

it assists in proving the above item; and whether the said statements, or part thereof, are of and concerning the pursuer, and falsely, maliciously, and calumniously represent the pursuer as being the seducer of his domestic servant or servants, and so being a person of immoral and dissolute habits—to the loss, injury, and damage of the pursuer?

- “3. Whether, on or about the 11th day of February 1868, in the Parliament House at Edinburgh, the defender did publish, by means of printed copies, the said letter, containing the following words, viz.—‘Although Duncan is an “honourable man,” I might have delicacy in referring even so trivial a matter to his oath,’ and whether the said words are of and concerning the pursuer, and falsely and calumniously represent the pursuer to be a man who was likely to commit perjury—to the loss, injury, and damage of the pursuer?
- “4. Whether, at time and place aforesaid, the defender did publish as aforesaid, the said letter containing the following statements—viz., (1) ‘A female who acted as servant to Mr and Mrs Duncan, and after her decease got the greater part of her body clothing and jewellery, and no doubt the poor thing had need thereof to help her and an unfortunate child, the fruits of her residence at the Grove.’ (2) ‘The servant at Nelson Street, before Lizie’s arrival, had left in the family way. This may account to some extent for Lizie being there; at all events, it assists in proving the above item’—and whether the said statements, or part thereof, are of and concerning the pursuer, and falsely and calumniously represent the pursuer as being the seducer of his domestic servant or servants, and so being a person of immoral and dissolute habits—to the loss, injury, and damage of the pursuer?”

The damages were laid at £2000.

SHAND and J. C. SMITH for pursuer.

GIFFORD and MAIR for defender.

The jury gave a verdict for the pursuer—damages, one shilling.

Agent for Pursuer—William Spink, S.S.C.

Agent for Defender—Thomas Wallace, S.S.C.

Wednesday–Thursday, July 22, 23.

(Before Lord Ormisdale.)

TAYLOR v. COWIE.

Jury Trial—Fraud—Essential Error.

The pursuer was George Taylor, shoemaker, Airdrie, executor-dative *qua* nearest of kin decerned to the deceased Archibald Taylor, store-keeper and shoemaker, and residing at No. 44 Commonside Street, Airdrie; and the defender was Alexander Cowie, iron merchant, Hallcraig Street, Airdrie. The issue submitted to the jury was as follows:—

- “Whether the pursuer, on or about 20th June 1865, subscribed the receipts, No. 6 and 7 of process, under essential error, and in the belief, caused by the fraudulent representations of the defender, that said receipts had reference, not to the whole executry estate, but were granted in acknowledgment merely of a payment to account of his (the pursuer’s) share of said estate?”

SCOTT and BRAND for pursuer.

CLARK and TRAYNER for defender.

After the evidence was partially led, it was intimated that the parties had agreed to accept a verdict for the defender. A verdict for the defender was accordingly returned.

Agent for Pursuer—D. F. Bridgeford, S.S.C.

Agents for Defender—Duncan, Dewar, & Black, W.S.

Friday, July 24.

GOULD AND ANOTHER v. THE CALEDONIAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Jury Trial—Reparation—Loss of Life.

In this case, in which Mrs Margaret Brown or Gould, residing at Abbotsford Place, Glasgow, widow of the deceased Peter Gould, some time dry-salter in Glasgow, and Thomas Gould, son of the said deceased Peter Gould and the said Mrs Margaret Brown or Gould, his mother and administrator-in-law, were pursuers, and the Caledonian Railway Company were defenders, the issue was as follows:—

- “Whether, on or about the 23d November 1867, the said Peter Gould, whilst travelling as a passenger along the defenders’ line of railway, and at or near to a part of said line near to Hamilton Station, and known as Hamilton or Newton Junction, was killed through the fault of the defenders—to the loss, injury, and damage of the pursuers, his widow and child?”

Damages laid at, to each of the pursuers, £2500.

WATSON and THOMSON for pursuers.

YOUNG and JOHNSTON for defender.

The jury awarded damages to the amount of £800 for the widow, and £500 for the son.

Agent for Pursuers—James Buchanan, S.S.C.

Agents for Defenders—Hope & Mackay, W.S.

Friday, July 24.

(Before the Lord President.)

PYLES v. MALCOLM.

Jury Trial—Reparation—Wrongous Apprehension.

In this case, in which John Pyles sen., sometime innkeeper in Dumfries, was pursuer, and John Malcolm, superintendent of police, and residing there, was defender, the issue was as follows:—

- “Whether, on or about the 21st day of November 1866, the defender wrongfully and illegally caused the pursuer to be apprehended and taken in custody to the Police Office of Dumfries—to the loss, injury, and damage of the pursuer?”

Damages laid at £500.

FRASER and RHIND for pursuer.

YOUNG and GIFFORD for defender.

The jury returned a verdict for the defender.

Agent for Pursuer—James Barton, S.S.C.

Agent for Defender—Wm. Kennedy, W.S.

Friday, July 24.

PYLES v. SCOTT AND MALCOLM.

Jury Trial—Reparation—Wrongous Search.

