# THE LAW AND PRACTICE OF PETITION OF RIGHT UNDER THE PETITIONS OF RIGHT ACT, 1860

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

#### ISBN 9780649626137

The Law and Practice of Petition of Right Under the Petitions of Right Act, 1860 by Walter Clode

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd. Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

## WALTER CLODE

# THE LAW AND PRACTICE OF PETITION OF RIGHT UNDER THE PETITIONS OF RIGHT ACT, 1860

Trieste

THE

BJ

ACN

## LAW AND PRACTICE

or

## PETITION OF RIGHT

UNDER

### THE PETITIONS OF BIGHT ACT, 1860.

WITH FORMS AND AN APPRNDIX CONTAINING THE LAWS BEGULATING PROCEEDINGS BY PETITIONS OF RIGHT

IN

IRELAND, SCOTLAND, AND CERTAIN COLONIES AND DEPENDENCIES.

BY

WALTER CLODE, OF THE INNER TEMPLE, BARBITTER-AT-LAW.

STANFORD LIBRARY

LONDON, WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED, 27, FLEET STREET.

1887.

 $224378^{\checkmark}$ 

÷

32

LONDON : PEINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED, STANFORD STREET AND CHARKS CROSS.

## STANFORD LIBRARY

### PREFACE.

By way of preface I have only to ask those into whose hands this book may fall, to bear in mind that it is the first one dealing with this branch of law, and to take a lenient view of any errors and omissions upon that ground.

WALTER CLODE.

12

3, HABCOURT BUILDINGS, TEMPLE. \*

**.** .

17

### TABLE OF CONTENTS.

a 83

2

85

(3) 11

## PART I.

#### CHAPTER I.

#### DEFINITION AND ORIGIN OF PETITION OF RIGHT.

-

÷.

											PAGE	÷
Definition		200	<b>9</b> 5	8.462		+	836			•3	1	
Origin .	10400	ca.		100				2.0	*		1	
The two the	eories	of its	origin	stated	and	discus	sed	54			2	
Origin of th	e righ	t of p	etitioni	ing th	e Cro	wn.	1.0	10			4	

#### OHAPTER II.

#### SKETCH OF THE HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE USES OF PETITION OF RIGHT.

(a.) History :					
Petitions in Parliament	<b>3</b> 8				6
Contents of			1		7
Some of them <sup>24</sup> petitions of right ".	80		2		ibid.
How petitions in parliament were dealt w	ith			13	ibid.
Referred either to (1) ordinary, or (2) spo	cial	tribun	al.		8-10
Same course with petitions " of right "	1 and a start of the start of t				11
Two examples of this procedure	1				12
Survival of this procedure with regard	to pe	titions	of ri	ight	
to the present day			••••		13
Reason of this survival	33 13			1	14
By transfer of petitions other than those	of ris	tht, so	me(1	) to	
the ordinary legal tribunals, (2) other					
and others to "the Council"	0.000	12000			4-17
Petitions of right not so transferred, but a	till a	ddrea	sed to	the	
king	-				18
(b.) Uses :	-			- X	
Original use of petition of right .	19	32	2.92	53	19
To obtain restitution of specific property	<u>3</u>	- C		100	bid.
to optimit restriction of specific property					

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS.

				24.2			PAGE
But not debts or damage			- <sup>1</sup> 11			$\sim$	19
Reason for this .			2.0			- 20	ibid.
Other existing remedies	for reco	overy o	f "deb	ts "			20
By petition for a "libera			200 - 200-000 	•	-		21
Difference between petiti	on " of	'right'	and fo	or a "]	iberat	8" :	22-23

-----

#### CHAPTER III.

#### WHY A PETITION OF RIGHT SO CALLED.

Staunford's derivation .		240						24
Objections to	1	23	90 <sup></sup>	2	÷.	12		ibid.
The true derivation suggested	100	1	8.00	37	8		12	25
From the endorsement .		<b>8</b> 2	1000	$\sim$				26

