YOUNG v. MARINE INS. CO.

Case No. 18,163.
{1 Cranch, 452.}[1]

Circuit Court, District of Columbia. Nov. Term, 1807.

COMPETENCY OF JUROR.

1. In an action against an insurance company, a nephew of a stockholder is not a competent juror.
2. It is not a principal cause of challenge, that the juror has had conversations with some of the parties; but it is evidence for the consideration of triors upon a challenge for favor.

{Action by James Young against the Marine Insurance Company of Alexandria.}

Mr. James R. Riddle, being called as a juror, was objected to by the plaintiff, because he was the nephew of a stockholder in the insurance company.

The fact being agreed, THE COURT decided it was a good principal cause of challenge.

Mr. Swann, for plaintiff, cited Williams v. Delafield, 2 N. Y. T. R. {Caines} 329; Livingston v. Delafield, 3 N. Y. T. R. {Caines} 49. It was then suggested by the plaintiff's counsel that perhaps some of the persons called as jurors had had conversations with some of the parties, and hoped that such persons might be excused, or rather struck off the panels.

But THE COURT told the counsel they might challenge for favor and have it tried by triors.

Mr. Swann, for plaintiff.

Mr. C. Lee, for defendant

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