

STATEMENT under Section 177 of the Bankruptcy Act of 1883 of the Receipts and Payments in the Estate of GEORGE WALDOCK ELL, of Christchurch, Stock-driver, adjudicated a Bankrupt the 6th day of August, 1886.

Particulars of Receipts—		£	s.	d.
Balance of moneys lying in the Supreme Court to Ell's credit	...	35	5	8
Particulars of Payments—		£	s.	d.
Service of summons	...	0	11	0
Advertising adjudication and first meeting	...	0	10	0
Special meetings	...	1	6	8
Postage-stamps and post-cards	...	0	0	8
Percentage on the net value of the estate realised	...	1	15	3
Court fee <i>re</i> public examination	...	0	13	0
Jury fees, Official Assignee <i>re</i> H. G. Ell	...	4	0	0
Assignee's solicitor, paid on order of the Judge	...	4	11	0
Creditors, on account	...	20	0	0
Balance in Bank of New Zealand	...	1	18	1
		£35	5	8
		£	s.	d.
Fee on filing statement of accounts	...	0	3	0
Fee on motion for release of Assignee, on affidavit therewith	...	0	10	0
Fee on order of release of Assignee	...	0	10	0
Advertising filing accounts and Assignee's intention to apply for release	...	0	2	0
		£1	5	0

E. C. LATTER, Official Assignee.

A. H. MACLEAN, Audit Inspector.

Examined and found correct.—JAMES EDWARD FITZGERALD, Controller and Auditor-General.

No. 10.

Documents in Action No. 683 (not printed); Supreme Court Records in Action No. 683 (*vide* Appendix 5).

No. 11.

RECEIPT, SECURITY FOR CHANGE OF VENUE (ACTION No. 683).

Supreme Court, 8th January, 1886.

RECEIVED from G. W. Ell the sum of £100, being amount paid into Court in the case of Ell *v.* Harper and another, No. 683, as security for costs under order of 22nd December, 1885.

W. H. EYES, Deputy Registrar.

No. 12.

ASSERTION OF MR. ELL THAT LIBEL ACTION, AUSTIN *v.* ELL, WAS NOT SETTLED OUT OF COURT.
Extract from "Telegraph" Report of the 11th April, 1885.—Supreme Court Criminal Sitzings, Friday, 10th April.

LIBEL.

AFTER the jury had given their verdict yesterday in the case against G. W. Ell for libel,

Mr. Denniston said that costs would of course follow the judgment.

His Honour could not understand this.

Mr. Denniston quoted authority, which his Honour accepted.

Mr. Russell submitted that he had not been heard on the question of publication. He had authorities to cite which he had not been allowed to quote.

Mr. Denniston submitted that verdict having been given and the record concluded, it could not be reopened. With great respect to his Honour, he felt, after the direction which had been given, that no steps could be taken to interfere with the verdict. His learned friend had not calculated the effect of the verdict.

His Honour said Mr. Russell should certainly have indicated that he intended quoting authorities. However, if Mr. Denniston had no objection, he would ask Mr. Russell to give him the cases he would have relied upon.

Mr. Denniston had no objection.

Mr. Russell cited the following cases: King *v.* Burdett, Alderson's Reps., Vol. iv., and Bolton *v.* Elphinstone, 2 W. Bl., 1037.

His Honour held that none of these cases were analogous. There must be publication by arriving at the mind of a third party. Now this was not the case here. None of the persons who had anything to do with the paper except Ell had read the libel. He was quite clear in his mind that there had been no publication, and the authorities cited had not altered his opinion.

Mr. Russell asked his Honour to reserve the point.

His Honour said that he could not reserve a point upon which he was perfectly clear.

The defendant was then discharged.

[In face of these facts the Registrar, in his evidence, states I settled the case out of Court.

My costs in this case were about £89, but, whether rightly or not, the Registrar taxed down to £15 15s. (See Mr. Conolly's report, H.-6, 1889.)—G. W. ELL. 29th September, 1892.]