 287 *et seq.*

In ex parte Virginia, 100 U. S. 339, where the relator, a State judge of Virginia, was indicted for excluding colored citizens from a jury on account of race, color, and previous condition of servitude, his petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* was denied. The relator argued that his act was judicial under State laws, and not amenable to the federal jurisdiction or laws. The court held that the act providing for the punishment of officers who exclude citizens from the jury on account of race or color is constitutional; that relator's act in selecting jurors was ministerial and not judicial; and that although he derived his authority from the State, he was bound, in the discharge of his duties, to obey the federal Constitution and laws. Mr. Justice Strong delivered the prevailing opinion; Mr. Justice Clifford and Mr. Justice Field, dissenting. 21 Alb. L. J. 182.

[1] Ableman *v.* Booth, 21 How. 506; Tarble, in re, 13 Wall. 397; Norris *v.* Newton, 5 McLean, 92; Robinson, ex parte, 6 McLean, 355.

[2] Robb *v.* Connelly, 111 U. S. 624; supra, § 37 *a*.

§ 981. On the other hand, the writ may issue from a federal court to relieve a person under arrest by process from a State court or a State magistrate, when such arrest is in alleged violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States.[1] It has also been held that a federal judge may release on *habeas corpus* a person committed by a State court for

Federal courts may review State arrests.

[1] U. S *v.* Jailer of Fayette Co., 2 Abb. U. S. 265; Royall, ex parte, 117 U. S. 241, 254. See note in 23 Cent. L. J. 15; Bridges, ex parte, 2 Woods, 428; Sifford, ex parte, 5 Am. L. Reg. 659; Jenkins, ex parte, 2 Wall. Jr. 521; Farrand, in re, 1 Abb. U. S. 140; Ho Ah Kow *v.* Numan, supra, § 920; Thompson, ex parte, 1 Flip. 507; McCready, ex parte, 1 Hughes, 598; Hanson, ex parte, 28 Fed. Rep. 127; Brosnahan, matter of, 4 McCr. 1; Wong Yung Quy, in re, 6 Sawy. 237; Lee Tong, in re, 5 Crim. Law Mag. 67; Parrott's case, 6 Sawy. 376; Ah Lee, 6 Sawy. 410; the three last being cases of alleged imprisonment "without due process of law," in contravention of the 14th Amendment. In Spink's case, 19 Fed. Rep. 631, it was held that the writ could issue to relieve pilots from arrest. See Buell, in re, 3 Dill. 116; Kenyon, ex parte, 5 Dill. 355.

Similar adjudications were made by federal judges releasing parties imprisoned under State laws for executing the federal fugitive slave law statute. Among these cases may be noticed Robinson, ex parte, 6 McL. 365, charge of Nelson, J., in 1 Blatch. 365; Robinson, ex parte, 1 Bond, 39; Jenkins, ex parte, 2 Wal. Jr. 521, 539; Sifford, ex parte, 5 Am. Law Reg. O. S. 659; Peter, in re, 2 Paine, 348. See analysis of cases in Church on Habeas Corpus, § 78.

In In re Wong Yung Quy, 6 Sawy. 237, it was held that a federal court may, upon *habeas corpus*, inquire into the validity of a judgment of a State court, where in the petition it is alleged that the judgment, by virtue of which the relator is held in custody, rests upon an act of the legislature passed in violation of the provisions of the federal Constitution or of a treaty of the United States. See Quong Woo, in re, 7 Sawy. 521.

In Clarke, ex parte, 100 U. S. 399, Beasley, J., said: "A justice of this court can exercise the power of issuing the writ of *habeas corpus* in any part of the United States where he happens to be. But as the case is one of which this court also has jurisdiction, if the justice who issued the writ found the questions involved to be of great moment and difficulty, and could postpone the case here for the consideration of the whole court without injury to the petitioner, we see no good reason why he should not have taken this course, as he did. It had merely the effect of making the application for a discharge one addressed to the court, instead of one addressed to a single justice." See Kaine's case, 14 How. 103. "Of course, under our system, no justice will needlessly refer a case to the court when he can decide it satisfactorily to himself, and will not do so in any case in which injury will be thereby incurred by the petitioner. No injury can be complained of in this case, since the petitioner was allowed to go at large on reasonable bail."

The right is not affected by a prior *habeas corpus* issued from a State court. Leary's case, 6 Abbott (N. Y.), N. C. 43; 10 Ben. 197.

contempt in disobeying its orders, when such orders are in contravention of the federal Constitution and statutes.[1] Whether a federal judge will discharge a party under arrest under State process, on ground of conflict of such process with the federal Constitution, is a matter of discretion which will not be exercised when there is an opportunity, after conviction, to take a writ of error to the State court, and then to the Supreme Court of the United States.[2] But for a matter relating solely to State jurisdiction, the federal courts have no power of review through this writ;[3] and, as a general rule, writ of error and not *habeas corpus* is the proper process to determine the question how far a prosecution in a State court is in conflict with the federal Constitution.[4] In any view, the petitioner's guilt or innocence of charges, of which a State court has jurisdiction, cannot be considered on a *habeas corpus* issued by a federal judge.[5]

Petition should state facts and be verified by affidavit.

§ 982. The petition should state the facts on which the charge of illegal restraint rests;[6] and, when the object is to attack a particular commitment, should give a copy of such commitment.[7] If the object be to discharge on bail, this object should be stated.[8] The facts of the petition are usually verified by affidavit;[9] though this is not required

[1] Electoral College, in re, 1 Hughes, 571; Turner, ex parte, 3 Woods, 603; Spink, in re, 19 Fed. Rep. 631; and cases infra, § 999.

As to *habeas corpus* in United States courts, see note by Judge Thompson, 18 Fed. Rep. 70; and see 2 Kan. L. J. 223; 20 Cent. L. J. 169.

[2] Royall, ex parte, 117 U. S. 241, 254; Fonda, ex parte, 117 U. S. 516; Coy, in re, 127 U. S. 731. See Ex parte Hung Hung, 108 U. S. 552. As to writ of error in such cases, see supra, § 1010.

[3] Dorr, ex parte, 3 How. 103; U. S. *v.* Rector, 5 McLean, 174; U. S. *v.* French, 1 Gall. 1; De Kraft *v.* Barney, 2 Black U. S. 704; U. S. *v.* Kinney, 3 Hughes, 9; Reynolds, ex parte, 3 Hughes, 559.

[4] Infra, § 996 *b*; Royall, ex parte, 117 U. S. 241, 254; Fonda, ex parte, 117 U. S. 516; Coy, in re, 127 U. S. 731. See Siebold, ex parte, infra, § 995; In re Wong Yung Quy, supra; Virginia, ex parte, 100 U. S. 339; Clarke, ex parte, 100 U. S. 399; McKean, ex parte, 3 Hughes, 23.

[5] Siebold, ex parte, 100 U. S. 374; Crouch, ex parte, 112 U. S. 178.

[6] Nye, ex parte, 8 Kans. 99; Deny, ex parte, 10 Nev. 212; Allen, ex parte, 12 Nev. 87; though see, as adopting a less stringent rule, White *v.* State, 1 Sm. & M. 149. As to New York practice, see People *v.* Cowles, 59 How. Pr. 287; and see, generally, Church on Habeas Corpus, chapters 8 and 9.

[7] Harrison, in re, 1 Cranch C. C. 159; Klepper, ex parte, 26 Ill. 532; Royster, ex parte, 6 Ark. 28; but see Champion, ex parte, 52 Ill. 311.

[8] Street *v.* State, 43 Miss. 1.

[9] 1 Ch. C. L. 124; 3 Black. C. 132; People *v.* Bartnett, 13 Abb. N. Y. Pr. 8; State *v.* Philpot, Dudley S. C. 46; Gibson *v.* State, 44 Ala. 17.

by the Act of 31 Charles II. In this country the practice varies with local statutes; it being sufficient, when no specific facts are alleged, for a petition in writing, attested by witnesses, to be filed.[1] And in any view an affidavit by the relator is not required when it is shown that he is so coerced as to be unable to make one.[2]

May be by next friend.

§ 983. It is not necessary that the party imprisoned should sue for the writ in person. The application may be made by husband or wife, parent or child, or by any other appropriate friend or agent.[3] A mere stranger, however, having no natural or legal claim to appear for the prisoner, will not be permitted to intervene.[4] And there may be cases in which counsel may be called upon by the court to make the affidavit.[5]

Writ to be directed to custodian, and to be served personally.

§ 984. The writ is to be personally served and due proof made of service, in order to justify an attachment.[6] But personal service may be waived by acceptance, either express or implied.[7]

When the prisoner is under sentence, the writ is to be directed to the officer having him in custody.[8] And generally the custodian is the person to whom the writ should be directed.[9] During the hearing the relator is in charge of the special officer deputed by the court.[10]

Notice must be given to prosecution.

§ 985. Due notice of the issue of the writ and of the hearing must be given, in criminal prosecutions, to the prosecuting officer of the State having jurisdiction of the offence.[11] In matters concerning military service, the notice must be given to the proper military officer.[12]

[1] Bollman, ex parte, 4 Cranch C. C. 75.

[2] Parker, in re, 5 M. & W. 32.

[3] Daly, in re, 2 F. & F. 258; R. v. Clarke, 1 Bnrr. 606; Gregory's case, 4 Bnrr. 1991; Ferrans, in re, 3 Ben. 442; People v. Mercien, 3 Hill (N. Y.), 399 (parent for child); Com. v. Downs, 24 Pick. 227; Com. v. Hammond, 10 Pick. 274; McConologue's case, 107 Mass. 154. See Thompson v. Oglesby, 42 Iowa, 598.

[4] Child, ex parte, 15 C. B. 238; Poole, in re, 2 McArthur, 683; Linda v. Hudson, 1 Cush. 385.

[5] Newton, in re, 16 C. B. 97.

[6] See infra, § 990.

[7] People v. Bradley, 60 Ill. 390.

[8] People v. Hefferman, 38 How. N. Y. Pr. 402.

[9] Nichols v. Cornelius, 7 Ind. 611; Booth, in re, 3 Wis. 1.

[10] Infra, § 1009.

[11] R. v. Taylor, 7 D. & R. 622; Smith, ex parte, 3 McLean, 121; People v. Pelham, 14 Wend. 48; Lumm v. State, 3 Ind. 293.

[12] Gale, ex parte, 3 D. & L. 114.

§ 986. When it is clear that there is no ground for the discharge, the writ will not be granted. "The ordinary course," says Shaw, C. J., "is for the court to grant a rule *nisi*, in the first instance, to show cause why the writ should not issue. Of course, if sufficient cause is not shown, it will be withheld."[1] But in all cases in which by statute the issue of the writ is obligatory, the order for its issue must be made at once; and it may also be made without a rule to show cause in all cases of urgency.[2] And when the question comes up on a rule *nisi*, the case will be treated by the court as if coming up upon the writ.[3]

Writ not granted when relator should be remanded.

§ 987. It is the duty of the person to whom the writ is addressed to produce the party imprisoned immediately in court. The time, however, may be enlarged in cases of sickness or other incapacity.[4] In such case the sickness must be specially returned, and verified by the affidavit of a medical attendant or nurse.[5]

Relator must be produced immediately in court. But sickness cause for delay.

§ 988. It is not enough for the respondent to bring the body of the relator into court. The cause of the detention must be returned.[6] If the detention be based on a commitment, a copy of the commitment, if not filed with the petition, must be produced.[7] Whatever facts are necessary to justify the detention must be set forth in the return.[8] But it is enough if the facts are set forth with ordinary certainty.[9]

Cause of detention must be returned.

§ 989. If the body of the relator is not produced, on the ground that he is not in the respondent's custody, the return, in order to protect the respondent from an attachment, must be explicit in its denial. If it deny that the relator was in the respondent's control, the denial must be

If body be not produced excuse must not be evasive.

[1] Sims's case, 7 Cush. 285; citing Blake's case, 2 M. & S. 428; R. *v.* Marsh, Bulstr. 27; Hobhouse's case, 3 B. & Ald. 420. See, to the effect that a writ will not be granted if nugatory, Kearney, ex parte, 7 Wheat. 38; Com. *v.* Robinson, 1 S. & R. 353; Williamson's case, 26 Penn. St. 9; Bethuram *v.* Black, 11 Bush. 628; Campbell, ex parte, 20 Ala. 89; Gregg, in re, 15 Wis. 179; Deny, ex parte, 10 Nev. 212. See Ex parte Lange, 18 Wall. 163.

[2] Kent, C. J., Stacy, in re, 10 Johns. 328.

[3] Bull, ex parte, 8 Jur. 827; 15 L. J. Q. B. 235.

[4] R. *v.* Clarke, 3 Burr. 1362.

[5] See Bryant, ex parte, 2 Tyler, 269.

[6] See Mowry, in re, 12 Wis. 52.

[7] Randall *v.* Bridge, 2 Mass. 549.

[8] Yates's case, 4 Johns. 317.

[9] Eden's case, 2 M. & S. 226. Whether return must be sworn to, see Neill, in re, 8 Blatch. 156.

square and direct.[1] It has been held insufficient for the respondent to return, "I had not at the time of receiving this writ, etc., nor have I since had, the body, etc., detained, in my custody."[2] "The general form," said Grose, J., "is that the party has not the person in his possession, custody, or power."[3] And it was held by Chancellor Kent that a return, that the relator "is not in my custody," is evasive; it should be, is not in my "possession or power."[4] The return must show that at the time of the notice of the writ the relator was not in the power or custody of the respondent.[5] A return, however, may be amended, after filing, at the discretion of the court.[6] And when ambiguous, it may be explained and supported by affidavits.[7] But when the return is explicit in denying custody or power of the relator, and is not impugned, the writ should be quashed.[8] And so when the return avers that the relator had been relieved from custody by giving bail.[9]

§ 990. In case the party addressed delays obedience to the writ within three days (to persons resident within twenty miles), according to the statute of Charles II., an attachment will, on application, be granted to compel obedience, without issuing an *alias* and a *pluries* writ,[10] on affidavit of service being made.[11] If the services of the attachment is resisted by superior force, the writ will be placed on the files of the court to be served when practicable.[12]

Writ to be enforced by attachment.

[1] R. *v.* Winton, 5 T. R. 89. See Church on Habeas Corpus, §§ 120 ff.

[2] R. *v.* Winton, 5 T. R. 89.

[3] See Warman's case, 1 W. Bl. 1204; U. S. *v.* Davis, 5 Cranch C. C. 622.

[4] Stacy, in re, 10 Johns. 328.

[5] R. *v.* Wagstaff, Viner's Abr. Hab. Cor. F.; Hurd's Hab. Corp., book ii., c. iii.

[6] R. *v.* Batchelder, 1 P. & D. 516; Watson's case, 9 A. & E. 731.

[7] R. *v.* Roberts, 2 F. & F. 292.

[8] Com. *v.* Kirkbride, 1 Brewst. 541; Com. *v.* Killacky, 3 Brewst. 565.

[9] Territory *v.* Cutler, McCahon, 152.

[10] R. *v.* Winton, 5 T. R. 89; Bosen, ex parte, 2 Ld. Ken. 289; Bank of the United States *v.* Jenkins, 18 Johns. 152; State *v.* Raborg, 2 South. 545; Com. *v.* Reed, 59 Penn. St. 425; People *v.* Bradley, 60 Ill. 390.

[11] State *v.* Raborg, 2 South. 545. Supra, § 984.

That attachment will not be issued, in extradition process, by State judge against federal marshal, see Macdonnell, in re, Davis, J., reported in note to same case, 11 Blatch. 79; cited more fully supra, § 980.

[12] Merryman, ex parte, Taney, 246; Winder, ex parte, 2 Cliff. 89. See Moore, ex parte, 64 N. C. 802; Kerr, ex parte, 64 N. C. 816.

§ 991. Whether a return can be controverted has been much questioned in England. In 1758 the opinions of the judges were given to the House of Lords on the question whether affidavits could be received to contradict such returns; and though the weight of opinion was that this is not, as a rule, admissible, yet, by several of the judges it was conceded that in certain extreme cases, *e. g.*, impressments, the court would permit the relator to show that the return was false.[1] Cases are reported in which this permission has been given;[2] and Lord Denman has intimated that an affidavit that the return was false might be the foundation of a motion to quash it.[3] But where the return is not traversed, it is to be treated as if demurred to by the relator.[4]

Return may be controverted.

In this country, while the rule that a record cannot be impugned applies to all cases in which the record of a court of general jurisdiction is produced as the ground of detention, the court, on hearing a writ of *habeas corpus*, when the object is to review the action of a subordinate or police magistrate, will go into the question of guilt or innocence; will examine as to the grade of guilt when the question is as to bail;[5] and will receive evidence as to identity.[6]

[1] Hurd's Habeas Corpus, 264 *et seq.*; Wilmot's Opinions, 106; 2 How. St. Tr. 1378.

[2] Goldswain's case, 2 W. Black. 1207. See Watson's case, 9 Ad. & E. 731; Gilstrap, ex parte, 14 Tex. 240.

[3] Watson's case, *ut supra*.

So far as concerns the respondent, he will be beyond question permitted to modify and explain his return. Thus it has been held that a federal judge will receive affidavits for the purpose of explaining and enlarging a return made by a State officer who has arrested a federal officer for alleged abuse of power. Jenkins, ex parte, 2 Wall. Jr. 521.

Whether the return may be assailed on other grounds depends on the peculiar exigency of the case. See Smith, ex parte, 3 McLean, 121.

[4] Milburn, in re, 59 Wis. 25. See Church on Habeas Corpus, §§ 166 ff.

[5] 2 Hawk. P. C. c. 15, s. 79. In Pennsylvania the *habeas corpus* act permits the amendment of the return, "and also suggestions made against it, that thereby material facts may be ascertained." Under this clause the courts in that State are in the habit of receiving evidence to determine the fact and the degree of guilt, so as either to discharge absolutely, or to discharge on suitable bail. Res. *v.* Gaoler, 2 Yeates, 258; Com. *v.* Ridgway, 2 Ashm. 247; Com. *v.* Carlisle, Bright. R. 36.

For other cases in which the merits of the charge were gone into, see infra, §§ 1005–7; and see State *v.* Scott, 30 N. H. 274; Powers, in re, 25 Vt. 261; Com. *v.* Harrison, 11 Mass. 63; People *v.* Cassels, 5 Hill N. Y. 164; People *v.*

[6] U. S. *v.* Jung Ah Lung, 124 U. S. 621.

The conflict, in other respects, even on the English rule, may be obviated, by applying to returns the familiar distinction that while a record cannot be assailed by parol except in cases where fraud or want of jurisdiction is set up, it may be explained by parol when obscure or incomplete.[1] Hence, when such a record is produced, it is admissible to show that the court had no jurisdiction of the subject-matter, or that the proceedings were fraudulent.[2] When the case does not rest on the return, then the court may go into the merits.[3] The distinction between our practice and that of England is this: with us, as has been seen, a commitment by a subordinate police magistrate may be opened and the case considered *de novo* by a court of general jurisdiction when hearing the writ; while in England it cannot.[4]

Discharge from defects of process.

§ 992. Arrest, when examined in court on a writ of *habeas corpus*, may be considered in two relations. The first arises when the court sits merely for the purpose of examining the validity of the arrest, and not in exercise of the powers of a justice of the peace. In such cases, if the arrest be on void process, the relator should be discharged.[5] Thus parties against whom no criminal charge is made out, or whom the court on *habeas corpus* has no jurisdiction to arrest *de novo*, have been released from custody under warrants having no seal;[6] and from warrants when the relator is privileged from arrest.[7] But a court, on the hearing of a writ of *habeas corpus*, will not, ordinarily, consider the constitutionality of the law authorizing the arrest. Such

Martin, 1 Park. C. R. 187; People *v.* Tompkins, 1 Park. C. R. 224; though see People *v.* McLeod, 1 Hill, 377; 3 Hill, 658; People *v.* Richardson, 4 Park. C. R. 656; State *v.* Best, 9 Blackf. 11; Mahone *v.* State, 30 Ala. 49. For other cases, see infra, § 1005.

The burden, however, of disproving the allegations of the return is on the relator. Infra, § 1007; Heyward, in re, 1 Sandf. 701, and cases cited 1 Pomeroy's Archbold, 204.

[1] See Whart. on Ev. §§ 980 *et seq.*

[2] Ibid. Supra, § 981; infra, § 994.

[3] People *v.* Martin, 1 Park. C. R. 187; People *v.* Tompkins, Ibid. 224. See State *v.* Scott, 10 Fost. 274.

[4] Newton, ex parte, 13 Q. B. 716.

[5] Conner *v.* Com., 3 Binn. 38; Com. *v.* Murray, 2 Va. Cas. 504; State *v.* Potter, 1 Dudley, 295. As to what constitutes illegality of arrest, see supra, §§ 5 *et seq.* As to privilege from arrest, see supra, § 60.

[6] See Bennett, ex parte, 2 Cranch, 612; State *v.* Drake, 36 Me. 366; Lough *v.* Millard, 2 R. I. 436; Tackett *v.* State, 3 Yerg. 392. See, however, Smith, ex parte, 5 Cow. 273.

[7] Dakins, ex parte, 16 C. B. 77. See Eggington, ex parte, 2 E. & B. 707.

questions, when dependent upon a contested interpretation, are to be reserved for the trial.[1]

The second relation in which writs of *habeas corpus* addressed to arresting officers are to be considered is that which arises when the court sits for the purpose not merely of examining the validity of the arrest, but of also determining whether the relator is *primâ facie* guilty of an indictable offence. If the latter turn out on the hearing to be the case, then the relator must be held to answer on the charge of committing such offence, no matter how outrageously oppressive or illegal may have been the process by which he was arrested.[2] The party arresting may have been guilty of such violence or fraud in the arrest as to require that he also should be held to trial for his misconduct. But this does not affect the relator's responsibility. If a probable case of guilt transpire against him at the hearing, he must be held to trial, even though he were actually kidnapped into court, and though the offence proved is not specifically that charged.[3]

So in case of oppression.

A writ of *habeas corpus* may issue from a superior court to give immediate hearing to a case should there be any undue delay in the action of an inferior court.[4]

Writ may test extradition process.

§ 993. We have already seen that the writ may be issued to test the legality of arrests on extradition process, whether such process come from a sister State or from a foreign State.[5] When the process is from a sister State, under the provision in the federal Constitution, and is regular, a discharge will not be granted, supposing the identity of the party and the genuineness of the record be established.[6] Not only will the court, on hearing the writ, decline to go into the

[1] Harris, in re, 47 Mo. 164.

[2] See supra, §§ 27, 49, 220; infra, § 996.

[3] Supra, § 27; infra, § 996; R. *v.* Goodall, Say. 129; R. *v.* Marks, 3 East, 157; O'Malia *v.* Wentworth, 65 Me. 129; State *v.* Buzine, 4 Harring. 575; Granice, ex parte, 51 Cal. 375; Jones *v.* Timberlake, 6 Rand. 678; State *v.* Killett, 2 Bailey, 289; Brady *v.* Davis, 9 Ga. 73. For other cases see supra, §§ 27 *et seq.*; infra, § 1005.

[4] Supra, § 70.

[5] See Woodhall's case, 20 Q. B. D. 833; Church on Habeas Corpus, §§ 459 ff.

[6] Supra, §§ 35, 37 *a*; Smith, ex parte, 3 McLean, 121; McKean, ex parte, 3 Hughes, 263; People *v.* Brady, 56 N. Y. 182; Bristow, in re, 51 How. Pr. 422; Watson, in re, 2 Cal. 59; White, ex parte, 49 Cal. 434; Hibler *v.* State, 43 Tex. 197; see Doo Woon, in re, 18 Fed. Rep. 898.

In Robinson *v.* Flanders, 29 Ind. 10, it was held that the question of identity was for the demanding State.

merits, but the questions of formal law, connected with the structure of the indictment, will not be considered, this being matter for the courts of the demanding State.[1] The recitals in the warrant of the governor of the asylum State will be treated as true;[2] though notice will be taken of material defects in the warrant.[3] Nor will an arrest by State officials of officers employed in extradition process under the federal Constitution be permitted; and if such arrest be made, the party arrested will be discharged by a federal court.[4] Nor does the writ lie to admit to bail a person under arrest to be carried into another county or State for trial.[5] But when there is an arrest to await a requisition, and after due time the warrant does not arrive, the prisoner will be discharged.[6]

The writ, also, may be granted to test the validity of process of extradition when the demandant is a foreign sovereign;[7] though in such cases the Supreme Court of the United States will not renew technical decisions of commissioners as to admissibility of evidence.[8] That a State court may also intervene in such cases by issuing the writ was at one time claimed;[9] but now the tendency of authority is that in all matters of foreign extradition which relate to federal statutes or treaties, the jurisdiction of the federal courts is exclusive.[10]

[1] Supra, §§ 35 *et seq.*; Davis's case, 122 Mass. 324; Clark, in re, 9 Wend. 212; Voorhees, in re, 32 N. J. L. 141; State *v.* Buzine, 4 Harring. 572; Manchester, in re, 5 Cal. 237.

[2] Supra, § 35; People *v.* Pinkerton, 77 N. Y. 245; see Leary, in re, 10 Ben. 197.

[3] Leland, in re, 7 Abb. N. Y. Pr. (N. S.) 64; Rutter, in re, Ibid. 67. Supra, §§ 35 *et seq.*

[4] Bull, in re, 4 Dill. 323; Jenkins, ex parte, 2 Wall. Jr. 521; Titus's case, 8 Ben. 412; U. S. *v.* McClay, 23 Int. Rev. Rec. 80; and cases cited supra, § 37 *a*.

[5] Gorsline, in re, 10 Abb. N. Y. Pr. 282. Supra, § 35 *a*.

[6] Porter *v.* Goodhue, 2 Johns. Ch. 198 (a State requisition). See other cases supra, §§ 34, 34 *a*.

[7] Atty.-Gen. *v.* Kwok-a-Sing, L. R. 5 P. C. 179; and cases cited supra, §§ 38, 57; see Ker, in re, 18 Fed. Rep. 167; 10 Rep. 580, where it was held that a writ of *habeas corpus* would not issue in a federal court to release a prisoner who was kidnapped in a foreign country and committed by a State court having jurisdiction of the crime charged against him. See 4 Crim. Law Mag. 913; see supra, § 27.

[8] Benson *v.* McMahon, 127 U. S. 457.

[9] Com. *v.* Hawes, 13 Bush, 697.

[10] Supra, § 981; see People *v.* Curtis, 50 N. Y. 321; People *v.* Fisk, 45 How. Pr. 296; reported supra, § 980; Lagrave, in re, 45 How. Pr. 301; Com. *v.* Deacon, 10 S. & R. 125. In Adrian *v.* Lagrave, 59 N. Y. 110, it was held that a State court will not intervene to relieve a party who claims that the extradition process by which he is brought into the State was fraudulently obtained, and does not cover the act for which he is arrested after his arrival in the country.

§ 994. The writ may be made to operate in behalf of a person sentenced by a court without jurisdiction to impose the particular sentence,[1] or detained under a sentence based on information in a federal court for an infamous crime,[2] or detained under a sentence which on its face has expired or is inoperative.[3] In other words, when a sentence is so on its face defective that with it the whole proceeding falls, the prisoner may be released on *habeas corpus;* though, as will presently be seen, for matters within the province of the trial court, the remedy must be by writ of error or motion for a new trial.[4] Nor can

The writ lies for redress under a void sentence.

As to void sentences, see article by Judge Thompson, in 4 Crim. Law Mag. 799.

The inconvenience, if not the unconstitutionality, of the issue of such writs by State judges, in extradition cases, is pointed out by Mr. Buchanan, in letters, when Secretary of State, to Mr. Butler, Dist. Atty. in N. Y., March 23, 1847; Mss. Dom. Let. Dep. of State; and to Mr. Durant, Dist. Atty. in New Orleans, May 20, 1847, Ibid. Mr. Cushing, in 1853, when Attorney-General, denied the right of a State court to take up the case by *habeas corpus* while it was under examination by a commissioner of the United States.

[1] Robinson *v.* Spearman, 3 B. & C. 493; Callicot, ex parte, 8 Blatch. 89; Lange, ex parte, 18 Wall. 163. See People *v.* Bowe, 58 How. (N. Y.) Pr. 174. In Lange, ex parte, 18 Wall. 163, it was held that where a prisoner shows that he is held under a judgment of a federal court, made without authority of law, the Supreme Court of the United States will, by writ of *habeas corpus* and *certiorari*, look into the record so far as to ascertain that fact, and if it is found to be so, will discharge the prisoner. See this case discussed supra, §§ 492, 913. To the same effect see Page, ex parte, 49 Mo. 291; Murray, ex parte, 43 Cal. 455; Bowen, ex parte, 46 Cal. 112; Roberts, ex parte, 9 Nev. 43. Compare supra, § 981. And see Virginia, ex parte, 100 U. S. 339.

[2] Wilson, ex parte, 114 U. S. 417.

[3] Wong Qui, in re, 6 Sawy. 237; State *v.* Glenn, 54 Md. 572; Shaw, ex parte, 7 Ohio St. 81; Howard *v.* People, 3 Mich. 207; Pope, ex parte, 49 Mo. 491; Snyder, ex parte, 64 Mo. 58; Millington, in re, 24 Kan. 214; Roberts, ex parte, 9 Nev. 43; Underwood, in re, 30 Mich. 502; Perry *v.* State, 41 Tex. 488; Gibson, ex parte, 31 Cal. 619. In People *v.* Liscomb, 60 N. Y. 559 (Tweed's case), hereafter discussed, it was held that the clause in the N. Y. Rev. Stat. 568, § 42, prohibiting the review, under a writ of *habeas corpus*, of the "legality and justice of any process, judgment, decree, or execution," does not preclude the court issuing the writ from inquiring whether the court entering the judgment had the power to give such judgment. See, however, criticism, infra, § 996 *b;* supra, §§ 579, 900, 932. And see Kirby *v.* State, 62 Ala. 51; Phillips, ex parte, 57 Miss. 357; Kelly, ex parte, 65 Cal. 154. As to cases of release under cumulative sentences, see supra, § 933.

As to discharge from operation of limitation or pardon, see infra, § 1006.

[4] U. S. *v.* Reed, 100 U. S. 13; 26 Int. Rev. Rec. 11; Wentworth *v.* Alexander,

the averments of a court of record be in this way collaterally impeached, however open they might be to criticism as a writ of error.[1]

§ 995. It has been already noticed that the rule, that the record of a court of general jurisdiction cannot be collaterally impeached unless on ground of want of jurisdiction or fraud applies to the records of such courts when brought up collaterally on a writ of *habeas corpus*. This rule holds in all cases in which the writ is applied for by a party against whom an indictment has been found by a court having jurisdiction. In such case, the question being whether there is probable cause for the prosecution, the indictment (unless impeachable for fraud, or non-identity, or want of jurisdiction) is conclusive proof of such probable cause.[2] *A fortiori* the averments of a sentence of conviction cannot be disputed on a writ of *habeas corpus*, unless under the limitations above given, of fraud, non-identity, or want of jurisdiction.[3] But in any one of these cases the writ may be granted.[4]

Writ cannot overhaul indictment or matters within province of trial court.

66 Ind. 30; Petty, in re, 22 Kan. 477. See infra, § 996.

"If the fine or imprisonment be either less (Shaw, ex parte, 7 Ohio St. 81) or greater (Van Hagan, ex parte, 25 Ohio St. 426) than that prescribed in the statute, the sentence was not void but erroneous, and therefore *habeas corpus* is not, but error to reverse the proceeding or sentence is the remedy." Okey, C. J., Dillen *v.* State, 38 Ohio St. 586. See supra, § 918.

That when the sentence or commitment is void, as resting on an unconstitutional law, the writ lies, see Ah Jou, in re, 20 Fed. Rep. 181; Rollins, ex parte, 80 Va. 314; Brown *v.* Duffus, 66 Iowa, 193; Mato, ex parte, 19 Tex. Ap. 112. (But see Boenninghausen, ex parte, 21 Mo. Ap. 267; 91 Mo. 301.) And so when it is imposed by a court without jurisdiction. Fisk, ex parte, 113 U. S. 713; Snow, in re, 120 U. S. 274; People *v.* Warden, 100 N. Y. 20. And so where the sentence or commitment is on its face void. Barker, in re, 56 Vt. 14; Brainerd, in re, 56 Vt. 495; McLaughlin, in re, 58 Vt. 136; Garvey, ex parte, 7 Col. 384, and cases cited above. And so where the sentence was on an indictment, which was amended after finding it was in conflict with the 5th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. Bain, ex parte, 121 U. S. 1. See supra, § 90.

[1] See infra, § 996.

[2] R. *v.* Bowen, 9 C. & P. 509; McLeod's case, 25 Wend. 483; Semler, in re, 41 Wis. 517; Whitaker, in re, 43 Ala. 323.

[3] Lees, ex parte, E., B. & E. 828; Brenan, in re, 10 Q. B. 492; R. *v.*

[4] That this is the case where the inferior court has no jurisdiction, see Yarborough, ex parte, 110 U. S. 651. That the Supreme Court of the United States can in this way determine the power of an inferior court to try and sentence a prisoner, but cannot review the rulings of such court when having jurisdiction, see Carll, ex parte, 106 U. S. 521.

§ 996. What has just been said rests on the general proposition that where a court of record[1] has jurisdiction, its action, though

Mount, L. R. 6 P. C. 283; Parks, ex parte, 93 U. S. 18; Siebold, ex parte, 100 U. S. 371; Reed, ex parte, 100 U. S. 13; Yarborough, ex parte, 110 U. S. 651; Bogart, in re, 2 Sawy. 369; Riley's case, 2 Pick. 172; Com. *v.* Whitney, 10 Pick. 434; Fleming *v.* Clark, 12 Allen, 191; People *v.* McLeod, 1 Hill N. Y. 377; People *v.* McCormack, 4 Park. C. R. 9; People *v.* Neilson, 16 Hun, 214; Wright, in re, 29 Hun, 357; 65 How. Pr. 119; Dickinson *v.* Byron, 9 S. & R. 71; Com. *v.* Lecky, 1 Watts, 66; Van Hagan, ex parte, 25 Ohio St. 426; Coffeen, in re, 38 Mich. 311; State *v.* Orton, 67 Iowa, 554; Ball, ex parte, 2 Grat. 588; Buddington, in re, 74 N. C. 607; Ray, ex parte, 45 Ala. 15; Sam, ex parte, 51 Ala. 34; Trueman, in re, 44 Mo. 181; Ezell, ex parte, 40 Tex. 451; Murray, ex parte, 43 Cal. 455; Le Bur, ex parte, 49 Cal. 160. Illegality of selection of grand jury cannot be tested on *habeas corpus* after conviction and sentence. State *v.* Fenderson, 28 La. An. 82. Nor can irregularities in the trial be so examined. State *v.* Sheriff, 24 Minn. 87; Ruthven, ex parte, 17 Mo. 541; Max, ex parte, 44 Cal. 579; Granice, ex parte, 51 Cal. 375. See other illustrations, 4 Crim. Law Mag. 803.

On the other hand, it has been ruled that where a petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* avers that the petitioners, being colored persons, have been tried for a capital offence before a State court, by a jury entirely composed of white persons, in contravention of U. S. Rev. Stat. § 641, the Circuit Court of the United States will grant the writ commanding the sheriff of the county to produce the bodies of the petitioners before the court, with a statement of the cause of their detention. Ex parte Reynolds, 3 Hughes, 559. See cases supra, § 981. And so where the offence is against the federal courts, the State courts having no jurisdiction. Bridges, ex parte, 2 Woods, 428.

In Siebold, ex parte, 100 U. S. 371; supra, § 981, it was held that the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States, exercisable by *habeas corpus*, extends to a case of imprisonment upon conviction and sentence in an inferior court of the United States, under and by virtue of an unconstitutional act of Congress, whether this court has jurisdiction to review the judgment by writ of error or not; and that the jurisdiction of this court by *habeas corpus*, when not restrained by some special law, extends generally to imprisonment by inferior tribunals of the United States which have no jurisdiction of the cause, or whose proceedings are otherwise void and not merely erroneous; and such a case occurs when the proceedings are had under an unconstitutional act. It was further held that when the court below has jurisdiction of the cause, and the matter charged is indictable under a constitutional law, any errors committed by the inferior court can only be reviewed by writ of error. See further, infra, § 996 *b*.

In Yarborough, ex parte, 110 U. S. 651, the right of the Supreme Court of the United States in this way to revise the action of a circuit court in case of want of jurisdiction was affirmed; but it was held that technical errors of law could not be in this way corrected. And see People *v.* Kelly, 39 Hun, 536.

[1] That the presumption of regularity does not apply to courts not of record, see Whart. on Ev. § 1308; Whart. Crim. Ev. § 830.

open to revision by appeal or writ of error, cannot be collaterally impeached, unless on proof of fraud.[1] No matter how gross, therefore, may be the mistakes of law or fact by a court of record having jurisdiction in a criminal case, its action cannot be reviewed, subject to the limitations above stated, by a writ of *habeas corpus*.[2] Even an excessive sentence, by a competent court, if not actually inoperative, cannot in this way be rectified. The remedy is writ of error to a court with appellate powers.[3] Nor will the writ be used to control the discretion committed to officers of a prison to modify or ameliorate confinement.[4] Even though the cause of detention be an order of court without judgment, this, if the order be by a court having jurisdiction, will not be reviewed even by a superior court by means of *habeas corpus*.

Writ cannot collaterally correct errors.

[1] See Whart. on Ev. §§ 982–91.

[2] R. *v.* Carlisle, 4 C. & P. 415; Barnes's case, 2 Roll. 157; R. *v.* Elwell, 2 Stra. 794; Coy, in re, 127 U. S. 457; O'Malia *v.* Wentworth, 65 Me. 129; Kellogg, ex parte, 6 Vt. 509; People *v.* Cavanagh, 2 Park. C. R. 650; People *v.* Nevins, 1 Hill, 154; Com. *v.* Leckey, 1 Watts, 66; Com. *v.* Keeper of Prison, 26 Penn. St. 279; Emanuel *v.* State, 36 Miss. 627; Kauffman, ex parte, 73 Mo. 588; Eaton, in re, 27 Mich. 1; Faust *v.* Judge, etc., 30 Mich. 266; Burger, in re, 30 Mich. 203; Crandell, in re, 34 Wis. 177; Semler, in re, 41 Wis. 517; Eldred *v.* Ford, 46 Wis. 530; State *v.* Hennepin Sheriff, 24 Minn. 87; Petty, in re, 22 Kan. 477; Johnson, ex parte, 15 Neb. 512; Winston, ex parte, 9 Nev. 71; Fisher, ex parte, 6 Nev. 309; Twohig, ex parte, 13 Nev. 302; Bergman, ex parte, 18 Nev. 32; Farnham, ex parte, 3 Col. 545; Hartman, ex parte, 44 Cal. 32; Oliver, ex parte, 3 Tex. Ap. 345; McGill, ex parte, 6 Tex. Ap. 498; Boland, in re, 11 Tex. Ap. 159.

That the writ will not lie to overhaul matters within the province of trial court, see U. S. *v.* Reed, 100 U. S. 13; Crouch, ex parte, 112 U. S. 178; Ker, ex parte, 18 Fed. Rep. 167; Byron, in re, Ibid. 722; Bigelow, ex parte, 113 U. S. 328; Harding, ex parte, 120 U. S. 782; People *v.* Kelly, 97 N. Y. 212; People *v.* Walters, 15 Abb. N. Cas. 461; Smith *v.* Hess, 91 Ind. 424; Willis *v.* Bayles, 105 Ind. 363; McGuire *v.* Wallan, 109 Ind. 284; Thompson, ex parte, 93 Ill. 89; State *v.* Orton, 67 Iowa, 554; Hamilton's case, 51 Mich. 174; State *v.* Hayden, 35 Minn. 283; Houser *v.* State, 33 Wis. 678; Milburn, ex parte, 59 Wis. 24; State *v.* Sloan, 65 Wis. 647, 651; Simmons, ex parte, 62 Ala. 416; State, ex parte, 76 Ala. 482; Cameron, ex parte, 81 Ala. 87; State *v.* Sheriff, 37 La. An. 617; Edwards, ex parte, 35 Kan. 99; Fuller, ex parte, 19 Tex. Ap. 241; Moan, ex parte, 65 Cal. 216. That matters of executive discretion cannot be thus reviewed, see Gilson, ex parte, 34 Kan. 641.

[3] Pember's case, 1 Whart. 439; Shaw, ex parte, 7 Ohio St. 81; Lark *v.* State, 55 Ga. 435. See, however, where the sentence is inoperative, supra, § 994.

[4] Com. *v.* Holloway, 42 Penn. St. 446. See Pember's case, 1 Whart. 439.

Thus, where, on an indictment containing several counts, the jury acquitted on some counts but said nothing as to others, it was held in Pennsylvania, by the Supreme Court, that an order of detention by the trial court could not be overhauled by a *habeas corpus* issued by the Supreme Court; but that if an error should occur in the subsequent trial and conviction of the defendant on the counts thus left open, the remedy would be a writ of error.[1] Nor, under the Pennsylvania statute, will the Supreme Court, by writ of *habeas corpus*, grant relief, during the term of a court of quarter sessions, to a person bound over to that term.[2] Nor can the validity of the commissions of *de facto* judges or other officers, having colorable titles, be thus tried.[3] Thus, Chief Justice Chase refused to review, on *habeas corpus*, the sentences of courts of the Confederate States during the late civil war.[4] Nor will the title or procedure of a committing-magistrate be thus examined collaterally, if a probable case of guilt be made out on the merits, and the question be as to such guilt.[5] But, as we have seen, where the sentence is one plainly beyond the jurisdiction of the court imposing it, a writ of *habeas corpus* may be issued by a court having general supervisory jurisdiction (*e. g.*, in England the Queen's Bench), to relieve the prisoner. And this holds where a sentence has expired, or is otherwise inoperative.[6]

Nor will bearing be interrupted.

§ 996 *a*. Unless the case be one of oppression, the hearing on a criminal charge before a committing-magistrate will not be interrupted by a writ of *habeas corpus*.[7]

§ 996 *b*. A distinction is to be noted between errors which can be corrected by appeal or writ of error and errors which can-

[1] Com. *v*. Norton, 8 S. & R. 71.

[2] Com. *v*. Sheriff, 7 W. & S. 108.

[3] Ah Lee, in re, 6 Sawy. 410. See Com. *v*. Fowler, 10 Mass. 290; Sheehan's case, 122 Mass. 445; Strang, ex parte, 21 Ohio St. 610; Boyle, in re, 9 Wis. 284; State *v*. Bartlett, 35 Wis. 287. See 4 Crim. Law Mag. 808. And see Whart. Crim. Law, 9th ed. § 652.

[4] Griffin's case, Chase's Dec. 364; 25 Tex. Sup. See McCrary on Elections, § 221; People *v*. Terry, 108 N. Y. 1; Russell *v*. Whiting, 1 Wins. N. C. 463; Call, ex parte, 2 Tex. Ap. 560; Strahl, ex parte, 16 Iowa, 369.

[5] Supra, § 992; Wakker, in re, 3 Barb. 162; Thompson, ex parte, 93 Ill. 89; Raye, ex parte, 63 Cal. 491; Garst, ex parte, 10 Neb. 78.

[6] Supra, § 994. A conviction based on invalid waiver of jury trial may be thus inquired into. Staff, in re, 63 Wisc. 285. Supra, § 733.

[7] Peoples, in re, 49 Mich. 626.

not be so corrected. Under the old English practice, where there was no writ of error in criminal cases, the courts were led, in cases of imprisonment claimed to be manifestly and grossly erroneous, to hear the question of the validity of such imprisonments on writs of *habeas corpus*. A similar condition exists in our federal courts, in those cases (*e. g.*, prosecutions in circuit or district courts) in which the only mode of obtaining revision is that which depends on the rare contingency of a certified difference of opinion between the judges trying the case. Under such circumstances it was but natural that the writ of *habeas corpus* should be applied for in cases in which a prisoner was held in custody under process which was believed to be in conflict with the Federal Constitution or statutes. The disposition of the Supreme Court of the United States was, for a time, to recognize this distinction so far as to hold that it could revise by *habeas corpus* an "illegal or void" judgment of an inferior Federal court; but more recently the position seems to be taken that where such inferior court has jurisdiction *habeas corpus* is not the remedy.[1] And in any view, where the object is to review the

Distinctive practice in cases in which there is no writ of error.

[1] In Siebold, ex parte, 100 U. S. 371, cited supra, §§ 981, 995, the following is from the opinion of the court given by Bradley, J.:—

"The only gronnd on which this court, or any court, without some special statute authorizing it, will give relief on *habeas corpus* to a prisoner under conviction and sentence of another court is the want of jurisdiction in such court over the person or the cause, or some other matter rendering its proceedings void. *This distinction between an erroneous judgment and one that is illegal or void is well illustrated by the two cases of Ex parte Lange*, 18 Wall. 163, and *Ex parte Parks*, 93 U. S. 18. In the former case we held that the judgment was void, and released the prisoner accordingly; in the latter we held that the judgment, whether erroneous or not, was not void because the court had jurisdiction of the cause; and we refused to interfere." The difficulty here is in the words "illegal *or* void." If a writ of *habeas corpus* can issue to correct *illegal* judgments, then the writ of *habeas corpus* becomes a writ of error. But the distinction taken in the italicised passage between an "erroneous" judgment and one that is "illegal or void" would show that "error" and "illegality" are not regarded as convertible. As conflicting with Lange's case, see Hagen, ex parte, 25 Ohio St. 426.

In Lange, ex parte, above cited (see, also, supra, §§ 780, 913, 988), the discharge was put on the ground of erroneous action of the court below (a district federal court) in amending a sentence after the defendant had been in prison under it for five days. It was held that after a sentence has been in part executed it cannot be amended, and that the amending sentence in such case is a nullity, and the

decision of a State court, the writ of *habeas corpus* will be refused when there can be a writ of error.[1]

defendant is to be released. But to this it may be objected that, if the Supreme Court of the United States can make such error ground of release on *habeas corpus*, the function of releasing prisoners on ground of error of sentence would be vested in every judge to whom the right of issuing a writ of *habeas corpus* belongs. See dissenting opinion of Clifford, J., in Lange's case.

In Siebold, ex parte, 100 U. S. 370, and Clark, ex parte, 100 U. S. 399, it was held that the court on *habeas corpus* could discharge a prisoner convicted under an unconstitutional law; and the same view has been taken in McCarthy *v.* Hinman, 35 Conn. 538; Nitingale, ex parte, 12 Fla. 272; Schwartz, ex parte, 9 Tex. Ap. 381, following other Texas cases. See *contra*, Harris, in re, 47 Mo. 64; Fisher, ex parte, 6 Neb. 309. But, in addition to the objections above stated, it may be here urged that it is essential to the stability of our system that a statute should only be pronounced unconstitutional when directly assailed either in the trial court, or by appeal or writ of error from that court.

The ruling in People *v.* Liscomb, 60 N. Y. 559, has been already criticised in other relations. It may be noticed here that even were that ruling sustainable on other grounds it is open to the serious objection of leaving the sentences of courts having jurisdiction, entered after deliberate consideration and full trial, at the mercy of scratch hearings by single judges with *habeas corpus* jurisdiction. Page, ex parte, 49 Mo. 291, follows People *v.* Liscomb, though in Page, ex parte, there would have been redress by writ of error or appeal. See 19 Cent. L. J. 102.

In Yarbrough, ex parte (1884), 110 U. S. 651, there is a marked withdrawal from the position taken in Lange's case, and it is said by Miller, J., giving what appears to be the unanimous opinion of the court, that "this latter principle" (*i. e.*, that of the right to review by the writ of *habeas corpus* void judgments by subordinate courts) "does not authorize the court to convert the writ of *habeas corpus* into a writ of error, by which the errors of law committed by the court that passed the sentence can be reviewed here; for if that court had jurisdiction of the party and the offence for which he was tried, and has not exceeded its powers in the sentence which it pronounced, this court can inquire no further.

"This principle disposes of the argument made before us on the insufficiency of the indictments under which the prisoners in this case were tried.

"Whether the indictment sets forth in comprehensive terms the offence which the statute describes and forbids, and for which it prescribes a punishment, is in every case a question of law which must necessarily be decided by the court in which the case originates, and is therefore clearly within its jurisdiction.

"Its decision on the conformity of the indictment to the provisions of the statute may be erroneous, but if it is so it is an error of the law made by the court acting within its jurisdiction, which could be corrected on a writ of error, if such writ were allowed, but which cannot be looked into on a writ of *habeas corpus* limited to an inquiry into the existence of jurisdiction on the part of that court.

"This principle is decided Ex parte,

[1] Supra, § 81.

§ 997. The action of a court-martial having jurisdiction will not be reviewed as such on a writ of *habeas corpus*;[1] nor will the proceedings of a court-martial, even when about to sit on a charge of desertion from a voidable enlistment, be overhauled by this writ;[2] nor will that of a military commission when imposed on a prisoner thereto amenable by law;[3]

Military judgments cannot be thus reviewed.

Tobias Watkins, 3 Pet. (U. S.) 203, and Ex parte Parks, 93 U. S. 21."

The objections to the Supreme Court of the United States hearing on *habeas corpus* non-jurisdictional errors are as follows: (1.) If this revision can be assumed by the court in banc (as it has been in the more conspicuous cases above noticed), it can, at common law, be assumed by a single judge; and in this way a single judge, it may be in an inferior court, might review and overturn the action of the full bench of the highest court in the land. (2.) The writ does not bring up the whole record, from which the entire history and limitations of the case may be discovered. All that the return necessarily presents is the warrant or commitment by which the prisoner is held. (3.) The hearing is summary, and unrestrained by those logical limitations which attend bills of exception—limitations which, artificial as they may sometimes seem, are yet the products of a wise experience, and are best calculated in the long run to bring out the merits of a litigated issue. See, as maintaining this view, Judge Thompson's article, above cited, 4 Crim. Law Mag. 806. Shaw, ex parte, 7 Ohio St. 87.

For the reasons given above, Kearney, ex parte, 55 Cal. 212, may be questioned. In that case it was held that the court hearing a writ of *habeas corpus* could release a prisoner convicted by a court of competent jurisdiction on the ground that the offence was not indictable. If this be good law, every judge who has jurisdiction to issue writs of *habeas corpus* becomes a court of error, by which not only all criminal convictions may be reviewed, but the question of what offences are indictable is arbitrarily determined. That the ruling, however, of a court of competent jurisdiction that an offence tried before it is a crime cannot be contested on a writ of *habeas corpus* is settled by a great preponderance of authority.—Parks, ex parte, 93 U. S. 18; Callicott, in re, 8 Blatch. 88; Eaton, in re, 27 Mich. 1; Bird, ex parte, 19 Cal. 130; Wilson, ex parte, 9 Nev. 71.

It was at one time supposed that after a discharge by a district or circuit federal judge on *habeas corpus* there could be no review by the Supreme Court of the United States. See note to Brosnahan, in re, 18 Fed. Rep. 82. But now such an appeal can by statute be taken. U. S. *v.* Jung Ah Lung, 124 U. S. 621; Roberts *v.* Reilly, 116 U. S. 80.

[1] Reed, ex parte, 100 U. S. 13, 23; Keyes *v.* U. S. 104 U. S., 336; Mason, ex parte, 105 U. S. 606; White, in re, 17 Fed. Rep. 723; Com. *v.* Cornman, 4 S. & R. 93; Com. *v.* Gamble, 11 S. & R. 93; People *v.* Fullerton, 10 Hun, 17 N. Y. Sup. Ct. 63. See Coulter, in re, 2 Sawy. 43; Opinions of Judge Advocates, 201.

[2] McConlogue's case, 107 Mass. 154, 170; Wall's case, Lowell, J., 8 Fed. Rep. 85; State *v.* Seaton, 61 Iowa, 999; White, in re, *ut sup.*

[3] See Vallandigham, ex parte, 1 Wall. 243; Vallandigham's trial, 258; 5 West L. Month. 37.

nor that of a naval court-martial.[1] But if a military court or court-martial be without jurisdiction, or with jurisdiction which has ceased, the petitioner will be released.[2] The question of the relief of persons illegally enlisted is considered in another volume.[3]

Nor summary police convictions.

§ 998. Summary convictions duly ordered by a justice of the peace will in like manner be respected. If he has statutory power so to convict, a court of errors will not review his decision, unless fraud or oppression be alleged.[4]

Nor committals for contempt.

§ 999. A committal for contempt, by a court having authority, cannot ordinarily be vacated by a writ of *habeas corpus* issued from another court.[5] This rule has been applied to commitments by federal courts for contempt when the writ was prayed for from a State court; and this independently of the question whether the federal court had jurisdiction of the principal case.[6] But where an inferior court transcends the statutory limits in a committal for contempt (*e. g.*, when the statute limits to thirty days, and the commitment is for an indefinite period), or in other cases of transcending jurisdiction, there may be a reviewal by *habeas corpus*;[7] and so where the commitment is on its

[1] Bogart, in re, 2 Sawy. 396.

[2] Barrett *v.* Hopkins, 2 McCrary, 129.

[3] Whart. Cr. L. §§ 267, 268.

[4] Chancellor Kent, in refusing a writ in a case of summary conviction by a police magistrate, said: "It is not for me to examine into the legality or regularity of the conviction any further than to see that the magistrate had competent jurisdiction to convict and imprison in the given case. . . . . I am only to exercise the power given me by the Habeas Corpus Act, and without that I should rather be inclined to think this court had no common law jurisdiction over the subject-matter. The conviction and imprisonment in this case are *prima facie*, good and valid in law, and that is sufficient upon this collateral inquiry. They must be held valid, until quashed or reversed in the regular course of appeal, by the appropriate tribunal." Matter of Goodhue, 1 City Hall Rec. 153. As to arrests for vagrancy, see supra, § 80.

[5] Supra, § 974 *a*; Clark, ex parte, 2 Q. B. 619; Andrews, ex parte, 4 C. B. 226; Cobbett, in re, 7 Q. B. 187; Carus Wilson, in re, 7 Q. B. 984; Crawford, in re, 13 Q. B. 613; Kearney, ex parte, 7 Wheat. 345; State *v.* Towle, 42 N. H. 540; Kearney's case, 13 Abb. N. Y. Pr. 459; People *v.* Cassels, 5 Hill N. Y. 164; Rob. *v.* McDonald, 29 Iowa, 330; Perry, in re, 30 Wis. 268; Cohn, ex parte, 55 Cal. 193; Cottrell, ex parte, 59 Cal. 420; Phillips *v.* Welch, 12 Nev. 158.

Nor will the writ lie to discharge a person from imprisonment for non-payment of fine for refusing to testify. Smith, ex parte, 117 Ill. 63.

[6] Williamson's case, 26 Penn. St. 9. See Williamson *v.* Lewis, 39 Penn. St. 9; 4 Crim. Law Mag. 802.

[7] Dakins, ex parte, 16 Q. B. 77; Fisk, ex parte, 113 U. S. 713; Ayers, in re, 123 U. S. 443; Shank's case, 15 Abb. N. Y. Pr. N. S. 38; Holman *v.* Mayor, 34 Tex. 668; State *v.* Sauvinet, 24 La. An. 119.

face defective.[1] And a federal court may review a State commitment for contempt when clashing with a federal duty.[2]

§ 1000. The ordinary mode of instituting a prosecution, as we have seen, is an oath by the party injured, or by a competent third party in any way cognizant of the facts, before a magistrate or justice of the peace having jurisdiction. The party charged is then arrested and brought before the magistrate, by whom, after the case is heard, the defendant, if the evidence in the magistrate's opinion shows probable cause, is held to answer to the court having local jurisdiction to try the offence.[3] The defendant is then in custody; *i. e.*, either in the custody of the officers of the law conducting him to prison, or of the keeper of the prison, or of his own bail. A writ of *habeas corpus* may then be sued out by the defendant addressed to the person by whom he is detained, and he is then brought by this person before the court issuing the writ. Supposing the object be, as is assumed in the present section, to determine whether there is sufficient proof to hold the defendant for trial, the court issuing the writ then proceeds to hear the evidence adduced by the prosecution. The case, for this purpose, begins *de novo*. The prosecution is not limited to the evidence produced before the committing magistrate. New documentary proof may be adduced; new witnesses may be called; new specifications of guilt introduced. The question before the court, on such writ, is not whether the magistrate acted with technical exactness, but whether the evidence, as presented to the court, shows that the defendant should be required to answer before a court and jury to a charge of a criminal offence. If this be the case, the defendant will be remanded to custody to answer such charge. It has been sometimes suggested that if there be a conflict of testimony, the court, on hearing the writ, should call a jury to its aid; and such has been the practice under some statutes.[4] But the usual

Court determines question of fact.

[1] Electoral College, in re, 1 Hughes, 571, cited supra, § 981; People *v.* Conner, 15 Abb. N. Y. Pr. N. S. 430; Dudley *v.* McCord, 65 Iowa, 671; Dill, ex parte, 32 Kan. 668. See supra, § 981. In Grady *v.* Superior Court, 64 Cal. 154, it was held that after discharge by a second court, the court committing could not re-imprison.

[2] Supra, § 981.

[3] See supra, §§ 6 *et seq.* As to practice, see Church on Habeas Corpus, §§ 177 ff.

[4] See Graham *v.* Graham, 1 S. & R. 331; but *contra*, Baker *v.* Gordon, 23 Ind. 20.

course is for the court to act on the facts presented in the same way as would a committing magistrate hearing the case *de novo*. If the facts on the hearing exhibit a *primâ facie* case of guilt of any offence of which the court has cognizance, the defendant should be remanded, but otherwise not.[1] And it is proper that the court should call for all the facts requisite for a due understanding of the issue.[2]

The question of the prisoner's identity with that of the party named in the writ is always open.[3]

Probable cause enough.

§ 1001. When, as has been just said, the question is whether the defendant should be bound over to trial, it is enough that probable cause should be made out against him. That this is the test in hearings before committing magistrates,[4] and in investigations before grand juries,[5] we have already seen; and it would be anomalous to require a higher degree of proof on hearing on *habeas corpus*. The object of the writ, in fact, in most cases falling within the category now before us, is to determine whether the case is one which should go before a grand jury; and the test, therefore, to be applied is whether the grand jury, on the evidence before the court, ought to find the bill. If there is probable cause in the evidence before the court, that the defendant has committed an indictable offence, then he should be remanded to answer such offence.[6]

Court not bound to exclude on technical grounds.

§ 1002. When the question of probable cause is thus brought before the court, it is not bound to apply to evidence the strict exclusionary rules applied in trials before juries. The proceedings are provisional; the prosecution at least is compelled to present its case on very brief notice; *probability* is the test; it is enough if there is probable proof, though still stronger proof may be attainable, if the latter is not

[1] Infra, § 1001; supra, §§ 71, 361; R. *v.* Carden, L. R. 5 Q. B. D. 1; 1 Crim. Law Mag. 197.

[2] Ibid. Supra, § 565.

[3] Leary, in re, 10 Ben. 197; U. S. *v.* Jung Ah Lung, 124 U. S. 621.

[4] Supra, § 71.

[5] Supra, § 361. See Church on Habeas Corpus, §§ 179 ff.

[6] Marshall, C. J., in Burr's case, supra, § 55; U. S. *v.* Johns, 4 Dall. 413; Benson *v.* McMahon, 127 U. S. 451; Com. *v.* Carlisle, Bright. R. 36; Com. *v.* Megary, 8 Phil. 607. See, however, Balcom, in re, 12 Neb. 316. But that a federal court will not review the decision of a commissioner on questions of fact, see Byron, in re, 18 Fed. Rep. 722. Cf. Gerdemann *v.* Com., 11 Phila. 374.

fraudulently withheld; and, in addition, the analogy of chancery practice, in which all testimony is offered to the court for inspection, irrespective of technical objection may be invoked.[1]

Remitting evidence by *certiorari*.

§ 1003. A justice of the peace or other committing magistrate is required in England to take the depositions of witnesses examined before him in criminal prosecutions, and to forward these depositions to the court to whom the case is returned. In New York, and other States, the same practice is prescribed. The writ of *habeas corpus* does not by itself require the return of such depositions, and consequently in order to obtain them, the court issuing the writ of *habeas corpus* issues at the same time a writ of *certiorari* to the magistrate, so as to obtain possession of all his proceedings. In England the practice of the court on *habeas corpus* is to read these proceedings as part of the case.[2] In most jurisdictions in the United States the case is heard *de novo* on the testimony produced by the prosecution. In several jurisdictions the writ of *certiorari* is used as auxiliary to the writ of *habeas corpus* when the object is to obtain possession of the entire record.[3]

Affidavits may be received.

§ 1004. In the English courts the practice has been to receive affidavits as part of the case both of relator and respondent.[4] In this country affidavits have also been received,[5] though not when secondary to other proof that might without great inconvenience be obtained.[6]

[1] Benson *v.* McMahon, 127 U. S. 457; Heywood, in re, 1 Sandf. 701; State *v.* Lyou, Coxe N. J. 403. That the waiver of the preliminary examination does not preclude the defendant from showing want of probable cause, see Cowell *v.* Patterson, 49 Iowa, 514.

[2] Bac. Abr. Certiorari, A.; Hurd's Habeas Corpus, b. ii. c. vi. s. 5; Van Boven's case, 9 Q. B. 676.

[3] Supra, §§ 770, 981; Snell, in re, 31 Minn. 110.

[4] Hurd's Habeas Corpus, 307; R. *v.* Delaval, 3 Burr. 1434; 1 W. Black. 412.

[5] Bollman, ex parte, 4 Cranch C. C. 75; Burr's Trial, i. 97; People *v.* Chegaray, 18 Wend. 637; State *v.* Lyon, Coxe N. J. 403.

[6] Ibid. In Burr's case, Marshall, C. J., said: "That a magistrate may commit upon affidavits has been decided in the Supreme Court of the United States, though not without hesitation. The presence of the witnesses to be examined by the committing justice, confronted with the accused, is certainly to be desired; and ought to be obtained, unless considerable inconvenience and difficulty exist in procuring his attendance. An ex parte affidavit, shaped, perhaps, by the party pressing the prosecution, will always be viewed with some suspicion, and acted on with some caution; but the court thought it would be going too far to reject it altogether."

For merely formal defects or variance, court will not discharge.

§ 1005. For merely formal defects, or misstatements of offence, a revisory court will not discharge on *habeas corpus*.[1] It will permit, as we have seen, the return to be amended; or it will, in the exercise of the powers belonging to justices of the peace, hold the relator over on the charge which the evidence develops.[2]

Discharge from pardon, or statute of limitations.

§ 1006. The writ may be employed to effect the discharge of a person under sentence to whom a pardon has been addressed, if he is still restrained of his liberty;[3] or is relieved from imprisonment by operation of statutes of limitation.[4] In such case, however, it must appear that the State authorities were in default in not previously instituting the prosecution, or bringing the case to trial.[5] Nor does the writ apply to a person out on bail.[6]

Discharge from want of probable cause; adjustment of bail.

§ 1007. Courts with oyer and terminer and quarter sessions jurisdiction have ordinarily the power of issuing writs of *habeas corpus* for the purpose of examining commitments by police magistrates; and if it appear that the commitment is without probable cause of discharging absolutely.[7] Such revisory courts, also, can readjust and reduce bail, or discharge on bail in cases in which discretion in this respect is not given to police magistrates. The local laws in this respect, as existing in different sections of the United States, it is not within our limits to detail. The practice as to bail has been already noticed. To justify a discharge in such cases the prosecution must be shown to be without probable cause.[8] As a general proposition, the writ

[1] People *v.* Baker, 89 N. Y. 460.

[2] Supra, §§ 991–2; Bollman, ex parte, 4 Cranch C. C. 75; Bennett, ex parte, 2 Cranch C. C. 612; U. S. *v.* Johns, 4 Dall. 413; Bank U. S. *v.* Jenkins, 18 Johns. 305; People *v.* Nevins, 1 Hill, 154; Taylor, ex parte, 5 Cow. 12; Com. *v.* Crans, 4 Penn. L. J. 459; 2 Clark, 172; Com. *v.* Hickey, 2 Pars. 317; S. C., 1 Clark, 436; State *v.* Buzine, 4 Harring. 575; Ring, in re, 28 Cal. 247; Ricard, ex parte, 11 Nev. 287.

[3] See Callicot, in re, 8 Blatch. 89; Greathouse's case, 2 Abb. U. S. 382; People *v.* Cavanaugh, 2 Park. C. R. 650; Edymoin, in re, 8 How. N. Y. Pr. 478; Knapp *v.* Thomas, 39 Ohio St. 377.

[4] State *v.* Maurignos, T. U. P. Charlton, 24. See supra, § 449.

[5] Clark *v.* Com., 29 Penn. St. 129; Logan *v.* State, 2 Brev. 415; Byrd *v.* State, 2 Miss. 163; Stanley, ex parte, 4 Nev. 113; see supra, §§ 328, 583.

[6] Logan *v.* State, 1 Treadw. S. C. Const. 493.

[7] See Eagan, ex parte, 18 Fla. 194; State *v.* Ensign, 13 Neb. 250.

[8] Troia, in re, 64 Cal. 152.

lies to determine the grade of bail, in all cases in which the court applied to has supervisory jurisdiction of the offence.[1] But there will be no discharge on bail when the evidence would sustain a capital conviction.[2]

Whether after an indictment found a writ will be granted to determine the amount of bail has been much discussed. It has been argued on the one side that the indictment is conclusive as to the amount of bail.[3] On the other hand, it is well replied that indictments are not conclusive as to grade of offences, since the indictment is usually for the major offence, when the major includes a minor, while the guilt may be only that of the minor offence. If the offence is bailable, it is further argued, it is for the court to fix the bail at its discretion.[4] The tests to be applied in the determination of the amount of bail have been already discussed.[5]

§ 1008. The judgment must be either discharge or remander. A conditional judgment that an examining magistrate must either

[1] Supra, § 81; Barronet, in re, 1 E. & B. 1; Dears. C. C. 51; R. *v.* Bartlemy, Dears. C. C. 60; U. S. *v.* Hamilton, 3 Dall. 17; State *v.* McNab, 20 N. H. 160; Jones *v.* Kelly, 17 Mass. 116; Whiting *v.* Putnam, 17 Mass. 175; People *v.* Cole, 6 Park. C. R. 695; State *v.* Rockafellow, 1 Halst. 332; Com. *v.* Ridgeway, 2 Ashm. 247; Champion, ex parte, 52 Ala. 311; Finch *v.* State, 15 Fla. 633; Snowdon *v.* State, 8 Mo. 483. In Bridewell, ex parte, 56 Miss. 39; aff. Wray, ex parte, 30 Miss. 681, it was held that under a constitutional provision that "excessive bail shall not be required, and all persons shall, before conviction, be bailable by sufficient sureties, except for capital offences where the proof is evident or the presumption great," there is no prohibition against admitting to bail a defendant charged with a capital crime; but he may be so admitted to bail within the sound discretion of the trial judge. Where, in such case, it was further held, a well-founded doubt of guilt is entertained, the proof is not evident, nor the presumption great, and bail should be granted. In such cases the burden is on the relator to show that he is illegally deprived of his liberty, and all available evidence should be produced, even if the hearing should be adjourned. Compare Street's case, 43 Miss. 1. That the burden is on the relator, see further Duncan, ex parte, 54 Cal. 75, cited infra; Miller *v.* State, 43 Tex. 579; Walker, ex parte, 3 Tex. Ap. 668; and compare points stated supra, §§ 76–81.

[2] Com. *v.* Keeper of Prison, 2 Ashm. 227; Troia, in re, 64 Cal. 152.

[3] Marshall, C. J., 1 Burr's Trial, 310; U. S. *v.* Reese, 3 Wash. C. C. 224; People *v.* Dixon, 4 Park. C. R. 651; People *v.* Tinder, 19 Cal. 539.

[4] State *v.* McNab, 20 N. H. 160; People *v.* Hyler, 2 Park. C. R. 570; Lynde *v.* People, 38 Ill. 497; Bryant, ex parte, 34 Ala. 270; Street *v.* State, 43 Miss. 1; Drury *v.* State, 25 Tex. 45. See supra, §§ 76–81.

[5] Supra, §§ 76 *et seq.* See Ex parte Duncan, 54 Cal. 75.

Judgment must be either discharge or remander.

commit the prisoner at once, or fully discharge him, cannot be sustained.[1]

During hearing custody is in court of writ.

§ 1009. The effect of the writ being to place the custody of the relator in the court issuing the writ, it is the duty of that court to see to his safe keeping. This is done by either remanding the relator to the keeper of the prison, if he were there confined, or placing him under the control of the sheriff or marshal of the court.[2]

Writ of error not permissible at common law: proceedings in error.

§ 1010. In England the action of the court on a writ of *habeas corpus* cannot be revised on error;[3] and the same rule has been repeatedly sustained in this country.[4] But in cases where irremediable injury may be done by the action of the court below, such action partaking of the nature of a final judgment, there is authority to hold that error lies.[5] And in most States appellate process is in such cases provided by statute;[6] in others, the case may be taken up to an appellate court by *certiorari*.[7] That some process of revision should be provided is essential. Otherwise a single judge, by writs

[1] People *v.* Donahue, 21 N. Y. Sup. Ct. 133.

[2] R. *v.* Bethel, 5 Mod. 22; Kaine, in re, 14 How. 132. As to the question of general custody, see supra, § 984.

[3] 8 Co. R. 121 *b*; R. *v.* Dean, 8 Mod. 27; 2 Bro. P. C. 554; Wilson's case, 7 Ad. & El. 984.

[4] Wyeth *v.* Richardson, 10 Gray, 240; Yates *v.* People, 6 Johns. 429 (though see *contra*, Yates *v.* People, 6 Johns. 337); Russell *v.* Com., 4 Pen. & W. 82; Clark *v.* Com., 29 Penn. St. 129; Com. *v.* Kryder, 1 Pennp. 143; Bell *v.* State, 4 Gill, 304; Hammond *v.* People, 32 Ill. 446; Thompson, ex parte, 93 Ill. 89; Curley, in re, 34 Iowa, 184; Wade *v.* Judge, 5 Ala. 18; Howe *v.* State, 9 Miss. 690; Jilz, ex parte, 64 Mo. 205; Mitchell, ex parte, 1 La. An. 313; Coopwood, ex parte, 44 Tex. 467; Ring, in re, 28 Cal. 347. See Fouts *v.* Pierce, 64 Iowa, 71.

[5] Holmes *v.* Jennison, 14 Pet. 540; Wells, ex parte, 18 How. 307; Robinson, ex parte, 6 McLean, 360; Lafonta, ex parte, 2 Robert. La. 495. See Knowlton *v.* Baker, 72 Me. 200.

In Thompson, ex parte, 96 Ill. 158, where it was held that a writ of error does not lie in Illinois to review a judgment on a writ of *habeas corpus*.

[6] See Macready *v.* Wilcox, 33 Conn. 321; Roth *v.* House of Refuge, 31 Md. 329; State *v.* Kirkpatrick, 54 Iowa, 373; Cleveland, ex parte, 36 Ala. 306; Rothschild, ex parte, 2 Tex. Ap. 566. As to practice in error see People *v.* Hessing, 28 Ill. 410. The rule in respect to the federal courts has been elsewhere discussed. Supra, § 57. As to the Michigan practice see Corrie *v.* Corrie, 42 Mich. 509.

[7] Hurd, Hab. Cor. 326; McLeod's case, 1 Hill, 377; Com. *v.* Biddle, 6 Penn. La. J. 287; 4 Clark, 35. Ex parte, La Fonta, 2 Rob. La. 495; Crow, in re, 60 Wis. 349, where the cases are examined in detail.

of *habeas corpus*, could not only discharge every prisoner in the State, but prevent the service of any judicial process requiring attachment of the person. Under our peculiar federal system, the judgments of State courts on *habeas corpus*, can, when conflicting with the federal constitution, be the subject of a writ of error to the Supreme Court of the United States.[1]

By the Act of March 3, 1885, an appeal was given from a final decision in *habeas corpus* of a circuit court to the Supreme Court of the United States; but this decision must be by the court and not by the judge sitting as a judge.[2] That a refusal by a district judge to issue a writ is ground for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States.[3] And a rightful discharge by a circuit judge will be sustained on appeal.[4]

How far discharge affects subsequent arrest.

§ 1011. When a court of competent jurisdiction has refused to discharge on *habeas corpus*, a court with concurrent jurisdiction may decline to issue a writ on the same case, unless there be an allegation of new facts.[5] It has also been held that if, after a discharge by one judge, the relator should be rearrested, he should be discharged when brought before another judge with coördinate powers.[6] But a discharge on a writ of *habeas corpus* (when the question is whether there is probable cause to hold over for trial) is no bar, in law, to subsequent proceedings for the same offence.[7] As a matter of courtesy or convenience, a judge may say, "This case has been heard already by a coördinate judge, who has remanded or discharged the relator,

[1] Tarble's case, 13 Wal. 397. See comments in § 996 *b*.

[2] Carter *v.* Fitzgerald, 121 U. S. 87; U. S. Jung Ah Lung, 124 U. S. 621. Supra, § 996 *b*.

[3] See Snow, in re, 120 U. S. 274. Supra, § 994.

[4] Wildenhus's case, 120 U. S. 6. As to rulings prior to act of 1885, see Tom Tong, ex parte, 108 U. S. 556; Hung Hung, ex parte, Id. 552; Brosnahan, in re, 18 Fed. Rep. 62, and note; S. C., 4 McCrary, 1.

[5] Lawrence, ex parte, 5 Binn. 304; Com. *v.* Wetherold, 2 Clark, 476. See Miller *v.* State, 43 Tex. 579. As to Georgia practice, see Perry *v.* McLendon, 62 Ga. 598.

[6] Ibid. See Da Costa, in re, 1 Parker C. R. 129; People *v.* Brady, 57 N. Y. 182; Com. *v.* McBride, 2 Brewst. 545.

[7] People *v.* Brady, 56 N. Y. 182; Walker *v.* Martin, 43 Ill. 508; Mitchell, ex parte, 1 La. An. 413. See Eldridge *v.* Fancher, 3 Thomp. & C. 189; People *v.* Fancher, 1 Hun, 27. *Contra*, under Missouri statute, Jilz, ex parte, 64 Mo. 205, where it was held that *autrefois acquit* could be pleaded in such cases.

and I will not go over the same ground."[1] But should a grand jury find a bill in such case, or an information, if an information be proper, be presented, the discharge would be no bar. To constitute such a bar there must be a formal acquittal or conviction of a court having jurisdiction.[2]

A more difficult question, however, arises in cases where the discharge is for error in sentence, and when the court imposing the sentence re-arrests. It has been maintained by a majority of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin that such second arrest is irregular and invalid.[3] But great practical difficulties are in the way of the maintenance of this rule. After a conviction had been sustained by the Supreme Court of a State, the defendant could be discharged on *habeas corpus* by a single judge without, on such a theory, the opportunity of revision or re-arrest; and the same confusion would arise in case one judge should undertake to discharge persons committed by another judge for contempt.[4] The only way of escaping such difficulties is by giving a writ of error in *habeas corpus* to the Supreme Court of the State, just as in cases of *habeas corpus*, conflicting with the federal constitution, there is a writ of error to the Supreme Court of the United States.

[1] See Alexander, ex parte, 14 Fed. Rep. 680; Kittrell, ex parte, 20 Ark. 499.

[2] Supra, §§ 436 *et seq.*

[3] Crow, in re, 60 Wis. 349.

[4] See Gundy *v.* Fresno, 64 Cal. 155. Supra, § 996; and argument in note to supra, § 996*b*.

TABLE OF CASES.

A.

