



Legal News
Warren
v.
Kent
Little Hinton
1867

Cat Shooting

SWINDON COUNTY COURT
Wednesday, June 19
(before C. F. D. Caillard, Esq., judge)

William Warren v. Edwin Kent for £2, damages or the loss of a cat. Mr Kinneir appeared for defendant. Plaintiff is a labourer, living at Little Hinton in a cottage adjoining some land in the occupation of defendant. On the 29th of April the cat was shot. Plaintiff said it was a very valuable cat, and would not have lost it for £5.

Plaintiff, cross examined, said it was not a valuable cat in consequence of its poaching propensities. Three days before the cat was shot it had had young, and these had to be destroyed. He could have made a pound a piece of the young ones had had the old one not been destroyed.

Caroline Warren said she saw her cat lying dead in Mr Johnson's ground, about 20 yards from her (Mrs Warren's) back door. She also saw Mr Kent pick the cat up and conceal it under his coat. At that time Mr Kent had a gun, but he directly after took it into a stable close by.

In answer to Mr Kinneir, Mrs Warren said he cat would have been cheap at £5 to any one, for it was such an excellent mouser, and anything might be left on the table without her touching it. She saw Mr Kent with a gun, and she heard the report of a gun, but did not see Mr Kent fire. The cat had not a strong liking for rabbits.

Ellen Lawrence was on the road between Wanborough and Hinton, and saw Mr Kent shoot Warren's cat, and then pick it up.

This being the case, Mr Kinneir said he should not contend against the fact that Kent did shoot the cat. He thought, however, that plaintiff had failed to prove any damage, and as to an ordinary cat being worth 32, that seemed preposterous.

His Honor said plaintiff was undoubtedly entitled to recover some sum for the loss of his cat. Defendant would have to pay £1 1s and costs.

The Swindon Advertiser 24 June 1867