

STIRLING SMALL DEBT COURT.

FRIDAY—SHERIFF ROBERTSON, presiding.

Dr Rogers v. James Hogg, printer and publisher of the *Stirling Journal*.

On this case being called,

Mr A. MONTEATH, writer, said he appeared for the defender Mr Hogg, and, at some length, went over the explanations of the case, as stated in our impression of last week, adding that this case had been before the police court, and had been dismissed. He concluded his remarks by quoting Bailie Taylor's decision.

The SHERIFF then called on the pursuer to state his case; and in a rambling speech the "Doctor"—who appeared for himself—said that the inferences made by Mr Monteath were not correct. What would the public think if Mr Monteath or himself had gone down to Taylorton. They could not have drawn any inference of a bad or injurious kind. He proceeded to state that it was and had been the habit of the publisher of the *Journal* to publish advertisements, such as the bill on the board, for the last five years.

The SHERIFF interposed, and said he was not proceeding on the record, and said that the case was whether the defender was owing this 2s. 6d. to the pursuer. The board shown did not seem to be damaged to that extent. A knock with a hammer would put it all right again.

Dr Rogers having again got permission to speak, proceeded just in the same course, when his lordship once more interfered, reiterating his statement with the alteration, that another kick on the opposite side of the board would put it all right again.

After a long and desultory discussion,

The SHERIFF said, it appeared to him that Dr Rogers had not established his claim that the defender was owing him the 2s. 6d. or any sum whatever, and therefore he must dismiss the action with expenses.

At the Sheriff Court on Monday Dr Rogers obtained an interdict against Mr Hogg, with the view of preventing that gentleman kicking any more of his libellous "posters" to pieces.

[A fit and proper *seale* to the last three week's disgraceful proceedings in this "reverend" quarter, would be for the Stirling Presbytery to grant an "interdict" against Dr Rogers bringing further scandal on the "church," of which he is anything but "a burning and a shining light." That the Presbytery have not seen fit to do something akin to this long ago is not very creditable to them; and unless they shortly take some action in the matter, we shall deem it a public duty to expose this man as a common pest and perfect nuisance to the community, and, like Sancho Panza, should be "tossed in a blanket" every day in the week.—E. S. O.]