#### CHAPTER IV.

#### TO WHOM A PETITION OF RIGHT LIES.

The Sovereign	124			108	343		. 27
But not the consort or the prin	Cen						. ibid.
Can the king be joined with a	subje	ct?	6	12			. 28
The old practice	(1997) (1997)						ibid.
The modern practice-		*	6 <b>4</b> 0		<b>a</b> .		. 29
(1) before the Act of 18	60		0000				. ibid.
(2) since the Act of 184	30				2	1	. 30
Third parties under the Act of	1860	1.20	en de			200	. ibid.
Does the petition abate by the	deat	h of th	he Sov	rereign	1 ? .	-	, 81
Common Law doctrine of abat-			10000			3	. 32
Modified by 1 Ed. 6, c. 7, and	1 An	ne 1.	c. 8	12	18		. ibid.
Practice under Petition of Rig				171	÷.	100	33-34

#### CHAPTER V.

#### WHO MAY SUR BY PETITION OF RIGHT.

Subjects governed by the com	mon	law		. B	÷	13		35
The position of colonial subject	ts u	ot gover	ned	by the	comn	non law		36
The case of Canada	эe	2. 22		S.,		0.00		ibid.
Laports v. the Principal Office	78 0	f Artille	ry	÷ .			1	37-38
Can subjects sue jointly ? .	20	eonigijeen F			14		्,	39
Is the right of suit assignable			÷2			12		40

#### CHAPTER VI.

#### WHERE THE PETITION SHOULD BE SUED.

68

0415

vi

### TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Reiner v. Marguis of Salis	bury.						42-43
Or in the place where the o		s made	4	12	2	1	. 44
Where there is no such tribe	inal .	28	÷.	20	÷.		. 45
And (1) the claim is for lan	d.				38		. ibid.
Re Holmes							46-48
(2) or in contract .	100	4	1	1263	1		48-49

#### CHAPTER VII.

#### FOR WHAT A PETITION OF RIGHT WILL NOT LIE.

The injury must be a legal	one .	si.	8	18	<b>.</b>		ē.	50
Mr. Anstey's theory a mist	aken one			2365		<b>a</b> 0	ið	id. 51
The true theory given in A								52
The subject cannot sue for	all legal in	niurie	s .	12.0	- He			ibid.
Division of legal injuries .			32		194.2			53
The subject cannot sue by p		r a ton	rt.			÷.		ibid.
The reason why		ing an					1	ibid.
Authorities :	8							
Canterbury $\mathbf{v}$ . Reg.			81		<b>6</b> 4			54
Tobin v. Reg.			- C-			<u></u>	1	55-57
Feather v. Reg.		8	<u>\$</u>	- B		9		58
The above rule obtains in (	Canada-	£	15	25				
Queen v. McFarlan	е.							59
Queen v. McLeod .		÷.	8	10	-12		- 3	60
And also in America-	S.	10	(A)	53		1	S (0	
Gibbons v. United	States	14		2.0	0.2			61
Langford v. United						÷.	ib	id. 62
The true test whether a pe		18	8	1	22			63
and the state whoman a po	analysis 1100	2.5			- 55	÷.		

#### CHAPTER VIII.

AN ENUMERATION OF THE CASES IN WEICH PETITION OF RIGHT LIES. THE AUTHORITHES UPON THE SUBJECT CONSIDERED.

What authorities cited .	•3	33		¥3.	33		. 64
Petitions in parliament omittee	1.			390			. ibid.
Reasons for this omission .			÷.				. 65
Discontinuity in the line of au	thori	ties	- 63			÷.	. ibid.
Classification of the authorities		88		•	0.8		66-67

#### CHAPTER IX.

٠

#### OF PETITION OF RIGHT TO OBTAIN RESTITUTION OF SPECIFIC PROPERTY.

Of petitions for restitution of property generally .	•	5 <b>9</b>	. 68
And the authorities by which they can be supported			. ibid.
Text-writers	- 22	- 62	. 69

vii