

## THOMAS V. WOODHOUSE.

[1 Cranch, C. C. 341.] $^{1}$ 

Circuit Court, District of Columbia. July Term, 1806.

PRACTICE AT LAW-SECURITY FOR COSTS-NOTICE.

The defendant may, at the trial-court, give notice to a non-resident plaintiff, that security for costs will be required, and the en use will be continued if the plaintiff is not ready to give the security.

THE COURT continued this cause to enable the defendant to give notice (according to law of Virginia, P. P. Ill), that security for costs will be required.

CRANCH, Chief Judge. contra, thought that the law did not intend that the plaintiff should be defeated of his trial, unless sixty days' notice had already been given.

Mr. Swann and E. J. Lee, for plaintiff.

Mr. Taylor and Mr. Hiort, for defendant.

<sup>1</sup> {Reported by Hon. William Cranch, Chief Judge.}

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

through a contribution from Google.