SECTION

Aaron *v.* State, 39 Ala. 75 447, 709
v. State, 40 Ala. 308 916
Abbey, State *v.* 29 Vt. 60 238, 241
Abbott, Com. *v.* 13 Met. 120 666, 810
State *v.* 11 Foster, 434, 238, 239
State *v.* 20 Vt. 537 237
Abel's case, 12 Kan. 451 963
Abernethy *v.* State, 78 Ala. 411 275
State *v.* Busb. 438 283
Ableman *v.* Booth, 21 How. 506 980
Abrahams, State *v.* 6 Iowa, 117 296
Abram *v.* State, 4 Ala. 272 497, 605
v. State, 25 Miss. 589 95
Absence, State *v.* 4 Port. 397 231
Achey *v.* State, 64 Ind. 56 845
Ackerson, State *v.* 25 N. J. L. 209 967
Acosta, People *v.* 10 Cal. 195 844, 889
Adams *v.* Barrett, 5 Ga. 404 260
Com. *v.* 7 Met. 50 180
Com. *v.* 1 Gray, 481 124, 125
Com. *v.* 4 Gray, 27 125
Com. *v.* 6 Gray, 359 418
Com. *v.* 7 Gray, 43 266, 291
Com. *v.* 127 Mass. 15 737, 742, 760
ex parte, 25 Miss. 883 974
in re, 7 Law Rep. 386 31
v. Moore, 2 Selw. N. P. 934 13
v. People, 1 Comst. 173; 1 Den. 190 422
v. People, 47 Ill. 376 815, 819, 831, 866
v. People, 109 Ill. 444 591, 801
People *v.* 17 Wend. 475 125
State *v.* 14 Ala. 486 442
State *v.* 2 Battle's Dig. 729 142
v. State, 52 Ga. 565 292
v. State, 65 Ga. 516 328
State *v.* 20 Iowa, 486 692
State *v.* 20 Kans. 311 602, 707, 834
State *v.* 31 La. An. 717 251, 865
State *v.* 78 Me. 486 158
State *v.* 6 N. H. 533 238
v. State, 3 Ohio St. 412 810

SECTION

Adams *v.* State, 29 Ohio St. 415 812
State *v.* 11 Oregon, 169 677
v. State, 10 Tex. Ap. 677 813
v. Woods, 2 Cr. 336 316
Adcock's case, 8 Grat. 662 328
Addington, State *v.* 2 Bailey, 516 533
Addison, State *v.* 2 S. C. 356 366
Addy, State *v.* 43 N. J. L. 113 913
Adler *v.* State, 35 Ark. 517 779 *b*
Adriance *v.* Lagrave, 59 N. Y. 110 27, 38, 993
Adwards, People *v.* 5 Mich. 22 464
Agnew *v.* Commis., 12 S. & R. 94 383
Ah Cha, ex parte, 40 Cal. 426 752
Ah Chew, State *v.* 16 Nev. 50 238
Ah Chung, People *v.* 54 Cal. 398 665
Ah Fong, People *v.* 12 Cal. 345 715
Ah Hop, People *v.* 1 Idaho, N. S. 698 700
Ah Jow, in re, 20 Fed. Rep. 181 994
Ah Kow *v.* Nunan, 5 Sawy. 552 920
Ah Lee, in re, 6 Sawy. 410 981, 996
Ah Lee, State *v.* 8 Or, 214 707
Ah Loy, People *v.* 10 Cal. 301 813
Ah Sam, People *v.* 41 Cal. 645 900
Ah Sing, People *v.* 59 Cal. 400 711
Ah Ton, People *v.* 53 Cal. 741 804
Ah Wee, People *v.* 48 Cal. 236 560
Ah Woo, People *v.* 28 Cal. 205 162, 181
Ah Ye, People *v.* 31 Cal. 451 751
Ahearne, R. *v.* 6 Cox C. C. 6 698
Ahl, Com. *v.* 43 Penn. St. 53 528, 532
Aholtz *v.* People, 121 Ill. 563 813
Abibol *v.* Beniditto, 2 Taunt. 401 119
Aichinson, People *v.* 7 How. Prac. Rep. 241 612
Aickless, R. *v.* 1 Leach, 294 533
Ailstock, Com. *v.* 3 Grat. 650 132, 273
Ainsworth *v.* Sessions, 1 Root, 175 881
State *v.* 11 Vt. 91 471, 475
Albany Bk. *v.* Schermerhorn, 9 Paige, 372 974
Albin *v.* State, 63 Ind. 599 711, 798 *a*
State *v.* 50 Mo. 419 385
Albright *v.* Lapp, 26 Penn. St. 99 963, 965

	SECTION
Alden *v.* State, 18 Fla. 187	369
Aleck, People *v.* 61 Cal. 137	408
Alexander *v.* Com., 105 Penn. St. 423	517
ex parte, 1 Low. 530	37 *b*
ex parte, 14 Fed. Rep. 680	1011
State *v.* 66 Mo. 148	830, 847
State *v.* 76 N. C. 231	522, 523
v. State, 21 Tex. Ap. 406	470, 473
Alford, State *v.* 31 Conn. 40	566
v. State, 8 Tex. Ap. 545	6, 13
Alfred *v.* State, 37 Miss. 296	640
v. State, 2 Swan, 581	642
Alibez, People *v.* 49 Cal. 452	468
Allegne, R. *v.* Arch. C. P. 160	772
Allen *v.* Colby, 47 N. H. 544	26
v. Com., 2 Bibb, 210	279
v. Com. 2 Leigh, 727	457, 752
ex parte, 12 Nev. 87	982
People *v.* 5 Denio, 76	220
v. People, 82 Ill. 610	220
R. *v.* 1 B. & S. 850	383, 443
R. *v.* 1 C. & K. 495	210
R. *v.* 17 L. T. N. S. 222	7
R. *v.* R. & R. 513	935
State *v.* 1 Ala. 442	421
v. State, 68 Ala. 98	244
v. State, 71 Ala. 5	716
State *v.* 74 Ala. 557	169
State *v.* 46 Conn. 531	501, 672
State *v.* 2 Humph. 258	33
v. State 12 Lea, 424	220
v. State, Mart. & Y. 294	913
v. State, 61 Miss. 627	350
State *v.* 83 N. C., 650	358 *a*
State *v.* R. M. Charlton (Ga.), 518	183, 213, 372, 759
v. State, 77 Ill. 484	358
v. State, 54 Ind. 461	733
v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 28	90
State *v.* 8 W. Va. 680	279
v. State, 5 Wis. 329	93, 134
v. State, 46 Wis. 383	777
v. Taylor, 26 Vt. 599	108
Allison *v.* Com., 99 Penn. St. 17	634
v. Farmers' Bank, 6 Rand. 233	453
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 402	578, 590
State *v.* 3 Yerg. 428	305
Almeida, U. S. *v.* Wh. Prec. 1061–2	151, 221
Almon, State *v.* 64 N. C. 364, 495	520, 726
Alphin *v.* State, 81 N. C. 566	890
Alphonse *v.* State, 34 La. An. 9	664

	SECTION
Alsopp's case, 11 Blatch. 129	46
Alston *v.* State, 41 Tex. 39	754
Alviso, People *v.* 55 Cal. 230	733
Ambler, State *v.* 56 Vt. 35	672
Ambrose *v.* State, 6 Ind. 351	440
Ames, Rollins *v.* 2 N. H. 350	627
State *v.* 1 Mo. 372	155
State *v.* 10 Mo. 743	146
Amherst *v.* Hadley, 1 Pick. 38	886
Amidon, State *v.* 58 Vt. 524	90
Ammons, ex parte, 34 Ohio St. 518	34 *a*
State *v.* 3 Murph. 123	203
Amos *v.* State, 73 Ala. 498	810, 811, 812
Amsbry *v.* Hinds, 48 N. Y. 57	320
Amy, U. S. *v.* 14 Md. 152, note	442
Amy Warwick, The, 2 Spr. 143; S. C., 2 Black, 635	939
Anderson *v.* Dunn, 6 Wheat. 204	964
v. George, 1 Burr. 352	852
People *v.* 44 Cal. 65	578, 810
People *v.* 53 Mich. 60	591
R. *v.* 2 M. & R. 469	194, 464
v. State, 65 Ala. 553	752
v. State, 34 Ark. 257	716
State *v.* 2 Bailey, 565	813, 819, 824
v. State, 43 Conn. 514	866–8
v. State, 20 Fla. 381	137
v. State, 14 Ga. 709	646, 844
v. State, 63 Ga. 675	661
State *v.* 5 Harring. 493	635
v. State, 28 Ind. 22	588
State *v.* 104 Ind. 467	810
State *v.* 40 Iowa, 207	953
State *v.* 30 La. An. 557	87, 88, 957–9
State *v.* 26 Minn. 66	189
State *v.* 89 Mo. 300	465, 896
State *v.* 4 Nev. 265	838, 844
v. State, 5 Pike, 445	279, 354
v. State, 3 Pinn. 367	700
State *v.* 3 Rich. 172	102, 117, 254
State *v.* 26 S. C. 599	693
State *v.* 3 S. & M. 751	785
v. State, 8 Tex. Ap. 542	860
U. S. *v.* 17 Blatch.	338
U. S. *v.* 8 Reporter, 677	139
Andrews, Com. *v.* 2 Mass. 409	518
Com. *v.* 3 Mass. 126	252
Com. *v.* 97 Mass. 543	548, 774
Com. *v.* 132 Mass. 263	297, 464, 738
ex parte, 4 C. B. 226	999

	SECTION
Andrews *v.* People, 117 Ill. 195	293, 358
R. *v.* 2 D. & L. 10	77
State *v.* 29 Conn. 100	833, 836
State *v.* 27 Mo. 267	472, 482
State *v.* 76 Mo. 101	453
v. State, 2 Sneed, 550	546, 549, 874
U. S. *v.* 2 Paine, 451	220, 282
Androscoggin *v.* Richard, 41 Me. 234	24
Angel *v.* Com., 2 Va Cas. 231	162, 251
Angell, State *v.* 7 Ired. 27	104
Anglea *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 698	528
Anon., 6 C. & P. 408	118
1 Cr. & Dix C. C. 152	191
31 Me. 592	383, 548, 774 *a*
3 Salk. 68	82
Anschicks *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 524	833
v. State, 45 Tex. 148	602
Anthes, Com. *v.* 5 Gray, 185	810
Anthony, Com. *v.* 2 Metc. (Ky.) 399	773
v. State, 29 Ala. 27	221
State *v.* 1 McCord, 285	279
U. S. *v.* 11 Blatch. 200	810, 812
Antle, State *v.* 6 Tex. Ap. 202	87
Antonio, People *v.* 27 Cal. 404	745
Antz, U. S. *v.* 4 Woods, 174; 16 Feb. Rep. 119	344
Apgar, People *v.* 35 Cal. 389	465
Appar *v.* Woolston, 43 N. J. L. (14 Vroom, 65)	383
Applegate, State *v.* 2 McCord, 110	963
Arbintrode *v.* State, 67 Ind. 267	413
Arces, People *v.* 32 Cal. 49	669
Arden, State *v.* 1 Bay, 487	312, 917
Arguelle's case, Wh. Con. of L. 941	38
Arlen *v.* State, 18 N. H. 563	771
Armendares *v.* State 10 Tex. Ap. 44	846
Armington, State *v.* 25 Minn. 29	672
Armistead *v.* State, 43 Ala. 340	709, 796 *a*
Armstead *v.* Com., 11 Leigh, 657	631, 636, 793
Armstrong's case, 13 Wall. 154	522, 525, 528
Foundry, 6 Wall. 766	528
Armstrong, Com. *v.* 7 Gray, 49	472
v. People, 70 N. Y. 38	293
U. S. *v.* 5 Phil. R. 273	162, 228, 251
Armstrong *v.* U. S. 13 Wall. 154	522, 525, 528
Arnold *v.* Com., 80 Ky. 300	961
People *v.* 40 Mich. 710	711, 798 *a*
People *v.* 46 Mich. 268	464
v. People, 75 N. Y. 663	577, 779
Res. *v.* 3 Yeates, 417	161
v. State, 51 Ga. 144	754
v. State, 9 Tex. Ap. 435	653
State *v.* 50 Vt. 731	90
v. Steeves, 10 Wend. 514	7
Arrington, State *v.* 3 Murph. 571	518
Arscott, R. *v.* 6 C. & P. 408	187
Arthur *v.* Craig, 48 Iowa, 264	533
State *v.* 2 Dev. 217	612
Arwo, U. S. *v.* 19 Wall. 486	139
Arwood *v.* State, 59 Ga. 391	869
Asbury, State *v.* 26 Tex. 82	321
Ash *v.* State, 81 Ala. 76	238–9
Ashman, Com. *v.* 3 Grant, 436	783 *a*
Ashnauer, People *v.* 47 Cal. 98	354
Ashton, Com. *v.* 125 Mass. 384	156, 183, 188, 189, 251
Atchison R. R. *v.* Franklin, 23 Kan. 74	517
U. S. *v.* 16 Fed. Rep. 853	970
State *v.* 3 Lea, 729	254
Athens Armory, U. S. *v.* 35 Ga. 315	522
U. S. *v.* 35 Ga. 344	528
Atkins, Com. *v.* 136 Mass. 160	251
v. State, 16 Ark. 568	522, 664, 828
v. State, 69 Ga. 595	700
v. State, 11 Tex. Ap. 89	589, 869
State *v.* 42 Vt. 252	181 *a*
Atkinson *v.* R. 3 Bro. P. C. 517	925
v. R. C. & M. 325	196
R. *v.* 2 Ld. Ray. 1248; 11 Mod. 78	940
R. *v.* 2 Mood. C. C. 215	186
R. *v.* 1 Salk. 382	301
State *v.* 9 Humph. 677	451
State *v.* 75 N. C. 519	711
State *v.* 93 N. C. 519	813
v. State, 19 Tex. Ap. 462	113
Attorney-Gen. *v.* Good, McCl. & Y. 286	794
v. Kook-a-Sing, L. R. 5 P. C. 179	993
Augustine, State *v.* 29 La. An. 119	470
State *v.* 20 Tex. 450	878
Austin, Com. *v.* 7 Gray, 51	629, 666, 810

SECTION

Austin, People *v.* 1 Park. C. R. 154 294
R. *v.* 4 Cox C. C. 385 373
R. *v.* 1 C. & K. 621 323
R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 796 293
v. State, 11 Mo. 366 405
v. State, 12 Mo. 393 48
v. State, 42 Tex. 355 844
State *v.* 6 Wis. 205 750
Autey, R. *v.* Dears. & B. 294; 7 Cox C. C. 329 192
Avery *v.* Hoole, Coop. 825 6
v. People, 11 Ill. Ap. 332 87
v. State, 26 Ga. 233 520
U. S. *v.* 13 Wall. 251 387
Axt, State *v.* 6 Iowa, 511 369
Ayer, State *v.* 3 Foster, 301 244, 836, 844, 847
Ayers, in re, 123 U. S. 443 999
Ayers *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap 450 899
(*See* Ayres.)
Aylesbury, R. *v.* Holt, 84 78
Aylett *v.* Jewel, 1 W. Blac. 1299 847
R. *v.* 6 A. & E. 247; 1 T. R. 63 92, 120
Ayrault *v.* Chamberlain, 33 Barb. 229 570
Ayres *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 368 711
(*See* Ayers.)
Ayrs *v.* State, 5 Cold. (Tenn.) 26 358

B

Babb *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 173 878
Babcock, State *v.* 1 Conn. 401 814, 815, 819, 823, 846
Baber, State *v.* 74 Mo. 292 641, 683
Babson, U. S. *v.* 1 Hare, 450 940
Bach, State *v.* 25 Mo. Ap. 554 251
v. State, 38 Ohio St. 664 886
Bachman *v.* People, 8 Col. 472 902
Backus, People *v.* 5 Cal. 275 518, 815, 823, 848
Bacon, State *v.* 17 S. C. 58 8
State *v.* 7 Vt. 219 164
State *v.* 41 Vt. 526 703
v. Town, 4 Cush. 234 447
Bader, U. S. *v.* 4 Woods, 189 279
Badgely, People *v.* 16 Wend. 531 176
Badger, R. *v.* 4 Q. B. 468 76
Bagg, R. *v.* 1 Rolle R. 79 203
Bailey, Com. *v.* 1 Mass. 62 167
Com. *v.* 78 Va. 19 220
R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 264 108
R. *v.* 2 Str. 1211 386
v. State, 26 Ga. 579 465
State *v.* 32 Kans. 83 220, 672, 730
State *v.* 21 Mo. 484 131

SECTION

Bailey *v.* State, 4 Oh. (N. S.) 440 295
v. State, 11 Tex. Ap. 140 452
State *v.* 1 Wins. (N.C.) 197 794
Baillie, R. *v.* 8 Cox C. C. 238 586
Bain, ex parte, 121 U. S. 1 90, 994
v. State, 70 Ala. 4 696
State *v.* 112 Ind. 335 463
Bainbridge *v.* State, 30 Oh. St. 264 294, 481
Bainton, R. *v.* 2 Str. 1088 385
Bakeman, Com. *v.* 105 Mass. 53 464, 471
Com. *v.* 131 Mass. 577 249, 755
Baker *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 353 774
v. Gordon, 23 Ind. 20 1000
People *v.* 1 Cal. 403 847
People *v.* 3 Hill, 159 295
v. People, 105 Ill. 402 153, 303, 772
People *v.* 89 N. Y. 460 1005
People *v.* 3 Parker, C. R. 181 602
v. State, 39 Ark. 180 700
v. State, 15 Ga. 498 646
State *v.* 30 La. An. 1134 664
State *v.* 13 Lea, 338 595
State *v.* 34 Me. 52 126
State *v.* 50 Me. 45 120, 146
State *v.* 19 Mo. 683 785
State *v.* 20 Mo. 338 376
State *v.* 63 N. C. 276 836
State *v.* 70 N. C. 530 291, 292
v. State, 12 Oh. St. 214 447
v. State, 4 Pike, 56 285
State *v.* 4 Reding, 52 120
v. State, 4 Tex. Ap. 243 845
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 332 167, 173
Balbo, People *v.* 19 Hun, 424; 80 N. Y. 484 27, 631, 632
Balcom, in re, 12 Neb. 316 1001
Baldwin's case, 2 Tyler, 473 348
Com. *v.* 129 Mass. 481 56
State *v.* 1 Dev. & B. 198 386
v. State, 12 Neb. 61 351
State *v.* 80 N. C. 390 660
Baldy, State *v.* 17 Iowa, 39 841
Bales *v.* State, 63 Ala. 30 639, 658
1500, U. S. *v.* 16 Pitts. L. J. 130 528
Ball's case, 8 Leigh, 726 518, 791, 863
ex parte, L. R. 10 Ch. D. 167; 40 L. T. N. S. 141 453
Ball, People *v.* 42 Barb. 324 121
People *v.* 14 Cal. 101 218
Ballard, State *v.* 2 Murph. 186 158
U. S. *v.* 3 McLean, 469 318, 946 *a*

SECTION

Ballew *v.* Alexander, 6 B. Mon. 38 453
Ballou, Com. *v.* 124 Mass. 26 163, 251
Balt, R. *v.* 6 C. & P. 329 253
Balt. & Ohio R. R. *v.* Wheeling, 13 Grat. 40 974
Bancroft, State *v.* 22 Kan. 170 652, 844
Bangenauer, People *v.* 40 Cal. 613 785
Bangor, State *v.* 38 Me. 592 759
Bangs *v.* State, 61 Miss. 363 578, 810
Bank *v.* Flanders, 4 N. H. 239 453
v. Hart, 3 Day, 491 660
v. Withers, 6 Wheat. 106 913
Banks *v.* State, 78 Ala. 14 354
State *v.* 10 Mo. Ap. 111 577
Baptiste, State *v.* 26 La. An. 134 531
Barada *v.* State, 13 Mo. 94 918
Barbee, State *v.* 93 N. C. 498 396
Barber, R. *v.* 1 C. & K. 442 302, 315, 576
v. Slack, 13 Fla. 675 601
v. State, 13 Fla. 675 689
v. State, 50 Md. 161 239, 240, 261
State *v.* 89 N. C. 524 816, 817
v. State, 39 Ohio St. 660 245, 742
Barbour *v.* State, 37 Ark. 61 716
Barge *v.* Com., 3 Pen. & W. 262 405, 406, 421, 486
Barham, State *v.* 82 Mo. 67 853
Barhart, People *v.* 58 Cal. 402 577
Barker, in re, 56 Vt. 14 994
v. People, 3 Cow. 686 490, 920
People *v.* 60 Mich. 277 649
State *v.* 18 Vt. 195 239, 240
Barkman *v.* State, 8 Eng. 703 112
Barksdale *v.* Toomer, 2 Bailey, 180 804
Barlow *v.* State, 2 Blackford, 115 661, 837, 844, 846
Barnard, Com. *v.* 6 Gray, 488 142, 146
v. State, 19 Conn. 399 164
State *v.* 34 La. An. 395 651, 674, 682
Barnes *v.* State, 20 Conn. 232 251
State *v.* 5 Lea, 598 338
State *v.* 29 Me. 561 387
State *v.* 32 Me. 530 477
Barnett, People *v.* 13 Ab. N. Y. Pr. 8 982
v. People, 54 Ill. 325 464, 465
v. State, 54 Ala. 579 161, 383
State *v.* 3 Kans. 250 120
Barney, Com. *v.* 10 Cush. 480 146
v. State, 12 Sm. & M. 68 341, 344

SECTION

Barnhart, U. S. *v.* 10 Sawyer, 491; 6 Cr. Law Mag. 201 442
Barnhouse *v.* State, 44 Ind. 255; 31 Ohio St. 39 125
Barnum, R. *v.* 1 Cr. & D. 147 237
Baron *v.* People, 1 Parker C. R. 246 771
Barran, R. *v.* Jebb, 245 237
Barret, People *v.* 1 Johns. 66; 2 Caines, 305 139, 457, 507, 512
Barrett *v.* Hopkins, 2 McCrary, 129 997
People *v.* 2 Caines, 304 447
R. *v.* 9 C. & P. 387 466
R. *v.* Jebb, 106 508
v. State, 35 Ala. 406 520
State *v.* 54 Ind. 434 406
State *v.* 8 Iowa, 536 602
State *v.* 42 N. H. 466 760
Barron *v.* People, 73 Ill. 256 344
v. State, 23 Tex. Ap. 462 798
Barronet, in re, 1 El. & Bl. 1 75, 1007
R. *v.* Dears. 51 81, 82
Barrowski, State *v.* 11 Nev. 119 733
Barry, Com. *v.* 124 Mass. 325 219
Barthelemy, R. *v.* Dears. C. C. 60 75, 1007
Bartlett *v.* Humphreys, Hardin, 513 358
R. *v.* 2 M. & R. 362 187
State *v.* 55 Me. 200 206
v. State, 28 Ohio St. 669 781
State *v.* 35 Wis. 287 996
Barton, R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 141 181
v. State, 67 Ga. 633 549
v. State, 67 Ga. 653 543, 549
State *v.* 32 La. An. 278 324
State *v.* 19 Mo. 227 814
State *v.* 71 Mo. 491 641
v. State, 21 Tex. Ap. 500 163 *a*
U. S. *v.* 20 Blatch. 349, 351 396
Bartz, People *v.* (Mich. 1884) 8
Bass, R. *v.* 2 C. & K. 822 61
State *v.* 82 N. C. 570 725
Basseman, State *v.* 54 Conn. 89 159 *a*
Basset *v.* U. S., 9 Wall. 89 913
Bassett *v.* State, 34 La. An. 1108 209
Batchelder *v.* Moore, 42 Cal. 412 968
U. S. *v.* 2 Gall. 15 220
Bates's case, 55 N. H. 325 969
Bates *v.* State, 31 Ind. 72 221, 231
v. State, 12 Tex. Ap. 26, 139 90, 409
v. U. S. 11 Biss. 70 177
Batre *v.* State, 18 Ala. 119 810
Batterson *v.* State, 63 Ind. 410 842

SECTION

Battiste, U. S. *v.* 2 Sumn. 243 805, 810
Battle, State *v.* 7 Ala. 259 513
v. State, 54 Ala. 93 350, 447, 672
Bauer, People *v.* 37 Hun, 407 918
Baum *v.* Clause, 5 Hill, N. Y. 196 521
Baxter *v.* People, 3 Gilm. 368 644, 693, 839
Bayaud, U. S. *v.* 15 Rep. 200, 520; 21 Blatch. 217, 287 164, 167, 255, 414
Bayliss *v.* People, 46 Mich. 221 414
Bayonne, State *v.* 23 La. An. 78 104, 111
Baysinger *v.* State, 77 Ala. 60 477
Baza, People *v.* 53 Cal. 690 742
Beadon, State *v.* 17 S. C. 55 159
Beak *v.* Thyrwhit, 3 Mod. 194; 1 Show. 6 437
Beal, ex parte, L. R. 3 Q. B. 382 469
Beale *v.* Com., 25 Penn. St. 11 780, 843, 927
Beall *v.* State, 39 Miss. 715 75
Bealoba, People *v.* 17 Cal. 389 546
Beam *v.* Link, 27 Mo. 261 378, 379, 380
Beaman, Com. *v.* 8 Gray, 497 209
Bean, Com. *v.* 14 Gray, 52 760
State *v.* 77 Me. 486 246, 383, 384
State *v.* 21 Mo. 269 752, 771, 927
State *v.* 36 N. H. 122 860, 873
State *v.* 19 Vt. 530 119, 173, 771
Beanny, R. *v.* R. & R. 416 237
Beard, R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 142 370
State *v.* 1 Dutch. 384 386
Beasley *v.* People, 89 Ill. 571 238, 241, 295, 296, 298
v. State, 18 Ala. 535 280
v. State, 32 La. An. 1162 766
Beasly, State *v.* 21 W. Va. 777 32
v. State, 2 Yerg. 481 922
Beaton, State *v.* 79 Me. 314 126
Beaty *v.* State, 82 Ind. 228 295
Beatty, People *v.* 14 Cal. 566 350
Beauchamp *v.* State, 6 Blackf. 299 92
Beavers *v.* State, 58 Ind. 530 591, 772
Bebee *v.* People, 5 Hill, 32 733, 814
Bechtell, Com. *v.* 1 Am. L. J. 414 93
Beck *v.* State, 65 Ga. 766 869
Becker *v.* State, 8 Oh. St. 391 238, 846
Beckley, Com. *v.* 3 Met. 330 761
Beckman, State *v.* 57 N. H. 174 220
Beckwith, People *v.* 108 N. Y. 67 632
State *v.* 1 Stew. 318 120, 123
Bedee *v.* People, 73 Ill. 320 507
Bedell, ex parte, 20 Mo. Ap. 125 920
v. Powell, 13 Barb. 184 566
Bedford *v.* State, 5 Humph. 553 813
Beebe, State *v.* 83 Ind. 171 87

SECTION

Beebe, State *v.* 17 Minn. 241 379, 560
Beebee, ex parte, 2 Wall. Jr. 127 969
Beere, R. *v.* 2 M. & Rob. 472 508
Beerman, U. S. *v.* 5 Cranch C. C. 412 470
Began's case, 12 R. I. 309 153
Beheimer, State *v.* 20 Oh. St. 579 465
Behler *v.* State, 22 Ind. 345 918
Behm, State *v.* 72 Iowa, 533 127
Behrent, in re, 22 Fed. Rep. 699 53
Beigler, People *v.* 3 Parker C. R. 316 81
Belcher, People *v.* 58 Mich. 325 6, 215
State *v.* 13 S. C. 4, 59 819, 845
Belden, State *v.* 33 Wis. 120 465
Belgard *v.* Morse, 2 Gray, 406 81
Belk, State *v.* 76 N. C. 10 3, 5, 756
Bell, ex parte, 2 Grat. 588 995
ex parte, 56 Miss. 282 925 *a*
v. Com., 8 Grat. 600 386
Penn. *v.* Addison, 171 284
v. State, 44 Ala. 393 517, 733
v. State, 48 Ala. 684 465, 466, 896
v. State, 42 Ind. 335 470
State *v.* 49 Iowa, 440 120, 865
State *v.* 3 Ired. 506 146, 283
State *v.* 27 Md. 675 293, 295
State *v.* 27 Mo. 324 906
State *v.* 81 N. C. 591 495, 509
v. State, 1 Swan (Tenn.), 42 203
Bellamy *v.* Pippin, 74 N. C. 46 847
Belton, R. *v.* 1 Salk. 372 386
Belville, State *v.* 7 Baxt. 548 158
Ben *v.* State, 22 Ala. 9 251, 254, 468, 469, 470, 696
Benedict, in re, Pamph. 1862 979
Benfield *v.* Petrie, 3 Douglas, 24 870
R. *v.* 2 Burr. 983 254, 285, 286, 302, 469
Benge, State *v.* 61 Iowa, 658 876
Benham, State *v.* 7 Conn. 414 468, 471
Benner, State *v.* 64 Me. 267 378, 844
U. S. *v.* Bald. 234 59
Bennet, People *v.* 37 N. Y. 117 91
Bennett, Com. *v.* 8 Leigh, 745 862
Com. *v.* 118 Mass. 452 158, 191
ex parte, 2 Cranch, 612 992
in re, 25 How. Pr. 149 980
in re, 11 Law J. Rep. 488 45
v. People, 52 Cal. 380 852
People *v.* 65 Cal. 267 750
People *v.* 49 N. Y. 137 706, 810, 812
People *v.* 4 Paige, 282 970
v. State, 13 Ark. 694 813
State *v.* 4 Dev. & Bat. 44 923

	SECTION
Bennett *v.* State, 8 Humph. 118	369, 771
v. State, 3 Ind. 167	283, 847
v. State, 30 Tex. 513	940
v. State, 24 Wis. 57	846
v. State (57 Wis.), 4 Crim. Law Mag. 398	429 *a*
v. State, 2 Yerg. 472	405
v. U. S., 16 Blatch. 338	749, 750
U. S. *v.* 17 Blatch. 357	167, 285
Benoit, State *v.* 16 La. An. 273	522
Benson, in re, 34 Fed. Rep. 647	53
v. McMahon, 127 U. S. 457	993, 996, 1001, 1002
People *v.* 52 Cal. 381	561
v. State, 68 Ala. 544	369
Benthall, State *v.* 82 N. C. 663	159, 189 *a*
Benton *v.* State, 30 Ark. 328	707
State *v.* 2 Dev. & Bat. 196	612, 637, 654, 656, 670, 689, 693, 791
Bentz, State *v.* 11 Mo. 27	306 *a*
Benus, State *v.* 51 Mich. 422	555, 556, 913
Berens, R. *v.* 4 F. & F. 842	561, 570
Bergh's case, 16 Abb. Pr. N. S. 266	367, 956
Bergman, ex parte, 18 Nev. 332	996
State *v.* 6 Oregon, 341	251, 440
Berkeley, State *v.* 92 Mo. 41	595
v. State, 4 Tex. Ap. 122	548
Berliner, State *v.* 6 Tex. Ap. 181	414
Bernard, R. *v.* 1 F. & F. 240	417, 560
Bernasconi *v.* Farebrother, 3 B. & Ad. 372	784
Berriman, R. *v.* 5 C. & P. 601	109, 118
Berry, Com. *v.* 1 Gray, 93	452
v. People, 36 Ill. 223	440
R. *v.* 13 Cox C. C. 189	417
R. *v.* 4 Term R. 217	203
v. State, 65 Ala. 117	457, 465
v. State, 10 Ga. 511,	577, 733
State *v.* 21 Mo. 504	314, 940
State *v.* 62 Mo. 595	397
Bertin, State *v.* 24 La. An. 46	707
Bertrand, R. *v.* L. R. 1 P. C. 520	790
Bescher *v.* State, 32 Ind. 480	515, 929
Besset, in re, 6 Q. B. 481	978
Bessette *v.* State, 101 Ind. 86	577
Best, State *v.* 9 Blackf. 1	991
Bethel *v.* Com., 80 Ky. 526	709
R. *v.* 5 Mod. 20	922, 1009
Bethuram *v.* Black, 11 Bush. 628	986
Betsall, State *v.* 11 W. Va. 703	589
Betton, Com. *v.* 5 Cush. 427	369
Bibb, State *v.* 68 Mo. 286	173
Bibbs, State *v.* 19 La. An. 76	318
Bickley *v.* Com., 2 J. J. Marsh. 572	974
Bicksley, U. S. *v.* 1 Mackey, 341	712, 902
Biddle, Com. *v.* 6 Penn. L. J. 289; 4 Clark, 35	1010
Bielby, State *v.* 21 Wis. 204	254
Bigelow, ex parte, 113 U. S. 328	996
Biggins, People *v.* 65 Cal. 564	404, 710
Biggs, ex parte, 64 N. C. 202	953, 958, 969
v. People, 8 Barb. 547	151, 166
Bigham, State *v.* 59 Miss. 529	440, 451
Bill *v.* People, 14 Ill. 432	798
Billingheimer *v.* State, 32 Ohio St. 435	238
Billingslea *v.* State, 68 Ala. 486	344
Bingham *v.* Dickie, 5 Taunt. 814	119
Bingley, R. *v.* 5 C. & P. 602	202
Binney, Com. *v.* 133 Mass. 571	246
Binns *v.* State, 35 Ark. 118	823
v. State, 38 Ind. 277	591
Birch, ex parte, 3 Gilm. 449	522
R. *v.* 1 Leach, 79	184
Birchard, Booth *v.* 4 Wis. 67	842
Bird, ex parte, 24 Ark. 275	75
ex parte, 19 Cal. 130	996 *b*
R. *v.* 5 Cox C. C. 11	82
R. *v.* 12 Cox C. C. 257	90, 219
R. *v.* T. & M. 437; 2 Den. C. C. 94; 2 Eng. L. & E. 448	249, 261, 464, 465, 466, 481, 486
v. State, 18 Fla. 493	824
v. State, 14 Ga. 43	802
v. State, 50 Ga. 585	358, 696
v. State, 53 Ga. 602	350
v. State, 55 Ga. 317	712
State *v.* 1 Mo. 417	813
Birdsall, Com. *v.* 69 Penn. 482	291, 292, 910
Birdsong *v.* State, 47 Ala. 68	608, 661, 693
Birdwell, State *v.* 36 La An. 859	651
Birkett, R. *v.* R. & R. 251	187
Birm. & Glou. R. R. Co. R. *v.* 3 Ad. & El. N. S. (3 Q. B.) 223; 9 C. & P. 478	100, 110, 404
Birmingham, State *v.* 1 Bush. 120	456, 461
Bishop, R. *v.* Andr. 220	386
v. State, 9 Ga. 121	804
v. State, 55 Md. 138	197
State *v.* 15 Me. 122	98, 106, 424
State *v.* 73 N. C. 44	754

SECTION

Bishop, State *v.* 98 N. C. 773 252
v. State, 43 Tex. 390 794
Bissell, in re, 40 Mich. 63 950
Bissott *v.* State, 53 Ind. 408 602
Bivens *v.* State, 6 Eng. (Ark.) 455, 465 716
Bixbe *v.* State, 6 Ohio, 86 680
Bixby *v.* State, 15 Ark. 395 866
Bixler, State *v.* 62 Md. 354 220
Black *v.* State, 36 Ga. 447 457, 785
State *v.* 31 Tex. 560 102, 117
Blackburn, Com. *v.* 1 Duvall, 4 464
R. *v.* 3 C. & K. 330; 6 Cox C. C. 333 575
Blackman, State *v.* 35 La. An. 483 504
v. State, 67 Ga. 76 798
Blackson, R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 43 293
Blackwelder, State *v.* 1 Phill. (N. C.) 38 547
Blackwell, State *v.* 9 Ala. 79 383, 447
State *v.* 10 S. C. 35 956, 967
Blair *v.* Com., 25 Grat. 850 522
Com. *v.* 126 Mass. 40 566, 779
Blaisdell, State *v.* 33 N. H. 388 523
v. State, 59 N. H. 329 435 *a*
Blake, in re, 2 M. & S. 428 986
v. Millspaugh, 1 Johns. 316 631
People *v.* 54 Mich. 239 770
Blakeley, State *v.* 83 Mo. 359 91
Blalock, State *v.* Phil. N. C. 242 525, 526, 531
Blan, State *v.* 69 Mo. 317 253, 301, 771, 801
Bland *v.* State, 2 Cart. (Ind.) 608 869, 916
Blandford *v.* State, 10 Tex. 627 49
v. State, 10 Tex. Ap. 627 421
Blaney, Com. *v.* 133 Mass. 571 247, 742
Blasdell *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 263 238
Blatchly *v.* Moser, 15 Wend. 215 453
Bleasdale, R. *v.* 2 C. & K. 765 470, 474
Bledsoe *v.* Com., 6 Rand. 673 588, 592, 793
Bleese, State *v.* 1 McMul. 472 220
Blennerhasset, State *v.* 1 Walk. 7 453, 866
Bliss, Com. *v.* 1 Mass. 32 599 *a*
R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 773 111
Block, U. S. *v.* 15 Bank. Reg. 325; 4 Sawy. 211 89
Blodgett *v.* Race, 18 Hun, 132 1
v. State, 3 Ind. 403 113, 156
State *v.* 50 Vt. 142 566
U. S. *v.* 35 Ga. 336 344, 345, 366, 683
Bloodworth, State *v.* 94 N. C. 918 240

SECTION

Bloom's case, 53 Mich. 597; 19 N. W. Rep. 200 932
Bloomer *v.* State, 3 Sneed, 66 36
v. State, 48 Md. 521 443
Bloomgart, U. S. *v.* 2 Benedict, 356 73
Bloomington *v.* Heiland, 67 Ill. 278 541
Blue, State *v.* 84 N. C. 807 746–756
Blumenberg *v.* State, 55 Miss. 528 90
Blumenthal, Com. *v.* Whart. Prec. 528 164
Blyth, State *v.* 1 Bay, 166 453
Blythe *v.* State, 4 Ind. 525 559
Boardman *v.* Gore, 15 Mass. 331 453
R. *v.* 2 M. & R. 147 185
Bodine, People *v.* 1 Denio, 281 620, 631, 654, 658, 676, 677, 682, 689, 693, 791, 793, 844
People *v.* 1 Edm. (N. Y.) Sel. Cas. 36 672
People *v.* 7 Hill N. Y. 147 602
Bodington *v.* Harris, 1 Bing. 187 852
Bodle, R. *v.* 6 C. & P. 186 565
Boenninghausen, ex parte, 21 Mo. Ap. 267; 91 Mo. 301 994
Bogart, in re, 2 Saw. 369 695, 997
People *v.* 36 Cal. 245 176, 218
Bohan, State *v.* 15 Kans. 407 602
Bohanan *v.* State, 15 Neb. 209 423, 693
v. State, 18 Neb. 57 465, 853
Bohannon *v.* State, 14 Tex Ap. 271 589, 601
Boland, in re, 11 Tex. Ap. 159 996
Bolen *v.* State, 26 Ohio St. 371 781
Boles *v.* State, 24 Miss. 445 344, 350
v. State, 9 S. & M. 284 712
v. State, 13 S. & M. 463 823
v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 650 291, 299
Bollig, ex parte, 31 Ill. 88 922
Bollman, ex parte, 4 Cranch C. C. 75 1004, 1005
Boltz, R. *v.* 8 D. & R. 65; 5 B. & C. 329, 335 548, 550
Bonahan *v.* Nebraska, 125 U. S. 692 774 *a*
Bond *v.* Cutler, 7 Mass. 205 865
R. *v.* 1 Den. C. C. 517 208
v. State, 17 Ark. 290 733
v. State, 23 Tex. Ap. 180 711
Bonds *v.* State, Mart. & Yerg. 143 92
Bone, State *v.* 7 Jones N. C. 121 613, 623, 637
Bonker *v.* People, 37 Mich. 5 565
Bonnell, State *v.* 64 Ind. 498 183, 740
Bonner *v.* State, 67 Ga. 510 547
Bonneville *v.* State, 53 Wis. 680 220, 669, 839, 846
Bonney, People *v.* 19 Cal. 426 754, 819
People *v.* 22 Cal. 348 815
State *v.* 34 Me. 389 168, 169, 176

SECTION

Bonsall *v.* State, 35 Ind. 460 464
Bonwell, State *v.* 2 Harring. 529 191, 635, 654
Boody *v.* Keating, 4 Me. 164 453
Book, U. S. *v.* 2 Cranch. C. C. 294 460
Boon *v.* State, 1 Kelley, 618 646
State *v.* 80 N. C. 461 684, 711
v. State, 42 Tex. 237 802
Booth *v.* Birchard, 4 Wis. 67 842
v. Com., 5 Met. 535 910, 911
in re, 3 Wis. 1 984
U. S. *v.* 21 How. 507 37 *a*
Bootyman, R. *v.* 5 C. & P. 301 703
Bordeaux, State *v.* 93 N. C. 560 370
Boren *v.* State, 23 Tex. Ap. 28 738
Borger, U. S. *v.* 19 Blatch. 249 417
Bork, People *v.* 31 Hun, 360 779 *a*
v. People, 78 N. Y. 346 773
People *v.* 96 N. Y. 188 928
Borroum, State *v.* 25 Miss. 203 344, 350
Borum *v.* State, 66 Ala. 468 244
Boscowitch, People *v.* 20 Cal. 436 954
Bosen, ex parte, 2 Ld. Ray. 289 990
Bostock *v.* State, 61 Ga. 635 707, 762
v. State, 10 Tex. Ap. 705 851
Bost. & W. R. R. Co. *v.* Dana, 1 Gray, 83 453
Boston R. R., Com. *v.* 35 Mass. 383 738
Boswell *v.* State, 20 Fla. 869 466
v. State, 111 Ill. 47 447
Bosworth, Com. *v.* 113 Mass. 200 438
Com. *v.* 22 Pick. 397 802
State *v.* 54 Conn. 1 474
Botto *v.* State, 26 Miss. 108 148
Botts *v.* Williams, 17 B. Mon. 687 29
Boudreaux, State *v.* 14 La. An. 88 762
Boulton, R. *v.* 1 Den. C. C. 508; 2 C. & K. 917 191
Bourne, R. *v.* 7 Ad. & E. 58 780, 918
Bouvier, ex parte, 12 Cox C. C. 303 49
in re, 27 L. J. N. S. 844 49
Boverlin, State *v.* 30 Kan. 611 154, 200
Bowden, Com. *v.* 9 Mass. 494 501, 725
State *v.* 71 Me. 89 845
v. State, 1 Tex. Ap. 137 447
Bowditch *v.* Balchin, 5 Exch. 387 8
Bowe, People *v.* 58 How. (N. Y.) Pr. 174 994
Bowen, ex parte, 46 Cal. 112 994
People *v.* 43 Cal. 439 523, 535
R. *v.* 9 C. & P. 509 995
R. *v.* 1 Den. C. C. 22 251
v. State, 108 Ind. 411 409
State *v.* 16 Kans. 475 812
State *v.* 17 S. C. 52 8
Bowler *v.* State, 41 Miss. 570 260
Bowling, State *v.* 10 Humph. 52 152, 247, 317, 318
Bowman, R. *v.* 6 C. & P. 101, 337 438, 481, 482, 520

SECTION

Bowman, State *v.* 103 Ind. 69 369
State *v.* 80 N. C. 432 664
U. S. *v.* 2 Wash. C. C. 328 120, 135
Boyall, R. *v.* 2 Burr. 832 132
Boyd *v.* State, 17 Ga. 194 7
State *v.* 2 Hill (S. C. Law), 288 363, 378
State *v.* 37 La. An. 781 601, 882
State *v.* 38 La. An. 374 700
v. State, 16 Lea, 148 711
Boyden, U. S. *v.* 1 Low. 269 839
Boyer, Com. *v.* 1 Binn. 201 183, 188
Boyes, R. *v.* 1 B. & S. 311 529
State *v.* 1 McMul. 191 291
Boyington, State *v.* 56 Me. 512 238, 239
v. State, 2 Port. 100 350
Boyle, People *v.* 64 Cal. 153 934
v. People, 4 Col. 176 668
State *v.* 9 Wis. 284 996
v. U. S. 11 Biss. 100 749
Boyleston *v.* Kerr, 2 Daly (N. Y.), 220 8
Boynton, Com. *v.* 12 Cush. 500 163 *a*, 164
v. State, 77 Ala. 30 73
Bradbury, People *v.* 60 Ill. 390 949
Bradford *v.* State, 54 Ala. 230 278
v. State, 15 Ind. 347 643
Bradlaugh *v.* R. L. R. 3 Q. B. Div. 607; 14 Cox C. C. 68; 38 L. T. N. S. 118 90, 166, 177, 760
Bradley, People *v.* 60 Ill. 390 784, 990
People *v.* 4 Park. C. R. 245 188
v. State, 68 Ala. 318 918
v. State, 69 Ala. 318 923
v. State, 32 Ark. 722 451
State *v.* 48 Conn. 535 608
v. State, 20 Fla. 738 246
State *v.* 1 Hayw. 403, 463 167, 203
v. State, 6 La. An. 560 757
State *v.* 30 La. An. Pt. I. 326 313, 549, 755, 906
State *v.* 32 La. An. 402 608
State *v.* 9 Richards. S. C. Law, 168 301, 309
Bradshaw *v.* Com., 16 Grat. 507 278
v. People, 17 Neb. 147 555, 577, 664
Bradstreet *v.* State, 17 Neb. 147 555
Brady, Com. *v.* 7 Gray. 320 92
People *v.* 56 N. Y. 182 28, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 993, 1011
v. State, 21 Tex. Ap. 659 505
State *v.* 14 Vt. 353 93, 244, 275

SECTION

Brady, U. S. *v.* (Star Route case) 3 Crim. Law Mag. 69 89
Bragle, People *v.* 88 N. Y. 585; 26 Hun, 378 540, 546
Brainard *v.* State, 25 Iowa, 572 709
Brainerd, in re, 56 Vt. 495 994
Brake *v.* State, 4 Baxt. 161 831
Brakefield *v.* State, 1 Sneed, 215 642, 844
Branch, State *v.* 25 La. An. 115 777
v. State, 20 Tex. Ap. 599 447
State *v.* 56 Vt. 532 348, 368
Brand *v.* U. S., 18 Blatch. 384 775
Brandon, State *v.* 28 Ark. 410 400
State *v.* 7 Kans. 106 244
Brandreth's case, 32 St. Tr. 771 348, 368, 613
Brannan, State *v.* 34 La. An. 942 918
Brannon, R. *v.* Law Times, Feb. 28, 1880 293
State *v.* 50 Iowa, 372 251
State *v.* 45 Mo. 329 815, 819
State *v.* 55 Mo. 63 465, 466
Branstetter *v.* State, 65 Mo. 149 847
Brant *v.* Fowler, 7 Cow. 562 841
Brantley, State *v.* 84 N. C. 766 803
Braswell, State *v.* 82 N. C. 693 577, 853
Brannschweig, State *v.* 36 Mo. 367 549
Bravo *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 177 218
Brawner, in re, 7 Fed. Rep. 86 37 *b*
Bray, State *v.* 1 Mo. 126 269
State *v.* 89 N. C. 480 746, 756
Brazleton *v.* State, 66 Ala. 96 661
Breeding *v.* State, 11 Texas, 257 671, 683, 692
Breese *v.* State, 12 Ohio St. 146 243, 244
Brenan, in re, 10 Q. B. 492 993
Brennan *v.* People, 15 Ill. 511 435
v. People, 110 Ill. 55 760
v. Shinkle, 89 Ill. 604 465, 602, 908
Bressant, Com. *v.* 126 Mass. 246 446, 447
Bressler *v.* People, 117 Ill. 422 906
Brettel, R. *v.* C. & M. 609 470
Brettun, Com. *v.* 100 Mass. 206 183, 188
Brewer, State *v.* 59 Ala. 101 321
State *v.* 33 Ark. 176 243
State *v.* 5 Ind. 501 474
State *v.* 59 Ind. 101 456
State *v.* 8 Mo. 373 379
v. State, 5 Tex. Ap. 248 134
Brewington, State *v.* 84 N. C. 783 203
Brewster, State *v.* 7 Vt. 118 27, 37
Brice *v.* State, 2 Tenn. 254 771
Briceland *v.* Com., 74 Penn. St. 463 513
Brickell, State *v.* 1 Hawks, 354 91

SECTION

Brickley, People *v.* 49 Cal. 241 752
Bridewell, ex parte, 56 Miss. 39 76
Bridges, ex parte, 2 Woods, 428 981
ex parte, 2 Woods, 428 995
v. State, 38 Ark. 510 541
U. S. *v.* 1 South. Law J. (N. S.); 1 Crim. Law Mag. 7; 10 Cent. L. J. 1 750
Briggs, Com. *v.* 5 Pick. 427 813
Com. *v.* 7 Pick. 177 383, 448
People *v.* 20 Cal. 432 756
People *v.* 1 Dak. Terr. 302 478
People *v.* 60 How. (N. Y.) Pr. 17 363, 379
State *v.* 68 Iowa, 416 125
v. State, 34 La. An. 69 601
v. State, 6 Tex. Ap. 144 212 *a*
Bright, Com. *v.* 78 Ky. 258 440, 459
v. State, 76 Ala. 96 423
Briley, State *v.* 8 Port. 472 225
Brimmer *v.* Long Wharf, 5 Pick. 131 87
Bringard, People *v.* 39 Mich. 22 417
Brinkley *v.* Brinkley, 47 N. Y. 40 970
State *v.* 54 Ga. 371 602, 889
Brinster *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 612 90
Briscoe, in re, 51 How. Pr. 422 28, 33, 36
Brister *v.* State, 26 Ala. 108 407, 614 *a*, 680, 696, 750
State *v.* 1 Houst. 150 260
Bristol, People *v.* 23 Mich. 118 464
Bristow, Com. *v.* 15 Grat. 634 494, 636, 672
Brite, State *v.* 73 N. C. 26 102, 117
v. State, 10 Tex. Ap. 368 813
British Privateers, 1 Wood & Minot, 66 38
Brittain, State *v.* 89 N. C. 481 847, 850
Britton, U. S. *v.* 2 Mass. 464 167, 176
U. S. *v.* 107 U. S. 655 220
Broadbeck, Com. *v.* 124 Mass. 329 711
Brock *v.* State, 22 Ga. 98 323
Brockway *v.* Crawford, 3 Jones N. C. 484 13
Bronson, Com. *v.* 14 B. Monr. 361 62
Brooke, R. *v.* 1 Den. C. C. 217; 2 Cox C. C. 436; 2 C. & K. 402 323
State *v.* 9 Ala. 10 350
Brooker *v.* Com., 12 S. & R. 175 963
Brooks *v.* Com., 61 Penn. St. 352 12, 13
v. People, 88 Ill. 327 328, 540
v. Perry, 23 Ark. 32 560
State *v.* 9 Ala. 10 427
State *v.* 4 Conn. 446 191
State *v.* 3 Humph. 70 513
State *v.* 92 Mo. 542 27, 542, 556, 641
Broome *v.* R. R., 12 Q. B. 838 93, 124

SECTION

Brooster *v.* State, 15 Ind. 190 111
Brosnahan, matter of, 18 Fed. Rep. 62; 4 McCr. 1 1010
Brotherton, People *v.* 43 Cal. 530 650
v. People, 75 N. Y. 159 368, 369
R. *v.* 2 Str. 702 386
Brougher, State *v.* 3 Blackf. 307 230
Broughton, R. *v.* 1 Trem. P. C. 111 285
State *v.* 7 Ired. 96 378
Brounbridge *v.* People, 38 Mich. 751 924
Brown's case, 3 Greenl. 177 280
112 Mass. 409 30, 36
Brown *v.* Brown, 4 Ind. 627 964
Com. *v.* 14 Gray, 419 253
Com. *v.* 2 Leigh, 769 636
v. Com., 8 Mass. 59 161, 759
Com. *v.* 103 Mass. 422 536
Com. *v.* 121 Mass. 69 285
Com. *v.* 141 Mass. 78 220
v. Com., 76 Penn. St. 319 338, 344, 350, 417
v. Com., 78 Penn. St. 122 90, 92
Com. *v.* 12 Phila. 600 913
Com. *v.* 3 Rawle, 207 518, 791
v. Com., 4 Rawle, 259 932
v. Com., 2 Va. Cas. 516 202*a*, 844
v. Crashaw, 2 Bulstr. 154 663
v. Duffus, 66 Iowa, 193 994
ex parte, 28 Fed. Rep. 653 28, 29, 31
La Crosse, 21 Wis. 51 846
People *v.* 48 Cal. 253 653
People *v.* 54 Cal. 243 595
People *v.* 59 Cal. 345 595
v. People, 34 Mich. 37 87
People *v.* 54 Mich. 15 415, 913
R. *v.* 8 Cox C. C. 69 157
R. *v.* 4 C. & P. 588, *n.* 569
R. *v.* 17 L. T. M. C. 145 414
R. *v.* M. & M. 163 137
v. Rice, 57 Me. 66 913
v. State, 47 Ala. 47 918, 927
v. State, 63 Ala. 97 750
v. State, 74 Ala. 478 343
State *v.* 16 Conn. 54 451, 457, 485
State *v.* 51 Conn. 1 701
State *v.* 1 Dev. N. C. Law, 137 208
v. State, 5 Eng. 607 447, 771
v. State, 28 Ga. 209 312
v. State, 44 Ga. 300 209
v. State, 55 Ga. 169 869
v. State, 65 Ga. 332 588, 601
State *v.* 5 Harring. 505 8
v. State, 7 Humph. 155 371

SECTION

Brown, State *v.* 8 Humph. 89 255, 354
v. State, 70 Ind. 576 643, 693
v. State, 103 Ind. 133 561
v. State, 105 Ind. 385 737
State *v.* 58 Iowa, 298 294
State *v.* 22 Kan. 222 827
State *v.* 35 La. An. 340 658
v. State, 2 Lea, 158 81
v. State, 57 Miss. 424 640
v. State, 60 Miss. 447 845
State *v.* 60 Mo. 141 260
v. State, 64 Mo. 368 834
v. State, 75 Mo. 317 733
State *v.* 3 Murph. 224 125
State *v.* 81 N. C. 516 371
v. State, 9 Neb. 157 798
State *v.* 7 Oreg. 186 836
State *v.* 2 Speers, 129 164
State *v.* 24 S. C. 224 120
v. State, 5 Tex. Ap. 126, 546 774*a*
v. State, 6 Tex. Ap. 286 869, 873
v. State, 38 Tex. 482 597
State *v.* 31 Vt. 603 369
State *v.* 49 Vt. 437 314, 472
State *v.* 1 Williams (Vt.), 619 177
v. Swan, 1 Mass. 202 854
U. S. *v.* 2 Low. 267 317
v. U. S. McCahon, 229 525, 528
v. Wadsworth, 15 Vt. 170 439
Brownbridge *v.* People, 38 Mich. 751 924
Browning *v.* Abrams, 51 How. Pr. 172 37
v. State, 33 Miss. 481 595, 815, 831
Brownlow, R. *v.* 11 A. & E. 119 132
State *v.* 7 Humph. 63 167, 170
Bruce, State *v.* 87 Ind. 450 813
v. State, 48 Iowa, 530 841
State *v.* 24 Me. 71 383
State *v.* 77 Mo. 193 355
Brucker *v.* State, 16 Wis. 333 827
Bruffey, State *v.* 75 Mo. 389; 11 Mo. Ap. 79 465, 896
Brumley *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 114 273
Brunding, ex parte, 47 Mo. 255 933
Brunson *v.* Martin, 17 Ark. 270 453
Bruzzo, People *v.* 24 Cal. 41 447, 536
Bryan *v.* Bates, 15 Ill. 87 8
ex parte, 76 Mo. 253 932
R. *v.* 2 Str. 1101 239
v. State, 26 Ala. 65 407

SECTION

Bryan, State *v.* 40 Iowa, 379 647
State *v.* 19 La. An. 435 318
State *v.* 89 N. C. 531 577, 767
Bryant, ex parte, 34 Ala. 270 75, 76
in re, 2 Tyler, 269 987
v. State, 36 Ala. 270 104, 111
State *v.* 41 Ark. 359 742
State *v.* 2 Car. Law R. 617 213
State *v.* 14 Mo. 340 111, 112
State *v.* 92 Mo. 273 641
State *v.* 65 N. C. 327 513
State *v.* 89 N. C. 531 577
State *v.* 58 N. H. 79 223, 239
State *v.* 10 Yerg. 527 350
Bryson, State *v.* 90 N. C. 747 121
Bube *v.* State, 76 Ala. 73 325
Buchanan *v.* State, 24 Ga. 282 694
State *v.* 5 Har. & J. 317, 500 305, 698, 773, 774
State *v.* 1 Ired. 59 393, 394
Buck *v.* Buck, 60 Ill. 105 969
v. Com., 107 Penn. St. 486 418
People *v.* 60 Ill. 115 949
State *v.* 59 Iowa, 382 255, 283, 414, 415
v. State, 1 Ohio St. 61 292
Buckalew, State *v.* 62 Ala. 334 321
Buckland *v.* Com., 8 Leigh, 732 167, 180
Buckley, Com. *v.* 145 Mass. 181 116
in re, 69 Cal. 1 957
People *v.* 49 Cal. 241 673
v. State, 2 Greene, 162 220
v. State, 60 Iowa, 471 802, 813
Buckman, State *v.* 8 N. H. 203 284
Buckner *v.* Beck, Dudley (S. C.) 168 453, 599 *a*
v. State, 56 Ind. 208 298
Buddington, in re, 74 N. C. 607 995
Buell, in re, 3 Dill. 116 28, 35, 37 *b*, 981, 993
Buffington, Resp. *v.* 1 Dall. 61 386
Buford, Com. *v.* 20 Alb. L. J. 361 605
Bugbee, Com. *v.* 4 Gray, 206 132
Buhler *v.* State, 64 Ga. 504 480, 481
Buhs, State *v.* 18 Mo. 319 548
Bull, ex parte, 8 Jur. 827 986
in re, 4 Dill. 323; Cent. L. J. 1877 35, 37, 993
R. *v.* 9 C. & P. 22 696
Bullard, State *v.* 16 N. H. 139 841
Bulliner *v.* People, 95 Ill. 394 358, 556, 733
Bullock *v.* State, 10 Ga. 47 771
State *v.* 63 N. C. 571 520, 820
v. State, 12 Tex. Ap. 42 890
Bulson *v.* People, 31 Ill. 409 451
Bundy, State *v.* 64 Me. 507 118
Burden *v.* People, 26 Mich. 162 649

SECTION

Burdett *v.* Abbott, 14 East, 1 964
R. *v.* Dears, 431 566
v. State, 9 Tex. 43 441, 451
Burdick *v.* Hunt, 43 Ind. 384 378
v. People, 58 Barb. 51 713
Burdine *v.* Grand, 37 Ala. (N. S.) 478 667
Burger, in re, 30 Mich. 203 996
Burgess *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 483 95, 369
People *v.* 35 Cal. 115 130
State *v.* 75 Mo. 541 164
U. S. *v.* 3 McCr. 278 89
Burgiss, R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 488 61
Burgson, State *v.* 53 Iowa, 318 163 *a*
Burk *v.* Com., 5 J. J. Marsh. 676 750, 751
v. State, 2 Har. & J. 426 261, 291
v. State, 81 Ind. 128 480
State *v.* 89 Mo. 635 247
Burke, Com. *v.* 15 Gray, 408 222, 273
ex parte, 58 Miss. 50 76
People *v.* 34 Cal. 661 220
R. *v.* 10 Cox. 519 696
v. State, 74 Ala. 399 246, 262
v. State, 66 Ga. 157 830
v. State, 47 Ind. 528 968, 975
v. State, 72 Ind. 392 890
State *v.* 38 Me. 574 383, 386, 448, 771
v. State, 5 Tex. Ap. 74 158
Burkett, R. *v.* Andr. 230 385
Burkhart, in re, 33 Fed. Rep. 25 602
Burks *v.* State, 24 Tex. Ap. 326 460, 488
Burlingham, State *v.* 15 Me. 104 350, 396
Burlington, Com. *v.* 136 Mass. 435 220
Burnham *v.* Hatfield, 5 Blackf. 21 378, 379
v. Morrissey, 14 Gray, 226 964
Burns *v.* Erben, 40 N. Y. 463 13
v. People, 1 Park. C. R. 182 465, 476
State *v.* 18 Fla. 185 773
State *v.* 33 Mo. 483 819
State *v.* 85 Mo. 47 668
State *v.* 20 N. H. 550 161
v. State, 12 Tex. Ap. 269 692
Burnside, State *v.* 37 Mo. 343 641, 713, 813, 854
Burr's case, Pamph. 658, 1000, 1004
Burrell, State *v.* 86 Ind. 313 1
v. State, 18 Tex. 713 664, 693
Burres *v.* Com., 27 Grat. 934 460
Burriss, State *v.* 38 Ark. 221 602
Burroughs *v.* State, 33 Ga. 403 844
U. S. *v.* 3 McLean, 405 173, 771

SECTION

Burrows *v.* Unwin, 3 C. & P. 310 829
Burt *v.* Panjaud, 99 U. S. 180 654, 693
v. Pyle, 89 Ind. 398 963
People *v.* 51 Mich. 200 5, 9
State *v.* 64 N. C. 619 211
State *v.* 25 Vt. 373 152, 247, 281, 284
Burtine *v.* State, 18 Ga. 534 815
Burton, Com. *v.* 4 Leigh, 645 342
R. *v.* 2 F. & F. 788 575
v. State, 75 Ind. 447 558
Burwell, State *v.* 34 Kans. 312 585
Busey *v.* State, 77 Ala. 66 293
Bush, Com. *v.* 2 Duval, 264 522, 527, 528
v. Kentucky, 107 U. S. 110 783 *a*
People *v.* 68 Cal. 623 622, 707, 823
People *v.* 4 Hill (N. Y.), 133 159, 791
R. *v.* 1 Leach, 79; 2 W. Bl. 790 183
R. *v.* R. & R. 372 113
v. State, 21 Fla. 761 772
Bushnell, ex parte, 9 Ohio St. 78 980
Buster, State *v.* 90 Mo. 574 220
Butcher, R. *v.* 2 M. & R. 229 570
Butler, Com. *v.* 1 Allen, 4 426
v. Com., 81 Va. 59 70, 339
ex parte, 18 Alb. L. J. 369 35
People *v.* 8 Cal. 435 341
People *v.* 3 Cow. 347 936
v. State, 22 Ala. 43 260
State *v.* 1 Idaho, N. S. 271 354
v. State, 3 McCord, 383 222
State *v.* 67 Mo. 59 866
U. S. *v.* 1 Hugh. 457 613
v. U. S., 4 Hughes, 514 89
Butman's case, 8 Greenl. 113 283
Butolph *v.* Blust, 5 Lansing, 84 8
Butter, in re, 7 Abb. Pr. (N. S.) 67 29
Butterfield, R. *v.* 2 M. & R. 522 92
Butterick, Com. *v.* 100 Mass. 12 133, 187, 189, 193
Butterwick, R. *v.* 2 M. & R. 196 187
Butterworth, R. *v.* R. & R. 520 312, 383
Button, R. *v.* 11 Q. B. 929 464, 465
Butts, Com. *v.* 124 Mass. 449 189, 218
Buzine, State *v.* 4 Harring. 572 29, 35, 992, 993
Buzzard, Com. *v.* 5 Grat. 694 90
v. State, 20 Ark. 106 279, 420, 421
Buzzel, Com. *v.* 16 Pick. 153 629, 636, 658, 665
State *v.* 58 N. H. 257; 59 N. H. 61, 65 458, 477, 483, 707
Buzzo, U. S. *v.* 18 Wall. 125 89, 164, 746

SECTION

Bybee, State *v.* 17 Kans. 462 793
Byers, State *v.* 73 Md. 209 376, 759
State *v.* 80 N. C. 426 711
Byrnes, People *v.* 33 Hun, 98 36
Bykerdike, R. *v.* 1 M. & Rob. 179 253
Byrd *v.* State, 1 How. (Miss.) 247 95, 163, 356, 555, 1006
State *v.* 31 La. An. 409 447, 465
Byron, in re, 18 Fed. Rep. 722 996, 1001

C.

Cabot *v.* Yarborough, 27 Ga. 476 974
Cabrera, ex parte, 1 Wash. C. C. 232 59
Cadle, State *v.* 19 Ark. 613 279, 282
Cady *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 776 124
State *v.* 47 Conn. 44 220
v. State, 4 Tex. Ap. 238 709
Caesar, People *v.* 1 Parker, C. R. 345 936
Caffey, State *v.* 2 Murphey, 320 173
Cage, ex parte, 45 Cal. 248 520,
People *v.* 48 Cal. 324 498, 513, 520
Cahill, Com. *v.* 12 Allen, 540 182, 189, 207, 212, 217
ex parte, 52 Cal. 463 446
v. People, 106 Ill. 621 8, 20
Cain, Com. *v.* 14 Bush. 525 773
Com. *v.* 102 Mass. 487 290, 383, 910
Com. *v.* 20 W. Va. 679 565
v. State, 18 Tex. 387 260
Caine, State *v.* 1 Hawks, 352 338, 339, 359, 363, 388
Calder's case, 6 Op. Att.-Gen. 91 50
Caldwell *v.* Com., 7 Dana, 229 940
Com. *v.* 14 Mass. 330 282
R. *v.* 17 Q. B. 503 774 *a*
v. State, 3 Baxter (Tenn.), 429 91
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 171 127
U. S. *v.* 8 Blatch. 131 49
Caleb *v.* State, 39 Miss. 721 823
Calhoun, State *v.* 1 Dev. & B. 374 369
Calico *v.* State, 4 Pike, 430 314, 940
Calicot, in re. *See* Callicot, in re.
Calkins *v.* Calkins, 3 Barb. 305 320
Call, Com. *v.* 21 Pick. 509 756, 759
ex parte, 2 Tex. Ap. 566 966
Callahan *v.* State, 55 Iowa, 334 750
Callender, U. S. *v.* Pamph. 19 658
Callicot, in re, 8 Blatch. 89 531, 994, 996 *b*, 1006
Calvin, State *v.* R. M. Charlton, 151 220

SECTION

Calvin, State *v.* 2 Zabr. 207 183, 191
Cameron, ex parte, 81 Ala. 87 996
State *v.* 2 Chand. (Wis.) 172 617, 679
v. State, 8 Eng. 712 112, 246, 261, 464, 465
v. State, 9 Tex. Ap. 332 237
State *v.* 40 Vt. 555 252, 570
Camp *v.* State, 25 Ga. 689 762
v. State, 3 Kelly, 417 220
State *v.* 23 Vt. 551 824
Campbell, *v.* Com. 2 Va. Cas. 314 777
ex parte, 20 Ala. 89 986
People *v.* 59 Cal. 243 88
v. People, 109 Ill. 565 291, 438, 442, 473, 477, 709, 737
People *v.* 4 Park. C. R. 386 90
R. *v.* 1 C. & K. 82 111, 113
R. *v.* 3 C. & P. 418 466
v. R. 11 Q. B. 799 248, 457, 756
v. State, 38 Ark. 498 869
v. State, 22 Tex. Ap. 262 476
v. State, 8 Tex. Ap. 84 354
State *v.* 9 Yerg. 333 785, 788, 895
Canada *v.* Com., 9 Dana, 304 550
v. Com., 22 Grat. 899 260, 464
Cancemi *v.* People, 18 N. Y. 128 733, 780
Candy *v.* State, 8 Neb. 482 293
Caniff, People *v.* 2 Park. C. R. (N. Y.) 586 614
Cannon, Com. *v.* 10 Phila. 456 890
in re, 47 Mich. 481 37, 49
v. State, 57 Miss. 147 844
State *v.* 90 N. C. 711 350
State *v.* 11 Oregon, 312 913
Canter *v.* People, 38 How. N. Y. Pr. 91 471, 502
Cantrill *v.* People, 3 Gilm. 356 152
Capehart *v.* Stewart, 80 N. C. 101 693
Cappo *v.* State, 4 Iowa, 502 269
Carberry *v.* State, 11 Oh. St. 410 196
Card *v.* People, 3 Neb. 357 505
State *v.* 34 N. H. 510 164, 263
Carden, R. *v.* L. R. 5 Q. B. D. 1 1000
Cardova *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 445 588
Cardwell, State *v.* 95 N. C. 643 916
Carey, Com. *v.* 12 Cush. 246 5, 8, 9, 17
Com. *v.* 103 Mass. 214 292, 771, 910
Cargan *v.* People, 39 Mich. 540 649
Carillo, People *v.* 54 Cal. 63 798
People *v.* 70 Cal. 643 711
Carland, State *v.* 90 N. C. 668 495
Carlisle, Com. *v.* Bright. R. 36 991, 1000, 1001

SECTION

Carlisle, R. *v.* 4 C. & P. 415 996
v. State, 32 Ind. 55 144
v. U. S. 16 Wall. 147 521, 525
Carll, ex parte, 106 U. S. 521 995
U. S. *v.* 105 U. S. 611 164, 222
Carlton *v.* Com., 5 Met. 532 283, 285, 290, 292
People *v.* 57 Cal. 559 88, 935
Carman, State *v.* 63 Iowa, 130 733
Carmichael, People *v.* 5 Mich. 10 464
Carnal, People *v.* 6 N. Y. 463 320
v. People, 1 Parker C. R. 256, 262, 273 676, 830, 847
Carney, Com. *v.* 4 Grat. 546 279
R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 351 196
Carothers, State *v.* 1 Greenl. 464 602
Carpenter *v.* People, 8 Barb. 610 805
v. People, 64 N. Y. 483 344
v. State, 23 Ala. 84 247, 465
State *v.* 74 N. C. 230 317
State *v.* 20 Vt. 9 164
Carper *v.* State, 27 Oh. St. 572 413
Carr, State *v.* 1 Fost. 166 854, 869
State *v.* 14 Ga. 358 871
State *v.* 43 Kan. 100 14
State *v.* 5 N. H. 367 167
State *v.* 6 Oregon, 133 251
Carradice, R. *v.* R. & R. 205 464
Carrick, State *v.* 16 Nev. 120 659
Carrier, People *v.* 46 Mich. 442 683
Carro, State *v.* 26 La. An. 377 189
Carroll, ex parte, 36 Ala. 300 75
State *v.* 2 Ired. 257 946 *a*
v. State, 5 Neb. 31 707
Carson, Com. *v.* 1 Wheel. C. C. 488 598
R. *v.* R. & R. 303 314, 470
State *v.* 50 Ala. 134 639
State *v.* 69 Ala. 235 238
State *v.* 27 Ark. 470 939 *a*
Car-Soy, People *v.* 57 Cal. 102 665
Carstapen, State *v.* 2 Hayw. 238 817
Carte, R. *v.* 1 C. & K. 741 194
Carter, Com. *v.* 108 Mass. 17 81
Com. *v.* 11 Pick. 277 583
v. Fitzgerald, 121 U. S. 87 1010
v. People, 2 Hill N. Y. 317 801
People *v.* 46 Mich. 442 617
v. State, 2 Carter, 617 283
State *v.* Conf. N. C. R. 210 169, 273
v. State, 46 Ga. 637 854, 859, 862
v. State, 48 Ga. 43 805
State *v.* 76 N. C. 20 707
v. U. S. 3 Cranch C. C. 423 955
Cartright, State *v.* 20 W. Va. 32 835

SECTION
Cartwright's case, 114 Mass. 231 963
Cartwright, State *v.* 12 Lea, 620 642, 798, 824, 846
State *v.* 10 Oreg. 193 551
Caruthers, U. S. *v.* 15 Fed. Rep. 309 269
Carver, State *v.* 49 Me. 588 350, 759
State *v.* 2 R. I. 285 251
Cary *v.* State, 76 Ala. 78 13
Casat *v.* State, 40 Ark. 511 845
Casborus, People *v.* 13 Johns. R. 351 435, 457
Casey, ex parte, 18 Fed. Rep. 86 913
People *v.* 53 Cal. 360 798
v. People, 72 N. Y. 393 158, 212 *a*, 251, 252, 253, 254, 777
People *v.* 96 N. Y. 115 632, 693
State *v.* 1 Bush. 209 451
Cash *v.* State, 10 Humph. 111 290
Cashiel, U. S. *v.* 1 Hugh. 552 439, 442
Casinoca *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 554 793
Cason, State *v.* 20 La. An. 48 189
Caspary, State *v.* 11 Rich. 356 273
Casper *v.* State, 47 Wis 535 698, 712
Cassady, State *v.* 12 Kans. 550 700
State *v.* 52 N. H. 500 238
Cassel, State *v.* 2 Harr. & Gill, 407 183, 283
Cassels, People *v.* 5 Hill N. Y. 168 999
v. State, 4 Yerg. 152 791, 813
Cassety, State *v.* 1 Rich. 91 256, 472, 475
Cassiano, People *v.* 30 Hun, 388; 1 N. Y. Cr. 505 830
Cassidy, R. *v.* 1 F. & F. 79 565
Castles, Com. *v.* 9 Gray, 123 184
Castro *v.* De Uriartre, 16 Fed. Rep. 93 50, 51
R. *v.* L. R. Q. B. 350; 5 Q. B. D. 490; L. R. 6 App. Ca. 229; 44 L. T. N. S. 354; 14 Cox C. C. 436, 546 281, 910
Catlow, in re, 16 Att'y-Gen. 642 56
Caton, U. S. *v.* 1 Cranch C. C. 150 970
Caudle *v.* Seymour, 1 G. & D. 454 5
Caudwell, R. *v.* 17 Q. B. 503 548
Caulfield, State *v.* 23 La. An. 148 651, 841
Cavanah *v.* State, 56 Miss. 300 571, 860, 873
Cavanaugh, People *v.* 2 Park. C. R. 650 996, 1006
Cave *v.* Mountain, 1 M. & G. 257 70
Caveness, State *v.* 78 N. C. 484 560
Caw *v.* People, 3 Neb. 357 819
Cawley *v.* State, 37 Ala. 152 291, 292, 911
Cawood, Com. *v.* 2 Va. Cas. 527 371
SECTION
Central R. R. *v.* Mitchell, 63 Ga. 173 660
Cert. Intox. Liquors, Com. *v.* 6 Allen, 596–9; 13 Allen, 26 561
Chadbourn *v.* Franklin, 5 Gray, 312 566
Chadwick, R. *v.* 11 Q. B. 205 773
Chaffin, State *v.* 2 Swan, 493 465, 467
Chambers *v.* People, 105 Ill. 409 798
v. People, 4 Scam. 351 220
R. *v.* L. R. 1 C. C. 341 200
Chamblee *v.* State, 78 Ala. 466 758
Champean, State *v.* 52 Vt. 313 344
Champion, ex parte, 52 Ill. 311 982, 1007
Champneys, R. *v.* 2 M. & Rob. 26 460, 468, 471
Chancellor, State *v.* 1 Strobh. 347 535
Chandler, State *v.* 2 Hawks, 439 369
State *v.* 31 Kans. 201 79, 285, 910
State *v.* 24 Mo. 371 159
Chapman, Com. *v.* 11 Cush. 422 396
Com. *v.* 5 Whart. 427 220, 235, 280
v. People, 39 Mich. 549 145
State *v.* 52 Vt. 313 447
Chappel *v.* State, 8 Yerg. 167 371
Chappell, People *v.* 27 Mich. 486 464
v. State, 52 Ala. 359 771
Chapple, R. *v.* R. & R. 77 237
Chard, R. *v.* R. & R. 488 237
Charles, U. S. *v.* 2 Cranch C. C. 76 378, 878
Charleston, in re, 34 Fed. Rep. 531 53
Charlesworth, R. *v.* 1 B. & S. 460; 9 Cox C. C. 44; 31 L. T. (M. C.) 25; 2 F. & F. 326 420, 436, 490, 722
Charlton's case, 2 My. & Cr. 316 958
Charlton *v.* Com. 5 Met. 532 285, 911
State *v.* 11 W. Va. 332 161
Chase, Com. *v.* 125 Mass. 154, 221
v. People, 40 Ill. 352 846
v. State, 46 Miss. 683 344, 432, 836
State *v.* 82 Mo. 595 725
v. State, 50 Wis. 510 95
U. S. *v.* 27 Fed. Rep. 807, 809 762
Chase's Trial, Pamph. 806
Chauncey, Com. *v.* 2 Ashm. 90 274, 350, 751, 759, 761, 873, 886
Cheadel *v.* State, 110 Ind. 310 957
Cheang-Kee *v.* U. S. 3 Wall. 320 913
Check *v.* State, 35 Ind. 492 840
Checketts, R. *v.* 6 M. & S. 88 106, 424
Cheek *v.* State, 38 Ala. 227 112
State *v.* 25 Ark. 206 507
v. State, 37 Ind. 533 900
State *v.* 63 Mo. 364 480

SECTION

Cheere, R. v. 7 D. & R. 461 152
Chegary, People v. 18 Wend. 637 1004
Cheltenham, etc. R. R. Co., in re, Law Rep. 8 Eq. 580 958
Cheney, Com. v. 6 Mass. 347 87
Com. v. 114 Mass. 281 306 a
Chenier, State v. 32 La. An. 103 699
Chepman, R. v. 12 Cox C. C. 4 8
Cherry, Com. v. 2 Va. Cas. 20 98, 106, 350
v. State, 6 Fla. 679 369
State v. 3 Murphey, 7 132
Chesley, Com. v. 107 Mass. 223 457, 477
Chevalier, State v. 36 La. An. 81 601
Chiavaro, Com. v. 129 Mass. 489 413
Child, Com. v. 10 Pick. 252 798
Com. v. 13 Pick. 198 759, 760
ex parte, 15 C. B. 238 983
Childers v. State, 68 Ga. 837 854
Childrens v. Saxby, 1 Vern. 207 969
Childs v. State, 10 Tex. Ap. 183 884
Chiles v. Com., 2 Va. Cas. 260 281
v. Drake, 2 Metc. (Ky.) 147 453
v. State, 45 Ark. 165 645
Chisholm v. State, 45 Ala. 66 218
Chivarrio v. State, 15 Tex. Ap. 335 139
Choen, State v. 85 Ind. 209 354, 577
Choice v. State, 31 Ga. 424 713
Chorley, R. v. 12 Q. B. 515 787
Christian v. Com., 5 Met. 530 780, 918
State v. 30 La. An. Pt. 1. 367 90, 383
Christianburg, State v. Busbee, 46 319
Christie, People v. 2 Park. C. R. 579 654, 683
R. v. 1 F. & F. 75 573
Christmas v. State, 53 Ga. 81 446
State v. 6 Jones N. C. 471 712
Chumley, State v. 67 Mo. 41 212 a, 220, 465, 742
Church, Com. v. 1 Barr, 107 232, 387, 388, 793
v. People, 10 Ill. App. 222 318
Churchhill, Com. v. 2 Met. 119 161, 872
Chute v. State, 19 Minn. 271 145, 707
Chyo, State v. 92 Mo. 395 27
Cicero v. State, 54 Ga. 156 712, 798
City Com'rs v. King, 4 McCord, 487 102
Claflin, U. S. v. 13 Blatch. 178 158
U. S. v. 25 Int. Rev. Rec. 465 453
Clair, Com. v. 7 Allen, 525 456, 457, 460
Clanton v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 139 664
Clapper, State v. 59 Iowa, 279 365
Clare v. People, 9 Col. 122 709
v. State, 68 Ind. 17 370, 701

SECTION

Clarissa, State v. 11 Ala. 57 345, 346, 350
Clark's case, 6 Grat. 675 159, 221
Clark, Com. v. 2 Browne, 325 346
v. Com. 29 Penn. St. 129 1006, 1010
Com. v. 2 Va. Cas. 401 424
ex parte, 2 Q. B. 619 999
ex parte, 2 Ben. 240 37 b
ex parte, 100 U. S. 399 966 b
v. Field, 12 Vt. 485 380
in re, 9 Wend. 212 30, 34, 35, 36, 37, 993
v. May, 2 Gray, 410 963, 974
v. Newsam, 1 Ex. 131 186, 199
v. People, 1 Breese, 266 962
People v. 67 Cal. 99 456-7
v. People, 31 Ill. 479 802
v. People, 1 Parker C. R. 360 548
People v. 3 Selden, 388 773
R. v. 1 Brod. & B. 473 456
R. v. R. & R. 358 111
R. v. R. & R. 181; 2 Leach, 1039 202, 214
State v. 32 Ark. 231 446, 457, 470
v. State, 8 Baxt. 591 827
v. State, 1 Carter, 253 95
v. State, 12 Ga. 350 247, 318, 323, 465
v. State, 68 Ga. 784 792
v. State, 4 Humph. 254 549
State v. 69 Iowa, 196 518
v. State, 34 Ind. 436 123
State v. 32 La. An. 558 548
State v. 37 La. An. 128 601
State v. 31 Minn. 207 203
v. State, 23 Miss. 261 383, 396, 447
v. State, 8 Ohio St. 630 185
State v. 42 Vt. 629 628
v. Stevenson, 2 W. Black. 803 847
v. Terr. 1 Wash. T. 82 672
Clarke, ex parte, 54 Cal. 412 446
ex parte, 100 U. S. 399 981
in re, 3 Burr. 1362 987
R. v. 1 Bulst. 204 130
R. v. 1 Burr. 606 983
Clary v. State, 33 Ark. 561 90
Claude, State v. 35 La. An. 71 866
Clawson v. U. S., 114 U. S. 477 661 a
Clay v. People, 86 Ill. 147 168
v. State, 43 Ala. 350 746, 756
Clayton, State v. 11 Rich. 581 313
Clearly v. Deliesseline, 1 McCord, 35 88
Cleaver, Resp. v. 4 Yeates, 69 386
Clem v. State, 31 Ind. 480 793
v. State, 42 Ind. 420 420, 465, 468, 477, 478, 810

SECTION

Clement, R. *v.* 4 B. & Ald. 218 952
Clements, in re, 36 L. T. Rep. N. S. 332 960
People *v.* 42 Hun, 353 711
v. State, 50 Ala. 117 709
v. State, 21 Tex. Ap. 258 119
Clemons *v.* State, 4 Lea, 23 251
Clendon, R. *v.* 2 Ld. Raym. 1572; 2 Stra. 870 286
Clenny, State *v.* 1 Head, 270 451, 485
Clere *v.* Com., 3 Grat. 615 771
Clerk, R. *v.* Salk. 377 260
Cleveland, ex parte, 36 Ala. 306 1010
People *v.* 49 Cal. 578 587, 712
Clews, People *v.* 57 How. (N. Y.) Pr. 245 388
Clifford, ex parte, 29 Ind. 106 925 *a*
State *v.* 58 Wis. 113; 4 Cr. L. Mag. 704 778
State *v.* 58 Wis. 477 517, 818
Clifton, State *v.* 78 Mo. 430 350
Clinton *v.* State, 6 Baxt. 507 452
Cloe's case, 8 Grat. 606 623, 635, 664
Clough, State *v.* 49 Me. 573 367
Cluck *v.* State, 40 Ind. 263 560, 643, 840, 853
Clue, Com. *v.* 3 Rawle, 207 791
Com. *v.* 3 Rawle, 498 491, 493, 507, 508, 518, 791
Cluggage *v.* Swan, 4 Binn. 150 847
Cluverius *v.* Com., 81 Va. 787 551, 636
Clyburn, State *v.* 16 S. C. 375 566
Clyncard's case, Cro. Eliz. 654 341
Cobb, Com. *v.* 14 Gray, 57 315
State *v.* 1 Dev. & B. 115 224
v. State, 27 Ga. 648 560
State *v.* 17 Me. 198 70
Cobbett, in re, 7 Q. B. 187 999
Cobia, People *v.* 61 Cal. 548 650
v. State, 16 Ala. 781 447, 457
Coble *v.* Coble, 79 N. C. 589 561
Coch, People *v.* 53 Cal. 607 756
Cochlin *v.* People, 93 Ill. 410 842
Cochran, People *v.* 2 Johns. Ca. 73 945
v. State, 30 Ala. 542 294
v. State, 7 Humph. 544 815, 842, 847
v. Street, 1 Wash. R. 79 847
Cochrane *v.* State, 6 Md. 400 457, 507
v. State, 9 Md. 400 90
v. State, 30 Ohio St. 61 775
Cocke, State *v.* 38 Vt. 437 220
Cockerham, State *v.* 2 Ired. 204 913
Cockman, State *v.* 2 Wins. (N. C.) 95 637
Codd *v.* Cabe, 13 Cox, 202 7

SECTION

Cody *v.* State, 3 How. (Miss.) 27 844
Coe, Com. *v.* 115 Mass. 481 182, 184
Coffee, *v.* State, 60 Iowa, 748 813
State *v.* 68 Mo. 120 740
v. State, 5 Tex. Ap. 545 709
v. U. S., 116 U. S. 436 453
Coffeen, in re, 38 Mich. 311 995
Coffey, State *v.* N. C. Term. R. 272 167, 203
Coffman, People *v.* 24 Cal. 230 672
Cofren, State *v.* 48 Me. 365 125
Cogan *v.* Ebden, 1 Burr. 383 847
R. *v.* 1 Leach, 448 460, 488
Cogdell, People *v.* 1 Hill N. Y. 95 793
Coggin, U. S. *v.* 10 Rep. 687 321
Cogswell *v.* State, 49 Ga. 103 839
Cohen *v.* People, 5 Park. C. R. 330 110
v. State, 7 Col. 274 220
Cohn, ex parte, 55 Cal. 193 999
Cohron *v.* State, 20 Ga. 752 816, 823
Coit *v.* Starkweather, 8 Conn. 289 108
Coker *v.* State, 20 Ark. 51 819, 836
Colbert, State *v.* 29 La. An. 715 566
State *v.* 75 N. C. 368 386
Colby, Com. *v.* 128 Mass. 91 243
Cole, ex parte, 14 Tex. Ap. 579 978
v. People, 84 Ill. 216 220, 752
People *v.* 43 N. Y. 508 566
People *v.* 6 Park. C. R. 695, 701 78, 107
v. State, 5 Eng. 318 550
State *v.* 48 Mo. 70 451
v. State, 11 Tex. Ap. 67 159
State *v.* 19 Wis. 129 388
U. S. *v.* 5 McLean, 513 305
Coleman *v.* State, 71 Ala. 312 325, 452
v. State, 17 Fla. 206 823
v. State, 111 Ind. 563 760, 853
State *v.* 27 La. An. 691 781
v. State, 59 Miss. 484 665, 683, 821
State *v.* 5 Port. 32 291
State *v.* 8 S. C. 237 273, 354, 602, 679
State *v.* 20 S. C. 441 637, 674
v. State, 97 U. S. 509, 530 435, 439
Colgate, State *v.* 31 Kan. 516 469 *a*
Colley, R. *v.* M. & M. 329 569
Collier, in re, 6 Ohio St. 55 980
Colling, R. *v.* 2 Cox, 184 383
Collins, Com. *v.* 3 S. & R. 220 165
People *v.* 48 Cal. 277 804
v. People, 39 Ill. 233 95, 217
v. People, 103 Ill. 21 693, 866
People *v.* 7 Johns. 549 108

SECTION

Collins, State *v.* 3 Dev. 117 369
v. State, 33 La. An. 162 246, 549
State *v.* 15 Lea, 434 902
State *v.* 1 McC. 355 306 *a*
State *v.* 48 Me. 217 155
State *v.* 81 Mo. 652 560, 821
State *v.* 86 Mo. 245 821
State *v.* 70 N. C. 241 560
v. State, 43 Tex. 577; 6 Tex. Ap. 72 109, 865
v. State, 5 Tex. Ap. 37 134
v. State, 6 Tex. Ap. 647 753
v. State, 8 Tex. Ap. 38 798
v. State, 20 Tex. Ap. 197 215, 570
v. State, 20 Tex. Ap. 400 571
U. S. *v.* 2 Curtis C. C. 194 921
Collyer, State *v.* 17 Nev. 275 350
U. S. *v.* Whart. Hom. App. 309
Colson, Com. *v.* 11 Gray, 1 95, 224
People *v.* 49 Cal. 679 694
v. State, 7 Black. 590 190, 238
Colt *v.* Eves, 12 Conn. 243 490
Colter, State *v.* 6 R. I. 195 244
Columbia, People *v.* 1 Wend. 297 847
Colvin, State *v.* 11 Humph. 599 451
Colwells, State *v.* 3 R. I. 284 162
Combe *v.* Pitt, 3 Burr. 1423 130
Combs *v.* State, 75 Ind. 215 577
Comfort, State *v.* 22 Minn. 271 220
State *v.* 5 Mo. 357 220
Commander *v.* State, 60 Ala. 1 716
Commission, State *v.* 3 Hill (S. C.) 241 465, 788, 895
Compton, People *v.* 1 Duer, 512 950
R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 139 235
State *v.* 13 W. Va. 852 389
v. Wilder, 3 Ohio L. J. 642; 40 Ohio St. 130 27, 33, 34, 49
Comstock, People *v.* 8 Wend. 549 790, 791
v. State, 14 Neb. 205 591
State *v.* 27 Vt. 553 90
Conant, U. S. *v.* Cent. L. J. 1879, 129 90
Conatson *v.* State, 12 Lea, 436 642, 653
Concord R. R., State *v.* 59 N. H. 85 269
Confiscation cases, 20 Wall. 92 528
Congdon, State *v.* 14 R. I. 458 707, 846, 889
Congleton, People *v.* 44 Cal. 92 602
State *v.* 44 Cal. 12 163 *a*
Conkle, State *v.* 16 W. Va. 736 411, 549

SECTION

Conlee *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 222 184, 203
Conley *v.* People, 1 Abbott Dec. N. Y. App. 418 911
State *v.* 39 Me. 78 91, 92, 95, 146, 309
Conlin *v.* State, 27 Vt. 318 733
Conn *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 390 577
Connell, State *v.* 49 Mo. 282 813
Conner *v.* Com., 3 Binn. 38 992
v. Com., 13 Bush. 715 239, 465
State *v.* 30 Ohio St. 405 251
U. S. *v.* 3 McLean, 573 791
Conners, Com. *v.* 116 Mass. 35 472
State *v.* 20 W. Va. 1 774 *a*
Connolly *v.* State, 60 Ala. 89 733
State *v.* 7 Mo. Ap. 40 830
State *v.* 3 Rich. 337 771
Connor, People *v.* 15 Abb. Pr. 430 999
State *v.* 5 Blackf. 325 93
State *v.* 5 Cold. 311 447
State *v.* 5 Cold. 315 420
Conover *v.* State, 86 Ind. 99 414
Conrad, State *v.* 21 Mo. 271 387
Terr. *v.* 1 Dak. 363 928
Conroy, People *v.* 97 N. Y. 62 90, 902
Constable, R. *v.* 7 D. & R. 663 550
Conway, State *v.* 23 Minn. 291 759
Cook's case, 13 How. St. Tr. 312 682
Cook *v.* Brown, 39 Me. 443 712
Com. *v.* 6 S. & R. 577 312, 490, 491, 493, 567
v. Middlesex, 2 Dutch. 326; 3 Dutch. 637 528
People *v.* 14 Barb. 259 101, 108
People *v.* 10 Mich. 164 90
People *v.* 2 Park. C. R. 12 281
R. *v.* 1 R. & R. 176 255, 777
R. *v.* 13 St. Tr. 334 661
v. State, 60 Ala. 39 549
v. State, 20 Fla. 802 139
v. State, 11 Ga. 43 120, 125, 220
State *v.* 30 Kans. 82 358, 836
State *v.* Phillips Rep. 535 526
v. State, 4 Zabr. 843 292, 911
U. S. *v.* 17 Wall. 168 238, 239, 317, 318, 481
Cooke *v.* Green, 11 Price, 736 848
People *v.* 6 Park. C. R. 31 119
R. *v.* 5 B. & C. 538; 7 D. & R. 673 305, 312, 698
R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 582 187, 375, 379
R. *v.* 2 East P. C. 616 237
Cooley, Com. *v.* 6 Gray (Mass.), 350 7
Com. *v.* 10 Pick. 37 280
Coolidge, U. S. *v.* 1 Gall. 488 919
U. S. *v.* 2 Gall. 364; 1 Wheat. 415 359, 481, 500, 516, 724, 820, 919, 954

SECTION

Coombs, State *v.* 32 Me. 527 472
Coon, People *v.* 45 Cal. 672 212
Cooper, Com. *v.* 15 Mass. 187 249
in re, 32 Vt. 258 974
R. *v.* 5 C. & P. 535 469 *a*
v. State, 21 Ark. 228 733
State *v.* 5 Day, 250 193
State *v.* 1 Green (N. J.), 361 466, 471
v. State, 47 Ind. 61 481
v. State, 79 Ind. 206 297
State *v.* 96 Ind. 331 387
State *v.* 31 Kans. 505 247
v. State, 64 Md. 40 426
v. State, 59 Miss. 257, 410 370, 664
State *v.* 85 Mo. 256 847
State *v.* 16 Ohio St. 328 638
Cope *v.* Com., 28 Penn. St. 297 528
Copeland, State *v.* 65 Mo. 497 504
State *v.* 2 Swan, 626 419
Copenhaven *v.* State, 14 Ga. 22 646
v. State, 15 Ga. 284 471
Copp, State *v.* 34 Kans. 522 341
State *v.* 15 N. H. 212 158
Coppersmith, U. S. *v.* 2 Flip. 546 614
Copping *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 59 251
Corbett, People *v.* 28 Cal. 330 541
v. State, 24 Ga. 391 82
State *v.* 12 R. I. 238 181 *a*
Core, State *v.* 70 Mo. 491 292, 641, 911
Corn, People *v.* 45 Cal. 672 206
Cornelius *v.* State, 7 Eng. (Ark.) 782 93, 815
Cornell, State *v.* 49 Mo. 282 353
Cornetta, People *v.* 92 N. Y. 85 632
Corning, People *v.* 2 Comstock, 1 405, 507, 773
Cornman, Com. *v.* 4 S. & R. 93 997
Cornwell *v.* State, Mart. & Yerg. 147 92
Corrie *v.* Corrie, 42 Mich. 509 1010
U. S. *v.* 1 Brunf. 686 384
Corrigan, State *v.* 24 Conn. 286 161, 194
Corson, State *v.* 12 Mo. 404 337, 345
Corwin, State *v.* 4 Mo. 609 230
Costello, Com. *v.* 120 Mass. 358 196, 285
Com. *v.* 121 Mass. 371 548
Com. *v.* 128 Mass. 88 749
People *v.* 1 Denio, 83 285, 293, 793
Coster *v.* Merest, 3 B. & B. 272 849
Costley, Com. *v.* 118 Mass. 1 712
Com. *v.* 12 Pick. 496 750, 751
Costly *v.* State, 19 Ga. 614 694, 846
Cothran *v.* State, 39 Miss. 541 810
Cotta, People *v.* 49 Cal. 166 566, 602

SECTION

Cotton, State *v.* 4 Fost. 143 131, 145, 414
v. State, 31 Miss. 504 640
State *v.* 4 Tex. 260 586
Cottrell, ex parte, 59 Cal. 420 999
Coughlin, State *v.* 19 Kans. 537 79
Coulson, R. *v.* 1 Den. C. C. 592; 1 Eng. L. & E. 550; 1 Temp. & M. C. C. 332; 4 Cox C. C. 227 174, 182
Counhaye, ex parte, L. R. 8 Q. B. 410 47, 53
Coupenhaver *v.* State, 39 Mo. 320 847
Courtney, State *v.* 6 Mo. 649 358
Courvoisier, R. *v.* 9 C. & P. 362 560–3
Covey *v.* State, 4 Port. 186 292, 302
Covington, State *v.* 4 Ala. 603 305
State *v.* 94 N. C. 913 169
Cowan, State *v.* 1 Head, 280 362, 374
State *v.* 29 Mo. 330 440
Coward *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 59 588
Cowell *v.* Patterson, 49 Iowa, 514 1002
State *v.* 4 Ired. 231 245, 466
Cowle, R. *v.* 2 Burr. 834 602
Cowles, People *v.* 59 How. Pr. 287 983
Cowman, State *v.* 12 Md. 250 762
Cox *v.* Coleridge, 1 B. & C. 37 73
ex parte, 12 Tex. Ap. 605 602
People *v.* 9 Cal. 32 760
v. People, 80 N. Y. 500 156, 350, 608, 609, 632
R. *v.* 1 C. & K. 487; 1 Den. C. C. 502 210
R. *v.* R. & R. 362 253
v. State, 76 Ala. 66 302
v. State, 32 Ga. 515 709
v. State, 64 Ga. 374 601, 609
State *v.* 6 Ired. 440 369, 371
v. State, 7 Tex. Ap. 1 823
v. State, 8 Tex. Ap. 254 273, 279
Coxon, R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 651 61
Coy, in re, 127 U. S. 731 770 *a*, 981, 996
State *v.* 2 Aiken, 181 247, 261, 465
Coyles *v.* Hurtin, 10 Johns. 85 10, 11
Crabtree *v.* State, 1 Lea, 267 797
v. State, 3 Sneed, 302 842
Craddock, R. *v.* 2 Den. C. C. 31 256, 291, 503
Craft *v.* State, 3 Kans. 450 813
State *v.* 1 Walk. 409 240
Craig, People *v.* 59 Cal. 370 150, 400
Craige, State *v.* 89 N. C. 475 759, 760, 813
Craighead, State *v.* 32 Mo. 561 90
Crain *v.* State, 2 Yerg. 390 282
Cranbourn's case, 4 St. Tr. 701; Salk. 633; East P. C. 116 257
Crank, State *v.* 2 Bailey, 66 654
Crans, Com. *v.* 3 Penn. L. J. 442; 2 Clark, 172 338, 367, 381, 1005

SECTION

Craton, State *v.* 6 Ired. 164 540, 549, 612, 613
U. S. *v.* 1 Cranch, 150 954
Craven's case, 2 East P. C. 601; R. & R. 14 183, 189
Crawford *v.* State, 2 Carter, 132 283
v. State, 12 Ga. 142 830
State *v.* 11 Kans. 32 652
State *v.* 13 La. An. 300 196
v. State, 15 Tex. Ap. 501 577
v. State, 2 Yerg. 60 842, 847
Craycroft, People *v.* 2 Cal. 243 232
Creek *v.* State, 24 Ind. 151 815, 823, 841
Creight, State *v.* 1 Brev. 169 93
Creighton, State *v.* 1 N. & McC. 256 369, 374
Crenshaw, State *v.* 22 Mo. 457 237
Crews *v.* People, 120 Ill. 317 591
Cribbs *v.* State, 9 Fla. 409 292
Crichton *v.* People, 6 Park. C. R. 365 120, 158 *a*
Crickdale, R. *v.* 3 E. & B. 947 *n* 787
Crimmins, State *v.* 31 Kan. 376 293
Crippen *v.* State, 8 Mich. 117 665
Crittenden, ex parte, 62 Cal. 534 970
U. S. *v.* Hemp. 61 125, 282, 367, 385
Crocker *v.* State, 47 Ala. 53 906
State *v.* 1 Houst. 122 8
v. State, Meigs, 127 378
State *v.* 3 Harring. 554 244
Crocket *v.* State, 52 Wis. 211 824, 827
Croft *v.* People, 15 Hun, 484 457
Crofts, R. *v.* 9 C. & P. 219 481
Crogan, State *v.* 8 Iowa, 523 145
Crone, R. *v.* Jebb, 47 191
Crookes, R. *v.* 3 Burr. 1841 386
Crookham *v.* State, 5 W. Va. 510 371, 494
Cropper *v.* U. S., Morris, 259 752
Crosby's case, 12 Mod. 66 77
Crosby *v.* Long, 12 East. 409 453
R. *v.* 1 Ld. Raym. 39 527
State *v.* 4 La. An. 434 822
U. S. *v.* 1 Hughes, 448 221
Crosier *v.* Cundy, 9 D. & R. 224 25
Cross, Com. *v.* 1 Ashm. 281 588
ex parte, 2 H. & N. 354 27
v. Guthery, 2 Root, 90 453
R. *v.* 1 Ld. Raym. 711; 3 Salk. 193. 201, 464
v. State, 63 Ala. 40 886
v. State, 68 Ala. 476 577
State *v.* 27 Mo. 332 540, 546, 549
v. State, 55 Wis. 262 159, 260, 794
U. S. *v.* 1 McArth. 149 89
Crossfield's case, 8 St. Tr. 773 366

SECTION

Croswell, People *v.* 3 Johns. Cas. 338 161
Croteau, State *v.* 23 Vt. 14 294, 810
Crotty, Com. *v.* 10 Allen, 403 6
Crouch, ex parte, 112 U. S. 178 981, 996
Crow, in re, 60 Wis. 349 1010
Crowell *v.* Merrick, 19 Me. 392 453
Crowley *v.* Com., 11 Met. 575 291
Crowther, R. *v.* 5 C. & P. 316 194
Croxdale *v.* State, 1 Head, 139 176
Crozier, People *v.* 1 Parker C. R. 403 810
State *v.* 12 Nev. 300 813
Cruce *v.* State, 59 Ga. 83 519, 573, 614, 755
Cruikshank *v.* Comyns, 24 Ill. 602 119
U. S. *v.* 92 U. S. 542 151, 920
Cruise, State *v.* 16 Mo. 391 813
Crummey, State *v.* 17 Minn. 72 261
Crump, Com. *v.* 1 Va. cases, 172 541
Crumpton *v.* State, 43 Ala. 31 392, 395, 406
Cruse, R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 541 306 *a*
Crutch, State *v.* 1 Houst. 204 507
Cubreth, ex parte, 49 Cal. 436 28, 29
Cucuel, State *v.* 2 Vroom, 249 (31 N. J. L.) 815, 816, 822, 836, 837, 841
Cullen, R. *v.* 5 C. & P. 116; 1 Mood. C. C. 300 193, 196
Culler, State *v.* 82 Mo. 323 641
Culp *v.* State, 1 Port. 33 188
Culton, Com. *v.* 11 Gray, 1 93
Cummings, Com. *v.* 3 Cush. 212 773
Com. *v.* 6 Gray, 487 146
v. Gann, 52 Penn. St. 484 661
Cunningham, Com. *v.* 13 Mass. 245, 441, 456, 471, 485
People *v.* 1 Denio, 524 712, 796 *a*
v. State, 20 Tex. Ap. 162 881
Curd *v.* Com., 14 B. Mon. 386 314
Curley *v.* Com., 84 Penn. St. 151 634
in re, 34 Iowa, 184 1010
Curling, People *v.* 1 Johns. 320 253, 771
Curran's case, 7 Grat. 619 309
Curran, R. *v.* Ry. & M. 132 8
Curry, R. *v.* 2 Mood. C. C. 218; C. & M. 652 187, 193
Curtis, Com. *v.* 11 Pick. 134 440, 465, 477, 485
ex parte, 3 Minn. 274 602, 953
v. People, 1 Breese, 199 260

SECTION

Curtis, People *v.* 50 N. Y. 321 37, 37 *c*, 793
v. State, 6 Cold. (Tenn.) 9 852
State *v.* 5 Humph. 601 508, 724
State *v.* 29 Kans. 384 440
State *v.* 30 La. An. Pt. II. 814 263
State *v.* 77 Mo. 267 859
State *v.* 71 N. C. 56 746, 756
v. State, 22 Tex. Ap. 227 476
U. S. *v.* 4 Mason, 232 696
Curvan, R. *v.* 1 Moody C. C. 132 5
Cushing, State *v.* 11 R. I. 314 703
Custer, State *v.* 65 N. C. 339 746
Cutbush, R. *v.* L. R. 2 Q. B. 379 932
Cutler, Com. *v.* 9 Allen, 486 472
v. State, 42 Ind. 244 591
Terr. *v.* McCahon, 152 989

D.

