

Friern Barnet & District Local History Society

Daily Post 1 November 1727:

“Whereas on the 14th, 15th, and 16th of October in the Night, some ill-difpofed People ftole from the Houfe, Out-houfes, and Grounds of Mr Stephen Bateman at Colney Hatch, Middlesex, late Sir Henry Bateman’s, two Sheep and one Lamb, mark’d H.B. on the left hip, two Geefe, feveral Ducks. Four Seats painted white; a great Quantity of Winer Fruit from the Garden Walls, among it a Number of Bon Chrifian Pears, remarkably large. Mr Bateman, to whoever difcovers the Perfon or Perfons concern’d in the above Thefts (fo that fuch be bought before a Magistrate) promifes a Reward of Three Guineas; likewife that if anyone actually concerned in the Fact convict his Accomplices, fuch Informer, fhall not only be acquitted, but fhall receive a Guinea Reward.

N.B. Mr Bateman will let his late Brother’s Houfe in Queen’s Square, Bloomsbury, very handfomely furnifh’d through every Part. The Coach-houfe and Stable, which ids for five Horfes, are taken out of Part of the Garden: Two very large Vaults are under the Street Part. Seventy or Eighty Loads of exceeding good Hay will be difpofed of, alfo a large Flock of Sheep. Further Enquiry may be made of his Houfe in Hatton Garden.”

Morning Post & Gazetteer 14 September 1802:

“John Hawkes and Thomas Worcester were indicted for different assaults upon Elizabeth Hanby and Rebecca Woodward. Worcester, one of the defendants in this case, was a butcher at Whetstone, and the other, John Hawkes, was his servant boy. The account given of the assault by the two prosecutors, was as follows: that on the 29th of May, in the evening, as they were going through the street at Whetstone, the boy (Hawkes) abused them both, calling them street-walkers, and other opprobrious names; Woodward, who was a butcher’s daughter also, near the defendant’s, went to Worcester’s door, meaning to complain of the impertinence of the boy; Hawkes then dragged her in the shop, and beat her; he threw her down and set two dogs upon her; she called out to her companion, Miss Hanby, who attempted to come in to her assistance, but at that moment the master (Worcester) came from his back room and gave Miss Hanby a blow in the face, and turned her out of the shop, saying, that one at a time was enough upon the boy. This account on the part of the prosecution was contradicted by the defendants, who being indicted separately, were witnesses for each other, and also by another woman. The account they gave was, that the boy was going to fetch the beer for his master’s supper; that just as he came up to the girls a coachman passing the road addressed them with, “Good night, my dears.” They returned this salutation with a reply of “Good night;” upon which the boy said “Oh! That’s the way you do it ladies.” One of them immediately called him a saucy puppy, and followed him to his master’s

door, where she struck him, and that instead of his pulling her into the shop, she followed him and was boxing him till they both fell to the ground. While he was on the ground, Miss Hanby came in and assisted by pulling his hair. The master, disturbed by the noise, came from his back room, turned out Hanby, "adding that "one at a time was enough." The servant of Worcester added, that when Woodward attacked the boy, she said "Curse you, Jack Hawkes, I'll have your life." To which he replied: "If you touch me, I'll tear the frill of your shift." It was most positively denied by the defendants that they began the assault – Worcester saying that the prosecution was founded in the malice of Woodward's father, who was a brother butcher, and envied the defendant's success in the same line.

The jury deliberated for a considerable time, and at last found Hawkes, the boy, *Guilty*; Worcester, the master, *Not Guilty*."

The Bury & Norfolk Post 27 January 1813:

"Forgery. – It has been discovered within these few days, that forgeries have been committed to a larger amount than any that have ever been accomplished in this country. The person accused of them is a Mr Parry, a merchant of Devonshire-square, who is charged with forging upon a mercantile house in the city to the amount of 60,000l; upon a lottery-office keeper for 20,000l; in the whole, bills of exchange, drafts, &c. to the amount of upwards of 100,000l. The discovery was made on Saturday se'nnight, (*sic*) when a meeting took place between Mr Parry and the parties forged upon. On promising to meet them again on Monday they let him go at large; but he did not attend. On enquiry it was ascertained that after leaving the parties on Saturday, he went off to his country-house at Whetstone, which place he left again on Sunday, and came to London, but since which time he has not been heard of and is supposed to have quitted the kingdom.

The two recently discovered forgeries, of Parry, and a tradesman in the neighbourhood of Covent Garden, have made serious impressions in the mercantile world. The latter defrauder has derived large sums from his speculations upon the Bank. He had a warrant of attorney to receive the dividends of Mrs Linley: and it is found that by means of a warrant which the lady never gave, the stock itself has been sold out."

Morning Chronicle 27 September 1816:

"THURSDAY SEPT 26. GEORGE WM. TAYLOR, a sorter and letter carrier in the post office at Finchley, was charged with stealing and feloniously abstracting from a letter, on the 2d (*sic*) of May, a one-pound Bank-note, sent by a Mr Flack to a Mrs Honyman.

Mr Bolland opened the proceedings.

Mr Gurney stated the case.

Henry Flack, Teacher of an Academy at Soho, is acquainted with Mrs Honyman, who lives at Colney Hatch; is in the habit of weekly sending 1l (£) to her. Always does this on a Saturday. On 30th April, or 1st May, received a letter from MRs Honyman, requesting that he would send 1l (£1) and on Thursday the 2d (*sic*) May, he enclosed the said 1l (£1) to her in a letter, of which he took the number and date. The number was 32,965 and it was dated 25th March 1916 and the sum 1l (£1) and addressed it to Mrs H at Colney Hatch, Friern Barnet, county of Middlesex. Sent this to the post office, with a son of his, in Gerrard-street, Soho. In a day or two heard the letter was miscarried, on which he gave information to the Post Office and Bank. Recovered the note from Solicitor to the Post Office.

Cross-examined: When he sends letters to a distance, he always takes the number. Took no number of any other note that day.

Charles James Flack, a boy, son of the above, remembers his father sending him to the post office with a letter to his aunt. Heard of the letter being lost, but does not recollect the time. Always put in the post every letter his father gave him, without losing any time. He always did so in the office in Gerrard-street, and none of them ever were lost before this.

George Mss is the windowman (that is, person who takes the unpaid letters out of the box) in Gerrard-street. He remembers distinctly Mrs Honyman's letter sent by Mr Flack being lost, and he also remembers having seen that letter, or one similar to it, about a week before he heard the letter was lost. He thinks the letter was put in in the 2d (*sic*) of May. He remembers the letter from it having been remarked to him by one of Mr Flack's scholars, that letters so directed by Mr Falck went through every week. Knew the hand-writing on it, from seeing a similar direction on another letter two weeks before. He delivered this letter to the usual stamper of letters.

John McAndrew, stamper of letters in the same office, was on duty on the 2d (*sic*) May, and received the letters as usual from last witness, which he afterwards handed to the usual sub-sorter, a Mr Thomas.

John Oakley, Clerk of the North Division, General Post Office, received the usual bundle from Gerrard-street on the 2d (*sic*) of May. He every day places the letters of the North Division in their respective boxes and then takes the value of them, as a check on the minor offices. And then gives them to Baker, the stamper, who affixes the usual seal of the office to them.

George Bradford is charge sorter and letter carrier at Finchley; four sorters are in his district, of whom the prisoner was one. Smart is letter carrier for Colney Hatch.

Cross-examined. – Letters to Mrs Honyman are not in the prisoner's district, and must have come into his hand by accident. His character always unblemished.

R G Hattersley; another sorter, saw no letter addressed to Mrs Honyman on the 2d (*sic*) of May.

Thomas Smart remembers Mrs Honyman applying to him respecting a letter she was to have received from London, and which had not come to hand.

Mrs Honyman received always every Saturday 1l (£1) from Mr Flack; made a request to him on the 1st of May to send 1l (£1) to her on a Thursday. On the Thursday she expected an answer, but got none.

Sarah Brown, grocer, at Finchley, identifies the note now shewn her, on which is written "Mrs Hohey". The prisoner gave her this note; and she wrote these words on receiving it, as the prisoner told her had taken it from Mrs Hobey of Whetstone. About the 10th of May she paid it away to Mr Evans.

Wm Evans proved his having received the note in payment of an account from Mrs Brown.

Ed Johnson, comptroller of the Twopenny Post-office, questioned the prisoner on the subject, and found, on information from Mr Flack, the note had come into the Bank. Went to Mrs Brown with the note, in company with the prisoner. Prisoner said he had received it from a woman in Ballards-lane, Finchley, who had a basket on her arm, and the appearance of a pedlar, who saw him counting his silver; and this woman said "You have a great deal of silver, and as I wish for change, will you give it to me?" He said he was glad to get rid off his silver, as the collector was very particular about it, and he gave her 18s in silver, and 2s in copper; and she gave him this note, and said her name and residence were "Mrs Hobey of Whetstone."

