



Infringement of the Cattle Plague Orders

At the petty sessions, on Thursday, before the Marquis of Bath, Lord Heytesbury, Rev. G. F. S. Powell and Captain Everett, the Rev. Henry Wightwick, of Codford St. Peter, was summoned for having, on Sunday morning, 25th March, caused a cow to be removed from Sherrington to Stockton, contrary to the orders of the Court of Quarter Sessions. Mr Ponting, on behalf of Mr Wightwick, admitted the offence, but said it was done under a misconception of the orders and not with an intention to violate them. The magistrates inflicted a fine a 1 l. and costs.

(Salisbury and Winchester Journal, Saturday 7th April, 1866)

Breach of Cattle Plague Orders

At the petty sessions, on Thursday, before Lord Heytesbury, Mr George Temple and the Rev. G. T. S. Powell, the Rev. H. Wightwick, of Codford, was summoned for a breach of the Cattle Plague Orders, by removing three cows more than 500 yards along a highway, without having a license so to do. Police-constable Parsons deposed that on the 11th of Sept. He saw the defendant's man taking three cows about three-quarters of a mile on the public high road. On the Tuesday following he saw the defendant and asked him if he had an order for removal of the cows, but the rev. gentleman refused to give him an answer, telling him if he wanted anything from him he had better take him by the collar and drag him to the lock-up. In his defence Mr Wightwick said it was perfectly true that there had been a breach of the law. He wished to say, however, that the constable had been extremely impertinent to him on several occasions and on the day in question in particular. He was then walking in a narrow public path, when the constable accosted him and pushed him in a most offensive and abrupt manner. He told the constable he had better take him by the collar at once. He was determined to resent his disgraceful conduct towards him by applying a higher authority even than that court. It was true there had been a breach of the law, but it was only through a mistake. While his crops were standing it was necessary that his cows should be driven about half a mile on the highway to their pasturage and he had orders, signed by Mr Ravenhill, for that purpose. When the cows were removed on the day in question, however, the last order he had obtained was two or three days out of date. He was away in Yorkshire at the time, but before he left he told his man that after the time when the order would be out of date he was to drive the cows over his own land to pasture, a distance of about 200 yards, instead of on the highway, where he would have to go round half a mile and he could not think why his man was such a fool as not to have done so, for the crops were then down.- Lord Heytesbury said the case was clearly made out. Mr Wightwick had been

previously convicted and fined for a like offence and they thought that ought to have made him more careful. As he was away from home at the time, however, they should fine him only in the same amount as on the former occasion, namely, 1 l. and the costs of the court, and he must think himself fortunate in getting off so easily.- Mr Wightwick said he did not wish the Bench to favour him in any way.- Lord Heytesbury said he was liable to a fine of 50 l. and if he was again convicted they should impose a much higher penalty.- Mr Wightwick said if they had fined him fifty pounds for the present offence he would have readily paid it. He did not think it likely he should come before the Bench again, for he was on the point of giving up his farm.- Superintendent Abbott, addressing the bench, said he gave the most unqualified denial to Mr Wightwick's charges against the constable; they were quite unfounded.- Mr Wightwick said they were true, and he was determined to take the matter to London.

(*Salisbury and Winchester Journal*, Saturday 6th October, 1866)

Breach of Cattle Plague Orders

WARMINSTER

At the petty sessions, on Thursday, (before Mr N. Barton, Mr G. Temple and the Rev. G. F. S. Powell), the Rev. Henry Wightwick, rector of Codford, was summoned for having, on the 20th of May unlawfully removed three cows, in the parish of Sherrington, contrary to the order of Her Majesty's Privy Council. On the above-named day constable Wheeler saw Mr Axford, a man in the employ of the rev. Gentleman driving three cows belonging to him on the highway to Sherrington. He asked Axford if he had an order and the man replied that he had not got one, but he thought there was one at his master's farm. Wheeler requested Axford to get the order, but he did not do so. The constable went to the farm-house and asked to see the order, when two old orders were shown to him instead of the one for the removal of the cows in question. My Wightwick, in defence, produced the proper order to the Court and alleged that the order, by the express direction of the police constable, given last year, was left at the farm-house instead of being taken by the man who removed the animals. The rev. Defendant also said that on the 21st of May he took the order to the constable's house to show it to him, but Wheeler was at the public-house, where he spent the best part of his time, - playing roulette, &c., and he was unable to see him.- The constable emphatically denied the rev. gentleman's statement.- Superintendent Abbott stated that Mr Wightwick, who had previously been convicted of a breach of the cattle plague orders, acted most persistently in defiance of the known regulations.- Mr Barton said the Bench were satisfied that the offence had been committed, but in the hope that Mr Wightwick would conform to the law in the future and there being a doubt whether he was not labouring under a misconception, they would dismiss the case on the payment of costs.- William Axford, Mr Wightwick's man, was also summoned for a similar offence committed at the same time and with the same animals. The charge against him was also dismissed on payment of the costs, but the Bench warned both defendants that if a similar case was proved against them they would be dealt with most severely.

(*Salisbury and Winchester Journal*, Saturday 8th June, 1867)
