A. A. NARTEY, Appellant, v. REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA, Appellee.

APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, MONTSERRADO COUNTY.

Argued October 14, 1957. Decided December 20, 1957.

An appeal which has not been perfected within the statutorily prescribed period of time will be dismissed.

On appeal from a judgment of conviction for manslaughter, appeal dismissed.

M. M. Johnson for appellant. Assistant Attorney General J. Dossen Richards for appellee.

MR. JUSTICE MITCHELL delivered the opinion of the Court.

Manslaughter is a criminal offense, punishable for the killing of any human being without legal justification and malice prepense not appearing from the circumstances surrounding.

At the May, 1955, term of the Circuit Court of the First Judicial Circuit, Montserrado County, an indictment was found by the Grand Jury against A. A. Nartey, for the crime of manslaughter. On August 9, 1955, defendant was arraigned on the charge and pleaded not guilty. He was tried and convicted on a verdict of the petty jury, to which he excepted and filed his motion for new trial, antecedent to an appeal before this Court. The said motion was heard, denied, and judgment rendered sentencing him to one calendar year's imprisonment.

It is from this judgment that the case has reached this Court on a bill of exceptions containing six counts. But, regrettably, there is no necessity for us to rehear the grounds of the appeal.

It has been repeatedly urged by this Court that counsel retained by parties to conduct their matters in the courts of Liberia, and especially this Court of last resort, should manifest every degree of interest in superintending such matters, to the extent that the safeguards and protection guaranteed under the strong arm of the law, will be secured. At the call of this case, a motion was filed by the appellee to dismiss the appeal because of its nonconformance to the mandatory statutes the completion of an appeal before this Court, in that judgment was rendered on August 22, 1955, and the appeal was not completed until March 16, 1956—approximately 137 days more than the period provided for by law.

To this motion, Counsellor M. M. Johnson, representing the appellant, made no resistance because, as he said, he conceded its legal cogency; and he waived argument.

It is almost inconceivable that a counsellor practicing before this Court would be so derelict with respect to a client's legal interest. And why should one of such a high calling be permitted to violate a firm rule of professional ethics with impunity? How can the liberties and freedom of citizens be handled with unconcern by persons who have sworn to the contrary? Neglect such as shown in the present case cannot be ignored by us, since it reflects on the judiciary system of the nation, which is the only means by which the rights of the people can be conserved.

Repeating the note of warning, it is hoped that counsel will be more dutiful and diligent in superintending their causes before this Court; otherwise, we will be compelled to punish those responsible.

Since, our courts cannot do for parties that which they should do for themselves, the instant motion is sustained, and the appeal dismissed. And it is hereby so ordered. *Appeal dismissed.*