Dabney's case, 1 Rob. (Va.) 696 536
Da Costa, in re, 1 Park. C. R. 129 1011
Dacre's case, Kelying, 59 733
Dacy *v.* State, 17 Ga. 439 485, 590
Dadson, R. *v.* T. & M. 385 9
Daffin *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 46 804
Dailey, Com. *v.* 12 Cush. 80 733
People *v.* 59 Cal. 600 801
v. State, 28 Ind. 285 570
Daily *v.* State, 10 Ind. 536 218, 810
Dakins, ex parte, 16 Q. B. 77 982, 999
Dale, R. *v.* 15 Jurist, 657; 5 E. L. & E. 360; 18 Alb. L. J. 127 102
R. *v.* 17 Q. B. 64 102
State *v.* 8 Oreg. 229 608
Daley, in re, 2 F. & F. 258 983
Com. *v.* 4 Gray, 209 481, 483
State *v.* 41 Vt. 564 159
Dallas, State *v.* 35 La. An. 899 818, 827
Dallinger, Com. *v.* 118 Mass. 439 188
Dalrymple, People *v.* 55 Mich. 519 384, 438, 771
Dalton, ex parte, 49 Cal. 463 932
State *v.* 2 Murph. 379 153
Daly, State *v.* 14 R. I. 510 424
Dam, Com. *v.* 107 Mass. 210 566
Damewood *v.* State, 1 How. (Miss.) 262 183, 188
Damon, People *v.* 13 Wendell, 351 509, 517, 664, 672
State *v.* 2 Tyler, 389 464, 468
Dan *v.* Tucker, 4 Johns. 487 847
Dana's case, 7 Ben. 1 37 *b*, 41

SECTION

Dana, Com. *v.* 2 Met. 329 26
v. State, 2 Ohio St. 91 168, 170
Dancy, State *v.* 78 N. C. 437 711, 798
Dane, People *v.* 59 Mich. 550 561
v. Smith, 13 Wis. 585 559
Danforth, State *v.* 3 Conn. 112 919
v. State, 75 Ga. 614 370, 429 *a*, 810
Daniel's case, 1 Bright. U. S. Dig. 294 37
Daniel, Com. *v.* 6 Penn. L. J. 417 35
Daniels *v.* Com., 7 Penn. St. 371 780, 918, 927
Com. *v.* 2 Va. Cas. 402 153
State *v.* 32 Mo. 558 470
State *v.* 66 Mo. 193 602
State *v.* 44 N. H. 383 277, 844
Dann, R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 424 463
Danovan *v.* Jones, 36 N. H. 246 8
Dantz *v.* State, 87 Ind. 398 771
Dark, State *v.* 8 Blackf. 526 457
Darling, Com. *v.* 129 Mass. 112 291
Darnell *v.* State, 24 Tex. Ap. 6 429 *a*
Da Rocha, State *v.* 20 La. An. 356 608
Darr, People *v.* 61 Cal. 538 355, 608, 716
Darrah, State *v.* 1 Houst. 112 260
Dart *v.* McKinney, 9 Blatch. 359 783 *a*
Dascom, Com. *v.* 111 Mass. 404 451
Daubert, State *v.* 42 Mo. 243 291, 293, 709
Daubner, U. S. *v.* 17 Fed. Rep. 793 813
Daugherty, State *v.* 30 Tex. 360 90, 273
Danner *v.* State, 54 Ala. 127 221
Dave *v.* State, 22 Ala. 23 712
Davenport *v.* People, 1 Leigh, 588 805
State *v.* 32 La. An. 558 548, 549
State *v.* 33 La. An. 231 830
U. S. *v.* 1 Deady, 264 788, 895
Daves, in re, 81 N. C. 72 968
David *v.* State, 40 Ala. 69; 54 Ala. 39 756, 841, 918
State *v.* 70 Mo. 460 220
State *v.* 14 S. C. 428 548
v. State, 19 Tex. Ap. 201 602
Davidson, State *v.* 2 Cold. 184 371, 372
State *v.* 36 Tex. 325 134
State *v.* 12 Vt. 300 369, 771
Davies *v.* R., 10 B. & C. 89 131
Davis's case, 122 Mass. 324 30, 35, 36, 993
Davis *v.* Capper, 10 B. & C. 28 70
v. Clements, 2 N. H. 390 6
Com. *v.* 11 Gray, 4 277, 278

	SECTION
Davis, Com. *v.* 121 Mass. 352	239
Com. *v.* 11 Pick. 432	155, 157, 702
v. Linn, 24 Iowa, 508	559
People *v.* 45 Barb. 494	771
v. People, 19 Ill. 74	692, 841
People *v.* 52 Mich. 569	702
People *v.* 56 N. Y. 95	139, 386
R. *v.* 10 B. & C. 89	130
R. *v.* 1 C. & P. 306	253
R. *v.* 1 C. & P. 470	93
R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 319	277
R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 785	561
R. *v.* 2 Den. C. C. 231	119
R. *v.* Gow's R. N. P. 219	408
R. *v.* 1 Leach, 493	235
R. *v.* 6 T. R. 177	6
v. Russell, 5 Bing. 364; 2 Moo. & P. 590	9, 14
v. Sherron, 1 Cranch, 287	969
v. State, 54 Ala. 89	846
v. State, 5 Baxt. 612	711
State *v.* 6 Baxt. 605	121
v. State, 4 Blackf. 345	451
v. State, 13 Bush, 318	220
v. State, 3 Cold. (Tenn.) 77	244
v. State, 20 Ga. 674	415, 417
v. State, 33 Ga. 98	577, 813, 853
v. State, 57 Ga. 66	289, 291
v. State, 58 Ga. 173	471
v. State, 35 Ind. 496	841
v. State, 69 Ind. 130	88
v. State, 88 Ind. 168	813
v. State, 100 Ind. 154	246
State *v.* 41 Iowa, 311	379
State *v.* 1 Ired. 125	273
State *v.* 2 Ired. 153	341
State *v.* 31 La. An. 249	913, 924
v. State, 39 Md. 355	92, 231, 465, 602, 700, 777
State *v.* 29 Mo. 391	641, 844
State *v.* 66 Mo. 684	733
State *v.* 73 Mo. 129	244
State *v.* 69 N. C. 313	176
State *v.* 80 N. C. 384	273, 495, 518, 844
v. State, 15 Ohio, 72	815, 824, 827
v. State, 19 Ohio St. 270	92
State *v.* 12 R. I. 492	350
State *v.* 1 South. 311	441
v. State, 85 Tenn. 522	589, 590
State *v.* 26 Tex. 201	163 *a*
v. State, 42 Tex. 494	478
v. State, 4 Tex. Ap. 456	235
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 645	712
v. State, 15 Tex. Ap. 594	921
State *v.* 100 U. S. 257	783 *a*
Davis, State *v.* 52 Vt. 376	716
v. State, 38 Wis. 487	517
U. S. *v.* 6 Blatch. 464	543, 875
U. S. *v.* 2 Sumn. 482; 5 Cranch, 622	38, 989
(Jefferson) U. S. *v.* Chase Dec. 124	76, 455 *a*
Davison *v.* People, 90 Ill. 221	690, 810
R. *v.* 2 F. & F. 250	513
R. *v.* 1 Leach, 241	191
v. State, 12 Tex. Ap. 214	190
Daw *v.* Eley, L. Rep. 7 Eq. 49	958
Dawes, State *v.* 75 Me. 51	206
Dawson, R. *v.* 2 Den. C. C. 75; 5 Cox C. C. 220; 1 Eng. L. & E. 589	192, 194
R. *v.* 3 Starkie R. 62	246, 465
State *v.* 65 Ind. 445	740, 762
U. S. *v.* 15 How. 467	141
Day *v.* Savage, Hob. 87	605
State *v.* 58 Iowa, 678	27, 422
State *v.* 74 Me. 220	120
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 26	228
Dayton, State *v.* 3 Zab. 49	92, 94, 95, 275, 283, 363, 386
Deacon, Com. *v.* 8 S. & R. 47	8, 13, 15
Com. *v.* 10 S. & R. 125	29, 993
v. Shreve, 2 Zab. 176	847
Dean, Com. *v.* 32 Grat. 912	813
Com. *v.* 109 Mass. 349	164, 383, 464
Com. *v.* 110 Mass. 64	163 *a*
R. *v.* 2 Leach, 693	191
R. *v.* 8 Mod. 27	1010
v. State, 43 Ga. 218	292
v. State, Mart. & Yerg. 127	92
Deane, R. *v.* 5 Cox C. C. 501	518
Dearborn, State *v.* 54 Me. 442	247, 465
Dearman *v.* State, 71 Ala. 351; 77 Ala. 10	465, 477, 601
Deaton, State *v.* 92 N. C. 788	302
Deckard *v.* State, 38 Md. 186	400
De Coursey, People *v.* 61 Cal. 134	285
Dedham, Com. *v.* 16 Mass. 142	100, 110, 423
Deeley, R. *v.* 4 C. & P. 579	151
R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 303; 4 C. & P. 57	109
R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 303	158
Deering, R. *v.* 5 C. & P. 165	561
De Foe *v.* People, 22 Mich. 224	579
De Frind *v.* State, 22 Tex. Ap. 570	838
Degant *v.* Michael, 2 Carter, 396	29, 36
De Given *v.* Dover, 2 Anst. 517	879
Degonia, State *v.* 69 Mo. 485	577, 608, 835, 886

SECTION

De Graffenried, State *v.* 9 Baxt. 287 466
Dejardin, Com. *v.* 126 Mass. 46 177
Dejarnette *v.* Com., 75 Va. 867 636, 709, 811
De Kraft *v.* Barney, 2 Black. U. S. 704 981
Delaney, People *v.* 49 Cal. 394 938
De Laney, State *v.* 28 La An. 434 465
Delaval, R. *v.* 3 Burr. 1434 1004
De Longchamps, Res. *v.* 1 Dall. 111 919
Demain, Com. *v.* Brightly R., 441 98, 106
Deming, in re, 10 Johns. 232 528
Demuth, Com. *v.* 12 S. & R. 389 100
Denman *v.* State, 15 Neb. 138 246, 249
Dennee, U. S. *v.* 3 Woods, 39 164
Dennis, Com. *v.* 105 Mass. 112 234, 280
v. State, 91 Ind. 291 145, 160
Dennison *v.* Collins, 1 Cow. 111 841
State *v.* 31 La. An. 847 465
Dent, R. *v.* 1 C. & K. 249; 2 Cox C. C. 354 299
State *v.* 3 Gill & Johns. 8 159
Denton, R. *v.* Dears, 3; 18 Q. B. 761 759
v. State, 21 Neb. 445 220
Deny, ex parte, 10 Nev. 212 982, 986
De Ollis *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 145 388
De Pass, State *v.* 31 La. An. 487 244
De Pay, in re, 3 Ben. 307, 316 531
De Phue *v.* State, 44 Ala. 32 802
De Puy, ex parte, 10 Int. Rev. R. 34 531
De Quilfeldt, U. S. *v.* 11 Rep. 455; 2 Crim. Law Mag. 214 802
De Rance, State *v.* 34 La. An. 186 651
Derecourt *v.* Corbishley, 5 El. & Bl. 188 8
Derichs, State *v.* 42 Iowa, 196 475
De Serrant, State *v.* 33 La. An. 979 558
Desmarteau, Com. *v.* 16 Gray, 16 277
Despard, R. *v.* 2 Man. & R. 406 669
Dever, Com. *v.* 10 Leigh, 685 358
Devett, R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 639 132, 302
Devlin *v.* De Serrant, 33 La. An. 979 370
v. People, 104 Ill. 504 712
State *v.* 25 Mo. 175 698
U. S. *v.* 6 Blatch. 71 614, 618
Devling *v.* Williamson, 9 Watts, 311 6
Dewar *v.* Spence, 2 Whart. 211 886
De Warren *v.* State, 29 Tex. 464 595
Dewee's case, Chase's Dec. 531 236
Dewick, People *v.* 2 Park. C. R. 230 686
Dick *v.* State, 3 Ohio St. 89 752, 942, 945

SECTION

Dick, State *v.* 2 Wins. N. C. 45 798
Dickens, State *v.* 1 Hayw. 406 124
Dickenson, R. *v.* R. & R. 401 359
U. S. *v.* 2 McLean, 325 294
Dickerson, Com. *v.* 7 Weekly Notes, 433 599 *a*
Dickey, U. S. *v.* 1 Morris, 412 220
Dickinson *v.* Byron, 9 S. & R. 19 995
Com. *v.* 3 Clark, Phil. 365 599 *a*
Diesbach *v.* State, 38 Ohio St. 369 812
Dignam, R. *v.* 7 A. & E. 593 945
Dill, ex parte, 32 Kan. 668 999
People *v.* 1 Scam. 257 773
v. State, 25 Ala. 15 14
Dillane, Com. *v.* 1 Gray, 483 120
Com. *v.* 11 Gray, 67 481
Dillard *v.* State, 58 Miss. 368 417
Dille, State *v.* 34 Ohio St. 560
Dillingham *v.* State, 5 Ohio St. 283 733
Dillon *v.* State, 38 Ohio St. 586 918, 994
Dilworth, Com. *v.* 12 Grat. 689 636, 654, 672
Dimes *v.* Canal, 3 H. L. 759 605
Dimick, People *v.* 107 N. Y. 13 794, 796
State *v.* 12 N. H. 194 980
Dingman *v.* State, 48 Wis. 485 588
Dinkey *v.* Com., 17 Penn. St. 126 245, 466
v. State, 34 La. An. 919 664
Disch, State *v.* 34 La. An. 1134 751, 756
Diskin, State *v.* 34 La. An. 919 672, 673
State *v.* 35 La. An. 46 285, 651, 869
Dixon, People *v.* 4 Park. C. R. 651 75, 76, 81, 1007
v. State, 29 Ark. 165 344
v. State, 13 Fla. 631, 636 541, 712
State *v.* 75 N. C. 275 713, 812
Do, Terr. *v.* 1 Ariz. 507 139, 756
Doane *v.* State, 26 Ind. 495 115
Dobbin, Com. *v.* 2 Pars. 380 297, 470
Dobbins *v.* State, 14 Ohio St. 493 505, 520, 725, 815
Dobson *v.* Oswalt, 20 Ark. 619 560
Dockham, Com. *v.* Thach. Cr. C. 238 425
Dodd, State *v.* 33 Ark. 517 244, 910
v. State, 10 Tex. Ap. 370 252, 470
v. State, 4 Zab. 455 918
Dodge, People *v.* 28 Cal. 445 595

SECTION

Dodge *v.* People, 4 Neb. 220 780, 906
State *v.* 78 Me. 439 235
U. S. *v.* 2 Gall. 313 969
Dodson, State *v.* 16 S. C. 453 577, 601
Doe, People *v.* 1 Mann. (Mich.) 451 688
State *v.* 50 Iowa, 541 90
Doherty, Com. *v.* 10 Cush. 52 132, 159
Com. *v.* 137 Mass. 245 80
Dohme, State *v.* 68 Ga. 339 737
Doig, in re, 4 Fed. Rep. 193 37 *b*
Dolan's case, 101 Mass. 101 925 *a*
Dolan, Com. *v.* 121 Mass. 374 251
v. People, 64 N. Y. 485 344, 350, 427, 608
v. State, 81 Ala. 11 797
State *v.* 40 Ark. 454 645, 841
v. State, 69 Me. 573 936, 937
v. State, 51 Mich. 610 452, 672
Dolby, R. *v.* 2 B. & C. 104 686
Dole, State *v.* 3 Blackf. 294 221
Doll, *v.* Anderson, 27 Cal. 248 908
ex parte, 27 Leg. Int. 20; S. C., 11 Int. Rev. Rec. 36 963
Dolling, State *v.* 37 Wis. 396 823
Dominick *v.* Bowdoin, 44 Ga. 357 532
v. State, 40 Ala. 680 471, 479
Donaghey, ex parte, 2 Pitts. Rep. 166 35
Donahoe *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 297 566
Donahue, Com. *v.* 126 Mass. 51 759
People *v.* 21 N. Y. Sup. Ct. 133 1008
People *v.* 84 N. Y. 438 35
Donaldson *v.* Com., 95 Penn. St. 21 565
ex parte, 44 Mo. 149 383, 447
Donnelly *v.* State, 78 Ala. 453 119
v. State, 2 Dutch. 463 290, 297, 548, 601
Donner *v.* Palmer, 23 Cal. 40 847
Donovan, Com. *v.* 13 Allen, 571 119
Com. *v.* 99 Mass. 425 601
v. Jones, 36 N. H. 246 8
State *v.* 1 Houst. 43 210
State *v.* 61 Iowa, 369 793
Donston *v.* State, 6 Humph. 275 833
Dooley, Com. *v.* 6 Gray, 360 746
v. State, 28 Ind. 239 842
Terr. *v.* 4 Mont. 295 742
Doo Woon, in re, 1 West Coast Rep. 333; 18 Fed. Rep. 898 34, 993
Doolittle, in re, 23 Fed. Rep. 550 951
State *v.* 58 N. H. 92 680
Doon, State *v.* R. M. Charlton, 1 379, 846
Doran, Com. *v.* 14 Gray, 37 274
v. State, 7 Tex. Ap. 385 756

SECTION

Dorr's case, Pamph. 7 Bost. L. R. 347 658, 810
Dorr, ex parte, 3 How. 103 981
Dorus *v.* State, 108 Mass. 488 749
Dorwart, Com. *v.* 7 Luz. Bar, 121 367
Doss *v.* Com., 1 Grat. 557 407, 573
Dos Santo's case, 2 Brock. 493 38
Doty, State *v.* 32 N. J. L. (3 Vroom) 403 956
Doubleday *v.* Sherman, 8 Blatch. 45 972
Dougherty *v.* Biddle, Bright. 4 980
v. Com., 69 Penn. St. 286 540, 545, 549, 550, 700, 706, 906
v. People, 1 Col. 514 712
State *v.* 70 Iowa, 439 913
State *v.* 55 Mo. 69 815
Douglas, R. *v.* 1 Camp. 212 237
Douglass, People *v.* 4 Cow. 26 814, 815, 819, 823
R. *v.* 13 Q. B. 42 910
State *v.* 63 N. C. 500 791
v. State, 8 Tex. Ap. 520 350
v. State, 3 Wis. 820 409, 541
U. S. *v.* 2 Blatch. 207 612
Dove, Com. *v.* 2 Va. Cas. 29 358
v. State, 3 Heisk. 348 566
Dover *v.* State, 75 Ala. 40 756
Dovey, R. *v.* 2 Den. C. C. 86; 2 Eng. L. & E. 532; 4 Cox C. C. 428 302, 312, 315
Dow's case, 18 Penn. St. 37; S. C., 1 Phil. 234 27, 29, 37
Dowdican, Com. *v.* 115 Mass. 133 447, 913
Dowdney *v.* Palmer, 4 M. & W. 664 566
Dowdy *v.* Com., 9 Grat. 727 291, 293, 846
Dowell, State *v.* 3 Gill & J. 310 208
Dowers, State *v.* 45 N. H. 543 155
Dowing *v.* Porter, 8 Gray, 539 26
v. State, 4 Mo. 572 184
Dowling, Com. *v.* 114 Mass. 259 751
People *v.* 84 N. Y. 478 740
v. State, 5 Sm. & M. 664 341
Downer, State *v.* 21 Wis. 275 712, 793
Downes, Com. *v.* 24 Pick. 227 980, 983
Downing, R. *v.* 1 Den. C. C. 52 300
Downshire, R. *v.* 4 A. & E. 699 703
Dowse, R. *v.* 4 F. & F. 492 573
Doyal *v.* State, 70 Ga. 134 384, 662, 692, 827, 837, 869
Doyall, People *v.* 48 Cal. 85 847
Doyle, Com. *v.* 110 Mass. 103 120, 134
R. *v.* 4 Leach, 67 916
v. State, 17 Ohio, 222 350

SECTION

Doyle, State *v.* 11 R. I. 574 759
v. U. S. 10 Fed. Rep. 269; 11 Biss. 100 714, 749, 750, 830
Dozier, State *v.* 33 La. An. 1362 608
Drake *v.* Lowell, 13 Met. 292 453, 599 *a*
R. *v.* Salk. 666 173
v. State, 51 Ala. 30 619, 672
v. State, 60 Ala. 42 467
State *v.* 36 Me. 366 6
State *v.* 64 N. C. 589 121
State *v.* 5 Tex. Ap. 649 672
State *v.* 1 Vroom, 422 161
Draper, People *v.* 28 Hun, 1 829
Drawdy, State *v.* 14 Rich. 87 810
Drennan *v.* People, 10 Mich. 169 7
Dresch *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 175 716
Dresser, State *v.* 54 Me. 569 405, 406, 425
Drew, Com. *v.* 3 Cush. 279 304, 390, 431, 452, 517
Com. *v.* 4 Mass. 391 5, 842, 847, 862, 869, 884
v. Com. 1 Whart. 279 780, 927
Driskill *v.* State, 7 Ind. 338 664
Driver, State *v.* 78 N. C. 423 780, 920
Droneberger *v.* State, 112 Ind. 105 145
Drum, Com. *v.* 19 Pick. 479 249, 261
Drury, R. *v.* 3 Cox C. C. 544; 3 C. & K. 193 457, 780
State *v.* 13 R. I. 540 98, 423, 426
Duane, U. S. *v.* Wall. C. C. 102 958
Dubois *v.* State, 50 Ala. 139 176, 189
State *v.* 24 La. An. 309 597
Dubose *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 418 435 *a*, 752, 779
Ducey, Com. *v.* 126 Mass. 269 26
Duchess of Kingston, R. *v.* 2 How. St. Tr. 544 451
Duckett, ex parte, 15 S. C. 210 924
Dudley *v.* McCord, 65 Iowa, 671 999
Duestoe, State *v.* 1 Bay, 377 273, 784
Duff, People *v.* 1 N. Y. Cr. 425; 65 N. Y. Pr. 365 344, 350
Duffield, Terr. *v.* 1 Ariz. 59 243, 715
Duffin *v.* People, 107 Ill. 113 113, 158, 181
Duffy, Com. *v.* 11 Cush. 145 756
Com. *v.* 96 Penn. St. 506 320
People *v.* 5 Barb. 205 913
v. People, 26 N. Y. 589 805, 810
R. *v.* 4 Cox C. C. 326 404, 428
Dufour, State *v.* 63 Ind. 569 95
Dugan, in re, 2 Low. 367 52, 56
Dugdale *v.* R. Dears. C. C. 64 177
Duignan *v.* Wyatt, 3 Blackf. 385 865
Duke, R. *v.* Holt, 399; 1 Salk. 400 549, 550

SECTION

Dulany, State *v.* 45 Md. 100 602
Dulittle, State *v.* 58 N. H. 92 311
Dull *v.* Com., 25 Grat. 965 189
v. People, 4 Denio, 91 614
Dumas *v.* State, 62 Ga. 88 661
v. State, 63 Ga. 600 835, 844
Duncan, ex parte, 54 Cal. 75 1007 *a*
v. Com., 6 Dana, 295 465, 471, 481, 489
v. Com., 4 S. & R. 449 148, 522, 527, 528
R. *v.* 44 L. T. N. S. 521; 7 Q. B. D. 198 785, 787
State *v.* 6 Ired. 98, 236 271, 350, 593, 844, 845
State *v.* 9 Port. 260 220
State *v.* 7 Yerg. 271 344, 347, 350
Dungey, R. *v.* 4 F. & F. 99 246
Dunham *v.* Baxter, 4 Mass. 79 876
Com. *v.* Thac. C. C. 516 597
v. State, 6 Iowa, 245 958
v. State, 9 Tex. Ap. 330 158
Dunlap *v.* Bartlett, 10 Gray, 282 75
Dunn *v.* Com., 6 Barr, 387 540, 545, 875
ex parte, 25 How. Pr. 467 979
People *v.* 1 Idaho, 75 709
v. People, 109 Ill. 635 590, 602, 813
People *v.* 90 N. Y. 104 285
R. *v.* 1 C. & K. 730 383
v. R. 12 Q. B. 1031 79, 941
v. State, 70 Ind. 47 481
State *v.* 80 Mo. 681 504
v. State, 2 Pike, 230 438
v. State, 7 Tex. Ap. 600 669
Dunster, Com. *v.* 145 Mass. 102 384, 472
Durand *v.* People, 47 Mich. 332 159
Durant *v.* Wash. Co. Woolw. 377 967
Durein, State *v.* 29 Kan. 688 614 *a*, 617
Durham *v.* People, 4 Scam. 172 460, 471
v. State, 9 Ga. 306 447
v. State, 70 Ga. 264 829, 845
State *v.* 72 N. C. 447 261, 464
Durrett *v.* State, 62 Ala. 434 804
Durst, State *v.* 7 Tex. 74 279
Dutcher *v.* State, 16 Neb. 30 894
Dutchess Co., People *v.* 2 Barb. 282 791
Dutton *v.* State, 5 Ind. 533 390, 452
Duval, U. S. *v.* Gilp. 356 813
Dwinnels *v.* Boynton, 3 Allen, 310 25, 26
Dyches, State *v.* 28 Tex. 535 522, 528
Dyer *v.* Com., 23 Pick. 402 756
R. *v.* 6 Mod. 96 386
v. State, 85 Ind. 525 84

SECTION
Dyèr *v.* State, 11 Lea, 509 420, 426
Dynes *v.* Hoover, 20 How. (U. S.) 65 439
Dyott *v.* Com., 5 Whart. 67 350, 417, 886
Dyson, ex parte, 25 Miss. 356 82, 540

E.

Eagan, ex parte, 18 Fla. 194 1007
v. State, 53 Ind. 162 241
Eagen, Com. *v.* 4 Gray, 18 665, 668
Eames *v.* State, 6 Humph. 53 9
v. State, 10 Tex. Ap. 421 577
Earll *v.* People, 73 Ill. 329 781
v. People, 99 Ill. 123 571
Early, State *v.* 3 Harring. 561 294
v. State, 1 Tex. Ap. 248 822
Earnest, People *v.* 45 Cal. 29 344
Earp *v.* Com., 9 Dana, 302 588, 590, 592
State *v.* 41 Tex. 487 273
Easland, Com. *v.* 1 Mass. 15 309
Eason *v.* State, 17 Am. L. Reg. 313; 6 Baxt. 466 642, 757
East Boston Ferry Co., Com. *v.* 13 Allen, 589 108
Easter, State *v.* 30 Ohio St. 542 344, 350
Eastman, Com. *v.* 1 Cush. 189 309, 386, 387, 405, 725
v. Com. 2 Gray, 76; 4 Gray, 416 189, 191, 212, 252, 470
v. State, 54 Ind. 441 752
Eastwood, People *v.* 3 Park. C. R. 25 707, 815, 823, 834
Eaton, in re, 27 Mich. 1 996, 996 *b*
R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 417 464
State *v.* 75 Mo. 586 452, 565
Eberle, Com. *v.* 3 S. & R. 11 802
Ebert, U. S. *v.* 1 Cent. L. J. 205 89
Ebner, People *v.* 23 Cal. 158 541
Eccles, R. *v.* 1 Leach, 274 165
Eckford, People *v.* 7 Cowen, 535 386, 389
Eckardt *v.* People, 83 N. Y. 462 236
Eden's case, 2 M. & S. 226 988
Edgar *v.* State, 43 Ala. 312 798
Edge *v.* Com., 7 Barr, 275 251, 285
Edgerly, Com. *v.* 10 Allen, 184 801, 828
Edgerton, Com. *v.* 5 Allen, 514 771
Edmon *v.* State, 1 Swan, 14 788
Edmonds, R. *v.* 4 B. & Ald. 471 622, 686, 694
v. State, 34 Ark. 720 297, 601
Edmondson *v.* State, 17 Ala. 179 101
Edsall, R. *v.* 2 East P. C. 984 184

SECTION
Edson, State *v.* 10 La. An. 229 208
Edwards, Com. *v.* 4 Gray, 1 91, 92, 94, 146, 388, 696
v. Com., 19 Pick. 124 131, 133
v. Edwards, 3 East, 451 801 996
ex parte, 35 Kan. 99 328,
in re, 43 N. J. L. 555 925 *a*
People *v.* 41 Cal. 640 650
v. People, 39 Mich. 393 414
R. *v.* R. & R. 224; 2 Leach, 621, *n.*; 3 Camp. 207 508
R. *v.* R. & R. 497 209
v. State, 22 Ark. 253 578
v. State, 25 Ark. 444 260
v. State, 53 Ga. 428 712, 846
State *v.* 34 La. An. 1012 856
v. State 47 Miss. 581 555
State *v.* 19 Mo. 674 273
State *v.* 70 Mo. 480 273
State *v.* 90 N. C. 710 261
v. State, 45 N. J. L. 419 733
Edymoin, in re, 2 How. Pr. 478 531, 533, 1006
Effinger *v.* State, 47 Ind. 256 125
Efler, State *v.* 85 N. C. 585 637
Egan, State *v.* 10 La. An. 699 124, 306
Eggington, ex parte, 2 E. & B. 717, 992
Egglesht, State *v.* 41 Iowa, 574 470, 471
Eggleton *v.* Smiley, 17 Johns. 133 846
Eichenlaub *v.* State, 36 Ohio St. 140 385
Eighmy *v.* People, 79 N. Y. 546 343 *a*, 521, 601
Elam *v.* State, 26 Ala. 48 294, 296
Elborn, State *v.* 27 Ind. 483 220
Elden, State *v.* 41 Me. 165 435 *a*, 535
Elder, State *v.* 65 Ind. 282 457, 460, 471
Eldred *v.* Ford, 46 Wis. 530 996
Eldredge *v.* State, 370 Ohio St. 191 910
Eldridge *v.* Fancher, 1 Hun, 27 1011
v. State, 12 Tex. Ap. 208 601
Eleck *v.* Terr., 1 Wash. 126 541
Electoral College, in re, 1 Hughes, 571 981
Elkin *v.* People, 5 Col. 508 822
Elkins, R. *v.* 4 Burr. 2129 967
v. State, 13 Ga. 435 240
State *v.* 1 Meigs, 109 369
State *v.* 63 Mo. 159 548
Ellerbe, in re, 4 McCrary, 449; 4 Crim. Law Mag. 60 954, 965
Ellington, State *v.* 7 Ired. 61 623, 637

SECTION

Elliott, Com. *v.* 2 Mass. 372 453, 599 *a*
ex parte, 3 Mont. & Ayr. 110 453
v. People, 13 Mich. 365 928
v. State, 26 Ala. 78 302, 315
State *v.* 7 Blackf. 280 271
v. State, 73 Ind. 10 624, 645
State *v.* 15 Iowa, 72 813
State *v.* 14 Tex. 423 278
Ellis *v.* Com., 78 Ky. 130 243, 255
People *v.* 15 Wend. 371 512
R. *v.* 6 B. & C. 145 780, 945
R. *v.* 4 Cox C. C. 258 194
State *v.* 4 Mo. 474 161, 228
State *v.* 74 Mo. 385 464
v. State, 10 Tex. Ap. 540 813
Ellison, State *v.* 4 Lea, 229 456
State *v.* 12 Tex. Ap. 557 672
Elrington, R. *v.* 10 W. R. 13; 9 Cox C. C 86; 1 B. & S. 689 465, 467
Elsee *v.* Smith, 1 D. & R. 97 18, 22
Elsham, State *v.* 70 Iowa, 731 290
Elwell, Com. *v.* 2 Met. 190 164, 301
Ely *v.* Hallett, 2 Caines, 57 533
v. Holton, 15 N. Y. 595 320
Emanuel *v.* State, 36 Miss. 627 996
Embden, R. *v.* 9 East, 437 456, 471
Emerick, State *v.* 35 Ark. 324 239
Emerson, U. S. *v.* 4 Cranch, 188 955
Emery *v.* Chesley, 18 N. H. 198 3
State *v.* 59 Vt. 84 351, 508
Emory, State *v.* 79 Mo. 461 577
Emporia *v.* Volmar, 12 Kans. 622 602
England, State *v.* 19 Mo. 481 95
State *v.* 78 N. C. 552 507
Engleman *v.* State, 2 Carter, 91 124, 274, 293
English, State *v.* 34 Kans. 629 779 *a*
State *v.* 2 Mo. 182 318, 385
v. State, 4 Tex. 125 91
Eno's case, 30 Alb. L. J. 144 47
Enoch, People *v.* 13 Wend, 159, 175 230, 281
Ensign, State *v.* 13 Neb. 250 1007
Entic *v.* Carrington, 19 St. Tr. 1067 24
Enwright *v.* State, 58 Ind. 567 96
Epes's case, 5 Grat. 676 517, 636
Ephraim, State *v.* 2 Dev. & Bat. 162 495, 722
Epps *v.* State, 19 Ga. 102 654, 689, 815, 836, 848
v. State, 102 Ind. 539 548, 561
State *v.* 76 N. C. 55 541
Erles's case, 2 Lew, 133 231
Erwin, ex parte, 21 Alb. L. J. 87; 7 Tex. Ap. 288 35 *a*, 81
v. State, 29 Ohio St. 186 449, 638
Esdaile, R. *v.* 1 F. & F. 213 157, 703

SECTION

Eskridge, State *v.* 1 Swan (Tenn.), 413 121
Esmon *v.* State, 1 Swan, 14 465, 895
Esselborn, in re, 20 Blatch. 1 328
Estep *v.* Lacy, 35 Iowa, 419 528
Estes *v.* State, 55 Ga. 131 911
v. State, 2 Humph. 490 941
State *v.* 70 Mo. 428 577
Etting *v.* Bank U. S., 1 Wheat. 59 797
Evans, Com. *v.* 101 Mass. 25 465, 476
v. Com., 3 Met. 453 87, 405
v. Com., 13 S. & R. 426 232
v. People, 44 Miss. 762 802
v. Roberts, 3 Salk. 147 779 *b*
R. *v.* 5 C. & P. 553 194, 464
R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 765 111
v. State, 62 Ala. 6 99
v. State, 33 Ga. 4 801, 804
State *v.* 7 Gill & J. 290 281
State *v.* 8 Humph. 110 354
v. State, 7 Ind. 271 815, 817
State *v.* 21 La. An. 321 722, 815
State *v.* 23 La. An. 525 918
State *v.* 65 Mo. 574 866
v. State, 8 Ohio St. 196 194
State *v.* 15 Rich. (S. C.) 31 189
State *v.* 23 S. C. 209 252
v. State, 6 Tex. Ap. 513 672, 856
v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 225 588, 802
Evarts *v.* State, 48 Ind. 422 146
Everett, R. *v.* 8 B. & C. 114 152
State *v.* Dudley S. C. 296 81
Eyland *v.* State, 4 Sneed (Tenn.), 357 216
Ezell, ex parte, 40 Tex. 451 995

F.

Faderman, R. *v.* 4 Cox. C. C. 357; 3 C. & K. 359; 1 Den. C. C. 565 404
Fagan, Com. *v.* 15 Gray, 194 277
Fagnan *v.* Knox, 66 N. Y. 526 453
Fahey, State *v.* 35 La. An. 9 866
Fahnestock *v.* State, 23 Ind. 231 643, 664
State *v.* 102 Ind. 156 246
Fair, People *v.* 43 Cal. 137 560, 844
Fairie, R. *v.* 8 Cox C. C. 66 475
Falconer, State *v.* 70 Iowa, 416 518
Falk *v.* People, 42 Ill. 331 810, 813
Falkner *v.* State, 3 Heisk. 33 486
Falvey, in re, 7 Wis. 630 964
Fancher, People *v.* 3 Th. & C. 189 1011
State *v.* 71 Mo. 460 151, 251
Fanning *v.* State, 12 Lea, 651 742
Farez's case, 2 Abb. U. S. 346 56, 57

SECTION

Farez's case, 7 Blatch. 34, 388 50, 51, 52, 53, 55
Faris *v.* State, 1 Ohio St. 188 744
Farnham, ex parte, 3 Col. 545 996
Farr, State *v.* 12 Rich. 24 423, 426
Farrand *v.* Fowler, 2 Am. L. T. (U. S. Ct.) 4 980
in re, 1 Abb. U. S. 140 980, 981
State *v.* 3 Halst. 333 167
Farrell, Com. *v.* 105 Mass. 189 425, 507
Farrer, State *v.* 35 La. An. 315 693
v. State, 2 Ohio St. 54 829, 830, 847
Farrier, State *v.* 1 Hawks, 487 202 *a*
Farring, U. S. *v.* 4 Cranch C. C. 465 447
Farrington, People *v.* 14 Johns. 348 193
State *v.* 2 Crim. L. Mag. 525; S. C. 5 Fed. Rep. 343 363, 367, 380
Farris *v.* State, 35 Ga. 241 709
Farrow, State *v.* 48 Ga. 30 114, 576, 579, 856
State *v.* 74 Mo. 531 641
Fasset, State *v.* 16 Conn. 457 358, 363, 367, 378, 379
Faulk *v.* State, 52 Ala. 415 478, 481
v. State, 30 La. An. Pt. II. 831 747
Faulkner's case, 1 Saund. 249 93
Faulkner, State *v.* 32 La. An. 725 470
Fauntleroy, R. *v.* 1 C. & P. 421; 1 Mood. C. C. 52 197
Faust *v.* Judge, etc., 30 Mich. 266 996
Fayetteville, State *v.* 2 Murph. 371 468, 471
Fee, State *v.* 19 Wis. 562 388
Fehrenback, U. S. *v.* 2 Woods, 175 316
Feigel *v.* State, 85 Ind. 589 158
Felch, State *v.* 58 N. H. 1 261
Felker, People *v.* 61 Mich. 110 713
Feller, State *v.* 25 Iowa, 67 819
Fellows *v.* State, 5 Greenl. 533 750
State *v.* 2 Hayw. 340 362
Fells, Com. *v.* 9 Leigh, 613 494, 508, 724
Felton, Com. *v.* 101 Mass. 14 304
State *v.* 25 Iowa, 67 819
Fenderson, State *v.* 28 La. An. 82 995
Fenleson, State *v.* 78 Mo. 495 756
Fenn, State *v.* 41 Conn. 590 212, 213
Fennessy, ex parte, 54 Cal. 101 328
Fenno, Com. *v.* 125 Mass. 387 156, 220
Fenwick, U. S. *v.* 4 Cranch C. C. 675 810
Ferguson, in re, 9 Johns. 239 980

SECTION

Ferguson, *v.* People, 90 Ill. 570 246
R. *v.* 6 Cox C. C. 454 289, 291
State *v.* 2 Hill (S. C.), 619 8
State *v.* 49 Ind. 33 561
Ferrell *v.* State, 2 Lea, 25 158, 251
v. State, 43 Tex. 503 712
v. State, 22 W. Va. 759 120
Ferelle, in re, 28 Fed. Rep. 878 51
Ferrens, in re, 3 Ben. 442 982
Ferris, in re, 35 N. Y. 262 928
State *v.* 56 Cal. 142 118
State *v.* 16 La. An. 424 597
State *v.* 3 Lea, 700 243
Ferro, U. S. *v.* 18 Fed. Rep. 901 152, 251
Fetter's case, 3 Zbr. 311, 29, 30, 36
Few, People *v.* 2 Johns. R. 290 969
Fiddler *v.* State, 7 Humph. 508 471
Field, Com. *v.* 11 Allen, 786 82
ex parte, 5 Blatch. C. C. 63 979
U. S. *v.* 16 Fed. Rep. 778; 21 Blatch. 330 89
Fielder, R. *v.* 2 D. & R. 46 893
Fielding's case, 2 Burr. 719 384, 599 *a*
Fielding, State *v.* 32 Me. 585 248
Fields *v.* State, 52 Ala. 348 465
State *v.* Pecks' Tenn. R. 140 91
Fife *v.* Com., 29 Penn St. 429 312, 772
State *v.* 1 Bailey, 1 468, 471
Fight *v.* State, 7 Ohio, 180 543, 875
Files, State *v.* 3 Brev. 304; 1 Const. R. 234 583, 587, 590
Finch, People *v.* 5 Johns. 237 188
v. State, 81 Ala. 41 661
v. State, 6 Blackf. 533 124
v. State, 53 Miss. 363 504
v. State, 64 Miss. 461 154
Findley, State *v.* 77 Mo. 338 125
Finlay *v.* Stewart, 56 Penn St. 183 566
Finley, State *v.* 61 Ala. 201 391 *a*, 438, 507, 927
Finn, State *v.* 31 La. An. 408 90
Finnegan, People *v.* 1 Park. C. R. 147 568, 810
Fiott *v.* Com., 12 Grat. 564 588
First, State *v.* 82 Ind. 1 85
Firth, R. *v.* L. R. 1 C. C. R. 172; 11 Cox C. C. 234 474
Fischblatt, Com. *v.* 4 Met. 359 457, 465, 518
Fischer *v.* State, 56 How. Pr. 218 950
Fish, State *v.* 4 Ired. 219 141, 147
Fisher *v.* Com., 1 Bush, 211 470
Com. *v.* 7 Gray, 492 92, 95
Com. *v.* 17 Mass. 46 193
in re, 6 Neb. 309 996, 996 *b*
v. People, 23 Ill. 283 749, 829

SECTION

Fisher *v.* People, 103 Ill. 101 869
People *v.* 14 Wend. 9 452, 517
v. Phil. 4 Brewst. 375 669
v. State, 46 Ala. 717 466
State *v.* 103 Ind. 503 742
State *v.* 37 Kans. 404 293
v. State, 40 N. J. L. 169 110
State *v.* 2 Nott & McC. 261 791, 813, 846
v. State, 33 Tex. 792 290
Fisk, ex parte, 113 U. S. 913 994, 999
People *v.* 45 How. Pr. 294 980, 993
v. State, 9 Neb. 62 131
Fissington *v.* Hutchinson, 15 L. T. N. S. 390 453
Fitch *v.* Chapman, 10 Conn. 8 801
Fitchburg R. R., Com. *v.* 10 Allen, 189 238, 706, 812
Com. *v.* 120 Mass. 372 907 *a*
Com. *v.* 126 Mass. 472 396
Fitzcox *v.* State, 53 Miss. 585 371
Fitzgerald, R. *v.* 1 C. & K. 201 511
R. *v.* 1 Salk. 401 913
State *v.* 49 Iowa, 260 555
v. State, 4 Wis. 395 92, 93
Fitzhugh *v.* State, 13 Lea, 258 350
Fitzpatrick *v.* Kelly, L. R. 8 Q. B. 337 77
164
v. People, 98 Ill. 269, 700
People *v.* 30 Hun, 493; 1 N. Y. Cr. 425, 344, 350
Flagg, Com. *v.* 135 Mass. 545 737
Flaherty *v.* Longley, 62 Me. 420 22
Flanagan, State *v.* 26 W. Va. 117 837
Flanakin, U. S. *v.* Hem. 30 358
Flannagan, State *v.* 6 Md. 167 246, 465
Flanigan, Com. *v.* 7 W. & S. 68 415, 623, 634, 791, 813, 844, 866, 871, 889
Flannigan, Com. *v.* 139 Mass. 560, 760
Flavel's case, 8 W. & S. 197 533
Fleming *v.* Clark, 12 Allen, 191 995
v. People, 27 N. Y. 329 238, 242
State *v.* 7 Humph. 152 383, 448
v. State, 11 Ind. 234 643, 707
Flemming, State *v.* 66 Me. 142 350
Fletcher *v.* People, 81 Ill. 116 910
v. People, 117 Ill. 184 869
v. State, 7 Eng. Ark. 169 413
v. State, 6 Humph. 249 508, 654, 665
v. State, 60 Miss. 675 588
State *v.* 18 Mo. 425 251
State *v.* 13 R. I. 522 120
Fley, State *v.* 2 Brev. 338 445

SECTION

Flint, R. *v.* Hardw. 370 161
State *v.* 33 La. An. 1238 261
State *v.* 62 Mo. 393 228
Flitters *v.* Allfrey, L. R. 10 C. P. 29 481
Flournoy *v.* Atty.-Gen., 1 Kelly, 606 528
Flower, R. *v.* 3 C. & P. 413 291
v. State, 1 Walk. 518 640, 655
Floyd *v.* State, 30 Ala. 511 353
Flye, State *v.* 26 Me. 312 293
Flynn, State *v.* 31 Ark. 35 602
State *v.* 42 Iowa, 164 358
v. State, 8 Tex. Ap. 398 940
Fogarty, R. *v.* 5 Cox C. C. 161 559
Fogerty, Com. *v.* 8 Gray, 489 220, 263
Fogg *v.* State, 9 Yerg. 392 198
Foggy, Com. *v.* 6 Leigh, 638 405
Folden *v.* State, 13 Neb. 328 551
Foley, ex parte, 62 Cal. 508 203
v. State, 9 Ind. 363 247
v. State, 15 Nev. 64 535
Fonda, ex parte, 117 U. S. 552 981
Fong, People *v.* 70 Cal. 8 866
Fonsonetta, State *v.* 38 La. An. 61 90
Fontaine *v.* State, 6 Baxt. 514 470
Fooks, State *v.* 65 Iowa, 452 745, 804
Foote *v.* State, 59 Md. 264 921
Foran, Com. *v.* 110 Mass. 179 798
Forbes, People *v.* 22 Cal. 135 931
People *v.* 4 Parker C. R. 611 80
Ford *v.* Ford, 10 Abb. Pr. N. S. (N. Y.) 74; 41 How. Pr. 169 950
R. *v.* 1 N. & Man. 776 901
v. State, 34 Ark. 649 507, 577, 579, 751
v. State, 112 Ind. 373 158, 350, 353
State *v.* 30 La. An. 311 549
State *v.* 37 La. An. 443 602, 651, 758, 810
v. State, 71 Mo. 200 577
U. S. *v.* 99 U. S. 594 447, 536
Foreman *v.* Hunter, 59 Iowa, 550 798 *a*
Forrest *v.* State, 13 Lea, 103 255, 468
Forshner, State *v.* 43 N. H. 89 692
Forsyth, R. *v.* R. & R. 274 212
Fortenberry *v.* State, 55 Miss. 403 273, 664
Forward *v.* State, 49 Md. 537 810
Foster, Com. *v.* 122 Mass. 317 909 *a*, 913
v. Com., 8 Watts & S. 77 404, 405, 421, 453, 486, 599 *a*
v. People, 50 N. Y. 598 712
R. *v.* 3 C. & K. 201 718
R. *v.* R. & R. 412 119
v. State, 38 Ala. 425 323, 325, 328

SECTION

Foster *v.* State, 39 Ala. 229 420, 471, 478, 484
State *v.* 33 Iowa, 525 467
State *v.* 30 Kan. 365 154, 220
State *v.* 32 La. An. 34 608
State *v.* 3 McCord, 442 190, 220
v. State, 52 Miss. 595 872
State *v.* 61 Mo. 549 712
State *v.* 9 Tex. 65 388
v. State, 1 Tex. Ap. 531 98
Foust *v.* State, 12 Lea, 404 438
v. State, 85 Tenn. 342 438
Foute *v.* State, 15 Lea, 712 291
Fouts *v.* Prince, 64 Iowa, 71 1010
State *v.* 7 Ohio St. 471 638
v. State, 8 Ohio St. 78 696
Fowler, Com. *v.* 4 Call (Va.), 35 533
in re, 18 Blatch. 430 52, 57
R. *v.* 4 B. & Ald. 273 790
v. State, 3 Heisk. 154 254, 301, 461
v. State, 85 Ind. 538 810
State *v.* 52 Iowa, 103 345, 358, 363
State *v.* 28 N. H. 184 255
State *v.* 13 R. I. 661 251
Fox, Com. *v.* 7 Gray, 585 156
Com. *v.* 7 Penn. St. 336 980
v. Gaunt, 3 B. & Ad. 798 17
v. Ohio, 5 How. U. S. 410 442, 490
v. People, 95 Ill. 71 577
R. *v.* 10 Cox C. C. 502 700
State *v.* 1 Dutch. 566 633, 844
State *v.* 79 Mo. 109 588
v. State, 34 Ohio St. 377, 752
v. State, 3 Tex. Ap. 319 523
State *v.* 15 Vt. 22 227
U. S. *v.* 1 Low. 301 125
Foxworthy, R. *v.* 7 Mod. 153 533
Foy, State *v.* 82 N. C. 679 211
Foye, U. S. *v.* 1 Curt. C. C. 364 158
Foynes, Com. *v.* 126 Mass. 267 90
Fraher, Com. *v.* 126 Mass. 265 435, 452
France, Com. *v.* 2 Brewst. 568 161
Com. *v.* 3 Brewst. 148 105
State *v.* 1 Tenn. 434 549
Francis, People *v.* 38 Cal. 183 591
People *v.* 52 Mich. 575 779
Francisco *v.* State, 1 Carter, 179 283
v. State, 4 Zabr. 30 247, 465
Francois *v.* State, 20 Ala. 83 759
Frank, State *v.* 23 La. An. 213 819
Franklin, People *v.* 3 Johns. Cas. 299 167
v. State, 12 Md. 236 810
Franklyn, R. *v.* 2 Ld. Raym. 1179 106
Frazer *v.* People, 54 Barb. 306 220

SECTION

Frazier, Com. *v.* 2 Brewst. 490 613, 614
v. Com., 12 B. Mon. 369 528
v. State, 19 Mo. 678 121
State *v.* 23 Ohio St. 551 638, 639
Fredericks, Com. *v.* 119 Mass. 199 423
Free, State *v.* 2 Hill S. C. 628 319
Freeland *v.* People, 11 Ill. 380 465, 471
Freels, State *v.* 3 Humph. 228 292
Freeman *v.* Jacob, 4 Camp. 209 135
v. People, 4 Denio, 9, 35 615, 618, 631, 670, 676, 686, 690, 693
State *v.* 6 Black. 248 164
State *v.* 5 Conn. 348 847
State *v.* 21 Mo. 481 93, 131, 275
State *v.* 13 N. H. 488 369
State *v.* 27 Vt. 523 935
State *v.* 59 Vt. 661 90
Freligh *v.* State, 8 Mo. 613 167
French, R. *v.* L. R. 1 C. C. R. 217 186
v. Smith, 4 Vt. 363 847
v. State, 12 Ind. 670 277
U. S. *v.* 1 Gall. 1 981
Freston, in re, 49 L. T. (N. S.) 290 953
Frey, State *v.* 35 La. An. 106 759
Friar *v.* State, 3 How. (Miss.) 422 371, 862
Friedburg *v.* People, 102 Ill. 190 869
Friedericks, Com. *v.* 119 Mass. 199 98
Friedlander *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 204 762
Fries's case, Wh. St. Tr. 606 560, 605, 798 *a*, 844, 847
Frisby, State *v.* 19 La. An. 143 830
Frittener, State *v.* 65 Mo. 422 865
Fritz *v.* State, 40 Ind. 18 457, 460, 466
State *v.* 27 La. An. 360 788, 895, 906
Froiseth, State *v.* 16 Minn. 296 359, 363
Frost, R. *v.* 9 C. & P. 129 61, 612, 672, 696
R. *v.* Dears. C. C. R. 474; 24 L. J. M. C. 116 90
State *v.* 1 Brev. 385 455
Frnge, State *v.* 28 La. An. 659 837, 847
Fry *v.* Bennett, 3 Bosw. 200 560
v. Oatley, 6 Wis. 42 27
R. *v.* R. & R. 482 218
Fuers, U. S. *v.* 12 Int. Rev. Rec. 43 338

SECTION

Fugate, Com. *v.* 2 Leigh, 725 521, 939 *a*
Fugler *v.* State, 56 Miss. 829 541
Fulford, State *v.* 1 Phil. (N. C.) L. 563 183, 189
Fulkner *v.* State, 3 Heisk. 33 405, 420
Fuller, Com. *v.* 1 Wheel. C. C. 323 591
ex parte, 19 Tex. Ap. 241 996
v. People, 92 Ill. 182 177
People *v.* 2 Parker C. R. (N. Y.) 16 608
People *v.* 2 Parker C. R. 16 631, 689
R. *v.* 1 B. & P. 180 236, 253
State *v.* 1 McCord, 178 522, 533
State *v.* 39 Vt. 74 696
Fullerton, People *v.* 10 Hun, 63 997
Fulmer *v.* Com., 97 Penn. St. 503 470, 772
Fults *v.* State, 2 Sneed (Tenn.), 232 913
Fuqua, People *v.* 61 Cal. 377 480
Furlong, U. S. *v.* 5 Wheat. 184 771
Furneaux's case, R. & R. 335 470
Furser, R. *v.* Say, 90 451
Fury, State *v.* 13 R. I. 623 101
Fussell, R. *v.* 3 Cox C. C. 291 285

G.

Gabe *v.* State, 1 Eng. (Ark.) 519 164, 358
Gable, Com. *v.* 7 S. & R. 423 243, 261
Gaffney, People *v.* 14 Abb. Pr. N. S. 36 828
v. People, 50 N. Y. 416 568, 777
State *v.* Rice, 431 247, 261, 291
State *v.* 56 Vt., 451 693
Gage *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 259 549
Gaines, People *v.* 52 Cal. 480 409, 700
Gainey *v.* People, 97 Ill. 270 827
Gainus, State *v.* 86 N. C. 632 159
State *v.* 2 Woods, 342 783 *a*
Galbreath *v.* State, 36 Tex. 200 302
Gale, Com. *v.* 11 Gray, 320 425
U. S. *v.* 109 U. S. 65 350, 353, 733, 760
Gallagher, Com. *v.* 126 Mass. 54 113, 189
Com. *v.* 4 Penn. L. J. 517; 2 Clark, 297 798, 802, 813, 844, 886
People *v.* 88 Ill. 335 328
v. People, 120 Ill. 179 87

SECTION

Gallaher *v.* State, 17 Fla. 370 350, 779, 801
Gallears, R. *v.* 2 C. & K. 981; 1 Den. C. C. 501 209
Galliard *v.* Laxton, 2 B. & S. 363 8
Galloway, State *v.* 5 Cold. 326 963
Galvin *v.* State, 6 Cold. (Tenn.) 283 5, 12, 242, 842
Gamble, Com. *v.* 11 S. & R. 93 997
Ganard, State *v.* 50 Miss. 147 802, 862
Ganaway *v.* State, 22 Ala. 777 278, 369
Gandolfo *v.* State 11 Ohio St., 114 547, 779
Gandy *v.* State, 81 Ala. 68 70
v. State, 13 Neb. 445 966, 974
Gane, Com. *v.* 3 Grant, 447 980
Gannon, State *v.* 11 Mo. Ap. 502 740
Ganz, R. *v.* 9 Q. B. D. 93 44, 53
Gaoler, Res. *v.* 2 Yeates, 258 991
Garcia, People *v.* 58 Cal. 102 285, 290, 297
v. State, 12 Tex. Ap. 335 669
v. State, 19 Tex. Ap. 383 151
v. Territory, 1 New Mex. 415 921
Gardener, R *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 390 3
Gardenheir *v.* State, 6 Tex. 348 465
Gardiner *v.* People, 6 Park. C. R. 155 435, 447, 507
State *v.* 1 Ired. 27 180, 183, 184
State *v.* Wright (Ohio), 392 118
Gardner *v.* Gardner, 2 Gray, 434 705
v. People, 106 Ill. 76 414
v. People, 3 Scam. 83 369, 602, 644
v. State, 4 Ind. 632 385
State *v.* 13 Lea, 134 278
v. Turner, 9 Johns. R. 261 608
Garland, ex parte, 4 Wall. 333, 334 522, 527, 528
v. State, 25 La. An. 532 954
Garlick *v.* State, 79 Ala. 265 712
Garlington *v.* State, 68 Ga. 837 779 *a*
Garnett, People *v.* 29 Cal. 622 291, 466
Garret, State *v.* 1 Wins. (N. C.) No. 1, 144 7
Garrett *v.* State, 76 Ala. 18 665
Garrigues, State *v.* 1 Hayw. 241 491, 495, 507
Garrison *v.* People, 87 Ill. 96 320
v. State, 87 Ill. 96 318
Garritty *v.* People, 107 Ill. 162 577, 813
Garrold *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 219 601

SECTION

Garside, R. *v.* 4 Nev. & Man. 33; 2 A. & E. 266 526, 527
Garst, in re, 10 Neb. 78 440, 996
Garthwaite, State *v.* 3 Zabr. 143 449
Garvey *v.* Com., 8 Gray, 382 935
ex parte, 7 Col. 384 994
v. People, 6 Col. 559 559
State *v.* 42 Conn. 232 383, 447
State *v.* 11 Minn. 154 163 *a*
Garvin *v.* State, 52 Miss. 207 90
Gary, State *v.* 36 N. H. 359 91, 161
Gascoine, R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 772 561
Gaston *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 143 588
U. S. *v.* 28 Fed. Rep. 848 285
Gates *v.* McDaniel, 4 Stew. & P. 69 974
v. People, 14 Ill. 433 644, 665
v. People, 13 Wend. 311 907
State *v.* 20 Mo. 400 602
Gatty *v.* Field, 9 Ad. & El. (N. S.) 431 102
Gavignan *v.* State, 55 Miss. 533 855
Gavin, Com. *v.* 121 Mass. 54 208
Gay, State *v.* 10 Mo. 440 301, 314, 940
Geach, R. *v.* 9 C. & P. 499 612, 661
Geary, R. *v.* 2 Salk. 630 906
Geddis, State *v.* 42 Iowa, 164 595
Gee, Com. *v.* 6 Cush. 174 93, 629, 656, 683
Geiger, People *v.* 49 Cal. 643 345
v. State, 5 Iowa, 484 104
Genet, People *v.* 59 N. Y. 80 774
Genner *v.* Sparks, 1 Salk. 79 3
Genung, People *v.* 11 Wend. 18 794
George *v.* Radford, Moody & M. 244 3
State *v.* 62 Iowa, 682 647, 693, 793
State *v.* 8 Ired. 324 568
State *v.* 34 La. An. 261 236
v. State, 39 Miss. 570 295, 845
Georgia *v.* Bolton, 11 Fed. Rep. 217 783 *a*
v. O'Grady, 3 Woods, 496 783 *a*
v. Post, 4 Woods, 513 783 *a*
Geraghty *v.* State, 110 Ind. 103 108
Gerard *v.* People, 3 Scam. 363 456, 471, 507
Gerbracht *v.* Com., 1 Pennyp. 471 812
Gerdemann *v.* Com., 11 Phila. 374 1001
Gerrish *v.* State, 53 Ala. 476 102
Gertrude, Terr. *v.* 1 Ariz. 74 715
Giacomo, in re, 12 Blatch. C. C. 391 38, 40
Gibbons, R. *v.* 12 Cox C. C. 237 164
State *v.* 1 South. 51 220

SECTION

Gibbs, Com. *v.* 4 Gray, 146 555
State *v.* 6 Baxt. 238 120
State *v.* 39 Iowa, 318 379
v. State, 45 N. J. 379 350
Gibert, U. S. *v.* 2 Sumn. 19 309, 407, 408, 490, 500, 785, 790, 791, 828, 861, 866, 873, 874
Gibson, Com. *v.* 2 Va. Cas. 70 890, 891
ex parte, 31 Cal. 619 995
v. People, 5 Hun, 542 935
R. *v.* 1 C. & M. 672 378
R. *v.* 8 East, 107 428, 486
R. *v.* 18 Q. B. D. 542 802
v. State, 54 Md. 447 239, 771
v. State, 59 Miss. 341 588
Giddins, R. *v.* C. & M. 634 254, 301, 469
Giesea, People *v.* 63 Cal. 217 457
Gilbert, People *v.* 57 Cal. 96 748
People *v.* 60 Cal. 108 742
v. State, 65 Ga. 449 294
v. State, 7 Humph. 524 862
State *v.* 24 Mo. 380 260
State *v.* 13 Vt. 647 91, 124, 161, 274, 276
Gilchrist, R. *v.* 2 Leach, 657; 2 M. C. C. 233; C. & M. 224 184, 192, 193
Giles, Com. *v.* 1 Gray, 466 157, 703, 705
Gilham, R. *v.* M. & M. 165 961
Gilkie, State *v.* 35 La. An. 53 742, 805
Gilkinson, People *v.* 4 Park. C. R. 26 161
Gill, R. *v.* 2 B. & Ald. 204 165
v. State, 33 Ark. 129 318, 457
v. State, 38 Ark. 524 136
v. State, 14 S. C. 410 692
Gillespie, Com. *v.* 7 Serg. & R. 469 119, 154, 167, 251, 285, 383, 422, 760, 910
State *v.* 80 N. C. 396 215
Gillett, State *v.* 56 Iowa, 430 247
Gillick, State *v.* 7 Clarke, Iowa, 289 346, 350, 692, 844
Gillis, R. *v.* 11 Cox C. C. 69 535
Gillman *v.* State, 1 Humph. 59 369
Gillon, Com. *v.* 2 Allen, 502 144
Gillooley *v.* State 58 Ind. 182 577, 643, 672, 846
Gillow, R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 85 253, 369
Gilman, State *v.* 70 Me. 329 844
Gilmore, People *v.* 4 Cal. 376 465
State *v.* 9 W. Va. 641 273
Gilson, ex parte, 34 Kan. 641 996
Gilstrap, ex parte, 14 Tex. Ap. 240 991
Giorgetti, R. *v.* 4 F. & F. 546 672

SECTION

Gipson *v.* State, 44 Ala. 17 982
v. State, 38 Miss. 295 751, 756
Girardin, People *v.* 1 Mann. (Mich.) 90 177
Girr, People *v.* 53 Cal. 629 159
Gise *v.* Com., 81 Penn. St. 428 321
Gisson, R. *v.* 2 C. & K. 781 261
Given, State *v.* 32 La. An. 782 273
Givens *v.* State, 6 Tex. 344 845
Gladden *v.* State, 12 Fla. 562 350, 540, 588, 875
Glascow, State *v.* 59 Md. 209 344
Glasgow, State *v.* Conf. 38 92
Glass, Com. *v.* 33 Grat. 827 225
State *v.* 5 Oregon, 73, 712
State *v.* 50 Wis. 218 747
Gleason, Com. *v.* 110 Mass. 66 369
State *v.* 56 Iowa, 203 456, 471
Glen, R. *v.* 3 B. & Ald. 373 395
Glenn, ex parte, 154 Md. 572 995
Glidewell *v.* State, 15 Lea, 133 842
Glodo *v.* People, 12 Ill. Ap. 348 772
Glover's case, 109 Mass. 340 583
Glover, Com. *v.* 111 Mass. 401 113
State *v.* 3 Greene, Iowa, 249 371
v. State, 109 Ind. 391 293
Glyden, State *v.* 51 Iowa, 463 709
Goas, R. *v.* London Law Times, July 18, 1882 805
Goddard, Com. *v.* 13 Mass. 456 405, 438, 439, 440, 486
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 566 120
Godet, State *v.* 7 Ired. 210 237
Godfreison *v.* People, 88 Ill. 284 548
Godfrey, R. *v.* Dears. & B. 426 190, 218
State *v.* 24 Me. 232 239, 240
Godwin's case, 5 City Hall Rec. (N. Y.) 11 75
Godwin, People *v.* 5 Ired. 401 847
Goersen *v.* Com., 99 Penn. St. 388 90, 151, 159, 702, 711
v. Com., 106 Penn. St. 477 835
Goggen, U. S. *v.* 9 Biss. 259 221
Golden, People *v.* 3 Park. C. R. 330 935
v. State, 19 Ark. 590 583
Golding, Com. *v.* 14 Gray, 49 452, 486
Goldsmith, R. *v.* 12 Cox C. C. 594; L. R. 2 C. C. 74 760
v. State, 63 Ga. 85 709
Goldstein, Com. *v.* 114 Mass. 272 133
People *v.* 32 Cal. 432 435
R. *v.* R. & R. 473; 7 Moore, 1 181, 185

SECTION

Goldswain's case, 2 W. Bl. 1207 991
Gompertz, R. *v.* 9 Q. B. 824 305, 306
Gonince, State *v.* 87 Mo. 627 844
Gonzales, People *v.* 35 N. Y. 49 802
v. State, 5 Tex. Ap. 584 293
v. State, 12 Tex. Ap. 657 289
State *v.* 26 Tex. 197 354, 555
Good *v.* State, 61 Ind. 69 457
Goode *v.* State, 76 Ga. 752 456, 480
Goodenough, Com. *v.* Thatch. Cr. C. 132 447
Goodenow, State *v.* 65 Me. 30 164
Goodhue, Com. *v.* 2 Met. 193 249
in re, 1 City Hall Rec. 153 998
v. People, 94 Ill. 37 295
People *v.* 2 Johns. Ch. 198 993
Goodin, in re, 67 Mo. 637 614
Gooding, R. *v.* C. & M. 297 151
U. S. *v.* Wheat. 473 159
Goodman *v.* State, 1 Meigs, 195 595
Goodrich, *v.* Hooper, 97 Mass. 181 *a*
v. People, 3 Park. C. R. 622 111
State *v.* 46 N. H. 186 213, 217
Goodwin, Com. *v.* 122 Mass. 19 203, 1070
People *v.* 18 Johns. 187 490, 502, 511, 520, 725
State *v.* 33 Kans. 538 255
U. S. *v.* 20 Fed. Rep. 237 222, 759
Gordon, ex parte, 1 Black, 503 770 *a*
v. Harvey, 4 Call, 450 865
People *v.* 39 Mich. 508 813
People *v.* 40 Mich. 716 565
R. *v.* 2 Dowl. 417 565
v. State, 3 Iowa, 410 465
U. S. *v.* 5 Blatch. C. C. 18 299
U. S. *v.* 22 Fed. Rep. 250 856 *a*
Gore, Com. *v.* 3 Dana, 474 358
Goree *v.* State, 71 Ala. 7 692
Gorham *v.* Luckett, 6 B. Mon. 638 962
Gorman, ex parte, 4 Cranch, 572 963
Gormley *v.* State, 37 Ohio St. 120 475
Gose *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 121 750
Goshen *v.* Sears, 7 Conn. 92 224
Gosline, in re, 10 Abb. Pr. 282 993
Goss *v.* State, 69 Me. 22 158
State *v.* 74 Mo. 592 358
v. State, 40 Tex. 520 714
Gouge, State *v.* 12 Lea, 132 369
Gough, R. *v.* 2 Dougl. 791 890

SECTION

Gougleman *v.* People, 3 Park C. R. 15 263
Gould, Com. *v.* 12 Gray, 171 447
v. People, 89 Ill. 216 409
R. *v.* 9 C. & P. 364 466
State *v.* 90 N. C. 659 212 *a*, 850
Gove, State *v.* 34 N. H. 510 164, 235, 263, 284, 452, 457
Grady *v.* State, 11 Ga. 253 906
State *v.* 84 Mo. 220 350, 378
State *v.* 83 N. C. 643 793
v. Superior Court, 64 Cal. 154 999
Graeter *v.* State, 54 Ind. 159 700
Graffenmuller, State *v.* 26 Minn. 6 1
Graham *v.* Com., 51 Penn. St. 255 324
v. Graham, 1 S. & R. 331 1000
v. People, 63 Barb. 468 780, 906, 928
People *v.* 21 Cal. 261 602
v. People, 115 Ill. 566 813
v. People, 6 Lansing, 149 906
R. *v.* 2 Leach, 547 109
v. State, 40 Ala. 659 116
State *v.* 51 Iowa, 72 247
State *v.* 65 Iowa, 617 189 *a*
State *v.* 74 N. C. 646 707
State *v.* 41 N. J. (12 Vroom) 15 536
v. State, 1 Pike, 428 973
State *v.* 15 Rich. 310 99
Granger, R. *v.* 3 Burr. 1617 423
v. State, 5 Yerg. 459 614
v. Warrington, 3 Gilman, 299 379
Granice, ex parte, 51 Cal. 375 992, 995
People *v.* 50 Cal. 447 733
Grant *v.* Astley, 1 Dougl. 730 771
v. Com., 71 Penn. St. 495 775
v. Moser, 5 Man. & G. 125 17
v. State, 55 Ala. 201 189, 216
v. State, 2 Cold. 216 383
State *v.* 22 Me. 171 108
State *v.* 76 Mo. 236 8
State *v.* 79 Mo. 113 9
Grate, State *v.* 68 Mo. 22 370, 544
v. State, 23 Tex. Ap. 458 869
Grattan *v.* State, 71 Ala. 344 221, 238
Graves, ex parte, 61 Ala. 381 392
v. Short, Cro. Eliz. 616 851
v. State, 63 Ala. 144 226
v. State, 63 Ga. 740 829
v. State, 41 N. J. L. (16 Vroom) 347 96, 777
Gray, ex parte, 77 Mo. 160 779 *b*
People *v.* 61 Cal. 164 841

SECTION

Gray *v.* People, 21 Hun, 140 762
v. People, 26 Ill. 344 644
People *v.* 4 Park. C. R. 616 80
People *v.* 5 Wend. 289 796
R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 164 293
R. *v.* 2 Den. C. C. 87 315
R. *v.* Leigh & Cave, 365 260
v. State, 55 Ala. 86 916
v. State, 29 Minn. 142 156, 251
State *v.* 1 Murph. 147 946 *a*
State *v.* 14 Rich. (S. C.) 174 280
v. State, 11 Tex. App. 411 159
Grayson, Com. *v.* 6 Grat. 712 791, 813, 902
Grear, State *v.* 28 Minn. 426 712
Great North of Eng. R. R. Co., R. *v.* 9 Q. B. 315 100
Great Works, State *v.* 20 Me. 41 100
Greathouse, U. S. *v.* 4 Sawy. 857; 2 Abb. U. S. 364, 383 523, 525, 533, 808, 1006
Green, Com. *v.* 17 Mass. 515 30, 790, 801, 884
v. Com., 111 Mass. 417 266
Com. *v.* 122 Mass. 333 189
People *v.* 53 Cal. 60 707, 838
v. People, 3 Col. 68 549
People *v.* 58 N. Y. 295 320, 520
People *v.* 13 Wend. 55 725
v. Rennet, 1 T. R. 782 135
R. *v.* Dears & B. 113; 26 L. J. M. C. 17; 7 Cox. C. C. 186; 2 Jur. N. S. 1146 460
v. State, 66 Ala. 40 779 *a*
v. State 73 Ala. 26 387, 388
v. State, 17 Fla. 669 740
State *v.* 3 Heisk. 131 161
State *v.* 16 Iowa, 239 451, 486
State *v.* 27 La. An. 598 218
v. State, 59 Md. 123 345, 692, 772
v. State, 23 Miss. 509 243
v. State, 13 Mo. 382 583
State *v.* 66 Mo. 632 295, 341
v. State, 10 Neb. 102 775
v. State, 9 Tex. Ap. 71 249
v. State, 21 Tex. Ap. 64 215
Greene *v.* State, 59 Ga. 859 760
v. State, 79 Ind. 537 369
Greenfield, People *v.* 6 Abb. N. C. 1; 74 N. Y. 277 621, 631, 633, 670
v. State, 7 Baxt. 18 913
Greenley *v.* State, 60 Ind. 141 664
Greenough, in re, 31 Vt. 279 31
Greenwall, People *v.* 108 N. Y. 296 801
Greenwood, R. *v.* 2 Den. C. C. 453 304
R. *v.* 23 Up. Can. Q. B. 250 471
v. State, 6 Baxt. 567 440

SECTION

Greenwood, State *v.* 1 Hayw. 141 518, 871
v. State, 44 Ind. 250 469
State *v.* 23 Minn. 104 344
State *v.* 5 Port. 474 420
Greer *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 149 683
v. State, 22 W. Va. 800 347
494, 546, 602, 664, 841, 845
Greeson *v.* State, 5 How. (Miss.) 33 92, 183
Gregg, in re, 15 Wis. 179 986
v. State, 64 Ind. 223 266
Gregory's case, 4 Burr. 1991 983
Gregory, Com. *v.* 2 Dana, 417 284
ex parte, 56 Miss. 144 528
People *v.* 30 Mich. 371 137, 139, 417, 420,
R. *v.* 1 C. & K. 228 944, 945
v. R. 15 Q. B. 957, 974 771
Gresham *v.* Walker, 10 Ala. 370 119
Grevil, R. *v.* 1 And. 194 236
Grey, Com. *v.* 2 Gray, 501 161, 162, 251
Griffin, Com. *v.* 3 Cush. 523 123, 125, 134, 314
Com. *v.* 21 Pick. 523, 525 226, 246, 314, 465
in re, Chase's Dec. 364 996
People *v.* 2 Barb. 427 350
v. State, 76 Ala. 32 711, 798
v. State, 15 Ga. 476 555, 646
v. State, 34 La. An. 37 742
State *v.* 38 La. An. 502 350
State *v.* 87 Mo. 608 555
State *v.* 89 Mo. 49 222
State *v.* 74 N. C. 316 350
State *v.* 14 Ohio St. 55 167
v. State, 34 Ohio St. 299 548
v. State, 12 Tex. Ap. 423 160
v. Wilcox, 21 Ind. 370 979
Griffiths, Com. *v.* 126 Mass. 252 189 *a*
Griggs *v.* People, 31 Mich. 471 700
Grimes, Com. *v.* 10 Gray, 470 189, 207, 217, 218
Grimm *v.* People, 14 Mich. 300 549
Grimme *v.* Com., 5 B. Mon. 263 145
Grisham, State *v.* 1 Hayw. 12 244
v. State, 19 Tex. Ap. 504 477
Grissom *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 374 652, 733, 819
v. State, 18 Tex. Ap. 386 693
Grogan *v.* State, 44 Ala. 9 447, 517
v. State, 63 Miss. 147 111
Gross, Com. *v.* 1 Ashm. 281 623, 634
Resp. *v.* 2 Yeates, 479 599 *a*
v. State, 2 Cart. (Ind.) 329 347, 664
Grosse *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 364 577
Grosset *v.* Ogilvie, 5 Bro. P. C. 527 528

SECTION

Grovenor *v.* Fenwick, 7 Mod. 156 851
Groves *v.* State, 73 Ga. 205 88
Gruber *v.* 3 W. Va. 700 447
Gruffey, State *v.* 75 Mo. 389 465, 896
Grummond *v.* State, Wilcox, 510 183, 184
Grumon *v.* Raymond, 1 Conn. 40 26
G. S., State *v.* 1 Tyler, 295 130, 139
Guedel *v.* People, 43 Ill. 226 456, 457, 471
Guenther *v.* People, 24 N. Y. 100 771
Guernsey, People *v.* 3 Johns. Cas. 265 92
Guess *v.* State, 1 Eng. Ark. 147 421
Guetig *v.* State, 66 Ind. 94 643
Guffy *v.* Com., 2 Grant, 66 785, 805
Guibert, State *v.* 73 Mo. 20 321
Guice *v.* State, 60 Miss. 714 669, 683
Guidici, People *v.* 100 N. Y. 503 781
Gumble, R. *v.* 42 L. J. M. C. 7; 12 Cox C. C. 248 90
Gummer, State *v.* 22 Wis. 441 285, 910
Gundy *v.* Fresno, 64 Cal. 155 1011
Gunnell, U. S. *v.* 5 Mackey, 196 711
Gunter, State *v.* 30 La. An. Pt. I. 536 878
Gunyan *v.* State, 68 Ind. 70 158
Guogando *v.* State, 41 Tex. 626 587
Gurney, State *v.* 37 Me. 149 220, 238, 239, 518
Gustave, State *v.* 27 La. An. 395 812
Gustin, State *v.* 2 South. 749 167
Gut *v.* State, 9 Wall. 35 602
State *v.* 13 Minn. 341 608
Guthrie, R. *v.* L. R. 1 C. C. 241 255
v. State, 16 Neb. 601 112
Guykowski, People *v.* 1 Scam. 476 760
Guyott *v.* Butts, 4 Wend. 579 868
Gwatkin, Com. *v.* 10 Leigh, 687 793

H.

