

80 p-80

Capt. Wright
Daniel v Mitchell.

in
MISC
116

In Chancery
May 20th 1773

Mode of proceed^g
for a new Patent
to obtain

Patent.

Capt. Wright v Hawksley
Topham
Harris

for Patent for Spinning Wool

Lord Chancellor - The course is that
any party entering a caveat ag^t a Patent
at the Atty Gen^l's Office must be warned to
proceed on his caveat. Then the Atty General
makes his report - and if the party objecting
persists in applying to the Chancellor he
may object to the Patent on various grounds
1. On public ground that the new patent will
be prejudicial to trade - Or 2^d on personal
ground that he is in violation of a prior patent
and will be prejudiced - And the petitioner
must support his petition by affidavit.

Sol^r General - for Capt Wright

who opposed the new patent - contended
that he need only produce his prior patent
& sh^d not be required to make affidavit
but that the party asking the Patent should
make affidavit

Lloyd meant an instance of -
Bramah's patent where Sir Thomas inspected
both the old & new Patents & directed an issue
to try whether new or not.

perists in applying to the Chancellor he
may object to the Patent on various grounds
1. On public ground that the new patent will
be prejudicial to trade - Or 2^d on personal
ground that he is in violation of a prior patent
and will be prejudiced - And the petitioner
must support his petition by affidavit.

Act General - for Cartwright

who opposed the new patent - contended
that he need only produce his prior patent
& sh^d. not be required to make affidavit
but that the party asking the Patent should
make affidavit

Lloyd meant an instance of -
Bramah's patent where Lord Mansfield inspected
both the old & new Patents & directed an issue
to try whether new or not.

In Chancery
15th June 1753

Practice Bill.
Plea

Whether on the
Master's Rem^{and} and a supplemental Bill and a plea to
of two suits being the Supplemental Bill that the original
for the same Bill was a suit pending for the same
the Plea matter
must be set down
for argument on
the form

Daniel v. Mitchell.

Motion to dismiss a Supplemental

In this Case there was an original
Bill and a supplemental Bill and a plea to
the Supplemental Bill that the original
Bill was a suit pending for the same
matter.

This Plea was set down by the Def^t