

Montmagny, 13th February, 1871.

Arsenault v. Rousseau & al.—Held: That several defendants, though they have appeared separately but by the same attorney, may join in and file but one plea. Bossé, J.

Quebec, 2nd February, 1871.

Batten v. Stone.—It no longer suffices to give notice within four days and move on first day of ensuing term for security for costs. The application should be made within the four days. Meredith, C. J.

4th March, 1871.

Huard v. Dunn.—No action lies for false imprisonment under a conviction, valid on its face, so long as such conviction is in full force and vigor and has never been annulled or vacated. Stuart, J.

IN THE COURT OF REVIEW.

Quebec, 4th February, 1871.

The National Bank v. The City Bank.—Held, That the Code has not changed the law existing anterior thereto as to particulars in S. C. cases, and does not require that they be annexed to declaration or fully or in detail set forth therein. Stuart, Taschereau and Casault.

Philippsthal v. Duval.—On the 6th May, 1870, an order was made on defendants motion, fixing 9th for striking jury and 14th for trial. On 7th defendant demanded *acte* that he required jury list to be made up at least of one half jurors speaking English. On 9th the jury was not struck as defendant did not make the requisite deposit, he alleging objections to the composition of jury. Subsequently plaintiff moved to vacate order for jury trial; the defendant moved for a jury *de medietate linguæ*; both applications were refused. On 18th June, an order was given on plaintiff's motion fixing 20th of June for striking jury and, 7th July for trial. The Prothonotary had prepared a list of forty-eight names for the striking ordered on the 9th May, between that date and 30th of June; when the jury was struck, a jury in another case had been struck. Defendant challenged the array on ground that a new list should have been made commencing with first name after the last on the last panel, *i. e.* that of the jury which had been struck between the 9th May and 30th June. Stuart, J., quashed the panel. Judgment reversed in review. Meredith, C. J., and Taschereau J. Stuart, J., dissenting.

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS.

Quebec, 18th March, 1871.

McLaughlin & Regina.—That no opposition lies to the execution of the judgment entered up by the Prothonotary under C. S. L. C. c. 106, s. 2 on a certificate from the Queen's Bench that a recognizance is forfeited, on the ground that the proceedings are irregular and the opposant should have been called upon to plead and defend before the Superior Court. Badgley & Drummond, dissenting.