Cross-examined. – Prisoner still continued on his duty; and did not abscond.

Prisoner, in his defence, gave a similar statement to what Mr Johnson had, and protested he was innocent. Mrs Brown, he said, had wrote his name on the note by his own desire.

Mrs Brown being called again by the Judge, stated she had wrote the name by Taylor's desire.

A great number of witnesses of the first respectability were then called, who gave the prisoner a most excellent character for honesty, sobriety, and the strictest integrity. One of these witnesses knew the woman Hobey, who was in the habit of hawking with a basket through the country. She is a female of the most notorious character.

Mr Baron Graham summed up, and the Jury retired for an hour, and found the prisoner Not Guilty."

NB The postage stamp was not introduced until 1840.

Freeman's Journal and Daily Commercial Advertiser 29 November 1821:

“DARING OUTRAGE, ROBBERY AND ATTEMPT AT MURDER. On Tuesday afternoon, as early as between two and three o'clock, as Mr William Abbott, of Russell Farm, East Barnet, who is overseer of his parish, was proceeding through Bets Stile-lane, Friern Barnet, in his official capacity, collecting the poor rate, he was stopped by three stout powerful men, who, without hesitation, knocked him down, tied his legs together, and cut open his breeches pockets, and robbed him of three 10l (£10) and three 5 pound Bank of England notes, and 18 sovereigns. When they had emptied his pockets, one of the gang asked him for his watch. He replied that he had not got one; upon which another of them exclaimed “D___n his eyes, kill him!” and the third man of the gang attacked him with a sharp instrument, which Mr Abbott supposes was a large knife, with which, no doubt, it was the villain's intention to rip him up; but providentially having a thick and stout waistcoat on, the instrument only entered it. Mr Abbott has no doubt but that it was owing to the position in which he was lying which saved him from being murdered; had he been standing, the knife would have entered his body. Two of the robbers were tall, and dressed in short smock frocks – the other was short, and wore a velveteen jacket. Yesterday Mr Abbott gave notice of the attack and robbery at Bow-street.”

Bell's Life in London & Sporting Chronicle 26 October 1834:

“DESPERATE ROBBERY AT WHETSTONE. A very considerable sensation has occurred at Whetstone and Barnet, in consequence an elderly man, named James Giffs Thurston, having been robbed and so dreadfully maltreated by two ruffians as to leave little hopes of recovery. The unfortunate old man was put in charge of a house belonging to Mr Crawley, a gentleman residing at Whetstone. On the night of Monday last week last Giffs was crossing a field in the vicinity of his employer's residence, when he was attacked by five men, who demanded his money. The poor old man said he had none, when the fellows attempted to steal his dog, which accompanied him; but failing in the attempt, they beat the victim most savagely, and robbed him of the contents of his pockets, amounting to 6s. The old man was subsequently discovered lying on the ground in an insensible state, bleeding profusely from the head; he was conveyed to his residence in the neighbourhood, and a medical gentleman was sent for who promptly attended and dressed his wounds. Information of the robbery was instantly given to the nearest police station, which is on the road side near the Bald-faced Stag, Finchley; and Collard, on the Bow-street mounted police, succeeded in apprehending two men on the following day, named Pent and Hamshanks, who having been examined before the Magistrates of St Alban's, on the charge of robbing and attempting to murder the old man. No hopes are entertained of the ultimate recovery of Thurston from the severe injuries he has received. Collard, the patrol, and the constables of Barnet and Whetstone, are in active search for the other three desperadoes. The brother of Hamshanks

(now in custody) was executed at Horsemonger-lane gaol about eighteen months back, for a burglary attended with violence at Moulsey.”

The Standard 11 July 1839:

“BOW STREET. Yesterday, a respectable looking person, named George Lean, a schoolmaster, residing at Whetstone, near Barnet, was brought to custody by Fletcher, the officer, and placed at the bar before Mr Minshull and Lord Mountford, charged with having feloniously used the superscription of a certain letter franked by the Earl of Winchilsea, with intent to avoid the payment of postage.

Mr Peacock, the Post Office solicitor, attended on behalf of the prosecution.

Mr Samuel Harmer, inspector of franks at the General Post Office, deposed that the letter produced was originally franked by Lord Winchelsea, and it appeared to have been posted at Thrapston, Northamptonshire, on the 5th of May last, being the date written by his lordship. The letter arrived at the General Post Office on the day following, and it bore the free stamp of the establishment. Witness had no doubt that the letter was addressed to London in the first instance, but that address had been erased, and it now appeared to be directed to the Secretary to the Bishop of Peterborough, at Peterborough, which address was written over the erasure. The letters M---y forming part of this postmark “May,” appeared also to have been erased, and the date, as originally written by Lord Winchelsea, was altered from the 5th of May to 6th of June, 1839. It further appeared that the letter had been re-posted at Whetstone in the month of June, as it bore the post-mark of the post office at that place. It reached the General Post Office on the 7th of June, and it bore the twopenny post stamp of that day. A letter posted at Whetstone, and addressed to Peterborough, would in its ordinary course, have passed through London before it was forwarded to its destination. The letter produced, on its way to Peterborough, was charged at 6s 2d postage and it was so taxed in the Inland Office because something irregular was discovered in the direction of the letter. There was no doubt that the figure “1839,” the word “Thrapston,” and the signature of “Winchilsea” in the corner, were in his lordship’s handwriting, and not written by the same person who addressed it “to the Secretary of the Bishop of Peterborough.” The letter was addressed to the secretary of the Bishop, and it was dated “Albion-house, Whetstone.” It was signed by the prisoner, and his object in writing it was to obtain testimonials, with a view to his being ordained in the diocese.

Fletcher deposed that he proceeded to Albion-house, Whetstone, the residence of the prisoner, that morning, accompanied by Mr Peacock, Jun. Having seen the prisoner, the letter was produced to him, and having been cautioned by Mr Peacock to be careful as to what he said, he at once admitted that the inclosure was in his handwriting, and that the letter had been forwarded by him as directed. He said that he procured the envelope from a gentleman residing at South Mimms, and witness understood him to say that the letter was

addressed to the gentleman in question, and that it was franked by Lord Winchelsea.

The prisoner, when asked what he had to say to the charge, appeared much agitated, and expressed his sorrow for having unintentionally committed so serious an offence.

Mr Peacock observed, that the Post Office authorities regretted that they were compelled by a sense of public duty to prosecute the case; and probably the prisoner was not aware that, if convicted, he would be liable to be transported for seven years.

The prisoner, who was deeply affected, declared that he was not aware of the nature of franking, or he never should have been tempted to render himself liable to such a charge. He considered that there was no harm in altering a frank, and his only object was to send the letter free, as it appeared more respectful to the Bishop's secretary than if he had sent it in the ordinary way. He declared that he had a wife and five children solely depending on him for support, and he hoped that the magistrates would not commit him to prison, but take bail for his appearance to answer the charge.

Mr Minshull observed that it was a very painful case, and having consulted with Lord Mountford and Mr Peacock, the prisoner was told that he might put in bail, himself in 500l (£500) and two sureties in the sum of 250l (£250) each. He was allowed until five o'clock to find the sureties.

The prisoner, being unable to procure the required bail, was permitted by Mr Minshull to retire to a public-house, within a few doors of the office, for the purpose of procuring some refreshment, and Fletcher, the officer, was directed to accompany him there, and afterwards to take him to prison in a coach, to avoid the exposure of being conveyed thither by the van. The prisoner had been only a short time in the parlour of the house, when he took advantage afforded him by the momentary absence of the officer, and, bolting into the street, he ran with all speed up Great Russell-street, and then mingled with the crowd in Covent-garden-market, with a view to escape from custody. Fletcher, however, instantly pursued him, and after a smart chase, succeeded in re-capturing him. He was then taken back to the office, and ordered to be remanded until Lord Winchelsea, who is a necessary witness in the case, can attend to give evidence

In the course of yesterday, the wife of the prisoner and several of his personal friends, came to the office to make inquiries respecting him. They attributed his conduct with respect to the letter to temporary delusion, and his attempt to escape to the excitement produced by the charge preferred against him."

