11756

1781. June 13. JEAN BELL against The MAGISTRATES of LOCHMABEN.

No 78.
Magistra es
liable, if they
do not imprison debtors as
soon as delivered to
them.

Letters of caption contain the following clause in the charge for incarcerating denounced debtors: 'And, if need be, that ye make steiked and lock-fast gates, doors, and houses, open and patent, and use our keys for that effect, within three days after they are charged by you thereto, under the pain of rebellion and putting of them to the horn,' &c. Two debtors were presented to the Magistrates of Lochmaben, on Tuesday the 25th March 1779, but were left at liberty till Saturday the 27th. The Magistrates were pursued by the creditor, for payment of the debt, and pleaded the above clause in their defence, as giving them a discretionary power of incarcerating at any time within three days.

Upon advising informations, the Lords "repelled the defences, decerned against the Magistrates for payment of the debt, and found them liable in expenses."

A reclaiming petition was refused unanimously.

Lord Ordinary, Westhall. Act. Ro. Dalzell. Alt. Il. Campbell & Geo. Gurrie.

D. Fol. Dic. v. 4. p. 136. Fac. Col. No 53. p. 93.

1786. January 24. Robert Gordon against Andrew Mellis.

No 79.
The temporary enlargement of a person imprisoned on a meditatione fugæ warrant, falls not under the act of sederunt 1671.

A DEBTOR of Gordon's was imprisoned in consequence of a warrant obtained against him as in meditatione fuzæ. Mellis, the jailor, having permitted the prisoner to go at large for a short while, but without any necessity, he was sued by Gordon in an action, founded on the act of sederunt of 14th June 1671.

The pursuer pleaded, This act of sederunt, which declares, 'That magistrates of burghs, who shall permit any person incarcerated for debt to go out of prison, except in extreme danger of his life from the confinement, shall be liable for the debt,' is applicable to the case in question.

Answered, The object of imprisoning for a debt already constituted, is to compel payment by means of the squalor carceris; and when a debtor so imprisoned is unnecessarily enlarged for ever so short a period, without his creditor's consent, the latter being so far deprived of his legal compulsatory, is no doubt entitled to ample indemnification. But the purpose of this imprisonment is merely to secure the prisoner's appearance in judgment, which the liberty given him has no tendency to endanger. Of consequence the act of sederunt cannot relate to circumstances like the present.

THE LORD ORDINARY having decerned against the defender,

The Court altered that judgment, and assoilzied the defender.

No 79.

Lord Ordinary, Hailes. Act. Corbet. Alt. Maconochie. Clerk, Menzies. S. Fol. Dic. v. 4. p. 136. Fac. Col. No 249 p. 382.

1786. June 29. Purdie and Company against Magistrates of Montrose.

No 80.
Magistrates
of a burgh
found liable
for the escape
of a prisoner.

HAY, a debtor of Purdie and Company, having been incarcerated, at their instance, in the prison of Montrose, made his escape from thence in the day-time, by picking the lock of the door of the apartment in which he was lodged,

The Creditors brought an action against the Magistrates for payment of the debt, in terms of the act of sederunt of 11th February 1671.

THE LORD ORDINARY pronounced this interlocutor: In respect it is not denied, that upon Sunday, 27th June 1784, when Hay made his escape, the prison of Montrose was kept and secured in the usual way in which it had been kept and secured for many years past, and that the said escape was made by picking a padlock upon an iron lattice-door of the said prison, as to which padlock, no former apparent insufficiency is alleged, assoilzies the defenders."

But the Court altered that judgment, and found the Magistrates liable for the debt.

Lord Ordinary, Henderland. Act. Baillie. Alt. Dean of Faculty & J. Erskine. Clerk, Colquboun.

Fol. Dic. v. 4. p. 136. Fac. Col. No 285. p. 440.

1788. July 8.

S.

ALEXANDER WILSON against The Magistrates of Edinburgh.

A DEBTOR of Alexander Wilson having been imprisoned in the jail of Canongate, obtained a judgment of the Court of Session, finding him entitled to a cessia banorum. This judgment was pronounced on 11th March, being the last day of the Winter-Session, and immediately after he was set at liberty by the jailor.

An action, founded on these proceedings, was brought by Alexander Wilson, against the Magistrates of Edinburgh, as proprietors of the burgh of Canongate, and responsible for the custody of persons confined in the jail belonging to it; when it was

Pleaded in defence, The obligation of magistrates with regard to the keeping of persons arrested for debt has been partly established by the common law,

No 8r.
Magistrates found liable for the sums due to an incarcerating creditor, even where the debtor had before his release obtained the sessio bonorum.