

1896

MADHUB
LALL
DURGUR
v.

WOOPENDRA-
NARAIN SEN.

stated, it is not, I think, a matter which I am at liberty to enquire into at the present state of the case. The rule must be discharged with costs.

Rule discharged.

Attorneys for the plaintiff : Messrs. *Remfry & Rose.*

Attorney for the defendant : Mr. *Farr.*

C. E. G.

1896

March 15.

Before Mr. Justice Sale.

IN THE MATTER OF AN ATTORNEY.

Practice—Attorney,—Charges against—Publication of name.

The practice which prevails in England as regards the non-publication of the name of an attorney, against whom a rule has been obtained, approved of and followed.

DURING the hearing of a rule obtained by the petitioner against an attorney of the High Court, in which he alleged certain charges of misconduct which, however, were not substantiated, the attention of the Court was called by the Counsel for the attorney to the fact that, contrary to the ordinary practice which prevails in England, the name of the attorney against whom the charges were being brought had been published in Court by the Counsel for the petitioner, and appeared in the Court list for the day.

His Lordship expressed his dissatisfaction with such a practice, and gave the following ruling in the course of his judgment :—

SALE, J.—The practice which prevails in England and to which Counsel has called my attention, namely, that of not publishing the name of the attorney, until the charges have been proved, has my entire sympathy. The present case affords an instance of the very great hardship which can be inflicted upon an attorney, when that course is not adopted.

C. E. G.

Rule discharged.