

Crime and Punishment

Durrington

DRUNK AND DISORDERLY CONDUCT

County Petty Sessions

Thomas Sheppard, labourer, of Durrington, was fined 20s. and costs, for being drunk and disorderly at Durrington on the 3rd inst.

(Salisbury and Winchester Journal, Saturday 13th February, 1869)

Three young men, belonging to Durrington, named Arthur Gopsill, Samuel Leaney and William Batchelor, were summoned upon a charge of having been drunk and disorderly at Durrington. Bachelor pleaded guilty and Mr E. F. Kelsey, who appeared on behalf of Leaney, said his client had instructed him to plead guilty, and to express regret for his misconduct. Gopsill did not appear. Mr Superintendent Gibson said BAtchelor appeared to have been excited by the other defendants throwing beer over him. Leaney and Gopsill were ordered to pay 10s. and costs, and Batchelor 5s. and costs, or go to prison for seven days each.

(Salisbury and Winchester Journal, Saturday 26th March, 1870)

Walter Spreadbury was fined 5s. and costs for being drunk at Durrington, on the 28th January.

Frederick Ranger, for being drunk and guilty of riotous behavior at the same place on the 28th ult., and was ordered to pay a similar sum, together with costs.

(Salisbury and Winchester Journal, Saturday 10th February, 1872)

©Wiltshire OPC Project/Cathy Sedgwick/2013

Thomas Shepherd, labourer, of Durrington, was charged with drunken and disorderly conduct in the streets of that place on the 3rd inst. The case was clearly proved, and it was stated that the defendant had been fined 20s. and costs for a similar offence three years ago. He was ordered to pay 20s. and costs, or in default to be imprisoned for seven days.

(Salisbury and Winchester Journal, Saturday 24th February, 1872)

Thomas Sheppard was summoned for being drunk and riotous in the street, at Durrington, on the night of the 9th inst. The case clearly proved by police-constable Hill, who is stationed at or near Durrington. The defendant denied that he was either drunk or riotous. The policeman said that he was very noisy and disturbed the people hallooing and singing.- Superintendent Wolfe said that the defendant had been twice convicted of a similar offence.- He was sentenced to seven days' imprisonment, with hard labour, without the option of paying a fine.

(Salisbury and Winchester Journal, Saturday 23rd March, 1872)