Habersham *v.* State, 56 Ga. 61 712, 810
Hackett *v.* Com., 15 Penn. St. 95 261, 273
v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 406 595
Hackley *v.* Hastie, 3 Johns. 252 828
Hackney *v.* State, 8 Ind. 494 317, 318
Hadcraft, Com. *v.* 6 Bush, 91 762
Haddix *v.* Wilson, 3 Bush, 523 525
Haddock, State *v.* 2 Hawks, 461 91, 92, 124
State *v.* 2 Hayw. 162 109, 111
Hagan, ex parte, 25 Ohio St. 426 996 *b*
Hagarman, Com. *v.* 10 Allen, 401 124
Hageman, State *v.* 1 Greene, 314 386

SECTION

Haggerty, Com. *v.* 4 Brewst. 329 533
v. People, 6 Lansing, 332 933
Hailey, State *v.* 6 Jones N. C. 42 325
Hailstock's case, 2 Grat. 564 623, 636
Haiman *v.* Moses, 39 Ga. 708 801, 804
Haines *v.* Com., 100 Penn. St. 317 612, 772
v. Haines, 35 Mich. 138 975
State *v.* 23 S. C. 170 164
Hair *v.* State, 16 Neb. 601 835
Halberstadt, U. S. *v.* Gilpin, 262 232
Halder, State *v.* 2 McCord, 377 273
Hale, Com. *v.* 13 Phila. 452 328
v. Cove, 1 Strange, 642 842
v. State, 8 Tex. 171 190
Haley, People *v.* 48 Mich. 495 8, 164
Hall's case, 6 Penn. L. J. 412 31
Hall, Com. *v.* 4 Allen, 305 251
Com. *v.* 6 Leigh, 615 836
Com. *v.* 15 Mass. 240 29
Com. *v.* 142 Mass. 254 742
Com. *v.* 3 Pick. 362 101
v. Com., 80 Va. 562 759
v. People, 47 Mich. 636 249
v. People, 48 Mich. 482 358
v. State, 40 Ala. 698 548
State *v.* 51 Ala. 9 639
v. State, 3 Cold. 125 220
State *v.* 4 Halst. 256 508
v. State, 8 Ind. 439 312, 830
v. State, 3 Kelly, 18 124, 127 *a*, 222, 274
State *v.* 85 Mo. 669 197
v. State, 3 Ohio St. 575 191
v. Washington, 2 Greene, 473 559
v. Wolff, 61 Iowa, 559 577
Halloran *v.* State, 80 Ind. 586 451
Halloway, Com. *v.* 44 Penn. St. 210 531, 532
R. *v.* 1 C. & P. 128 209
Halsted *v.* State, 12 Vroom, 552 164
Ham *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 645 37, 173
Hambleton, State *v.* 22 Mo. 452 237
Hamblett *v.* State, 18 N. H. 384 183, 189, 207, 217
Hamilton, Com. *v.* 15 Gray, 480 369
Com. *v.* 129 Mass. 479 440
v. Com., 16 Penn St. 129 540, 550, 875, 906
in re, 51 Mich. 174 996
v. People, 29 Mich. 173 70
R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 448 157
v. State, 35 La. An. 1043 712
State *v.* 55 Mo. 520 577
v. State, 17 S. C. 462 813
State *v.* 3 Tex. Ap. 643 440
v. U. S. 7 Ct. of Cl. 144 525

SECTION

Hamilton, U. S. *v.* 3 Dall. 17 37, 1007
U. S. *v.* 106 U. S. 63 387
Hamlin, State *v.* 47 Conn. 95 304, 350, 367, 871
State *v.* 77 Md. 383 614 *a*
Hammell *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 326 161, 228
Hammond *v.* Hawes, Wall. C. C. 1 597
v. People, 32 Ill. 446 1010
v. Wadhams, 5 Mass. 353 869
Hampton's case, 3 Grat. 590 220, 225
Hampton *v.* State, 8 Ind. 336 125
Hancock *v.* Haywood, 3 T. R. 433 292
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 392 595, 804
Hand, State *v.* 1 Eng. Ark. 165 97
Handly *v.* Harrison, 3 Bib. 481 876
Haney, State *v.* 2 Dev. & B. 390, 400 273, 294
State *v.* 1 Hawks, 460 122
State *v.* 67 N. C. 467 525
v. State, 2 Tex. Ap. 504 273, 756
v. State, 5 Wis. 529 918
Hankins *v.* State, 106 Ill. 628 440, 477, 942
Hanley, Com. *v.* 140 Mass. 457 480
Hanlon, Com. *v.* 3 Brewst. 461 577, 853, 861
Hann, People *v.* 44 Cal. 96 316
Hanna *v.* People, 19 Mich. 316 464
Terr. *v.* 5 Mont. 245 568
Hannah *v.* State, 11 La. 201 819
Hannahan *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 664 924
Hanrahan *v.* State, 91 Ill. 142 146
v. State, 95 Ill. 165 927
Hanscom's case, 2 Hale P. C. 295 508
Hanson, ex parte, 28 Fed. Rep. 127 981
R. *v.* C. & M. 334 158
State *v.* 39 Me. 337 120
v. State, 43 Ohio St. 376 245, 700
State *v.* 23 Tex. 232 177
Hanvey *v.* State, 68 Ga. 612 862, 884
Hanway, U. S. *v.* 2 Wall. Jr. 139 555, 617, 625, 658
Harden, State *v.* 2 Rich. 533 353
v. State, 12 Tex. Ap. 186 447
Hardiman, Com. *v.* 9 Allen, 487 472
Hardin *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 355 658
v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 192 813
v. State, 26 Tex. 113 101
Harding, ex parte, 120 U. S. 782 996
People *v.* 53 Mich. 482 505
v. State, 22 Ark. 210 421
State *v.* 2 Bay, 267 862
Territory *v.* 6 Montana, 323 354

SECTION

Harding, U. S. *v.* 6 P. L. J. 14 486
U. S. *v.* 1 Wall. Jr. 127 312, 465, 791, 895, 929
Hardisson, People *v.* 61 Cal. 378 435 *a*
Hardy, Com. *v.* 2 Mass. 303 791
R. *v.* 24 How. St. Tr. 755 566
R. *v.* 24 St. Tr. 418 718
v. State, 7 Mo. 607 805, 810
State *v.* 47 N. H. 538 247, 465
Hare, People *v.* 57 Mich. 505 798
v. State, 4 How. (Miss.) 187 815, 826
v. State, 95 N. C. 682 119
U. S. *v.* 1 Brunf. 449 417
U. S. *v.* Pamph. 417, 658
Hargrave, State *v.* 13 Lea, 178 716
Harker *v.* State, 8 Blackf. 540 447
Harland, R. *v.* 8 Dowl. P. C. 328 953
Harley, State *v.* 54 Me. 562 387
Harman, Com. *v.* 4 Barr, 269 810
v. Com., 12 S. & R. 69 263, 285, 291
Harmon, Com. *v.* 2 Gray, 289 167
Harne *v.* State, 39 Md. 552 116, 386, 400
Harp *v.* Osgood, 2 Hill (N. Y.), 216 62
v. State, 31 Kan. 496 125
Harper, Com. *v.* 14 Weekly Notes, 10 261
R. *v.* 44 L. T. (N. S.) 615 187
State *v.* 64 N. C. 129 161
Harrall *v.* State, 26 Ala. 53 354
Harriden, People *v.* 1 Park. C. R. 544 749
Harriman *v.* State, 2 Greene (Iowa), 270 279, 358, 716
Harrington, Com. *v.* 130 Mass. 135 90
v. Harrington, 107 Mass. 329 705
People *v.* 42 Cal. 165 540 *a*
Harriot, People *v.* 3 Park. C. R. 112 350
Harris, Com. *v.* 7 Grat. 600 940
v. Com., 23 Pick. 280 922
in re, 47 Mo. 164 992
People *v.* 4 Denio, 150 602
People *v.* 1 Edm. Sel. Ca. 453 706
People *v.* 21 How. Pr. 83 81
v. People, 59 N. Y. 599 780
R. *v.* 1 Den. C. C. 461 256
R. *v.* 1 Ld. Raymond, 482 916
v. State, 31 Ark. 196 750
v. State, 34 Ark. 469 712
State *v.* 2 Halst. 361 92
State *v.* 11 Iowa, 414 251
State *v.* 30 La. An. 90 672
State *v.* 34 La. An. 118 548, 829
v. State, 3 Lea, 324 273

SECTION

Harris *v.* State, 7 Lea, 538 810
v. State, 47 Miss. 318 713, 793
v. State, 61 Miss. 304 845
State *v.* 12 Nev. 414 555, 838
State *v.* 91 N. C. 656 446
U. S. *v.* 1 Abb. U. S. 110 528
Harrison *v.* Bank, Lond. L. T. July 5, 1884 565
Com. *v.* 11 Gray, 308; 11 Mass. 63 121, 991
Com. *v.* 2 Va. Cas. 202 773
in re, 1 Cranch C. C. 159 982
v. State, 36 Ala. 248 471
v. State, 78 Ala. 5 577
v. State, 35 Ark. 358 953
State *v.* 10 Yerg. 542 278
U. S. *v.* 3 Sawy. 556 466, 467
Harrod, R. *v.* 2 C. & K. 294; 2 Cox C. C. 242 527, 535
State *v.* 34 La. An. 118 828
Hart, Com. *v.* 11 Cush. 130 238, 241
Com. *v.* 10 Gray, 468 158 *a*
R. *v.* 6 C. & P. 106 187, 194
R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 652 294
R. *v.* 1 Leach, 145 167
v. State, 55 Ind. 599 176
v. State, 57 Ind. 102 643
State *v.* 4 Ired. 246 90
State *v.* 33 Kans. 218 447, 518
State *v.* 14 Neb. 72 560
v. State, 21 Tex. Ap. 163 890
Hartell, R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 475 293, 562
Hartford *v.* State, 96 N. C. 461 231
Hartigan *v.* Terr., 1 Wash. 360 549
Hartley *v.* Hindmarsh, L. R. 1 C. P. 553 438
in re, 31 L. J. M. C. 232 469
Hartman *v.* Aveline, 63 Ind. 344 34
v. Com., 5 Barr, 60 771, 910
ex parte, 44 Cal. 32 996
State *v.* 8 Baxt. 384 269
Hartnett, State *v.* 75 Mo. 251 150
Hartranfft's App., 85 Penn. St. 433 338
Hartung *v.* People, 22 N. Y. 95 836
v. People, 26 N. Y. 154 167, 420, 502, 773
People *v.* 28 N. Y. 400; 23 How. Pr. 314 502
People *v.* 4 Park. C. R. 256, 316, 339 827, 838
Hartwell, State *v.* 35 Me. 129 73
U. S. *v.* 3 Cliff. 221 418
Hartwright *v.* Badham, 11 Price, 383 848
Hartzell, Com. *v.* 40 Penn. St. 463 613
State *v.* 58 Iowa, 520 710
Harvey's case, 10 Mod. 334 78
Harvey, R. *v.* L. R. 1 C. C. 284 236, 241

SECTION

Harvey, R. *v.* R. & R. 227 185
v. State, 67 Ga. 639 597
v. State, 40 Ind. 516 571
State *v.* 3 N. H. 65 306 *a*
Harwell *v.* State, 10 Lea, 544 966
v. State, 22 Tex. Ap. 251 756
Hascall, State *v.* 6 N. H. 352 849, 886
Hasell, R. *v.* 2 Circ. C. C. 220 560
Haskell, State *v.* 76 Me. 399 251
U. S. *v.* 4 Wash. C. C. 402 500, 508, 509, 724, 820
Hasket, State *v.* 3 Hill (S. C.), 95 383, 447
Haskett *v.* State, 51 Ind. 176 954, 969
Haskin, ex parte, 3 Sawy. 262 37 *b*
Haskins, Com. *v.* 128 Mass. 60 737, 909 *a*
v. People, 16 N. Y. 344 146
U. S. *v.* 3 Sawy. 262 37 *b*
Haslett, Com. *v.* 1 Crumr. (Pitts.) 169 913
Hasley *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 217 350, 352
Haslip *v.* State, 4 Hawy. 273 284
Hasselmeyer *v.* State, 6 Tex. App. 21 862
Hastings, State *v.* 53 N. H. 452 251
State *v.* 86 N. C. 596 452
Hatch *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 384 470
v. State, 8 Tex Ap. 416 577, 798 *a*
Hatcher, State *v.* 18 Ga. 460 560
Hatchett, Com. *v.* 76 Va. 1026 813
Hatfield, State *v.* 3 Head, 231 359
Hathaway *v.* Johnson, 55 N. Y. 93 320
Hattabough, State *v.* 66 Ind. 223 461, 465, 476
Hatton, Com. *v.* 3 Grat. 623 457, 752
Hatwood *v.* State, 18 Ind. 492 137, 317
Hauck *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 357 871
Haught *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 3 106, 358
Haun, People *v.* 44 Cal. 96 560
v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 333 27
Hausen *v.* State, 33 Wis. 678 996
Haven, State *v.* 59 Vt. 399 251, 256
Havey, State *v.* 58 N. H. 377 120
Hawart, R. *v.* Ry. & M. 207 13
Hawes, Com. *v.* 13 Bush, 697 38, 49, 993
Hawk *v.* Minnick, 19 Ohio St. 462 453
Hawker *v.* People, 75 N. Y. 487–96 291, 737
Hawkins, Com. *v.* 11 Bush, 603 471
Com. *v.* 3 Gray, 463 394, 771
People *v.* 34 Cal. 181 302

SECTION

Hawkins *v.* People, 106 Ill. 628 477, 942
v. State, 9 Ala. 137 309, 310
v. State, 1 Port. 475 523, 526
Hawley *v.* Butler, 54 Barb. 490 13
v. Com., 75 Va. 847 304
Haworth, R. *v.* 4 C. & P. 254 176
v. State, Peck (Tenn.), 89 116
Hawthorne *v.* State, 56 Md. 530 90, 187
Hayden *v.* Com., 10 B. Mon. 125 358
Com. *v.* 4 Gray, 18 683
in re, 35 Minn. 283 996
State *v.* 51 Vt. 296 844
Hayes *v.* Missouri, 120 U. S. 68 641, 693
People *v.* 1 Edm. Sel. Ca. 852 631
R. *v.* 2 M. & Rob. 156 302
State *v.* 58 Ga. 35 602, 700
State *v.* 14 Mo. Ap. 173 602
State *v.* 24 Mo. 358 125, 133
State *v.* 78 Mo. 307 641
v. U. S., 32 Fed. Rep. 662 793
Haym *v.* U. S., 7 Ct. of Cl. 443 531, 533
Haynes, R. *v.* 4 M. & S. 214 120
State *v.* 71 N. C. 79 566
State *v.* 36 Vt. 667 484
Hays, State *v.* 21 Ind. 176 189
v. State, 77 Ind. 450 159
State *v.* 2 Lea, 156 496
v. State, 13 Mo. 246 156
State *v.* 23 Mo. 287 356, 555
State *v.* 78 Mo. 600 457, 507
Hayward, in re, 1 Sandf. 701. *See* Heyward, in re, 1.
v. Knapp, 22 Minn. 5 707
State *v.* 83 Mo. 299 177, 220
Haywood, State *v.* 73 N. C. 437 344
State *v.* 94 N. C. 847 350
Hazard, State *v.* 2 R. I. 474 290, 291, 294
Hazen *v.* Com., 23 Penn. St. 355 771, 780
Heacock *v.* State, 42 Ind. 393 354, 371, 643, 754
v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 97 668
Heane, R. *v.* 4 B. & S. 947; 9 Cox, 433 385, 388, 396
Heanley *v.* State, 74 Ind. 99 88
Heath, Com. *v.* 1 Robins. 735 631, 636, 654, 658, 676, 682, 694, 735, 793, 844
R. *v.* 14 How. St. Tr. 123 833
v. State, 68 Ga. 287 600
v. State, 7 Tex. Ap. 464 712
Heaton, State *v.* 81 N. C. 542 238, 239
State *v.* 23 W. Va. 369, 370
Heck, State *v.* 23 Minn. 551 122, 158 *a*, 164

SECTION

Hector *v.* State, 2 Mo. 135 508, 724
Hedge, State *v.* 6 Ind. 330 273
Hefferman, People *v.* 38 How. Pr. 402 984
Heffernan *v.* Porter, 6 Cold. 391 439
Heffren, ex parte, 27 Ind. 87 75
Heffron, Com. *v.* 102 Mass. 148 145
v. Com., 4 Metc. (Ky.) 5 202*a*
People *v.* 53 Mich. 527 154
Height, People *v.* 50 N. Y. 392 804
Heikes *v.* Com., 26 Penn. St. 513 144, 456, 472
Heilbron's case, 12 N. Y. Leg. Obs. 65 57
Heineman *v.* State, 22 Tex. Ap. 44 243
Heinrich, in re, 5 Blatch. 425 50, 53, 57
Helbing, ex parte, 66 Cal. 215 220
People *v.* 61 Cal. 620 466, 480
Helding, People *v.* 59 Cal. 364 419
Helgen, State *v.* 1 Speers, 310 230
Heller *v.* State, 23 Ohio St. 582 466
Helm, State *v.* 6 Mo. 263 220
v. State, 20 Tex. Ap. 41 860
Helpick *v.* Com., 29 Gratt. 844 220
Helvenston, State *v.* R. M. Charlt. 48 956
Hemanus *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 372 781
Hempstead, R. *v.* R. & R. 344 315, 383
Henderson, People *v.* 28 Cal. 465 803
R. *v.* C. & M. 328 466, 471
State *v.* 1 Rich. 179 167, 181*a*
State *v.* 29 W. Va. 147 683
Hendrick *v.* Com., 5 Leigh, 708 442, 617, 636, 675, 679
Hendricks, State *v.* Conf. 369 125, 134, 256
v. State, 73 Ga. 577 793
v. State, 36 Ind. 493 794
State *v.* 32 Kan. 559 824
Hendrie, Com. *v.* 2 Gray, 503 111, 112
Hendryx, People *v.* 56 Mich. 319 555
Hennepin, State *v.* 24 Minn. 87 996
Hennessey *v.* People, 21 How. Pr. 239 469*a*
State *v.* 23 Ohio St. 339 252, 470
Henning *v.* State, 106 Ind. 386 350, 733
v. State, 24 Tex. Ap. 315 590
Henrich, *see* Heinrich.
Henrie *v.* State, 41 Tex. 573 844
Henries, People *v.* 1 Park. C. R. 579 612
Henry *v.* Ellis, 49 Iowa, 205 957, 969
v. State, 33 Ala. 389 420
v. State, 77 Ala. 75 672
v. State, 4 Humph. 270 793
State *v.* 59 Iowa, 391 291

SECTION

Henry *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 388 273
Hensey, R. *v.* 1 Burr. 643 408
Henshaw, People *v.* 52 Mich. 564 813
Hensley, State *v.* 7 Blackf. 324 388
Henson, in re, 24 Tex. Ap. 305 81
Henwood *v.* Com., 52 Penn. St. 424 289, 291
Hepburn's case, 3 Bland, 114 453
Herber *v.* State, 7 Tex. 69 813, 869
Herbert, R. *v.* 5 Cranch C. C. 87 159, 435, 452
Herndon, State *v.* 5 Blackf. 75 345, 350
Herres, in re, 32 Fed. Rep. 583 53
in re, 33 Fed. Rep. 105 50, 53, 55
Herring *v.* State, 1 Clarke (Iowa), 205 566
Herron *v.* Com., 79 Ky. 38 925
Hersey, Com. *v.* 27 Allen, 1 163*a*
Herty, Com. *v.* 109 Mass. 348 465, 896
Heshew *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 606 859, 876
Hess *v.* State, 5 Ohio, 5 180, 261, 464
U. S. *v.* 124 U. S. 488 222
Hessing, People *v.* 28 Ill. 410 1010
Hevice, Res. *v.* 2 Yeates, 114 285
Hewitt, R. *v.* R. & R. 158 385
v. State, 25 Tex. 722 90
Hewlett *v.* Cruchley, 5 Taunt. 277 879
Heydon, R. *v.* 1 W. Bl. 351 870
Heymann, R. *v.* 12 Cox C. C. 383; L. R. 8 Q. B. D. 102 760
Heyward, in re, 1 Sand. (N. Y.) 701 29, 36, 991, 1002
Heywood, Terr. *v.* 2 Wash. Ter. 181 255
Hibbs, ex parte, 26 Fed. Rep. 421, 431 37, 49, 51, 910, 911
Hibler *v.* State, 43 Tex. Ap. 197 28, 993
Hickery, ex parte, 12 Miss. 751 958
Hickey, Com. *v.* 2 Pars. 317 1005
ex parte, 4 Sm. & M. 751 530
v. State, 23 Ind. 21 189
v. State, 12 Neb. 490 846
Hicklin, R. *v.* L. R. 3 Q. B. 360 164
Hickling, State *v.* 45 N. J. L. (16 Vroom) 152 383, 384
Hickman, R. *v.* 1 Moody C. C. 34 89
State *v.* 3 Halst. 299 220
State *v.* 75 Mo. 416 595
Hicks, R. *v.* 2 M. & Rob. 302 111
State *v.* 92 Mo. 431 813, 853
Hidden, People *v.* 32 Cal. 445 350
Higbee, People *v.* 66 Barb. 131 215
Higden *v.* Higden, 2 A. K. Marsh. 42 861
Higgenbotham *v.* State, 79 Fla. 557 577

SECTION

Higgins, in re, 27 Fed. Rep. 443 951
People v. 59 Cal. 357 511, 543
R. v. 2 East, 5 159
R. v. 1 Vent. 366 772
State v. 53 Vt. 191 111, 153, 221
Highland v. People, 1 Scam. 392 753
Hilands v. Com., 111 Penn. St. 1 493
v. Com., 114 Penn. St. 372 466
Hildebrand v. State, 5 Mo. 548 292
Hildreth v. Hunt, 1 Ill. Ap. 82 521
Hill, Com. v. 4 Allen, 591 629, 661
Com. v. 11 Cush. 137 111, 112, 113, 156, 378
Com. v. 5 Grat. 682 238, 813
Com. v. 14 Mass. 207 417
v. Crandall, 52 Ill. 70 955, 963
v. Davis, 4 Mass. 137 87
ex parte, 3 Cow. 355 817
5 Nev. 154 980
v. People, 16 Mich. 351 846
v. People, 26 Mich. 496 696
R. v. 2 Mood. C. C. 30 253
State v. 3 Brev. 89 77, 81
v. State, 53 Ga. 472 241, 249
State v. 13 R. I. 314 702
v. State, 11 Tex. Ap. 379 798
v. State, 17 Wis. 675 543, 549, 875
v. State, 2 Yerg. 248 419, 922
U. S. v. 1 Brock. 156 340
Hills, Com. v. 10 Cush. 530 290, 910
Hilton, R. v. Bell, 201; 8 Cox, 87 291
Hinch v. State, 25 Ga. 699 709
Hinchman v. Clark, Coxe, 446 660
Hindle v. Birch, 1 Moore, 455 847
Hinds, Com. v 101 Mass. 209 196, 759
Hiner v. People, 34 Ill. 297 771
Hines, Com. v. 101 Mass. 33 93
v. State, 26 Ga. 614 937
v. State, 8 Humph. 597 513, 517, 815, 823
v. State, 24 Ohio St. 134 435, 505, 520, 785
Hing, State v. 16 Nev. 307 664
Hinkle v. Com., 4 Dana, 518 251
State v. 27 Kan. 308 139, 669
Hinley, R. v. 2 M. & R. 524 294
Hinman, U. S. v. 1 Baldw. 292 167, 173, 183
Hirn v. State, 1 Ohio St. 16 486
Hirsch v. State, 8 Baxt. 89 954
v. U. S., 100 U. S. 33 321
Hirschfield v. State, 11 Tex. Ap. 207 456, 471
Hirst, in re, 9 Phila. 216 959
Hitchman, Com. v. 46 Penn. St. 357 522, 528

SECTION

Hite v. State, 9 Yerg. 357 183, 354, 460, 471
Hix v. Drury, 5 Pick. 296 828
Hizer v. State, 12 Ind. 330 124
Hoard v. State, 15 Lea, 318 844
Hobbs, Com. v. 140 Mass. 443 164, 272
State v. 39 Me. 212 137, 318
v. State, 9 Mo. 855 188
Hoberg v. State, 3 Minn. 262 830
Hodde v. State, 8 Tex. Ap. 382 881
Hodge v. R., 5 Crim. Law Mag. 391 918
v. State, 85 Ind. 561 87
Hodgeden, State v. 3 Vt. 481 124, 274
Hodges, R. v. 8 C. & P. 195 362
State v. 55 Md. 127 151
v. State, 6 Tex. Ap. 615 847
Hodgkins, State v. 42 N. H. 475 438
Hodgkiss, R. v. 7 C. & P. 298 566
R. v. L. R. 1 C. C. 212 158
Hodgson's case, 1 Lew. C. C. 236 108
Hodgson, R. v. 3 C. & P. 422 703
Hoffman, Com. v. 121 Mass. 369 456
v. Coster, 2 Whart. R. 453 523
v. State, 20 Md. 425 503
v. State, 78 Mo. 256 519, 548
v. State, 12 Tex. Ap. 406 602
v. State, 65 Wis. 46 560
Hogan, State v. R. M. Charlton, 474 293
v. State, 30 Wis. 437 914
Hoge v. People, 117 Ill. 35 711
Hogg, R. v. 2 M. & Rob. 380 111
v. Ward, 3 H. & N. 417 9
Hogshead v. State, 6 Humph. 59 841
Hoh Ah Kow v. Nunan, 20 Alb. L. J. 250 920
Hoiles v. U. S., 3 McArth. 370 251, 470
Holbrook, People v. 13 Johns. 90 183, 184, 189
Holchester, R. v. 10 Cox C. C. 226 576
Holcomb, State v. 86 Mo. 371 345
Holden, R. v. 5 B. & Ad. 347 602
R. v. 8 C. & P. 609 565
v. State, 1 Tex. Ap. 225 279
Holder v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 601 588
Holeman v. State, 13 Ark. 105 862
Holland v. R., 2 Jebb & S. 357 780
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 182 716
Hollenscheit, State v. 61 Mo. 302 314
Holley, Com. v. 3 Gray, 458 90
v. State, 75 Ala. 14 355
Holliday v. People, 4 Gilman, 111 550
Hollingberry, R. v. 4 B. & C. 329; 6 D. & R. 345 158, 883
Hollingsworth v. Duane, 4 Dall. 353; Wall. C. C. 77 846, 958, 963, 968
v. Napier, 3 Caines, 182 855

SECTION

Hollis *v.* Davis, 56 N. H. 74 85
v. State, 8 Tex. Ap. 620 886
Hollon *v.* Hopkins, 21 Kans. 638 925, 925 *a*
Hollond, R. *v.* 5 T. R. 607, 623 120, 166
Holloway *v.* Com., 42 Penn. St. 446 996
v. R. 2 Den. 287; 17 Q. B. 317 771, 777, 780, 782
Holly *v.* Mix, 3 Wend. 350 13
Holman *v.* Austin, 34 Tex. 668 954
ex parte, 28 Iowa, 89 980
v. State, 105 Ind. 513 955
Holmes, Com. *v.* 17 Mass. 336 177, 771
Com. *v.* 103 Mass. 440 298
Com. *v.* 119 Mass. 198 255
Com. *v.* 137 Mass. 248 737
v. Com., 25 Penn. St. 221 549
ex parte, 21 Neb. 324 890
ex parte, 12 Vt. 631 37 *c*
v. Jennison, 14 Pet. 540 37, 37 *c*, 1010
People *v.* 5 Wend. 192 877
v. State, 54 Ga. 303 866
v. State, 17 Neb. 73 403
State *v.* 48 N. H. 377 15
U. S. *v.* 1 Wall. Jr. 1 208
Holt *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 156 588, 591
v. People, 13 Mich. 224 649, 653
R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 518 941
v. R., 2 D. & L. 774 780
R. *v.* 5 T. R. 436 890
v. State, 38 Ga. 187 456, 471
v. State, 62 Ga. 314 798
State *v.* 90 N. C. 749 733
v. State, 9 Tex. Ap. 571 693
Holten *v.* State, 2 Fla. 476 830
Holton, ex parte, 69 Ala. 164 602
Homan, State *v.* 41 Tex. 155 302, 315
Homer, State *v.* 40 Me. 438 101, 427
Honeycutt *v.* State, 8 Baxt. 371 712
State *v.* 74 N. C. 391 495
Honeyman, People *v.* 3 Denio, 121 631, 690
Resp. *v.* 2 Dall. 228 131
Honig, State *v.* 78 Mo. 249 562
Hoobach *v.* State, 43 Tex. 242 677
Hood, People *v.* 6 Cal. 236 161
R. *v.* 1 Moody, 281 6
State *v.* 51 Me. 363 217, 291, 292, 295, 911, 931
Hoogkerk, People *v.* 96 N. Y. 149 344
Hooker *v.* Com., 13 Grat. 763 540, 548
v State, 4 Ohio, 350 617, 677
State *v.* 17 Vt. 658 292, 911
Hooper, in re, 52 Wis. 699 28, 35
State *v.* 2 Bailey, 37 791
State *v.* 82 N. C. 663 159
Hoover *v.* State, 5 Baxt. 672 837

SECTION

Hoover, State *v.* 56 Md. 584 121
Hope *v.* Com., 9 Met. 134 217
Com. *v.* 22 Pick. 1 249, 290
People *v.* 62 Cal. 291 634, 712
v. People, 83 N. Y. 418 359, 363, 771
Hopkins *v.* Com., 50 Penn. St. 9 369
State *v.* 1 Bay, 373 844
State *v.* 7 Blackf. 494 123, 940
v. State, 10 Lea, 204 602
State *v.* 56 Vt. 250 469, 810, 827
Hopkirk, State *v.* 84 Mo. 278 641
Hoppe, State *v.* 39 Iowa, 468 189
Hopper, Com. *v.* 6 Grat. 684 555
State *v.* 71 Mo. 425 710, 793, 813, 827, 829
Hopt *v.* Utah, 110 U. S. 574, 577 541, 545, 812
v. Utah, 120 U. S. 430 693
Horan *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 183 164
Hord *v.* Com., 4 Leigh, 674 430
Horford *v.* Wilson, 1 Taunt. 12 801
Horn, People *v.* 70 Cal. 17 435, 517, 785
State *v.* 34 La. An. 400 793
Horne *v.* State, 37 Ga. 86 302
State *v.* 9 Kans. 119 847
Horneby, State *v.* 8 Rob. La. 583 447
Horneman, State *v.* 16 Kans. 452 468
Horner, R. *v.* 1 Leach, 270 81
Hornsby, State *v.* 32 La. An. 1268 749
Horsey *v.* State, 3 Har. & J. 2 759
Horspool *v.* Harrison, 1 Stra. 556 105
Horton, Com. *v.* 9 Pick. 206 418, 945
v. Horton, 2 Cow. 589 815
People *v.* 4 Park. C. R. 222 338, 345
People *v.* 13 Wend. 9 667, 670
v. State, 60 Ala. 73 161
v. State, 33 La. An. 389 601
U. S. *v.* 2 Dill. 94 963
Hoskey *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 202 221
Hoskins *v.* State, 11 Ga. 92 193, 243, 251, 285, 409
State *v.* 77 N. C. 530 783 *a*
Houghton *v.* Bachman, 47 Barb. 388 61
House, R. *v.* 6 Cr. L. Mag. 500 27
State *v.* 55 Iowa, 466 251
v. State, 65 N. C. 747 871
v. State, 19 Tex. Ap. 227 577
Houseman, R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 180 185
Housh, People *v.* 75 Ill. 487 1
Houston, R. *v.* 2 Cr. & D. 310 404, 405, 435 *a*, 452, 457, 773
Hover, State *v.* 58 Vt. 496 220
How, R. *v.* 2 Str. 699 203
Howard, Com. *v.* 13 Mass. 222 453

SECTION

Howard *v.* Durand, 36 Ga. 346 974
ex parte, 17 N. H. 545 916
v. People, 3 Mich. 207 994
People *v.* 50 Mich. 241 813
v. State, 34 Ark. 433 297, 776
v. State, 50 Ind. 190 793
State *v.* 17 N. H. 171 627, 664, 670, 683, 844, 847
v. State, 25 Ohio St. 399 244
State *v.* 15 Rich. 274 318, 323, 383, 385
v. State, 8 Tex. Ap. 447 466
State *v.* 31 Vt. 414 602
U. S. *v.* 3 Sumn. 12, 19 114, 158
Howarth, R. *v.* 1 Ry. & Moody C. C. 207 3, 8
Howe, Com. *v.* 14 Gray, 26 771
v. Plainfield, 8 Vroom, 150 440
v. State, 9 Miss. 690 1010
State *v.* 1 Rich. 260 255
Howel *v.* Com., 5 Grat. 664 220, 811
Howell *v.* People, 5 Hun, 620 812
People *v.* 4 Johns. 296 187, 194, 305
v. People, 69 N. Y. 607 812
v. State, 1 Oregon, 241 780
State *v.* R. M. Charlt. 120 29
Howerton *v.* State, Meigs, 262 642, 844
Howes, Com. *v.* 15 Pick. 231 230
Howland *v.* Gifford, 1 Pick. 43 886
Howser *v.* Com., 51 Penn. St. 333 654, 658, 682, 833
Hoxey, Com. *v.* 16 Mass. 385 284
Hoy *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 32 756
Hoye, Com. *v.* 11 Gray, 462 224
v. State, 39 Ga. 718 866
Hoyer, Com. *v.* 125 Mass. 299 121, 241
Hoyt, State *v.* 46 Conn. 330 916
State *v.* 47 Conn. 518 560, 566, 631, 655, 693, 750, 906
Hubbard *v.* Rutledge, 57 Miss. 7 660
v. State, 72 Ala. 164 290, 369, 414, 603, 696
Hubbs, State *v.* 58 Ind. 415 159
Huber *v.* Reily, 53 Penn. St. 112 939
State *v.* 8 Kans. 447 923
Huddleston *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 73 409
Hudelson *v.* State, 94 Ind. 426; 5 Crim. Law Mag. 524 810, 812
Hudgius *v.* State, 61 Ga. 182 859
v. State, 2 Kelly, 174 646
v. State, 32 La. An. 1052 935
Hudson, Com. *v.* 14 Gray, 11 472
v. State, 1 Blackf. 318 345, 654
v. State, 40 Tex. 12 712
v. State, 9 Yerg. 408 831, 847

SECTION

Huff's case, 14 Grat. 648 385
Huff *v.* State, 23 Tex. Ap. 291 90
Huffman *v.* Com. 6 Rand. 685 273
Penn. *v.* Addis. 140 435
v. State, 22 Tex. Ap. 491 474
Hufford, State *v.* 28 Iowa, 391 28
Hugel, State *v.* 27 La. An. 375 906
Hughes, Com. *v.* 133 Mass. 496 934
Com. *v.* 11 Phil. 430 309, 400
Com. *v.* 5 Rand. 655 844
in re, Phill. N. C. (L.) 57 30, 31, 32
People *v.* 29 Cal. 257 847, 925
v. People, 8 Col. 536 440
v. People, 116 Ill. 330 844
R. *v.* 1 C. & K. 235, 519 366, 378, 684
R. *v.* 4 Cox, 519 696
State *v.* 1 Ala. 655 (N. S.) 345, 358, 541
State *v.* 2 Ala. 102 546, 549
State *v.* 75 Ala. 31 711
State *v.* 2 Har. & McHen. 479 105, 423
v. State, 65 Ind. 39 752
v. State, 4 Iowa, 554 550
State *v.* 58 Iowa, 165 344
State *v.* 1 Swan, 26 101
U. S. *v.* 1 Bond, 574 531
Huidekoper *v.* Cotton, 3 Watts, 56 378
Hulbut, People *v.* 4 Denio, 133 363, 375, 378, 379
Huling *v.* State, 17 Ohio, 583 350
Hull *v.* Alexander, 26 Iowa, 569 560
v. L'Eplattimer, 49 How. Pr. 500 954
R. *v.* 2 F. & F. 16 323
U. S. *v.* 14 Fed. Rep. 324; 4 McCr. 273 162, 251
Hulse *v.* People, 35 Ohio St. 421 714
Humbree *v.* State, 81 Ala. 67 712
Hummel, in re, 9 Watts, 416 974
v. State, 17 Ohio St. 628 189
Humphreys, R. *v.* C. & M. 601 373
State *v.* 10 Humph. 442 185
Hunckeler, People *v.* 48 Cal. 331 498
Hung Hung, ex parte, 108 U. S. 552 1010
Hunnicutt *v.* State, 18 Tex. Ap. 523 829, 830
Hunt, Com. *v.* 4 Pick. 252 114
ex parte, 5 Eng. 284 533
v. People, 78 N. Y. 330 777
R. *v.* 3 B. & Ald. 430, 444 602, 886
R. *v.* 1 Ry. & M. 93 8
v. State, 49 Ga. 255 560
v. State, 61 Miss. 577 733

SECTION

Hunt *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 663 212 *a*
Hunter *v.* Com., 79 Penn. St. 503 261, 289, 291, 860 *a*
ex parte, 2 W. Va. 122 537
v. Fairfax, 3 Dall. 305 597
People *v.* 54 Cal. 65 368
R. *v.* 4 C. & P. 128 176
R. *v.* 2 Leach, 624 185, 196
State *v.* 33 Iowa, 361 940
v. State, 40 N. J. L. 495 297, 771, 802
State *v.* Peck's Tenn. R. 166 91
v. State, 8 Tex. Ap. 75 842
Huntley, R. *v.* 8 Cox C. C. 260 291
Huntzinger *v.* Com., 97 Penn. St. 336 774, 918
Hurd *v.* Com., 5 Leigh, 715 589
v. People, 25 Mich. 405, 556, 565
Hurds, State *v.* 19 Neb. 316 163 *a*
Hurlbut, State *v.* 1 Root, 90 549, 550
Hurley *v.* State, 29 Ark. 17 846
State *v.* 71 Me. 354 146
v. State, 6 Ohio, 399 815
Hurst, People *v.* 41 Mich. 328 555
State *v.* 11 W. Va. 54 189
Hurston, Penn. *v.* Addison, 334 306
Hurt *v.* State, 26 Ind. 106 601
v. State, 25 Miss. 378 449, 462
State *v.* 7 Mo. 321 358
Hurtado *v.* Cal., 110 U. S. 516 85
Huse, Pringle *v.* 1 Cow. 432 631
Hussey, Com. *v.* 111 Mass. 432 189
State *v.* 7 Iowa, 409 317, 318
Husted, People *v.* 52 Mich. 624 130
Huston, State *v.* 50 Iowa, 512 363
Hutchings, State *v.* 24 S. C. 142 293
Hutchins *v.* State, 28 Ind. 34 151
Hutchinson's case, 3 Keb. 785 437
Hutchinson, Com. *v.* 2 Pars. 453 317, 318, 320
v. State, 62 Ind. 556 125, 134
v. State, 6 Tex. Ap. 468 856, 862
State *v.* 26 Tex. 111 273
Hutchison *v.* Com., 82 Penn. St. 472 291, 292, 407, 771
Hutson, State *v.* 15 Mo. 512 119
Hutton, Com. *v.* 5 Gray, 89 123
Hutts *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 44 273
Hyler, People *v.* 2 Park. C. R. 566, 570 338, 361, 362, 1007
Hylliard *v.* Nichols, 2 Root, 176 849

I.

Iams, People *v.* 57 Cal. 115 617
Igo, State *v.* 21 Mo. 459 814

SECTION

Ike *v.* State, 23 Miss. 525 220
Illidge, R. *v.* 2 C. & K. 871; 3 Cox C. C. 552; T. & M. 127 193
Imlay *v.* Rogers, 2 Halst. 347 378
Inder, R. *v.* 2 C. & K. 635 181
Ingalls, State *v.* 59 N. H. 88 120, 137
v. State, 48 Wis. 647 934
Ingram *v.* State, 39 Ala. 247 401, 945
State *v.* 16 Kans. 14 447
Inness, State *v.* 53 Me. 536 420
Insall *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 145 154
Inskeep *v.* State, 35 Ohio St. 482 775
Intox. Liquors, Com. *v.* 6 Allen, 596–9 26
Com. *v.* 13 Allen, 52 26
Com. *v.* 109 Mass. 371–373 22
Com. *v.* 116 Mass. 21 111
Irvin, State *v.* 5 Blackf. 343 111
v. State, 19 Fla. 872 551, 812
v. State, 7 Tex. Ap. 109 273
Irvine *v.* Keen, 14 S. & R. 292 634
v. State, 20 Tex. Ap. 12 590, 712
U. S. *v.* 98 U. S. 450 321
Isaacs, People *v.* 1 N. Y. Cr. R. 148 181 *a*
Isham *v.* State, 1 Sneed, 112 356, 771
U. S. *v.* 17 Wall. 496 89
Ismahl, Com. *v.* 134 Mass. 201 288, 293
I. S. S., State *v.* 1 Tyler, 178 383
Iverson *v.* State, 52 Ala. 170 693

J.

Jack *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 658 843
Jackson's case, 12 Am. L. R. 602 31
1 Black, U. S. 484 139
1 East P. C. 298 12
Jackson *v.* Com., 19 Grat. 656 546, 547, 549, 830, 874
v. Com., 23 Grat. 919 70, 635
Com. *v.* 2 Va. Cas. 501 451, 485
v. Dickenson, 15 Johnson, 309 847
ex parte, 14 Blatch. 245 1
ex parte, 96 U. S. 727 22, 919, 924
in re, 2 Flip. 123 31
in re, 3 MacArth. 24 924
v. Malin, 15 Johns. 293 865
People *v.* 8 Barb. 637 110, 183, 188, 208
People *v.* 3 Den. 101 122
People *v.* 3 Hill (N. Y.), 92 249, 261, 464

SECTION

Jackson *v.* People, 18 Ill. 264 132
v. Provost, 2 Caines, 165 108
R. *v.* Cowp. 297 232
v. Sheriff, 1 Oreg. 246 802
State *v.* 74 Ala. 26 369, 664, 738, 779
v. State, 77 Ala. 18 639
v. State, 54 Ga. 439 894
v. State, 64 Ga. 344 400
v. State, 76 Ga. 551 220, 384, 777, 829
State *v.* 7 Ind. 270 221
v. State, 14 Ind. 327 467, 470
v. State, 4 Kan. 150 354
State *v.* 27 Kan. 581 846, 886
State *v.* 12 La. An. 679 696
State *v.* 21 La. An. 574 88
State *v.* 36 La. An. 207 350
State *v.* 37 La. An. 768 651
State *v.* 1 Lea, 160 238
State *v.* 39 Me. 291 133, 141
State *v.* 17 Mo. 544 293
State *v.* 90 Mo. 156 737
State *v.* 95 Mo. 623 853
v. State, 39 Ohio St. 37 253, 740
State *v.* 7 S. C. 283 307
v. State, 11 Tex. 261 350
State *v.* 26 W. Va. 250 218
v. Warford, 7 Wendell, 62 852
Jacob, Res. *v.* 1 Smith's Laws (Penn.), 57 82
State *v.* 10 La. An. 141 290, 293
Jacobi, R. *v.* 46 L. T. 593 45
Jacobs, Com. *v.* 9 Allen, 274 179
v. Com., 5 S. & R. 315 120, 123, 134, 875
v. State, 4 Lea, 196 479
People *v.* 66 N. Y. 8 975
State *v.* 6 Tex. 99 344
v. State, 9 Tex. Ap. 278 661
v. State, 18 Tex. Ap. 586 871
Jacoby, U. S. *v.* 12 Blatch. C. C. 491 220, 291
Jacquins *v.* Com., 9 Cush. 279 780
Jaeger, State *v.* 66 Mo. 208 812
Jailor, U. S. *v.* 2 Abb. U. S. 265 981
James's case, 5 Cr. Crim. L. Mag. 216 62
James, Com. *v.* 99 Mass. 438 310
Com. *v.* 1 Pick. 376 208
v. Com. 12 S. & R. 220 155, 919, 920
in re, 18 Fed. Rep. 854 37 *b*
People *v.* 2 Caines, 57 533
R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 292 194
R. *v.* 6 Q. B. 620 385, 396

SECTION

James, State *v.* 37 Conn. 355 75
v. State, 45 Miss. 572 344, 906
v. State, 55 Miss. 57 750, 831
State *v.* 80 N. C. 370 6, 10, 15
Jane *v.* Com., 3 Metc. (Ky.) 18 260
v. State, 3 Mo. 61 123, 133
Jaques *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 690 660
v. 68 Mo. 260 238
Jarnigan *v.* State, 10 Yerg. 529 356, 555, 815
Jarrell *v.* State, 58 Ind. 293 394
Jarvis, State *v.* 63 N. C. 556 396
v. State, 19 Ohio St. 585 788, 895
Jasper, State *v.* 4 Dev. 323 125
Jay, State *v.* 57 Iowa, 164 249
Jefcoat, State *v.* 20 S. C. 383 273, 548, 906
Jefferds, People *v.* 5 Park. C. R. 518 81
Jeffers, State *v.* 64 Mo. 376 504
State *v.* 3 Murph. 480 518
Jefferson, Com. *v.* 6 B. Mon. 313 773
People *v.* 52 Cal. 453 945
v. People 101 N. Y. 19 238
State *v.* 66 N. C. 309 495, 520
Jeffries *v.* Com., 12 Allen, 145 92, 134, 906
v. Randall, 14 Miss. 205 849
v. State, 40 Ala. 381 457, 507
Jeffs, R. *v.* 2 Strange, 984 512
Jenkins, Com. *v.* Thatch. C. C. 118 827
ex parte, 2 Wall. Jr. 521 537, 981, 991, 993
v. State, 78 Ind. 133 482
v. State, 84 N. C. 812 518, 541
State *v.* 20 S. C. 351 471
Jenks, Com. *v.* 1 Gray, 496 383, 472, 488
Com. *v.* 138 Mass. 484 189, 309
Jennes, People *v.* 5 Mich. 305 294
Jennings *v.* Com., 105 Mass. 586 314, 383
Com. *v.* 121 Mass. 47 119, 239, 241
Com. *v.* 17 Pick. 80 233, 771
R. *v.* 1 Cox, 115 251
State *v.* 24 Kan. 642 906
State *v.* 18 Mo. 435 771
Jenour, R. *v.* 7 Mod. 400 254
Jenson, State *v.* 60 Wis. 577 239
U. S. *v.* 15 Fed. Rep. 138 771
Jericho, State *v.* 40 Vt. 121 124, 276
Jerry *v.* State, 1 Blackf. 395 92, 95, 813
Jesse, State *v.* 3 Dev. & B. 297 461, 466

	SECTION
Jesse *v.* State, 20 Ga. 156	671, 683, 692
Jessie, State *v.* 30 La. An. 1176	744
Jetton *v.* State, 1 Meigs, 192	343, 358
Jewell *v.* Com., 22 Penn. St. 94	548, 613
State *v.* 33 Me. 583	626, 664
Jewett, People *v.* 3 Wend. 314, 319	91, 344, 346, 347, 350, 608
Jillard *v.* Com., 26 Penn. St. 169	356, 359
Jilz, ex parte, 64 Mo. 205	974, 1010, 1011
Jim, State *v.* 1 Dev. 142	263
v. State, 15 Ga. 535	591, 646, 844
v. State, 4 Humph. 289	843, 844
State *v.* 3 Murph. 3	190, 191, 281, 282
Jipton *v.* State, Peck's R. 308	92
Joan *v.* Com., 136 Mass. 162	778
Job, ex parte, 17 Nev. 184	446
Jobe *v.* State, 28 Ga. 235	913
Jocelyn, People *v.* 29 Cal. 562	405, 588, 883
Joel *v.* State, 28 Tex. 642	120
John *v.* State, 2 Ala. 290	918
v. State, 16 Ga. 200	646, 750
v. State, 8 Ired. 330	623
Johns *v.* State, 55 Md. 350	693
U. S. *v.* 4 Dall. 413	1001, 1005
U. S. *v.* 1 Wash. C. C. 363	614
Johnson, ex parte, 15 Neb. 512	924, 996
v. Burrell, 2 Hill, 238	320
v. Com., 137 Mass. 562	803
v. Com., 24 Penn. St. 386	914
v. Com., 115 Penn. St. 361	540, 733
Com. *v.* 2 Wheel. C. C. 367	658
v. People, 65 Barb. 342; 55 N. Y. 512	935, 938
v. People, 83 Ill. 431	910
People *v.* 104 N. Y. 213	90
R. *v.* 6 East, 583	428
R. *v.* 1 Wils. 325	386
v. State, 29 Ala. 62	285, 295, 296
v. State, 32 Ala. 583	161
v. State, 47 Ala. 9	716
v. State, 50 Ala. 456	161
v. State, 73 Ala. 21	6
v. State, 74 Ala. 537	716
v. State, 29 Ark. 31	465
State *v.* 33 Ark. 174	358
v. State, 2 Dutch. 313	124
v. State, 8 Eng. (Ark.) 685	315
Johnson *v.* State, 14 Ga. 55	246, 466
v. State, 59 Ga. 189	978 *a*
v. State, 61 Ga. 212	291
v. State, 62 Ga. 299	193
State *v.* 3 Hill S. C. 1	252, 255, 760
v. State, 23 Ind. 32	369
v. State, 65 Ind. 204	110
State *v.* 72 Iowa, 393	853, 866
State *v.* 5 Jones (N. C.), 221	256, 291, 325
State *v.* 10 La. An. 456	297
State *v.* 31 La. An. 369	693
v. State, 33 La. An. 889	651
State *v.* 34 La An. 48	244, 309
v. State, 35 La. An. 208	540
v. State, 35 La. An. 279	842
State *v.* 30 La. An. Pt. I. 305	266
State *v.* 30 La. An. Pt. II. 904	206
v. State, 11 Lea, 47	642
State *v.* 12 Minn. 476	131
v. State, 59 Miss. 543	440
State *v.* 76 Mo. 121	565
State *v.* 93 Mo. 73, 317	102
State *v.* 67 N. C. 58	102, 906
v. State, 11 Ohio St. 324	190
v. State, 42 Ohio St. 207	328, 449, 601
State *v.* 3 R. I. 94	472
State *v.* 11 Tex. 22	159
v. State, 27 Tex. 758	847
v. State, 5 Tex. Ap. 43	8
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 306	759
State *v.* 1 Vroom, 185	247, 261, 465
State *v.* 1 Walker (Miss.), 392	131, 279, 640
v. U. S., 3 McLean, 89	317, 320
Johnston, Com. *v.* 85 Penn. St. 54	713, 798, 810, 913, 927, 932
People *v.* 46 Cal. 78	650, 653
People *v.* 48 Cal. 549	369
v. Riley, 13 Ga. 97	32, 34, 36
v. State, 2 Dutch. 313	464
Joiner, State *v.* 19 Mo. 224	358
Joliffe, Com. *v.* 7 Watts, 585	613, 661
Jones's case, 1 Leigh, 598	509, 598, 655, 685, 895, 897
Jones *v.* Board, 56 Miss. 766	521, 537
v. Clay, 1 Bos. & P. 191	384, 453
Com. *v.* 136 Mass. 173	302

SECTION

Jones, Com. *v.* 12 Phila. 550 669, 839
ex parte, 13 Ves. 237 951
v. Fletcher, 41 Me. 254 25
v. Harris, 1 Strobh. 160 523
v. Kelly, 17 Mass. 116 1007
v. Leonard, 50 Iowa, 106 31, 35, 36
People *v.* 53 Cal. 58 244
v. People, 2 Col. 351 864
v. People, 6 Col. 452 652, 664, 712, 813, 841, 843
People *v.* 5 Lans. 340 183, 189
People *v.* 24 Mich. 216 711, 712
People *v.* 48 Mich. 554 488
R. *v.* 2 B. & Ad. 611 158
R. *v.* 2 Camp. 121, 132 285, 293, 910
R. *v.* 1 Cox C. C. 105 219
R. *v.* 4 C. & P. 217 474
R. *v.* 6 C. & P. 343, 391 61, 938
R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 776 292
R. *v.* Dougl. 300 184
R. *v.* 8 East, 34 592
State *v.* 5 Ala. 666 387, 394, 673, 716, 810
v. State, 50 Ala. 161 193
v. State, 63 Ala. 27 104
v. State, 81 Ala. 79 363
v. State, 15 Ark. 261 787
v. State, 2 Blackf. 477 347, 664
v. State, 6 Col. 452 652, 664, 712, 813, 841, 843
State *v.* 7 Ga. 422 451, 773
State *v.* 48 Ga. 163 871
v. State, 65 Ga. 147, 506, 621 118, 297, 571
v. State, 68 Ga. 760 827
State *v.* 4 Halst. 357 92, 93, 139, 283
v. State, 89 Ind. 82 828, 847
State *v.* 52 Iowa, 284 712
State *v.* 70 Iowa, 505 545
v. State, 10 Lea, 585 600
State *v.* 16 Kan. 608 445
v. State, 1 Kelly, 610 309
v. State, 10 Lea, 585 585
v. State, 1 McMull. 236 162, 251
v. State, 51 Miss. 718 906
v. State, 57 Miss. 424 665
v. State, 60 Miss. 117 590, 600
State *v.* 61 Mo. 232 798
State *v.* 64 Mo. 391 810
State *v.* 7 Nev. 408 824, 841
State *v.* 87 N. C. 547 796 *a*
State *v.* 88 N. C. 671 6
v. State, 13 Tex. 168 465, 841
v. State, 12 Tex. Ap. 424 220
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 85 733, 846

SECTION

Jones *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 540 276
v. Timberlake, 6 Rand. 678 992
v. Turpin, 6 Heisk. 181 378
U. S. *v.* 31 Fed. Rep. 725 457
U. S. *v.* 32 Fed. Rep. 569 802
U. S. *v.* 3 Wash. C. C. 224 77, 78
v. Ward, 2 Metc. (Ky.) 271 932
Jorasco *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 238 112, 261
Jordan, People *v.* 63 Cal. 217 457
R. *v.* 9 C. & P. 118 573
v. State, 81 Ala. 20 465, 797, 896
v. State, 22 Ga. 545 141, 147, 465
State *v.* 19 Mo. 213 159
Jordon *v.* State, 14 Tex. 436 974
Jordt *v.* State, 31 Tex. 571 237
Josephine *v.* State, 39 Miss. 613 504, 513, 658
Josslyn *v.* Com., 6 Met. 236 285, 291, 465, 771
Jourdan, State *v.* 32 Ark. 203 294
Journey *v.* State, 1 Mo. 304 230
Joy *v.* State, 14 Ind. 139 435 *a*
Joyce *v.* State, 7 Baxt. 273 841
R. *v.* 10 Cox C. C. 100; L. & C. 576 200
v. Joyner, 81 N. C. 534 279
J. P., State *v.* 1 Tyler, 283 137, 385
Judd, Com. *v.* 2 Mass. 329 165
Judson, ex parte, 3 Blatch. 84, 148 954, 963, 967, 988
in re, 3 Blatch. 148 963, 968
Jukes, R. *v.* 8 Term R. 536, 625 164, 229
Jumpertz *v.* People, 21 Ill. 375 815, 819, 823, 831
Jung Ah Lung, U. S. *v.* 124 U. S. 621 991, 996 *b*, 1000, 1011
People *v.* 70 Cal. 469 551
Jurche *v.* State, 17 La. An. 71 810
Justice *v.* Com., 81 Va. 209 456, 477
R. *v.* 1 M. & S. 444 913
Justices, R. *v.* 10 L. R. Ir. 294 80
Justus, State *v.* 11 Oregon, 17 367
J. W., State *v.* 1 Tyler, 417 871

K

Kaine, ex parte, 14 How. 103 50, 52, 53, 57, 1009
in re, 3 Blatch. 1 50, 57
Kalloch *v.* San Francisco Court, 56 Cal. 229 85, 358 *a*
Kaltmeyer, U. S. *v.* 16 Fed. Rep. 760; 5 McCr. 260 177

SECTION

Kane *v.* Com., 89 Penn. St. 552; S. C. 12 Phila. 630; 109 Penn. St. 341 810, 866, 935
v. People, 3 Wend. 364 394, 771
v. People, 8 Wend. 203 290, 292, 294, 301, 908, 918, 922
State *v.* 63 Wis. 260 238
U. S. *v.* 6 Cr. Law Mag. 530 951
Kannon *v.* State, 10 Lea, 366 468
Kanouse, State *v.* 33 Iowa, 365 457
State *v.* 1 Spencer, 115 785
v. Lexington, 12 Ill. Ap. 318 918
Karn, State *v.* 16 La. An. 183 273
Karstendick *v.* U. S. 93 U. S. 396 918
Kauffman, *v.* Com. 1 Phila. 534 966
ex parte, 73 Mo. 588 996
v. State, 51 Iowa, 578 733
Kay, R. *v.* L. R. 1 C. C. R. 257 194
Kazinski, U. S. *v.* 2 Sprague, 7 302
Kean, State *v.* 10 N. H. 347 102, 271, 279
Kearney's case, 13 Abb. Pr. 459 991
Kearney, ex parte, 7 Wheat. 38 710 *a*, 970, 971, 974, 986, 999
ex parte, 55 Cal. 212 996 *b*
State *v.* 1 Hawks, 54 921, 924
v. State, 48 Md. 16 189 *a*
Kearns, Com. *v.* 1 Va. Cas. 109 173
Kee, State *v.* 28 Ark. 155 841
Keech *v.* State, 15 Fla. 591 299, 906
Keefe, Com. *v.* 7 Gray, 332 124
Keefer *v.* State, 4 Ind. 246 162, 291, 293
People *v.* 65 Cal. 232 518
Keeler, People *v.* 99 N. Y. 463 964
Keeling *v.* State, 107 Ind. 563 742
Keely, People *v.* 94 N. Y. 526 759, 830
Keen, U. S. *v.* 1 McLean, 429 183, 383, 465
Keenan, Com. *v.* 67 Penn. St. 203 181 *a*, 374
Com. *v.* 10 Phil. 194 612
People *v.* 13 Cal. 581 560
v. People, 104 Ill. 385 860, 861
v. State, 8 Wis. 132 14
Keeper of Prison, Com. *v.* 2 Ash. 227 76, 81, 1007
Com. *v.* 26 Penn. St. 279 996
Keffer, Penn. *v.* Addis. 290 377, 379
Kegan, State *v.* 62 Iowa, 106 742
Keger, Com. *v.* 1 Duvall, 240 278
Keim, State *v.* 79 Mo. 515 87
Keith, Com. *v.* 8 Met. 531 457, 460, 507
State *v.* 63 N. C. 140 525, 526

SECTION

Keithler *v.* State, 10 Sm. & M. 192 354, 712
Kelcher, Com. *v.* 3 Metc. (Ky.) 484 102
Kell, R. *v.* 1 Cr. & D. 151 511, 516, 518
Kellenbeck *v.* State, 10 Md. 431 263
Keller, U. S. *v.* 19 Fed. Rep. 633 810
Kellerman, State *v.* 14 Kans. 135 856, 900
Kelley, ex parte 37 Ala. 474 980
in re, 25 Fed. Rep. 268 51, 55
in re, 2 Low. 339 50, 52
People *v.* 39 Hun, 536 996
People *v.* 24 N. Y. 74 954, 974
v. State, 25 Ark. 392 104
Kellogg, ex parte, 6 Vt. 509 996
Kellum *v.* State, 64 Miss. 226 756
Kelly, Com. *v.* 9 Phila. 586 532
ex parte, 65 Cal. 154 994
v. Holdship, 1 Browne Pa. 36 865
in re, 26 Fed. Rep. 852 51, 57
People *v.* 6 Cal. 210 90
v. People, 115 Ill. 583 936
People *v.* 24 N. Y. 75 967
People *v.* 97 N. Y. 212 996
v. State, 7 Baxt. 323 927
State *v.* 97 N. C. 404 549
v. State, 3 S. & M. 518 124, 274, 550, 780, 927
v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 158 49, 422
Terr. *v.* 2 New Mex. 292 540 *a*
v. U. S. 27 Fed. Rep. 616 90, 500
U. S. *v.* 4 Wash. C. C. 528 310
Kelso *v.* State, 11 Mo. Ap. 91; 76 Mo. 505 482
Kemp *v.* Com., 18 Grat. 969 894
v. State, 11 Tex. Ap. 174 350
v. State, 16 Wis. 359 979
Kendall *v.* State, 65 Ala. 492 518
Kendrick, R. *v.* 5 A. & E. N. S. (5 Q. B.) 49 157, 305, 308
Kennedy, Com. *v.* 15 B. Mon. 531 282
Com. *v.* 97 Mass. 224 472
Com. *v.* 131 Mass. 584 247, 400, 413, 927
Com. *v.* 136 Mass. 152 8
v. Com. 2 Va. Cas. 510 815, 844
v. Howard, 74 Ind. 87 932
v. People, 40 Ill. 488 712, 793
People *v.* 58 Mich. 572 913
State *v.* 7 Blackf. 233 247, 261
v. State, 62 Ind. 136 158, 918
v. State, 81 Ind. 379 585

SECTION

Kennedy, State *v.* 89 N. C. 589 770
v. State, 19 Tex. Ap. 537 517, 664
Territory *v.* 3 Mont. 520 623
v. Williams, 2 Nott & McCord, 79 886
Kenney *v.* State, 5 R. I. 385 254
Kent, People *v.* 1 Dougl. (Mich.) 42 191
v. State, 42 Ohio St. 383 847
Kentucky *v.* Dennison, 24 How. 66 30, 32, 34, 36
Kenworthy, R. *v.* 3 D. & R. 173; 1 B. & C. 711 775
Kenyon, ex parte, 5 Dill. 385 981
Keogh, State *v.* 13 La. An. 243 466, 471
Kepper, Com. *v.* 114 Mass. 278 193
Ker, ex parte, 18 Fed. Rep. 167; 4 Crim. Law Mag. 913 27, 993, 996
v. People, 110 Ill. 627; aff. S. C. U. S., 119 U. S. 436 27, 49, 220, 293
Kerr, ex parte, 64 N. C. 816 990
Kernsdie *v.* Cason, 25 Ind. 362 964
Kerrigan, in re, 4 Vroom, 344 963
Ketchey, State *v.* 70 N. C. 621 660
Ketchingman *v.* State, 6 Wis. 426 290
Kettleman, State *v.* 35 Mo. 105 788, 895
Key, R. *v.* 5 Cox C. C. 369; 2 Den. C. C. 347 938
Keyes, State *v.* 8 Vt. 57 88
Kibbie, State *v.* 7 Mo. 317 285
Kidder *v.* State, 58 Ind. 68 294
Kie, U. S. *v.* 1 West. Coast Rep. 553 78
v. U. S., 27 Fed. Rep. 351 551, 875
Kilbourn *v.* Thompson, 103 U. S. 168 964
Kilcrease, State *v.* 6 Rich. N. S. 444 358, 385
Kilgore, ex parte, 3 Tex. Ap. 247 968
v. State, 74 Ala. 1 738
State *v.* 93 N. C. 533 637, 686
Kilham, R. *v.* L. R. 1 C. C. R. 264 191
Kilkelly *v.* State, 43 Wis. 604 159
Killacky, Com. *v.* 3 Brewst. 565 989
Killminster, R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 228 323
Kilpatrick *v.* Com., 31 Penn. St. 198 798
v. U. S., 11 Fed. Rep. 765 366
Kilrow *v.* Com., 89 Penn. St. 480 90, 252, 470
Kimball, Com. *v.* 7 Gray, 328 383, 447
Com. *v.* 21 Pick. 373 759
State *v.* 29 Iowa, 267 366
State *v.* 50 Me. 409 829

SECTION

Kimpton's case, 18 Alb. L. J. 298 34
Kincaird *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 465 120
King, Com. *v.* 3 Gray, 501 555
People *v.* 27 Cal. 507 844
People *v.* 28 Cal. 265 405
People *v.* 64 Cal. 338 437
R. *v.* 3 Burr. 1812 916
R. *v.* 7 Q. B. 782 923
R. *v.* 2 Str. 1268 386
State *v.* 71 Ala. 1 712
v. State, 2 Carter, 523 283
v. State, 5 How. (Miss.) 730 358, 359, 640, 655
State *v.* 37 La. An. 91 213
State *v.* 71 Mo. 551 413
v. State, 4 Tex. Ap. 256 813
v. Tremaine, 7 Dowl. & Ryl. 684 846
Kingen *v.* State, 46 Ind. 132 518
Kingsbury's case, 106 Mass. 223 31, 35, 44
Kinsbury, Com. *v.* 5 Mass. 106 456, 464, 465
State *v.* 58 Me. 239 626
Kingsley, People *v.* 2 Cow. 522 176
Kingston, R. *v.* 1 East, 468 285, 302
Kinlock's case, Fost. 16, 28 512, 724
Kinnear, R. *v.* 2 B. & Ald. 462 718, 733
Kinnersley *v.* Knott, 7 C. B. 980 102
R. *v.* 1 Stra. 193 305
Kinney, Com. *v.* 2 Va. Cas. 139 471
v. People, 108 Ill. 519 806
State *v.* 31 Mo. 101 354, 813
v. State, 5 R. I. 385 469
State *v.* 26 W. Va. 110 158
Kinsey, People *v.* 51 Cal. 278 485, 488
R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 447 61
State *v.* 80 N. C. 458 798
v. State, 21 Tex. Ap. 348 220
Kinsler *v.* Terr., 1 Wy. 112 906
Kinsley *v.* State, 3 Ohio St. 508 775
Kirby, Com. *v.* 2 Cush. 577 164, 907, 908, 927
v. State, 62 Ala. 51 994
State *v.* 3 Humph. 489 813
U. S. *v.* 7 Wall. 482 59
Kirk *v.* Com., 9 Leigh, 627 465
v. State, 73 Ga. 620 835
v. State, 6 Mo. 469 93
Kirkpatrick, State *v.* 54 Iowa, 393 1010
Kistler *v.* State, 64 Ind. 371 447
Kit *v.* State, 11 Humph. 167 151
Kitcat *v.* Sharp, 48 L. T. (N. S.) 64 957
Kitchens, State *v.* 2 Hill, S. C. 612 916
Kite *v.* Com., 11 Met. 581 291, 383, 387, 911, 932, 933

	SECTION
Kitrol *v.* State, 9 Fla. 9	350
Kittle, State *v.* 2 Tyler, 471	457, 465, 788
Kittrell, ex parte, 20 Ark. 499	1011
Kizer *v.* State, 12 Lea, 564	560
Klein *v.* People, 113 Ill. 596	866
v. People, 31 N. Y. 229	304, 306, 312, 752
State *v.* 78 Mo. 627	288
Klepper, ex parte, 26 Ill. 532	982
Klinger, State *v.* 43 Mo. 127	587, 592
State *v.* 46 Mo. 224	571
Klock *v.* People, 2 Park C. R. 676	512
Knapp, Com. *v.* 9 Pick. 498	358, 555, 617, 629, 654, 696, 707
Com. *v.* 10 Pick. 477	555, 672, 805
People *v.* 26 Mich. 112	465, 896
People *v.* 42 Mich. 267	827
State *v.* 45 N. H. 148	707
v. Thomas, 39 Ohio St. 377	531, 532, 1006
Kneeland, Com. *v.* 20 Pick. 206	203
Knickerbocker, People *v.* 1 Park. C. R. 302	682, 693
Knight, ex parte, 61 Ala. 482	777
v. Freeport, 13 Mass. 218	831, 849
R. *v.* 9 Cox C. C. 439	470
R. *v.* 14 Cox C. C. 31	760
State *v.* 3 Baxter, 418	309
v. State, 84 Ind. 73	355
Knopf *v.* State, 84 Ind. 316	243
Knote *v.* U. S., 10 Ct. of Cl. 397; 95 U. S. 149	521, 528
Knott *v.* Sargent, 125 Mass. 95	380
Knouff *v.* People, 6 Ill. Ap. 154	781
Knowles *v.* State, 3 Day, 103	284
State *v.* 34 Kans. 393	762
v. State, 2 Root, 282	923
Knowlton *v.* Baker, 72 Me. 202	1010
Koch *v.* State, 32 Ohio St. 353	348
Koerner *v.* State, 96 Ind. 243	916
Kohle, People *v.* 4 Cal. 198	672
Kohler, People *v.* 5 Cal. 72	546, 547
People *v.* 49 Mich. 324	813
Kohlheimer *v.* State, 39 Miss. 548	507
Koontz *v.* State, 41 Tex. 570	273, 756
Kopke *v.* People, 43 Mich. 41	238
Krans *v.* State, 61 Miss. 158	578
Kraus, ex parte, 1 B. & C. 258	27
Krebs *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 1	309
Kreps, State *v.* 8 Ala. 951	383, 447
Krieger, ex parte, 7 Mo. Ap. 367	954, 963
Kriel *v.* Com., 5 Bush (Ky.), 362	118
Kring, State *v.* 74 Mo. 612	417
Kroer *v.* People, 78 Ill. 294	910
Krous, ex parte, 1 Barn. & C. 261	13
Kruise, State *v.* 3 Vroom, 313	70
Krull, State *v.* 5 Mo. Ap. 589	90
Kryder, Com. *v.* 1 Pennyp. 143	770, 1010
Kube, State *v.* 20 Wis. 217	771
Kuhnke, State *v.* 30 Kan. 462	456
Kurtz *v.* Moffit, 115 U. S. 487	472

L.

Labbaite *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 257	370, 602
Lacaze, Resp. *v.* 2 Dall. 118	816, 890
Lacefield *v.* State, 34 Ark. 275	158, 409
Lacey *v.* State, 58 Ala. 385	383
Lackey, Com. *v.* 1 Watts, 66	996
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 164	87
La Costa, U. S. *v.* 2 Mason, 129	125, 282
La Creux, State *v.* 1 M'Mull. 488	220
Lacy *v.* State, 8 Baxt. 401	249
Lad's case, Leech, 112	259
Ladd, Com. *v.* 15 Mass. 526	186
v. State, 17 Fla. 315	692
State *v.* 10 La. An. 271	830
State *v.* 2 Swan. 226	220
Lafferty, State *v.* 5 Harring. 49	8
La Fonta, ex parte, 2 Rob. La. 495	1010
Lafontaine, U. S. *v.* 4 Cranch, 173	59
Lago's case, 18 Alb. L. J. 149	30
Lagrave, in re, 45 How. Pr. 301	993
Lagrone *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 436	203, 221
Lakey, State *v.* 65 Mo. 217	132
Lake, State *v.* 34 La. An. 1069	924
Lamar *v.* State, 64 Miss. 687	844
Lambert *v.* People, 7 Cowen, 166	386
State *v.* 9 Nev. 321	452, 470
State *v.* 93 N. C. 619	844
Lamkin *v.* People, 94 Ill. 101	136, 318
Lamon, State *v.* 3 Hawks, 175	146, 350
Lamothe, State *v.* 37 La. An. 43	859
Lamphere's case, 61 Mich. 105	932
Lamphier *v.* State, 70 Ind. 317	847
Lampson, People *v.* 70 Cal. 204	589
Lancaster *v.* State, 3 Cold. 339	709
v. State, 43 Tex. 519	228
U. S. *v.* 2 McLean, 431	183, 220, 827
U. S. *v.* 4 Wash. C. C. 64	528
Land, State *v.* 42 Ind. 311	121, 125
Lander *v.* People, 104 Ill. 248	813
Landis, Com. *v.* 34 Leg. Int. 204; 12 Phila. 576	828
Landrum *v.* State, 63 Miss. 107	711
Lane *v.* Com., 59 Penn. St. 371	713
ex parte, 6 Fed. Rep. 34	51
State *v.* 4 Ired. 113	92, 124, 144

SECTION

Lane *v.* State, 39 Ohio St. 312 836
Lanergan *v.* People, 39 N. Y. 39 294
Lang, Com. *v.* 10 Gray, 11 751
Langdale, People *v.* 100 Ill. 263 167, 180, 273
Langdon, ex parte, 25 Vt. 680 954, 968, 974
Lange, ex parte, 18 Wall. 163 492, 500, 780, 913, 981, 986, 994, 996 *b*
State *v.* 59 Mo. 418 591
Langenotti *v.* State, 22 Tex. Ap. 61 221
Langford, State *v.* 3 Hawks, 381 221
Langhurst, R. *v.* 10 Cox C. C. 353; 4 F. & F. 969 585, 591
Lanier, State *v.* 88 N. C. 658 239
State *v.* 90 N. C. 714 350
Lanigan, Com. *v.* 2 Bost. L. R. 49 284
Lannan, Com. *v.* 13 Allen, 563 433
Lantz, State *v.* 23 Kan. 728 828
Lapeyre *v.* U. S., 17 Wall. 191 525, 531
La Puente, People *v.* 6 Cal. 202 139
Laque, State *v.* 37 La. An. 853 293
Larison *v.* State, 49 N. J. L. 257 251
Larkin, R. *v.* Dears. C. C. 365; 23 L. J. M. C. 125 90
State *v.* 11 Nev. 314 672
State *v.* 49 N. H. 36 458, 471
Larned *v.* Com., 12 Met. 240 183, 189, 217
Larney *v.* Cleveland, 34 Ohio St. 599 932, 935
Larrigan, State *v.* 66 Iowa, 436 733
Larrimore, State *v.* 20 Mo. 425 866
Larson, People *v.* 68 Cal. 18 507
Lashus, State *v.* 79 Me. 540 425
Lassiter *v.* State, 67 Ga. 739 220, 549
Lasure *v.* State, 19 Ohio St. 44 90
Latham *v.* R., 9 Cox C. C. 516; 5 B. & S. 635 771
Lathrop *v.* State, 51 Ind. 192 246
Laubach *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 583, 592 561, 577, 793
Lauglin *v.* State, 18 Ohio, 99 569
Launig, State *v.* 42 Ind. 541 726
Laura *v.* State, 26 Miss. 174 464
Laura, The, 19 Blatch. 562 528
Lautenschlager, State *v.* 22 Minn. 514 679, 712
Lavarre *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 685 218
Lavender *v.* State, 60 Ala. 80 209
Lavery, Com. *v.* 101 Mass. 207 217
v. Com., 101 Penn. St. 560 733
Lavett *v.* People, 7 Cow. 339 774
Lavin *v.* People, 69 Ill. 603 668
Law, ex parte, 35 Ga. 285 525
Lawler, State *v.* 28 Minn. 216 693

SECTION

Lawless, Com. *v.* 101 Mass. 32 185, 256
Lawley, R. *v.* 2 Stra. 904 153
Lawrence *v.* Com., 30 Grat. 845 540, 549, 716, 875
ex parte, 5 Binn. 304 1011
v. Hedger, 3 Taunt. 14 9
v. People, 1 Scam. 414 457
R. *v.* 4 F. & F. 901 585
v. State, 10 Ind. 453 309
State *v.* 57 Me. 474 803
State *v.* 81 N. C. 521 236, 281, 282, 291, 777, 927
State *v.* 12 Oregon, 297 344
U. S. *v.* 13 Blatch. 295, 306 27, 49
U. S. *v.* 4 Cranch C. C. 514 360
Lawther, State *v.* 65 Mo. 454 602
Laxton, State *v.* 78 N. C. 564 566
Layer, R. *v.* 8 Mod. 93; 6 St. Tr. 328 204, 699
Layton, R. *v.* 1 Salk. 353 922
v. State, 56 Miss. 791 798
Lazarre, State *v.* 12 La. An. 166 62
Lazier *v.* Com., 10 Grat. 708 124, 273, 274, 290, 400
Lea, State *v.* 1 Cold. (Tenn.) 175 299
Leach *v.* People, 53 Ill. 311 644
Leafe, R. *v.* Andr. 226 152, 385
League *v.* State, 36 Md. 259 733
Leak *v.* State, 10 Humph. 144 813
State *v.* 5 Ind. 359 532
Learned, People *v.* 5 Hun, 626 964
State *v.* 47 Me. 426 90
State *v.* 80 N. C. 403 173
Leary's case, 6 Abb. (N. Y.) N. C. 43; S. C. 10 Ben. 197 35, 903, 981, 1000
Leary, R. *v.* 3 Cr. & D. 212 508
Leath *v.* Com., 32 Grat. 873 251
Com. *v.* 1 Va. Cas. 151 931, 932
Leatherwood *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 244 87, 239
Le Bur, ex parte, 49 Cal. 160 995
Le Cerf, State *v.* 1 Bailey, 410 62
Leck *v.* State, 55 Ga. 435 996
Leckey, Com. *v.* 1 Watts, 66 995
Lee *v.* Chadwick, 11 Int. Rev. Rec. 133 968
v. Clark, 2 East, 333 229
v. Murphy, 22 Grat. 789 523, 533
People *v.* 17 Cal. 76 683, 757, 880
v. State, 26 Ark. 260 511, 517
v. State, 69 Ga. 705 350, 859
v. State, 29 Minn. 445 440
v. State, 45 Miss. 114 640, 653
v. State, 51 Miss. 596 560
State *v.* 10 R. I. 494 785
v. State, 22 Tex. Ap. 547 120

SECTION

Lee, U. S. *v.* 4 McL. 103 536
Lee Ping, State *v.* 10 Oreg. 27 273
Lee Ping Bow, State *v.* 10 Oreg. 27 577
Lee Tong, in re, 5 Crim. Law Mag. 67 981
Lee Yan, State *v.* 10 Oreg. 27 266
Lees, ex parte, E., B. & E. 828 995
Le Fanu *v.* Macolmson, 1 H. of L. Cas. 637 181 *a*
Le Flemming *v.* Simpson, 1 M. & Ryl. 269 876
Lefroy, R. *v.* L. R. 8 Q. B. 134 961, 963, 968, 974
Leftwich *v.* Com., 20 Grat. 716 218, 774
Legmon *v.* Latimer, 3 Exch. D. 15 521
Legori *v.* State, 8 Sm. & M. 697 148
Leigh *v.* People, 113 Ill. 372 793
Leighton *v.* People, 10 Abb. (N. Y.) N. C. 261 869
Leland, in re, 7 Abb. Pr. (N. S.) 64 29, 36, 993
Lemley, Com. *v.* 2 Pitts. 362 76, 81
Lemons *v.* State, 4 W. Va. 755 279, 776, 777
Lennox, People *v.* 67 Cal. 113 414
Lenox, Com. *v.* 3 Brewst. 249 355, 356, 623, 634
Leonard, State *v.* 22 Mo. 449 295
U. S. *v.* 18 Blatch. 187 742
Lepper, State *v.* 51 Mich. 196 414
Leppere, State *v.* 66 Wis. 355 813
Leschi *v.* Terr., 1 Wash. Terr. 23 875
Lesher, Com. *v.* 17 Serg. & R. 155 664, 793
Leslie *v.* State, 83 Ind. 180 602
v. State, 18 Oh. St. 390 788, 895
Lessing, State *v.* 16 Minn. 75 247, 465
Lester *v.* Goode, 2 Murph. 37 865
v. State, 11 Conn. 415 779, 862, 897
v. State, 33 Ga. 192 76, 506
v. State, 9 Mo. 658 132
Lesynski, in re, 7 Rep. 358; 14 Blatch. 9 453
Leunig, State *v.* 42 Ind. 541 505, 726
Leong Quong, People *v.* 60 Cal. 107 103
Levells *v.* State, 32 Ark. 585 751
Leverett *v.* State, 1 Tex. L. J. 113 842
Levi *v.* Milne, 4 Bing. 198 791
Levien *v.* R., L. R. 1 P. C. C. Ap. 536 521
Levining *v.* State, 13 Ga. 513 869
Levison *v.* State, 54 Ala. 520 385
Levy, R. *v.* 2 Stark. N. P. 458 285
v. State, 79 Ala. 259 189 *a*
v. State, 6 Ind. 281 440
State *v.* 24 Minn. 362 82, 748
Lewis *v.* Commiss., 74 N. C. 194 338

SECTION

Lewis, Com. *v.* 25 Grat. 938 309
Com. *v.* 1 Met. (Mass.) 151 98, 106, 306 *a*
Com. *v.* 15 Weekly Notes, 205 338
v. Com., 81 Va. 416 413
People *v.* 61 Cal. 366 220
People *v.* 64 Cal. 401 587, 414, 934
v. State, 51 Ala. 1 465, 891
v. State, 21 Ark. 209 440
v. State, 4 Ham. 389 712
State *v.* 2 Hawks, 98 465, 471
v. State, 1 Head, 329 425
State *v.* 48 Iowa, 578 464
v. People, 51 Mich. 172 414
v. State, 11 Mo. 366 405
State *v.* 69 Mo. 92 551, 711
State *v.* 74 Mo. 222 601, 598 *a*
State *v.* 80 Mo. 110 548
State *v.* 9 Mo. Ap. 321 878
v. State, 14 Mo. Ap. 191 707, 793
State *v.* 93 N. C. 581 577
v. State, 9 S. & M. 115 664
v. State, 1 Tex. Ap. 323 435, 471
v. State, 15 Tex. Ap. 647 651
U. S. *v.* 2 New Mex. 459 902
v. Wake Co., 74 N. C. 194 366
Leyman *v.* Latimer, L. R. 3 Exch. D. 352; 14 Cox C. C. 51 523
Leyton, R. *v.* Cro. Car. 584 386
Libby *v.* Nicola, 21 Ohio St. 414 528, 533
Light R. *v.* 7 Cox C. C. 389 8
Lightner, People *v.* 49 Cal. 226 520
Ligon, State *v.* 7 Port. 167 350
Lillard, State *v.* 59 Iowa, 479 146
Lilly, People *v.* 38 Mich. 270 772
Lincoln, State *v.* 17 Wis. 579 119
Linda *v.* Hudson, 1 Cush. 385 983
Linde, State *v.* 54 Iowa, 139 609
Lindley *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 283 871
Lindsay, Com. *v.* 2 Va. Cas. 345 383, 447
v. People, 63 N. Y. 143 536
v. State, 48 Ala. 169 302, 315
Lindsey *v.* State, 72 Ind. 40 88
State *v.* 78 N. C. 499 307, 309
Links *v.* State, 13 Lea, 70 709
Linney, State *v.* 52 Mo. 40 560, 566
People *v.* 5 Tex. Ap. 344 220
Linton, Com. *v.* 2 Va. Cas. 476 759
Lippard, Com. *v.* 6 S. & R. 395 344, 608
Lipsey, State *v.* 3 Dev. 485 518, 791
Liscomb, People, ex rel. Tweed *v.* 60 N. Y. 559 900, 932, 994, 996 *b*
Lisle *v.* State, 58 Ind. 182 846
v. State, 6 Mo. 426 696, 844
Litch, State *v.* 33 Vt. 67 120, 134

SECTION

Lithgow *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 297 110, 465, 635, 654, 693
Little *v.* Com., 25 Grat. 921 343 *a*, 378
v. Com., 82 Ky. 250 252
v. State, 90 Ind. 338 956
State *v.* 42 Iowa, 51 358
State *v.* 1 N. H. 257 451, 483, 485
State *v.* 1 Vt. 331 220
Littlefield, People *v.* 5 Cal. 355 120, 206, 752
State *v.* 70 Me. 452 476, 477
Littler *v.* Thompson, 2 Beav. 129 951
Livermore, Com. *v.* 4 Gray, 18 194
Livingston's case, 14 Grat. 592 465
Livingston, State *v.* 64 Iowa, 560 842
Lloyd, in re, 5 Penn. L. J. 60; 3 Clark, Phil. 193 377
v. State, 45 Ga. 57 646, 653
Lockbaum, State *v.* 38 Conn. 400 154
Locke, State *v.* 77 N. C. 480 711
v. State, 32 N. H. 106 753
Lockett, R. *v.* 1 Leach, 110 194
Lockhart, ex parte, 1 Disney, 108 531
Locklear, State *v.* Bushee, 205 163, 251
Lockley, R. *v.* 4 F. & F. 155 8
Locklin, State *v.* 59 Vt. 64 471, 482
Lockwood, Com. *v.* 109 Mass. 323 522, 523, 526
People *v.* 6 Cal. 205 101
State *v.* 58 Vt. 378 273, 290, 883
U. S. *v.* 43 Wis. 403 733
Lodano *v.* State, 25 Ala. 64 220
Loehr, State *v.* 93 Mo. 402 358
Loew *v.* State, 60 Wis. 559 805, 829
Loftin, State *v.* 2 Dev. & B. 31 230, 238, 239
v. State, 11 Sm. & M. 358 774
Lofton *v.* Vogles, 17 Ind. 105 453
Logan, People *v.* 4 Cal. 188 597
v. State, 2 Brev. 415; 1 Treadw. 493 1006
v. State, 50 Miss. 269 344, 640
State *v.* 1 Mo. 377 208
State *v.* 1 Nev. 509 363, 388
v. State, 5 Tex. Ap. 306 238
Logg *v.* People, 8 Ill. Ap. 99 459, 895
Loggins *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 65 693
Lohman, People *v.* 2 Barb. 450 76, 164, 690
v. People, 1 Comst. (1 N. Y.) 379 261, 464, 466, 631
Long, Com. *v.* 2 Va. Cas. 318 425
v. State, 12 Ga. 293 13, 243, 712
v. State, 38 Ga. 491 597, 601
v. State, 56 Ind. 182, 294, 853
v. State, 52 Miss. 23 548
v. State, 36 Tex. 6 935, 938
v. State, 10 Tex. Ap. 186 844

SECTION

Long, State *v.* 11 Tex. Ap. 381 711
Longbottoms, State *v.* 11 Humph. 39 218
Longfellow *v.* Langton, 35 Kan. 375 70
v. State, 10 Neb. 105 741
Longley, State *v.* 10 Ind. 482 299
Longnecker, State *v.* 22 Ind. 247 709
Lonsdale *v.* Brown, 4 Wash. C. C. 148 828
Loom, R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 160 237
Loomis, State *v.* 27 Minn. 531 226
Loop, People *v.* 3 Park. C. R. 559 189, 466
Lopez, State *v.* 19 Mo. 254 279, 383
State *v.* 15 Nev. 407 707
Lord *v.* State, 18 N. H. 173 696
v. State, 20 N. H. 404 217
Lorey, State *v.* 2 Brev. 395 423
Lorraine, ex parte, 16 Nev. 63 35
Lorton *v.* State, 7 Mo. 55 252, 470
Lot, State *v.* 1 Rich. 260 243
Lott *v.* State, 18 Tex. Ap. 627 571
Lottery Tickets, Com. *v.* 5 Cush. 369 1
Lou Yong, State *v.* 34 La. An. 346 869
Loud, Com. *v.* 3 Met. (Mass.) 328 438, 457, 507
Love, State *v.* 6 Bax. 159 832, 835
State *v.* 4 Humph. 255 338
State *v.* 63 Mo. 541 779
Lovell *v.* State, 45 Ind. 550 92
Lovet *v.* State, 60 Ga. 257 798
Low *v.* People, 2 Park. C. R. 37 207, 217
Lowder, State *v.* 85 N. C. 564 6
Lowe's case, 4 Greenl. 448 376
Lowe *v.* State, 57 Ga. 171 470
Lowenberg *v.* People, 5 Parker C. R. 414; 27 N. Y. 336 653, 664, 916
Lowry, Com. *v.* 14 Leg. Int. 332 82
People *v.* 70 Cal. 193 707
State *v.* 1 Swan. 34 451
Loyd *v.* State, 45 Ga. 57 597, 646, 653
v. State, 19 Tex. Ap. 137 774 *a*
Luck *v.* State, 96 Ind. 16 836
Lucy *v.* State, 8 Mo. 134 358
Lukens, Resp. *v.* 1 Dall. 5 358
Lum *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 483 693
Lumm *v.* State, 3 Ind. 293 81, 985
Lumpkin *v.* State, 68 Ala. 56 358 *a*
Lung's case, 1 Conn. 428 364, 367
Lunn *v.* State, 44 Tex. 85 215
Lunsford *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 217 812
Lupton, State *v.* 63 N. C. 483 358
Lurch, State *v.* 12 Or. 104
Luster *v.* State, 11 Humph. 169 827, 835
Lutton *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 518 598
Luttrell *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 147 772

SECTION

Lutwell *v.* State, 85 Tenn. 232 801
Lutz *v.* Com., 29 Penn. St. 441 760
Lyerly, State *v.* 7 Jones (N. C.), 159 314
Lyles *v.* State, 41 Tex. 172 669, 860, 873
U. S. *v.* 4 Cranch C. C. 469 337
Lyman, People *v.* 7 Ill. Ap. 345 343
People *v.* 2 Utah, 39 354
Lynch *v.* Com., 88 Penn. St. 189 541, 549, 550, 762
v. People, 38 Ill. 497 75, 1007
State *v.* 5 Crim. Law Mag. 397 938
Lynes *v.* State, 46 Ga. 208 580
v. State, 36 Miss. 617 802
v. State, 5 Port. 236 106, 423
Lynne Regis, R. *v.* 1 Dougl. 159 151
Lynott, State *v.* 2. Ames (R. I.), 295 798
Lyon, State *v.* Cox, 403 1002, 1004
R. *v.* R. &. R. 255 197
State *v.* 12 Conn. 487 813
State *v.* 81 N. C. 600 536
State *v.* 45 N. J. L. 272 120
State *v.* 17 Wis. 237 299
Lyons *v.* People, 68 Ill. 271 265
People *v.* 49 Mich. 78 71
Lytle, State *v.* 5 Ired. 58 722

M.

