



delay, seek to put the responsibility of the same upon his former attorney, and there is certainly evidence that he has been most negligent in prosecuting the case. It is not clear to what extent a client should be held responsible for the laches of his attorney. It is difficult to lay down any general rule upon the subject, but each case must be left to its own circumstances. It may be said, however, that whilst courts should be indulgent to suitors who are prejudiced by the neglect and delays of those to whom they have committed the management of their business, there is a limit to such indulgence. In the present case the creditors had a right to assume, after the lapse of six years, that the bankrupt had abandoned the proceedings, and especially since in one instance, at least, he had renewed the notes of a creditor which were about to be barred by the statute of limitations.

I must hold that the culpable neglect of the attorney will not excuse the bankrupt for the long delay; and that he must hold him responsible for all damages which he may suffer for such neglect. The motion to dismiss is granted.

This volume of American Law was transcribed for use  
on the Internet  
through a contribution from [Google's Public Sector](#)

[Engineering.](#) 