

In the High Court of Justice
Queen's Bench Division

1891 L N^o 4086

Between The City Assets Company
(Limited) Plaintiffs

and
Hinds and Son Defendants

Defence.

The Defendants say that:—

- 1 The work and labour and materials sued for was not nor was any part thereof done or provided for the Defendant firm
- 2 As to £103. 2. 5 parcel of the Plaintiffs claim the Defendants say that the same is in respect of work and labour and materials done and provided for the Defendant Stephen Hinds a member of the said firm in his separate capacity and the said Defendant claims to set off against so much of the said claim a like sum due from the Plaintiffs alleged assignor (the said James Trollope) to the said Defendant Stephen Hinds as herein after appears
- 3 The said James Trollope was at the date of the alleged assignment to the Plaintiffs and still is indebted to the Defendant Stephen Hinds in an amount exceeding the said claim of £103. 2. 5. that is to say in the amount of £4184. 1. 9 for monies found to be due to the said Defendant from the said James Trollope upon an account stated between them ~~on~~ or about the 25th November 1890 which amount so far as is necessary the said Defendant desires to set off against the claim pleaded to in the preceding paragraphs
- 3 In the alternative as to £58. 0. 5 the residue of the Plaintiffs claim the Defendants say that the amounts charged are excessive and incorrect and the Defendants

See Opinion

pay £ into Court in satisfaction of the
said residue and say that the same is sufficient to
satisfy the claim pleaded to

4 The Defendants do not admit the alleged assignment
or the alleged written notice thereof

(signed) J Alderson Gooe

Dated the day of November 1891 by

Prior Blurch & Adams

61 Lincoln's Inn Fields

Agents for Emerson & Co

Sandwich

Defendants' Solicitors

In the High Court of Justice
Queen's Bench Division

City Assets Company
Limited

vs
Hinds & Son

Copy
Defence

7

Prior, Burch & Adams
61 Lincoln's Inn Fields