Mabel, R. *v.* 9 C. & P. 474 8
Maas, State *v.* 37 La. An. 202 169
Macartney *v.* Corry, Irish R. 7 C. L. 242 958
Macaulay, People *v.* 1 Cal. 379 650
Macdonnell, in re, 11 Blatch. 79 50, 51, 52, 57, 980, 990
Mace, State *v.* 76 Me. 64 251
State *v.* 86 N. C. 666 354
Mackalley's case, 9 Coke, 65 3
Mackesey *v.* People, 6 Park. C. R. 114 159
Mackey *v.* State, 3 Ohio St. 362 93, 251
State *v.* 12 Or. 154 902
v. State, 20 Tex. Ap. 603 111
Mackin *v.* People, 115 Ill. 313 350, 378
Mackintosh, R. *v.* 1 Stra. 308 81
Macloon, Com *v.* 5 Gray, 91 124
Macready *v.* Wilcox, 33 Conn. 321 1010
Madan, R. *v.* 1 Leach, 224 533
Madden, R. *v.* 12 Cox C. C. 239 576
v. State, 70 Ga. 383 774 *a*
v. State, 1 Kans. 340 823
Maddocks, R. *v.* 1 Sid. 430 532
Maddox, State *v.* 74 Ind. 105 238
v. State, 12 Tex. Ap. 429 793

SECTION

Maden *v.* Emmons, 83 Ind. 381 505
Madon's case, Leech C. C. 220 533
Madoil, State *v.* 12 Fla. 151 661, 825
Maeder *v.* State, 11 Mo. 363 405
Magee, Com. *v.* 10 Phila. 201 812
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 367 278, 602
Maginnis *v.* Parkhurst, 4 N. J. Eq. 433 969
Magoon, State *v.* 50 Vt. 338 565, 566
Magrath, State *v.* 19 Mo. 678 120
State *v.* 44 N. J. L. 227 369
Maguire *v.* State, 47 Md. 485 762, 935
Mahala *v.* State, 10 Yerger, 532 496, 508, 513, 724
Mahan *v.* State, 10 Ohio, 232 614 *a*
State, *v.* 12 Tex. 283 350
Maher, Com. *v.* 4 Crim. Law. Mag. (Phil.) 411 477, 480
People *v.* 4 Wend. 229 457
State *v.* 35 Me. 225 472
v. State, 3 Min. 444 823
Mahly, State *v.* 68 Mo. 315 561, 570, 712, 713, 853
Mahon, in re, 34 Fed. Rep. 395 27
R. *v.* 4 A. & E. 475 945
State *v.* 3 Harring. 568 62
Mahone *v.* State, 66 Ga. 539 810
Mahony, People *v.* 18 Cal. 180 650
Main *v.* McCarty, 15 Ill. 422 8
Maine, State *v.* 27 Conn. 281 733
State *v.* 31 Conn. 572 447
Maines *v.* State, 23 Tex. Ap. 568 711, 801
Mainor, State *v.* 6 Ired. 340 301, 305
Major, R. *v.* 2 East P. C. 1118, 190
v. State, 4 Sneed, 597 642
Majors, People *v.* 65 Cal. 138 468, 681, 914
Malaspina, People *v.* 57 Cal. 328 711
Mailings, R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 242 579
Mallet *v.* Stevenson, 26 Conn. 428 122
Malling, State *v.* 11 Iowa, 239 788, 895
Mallon, People *v.* 3 Lansing, 225 632
State *v.* 75 Mo. 355 256, 292, 293
Malloy, Com. *v.* 119 Mass. 347 220
Malone, Com. *v.* 9 Fed. Rep. 897 913
v. State, 49 Ga. 212 600
U. S. *v.* 20 Blatch. 137 164, 739, 890
Maloney, State *v.* 12 R. I. 251 350, 387, 738
Manahan, People *v.* 32 Cal. 68 346
Manchester, in re, 5 Cal. 237 35, 993
Mangrum, State *v.* 35 La. An. 619 555
Manley, Com. *v.* 12 Pick. 173 111
v. State, 7 Md. 149 292, 911
Manluff, State *v.* 1 Houst. 268 293
Manly, State *v.* 52 Ind. 215 602

SECTION

Mann, R. *v.* 4 M. & S. 337 457
State *v.* 27 Conn. 281 541
v. State, 3 Head, 373 824
State *v.* 83 Mo. 589 654, 658, 670, 676
v. State, 44 Tex. 642 869
U. S. *v.* 1 Gall. C. C. 3 89
Manning, R. *v.* 12 Q. B. D. 241; 51 L. T. N. S. 121 305
State *v.* 14 Tex. 402 90, 101, 793
Mansell *v.* R., 8 El. & Bl. 54; Dears. & B. 375 612, 782
Manson, Com. *v.* 2 Ashm. 31 293, 305, 309, 696, 871, 873, 874
Manzano, R. *v.* 2 F. & F. 64 579
Mapes *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 85 549
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 129 588
Marble, People *v.* 38 Mich. 117 712
March, People *v.* 6 Cal. 543 507
v. R. R., 19 N. H. 372 627
v. State, 44 Tex. 64 853
Marchant, U. S. *v.* 4 Mason, 160; 12 Wheat, 480 310, 614 *a*, 620, 680
Marigold, U. S. *v.* 9 How. (U. S.) 560 442
Markham, People *v.* 64 Cal. 157 400
Markley *v.* State, 10 Mo. 291 134
Marks, ex parte, 64 Cal. 29 533
R. *v.* 3 East, 157 27
v. State, 15 Nev. 33 844
Marlatt *v.* People, 104 Ill. 304 813
Marler *v.* State, 67 Ala. 55 309
Marsden, R. *v.* L. R. 1 C. C. R. 131 8
R. *v.* 4 M. & S. 164 167
Marseiler, People *v.* 70 Cal. 98 220
Marsh, People *v.* 2 Cow. 493 949
R. *v.* 6 A. & E. 236 91, 92, 341, 379
R. *v.* Bulst. 27 986
R. *v.* 1 Den. C. C. 505 159, 221
Marshall *v.* Com., 5 Grat. 663 756
R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 158 161
State *v.* 8 Ala. 302 669, 683, 692
State *v.* 37 La. An. 26 407
v. State, 6 Neb. 121 441, 442
v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 492 221
Marston *v.* Jenness, 11 N. H. 156 438
Martha *v.* State, 26 Ala. 72 484
Martin, Com. *v.* 2 Barr, 244 271, 774
v. Com., 2 Leigh, 745 814, 816
Com. *v.* 98 Mass. 4 6
Com. *v.* 125 Mass. 394 156
in re, 45 Barb. 142 979, 980
People *v.* 32 Cal. 91 202

SECTION

Martin, People *v.* 52 Cal. 201 152, 221
People *v.* 1 Park. C. R. 187 320, 991
v. People, 13 Ill. 341; 54 Ill. 225 773, 837
R. *v.* 3 Cox C. C. 56 560
R. *v.* 9 C. & P. 213 299
R. *v.* L. R. 1 C. C. 214, 378, 388 707, 831, 938
R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 483; 7 C. & P. 549 185
v. State, 28 Ala. 71 759
v. State, 59 Ala. 34 472
v. State, 62 Ala. 240 407
v. State, 40 Ark. 364 541
v. State, 46 Ark. 38 752
v. State, 25 Ga. 494 833
v. State, 6 Humph. 204 115
State *v.* 2 Ired. 101 350, 602
v. State, 63 Miss. 505 561, 853
State *v.* 10 Mo. 391 101
State *v.* 76 Mo. 337 465, 896
State *v.* 82 N. C. 672 212, 474
v. State, 16 Ohio, 364 664
v. State, 24 Tex. 61 320
State *v.* 30 Wis. 294 465, 483, 602, 896
U. S. *v.* 8 Sawy. 473 282 *a*
Martinez *v.* State, 41 Tex. 164 189
Marvin, State *v.* 34 Conn. 113 292
Marx *v.* People, 63 Barb. 618 801, 803
Mash, Com. *v.* 7 Met. 472 522, 527
Mask *v.* State, 32 Miss. 405 304, 310, 312, 755
v. State, 36 Miss. 77 712
Mason *v.* Bustill, 8 Mod. 51 105
ex parte, 105 U. S. 696 979, 997
in re, 8 Mich. 70 913
v. People, 15 Ill. 536 310
R. *v.* 2 East P. C. 975 167
v. State, 42 Ala. 532 220
v. State, 15 Tex. Ap. 534 577
Massengale *v.* State, 24 Tex. Ap. 181 429 *a*
Massey, State *v.* 27 N. C. 465 236
Masterson *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 574 293
Mastronada *v.* State, 60 Miss. 86 414
Mather *v.* Hood, 8 Johns. R. 44 963
People *v.* 4 Wend. 265 450, 464, 465, 631, 683, 688, 793
Mathis *v.* State, 33 Ga. 24 802
State *v.* 21 Ind. 277 95
State *v.* 3 Pike, 84 386, 394
Mato, ex parte, 19 Tex. Ap. 112 994
Maton *v.* State, 15 Ill. 536 680
Matthews, R. *v.* 1 Den. C. C. 596 306 *a*
State *v.* 80 N. C. 419 577

SECTION

Matthews, State *v.* 37 N. H. 450 958, 964, 968, 969
State *v.* 42 Vt. 542 251
v. State, 2 Yerg. 233 238, 240
Maull *v.* State, 37 Ala. 160 245
Maulsby, ex parte, 13 Md. 625 964, 974
Maurer *v.* People, 43 N. Y. 1 547
R. *v.* L. R. 10 Q. B. D. 513 57
Maurignos, State *v.* T. U. P. Charlton, 24 1006
Mawbey, R. *v.* 6 T. R. 638 894
Max, ex parte, 44 Cal. 579 995
Maxey, State *v.* 1 McMullen, 503 80
Maxwell, Com. *v.* 2 Pick. 139 240, 241
ex parte, 11 Nev. 428 505
U. S. *v.* 3 Dill. 275 89
U. S. *v.* 21 Int. Rev. Rec. 148 89
May *v.* People, 8 Col. 210 814, 841
State *v.* 4 Dev. 328 125
v. State, 14 Ohio, 461 277
U. S. *v.* 2 McArth. 512 913
Mayer *v.* Allaire, 14 Ala. 400 440
Mayes *v.* People, 106 Ill. 306 577, 771
Mayloy, Com. *v.* 57 Penn. St. 291 913
Maynard *v.* State, 14 Ind. 427 291
Maynes, State *v.* 61 Iowa, 119 355, 356
Mayo *v.* State, 30 Ala. 32 293
U. S. *v.* 1 Curtis C. C. 433 411, 541, 542, 550
Mayor *v.* Cooper, 6 Wall. 247 783 *a*
v. Hussey, 21 Ga. 80 440
Mayor, etc. of Manchester, R. *v.* 7 El. & Bl. 453 100
Mays, State *v.* 28 Miss. 706 555
State *v.* 24 S. C. 190 70
Maze, State *v.* 6 Humph. 17 230
McAdams *v.* State, 24 Tex. Ap. 86 866
McAdory *v.* Hale, 62 Ala. 154 798
McAfee *v.* State, 31 Ga. 411 862, 866
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 688 102
McAlhey, R. *v.* 9 Cox C. C. 251 306 *a*
McAllister *v.* State, 17 Ala. 434 845
v. State, 17 Ga. 434 846
State *v.* 26 Me. 374 95
McAnulty, State *v.* 26 Kans. 533 218, 252
McAtee, Com. *v.* 8 Dana (Ky.), 29 166
McAuley, Com. *v.* 105 Mass. 69 472
v. State, 7 Yerg. 526 190
McAvoy, U. S. *v.* 4 Blatch. 418 354
McBeth *v.* State, 50 Miss. 81 118, 712
McBride, Com. *v.* 2 Brewst. 545 1011
v. State, 2 Eng. (Ark.) 374 247, 465
v. State, 10 Humph. 615 139, 142
McBryde *v.* State, 34 Ga. 202 120

SECTION

McCafferty, State *v.* 64 Me. 223 84
McCahill, State *v.* 72 Iowa, 111 801, 813
McCall *v.* McDowell, 1 Abb. U. S. 212 979
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 353 742
McCalla, People *v.* 8 Cal. 301 614 *a*
McCanless, State *v.* 9 Ired. 375 800
McCann's case, 14 Grat. 570 440, 445
McCann *v.* People, 88 Ill. 105 910
State *v.* 1 Meigs, 91 358
v. State, 9 Sm. & M. 465 728, 814, 815, 826, 836
McCarney *v.* People, 83 N. Y. 408 566
McCarter, State *v.* 98 N. C. 637 163
McCarthy *v.* Hinman, 35 Conn. 538 996 *b*
People *v.* 49 Cal. 241 617
v. State, 56 Miss. 295 90, 913
v. Terr., 1 Wy. 311 221
McCartie, R. *v.* 11 Ir. C. L. R. 207 612
McCarty, State *v.* 1 Bay S. C. 334 526
State *v.* 17 Minn. 76 369
v. State, 26 Miss. 299 683
McCaul, Com. *v.* 1 Va. Cas. 271 815, 822
McCauley, Com. *v.* 105 Mass. 69 410
McCay *v.* Ins. Co., 2 Caines, 384 583
McChord, Com. *v.* 2 Dana, 242 302, 313, 315, 463
McClain *v.* Com., 10 Yerg. 241 815
McClary *v.* State, 75 Ind. 260 353
McClay, U. S. *v.* 23 Int. Rev. Rec. 80 993
McCleroy *v.* State, 77 Ala. 95 712
McClintock, State *v.* 8 Iowa, 203 254, 469
McCloskey, People *v.* 5 Park. C. R. 57 110
McCluer, State *v.* 5 Nev. 132 793
McClure *v.* Com., 86 Penn. St. 353 164
v. State, 1 Yerg. 206 91, 92, 672, 846
McCollum, State *v.* 44 Mo. 343 162, 251
McConkey *v.* State, 20 Iowa, 574 111
v. Com. 101 Penn. St. 416 902
McConnell *v.* State, 46 Ind. 298 954, 968
McConologue, in re, 107 Mass. 172 980, 983, 997
McCord, State *v.* 8 Kans. 232 465
McCormack, Com. *v.* 126 Mass. 258 407, 410, 775
Com. *v.* 130 Mass. 61 436, 660
People *v.* 4 Park. C. R. 9 995

SECTION

McCormack, State *v.* 56 Iowa, 585 251
State *v.* 8 Oreg. 236 470
McCormick, State *v.* 27 Iowa, 402 914
U. S. *v.* 4 Cranch C. C. 104 475
McCort, State *v.* 23 La. An. 326 578
McCortney, State *v.* 6 Mo. 649 358
McCory, State *v.* 2 Blackf. 5 785
McCoy *v.* State, 46 Ark. 141 70, 460
v. State, 15 Ga. 205 712, 797
State *v.* 29 La. An. 593 279
McCracken, State *v.* 20 Mo. 411 146
McCready, ex parte, 1 Hughes, 598 981
McCreary *v.* Com., 29 Penn. St. 323 493, 815, 818
McCrory, People *v.* 41 Cal. 458 591, 701
McCue *v.* Com., 78 Penn. St. 185 777, 780, 906
State *v.* 39 Mo. 112 292, 752, 911
McCulley *v.* State, 62 Ind. 428 916
McCullough *v.* Com., 67 Penn. St. 30 338, 354, 368
McCully, R. *v.* 2 Mood. C. C. 34 237
McCune *v.* Com., 2 Rob. Va. 790 791
McCurdy, People *v.* 68 Cal. 576 836
McCurry, State *v.* 63 N. C. 33 803
McCutcheon *v.* State, 69 Ill. 601 236
McDade *v.* State, 20 Ala. 81 120
McDaniel *v.* State, 30 Ga. 853 810
v. State, 8 S. & M. 401 600
McDermott *v.* State, 89 Ind. 187 589
McDevro *v.* State, 23 Tex. Ap. 429 119
McDonald *v.* Beall, 55 Ga. 288 846
Com. *v.* 5 Cush. 365 159
ex parte, 29 Alb. L. J. 382 964
ex parte, 2 Whart. 440 528
Rob *v.* 29 Iowa, 330 999
v. State, 63 Ind. 544 793
v. State, 45 Md. 90 780
State *v.* 65 Me. 465 712
v. State, 8 Mo. 283 183, 369
State *v.* 37 Mo. 41 253, 254
State *v.* 67 Mo. 13 212 *a*, 256
State *v.* 85 Mo. 539 907
State *v.* 9 W. Va. 456 661, 849
McDonnell, in re, *see* Macdonnell, in re.
People *v.* 47 Cal. 134 866
People *v.* 92 N. Y. 657 246, 249
State *v.* 32 Vt. 491 709, 810
McDonough, Com. *v.* 13 Allen, 581 759
McDougal *v.* State, 88 Ind. 24 710

SECTION

McDowell, Com. *v.* 1 Browne, 360 183
State *v.* 6 Blackf. 49 105
State *v.* 84 N. C. 798 127
McDuffie, State *v.* 52 Ala. 4 963
McElhaney, Com. *v.* 111 Mass. 439 890
McElhanon *v.* People, 92 Ill. 469 391 *a*
McElhinney *v.* Com., 22 Penn. St. 365 230
McElmurray, State *v.* 3 Strobh. 33 815, 824
v. State, 21 Tex. Ap. 691 456
McElrath *v.* State, 2 Swan, 378 832, 850
McElroy *v.* State, 8 Eng. (13 Ark.) 708 141, 147
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 235 258
McEntee *v.* State, 24 Wis. 43 189 *a*
McEntie *v.* Sandford, 42 N. J. L. 200 321
McEntire, State *v.* Car. L. R. 287 359
McEwen, People *v.* 62 N. Y. Pr. 412 924
McFadden *v.* State, 23 Penn. St. 12 447, 493, 517, 617, 663, 665, 672, 675, 724, 816
McFarland, State *v.* 49 Iowa, 99 244
v. State, 68 Wis. 400 451, 486
McGahahin *v.* State, 17 Fla. 665 289
McGahey, Com. *v.* 11 Gray, 194 20
McGarrigall's case, cited 1 Ben. & Heard Lead. Cas. 551 164
McGary *v.* People, 45 N. Y. (6 Hand) 153 100, 110
McGee, State *v.* 36 La. An. 207 350
McGehan, ex parte, 22 Ohio St. 442 449
McGehee *v.* State, 58 Ala. 360 383
McGill, ex parte, 6 Tex. Ap. 498 996
v. State, 34 Ohio St. 328 846
McGilver, People *v.* 67 Cal. 55 117
McGimpsey, State *v.* 80 N. C. 377 495, 513
McGinnis *v.* Com., 102 Penn. St. 66 902
McGlinchy *v.* Barrows, 41 Me. 74 25
McGovern, Com. *v.* 10 Allen, 139 387
McGowan *v.* Com., 2 Metc. (Ky.) 3 121
Com. *v.* 2 Pars. 341 464, 802
v. People, 104 Ill. 100 774 *a*
People *v.* 17 Wend. 386 466, 470, 482
v. State, 9 Yerg. 154 642, 693
McGrath, Com. *v.* 115 Mass. 150 752
State *v.* 19 Mo. 678 137
State *v.* 1 Vroom (44 N. J. L.), 227 369
McGraw, State *v.* 1 Walker, 208 457, 460

SECTION

McGregg *v.* State, 4 Blackf. 101 354, 643, 754
McGregor *v.* State, 16 Ind. 9 161
State *v.* 41 N. H. 407 385
McGrew, State *v.* 13 Rich. 316 309
McGuffie *v.* State, 17 Ga. 497 369, 686, 847
McGuire, Com. *v.* 1 Va. Ca. 119 302
v. State, 10 Ala. (Sel.) Ca. 69; 37 Ala. 161 193, 194, 282
v. State, 35 Miss. 366 405
v. State, 37 Miss. 369 661 *a*, 672
v. Wallace, 109 Ind. 284 996
McGungill, People *v.* 41 Cal. 429 673, 693
McHale, Com. *v.* 97 Penn. St. 397 354
McHenry, U. S. *v.* 6 Blatch. 503 625
McHugh *v.* State, 38 Ohio St. 153 608, 638
v. State, 40 Ohio St. 154 638
v. State, 42 Ohio St. 154 608, 779
McIntire, State *v.* 1 Jones (N. C.), 1 532
McIntosh, R. *v.* 2 East P. C. 942 194
v. State, 18 Tex. Ap. 288 209, 237
McInturf *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 230 555, 751
McIntyre *v.* People, 38 Ill. 514 827
People *v.* 1 Park. C. R. 371 309
v. State, 58 Iowa, 572 793
v. State, 59 Iowa, 267 370
McJunkins *v.* State, 10 Ind. 140 309
McKane *v.* State, 11 Ind. 195 218
McKay *v.* Ins. Co., 2 Caines, 384 597
People *v.* 18 Johns. 212 457, 890
R. *v.* 3 Cr. & Dix. 205 61
v. State, 8 Tex. 376 108
v. State, 44 Tex. 43 173
McKean, ex parte, 3 Hughes, 213 981, 993
McKee, Penns. *v.* Add. 36 134
v. People, 32 N. Y. 239 928
State *v.* 1 Bailey, 651 383, 447, 508, 511, 815, 819
U. S. *v.* 4 Dillon, 128 453, 528
McKenna, Com. *v.* 125 Mass. 397 407, 417
McKenzie, R. *v.* R. & R. 429 759
v. State, 26 Ark. 334 502, 722
McKettrick, State *v.* 14 S. C. 346 281
McKiernan, State *v.* 17 Nev. 224 204
McKinney, People *v.* 10 Mich. 54 157
State *v.* 31 Kan. 570 447, 452, 750, 818

SECTION

McKisson, Com. *v.* 8 S. & R. 420 292, 771
McLain, State *v.* 2 Brev. 443 237
McLaine *v.* State, 4 Ga. 335 137, 317, 318, 813
State *v.* 15 Nev. 345 310
v. U. S. 6 Pet. 405 528
McLaughlin, Com. *v.* 12 Cush. 615 8, 254, 301, 469
v. Com., 4 Rawle, 464 110, 183, 188, 273
ex parte, 41 Cal. 211 520
in re, 58 Vt. 136 994
v. State, 45 Ind. 338; 52 Ind. 476 90, 119
State *v.* 44 Iowa, 82 841, 847
v. Stevens, 2 Cranch C. C. 149 440
McLean *v.* State, 8 Mo. 153 819, 822
McLellan *v.* Crofton, 6 Greenl. 307 846
v. Richardson, 13 Me. 82 366, 380
McLemore, State *v.* 2 Hill (S. C.), 680 513
McLeod, People *v.* 1 Hill (N. Y.), 377; 25 Wend. 483; 3 Hill, 658 383, 447, 991, 995, 1010
v. State, 35 Ala. 395 940
State *v.* 1 Hawks, 344 379
McLoon, Com. *v.* 5 Gray, 91 274
State *v.* 78 Me. 420 222
McMahon, Com. *v.* 133 Mass. 394 760
People *v.* 2 Parker C. R. 663 689
State *v.* 17 Nev. 365 518
McMahone *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 220 203
McMannis *v.* Butler, 49 Barb. 176, 181 320
McManus *v.* Com., 91 Penn. St. 57 779
McMath *v.* State, 55 Ga. 303 134, 578, 810
McMillan *v.* State, 5 Ohio, 269 183
McNab, State *v.* 20 N. H. 160 75, 1007
McNair *v.* People, 89 Ill. 441 177
McNally, State *v.* 32 Iowa, 580 261
State *v.* 55 Md. 559 387
State *v.* 34 Me. 210 6
McNamara, R. *v.* 14 Cox C. C. 289 707
McNamee *v.* People, 31 Mich. 473 88
State *v.* 25 S. C. 168 837
McNaught, State *v.* 36 Kan. 624 895
McNeal, U. S. *v.* 1 Gall. 387 135
McNealy, People *v.* 17 Cal. 333 507

SECTION

McNeill, State *v.* 3 Hawks, 183 383, 447
State *v.* 93 N. C. 552 293, 294, 376, 614 *a*
McNevins, People *v.* 61 Barb. 307 713
McNiel's case, 1 Caines, 72 82
McNinch, State *v.* 12 S. C. 89 366, 608
McNutt, People *v.* 64 Cal. 116 801
McO'Blenis, State *v.* 21 Mo. 272 314, 528
McPherson, State *v.* 29 Ark. 228 602
v. State, 22 Ga. 478 810
McPhun, in re, 30 Fed. Rep. 57 53
McPike, Com. *v.* 3 Cush. 181 253, 464
McQuaige, State *v.* 5 S. C. 429 344, 620, 693
McQueen *v.* State, 82 Ind. 72 189 *a*
McQuillan *v.* State, 8 Sm. & M. 587 44, 350, 819
McQuillon, ex parte, 1 West. L. Month. 440; 9 Pitts. L. J. 29 979
McQuoid *v.* People, 3 Gilman, 76 152, 482, 918
McRae *v.* Americanus, 59 Ga. 168 471
McReynolds *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 327 212 *a*
McRoberts, ex parte, 16 Iowa, 600 980
McShane, Com. *v.* 110 Mass. 502 472
McTigue *v.* State, 4 Baxt. 318 244
McWaters *v.* State, 10 Mo. 167 358
McWilliams, State *v.* 7 Mo. Ap. 99 251, 387
Mead, Com. *v.* 10 Allen, 396 472
Com. *v.* 12 Gray, 167 343 *a*, 378, 379, 847
v. Norris, 21 Wis. 310 950
People *v.* 92 N. Y. 415 6, 444
People *v.* 1 N. Y. Cr. 417 965
R. *v.* 4 C. & P. 535 191
v. State, 26 Ohio St. 505 102, 117
State *v.* 27 Vt. 722 110
Meader, State *v.* 54 Vt. 126 802, 803
Meadows *v.* State, 22 W. Va. 766 265
Meaker, State *v.* 54 Vt. 112 615, 628, 680
Meany, R. *v.* L. & C. 213; 9 Cox, 231 754
Mears *v.* Com., 2 Grant, 385 260
Medaris *v.* State, 10 Yerg. 239 358
Medler *v.* State, 26 Ind. 171 824
Medlicott, State *v.* 9 Kans. 257 652
Meece *v.* Com., 78 Ky. 586 547, 758
Meek *v.* Peirce, 19 Wis. 300 2
State *v.* 70 Mo. 355 239
Meeks *v.* State, 57 Ga. 327 871
Meeser, Com. *v.* 1 Brewst. 49 181 *a*
Megary, Com. *v.* 8 Phila. 607 1001
Meinhart, State *v.* 73 Mo. 562 263
Meister *v.* People, 31 Mich. 99 555

SECTION

Melin *v.* Taylor, 2 Hodges, 126 791
Mellor, State *v.* 13 R. I. 666 350
Melton *v.* State, 37 La. An. 77 693, 712, 797
v. State, 8 Tex. Ap. 619 409
Melvin *v.* Easley, 1 Jones N. C. L. 386 571
Mentor *v.* People, 30 Mich. 91 395
Mercein, People *v.* 3 Hill N. Y. 399 932
Mercer *v.* State, 17 Ga. 146 646
Merill, State *v.* 2 Dev. 269 802
Merkle *v.* State, 37 Ala. 139 171
Merrick *v.* State, 63 Ind. 327 297, 327
Merrill, Com. *v.* 8 Allen, 545 420, 478
v. Nary, 10 Allen, 416 829
People *v.* 14 N. Y. 75 773, 775
State *v.* 37 Me. 329 405
v. State, 45 Miss. 651 183, 189
State *v.* 44 N. H. 624 255, 292, 383, 470
Merryman, ex parte, Taney, 246 979, 990
Mersey Dock Trustees *v.* Gibbs, L. R. 4 H. L. 298 602
Mershen *v.* State, 44 Ind. 598 602
Mershom *v.* State, 51 Ind. 14 290, 345
Mertens, State *v.* 14 Mo. 94 369
Mervin *v.* People, 26 Mich. 298 90, 156, 213, 218
Merwin, State *v.* 34 Conn. 113 911
Mesca, Resp. *v.* 1 Dall. 73 352
Meschac, State *v.* 30 Tex. 518 221, 231
Meshek, State *v.* 51 Iowa, 308 709, 793
v. State, 61 Iowa, 316 561
Messenger, Com. *v.* 4 Mass. 462 87
State *v.* 58 N. H. 348 151
Messersmith, People *v.* 61 Cal. 246 711, 799
Messinger, Com. *v.* 1 Binn. 373 227 *a*
Messingham, R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 257 302, 312
Messner *v.* People, 45 N. Y. 1 780, 906, 928
Metcalf, R. *v.* Arch. C. P. 162 718
Metharde *v.* State, 19 Ohio St. 363 460
Metzger's case, 1 Barb. 248; S. C. 1 Edm. Sel. Ca. 399 38
Metzger *v.* State, 18 Fla. 481 653, 664
Metzker *v.* People, 14 Ill. 101 238, 240
Mewherter, State *v.* 46 Iowa, 85 605
Meyer *v.* Clark, 41 N. Y. Sup. Ct. 105 8
v. State, 19 Ark. 156 645, 844
State *v.* 58 Vt. 457 628, 810
State *v.* 1 Speers, 305 162
v. State, 4 Tex. Ap. 121 218
Meyers *v.* Com., 83 Penn. St. 131 712
ex parte, 44 Mo. 279 925, 932
State *v.* 68 Mo. 266 318, 760

SECTION

Miazza *v.* State, 36 Miss. 613 452
Mickey *v.* Com., 9 Bush, 593 752
Middlebrook *v.* State, 43 Conn. 257 967, 973
Middlehurst, R. *v.* 1 Burr. 400 163
Middlesex Commis., 6 C. & P. 90 358 *a*
Middlesex Just., R. *v.* 3 Nev. & Man. 110 520
Middleton, R. *v.* L. R. 2 C. C. 41 266
State *v.* 5 Port. 484 350
Middletown *v.* Ames, 7 Vt. 166 348, 662
Mieir *v.* McMillan, 51 Iowa, 540 932
Mifflin *v.* Com., 5 Watts & S. 451 165
Migotti *v.* Colville, 14 Cox C. C. 263 925
Mikell *v.* State, 62 Ga. 68 610
Mikels *v.* State, 3 Heisk. 321 438
Mikesell, State *v.* 70 Iowa, 176 465
Milburn, ex parte, 9 Pet. 704 62, 445
in re, 59 Wis. 25 991, 996
Miles *v.* Com., 13 Penn. St. 631 918
in re, 52 Vt. 609 35, 37
v. Rem., 4 Yeates, 319 775
State *v.* 31 La. An. 825 350
U. S. *v.* 103 U. S. 304 664
Millar *v.* State, 2 Kans. 174 926, 927
Millard, Com. *v.* 1 Mass. 6 587, 588
Miller's case, 9 Cow. 730 913
Miller *v.* Allen, 11 Ind. 889 932
Com. *v.* 2 Ashm. 61 383, 446, 517
Com. *v.* 5 Dana, 320 438, 440, 467, 471
v. Com., 79 Ky. 457 120
Com. *v.* 2 Pars. R. 197, 480 221, 230, 299, 302
Com. *v.* 107 Penn. St. 276 251
in re, 6 Cr. Law Mag. 511; 23 Fed. Rep. 32 48, 49
People *v.* 12 Cal. 291 137, 318
v. People, 39 Ill. 457 101
v. People, 90 Ill. 409 780
v. State, 54 Ala. 155 98
v. State, 41 Ark. 489 278
State *v.* 6 Baxt. 513 913
State *v.* 24 Conn. 522 238, 255
State *v.* 1 Dev. & B. 500 791, 815, 817, 819
v. State, 58 Ga. 200 465
v. State, 5 How. (Miss.) 250 163, 243
v. State, 42 Ind. 544 591
v. State, 51 Ind. 405 293
State *v.* 7 Ired. 275 771
v. State, 25 Kan. 679 159
State *v.* 29 Kan. 43 652
State *v.* 93 Mo. 263 220
State *v.* 75 N. C. 73 560
v. State, 3 Ohio St. 475 472

SECTION

Miller *v.* State, 3 Ohio St. 476 90
State *v.* 24 W. Va. 802 837
U. S. *v.* 3 Hughes, 553 305
Millican, State *v.* 15 La. An. 557 762, 847
Milligan, ex parte, 4 Wall. 3 979
Millington, in re, 24 Kan. 214 995
Mills *v.* Com., 13 Penn. St. 634 256, 285, 927, 932
v. State, 52 Ind. 187 296
Millsops, State *v.* 69 Mo. 359 400
Millspangh, Blake *v.* 1 Johnson, 316 631
Milne *v.* State, 61 Cal. 71 253
Mimms *v.* State, 16 Ohio St. 221 803
Mims *v.* State, 26 Minn. 498 932
Miner, U. S. *v.* 11 Blatch. 511 470
Mingo, U. S. *v.* 2 Curtis C. C. 1 563
Minich *v.* People, 8 Col. 440 541
Minor *v.* Mead, 3 Conn. 289 784
v. State, 63 Ga. 318 400
Mirelles *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 346 775
Mitchell, R. *v.* 3 Cox C. C. 93; 12 Eng. L. & E. 588 247, 383, 447
Mitchell, R. *v.* 2 F. & F. 44 194
v. Semon, 34 Md. 176; 43 Md. 490 9
v. State, 60 Ala. 26 798
State *v.* 1 Bay, 267 87, 88
v. State, 7 Eng. 50 11
v. State, 22 Ga. 211 594, 751, 813, 815
v. State, 41 Ga. 527 619
v. State, 3 Mo. 283 774
State *v.* 6 Mo. 147 220
State *v.* 64 Mo. 191 709
State *v.* 83 N. C. 674 422
v. State, 42 Ohio St. 88 456, 505, 517
Mitchum *v.* State, 11 Ga. 616 844
Mither, People *v.* 4 Wend. 229 134
Mix *v.* Woodward, 12 Conn. 262 181 *a*
Mixon *v.* State, 55 Ala. 129 508
Mize *v.* State, 49 Ga. 375 441
Moan, ex parte, 65 Cal. 216 996
Mobley *v.* State, 46 Miss. 501 886
Moett *v.* People, 85 N. Y. 67 927
Moffett *v.* Bowman, 6 Grat. 219 847
State *v.* 1 Greene (Iowa), 247 232
Mohr, ex parte, 73 Ala. 503; 5 Crim. Law Mag. 539 31, 32, 37 *a*
Mohun's case, 1 Salk. 104 81
Moice, People *v.* 15 Cal. 329 555
Moland, R. *v.* 2 Mood. C. C. 270 304
Moles, State *v.* 9 Mo. 685 358
Molier, State *v.* 1 Dev. 263 169, 273
Mollor, U. S. *v.* 16 Blatch. 65 87, 400, 477
Molloy, U. S. *v.* 31 Fed. Rep. 19 700

SECTION

Monagle, Com. *v.* 1 Mass. 517 283, 383
Monahan, Com. *v.* 9 Gray, 119 135
Moncrieff *v.* State, 59 Ga. 470 844
Money *v.* Com., 108 Mass. 433 471
v. Leach, 1 W. Bl. 555 6
Mongeon *v.* People, 55 N. Y. 613 320
Monroe *v.* State, 5 Ga. 85 646, 842
v. State, 23 Tex. 210 813
Montague, Com. *v.* 10 Grat. 767 623, 636, 656, 683
v. State, 17 Fla. 662 652
State *v.* 2 McCord, 257 291
Montee *v.* Com., 3 J. J. Marsh. 150 805, 810
Montross *v.* State, 61 Miss. 429 438, 507
Montgomery, ex parte, 79 Ala. 275 924
People *v.* 13 Abbott Pr. Rep. N. S. 207 866
People *v.* 53 Cal. 576 672
Res. *v.* 1 Yeates, 419 16
v. State, 40 Ala. 684 771
State *v.* 65 Iowa, 483 555
v. State, 7 Ohio St. 107 780, 927
v. State, 11 Ohio, 424 810
v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 94 842
v. State, 23 Tex. Ap. 650 801
Moody *v.* People, 20 Ill. 315 314, 591
R. *v.* L. & C. 173 185
v. State, 60 Ala. 78 480
v. State, 7 Baxt. 100 159
v. State, 54 Ga. 660 600, 712
State *v.* 69 N. C. 529 383
v. State, 1 W. Va. 337 292
Moon *v.* State, 68 Ga. 687 689, 845
State *v.* 41 Wis. 684 456
Mooney *v.* People, 111 Ill. 388 813
State *v.* 74 N. C. 98 528
Moore, Com. *v.* 9 Mass. 402 417
Com. *v.* 99 Penn. St. 570 742, 760
v. Coxe, 10 Weekly Notes, 135 26
ex parte, 64 N. C. 90, 398, 802 953, 979, 990
v. Illinois, 14 How. U. S. 13 442, 473
in re, 63 N. C. 397 958
v. Mausert, 49 N. Y. 332 320
People *v.* 2 Douglass (Mich.), 1 11
v. People, 14 How. (U. S.) 13 36
People *v.* 65 How. (N. Y.) Pr. 177 363
v. The Phila. Bank, 5 Serg. & Rawle, 41 854

SECTION

Moore *v.* State, 71 Ala. 307 467
v. State, 65 Ind. 213 112
v. State, 85 Ind. 90 711
v. State, 59 Miss. 529 466
State *v.* 66 Mo. 372 481
v. State, 82 N. C. 659 159
State *v.* 12 N. H. 42 253
State *v.* 42 N. J. L. 208; 43 N. J. L. 203 320
v. State, 12 Ohio St. 387 145
v. State, 13 Sm. & M. 259 358
v. State, 7 Tex. Ap. 42 275
v. State, 21 Tex. Ap. 666 561
v. State, 22 Tex. Ap. 117 733
v. State, 1 Walker, 134 504, 513
Mopsey, R. *v.* 11 Cox C. C. 143 187
Morales *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 494 562
Moran, Com. *v.* 130 Mass. 281 350
More, People *v.* 68 Cal. 500 388
U. S. *v.* 3 Cranch, 159 773
Morea, State *v.* 2 Ala. 275 639
Morehead *v.* State, 34 Ohio St. 212 465
Morel *v.* State, 189 Ind. 275 869
Morey, Com. *v.* 30 Leg. Int. 141 770
v. Com. 108 Mass. 433 464, 472
State *v.* 2 Wis. 494 209
Morgan *v.* Com., 14 Bush, 106 585
v. Com., 7 Grat. 592 161
ex parte, 20 Fed. Rep. 278 28
R. *v.* 11 East, 457 945
v. State, 19 Ala. 556 95
v. State, 47 Ala. 34 924
v. State, 48 Ala. 65 823
v. State, 13 Fla. 671 125, 150, 213, 601
v. State, 31 Ind. 193 643
State *v.* 62 Ind. 35 438, 440
State *v.* 35 La An. 293 273
State *v.* 95 N. C. 641 466
State *v.* 98 N. C. 641 235
Moriarty, Com. *v.* 135 Mass. 540 160
State *v.* 50 Conn. 415 472
v. State, 62 Miss. 658 693
Morley, R. *v.* 1 Y. & J. 221 161
Morman *v.* State, 24 Miss. 54 164, 472
Morningstar *v.* State, 52 Ala. 405 109
Morphin, State *v.* 37 Mo. 373 470
Morrell *v.* Kimball, 1 Greenl. 322 870
v. Quanels, 35 Ala. 544 27, 29
Morrill, State *v.* 16 Ark. 384 958
Morris, Com. *v.* Pamph. 658
R. *v.* L. R. 1 C. C. 90 465, 476
State *v.* 1 Blackf. 37 465, 788
v. State, 7 Blackf. 607 672
State *v.* 47 Conn. 546 710, 793
State *v.* 1 Houst. 124 396
v. State, 104 Ind. 457 560
v. State, 8 Sm. & M. 762 465, 895
v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 65 159

SECTION

Morris, U. S. *v.* 1 Curtis C. C. 23 447, 509, 672, 726, 810
U. S. *v.* 10 Wheaton, 246 528
v. Whitehead, 65 N. C. 637 972
Morrisette, People *v.* 20 How. Pr. 118 913
v. State, 77 Ala. 71 457, 510, 518
Morrisey, State *v.* 70 Me. 41 212 *a*
Morrison, People *v.* 1 Park. C. R. 624 791
State *v.* 31 La. An. 211 325
State *v.* 31 La. An. Pt. II. 817 369
Morrow *v.* State, 14 Lea, 475 458
v. State 57 Miss. 836 565
Morse, Com. *v.* 2 Mass. 128 759
Com. *v.* 14 Mass. 217 111
Mortier, People *v.* 58 Cal. 262 846
Mortimer, Com. *v.* 2 Va. Cas. 325 460
People *v.* 46 Cal. 114 844
People *v.* 48 Mich. 37 810
Morton, Com. *v.* 12 Phil. 595 339, 350
R. *v.* 12 Cox C. C. 456; L. R. 2 C. C. R. 22 197
v. Skinner, 48 Ind. 123 30, 36
v. State, 1 Lea, 498 470, 833
State *v.* 27 Vt. 310 243, 251
Mosby, ex parte, 31 Tex. 566 75
Moseley *v.* State, 33 Tex. 671 505, 520, 722, 725
Moser, State *v.* 33 Ark. 140 220
Moses, State *v.* 2 Dev. 452 273, 274
v. State, 11 Humph. 232 642, 660
Mosley, State *v.* 31 Kan. 355 577
Moss *v.* Com., 107 Penn. St. 267 493, 823
Mostranda *v.* State, 60 Miss. 87 414
Mott, Com. *v.* 21 Pick. 492 522
People *v.* 34 Mich. 80 90
R. *v.* 3 East P. C. 1075 237
State *v.* 29 Ark. 147 90
State *v.* 45 N. J. L. 494 182
Moughan *v.* State, 59 Ga. 308 623
Moulton, Com. *v.* 4 Gray, 39 566
Com. *v.* 108 Mass. 308 203
U. S. *v.* 5 Mason, 537 183, 191
Moultrie, State *v.* 33 La. An. 1146 291, 601, 742
Mount *v.* Com., 2 Duvall, 93 457, 534
R. *v.* L. R. 6 P. C. 283 995
Mountain *v.* State, 40 Ala. 344 420, 479
Mounts *v.* State, 14 Ohio, 295 278, 383, 435, 447
Mowbray *v.* Com., 11 Leigh, 643 771

SECTION

Mowry, in re, 12 Wis. 52 988
Moyer *v.* Com., 7 Barr, 439 161, 273
Mudge *v.* Pierce, 32 Me. 165 566
Muir, State *v.* 32 Kans. 481 549
Mulcahy *v.* R. L. R., 3 H. L. Cas. 306 92, 401, 692
Mulhisen, State *v.* 69 Ind. 145 269
Mull's case, 8 Grat. 695 587, 591
Mullee, in re, 7 Blatch. 23 528, 971, 972
Mullen, Com. *v.* 13 Allen, 551 92, 93
v. State, 45 Ala. 43 906
State *v.* 14 La. An. 570 90
Muller's case, 5 Phil. Rep. 289 39
Mullinix *v.* People, 76 Ill. 211 810
Mulroony *v.* State, 26 Ohio St. 326 90
Munch, State *v.* 22 Minn. 67 124, 158
Mundel, U. S. *v.* 6 Call, 245 358
Munford *v.* State, 39 Miss. 558 457
U. S. *v.* 16 Fed. Rep. 164 344, 345
Munger, State *v.* 15 Vt. 291 120, 125, 134, 240, 271
Munly *v.* State, 7 Blackf. 593 672
Munroe *v.* Brigham, 19 Pick. 318 692
Munshower *v.* Patton, 10 S. & R. 334 608
v. State, 56 Md. 517 766
Munson *v.* State, 79 Ind. 541 176
State *v.* 76 Mo. 109 711
v. State, 21 Tex. Ap. 349 465
Murback, People *v.* 64 Cal. 369 923
Murdock *v.* State, 65 Ala. 520 159
v. State, 35 La. An. 729 756
State *v.* 9 Mo. 730 260
Murphey *v.* Com., 23 Grat. 960 466, 771
Com. *v.* 2 Gray, 516 306 *a*
Murphy, Com. *v.* 2 Allen, 163 245, 250
Com. *v.* 11 Cush. 472 452, 453, 764
v. Com., 1 Metc. (Ky.) 365 733
v. McMillan, 59 Iowa, 515 918
People *v.* 45 Cal. 137 650, 916
People *v.* 47 Cal. 103 555
R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 297 287, 292, 569
v. State, 6 Ala. 845 218
v. State, 37 Ala. 147 664
v. State, 97 Ind. 579 733
v. State, 47 Mo. 274 251
v. State, 15 Neb. 383 648, 813
State *v.* 9 Port. 487 93
State *v.* 39 Tex. 46 206
v. State, 6 Tex. Ap. 554 173
v. State, 55 Vt. 547 122, 158

SECTION

Murphy, U. S. *v.* 1 McArth. & Mac. 375 359
Murray, Com. *v.* 2 Ashm. 41 518, 854, 857
v. Com., 79 Penn. St. 311 710
Com. *v.* 2 Va. Cas. 504 992
ex parte, 43 Cal. 455 994, 995
People *v.* 41 Cal. 60 567
People *v.* 67 Cal. 103 220
People *v.* 52 Mich. 288 546, 804, 878
v. R., 3 D. & L. 100; 7 Q. B. 700 238, 549
v. State, 48 Ala. 675 672
State *v.* 41 Iowa, 580 151
State *v.* 55 Iowa, 20 471
State *v.* 15 Me. 100 456, 464, 465
State *v.* 91 Mo. 423 823
v. State, 36 Tex. 642 866
v. State, 1 Tex. Ap. 417 589
Musick *v.* People, 40 Ill. 268 346, 349, 350, 668
Myddleton, R. *v.* 6 Term. R. 739 164
Myers *v.* Com., 79 Penn. St. 308 121
Com. *v.* 1 Va. Cas. 188; 3 Wheel. C. C. 550 438, 480, 517
People *v.* 70 Cal. 582 827
v. People, 92 Ind. 390 158, 908
State *v.* 10 Iowa, 448 251
State *v.* 10 Lea, 717 426
State *v.* 85 Tenn. 203 273, 354, 355
v. State, 9 Tex. Ap. 157 712
Myrick, State *v.* 38 Kan. 238 541

N.

Nagle, State *v.* 14 R. I. 331 125
U. S. *v.* 17 Blatch. 258 354, 446
Nance *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 457 836-7
Naramore, State *v.* 58 N. H. 273 161
Nardin *v.* State, 22 Ind. 347 452
Nash *v.* R., 9 Cox C. C. 424; 4 B. & S. 935 255, 777
State *v.* 7 Iowa, 347 592
State *v.* 86 N. C. 650 469
Nathan, State *v.* 5 Rich. 213 465
Naughton, People *v.* 7 Abb. Pr. (N. S.) 421 358
Naynes, State *v.* 54 Iowa, 109 345
Neal *v.* Delaware, 103 U. S. 370 783 *a*
v. Farmer, 9 Ga. 555 453
v. State, 64 Ga. 272 822
Neale, R. *v.* 1 Den. C. C. 36 464
Neales *v.* State, 10 Mo. 498 239, 733

SECTION

Ned *v.* State, 33 Miss. 364 815, 836
v. State, 7 Port. 187 490, 491, 497, 513, 639, 640
Needham, People *v.* 98 Ill. 275 712
Neely *v.* People, 13 Ill. 685 644
Neff *v.* State, 57 Md. 385 775
Neiderluck *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 320 119
Neill, in re, 8 Blatch. 156 988
Neilson, People *v.* 22 Hun, 1 684, 995
Nelms *v.* State, 58 Miss. 362 711
v. State, 13 Sm. & M. 500 640, 815
Nels *v.* State, 2 Tex. 280 810
Nelson *v.* People, 23 N. Y. 293 295
State *v.* 7 Ala. 610 406, 487
State *v.* 58 Cal. 104 244
State *v.* 26 Ind. 366 505, 520
v. State, 58 Iowa, 208 647
State *v.* 32 La. An. 842 847
State *v.* 29 Me. 329 98, 106, 240, 251, 290, 294, 297, 306 *a*, 470
v. State, 61 Miss. 212 709
State *v.* 8 N. H. 163 243, 255
State *v.* 14 Rich. 169 291, 292, 293
v. State, 2 Swan, 482 590, 810
v. State, 52 Wis. 534 911
U. S. *v.* 29 Fed. Rep. 202 238
Nemo *v.* Com., 2 Grat. 558 751
Nesbitt, ex parte, 8 Jurist, 1071 6
Nestle, People *v.* 19 N. Y. 583 773, 775
Neverson, U. S. *v.* 1 Mack. 152 293, 453, 565 *a*, 693
Neville, State *v.* 6 Jones (N. C.), 423 804
Nevins, People *v.* 1 Hill (N. Y.), 154 953, 996, 1005
State *v.* 23 Vt. 519 194
Newberry, in re, 4 Ad. & E. 100 953
Newcomb *v.* State, 37 Miss. 397 90
Newell, Com. *v.* 7 Mass. 244 249, 260, 261, 464
v. Cowan, 30 Miss. 492 463
Resp. *v.* 3 Yeates, 407 284, 870
Newer, State *v.* 7 Blackf. 307 351
Newfane, State *v.* 12 Vt. 422 350
Newman, People *v.* 5 Hill (N. Y.), 295 791
R. *v.* 1 El. & Bl. 268; Dears. C. C. 85 890
R. & 1 Ld. Ray. 562 101
State *v.* 2 Car. L. R. 423
v. State, 62 Ga. 533 239
v. State, 14 Wis. 393 297
Newsom, State *v.* 13 W. Va. 859 161, 756
Newson, State *v.* 13 W. Va. 859 158

SECTION

Newton, Com. *v.* 1 Grant, 453 974
ex parte, 13 Q. B. 716 991
in re, 16 C. B. 97 983
v. Locklin, 77 Ill. 103 963
v. Maxwell, 2 Cr. & Jer. 215 103
R. *v.* 2 Mood. 59 194
R. *v.* 2 M. & Rob. 506 373, 446
R. *v.* 13 Q. B. 716; 3 Cox C. C. 484 727
v. State, 15 Fla. 610 536
v. State, 21 Fla. 53 853
State *v.* 59 Ind. 173 80
State *v.* 42 Vt. 537 252, 470
New York *v.* Mason, 4 E. D. Smith, 142 125
New York & Osw. M. R. R. Co. *v.* Van Horn, 57 N. Y. 473 320
Nicholas's case, Fost. Cr. L. 64 456, 476
Nichols, Com. *v.* 10 Allen, 199 251
v. Com., 78 Ky. 180 470
v. Cornelius, 7 Ind. 611 984
v. Nichols, 136 Mass. 256 841
State *v.* 26 Ark. 74 523, 531
State *v.* 38 Ark. 550 438
State *v.* 8 Conn. 496 466
State *v.* 83 Ind. 228 227 *a*
State *v.* 29 Minn. 357 828
v. State, 58 N. H. 41 125
v. State, 2 South. 539 79
v. State, 35 Wis. 308 279
Nicholson *v.* Com., 96 Penn. St. 503 285, 291, 338, 810
v. State, 72 Ala. 176 438
State *v.* 77 Md. 1 151
Nickerson, Com. *v.* 5 Allen, 519 771
Niles *v.* Brackett, 15 Mass. 378 852
v. State, 11 Lea, 694 838, 847
Nillins, R. *v.* 53 Law Journ. 157 45
Nitingale, ex parte, 12 Fla. 272 996 *b*
Nixon *v.* State, 68 Ala. 535 344
State *v.* 78 N. C. 558 452
State *v.* 18 Vt. 70 94, 95, 145
Noakes *v.* People, 25 N. Y. 380 193
Noble *v.* People, Breese, 54 644
v. State, 59 Ala. 73 161
Noblett, State *v.* 2 Jones (N. C.), 418 831
Noe *v.* People, 39 Ill. 96 146
v. People, 92 Ind. 92 643
v. State, 4 How. (Miss.) 330 640
Noel, State *v.* 5 Blackf. 548 220
Noelke, U. S. *v.* 17 Blatch. 554 167, 566, 624
Nolan *v.* State, 55 Ga. 521 517
State *v.* 13 La. An. 376 664, 699
Noland, State *v.* 29 Ind. 212 120, 134, 318

SECTION

Noland *v.* State, 85 N. C. 576 579
v. State, 19 Ohio, 131 798
Nolen *v.* State, 2 Head, 520 833
v. State, 8 Tex. Ap. 585 545
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 474 590
Noles *v.* State, 24 Ala. 672 88, 90, 91
Nomague *v.* People, Breese, 109 369, 541, 750
Nonemaker *v.* State, 34 Ala. 211 420, 479
Norfleet *v.* State, 4 Sneed, 340 642, 693, 844
Norris *v.* State, 3 Greene (Iowa), 513 145, 341
v. State, 25 Ohio St. 217 35
North, R. *v.* 6 D. & R. 143 162, 251
Northampton, Com. *v.* 2 Mass. 116 280
Northington *v.* State, 14 Lea, 424 570, 597
Northway, U. S. *v.* 120 U. S. 327 220
Norton, Com. *v.* 8 S. & R. 7 996
R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 196 152
R. *v.* R. & R. 510 109, 118
v. State, 14 Tex. 387 438
State *v.* 45 Vt. 158 696
State *v.* 3 Zab. 33 92, 93, 350
U. S. *v.* 91 U. S. 566 316
Norvell *v.* State, 50 Ala. 174 285
State *v.* 2 Yerg. 24 435, 457, 435 *a*, 518, 785
Norwood, State *v.* 93 N. C. 578 918
Nowlan *v.* Griffin, 68 Me. 183 453
Nowlass *v.* Griffin, 68 Me. 235 453
Noyes *v.* Byxbee, 45 Conn. 382 964
in re, 17 Alb. L. J. 407 27, 37
Nugent, ex parte, 1 Am. L. J. 107 964
People *v.* 4 Cal. 341 238
v. State, 4 St. & Port. 72 514
Nulf, State *v.* 15 Kans. 404 354
Null, State *v.* 15 Kans. 404 354
Nunnemacher, U. S. *v.* 7 Biss. 129 236, 243
Nutt, R. *v.* 1 Barnard, 307 772
State *v.* 28 Vt. 598 472
Nutting, State *v.* 39 Me. 359 383
Nuzum *v.* State, 88 Ind. 599 810, 812, 852
Nye, ex parte, 8 Kans. 99 982
Nyman, State *v.* 55 Conn. 17 560

O.

O'Banson, State *v.* 1 Bail. 144 220
O'Brian's case, 1 Towns. St. Tr. 469 533
O'Brian *v.* Com., 6 Bush, 563 506
v. Com., 9 Bush. 333 435, 506, 509, 722

SECTION

O'Brian *v.* State, 12 Ind. 369 438
U. S. *v.* 3 Dill. 381 31
O'Brien, Com. *v.* 2 Brewst. 566 90
Com. *v.* 107 Mass. 208 254, 301, 314, 469
People *v.* 64 Cal. 53 281
v. People, 36 N. Y. 276; 48 Barb. 274 118, 632, 664
v. R., 2 Ho. Lords Cas. 465 686
R. *v.* 46 L. T. (N. S.) 177 456, 460
v. State, 22 La. An. 27 757
State *v.* 74 Mo. 549 268
State *v.* 7 R. I. 337 309, 823
O'Callahan, U. S. *v.* 6 McLean, 596 285, 301, 910
O'Connell, Com. *v.* 12 Allen, 451 207, 217, 252, 291, 470
v. R., 11 Cl. & Fin. 155; 9 Jurist, 30 79, 423, 427, 608, 771, 886, 910, 941
O'Connor *v.* Guthrie, 11 Iowa, 180 830
v. State, 9 Fla. 215 660, 661
O'Dea *v.* State, 57 Ind. 31 862
Odell, People *v.* 1 Dak. 197 742
State *v.* 4 Blackf. 156 438, 439
Odgers, R. *v.* 2 M. & Rob. 479 404
Odle *v.* State, 6 Baxt. 159 822, 832
O'Donnell, R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 138 61
State *v.* 10 R. I. 472 241
Offutt *v.* Parrott, 1 Cranch, 154 956
State *v.* 4 Blackf. 355 378
Ogden *v.* State, 13 Neb. 436 845, 869
Ogilvie, R. *v.* 2 C. & P. 230 109
Ogle *v.* State, 33 Miss. 383 640, 693
O'Gorman, State *v.* 68 Mo. 179 238
O'Grady, State *v.* 31 La. An. 378 871
O'Hara *v.* People, 41 Mich. 623 339, 414
O'Hearn, Com. *v.* 132 Mass. 553 116
Ohms *v.* State, 49 Wis. 415 876
Ohio R. R. *v.* Fitch, 20 Ind. 505 980
O'Kane, State *v.* 23 Kans. 244 249
O'Keefe, State *v.* 41 Vt. 691 125
O'Kelly, State *v.* 88 N. C. 609 898
Olathe *v.* Thomas, 26 Kans. 233 469
Olcutt, People *v.* 2 Johns. Cas. 301 502, 698
Olds, Com. *v.* 5 Little, 137 506
v. Com., 3 Marsh. 467 595
Oleson, State *v.* 26 Minn. 507 440
Olifer, R. *v.* 10 Cox, 402 164
Olive *v.* State, 11 Neb. 1 648
Oliver, R. *v.* 8 Cox C. C. 384; Bell C. C. 287 246, 251, 465
State *v.* 2 Houst. 585 8
Olivera, People *v.* 7 Cal. 403 260
O'Malia *v.* Wentworth, 65 Me. 129 992, 996

SECTION

O'Mally, State *v.* 48 Iowa, 501 203
O'Mara *v.* Com., 75 Penn. St. 424 635, 655
O'Meara *v.* State, 17 Ohio St. 515 452
O'Neal, State *v.* 7 Ired. 251 570, 712
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 474 588
O'Neil, Com. *v.* 6 Gray, 343 668
v. State, 48 Ga. 66 119, 457, 810
O'Neill, People *v.* 47 Cal. 109 974–5
U. S. *v.* 2 Sawy. 481 1835, 1837
On Gee, State *v.* 15 Neb. 184 220
Onions *v.* Naish, 7 Price, 203 848
Onnmacht, State *v.* 10 La. An. 198 369
Onslow, R. *v.* 12 Cox. C. C. 358 957, 968, 969
Ooton *v.* State, 5 Ala. 463 918
Orbell, R. *v.* 6 Mod. 42 386
Organ *v.* State, 26 Miss. 78 823, 848
Ormond, State *v.* 1 Dev. & B. 119 220
Ormsby, People *v.* 48 Mich. 494 548
O'Rourke, State *v.* 55 Mo. 440 602
Orr *v.* State, 18 Ark. 540 285
Orrell, R. *v.* 1 Mood. & R. 467 561–2
Orton, State *v.* 67 Iowa, 554 995, 996
Ortwein, Com. *v.* 76 Penn. St. 414 623, 635
Osborn *v.* State, 61 Iowa, 330 345
U. S. *v.* 91 U. S. 474–8 521, 528, 533
Osborne *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 225 116
Oscar, State *v.* 13 La. An. 297 916
Osgood *v.* People, 39 N. Y. 449 254
v. State, 63 Ga. 791 846
O'Shields *v.* State, 55 Ga. 696 727, 731, 844, 866
Osiander, Com. *v.* 3 Leigh, 780 636
Osmer, R. *v.* 5 East, 304 152
Osterhout, People *v.* 41 N. Y. 261 700, 701
Ostrander, State *v.* 18 Iowa, 434 647, 653, 683
Osulton, R. *v.* 2 Str. 1107 444
Oswald's case, 1 Dall. 319 958
Otto, People *v.* 70 Cal. 523 474
Oulaghan, R. *v.* Jebb, 270 516
Outs, State *v.* 30 La. An. 1155 548
Overbee *v.* Com., 1 Robins. (Va.) 756 815, 822
Overshiner *v.* Com., 2 B. Mon. 344 369
Owen, R. *v.* 20 Q. B. D. 829 247
v. State, 38 Ark. 512 541
v. State, 78 Mo. 367 325, 507, 740
State *v.* 72 N. C. 605 716
v. Warburton, 1 N. R. 326 847
Owens, State *v.* 28 La. An. 5 457
v. State, 63 Miss. 450 711
v. State 79 Mo. 619 803

SECTION

Oxford, R. v. 3 N. & M. 877 790
State v. 30 Tex. 428 379
Oyer & Terminer Court, People v. 83 N. Y. 436 631

P.

Pace v. State, 69 Ala. 231 101
State v. 9 Richs. 355 771
Packard v. U. S., 1 Iowa, 225 847
Packer, People v. 8 Col. 361 246, 279
Padelford, U. S. v. 9 Wall. 531 528
Padgett, State v. 58 N. H. 379 130
State v. 82 N. C. 544 785
Page, Com. v. 27 Grat. 954 483, 636
v. Com., 9 Leigh, 683 457, 518
ex parte, 49 Mo. 291 994, 996 b
People v. 1 Idaho, 114 828
R. v. 9 C. & P. 756 935
Pagels, State v. 92 Mo. 300 358, 556, 586, 591
Paget, R. v. 1 Leon. 5 772
Paine v. Fox, 16 Mass. 129 122
Painter, State v. 40 Iowa, 298 601
Palmer v. State, 32 La. An. 565 251, 760
v. People, 4 Neb. 68 813
State v. 35 Me. 9 243
v. State, 39 Ohio St. 236 424
State v. 18 Vt. 570 239
U. S. v. 2 Cranch C. C. 11 360, 366
Palmore v. State, 29 Ark. 248 712
Pancake v. State, 81 Ind. 93 121, 711
Pannell, Com. v. 86 Penn. St. 260 793, 798
Papineau v. Bacon, 110 Mass. 319 10, 70
Parchman v. State, 2 Tex. Ap. 228 505
Pargoud's case, 13 Wall. 156 522, 528
Parham v. State, 10 Lea, 498 869
Paris, State v. 36 Ala. 232 602
Parish, State v. 43 Wis. 395 435, 435 a, 518
Park v. State, 3 Ohio St. 101 752
Parker v. Com., 12 Bush, 191 363
v. Com., 8 B. Mon. 30 771
Com. v. 2 Pick. 563 350
v. Hardy, 24 Pick. 246 857
in re, 5 M. & W. 32 982
v. People, 97 Ill. 32 911
R. v. 9 Cox C. C. 475; L. & C. 459 323
State v. 1 Chipm. 298 176
State v. 1 Houst. 9 266
State v. 66 Iowa, 386 505
State v. 5 Lea, 568 123
v. State, 51 Miss. 535 913
v. State, 55 Miss. 414 640

SECTION

Parker, State v. 81 N. C. 548 234, 279
v. State, 9 Tex. Ap. 351 111
v. Stevens, 24 Pick. 277 533
Parkhurst, People v. 49 Mich. 22 813, 927
Parkin, R. v. 1 Mood. 45 750, 751
Parkinson, R. v. 2 Den. C. C. 459 548
Parks, ex parte, 93 U. S. 18 981, 995, 996 b
State v. 21 La. An. 251 844
v. State, 4 Ohio St. 234 844, 846
Parmenter, Com. v. 101 Mass. 211 108
Com. v. 5 Pick. 279 173
Parmer v. State, 41 Ala. 416 309
Parr, Com. v. 5 Watts & S. 345 407, 456, 464, 465, 773, 793, 801
R. v. 2 F. & F. 861 820
R. v. 2 M. & Rob. 346 312
v. Seams, Barnes, 438 842
Parrant, State v. 16 Minn. 178 815
Parris v. People, 76 Ill. 274 88
Parrish v. State, 12 Lea, 655 660, 846
v. State, 14 Neb. 60 712
Parrob's case, 6 Sawy. 376 981
Parry, R. v. 7 C. & P. 836 463, 481, 483, 612, 619, 679
Parsons, Com. v. 139 Mass. 381 888
v. Hunter, 2 Sumn. 419 316
v. State, 22 Ala. 50 774 a
Partee v. State, 67 Ga. 570 869
Passmore, Res. v. 3 Yeates, 441 958
Patience, R. v. 7 C. & P. 775 11
Patrick, R. v. 1 Leach, 253 110
State v. 3 Jones N. C. 443 672, 844
State v. 71 N. C. 656 209
State v. 16 Neb. 330 346
Patterson's case, 18 Alb. L. J. 190 31
Patterson v. People, 46 Barb. 625 309
R. v. 2 Lew. C. C. 262 573
v. State, 2 Eng. 59 810
v. State, 70 Ind. 341 447, 846
State v. 7 Ired. 70 155
State v. 38 Kans. 204 652
State v. 1 McCord, 177 583
State v. 68 Me. 473 273
State v. 73 Mo. 695 447
State v. 88 Mo. 88 518
v. State, 49 N. J. L. 326 328
State v. 45 Vt. 308 829
U. S. v. 26 Fed. Rep. 344 955
U. S. v. 29 Fed. Rep. 775 923
Pattison, ex parte, 56 Miss. 161 78
Patton v. Freeman, Coxe, 143 453
State v. 19 Iowa, 458 928

SECTION

Patty, U. S. *v.* 9 Biss. 429 125, 253, 470
Pauli *v.* Com., 89 Penn. St. 432 812
Paulus, Com. *v.* 11 Gray, 305 188
Paxton's case, 10 Low. Can. R. 212 49
Paylor, State *v.* 89 N. C. 539 546, 716, 770
Payne *v.* People, 6 Johns. 103 213
State *v.* 4 Mo. 376 438
Payson, State *v.* 37 Me. 362 465
Payton, State *v.* 90 Mo. 220 821
Peace's case, 3 B. & Ald. 579 108, 111
Peace, State *v.* 1 Jones N. C. 251 810
Peacher *v.* State, 61 Ala. 22 293
Pearee, State *v.* 14 Fla. 153 95
v. State, 1 Sneed, 63 154, 221, 230
Pearse, R. *v.* 9 East, 358 6
Pease, Com. *v.* 137 Mass. 576 813
People *v.* 3 Johns. (N. Y.) Cas. 333 533
v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 492 813
Peck, ex parte, 3 Blatch. C. C. 113 954
Peebles *v.* State, 55 Miss. 454 90
Peek *v.* State, 2 Humph. 78 260, 802
Peele, R. *v.* 9 Cox C. C. 220 149
Pefferling *v.* State, 40 Tex. 487 712
Pegalow *v.* State, 20 Wis. 61 898, 929
Peichart, U. S. *v.* 32 Fed. Rep. 142 276
Peiffer *v.* Com., 15 Penn. St. 468 733, 815, 819, 822
Pelham *v.* Page, 1 Eng. (Ark.) 535 841
People *v.* 14 Wend. 48 985
R. *v.* 8 Q. B. 959 132
Pember's case, 1 Whart. 439 996
Pemberton, Com. *v.* 118 Mass. 36 712
v. State, 85 Ind. 507 155
State *v.* 30 Mo. 376 762
Pender *v.* People, 18 Hun, 560 632
Pendleton *v.* Com., 4 Leigh, 694 176
Pennell *v.* Com., 86 Penn. St. 260 793
State *v.* 56 Iowa, 29 249
Pennington, State *v.* 3 Head (Tenn.), 119 235, 367
v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 44 558
Penns. *v.* Bell, Add. 173 93
Penny *v.* Walker, 64 Me. 430 59
Peoples, in re, 47 Mich. 626 70, 996 *a*
Pepper, R. *v.* Comb. 298 81
Percival. R. *v.* 1 Sid. 243 661
Perdue *v.* Com., 96 Penn. St. 311 273, 779 *a*
People *v.* 49 Cal. 425 602
Perez *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 610 946
U. S. *v.* 1 Wheaton, 579 500, 518, 520
Perham, State *v.* 4 Oregon, 188 231
Peri *v.* People, 65 Ill. 17 931, 932

SECTION

Perigo, State *v.* 70 Iowa, 657 602
Perkins, Com. *v.* 7 Grat. 654 180
Com. *v.* 1 Pick. 388 101, 108
People *v.* 1 Wend. 91 546, 549, 750
R. *v.* Holt, 403 518
R. *v.* Ld. Raym. 64 820
v. State, 50 Ala. 154 798, 812
v. State, 66 Ala. 457 452
v. State, 8 Baxt. 559 762
v. State, 4 Ind. 222 378
State *v.* 82 N. C. 681 247, 924
v. State, 26 N. H. 494 831
Perrigo, Com. *v.* 3 Mete. (Ky.) 5 161
Perrin, State *v.* 2 Brev. 474 181 *a*
Perry, in re, 2 Cr. Law Mag. 84 28, 34
in re, 19 Wis. 676 76
in re, 30 Wis. 268 999
v. McLendon, 62 Ga. 548 1011
People *v.* 8 Abb. (N. Y.) Pr. N. S. 27 75, 76
R. *v.* 1 Den. C. C. 69; 1 C. & K. 727 202, 214
v. State, 43 Ala. 21 906
State *v.* 1 Busbee, 330 660, 815
v. State, 41 Tex. 488 994
Perteet, People *v.* 70 Ill. 71 602, 733
Pervear *v.* Com., 5 Wall. 476 920
Peter, ex parte, 2 Paine, 348 981
State *v.* Ga. Dec. (pt. i.) 46 814
v. State, 3 How. (Miss.) 433 358, 371
Peters, Com. *v.* 12 Met. 387 438, 440
ex parte, 4 Dill. 169 910
ex parte, 2 McCrary, 403 910
R. *v.* 1 Burr. 568 790
v. State, 67 Ga. 29 798
Peterson *v.* Barry, 4 Binn. 481 881
v. State, 74 Ala. 34 716
U. S. *v.* 1 W. & M. 305 241, 285, 383
Petite *v.* People, 8 Col. 518 561, 902
Petrea, People *v.* 92 N. Y. 128 85, 344, 350
Petrie *v.* Woodworth, 3 Caines, 219 119
Petry, People *v.* 2 Hilt. 523 542
Pettes, Com. *v.* 126 Mass. 245 297, 760
Pettie, State *v.* 80 N. C. 367 921
Pettingill *v.* Rideout, 6 N. H. 454 453
Pettus *v.* State, 42 Ga. 358 37
Petty, in re, 22 Kan. 477 994, 996
State *v.* Harp. 59 222
v. State, 4 Lea, 328 595
Pety, R. *v.* 2 Salk. 503 770
Pew, R. *v.* Cro. Car. 183 4
Pfeiffer *v.* Com., 15 Penn. St. 468 493, 516
Pfitzer, ex parte, 28 Ind. 450 29, 34, 36
Phair, State *v.* 48 Vt. 366 628

SECTION

Pharr *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 472 810
Phelps *v.* People, 13 N. Y. S. C. (6 Hun) 401; 72 N. Y. 334 187, 188, 215, 220, 273, 632, 771
People *v.* 4 Thomp. & C. 467 954, 962
R. *v.* 1 C. & M. 180 404
v. State, 15 Tex. 45 590
State *v.* 11 Vt. 117 284
Phil, State *v.* 1 Stew. 31 457
Philadelphia, Com. *v.* 4 Brewst. 320 533
Philbin, State *v.* 38 La. An. 964 231
Philbrick, State *v.* 31 Me. 401 151
Philips *v.* Com., 19 Grat. 485 728, 815, 823
Phillips, Com. *v.* 16 Mass. 426 583
v. Com., 44 Penn. St. 197 90
Com. *v.* 16 Pick. 211 90
ex parte, 57 Miss. 357 994
ex parte, 7 Watts, 363 328
v. Fadden, 125 Mass. 198 8
People *v.* 70 Cal. 61 173
v. People, 55 Ill. 430 442
v. People, 88 Ill. 160 507
People *v.* 42 N. Y. 200 780, 927, 928
People *v.* 42 N. Y. 200 918
People *v.* 1 Parker C. R. 95 80
R. *v.* 11 Cox C. C. 142 509
R. *v.* R. & R. 369 317, 323
R. *v.* 2 Str. 921 302
v. State, 68 Ala. 469 695
v. State, 58 Miss. 578 528
State *v.* 78 Mo. 49 713
State *v.* 66 N. C. 647 773
v. State, 85 Tenn. 551 470, 473
v. State, 6 Tex. Ap. 44 798 *a*
v. Trull, 11 Johns. 486 16
v. Welsh, 13 Nev. 158 968
Phillipsburg, Com. *v.* 10 Mass. 78 100
Philpot, State *v.* Dudley (S. C.), 46 982
Phinney's case, 32 Me. 440 122
Phipps, ex parte, 8 Ontario App. R. 77; 14 Crim. Law Mag. 865 54
v. State, 3 Cold. 344 709
Pickens *v.* State, 58 Ala. 364 373
Picket *v.* State, 22 Ohio St. 405 780, 923, 928
Pickett *v.* State, 60 Ala. 77 161
Pico, People *v.* 62 Cal. 50 237
Piela *v.* People, 6 Col. 343 866
Pierce, State *v.* 19 La. An. 90 318
v. State, 3 N. H. 536 622, 656, 810
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 365 278

SECTION

Pierre, State *v.* 38 La. An. 91 244
Pierson *v.* People, 79 N. Y. 424 608, 701
v. State, 12 Ala. 153 810
State *v.* 59 Iowa, 271 189, 213
v. State, 18 Tex. Ap. 524 561
Pike, State *v.* 65 Me. 111 96, 547, 712, 831, 847
State *v.* 49 N. H. 399 627
Pinckford *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 468 590
Pine, People *v.* 2 Barb. 571 805
R. *v.* R. & R. 425 283
Pinkerton, People *v.* 77 N. Y. 245; S. C. 17 Hun, 199 35, 37, 993
Pintard, Com. *v.* 1 Browne, 59 153
Piot, ex parte, 48 L. T. (N. S.) 120 51
Piper *v.* Com., 14 Grat. 710 924
People *v.* 50 Mich. 390 746
Pipher *v.* Lodge, 16 Serg. & R. 214 661
Pirates, U. S. *v.* 5 Wheat. 184 297, 441
Piscat. Bank *v.* Turnley, 1 Miles, 312 453
Pistorius *v.* Com., 84 Penn. St. 158 712
Pitman's case, 1 Curtis, 186 953
Pitman *v.* Clarke, 1 McMullen, 316 949
v. Com., 2 Robin. 800 232
in re, 1 Curt. U. S. 186 969
Pitner *v.* State, 44 Tex. 578 477
Pitt *v.* Davidson, 37 N. Y. 235 974
Pittman *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 576 87, 213
Pitts, State *v.* 57 Mo. 85 466
Pizano *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 139 491, 505, 520
Plant, R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 575 458
Plating Co. *v.* Faquharson, 44 L. T. (N. S.) 389 958
Platt, R. *v.* 1 Leach C. L. 187 81
Pleasant *v.* State, 15 Ark. 624 813
v. State, 8 Eng. (13 Ark.) 360 810
Plime, State *v.* T. Chalt. 142 980
Plumbly *v.* Com., 2 Met. 413 935
Plumer, U. S. *v.* 3 Cliff. 25 1, 28, 771, 779 *b*
Plummer, People *v.* 9 Cal. 298 844
Plunkett, State *v.* 3 Harrison, 5 441
State *v.* 2 Stew. 11 223, 237
Poage *v.* State, 3 Ohio St. 239 509, 520, 815, 819
Poe, *v.* State, 10 Lea, 673 540 *a*
Pogue *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 283 813
Point *v.* State, 37 Ala. 148 119
Pointer *v.* Hill, L. R. 12 Q. B. D. 306 80

SECTION

Pointer *v.* State, 89 Ind. 255 350, 419, 420, 424
Polin *v.* State, 14 Neb. 540 350, 572, 591, 819
Polinski *v.* People, 73 N. Y. 65; 11 Hun, 393 158, 440, 910
Polk, State *v.* 92 N. C. 652 405
Pollard, Com. *v.* 5 Randolph, 639 636
State *v.* 53 Me. 124 209
Pollock *v.* The Laura, 12 Rep. 453 528
Polser *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 510 853, 855, 865
Polson, State *v.* 29 Iowa, 133 546
Pomeroy, Com. *v.* 117 Mass. 143 757
Pond *v.* People, 8 Mich. 150 16
U. S. *v.* 2 Curtis C. C. 265 220, 221, 388
Pool, People *v.* 27 Cal. 572 4
State *v.* 2 Dev. 202 283
State *v.* 4 Lea, 363 496
State *v.* 75 N. C. 603 779
v. Trumbal, 3 Mod. 56 528
Poole, in re, 2 MacArth. 683 983
Poore *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cases, 474 844
Pope, ex parte, 40 Mo. 491 994
v. Foster, 4 T. R. 590 135
v. State, 36 Miss. 122 838
v. State, 63 Miss. 53 469
Popplewell, R. *v.* 2 Str. 686 203
Populus, State *v.* 12 La. An. 710 518, 733, 815, 822
Porter, Com. *v.* 1 Gray, 476 629
Com. *v.* 10 Met. (Mass.) 286 805, 810
People *v.* 4 Park. C. R. 524 383
v. State, 2 Ind. 435 815
v. State, 17 Ind. 415 482
State *v.* 34 Iowa, 241 566
v. State, 57 Miss. 300 159
State *v.* 26 Mo. 201 861
U. S. *v.* 1 Bald. 78 598
U. S. *v.* 2 Cranch C. C. 60 285, 320
Portwood *v.* State, 29 Tex. 47 265
Posey *v.* State, 73 Ala. 490 602
State *v.* 7 Rich. 484 291
Post *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 579 652
State *v.* 4 Woods, 513 783 *a*
Potsdamer *v.* State, 17 Fla. 895 353, 779 *a*, 781, 924
Potter *v.* Muller, 1 Bond, 601 950
People *v.* 1 Parker C. R. 47 533
v. State, 42 Ark. 29 505
State *v.* 18 Conn. 166 617, 623, 630, 677, 679
State *v.* 1 Dudley, 295 992
State *v.* 15 Kan. 303 757
State *v.* 16 Kan. 80 733

SECTION

Potter, Terr. *v.* 1 Ariz. 421 556, 558
U. S. *v.* 6 McLean C. C. 182, 186 161, 750, 771
Poulson, ex parte, 15 Haz. Pa. Reg. 380 958
Ponnd *v.* State, 43 Ga. 88 833
Powell's case, 17 Tex. Ap. 345 491, 505
Powell, Com. *v.* 8 Bush, 7 255
ex parte, 73 Ala. 517 531
ex parte, 20 Fla. 806 34
R. *v.* 14 Eng. L. & Eq. 575; 2 Den. C. C. 403 191
R. *v.* 1 Leach, 77 187
State *v.* 19 Ala. 577 508, 513, 520
State *v.* 48 Ala. 154 672
v. State, 65 Ga. 707 810
State *v.* 2 Halst. 244 833
State *v.* 86 N. C. 640 773
State *v.* 10 Oreg. 145 847
v. State, 61 Wis. 319 828
Powers, in re, 25 Vt. 261 991
People *v.* 2 Selden, 50 935
State *v.* 25 Conn. 48 142, 238
v. State, 87 Ind. 97 164, 167, 183, 394
v. State, 87 Ind. 144 802, 810
Powner, R. *v.* 12 Cox C. C. 235 220, 221
Praed, R. *v.* 4 Burr. 2257 457
Pratt *v.* Bogardus, 49 Barbour, 89 6
Com. *v.* 132 Mass. 246 266
Com. *v.* 137 Mass. 98 290, 295, 394, 470
People *v.* 22 Hun, 220 1
v. State, 56 Ind. 179 841
State *v.* 10 La. An. 191 220
State *v.* 54 Vt. 484 220, 271, 354
Pray, Com. *v.* 13 Pick. 359 125, 155
Prell *v.* McDonald, 7 Kan. 457 385
Presbury *v.* Com., 9 Dana, 203 669, 844, 845
Presby, Com. *v.* 14 Gray, 65 9
Prescott, State *v.* 7 N. H. 287 790, 814, 815, 823
Preston *v.* People, 45 Mich. 486 440
R. *v.* 2 Str. 1040 772
v. State, 25 Miss. 383 435
State *v.* 77 Mo. 294 813
Prewitt, Com. *v.* 82 Ky. 240 465
Price *v.* Com., 21 Grat. 846 369
v. Com., 33 Grat. 819 550, 751, 913
v. Hutchinson, L. R. (9 Eq.) 534 949
v. People, 9 Ill. Ap. 36 471, 742
v. Seeley, 10 Cl. & F. 28 16
v. State, 67 Ga. 723 784

SECTION

Price, State *v.* 8 Gill, 295 602
State *v.* 12 Gill & J. 260 240
State *v.* 6 Halst. 203 92, 162, 251
State *v.* 37 La. An. 215 350, 847, 859
v. State, 36 Miss. 533 504, 550
v. State, 19 Ohio, 423 101, 456, 471
State *v.* 10 Rich. Law, 351 678
Prickett *v.* Gratrex, 8 Q. B. 1021 80
Priebnow, State *v.* 16 Neb. 131 457, 507
Pries, R. *v.* 6 Cox C. C. 165 185
Priest *v.* State, 10 Neb. 393 350
Prigg *v.* Com., 16 Pet. 608 37
Primm, State *v.* 60 Mo. 166 447
Prince, R. *v.* L. R. 1 C. C. R. 154 164
v. Shepherd, 9 Pick. 176 801
State *v.* 63 N. C. 528 495
State *v.* 41 Tex. 300 467
v. Towns, 33 Fed. Rep. 161 50
Prindeville *v.* People, 42 Ill. 217 249, 464
Prine *v.* Com., 18 Penn. St. 104 540, 549, 875
Pringle *v.* Huse, 1 Cow. 432 608, 631
Prior, *v.* State, 77 Ala. 57 750
U. S. *v.* 5 Cranch C. C. 37 291
Pritchard, R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 303 417
State *v.* 15 Nev. 74 617, 665
State *v.* 16 Nev. 101 664, 672, 722
Pritchett, State *v.* 3 Sneed, 285 507
Proffit *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 51 797
Profit, Com. *v.* 4 Binn. 424 774
Puckering, R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 242 209
Puddick, R. *v.* 4 F. & F. 497 576
Puddifoot, R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 247 237
Pugh, State *v.* 15 Mo. 509 221
Pulbrook, R. *v.* 9 C. & P. 37 194, 196
Pulham, R. *v.* 9 C. & P. 293 302
Pullen *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 89 589
Pullens, State *v.* 81 Mo. 387 119, 169
Purchase, Com. *v.* 2 Pick. 521 490, 501, 505, 507, 520
R. *v.* 1 C. & M. 617 404, 426
Purdie, State *v.* 67 N. C. 326 261
Purdy *v.* State, 68 Ga. 295 440
Putnam, State *v.* 38 Me. 296 386, 387, 759
State *v.* 18 S. C. 175 304
Putney *v.* Celestine, 4 Am. L. J. 164 441
Pybos *v.* State, 3 Humph. 49 341
Pye's case, 1 East P. C. 783 158

Q.

SECTION

Quarrel, State *v.* 2 Bay, 150 846
Queen's case, 2 Brod. & B. 292 566
Quesenbury, State *v.* 3 Stew. & Port. 308 639, 640
Quick, People *v.* 56 Mich. 321 358, 556
Quimby *v.* Blackey, 63 N. H. 77 453
State *v.* 51 Me. 395 346, 350, 692
Quin, Com. *v.* 5 Gray, 478 143
Quinlan, People *v.* 6 Park. C. R. 9 189
Quinn *v.* Heisel, 40 Mich. 576 8, 9
v. State, 49 Ala. 353 285
v. State, 14 Ind. 589 819
v. State, 35 Ind. 485 154
Quintzow *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 47 470
Quong Woo, in re, 7 Sawy. 526 981
Quvise, People *v.* 56 Cal. 396 255

R.

Raake, R. *v.* 2 Mood. C. C. 66 192
Rabon, R. *v.* 1 Chit. R. 698 165
State *v.* 4 Rich. 260 258
Raborg, State *v.* 2 South. 545 990
Rader *v.* State, 5 Lea, 610 844, 847
Radley, R. *v.* 3 Cox C. C. 460; 1 Den. C. C. 450; 2 C. & K. 977 158, 191
R. *v.* R. & R. 489 104
Radloff, Att.-Gen. *v.* 10 Ex. 84 230
Rafe *v.* State, 20 Ga. 60 661
Rafferty *v.* People, 69 Ill. 111; S. C. 72 Ill. 37 5, 6, 813
Raganthall, Com. *v.* 14 Bush, 457 669
Ragsdale, State *v.* 10 Lea, 671 956, 785, 918
Raiford, State *v.* 7 Port. 101 124, 163, 223, 274
Railroad, Com. *v.* 1 Grant, 331 523
Rainer, R. *v.* 1 Sid. 214 923
Rainey *v.* People, 3 Gilman, 71 371
v. State, 53 Ind. 278 871
v. State, 19 Tex. Ap. 479 841
Raisler *v.* State, 56 Ala. 64 161
Rake *v.* Pope, 7 Ala. 161 483
Ranch *v.* Com., 78 Penn. St. 490 935
Rand *v.* Com., 9 Grat. 738 935, 936
Com. *v.* 7 Met. 475 189
R. *v.* L. R. 1 Q. B. 230 605
State *v.* 33 N. H. 216 350, 836
Randall *v.* Bridge, 2 Mass. 549 988
Com. *v.* 4 Gray, 36 158
Com. *v.* Thatcher's C. C. 500 876, 879
R. *v.* R. & R. 195 187
State *v.* 88 N. C. 611 898
Randle, State *v.* 41 Tex. 292 285

SECTION

Randolph *v.* Com., 6 S. & R. 398 159
v. Woodstock, 35 Vt. 291 568
Rank *v.* Shewey, 4 Watts, 218 660
Rankin, State *v.* 4 Cold. 145 439, 473, 496
Ransom, People *v.* 7 Wend. 423 815, 866
Rasberry *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 664 371
Rash *v.* State, 61 Ala. 89 779 *a*
Rasnick *v.* Com., 2. Va. Cas. 356 162, 243, 251
Rastall *v.* Stratton, 1 H. Bl. 49 135
Rataree *v.* State, 62 Ga. 245 762
Rathbun, People *v.* 21 Wend. 509 518, 631, 688, 793, 798
Rather *v.* State, 1 Port. 132 306 *a*
Ratliff *v.* State, 12 Tex. Ap. 330 585
Rattray *v.* State, 61 Miss. 377 167
Ratts, State *v.* 63 N. C. 503 281
Ratzky *v.* People, 29 N. Y. 124 435, 780
Rauscher, U. S. *v.* 119 U. S. 407 38, 49
Ravara, U. S. *v.* 3 Dall. 299, *n.* 59
Rawlins *v.* State, 2 Md. 201 918
Rawls *v.* State, 8 Sm. & M. 599 350, 406
Rawson *v.* State, 19 Conn. 292 274
Ray, Com. *v.* 1 Va. Cas. 262 940
ex parte, 45 Ala. 15 995
v. People 6 Col. 231 409
v. State, 15 Ga. 223 646, 648, 844, 847
State *v.* Rice, 1 456, 457, 471
v. State, 4 Tex. Ap. 450 658
Raye, ex parte, 63 Cal. 491 966
Raymond, People *v.* 93 N. Y. 38 936
State *v.* 20 Iowa, 582 273, 762
Read *v.* Bertrand, 4 Wash. C. C. 556 37
v. Com. 22 Grat. 924 772, 827, 832, 847, 854, 859, 902
v. People, 86 N. Y. 381 251
Reading, R. *v.* 2 Leach, 590; 2 East P. C. 952 184
Reagle, People *v.* 60 Barb. 529 502, 722, 824
Reaky, State *v.* 1 Mo. Ap. 3 279
Reardon *v.* State, 44 Ark. 331 540
Reavey, People *v.* 38 Hun, 418 189 *a*
Reavy, People *v.* 45 Hun, 418 293, 831
Reckards, State *v.* 21 Minn. 47 541
Record, State *v.* 56 Ind. 107 154
Recorder, People *v.* 6 Hill, 429 1
Rector *v.* Com., 80 Ky. 468 935
v. State, 1 Eng. (Ark.), 187 438
U. S. *v.* 5 McLean, 174 981

SECTION

Reddick *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 82 89
Redemier, State *v.* 71 Mo. 173 866
Redinger, People *v.* 55 Cal. 280 774 *a*
Redman, State *v.* 40 Ark. 445 869
v. State, 28 Ind. 205 955
State *v.* 17 Iowa, 329 457, 505, 722, 753
Redmond *v.* State, 12 Kans. 172 73
State *v.* 37 La. An. 77 693
Reed's case, 2 Rodger's Rec. 168 208
Reed, Com. *v.* 3 Am. L. J. 140 260
Com. *v.* 59 Penn. St. 425 990
People *v.* 47 Barb. 235 129
R. *v.* 1 Eng. L. & E. 595 435
R. *v.* 2 Mood. C. C. 62 200
v. Rice, 2 J. J. Mar. 44 25
v. State, 16 Ark. 499 111, 112, 113, 156
State *v.* 26 Conn. 202 451, 485
State *v.* 49 Iowa, 85 602, 605, 798 *a*
State *v.* 12 Md. 263 456, 466, 471
State *v.* 35 Me. 489 124, 274
State *v.* 67 Me. 127 354
v. State, 1 Tex. Ap. 1 344
State *v.* 40 Vt. 603 247, 465
U. S. *v.* 2 Blatch. 435, 455 340, 363, 378, 379
U. S. *v.* 100 U. S. 13 994, 996 *b*, 997
Reel, State *v.* 80 N. C. 442 289, 292, 296
Reese *v.* U. S. 9 Wall. 13 70
Reeves *v.* State, 20 Ala. 33 91, 92, 93
v. State, 84 Ind. 116 370
Regan, State *v.* 52 Iowa, 106 742
Reggel, ex parte, 114 U. S. 642 30, 34, 36, 55
ex parte, 114 U. S. 642 30, 31, 35
Rego, People *v.* 43 Hun, 129 709
Reich *v.* State, 53 Ga. 73 350
Reichart, U. S. *v.* 32 Fed. Rep. 142 274
Reid, R. *v.* 2 Den. C. C. 88; 1 Eng. L. & E. 599 250, 435
R. *v.* 15 Jur. 181 466
v. State, 50 Ga. 556 661
State *v.* 20 Iowa, 413 131
U. S. *v.* 12 How. 361 847
Reiley, State *v.* 2 Brev. 126 785
Reilly, R. *v.* 1 Leach, 454 527
U. S. *v.* 20 Fed. Rep. 46 89
Reins *v.* People, 30 Ill. 256 823
Reiter, U. S. *v.* 4 Am. L. Reg. N. S. 534 439
Remley *v.* De Wall, 41 Ga. 466 950
Renfrow, People *v.* 41 Cal. 37 673
Reno, ex parte, 66 Mo. 266 531

SECTION
Renshaw, ex parte, 6 Mo. Ap. 474 954
Reside *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 675 189 *a*
Restell, People *v.* 3 Hill (N. Y.), 289 801
Renck *v.* McGregor, 3 Vroom (N. J.), 70 13
Revels, State *v.* 1 Bush. 200 471
State *v.* 35 La. An. 302 651
Reyes, People *v.* 5 Cal. 347 622, 668
Reynolds, Com. *v.* 120 Mass. 190 18
ex parte, 3 Hughes, 559 981, 995
People *v.* 16 Cal. 128 668
v. People, 83 Ill. 479 458, 466
v. State, 68 Ala. 502 906
v. State, 64 Ind. 498 895
State *v.* 1 Kelly, 222 613, 646
v. State, 3 Kelly, 53 447
v. State, 11 Tex. 120 247, 354, 465
v. U. S., 98 U. S. 145; 1 Utah, 319 226, 341, 625, 661 *a*, 670, 688, 711, 798 *a*
Rhea *v.* State, 25 Kan. 576 842
v. State, 10 Yerg. 258 592
Rhinehart *v.* Lance, 43 N. J. L. (14 Vroom) 311 963
Rhode Island *v.* Mass., 11 Pet. 226 597
Rhodes, Com. *v.* 1 Dana, 595 87
ex parte, 2 Whart. Cr. Cas. 559 37
in re, 65 N. C. 518 530, 972
R. *v.* 2 Stra. 703 453
U. S. *v.* 1 Abb. U. S. 28 224
Ricard, ex parte, 11 Neb. 287 1005
Rice *v.* Com., 12 Met. (Mass.) 246 918
v. Com., 100 Penn. St. 28 710
v. People, 15 Mich. 9 159
v. State, 3 Heisk. 215 279, 771
v. State, 7 Ind. 332 643, 844
v. State, 16 Ind. 298 661
v. State, 3 Kans. 141 440
Rich *v.* State, 1 Tex. Ap. 206 860
Richards, Com. *v.* 1 Mass. 337 183, 188, 189
v. Com., 81 Va. 110 386, 396, 771, 909 *a*
People *v.* 1 Maine, 216 464
R. *v.* 1 M. & R. 177 145
R. *v.* 5 Q. B. 926 27
R. *v.* R. & R. 193 193
State *v.* 23 La. An. 1294 161
v. State, 22 Neb. 145 446
Richardson *v.* Com., 126 Mass. 34 241
v. Fisher, 1 Bing. 145 879
SECTION
Richardson *v.* Luntz, 26 La. An. 313 599 *a*
People *v.* 4 Park. C. R. 656 991
U. S. *v.* 28 Fed. Rep. 61 344, 345, 346, 425
Richie *v.* State, 58 Ind. 355 865
v. State, 59 Ind. 121 577
Richmond *v.* Dayton, 10 Johns. R. 393 963
R. *v.* 1 C. & K. 240 507
Rickard *v.* State, 74 Ind. 275 827
Ricketson, Com. *v.* 5 Met. (Mass.) 412 830
Rickey, State *v.* 4 Halst. 293 386, 388
State *v.* 5 Halst. 83 346, 347, 350
Rickles *v.* State, 68 Ala. 538 477
Ricks *v.* State, 16 Ga. 600 810
State *v.* 32 La. An. 1098 651
Ricord *v.* R. R., 15 Nev. 167 474
Riculfi, State *v.* 35 La. An. 770 712
Riddle, State *v.* 20 Kans. 711 560
Ridenhour *v.* State, 75 Ga. 382 810
Ridenour *v.* State, 38 Ohio St. 272 738, 740, 771, 779
Rider, R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 539 579
Ridgeway's case, 2 Ashm. 247 338, 991, 1007
Ridgway *v.* State, 41 Tex. 231 189
Ridley, R. *v.* R. & R. 515 145
v. Sherbrook, 3 Coldw. 569 537
Ridling *v.* State, 56 Ga. 601 341
Riffe, State *v.* 10 W. Va. 794 220, 396
Riggs, Com. *v.* 14 Gray, 376 277, 278
v. State, 104 Ind. 261 189 *a*
Righetti, People *v.* 66 Cal. 184 213
Rigsby, U. S. *v.* 2 Cranch C. C. 364 218
Riley's case, 2 Pick. 172 995
Riley *v.* State, 95 Ind. 446 827
v. State, 43 Miss. 397 240, 241
v. State, 20 Tex. Ap. 100 712
U. S. *v.* 5 Blatch. C. C. 204 500, 517, 578, 808, 810
Ring, in re, 28 Cal. 247 1005
State *v.* 29 Minn. 78 669
Risher, State *v.* 1 Rich. 219 456, 460, 471
Risley, People *v.* 1 N. Y. Cr. Rep. 492 557
State *v.* 72 Mo. 609 435
Ritchey *v.* State, 7 Blackf. 168 215
Ritson, R. *v.* 50 L. T. (N. S.) 727 565
Rivers, State *v.* 58 Iowa, 102 278
v. State, 10 Tex. Ap. 177 158, 237, 522, 533
Rives, State *v.* Sup. Ct. U. S. 1880 783 *a*

SECTION

Rives, U. S. *v.* 100 U. S. 313 783 *a*
Roach *v.* People, 77 Ill. 25 712, 798
v. State, 5 Cold. (Tenn.) 39 310
v. State, 34 Ga. 78 859, 871
State *v.* 2 Hayw. 352 123, 385
Roane, State *v.* 2 Dev. 58 13
Robb *v.* Connolly, 111 U. S. 624 35, 37 *a*, 980
in re, 64 Cal. 431 35
in re, 19 Fed. Rep. 25; 5 Crim. Law Mag. 366 37 *a*
in re, 1 Pac. Rep. 881; 19 Fed. Rep. 25 37 *a*
v. McDonald, 29 Iowa, 330 963
Robbins's case, Whart. St. Tr. 392 44, 47
Robbins *v.* People, 95 Ill. 175 440
R. *v.* 1 C. & K. 456 164
v. State, 20 Ala. 36 945
v. State, 8 Ohio St. 131 771, 810
State *v.* 1 Strobh. 355 283
Roberts, Com. *v.* 1 Yeates, 6 245
ex parte, 24 Fed. Rep. 132 30
ex parte, 9 Nev. 42 932, 994
People *v.* 6 Cal. 214 369
v. People, 9 Col. 458 139, 597
R. *v.* C. & M. 682 194
R. *v.* 2 Strange, 1208 874
v. Reilly, 116 U. S. 80 29, 30, 31, 33
Resp. *v.* 2 Dall. 124 466
v. State, 19 Ala. 526 120
State *v.* 2 Dev. & B. 540 359
v. State, 14 Ga. 8 465, 466, 471, 472, 815
v. State, 111 Ill. 340 714
v. State, 3 Kelly, 310 862
State *v.* 26 Me. 263 146
v. State, 55 Miss. 414 236, 466–742
v. State, 14 Mo. 138 9, 80, 533
State *v.* 15 Mo. 28 309
Robertson *v.* State, 42 Ala. 509 752
v. State, 43 Ala. 325 696
Robins, R. *v.* 1 Cox C. C. 114 326
Robinson, Com. *v.* 1 Gray, 555 310, 311
Com. *v.* 126 Mass. 259 472, 474
Com. *v.* 1 S. & R. 353 986
v. Com., 32 Grat. 866 460, 507
v. Culph, 1 Const. 231 453
ex parte, 1 Bond, 39 981
ex parte, 3 McArthur, 418 247

SECTION

Robinson, ex parte, 6 McLean, 355 441, 981, 1010
ex parte, 19 Wall. 505 513, 953, 962
v. Flanders, 29 Ind. 10 34 *a*, 35, 993
v. Gleadow, 2 Scott, 250 795
in re, 23 L. J. Q. B. 286 76
v. McElhane, 2 How. (N. Y. Prac.) 454 955
People *v.* 2 Park. C. R. 285 797
R. *v.* 2 Burr. 799 233
R. *v.* 1 Holt N. P. 595 112, 113, 156
R. *v.* 1 Moody, 413 909
v. Richardson, 13 Gray, 454 26
v. Spearman, 3 B. & C. 493 794
v. State, 32 Ala. 587 457
State *v.* 33 Ark. 180 805, 810, 859
v. State, 38 Ark. 548 121
State *v.* 9 Fost. 274 137, 317, 385
v. State, 66 Ga. 707 810
v. State, 57 Ind. 113 324
v. State, 1 Lea, 673 309
State *v.* 2 Lea, 114 428
State *v.* 2 Lea, 114 339, 425
v. State, 21 Tex. Ap. 160 465
State *v.* 20 W. Va. 713 829
Robles, People *v.* 34 Cal. 591 217
Robson, R. *v.* 4 F. & F. 360 820
Roby, Com. *v.* 12 Pick. 496 249, 464, 476, 523, 750, 751, 814, 823, 831, 894
State *v.* 8 Nev. 312 247, 465
Rocco *v.* State, 37 Miss. 357 90, 378, 480
Roche, R. *v.* 1 Leach, 134, 160 420, 437, 478
Rock, Com. *v.* 10 Gray, 4 810
Rockafellow, State *v.* 1 Halst. (1 N. J. L.) 332 75, 347, 350, 1007
Rockett, State *v.* 87 Mo. 666 866
Roderigas, People *v.* 49 Cal. 9 239
Rodes *v.* State, 10 Lea, 414 358
Roe, People *v.* 5 Park. C. R. 231 317, 420
v. Rodrigo, 69 Cal. 601 388
State *v.* 16 Vroom, 49 709
State *v.* 12 Vt. 93 383, 447, 448
Roebuck *v.* State, 57 Ga. 154 328

SECTION

Roelker, ex parte, 1 Sprague, 276 954
Rogers, Com. *v.* 7 Met. 500 617, 677
v. Com., 5 S. & R. 463 159
ex parte, 10 Tex. Ap. 655 507
v. Jones, 1 Wend. 261 440
v. Lamb, 3 Blackf. 155 661
v. People, 34 Mich. 345 249, 261
R. *v.* 3 Burr. 1812 540 *a*
R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 629 187
R. *v.* 9 C. & P. 41 185, 196
State *v.* 94 N. C. 860 853
U. S. *v.* 6 Crim. Law Mag. 549 37 *b*
Rogers Man. Co. *v.* Rogers, 38 Conn. 121 350
Rohfrischt, State *v.* 12 La. An. 382 369
Roland, Com. *v.* 97 Mass. 598 278
Rolland *v.* Com., 82 Penn. St. 306 346, 350
Rollins *v.* Ames, 2 N. H. 349, 350 627
ex parte, 80 Va. 314 994
State *v.* 8 N. H. 550 522
Rolls *v.* State, 52 Miss. 391 465, 540, 546, 550
Romaine, in re, 23 Cal. 585 29, 34
v. State, 7 Ind. 63 844
. Terr. *v.* 2 New Mex. 114 839
Roman *v.* State, 4 Wis. 312 712, 841
Romp *v.* State, 3 Greene (Iowa), 276 238
Rondeau, U. S. *v.* 16 Fed. Rep. 109 ; 4 Woods, 185 344, 350
Ronzone, U. S. *v.* 14 Blatch. 69 87, 337
Rooker *v.* State, 65 Ind. 86 167
Rookwood, R. *v.* Holt, 684 396
Roozevelt *v.* Gardiner, 2 Cow. 463 101
Roper, R. *v.* 1 Cr. & D. 185 447
State *v.* 88 N. C. 656 260
Rorabacher, State *v.* 19 Iowa, 155 601
Rose *v.* Leggett, 61 Mich. 445 8
v. State, 8 Cow. 17 841
State *v.* 32 La. An. 854 747
State *v.* 32 Mo. 560 641
v. State, 20 Ohio, 31 540, 541, 874
Rosenblatt, ex parte, 51 Cal. 285 28, 29
Rosencrants *v.* State, 6 Ind. 407 882
Rosenweig *v.* People, 63 Barb. 634 801
Ross, ex parte, 2 Bond. 252 29, 50
v. Leggatt, 61 Mich. 445 8
v. State, 55 Ala. 177 323
State *v.* 1 Blackf. 390 345
v. State, 64 Ga. 27 890
State *v.* 14 La. An. 364 773
State *v.* 4 Lea, 442 456, 471
v. State, 9 Mo. 687 405, 421

SECTION

Ross, State *v.* 29 Mo. 32 465, 798
Rosser, R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 648 833
Roth, in re, 15 Fed. Rep. 506 51
v. House of Refuge, 31 Md. 329 1010
State *v.* 17 Iowa, 336 73
Rothschild, State *v.* 68 Mo. 52 798
ex parte, 2 Tex. Ap. 560 1010
v. State, 4 Tex. Ap. 419 652
v. State, 7 Tex. Ap. 519 366, 548
Roulstone, State *v.* 3 Sneed, 107 302
Rounds *v.* State, 76 Me. 127 737
v. State, 57 Wis. 555
Roundtree *v.* State, 58 Ala. 381 266
v. State, 32 La. An. 1144 663
Roussel's case, 28 Grat. 930 588
Rout, State *v.* 3 Hawks, 618 183, 188
Rowan *v.* State, 30 Wis. 129 85, 88, 90, 823
State *v.* 35 Wis. 303 602
Rowand *v.* Com., 82 Penn. St. 405 338, 373
Rowe, People *v.* 4 Park. C. R. 252 27, 388
v. State, 1 Humph. 491 831, 836
State *v.* 8 Richs. 17 6
v. Yuba, 17 Cal. 61 559
Rowland *v.* State, 55 Ala. 210 771
Rowlands, R. *v.* 2 Den. C. C. 367; 17 Q. B. 671 383
R. *v.* 2 Den. C. C. 386 890
Rowley, State *v.* 12 Conn. 101 87, 453
Roy *v.* State, 2 Kans. 405 652
State *v.* 83 Mo. 268 358
Royal, State *v.* 90 N. C. 755 847
Royall, ex parte, 117 U. S. 241, 254 981
U. S. *v.* 3 Cranch C. C. 618 154, 155, 919
Royster, ex parte, 6 Ark. 28 982
Ruby, State *v.* 61 Iowa, 86 354, 817
Rucker, State *v.* 93 Mo. 88 220
v. State, 7 Tex. Ap. 549 301, 309
Rudland, R. *v.* 4 F. & F. 495 576
Ruffner, Com. *v.* 28 Penn. St. 259 317
Ruggles *v.* Hall, 14 Johns. 112 881
Ruhl, in re, 5 Sawy. 186 533
State *v.* 8 Clarke (Iowa), 447 566
Rulo *v.* State, 19 Ind. 298 508
Ruloff *v.* People, 18 N. Y. 179 707, 733, 815, 834
v. People, 45 N. Y. 213 13, 14
Rumford Works, Com. *v.* 16 Gray, 231 232

SECTION

Rundlett, U. S. *v.* 2 Curtis C. C. 41 963
Runnels *v.* State, 28 Ark. 121 856, 900
Ruse, U. S. *v.* 3 Wash. C. C. 224 1007
Rush *v.* Cavanaugh, 2 Barr, 187 356, 555
State *v.* 95 Mo. 199 847
State *v.* 13 R. I. 198 238
Rushworth, R. *v.* R. & R. 317 163 *a*
Russel *v.* Com., 7 S. & R. 489 281
Russell *v.* Ball, Barnes, 455 846
Com. *v.* 32 Grat. 912 813
R. *v.* 1 C. & M. 247 359
R. *v.* 3 E. & B. 942 787
v. State, 71 Ala. 348 238
v. State, 68 Ga. 785 750, 813
State *v.* 1 Houst. 122 8
v. State, 50 Ind. 174 238
v. State, 53 Miss. 368 841
v. State, 11 Tex. Ap. 288 824
U. S. *v.* 22 Fed. Rep. 390 750
Russen *v.* Lucas, 1 Car. & P. 153 3
Rust, People *v.* 1 Caines, 133 152
State *v.* 8 Blackf. 195 137, 318
v. State, 31 Kans. 509 447
State *v.* 35 N. H. 438 220, 298
Ruth, Com. *v.* 104 Penn. St. 294 775
State *v.* 14 Mo. Ap. 226 144
Rutherford *v.* Com., 78 Ky. 639 546
Com. *v.* 5 Rand. 646 81
v. Holmes, 5 Hun, 317; 66 N. Y. 368 954, 963
State *v.* 13 Tex. 24 394
v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 92 111
Ruthven, ex parte, 17 Mo. 541 995
State *v.* 58 Iowa, 121 350
Rutledge, State *v.* 8 Humph. 32 232, 405
Rutter's case, 7 Abb. Pr. (N. S.) 67 36, 993
Rützen *v.* Farr, 5 Nev. & M. 617 801
Ryalls *v.* R., 11 Q. B. 781; 18 L. J. M. C. 69 122, 158 *a*
Ryan, Com. *v.* 5 Mass. 90 348
v. Donelly, 71 Ill. 100 15
v. Harrow, 27 Iowa, 494 841
in re, 45 Mich. 173 918
R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 854; 2 Mood. C. C. 15 220
State *v.* 13 Minn. 370 819
State *v.* 15 Oregon, 512 250
Rynders, People *v.* 12 Wend. 425 285

S.

