

(1879) 11 PRI CK 0003

Privy Council

Case No: None

In Re: F. W. Quarry

APPELLANT

Vs

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Nov. 25, 1879

Citation: (1880) 2 ILRPC 511 : (1879) 7 IndApp 6

Hon'ble Judges: J. W. Colvile, B. Peacock, M. E. Smith, R. P. Collier, JJ.

Judgement

J.W. Colvile, J.

1. This is an appeal made to the discretionary power of the Court to grant special leave to appeal against an order of the High Court dated as long ago as the 3rd of April 1879, whereby the petitioner was suspended for three months from practising as a vakil. The period of suspension has obviously expired considerably before the time at which this application is made, and that in itself forms some ground why their Lordships should not accede to the application. Their Lordships, however, do not mean to go so far as to say that, if the effect of the order had been to inflict upon the character of the applicant a lasting stigma, and there had been a clear miscarriage of justice shown, the fact that the period of suspension had expired would alone have induced them to refuse this application. But it appears to their Lordships, after hearing the statement at the bar, and reading the proceedings which have been filed in support of the application, that the Court below acted within its jurisdiction; that upon the complaint of Mr. Bullock, the Judge of the Small Cause Court, they formulated certain charges, charges which, if substantiated, would have justified their order, that a rule to show cause was served upon the applicant, that he put in his answer, that there were affidavits filed on both sides, that the Court heard both parties, and having heard both parties made the order which is now complained of. Their Lordships think that the Court acted within its jurisdiction when they found upon the evidence that ground was made out upon which the rule should be made absolute, or rather that enough had been made out to justify them in suspending the applicant for the time for which they did suspend

him from practice, and, so far as their Lordships can judge from the materials before them, they are not prepared to say that this was not a right conclusion. It would not have followed, even if their Lordships had entertained more doubt on the subject, that they would have granted an appeal against Judges acting regularly within their jurisdiction upon a pure question of fact. The application must therefore be refused.