

try to the Civil law l. 3 pr. Pro Civil. And to our own
where the Names of the parties are a necessary Part
in a Criminal trial, Item. Attachment 30. This the par-
ticular Statute allowing of General libel against
-Hallow and Cognovit, and so plainly Argued the Un-
fulness of them against other Criminals: For that
otherways such a Special Indictment had been the
officer Melioris Crim. part 2. Tit. 2. 52. But if the
not naming the person injured is highly Inconvenion
and Unreasonable: because, of such a Banditry libel
Supposed the panel of Defendants that might otherwise
be Competent to him: as to prove that the person said to
be Robbed was alibi at such a time; or that he was not
free Liege; or had Robbed the panel immediately before
such a General libel might be a hindrance to bring the per-
son injured as a witness under Colour of the jurisdiction he may
have done to some body else. If the panel were Acquitted
upon such a General libel, the party could not say
that as the Indictment in her of a prosecution the fact of
private party injured. It was Replied for the purpose libel
must be framed according to the different Circumstances
and facts, and Intentions of the parties. About whose
private party injured for his Intention or Reparation
Damage. The Nature of the thing requires the person
Injured to be Named for Clearing that such a one is by
title to accuse, as having Received the Injury or Not
Concerned in the person injured: Yet in a prosecution
the fact of the King, whose Interest it is to prove
all his subjects from injured, it sufficeth to libel
the Prince and set forth a proper cognizance Society
that being the same who over us injured; Unless the
quality of it depend upon the Circumstances of
party injured, all which one is accused of Robbery;
which as for the libel must bear the Name of the

person with whom Robbery was Committed l. 3. ff. 20 Recd
before being necessary to prove such a Person. For in other Crimes
as Robbery upon the high way, Murder &c. it were Unreasonable
that the Crown could not prosecute a Robber, because the Court
neither who saw the fact Committed and Apprehended him, nor
knowing the person Robbed could swear only to the Crime: or
that the Murder of a Stranger known to No Body or of a per-
son so Mangled that he cannot be known should go unpunish-
ed, because he cannot be Named. For a libel in the King's
Justices hearing frequent Robbing off the borders of two counties
and towns, without naming the persons was sustained
Melioris Crim. part 1. Tit. 34. 58. About this panel was
thereby in some Measure abridged of the opportunity of proving
himself alibi. Which is not fit to be Understood as if the Cri-
minal claimed any Exemption from the Common Rule of
law: for there is no Contrary General Rule; and the Nature
of the Crime and Intent of the prosecutor determines in
every case whether the person injured shoule be Named or not.
Nor as though things of any weight that are Misdemeanors
concerned arising to the panel from a General libel,
that do not forth the person injured. For if the panel knew
is not bound to frame the libel in such manner as may
be easiest for the panel to take off; more than he should
that what Colour of body the Panel does or, or whether
he does, to afford him an opportunity of contradicting
such Circumstances. And the Law allows a panel to prove
himself alibi Contrary to the libel; if he doth not allow him
to prove the person injured alibi, whereby two shall wit-
nessed might Distract every trial. When it is proved upon
the panel, that he did Commit Robbery upon a person
his proving that such a person did alibi, amounts only
to this, that the witness who saw the Person and knew
the Committee, Mistook the person injured; Not with
standing whereof the panel is still guilty and shoule
not escape unpunished, because the witness was not
acquainted with the others against the person injur-