YesWeScan: The FEDERAL CASES

IN RE WOODWARD ET AL.

Case No. 17,999. [4 Ben. 102;¹ 3 N. B. R. 719 (Quarto, 177).]

District Court, E. D. New York.

March, 1870.

PRIVILEGE OF COUNSEL-WITNESS.

A witness who claims to have acted as counsel for a bankrupt, cannot, on that ground, refuse to be sworn as a witness in the bankruptcy proceedings.

[In the matter of George Woodward and Julius C. Woodward, bankrupts.]

In this case, the assignee for the bankrupt, by his counsel, attended before the register, and one William McKeag attended as a witness, but refused to be sworn, on the ground that he had acted as counsel for the bankrupt, and was still his adviser.

The register decided as follows: "The

In re WOODWARD et al.

right to refuse to answer a question on the ground of privilege, does not warrant a refusal to be sworn as a witness. The privilege cannot be interposed until a question is asked which invades the privilege."

On request the register certified the question to the court.

BLATCHFORD, District Judge. The decision of the register is correct.

¹ [Reported by Robert D. Benedict, Esq., and here reprinted by permission.)

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

through a contribution from Google.