

sonville, Florida, issuing an injunction against the sheriff to prevent him from interfering with a prize fight, is one calculated to fill the breasts of the right-thinking members of the legal profession with indignation and shame, and to send the mind upon a search for the motive which could have prompted such extraordinary action. A judge having the slightest acquaintance with the principles of equity should have known that the writ of injunction is never issued in matters of crime, with one or two limited and marked exceptions, in which prize fighting is not included. One of those exceptions is that an injunction will sometimes issue to enjoin a nuisance; but it is not among those exceptions that an injunction will be issued to protect a nuisance—that is, to restrain the sheriff from preventing the perpetration of a public nuisance. If it is answered that there is no statute law in Florida making prize fighting illegal, the reply may confidently be urged that an ordinary public prize fight is a nuisance at common law. But if it is not a nuisance by the common law of Florida—and if it is not, so much the worse for that law—then the elementary principle remains that an injunction is only used by Courts of equity for the protection of the rights of property and business. Now, what right of property or of business is involved in a prize fight? The possible right to property in a stake of 20,000 dollars, which is put up and which is to be had by the winner, and the business of engaging in a beastly encounter for the purpose of winning a bet.—*American Law Review*.

**GROUNDS OF DIVORCE.**—The *Omaha Bee* reports that in San Francisco a sensitive husband is suing his wife for divorce because she bleached her hair. In his petition he says: ‘Bleached or artificially colored hair is easily distinguished as such and does not appear natural, nor does it deceive any person, but it is perfectly patent and noticeably conspicuous. It is regarded by the majority of right thinking persons as an indication of a loose, dissolute and wanton disposition, and is regarded as and commonly held to be a practice never affected by modest, pure and respectable women.’ The husband claims that he is mortified and humiliated on account of the change in the color of his wife’s hair. He adds: ‘She is a brunette naturally. Her hair is of a chestnut brown color, which in its normal state is modest and becoming, and harmonizes with the natural color of her skin and eyes. Since we married she has, against my wishes and protest, and with intent to vex, annoy, exasperate and shame me, dyed her hair and changed its shade to a conspicuous and showy straw or canary color. As a consequence of this artificial coloring, she has been obliged to paint her face to secure an artificial complexion in keeping with the artificial color of her hair. The combination has given her a giddy, fast and sporty appearance.’