

December 1930

Masthead Volume 37, Issue 1

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/wvlr>

Recommended Citation

Masthead Volume 37, Issue 1, 37 W. Va. L. Rev. (1930).

Available at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/wvlr/vol37/iss1/1>

This Prefatory Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the WVU College of Law at The Research Repository @ WVU. It has been accepted for inclusion in West Virginia Law Review by an authorized editor of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact ian.harmon@mail.wvu.edu.

West Virginia Law Quarterly and THE BAR

Published by the Faculty of the College of Law of West Virginia University, and issued in December, February, April and June of each academic year. Official publication of The West Virginia Bar Association.

Subscription price to individuals, not members of The West Virginia Bar Association, \$2.00 per year. To those who are members of the Association the price is \$1.50 per year and is included in their annual dues. Single copies, 50 cents.

FACULTY EDITOR IN CHARGE

JEFFERSON B. FORDHAM

MANAGING EDITOR

LOUISE FARRELL HARTLEY

FACULTY BOARD OF EDITORS

THURMAN W. ARNOLD

LEO CARLIN

DAVID F. CAVERS

EDMUND C. DICKINSON

ROBERT T. DONLEY

THOMAS P. HARDMAN

JAMES W. SIMONTON

CLIFFORD R. SNIDER

STUDENT BOARD OF EDITORS

MELVILLE STEWART, *Chairman*

HENRY K. HIGGINBOTHAM

JEROME KATZ

SIDNEY J. KWASS

DAVID G. LILLY

ROBERT E. STEALEY

MARRS WISEMAN

JOHN H. HOGE

JACK DOWELL JENNINGS

JAMES A. MCWHORTER

AUGUST W. PETROPLUS

BERNARD SCHOVE

HENRY F. SNYDER

NECESSITY OF MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL WHEN VERDICT DIRECTED.—It has been a fundamental rule of procedure in West Virginia, emphasized by decisions, both early and late, too numerous to mention,¹ that when a case has been tried before a jury, no appellate relief involving exclusively trial error can be sought in the Supreme Court of Appeals unless a motion in the trial court to set aside the verdict has first been made and acted upon. Justification of this rule is based on the assumption that, in the course of a trial by jury, the court must rule hurriedly on objections interposed, in order that the case may be submitted to the jury without delay, and hence may commit errors which it will concede on due deliberation and, by granting a new trial, prevent the delay and expense of a writ of error to obtain the same result.

“The rulings of the court during the trial are often necessarily hastily made, and if a motion is made for a new trial on the ground of erroneous rulings made at the trial, the court may at his leisure critically review his rulings, and, if convinced that they were erroneous, will correct them in the only manner he can by setting aside the verdict and granting a new trial, and thus save to the parties the expense of a writ of error.”²

¹ See *State v. Phares*, 24 W. Va. 657 (1884); *Danks v. Rodeheaver*, 26 W. Va. 274 (1885); *Hinton Milling Co. v. New River Milling Co.*, 78 W. Va. 314, 88 S. E. 1079 (1916).

² *State v. Phares*, *supra* n. 1.