In this case, in which John Pyles sen., sometime innkeeper in Dumfries, was pursuer, and

John Turner Scott, burgh officer of Dumfries, and residing there, and John Malcolm, superintendent of police, Dumfries, and residing there, were defenders, the issue was as follows:—

“Whether, on or about the 21st day of November 1866, the defenders wrongfully and illegally searched the Hound and Hare Inn, in Dumfries, occupied and tenanted by the pursuer, or part thereof—to the loss, injury, and damage of the pursuer?”

Damages laid at £500.

FRASER and RHIND for pursuer.

YOUNG and GIFFORD for defenders.

The jury returned a verdict for the defenders.

Agent for Pursuer—James Barton, S.S.C.

Agent for Defenders—Wm. Kennedy, W.S.

Friday–Saturday, July 24, 25.

(Before Lord Ormidale.)

SMART v. GLASGOW AND SOUTH-WESTERN RAILWAY.

Jury Trial—Reparation—Personal Injury.

In this case, Archibald Smart, gardener, Fullarton House, Troon, was pursuer; and the Glasgow and South-Western Railway Company were defenders. The issue sent to the jury was in the following terms:—

“Whether, on or about the 22d of May 1867, at or near Dalry Junction, on the defenders’ line of railway, one of the passenger trains on the said line came into collision with an excursion train, in which the pursuer was travelling, and then standing at or near the said junction, in consequence of which the pursuer was injured in his head and chest, and other parts of his body, through the fault of the defenders—to his loss, injury, and damage?”

Damages were laid at £2000.

MONCREIFF, D.-F., and BRAND for pursuer.

YOUNG, SHAND, and JOHNSON, for defenders.

The jury returned a verdict for pursuer, assessing the damages at £500.

Agent for Pursuer—A. K. Mackie, S.S.C.

Agents for Defenders—Gibson-Craig, Dalziel, & Brodies, W.S.

Friday–Tuesday, July 24–28.

(Before the Lord President.)

KERR v. J. CLARK AND CO.

Jury Trial—Patent—New Invention.

The pursuer in this case was Peter Kerr, of the firm of Clark & Co., thread manufacturers, Seedhills, Paisley, and the defenders were J. Clark & Co., thread manufacturers, Gordon’s Loan, Paisley, and John Clark, thread manufacturer there, the sole partner of the said firm of J. Clark & Co. The pursuer set forth that on the 2d October 1857 he obtained letters-patent under the Great Seal, and sealed the 5th January 1858, for the invention of “Improvements in Preparing and Finishing Threads or Yarns.” By the said letters-patent there was granted to the pursuer, for fourteen years from the date of the same, the exclusive privilege of making, using, and vending the said invention within the United Kingdom. At the date of the patent the invention was new, and the

pursuer was the first and true inventor thereof. The patent was still in force, and the pursuer continued to hold the rights which were thereby created and secured. The pursuer further set forth that, in contravention of the said letters-patent, the defenders, at their works in Paisley, during the period between 20th April 1867 and the date of raising the present action, had been wrongfully using the pursuer’s invention, or a material part thereof, for the purpose of preparing, polishing, and finishing threads and yarns, and the pursuer had suffered loss and damage through the defenders’ contravention of the patent. The defenders denied that the patent was valid. They alleged that the inventions described in the said letters-patent, so far as they differed from machines or mechanism in common use long before the date, and at the date, of the said letters-patent showed no ingenuity or invention, and were of no practical use. The alleged inventions described in the said letters-patent, specifications, and drawings, consisted of mere colourable and useless modifications or alterations upon mechanism perfectly well known and in public use at and prior to the date of the said letters-patent.

The following were the issues sent to the jury:—

“It being admitted that the pursuer obtained the letters-patent No. 9 of process, dated 2d October 1857, and sealed 5th January 1858, and duly filed, the specification of which No. 14 of process is a certified copy, and relative drawings of which No. 15 of process is a certified copy; and it being further admitted that, on 16th July 1864, the pursuer duly executed, and thereafter, on 18th August 1864, duly filed a disclaimer and memorandum of alteration upon the said specification, of which No. 16 of process is a certified copy:—

“Whether, from the 20th April 1867 to the 14th November 1867, or during part of said period, and during the currency of the said letters-patent, the defenders did, at their works at Paisley, wrongfully and in contravention of the said letters-patent use the invention described in the said letters-patent, specification, and relative drawings, as altered by the said disclaimer and memorandum of alteration, or a material part of the said invention, to the loss, injury, and damage of the pursuer?”

Or,

1. Whether the pursuer is not the first and true inventor of the invention described in the said letters-patent and relative specification and drawings and disclaimer?
2. Whether the invention described in the said letters-patent and relative specification and drawings and disclaimer was publicly used in the United Kingdom prior to the date of the said letters-patent?”

Damages laid at £500.

CLARK and BALFOUR for pursuer.

YOUNG and GIFFORD for defenders.

The jury, after an absence of an hour and a-half, returned the following verdict:—

“At Edinburgh, the 24th, 25th, 27th, and 28th days of July 1868. Before the Right Honourable the Lord President—Compared the said pursuer and the said defenders by their respective counsel and agents; and a jury having been balloted and sworn to try the issue No. 19 of process, and the counter issues No. 17 of process, between the said parties, say upon their oath that, in respect of the matters proven before them, they find for the