mental constitution, or peculiarly open to sentimental considerations of some sort, and artfully play on such eccentricities. The suggestion often made, to allow verdicts in civil cases to be given by a vote of three-fourths of the jury, deserves to be kept constantly before the public. It is our opinion that in most trials nine jurymen out of twelve reach a just and truthful result by legitimate scientific methods, and that the best interests of the community would, in the long run, be subserved by doing away with the requirement for a unanimous vote.—*New York Law Journal.*

ITEMS FROM HINDOSTAN.—In this country our readers have doubtless noticed that when one pulls trigger at a snipe, a cooly instantly rises in the paddy fields beyond and receives the pellets in his manly bosom. When one levels one's trusty express at a herd of bounding antelope, a ryot with a yoke of oxen at once appears on the black soil in the horizon. When one goes to the range with the volunteers, a bullet is sure to hit the edge of the target and to go humming and zipzipping away into a group of fishermen on the beach. These things will happen, and therefore we have given at length (in December) the interesting case of *Stanley* v. *Powell* (1891), 1 Q.B. 86, where a beater, who lost his eye by a pellet that glanced from the branch of a tree, sued for damages. This propensity of people to get in the way of one's shot is a very old grievance, and troubled our forefathers. The earliest case is in the year book of 21 Henry VII., equivalent to A.D. 1506, before the battle of Flodden. Rede, J., remarked in the Norman jargon, which was then the language of English Courts: "*Mes ou on tire a les buts et blesse un home, coment que est incontre sa volonte, il sera dit un trespassor incontre son entent.*" In the following century was the well-known case of Abbott, Archbishop of Canterbury, who, shooting with a bow in the park, missed the deer but killed the keeper. It was gravely contended that the Archbishop had rendered himself "irregular" and incapable of performing any ecclesiastical functions.—*Indian Jurist.*

A curious case of murder was recently tried before the Kistna Sessions Court. The Kurnum of a village, with the station officer and a crowd of villagers, went to search the huts of some Yanadis for stolen property. One Yanadi was found in the huts, and in the excitement the Kurnum exclaimed, "Stab him!" A bystander with a spear did stab him, and the unhappy Yanadi died. The Sessions Judge convicted the man who had used the spear and sentenced him to transportation for life. As for the Kurnum who exclaimed "Stab him!" the Judge held that the words may not have been seriously intended. The High Court served notice on the Kurnum to show cause why a new trial be not ordered, but, after hearing counsel on his behalf, Collins, C.J., and Weir, J., came to the conclusion that the judge's view was a possible view, and did not order a new trial. We are irresistibly reminded by this sad case of an incident that happened many, many years ago. We were out in camp with a collector, who was very sensitive to the least noise. A horse-keeper's infant cried shrilly. The collector groaned and called "Peon!" "Saheb?" replied the stalwart Dafadar, standing in the