

Crime and Punishment

Dinton



CORN DEALER SUMMONED

SALISBURY PETTY SESSIONS – Monday

Before the Mayor, Mr F. R. Fisher, Mr J.C. Wheeler, Mr F. Attwood and Mr T.W. Gilbert

Mr James North, corn dealer, of Dinton, was summoned by Mr W.F. Terrill, of Coombe, under the Act 5th Vict., c. 14, charged with dealing in British corn in Salisbury, without making a declaration before the magistrates.- Mr Terrill briefly stated the case, and deposed that he himself had bought corn from Mr North. In cross-examination by Mr Whatman, who appeared on behalf of the defendant, Mr Terrill admitted that he was himself summoned under the Act at Warminster some years ago. It was some years since he had made corn returns in Salisbury, because there was no officer there to receive them. He had not summoned Mr North in reference to returns, however, but for neglecting to make the declaration which he was required to make. He admitted that Mr North had summoned him to the last county court for a disputed claim, but he (Mr Terrill) got the verdict.- Mr Whatman then addressed the Court on behalf of the defendant, contending that the whole case had been got up by Mr Terrill out of a piece of dirty contemptible spite, because Mr North had summoned him to the county court. When Mr Terrill went to take out the summons it was hinted to him very strongly that the Act of Parliament requiring the declaration in question had been repealed with respect to various places, including Salisbury, and Mr Terrill ought not only to have withdrawn the summons, but also to have made an ample apology to Mr North. The complainant ought to be ashamed of his motives and conduct altogether, and he (Mr Whatman) hoped that the Bench would not saddle the defendant with the costs of appearing to defend such a charge, instituted by such paltry, contemptible spite.- Mr Terrill replied that he thought the language which they had just heard from Mr Whatman was very strong- stronger, he thought, than he had ever heard in that court before. When he applied for the summons, as he had a perfect right to do, he was not told that the Act had been repealed.- Mr Lee said it was not the duty of the magistrates' clerks to advise any complainant at all, and if there was any complaint against the clerk it would be answered at the proper time and place.- The case was dismissed, and Mr Whatman applied for his costs in attending the court on behalf of the defendant, which were allowed, the Bench ordering a guinea to be paid.

(Salisbury and Winchester Journal, Saturday 6th April, 1867)