



Court Visits of Ballard Bishopstone 1857 - 1860

Nathaniel Ballard

1857

Faringdon – **Wm. Mansell** and **Geo. Bennett**, both of the Berks. Constabulary, were charged before the Magistrates with violation of duty by unlawfully apprehending **Mr. Nathaniel Ballard**, of Bishopstone, wool-stapler, on Thursday last. Mr. Ballard was walking from Faringdon to Shrivenham station, and had with him two greyhounds, when one of them rushed out and killed a hare as it was crossing the road into a field adjoining. The defendants, whom Mr. Ballard had just before met, immediately turned back and accused Mr. Ballard of poaching, which he denied, and they asked his name, which he gave them. They took the hare from him, and said he must go with them, and as they were going to take him to the public house at Longcot, he refused to go, and said he was known to Mr. Fairthorpe of that place, where they took him, and on being satisfied that he had given the correct name, &c., they went away. Fined 1s. 6d. and 8s. 6d. costs each.

Devizes and Wiltshire Gazette, 12 March 1857

1860

Faringdon County Court – Monday
(before J. B. Parry esq., Q.C. Judge.)

Thomas Mortimer and Henry Tombs v. Nathaniel Ballard – The plaintiffs are labourers, and the defendant a woolstapler at Faringdon. Mr. Haines appeared for the latter. The amount claimed was 4L. 3s. 8d. for digging a well, which the defendant disputed on the ground of non completion of the work, and that through the neglect of the plaintiffs to wall it up, the well had fallen in, and had been obliged to employ others to finish the work. The plaintiffs, on the contrary, swore that they had sunk to the depth of forty feet, and that the wall work formed no part of their agreement, and that it was in consequence of the default of the defendant to provide bricks for the walling and an influx of water that the well had fallen in, His Honour, in giving judgment, remarked that the plaintiffs were entitled in law to payment for as much work as they had performed, unless there were circumstances in the case to show that they were not so entitled, and the defendant having failed to prove such, his verdict would be for the plaintiffs with costs.

Berkshire Chronicle, 10 March 1860

Faringdon Petty Sessions – Tuesday

Nathaniel Ballard, of Faringdon, woolstapler, was charged with assaulting **Jas. Jefferies**, one of the bailiffs of the Faringdon County Court, when in the execution of his duty. The complainant's case was that on Monday morning last he went to Coxwell Lodge for the purpose of levying an execution from the County Court on the defendants goods, and that in consequence of his refusing to take the defendant's cheque in satisfaction of the execution the latter took him by the collar and endeavoured to eject him from the house, at the same time taking the key of the door with the supposed intention of locking him out. This however defendant failed to do, and left the house, saying he would "d--- soon get some one who would turn him out", but returned shortly afterwards and paid him the required amount in cash. The complainant was cross examined by the defendant with the view of showing that he (complainant) collared the defendant first, so as to prevent his locking the door, but this the complainant positively denied, but this the complainant positively denied. Each of the parties called a witness, but the evidence being of a vary conflicting nature, the magistrates dismissed the charge.

Berkshire Chronicle, 31 March 1860

Faringdon Petty Sessions – Tuesday June 12

Assault – **Nathaniel Ballard**, of Bishopstone, woolstapler, appeared on return of summons, on a charge of assaulting **Francis Baker**, engine driver, in the defendant's employ, on the previous Saturday. From the evidence it would appear that the complainant was sent by defendant to his father's residence to receive his wages, and on his going and not finding the father at home, went to the defendant who accompanied him back and got him his money, when the complainant began abusing the defendant, and they had a fight. The complainant called a witness, who stated that he (the complainant) was drunk, and not only abused the defendant, but struck the first blow. The Bench dismissed the compliant.

A similar complaint had been laid against **William Ballard**, the father of the defendant in the above case, but this, after the dismissal of the other, was not gone into.

Reading Mercury, 16 June 1860