

THREE GERMAN BROTHERS GIVEN DAMAGES OF \$500

Jury Finds For the Plaintiffs Against E. D. & B. C. Railway

The end of the action for damages against the E. D. & B. C. railway brought by three German brothers named Meredic; on account of trespass and false imprisonment was brought to a close Friday evening with the jury bringing in a verdict in favor of the plaintiffs assessing the damages at \$500, which was divided between them in the following manner: Ludwig and August, \$200 each and the boy, Paul, \$100.

The Hon. Mr. Justice Hyndman left six questions to be decided by the jury, which they did in the following manner:

1. Was Stafford an agent or servant of the E. D. & B. C. railway company? Answer, Yes.

2. Did he search the house? Answer, Yes. Did he have the consent of the owner, or not? Answer, No.

3. What damage for trespass by search of plaintiff's house? Answer, \$1.

4. Did Stafford have reasonable and probable cause for believing that the Meredics were guilty of theft? Answer, No.

5. If Stafford had no reason, what damages are each of the plaintiffs entitled to in respect of the false imprisonment? Answer, Ludwig Herman Meredic, \$200; August Meredic, \$200; and Paul Meredic, \$100.

The learned judge gave the jury a careful and analytical summing-up, going carefully into the facts of the visit of Stafford, a detective, who said that he believed himself to be in the employ of the railway company, of the searching of the plaintiffs for goods which it was alleged they had stolen from box-cars on the defendant company's line and their subsequent arrest and false imprisonment during the preliminary hearing before Col. Belcher, who dismissed the charges against them. False imprisonment, his lordship pointed out, was the arrest of the liberty of the person, which was the inherent right of everyone. If a man was to be arrested it must be according to law. It was very often necessary to arrest a person without a warrant, especially in the north country where it sometimes took several days to obtain a warrant, but the person arresting another must act on reasonable grounds. The question of whether Stafford was in the employ of the E. D. & B. C. railway or the J. D. McArthur Construction company was then fully gone into.

A. U. G. Bury represented the plaintiffs and H. B. Woods, K.C., and V. R. Baldwin the defendant company.

The question of costs was reserved by the judge who granted a stay of execution in view of an appeal being entered.