The Morning Post 12 October 1835:

"FARMING AND ILLICIT DISTILLATION. On Saturday morning a private distillery on an extensive scale was discovered on the farm of Mr Fordham, at

Winchmore-hill, near Hendon. It appears that suspicions have for some time past been entertained that Mr Fordham, apparently a respectable farmer, and formerly a publican, was engaged in such illicit proceedings, and on Saturday morning positive information of the fact having been received, Mr Burgess, a supervisor, went from London with a party of officers to search the farm. Having placed several persons about the house to prevent escape, Burgess and Smith entered, and, finding the farmer in his parlour, immediately seized him. He seemed terribly agitated, but a room of suspicious appearance at the end of the range of buildings being observed, he willingly accompanied the officer, who wished to examine it. In that room a trapdoor was found, leading to a large cellar; and it being lifted, a youth, who proved to be the farmer's son, came running up the steps with another person, the servant, and both were secured. In the cellar a still of unusually large dimensions (between sixty and seventy gallons) was found at work, with a quantity of molasses, wash, some manufactured spirits, and all the appurtenances of a private distillery. The place had been well contrived with means of conveying off the waste matter under ground to a cesspool some distance. The servant, when discovered, pointed to Fordham, as his employer; and addressing the latter, said, "A pretty mess you've brought me into, master." The three prisoners were taken immediately afterwards before Dr Robinson and another Magistrate. Fordham was recognised by the Doctor as a person who, before he took the farm in question, kept a public-house at Whetstone. The Magistrates remanded all the prisoners for a week that the solicitor to the excise might attend."

The Morning Post 15 December 1836:

"SUSPECTED HIGHWAY ROBBERY and MURDER. A very considerable degree of excitement has prevailed at Finchley, Whetstone, and surrounding districts since Tuesday morning last, in consequence of the body of a well-dressed female, apparently about 28 years of age, having been discovered in a ditch near the eight-mile stone on the Whetstone road; and, from the circumstance of considerable marks of violence being apparent, as well as her head-dress disordered, and no property whatever woman has been robbed and murdered.

It appears that, between six and seven o'clock on the morning above stated, two labouring men, of the names of Blackborough and Maywood, were going to their work, when they observed the body of the deceased in a ditch by the road side. She was partly under water. They got her out, she was quite dead, and her head and face were very much contused and bruised, as were also her hands. The body was removed to the Swan Inn, a short distance off, where Mr Stott, a surgeon, saw it, and information of the circumstance was immediately conveyed to the mounted police station, as also to the resident magistrates of Finchley. The latter immediately gave orders to Smith, the patrol, to make every inquiry upon the road as to whether a female answering the description of the deceased had been seen. The body was searched before the parish officers,

but no money, papers, or property whatever was found. She is of dark complexion, and of middle stature. Her apparel is good, consisting of a black silk bonnet, dark mourning gown, black silk stockings, and shoes, with Brunswick ties. She had a wedding ring on her left hand, and a pair of gold earrings. Her under garments are of a very good description. Information of the occurrence has been forwarded to Mr Stirling, the Coroner, who has appointed the inquest for Friday afternoon next. In the meantime, every exertion will be used to obtain evidence to elucidate the shocking and mysterious affair.”

The Morning Post 23 September 1839:

“CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT. SEPT 21. (Before Mr Justice Vaughan and Mr Justice Coltman). *William Barker*, aged 19, a fellow in the garb of a carter, was capitally indicted for a rape upon the person of Margaret Fell, aged 18.

The prisoner was undefended by counsel.

From the evidence adduced it appeared that the prosecutrix was a person in a low station in life, and that being in a destitute condition and afflicted with a white swelling on the knee, she, on Saturday, the 14th of September, set out from London with only a penny in her pocket, intending to make her way to Nottingham, her native place, and where her friends still resided. She had walked as far as Whetstone, near Barnet, when she entered a beer-shop for the purpose of procuring some refreshment, and found that the prisoner and a young man not in custody, who appeared to be his companion, in charge of a Nottingham waggon. She entered into conversation with them, and afterwards partook of some of their liquor; and when the prisoner proposed to go on the road with the waggon, which he was employed to drive for the day only by the regular waggoner, who had stayed behind, he invited the prosecutrix to ride. She accepted the invitation, and entered the waggon; but she had not been there long before the prisoner and his companion followed, saying that it rained hard and they wanted shelter. They soon, however, convinced her of the nature of their designs, and they proceeded with great violence to accomplish their object in spite of her cries and struggles. The evidence went to show that the prosecutrix had led a dissolute course of her life.

The prisoner, in his defence, intimated that the prosecutrix had made no objection to his advances.

Mr Justice Vaughan summed up the case to the jury, who retired to consider their verdict, and after an absence of about an hour they returned into court and declared the prisoner *Guilty*, but recommended him to mercy on account of his youth, as well as of the opportunities afforded him by the prosecutrix for the commission of the offence.

The prisoner said he was known in the neighbourhood of Whetstone, and that he had never known any harm of the prisoner. He was not in the habit of sleeping in a bed, but usually lodged in houses or outhouses.

The prisoner having been called up for judgement, Mr Justice Vaughan proceeded to pass sentence upon him. He said that the prisoner had been found guilty, after a patient and calm investigation. It could not be endured that the punishment for such a crime should be less than capital. In the case of the prisoner there were circumstances of great aggravation. Here was a girl eighteen years of age, a cripple, and of great infirmity, on her way to Nottingham, and he invited her to take a place in his waggon to assist her on her journey; and under these circumstances, not alone, but in concert with a companion, who was still amenable to justice, and who, he hoped, would not escape the law, they determined to violate the girl each of them, against her will; and the prisoner, being the first to commit the crime, had no sooner perpetrated it, aided by his companion, than he assisted his partner in wickedness in his completion of the same crime and the same object. Under these circumstances, therefore, if ever there was a case in which a judge was justified in saying that the law should take its course, he thought this was one. At the same time that he expressed this opinion, however, he was not insensible to, nor did he forget the recommendation of the jury, which was given on account of his youth, and also of – and this he could not so well understand – the prosecutrix being in the way; but he should feel it right that the recommendation of the jury should be conveyed to the Crown, in order that the Secretary of State might have an opportunity of dealing with the case in such a manner as should be thought fit. He was there only to determine for himself, and he thought that he should weaken the protection to which society was entitled if he had not taken the course which he had adopted. He had had an opportunity of reflecting on his course of duty during the absence of the jury, and he had done so carefully, and with the wish to find if he could find any circumstance of mitigation in the case, but without effect. It was not because the girl did not present herself chaste and untouched that she was to be the prey of any one whose passions might induce him to address her. He had now only a most painful duty to perform, and he felt that the best service which he could render the prisoner would be to entreat him, without loss of time, to repair to his cell, and there on his bended knees, and with the assistance of that spiritual instructor who would attend him, and with a contrite and penitent heart repent him of the great sin of which he had been guilty. It only remained for him, in conclusion, to pass upon him the dreadful sentence of the law, and that was that he should be taken to the place from whence he came, and from thence to the place of execution, and that he should be there hanged by the neck until he should be dead.

The Learned Judge was frequently interrupted by the prisoner's declarations of his innocence during the time he was passing sentence.

His Lordship subsequently directed that, as the prisoner was unfriended, a memorial stone should be drawn up for him, and transmitted to the Home Office, setting forth the recommendation of the jury, and the ground upon which it had been made.

The Under-Sheriff promised that this instruction should be obeyed, and the prisoner was then removed from the bar.”

The London Dispatch 29 September 1839:

“William Barker, aged 19, was inducted capitally for a rape upon the person of Margaret Full. It appeared from the evidence of the prosecutor, a girl of loose character, that she was 18 years of age, and a native of Nottingham, where her friends resided. Being afflicted with a white swelling on her knee, and having no means of procuring an honest livelihood in London, she determined to walk to Nottingham, and set out on her journey at an early hour on Saturday morning, the 14th inst., with only one penny in her pocket. Having proceeded as far as Whetstone, she went into a beer shop in that place, and procured half a pint of beer. The prisoner was there with another man, and she found that they had been left in charge of a Nottingham waggon, which was standing at the door, the regular driver of which had hire the prisoner for the day to drive the waggon part of the journey. She entered into conversation with the prisoner and his companion, and having partaken of some of their beer, the prisoner understanding that she was going to Nottingham, proposed to give her a lift in the waggon, and she gladly accepted the offer as she felt very tired, and it was raining hard at the time. She accordingly got into the waggon, which was covered over, and the prisoner and the other young man rode outside. Having proceeded some distance, they came to a lonely part of the road, when the prisoner and his companion entered the waggon, saying that it rained hard, and they wanted shelter. The prisoner then began to take liberties with her, which she resisted, but he finally seized her round the neck, threw her down in the waggon, and while his companion held her legs, he forcibly accomplished his purpose in spite of her cries and struggles, and after he had succeeded in his design, his companion committed the same violence upon her, the prisoner holding her down until the second outrage was effected. They then left her, but, fearing to remain inside the waggon any longer, she contrived to scramble out, and rode on the hinder part until she saw some women on the road, to whom she complained of the outrage committed upon her, and shortly after the driver of the waggon came up, to whom she also related what had occurred. The prisoner and his companion then ran away, but having procured the assistance of a constable, she accompanied to the latter to the White Lion public-house, near Barnet, and, upon searching the stable, the prisoner was discovered concealed amongst the straw, and immediately taken into custody. His companion was also sought for, but he, it appeared, had effected his escape. The prisoner was conveyed before a magistrate on the following Monday, when he stated in his defence that the girl was a consenting party, and that it was her

