

have been scandalous, though immaterial; because the plaintiff led him into it; but now he is impertinent for going out of the way purely to reflect on the plaintiff. (*j*)

And where, after the defendant had answered, and the plaintiff had amended his mere bill of discovery so as to pray relief, it was held, that the defendant could not put in a complete answer over again; and that if he did so, all that part of it which purported to be an answer to any thing beyond the amended bill might be expunged as impertinent. (*k*)

And where the object of the bill was to obtain an account, and as a means of relief to have an explanation of certain bills of costs and accounts, with the amount of which the plaintiff had been charged, and the plaintiff, for that purpose, had propounded to the defendant sundry very minute and particular interrogatories as to their nature; calling upon the defendant to specify, and shew how they were made out; and by what computation the result had been produced; or where the object was to ascertain the amount and the nature of the assets in the hands of an executor; and the interrogatories propounded asked him to state the amount of the assets which had come to his hands, with a particular account of their nature. And the defendant annexed to his answer a large and minute schedule of the items of his account, with a commentary of his own upon each item; or had appended to his answer a schedule which was, in fact, nothing more than a mere transcript of tradesmen's bills; or where the defendant, the executor, having sold the testator's household furniture by auction, set forth, in the schedule to his answer, a copy of the auctioneer's catalogue, with the description and price of every article.

It was held, that such schedules were altogether unnecessary and impertinent, notwithstanding the minute and special inquiries of the plaintiff, and were expunged accordingly; because they conveyed not the least degree of information upon the questions asked by the bill, the object of which was to have the heads of one claim and another so set out as to be informed how a particular balance had been produced; and because, although the plaintiff had pertinaciously insisted on a full disclosure; and therefore, after so insisting, could not object to the disclosure in ordinary cases; yet the defendant could not be justified in setting out all the items of a tradesman's bill, unless they were specifically called

---

(*j*) *Smith v. Reynolds*, Mosely, 70.—(*k*) *Hildyard v. Cressy*, 3 Atk. 303.