Saal, Com. *v.* 10 Phila. 496 733
Safford *v.* People, 1 Park. C. R. 474 906
Sage, State *v.* 89 Ind. 141 429 *a*

SECTION

Sahlinger *v.* People, 102 Ill. 241 541, 549, 771, 866
Saine *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 144 94
Sale *v.* State, 68 Ala. 530 605
Sales, State *v.* 2 Nev. 268 966
Salge, State *v.* 2 Nev. 321 354, 414, 477
Saliba, State *v.* 18 La. An. 35 810
Salisbury *v.* Com., 79 Ky. 425 601
v. State, 6 Conn. 101 183
Sallie *v.* State, 39 Ala. 691 183, 189
Salvi, R. *v.* 10 Cox C. C. 481 *n.* 465, 476
Sam, ex parte, 51 Ala. 34 995
State *v.* 2 Dev. 569 305
v. State, 13 Sm. & M. 189 640
v. State, 1 Swan, 61 833
Sammis, People *v.* 3 Hun, 560 602
Sampson, Com. *v.* 97 Mass. 407 301
v. Com., 5 W. & S. 385 298, 299, 777
Samsels, People *v.* 66 Cal. 99 672
Sanders *v.* State, 85 Ind. 318 414, 779 *b*
v. State, 12 Iowa, 230, 278 749
State *v.* 68 Mo. 202 707, 828
v. State, 26 Tex. 119 120
Sandos, State *v.* 37 La. An. 376 285
Sands *v.* Robinson, 20 Miss. (12 S. & M.) 704 378
Sanford *v.* Bennet, 24 N. Y. 20 320
Com. *v.* 5 Litt. 289 773
People *v.* 43 Cal. 29 672, 712
State *v.* 1 Nott & McC. 512 555, 556
San Francisco *v.* Randall, 54 Cal. 408 108
Santo *v.* State, 2 Iowa, 165 22, 26
Santos, U. S. *v.* 5 Blatch. C. C. 104 541, 546, 549
Sarah *v.* State, 16 Ark. 114 945
v. State, 28 Ga. 576 733, 906
v. State, 28 Miss. 267 293
Sargent, Com. *v.* Thach. Cr. C. 116 369
v. Roberts, 1 Pick. 337 830
v. State, 96 Ind. 63 774 *a*
v. State, 11 Ohio, 473 749, 750, 751, 824
v. ———, 5 Cow. 106 881
Sarmon, R. *v.* 1 Burr. 516 385
Sartain *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 651 934
Sasse *v.* State, 68 Wis. 530 707, 853
Sater, State *v.* 8 Iowa, 420 647
Satterlee, People *v.* 5 Hun, 167 289, 293
Satterwhite *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 609 813
Sattler *v.* State, 59 Ill. 68 371

SECTION

Saunders, People *v.* 4 Park. C. R. 197 465
v. State, 85 Ind. 318 414, 779 *b*
State *v.* 53 Me. 234 700
v. State, 10 Tex. Ap. 336 413
Sauvinet, State *v.* 24 La. An. 119 975, 999
Savage, R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 51 609, 684
v. State, 18 Fla. 909 94, 420, 612, 614, 617
State *v.* 69 Me. 112 781
Savina *v.* State, 63 Ga. 513 13, 29
Sawdon's case, 2 Lewin. C. C. 117 661
Sawtelle, Com. *v.* 11 Cush. 142 176, 183, 189, 207, 217, 218
Sawyer *v.* Hannibal R. R., 37 Mo. 240 847
in re, 124 U. S. 201 770
v. Joiner, 16 Vt. 497 549
v. Merrill, 10 Pick. 16 860
Sayres, Com. *v.* 8 Leigh, 722 341, 368, 423
v. Com., 88 Penn. St. 291 770
Scagg *v.* State, 8 S. & M. 722 540
Scaife, R. *v.* 2 Den. C. C. 281; 17 Q. B. 238; 9 D. P. C. C. 553 75, 513, 785, 790
Scalbert, R. *v.* 2 Leach, 620 508
Scannel, Com. *v.* 11 Cush. 547 261, 271
State *v.* 39 Me. 68 756
Scarborough *v.* State, 46 Ga. 26 577
Schaeffer, Resp. *v.* 1 Dall. 236 360, 362
Schaeffler *v.* State, 3 Wis. 823 648, 670
Schele, State *v.* 52 Iowa, 608 247
Schenck, People *v.* 2 Johns. 479 29
Schlagel, State *v.* 19 Iowa, 169 712
Schlemm, State *v.* 4 Harring. 577 35
Schleter, R. *v.* 10 Cox C. C. 409 417
Schlinger *v.* People, 102 Ill. 241 543
Schloss, State *v.* 63 Mo. 361 247, 284
Schmidt, People *v.* 63 Cal. 28 236
People *v.* 64 Cal. 260 457
v. State, 78 Ind. 41 236
Schnelle, State *v.* 24 W. Va. 767 90, 561, 636, 836, 884
Schoch, State *v.* 56 Mo. 552 847
Schoeffler *v.* State, 3 Wis. 823 614
Schoeneth, People *v.* 44 Mich. 489 436
Scholfield, U. S. *v.* 1 Cranch, 130 969
Schricker, State *v.* 29 Mo. 265 90
Schuler *v.* State, 105 Ind. 290 555, 602, 707
U. S. *v.* 6 McLean, 28 164

SECTION

Schultz *v.* State, 15 Tex. Ap. 258 278
Schumaker *v.* State, 5 Wis. 324 670
Schumann, U. S. *v.* 2 Abb. (U. S.) 523; 7 Sawy. 439 366, 383
Schuylkill *v.* Reifsnyder, 46 Penn. St. 446 528
Schwartz, ex parte, 9 Tex. Ap. 381 996 *b*
People *v.* 32 Cal. 160 110
Schweiter, State *v.* 27 Kans. 499 285
Scofield, State *v.* 54 Ga. 635 878
Scoggins *v.* State, 32 Ark. 205 321
Scott, Com. *v.* 5 Grat. 697 752
Com. *v.* 10 Grat. 750 773
v. Com., 14 Grat. 687 394
Com. *v.* 121 Mass. 33 383
Com. *v.* 123 Mass. 122 555, 579
v. Com., 6 S. & R. 224 158
in re, 9 B. & C. 446 27
People *v.* 59 Cal. 341 414
v. People, 63 Ill. 508 358, 696
People *v.* 60 Miss. 268 249
R. *v.* 4 B. & S. 368 254, 469
R. *v.* 3 Burr. 1262 306, 698
R. *v.* Dears. & B. C. C. 47 122
v. Soans, 3 East, 111 99, 423
State *v.* 25 Ark. 107 358
v. State, 64 Ind. 600 711, 737, 798 *a*
State *v.* 78 N. C. 485 601
State *v.* 30 N. H. 274 991
State *v.* 15 S. C. 434 290, 911
v. State, 10 Tex. Ap. 112 712
State *v.* 24 Vt. 129 260, 261, 464
U. S. *v.* 4 Biss. 29 289
v. U. S. 8 Ct. of Claims, 457 533
v. U. S., 1 Morris, 142 465, 471
Scrafford, in re, 21 Kans. 735 328, 449
Scragg *v.* State, 8 S. & M. 722 540
Scribner, State *v.* 2 Gill & Johns. 246 208
Scruggs, State *v.* 7 Baxt. 38 255
Scudder *v.* State, 62 Ind. 13 260
Scully, R. *v.* 1 Al. & Nap. 262 548
Scurry, State *v.* 3 Rich. 68 119
Seaborn, State *v.* 4 Dev. 305 350
Seacord *v.* People, 121 Ill. 623 220
Seal *v.* State, 13 Sm. & M. 286 670
Sealy *v.* State, 1 Kelly, 213 613
Seamens, State *v.* 1 Iowa, 418 124
Seamons, State *v.* 1 Greene (Iowa), 418 220, 274
Searcy *v.* State, 4 Tex. 450 141, 150
Searight *v.* Com., 13 S. & R. 301 314
Searle, Com. *v.* 2 Binney, 332 167, 280, 281
Searls *v.* Viets, 2 Th. & C. 224 3
Seaton, State *v.* 61 Iowa, 563 974, 999

SECTION

Seawood, R. *v.* 2 Ld. Ray. 1472 87
Seely, State *v.* 30 Ark. 162 117
Sego, Com. *v.* 125 Mass. 210 120
Selfridge's case, Pamph. 658
Sellers *v.* People, 3 Scam. 412 844
Semler, in re, 41 Wis. 517 995
Semmes, Com. *v.* 11 Leigh, 665 81
Senott, People *v.* 20 Alb. L. J. 230 31, 37
Sepulveda, People *v.* 59 Cal. 342 755, 756
Sergeant, R. *v.* 1 R. & M. 352 306 *a*
Serpentine *v.* State, 1 How. (Miss.) 260 134, 256
Severin *v.* People, 37 Ill. 414 440, 465
Sexton, State *v.* 3 Hawks, 184 385
Seymour, Com. *v.* 2 Brewst. 567 90, 383, 447
Shackelford, U. S. *v.* 3 Cranch C. C. 178 661
Shackleford, U. S. *v.* 18 How. (U. S.) 588 614
Shafer *v.* People, 1 Utah, 260 518
Shaffer's case, Sup. Ct. Utah, 1885 963
Shaffer *v.* State, 27 Ind. 131 505
State *v.* 59 Iowa, 290 244
Shakespear, R. *v.* 10 T. R. 83 119
Shank, in re, 15 Abb. Pr. 38 999
Shanks, Com. *v.* 10 B. Mon. 304 918 *a*
Shanley *v.* Wells, 71 Ill. 78 8, 80
Shannahar, Com. *v.* 145 Mass. 99 238
Shappoonmash *v.* Terr., 1 Wash. Terr. 219 875
Shark *v.* State, 72 Mo. 37 555
Sharp *v.* State, 17 Ga. 290 220
v. State, 6 Tex. Ap. 650 693
U. S. *v.* Peters C. C. 118, 131 243, 874
Sharpless, Com. *v.* 2 S. & R. 91 177
Shattuck, People *v.* 6 Abb. (N. C.) 33 368, 379
v. State, 11 Ind. 473 366, 367
v. State, 51 Miss. 50 975
State *v.* 45 N. H. 205 924
Shaver, Com. *v.* 3 W. & S. 338 89
Shaw, Com. *v.* 1 Crumrine (Pitts.), 492 541
Com. *v.* 6 Cr. Law Mag. 243 27
ex parte, 7 Ohio St. 81 994, 995, 996, 996 *b*
People *v.* 5 Johns. 236 194
People *v.* 13 N. Y. 36 486
People *v.* 63 N. Y. 36 605
v. State, 18 Ala. 547 254, 469, 771
State *v.* 35 Iowa, 575 221, 236

SECTION

Shaw, State *v.* 3 Ired. 20, 532 11, 16, 660
State *v.* 4 Jones (N. C.) Law, 440 712
State *v.* 58 N. H. 74 273
v. State, 27 Tex. 750 862
Shay *v.* People, 22 N. Y. 317 273
Shea, State *v.* 95 Mo. 85 898, 927
Sheaff *v.* Gray, 2 Yeates, 273 828
Sheazle, in re, 1 Wood. & Minn. 66 45
Sheehan's case, 122 Mass. 445 996
Sheen, R. *v.* 2 C. & P. 635 111, 456, 483, 488
Sheets, State *v.* 89 N. C. 543 544, 562, 577, 750
Sheffield, Com. *v.* 11 Cush. 178 127
Shehane *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 533 802
Sheight, State *v.* 69 N. C. 72 771
Sheldon, ex parte, 34 Ohio St. 319 33
People *v.* 68 Cal. 434 220
Shelledy, State *v.* 8 Iowa, 477 647, 771
Shelters *v.* State, 73 Ala. 5 696
State *v.* 51 Vt. 102 181 *a*
Shelton, State *v.* 64 Iowa, 333 647
State *v.* 65 N. C. 294 523, 525, 526
State *v.* 79 N. C. 605 5
v. State, 1 Stew. & Por. 208 120, 137
Shepard, State *v.* 7 Conn., 54 464, 465
State *v.* 10 Iowa, 126 465
State *v.* 8 Ired. 195 273
State *v.* 32 La. An. 1216 297
U. S. *v.* 1 Abb. (U. S.) 431 88, 385, 388
U. S. *v.* 12 Int. Rev. Rec. 10 358
Sheperd, R. *v.* 2 East P. C. 944 194
Shepherd *v.* People, 25 N. Y. 407 320, 435, 502
v. State, 64 Ind. 43 339, 340, 561, 759, 764, 853
Sheppard *v.* State, 42 Ala. 531 213, 215, 217
State *v.* 97 N. C. 401 359
Sherburne, State *v.* 58 N. H. 535 435, 507
State *v.* 59 N. H. 99 160
Sheriff, Com. *v.* 3 Brewst. 394 521
Sheriff, etc., Com. *v.* 16 S. & R. 304 325, 326, 328
Com. *v.* 7 W. & S. 108 996
State *v.* 37 La. An. 617 996
Sherill, State *v.* 81 N. C. 550 116
State *v.* 82 N. C. 694 459
Sherlock, R. *v.* L. R. 1 C. C. R. 20 10

SECTION

Sherman, Com. *v.* 13 Allen, 248 111, 413
v. State, 17 Fla. 888 813
Sherry, Com. *v.* Wh. on Hom. App. 658, 810
Shevlin *v.* Com., 106 Penn. St. 362 7
Shields, Com. *v.* 2 Bush, 81 827
State *v.* 45 Conn. 266 856, 869
State *v.* 33 La. An. 991, 1410 371, 665, 699, 906
State *v.* 40 Md. 301 785
Shiflet, State *v.* 20 Mo. 415 220
Shimmir, R. *v.* London Law Times, May 13, 1882 579
Shines *v.* State, 42 Miss. 331 753
Shinn, State *v.* 68 Ind. 423 269
Shipley, Terr. *v.* 4 Mont. 498 189
Shipman, State *v.* 63 Mo. 147 602
Shipp *v.* State, 11 Tex. Ap. 46 542
Shippey, State *v.* 10 Minn. 223 369
Shisler, Com. *v.* 2 Phila. 256 526, 528
Shive, U. S. *v.* 1 Bald. 512 578, 805, 808
Shiver, State *v.* 20 S. C. 392 189 *a*, 387, 456, 490, 813
Shock, State *v.* 58 Mo. 552 847
Shoefercater *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 207 137
Shoemaker, U. S. *v.* 2 McLean, 114 383, 447, 500, 512
Sholes, Com. *v.* 13 Allen, 554 94, 501, 507
Shonhausen, State *v.* 26 La. An. 421 189
Shoop *v.* Com., 3 Barr, 126 528
Shorey, U. S. *v.* 9 Int. Rev. Rec. 201 317
Short *v.* State, 63 Ind. 376 290, 740
v. State, 36 Tex. 644 209
v. State, 7 Yerger, 339 746
Shott, R. *v.* 3 C. & K. 206 464
Shotwell, People *v.* 27 Cal. 394 255, 292
Shouse *v.* Com., 5 Barr, 83 245, 247, 312
Shreve, State *v.* 39 Mo. 90 601
Shubert *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 551, 691 470, 482
Shubrick *v.* State, 12 S. C. 21 237
Shufelt, People *v.* 61 Mich. 237 597, 649
Shule, State *v.* 10 Ired. 132 754
Shuler, People *v.* 28 Cal. 490 602, 608
v. State, 105 Ind. 289 707
Shull, State *v.* 3 Head (Tenn.), 42 146
Shumaker *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 117 932
Shumpert, State *v.* 1 Rich. (S. C.) N. S. 85 88
Sias, State *v.* 17 N. H. 558 460, 471

SECTION

Sibley *v.* Phelps, 6 Cush. 172 188
Siebert *v.* State, 95 Ind. 471 247, 464, 555
Siebold, ex parte, 100 U. S. 371 981, 995, 996 *b*
Sifford, ex parte, 5 Am. L. R. 659 981
Sikes *v.* State, 67 Ala. 77 221
Sillem, R. *v.* 2 H. & C. 431 297
Silvera, People *v.* 59 Cal. 592 712
Silversides *v.* R. 2 G. & D. 617; 3 Q. B. 406 780
Silvey, Com. *v.* 71 Ga. 553 818
Simco *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 338 457
Simien, State *v.* 36 La. An. 923 881
Simmerman *v.* State, 16 Neb. 615 15
Simmonds, R. *v.* 1 C. & P. 84 565
Simmons *v.* Com., 1 Rawle, 142 123, 153, 274
ex parte, 62 Ala. 416 996
R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 50 599 *a*
v. State, 7 Hammond, 116 180
State *v.* 73 N. C. 269 221
U. S. *v.* 96 U. S. 360 151, 158, 159, 222
Simms, State *v.* 68 Mo. 305 588
State *v.* 71 Mo. 538 465, 700, 896
v. State, 8 Tex. Ap. 230 844
v. State, 10 Tex. Ap. 131 293
Simon, State *v.* 50 Mo. 370 146
Simonds, State *v.* 3 Mo. 415 441
Simons, Com. *v.* 6 Phil. R. 167 338, 354, 367
R. *v.* Sayer, 35 847
v. State, 25 Ind. 331 255
Simpson *v.* Norton, 45 Me. 281 899
People *v.* 50 Cal. 304 813
R. *v.* 3 C. & K. 207 464
State *v.* 28 Minn. 269 451
v. State, 56 Miss. 297 548
State *v.* 67 Mo. 647 278
v. State, 10 Yerg. 525 232
Sims, Com. *v.* 2 Va. Cas. 374 105, 106
in re, 7 Cush. 285 980, 986
State *v.* 2 Bailey, 29 518, 791
State *v.* 75 Mo. 538 465, 896
State *v.* 16 S. C. 486 8
State *v.* 3 Strobh. 137 294, 295
Singer, People *v.* 18 Abb. (N. Y.) N. C. 96 363
v. People, 13 Hun, 418; 75 N. Y. 608 159
Singleton *v.* Johnston, 9 M. & W. 67 111
Sing Lung, People *v.* 61 Cal. 538 557
Sinnot *v.* State, 11 Lea, 281 956
Sipple *v.* People, 10 Ill. App. 44 405, 518
Sites, State *v.* 20 W. Va. 13 774 *a*
Six Lots, U. S. *v.* 1 Woods, 234 533

SECTION

Skains *v.* State, 21 Ala. 218 944
Skates *v.* State, 64 Miss. 644 823
Skeen, R. *v.* 8 Cox C. C. 143; Bell C. C. 97 419
Skinner, State *v.* 34 Kan. 256 293, 427, 614 *a*
U. S. *v.* 1 Bruns. 446 339
Skipworth, R. *v.* 12 Cox C. C. 371 957, 958, 968
v. State, 8 Tex. Ap. 135 358
Slack, State *v.* 1 Bailey, 330 790, 886
State *v.* 30 Tex. 354 120, 131
Slacum, U. S. *v.* 1 Cranch C. C. 485 320, 322
Slagle, State *v.* 82 N. C. 653 285
Slater, People *v.* 5 Hill (N. Y.), 401 145
Slaughter *v.* State, 6 Humph. 410 457, 465
Slawson *v.* State, 7 Tex. 63 309
Slicker *v.* State, 8 Eng. (Ark.) 397 251
Sloan, State *v.* 55 Iowa, 217 321
State *v.* 47 Mo. 604 465
State *v.* 67 N. C. 357 385
State *v.* 65 Wisc. 647, 651 996
Sly *v.* State, 4 Oreg. 277 440
Slymer *v.* State, 62 Md. 237 90
Small, Com. *v.* 26 Penn. St. 42 971
State *v.* 31 Mo. 197 481, 483
Smalley, State *v.* 50 Vt. 736 291
Smalls, State *v.* 11 S. C. 262 251, 256
Smallwood, State *v.* 75 N. C. 104 565, 847
Smart, State *v.* 4 Rich. 356 213
Smethurst, in re, 2 Sandf. 724 967
Smith's case, East P. C. 783 267
Smith *v.* Bowker, 1 Mass. 76 98, 106
v. Com., 7 Grat. 593 467, 468, 469, 471
Com. *v.* 1 Mass. 245 217
Com. *v.* 9 Mass. 107 345, 350
Com. *v.* 98 Mass. 10 383
Com. *v.* 103 Mass. 444 164
v. Com. 104 Penn. St. 339 431
Com. *v.* 10 Phil. 189 570
Com. *v.* 14 S. & R. 69, 541 733, 935, 937
v. Com. 14 Weekly Notes, 40 452
v. Donnelly, 66 Ill. 464 13
v. Eames, 3 Scam. 78 644
ex parte, 5 Cow. 273 982
ex parte, 117 Ill. 63 999
ex parte, 28 Ind. 47 953, 955, 962
ex parte, 3 McLean, 121 29, 36, 985, 993

SECTION

Smith *v.* Hess. 91 Ind. 424 913, 996
in re, 3 Crim. Law Mag. 855 417
v. Lerndon, 59 Ga. 523 953
v. Mall, 2 Roll. Rep. 263 161
v. Mason, 2 Stra. 816; 2 Ld. Ray. 1541 105
v. Matham, 4 D. & R. 738 970
People *v.* 57 Barb. 46 464, 465, 466
People *v.* 1 Cal. 9 76
People *v.* 59 Cal. 601 748
v. People, 1 Colo. 121 777
v. People, 2 (Man.) Mich. 415 568
People *v.* 9 Mich. 413 733
People *v.* 3 Weekly Dig. 162 471
R. *v.* 4 Cox C. C. 42 404
R. *v.* 4 C. & P. 569 253
R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 402; 6 C. & P. 151 112, 113
R. *v.* 2 Mood. C. C. 295 187
R. *v.* R. & R. 295 294
v. State, 52 Ala. 407 480
v. State, 55 Ala. 1 664
v. State, 62 Ala. 29 321
v. State, 63 Ala. 424 465
v. State, 79 Ala. 257 474
v. State, 81 Ala. 74 239
State *v.* 1 Bailey, 283 27, 533
v. State, 8 Col. 457 540
v. State, 49 Conn. 376 572, 805
State *v.* 5 Day, 175 932
State *v.* 7 Eng. 622 101
v. State, 59 Ga. 513 733
State *v.* 60 Ga. 430 549
v. State, 63 Ga. 90 814
v. State, 63 Ga. 168 252, 716
v. State, 64 Ga. 439 890
v. State, 67 Ga. 769 902
State *v.* 2 Harring. 532 91
State *v.* 5 Harring. 490 146, 148
v. State, 28 Ind. 321 110
v. State, 33 Ind. 159 179, 218
State *v.* 74 Ind. 557 269
v. State, 85 Ind. 183 158
v. State, 85 Ind. 553 742
State *v.* 46 Iowa, 662 220
State *v.* 2 Ired. 402 314, 412, 620, 680, 874
State *v.* 31 La. An. 406 875
v. State, 35 La. An. 1414 756
v. State, 2 Lea, 614 249
State *v.* 31 Me. 386 243
v. State, 28 Miss. 728 353, 369
v. State, 55 Miss. 410 664
v. State, 57 Miss. 822 244, 614 *a*

	SECTION
Smith *v.* State, 61 Miss. 754	363, 660, 672
State *v.* 53 Mo. 139	465
State *v.* 65 Mo. 314	863
State *v.* 71 Mo. 45	452
State *v.* 90 Mo. 57	545
State *v.* 63 N. C. 234	273
State *v.* 75 N. C. 306	561, 853
State *v.* 80 N. C. 410	350
State *v.* 10 Nev. 107	925
State *v.* 49 N. H. 155	383, 447
v. State, 41 N. J. L. 370	709
State *v.* 41 N. J. L. 598	502, 511
State *v.* 46 N. J. L. 491	745
State *v.* 1 N. & McC. 13	940
v. State, 8 Oh. 294	117
State *v.* Peck (Tenn.), 165	124
State *v.* 10 Rich. 341	798
State *v.* 6 R. I. 33	829
State *v.* 18 S. C. 149	737
v. State, 42 Tex. 444	707
v. State, 43 Tex. 103	798
v. State, 1 Tex. Ap. 408	700
v. State, 7 Tex. Ap. 382	209
v. State, 18 Tex. Ap. 399	167
v. State, 21 Tex. Ap. 277	571
v. State, 22 Tex. Ap. 196	711
v. State, 23 Tex. Ap. 350	465
State *v.* 24 Tex. Ap. 1	177
State *v.* 22 Vt. 74	294, 481
State *v.* 43 Vt. 324	466, 467
State *v.* 24 W. Va. 767	295, 296, 297, 884
State *v.* 24 W. Va. 802	837
U. S. *v.* 3 Blatch. 255	793
U. S. *v.* 4 Day, 121	317, 324
U. S. *v.* 2 Mason, 143	236, 282
v. U. S., 94 U. S. 97	774
Smurr *v.* State, 88 Ind. 504	710, 712
Smyth, Com. *v.* 11 Cush. 473	369
Sneed *v.* People, 38 Mich. 248	555
v. State, 5 Pike, 431	549, 550
Snell, in re, 31 Minn. 110	770, 1003
State *v.* 78 Mo. 240	534
Snelling, Com. *v.* 15 Pick. 321	157, 181 *a*, 704, 799, 830
R. *v.* Dears. 219; 22 Eng. L. & E. 597	187, 193
Snow, in re, 120 U. S. 274	474, 475, 994, 1010
State *v.* 30 La. An. 401	318
State *v.* 74 Me. 354	756, 762
v. State, 6 Tex. Ap. 274	273
Snowden, Com. *v.* 1 Brewst. 218	967
v. State, 8 Mo. 483	1007
Snyder, ex parte, 64 Mo. 58	37, 995
State *v.* 41 Ark. 227	220
v. State, 59 Ind. 105	294, 295
Snyder, State *v.* 20 Kans. 306	827, 832
State *v.* 50 N. H. 150	255, 470
U. S. *v.* 4 McCr. 618	211 *b*
Sobenson, State *v.* 32 Minn. 109	738
Solby, Com. *v.* 15 Weekly Notes, 392	860 *a*
Solliday, *v.* Com., 28 Penn. St. 13	420, 479, 485, 788
Solomon's case, 1 Abb. Pr. (N. S.) 347	29, 34, 36
Solomon *v.* Lawson, 8 Q. B. 825	181 *a*
State *v.* 6 Yerg. 360	773
Somerville, Com. *v.* 1 Va. Cas. 164	457
v. Richards, 37 Mich. 299	9
State *v.* 6 Tex. Ap. 433	273, 802
Sommers, State *v.* 3 Vt. 156	238
Sommersett *v.* Zellers, 2 Halst. 31	968
Somnier *v.* State, 33 La. An. 237	548
Son *v.* People, 12 Wend. 344	550
Soper, State *v.* 16 Me. 293	310, 874
Sopher, State *v.* 35 La. An. 976	369
Sarenson, State *v.* 32 Minn. 118	758
Sorrell, State *v.* 98 N. C. 738	293
Soto, People *v.* 49 Cal. 69	237
Souey, State *v.* 13 Lea, 472	709
Soule, State *v.* 20 Me. 19	280, 282
Southampton, R. *v.* 19 Q. B. D. 590	787
Southwell, People *v.* 46 Cal. 141	344
Southworth *v.* State, 5 Conn. 325	284
Spain *v.* State, 8 Baxt. 514	827
v. State, 55 Miss. 191	664
Spangler *v.* Com., 3 Binn. 533	183, 188
in re, 11 Mich. 298	980
Sparks *v.* Com., 9 Barr, 354	369
v. State, 59 Ala. 82	759
State *v.* 78 Ind. 166	261
State *v.* 27 Tex. 627	949
Sparling, R. *v.* 1 Str. 498	203
Sparrenberger *v.* State, 53 Ala. 481	363
Sparrow, State *v.* 3 Murph. 487	791
Spaulding, State *v.* 24 Kan. 1	652
State *v.* 34 Minn. 361	802
Spear, State *v.* 6 Mo. 644	435
State *v.* 13 R. I. 324	181 *a*
Speers *v.* Com., 17 Grat. 570	244, 250
Speight, State *v.* 69 N. C. 72	291, 292, 911
Speke, R. *v.* 3 Salk. 358	906
Spencely *v.* De Willot, 7 East, 108	849
Spencer, in re, 18 Alb. L. J. 153; 5 Sawyer, 195	524
R. *v.* 3 F. & F. 857	8
v. State, 50 Ala. 124	794, 798

SECTION

Spencer, State *v.* 38 Me. 30 25, 26
State *v.* 1 Zabr. 196 633, 654
Sperry *v.* Com., 9 Leigh, 623 511, 540
Spicer *v.* People, 11 Ill. Ap. 294 409
R. *v.* 1 C. & K. 699 237
v. State, 69 Ala. 159 551
Spier's case, 1 Dev. 491 441, 447, 495, 513
Spies *v.* Illinois, 123 U. S. 131 90, 641, 644, 693, 770 *a*
Spigener *v.* State, 62 Ala. 383 378, 613, 672
Spilman, Com. *v.* 124 Mass. 327 176, 196
Spink, in re, 19 Fed. Rep. 631 981
Spooner, People *v.* 1 Denio, 343 801
Spragg, R. *v.* 2 Burr. 930; 1 W. Bl. 209 548
Sprague, People *v.* 53 Cal. 422 569
People *v.* 54 Cal. 92 550
Spratt *v.* State, 8 Mo. 247 363, 369
Springer *v.* State, 34 Ga. 379 661
Springfield, Com. *v.* 7 Mass. 9 139, 142, 280
Sprinkles, Com. *v.* 4 Leigh, 650 314
Sprouce *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 375 636, 815
Sprouse *v.* Com., 81 Va. 374 251, 253
Spurbeck, State *v.* 44 Iowa, 667 602
Squire, State *v.* 10 N. H. 558 376
Squires, Com. *v.* 1 Met. 258 261, 464, 469
State *v.* 1 Tyler, 147 176
Stacey, Com. *v.* 8 Phila. 617 181 *a*
Stacy, in re, 10 Johns. 328 986, 989
Staeger *v.* Com., 103 Penn. St. 469 261, 289
Staff, in re, 63 Wis. 285 733, 996
Stafford, Com. *v.* 12 Cush. 619 125
Stagner *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 540 652
Staker, State *v.* 3 Ind. 570 394
Stalls *v.* State, 28 Ala. 25 664
Stalmaker, State *v.* 2 Brev. 1 612
Stamper *v.* Griffin, 12 Ga. 450 568
Stanbury, R. *v.* L. & C. 128 92, 139
Standifer, State *v.* 5 Port. 523 466, 468, 471
Stanford, People *v.* 64 Cal. 27 209, 854
Stanglein *v.* State, 17 Ohio St. 453 238
Stanley, ex parte, 4 Nev. 113 1006
People *v.* 47 Cal. 113 934
290 467, 471
v. Sutherland, 54 Ind. 339 847
State *v.* 33 Iowa, 526 696
State *v.* 4 Jones (N. C.) 290 467, 471

SECTION

Stanton *v.* Beadle, 4 T. R. 473 846
R. *v.* 5 Cox C. C. 324 467
v. State, 13 Ark. 318 712, 836
State *v.* 1 Ired. 424 220, 788, 895
Staples *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 136 8
Star Route Cases, 2 Crim. Law Mag. 69 89
Star Route Cases (Newspaper Rep.) 366
Starnes, State *v.* 97 N. C. 423 866
State, ex parte, 76 Ala. 492 996
Statham *v.* State, 41 Ga. 507 383
Staton, U. S. *v.* 1 Flip. 310 210
Staup *v.* Com., 74 Penn. St. 458 635, 654–5, 774
Stazey *v.* State, 58 Ind. 514 269
St. Clair, Com. *v.* 1 Grat. 556 350
People *v.* 55 Cal. 524 273
People *v.* 56 Cal. 406 273
Stead, R. *v.* 8 T. R. 142 125
Steady *v.* State, 5 Cold. 306 709
Stearns *v.* People, 21 Wend. 409 405
Stebbins, State *v.* 29 Conn. 463 87, 771
Stedman, R. *v.* 2 Ld. Ray. 1307 87
State *v.* 7 Port. 495 231, 247, 281, 465
Steel *v.* People, 45 Ill. 152 590
R. *v.* L. R. 2 Q. B. D. 40 87
Steele *v.* State, 1 Tex. 142 363
Steely, State *v.* 65 Mo. 218 614, 672
Stegner, State *v.* 72 Iowa, 13 597
Stein *v.* State, 37 Ala. 123 164
Stell *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 59 733, 751
Stephen *v.* State, 11 Ga. 225 291
Stephens, Com. *v.* 1 Mass. 203 167
v. Com., 38 Mich. 739 656
v. Hill, 10 M. & W. 28 970
People *v.* 19 N. Y. 549; 4 Park. C. R. 396 549, 802, 803, 815, 819
People *v.* 38 Mich. 156 649, 683
v. State, 51 Ga. 236 756
State *v.* 71 Mo. 535 414
v. State, 14 Ohio, 386 302
State *v.* 13 S. C. 285 435 *a*
v. State, Wright (Oh.), 73 167
Stephenson, State *v.* 83 Ind. 246 161
v. State, 110 Ind. 358 693, 715
Stereoscope Co., U. S. *v.* Sprague, 467 746
Sternack *v.* Brooks, 7 Daly (N. Y.) 142 8

SECTION

Stetson, People *v.* 4 Barb. 151 215
U. S. *v.* 3 W. & M. 164 292
Stetter's case, MS. 535
Stettinus, U. S. *v.* 5 Cranch C. C. 573 810
Stevens *v.* Fassett, 27 Me. 266 438
v. People, 1 Hill (N. Y.), 261 935
People *v.* 13 Wend. 341 440, 453
v. State, 18 Fla. 903 229
State *v.* 62 Me. 284 189, 252
v. State, 14 Ohio, 386 315
Stevenson, R. *v.* 2 Leach, 546 511, 718
v. Stiles, 2 Pen. (N. J.) 543 660
Stevick *v.* Com., 78 Penn. St. 460 289, 291
Stevsisinger *v.* State, 61 Iowa, 623 278
Stewart *v.* Blaine, 1 McArth. 453 964
v. Com., 28 Grat. 950 452
v. Com., 117 Penn. St. 239 560
v. Com., 4 S. & R. 194 183, 188
People *v.* 7 Cal. 140 664, 810
People *v.* 64 Cal. 60 478, 672
People *v.* 1 Idaho, N. S. 546 526
v. People, 23 Mich. 63 649, 653, 750
v. State, 8 Eng. (13 Ark.) 720 688, 693
v. State, 58 Ga. 577 293
v. State, 111 Ind. 554 243
v. State, 62 Md. 413 188
v. State, 50 Miss. 587 617
State *v.* 89 N. C. 563 733
State *v.* 91 N. C. 566 745
v. State, 5 Ohio, 242 247, 261, 464, 465
v. State, 1 Ohio St. 66 683
v. State, 15 Ohio St. 161 518, 661
State *v.* 11 Oregon, 52 456
State *v.* 26 S. C. 125 700, 824
State *v.* 59 Vt. 273 387
v. State, 4 Tex. Ap. 527 756
State *v.* 60 Wis. 584; 19 N. W. Rep. 429 27, 30, 37
U. S. *v.* 2 Dall. 343 75
Stickney, People *v.* 50 Mich. 99 414
Stiles, State *v.* 40 Iowa, 148 151
v. Tilford, 10 Wend. 338 801
Stimpson *v.* Pond, 2 Curtis C. C. 502 316
State *v.* 45 Me. 608 291
Stimson, State *v.* 4 Zabr. 478 164, 189, 213, 216, 218

SECTION

Stinson *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 31 273
St. John, R. *v.* 9 C. & P. 40 145
St. Louis *v.* State, 8 Neb. 406 866
St. Louis Street Foundry, 6 Wall. 770 525
St. Paul's, Cov. Garden, R. *v.* 7 Q. B. 232 6
Stockbridge, Com. *v.* 11 Mass. 279 280, 282
Stocker, R. *v.* 1 Salk. 342, 371 161
Stockham, People *v.* 1 Park. C. R. 424 309
Stockton *v.* State, 25 Tex. 772 115
Stockwell *v.* U. S. 17 Wall. 531 89
Stoddard, Com. *v.* 9 Allen, 280 111
Stokely *v.* Com., 1 Va. Cas. 330 974
State *v.* 16 Minn. 282 661
Stokes, People *v.* N. Y. 1872 555
People *v.* 53 N. Y. 164 632, 778, 801
People *v.* 66 N. Y. 342 942
R. *v.* 1 Den. C. C. 307 273
v. State, 4 Baxt. 47 802
Stollenwerk *v.* State, 55 Ala. 142 209
Stone *v.* Blackburn, 4 Esp. 37 566
Com. *v.* 3 Gray, 453 93, 125
v. Marsh, 6 B. & C. 551 453
v. People, 2 Scam. 326 505, 509, 517, 724
People *v.* 9 Wend. 182 387
R. *v.* 6 T. R. 530 718, 728
v. State, 4 Humph. 27 814, 815, 827
v. State, 30 Ind. 115 91, 104
v. State, Spencer, 404 292
Stonecifer, People *v.* 6 Cal. 405 693
Stonum, State *v.* 62 Mo. 596 712
Storey *v.* People, 79 Ill. 45 958
v. State, 71 Ala. 330 716
Storro *v.* State, 3 Mo. 9 133, 910
Story *v.* Hammond, 4 Ohio, 376 453
Stoughton, R. *v.* 2 Str. 900 161
State *v.* 51 Vt. 362 614 *a*
Stout, Com. *v.* 7 B. Mon. 247 164
v. Com., 11 S. & R. 177 131, 260
People *v.* 4 Park. C. R. 71 631
v. State, 93 Ind. 150 354
v. State, 96 Ind. 88, 407 810
State *v.* 112 Ind. 245 162
Stow, Com. *v.* 1 Mass. 54 167
Stowell, Com. *v.* 9 Met. 572 876
v. State, 60 Iowa, 535 793
U. S. *v.* 2 Curtis C. C. 153 383, 386, 447
Stoyell, State *v.* 70 Me. 560 781
Strader *v.* State, 91 Ind. 376 272
Strafford *v.* Jackson, 14 N. H. 16 922
Strahan, R. *v.* 7 Cox C. C. 85 419
Strahl, ex parte, 16 Iowa, 369 996
Straker *v.* Graham, 4 M. & W. 721 847

SECTION

Strander, Com. *v.* 11 W. Va. 745; S. C., reversed by Sup. Ct U. S. 1880 783 *a*, 844
Strang, ex parte, 21 Ohio St. 610 996
Strange *v.* State, 110 Ind. 354 369
Strangford, Com. *v.* 112 Mass. 289 208
Stratton *v.* People, 5 Col. 276 664, 683
Strauder *v.* West Va., 100 U. S. 303 783 *a*
Straugham *v.* State, 16 Ark. 37 314
Strauss *v.* State, 58 Miss. 53 601
Streek, R. *v.* 2 C. & P. 413 519, 544, 549, 718
Street *v.* State, 43 Miss. 1 982, 1007
State *v.* Tayl. 158 167
Strickland, State *v.* 10 S. C. 191 279, 290, 291
State *v.* 13 Tex. Ap. 364 589
Stringer *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 520 164
Strong, People *v.* 46 Cal. 302 555
Strother, Com. *v.* 1 Va. Cas. 186 368
Strond, R. *v.* 1 C. & K. 187; 2 Mood. C. C. 270 111, 112, 113
Stroulger, R. *v.* 17 Q. B. D. 327 760
Struble, State *v.* 71 Iowa, 11 801
Stuart, Com. *v.* 28 Grat. 950 465, 788, 895
v. People, 42 Mich. 255 70
v. People, 3 Scam. 395, 405 958, 974
State *v.* 61 Iowa, 263 728 *a*
Stubbs *v.* State, 49 Miss. 716 549, 550
Stumbo, State *v.* 26 Mo. 306 866
Stupp, in re, 11 Blatchf. 124 46
12 Blatchf. 501 57
Sturge, R. *v.* 3 E. & B. 734; 23 L. J. M. C. 172 90
Sturgeon *v.* Gray, 96 Ind. 166 940
Sturm *v.* State, 74 Ind. 335 601
Sturoc, Matter of, 48 N. H. 428 958
Sturtivant, Com. *v.* 117 Mass. 139 571
Sudbury, R. *v.* 12 Mod. 262; 1 Ld. Ray. 484; 2 Salk. 593 305
Suggs, State *v.* 89 N. C. 527 816, 817
Sullings *v.* Shakespeare, 46 Mich. 408 693
Sullivan, Com. *v.* 6 Gray, 478 97
Com. *v.* 104 Mass. 552 290, 295
v. People, 31 Mich. 1 794
R. *v.* 8 A. & E. 831 509, 846, 886
State *v.* 66 Ala. 48 810
State *v.* 70 Ala. 16 733
State *v.* 35 La. An. 844 90
v. State, 47 N. J. L. 151 560

SECTION

Sullivan *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 462 146, 265
Summers, ex parte, 5 Ired. 149 949, 974
R. *v.* L. Rep. 1 C. C. 182 938
Superintendent of Prisons, Com. *v.* 4 Brewst. 320
Superintendent of Prisons, Com. *v.* 97 Penn. St. 210 328
Superior Ct. N. Y. People *v.* 10 Wend. 285 865
Surratt *v.* State, 45 Miss. 601 240, 241
Sutcliffie *v.* State, 18 Ohio, 469 457, 469, 725
State *v.* 4 Strobh. 372 946 *a*
Sutfin, State *v.* 22 W. Va. 771 490, 518, 545, 711
Sutherland, Com. *v.* 109 Mass. 342 460, 480
Sutton *v.* Fox, 55 Wis. 531 669
R. *v.* 5 B. & Ad. 52 457
R. *v.* 8 B. & C. 417; 2 M. & R. 406 519, 609, 669, 845, 846
R. *v.* 4 M. & S. 542 224, 828, 833
State *v.* 4 Gill, 494 261, 291, 464
State *v.* 10 R. I. 159 614
Swafford, State *v.* 1 Lea, 274 426
Swaim, State *v.* 97 N. C. 462 120
Swain, R. *v.* 2 M. & Rob. 112 661, 668
Swan *v.* Saunders, 44 L. T. N. S. 424 869
Swancoat *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 105 125, 471
Swann *v.* State, 64 Md. 424 779
Swart *v.* Kimball, 43 Mich. 27 1
Swartzbaugh *v.* People, 85 Ill. 457 238
Swearingen, ex parte, 13 S. C. 74 34
Sweedon *v.* State, 19 Ark. 205 540, 541
Sweeny *v.* Baker, 13 W. Va. 158 669
People *v.* 55 Mich. 586 287, 293, 614 *a*
Sweetsir, State *v.* 53 Me. 438 402
Sweney, Com. *v.* 10 S. & R. 173 167, 170
v. State, 35 Ark. 585 810
State *v.* 37 La. An. 1 856
Swenson, People *v.* 49 Cal. 388 760
Swepson, State *v.* 79 N. C. 632 451
State *v.* 81 N. C. 571 410, 483
Swift Run Gap Turnpike Co., Com. *v.* 2 Va. Cas. 362 100

SECTION

Swift, State *v.* 14 La. An. 827 341
Swinney, Com. *v.* 1 Va. Cas. 146 190, 191
v. State, 8 S. & M. 576 246, 465
Swope, State *v.* 72 Mo. 399 29, 36
Sydam's case, 20 Alb. L. J. 230; Chic. Leg. News, Dec. 13, 1879 31, 37
Sykes *v.* Dunbar, 2 Selw. N. P. 1059 379
Sylvester, Com. *v.* 6 P. L. J. 283; Brightly R. 331 288, 910
v. State, 72 Ala. 201 465
Symonds, Com. *v.* 2 Mass. 163 243
People *v.* 22 Cal. 348 823
State *v.* 36 Me. 128 341, 350, 376
Szudarskie, R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 429 181

T.

Tabart *v.* Tipper, 1 Camp. 350 180
Tabler *v.* State, 34 Ohio St. 127 549, 712
Tabor *v.* People, 90 N. Y. 248; S. C. 25 Hun, 638 775
Tackett *v.* State, 3 Yerg. 392 992
Taff *v.* State, 39 Com. 82 918
Taggart, R. *v.* 1 C. & P. 201 312
State *v.* 38 Me. 298 369
Taintor *v.* Taylor, 36 Conn. 242 (*see* Taylor *v.* Taintor) 33
Taliaferro *v.* State, 40 Tex. 523 712
Tall, State *v.* 56 Wis. 577 7
Tallman, U. S. *v.* 10 Blatchf. 21 340, 344, 350
Tally, State *v.* 23 La. An. 677 810, 830
Tancock, R. *v.* 13 Cox C. C. 217; 13 Eng. R. 659 465, 471
Tankersley, State *v.* 6 Lea, 582 358 *a*, 363
Tannahill, State *v.* 4 Kans. 117 354
Tanner, Com. *v.* 5 Bush, 316 220
People *v.* 2 Cal. 257 664
State *v.* 38 La. An. 307 829
Tannet, R. *v.* R. & R. 351 119, 1010
Tarble, in re, 13 Wall. 397 980
Tarbox, Com. *v.* 1 Cush. 66 167, 177
v. State, 38 Ohio St. 581 779, 802
Tarleton, ex parte, 2 Ala. 35 770
Tarr, Com. *v.* 4 Allen, 315 797
Tate *v.* State, 46 Ga. 148 793
Tatlow, State *v.* 34 Kans. 80 813
Tatman, State *v.* 59 Iowa, 471 514
Tatum *v.* State, 66 Ala. 465 90
v. State, 59 Ga. 638 212 *a*

SECTION

Tannt, State *v.* 16 Minn. 109 178, 207
Tayloe, ex parte, 5 Cow. 12, 39 75, 76, 1005
Taylor, Com. *v.* 5 Cush. 605 167
Com. *v.* 29 Grat. 780 599 *a*
Com. *v.* 113 Mass. 1 107
Com. *v.* 11 Phila. 386 81
v. Com. 2 Va. Cas. 94 142
v. Com., 77 Va. 692 601
v. Greely, 3 Greenl. 204 847
People *v.* 3 Denio, 91 151, 156, 166, 167, 405, 486
R. *v.* 3 B. & C. 502; 5 D. & R. 422 462, 486
R. *v.* 1 C. & K. 213; 7 D. & R. 622 194, 985
R. *v.* L. R. 1 C. C. R. 194; 11 Cox C. C. 261 466
R. *v.* 13 Cox C. C. 77 571
State *v.* 48 Ala. 180 602
State *v.* 2 Bailey, 49 464
State *v.* 3 Brev. 243 202 *a*
v. State, 44 Ga. 263 209
State *v.* 1 Hawks, 462 457
v. State, 6 Humph. 285 237, 276
State *v.* 15 Kans. 420 109
State *v.* 20 Kans. 643 836
State *v.* 27 La. An. 393 906
State *v.* 31 La. An. 851 321
v. State, 34 La. An. 978 446, 773
v. State, 11 Lea, 708 693, 696, 856
v. State, 11 Lea, 709 517, 588, 696
State *v.* 64 Mo. 358 844, 845
v. State, 84 N. C. 773 503, 740
State *v.* 3 Oregon, 10 246, 465
v. State, 35 Tex. 98 447
v. State, 42 Tex. 504 830
v. State, 5 Tex. Ap. 569 756
v. Taintor, 16 Wall. 366 28, 30, 32, 33
U. S. *v.* 11 Fed. Rep. 470 733
U. S. *v.* 3 McCrary, 500 812
Teahan, State *v.* 50 Conn. 92 251
Teal, R. *v.* 11 East, 307; 1 Sess. Cas. 428 802, 893
Teas *v.* State, 7 Humph. 174 354
Teat *v.* State, 53 Miss. 439 468, 504
Teft *v.* Com., 8 Leigh, 721 92
Teissedre *v.* State, 30 Kans. 876 358
Tempest, R. *v.* 1 F. & F. 381 820
Temple, Com. *v.* 38 Vt. 37 125, 126
State *v.* 3 Fairf. 214 271
Templeman, R. *v.* 1 Salk. 55 550, 945
Tennessee *v.* Davis, 100 U. S. 257 783 *a*
Tenney, Com. *v.* 97 Mass. 50 456, 471
ex parte, 23 N. H. 162 958

SECTION

Terraz's case, 14 Cox C. C. 153 38, 53, 58
L. R. 4 Ex. D. 63 54
Terrel *v.* State, 41 Tex. 463 371
Terrell *v.* State, 9 Ga. 58 350, 766
Territory *v.* McFarlane, 1 Martin, 224 271
Terry, Com. *v.* 114 Mass. 263 151, 154
People *v.* 108 N. Y. 1 996
v. State, 17 Ga. 204 712
State *v.* 30 Mo. 368 337, 338
v. State, 15 Tex. Ap. 66 363
Testerman, State *v.* 68 Mo. 408 132, 293, 771
Testick's case, 1 East P. C. 181, *n.*; 2 East P. C. 925 180, 185
Texas *v.* Gaines, 2 Woods, 342 783 *a*
Thayer, Com. *v.* 5 Met. 246 161
v. People, 2 Dougl. (Mich.) 418 345
Thayers, People *v.* 1 Park. C. R. 395 810
Thedge *v.* State, 83 Ind. 126 756
Thetge *v.* State, 83 Ind. 126 810
Thibeau, State *v.* 30 Vt. 100 91
Thomas *v.* Ashland, 12 Ohio St. 127 9
Com. *v.* 8 Grat. 637 871
Com. *v.* 22 Grat. 912 938
v. Com., 2 Robins. 795 378
in re, 12 Blatch. 370 50
People *v.* 3 Hill N. Y. 169 793
v. People, 113 Ill. 531 287
v. People, 39 Mich. 309 565
People *v.* 67 N. Y. 218 621, 632, 633, 694, 931
R. *v.* 3 D. & C. 290 386
R. *v.* 2 Mood. C. C. 16 194
v. State, 58 Ala. 368 87
State *v.* 47 Conn. 546 810
v. State, 52 Ga. 509 859
v. State, 67 Ga. 460 608
State *v.* 71 Ga. 44 139
v. State, 5 How. (Miss.) 20 429
v. State, 103 Ind. 419 177
State *v.* 53 Iowa, 214 289
v. State, 34 La. An. 1084 715
State *v.* 30 La. An. Pt. I. 301 317, 318
State *v.* 2 McCord, 527 213
v. State, 6 Miss. 20 354
v. State, 61 Miss. 60 588, 853
v. State, 78 Mo. 327 813
State *v.* 8 Richards. 295 319
State *v.* 14 Richards. 163 910
v. State, 4 Tex. 6 78
v. State, 40 Tex. 36 466
Thomason, State *v.* 71 N. C. 146 189

SECTION

Thomasson *v.* State, 22 Ga. 499 396
U. S. *v.* 4 Biss. 336 528
Thompson's case, 8 Grat. 638 841, 842
Thompson *v.* Barkley, 27 Penn. St. 263 560
Com. *v.* 11 Allen, 23 164
Com. *v.* 8 Grat. 638 815, 831, 854, 869
v. Com., 20 Grat. 724 279, 369
Com. *v.* 4 Leigh, 667 351
Com. *v.* 3 Litt. 284 447
Com. *v.* 108 Mass. 461 226
Com. *v.* 116 Mass. 346 245
Com. *v.* 1 Va. Cas. 319 513
ex parte, 1 Flip. 507 981
ex parte, 93 Ill. 89 996, 1010
v. Ogleby, 42 Iowa, 598 983
People *v.* 4 Cal. 238 590, 593, 913
People *v.* 28 Cal. 214 290
v. People, 96 Ill. 158 159
People *v.* 2 Wheel. C. C. 473 513
R. *v.* 2 T. R. 18 6
R. *v.* 9 W. R. 203 465, 467
v. State, 25 Ala. 41 90, 310
v. State, 48 Ala. 165 117
v. State, 70 Ala. 26 742
v. State, 37 Ark. 408 161
v. State, 9 Ga. 210 350
v. State, 24 Ga. 297 646, 844
v. State, 54 Ga. 577 859
v. State, 55 Ga. 47 813
State *v.* 3 Hawks, 613 383
State *v.* 9 Iowa, 188 647, 653
State *v.* 44 Iowa, 399 25
State *v.* 46 Iowa, 699 927
State *v.* 13 La. An. 515 309
v. State, 51 Mass. 353 150
State *v.* 32 Minn. 144 700
State *v.* 49 Mo. 188 6
v. State, 6 Neb. 102 438
State *v.* 95 N. C. 596 737
State *v.* 2 Strobh. 12 232, 288
v. State, 25 Tex. (Sup.) 395 75
v. State, 30 Tex. 356 251
v. State, 37 Tex. 121 566
v. State, 9 Tex. Ap. 649 510
v. State, 15 Tex. Ap. 39 279
v. State, 19 Tex. Ap. 594 652, 694

SECTION

Thompson, State *v.* 21 W. Va. 741 711, 798
U. S. *v.* 6 McLean, 56 91, 93
Thomson *v.* People, 24 Ill. 60 644
Thorn, R. *v.* 1 Leach, 396 535
Thorne, State *v.* 81 N. C. 558 235, 236, 282, 927
U. S. *v.* 15 Fed. Rep. 739 328
Thornton *v.* State, 13 Ired. 256 447
State *v.* 37 Mo. 360 438, 440, 481, 483
State *v.* 2 Rice Dig. 109 271
v. State, 56 Vt. 35 759
Thrasher, Com. *v.* 11 Gray, 57 623, 629, 668
State *v.* 79 Me. 17 318
Thurlow, Com. *v.* 24 Pick, 374 240
Thurmond, State *v.* 37 Tex. 340 974
Thursfield, R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 269 565
Thurston, People *v.* 5 Cal. 69 341
State *v.* 2 McMull. 382 252, 470
Thurtell *v.* Beaumont, 1 Bingham, 339 870
Tichborne case, 1879 784
v. Mostyn, Law. Rep. 7 Eq. 55 958
Ticket, State *v.* 13 Nev. 502 798
Tidwell, State *v.* 70 Ala. 33 696, 798, 810
Tilghman, State *v.* 11 Ired. 513 823, 831, 836
Tilladam *v.* Bristol, 4 N. & M. 144 323
Tillery, State *v.* 1 N. & McC. 9 213
Tilley, State *v.* 8 Baxt. 381 391 *a*
v. State, 21 Fla. 242 369
Tillotson, State *v.* 7 Jones, 114 513
Tilton, Com. *v.* 8 Met. 232 418
v. State, 52 Ga. 478 750
Timmons *v.* State, 56 Miss. 786 746, 752
Tindal *v.* Nichols, 20 Mo. 326 379
Tindall, State *v.* 10 Richards. 212 828
Tinder, People *v.* 19 Cal. 539 361
Tiner *v.* State, 44 Tex. 128 8
Tinney, State *v.* 26 La. An. 460 369
Tinsdale, People *v.* 10 Abb. Pr. N. S. 374 254
Tiot, in re, 48 L. T. N. S. 120 51
Tipper *v.* Com., 1 Metc. (Ky.) 6 759
Tipton, State *v.* 1 Blackf. 166 949
v. State, 2 Yerg. 542 271
Tisdale, State *v.* 2 Dev. & B. 159 390, 431, 441, 452
Titus's case, 8 Ben. 412 993
Titus *v.* State, 49 N. J. L. 36 220, 231
Tivnan, R. *v.* 5 B. & S. 645 45, 72
Toakley, R. *v.* 10 Cox C. C. 406 573
Tobin, Com. *v.* 125 Mass. 123 819
v. People, 101 Ill. 121 865, 869

SECTION

Tobin *v.* People, 104, Ill. 565 737
Tod, U. S. *v.* 25 Fed. Rep. 815 89
Todd *v.* Gray, 16 S. C. 635 660
v. State, 25 Ind. 212 881
Toland, Com. *v.* 11 Phila. 433 860
Tolever, State *v.* 5 Ired. 452 146
Tom Tong, ex parte, 108 U. S. 556 1010
Tombes *v.* Ethrington, 1 Lev. 120 528
Tomlinson, People *v.* 35 Cal. 503 161, 251
Tompkins, People *v.* 1 Park. C. R. 224 991
v. State, 17 Ga. 356 293, 294
State *v.* 71 Mo. 613 828
v. State, 4 Tex. Ap. 161 161
U. S. *v.* 2 Cranch C. C. 46 337
Tompson, Com. *v.* 2 Cush. 551 111
Toney, ex parte, 11 Mo. 662 779 *b*
v. State, 60 Ala. 97 771
State *v.* 13 Tex. 74 96
Tongate, ex parte, 31 Ind. 370 922
Tooel *v.* Com., 11 Leigh, 714 672, 814, 815, 816
Tootle, State *v.* 2 Harring. 541 237
Tower *v.* Com., 111 Mass. 117 142
Com. *v.* 8 Met. (Mass.) 527 418, 940
Towle *v.* State, 3 Fla. 202 358
State *v.* 42 N. H. 540 963, 999
Town, State *v.* Wright's R. 79 664
Townley *v.* State, 3 Harring. 311 283
Townsend, Com. *v.* 5 Allen, 216 520, 719
People *v.* 3 Hill (N. Y.), 479 475, 793
v. Smith, 47 Wis. 423 27
State *v.* 2 Harring. 543 465, 471
State *v.* 5 Harring. 48 77
State *v.* 1 Houst. 337 212 *a*
State *v.* 86 N. C. 676 167, 168
v. State, 5 Tex. Ap. 574 90
Tracy, Com. *v.* 5 Met. 536 29
ex parte, 25 Vt. 93 541
Trafford, R. *v.* 1 B. & Ad. 874 301
Trainor, Com. *v.* 123 Mass. 414 118
Traube *v.* State, 56 Miss. 154 746
Travers, Com. *v.* 11 Allen, 260 125
People *v.* 73 Cal. 580 752
Traviss *v.* Com., 106 Penn. St. 362 634
Trehearne, R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 298 121, 318

SECTION

Tremaine, R. *v.* 7 D. & R. 684; 5 B. & C. 254 845, 846, 886
Trexler *v.* State, 19 Ala. 21 159
Trezevant, State *v.* 20 S. C. 363 363
Trickey, Com. *v.* 13 Allen, 559 471
Trim *v.* Com., 18 Grat. 983 827, 835
Trimble *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 143 90
Trimmer, Com. *v.* 1 Mass. 476 306 *a*
Com. *v.* 84 Penn. St. 65 402, 403, 456, 460
Trinidad *v.* Simpson, 5 Col. 65 669
Trittip *v.* State, 10 Ind. 343 441
Troia, in re, 64 Cal. 152 1007
Trout, U. S. *v.* 4 Biss. 105 283
v. State, 111 Ind. 499 158
Troutman's case, 4 Zabr. 634 33
Trowbridge *v.* State, 74 Ga. 431 742
Trueman, in re, 44 Mo. 181 995
R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 727 290, 294, 297
Tryer, Res. *v.* 3 Yeates, 451 220, 232
Tryon, Com. *v.* 99 Mass. 442 306 *a*
Tuck, Com. *v.* 20 Pick. 356 243, 244, 255, 383, 447, 448, 760
Tucker's case, 8 Mass. 286 345, 348
Tucker *v.* State, 57 Ga. 503 812
State *v.* 20 Iowa, 508 363, 388
v. State, 6 Tex. Ap. 251 255
Tudor, State *v.* 5 Day, 329 793
Tufts, State *v.* 56 N. H. 137 383
Tuller, State *v.* 34 Conn. 280, 281, 292 125, 290, 292, 295, 518, 844, 911
Tullis *v.* Fleming, 69 Ind. 15 29
Tully *v.* Com., 13 Bush, 142 325
v. Com., 4 Met. 357 265
in re, 22 Blatch. 213; 20 Fed. Rep. 812 39, 47
v. People, 67 N. Y. 15 236
Turbeville *v.* State, 56 Miss. 793 605
Turk *v.* State, 2 Hammond, 7 Ohio, pt. ii. 240 363
Turley *v.* State, 3 Humph. 323 237
Turnbull, State *v.* 78 Me. 392 221
Turner's case, 5 Ohio, 542 417
Turner, Com. *v.* 8 Bush, 1 220, 269
v. Com., 86 Penn. St. 54 711
ex parte, 45 Mo. 331 932
ex parte, 3 Woods, 603 981
v. People, 33 Mich. 363 120
R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 239 235
v. State, 40 Ala. 21 401, 457
State *v.* 6 Baxt. 201 802, 842
v. State, 70 Ga. 767 577, 597
v. State, 102 Ind. 425 208
v. State, 4 Lea, 206 577
v. State, 1 Ohio St. 422 164
Turnpike, Com. *v.* 2 Va. Cas. 361 230
Turns, Com. *v.* 6 Met. 423 717
Turpin *v.* State, 4 Blackf. 72 305

SECTION

Turpin *v.* State, 80 Ind. 148 541, 700
v. State, 55 Md. 462 612, 613, 617, 620
v. State, 19 Ohio St. 540 163
Tuska, U. S. *v.* 14 Blatch. 5 351
Tutchin, R. *v.* 5 St. Tr. 532 181 *a*
Tuttle *v.* Com., 2 Gray, 505 937
v. State, 6 Baxt. 556 545
v. State, 6 Tex. Ap. 556 841, 856
Tweed *v.* Liscomb, 60 N. Y. 5 605, 910, 953, 994, 996 *b*
People *v.* 50 How. Pr. 262 344
Tweedy *v.* Jarvis, 27 Conn. 42 102
State *v.* 11 Iowa, 350 465
Twiggs, State *v.* 1 Wins. (N. C.) 142 926
Twitchell, Com. *v.* 4 Cush. 74 251
Twitty, State *v.* 2 Hawks, 248 167
State *v.* 4 Hawks, 193 533
Two Calf, ex parte, 11 Neb. 221 328
Twohig, ex parte, 13 Nev. 302 996
Twombly, Com. *v.* 10 Pick. 480 672
Tyler, Doe *v.* 6 Bing. 561 801
ex parte, 64 Cal. 434 955
People *v.* 36 Cal. 522 570
Tyra *v.* Com., 2 Metc. (Ky.) 1 733

U.

Udderzook, Com. *v.* 76 Penn St. 340 828
Ulrich *v.* People, 39 Mich. 245 649, 712
Ulriel, U. S. *v.* 3 Dill. 535 159
Underwood, in re, 30 Mich. 502 994
State *v.* 2 Ala. 745 754
v. State, 6 Ired. 96 802
State *v.* 75 Mo. 230 9
v. State, 76 Mo. 630 793, 827
State *v.* 64 N. C. 599, 600 528
State *v.* 77 N. C. 502 307
Union Ins. Co. *v.* Cheever, 36 Ohio St. 201 571
Unknown, Com. *v.* 6 Gray, 489 222
Upchurch, State *v.* 9 Ired. 455 261
Updegraph *v.* Com., 6 S. & R. 5 232
v. Com., 11 S. & R. 394 203
Upstone *v.* People, 109 Ill. 169 793
Upton, State *v.* 1 Dev. 513 119
State *v.* 20 Mo. 397 841
Urbyn, R. *v.* 2 Saunders R. (Williams's ed.) 308 703
Useful Man. Co., State *v.* 42 N. J. L. 504 94
Utley, State *v.* 82 N. C. 556 159

V.

SECTION

Vahl, State *v.* 20 Tex. 779 353
Vail, People *v.* 6 Abb. (N. Y.) Sel. Ca. 206 548
Vaise *v.* Delaval, 1 Term. Rep. 11 847
Valencia, People *v.* 43 Cal. 552 290, 304, 710
Valentine, State *v.* 6 Yerg. 533 261
Valesco, State *v.* 9 Tex. Ap. 76 237
Vallandigham's Trial, Pamph. 5 West L. Month. 37 997
Vallandingham, ex parte, 1 Wall. 243 997
Valle *v.* State, 9 Tex. Ap. 57 882
Van Aernam's case, 3 Blatch. 160 57
Vananken *v.* Bremer, 1 Southard, 364 608
Vanatta *v.* State, 31 Ind. 210 87
Van Boven's case, 9 Ad. & El. N. S. 676, 1003
Van Buskirk, State *v.* 59 Ind. 384 378, 380
Van Campen, ex parte, 2 Ben. 419 73
Vance *v.* Com., 2 Va. Cas. 162 592, 602, 793, 844
Vandercomb, R. *v.* 2 Leach, 708, 818 294, 456, 488
Vanderkarr *v.* State, 51 Ind. 91 354
Vandermark *v.* People, 47 Ill. 122 102, 117
Vanderpoel, State *v.* 39 Ohio St. 273 49
Vandervelpen, in re, 14 Blatch. 137 57
Van Duzen *v.* Howe, 21 N. Y. 531 453
Vandyke *v.* Dare, 1 Bailey, 65 93
Vane's case, 1 Sid. 85; 1 Keble, 384 772
Van Hagan, ex parte, 25 Ohio St. 426 994, 995
Van Hooen, in re, 4 Dill. 411 51
Van Hook, State *v.* 88 Mo. 105 700
Vanhook *v.* State, 12 Tex. 252 344, 350
Van Horne, People *v.* 8 Barb. 158 76, ,447, 448
Van Houten, State *v.* 37 Mo. 357 397
Van Hoven, ex parte, 4 Dill. 411 50
Van Keuren, People *v.* 5 Park. C. R. 66 471
Van Matre, State *v.* 49 Mo. 268 733
Van Meter *v.* People, 60 Ill. 168 595
Vann, State *v.* 82 N. C. 631 672
Van Santvord, People *v.* 9 Cow. 660 120, 318
Vansickle, Com. *v.* 1 Brightly, 69 232, 810
Van Tuyl, Com. *v.* 1 Metc. (Ky.) 1 810

SECTION

Vanvickle *v.* State, 22 Tex. Ap. 625 94
Van Wyck, People *v.* 2 Caines, 333 548
Varnadoe *v.* State, 67 Ga. 768 590
Varnes *v.* State, 20 Tex. Ap. 107 505
Varney, Com. *v.* 10 Cush. 402 109, 167
Varnum, People *v.* 53 Cal. 630 446
Vasquez, People *v.* 49 Cal. 860 694
People *v.* 16 Nev. 42 756
Vattier *v.* State, 4 Blackf. 73 350
Vaughan *v.* Com., 17 Grat. 576 244
v. Com., 2 Va. Cas. 273 468, 469
R. *v.* Doug. 516 969
State *v.* 29 Iowa, 286 505, 549, 722
Vaughn *v.* State, 4 Mo. 530 302
State *v.* 26 Mo. 29 220
State *v.* Harper S. C. 313 6
Vaux's case, 4 Coke R. 44 *a* 457, 460, 507
Veal *v.* State, 8 Tex. Ap. 474 946
Veatch *v.* State, 60 Ind. 291 465, 756
Venters *v.* State, 18 Tex. Ap. 211 447
Veremaitre's case, 7 N. Y. Leg. Obs. 137 57
Vermilyea, ex parte, 6 Cow. 555 632
People *v.* 7 Cow. 108, 369 595, 790, 793, 844, 860, 861, 862, 863, 873, 874
Vermont Cent. R. R., State *v.* 27 Vt. 103 269
Vermont Cent. R. R., State *v.* 28 Vt. 583 100, 110
Vernon *v.* Hankey, 2 T. R. 113 859
Vest, State *v.* 21 W. Va. 796 90
Vestal, State *v.* 82 N. C. 563 672
Vicary *v.* Farthing, Cro. Eliz. 411 828
Vickery, U. S. *v.* 1 Har. & J. 427 918
Victor, in re, 31 Ohio St. 206 533
Videto, People *v.* 1 Park. C. R. 603 810
Vigol, U. S. *v.* 2 Dall. 347; Wh. St. Tr. 176 830
Villarino, People *v.* 66 Cal. 228 70, 407 *b*
Vincent, ex parte, 43 Ala. 402 722
R. *v.* 9 C. & P. 22 696
State *v.* 1 Car. L. R. 493 354
State *v.* 91 Mo. 662 452, 772
Vines, State *v.* 34 La. An. 1079 324, 459, 471, 481, 835
State *v.* 93 N. C. 493 812
Vinson, State *v.* 37 La. An. 792 810
Virginia, ex parte, 100 U. S. 339 980, 981, 993
v. Rivers, 100 U. S. 313 783 *a*

SECTION
Vise *v.* Hamilton, 19 Ill. 78 559
Vittum, State *v.* 9 N. H. 519 108
Vivian, R. *v.* 1 C. & K. 719; 1 Den. C. C. 35 192
Vodden, R. *v.* Dears. C. C. 229; 6 Cox C. C. 226 750, 751
Vogel *v.* State, 31 Ind. 64 87
Voight, State *v.* 13 Tex. Ap. 21 874
Volmer *v.* State, 6 Kan. 379 935
Volz, U. S. *v.* 14 Blatch. 15 37 *b*
Vondersmith, U. S. *v.* MS. 322
Voorhees, State *v.* 3 Vroom (31 N. J. L.) 141 30, 31, 32, 34, 993
Voshall, State *v.* 4 Ind. 590 124, 274

W.

