

Harris Vs. Mandeville

Harris Vs. Mandeville

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/78126

Court : US Supreme Court

Decided On : 1796

Appeal No. : 2 U.S. 256

Appellant : Harris

Respondent : Mandeville

Judgement :

HARRIS v. MANDEVILLE - 2 U.S. 256 (1796)

U.S. Supreme Court HARRIS v. MANDEVILLE, 2 U.S. 256 (1796)

2 U.S. 256 (Dall.)

Harris

v.

Mandeville

Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

September Term, 1796

The plaintiff and defendant were both British subjects; the debt, for which the present action was brought, had been contracted in England; and the defendant, before the suit was instituted, had obtained his certificate under a commission of bankrupt issued against him in that country.

Under these circumstances, Heatly obtained a rule to shew cause why an exoneretur should not be entered on the bail piece; and in support of the rule cited 4 Term. Rep. 182. Co. Bank. Law. 497.

Tilghman declined opposing the rule, being of opinion, that between British subjects, the proceedings under a British commission of bankrupts must be valid and obligatory. He said, that it had been so decided by Iredell, Justice, in the Circuit Court, for the District of Massachusetts;* but, at the same time,

Page 2 U.S. 256, 257

the Judge had judicially circumscribed the operation of a certificate under the Pennsylvania bankrupt law, within the limits of the State.

By the Court: Let the rule be made absolute. Footnotes

[[Footnote *](#)] In Grenough v. Emmory.