8521

Supreme Court of Illinois

John McElvain

VS.

County of Hamilton

71641

John mollman & leavey S. Vise - 3Appellants County of Mamilton, Oppellee. Appeal from Hamilton -In the Supreme Court to hand Division, Houender tenn Ady 85%. beaute this day the appellants by Welson and in their own pusons, and Lay that in the record, and proceeding herein, there is manifest error. Be--cause they any that the Circuit Coul of Hamilton County, State of allinis rendered a judgment in foor of The oppelles, whereas by the law of the land the said Crionil Courtings to have rendered a judgment in form of the appellants and against the said appeller, and this they are Mady to verify 4c. And for opigning enors spe--cially upon the record aforesaid, the appeleants say that the said Orient Court erned claim of appellants and rendering gred prient there for a garrett the appelle, in said appeal case from the cowly Court of Hamilton County -29 The Court ened in not reversing the profrment of the said county Court, and remanding the [8521-1]

the claim of appellants against the appeller, in the count, Court of (hu wint 3 km) Where fore they beek that the pedfinent of the said Chicaich may he reversed. Helden + Me Elwain & Vise allejs for Appellants. 3. The Curit County Hamilton lovely erred in readering Ludgment as four of appellus & against the appellants. Formaler in Error JS Robinson For appeller.

I has held before the Honorable Edwin Buchen Freding Judge of the twelth fudicial les weit of the State of Illinois of which Hamilton County forms a part The faces face Cuity peder of Haliam I Malore and faces beard associato purtices of the County lint part and bis. Vise and folice Melvain attorneys at law of the other part do hurby Submit and a following cutilled chair the Cary & Jose 4 & assumpant Lotte M Chain The Cent of Hamitton's that the Said bay S. Vin and Lelen M'Elevier allenny at have were duly appointed by Edwing Buchen purcil. eny pedge of the Laweller ling Cuit Court to deflued one Charles Mund who was feede cated and prosecu led un said Cer cuit court for the Ciein of Joseph and alledyduper out Coursel, muable le employ Coursel and that he desired bud Coursel oppointed for here by the

appendente, the Said Cary S. Vise and Lelier M'olverin deit proceed To defend Said defendant, and that each of the above ranged aller very have presented against the Count of Said Count, a Charle of \$20. for The levies ofore said and that for the services wedened by Them in Said laure the Charge of twenty delecters to rade is unscrable all of which facts to exest Jany Jane 6. 1. 16,60 Jany J. Walen Co. J. P. lend afterwards territ at the May time 1857 of said Circuit Count the following order vers minde Low Mile blown Eassurpret The count of Humitten and new on this day come as well the plantificas this defendants and upon ipen being freied this cause was subwilled to the court upon an apreed Statement of facts filed huis which is drewed to be made a part of the record, and the Court

being lufficently advised in the period in of opinion that the law law is with the defendants, Whenfew the verdiel is that the defendants ar cerew of the plantiffs then costs 42 Whenfur the said planliffs prays are appeal to the Supreme Court while is alleved without band, defendants warring buil 4 e Haw County 35et S. J. Thomaster Chist of the curcint Court in and for Said County do hunty cutify that the foregoing hours cipt to a tem and prefect copy of the proceedings had at day line a 1857 of Said Cu cuit court in the above Styled Cause as ap pears of green 42 of land Court and the Teal dung at Mileausten This I'm day of Oct, AD A. Thousash cep

Tha his 21. 185 N. Shurten Ch N 52

SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS.

FIRST GRAND DIVISION.

NOVEMBER TERM, A. D. 1857.

Record Page.

Carey S. Vise, and John Mc. Elvain, Appellants, Appeal from Hamilton.

The County of Hamilton, Appellee. Appellants were appointed by the Circuit court of Hamilton County to defend a criminal indicted for "forgery." who desired counsel and was unable to employ counsel for his defense. At the the subsequent term of the county court of Hamilton county, the appellants lad in a claim of \$20.00 each against the county as a fee for defending said criminal, which the court refused to allow. An agreed case was made out and sent up to the Circuit court, showing that the appellants were regularly appointed by the Court to defend, as aforesaid, and also that the services were rendered, and that \$20,00 each was a

reasonable fee for the services.