own proposal to get into the waggon. The magistrate, upon this statement of the prisoner, required the attention of a surgeon to examine the person of the prosecutrix for the purpose of ascertain the truth of his statement, and from his report, it appeared that he discovered bruises upon her legs and arms, but with respect to the violation of her person he would give no positive evidence, as it appeared that the girl, by her own admission, had previously led an abandoned life in the streets of London. The prisoner, when called upon for his defence, declared that the girl had consented to his wishes. Mr Justice Vaughan summed up the evidence, and told the jury that the fact of the alleged violence depended solely upon the statement of the prosecutrix, confirmed as it partly had been by the evidence of the surgeon with respect to the bruises on her person. There was also a strong circumstance in favour of the truth of her story, which was that she had lost no time in complaining of the treatment she had received. The jury, having retired to consider their verdict, remained out of court for about half an hour, and then found the prisoner guilty of the charge, but recommended him to mercy on account of his youth, and also that the girl herself had afforded him an opportunity for the commission of the offence. The prisoner was then called up for judgement, and the usual proclamation for silence having been made, while sentence of death was passing, the learned judge put on the black cap, and passed sentence of death on the prisoner.”

Morning Chronicle 20 Feb 1845:

“Mr Samuel Stoke, a gentleman of independent fortune, residing at Whetstone, Hertfordshire, was placed in the felon’s dock, charged into conservation with indecently assaulting John Thornton.

The evidence was to this effect:- That the prosecutor, a smart intelligent lad, about 17, one of the toll-collectors at Holloway-gate, was standing there between seven and eight o’clock on the previous evening, when the prisoner came up. The prisoner fell into conversation with him, gave him an orange, and asked him to walk along the road with him for awhile. The prosecutor not being on duty consented. They had not proceeded far when the prisoner’s observations startled the boy, who however, bore with them; at length the prisoner, seizing him, proceeded to treat him in a manner too shocking to be mentioned. A police constable came up, and the prosecutor gave him into custody. The constable swore that when he came up the boy’s dress was much disordered.

The prisoner, in defence, said that the statement was partly true and partly false; but made no attempt to distinguish the one from the other.

Mr Combe decided upon committing him for trial, and told him he could not accept of less bail than two sureties in £100 each, and himself in £200.

Prisoner: Oh, I shall easily find that.

They were not forthcoming, however, and he was locked up.”

London Standard 9 November 1849:

“(Before Mr Serjeant ADAMS, Assistant Judge.) A SAVAGE. John Fitzgibbon, alias Maloney, a muscular, morose looking fellow, a deserter from the 10th Hussars, was indicted for the following diabolical assault.

The Prosecutor, who spoke with great difficulty in consequence of the fearful nature of the injury the prisoner had inflicted upon him, deposed that on the 31st inst. He was at the Orange-tree public house, at Colney Hatch, in company with several companions, labouring men; and the prisoner, who was a stranger to them all, was also present. He assumed a dictatorial tone towards the whole company, and proclaimed silence to allow of an Irishman singing a song. He (prosecutor) said he would exert himself to procure silence, upon which the prisoner charged him with interfering with what did not concern him, and in an instant he took off his coat and commenced beating him. He resisted as well as he could, but the prisoner threw him upon the floor, and giving a loud yell he immediately threw himself upon him. The next minute he rose with his face besmeared with blood, and called the attention of his company to something he held between his teeth. Having done so he spat it into his hand, and threw it upon the table, saying “Look there!” The prosecutor was assisted up, when his face presented a dreadful appearance, his under lip having been completely bitten off by the prisoner. It was the lip that the prisoner had so exultingly held between his teeth and thrown upon the table, and so shocked were all present at what had taken place, that they fell upon the prisoner, secured him, and handed him over to a constable.

Several witnesses gave corroborative testimony, and the lip was produced, it having been preserved in spirits.

The prisoner said he was drunk at the time and knew nothing about the affair.

The jury found the prisoner Guilty.

The learned Judge said that a more ruffianly, savage, yet cowardly outrage, he had never heard of.

A serjeant of the 10th Hussars here said that the prisoner was a deserter from the regiment, and when released by the civil authorities he would be tried by a court-martial for his desertion.

The learned Judge then sentenced the prisoner to six months' hard labour, remarking that he was not sorry that after that period he would be further punished by the military authorities. He was a disgrace to humanity."

Daily News 22 January 1851:

"George Luck, 20, George Sands, 23, Thomas Cox, 21, and Henry Cooper, 10, were indicted for a robbery upon Thomas Howell.

Mr Cooper held the depositions, and examined the witnesses for the prosecution by direction of the Court. Mr Ballantine defended Cox, and Mr Payne appeared for Sands. The other two were not defended.

On the 2nd instant, the prosecutor was at the Griffin public house at Whetstone, where for three or four hours he was regaling himself and other persons with beer, and though the prisoners were not there when he first went into the house, they subsequently formed part of the company, and the prosecutor "tossed" them for beer. Having spent all his silver money, he obtained for a sovereign, and immediately afterwards some of the prisoners challenged him to toss for money, which he declined, though afterwards he tossed for more beer. One of the prisoners tauntingly told him that the reason he did not toss for money was that he had none to toss with, upon which he took out of his pocket the change he had received, and held it out in his hand. The prisoner Luck then struck his hand, and the money was scattered about the floor, and a general scramble took place. The case against the prisoners was, that they were all parties to this transaction, and that they each had an intention to press themselves of the prosecutor's money. In cross-examination the prosecutor said he went out on the night in question to enjoy himself, the period (12 months) for which he had taken the pledge as a teetotaler having expired the preceding day. The remainder of the evidence against the prisoners consisted of vague admissions made by some of them to the police.

The learned Judge summed up for an acquittal, and the jury found the prisoners Not Guilty."

The Morning Chronicle 3 December 1861:

"COMMITTAL OF A POSTMAN FOR STEALING LETTERS. Quinton Woolnough, a young fellow about 20 years of age, a postman engaged in the delivery of letters between Finchley and Whetstone, was charged before Mr Baker with neglecting to deliver a number of letters that had been entrusted to his care as a Post-office servant, and also stealing the same.

Mr Wm Peacock, from the office of the Solicitor of the Post-office, attended for the prosecution, and stated that since the remand it had been ascertained that

the prisoner had purloined thirteen letters, some of them having been posted on the 13th ult. Some of the letters in the prisoner's possession had been opened and refastened. There had been a great many complaints from the neighbourhood in which the prisoner was engaged in the delivery of letters, of the non-delivery of letters and the loss of property, but no property had been abstracted from these letters. He should call witnesses who would prove the non-receipt of letters addressed to them, and found in the prisoner's possession, and then ask for the committal of the prisoner.

Police-constable Kilbey, 220 G, said: On Saturday night, the 16th ult, about eight o'clock, I was in Old-street, St Lukes, when the prisoner, who was very much the worse for liquor, came up to me, and wished me to take him into custody. I asked him what he wanted to go to the station for, when he told me he was a postman, that he had neglected his duty in delivering letters entrusted to his charge, and that he had broken them open to see if there was anything in them. He also said that if there had been anything in the letters he would have been further afield before then. I then told him that if he would show me a letter or a part of one I would take him to the station, when the prisoner took from his pocket a number of letters which I saw had been opened. I then took him to the police-station, and when there I asked him if he had any more letters, when he said, "Oh, yes; I have plenty more." The prisoner asked me to let him pull off his coat, and he produced thirteen different letters addressed to persons residing at Whetstone and Finchley. They bear different postmarks, dated from the 14th to the 23rd of November inclusive. On the day afterwards, I went to the prisoner's residence at Whetstone, and found in the prisoner's coat pocket a piece of embroidery.

The prisoner, who treated the charge with indifference, said he did not wish to ask any questions.

Mr William Eade said: I reside at Whetstone, and am the senior letter carrier at the Whetstone post-office. The prisoner was an auxiliary letter carrier in the same office and had been employed there between two and three ears up to Saturday, the 23rd November last. I have looked at the thirteen letters produced by 220 G. They are all addressed to persons residing in the prisoner's delivery, and should have been delivered by him at the addresses the same morning that they came to hand. The London postmarks on them vary from the 15th to the 23rd of November. The prisoner left Whetstone without giving any intimation of going away.

