

**A REPORT OF THE CASE OF THE KING V.  
WESTWOOD: WITH A PRELIMINARY  
DIGEST OF THE AUTHORITIES ON THE  
POINTS OF CORPORATION LAW  
THEREIN DISCUSSED AND REFERRED TO**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649061808

A Report of the Case of the King V. Westwood: With a Preliminary Digest of the Authorities on the Points of Corporation Law Therein Discussed and Referred to by John Rumsey

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](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**JOHN RUMSEY**

**A REPORT OF THE CASE OF THE KING V.  
WESTWOOD: WITH A PRELIMINARY  
DIGEST OF THE AUTHORITIES ON THE  
POINTS OF CORPORATION LAW  
THEREIN DISCUSSED AND REFERRED TO**



0

A REPORT  
OF  
*The Case*  
OF  
THE KING *v.* WESTWOOD,  
WITH  
A PRELIMINARY DIGEST  
OF THE  
AUTHORITIES ON THE POINTS OF CORPORATION LAW  
THEREIN DISCUSSED AND REFERRED TO.

---

BY JOHN RUMSEY, GENT.

---

© LONDON:  
STEVENS & SONS, BELL YARD, LINCOLN'S INN,  
*Law Booksellers and Publishers.*  
MDCCKXXX.

TO  
**WILLIAM DENNY, ESQ.**

IN WHOSE MAYORALTY WAS PRONOUNCED

THE IMPORTANT JUDGMENT HERE RECORDED,

AND TO

THE ALDERMEN, BAILIFFS, AND BURGESSES,

OF

**Chipping Nibley.**

THE FOLLOWING REPORT

IS MOST RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED,

BY THEIR MOST FAITHFUL SERVANT,

**JOHN RUMSEY.**

*John Rumsey*

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10



---

## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

THE contest concerning the corporate privileges of the borough of Chepping Wycombe having been finally terminated by the decision of the highest tribunal in the realm, I have flattered myself that some account of the various stages of its progress, which might be deposited among its archives, as a monument of the zeal which has been manifested in preserving unimpaired its corporate rights, would neither be unacceptable to the members of the corporation as a permanent record of this memorable struggle, nor useless to the community at large when similar questions shall hereafter come in discussion.

In the contest which these pages record, some of the most important questions relative to the law of Corporations have undergone investigation. The most eminent lawyers of the day have been engaged in arguing them, and, as was to be expected, the whole field of research and all the resources of talent and ingenuity have been exhausted in their elucidation.

Having, in conjunction with Mr. Robert Nash,—my most valued and respected friend,—had the



honour to act professionally for that part of the corporation, which has supported the case of the defendant, I have had very considerable opportunities of informing myself fully as to every part of this investigation.

In whatever way the corporate elective franchise be regarded,—whether as affecting the internal government of this borough in the preservation of social order, or as influencing the return of members to the legislature,—the importance of keeping it in a state of sound and wholesome regulation cannot be too highly estimated, nor its purity too vigilantly guarded.

At the conclusion of this contest, in conducting which I have taken no inactive part, I have only further to express my earnest hope that the elective privileges of this borough may still continue to be exercised in the spirit of the original charters, with a wholesome regard to all the interests it was intended to protect, free from every unlawful controul, and untainted by any improper influence.

J. R.

CHEPPING WYCOMBE, 6th Aug. 1830.

---

TABLE OF CASES CITED.

A.

Amery, Rex *v.*, 1 T. R. 375.  
Ashwell, Rex *v.*, 12 East, 22.

B.

Bird, Rex *v.*, 13 East, 367.  
——— (*nomine*, *Hoblyn v. Rex.*) 6 Bro. P. C. 511.  
Bishop of York, the University of Cambridge, *v.*, 10 Mod.  
207.

C.

Case of Corporations, 4 Co. 77; Jenk. 273.  
Case of the Corporation of Colchester, 3 Bulstr. 71.  
Child *v.* Hudson's Bay Company, 2 P. Wms. 507.  
City of London *v.* Vanacker, 1 Ld. Raym. 496; 5 Mod.  
439.  
Cutbush, Rex *v.*, 4 Burr. 2204.

F.

Francis, Newling *v.*, 3 T. R. 189.

G.

Ginever, Rex *v.*, 6 T. R. 732.

H.

Haddock's Case, Sir T. Raym. 435; Vent. 355.  
Head, Rex *v.*, 4 Burr. 2515.  
Hicks *v.* Launceston, 1 Roll. Abr. 513, tit. Corporation (G).  
Hoblyn *v.* Rex, *see* Rex *v.* Bird.  
Holland, Rex *v.*, 2 East, 70.  
Hudson's Bay Company, Child *v.*, 2 P. Wms. 507.

L.

Larwood, Regina *v.*, 1 Ld. Raym. 29.  
Launceston, Hicks *v.*, 1 Roll. Abr. 513, tit. Corporation (G).  
Lee *v.* Wallis, 3 Burr. 1833.

## N.

Newling v. Francis, 3 T. R. 189.  
 Norris v. Staps, Hob. 210.

## P.

Phillips, Mayor of Carmarthen, Rex v., 3 Burr. 1833.

## R.

Regina v. Larwood, 1 Ld. Raym. 29.  
 Rex v. Amery, 1 T. R. 575.  
 — v. Ashwell, 12 East, 22.  
 — v. Bird, 13 East, 367.  
 — — — (nomine Hoblyn v. Rex), 6 Bro. P. C. 511.  
 — v. Cutbush, 4 Burr. 2204.  
 — v. Ginever, 6 T. R. 732.  
 — v. Head, 4 Burr. 2515.  
 — v. Holland, 2 East, 70.  
 — v. Phillips, Mayor of Carmarthen, 3 Burr. 1833.  
 — v. Spencer, 3 Burr. 1827.  
 — v. Tomlyn, Cas. Temp. Hardw. 316.  
 — v. Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, 3 Burr. 1647.

## S.

Spencer, Rex v., 3 Burr. 1827.  
 Staps, Norris v., Hob. 210.  
 Sutton's Hospital Case, 10 Co. 31.

## T.

Tomlyn, Rex v., Cas. Temp. Hardw. 316.

## U.

University of Cambridge v. Bishop of York, 10 Mod.  
 207.

## V.

Vanacker, City of London v., 1 Ld. Raym. 496;  
 5 Mod. 439.

## W.

Wallis, Lee v., 3 Burr. 1833.