

ORME v. PRATT.

{4 Cranch, C. C. 124.}¹

Circuit Court, District of Columbia. Dec. Term, 1830.

NEW TRIAL—JUROR RELATED TO PLAINTIFF.

The court will not grant a new trial because one of the jurors was brother-in-law of the plaintiff.

{Cited in *Brewer v. Jacobs*, 22 Fed. 239.}

Assumpsit. Verdict for plaintiff, \$99.75.

C. Cox, for plaintiff.

Motion by R. S. Coxe, for defendant [Thomas G. Pratt], for a new trial, because one of the jurors was brother-in-law of the plaintiff [Jeremiah Orme], a fact not known to the defendant, who was not personally present at the trial, nor to his counsel. The motion was supported by affidavits of the fact. The other eleven jurors made affidavit that the jury was unanimous in their verdict, immediately after their retirement, and that the other juror did not say or do any thing to influence the verdict.

Motion overruled.

¹ [Reported by Hon. William Cranch, Chief Judge.]

This volume of American Law was transcribed for use
on the Internet

through a contribution from [Google](#). 