Mrs Emma Elsey: I reside at Woodride-gardens, (*sic*) Whetstone. The letter produced was addressed and intended for me. It is from my agent in Boston, Lincolnshire. The prisoner delivered letters at my house, and I considered him a civil, respectable man. He never delivered the letter produced.

Mr Thomas Naylor: I live at Woodride-gardens (*sic*), Whetstone. The letter produced and addressed to me is from a Mr Hannau of Hay-hall, near Wigan, and has never been delivered to me by the post. I never saw it until I saw it in the hands of the police-officer.

Miss Eliza Scarlett: I live at the Torrington Arms, Whetstone (*sic*). The letter produced is addressed to me, and is from my sister at Woodford. The prisoner delivered letters to our house, but he never delivered the letter in question.

Mrs Jane Wright: I am the wife of Joshua Henry Wright. I reside at Launceston-place, Finchley. The letter produced and addressed to me is from a friend of mine at Killarney. The prisoner delivered letters at our house, but he never delivered the letter in question.

The prisoner having received the usual caution, said he did not wish to make any defence, or to say anything why he should not be committed for trial.

Mr Barker fully committed the prisoner to Newgate for trial.”

The Morning Post 7 December 1865:

“MIDDLESEX SESSIONS. (Before Mr Bodkin, Assistant-Judge). *Henry Smith*, alias *William Ward*, 23, and *William Brooks*, alias *Henry Rowe*, 23, were indicted for stealing two shawls and other articles, value 2l (£2), the property of Edward Nunnely. There were other indictments against them.

Mr Metcalfe and Mr Collins appeared for the prosecution; Mr Pater for Mr Rowe; and Mr Montague Williams for Ward.

The prosecutor is a linen draper, carrying on business at Hadley, and on the 15th of November the prisoner Brooks entered the shop with a quantity of artificial flowers, and wished him to purchase them, but he declined to do so. Notwithstanding his refusal to purchase, the prisoner Brooks seemed unwilling to quit the shop, and whilst he was engaged in talking to him, the other prisoner entered the shop and asked to be served with binding for a waistcoat and some other trifling articles, which were handed to him. While the prosecutor was serving Ward, his back was necessarily turned towards both the prisoners. They went away, and afterwards he discovered that several articles that were lying on the counter when the prisoners entered the shop were missing. The same evening a police-constable, 273, S, asked him if he had lost any shawls, and he said that he had, and described the marks upon them. He went to Whetstone police-station, where he identified the property which had been taken away from the shop.

Benjamin Ellis, police-constable 53 S, said he went, in company with James Stamford 273 S, to the Swan with Two Necks public-house at Whetstone, and

he saw Smith in front of the house with a horse and cart, and he asked him what he had got there, and he said if the horse and cart belonged to him. He said, "No, to a friend of mine who is in the public-house." Witness said he would have a look at him, upon which Smith went towards the door, but suddenly turning around, he ran away. Witness then jumped into the cart, pursued him, and overtook him in the high-road, but he suddenly ran into an adjoining field, where witness pursued and overtook him. Witness told him he should detain him on the charge of stealing several articles when he said he knew nothing about it, and that he (the policeman) was mistaken. He took Smith to the station-house, together with the horse and cart, and they were searched. Soon afterwards Stamford brought in Brooks. In the cart witness found two woollen plaid shawls, and a winsey shirt, besides several other articles. Brooks said the two shawls and shirt belonged to him, and that he had bought them of a man near the Bull public-house on the road for 14s, but he knew nothing about them.

The jury found both prisoners Guilty.

The prisoners were then tried and found guilty on another indictment.

Mr George Lockyer, prison officer, put in the following convictions against the prisoner Rowe: - One month in 1859, three months in 1859, six weeks in 1860, two years in 1861, and six months in 1864.

The Assistant-Judge said that robberies of this kind, committed with the aid of a horse and cart, were a great aggravation of the offence. The prisoners were both dangerous characters, and as Rowe had been several times convicted, the sentence of the court upon him was that he be kept in penal servitude for seven years, and Ward to be imprisoned and kept to hard labour for twelve months."

Manchester Courier & Lancashire General Advertiser 2 October 1867:

"ANOTHER POLICEMAN SHOT IN LONDON. A policeman was shot on Thursday night near Highgate. Several and different contradictory accounts have reached us of the affair. The following particulars are given by one of the police-court reporters: - "Near upon 11 o'clock on Thursday night Police-constable Thomas O'Brien, No 782 of the A Reserve, and mounted, was proceeding along Smeeton-lane, near Friern Barnet when his attention was drawn to a match being struck close by a haystack in the corner of a field. The stack was surrounded by railings. O'Brien dismounted and tied his horse to a gate. He then got over into the field and approaching the stack, he met two men, and asked them what their business was there. They said they were minding the haystack. O'Brien, knowing this to be an unusual thing, requested them to get over the rail and let him see if he knew them. After some little hesitation, they came over the rails, and he noticed that one had a black leather portmanteau. The constable told him he would like to see what it contained.

The man who was carrying it said: "There is the key (holding one out): you can look for yourself." O'Brien said that he would not do for him. They must open it and he would look. The man with the bag said he would see him in hell first, and would not be interfered with, and that he (O'Brien) had better do his own dirty work. The constable said that he must take him and his companion for being there for some unlawful purpose. He took hold of him, when his hat, as well as his wig, fell to the ground. His companion at this instant presented a pistol at the officer, who let go of the first man, and seized hold of the pistol with his left hand. He had no sooner done so than it went off, and wounded the officer. He fell and could not see for some time. When he recovered consciousness, he could not see anything of the men. He went to the gate where he had left his horse, and found that it had been taken. O'Brien went along the road, screaming and shouting, but could make no-one hear at a farmhouse close by. The place where the occurrence took place is a very lonely spot, and O'Brien with much exertion managed to get to some cottages about a quarter of a mile away. His shouts and cries awoke a carpenter named Simpson, residing in Totterdown Cottages in Friern Barnet. Simpson at once took the officer in, and with the assistance of Mr Harvey, his landlord, as well as his wife, they bound up his left hand, which was in a shattered state and bleeding copiously. By this time the constable was in a very exhausted condition, and they gave him water and bathed his head. Stevenson then obtained a fly, and took the poor fellow to Highgate police-station, where Dr Forshall was sent for, and was at once in attendance. He found the officer in an exceedingly low state, and his left hand in a shattered state – so much as to necessitate the removal of the forefinger and metacarpal bone. Mr Forshall deemed the injury so severe and the shock to the system so great as to endanger the life of the officer. He still lies at Highgate police-station. Information was at once forwarded to Supt Webb, of the Y Division of police, and he, in company with Mr Inspector O'Loghlen, at once proceeded to the place named and found traces of blood along the whole distance, as above mentioned. Mr Webb with several clever detectives of the division, are out making searching and active enquiries, with a view to apprehend the parties. The officer still lies in a precarious state. The horse has not yet been traced. It is hoped that this being missing will give a clue to the parties."

Liverpool Daily Post 4 Nov 1867:

"From enquiries made on Saturday morning it was ascertained that the constable, Thomas O'Brien, No 782 A Reserve, who was shot in a field in Smeeton-lane, near Friern Barnet was progressing favourably. His three remaining fingers are badly lacerated at the back. A pond near the spot was by order of Mr Supt Webb of the Y division, dragged, and a large cavalry pistol, bearing the Tower mark, got from it. Near the spot there were picked up to ball cartridges. Mr Webb, with several detective officers, are making diligent inquiries into the matter. The landlady of the Prince of Wales beershop, Bounds Green, in the locality where the occurrence took place, said shortly after the

affair two men came in and had a pint of ale, and then left hurried. They both appeared very excited, and one was carrying a black bag. The supposition as regards the horse is that they untied it from the gate, that both men mounted, and after riding it some distance turned it adrift.”

Lloyds Weekly Newspaper 20 June 1875:

“MALE SERVANTS’ LICENCES. – Mr Thomas Walter Blyth, a gentleman farmer, of Brook farm, Whetstone, appeared on a summons taken out at the instance of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, for having kept a male servant without a licence. Mr Kelly, supervisor of Excise, gave evidence to the effect that on the 27th April, he called the defendant’s attention to a man who was at work in the stable, when the latter said that he had only had him a week. Witness said he would send a form of declaration and advised defendant to take out a licence at once. As he had not since done so, a summons was issued. The Bench imposed a penalty of 5l, which was paid at once.”