Waddell, U. S. *v.* 112 U. S. 76 89
Waddington, R. *v.* 1 East, 143; 2 East P. C. 513 82, 130
Wade, Com. *v.* 17 Pick. 395 456, 460, 469 *a*, 471, 516, 676
v. Judge, 5 Ala. 18 1010
R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 86 516
v. State, 40 Ala. 74 309
v. State, 12 Ga. 25 547, 830, 844
State *v.* 34 N. H. 495 238
v. State, 12 Tex. Ap. 358 694
v. State, 23 Tex. Ap. 308 111
v. State, 54 Vt. 358 628
Wadkins, U. S. *v.* 7 Sawy. 85 164, 439
Wadsworth, R. *v.* 5 Mod. 13 386
v. State, 30 Conn. 56 804
Wage, in re, 21 Blatch. 300; 16 Fed. Rep. 332 53, 55, 56
Wagner *v.* People, 4 Abb. App. Dec. 509 92
v. State, 78 Mo. 644 595
Waite, Com. *v.* 5 Mass. 261 869
Com. *v.* 11 Allen, 264 164
R. *v.* 4 Burr. 780 80
Wakefield *v.* Mackey, 1 Phill. R. 134 111
Wakely *v.* Hart, 6 Binney, 316 13
Wakker, in re, 3 Barb. 162 996
Waldo *v.* Wallace, 12 Ind. 582 440
Walkden, R. *v.* 1 Cox, 282 249
Walker, ex parte, 25 Ala. 81 954
v. Martin, 43 Ill. 508 1011
R. *v.* 3 Camp. 264 156
R. *v.* 6 C. & P. 657 261, 464
v. State, 61 Ala. 30 447
v. State, 72 Ala. 218 716
v. State, 35 Ark. 386 756
v. State, 39 Ark. 221 804
State *v.* 26 Ind. 346 505, 520
State *v.* 87 N. C. 556 760
Walker *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 618 588, 597, 756
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 609 759, 813
v. State, 37 Tex. Ap. 366 828
U. S. *v.* 1 Crumrine (Pitts.) 437 73
Wall, in re, Sewell, J. 188; 12 Rep. 222 997
v. State, 23 Ind. 150 369
v. State, 51 Ind. 453 293
State *v.* 15 Mo. 208 387
Wallace, Com. *v.* 108 Mass. 12 383
Com. *v.* 114 Penn. St. 405 387
v. People, 27 Ill. 45 176
v. People, 63 Ill. 451 110
v. State, 28 Ark. 531 869
v. State, 2 Lea, 29 359, 746
Waller *v.* State, 40 Ala. 325 457, 756
State *v.* 3 Murph. 229 125
U. S. *v.* 1 Sawy. C. C. 701 89
Wallman, State *v.* 31 La. An. 146
Walsh, Com. *v.* 124 Mass. 33 608, 685
Com. *v.* 132 Mass. 8 756
People *v.* 43 Cal. 447 712, 797
Walston *v.* Com., 16 B. Mon. 15 762
Walter *v.* Com., 6 Weekly Notes, 389 238, 254
v. People, 32 N. Y. 147 664
State *v.* 14 Kans. 375 146
Walters, Com. *v.* 6 Dana, 291 225, 369
People *v.* 15 Abb. N. Ca. 461 996
R. *v.* C. & M. 588 194, 196
State *v.* 16 La. An. 400 457
State *v.* 97 N. C. 489 924
Waltham, State *v.* 48 Mo. 55 560, 562
Walton, Com. *v.* 11 Allen, 238 387
ex parte, 2 Whart. 501 81, 328
v. People, 3 Sneed, 687 447
v. State, 74 Mo. 270 641
Waltzer *v.* State, 3 Wis. 785 314, 940
Wanklyn, R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 291 698
Want, State *v.* 51 Iowa, 587 779
Wanzer *v.* Bright, 52 Ill. 35 27
Ward, Com. *v.* 2 Mass. 397 180
v. People, 30 Mich. 116 733
People *v.* 15 Wend. 231 471
R. *v.* 10 Cox C. C. 42; 17 L. T. N. S. 220 293, 436, 490, 508
v. State, 22 Ala. 16 354
v. State, 50 Ala. 120 273
State *v.* 49 Conn. 429 419
State *v.* 2 Hawks, 443 350
State *v.* 9 Heisk. 100 532

SECTION

Ward *v.* State, 1 Humph. 253 447, 672
v. State, 48 Ind. 289 350, 351
State *v.* 14 La. An. 673 651, 844
v. State, 64 Miss. 207 203
v. State, 2 Mo. 120 337
State *v.* 74 Mo. 253 132, 845
State *v.* 39 Vt. 226 664
Warden, People *v.* 66 N. Y. 343 925, 942
People *v.* 100 N. Y. 20 994
Wardle, R. *v.* C. & M. 647 509, 660, 718
Ware, State *v.* 62 Mo. 597 712
Waring *v.* U. S., 7 Ct. of Cl. 501 531, 533
Warman, in re, 1 W. Bl. 1204 989
Warner *v.* Com., 1 Barr, 154 281
People *v.* 5 Wend. 271 203, 273
State *v.* 14 Ind. 572 465, 466, 471
v. U. S., 26 Fed. Rep. 616 221
Warnock *v.* State, 6 Tex. Ap. 450 465
Warren *v.* Com., 37 Penn. St. 45 613
People *v.* 53 Mich. 78 742
People *v.* 1 Park. C. R. 338 467, 468, 469, 470
v. State, 19 Ark. 214 541, 550
State *v.* 92 N. C. 825 913
v. State, 9 Tex. Ap. 619 842
v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 348 409
v. State, 22 Tex. Ap. 383 798
U. S. *v.* 17 Fed. Rep. 145 167
Warshaner, R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 466; 7 C. & P. 429 181, 218, 229, 278 *a*
Wart, State *v.* 51 Iowa, 587 836
Wartena *v.* State, 105 Ind. 445 560
Warwick *v.* Bruce, 4 M. & S. 140 870
v. State, 73 Ala. 517 774 *a*
v. State, 25 Ohio St. 21 1263
Wasden, State *v.* N. C. Term R. 163 91, 92
Wash *v.* State, 14 Sm. & M. 120, 126 .296, 771
Washburn, Com. *v.* 128 Mass. 421 151, 221
in re, 4 Johns. Ch. 106 38
State *v.* 91 Mo. 571 823
Washington *v.* State, 63 Ala. 189 359, 810
v. State, 68 Ala. 85 98
State *v.* 1 Bay, 120 279
State *v.* 28 La. An. 129 477
v. State, 33 La. An. 896 350

SECTION

Washington, State *v.* 89 N. C. 535 495, 722
State *v.* 90 N. C. 664 495
Wassels *v.* State, 26 Ind. 30 369, 595, 601
Waterborough, Com. *v.* 5 Mass. 257 88
Waterhouse, State *v.* 1 Mart. & Y. 278 496
Waterman, ex parte, 33 Fed. Rep. 29 550, 916, 918
State *v.* 1 Nev. 543 751
Waters *v.* Campbell, 5 Sawy. 17 979
People *v.* 5 Park. C. R. 661 386
v. People, 6 Park. C. R. 16 109, 118
R. *v.* 1 Den. C. C. 356 97
R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 457; 2 C. & K. 862 111
v. State, 51 Md. 430 635
State *v.* 39 Me. 54 246, 247, 465
State *v.* 62 Mo. 196 733
State *v.* 2 Tred. 669 173
Watkinds, U. S. *v.* 7 Sawy. 85; 11 Rep. 560 164, 939
Watkins, R. *v.* 2 Moody, 217 250
v. State, 37 Ark. 320 742
v. State, 60 Ga. 601 509, 517
v. State, 68 Ind. 427 451
U. S. *v.* 3 Cranch C. C. 441 317, 320, 406
Watson, in re, 9 A. & E. 731 533, 989, 991
in re, 3 Lans. 408 963
v. People, 64 Barb. 130 711, 794, 798
R. *v.* 2 Ld. Raym. 818 530
R. *v.* 2 T. R. 200 176
State *v.* 68 Ga. 832 324
v. State, 30 Kan. 281 742, 802
v. State, 31 La. An. 379 350
State *v.* 34 La. An. 669 353, 367
v. State, 5 Mo. 497 465
State *v.* 65 Mo. 115 236
State *v.* 95 Mo. 411 913
State *v.* 86 N. C. 624 350
v. State, 39 Ohio St. 123 251
v. State, 5 Tex. Ap. 271 451
v. State, 9 Tex. Ap. 237 159
U. S. *v.* 3 Ben. 1 436, 500
U. S. *v.* 7 Blatchf. 60 383
Watts, Com. *v.* 4 Leigh, 672 759
State *v.* 10 Ind. 369 756
State *v.* 82 N. C. 656 261, 291
U. S. *v.* 8 Sawy. 370; 14 Fed. Rep. 130 49
Wau-kon-chaw-neck-kaw *v.* U. S., 1 Morris, 332 369, 647

SECTION

Waverton, R. *v.* 17 Q. B. 562; 2 Den. C. C. 347 95
Way *v.* Butterworth, 106 Mass. 75 378
in re, 41 Mich. 299 80
People, *v.* 10 Cal. 336 194
Wayne *v.* Com., 26 Penn. St. 154 292
U. S. *v.* Wall. C. C. 134 967
v. Walker, 7 Weekly Notes, 377 559
Weare, State *v.* 38 N. H. 314 87, 108
Weatherhead, Com. *v.* 110 Mass. 175 301
Weatherspoon, State *v.* 88 N. C. 18 445
Weaver *v.* Com., 29 Penn. St. 445 766, 918
v. State, 83 Ind. 289 517, 700, 813
State *v.* 13 Ired. 491 173
State *v.* 13 Ired. 203 512
v. State, 24 Ohio St. 584 560
v. State, 19 Tex. Ap. 547 369
v. Ward, Hob. 134 620
Webb, People *v.* 38 Cal. 467 498, 508, 515, 518, 785
People *v.* 1 Hill, 179 602
R. *v.* 3 Burr. 1469 395, 396
R. *v.* 4 F. & F. 862 576
State *v.* 74 Mo. 333 452
State *v.* 29 Ohio St. 350 565, 566
v. State, 9 Tex. Ap. 490 884
Terr. *v.* 2 New Mex. 147 813
Webber *v.* State, 10 Mo. 5 756
Webster's case, 5 Cush. 295, 386, 394, 533 156, 297, 627, 664, 774, 916
Webster *v.* People, 92 N. Y. 422 601
People *v.* 3 Park. C. R. 503 963
R. *v.* London, 1879 917
State *v.* 30 Ark. 166 102
State *v.* 5 Greenl. 432 369
State *v.* 5 Halst. 293 240
State *v.* 13 N. H. 491 627
Weed *v.* People, 31 N. Y. 465 916, 926
Weeks, State *v.* 79 Mo. 496 400
Weil, R. *v.* L. R. 9 Q. B. D. 701 51
State *v.* 89 Ind. 533 973
Weimer, ex parte, 8 Biss. 321 535
Weinzorpflin *v.* State, 7 Blackf. 186 95, 285, 290, 391, 396, 447
Weis *v.* State, 22 Ohio St. 486 841
Weiterhold, Com. *v.* 112 Penn. St. 84 260
Welde *v.* Com., 2 Met. 408 87
Welker, State *v.* 14 Mo. 398 120
Welland, R. *v.* R. & R. 494 237
Wellesley, in re, 2 Rus. & M. 639 951

SECTION

Wellington, Com. *v.* 7 Allen, 299 158
Wellock *v.* Constantine, 2 H. & C. 146 453
Wells *v.* Abraham, L. R. 7 Q. B. 554 453
v. Com., 21 Grat. 500 970
v. Com., 12 Gray, 326 120, 125
ex parte, 18 How. U. S. 307 533, 1010
ex parte, 18 Wall. 304 533
v. Gurney, 8 B. & C. 769 27
in re, 17 Alb. L. J. 111 873 *a*
v. State, 28 Kan. 321 659
v. State, 4 Tex. Ap. 20 189 *a*
Welsh *v.* Barber, 52 Conn. 219 954
Com. *v.* 97 Mass. 593 479
People *v.* 49 Cal. 174 752
v. Scott, 5 Ired. 72 6
State *v.* 37 Wis. 196 236
Welton, R. *v.* 9 Cox C. C. 297 90
Wenborn, R. *v.* 6 Jur. 267 718
Wentworth *v.* Alexander, 66 Ind. 30 994
State *v.* 37 N. H. 196 144
U. S. *v.* 11 Fed. Rep. 52 159, 163 *a*, 167, 285
Wentz, Com. *v.* 1 Ashm. 269 208
Werner *v.* State, 51 Ga. 426 121
Wesley *v.* State, 52 Ala. 182 370
v. State, 65 Ga. 731 672
v. State, 11 Humph. 502, 518, 733, 819, 822
West, in re, 111 Mass. 443 533
People *v.* 106 N. Y. 293 220
R. *v.* 2 C. & K. 496; 1 Den. C. C. 258 185, 186, 199
R. *v.* 40 Eng. L. & E. 564; Dears. & B. 109; 7 Cox C. C. 183 190, 219
v. State, 48 Ind. 483 101
State *v.* 69 Mo. 401 841
State *v.* 95 Mo. 141 853
State *v.* 71 N. C. 263 773
v. State, 6 Tex. Ap. 485 760
v. State, 7 Tex. Ap. 150 823
v. State, 2 Zab. 212 435, 771, 906
Westbeer, R. *v.* Leech, 14 249
Westbrook *v.* State, 52 Miss. 777 756
Westchester, People *v.* 1 Park. C. R. 659 442
Westley, R. *v.* Bell C. C. 193 222
Westmoreland *v.* State, 45 Ga. 228 646
Weston *v.* Com., 111 Penn. St. 257 634
v. State, 63 Ala. 155 350, 446
West Riding, R. *v.* 2 East, 362, *n.* 787
Wetherford, State *v.* 25 Mo. 439 602
Wetherold, Com. *v.* 2 Clark, 476 1011
Weymouth, Com. *v.* 2 Allen, 144 913

SECTION

Weyrich, People *v.* 89 Ill. 90 711
Whaley, Com. *v.* 6 Bush. 266 151
Whalley, R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 245 1
Wheatley *v.* Thorn, 23 Miss. 62 453
Wheeler, Com. *v.* 2 Mass. 172 383, 447
R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 170 293
v. State, 42 Md. 563 401, 810
State *v.* 3 Vt. 344 261
State *v.* 15 Vroom, 88 772
Whipple, People *v.* 9 Cow. 707 89
Whiskey, State *v.* 54 N. H. 164 22
Whit, State *v.* 5 Jones N. C. 224 570
Whitaker, in re, 43 Ala. 323 995
State *v.* 85 N. C. 566 6
State *v.* 89 N. C. 472 751, 756
White *v.* Com., 6 Binn. 179 281
Com. *v.* 3 Brewst. 30 927
v. Com., 29 Grat. 824 369
v. Com., 80 Ky. 480 587
Com. *v.* 123 Mass. 430 189
Com. *v.* 10 Met. (Mass.) 14 810
ex parte, 49 Cal. 434, 442 28, 29, 36
v. Fort, 3 Hawks, 251 453
v. Fox, 1 Bibb, 369 378, 380
in re, 17 Fed. Rep. 723 997
People *v.* 55 Barb. 606; 32 N. Y. 465 112, 309, 312
v. People, 90 Ill. 117 560
People *v.* 14 Wend. 111 562, 801
People *v.* 22 Wend. 167, 175 261, 464, 794
R. *v.* 9 C. & P. 282 194
v. State, 49 Ala. 344 507
v. State, 74 Ala. 31 387
v. State, 17 Ark. 404 866
v. State, 7 Cent. L. J. 461; 6 Tex. Ap. 476 318
v. State, 31 Ind. 262 584
State *v.* 32 Iowa, 17 98, 106
State *v.* 6 Ired. 418 181 *a*
State *v.* 9 Kans. 445 541
State *v.* 33 La. An. 1218 733
State *v.* 35 La. An. 96 805, 813
v. State, 42 Miss. 635 528
v. State, 52 Miss. 216 640
State *v.* 88 N. C. 698 358 *a*
v. State, 13 Ohio St. 569 465
v. State, 15 S. C. 381 273, 285
v. State, 1 Sm. & M. 149 982
v. State, 9 Tex. Ap. 390 440
v. State, 10 Tex. Ap. 167 862
v. State, 19 Tex. Ap. 383 711, 798
U. S. *v.* 5 Cranch C. C. 39, 73, 116 317, 318, 320, 324, 327
U. S. *v.* 5 Cranch C. C. 457 346, 350
U. S. *v.* 2 Wash. C. C. 29 72, 360

SECTION

Whitehead, R. *v.* L. R. 1 C. C. 33 566
R. *v.* 7 Q. B. 583; 1 Cox, 199 918
v. State, 10 Ohio St. 449 309
Whitehouse, R. *v.* 18 Eng. L. & E. Rep. 105; 1 Dears. C. C. 1 879, 901
Whitehurst's case, 79 Va. 556 871
Whitehurst *v.* Davis, 2 Hayw. 113 759
Whiteley, People *v.* 64 Cal. 211 742
Whiteside *v.* State, 4 Cold. 183 161, 162
Whitesides *v.* People, 1 Breese, 41 124, 274
Whitfield, R. *v.* 3 C. & K. 121 417
Whitford *v.* State, 24 Tex. Ap. 489 456
Whiting, R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 771 566
v. State, 14 Conn. 487 220
Whitley *v.* State, 38 Ga. 50 457, 585, 601
Whitney, Com. *v.* 10 Pick. 431 995
R. *v.* 1 Moody C. C. 3 191, 237
v. State, 8 Mo. 165 814
State *v.* 7 Oreg. 386 366, 794
State *v.* 15 Vt. 298 273
Whittem *v.* State, 36 Ind. 196 951, 954, 955, 968, 974
Whitten *v.* State, 61 Miss. 717 504
Whittier, State *v.* 21 Me. 341 448
Whitton, State *v.* 68 Mo. 91 344, 589
Wholford *v.* Com., 4 Grat. 553 883
Wicks, R. *v.* R. & R. 149 187
Wickwire *v.* State, 19 Conn. 477 388, 405
Widerman, ex parte, 12 Jurist (N. S.), 536 54
Widner *v.* State, 25 Ind. 234 208
Wiegand's case, 14 Blatch. 370 57
Wigan, R. *v.* 1 W. Bl. 47 16
Wigg, R. *v.* 2 Salk. 460; 2 Ld. Raym. 1165 232, 386
Wiggins *v.* State, 93 U. S. 405 778
Wightman, State *v.* 26 Mo. 515 466
Wilbanks *v.* State, 10 Tex. Ap. 642 798
Wilber, People *v.* 4 Park. C. R. 19 154, 230
Wilburn *v.* State, 21 Ark. 198 350
State *v.* 25 Tex. 738 90
Wilburne, State *v.* 2 Brev. 296 374
Wilcox *v.* Nolze, 34 Ohio St. 520 30, 31, 35
R. *v.* R. & R. 50 181
R. *v.* 2 Salk. 458 527
v. State, 6 Lea, 571 466, 471
v. State, 31 Tex. 586 104, 466
Wilde *v.* Com., 2 Met. 408 770
Wildenhu's case, 120 U. S. 1 1010

SECTION

Wilder *v.* State, 47 Ga. 522 396
Wildey, R. *v.* 1 Maule & S. 188 457
Wile *v.* State, 60 Miss. 260 233, 260
Wiley, People *v.* 3 Hill (N. Y.), 194 183, 212, 470
v. State, 1 Swan, 256 518, 815, 822
Wilhelm *v.* People, 72 Ill. 468 828
Wilhite, State *v.* 11 Humph. 602 374
Wilke *v.* People, 53 N. Y. 525 566
Wilkerson *v.* Utah, 99 U. S. 130 (S. C. 2 Utah, 158) 921
Wilkes *v.* R. 4 Bro. P. C. 361 932
R. *v.* 4 Burr. 2527 784, 910
Wilkins *v.* State, 17 Vt. 151 405
Wilkinson *v.* State, 76 Me. 317 358, 708, 798
Willace, R. *v.* 1 East P. C. 186 323
Willand, ex parte, 11 C. B. 544 953
Willard *v.* Wetherbee, 4 N. H. 118 883
Willett, R. *v.* 6 T. R. 294 363
Willey *v.* State, 46 Ind. 363 370
v. State, 52 Ind. 421 560, 564
v. State, 22 Tex. Ap. 408 310
Williams *v.* Baldwin, 18 Johns. 489 857
v. Bryant, 5 M. & W. 447 111
Com. *v.* 2 Ashm. 69 854, 859, 862, 866, 869
Com. *v.* 2 Cush. 582; Thach. C. C. 87 130, 146, 212, 252, 470, 555, 726
v. Com., 2 Grat. 568 350, 491, 494
v. Com., 78 Ky. 93 458, 492, 506
v. Com., 82 Ky. 640 560
v. Com., 91 Penn. St. 493 220, 608, 702
v. Jones, Cas. temp. Hardwicke, 284 3
v. Ogle, 2 Str. 889 119
People *v.* 45 Barb. 201 866
People *v.* 6 Cal. 206 650
People *v.* 35 Cal. 671 211
People *v.* 59 Cal. 674 540 *a*, 813
People *v.* 4 Hill N. Y. 10 791
People *v.* 24 Mich. 156 201
R. *v.* 2 C. & K. 51; 4 Cox C. C. 356; 2 Eng. L. & E. 533; 1 Mood. C. C. 107 184, 192, 193, 194, 209
R. *v.* 7 C. & P. 298 109
R. *v.* Comb. 18 527
R. *v.* 8 D. P. C. 301 75
R. *v.* 10 Mod. 63 306 *a*
R. *v.* T. & M. 382; 2 Den. C. C. 61 184, 194, 209

SECTION

Williams *v.* State, 45 Ala. 57 602, 725, 823
v. State, 77 Ala. 53 293
v. State, 81 Ala. 1 672
State *v.* 3 Foster, 321 269
v. State, 57 Ga. 478 447
v. State, 59 Ga. 401 253, 293
v. State, 60 Ga. 367 560, 738
v. State, 63 Ga. 306 750
v. State, 67 Ga. 260 862, 871
v. State, 69 Ga. 11 293, 350, 555, 591, 601
v. State, 3 Heisk. 376 269, 273, 713, 804
State *v.* 2 Hill (S. C.), 382 385
State *v.* 10 Humph. 101 252, 470
v. State, 15 Lea, 129 842
State *v.* 4 Ind. 235 131
v. State, 45 Ind. 157 813
v. State, 64 Ind. 553 236
State *v.* 20 Iowa, 98 101, 238
State *v.* Iowa, 1884 563
State *v.* 7 Jones (N. C.), 446 156
State *v.* 3 Kelly, 453 624, 664, 668, 672
State *v.* 30 La. An. 842 318
v. State, 32 La. An. 335 774 *a*
State *v.* 2 McCord, 301 91, 93, 95, 288, 602
State *v.* 5 Md. 82 507
v. State, 60 Md. 402 543, 750, 752
State *v.* 30 Me. 484 662
State *v.* 76 Me. 480 120, 708
v. State, 32 Miss. 389 664
v. State, 9 Mo. 270 358
State *v.* 69 Mo. 110 710, 793
State *v.* 77 Mo. 310 921
State *v.* 94 N. C. 891 460
State *v.* 1 Nott & McC. 27 528
v. State, 12 Ohio St. 622 733, 931
v. State, 18 Ohio St. 46 932
v. State, 35 Ohio St 175 90
State *v.* 11 S. C. 288 440, 910
v. State, 12 Sm. & M. 58 190
State *v.* 2 Speers, 26 444, 973
State *v.* 2 Stew. 454 623, 639
State *v.* 2 Strobh. 474 220
v. State, 4 Tex. Ap. 265 801, 862
v. State, 5 Tex. Ap. 226 756

SECTION

Williams *v.* State, 7 Tex. Ap. 163 859
v. State, 10 Tex. Ap. 528 601
v. State, 12 Tex. Ap. 226, 395 90, 120
v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 285 477
v. State, 20 Tex. Ap. 359 759
v. State, 24 Tex. Ap. 17, 32 608, 710, 743
State *v.* 27 Vt. 724 878, 880, 881
State *v.* 14 W. Va. 851 844, 846, 865
U. S. *v.* 1 Cliff. 5 92, 95, 791
U. S. *v.* 1 Dill. 485 348, 350, 421
Williamson's case, 26 Penn. St. 9, 23 971, 986, 999
Williamson, State *v.* 42 Conn. 261 798
State *v.* 3 Murph. 216 183, 184, 189
v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 514 112
Willingham *v.* State, 21 Fla. 761 370
Willis *v.* Baylis, 105 Ind. 363 986
v. McNeill, 57 Tex. 465 577
v. People, 32 N. Y. 715 844, 849
v. People, 1 Scam. 399 111
R. *v.* 1 C. & K. 722 112, 118
R. *v.* L. R. 1 C. C. 363 935
v. State, 12 Ga. 444 646
v. State, 62 Ind. 391 890
State *v.* 78 Me. 70 131
v. State, 24 Tex. Ap. 586 470, 483
Willoughby, R. *v.* 2 East P. C. 581 192, 194
Wilmoth, State *v.* 63 Iowa, 380 354
Wilson *v.* Com., 3 Bush, 105 506
Com. *v.* 2 Chest. Co. Rep. 164 338
Com. *v.* 2 Gray, 70 167
Com. *v.* 1 Phila. 83 955
ex parte, 7 Ad. & El. 984 1010
ex parte, 9 Nev. 71 996 *b*
ex parte, 114 U. S. 417 89, 916, 994
People *v.* 64 Ill. 195 958
v. People, 90 Ill. 229 693
v. People, 24 Mich. 410 752, 927
People *v.* 55 Mich. 506 8, 563
People *v.* 3 Park. C. R. 199 592, 595, 664
v. People, 4 Park. C. R. 619 827, 828
R. *v.* 2 C. & K. 527; 1 Den. C. C. 284; 2 Cox C. C. 426 119, 173

SECTION

Wilson, R. *v.* L. R. 3 Q. B. Div. 42 38
R. *v.* 6 Q. B. 620 385, 396
R. *v.* 4 T. R. 487 945
R. *v.* 8 T. R. 357 270
v. State, 16 Ark. 601 520
v. State, 33 Ark. 557 238
v. State, 6 Baxt. 206 832
v. State, 24 Conn. 57 460, 465, 466, 471
State *v.* 30 Conn. 500 112, 159
State *v.* 36 Conn. 126 931
State *v.* 38 Conn. 140 623, 630
v. State, 68 Ga. 827 477
v. State, 69 Ga. 591 183
v. State, 69 Ga. 225 423
v. State, 3 Heisk. 278 712
v. State, 28 Ind. 393 939
State *v.* 8 Iowa, 407 668, 712
State *v.* 24 Kan. 189 555
State *v.* 23 La. An. 558 601
State *v.* 33 La. An. 261 599 *a*
State *v.* 36 La. An. 863 774 *a*
v. State, 11 Lea, 310 13
v. State, 85 Mo. 135 641
v. State, 90 N. C. 736 577
State *v.* 59 N. H. 139 742
v. State, 2 Ohio St. 318 543
v. State, 20 Ohio, 26 291, 756
v. State, 1 Porter, 118 183, 213
v. State, 2 Scam. 226 712
v. State, 12 Tex. Ap. 481 756
v. State, 45 Tex. 76 470
U. S. *v.* 1 Baldwin, 78 612, 625, 664, 808, 874
U. S. *v.* 7 Pet. 150 526, 527, 531
Wilt *v.* State, 5 Cold. 11 547
Wimberly, State *v.* 3 McCord, 190 151, 169, 261, 273
Wimbush, State *v.* 9 S. C. 309 5
Winchell, People *v.* 7 Cow. 521 549, 550
Winder, ex parte, 2 Cliff. 89 990
Windsor, in re, 10 Cox, 118; 34 L. J. M. C. 163 47, 54
Winfield *v.* State, 3 Greene (Iowa), 339 274, 813
Wingard *v.* State, 13 Ga. 396 120, 146, 162, 251, 474
v. State, 13 Ind. 396 161
Wingo *v.* State, 62 Miss. 311 560
Winn *v.* State, 5 Tex. Ap. 621 91
Winsett *v.* State, 56 Ind. 26 565
Winslow, U. S. *v.* 3 Sawy. 337 125, 137
Winsor, R. *v.* 6 B. & S. 143; 1 L. R. Q. B. 289, 395 490, 529, 722, 725, 777
Winston, ex parte, 52 Ala. 419, 447
ex parte, 9 Nev. 71 996

SECTION

Winston *v.* State, 9 Tex. 351 156
Winter, State *v.* 72 Iowa, 627 693
U. S. *v.* 13 Blatch. 276 102
Winton, R. *v.* 5 T. R. 89 989, 990
Wirebach *v.* Bank, 97 Penn. St. 543 660
Wise, Com. *v.* 110 Mass. 181 154
v. State, 24 Ga. 31 762
v. State, 2 Kans. 419 802
State *v.* 7 Rich. 412 309, 620, 750, 874
Wiseman, State *v.* 68 N. C. 403 495, 511
v. State, 14 Tex. Ap. 7 203
Wishon, State *v.* 15 Mo. 503 386, 394
Wissmark, State *v.* 36 Mo. 592 712
Witham, State *v.* 47 Me. 165 169
State *v.* 72 Me. 531 295
Withers, Com. *v.* 5 S. & R. 59 698
R. *v.* 4 Cox C. C. 17 108
Witt, State *v.* 5 Cold. 11 830
State *v.* 34 Kan. 488 119
Witte *v.* State, 21 Tex. Ap. 88 231
Witten *v.* State, 4 Tex. Ap. 70 273
Wittingham *v.* State, 5 Sneed, 64 918
Wittington, State *v.* 33 La. An. 1403 350
Wolcott, State *v.* 21 Conn. 272, 363 338
Wolf, in re, 27 Fed. Rep. 606 602
v. State, 19 Ohio St. 248 8, 13, 90
Wolverton *v.* Com., 75 Va. 909 440
Womack, State *v.* 7 Cold. (Tenn.) 508 254, 290, 295, 296, 468
State *v.* 31 La. An. 635 159
Wong, People *v.* 54 Cal. 151 798
Wong Yung Quy, in re, 6 Sawy. 237 981, 995
Wood, Com. *v.* 2 Cush. 149 341
Com. *v.* 4 Gray, 11 157, 703, 705
Com. *v.* 12 Mass. 313 312
v. People, 92 Ind. 269 555
v. People, 53 N. Y. 512 938
v. State, 34 Ark. 341 849
v. State, 48 Ga. 192 466
v. State, 68 Ga. 296 792
v. State, 62 Miss. 220 845
v. State, 68 Mo. 444 585
State *v.* 86 N. C. 708 121
State *v.* 53 N. H. 484 156, 378
State *v.* 14 R. I. 151 251
v. State, 13 Tex. Ap. 135 842
U. S. *v.* 2 Wheeler C. C. 336 92
Woodall *v.* McMillan, 38 Ala. 622 1
Woodbridge *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 443 756

SECTION

Woodburg *v.* State, 69 Ala. 202 709, 711
Woodfall, R. *v.* 5 Burr. 2667 508, 746, 756, 847
Woodfin, State *v.* 5 Ired. 199 444, 973
Woodford *v.* Ashley, 11 East, 508 135
v. People, 62 N. Y. 117 254, 296, 469
v. State, 1 Ohio St. 427 276
Woodhall, R. *v.* 12 Cox C. C. 240 261, 464
Woodhead, R. *v.* 2 C. & K. 520 565
Woodhell's case, 20 Q. B. D. 883 55, 993
Wooding *v.* Oxley, 9 C. & P. 1 17
Woodrow, R. *v.* 15 M. & W. 404 164
Woodruff, State *v.* 2 Day, 504 507, 725
Woods, Com. *v.* 10 Gray, 480 180, 365
R. *v.* 6 Cox C. C. 224 566
v. State, 43 Miss. 364 504, 518, 733, 819, 822
U. S. *v.* 4 Cranch C. C. 484 625
Woodside, Com. *v.* 105 Mass. 594 536
Woodsides *v.* State, 2 How. (Miss.) 655 92, 369
Woodson *v.* State, 19 Fla. 549 774 *a*
Woodward, R. *v.* 1 Mood. C. C. 323 144
State *v.* 21 Mo. 266 394
State *v.* 95 Mo. 129 866
Woolaver, State *v.* 77 Mo. 103 464
Wooldridge *v.* State, 13 Tex. Ap. 443 756
Wooler, R. *v.* 6 M. & S. 366 847
Woolery *v.* State, 29 Mo. 300 522, 527
Woolf, R. *v.* 1 Chit. 402 733, 814, 817
Woolley, in re, 11 Bush. 95 953
v. U. S., 20 L. Rep. 631 439
Woolmer, R. *v.* 1 Moody C. C. 334 4, 7, 9
Woolsay *v.* State, 14 Tex. Ap. 57 267, 269
Word's case, 3 Leigh, 744 560
Worden, State *v.* 46 Conn. 349 733
Work *v.* Carrington, 34 Ohio St. 64 319 33, 34, 35, 36
Com. *v.* 3 Crumrine, 493 634
Worley *v.* State, 11 Humph. 172 238
Wormeley, Com. *v.* 10 Grat. 658 588, 602, 613, 636
Wormely's case, 8 Grat. 712 827
Wortham *v.* Com., 5 Rand. 669 358, 383, 447

SECTION

Wragg *v.* Penn Township, 94 Ill. 23 440
Wray, ex parte, 30 Miss. 673 76
v. People, 78 Ill. 212 878
Wren *v.* State, 70 Ala. 1 423, 733
Wright *v.* Clements, 3 B. & Ald. 503 167
Com. *v.* 1 Cush. 46 167, 168, 169, 170, 175
Com. *v.* Grant, 437 980
v. Com., 32 Grat. 941 636
Com., *v.* 139 Miss. 382 177
v. Com., 74 Va. 914 494
ex parte, 65 Ind. 504 968
v. Ill. Tel. Co., 20 Iowa, 19 847
in re, 29 Hun, 357; 65 How. Pr. 119 995
People *v.* 2 Caines, 213 29
People *v.* 9 Wend. 193 243
v. R., 14 Q. B. 148 774
R. *v.* 1 Vent. 170 165
v. Rindskoff, 43 Wis. 344 383, 536
v. State, 35 Ark. 639 823
v. State, 42 Ark. 94 696
v. State, 18 Ga. 383 646, 653, 844
v. State, 34 Ga. 110 862
v. State, 4 Humph. 194 290
v. State, 5 Ind. 290 383, 447, 511, 513
v. State, 5 Ind. 527 261, 464, 465, 476
v. State, 11 Ind. 569 750
State *v.* 53 Me. 328 350, 692
v. State, 12 Tex. Ap. 163 669, 693
Writhpole's case, Cro. Car. 147 457
Wroe *v.* State, 20 Ohio St. 460 465
Wyatt, Com. *v.* 6 Rand. 694 921
R. *v.* R. & R. 430 916, 917
v. State, 1 Blackf. 257 815, 817
State *v.* 50 Mo. 309 713, 854, 859
Wycherly, R. *v.* 8 C. & P. 262 917
Wyeth *v.* Richardson, 10 Gray, 240 34, 1010
Wylde, R. *v.* 6 C. & P. 380 569
Wyman, Com. *v.* 12 Cush. 237 946
Wymouth, Com. *v.* 2 Allen, 144 913
Wyndham, R. *v.* 1 Strange, 2 78
Wynn, R. *v.* 2 East, 226 395
U. S. *v.* 3 McCr. 266 89
Wyoming *v.* Anderson, 1 Wg. Ter. 20 358
Wyrral's case, 5 Coke, 49 *a* 523

Y.

SECTION

Yancey, State *v.* 1 Tread. Conf. Rep. 237 92, 279
State *v.* 1 Car. L. R. 519 444
Yanes *v.* People, 34 Mich. 286 73
Yanez *v.* State, 20 Tex. 656 882
v. State, 6 Tex. Ap. 429 669, 844
Yarberry, Terr. *v.* 2 New Mex. 391 533, 551, 866
Yarborough, ex parte, 110 U. S. 651 89, 995, 996
Yardley *v.* Arnold, 10 M. & W. 141 566
Yates's case, 4 Johns. 317 988
Yates, ex parte, 6 Johns. 337, 429 974, 1010
v. Lansing, 5 Johns. 282 445
v. Lansing, 9 Johns. 395 953
v. People, 38 Ill. 327 828
v. People, 6 Johns. 317 953
v. People, 32 N. Y. 509 3, 4
State *v.* 21 W. Va. 761 802
Yerger, State *v.* 86 Mo. 33 169
Yeadon, R. *v.* 9 Cox C. C. 91 246, 251, 465
Yoe *v.* People, 49 Ill. 410 571
Youmans, State *v.* 5 Ind. 280 528
Youndt *v.* State, 64 Ind. 443 740
Young, Com. *v.* 7 B. Mon. 1 279
v. Com., 4 Grat. 550 883
v. Com., 1 Robt. Va. 744 79
v. Johnson, 53 N. Y. Sup. Ct. 167 632
People *v.* 31 Cal. 564 378
R. *v.* Peake's Add. Cas. 228 293
v. R. 3 T. R. 98, 104 285, 292, 301, 302, 307, 907
v. State, 56 Ga. 403 871
State *v.* 77 N. C. 498 750
v. State, 6 Ohio, 435 95
State *v.* 34 La. An. 346 869
v. State, 19 Tex. Ap. 537 577
Territory *v.* 2 New Mex. 93 548
Younger *v.* State, 2 W. Va. 579 549

Z.

Zachary *v.* State, 7 Baxt. 1 477
Zallner *v.* State, 15 Tex. Ap. 23 239
Zane, People *v.* 105 Ill. 662 602
Zarresseller *v.* People, 17 Ill. 101 279
Zeigler, State *v.* 46 N. J. L. 307 387

	SECTION
Zell *v.* Com., 94 Penn. St. 258	617
Zellers, State *v.* 2 Halst. 220	587, 654
v. State, 7 Ind. 659	112
Zembrod *v.* State, 25 Tex. 519	75
Zepp, Com. *v.* 5 Penn. L. J. 255	457
Zimmerman, State *v.* 56 Md. 536	636
Ziord *v.* State, 30 La. An. Part II. 867	189 *a*, 216
Zule, State *v.* 5 Halst. 348	912
Zulich, State *v.* 29 N. J. L. 409	980
Zumbunson, State *v.* 7 Mo. Ap. 526; 86 Mo. 111	577

INDEX.

[THE FIGURES REFER TO THE SECTIONS.]

ABATEMENT, PLEA IN.
Error as to defendant's name may be met by plea in abatement, 423.
and so of error in addition, 424.
and so of defects as to grand jury, 350, 351, 376.
plea of insanity, 429 *a*.
judgment for defendant no bar to indictment in right name, 425.
after not guilty plea in abatement is too late, 426.
plea to be construed strictly, 427.
defendant may plead over, 428.
ABATEMENT OF NUISANCES, 922 *a*.
ABBREVIATIONS (*see* CLERICAL ERRORS), 274 *et seq*.
ABSENCE of defendant on trial, 540 *et seq*.
ACCESSARIES, pleading as to, 594 (*see* JOINDER OF DEFENDANTS).
verdict as to, 313, 755 (*see* VERDICT).
how far indictment against is barred by proceedings against principal, 458.
ACQUITTAL, mode of (*see* VERDICT).
effect of (*see* AUTREFOIS ACQUIT).
when court may direct, 812.
when defendant may be held to bail after, 82.
no new trial after acquittal, 785.
otherwise when verdict was fraudulent, 786.
so in *quasi* civil cases, 787.
motion for new trial only applicable to counts where there has been a conviction, 788.
conviction of minor offence is acquittal of major, 789.
of joint defendants, 305, 313, 755.
"ACQUITTANCE," meaning of, 186.
"ADDITION," what required in pleading (*see* CLERICAL ERRORS), 105-6.
objecting to by plea, 424.
ADDRESSES TO JURY (*see* COUNSEL).
ADULTERY, not barred by acquittal of bigamy, 471.
AFFIDAVIT OF JUROR, when admissible to affect verdict, 847.

AFFIDAVITS, admissible to inform court before pronouncing sentence, 945.
when receivable on *habeas corpus*, 1004.
AFFRAY, right to disperse (*see* ARREST).
conviction for assault under, 742.
"AFORESAID," how far referring back to prior averments, 131, 297–300.
AFTER-DISCOVERED EVIDENCE, when admissible for new trial, 854.
"AGAINST THE PLACE," etc., when required in concluding indictment (*see* CONCLUSION OF INDICTMENTS), 279.
AGENCY OF WRONG, statement of, 212 *a*.
AGENT, place of act of, how to be averred (*see* AGENT), 140.
act of, may be charged to principal, 159 *a*.
AGGRAVATION, need not be pleaded, 165.
unless essential to offence, 159.
may be disregarded as surplusage, 158.
AGGRAVATIVE TERMS, not necessary in indictment, 269.
ALIAS, effect of averment of, 99.
ALIBI, defective instructions as to, 711, 794.
ALIENAGE, when disqualification to juror, 669, 846, 886.
of juror, when ground for challenge, 669.
when for new trial, 846.
ALLOCATUR, SPECIAL, nature of (*see* ERROR), 774.
ALTERATION (*see* AMENDMENT).
ALTERNATIVE STATEMENTS, in pleading, are inadmissible, 161.
AMENDING, of indictment (*see* JEOFAILS), 90.
AMENDING VERDICT, practice as to, 751.
AMENDMENT OF SENTENCE, at what time permissible, 913.
AMNESTY, meaning and effect of, 325.
"AND," effect of as a copulative, 131, 161, 297.
ANIMALS, description of (*see* PERSONAL CHATTELS), 209.
description of, in statute, 237.
APPEALS (*see* ERROR), 770.
APPEARANCE OF DEFENDANT IN COURT, must be in person, 540.
right may be waived in misdemeanors of nature of civil process, 541.
in such cases waiver may be by attorney, 542.
removal of defendant for turbulent conduct does not militate against rule, 543.
involuntary illness not a waiver, 544.
presence essential at arraignment and empanelling, 545.
also at reception of testimony, 546.
also at charge of court, 547.
but not at making and arguing of motions, 548.
presence essential at reception of verdict, 549.
and at sentence, 550.
in felonies defendant must be in custody, 540 *a*.
APPELLATE COURT, power of as to new trial (*see* NEW TRIAL), 897.
ARGUMENT, practice as to (*see* COUNSEL), 560 *et seq.*, 577, 853.

ARRAIGNMENT.
Defendant usually required to hold up the hand, 699.
failure to arraign may be fatal, 700.
defendant may waive right, 541, 701.
ARRAY, challenges to (*see* CHALLENGE), 608.
ARREST, when reviewable by *habeas corpus* (see HABEAS CORPUS), 978 *et seq.*
ARREST OF ACCUSED.
Arrest generally.
Criminal procedure usually begins with oath before magistrate, 1.
officer may be described by office, 2.
to arrest, corporal control and notice are essential, 3.
but notice may be by implication, 4.
By Officers.
Officer not protected by illegal warrant, 5.
warrant omitting essentials is illegal, 6.
not necessary for officers to show warrant, 7.
peace officers may arrest without warrant for offences in their presence, and for past felonies and breaches of the peace, 8.
reasonable suspicion convertible with probable cause, 9.
By Persons not Officers.
Peace officers may require aid from private persons, 10.
officers may have special assistants, 11.
pursuers of felon are protected, 12.
private persons may arrest with probable cause, 13.
may use force necessary to prevent felony, 14.
may arrest felon after escape, 15.
may interfere to prevent riot, 16.
and so as to other offences, 17.
Breaking Doors and Search-warrants.
House may be broken to execute warrant in felonies or breaches of the peace, 18.
in felonies this may be done by private person, 19.
peace officers may, on reasonable suspicion, break doors without warrant, 20.
private person requires stronger ground for interference, 21.
search-warrants may be issued on oath, 22.
houses of third persons may be broken to secure offender or stolen goods, 23.
in opening trunks, etc., keys should be first demanded, 24.
warrant must be strictly followed, 25.
search-warrants limited by Constitution, 26.
that arrest was illegal is no defence on trial of offence, 27.
Fugitives, Extradition of, between the several United States.
Under federal Constitution fugitives may be arrested when fleeing from State to State, 28.

ARREST OF ACCUSED—(*continued*).
arrest may be in anticipation of requisition, 29.
sufficient if offence be penal in demanding State, 30.
requisition lies only for fugitives, 31.
federal courts cannot compel governor to surrender, 32.
no objection that fugitive is amenable to asylum State, 33.
governor of asylum State cannot impeach requisition, 34.
habeas corpus cannot go behind warrant, 35.
bail not to be taken, 35 *a*.
indictment or affidavit must set forth a crime, 36.
fugitive may be tried for other than requisition offence, 37.
officers executing process protected by federal courts, 37 *a*.
for federal offences warrants may be issued in all districts, 37 *b*.
Between Federal Government and Foreign States.
Limited by treaty, 38.
offence must be one recognized in asylum State, 39.
treaties are retrospective, 40.
extradition refused when there cannot be fair trial, 41.
and so for political offences, 42.
and so for persons escaping military service, 43.
but not because person demanded is subject of the asylum State, 44.
where asylum State has jurisdiction there should be no surrender, 45.
conflict of opinion as to whether foreign State can claim a subject who has committed a crime in a third State, 46.
extradition does not lie for a case not in treaty, 47.
nor where defendant is in custody for another offence, 48.
trial should be restricted to the offence charged, 49.
courts may hear case before mandate, 50.
complaint should be special, 51.
warrant returnable to commissioner, 52.
evidence should be duly authenticated, 53.
terms to be construed as in asylum State, 54.
evidence must show probable cause, 55.
evidence may be heard from defence, 56.
Circuit Court has power of review, 57.
surrender is at discretion of executive, 58.
Privilege from Arrest.
Foreign ministers privileged from arrest, 59.
Right to take Money from Person of Defendant.
Proof of crime may be taken from person, 60.
but not money unless connected with offence, 61.
Right of Bail to arrest Principal.
Bail may arrest and surrender principal, 62.
ARREST OF JUDGMENT.
At common law, most demurrable exceptions may be taken on motion in arrest, 759.

ARREST OF JUDGMENT—(*continued*).
informalities are cured by verdict, 760.
misnomer no ground, 761.
under statute right is restricted, 762.
insensible verdict will be arrested, 763.
pendency of prior indictment no ground for arrest, 764.
otherwise as to statute of limitations, 765.
irregularities of jury no ground, 766.
time and mode of motion is limited, 767.
sentencing defendant is equivalent to discharge of motion, 768.
precludes judgment from being a bar, 435 *a*.
ARSON, *autrefois acquit* as to, 469 *a*, 470.
ASSAULT, may be included in major crime, 248.
aggravations may be discharged, 247.
indictments for may be general, 159.
joinder with other offences (*see* DUPLICITY, JOINDER OF OFFENCES).
verdicts for (*see* VERDICT).
conviction of, how far affecting prosecution for riot, 471.
when on two persons at one time, 469.
when cross-bills can be tried at one time, 698
when aggravating incidents should be averred, 159.
conviction of, under indictment for major offence, 249, 742.
ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR (*see* ERROR), 781.
ATTACHMENT may issue to enforce obedience to court, 948.
may be used to enforce *habeas corpus*, 990.
ATTEMPTS, must be specially averred, 159.
may be verdict of, on major offence, 262.
ATTENDANCE OF DEFENDANT IN COURT, at what times essential, 540.
ATTORNEY-GENERAL, OR PROSECUTING ATTORNEY, duty of as to information, 87.
duty in instituting prosecution, 332–8.
must sanction bill of indictment, 354.
must sign bill, 355.
may attend grand jury, 366.
cannot impeach finding, 380.
may enter *nolle prosequi*, 383.
may employ associates, 555.
occupies semi-judicial position, 558.
length of speech at discretion of court, 560.
not to open confessions or matters of doubtful admissibility, or unduly prejudice jury, 561.
misconduct of ground for new trial, 561, 855.
should call all witnesses to act, 565.
in reading books may be restricted by court, 571.
when entitled to close, 573–6.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL, OR PROSECUTING ATTORNEY—(*continued*).
misstatements of, 577.
not to argue law to jury (*see* COUNSEL), 578.
AUTREFOIS ACQUIT OR CONVICT.
As to Nature of Judgment.
Acquittal without judgment a bar, but not always conviction, 435.
judgment arrested or new trial granted no bar, 435 *a*.
arbitrary discharge may operate as an acquittal, 436.
record of former judgment must have been produced, 437.
court must have had jurisdiction, 438.
judgment by court-martial no bar, 439.
and so of police and municipal conviction or acquittal, 440.
of courts with concurrent jurisdiction, the court first acting has control, 441.
offence having distinct aspects separate governments may prosecute, 442.
proceedings for contempt no bar, 444.
nor proceedings for *habeas corpus*, 445.
ignoramus and quashing no bar, 446.
nor is *nolle prosequi* or dismissal, 447.
after verdict *nolle prosequi* a bar, 448.
discharge for want of prosecution not a bar, 449.
foreign statutes of limitation a bar, 450.
fraudulent prior judgment no bar, 451.
nor is pendency of prior indictment, 452.
nor is pendency of civil proceedings, 453.
new trial after conviction of minor is bar to major, 455.
specific penalty inflicted by sovereign may be exclusive, 455 *a*.
As to Form of Indictment.
If former indictment could have sustained a verdict, judgment is a bar, 456.
judgment on defective indictment is no bar, 457.
same test applies to acquittal of principal or accessary, 458.
acquittal on one count does not affect other counts; but otherwise as to conviction, 459.
acquittal from misnomer or misdescription no bar, 460.
nor is acquittal from variance as to intent, 461.
otherwise as to variance as to time, 462.
acquittal on joint indictment a bar if defendant could have been legally convicted, 463.
acquittal from merger no bar, 464.
where an indictment contains a minor offence inclosed in a major, a conviction or acquittal of minor bars major, 465.
conviction or acquittal of major offence bars minor when on first trial defendant could have been convicted of minor, 466.
prosecutor may bar himself by selecting a special grade, 467.

AUTREFOIS ACQUIT OR CONVICT—(*continued*).
As to Nature of Office.
When one unlawful act operates on separate objects, conviction as to one object does not extinguish prosecution as to other; *e. g.*, when two persons are simultaneously killed, 468.
otherwise as to two batteries at one blow, 469.
so where several articles are simultaneously stolen, 470.
when one act has two or more indictable aspects, if the defendant could have been convicted of either under the first indictment, he cannot be convicted of the two successively, 471.
so in liquor cases, 472.
severance of identity by place, 473.
severance of identity by time, 474
but continuous maintenance of nuisances can be successfully indicted otherwise as bigamy, 475.
conviction of assault no bar (after death of assaulted party) to indictment for murder, 476.
Practice under Plea.
Plea must be special, 477.
must be pleaded before not guilty, 478.
verdict must go to plea, 479.
identity of offender and of offence to be established, 480.
identity may be proved by parol, 481.
plea, if not identical, may be demurred to, 482.
burden of proof is on defendant, 483.
when replication is *nul tiel record* issue is for court, 484.
replication of fraud is good on demurrer, 485.
on judgment against defendant he is usually allowed to plead over, 486.
prosecution may rejoin on its demurrer being overruled, 487.
issue of fact is for jury, 488.
novel assignment not admissible, 489.
Once in Jeopardy.
Constitutional limitation taken from common law, 490.
but in some courts held more extensive, 491.
rule may extend to all infamous crimes, 492.
in Pennsylvania, any separation in capital cases except from actual necessity bars further proceedings, 493.
rule in Virginia, 494.
in North Carolina, 495.
in Tennessee, 496.
in Alabama, 497.
in California, 498.
in the federal courts a discretionary discharge is no bar, 500.
in Massachusetts and Connecticut, 501.
so in New York, 502.
so in Maryland, 503.

AUTREFOIS ACQUIT OR CONVICT—(*continued*).
so in Mississippi, Louisiana, and Missouri, 504.
so in Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Iowa, Nebraska, Nevada, Arkansas, and Texas, 505.
so in Kentucky, 506.
no jeopardy on defective indictment or process, 507.
illness or death of juror is sufficient excuse for discharge, 508.
discharge of jury from intermediately discovered incapacity no bar, 509.
conviction no bar when set aside for defective ruling of judge, 510.
and so of discharge from sickness of defendant, 511.
discharge from surprise a bar, 512.
discharge from statutory close of court no bar, 513.
and so from sickness of judge, 514.
and so from death of judge, 515.
but not from sickness or incapacity of witness, 516.
until jury are "charged," jeopardy does not begin, 517.
waiver by motion for new trial on writ of error and motion for arrest, 518.
in misdemeanors separation of jury permitted, 519.
plea must be special; record must specify facts, 520.
AUTREFOIS CONVICT (*see* AUTREFOIS ACQUIT), 435 *et seq.*

BAIL.
At common law bail to be taken in all but capital cases, 74.
excessive bail not to be required, 75.
proper course is to require such bail as will secure attendance, 76.
after continuance bail may be granted, 77.
and so in cases of sickness, 78.
bail to keep the peace may be required, 79.
vagrants may be held to bail, 80.
Bail after Habeas Corpus.
On *habeas corpus* court may adjust bail, 81, 1007.
Bail after Verdict or Quashing.
Bail permissible after verdict, 82, 941.
after quashing bail may be taken, 83.
after acquittal may be required, 941.
tests as to adequacy of, 76.
right of to arrest principal (*see* ARREST), 62.
not to be taken in extradition process (*see* EXTRADITION), 35 *a*.
incompetent as jurors, 661.
BANK NOTES, averment of, 189.
"BARRATOR, COMMON," may be indicted as such, 155.
BASTARD CHILD, name of, how averred, 96–104.
BATTERIES, several may be joined, 254.
when two make one offence, 469.
BATTERY, divisible from assault, 158, 247.
BELLIGERENTS, when subject to martial law, 979, note.
trial of, courts for, 439.

BENEFIT OF CLERGY, now obsolete, 946 *a*.
BIAS OF JUROR, when ground for challenge (*see* CHALLENGE), 622.
when for new trial (*see* NEW TRIAL), 844.
BIGAMY, acquittal of does not bar adultery, 471.
BILL OF EXCEPTION, rules as to, 772.
"BILL OF EXCHANGE," meaning of, 187.
BILL OF INDICTMENT (*see* INDICTMENT).
BILL OF PARTICULARS (*see* PARTICULARS), 702.
BILLS, BANK, averment of, 189, 189 *a*.
BINDING OVER, by magistrate (*see* MAGISTRATE), 74.
by court (*see* BAIL).
BLASPHEMY, indictment for, 203.
"BOND," meaning of, 197.
BONDS TO KEEP THE PEACE (*see* BAIL).
BOOKS, what may be taken out by jury, 829.
what may be read to jury, 571.
averment of in larceny, 208.
BREAKING DOORS AND SEARCH-WARRANTS.
house may be broken to execute warrant in felonies or breaches of the peace, 18.
in felonies this may be done by private person, 19.
peace officers may, on reasonable suspicion, break doors without warrant, 20.
private person requires stronger ground for interference, 21.
search-warrants may be issued on oath, 22.
houses of third persons may be broken to secure offender or stolen goods, 23.
in opening trunks, etc., keys should be first demanded, 24.
warrant must be strictly followed, 25.
search-warrants limited by Constitution, 26.
that arrest was illegal is no defence on merits of offence, 27.
BURGLARY, effect of acquittal of in indictment for burglary and larceny, 455, 465, 789, 896.
may be joined with larceny in one count, 244.
"BURGLARIOUSLY," essential to burglary, 265.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT, scruples as to, when ground for challenge, 665.
CAPTION AND COMMENCEMENT OF INDICTMENT.
Caption is no part of indictment, being explanatory prefix, 91.
substantial accuracy only required, 92.
caption may be amended, 93.
commencement must aver office and place of grand jurors and also their oath, 94.
each count must contain averment of oath, 95.
CARET, effect of in pleading, 277.
CERTAINTY, degree of, necessary in indictment, 151.

CERTIORARI, used to bring up procedure to appellate court (*see* ERROR), 770.
brings up caption, 91, 93.
when applicable in cases of *habeas corpus*, 1003, 1010
CHALLENGE OF GRAND JURY, irregularities in empanelling to be met by challenge to array, 344.
disqualified juror may be challenged, 345.
preadjudication ground for challenge, 346.
so of conscientious scruples, 347.
personal interest a disqualification, 348.
"Vigilance membership" no ground, 349.
objection to juror must be before general issue pleaded, 350.
plea should be special, 351.
aliens not necessary in prosecutions against aliens, 352.
CHALLENGE ON TRIAL.
Challenges to Court.
Judges not open to challenge, 605.
Challenges to Jury.—To the Array.
Principal challenge to array is based on irregularity of selection, 608.
burden is on challenger, 609.
after plea too late, 610.
challenge to array for favor is where the question is disputed fact, 611.
To the Polls.—(a.) *Peremptory.*
Prosecution has no peremptory challenge, but may set aside juror, 612.
practice is under direction of court; and so as to order of challenge, 613.
defendant may peremptorily challenge at common law, 614.
rule as to joint defendants, and several counts, 614 *a*.
on preliminary issues no challenge, 615.
nor on collateral issues, 616.
right ceases when panel is complete, 617.
in misdemeanors no peremptory challenges at common law, 618.
matured challenge cannot ordinarily be recalled, 619.
right is to reject, not select, 620.
(b) *Principal.*
Principal challenge is where case does not rest on disputed fact, 621.
(a¹.) *Preadjudication of Case.*
Preadjudication of case is ground for challenge, 622.
but opinions thrown out as jest, or as vague, loose talk, do not ordinarily disqualify, 623.
nor does a general bias against crime, 624.
in United States courts a deliberate opinion as to defendant's guilt disqualifies, 625.
and so in Maine, 626.
and in New Hampshire, 627.
in Vermont prior expression of opinion disqualifies, 628.
in Massachusetts prejudice must go to particular issue, 629.

CHALLENGE ON TRIAL—(*continued*).
so in Connecticut, 630.
in New York, at common law, opinion, but not impression, disqualifies, 631.
but by statute no disqualification of witness not under bias, 632.
in New Jersey hypothesis does not exclude, 633.
in Pennsylvania, opinion, but not impression, disqualifies, 634.
so in Delaware and Maryland, 635.
so in Virginia, 636.
so in North and South Carolina, 637.
so in Ohio, 638.
so in Alabama, 639.
so in Mississippi, 640.
so in Missouri, 641.
so in Tennessee, 642.
so in Indiana, 643.
so in Illinois, 644.
so in Arkansas, 645.
so in Georgia, 646.
so in Iowa, 647.
in Wisconsin and Nebraska when opinion is ground for challenge, 648.
in Michigan opinion must be unqualified, 649.
so in California, 650.
so in Louisiana, 651.
so in Kansas, Florida, Texas, and Colorado, 652.
(b[1].) *General Propositions as to Prejudice.*
opinion must go to whole case, 653.
juror must answer questions, though not to inculpate himself, 654.
must be first sworn on *voir dire*, 655.
court may ask questions, 656.
only party prejudiced may challenge, 657.
jury may be examined as to details, 658.
bias must go to immediate issue, 659.
relationship and business association cause for challenge, 660.
and so of prior connection with case, 661.
and so of participation of cognate offence, 661 *a*.
and so of pecuniary interest in result, 662.
and so of irreligion and infamy, 663.
and so of conscientious scruples as to capital punishment, 664.
and so of other conscientious scruples, 665.
and so of belief that statute is unconstitutional, 666.
membership of specific "vigilance" associations, or prospective organizations, may disqualify, but not of general association to put down crime, 668.
(c[1].) *Alienage.*
Alienage or non-residence may be a disqualification, and so of ignorance of language, and drunkenness, 669.

CHALLENGE ON TRIAL—(*continued*).
(c.) *Challenges to Polls for Favor.*
Challenges for favor are those involving disputed questions of fact, 670.
challenges cannot moot privileges of juror, 671.
Mode and Time of Taking Challenge.
Challenge must be prior to oath, 672.
when for favor must specify reasons, 673.
juror to be sworn *voir dire*, 674.
passing over to court no waiver, 675.
after principal challenge may be challenge for favor, 676.
peremptory challenge may be after challenge for cause, 677.
challenge may be made by counsel, 678.
in cases of surprise may be recalled, 679.
one defendant cannot object to co-defendant's challenges, 680.
juror passed by one side may be challenged by other, 681.
juror may be cross-examined and contradicted, 682.
court may of its own motion examine, 683.
How Challenges are to be tried.
At common law at discretion of court, 684.
as to array, triers are appointed on issues of fact; otherwise when there is demurrer, 685.
at common law, on challenges to the polls, triers are appointed by court, 686.
no challenge to triers, 687.
when triers are not asked for, parties are bound by decision of court, 688.
all evidence tending to show bias is admissible, 689.
but bias must be shown to set aside juror, 690.
Juror's Personal Privilege not Ground for Challenge, 692.
Revision by Appellate Court.
Defendant not exhausting peremptory challenges cannot except to overruling challenge for favor, 693.
otherwise where he has exhausted his personal challenges, 694.
error lies when challenge is on record, 695.
"CHALLENGE TO FIGHT," averment of, 202 *a*.
CHANCELLOR cannot enjoin criminal proceedings, 770.
CHANGE OF VENUE, motion for, 602.
CHARACTER, evidence as to, admissible before sentence, 945.
CHARGE OF COURT.
Questions of law are for court, 708.
defendant has a right to full statement of law, 709.
misdirection a cause for new trial, 710, 793.
error as to presumption, 794.
judge may give his opinion on evidence, 711, 798.
must, if required, give distinct answer as to law, 712.
error to exclude point from jury unless there be no evidence, 713.
charge must be in open court and before parties, 714, 799.

CHARGE OF COURT—(*continued*).
when required, must be in writing, 715.
error in, ground for reversal, 794, 796.
abstract discussions not required, 797.
Opinion on evidence may be given, 798.
"CHARGED WITH CASE," meaning of, 517.
"CHARGING," meaning of in respect to jury, 517.
CHATTELS, descriptions of (*see* PERSONAL CHATTELS), 206 *et seq.*
"CHEQUE," included under bill of exchange, 187.
"CHOSES IN ACTION," averment of, 191.
CIVIL RIGHTS, as affecting removal to federal courts, 783 *a*.
when vindicated by *habeas corpus*, 980.
CIVIL SUIT, not barring criminal prosecution, 453.
CLERICAL ERRORS.
Verbal inaccuracies not affecting sense are not fatal, 273.
numbers may be given by abbreviations, 274.
omission of formal words may not be fatal, 275.
signs cannot be substituted for words, 276.
erasures and interlineations not fatal, 277.
tearing and defacing not necessarily fatal; lost indictment, 278.
pencil writing may be sufficient, 278 *a*.
CLOSE OF TERM, whether verdict can be given after, 513.
whether sentence can be amended after, 973.
CO-DEFENDANTS, joinder of (*see* JOINDER OF DEFENDANTS), 301.
COIN, how to be averred, 218.
COLOR, PERSONS OF, statutory disqualifications of, ground of removal to federal courts, 783 *a*.
discriminations as to, when reviewable on *habeas corpus*, 980.
COMMENCEMENT of indictment (*see* CAPTION), 94.
COMMISSIONER, when with power to commit for contempt, 963.
COMMITMENT by magistrate (*see* MAGISTRATE), 74.
COMMITMENTS, when reviewable by *habeas corpus*, 991 *et seq.*
COMMITMENTS FOR CONTEMPT, how affected by pardon, 530.
"COMMON BARRATOR," common scold, indictable as such, 155.
COMMON LAW, when absorbed by statute, 232, 234.
COMMON THIEF, when indictable as such, 155.
COMMON VAGRANT, or street-walker, liable to arrest, 80.
CONCLUSION OF INDICTMENTS.
Conclusions must conform to Constitution, 279.
where statute creates or modifies an offence, conclusion must be statutory, 280.
otherwise when statute does not create or modify, 281.
conclusion does not cure defects, 282.
conclusion need not be in plural, 283.
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, not ordinarily sufficient in pleading, 159.

CONCURRENT JURISDICTIONS, when absorptive, 44.
CONCURRENT OFFENCES, merger of, 468.
CONDITIONAL PARDONS, when valid, 533.
CONFEDERATE, act of one may be charged to the other, 159 *a*.
CONFEDERATE COURTS, sentences not reviewable on *habeas corpus*, 996.
CONFLICT OF JURISDICTION, as to *habeas corpus*, 980, 981.
CONSCIENTIOUS SCRUPLES, when ground for excusing grand juror, 347.
when ground for challenge to petit juror, 664.
CONSENT, to irregularities (*see* WAIVER).
CONSOLIDATION OF PROSECUTIONS, practice as to, 285, 294, 910 *et seq.*
CONSPIRACY may be joined with misdemeanor, 287.
bill of particulars allowed in, 703.
at least two defendants necessary, 305.
CONSPIRATOR, act of one may be charged to the other, 159 *a*.
CONSTABLE, arrest by (*see* ARREST), 1–62.
CONSTITUTIONALITY OF STATUTE, when considered on *habeas corpus*, 981 *et seq.*
when authorizing insufficient indictment, 90.
CONSULTATIONS OF JURY, to be protected from intrusion, 727.
CONTEMPT.
When the only Method of Suppression is by Summary Commitment.
In such cases attachment may issue, 948.
attachments may issue to enforce process, 949.
and so as a penalty on disobedience, 950.
and so on physical interference with parties and receivers, 951.
and so on publication of proceedings ordered not to be published, 952.
and so as to misconduct of officers of court, 953.
and so as to obstruction to trial, 954.
and so as to disorder in presence of court, 955.
and so as to misconduct of or tampering with jurymen, 956.
When the Contempt can be suppressed otherwise than by Commitment.
Criticisms on cases before court constitute contempt, 957.
and so as to other publications interfering with due course of justice, 958.
but summary commitment only to be used when necessary, 959.
in cases of this class an ordinary prosecution is the better course, 960.
danger of depositing such power in courts, 961.
By whom such Commitments may be issued.
Superior courts have power to issue common law commitments, 962.
other courts are limited to contempts in their presence, 963.
commissioners and notaries have no power, 963.
so as to legislatures, 964.
Indictability of Contempts: Embracery.
Interference with public justice indictable, 965.
so with embracery, or improper interference with jury, 966.

CONTEMPT—(*continued*).
Practice.
In cases in face of court rule may be made instantly returnable, 967.
otherwise as to contempts not in face of court, 968.
hearing may be inquisitorial, 969.
Punishment.
Court may fine and imprison, 970.
commitment must be for fixed period, 971.
fine goes to State, 972.
Conviction no Bar to other Proceedings.
Contempt not barred by other procedure, and the converse, 973.
proceedings in, when a bar to indictments, 445.
Appeal, Error, and Pardon.
When on record, proceedings may be revised in error, 974.
when by *habeas corpus*, 974 *a*, 999.
pardon does not usually release, 975.
CONTINUANCE AND CHANGE OF VENUE.
On Application of Prosecution.
By statute in some States trial must be prompt, 583.
On Application of Defendant.—Absence of Material Witness.
Such absence ground for continuance if due diligence is shown, 585.
and so on unauthorized withdrawal of witness, 586.
continuance not granted when witness was out of jurisdiction of court, or of uncertain attendance, 587.
not granted when there has been laches, 588.
or unless there was due diligence, 589.
not granted when testimony is immaterial, 590.
affidavit must be special, 591.
impeaching witnesses, and witnesses to character, not "material," 592.
if object be delay, reason ceases, 593.
refusal cured by subsequent examination of witness, 594.
usually continuance is refused when opposite party concedes facts, 595.
not granted when witness had notice, unless he secretes himself, 596.
Inability of Defendant or Counsel to attend.
Inability to attend may be a ground for continuance, 597.
Improper Prejudice of Case.
Continuance granted when there has been undue prejudice of case, 598.
treachery of counsel, 598 *a*.
Inability of Witness to understand Oath.
In such case continuance may be granted, 599.
Pendency of Civil Proceedings, 599 *a*.
New Trial.
For refusal to give continuance new trial may be granted, 600.
Question in Error.
Refusal to continue not usually subject of error, 601.

CONTINUANCE AND CHANGE OF VENUE—(*continued*).
Change of Venue.
On due cause shown venue may be changed, 602.
CONTINUANDO, averment of, 125.
CONTINUOUS OFFENCE, how far divisible, 475.
averment of, 474–5.
how affected by statute of limitations, 321.
CONTINUOUSNESS, presumed, 551.
CONVICTION, former, how to be averred, 935.
when a bar (*see* AUTREFOIS ACQUIT).
effect of foreign, 936.
proceedings on second trial, 935.
form of (*see* SENTENCE).
new trial after (*see* NEW TRIAL), 790.
when court may direct, 812.
may be for part of divisible count, 742.
CONVICTS, RELAPSED, practice as to, 935 *et seq.*
COPY, requisites of exactness of, in indictment (*see* WRITTEN INSTRUMENTS), 167 *et seq.*
COPY OF INDICTMENT, when to be furnished to defendant, 696.
CORAM NOBIS, error, 779 *b* (*see* ERROR).
CORPORAL PUNISHMENT, 921.
CORPORATIONS, name of, how to be given in indictment, 100, 110.
COSTS, when removed by pardon, 528.
on motion for new trial, 901.
COUNSEL.
Counsel for Prosecution.
Prosecuting attorneys may employ associates, 555.
prosecuting attorney occupies semi-judicial post, 556.
Counsel for Defence.
Defendants entitled to counsel by Constitution, 557.
counsel, if necessary, may be assigned by court, 558.
such counsel may sue county for their fees, 559.
Duties of Counsel.
Order and length of speeches at discretion of court, 560.
prosecuting attorney not to open confessions or matter of doubtful admissibility, or unfairly prejudice jury, 561.
misconduct of, ground for new trial, 561, 853.
counsel on both sides should be candid in opening, 562.
opening speeches not to sum up, 563.
examination of witnesses at discretion of court, 564.
prosecution should call all the witnesses to the guilty act, 565.
order of testimony discretionary with court, 566.
impeaching testimony may be restricted, 567.
witness to see writings before cross-examination, 568.
witnesses may be secluded from court-room, 569.

COUNSEL—(*continued*).
defendant's opening to be restricted to admissible evidence, 570.
reading books is at discretion of court, 571.
counsel may exhibit mechanical evidence in proof, 572.
if defendant offers no evidence, his counsel closes, 573.
otherwise when he offers evidence, 574.
defendants may sever, 575.
priority of speeches to be determined by court, 576.
misstatements not ground for new trial if not objected to at time, 577, 853.
ordinarily counsel are not to argue law to jury, 578.
party may make statement to jury, 579.
absence of, when ground for continuance (*see* ATTORNEY-GENERAL).
mistake of, when ground for new trial, 876.
treachery of, ground for continuance, 598 *a*.
COUNT, defective, when vitiating indictment, 771.
COUNTS, distribution of punishment as to (*see* SENTENCE), 907.
joinder of (*see* JOINDER OF OFFENCES), 285.
when bad, to be withdrawn by prosecution, 737.
when bad, may be rejected in sentence, 907.
"COUNTY," averment of (*see* PLACE), 146.
how to be averred, when divided, 141.
COURT, power of as to preserving order (*see* NEW TRIAL, TRIAL).
may preserve order by attachments (*see* CONTEMPT), 948.
directs order and details of trial, 563 *et seq.*
power of as to law and fact, 708 *et seq.* (*see* CHARGE OF COURT, NEW TRIAL).
duty as to charging jury, 709.
any material misruling ground for new trial, 793.
and so as to mistaken ruling as to presumption of fact, 794.
omission to charge cumulatively is no error, 795.
not required to charge as to undisputed law, when no points are tendered, 796.
otherwise when jury fall into error from lack of instruction, 796 *a*.
abstract dissertations are not required, 797.
may give opinion as to weight of evidence, 798.
may give supplementary charge, but not in absence of defendant, 799.
erroneous instruction on one point vitiates when there is general verdict, 800.
may adjourn during deliberations of jury, 744.
power of as to contempts (*see* CONTEMPTS), 948 *et seq.*
COURT-MARTIAL, judgment of, when a bar, 439.
when reviewable by *habeas corpus*, 997.
jurisdiction of, 979, note.
CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS, removal of to federal courts, 783 *a*.
CROSS-BILL, practice as to, 698.

"CRUEL AND UNUSUAL," what punishments are, 920.
CUMULATIVE AVERMENTS, may be discharged as surplusage (*see* DUPLICITY), 158.
CUMULATIVE CONVICTIONS, practice as to (*see* SENTENCE), 935.
CUMULATIVE PUNISHMENTS, when permitted on one indictment, 910.
CURRENCY, averment of, 189, 189 *a*.
CUSTODY, when defendant must be during trial, 540 *a*.
escape from (*see* ARREST, SENTENCE).
commitment to for misconduct (*see* CONTEMPT).

DATE, pleading of (*see* TIME), 120 *et seq*.
DATES, averment of in indictment (*see* TIME), 120 *et seq*.
DAY OF THE WEEK, when to be alleged, 121.
DEAFNESS, when disqualifying juror, 669–692.
DEATH, when to suggest on record, 308.
sentence to, 914.
place of in indictment for homicide, 138.
"DEED," averment of, 197.
DE FACTO OFFICERS, acts of not reviewable on *habeas corpus*, 996.
DEFAULT, no conviction sustainable for, 540.
DEFENDANT.
Right to take Money from Person of.
Proof of crime may be taken from person, 60.
but not money unless connected with offence, 61.
pleading name of, 96.
right to be present on trial, 540 *et seq*.
right to make statement to jury, 579.
to be asked if he has anything to say in sentence, 906.
DEFENDANTS, joinder of (*see* JOINDER OF DEFENDANTS), 301.
DEGREE OF CRIME, practice as to designating in verdict, 752.
DELAY IN PROSECUTION, when barring prosecution, 326.
DELIBERATIONS OF JURY, to be protected from intrusion, 727.
DEMURRER, reaches defects of record, 400.
may go to particular counts, 401.
brings up prior pleadings, 402.
admits facts well pleaded, 403.
nature of judgment in, 404, 405.
effect of judgment, 457.
joinder in is formal, 407 *a*.
demurrer should be prompt, 407 *b*.
DEMURRER TO EVIDENCE, bring up the whole case, 407, 706.
DEPOSITIONS, when evidence on *habeas corpus*, 1004.
DESCRIPTIVE AVERMENT, must ordinarily be proved, 160.
DISCHARGE OF DEFENDANT FROM FAILURE TO TRY, 328.
DISCHARGE OF JURY FROM DISAGREEMENT, 490 *et seq*.
DISCONTINUANCE (*see* NOLLE PROSEQUI).

DISCRETION, exercised in motion to quash, 385.
DISCRETION OF COURT, limits of, 779.
DISFRANCHISEMENT, penalty of, 939.
DISJUNCTIVE AVERMENTS not ordinarily admissible, 161 *et seq.* 228.
DISMISSAL OF CASE no bar to indictment, 447.
DISOBEDIENCE, to magistrate, 10 *et seq.*
to court, 947 *et seq.*
DISORDER IN COURT may be punished by attachment, 954 *et seq.*
DISORDERLY PERSONS, when to be held to bail, 80.
DISQUALIFICATION, of judge, 605.
of juror, 608 *et seq.*
of grand juror, 344.
DISSUADING WITNESSES, a contempt, 954.
DISTRICT, what has jurisdiction in United States courts, 139 *et seq.*
DISTRICT ATTORNEY (*see* ATTORNEY-GENERAL).
DIVISIBILITY OF COUNT, may be determined by verdict, 742.
of offence as pleaded, 158.
DIVISIBILITY OF OFFENCES, by place, 473.
by time (*see* SURPLUSAGE), 474.
of things stolen, in larceny, 212, 252.
DOCUMENTS, pleading of (*see* WRITTEN INSTRUMENTS), 167 *et seq.*
DOUBLE ACTS, when divisible, 488.
DOUBLE OFFENCES, when to be joined (*see* DUPLICITY).
DRUNKENNESS, disqualifying juror, 669, 841.
DUMBNESS, when excusing plea, 417.
DUPLICITY.
Joinder in one count of two offences is bad, 243.
exception when larceny is included in burglary or embezzlement, 244.
and so where fornication is included in major offence, 245.
when major offence includes minor, conviction may be for either, 246, 465.
"assault" is included under "assault with intent," 247.
on indictment for major there can be conviction of minor, 248.
misdemeanor may be inclosed in felony, 249.
but minor offence must be accurately stated, 250.
not duplicity to couple alternate statutory phases, 225, 251.
several articles may be joined in larceny, 252.
and so of cumulative overt acts and agencies, 253.
and so of double batteries, libels, or sales, 254.
duplicity is usually cured by verdict, 255.
DUTY, allegation of, 151 *et seq.*

EAVESDROPPING, an offence, 721, 729.
ELECTION between offences charged, when compelled, 293, 294.
As to defendants, 309 *et seq.*
EMBEZZLEMENT, bill of particulars allowed in, 703.
jurisdiction in cases of, 149.

EMBRACERY, how punished, 966.
as to grand jury, 338.
ENACTING clause of statute, scope of, 238.
ENGLISH, indictment must be in, 274–276.
juror must understand, 669.
EQUITY cannot enjoin criminal proceedings, 770.
ERASURES in indictment not fatal, 277.
ERROR, WRIT OF.
To what courts, 770.
practice in federal courts, 770 *a*.
How one bad Count affects Conviction.
when bad count may vitiate judgment, 771.
Bill of Exceptions.
At common law bill of exceptions cannot be tendered, 772.
In whose behalf Writ of Error lies.
At common law no writ of error lies for prosecution; otherwise by statute, 773.
for defendant a special *allocatur* is usually necessary, 774.
fugitive cannot be heard on writ, 774 *a*.
At what Time.
Error does not lie till after judgment, 775.
failure to demur, etc., does not affect right, 776.
For what Errors.
At common law only to matter of record, 777.
otherwise by statute, 778.
error does not lie to matters of discretion nor for matters not injuring the defendant, 779.
regularity presumed, 779 *a*.
for errors of fact error *coram nobis* lies, 779 *b*.
Error in Sentence.
Appellate court reversing for error in sentence must at common law discharge, 780.
Assignment of Errors.
Error must be assigned, 781.
Joinder in Error.
This is necessary, 782.
Supersedeas.
At common law, a writ of error is a supersedeas in capital cases, 783.
Removal to Federal Courts.
Such removal provided for by statute, 783 *a*.
ESCAPE, right to arrest after, 8 *et seq.*
of prisoner, trial after, 933.
after escape, error will not be heard, 774 *a*.
EVIDENCE, mistakes in admission of, ground for new trial (*see* NEW TRIAL), 801.
need not be stated in indictment, 158.

EVIDENCE—(*continued*).
all relevant to *res gestae* must be presented by prosecution, 565.
order of at discretion of court, 566 *et seq.*
relation of to speeches of counsel, 573 *et seq.*
exclusion of witnesses from court, 569.
mistake of judge as to, ground of new trial, 794–8.
and so of erroneous admission or rejection of, 801.
verdict against, ground for new trial, 813.
after-discovered, when ground for new trial, 855.
motion must be special, 855.
must be supported by affidavits, 856.
may be contested, 857.
must be usually moved before judgment, 858.
must be newly discovered, 859.
acquitted co-defendant as a witness is no ground, 860.
discovered before verdict should be given to jury, 861.
if evidence could have been secured at trial, ground fails, 862.
and so of withholding papers which due diligence could have secured, 863.
otherwise in cases of surprise, 864.
party disabled who neglects to obtain evidence on trial, 865.
must be material and not cumulative, 866.
surprise is an exception, 867.
and so when evidence is of a distinct class, 868.
new trial not granted merely to discredit opposing witness, 869.
subsequent indictment for perjury no ground, 870.
should be such as to change result on merits, 871.
new defence must not be merely technical, 872.
EVIDENCE BEFORE GRAND JURY.
Witnesses must be duly sworn, 358 *a*.
defects in this respect may be met by plea, 359.
evidence confined to prosecution, 360.
probable cause enough, 361.
legal proof only to be received, 362.
grand jury may ask advice of court, 364.
new bill may be found on old testimony, 365.
witnesses for prosecution to be bound to appear, 357.
names of witnesses usually placed on bill, 358.
EVIDENCE, DEMURRER TO, nature and effect of, 407.
EVIDENCE ON HABEAS CORPUS, 1000 *et seq.*
EVIDENCE REQUISITE BEFORE MAGISTRATE.
Practice not usually to hear witnesses for defence, 71.
exception in cases of identity, or of one-sidedness in prosecution's case, 72.
probable cause only need be shown, 73.
EXACTNESS requisite in pleading, 151.

EXAMINATIONS before magistrate, practice as to, 71 *et seq.*
EXAMPLE, an incidental object of punishment, 943 *et seq.*
EXCEPTIONS, in statutes, how to be pleaded, 240.
EXCEPTIONS, BILL OF (*see* ERROR), 772.
EXCITEMENT, public, when ground for continuance, 598.
for change of venue, 602.
for new trial, 889.
EXCLUSION OF WITNESSES from court-room, when ordered, 569.
practice as to, 569.
EXCUSE, when to be averred in indictment, 238 *et seq.*
EXECUTION, capital, mode of sentence for, 916.
non-capital (*see* SENTENCE), 907 *et seq.*
ordinance of necessary to satisfaction, 925 *a.*
EXECUTIVE, duty to surrender on extradition, 32 *et seq.*, 58.
right of as to pardon (*see* PARDON), 521 *et seq.*
duties of as to extradition (*see* EXTRADITION), 28.
EX POST FACTO punishment, 946.
EXTRADITION.
Between the several United States.
Under federal Constitution fugitives may be arrested when fleeing from State to State, 28.
arrest may be in anticipation of requisition, 29.
sufficient if offence be penal in demanding State, 30.
requisition must be duly framed, and lies only for fugitives, 31.
federal courts cannot compel governor to surrender, 32.
no objection that fugitive is amenable to asylum State, 33.
governor of asylum State cannot impeach requisition, 34.
ordinarily issues warrant, 34 *a.*
habeas corpus cannot go behind warrant, 35.
bail not to be taken, 35 *a.*
indictment or affidavit must set forth a crime, and must be in course of judicial proceedings, 36.
fugitive may be tried for other than requisition offence, 37.
officers executing process protected by federal courts, 37 *a.*
for federal offences warrants may be issued in all districts, 37 *b.*
Between Federal Government and Foreign States.
limited by treaty, 38.
arrest in cases of, 27.
offence must be one recognized in asylum State, 39.
treaties are retrospective, 40.
extradition refused when there cannot be fair trial, 41.
and so for political offences, 42.
and so for persons escaping military service, 43.
but not because person demanded is subject of the asylum State, 44.
where asylum State has jurisdiction there should be no surrender, 45.

EXTRADITION—(*continued*).
conflict of opinion as to whether foreign State can claim a subject who has committed a crime in a third State, 46.
extradition does not lie for a case not in treaty, 47.
nor where defendant is in custody for another offence, 48.
trial should be restricted to the offence charged, 49.
courts may hear case before mandate, 50.
complaint and warrant should he special, 51.
warrant returnable to commissioner, 52.
evidence should be duly authenticated, 53.
terms to be construed as in asylum State, 54.
evidence must show probable cause, 55.
evidence may be heard from defence, 56.
Circuit Court has power of review, 57.
surrender is at discretion of executive, 58.
may be tested by *habeas corpus*, 993.

FACTS, unnecessary, indictment need not specify, 158.
jury judges of, 794, 813.
when court can charge as to, 711, 798.
"FALSELY," essential to perjury, 264.
when requisite as a term of art, 264.
FALSE PRETENCES, divisibility of, 253 *et seq.*
joinder of counts, 297.
specifications of, 221 *et seq.*
FALSE RETURN, in *habeas corpus*, 988, 989.
FAVOR, challenges for (*see* CHALLENGE).
FEDERAL COURTS, may discharge from State arrests, 981.
removal of cases to from State courts, 783 *a*.
jurisdiction of in *habeas corpus* (*see* HABEAS CORPUS), 981.
appellate jurisdiction of, 770 *a*.
FEDERAL CURRENCY, averment of, 189 *a*.
FELONIES, when to be joined in the same indictment (*see* JOINDER of OFFENCES), 290.
right of officers to arrest for (*see* ARREST), 8 *et seq.*, 17.
"FELONIOUSLY," essential to felony, 260.
may be rejected as surplusage, 261.
FELONY, may inclose misdemeanor, 249.
one charged with may be arrested, 8 *et seq.*, 17.
bail for parties charged with, 74, 1007.
election in cases of, 293.
indictment for attempts to commit, 159.
verdict in cases of, 737 *et seq.*
separation of jury in cases of, 719 *et seq.*
defendant must be present on trial of, 540.
challenges in cases of, 614 *et seq.*

FEME COVERT, may be joined in indictment, 306 *a*.
FIGURES, when allowable in indictment, 276.
FINDING AND ATTESTING BILL.
Twelve must concur in bill, 368.
foreman usually attests bill, 369.
bill to be brought into court, 370.
finding must be recorded, 371.
bill may be amended by grand jury, 372.
finding may be reconsidered, 373.
jury usually cannot find part only of count, 374.
insensible finding is bad, 375.
grand jury may be polled, 376.
FINE, may be imposed for contempt (*see* SENTENCE), 970.
FINES, a common law penalty, 916.
how to be imposed, 940.
how collected (*see* SENTENCE), 920.
remission of, by pardon, 528.
FLIGHT, how affecting statute of limitations, 324.
"FORCE AND ARMS," not necessary in indictment, 271.
"FORCIBLY," when necessary to forcible entry and rape, 270.
FOREIGN CONVICTION.
Will not sustain cumulative punishment, 936.
FOREIGN LANGUAGE, how to be averred, 181.
FOREIGN MINISTERS, privileged from arrest, 59.
FOREIGN PARDONS, effect of, 537.
FOREIGN STATES, extradition to (*see* EXTRADITION), 38 *et seq.*
larceny in, jurisdiction of, 149.
FOREIGN STATUTES OF LIMITATION, effect of, 329, 450.
FOREMAN of grand jury, duties of, 342 *et seq.*
of petit jury, duties of, 741 *et seq.*
FORFEITURE, effect of pardon as to, 528.
may be imposed as a penalty, 922, 939.
FORGED WRITINGS, pleading of (*see* WRITTEN INSTRUMENTS), 167 *et seq.*
FORGERY, conjunctive averment of allegations in venue in, 162.
setting forth of document in, 167.
averment of title of document in, 184 *et seq.*
conviction of how far barring cognate offences, 471.
FORM, errors of, when cured by verdict, 90, 273, 760.
FORMAL ERRORS, how far vitiating, 273 *et seq.*, 760.
FORMER CONVICTION, how averred, 935.
when a bar (*see* AUTREFOIS ACQUIT.)
FORMER JEOPARDY (*see* JEOPARDY,) 490.
FORNICATION, conviction of under indictment for greater offence, 245.
FRAUD, operates to vacate pardon, 532.
and to vacate judgment, 451.

FRAUDULENT JUDGMENT, not barring further proceedings, 452.
"FRAUDULENTLY," when assented, 269.
FREEMASONRY, when cause for challenge, 667.
FRIENDSHIP, when ground for challenge of juries, 659 *et seq.*
FUGITIVE, cannot be heard in error, 774 *a.*
FUGITIVES, who are under extradition acts (*see* EXTRADITION), 28 *et seq.*

GAMING, details required in indictment for, 155 *et seq.*, 221 *et seq.*
when exceptions in statutes against to be negatived, 238.
GENERAL DEMURRER, characteristics of, 400 *et seq.*
GENERAL ISSUE, characteristics of, 408.
GENERAL VERDICT, practice as to, 747.
effect of, 738.
how to be rendered (*see* VERDICT), 747.
GOODS, how to be described (*see* PERSONAL CHATTELS), 206 *et seq.*
GOODS, when may be seized under search-warrant, 22.
may be taken from defendant, 60.
lumping description of, 252.
"GOODS AND CHATTELS," averment of, 191.
GOVERNOR OF STATE, duty of as to extradition (*see* EXTRADITION), 32 *et seq.*, 58.
GRAMMAR, BAD, does not necessarily vitiate indictment, 273 *et seq.*
GRAND JURIES.
Powers of to institute Prosecutions.
Conflict of opinion as to power of grand jury to originate prosecutions, 332.
theory that such power belongs to grand jury, 334.
theory that grand juries are limited to cases of notoriety, or in their own knowledge, or given to them by court or prosecuting officers, 335.
theory that grand juries are restricted to cases returned by magistrate, and prosecuting officers, 339.
power of grand juries limited to court summoning them, 340.
Constitution of Grand Juries.
Number must be between twelve and twenty-three, 341.
foreman usually appointed by court, 342.
jurors to be duly sworn, 343.
bound to secrecy, 343 *a.*
Irregularities in empanelling to be met by challenge to array, or motion to quash or plea, 344.
cannot usually be examined on arrest of judgment or error, 350, 353, 766.
nor on *habeas corpus*, 1005 *et seq.*
disqualified juror may be challenged, 345.
Disqualifications.
preadjudication ground for challenge, 346.
so of conscientious scruples, 347.
personal interest a disqualification, 348.
"vigilance membership" no ground, 349.

GRAND JURIES—(*continued.*)
objection to juror by plea must be before general issue pleaded, 350.
plea should be special, 351.
aliens not necessary in prosecutions against aliens, 352.
as to record jurisdictional objections, there may be arrest of judgment, 353.
Sanction of Prosecuting Attorney.
Ordinarily bill must be signed by prosecuting officer, 354.
name may be signed after finding, 355.
prosecuting officer's sanction necessary, 356.
Summoning and Indorsement of Witnesses.
Witnesses for prosecution to be bound to appear, 357.
names of witnesses usually placed on bill, 358.
Evidence.
Witnesses must be duly sworn, 358 *a*.
defects in this respect may be met by plea, 359.
evidence confined to prosecution, 360.
probable cause enough, 361.
legal proof only to be received, 363.
grand jury may ask advice of court, 364.
new bill may be found on old testimony, 365.
Powers of Prosecuting Attorney.
Prosecuting officer usually in attendance, 366.
defendant and others not entitled to attend, 367.
Finding and Attesting Bill.
Twelve must concur in bill, 368.
foreman usually attests bill, 369.
bill to be brought into court, 370.
finding must be recorded, 371.
bill may be amended by grand jury, 372.
finding may be reconsidered, 373.
jury usually cannot find part only of count, 374.
insensible finding is bad, 375.
grand jury may be polled or vote tested by plea in abatement, 376.
Misconduct of Grand Juror.
Grand juror may be punished by court for contempt, but is not otherwise responsible, 377.
Duty to testify.
Grand juror may be examined as to what witness said, 378.
cannot be admitted to impeach finding, 379.
prosecuting officer or other attendant inadmissible to impeach finding, 380.
Tampering with an officer, 381.
"GREENBACKS," averment of, 189 *a*.
"GUARANTEE," averment of, 200.
GUILT, grade of, as affecting right to bail, 74, 81, 1007.
as affecting degree of sentence, 942.

GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY.

Plea of not guilty is general issue, 408.
plea is essential to issue, 409.
omission of *similiter* not fatal, 410.
in felonies pleas must be in person, 411.
pleas must be several, 412.
plea of guilty reserves motion in arrest and error, 413.
may at discretion be withdrawn, 414.
mistakes in may be corrected, 415.
after plea degree of offence may be ascertained by witnesses, 416.
plea of not guilty may be entered by order of court, 417.
plea of *nolo contendere* equivalent to not guilty, 418.

HABEAS CORPUS.

Writ available at any stage of imprisonment, 978.
cannot be suspended by president or governor, 979.
State court cannot discharge from federal arrest, 980.
federal courts may review state arrests, 981.
petition to be verified by affidavit, 982.
may be applied for by next friend, 983.
to be directed to custodian and to be served personally, 984.
notice to be given to prosecution, 985.
writ not granted when relator should be remanded, 986.
relator, if in custody, must be produced immediately in court, 987.
causes of detention must be returned, 988.
return must not be evasive, 989.
writ to be enforced by attachment, 990.
return may be controverted, 991.
discharge from defects of process; and so in cases of oppression, 992.
writ may test extradition process, 993.
may obtain redress from void sentence, 994.
but cannot overhaul indictment or matters within province of trial court, 995.
cannot collaterally correct errors, and here of *de facto* courts, 996.
nor interrupt hearing, 996 *a*.
practice where there can be no writ of error, 996 *b*.
military judgments cannot be thus reviewed, 997.
nor summary police convictions, 998.
nor committals for contempt, 999.
court determines questions of fact, 1000.
probable cause enough, 1001.
evidence not excluded on technical grounds, 1002.
remitting procedure by *certiorari*, 1003.
affidavits may be received, 1004.
no discharge for technical defects or variance, 1005.
discharge from pardon or limitation, 1006.

HABEAS CORPUS—(*continued*).
discharge from want of probable cause; adjustment of bail, 1007.
judgment must be discharge or remainder, 1008.
during hearing custody is in court, 1009.
no writ of error at common law; proceedings in error, 1010.
how far discharge affects subsequent arrest, 1011.
proceedings in, when a bar to indictment, 445.
may issue to bring up prisoner, 931.
"HAM," averment of in indictment, 209.
HAND, holding up on arraignment, 699.
HANGING, the usual form of capital execution, 916.
HEARING BEFORE MAGISTRATE.
Commitment for further Hearing.
Waiver; hearing may be adjourned from time to time, 70.
Evidence requisite.
Practice not usually to hear witnesses for defence, 71.
exceptions in cases of identity, or of one-sidedness in prosecution's case, 72.
probable cause only need be shown, 73.
Final Commitment and Binding over.
At common law bail to be taken in all but capital cases, 74.
excessive bail not to be required, 75.
proper course is to require such bail as will secure attendance, 76.
after continuance bail may be granted, 77.
and so in cases of sickness, 78.
bail to keep the peace may be required, 79.
Vagrants, Disorderly Persons, and Professional Criminals.
Magistrates have power to hold vagrants, etc., to bail, 80.
Bail after Habeas Corpus.
On *habeas corpus* court may adjust bail, 81.
Bail after Verdict.
in exceptional cases bail permissible after verdict, 82.
HIGH SEAS, venue of offences on, 139.
HOLDING OVER TO COURT (*see* ARREST, HABEAS CORPUS).
HOLIDAY, LEGAL, holding court on, 758.
HOMICIDE, bail in, 74 *et seq.*, 1007.
averment of death in, 138.
venue in cases of, 139 *et seq.*
joinder of defendants in, 301 *et seq.*
allegation of party killed in, 109 *et seq.*
allegation of fatal instrument, 212 *a*, 297.
divisibility of averments in, 246.
conclusion of indictment in, 279 *et seq.*
allegation of time in, 138.
technical averments in, 258.
attempts to commit how averred, 159.