At the May term of the year 1857, of Hamilton circuit court, when said agreed case was brought on to be heard, the court decided that the county was not liable for the fee of appellants, for defending a criminal in such case, and affirmed the judgement of the

An appeal was prayed from the judgement of the said circuit court, and the cause is 4. now brought into this court for the purpose of reversing the said judgement, and testing the question of the liability of the county for the fee of the appellants for the service rendered, and for the errors assigned upon the record.

NELSON, VISE, & Mc ELVAIN Attys.,

For Appelants.

Bruis of reprences relied on & reported to by appellants 1 4- Vunwal reports 37 by analogy to Case of francis to be pursue for 2? Importation on Court to allow an Town reports 4/3 3 are attorney find for represent to ach 4 Poster Indiana Helports 525 an attorney fee 4 Porter Preports 528-I Count be Competted to wet without fee & Porto Reports 14 AB for allowed to Lunge Breege. Theben & Tolusa

SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS. FIRST GRAND DIVISION. NOVEMBER TERM, A. D. 1857.

Record Page.

Carey S. Vise, and John Mc. Elvain, Appellants, Appeal from Hamilton.

The County of Hamilton, Appellee. Appellants were appointed by the Circuit court of Hamilton County to defend a criminal indicted for "forgery." who desired counsel and was unable to employ counsel for his defense. At the the subsequent term of the county court of Hamilton county, the appellants laid in a claim of \$20.00 each against the county as a fee for defending said eruninal, which the court refused to allow. An agreed ease was made out and sent up to this Circuit court, showing that the appellants were regularly appointed by the Court to defend, as aforesaid, and also that the services were rendered, and that \$20,00 each was a

reasonable fee for the services.

At the May term of the year 1857, of Hamilton circuit court, when said agreed case was brought on to be heard, the court decided that the county was not liable for the fee of appellants, for defending a criminal in such case, and affirmed the judgement of the

An appeal was prayed from the judgement of the said circuit court, and the cause is now brought into this court for the purpose of reversing the said judgement, and testing the question of the liability of the county for the fee of the appellants for the service rendered, and for the errors assigned upon the record.

NELSON, VISE, & Mc ELVAIN, Attys., For Appellants.

query men les grantes de la proposition de la la company de la company d the 27, Arry 1857.

William Brown 30 Legar Crews & Cros to logue L'agrees straight Toinelle in crew Milliam Wilson & 3 Jacob Grisler heilstand Sinder in Error Beng Kard to I min in Joseph Boules

7

41 oppose rule

Andrew Mc Callen H. T. Pace appeal County by September John Mic Shvain 3 52 Concert of Haccilla I Sinder in one [25714]

Hany B. Lucas & Lack Edmiston

SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS.

FIRST GRAND DIVISION.

NOVEMBER TERM, A. D. 1857.

Record Page.

[8521-7]

Carey S. Vise, and John Mc. Elvain, Appellants,

Vs.

Appeal from Hamilton.

The County of Hamilton, Appellee.

Appellants were appointed by the Circuit court of Hamilton County to defend a criminal indicted for "forgery." who desired counsel and was anable to employ counsel for his defense. At the the subsequent term of the county court of Hamilton county, the appellants laid in a claim of \$20.00 each against the county as a fee for defending said cruninal, which the court refused to allow. An agreed case was made out and sent up to the Circuit court, showing that the appellants were regularly appointed by the Court to defend, as aforesaid, and also that the services were rendered, and that \$20,00 each was a reasonable fee for the services.

At the May term of the year 1857, of Hamilton circuit court, when said agreed case was brought on to be heard, the court decided that the county was not liable for the fee of appellants, for defending a criminal in such case, and affirmed the judgement of the County Court.

An appeal was prayed from the judgement of the said circuit court, and the cause is now brought into this court for the purpose of reversing the said judgement, and testing the question of the liability of the county for the fee of the appellants for the service rendered, and for the errors assigned upon the record.

nelson, vise, & Mc Elvain, Attys., For & ppellants.

27 Creen 473 seviseis. 24 Porter 5-25-4 Porter 14-4 Bluety The first of the control of the cont

No 52 Ane 1857 John McElevenin and Carry S. Veise, County of Mamilton Appl from Hamilton 854 Affirmen