Lloyds Weekly Newspaper 26 December 1875:

“UNFAIR TRADING. At the Highgate Petty Sessions on Monday, Frederick Hall, grocer and cheesemonger, of Whetstone, was charged on a summons with having seven light weights in his possession. Defendant, who spoke in a German accent, was asked if he pleaded guilty or not guilty. “He replied: I must admit it was only neglect. I am a foreigner. It wasn’t done for a bad purpose. I hope you will see it over this time. I will see that in future it does not happen again.”

“UNJUST WEIGHTS. George Shaw, assistant-inspector, proved seizing the seven unjust weights now produced, in defendant’s shop on 22nd ult., and Mr Faulkner, the inspector, tested them in view of the magistrates. Defendant said he had been in the business 18 months. Mr Bodkin: “And poor people who deal with you are to suffer your neglect.” Defendant said it was not much. He bought the weights about two years ago in Bethnal-green, and never saw to them. The scales he could attend to himself, having been an engineer. The scales were correct. Mr Bodkin told him he must pay a fine of 10s and 7s costs. Defendant: “That’s a nice Christmas box.” The money was paid.

Reynolds Newspaper 12 September 1886:

“MYSTERIOUS DEATH OF A DRUNKARD. Dr Wynn Westcott, deputy-coroner for Central Middlesex, held a lengthened inquiry at the Bull and Butcher Inn, High Road, Whetstone, into the circumstances attending the death of William Scarfe, aged forty-five, living at Smith’s Cottages, High Street, Whetstone. Sarah Scarfe, the widow, stated that her husband was by trade a shoemaker,

but had not worked for some time past. They had a garden, and he used to make up nosegays, and sell them to parties in traps who passed through the village; and if he got a shilling or two, he would get drunk, and stop away from home for several nights. He did not give her any money, and she was compelled to go out to work to keep her family of five, the two eldest boys being in the army and navy. On Tuesday, the 31st of August, he came home very drunk at half-past ten at night. She was standing two or three doors off, talking to a neighbour, as he was just returning from work, and he said, "Come home and wash my head." She did so and found he had a cut at the back of his head, and there was a lot of gravel in it. The Coroner: Did he tell you how it happened? Witness: No, he kept on jawing and said he had been knocked down, and next morning, when he came across to the Bull and Butcher, he was told that Sergeant Ellis's son had knocked him down at the top of Black-horse-lane. Joseph Dowson, a bricklayer, stated that on Monday week he was in the Griffin just before ten o'clock, and saw the deceased look in. Five minutes afterwards he was called by a man named Ellis, who asked him to assist in picking up the deceased, who was in the Oakleigh-road, about fifty yards off. Witness did so, and asked him what was amiss, and he answered, "All right mate." They then all went into the Griffin together, and all were sober. Witness stayed about a quarter of an hour, and then went home. Dr Henry Ross Todd, living at Whetstone, and acting as *locum tenens* for Dr Perry, stated that on Monday last the deceased was brought to the surgery by his wife with a piece of stick half a yard long between his teeth to keep his jaws apart. He was evidently suffering from tetanus in its first stage. On examination he found a wound on his head about an inch in length. He made a rambling statement as to how it was caused, but said nothing tangible. On Tuesday when witness again saw him general tetanus had set in, and he died on Wednesday. By the Coroner: The tetanus was caused from the injury to the back of the head, which was such as might be caused by a fall in a road, and he understood the deceased to say that the accident took place on Tuesday week. The Coroner said it was very unsatisfactory that the evidence was so contradictory as to the date, and that there were no witnesses who could throw a light upon it. The jury ultimately returned their verdict, "That the deceased died from tetanus, caused by a wound on the back of the head following a fall when in a state of alcoholism."

Western Mail 27 April 1887:

"BREACH OF PROMISE BY A WIDOWER. A DISAPPOINTED WIDOW SOLACED. In the Queen's Bench Division on Monday (before Mr Justice Grantham) Mrs Tupp, a widow, who used to carry on the business of a laundress at Somers-town, sued Mr Goddard, a widower, a publican, carrying on the business at the Anchor, Whetstone, in the county of Middlesex, for breach of promise of marriage. It appeared that the plaintiff and her late husband, who died in August 1885, were acquainted with the defendant, and that after the death of her husband the defendant renewed his acquaintance with her, and, after a courtship, became engaged to her on June 8, 1886.

Ultimately, on October 19 of that same year, the defendant married another woman, having previously told the plaintiff that he had changed his mind and that she had better do the same. She, however, held him to his promise, and hence the present action, for, in consequence of her engagement, she had sold her laundry business and spent some £50 in preparation for her promised marriage. There was no defence, and the jury found a verdict for the plaintiff, damages £200.”

The Pall Mall Gazette 27 April 1887:

“Mrs Maria **Tripp**, a widow, obtained in the Queen’s Bench Division yesterday a verdict, with £200 damages, against Mr **Goodwin**, a horse dealer and publican at Whetstone, who promised to marry her, but didn’t.”

The Illustrated Police News 3 March 1888:

“CAPTURE OF AN ALLEGED SMASHER. At the Barnet Police-court, on Monday, Mr H E C Stapylton on the chair, John William Walker, of Bawtry-road, Whetstone, was charged with having uttered counterfeit coin. The evidence of Christina Shaw, daughter of the landlord of the York Arms, Whetstone, was to the effect that on the 10th ult. the prisoner came to the house and was served with a pint of ale, for which he paid with a florin. Her father subsequently found that the florin was bad. Having found out where the prisoner resided, he went to him and got good money for the beer, retaining the florin, which was afterwards handed to the police. Mrs Sarah Grimsey, keeper of a small shop at Friern Barnet, gave evidence to the effect that on the 25th ult. the prisoner went to her shop and purchased some bacon, paying with a shilling. A few minutes afterwards he sent a child for a loaf, and the child also tendered a shilling in payment. The coin looked doubtful, and on examination proved to be bad. This aroused her suspicions, and she then found the first shilling was also counterfeit. She went to the residence of the prisoner, and under threat of giving him in charge obtained good money from him. Mrs Lydia Sharp, another shopkeeper in the neighbourhood, and Sydney Smith, potman at the Railway Hotel, New Southgate, gave evidence as to similar attempts on the part of the prisoner to pass base money at their respective establishments. Sergeant Goodship, 32S, proved the arrest of the prisoner, and a witness named Helmes gave evidence as to the finding of eight counterfeit shillings close to the spot where Walker was apprehended. Prisoner was remanded in custody.”

Daily News 24 November 1888:

“MYSTERIOUS DEATH OF A CHILD. Yesterday Dr W Wynn Westcott held an inquiry at the Anchor Inn, High-road, Whetstone, concerning the death of Ethel Maud Ingham, 14 years old, the daughter of parents residing at Sundridge Cottage, Whetstone, who was found drowned in a well at the rear of the house

at the latter address on Tuesday night. Mr Edmonson appeared for the relatives of the deceased – John Edward Ingham, the father, who said he was connected with the theatrical profession, deposed that the deceased was an amiable girl, but had suffered the past few weeks from illness, and had been medically treated. On the evening of Monday last he had reason to scold the deceased owing to money being missing from “her mamma’s” purse. He told her she would have to be punished, and he accordingly shut her in her bedroom and forbade her to leave. At seven pm he missed her from the room, and after searching and making enquiries in the village she could not be found. The following night at 10.40 the body of the deceased was found in the well. She never attended school, but used to assist her “mamma” in the housework. The latter was her stepmother. The other occupants of the house were witness, his son, and a manservant. In answer to the Coroner, the witness stated that the heavy stone on the top of the well had been removed the last ten days. It was owing to the main supply being cut off by the company that had recourse to the well. By a juror: Deceased confessed before the witness and his son that she had taken a sovereign from her ma’s purse. She said she had spent it in silver presents for her friends. He had not made enquiries as to where she purchased the goods, nor the friends to whom she gave them. He had never beat her. Upon one occasion, about four months ago, he gave her “a good whipping”. Mr Edmondson objected to the line of cross-examination by the juror. The Coroner said that the father had a perfect right to correct the child, but if it was shown that the death had been accelerated by his conduct then it might be a matter for a criminal charge. The father, continuing, stated that he did not think of searching the well until Tuesday night. Dr Bury deposed that he was called by Mr Ingham’s servant to the deceased on Tuesday night. She was dead and had evidently been immersed in water for about twenty-four hours. There were no marks of violence on the body, and death was due to suffocation by drowning. The body of the deceased was very thin and appeared not well nourished. Dr Tunnercliffe deposed that he had attended the deceased from the 13th to the 15th instant. She was suffering from a severe attack of biliousness. She recovered from that. In the witness’s opinion she was “very thin”, but he could not say if it arose from insufficient food. Several jurors thought that a post-mortem should be made, to ascertain if any disease existed to cause the wasting, as “it was common talk in the village” that the deceased had been kept without food. Ann Charge, a neighbour, stated that she had known the deceased in the village for a twelvemonth. She had never complained to her of ill-usage, but she did of “want of food.” It generally happened when her parents went away. Witness had often given her food, and she had never refused it. By the Coroner: She always appeared a cheerful girl, and she never said she would end her life. The witness never saw her with a sovereign in her possession. Ann Druce, also a neighbour, said the deceased had told her her mother was most cruel and she would run away from home. Deceased had also remarked she was kept without food. By the Coroner: She did not specify the cruelty. The father, recalled, stated that when away from home he used to send the deceased 5s to 7s a week. He had never left her alone at Whetstone for

