



# *The Calley Arms Wanborough 1873 - 1875*

## **Prohibited Hours and License Renewal**

SWINDON POLICE COURT  
Thursday

William Dudman, of the Calley Arms, Wanborough, was fined 13s., including costs, for having his house open during prohibited hours; and Charles Rolfe and John Stroud were fined 10s. 9d. each for being on the premises at the time in question.

### **The Western Daily Press, 30 May 1873**

SWINDON POLICE COURT  
Thursday

An application was made for an extension of hours on the occasion of a ball on the opening of a new school for the Calley Arms, Wanborough. The ball was to take place on the 29th, and was expected to last till six in the morning. An extension was required for the horses and carriages. Application granted.

### **Swindon Advertiser and North Wilts Chronicle 26 January 1874**

SWINDON POLICE COURT  
Thursday

(Before D. Archer, Esq., chairman; H. Calley, Esq.; W. W. Codrington, Esq., and J. E. Prower, Esq.)

William Dudman, of the Calley Arms Inn, Upper Wanborough, was charged by the police with keeping his house open for the sale of liquors during prohibited hours, on the afternoon of Christmas Day. There was a previous conviction in May 1873.

P.C. Hancock said he visited the house about quarter past four in the afternoon of Christmas Day. On going into the yard he met a man named Henry Davis, he then went into the tap room, where he saw the landlady and two men sat down. There was a pint cup with a little beer in it on the table. He said to the men, "This is how you do it?" They replied that they thought it no harm, coming into get a warm, as they were very cold. The landlady said there was no harm in it if no one made harm of it. The beer was not drawn for those men but for some private friends. He met Dudman coming in at the front door, and told him what he had found. He replied that the men must have come in at the front door whilst he

was out serving the cattle. He hoped nothing would be said about it. The men were named John Stroud, and Reuben Hughes, both of the same village.

Defendant said he knew nothing of the men coming in. He had some friends down from London, cousins of his, and they went out for a walk in the afternoon whilst he went to serve the cattle. These friends met the two men in the street, and knowing them asked them in to have a pint of beer, which he believed they had. He had done all in his power to keep his house orderly ever since he was convicted in 1873. This would not have happened if he had been at home. He called his son to corroborate his statement. He said it was his uncle who ordered the beer, and he paid for it.

The Chairman: It was that paying for it that makes the case, you were trying to make us believe it was a gift. Defendant said it was a very paltry offence, if one at all. He hoped they would not inflict a severe fine as he could not afford to pay it, not taking 2s. 6d. a day. He should not be able to live if he did not go out labouring.

Major Calley: I am glad to hear Wanborough has become such a sober place.

Defendant : There is no chance of getting a living there, there being 10 houses in the parish.

Major Prower: Then I would give up the business.

The Bench retired to consider their decision, and decided to hear the charges against the men found in the house first.

Reuben Hughes and John Stroud were then charged with being on licensed premises, as stated in the first case. Stroud, who works on the G. W. Railway at Bristol, did not appear. P.C. Handcock repeated the evidence given in the last case. Defendants told him they had only come in to warm themselves. He did not see any friends in the house. He looked in the private room, and only found a little girl there. Hughes told a similar story to Dudman about being asked in by the friends. In answer to the Bench he admitted, however, that he did not see these friends after they got into the house, the beer being brought to him in the tap room by Mrs. Dudman.

The Bench said Dudman was liable to a fine of £20. They would mitigate that to a fourth, £5, and order him to pay the costs in addition, 9s. They should also direct that the license be endorsed, and if there was another complaint the license would be forfeited. Defendant said he had not the money and asked for time to pay. The Bench said they could not allow this, and a distress warrant must be issued.

The policeman, however, who took the warrant, would withhold it for a week to allow him time to pay.

In the case against the men, Hughes would be fined 10s. and 6s. costs. Stroud, who had been previously convicted, £1 and 7s. Costs.

### **Swindon Advertiser and North Wilts Chronicle, 11 January 1875**

#### **SWINDON POLICE COURT**

Thursday

(Before A. L. Goddard, Esq., M.P, chairman; D. Archer, Esq.; J. E.Prower, Esq.; and W. W. Codrington, Esq.)

Mr. Townsend applied for a hold over of the license of the above house to Edward Hillier, late of Lyneham. Mr. Townsend said he appeared for the owners of the property, Messrs. Reed, of Marlborough, who had not heard of the charge against Dudman, heard before the Bench last week, until they saw it in the newspapers. It was their desire to keep the house orderly and respectable, and immediately the facts of the case came under their notice they gave Dudman notice to quit, which notice expired today. In fact, Hillier had possession of the premises.

Mr. Townsend also applied that the order to endorse the license should be rescinded. Mr. Archer said he for one should not agree to this. He did not see how one Bench could very well alter what another Bench had ordered, unless the same magistrates were present. The hold over was granted, and the consideration of the other question adjourned for a fortnight.

**Swindon Advertiser and North Wilts Chronicle, 18 January 1875**

SWINDON POLICE COURT

Thursday

William Dudman, of the Calley Arms Inn, Wanborough, applied for a transfer of his license to Edward Hillier, late a carrier of Lyneham, who is now in possession under a hold over. Granted.

**Swindon Advertiser and North Wilts Chronicle, 5 April 1875**