HOMICIDE—(*continued*).
verdict in, 742.
sentence in, 914 *et seq.*
HOMICIDES, two by one blow, when divisible, 468.
"HORSES," averment of in indictment, 209, 237.
HOUR, when to be stated in indictment (*see* TIME), 130 *et seq.*
HUSBAND AND WIFE may be joined as co-defendants, 306 *a.*

IDEM SONANS, what is as to name (*see* INDICTMENT), 119.
as to document, 173 *et seq.*
IDENTITY, proof of in *autrefois acquit*, 480, 481.
plea denying, 408–419.
IGNORANCE OF JUROR, how excepted to, 669, 839.
IGNORAMUS, not a bar to indictment, 446.
action of grand jury as to, 368 *et seq.*
ILLNESS, of defendant during trial, effect of, 544.
of juror, when ground for discharge, 508.
"IMMEDIATELY," when defective as an averment of time, 132.
IMPEACHING WITNESS, practice as to, 567.
IMPEACHING FINDING OF BILL.
Grand juror may be examined as to what witness said, 378.
cannot be admitted to impeach finding, 379.
prosecuting officer inadmissible to impeach finding, 380.
IMPEACHMENT OF JUDGE, 605.
IMPEACHMENTS, not usually reached by pardon, 521.
IMPRISONMENT, sentence for must be definite, 923.
but may present alternatives, 924.
day of sentence is first day of imprisonment, 925.
expiration without endurance is not satisfaction, 925 *a.*
prison need not at common law be specified, 926.
in case of second trial of convict, prisoner may be brought up for second trial by *habeas corpus*, 931.
a second imprisonment begins at the former's termination, 932.
an escaped prisoner may be sentenced for escape in like manner (*see* SENTENCE), 933.
may be imposed for contempt, 970.
relief from by *habeas corpus* (*see* HABEAS CORPUS), 978 *et seq.*
INCAPACITY of juror, when ground for new trial, 846.
INCONSISTENT AVERMENTS cannot be joined, 256.
INDECENT WRITING OR PICTURE, how to be pleaded, 177.
INDICTMENT.
Finding of, 352 *et seq.*
Indictmemt as Distinguished from Information.
Under federal Constitution trials of all capital or infamous crimes must be by indictment, 85.
presentment is an information by grand jury on which indictment may be based, 86.

INDICTMENT—*(continued)*.
information is *ex officio* procedure by attorney-general, 87.
is not usually permitted as to infamous crimes, 88.
"infamous crimes" are such as involve disgrace or expose to penitentiary, 89.
Statutes of Jeofails and Amendment.
By statutes formal mistakes may be amended and formal averments made unnecessary, 90.
Caption and Commencement.
Caption is no part of indictment, being an explanatory prefix, 91.
substantial accuracy only required, 92.
caption may be amended, 93.
commencement must aver office and place of grand jurors and also their oath, 94.
each count must contain averment of oath, 95.
Name and Addition.—As to Defendant.
Name of defendant should be specifically given, 96.
omission of surname is fatal, 97.
mistake as to either surname or Christian name may be met by abatement, 98.
surname may be laid as *alias*, 99.
inhabitants of parish and corporations may be indicted in corporate name, 100.
middle names to be given when essential, 101.
initials requisite when used by party, 102.
party cannot dispute a name accepted by him, 103.
unknown party may be approximately described, 104.
at common law addition is necessary, 105.
wrong addition to be met by plea in abatement, 106.
defendant's residence must be given, 107.
"Junior" must be alleged when party is known as such, 108.
As to Parties injured and Third Parties.
Name, only, of third person need be given, 109.
corporate title must be special, 110.
third person may be described as unknown, 111.
but this allegation may be traversed, 112.
the test is, whether the name was unknown to grand jury, 113.
immaterial misnomer may be rejected as surplusage, 114.
sufficient if description be substantially correct, 115.
variance in third party's name is fatal, 116.
name may be given by initials, 117.
reputative name is sufficient, 118.
Idem sonans is sufficient, 119.
Time.
Time must be averred, but not generally material, 120.
when "Sunday" is essence of offence, day must be specified, 121.
videlicet may introduce a date tentatively, 122.

INDICTMENT—(*continued*).
blank as to date is fatal, 123.
substantial accuracy is enough, 124.
double or obscure dates are inadequate, 125.
date cannot be laid between two distinct periods, 126.
negligence should have time averred, 127.
time may be designated by historical epochs, 128.
recitals of time need not be accurate, 129.
hour not necessary unless required by statute, 130.
repetition may be by "then and there," 131.
other terms are insufficient, 132.
"then and there" cannot cure ambiguities, 133.
repugnant, future, or impossible dates are bad, 134.
record dates must be accurate, 135.
and so of dates of documents, 136.
time should be within limitation, 137.
in homicide death should be within a year and a day, 138.
Place.
Enough to lay venue within jurisdiction, 139.
when act is by agent, principal to be charged as of place of act, 140.
when county is divided, jurisdiction is to be laid in court of *locus delicti*, 141.
when county includes several jurisdictions, jurisdiction must be specified, 142.
name of State not necessary to indictment, 143.
sub-description in transitory offences immaterial, 144.
but not in matters of local description, 145.
"county aforesaid" is enough, 146.
title, when changed by legislature, must be followed, 147.
venue need not follow fine, 148.
in larceny venue may be laid in place where goods are taken, 149.
omission of venue is fatal, 150.
Statement of Offence.
Offence must be set forth with reasonable certainty, 151.
omission of essential incidents is fatal, 152.
terms must be technically exact, 153.
not enough to charge conclusion of law, 154.
excepting in cases of "common barrators," "common scolds," and certain nuisances, 155.
matters unknown may be proximately described, 156.
bill of particulars may be required, 157.
surplusage need not be stated, and if stated may be disregarded, 158.
videlicet is the pointing out of an averment as a probable specification, 158 *a*.
assault may be sustained without specification of object, 159.
act of one confederate may be averred as the act of the other, 159 *a*.

INDICTMENT—(*continued*).
descriptive averment must be proved, 160.
alternative statements are inadmissible, 161.
disjunctive offences in statute may be conjunctively stated, 162.
otherwise as to distinct and substantive offences, 163.
intent when necessary must be averred, 163 *a*.
and so of guilty knowledge, 164.
inducement and aggravation need not be detailed, 165.
particularity is required for identification and protection, 166.
Written Instruments.—Where, as in Forgery and Libel, Instruments must be set forth in full.
When words of document are material, they should be set forth, 167.
in such cases the indictment should purport to set forth the words, 168.
"purport" means effect; "tenor" means contents, 169.
"manner and form," "purport and effect," "substance," do not impart verbal accuracy, 170.
attaching original paper is not adequate, 171.
when exact copy is required, mere variance of a letter is immaterial, 173.
unnecessary document need not be set forth, 174.
quotation marks are not sufficient, 175.
document lost or in defendant's hands need not be set forth, 176.
and so of obscene libel, 177.
prosecutor's negligence does not alter the case, 178.
production of document alleged to have been destroyed is a fatal variance, 179.
extraneous parts of document need not be set forth, 180.
foreign or insensible document must be explained by averments, 181.
innuendoes can explain but cannot enlarge, 181 *a*.
Where, as in Larceny, general Designation is sufficient.
Statutory designations must be followed, 182.
though general designation be sufficient, yet if indictment purport to give words variance is fatal, 183.
What general Designation will suffice.
If designation is erroneous, variance is fatal, 184.
"receipt" includes all signed admissions of payment, 185.
"acquittance" includes discharge from duty, 186.
"bill of exchange" is to be used in its technical sense, 187.
"promissory note" is used in a large sense, 188.
"bank note" includes notes issued by bank, 189.
"treasury notes and federal currency," 189 *a*.
"money" is convertible with currency, 190.
"goods and chattels" include personalty exclusive of *choses in action*, 191.
"warrant" is an instrument calling for payment or delivery, 192.
"order" implies mandatory power, 193.
"request" includes mere invitation, 194.

INDICTMENT—(*continued*).
terms may be used cumulatively, 195.
defects may be explained by averments, 196.
a "deed" must be a writing under seal passing a right, 197.
"obligation" is a unilateral engagement, 198.
and so is "undertaking," 199.
a guarantee and an "I. O. U." are undertakings, 200.
"property" is whatever may be appropriated, 201.
"piece of paper" is subject of larceny, 202.
"challenge to fight" need not be specially set forth, 202 *a*.
Words spoken.
Words spoken must be set forth exactly, though substantial proof is enough, 203.
in treason it is enough to set forth substance, 204.
Personal Chattels.—Indefinite, Insensible, or Lumping Descriptions.
Personal chattels, when subjects of an offence, must be specifically described, 206.
when notes are stolen in a bunch, denominations may be proximately given, 207.
certainty must be such as to individuate offence, 208.
"dead" animals must be averred to be such; "living" must be specifically described, 209.
when only specified members of a class are subjects of offence, then specifications must be given, 210.
minerals and vegetables must be averred to be severed from realty, 211.
variance in number or value is immaterial, 212.
Value.
Value must be assigned when larceny is charged, 213.
larceny of "piece of paper" may be prosecuted, 214.
value essential to restitution, and also to mark grades, 215.
legal currency need not be valued, 216.
when there is lumping valuation, conviction cannot be had for stealing fraction, 217.
Money and Coin.
Money must be specifically described, 218.
when money is given to change, and change is kept, indictment cannot aver stealing change, 219.
Offences created by Statute.
Usually sufficient and necessary to use words of statute, 220.
otherwise when statute gives conclusion of law, 221.
and so if indictment professes but fails to set forth statute, 222.
special limitations are to be given, 223.
private statute must be pleaded in full, 224.
offence must be averred to be within statute, 225.
section or title need not be stated, 226.
where statute requires two defendants, one is not sufficient, 227.

INDICTMENT—(*continued*).
disjunctions in statute to be averred conjunctively, 228.
at common law defects in statutory averment not cured by verdict, 229.
statutes creating an offence are to be closely followed, 230.
when common-law offence is made penal by title, details must be given, 231.
when statute is cumulative, common law may still be pursued, 232.
when statute assigns no penalty, punishment is at common law, 233.
exhaustive statute absorbs common law, 234.
statutory technical averments to be introduced, 235.
but equivalent terms may be given, 236.
where a statute describes a class of animals by a general term, it is enough to use this term for the whole class; otherwise not, 237.
provisos and exceptions, not part of definition, need not be negatived, 238.
otherwise when proviso is in same clause, 239.
exception in enacting clause to be negatived, 240.
question in such case is whether the statute creates a general or a limited offence, 241.
Duplicity.
Joinder in one count of two offences is bad, 243.
exception when larceny is included in burglary or embezzlement, 244.
and so where fornication is included in major offence, 245.
when major offence includes minor, conviction may be for either, 246.
"assault" is included under "assault with intent," 247.
on indictment for major there can be conviction of minor, 248.
misdemeanor may be inclosed in felony, 249.
but minor offence must be accurately stated, 250.
not duplicity to couple alternate statutory phases, 251.
several articles may be joined in larceny, 252.
and so of double overt acts, 253.
and so of double batteries, libels, or sales, 254.
duplicity is usually cured by verdict, 255.
Repugnancy.
Where material averments are repugnant, indictment is bad, 256.
Technical Averments.
In treason "traitorously" must be used, 257.
"malice aforethought" essential to murder, 258.
"struck" essential to wound, 259.
"feloniously" essential to felony, 260.
"feloniously" can be rejected as surplusage, 261.
in such cases conviction may be had for attempt, 262.
"ravish" and "forcibly" are essential to rape, 263.
"falsely" essential to perjury, 264.
"burglariously" to burglary, 265.
"take and carry away" to larceny, 266.

INDICTMENT—(*continued*).
"violently and against the will" to robbery, 267.
"piratical" to piracy, 268.
"unlawfully" and other aggravative terms not necessary, 269.
"forcibly" and with a strong hand, essential to forcible entry, 270.
vi et armis not essential, 271.
"knowingly" always prudent, 272.
Clerical Errors.
Verbal inaccuracies not affecting sense are not fatal, 273.
numbers may be given by abbreviations, 274.
omission of formal words may not be fatal, 275.
signs cannot be substituted for words, 276.
erasures and interlineations not fatal, 277.
tearing and defacing not necessarily fatal. Lost indictment, 278.
pencil writing may be sufficient, 278 *a*.
Conclusion of Indictments.
Conclusions must conform to Constitution, 279.
where statute creates or modifies an offence, conclusion must be statutory, 280.
otherwise when statute does not create or modify, 281.
conclusion does not cure defects, 282.
conclusion need not be in plural, 283.
statutory conclusion may be rejected as surplusage, 284.
Joinder of Offences.
Counts for offences of same character and same mode of trial may be joined, 285.
assaults on two persons may be joined, 286.
conspiracy and constituent misdemeanor may be joined, and assault with assault with intent, 287.
and so of common law and statutory offences, 288.
and so of felony and misdemeanor, 289.
cognate felonies may be joined, 290.
and so of successive grades of offence, 291.
joinder of different offences no ground for error, 292.
election will not be compelled when offences are connected, 293.
object of election is to reduce to a single issue, 294.
election is at discretion of court, 295.
may be at any time before verdict, 296.
counts may be varied to suit case, 297.
two counts precisely the same are bad, 298.
one bad count cannot be aided by another, 299.
counts may be transposed after verdict, 300.
Joinder of Defendants.—Who may be joined.
Joint offenders can be jointly indicted, 301.
but not when offences are several, 302.
so as to officers with separate duties, 303.

INDICTMENT—(*continued*).
principals and accessaries can be joined, 304.
in conspiracy at least two must be joined, 305.
in riot three must be joined, 306.
husband and wife may be joined, 306 *a*.
misjoinder may be excepted to at any time, 307.
death need not be suggested on the record, 308.
Severance.
Defendants may elect to sever, 309.
severance should be granted when defences clash, 310.
in conspiracy and riot no severance, 311.
Verdict and Judgment.
Joint defendants may be convicted of different grades, 312.
defendants may be convicted severally, 313.
sentence to be several, 314.
offence must be joint to justify joint verdict, 315.
Statutes of Limitations.
Construction to be liberal to defendant, 316.
statute need not be specially pleaded, 317.
indictment should aver offence within statute or exclude exceptions, 318.
statute, unless general, operates only on specified offences, 319.
statute is retrospective, 320.
statute begins to run from commission of crime, 321.
indictment or information saves statute, 322.
in some jurisdictions statute saved by warrant or presentment, 323.
when flight suspends statute, it is not revived by temporary return, 324.
failure of defective indictment does not revive statute, 325.
courts look with disfavor on long delays in prosecution, 326.
statute not suspended by fraud, 327.
under statute indictment unduly delayed may be discharged, 328.
statutes have no extra-territorial effects, 329.
indorsement of prosecutor's name, 358.
witnesses on, 358.
indorsement of foreman's name on, 369.
of prosecuting officer's name on, 354.
furnishing copy of to defendant, 696.
finding of (*see* GRAND JURY).
INDICTMENT, DEMURRER TO (*see* DEMURRER), 400.
INDICTMENT, QUASHING.
Indictment will be quashed when no judgment can be entered on it, 385.
quashing refused except in clear case, 386.
quashing usually matter of discretion, 387.
extrinsic facts no ground for quashing, 388.
defendants may be severed in quashing, 389.
when two indictments are pending one may be quashed, 390.
quashing ordered in vexatious cases, 391.

INDICTMENT, QUASHING—(*continued*).
bail may be demanded after quashing, 392.
pending motion *nolle prosequi* may be entered, 393.
one count may be quashed, 394.
quashing may be on motion of prosecution, 395.
time usually before plea, 396.
motion should state grounds, 397.
INDORSEMENT, of witnesses on indictment, 357.
of foreman's name, 369.
of prosecuting officer's name, 354.
of document when to be pleaded, 180.
INDUCEMENT, need not be pleaded, 165.
"INFAMOUS OFFENCE," meaning of, in federal Constitution, 85, 88, 89.
INFAMY, when ground for challenge, 663.
of juror, when ground for new trial, 846.
what constitutes, 89.
INFERIOR COURTS, power of as to contempts, 963.
power as to *habeas corpus*, 981 *et seq.*
INFLUENCE, subjection to, when disqualification of juror, 659.
INFORMALITIES, when cured by verdict, 760.
INFORMATIONS.
Under federal Constitution trials of all capital or infamous crimes must be by indictment, 85.
presentment is an information by grand jury on which indictment may be based, 86.
information is *ex officio* proceeding by attorney-general, 87.
is not usually permitted as to infamous crimes, 88.
"infamous crimes" are such as preclude person convicted from being a witness, 89.
INITIALS, when allowed in pleading, 102, 117.
INJUNCTION, cannot be maintained against criminal proceedings, 770 *a*.
INK, when requisite to indictment, 278 *a*.
INNUENDOES, effect of in pleading, 181 *a*.
INSANITY, a disqualification to juror, 671, 692, 846.
plea of, when allowed by statute, 429 *a*.
INSPECTION (*see* VIEW).
INSTRUCTIONS OF JUDGE (*see* CHARGE OF COURT), 708 *et seq.*, 796 *et seq.*
INSTRUMENT OF INJURY, averment of, 212 *a*.
INTENT, when to be averred in indictment, 163 *a*.
INTERLINEATIONS IN INDICTMENT, not fatal, 277.
INTERNATIONAL LAW, as regulating extradition, 38.
INTOXICATING LIQUORS, questions of *autrefois acquit* as to, 472.
INTOXICATION OF JUROR, ground for challenge, 669.
ground for setting aside verdict, 841.

"I. O. U.," averment of, 200.
IRONS, when defendant may be placed in during trial, 540 *a*.
IRRELIGION, when ground for challenge, 663.
ISSUE, general plea of, 408.
joinder in, 410.
must be single, 419.

JEOFAILS AND AMENDMENT.
By statutes formal mistakes may be amended and formal averments made unnecessary, 90.
JEOPARDY, nature of under Constitution:
constitutional limitation taken from common law, 490.
but in some courts held more extensive, 491.
rule may extend to all infamous crimes, 492.
in Pennsylvania any separation in capital cases, except from actual necessity, bars further proceedings, 493.
so in Virginia, 494.
and in North Carolina, 495.
and in Tennessee, 496.
and in Alabama, 497.
and in California, 498.
in the federal courts a discretionary discharge is no bar, 500.
so in Massachusetts, 501.
so in New York, 502.
so in Maryland, 503.
so in Mississippi and Louisiana, 504.
so in Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Iowa, Nebraska, Nevada, Arkansas, and Texas, 505.
so in Kentucky, Georgia, and Missouri, 506.
so in South Carolina, 506 *a*.
no jeopardy on defective indictment, 507.
illness or death of juror is sufficient excuse for discharge, 508.
discharge of jury from intermediately discovered incapacity no bar, 509.
conviction no bar when set aside for defective ruling of judge, 510.
and so of discharge from sickness or escape of defendant, 511.
discharge from surprise a bar, 512.
discharge from statutory close of court no bar, 513.
and so from sickness of judge, 514.
and so from death of judge, 515.
but not from sickness or incapacity of witness, 516.
until jury are "charged," jeopardy does not begin, 517.
conflict of opinion as to whether defendant can waive his privilege in this respect, 518.
in misdemeanors separation of jury permitted, 519.
plea must be special; record must specify facts, 520.
JOINDER, IN ERROR, practice as to (*see* ERROR), 782.

JOINDER IN ISSUE, 410.
JOINDER OF DEFENDANTS.
Who may be joined.
Joint offenders can be jointly indicted, 301.
no joinder when offences are several, 302.
nor as to officers with separate duties, 303.
principals and accessaries can be joined, 304.
in conspiracy at least two must be joined, 305.
in riot three must be joined, 306.
husband and wife may be joined, 306 *a*.
misjoinder may be excepted to at any time, 307.
death need not be suggested on the record, 308.
Severance.
Defendants may elect to sever, 309.
severance should be granted when defences clash, 310.
in conspiracy and riot no severance, 311.
Verdict and Judgment.
Joint defendants may be convicted of different grades, 312.
defendants may be convicted severally, 313, 755.
sentence to be several, 314.
offence must be joint to justify joint verdict, 315.
JOINDER OF OFFENCES.
Counts for offences of same character and same mode of trial may be joined, 285.
assaults on two persons may be joined, 286.
conspiracy and constituent misdemeanor may be joined, and assault with assault with intent, 287.
and so of common law and statutory offences, 288.
and so of felony and misdemeanor, 289.
cognate felonies may be joined, 290.
and so of successive grades of offence, 291.
joinder of different offences no ground for error, 292.
election will not be compelled when offences are connected, 293.
object of election is to reduce to a single issue, 294.
election is at discretion of court, 295.
may be at any time before verdict, 296.
counts should be varied to suit case, 297.
two counts precisely the same are bad, 298.
one bad count cannot be aided by another, 299.
counts may be transposed after verdict, 300.
verdict when there are several counts, 737 *et seq.*
sentence in such cases, 907 *et seq.*
JUDGE, whether succeeding, may sentence, 898, 929.
when open to challenge, 605.
preadjudication by, when ground for new trial, 798 *a*.
one not sitting on trial may sentence, 929.

JUDGE—(*continued*).
duties of on trial (*see* COURT), 793 *et seq.*
determines order of business (*see* COUNSEL), 566 *et seq.*
contempt to, punishable by attachment (*see* CONTEMPT), 948.
may charge as to fact, 711, 798.
must charge as to law, 712.
see CHARGE OF COURT.
address of, to prisoner on sentence, 906, 915.
discretion of, 779.
JUDGMENT, ARREST OF.
At common law, most exceptions may be taken on motion in arrest, 759.
informalities are cured by verdict, 760.
misnomer no ground, 761.
under statute rule is extended, 762.
insensible verdict will be arrested, 763.
pendency of prior indictment no ground for arrest, 764.
otherwise as to statute of limitations, 765.
but not irregularities of grand jury, 766.
time for motion is limited, 767.
sentencing defendant is equivalent to discharge of motion, 768.
nature of, required to sustain *autrefois acquit*, 435.
JUDICIAL DISCRETION, range of, 779.
"JUNIOR," when description necessary in indictment, 108.
JURISDICTION, averment of (*see* PLACE), 139 *et seq.*
concurrent, 139.
plea to, 422.
indictment may be quashed for want of, 139.
want of, may be examined on *habeas corpus*, 978, 994 *et seq.*
JUROR, not admissible to impeach verdict, 847.
JURORS, GRAND (*see* GRAND JURORS), 332 *et seq.*
JURY, power of over law, 805.
irregularity in summoning, when ground for new trial, or arrest, or error, 886.
challenge of (*see* CHALLENGE).
when trial by, may be waived, 733.
Swearing of.
Jury must appear to have been sworn, 716.
Conduct during Trial; Adjournment and Discharge.
May separate in most jurisdictions before commitment, 815, 818.
misconduct of jury is a contempt, 717.
ignorance or inattention, 839.
intoxication, 841.
when misconduct ground for new trial (*see* NEW TRIAL), 814 *et seq.*
misconduct of, or to, may be punished, 717, 956, 966.
deliberations of, to be protected from intrusion, 727.
what evidence may be taken out by, 829.

JURY—(*continued*).
in England juries may be discharged at discretion of court, 718.
in this country separations allowed in cases less than capital, 719, 815–8.
otherwise as to capital cases, 720.
tampering with jury to be punished, 721, 837 *et seq.*
court can discharge jury in cases of surprise when gross injustice would otherwise be done, 722.
adjournment of court is ground for discharge, 723.
and so is sickness or eminent disqualification of juror, 724.
in non-capital cases jury may be discharged at discretion of court, 725 (*see* 490 *et seq.*).
conflict of opinion in capital cases, 726.
order of speeches to, 560.
Deliberations of.
Jury must be secluded during deliberations, 725, 726, 727, 814, 821.
misconduct during, 836 *et seq.*
tampering with, 833 *et seq.*
levity in action of, 833.
Swearing Officer.
Officer must be duly sworn, 728.
Communications by Third Parties.
Illegal communication with jury is indictable, 729.
such communications ground for new trial, 730.
Food and Drink.
Food and drink may be supplied to jury, 731.
intoxication of jurors, 841.
Books to be examined by, 829.
Casting Lots.
May be ground for new trial, 732.
Curing Irregularities by Consent.
How far consent cures irregularities, 733.
how far judges of law, 805, 806.
Discharge of for disagreement, 436, 490, 500.
JURY OF MATRONS, practice as to, 917.
JUSTICE, fugitives from (*see* EXTRADITION).
JUSTICE OF THE PEACE, hearing before (*see* ARREST, MAGISTRATE), 70.
practice as to arrest and committal by (*see* ARREST), 1–60.
when action of is reviewable by *habeas corpus*, 27, 991.
when having power to commit for contempt, 963.
KEEP THE PEACE, holding over to, as part of sentence, 82, 941.
KIDNAPPING, when reviewable on *habeas corpus*, 27, 996.
KILLING (*see* HOMICIDE).
"KNOWINGLY," when necessary, 164, 272.
KNOWLEDGE, guilty, when to be averred in indictment, 164.

LANGUAGE OF INDICTMENT, rule as to, 273 *et seq.*
LANGUAGE OF TRIAL, juror's ignorance of, 669, 839.
LARCENY, pleadings of writings in, 182.
technical terms in (*see* RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS), 266.
averment of venue in, 440.
several articles can be joined in, 252.
search-warrants in case of, 18.
averment of documents stolen, 182.
attempts to commit, indictment for, 159.
joinder of counts in, 285 *et seq.*, 291.
description of articles in, 206.
averment of value in, 213.
sequestration of things stolen, 60.
may be inclosed in embezzlement, 244.
and in burglary, 244.
conviction of, not barring burglary, 471.
LAW, jury bound to receive from court, 805.
earlier doctrine in this respect to the contrary, 806.
early cases no longer authoritative, 807.
jury are at common law not judges of law, 810.
court bound to hear counsel as to law, 811.
court may direct acquittal or conviction, 812.
misruling of, ground for new trial (*see* NEW TRIAL), 793.
right of counsel to argue, 578, 811.
LEAD PENCIL, effect of in writing, 278 *a*.
LEVYING WAR, requisites of indictment for, 257.
LIBEL, indictment for must set out document, 167.
joinder of defendants in, 301, 302.
joinder of offences in, 301 *et seq.*
disjunctive averments in, 161, 162, 251.
innuendo in, 181 *a*.
bill of particulars in, 157, 702.
when oral, practice as to, 203.
when obscene, rule as to, 177.
LIBELS, pleading of (*see* WRITTEN INSTRUMENTS), 167 *et seq.*
LICENSE, existence of, when to be negatived, 238, 239, 240.
LIMITATION, STATUTES OF.
Construction to be liberal to defendant, 316.
statute need not to be specially pleaded, 317.
indictment should aver offence within statute or exclude exceptions, 318.
statute, unless general, operates only on specified offences, 319.
statute is retrospective, 320.
statute begins to run from commission of crime, continuous offences, 321.
indictment or information saves statute, 322.
in some jurisdictions statute saved by warrant or presentment, 323.
when flight suspends statute, it is revived by temporary return, 324.

LIMITATION, STATUTES OF—*(continued)*.
failure of defective indictment does not revive statute, 325.
courts look with disfavor on long delays in prosecution, 326.
statute not suspended by fraud, 327.
under statute indictment unduly delayed may be discharged, 328.
"three term statutes," 328, 523.
statutes have no extra-territorial effects, 329.
may be applied on *habeas corpus*, 1006.
foreign statutes may bar further proceedings, 450.
LIQUOR, INTOXICATING, when juror may take, 841.
LIQUOR PROSECUTIONS, plea of *autrefois acquit* in, 472.
LIS PENDENS, not barring further proceedings, 452.
LOCAL DESCRIPTION, how to be given (*see* PLACE), 145.
LOCALITY, how averred, 145.
LORD'S DAY (*see* SUNDAY).
LOST DOCUMENT, how to be pleaded, 176, 178.
LOST INDICTMENT, proceedings on, 278.
LOT, resort to, when vitiating verdict, 842.
LOTTERY, when indictment must specify, 167 *et seq.*
when several tickets may be joined, 470.
"LYING IN WAIT," when to be averred, 260.
LUNACY (*see* INSANITY).

MAGISTRATE, practice as to arrest and committal (*see* ARREST), 1–60.
relief from imprisonment by (*see* HABEAS CORPUS), 992.
power of as to contempt, 963.
hearing before, 70.
MAJOR OFFENCE, effect of conviction or acquittal of, 245, 248, 742, 910.
MALFEASANCE, averment of, 127, 151.
"MALICE AFORETHOUGHT," when essential to homicide, 258.
MALICE AND NEGLIGENCE, effect of concurrence of, 468.
MALICIOUS MISCHIEF, statutory indictments for, 220 *et seq.*
description of animals in, 237.
"MALICIOUSLY," averment of, 258, 269.
MANACLES, when prisoner is to be put in, 540 *a*.
MANSLAUGHTER, indictment for murder contains, 246, 248.
verdict for, 742.
conviction of bars murder, 465.
bail in cases of, 74 *et seq.*, 1007.
MARGIN OF INDICTMENT, averments in, 91 *et seq.*
MARKS OF QUOTATION, when proper averment of tenor, 175.
MARRIED WOMAN, may be indicted with her husband, 306 *a*.
MARTIAL LAW, characteristics of, 979, note.
effect of convictions by, 439.
MATERIAL AVERMENTS, necessary to be made, 151.
MATRONS, jury of, 917.

MAYHEM, technical requisites for indictment, 260.
may be convicted of assault under, 742.
MEANS, when to be set out in indictment, 151–159.
MEAT, how to be averred in indictment, 209.
MERCY, recommendation to, effect of, 757.
MERGER, operation of when felony and misdemeanor are part of one act, 464.
MIDDLE NAME, when to be averred, 101.
MILITARY COURTS, where judgment of is a bar, 439.
when reviewable on *habeas corpus*, 997.
MILITARY JUDGMENTS, when reviewable on *habeas corpus*, 997.
MILITARY LAW, characteristics of, 979, note.
MILITARY OFFENCES, no extradition for (*see* EXTRADITION), 44.
MINERALS, averments of (*see* PERSONAL CHATTELS), 211.
MINOR OFFENCE may be inclosed in major, 245, 248, 742, 910.
MISCHIEF (*see* MALICIOUS MISCHIEF).
MISCONDUCT in court may be punished by attachment, 954 *et seq.*
MISCONDUCT OF JURY, how to be punished, 717.
MISDEMEANOR may be inclosed in felony, 249.
conviction on trial for felony, 464, 742.
bail in cases of, 74, 1007.
when defendant must be present in trial of, 541.
may be joined with other offences, 247, 285.
election in such cases, 293.
challenges in cases of, 608 *et seq.*
MISDEMEANORS, right to arrest for (*see* ARREST), 8 *et seq.*, 17.
MISJOINDER of defendants, how excepted to (*see* JOINDER), 307.
MISNOMER, effect of, 96 *et seq.*
plea of, 423.
MISSPELLING, when fatal to pleading (*see* CLERICAL ERRORS), 273.
MISTAKE, WHEN GROUND FOR NEW TRIAL.
Mistake may be ground if there was due diligence, 876.
mistake of law no ground, 877.
nor is negligence of counsel, 878.
otherwise as to blunder or confusion of witness, 879.
mistake of jury as to punishment, 880.
MONEY, averment of, 190, 218.
MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL (*see* NEW TRIAL).
MOTION IN ARREST (*see* ARREST OF JUDGMENT).
MOTION TO QUASH (*see* QUASHING).
MOTIONS, when defendant must be present at argument of, 548.
MUNICIPAL CONVICTION, when barring further prosecution, 440.
MURDER, technical requisites in indictment for, 258, 260.
verdict for (*see* VERDICT), 742.
sentence for (*see* SENTENCE), 914.
barred by conviction of manslaughter, 465.
MUTE, standing on arraignment, effect of, 417.

NAME, abatement for error in, 423.
NATIONAL COURTS (*see* FEDERAL COURTS).
NAME AND ADDITION, PLEADING OF.
As to Defendant.
Name of defendant should be specifically given, 96.
omission of surname is fatal, 97.
mistake as to either surname or Christian name may be met by abatement, 98.
surname may be laid as *alias*, 99.
inhabitants of parish and corporations may be indicted in corporate name, 100.
middle names to be given when essential, 101.
initials requisite when used by party, 102.
party cannot dispute a name accepted by him, 103.
unknown party may be approximately described, 104.
at common law, addition is necessary, 105.
wrong addition to be met by plea in abatement, 106.
defendant's residence must be given, 107.
"Junior" must be alleged when party is known as such, 108.
error must be met by plea in abatement, 423.
As to Parties injured and Third Parties.
Name, only, of third person need be given, 109.
corporate title must be special, 110.
third person may be described as unknown, 111.
but this allegation may be traversed, 112.
the test is, whether the name was unknown to grand jury, 113.
immaterial misnomer may be rejected as surplusage, 114.
sufficient if description be substantially correct, 115.
variance in third party's name is fatal, 116.
name may be given by initials, 117.
reputative name is sufficient, 118.
idem sonans is sufficient, 119.
NECESSITY, ground for discharging juror, 508, 723–4.
NEGATIVES, averment of in indictment, 238–40.
NEGLIGENCE, averments in indictments for, 127.
concurrent with malice, when absorbed, 488.
NEW TRIAL.
In what New Trials consist.
A new trial is an examination after verdict of facts and law not of record, 784.
In what Cases Courts have Authority to grant.—After Acquittal.
No new trial after acquittal, 785.
otherwise when verdict was fraudulent, 786.
so in *quasi* civil cases, 787.
motion for new trial only applicable to counts where there has been a conviction, 788.

NEW TRIAL—(*continued*).
conviction of minor offence is acquittal of major, 789.
After Conviction.
Generally new trial can be granted at discretion of court, 790.
For what Reasons.—Misdirection of Court.
Any material misruling ground for new trial, 793.
and so as to mistaken ruling as to presumption of fact, 794.
omission to charge cumulatively is no error, 795.
judge not required to charge as to undisputed law, when no points are tendered, 796.
otherwise when jury fall into error from lack of instruction, 796 *a*.
abstract dissertations by judge are not required, 797.
judge may give opinion as to weight of evidence, 798.
preadjudication by, may be ground for new trial, 798 *a*.
judge may give supplementary charge, but not in absence of defendant, 799.
erroneous instruction on one count vitiates when there is general verdict, 800.
Mistake as to Admission or Rejection of Evidence.
Such error ground for new trial, 801.
usually court will not presume that illegal evidence had no effect, 802.
when erroneous ruling is rescinded no ground for a new trial, 803.
objection to avail must have been made at the time, 804.
Verdict against Law.
Jury bound to receive law from court, 805.
earlier doctrine in this respect to the contrary, 806.
early cases no longer authoritative, 807.
jury are at common law not judges of law, 810.
court bound to hear counsel as to law, 811.
court may direct acquittal or conviction, 812.
Verdict against Evidence.
Verdict against evidence may be set aside, 813.
Irregularity in Conduct of Jury.
Mere inadvertent and innoxious separation not generally ground for new trial, 814.
in some courts this view is not accepted, 815.
separation before case is opened is always permissible, 816.
in misdemeanors jury may separate during trial, 817.
and so as to felonies less than capital, 818.
but not generally as to capital felonies, 819.
court in such cases may adjourn from day to day, 820.
conflict of opinion as to whether separation after committal of case is permissible, 821.
courts holding such separation absolutely fatal, 822.
courts holding such separation only *prima facie* ground for new trial, 823.

NEW TRIAL—(*continued*).
courts holding such separation fatal only when there has been proof of tampering, 824.
the latter is the prevailing view as to misdemeanors, 825.
prevailing view is that such irregularities may be cured by consent, 826.
unsworn or improper officer in charge is ground for new trial; intrusion of officer during deliberations, 827.
and so of improper reception of materials of proof, 828.
and so of irregular reception of books, 829.
and so of reception of reports of trial, 829 *a*.
and so of irregular communications of court, 830.
and so of conversing with others as to case, 831.
and so of presence of party, 832.
and so of material testimony submitted by jury or others, 833.
and so of visiting scene of offence, 834.
but not accidental intrusion or necessary visit, 835.
mere casual exhibition of evidence not fatal, 836.
and so of the mere approach of strangers, and trivial conversation, 837.
but presumption is against communications, 838.
inattention of juror not ordinarily ground, 839.
but otherwise as to disobedience to court resulting in injury, 840.
intoxication ground for new trial, 841.
so of casting lots by jurors, when decisive, 732, 842.
otherwise as to mere collateral indecorum, 843.
absolute preadjudication by juror ground for new trial when a surprise, 844.
otherwise when party could have known of prejudice in time for challenge, 845.
absolute incapacity of juror a ground, 846.
juror inadmissible to impeach verdict, 847.
and so are affidavits attacking jury, 848.
Misconduct of Prevailing Party.
Such misconduct ground for new trial, 849.
and so of undue influence on jury, 850.
and so of tampering with evidence, 851.
and so of tricks when operative, 852.
but not of remarks of opposite counsel unless objected to at time, 577, 853.
After-discovered Evidence.
Motion must be special, 855.
must be supported by affidavits, 856.
may be contested, 857.
must be usually moved before judgment, 858.
evidence must be newly discovered, 859.
acquitted co-defendant as a witness is no ground, 860.
nor is acquittal of defendant of a part of a charge on which he was excluded as a witness, 860 *a*.

NEW TRIAL—(*continued*).
evidence discovered before verdict should be given to jury, 861.
if evidence could have been secured at trial, ground fails, 862.
and so of withholding papers which due diligence could have secured, 863.
otherwise in cases of surprise, 864.
party disabled who neglects to obtain evidence on trial, 865.
evidence must be material and not cumulative, 866.
surprise is an exception, 867.
and so when evidence is of a distinct class, 868.
new trial not granted merely to discredit opposing witness, 869.
subsequent indictment for perjury no ground, 870.
evidence should be such as to change result on merits, 871.
new defence must not be merely technical, 872.
acquittal of co-defendant no ground, 873.
otherwise as to refusal to sever defendants, 874.
Absence of Defendant on Trial.
Such absence may be ground for new trial, 875.
Mistake in Conduct of Cause.
Mistake may be ground if there was due diligence, 876.
mistake of law no ground, 877.
nor is negligence of counsel, 878.
otherwise as to blunder or confusion of witness, 879.
but not mistake of jury as to punishment, 880.
Surprise.
Surprise, when genuine and productive of injustice, ground for new trial, 881.
so of undue haste in hurrying on trial, 882.
but absence of witness no ground when evidence is cumulative, 883.
ordinary surprise at evidence no ground, 884.
nor is unexpected bias of witness, 885.
Irregularity in Summoning of Jury.
Ordinarily defects in jury process no ground, 886.
and so of irregularity in finding bill, 887.
otherwise as to after discovery of incompetency of juror, 888.
and so of prejudice of jury, and popular excitement, 889.
At what Time Motion must be made.
Motion must be prompt, 890.
when verdict is set aside new trial is at once ordered, 891.
To whom Motion applies.
Any defendant may move, 892.
defendant must be personally in court, 893.
new trial may be granted as to one of several, 894.
When Conviction is for only Part of Indictment.
New trial goes only to convicted counts, 895.
conviction of minor offence is acquittal of major, 896.

NEW TRIAL—(*continued*).
By what Courts.
Appellate court may revise evidence from notes, 897.
conflict of opinion as to whether successor of judge can hear motion, 898.
In what Form.
Rule to show cause first granted, 899.
motion must state reasons, 900.
Costs.
Costs may await second trial, 901.
Error.
Error does not usually lie to action of court, 779, 902.
NIGHT-TIME, averment of, 130.
NIGHT WALKERS, arrest of, 80.
NOLLE PROSEQUI, a prerogative of sovereign, 383.
when to be granted, 384.
not a bar to indictment, 447.
NOLO CONTENDERE, effect of plea of, 418.
NOTARIES, have no power to commit for contempt, 963.
NOT GUILTY, plea of (*see* PLEAS), 408.
NOVEL ASSIGNMENT, in criminal cases, inadmissible, 489.
NUISANCE, general statement of is sufficient, 155.
continuandos in indictments for, 125.
NUISANCES, bill of particulars allowed in, 703.
NUL TIEL RECORD, replication of, 487.
NUMBER, how to be averred, 212.
averments of divisible, 252.
NUMERALS, when allowed in pleading, 124, 274.
NUNC PRO TUNC, entry of sentence by, 913.

OATH, of jury, form of, 716.
to jury of matrons, 917.
to grand jury, 343.
to officer in charge of jury, 827.
"OBLIGATION," averment of, 198.
OBSCENE WORDS, indictment for, 203.
OBSCENE WRITING OR PICTURE, how to be pleaded, 177.
OFFENCE, STATEMENT OF IN INDICTMENT.
Offence must be set forth with reasonable certainty, 151.
omission of essential incidents is fatal, 152.
terms must be technically exact, 153.
not enough to charge conclusion of law, 154.
excepting in cases of "common barrators," "common scolds," and certain nuisances, 155.
matters unknown may be proximately described, 156.
bill of particulars may be required, 157.
surplusage need not be stated, and if stated may be disregarded, 158.

OFFENCE, STATEMENT OF, IN INDICTMENT—(*continued*).
videlicet is the pointing out of an averment as a probable specification, 158 *a*.
assault may be sustained without specification of object, 159.
act of one confederate may be averred as act of the other, 159 *a*.
descriptive averment must be proved, 160.
alternative statements are inadmissible, 161.
disjunctive offences in statute may be conjunctively stated, 162.
otherwise as to distinct and substantive offences, 163.
intent when necessary must be averred, 163 *a*.
and so of guilty knowledge, 164.
inducement and aggravation need not be detailed, 165.
particularity is required for identification and protection, 166.
OFFENCES, JOINDER OF (*see* JOINDER OF OFFENCES), 285.
OFFICER, duties of when attending jury (*see* TRIAL), 827.
OFFICER DE FACTO, title not reviewable on *habeas corpus*, 996.
OFFICERS.
Officer not protected by illegal warrant, 5.
warrant omitting essentials is illegal, 6.
not necessary for officers to show warrant, 7.
peace officers may arrest without warrant for offences in their presence, and for past felonies and breaches of the peace, 8.
reasonable suspicion convertible with probable cause, 9.
title of, how far to be detailed in indictment, 152, 158.
OFFICERS OF COURT, misconduct of may be punished by attachment, 953.
OLD AGE, when relieving juror, 692.
OMISSIONS in indictment, when fatal, 275.
OMISSIONS IN CHARGE, when ground for new trial, 795.
"ONCE IN JEOPARDY," plea of (*see* AUTREFOIS ACQUIT), 490 *et seq.*
OPENING SPEECHES, practice as to, 561.
OPINION OF JUDGE, as to facts, when permissible, 798.
OPINION OF JUROR, when excluding, 622.
"OR," when fatal in indictment, 161.
when in statute, how to be pleaded, 251.
ORAL PLEAS, how to be tendered, 411.
"ORDER," meaning of, 193.
ORDER OF PLEAS (*see* PLEAS), 419.
ORDER OF PROCEEDINGS (*see* TRIAL).
ORIGINATION OF PROSECUTIONS, conflict as to right of, 332.
OVERT ACT, when surplusage, 253.
OWNERSHIP, how to be averred, 109 *et seq.*, 111, 112.

PAPER, indictment to be on, 277, 278.
PAPERS, what may go to jury, 828 *et seq.*

PARDON.
Pardon is a relief from the legal consequences of crime, 521.
pardon before conviction to be exactly construed, 522.
pardon after conviction more indulgently construed, 523.
rehabilitation is restoration to *status*, 524.
amnesty is addressed to class of people, and is in nature of compact, 525.
executive pardon must be specially pleaded; otherwise amnesty, 526.
pardons cannot be prospective, 527.
pardon before sentence remits costs and penalties, 528.
limited in impeachments, 529.
and so as to contempts, 530.
must be delivered and accepted, but cannot be revoked, 531.
void when fraudulent, 532.
conditional pardons are valid, 533.
pardon does not reach second convictions, 534.
pardon must recite conviction, 535.
calling a witness as State's evidence is not pardon, 536.
foreign pardons operative as to crimes within sovereign's jurisdiction, 537.
held not to release in cases of contempt, 973.
may be applied in cases of *habeas corpus*, 1006.
PARISH, how to be described in indictment, 100.
PARTICULARITY, why prescribed in indictment, 166.
PARTICULARS, BILL OF, may be required when indictment is general, 702.
affidavit should be made, 703.
particulars may be ordered on general pleas, 704.
action on particulars not usually subject of error, 705.
may be required when proper, 157, 702.
PEACE, binding over to, as part of sentence, 82, 941.
PEACE OFFICER, practice as to arrest and committal by (*see* ARREST), 1–60.
PENALTIES, when cancelled by pardon, 528.
PENCIL WRITING, when sufficient in pleading, 278 *a*.
PEREMPTORY CHALLENGES (*see* CHALLENGES), 612.
Prosecution has no peremptory challenge, but may set aside juror, 612.
practice is under direction of court, 613.
defendant may peremptorily challenge at common law, 614.
rule as to joint defendants, 614 *a*.
on preliminary issues no challenge, 615.
nor on collateral issues, 616.
right ceases when panel is complete, 617.
in misdemeanors no peremptory challenges at common law, 618.
matured challenge cannot ordinarily be recalled, 619.
right is to reject, not select, 620.
PERJURY, technical terms in, 264.
defendants cannot be joined in, 302.
divisibility of assignments in, 158, 253, 254.

PERJURY—(*continued*).
lies for false oath before grand jury, 358 *a*, 378.
when ground for new trial, 870.
how oath and record to be set out in, 167, 173 *et seq.*
before grand jury, 378.
PERSON, how to be named in indictment (*see* NAME), 96 *et seq.*
PERSONAL CHATTELS, DESCRIPTION OF.
Indefinite, Insensible, or Lumping Descriptions.
Personal chattels, when subjects of an offence, must be specifically described, 206.
when notes are stolen in a bunch, denominations may be proximately given, 207.
certainty must be such as to individuate offence, 208.
"dead" animals must be averred to be such; "living" must be specifically described, 209.
when only specified members of a class are subjects of offence, then specifications must be given, 210.
minerals must be averred to be severed from realty, 211.
variance in number or value is immaterial, 212.
Value.
Value must be assigned when larceny is charged, 213.
larceny of "piece of paper" may be prosecuted, 214.
value essential to restitution, and also to mark grades, 215.
legal currency need not be valued, 216.
when there is lumping valuation, conviction cannot be had for stealing fraction, 217.
Money and Coin.
Money must be specifically described, 218.
when money is given to change, and change is kept, indictment cannot aver stealing change, 219.
PETIT JURY (*see* CHALLENGES, JURY).
"PIECE OF PAPER," averment of, 202.
PLACE, statement of in indictment, 139.
enough to lay venue within jurisdiction, 139.
when act is by agent, principal to be charged as of place of act, 140.
when county is divided, jurisdiction is to be laid in court of *locus delicti*, 141.
when county includes several jurisdictions, jurisdiction must be specified, 142.
name of State not necessary to indictment, 143.
sub-description in transitory offences immaterial, 144.
but not in matters of local description, 145.
"county aforesaid" is enough, 146.
title, when changed by legislature, must be followed, 147.
venue must follow fine, 148.
in larceny venue may be laid in place where goods are taken, 149.
omission of venue is fatal, 150.

PLEA.

Guilty or not Guilty.

Plea of not guilty is general issue, 408.
plea is essential to issue, 409.
omission of *similiter* not fatal, 410.
in felonies pleas must be in person, 411.
pleas must be several, 412.
plea of guilty reserves motion in arrest and error, 413.
may at discretion be withdrawn, 414.
mistakes in may be corrected, 415.
after plea degree of offence may be ascertained by witnesses, 416.
plea of not guilty may be entered by order of court, 417.
plea of *nolo contendere* equivalent to guilty, 418.

Special Pleas.

Repugnant pleas cannot be pleaded simultaneously, 419.
in practice special plea is tried first, 420.
judgment against defendant on special plea is *respondeat ouster*, 421.

Plea to the Jurisdiction.

Jurisdiction may be excepted to by plea, 422.

Plea in abatement.

error as to defendant's name may be met by plea in abatement, 423.
and so of error in addition, 424.
judgment for defendant no bar to indictment in right name, 425.
after not guilty plea in abatement is too late, 426.
plea to be construed strictly, 427.
defendant may plead over, 428.

Other Special Pleas.

Plea of non-identity only allowed in cases of escape, 429.
Plea of insanity allowed under special statute, 429 *a*.
plea to constitution of grand jury must be sustained in fact, 430.
pendency of other indictment no bar, 431.
plea of pregnancy, 917.
plea of law is for court, 432.
ruling for prosecution on special plea is equivalent to judgment on demurrer, 433.

Autrefois Acquit or Convict.—As to Nature of Judgment.

Acquittal without judgment a bar, but not always conviction, 435.
arbitrary discharge may operate as an acquittal, 436.
record of former judgment must have been produced, 437.
court must have had jurisdiction, 438.
judgment by court-martial no bar, 439.
and so of police and municipal conviction, 440.
of courts with concurrent jurisdiction, the court first acting has control, 441.
offence having distinct aspects successive governments may prosecute, 442.
proceedings for contempt no bar, 444.

PLEA—(*continued*).
nor proceedings for *habeas corpus*, 445.
Ignoramus and quashing no bar, 446.
nor is *nolle prosequi* or dismissal, 447.
after verdict *nolle prosequi* a bar, 448.
discharge for want of prosecution not a bar, 449.
foreign statutes of limitation a bar, 450.
fraudulent prior judgment no bar, 451.
nor is pendency of prior indictment, 452.
nor is pendency of civil proceedings, 453.
new trial after conviction of minor is bar to major, 455.
As to Form of Indictment.
If former indictment could have sustained a verdict, judgment is a bar, 456.
judgment on defective indictment is no bar, 457.
same test applies to acquittal of principal or accessary, 458.
acquittal on one count does not affect other counts; but otherwise as to conviction, 459.
acquittal from misnomer or misdescription no bar, 460.
nor is acquittal from variance as to intent, 461.
otherwise as to variance as to time, 462.
acquittal on joint indictment a bar if defendant could have been legally convicted, 463.
acquittal from merger no bar, 464.
where an indictment contains a minor offence inclosed in a major, a conviction or acquittal of minor bars major, 465.
conviction of major offence bars minor when on first trial defendant could have been convicted of minor, 466.
prosecutor may bar himself by selecting a special grade, 467.
As to Nature of Offence.
When one unlawful act operates on separate objects, conviction as to one object does not extinguish prosecution as to other; *e. g.*, when two persons are simultaneously killed, 468.
otherwise as to two batteries at one blow, 469.
so where several articles are simultaneously stolen, 470.
when one act has two or more indictable aspects, if the defendant could have been convicted of either under the first indictment, he cannot be convicted of the two successively, 471.
so in liquor cases, 472.
severance of identity by place, 473.
severance of identity by time, 474.
but continuous maintenance of nuisances can be successively indicted, 475.
conviction of assault no bar (after death of assaulted party) to indictment for murder, 476.
Practice under Plea.
Plea must be special, 477.
must be pleaded before not guilty, 478.

PLEA—(*continued*).
verdict must go to plea, 479.
identity of offender and offence to be established, 480.
identity may be proved by parol, 481.
plea, if not identical, may be demurred to, 482.
burden of proof is on defendant, 483.
when replication is *nul tiel record* issue is for court, 484.
replication of fraud is good on demurrer, 485.
on judgment against defendant he is usually allowed to plead over, 486.
prosecution may rejoin on its demurrer being overruled, 487.
issue of fact is for jury, 488.
novel assignment not admissible, 489.
Once in Jeopardy.
Constitutional limitation taken from common law, 490.
but in some courts held more extensive, 491.
rule may extend to all infamous crimes, 492.
in Pennsylvania, any separation in capital cases except from actual necessity bars further proceedings, 493.
so in Virginia, 494.
and in North Carolina, 495.
and in Tennessee, 496.
and in Alabama, 497.
and in California, 498.
in the federal courts a discretionary discharge is no bar, 500.
so in Massachusetts, 501.
so in New York, 502.
so in Maryland, 503.
so in Mississippi and Louisiana, 504.
so in Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Iowa, Nebraska, Nevada, Arkansas, and Texas, 505.
so in Kentucky, Georgia, and Missouri, 506.
so in South Carolina, 506 *a*.
no jeopardy on defective indictment, 507.
illness or death of juror is sufficient excuse for discharge, 508.
discharge of jury from intermediately discovered incapacity no bar, 509.
conviction no bar when set aside for defective ruling of judge, 510.
and so of discharge from sickness of defendant, 511.
discharge from surprise a bar, 512.
discharge from statutory close of court no bar, 513.
and so from sickness of judge, 514.
and so from death of judge, 515.
but not from sickness or incapacity of witness, 516.
until jury are "charged" jeopardy does not begin, 517.
waiver by motion for arrest, new trial, or writ of error, 518.
in misdemeanors separation of jury permitted, 519.
plea must be special; record must specify facts, 520.

PLEA OF PARDON.
Pardon is a relief from the legal consequences of crime, 521.
pardon before conviction to be rigidly construed, 522.
pardon after conviction more indulgently construed, 523.
rehabilitation is restoration to *status*, 524.
amnesty is addressed to class of people, and is in nature of compact, 525.
executive pardon must be specially pleaded, otherwise amnesty, 526.
pardons cannot be prospective, 527.
pardon before sentence remits costs and penalties, 528.
limited in impeachments, 529.
so as to contempts, 530.
must be delivered, 531.
void when fraudulent, 532.
conditional pardons are valid, 533.
pardon does not reach second conviction, 534.
pardon must recite conviction, 535.
calling a witness as State's evidence is not pardon, 536.
foreign pardons operative as to crimes within sovereign's jurisdiction, 537.
PLEADING, waivers in, 759. *See* 733.
PLEADING OVER, practice as to, 404–7.
POLICE CONVICTIONS, when reviewable by *habeas corpus*, 998.
POLICE JUDGMENT, when a bar to further proceedings, 440.
POLICE OFFICER, arrest by (*see* ARREST), 1–62.
revision of arrest by *habeas corpus*, 922.
POLITICAL OFFENCES, no extradition for (*see* EXTRADITION), 42.
POLLING JURY, when a right, 750.
POLLS, challenges to (*see* CHALLENGES), 612 *et seq.*
POSTPONEMENT (*see* CONTINUANCE).
PREAMBLE OF STATUTE, effect of, 222–238.
PREGNANCY, ground for respite in capital cases, 917.
PREJUDICE, when ground for challenge (*see* CHALLENGE).
preadjudication of case is ground for challenge, 622.
but opinions thrown out as jest, or as vague, loose talk, do not ordinarily disqualify, 623.
nor does a general bias against crime, 624.
views held in particular jurisdictions, 625–52.
opinion must go to whole case, 653.
juror must answer questions, though not to inculpate himself, 654.
must first be sworn on *voir dire*, 655.
court may ask questions, 656.
only party prejudiced may challenge, 657.
juror may be examined as to details, 658.
bias must go to immediate issue, 659.
relationship a cause for challenge, 660.
and so of prior connection with case, 661.
and so of participation in cognate offence, 661 *a*.

PREJUDICE—(*continued*).
and so of pecuniary interest in result, 662.
and so of irreligion and infamy, 663.
and so of conscientious scruples as to capital punishment, 664.
and so of other conscientious scruples, 665.
and so of belief that statute is unconstitutional, 666.
membership of specific "vigilance" associations, or proscriptive organizations, may disqualify, but not of general association to put down crime, 668.
when ground for new trial, 844.
popular, when ground for new trial, 889.
PREMISES, description of, 145.
view of, when granted, 707.
PRESENCE OF DEFENDANT IN COURT.
Defendant's appearance must be in person, 540.
in felonies must be in custody, 540 *a*.
right may be waived in misdemeanors of nature of civil process, 541.
in such cases waiver may be by attorney, 542.
removal of defendant for turbulent conduct does not militate against rule, 543.
involuntary illness not a waiver, 544.
presence essential at arraignment and empanelling, 545.
also at reception of testimony, 546.
also at charge of court, 547.
at view of premises, 707.
but not at making and arguing of motions, 548.
presence essential at reception of verdict, 549.
and at sentence, 550.
presence presumed to be continuous, 551.
PRESENTMENT, by grand jury, 86.
PRESIDENT, power of as to *habeas corpus*, 979.
power of as to pardon (*see* PARDON).
PRESUMPTION, erroneous charging, 794.
as to ground for new trial, 794.
PREVENTION, an incidental object of punishment, 943 *et seq*.
PRINCIPAL chargeable with agent's act, 159 *a*.
PRINCIPAL AND ACCESSARY, when joined in indictment, 304.
PRISON, mode of sentence, 918 *et seq*.
PRISONER (*see* DEFENDANT).
PRIVATE PERSONS, POWER TO ARREST.
Peace officers may require aid from private persons, 10.
officers may have special assistants, 11.
pursuers of felon are protected, 12.
private persons may arrest with probable cause, 13.
may use force necessary to prevent felony, 14.
may arrest felon after escape, 15.

PRIVATE PERSONS, POWER TO ARREST—(*continued*).
may interefere to prevent riot, 16.
and so as to other offences, 17.
PRIVATE STATUTES, how to be pleaded, 224.
PRIVILEGE OF JUROR, when he may assert in order to release, 692.
PROBABLE CAUSE, sufficient to justify binding over, 73.
sufficient to justify finding bill, 360–1.
sufficient on *habeas corpus*, 1001.
PROCESS may be enforced by attachment (*see* CONTEMPT), 949.
PROFANE LANGUAGE, indictment for, 203.
"PROMISSORY NOTE," averment of, 188.
PROOF, what requisite in *habeas corpus* (*see* HABEAS CORPUS), 1000.
what requisite before committing magistrate, 71–2.
"PROPERTY," averment of, 201.
seizure of, 23.
attachment of, to collect fine, 922.
PROSECUTING ATTORNEY (*see* ATTORNEY-GENERAL, COUNSEL).
when allowance necessary to writ of error, 774.
may employ associates, 555.
PROSECUTION, usually begins with oath before magistrate, 1.
officer may be described by office, 2.
to arrest, corporal control and notice are essential, 3.
but notice may be by implication, 4.
institution of (*see* GRAND JURY).
conflict of opinion as to power of grand jury to originate prosecutions, 332.
theory that such power belongs to grand jury, 334.
theory that grand juries are limited to cases of notoriety, or in their own knowledge, or given to them by court or prosecuting officers, 335.
theory that grand juries are restricted to cases returned by magistrates and prosecuting officers, 339.
power of grand juries limited to court summoning them, 340.
PROSECUTOR, when name must be on bill, 358.
to be notified of *habeas corpus*, 985.
PROVISOS, how to be pleaded, 238.
PUBLICATIONS reflecting on court may be a contempt, 959.
PUBLIC EXCITEMENT, when ground to continue case, 598.
when ground for change of venue, 602.
when ground for new trial, 889.
PUBLIC OFFICER (*see* OFFICER).
PUNISHMENT (*see* SENTENCE).
Distribution as to Counts.
On general verdict superfluous counts may be got rid of by *nolle prosequi*, 907.
and so even as to bad count, 908.
conflict as to general sentence when some counts are bad, 909.
a verdict and judgment as to one count disposes of the others, 909 *a*.

PUNISHMENT—(*continued*).
successive punishments may be given on successive counts, 910.
but only where counts are for distinctive offences, 911.
practice as to designating in verdict, 752.
PUNISHMENT, CAPITAL, 914.
PUNISHMENT, CORPORAL.
Limits to be determined by statute. Discretion of court, 918.
fine and imprisonment are the usual common law penalties, 919.
"cruel and unusual" punishments unlawful, 920.
"whipping" not cruel and unusual, 921.
PUNISHMENTS, assignment of, 942.
courts have usually large discretion, 942.
primary object is retribution; but example and reform to be incidental, 943.
evidence may be received in aggravation or mitigation of guilt, 945.
"PURPORT," meaning of term, 169.
PURSUERS, right of, to arrest, 10–13.

QUASHING BILL, not a bar to indictment, 446.
QUASHING INDICTMENTS.
Indictment will be quashed when no judgment can be entered on it, 385.
quashing refused except in clear case, 386.
quashing usually matter of discretion, 387.
extrinsic facts usually no ground for quashing, 388.
defendants may be severed in quashing, 389.
when two indictments are pending one may be quashed, 390.
quashing ordered in vexatious cases, 391.
so when bill is defectively found, 344.
bail may be demanded after quashing, 392.
pending motion *nolle prosequi* may be entered, 393.
one count may be quashed, 394.
quashing may be on motion of prosecution, 395.
time usually before plea, 396.
motion should state grounds, 397.
"QUEUES OF CHINESE," cutting off as a penal discipline, 920.
QUOTATION MARKS, effect of in indictment, 175.
effect of in pleading, 175.

RAPE, technical averments in, 263.
"RAVISH," essential to rape, 263.
"RECEIPT," meaning of term, 185.
RECEIVERS, interference with a, contempt, 951.
RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS, 291.
joinder with larceny, 291.
scienter in, 164.
RECOGNIZANCES (*see* BAIL).
RECOMMENDATION TO MERCY, effect of, 757.

RECORD, revision of, on errors (*see* ERROR), 777.
must show appearance in court, 540 *et seq.*
must show grounds of discharge of jury, 520.
may be brought up by *certiorari* as well as writ of error, 770–1003.
may be amended during term, 93, 913.
mode of pleading, 135, 417.
RECORD DATES, how to be averred in indictment, 135.
REFORM, an incidental object of punishment, 943 *et seq.*
REFRESHMENTS, what may go to jury, 731.
REGULARITY, presumption of, 779 *a.*
REHABILITATION, effect of in pardon, 525 *et seq.*
RELATIONSHIP, when a cause for challenge, 660.
REMOVAL OF CASES to federal courts, 783 *a.*
REMOVAL OF DEFENDANT from one federal district to another, 37 *b.*
REPLICATION to *autrefois acquit*, 484.
REPLY, in argument, practice as to, 576.
REPUGNANCY.
Where material averments are repugnant, indictment is bad, 256.
and so as to general verdict when counts are repugnant, 738.
REPUGNANT PLEAS, effect of, 419.
"REQUEST," averment of, 194.
REQUISITION, in extradition (*see* EXTRADITION), 31.
RESIDENCE, of defendant, when to be averred, 107.
RESPITE OF SENTENCE, practice as to, 913, 917.
RESPONDEAT OUSTER, judgment of, 421.
RESTITUTION OF GOODS, judgment of, 918.
RETRIBUTION, primary object of punishment, 943.
RETROSPECTIVE PUNISHMENT, when applicable, 946.
RIGHTS, WAIVER OF, how far permitted (*see* WAIVER), 733.
RIOT, number of defendants necessary to, 306.
verdict as to, 755.
severance as to, 309.
right of private persons to suppress, 16.
not barred by prosecution for assault, 471.
when inclosing assault, 742.
ROBBERY, technical averments in, 267.
when including minor offence, 244–6, 465.
averment of goods in, 206 *et seq.*
SABBATH, how to be averred, 21.
"SAID," effect of in indictment, 146, 298.
SALE, averment of in indictment for illegal selling, 220 *et seq.*
distinctions as to on plea of *autrefois acquit*, 472.
negation of license, 238.
bill of particulars, 702.
"SAME," effect of averment in indictment, 298.
SCANDALOUS WORDS, how averred, 203.

SCIENTER, when to be averred in indictment, 164, 272.
"SCOLD, COMMON," may be indicted as such, 155.
SEAL, when necessary to warrant, 6.
when to be described in indictment, 180.
SEALED VERDICT, practice as to (*see* VERDICT), 749.
SEARCH-WARRANTS, right to execute (*see* ARREST), 22.
SECOND OFFENCES, practice as to, 934 *et seq.*
SECRECY, how far required in grand jury (*see* GRAND JURY).
SECURITY, for good behavior, 79.
in other cases, 74 *et seq.*, 941.
SEIZING GOODS, power of, under warrant, 22, 60.
SENTENCE.
Defendant to be asked if he has anything to say.
In felonies this is essential, 906.
Distribution of Punishment as to Counts.
On general verdict superfluous counts may be got rid of by *nolle prosequi*, 907.
and so even as to bad count, 908.
conflict as to general sentence when some counts are bad, 909.
a verdict and judgment as to one count disposes of the others, 909 *a*.
successive punishments may be given on successive counts, 910.
but only where counts are not for distinct offences, 911.
Defendant's Presence Essential, 912.
Amendment or Stay.
Court may amend or stay during term, 913.
When Reviewable by habeas corpus, 994, 995, 996.
Capital Punishment.
On verdict of guilty on indictment for murder court will sentence for second degree, 914.
defendant to be asked as to sentence, and may reply, 915.
as to form of sentence, practice varies, 916.
pregnancy is ground for respite, 917.
Corporal Punishment.
Limits to be determined by statute. Discretion of court. Reversal for sentence below limit. Restitution, 918.
fine and imprisonment are the usual common law penalties, 919.
"cruel and unusual" punishments unlawful, 920.
"whipping" not cruel and unusual, 921.
Fines and Abatement.
Fines may be collected by execution, 922.
abatement a form of execution, 922 *a*.
Form of Sentence.
Must be definite, 923.
but may present alternatives, 924.
day of sentence is first day of imprisonment, 925.
endurance of full sentence necessary to satisfaction, 925 *a*.

SENTENCE—(*continued*).
defects of not ordinarily reviewable on *habeas corpus*, 995.
prison need not at common law be specified, 926.
Sentence by Appellate Court.
Appellate court may sentence or may reverse for error, 927.
in capital and other cases record remanded to court below for execution, 928.
Sentence by succeeding Judge.
Such sentence may be regular, 929.
Successive Imprisonments.
Prisoner may be brought up for second trial by *habeas corpus*, 231.
a second imprisonment begins at the former's termination, 932.
an escaped prisoner may be sentenced for escape in like manner, 933.
When Severer Punishment is assigned to Second Offence.
Such statutes constitutional, 934.
Under statutes to this effect, prior conviction should be averred, 935.
prior conviction must be legal. *Foreign* conviction not adequate, 936.
conviction to be proved by record and identification, 937.
prosecution may waive first conviction, 937 *a*.
prior conviction not to be put in evidence until main issue is found against defendant, 938.
Disfranchisement and incapacitation.
Conviction a prerequisite to disfranchisement, 939.
and so of forfeiture of office, 939 *a*.
and so of incapacitation as witness, 939 *b*.
Joint Sentences.
Joint defendants may each be punished to full amount, 940.
Bindings to keep the Peace.
Defendant after verdict may be bound over to keep the peace, 941.
Considerations in adjusting Sentence.
Courts have usually large discretion, 942.
primary object is retribution; but example and reform to be incidental, 943.
evidence may be received in aggravation or mitigation of guilt, 945.
defendant must be present at, 550.
when reviewable on *habeas corpus*, 994.
Ex post facto Penalties.
How far constitutional, 946.
SEPARATE TRIALS, right to (*see* SEVERANCE), 309.
SEPARATION OF JURIES IN TRIAL, summary of law as to (*see* TRIAL), 821.
SEPARATION OF WITNESSES, when ordered, 569.
SETTING ASIDE JURORS, 612.
SEVERANCE OF DEFENDANTS, when allowed on trial, 309.
in verdicts, 755.
SEVERANCE OF IDENTITY OF OFFENCE, by time or place, 470 *et seq.*

SHACKLES, when defendant must be in during trial, 540 *a*.
SHERIFF, arrest by (*see* ARREST), 1–62.
return by on *habeas corpus*, 989.
SHOOTING, permissible as a mode of capital execution, 921.
indictment for an attempt, 159.
SICKNESS, of defendant during trial, effect of, 544.
of juror, when ground for discharge, 512, 724.
when ground for excuse, 692, 724.
SIGNS, how averred in indictment, 276.
SIMILITER, when required in pleading, 410.
SIMULTANEOUS OFFENCES, merger of, 468 *et seq.*
SLANDEROUS WORDS, how to be averred, 203.
SODOMY, technical averments in, 263.
SOLICITATIONS, indictments for, 159.
SOLICITOR (*see* ATTORNEY-GENERAL).
SPECIAL DEMURRER, characteristics of, 401.
SPECIAL PLEAS.
Repugnant pleas cannot be pleaded simultaneously, 419.
in practice special plea is tried first, 420.
judgment against defendant on special plea is *respondeat ouster*, 421.
plea of non-identity only allowed in cases of escape, 429.
plea to constitution of grand jury must be sustained in fact, 430.
pendency of other indictment no bar, 431.
plea of law is for court, 432.
ruling for Commonwealth on special plea is equivalent to judgment on demurrer, 433.
SPECIAL VERDICT, practice as to, 745–6.
SPEECHES OF COUNSEL, practice as to, 570 *et seq.*
SPELLING, defective, effect of, 119, 273.
SPIRITUOUS LIQUOR, when to be permitted to jury, 731, 821, 841.
selling (*see* SALE).
SPLITTING OFFENCES, in several prosecutions, objections to, 910.
STATE, duty of as to extradition (*see* EXTRADITION), 28 *et seq.*
jurisdiction of, how averred, 94, 139.
power of as to federal arrests, 980.
right to challenge, 612.
STATE COURTS, removal of cases to federal courts, 783 *a*.
cannot discharge from federal arrests, 980.
STATEMENT, right of defendant to make to jury, 579.
STATUTE, effect of in defining crime (*see* STATUTORY OFFENCES), 220.
relations of to common law, 232.
when prescribing form of indictment, 90.
what conformity to is required, 220 *et seq.*
when changing venue, 602.
effect of exceptions and provisos, 238.
when absorbing common law, 232–4.

STATUTE OF JEOFAILS, operation of, 90.
STATUTES OF LIMITATION (*see* LIMITATION), 316.
STATUTORY OFFENCES, pleading of, 220.
usually sufficient and necessary to use words of statute, 220.
otherwise when statute gives conclusion of law, 221.
and so if indictment professes but fails to set forth statute, 222.
special limitations are to be given, 223.
private statute must be pleaded in full, 224.
offence must be averred to be within statute, 225.
section or title need not be stated, 226.
where statute requires two defendants, one is not sufficient, 227.
when object of statute is in plural, it may be pleaded in singular, 227 *a*.
disjunctions in statute to be averred conjunctively, 228.
at common law defects in statutory averment not cured by verdict, 229.
statutes creating an offence are to be closely followed, 230.
when common-law offence is made penal by title, details must be given, 231.
when statute is cumulative, common law may be still pursued, 232.
when statute assigns no penalty, punishment is at common law, 233.
exhaustive statute absorbs common law, 234.
statutory technical averments to be introduced, 235.
but equivalent terms may be given, 236.
where a statute describes a class of animals by a general term, it is enough to use this term for the whole class; otherwise not, 237.
provisos and exceptions not part of definition need not be negatived, 238.
otherwise when proviso is in same clause, 239.
exception in enacting clause to be negatived, 240.
question in such case is whether the statute creates a general or a limited offence, 241.
STAY OF SENTENCE, practice as to, 913.
under writ of error, 783.
on removal of case from state to federal jurisdiction, 783 *a*.
on commutation of punishment, 533.
as to form of sentence practice varies, 916.
pregnancy is ground for respite (*see* SENTENCE), 917.
"STEAL," averment of in larceny, 266.
STREET-WALKERS, when to be held to bail, 80.
"STRUCK," essential to wound, 259.
SUBSTANTIAL AVERMENTS, necessary to be made, 151.
SUCCESSIVE PENALTIES, when permissible on successive counts, 910.
SUMMARY CONVICTIONS, when permitted, 80, 440, 998.
when reviewable on *habeas corpus*, 998.
in contempt, 948 *et seq.*
SUMMINGS UP, of counsel, 976.
of judge, 708.
"SUNDAY," how to be averred in indictment, 121.
rendering of verdict on, 758.

SUPERIOR COURTS.
Jurisdiction in contempt, 948 *et seq.*
in *habeas corpus*, 978.
distinctive powers as to *autrefois acquit*, 438.
SUPERSEDEAS, practice as to (*see* ERROR), 783.
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES (*see* FEDERAL COURTS).
SURETIES, when required to keep the peace, 80.
when required generally (*see* BAIL).
when authorized to arrest principal, 62.
when allowable on *habeas corpus*, 1007.
when respondents in *habeas corpus*, 984.
"SURNAME," pleading of (*see* NAME AND ADDITION), 98 *et seq.*
SURPLUSAGE, need not be stated in indictment, 158, 473, 474.
may be rejected, 158.
SURPRISE, as ground for new trial, 881.
when genuine and productive of injustice ground for new trial, 881.
so of undue haste in hurrying on trial, 882.
but absence of witness no ground when evidence is cumulative, 883.
ordinary surprise at evidence no ground, 884.
nor is unexpected bias of witness, 885.
SURRENDER, of principal by bail, 62.
SUSPICION, what justifies arrest, 9, 21.

"TAKE AND CARRY AWAY," essential to larceny, 266.
TAMPERING WITH JURY, how to be punished, 328, 729.
TECHNICAL AVERMENTS.
In treason, "traitorously" must be used, 257.
"malice aforethought" essential to murder, 258.
"struck" essential to wound, 259.
"feloniously" essential to felony, 260.
"feloniously" can be rejected as surplusage, 261.
in such case conviction may be had for attempt, 262.
"ravish" and "forcibly" are essential to rape, 263.
"falsely" essential to perjury, 264.
"burglariously" to burglary, 265.
"take and carry away" to larceny, 266.
"violently and against the will" to robbery, 267.
"piratical" to piracy, 268.
"unlawfully" and other aggravative terms not necessary, 269.
"forcibly" and with a strong hand, essential to forcible entry, 270.
vi et armis not essential, 271.
"knowingly" always prudent, 272.
"TENOR," meaning of term, 169.
TERM, close of, whether verdict can be given after, 513.
whether sentence can be amended after, 973.

"THEN AND THERE," effect of averment of, 131, 146.
"THERE SITUATE," meaning of allegation, 144–6.
THIEVES, COMMON, when to be held to bail, 80.
THINGS, description of (*see* PERSONAL CHATTELS), 206 *et seq.*
"THREE TERM STATUTES," limiting time of trial, 328, 523.
TIME IN INDICTMENT.
Time must be averred, but not generally material, 120.
when "Sunday" is essence of offence, day must be specified, 121.
Videlicet may introduce a date tentatively, 122.
blank as to date is fatal, 123.
substantial accuracy is enough, 124.
double or obscure dates are inadequate, 125.
date cannot be laid between two distinct periods, 126.
negligence should have time averred, 127.
time may be designated by historical epochs, 128.
recitals of time need not be accurate, 129.
hour not necessary unless required by statute, 130.
repetition may be by "then and there," 131.
other terms are insufficient, 132.
"then and there" cannot cure ambiguities, 133.
repugnant, future, or impossible dates, are bad, 134.
record dates must be accurate, 135.
and so of dates of documents, 136.
time should be within limitation, 137.
in homicide death should be within a year and a day, 138.
TIME, effect in weakening case of prosecution (*see* LIMITATION), 316, 326 *et seq.*
TITLE TO OFFICE, not reviewable on *habeas corpus*, 996.
how averred, 159, 165.
TOWN, averment of as venue, 139 *et seq.*
TRAMPS, when to be held to bail, 80.
TRANSITORY OFFENCES, averment of place in, 144.
TRANSLATION, how to be averred, 181.
TRANSPOSING COUNTS, 300.
TREASON, technical averments in, 257.
TREASURY NOTES, averments of, 189 *a*.
TREATY, extradition by (*see* EXTRADITION), 38 *et seq.*
TRIAL, INCIDENTS OF.
When must be by jury, 733.
continuance (*see* CONTINUANCE), 533 *et seq.*
change of venue, 602.
Furnishing copy of indictment, 696.
Concurrent Trial of Separate Indictments, 697.
Severance of Defendants on Trial, 698.
Arraignment.
Defendant usually required to hold up the hand, 699

TRIAL, INCIDENTS OF—(*continued*).
failure to arraign may be fatal, 700.
defendant may waive right, 701.
defendant must be present at, 540.
Bill of Particulars.
May be required when indictment is general, 702.
affidavit should be made, 703.
particulars may be ordered on general pleas, 704.
action on particulars not usually subject of error, 705.
Demurrer to Evidence.
Demurrer to evidence brings up whole case, 706.
View of Premises.
such view may be directed when conducive to justice, 707.
Examination of witnesses, 564, 565, 566.
who are to be called, 565.
when to be excluded from count, 569.
Charge of Court.
Questions of law are for court, 708.
defendant has a right to full statement of law, 709.
misdirection a cause for new trial, 710.
judge may give his opinion on evidence, 711.
must, if required, give distinct answer as to law, 712.
error to exclude point from jury unless there be no evidence, 713.
charge must be in open court and before parties, 714.
challenges of jurors (*see* CHALLENGES), 608 *et seq.*
Swearing.
Jury must appear to have been sworn, 716.
Conduct during Trial; Adjournment and Discharge.
Misconduct of jury is a contempt, 717.
in England juries may be discharged at discretion of court, 718.
in this country separations allowed in cases less than capital, 719.
otherwise as to capital cases, 720.
tampering with jury to be punished, 721.
court can discharge jury in cases of surprise when gross injustice would otherwise be done, 722.
adjournment of court is ground for discharge, 723.
and so in sickness or eminent disqualification of juror, 724.
in non-capital cases jury may be discharged at discretion of court, 725.
conflict of opinion in capital cases, 726.
Deliberations of Jury.
Jury must be secluded during deliberations, 727.
Swearing Officer.
Officer must be duly sworn, 728.
Communications by Third Parties.
Illegal communication with jury is indictable, 729.
such communications ground for new trial, 730.

TRIAL, INCIDENTS OF—(*continued*).
Food and Drink.
Food and drink may be supplied to jury, 731.
Casting Lots
May be ground for new trial, 732.
Curing Irregularities by Consent.
Consent may cure minor irregularities, 733.
Duties of Counsel.
Defendants entitled to counsel by Constitution, 557.
counsel, if necessary, may be assigned by court, 558.
such counsel may sue county for their fees, 559.
order and length of speeches at discretion of court, 560.
prosecuting attorney not to open confessions or matter of doubtful admissibility, 561.
counsel on both sides should be candid in opening, 562.
opening speeches not to sum up, 563.
examination of witnesses at discretion of court, 564.
prosecution should call all the witnesses to the guilty act, 565.
order of testimony discretionary with court, 566.
impeaching testimony may be restricted, 567.
witness to see writings before cross-examination, 568.
witnesses may be secluded from court-room, 569.
defendant's opening to be restricted to admissible evidence, 570.
reading books is at discretion of court, 571.
counsel may exhibit mechanical evidence in proof, 572.
if defendant offers no evidence his counsel closes, 573.
otherwise when he offers evidence, 574.
defendants may sever, 575.
priority of speeches to be determined by court, 576.
misstatements not ground for new trial if not objected to at time, 577.
ordinarily counsel are not to argue law to jury, 578.
party may make statement to jury, 579.
defendant's presence essential to, 540.
Separation of Jury, 814.
Mere inadvertent separation not ground for new trial, 814.
in some courts this view is not accepted, 815.
separation before case is opened is always permissible, 816.
in misdemeanors jury may separate during trial, 817.
and so as to felonies less than capital, 818.
but not generally as to capital felonies, 819.
court in such cases may adjourn from day to day, 820.
conflict of opinion as to whether separation after committal of case is permissible, 821.
courts holding such separation absolutely fatal, 822.
courts holding such separation only *prima facie* ground for new trial, 823.

TRIAL, INCIDENTS OF—(*continued*).
courts holding such separation fatal only where there has been proof of tampering, 824.
the latter is the prevailing view as to misdemeanors, 825.
Irregularity in Conduct of Jury, 826.
Unsworn or improper officer in charge is ground for new trial; intrusion of officer during deliberations, 827.
and so of improper reception of materials of proof, 828.
and so of irregular reception of books, 829.
and so of receptions of reports of trial, 829 *a*.
and so of irregular communications of court, 830.
and so of conversing with others as to case, 831.
and so of presence of party, 832.
and so of material testimony submitted by jury or others, 833.
and so of visiting scene of offence, 834.
but not accidental intrusion of stranger, 835.
mere casual exhibition of evidence not fatal, 836.
and so of the mere approach of strangers, and trivial conversation, 837.
but presumption is against communications, 839.
inattention of juror not ordinarily ground, 838.
but otherwise as to disobedience to court, resulting in injury, 840.
intoxication ground for new trial, 841.
so of casting lots by jurors, when decisive, 842.
otherwise as to mere collateral levity, 843.
absolute preadjudication by juror or judge ground for new trial when a surprise, 844.
otherwise when party knew of prejudice in time to challenge, 845.
subsequent discovery of alienage or irreligion is no ground, but otherwise as to absolute incapacities, 846.
juror inadmissible to impeach verdict, 847.
and so are affidavits attacking jury, 848.
TRIAL BY JURY, when it may be waived, 733.
TRICK, when operating to vitiate verdict, 851.
TRIERS, duties of, in respect to challenges, 686.
"TRUE BILL," indorsement of, 369.
TWO OFFENCES cannot be joined in one count (*see* DUPLICITY), 243.
but may be joined in successive counts, 285.
TWO TERM LAW, discharge under, 328.

"UNDERTAKING," averment of, 200.
UNITED STATES, extradition statutes of (*see* EXTRADITION), 28 *et seq.*
jurisdiction of, as determining venue, 139.
UNITED STATES COURTS, removal of cases to, 783 *a*,
revisory power of, by *habeas corpus*, 980 *et seq.*
UNKNOWN PERSONS, how to be described, 104, 111.
UNKNOWN THINGS may be proximately described, 156.

"UNLAWFULLY," when necessary in indictment, 269.
"UNTIL," meaning of averment, 125–6.

VAGRANTS, when to be held to bail, 80.
VALUATION OF PROPERTY, when requisite in verdict, 753.
VALUE, how and when to be averred, 213.
VARIANCE, in averment of writing, 173.
in names, 96, 109, 116.
in averring instrument of injury, 212 *a*.
in description of goods, 206.
in ownership, 116.
acquittal from, no bar to amended indictment, 460.
VEGETABLES, how averred, 211.
VENIRE, as to grand jury, 344.
as to petit jury, 603.
VENUE, how to be laid (*see* PLACE), 139 *et seq.*
change of, practice as to, 602.
VERBAL INACCURACIES.
When fatal to pleading (*see* CLERICAL ERRORS), 273.
VERDICT.
Where there are several Counts.
Prosecution may withdraw superfluous or bad counts, 737.
general verdict when there is one bad count, or counts are repugnant, 738.
new trial may be on single count, 739.
verdict of guilty on one count equivalent to not guilty on others, 740.
(informalities cured by verdict, 760.)
Defendant must be present, 741.
Double or Divisible Count.
Verdict may go to part of divisible count, 742.
Adjournment of Court Prior to.
Court may adjourn during deliberations of jury, 744.
Special Verdict.
Jury may find special verdict, 745.
such verdict must be full and exact, 746.
How Verdict is rendered.
General verdict is by word of mouth, 747.
verdict must be recorded, 748.
Sealed Verdict.
In misdemeanors sealed verdict may be rendered, 749.
Polling Jury.
Jury may be polled at common law, 750.
Amending Verdict.
Verdict may be amended before discharge of jury, 751.
Designation of Degree or of Punishment.
Such designation must be specific, 752.

VERDICT—(*continued*).
Valuation of Property.
Jury may find a special valuation, 753.
When Court may refuse to receive Verdict.
Palpably wrong verdict may be rejected by court, 754.
When there are several Defendants.
Defendants may be severed in finding, 313, 755.
Defective Verdict.
May be inoperative, 756.
Recommendation to Mercy.
Such recommendation not obligatory, 757.
Collateral Points.
when bail may be taken after, 82.
defendant must be present at, 549.
rendering on Sunday or legal holiday, 758.
formal defects cured by, 760.
"VIDELICET," meaning of, in indictment, 122, 158 *a*.
"VI ET ARMIS," not essential, 271.
VIEW OF PREMISES.
Such view may be directed when conducive to justice, 707.
"VIOLENTLY," when essential to robbery, 267.

WAIVER, general considerations relating to, 733–4.
WAIVER BY DEFENDANT, of preliminary examination or process, 70 *et seq.*
of arraignment, 541.
of grand jury, 733.
of formal defects by pleading over, 760.
of technical objections to jurors, 845, 886.
of objections to evidence, 802–4.
of presence in court, 541.
of jeopardy by motion for new trial, 518, 733.
of irregularities in conduct of jury, 733.
of twelve jurymen, 733.
of trial by jury, 733.
of separation of jury, 518, 733.
WAR, effect of, in authorizing military conviction, 439.
in establishing martial law, 979, note.
"WARRANT," averment of, 192.
WARRANT IN EXTRADITION (*see* EXTRADITION).
WARRANT OF ARREST, practice as to (*see* ARREST), 1–62.
WARRANT, SEARCH, practice as to, 18.
WEIGHT OF EVIDENCE, on primary hearing, 71.
before grand jury, 361.
on *habeas corpus*, 1001.
on trial, 813.

WEAPON, variance as to, 212 *a*.
duplicity as to, 253.
WHIPPING, not forbidden by Constitution, 921.
WIFE, may be joined with husband in indictment, 306 *a*.
"WILFULLY," averment of, 267, 269.
WITHDRAWAL OF JUROR, practice as to, 722.
WITNESS, ignorance of, when ground for continuance, 599.
absence of, ground for continuance (*see* CONTINUANCE), 585.
after-discovered, when ground for new trial (*see* NEW TRIAL), 855.
practice as to examining, 566 *et seq*.
when jurors may be, 833.
practice as to before magistrate, 71.
practice as to before grand jury, 358 *a*.
practice as to on *habeas corpus*, 1001.
incompetency of through infamy, 939 *b*.
when to be excluded from court, 569.
ruling as to when ground for new trial, 801.
all present at litigated act should be called, 565.
when notice must be given by prosecution, 565.
indorsement of name of on indictment, 358.
WORDS SPOKEN.
Words spoken must be set forth exactly, though substantial proof is enough, 203.
in treason it is enough to set forth substance, 204.
WRIT OF CERTIORARI (*see* CERTIORARI).
WRIT OF ERROR (*see* ERROR).
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (*see* HABEAS CORPUS).
WRITTEN INSTRUMENTS, PLEADING OF.
Where, as in Forgery and Libel, Instrument must be set forth in full.
When words of document are material they should be set forth, 167.
in such cases the indictment should purport to set forth the words, 168.
"purport" means effect; "tenor" means contents, 169.
"manner and form," "purport and effect," "substance," do not import verbal accuracy, 170.
attaching original paper is not adequate, 171.
when exact copy is required, mere variance of a letter is immaterial, 173.
unnecessary document need not be set forth, 174.
quotation-marks are not sufficient, 175.
document lost or in defendant's hands need not be set forth, 176.
and so of obscene libel, 177.
prosecutor's negligence does not alter the case, 178.
production of document alleged to be destroyed is a fatal variance, 179.
extraneous parts of document need not be set forth, 180.
foreign or insensible document must be explained by averments, 181.
innuendoes can explain, but cannot enlarge, 181 *a*.

WRITTEN INSTRUMENTS, PLEADING OF—(*continued*).
Where, as in Larceny, general Designation is sufficient.
Statutory designations must be followed, 182.
though general designation be sufficient, yet if indictment purport to give words, variance is fatal, 183.
What general Designation will suffice.
If designation is erroneous, variance is fatal, 184.
"receipt" includes all signed admissions of payment, 185.
"acquittance" includes discharge from duty, 186.
"bill of exchange" is to be used in its technical sense, 187.
"promissory note" is used in a large sense, 188.
"bank notes" includes notes issued by bank, 189.
"treasury notes and federal currency," 189 *a*.
"money" is convertible with currency, 190.
"goods and chattels" include personalty exclusive of *choses in action*, 191.
"warrant" is an instrument calling for payment or delivery, 192.
"order" implies mandatory power, 193.
"request" includes mere invitation, 194.
terms may be used cumulatively, 195.
defects may be explained by averments, 196.
a "deed" must be a writing under seal passing a right, 197.
"obligation" is a unilateral engagement, 198.
and so is "undertaking," 199.
a guarantee and an "I. O. U." are undertakings, 200.
"property" is whatever may be appropriated, 201.
"piece of paper" is subject of larceny, 202.
"challenge to fight" need not be specially set forth, 202 *a*.