more than a fortnight together. Emile Mark, a German, employed as butler with Mr Ingham, stated that he once heard deceased say. "I will go down the well if ma or pa punish me again." Cornelia Ingham, a Hungarian, an actress, deposed that the deceased was her stepdaughter. She had known her for nine years. She was a very happy girl, and generally truthful. On Monday last the deceased admitted having taken money from the witness's purse seven months previously. It was her stepson Sidney that first told her that his sister had taken it. The witness had never beaten her, nor had she strapped her to the bedstead as reported by the village folk. She generally "corrected the deceased with words." On the evening of Monday last she spoke to Mr Ingham about the theft, a matter of a sovereign, and he at once shut the deceased up in her room. She saw nothing more of her until the body was found in the well. Witness would have "looked upon it as a crime to have beaten her." Both her husband and herself were in London a good deal, and had been short of money. When the deceased was left at Whetstone. they sent her sums of money as much as they could afford. It averaged 8s a week. The Coroner summed up, and the jury returned a verdict, "That the deceased was found drowned, but whether by accident or otherwise there was not sufficient evidence to show, but the jurors regret that the deceased should have been for some time exposed to very trying circumstances of solitude and want of the comforts of life."

The Standard 4 December 1888:

"Frederick Smith, twelve, schoolboy, of 4 Swan-lane, Whetstone, Henry Gilbey, 14, errand boy, of 46 The Avenue, New Southgate and Frank Hickey, errand boy, of 25 Doncaster-terrace, Oakleigh-road, Whetstone, were charged at the Barnet Police-court yesterday, before the Earl of Stafford and other Magistrates, with having been concerned together in stealing 7l (£7) in gold, the property of Frederick Smith, senior, from a drawer in a bed-room at 4, Swan-lane, Whetstone, on the 28th November. Prosecutor stated that the Prisoner Frederick Smith was his son, and lived with him at the above address. When Witness left home at eight o'clock on the morning of Nov 28, to go to work, he placed 12l (£12) and some silver in a tobacco box, which was then wrapped in a suit of clothes and locked in one of a chest of drawers. Prisoner left the house at the same time to go to school, and Mrs Smith also went out to work that morning. Witness locked up the premises and took the key. On his return at noon, he saw marks on the front door as though an attempt had been made to force it with a chisel, and discovered that an inner door had been forced and the back door literally wrenched away from its fastenings. He went to the drawer upstairs and found that it had been forced and 7l (£7) stolen. His son did not come home to dinner, and he, therefore, grew suspicious of him, and having searched for him in vain, he gave the information to the police. Detective Serjeant J Bradbrook, stationed at Barnet, said he received notice that three boys were in custody at Islington. He went there and saw the three prisoners. When he told Smith the charge, the boy said, "I took it," but Gilbey and Hickey both stated that they did not take part in breaking open the house, but waited

in the lane while Smith did it. Asked what had become of the stolen property, Smith handed him a watch, and a purse containing 3s 8d. Hickey produced another watch, a purse, and 1s 9d.; and Gilbey said the hats, coats and boots which they then wore had been purchased with the balance of the money. After some further evidence, the Prisoners having pleaded guilty, the Chairman said the offence was a most serious one; but the Bench would be lenient on account of the youth of the offenders. Each would receive twelve strokes from the birch, Smith would go to prison for a month, the others for 21 days.”

Bristol Mercury 29 November 1893:

“THE VICAR AND THE LAUNDRESS. Ellen Pountney, a poor sickly-looking woman, who was allowed to be seated, and who cried a good deal during the process of the case, of 23 Doncaster Terrace, Friern Barnet, was summoned at Highgate police court for illegally pawning six shirts, the property of the Rev H S Miles, vicar of All Saints’, Friern Barnet.

The prosecutor, who is also vice-chairman of the Barnet Board of Guardians, stated that defendant was employed by him as washer-woman, and had pawned six of his shirts at Messrs Knight’s, Southgate.

Defendant said she was sorry, but it was through sheer starvation. A written statement was put in which the defendant said her family were starving. Mr Miles stated that he lent money to defendant’s husband, which was to be repaid by defendant in washing.

Mr Bodkin: She is a poor person.

Defendant: My husband broke his shoulder.

Mr Bodkin: She says her children were crying for food and were without boots. Is that one of the causes?

Mr Miles (hesitatingly): Yes, I do not wish her punished.

Mr Homan (one of the magistrates): It would have been better to have relieved the poor woman.

Defendant: There is £1 1s 8d owing to me.

Mr Miles said it was not a case for relief. All had been done that could be, and he only wanted to protect the property of others, as it seemed easy to get rid of property. The money he lent to defendant’s husband he had repaid.

Mr Bodkin: Probably you have never had children crying for food, and do not know what the temptation may be under those circumstances, though I do not justify it.

Defendant: I have worked for Mr Homan's daughter.

Mr Bodkin said the charge must be dismissed and the property given up.

The Clerk said that could not be done. She could only be sentenced to one day either and the property given up; so in the end she was fined 1s, and the goods ordered to be given up.

Mr Bodkin said it was a case a clergyman should look into.

Mr Miles said that had been done."

There was a follow up to this case, as the *Birmingham Daily Post* reported on 2 January 1894:

"The Lord Chancellor has received a petition requesting him to make a thorough investigation into the conduct of the Highgate magistrates who had heard the recent case in which the Rev H S Miles, vicar of All Saints', Friern Barnet, and vice-chairman of the Barnet Local Board of Guardians, prosecuted a laundress named Ellen Pountney for having illegally pawned some sheets and tablecloths belonging to him. The accused said she did it through sheer starvation, and the Bench, after making some observations which seemed to show that they thought the reverend gentleman was dealing harshly with her (though he emphatically denied that), let her off with the nominal fine of one shilling or one day's imprisonment. The petition to the Lord Chancellor states that, in consequence of "the unwarranted and uncalled-for remarks of the Bench on the occasion of the first hearing," the reverend gentleman has been subjected to most undeserved criticism in the public press and has also been abused in numbers of anonymous letters. The action of the Bench is described as "nothing less than scandalous," and calculated to lead to the increase of crime and the decrease of its detection, and it is alleged that they prevent him from doing what they afterwards said he ought to have done. The Lord Chancellor has, it is understood, called upon the Highgate magistrates for an explanation of the circumstances referred to."

Barnet Press 17 February 1896:

"THE BURGLAR AND THE CHURCH BRANDY. William Starkey (17), a hawker of salt, was charged at Highgate Police-court, London, on Saturday, with breaking into Friern Barnet Parish Church and stealing therefrom five surplices, ten pocket handkerchiefs, one pair of gloves, one bottle which contained brandy, one pair of boots, a metal ring, a postage stamp and a farthing, worth 15s, the property of the Rev Frederick Hall, rector of Friern Barnet. The church is only about a mile and a half from the scene of the murder at Muswell Hill, and this offence was probably committed about the same time as the other deed was perpetrated. Police-constable Huggett stated that just before 3 o'clock on Friday morning he saw a light in the church. He went to one of the vestry

windows and saw the prisoner with a lighted candle. Prisoner drank some of the brandy whilst in church. He was remanded.”

Daily News 25 February 1896:

“THE POWERS OF DISTRICT COUNCILS. IMPORTANT DECISION. Elizabeth Gooday, of High-road, Whetstone, was charged at the Highgate Police-court yesterday, on a summons by the Friern Barnet District Council, with having wilfully obstructed a person duly employed in the execution of the Public Health Act 1875. Mr Goodship, clerk to the Friern Barnet District Council, prosecuted; Mr Forbes defended. It appeared that for some time past the District Council, as “the local authority,” had under Section 62 of the Public Health Act, been endeavouring to compel Mrs Gooday to lay on a supply of water to her premises from the mains of the company supplying that district. Mrs Gooday refused to do so, having, as she said, a “good supply” from other sources. The Council’s notices not being complied with, officers in the employ of the Council were sent to do the work of laying on the water, but Mrs Gooday refused to permit them to enter her premises, and this was claimed to be “obstruction” within the provisions of Section 306 of the Act, Mr Goodship also contending that the Council had no need to take the preliminary step of getting a magistrate’s order for the work to be done before they undertook it themselves. Mr Forbes, solicitor, submitted that Mrs Gooday had not been guilty of any “offence.” Mr John Glover said that the Bench were quite satisfied that the local authority, against the will of an owner or occupier, could not force an entrance until such local authority had obtained a magistrate’s order for what they wanted to do. In this case the District Council had not obtained such an order, and therefore the summons was dismissed. Mr Goodship asked the Bench to state a case for the High Court, and this they consented to do.”

The Morning Post 10 March 1896:

“William Grant, of the Blue Anchor Inn, Whetstone, appeared in answer to a summons charging him with having sold, to the prejudice of Arthur Liddall Bridge, a quantity of whisky which was not of “the nature, substance, and quality of the article demanded, but was 28 degrees under proof,” contrary to Section 6 of the Sale of Food and Drugs Act of 1879.

Mr H W Pole defended. Mr Bridge, an inspector under the Act for the County of Middlesex, said that he purchased half-a-pint of Scotch whisky at the Blue Anchor, for which he paid 1s 4d. After he had made this purchase he saw exhibited in another compartment a notice which read, “All spirits sold at this establishment are diluted according to price.”

Mr Glover: That means that the public can have anything they like. They pay a certain price, and have the spirit watered accordingly. Mr Poole contended that

the offence was a very trivial one. Under the Act whisky could be sold 25deg under proof, so that this was only 3deg out. Defendant did not “break down” his spirits himself but sold them as he received them from the distillers. Gin could be “broken down” to 30deg under proof. Defendant was fined 20s and 5s 6d costs.”

Lloyds Weekly Newspaper 22 March 1896:

“CHARGE OF STEALING MARKED PORK. Thomas Holmes, 21, a gardener, of High-road, Whetstone, was charged at Highgate police-court, yesterday, with stealing two pieces of salt pork from Mr Samuel Wright’s butcher’s shop, High-road, Whetstone. Prosecutor said he had missed so much meat lately from the salting house at the rear of his premises that previous day he counted up the pieces he had put there and stuck little pieces of paper on each piece. That was at six pm. At eight pm he went to count his meat, and found two pieces gone. He was holding a piece of candle, and prisoner came upon the scene and said “Shall I hold the candle?” He said “No; get out of it,” and continued his search, noticing that the prisoner watched him through a hole in an outhouse. Looking in a trap in the yard he found a handkerchief containing the two pieces of pork produced, with his pieces of paper stuck on, and he asked the prisoner if it was his hand kerchief. He said nothing, but tried to get over the gate. He caught hold of his leg and held it till Constable \Hunt 232S, arrived, and he asked for mercy, saying, “I haven’t had any of Mr Wright’s meat for a long time. “Prisoner admitted the handkerchief was his, and repeated the statement he made to Hunt. Mr Reynolds remanded him.

The Standard 16 March 1897:

“James Simpson, 17, labourer, and John Simpson, 14 errand boy, brothers, of Brownlow-road, Church-end, Finchley; Harry Tingley, 11. Schoolboy, of Belgrave-terrace, North Finchley; and Albert Wilding, 18, of Swan-lane, Whetstone, were charged, on remand, with being concerned together in breaking and entering the Working Men’s Self Help Social Institute, Dale-road, Finchley, and stealing therefrom 130 packets of cigarettes, seven ounces of tobacco, and two packs of playing cards, together of the value of 12s, the property of the Institute. It appeared the premises of the Institute were locked up at eleven on Monday night, the 8th inst., but were subsequently broken into. On Tuesday evening, Arnold, 340 S, arrested the younger Simpson, and found him in possession of 31 packets of cigarettes. Chasey, 567 S, arrested the elder Simpson, who had five packets of cigarettes similar to those found on his brother. Detective-sergeant Airey, S Division, arrested the other Prisoners, both of whom had tobacco and cigarettes in their pockets. James Simpson and Wilding were each sentenced to one month’s hard labour; Tingley was sentenced to receive six strokes with the birch; and John Simpson was remanded in custody.”

The Morning Post 23 March 1897:

“Ernest Cripps, errand boy, of Holly Terrace, Whetstone, was charged on remand with stealing a purse containing £5 3s 0½d, belonging to Mrs Bury, wife of Dr Bury of Breakspear, Whetstone, and Frederick Wood, 15, clerk, of Hadley-cottages, Friern-lane, Whetstone and George Allen, 13, schoolboy, of Sherwood-lane, Whetstone, were charged with being concerned with Cripps in the theft. Last Tuesday afternoon Mrs Bury left her purse on a table in the surgery, and some time afterwards found that it had been taken away. When taxed with the theft Cripps, who had then been in the employ of Dr Bury for three days, denied it, but when he was confronted with Kennison, 267 S, he said that he had taken it, that he did so because Wood and Allen told him to do so, and that those boys had the money. During the time Cripps has been at the workhouse under remand Kenison arrested the other prisoners. In the possession of Wood were found nine postal orders, value £1 10s 6d, two cheques value £6 5s, a six chambered revolver, ££3 5s 10d in cash, a watch and chain, and a metal match box. At his lodgings the police found one pawnticket, a cashbox containing three cheques, value £16 10s, six fountain pens, a postal order for 10s 6d, and 21s 4½d in cash. In the possession of Allen were found a box of rubber stamps and two pocket books. Wood, who was convicted at this Court a fortnight ago of another theft and bound over to come up for judgement if called upon, and Allen were arrested in the Euston-road. They told Kennison he had only caught them just in time, as they were about to go from Euston Station to Liverpool, and thence to Canada. Both admitted that they instigated Cripps to commit the robbery at Breakspear, and Wood told the constable that it was a good thing for him that he had no cartridges, adding, “I would not have been here: I would have shot you.” A detective-inspector in the City Police force said that Wood and Allen would be further charged with stealing the cheques mentioned and other articles from a desk in an office in the City. All the prisoners were remanded in custody.”

Reynolds Newspaper 4 April 1897:

“A BAD BOY’S DIARY. An extraordinary case of youthful depravity was heard at Highgate on Monday. Edward Cripps, 12, errand boy, of 3, Hadley-terrace, Whetstone; George Allen, 13, errand boy, of 3 Sherwood-street, Whetstone; and Frederick Wood, 15, clerk of 2, Hadley-cottages, Friern Barnet, were charged on remand with being concerned together with stealing a purse containing £5 3s 0½d from surgery of Dr Bury, of Breakspeare, Whetstone. Wood and Allen were further charged with breaking open a desk in an office at 1, Gresham-buildings, Basinghall-street, E.C., and stealing in paper and cash £31 odd.

On the afternoon of the 16th inst. Cripps, who had been told by Wood to rob his master, Dr Bury, “all he could,” stole the purse, handed it to Wood and received

6d as his share. Police-constable Kennison, 267S, made enquiries, and found Wood and Allen had put up at the Waverley Hotel, King's Cross. On the night of Saturday, the 20th, he saw the two boys near Euston Station and succeeded in arresting them both. They said they were just about to book to Birmingham from Euston, and after stopping there a few days they had intended going to Liverpool and from there to Canada. He found on Wood and in his bag a revolver, some spent cartridges, two screwdrivers, cheques value £23 0s 6d, postal orders value 2s 6d., a sovereign purse with £3 in it, a licence for the revolver, a cash-box and diary. The diary was mostly in cypher, but one entry was clear and read: "Went to the Room of Horrors. Saw Fowler and Milson" (the Muswell Hill burglars). Wood is crippled in his hands and feet and is an expert penman. He committed forgery while employed by the National Lifeboat Institution and was recently bound over to come up for judgement at this court for larceny, in which case he forged his mother's signature.

As to the second charge, Martha Bradshaw, an occasional helper at Gresham-buildings, said 'on the morning of the 20th inst Wood and Allen acme up to her while she was dusting, and the first-named asked for the key of Mrs Jarvis's office. She thought they were clerks employed at the office and gave him the key. They returned the key in about ten minutes. Other evidence showed that a desk in the office had been forced open, and cheques, postal orders, and cash in all value about £31 stolen. For one week last year Wood was employed by Mr Jarvis. When arrested he admitted his part in the robbery.

The Bench sentenced Wood twelve months' hard labour, and the other two were dealt with under the First Offenders Act and, besides being bound over to come up for judgement when called upon, were ordered to receive, Allen twelve and Cripps eight strokes with the birch."

Source: British Newspaper Archive

Researched by Nick McKie

Transcribed by David Berguer

© Friern Barnet & District Local History Society

