

Notes and Selections.

FALSELY PRETENDING TO BE A SOLICITOR.—At the Manchester City Police Court, on the 23rd ult., Thos. Haslam, of Westmoreland street, was summoned, at the instance of the Incorporated Law Society, for wilfully and falsely pretending to be a solicitor. Mr. Beckton prosecuted, and said that defendant was a debt collector, and on the 12th July he handed to Mrs. Tye, a neighbour, a letter, which was in the following terms: "Dear Madam,—Mr. Harper has handed me your account for collection, and also to say if it be not paid on or before Friday next, in the morning, we shall at once take proceedings for the recovery of the same." This was the offence complained of. Mrs. Tye was led by the letter into the belief that the defendant was a solicitor. Mr. Roberts, who appeared for defendant, said Mrs. Tye had known the defendant for a dozen years, and as she knew that he was not a solicitor she could not have been deceived by the letter. As a matter of fact, on the defendant not being paid, he consulted him (Mr. Roberts), and a writ was issued. The prosecution was vindictive on the part of Mrs. Tye.—The stipendiary magistrate said the defendant had no right to write a letter such as that which had been read. There would be a fine of 20s. and costs.—*Law Gazette.*

RAILWAY COMPANY—REFUSAL TO FURNISH A SEAT TO PASSENGER.—It has been held in the case of *Louisville, etc., R. IV. Co. v. Patterson*, Mississippi S.C. (13 S.R. 697), that a railway company is liable for the refusal and failure of one of its conductors to furnish a passenger with a seat, for which he has purchased and holds a ticket, when there are more of such seats than there are passengers, but none are actually vacant, because some passengers occupy two seats, and other seats are filled with baggage. The plaintiff insisted that the conductor should find him a seat, which the conductor refused to do, emphasizing his refusal with words which are not necessarily for publication. A jury having given the plaintiff a verdict for \$75, the railway company appealed, when the opinion of the court is expressed as follows: "The appellee paid for a seat in a first-class coach, and was entitled, as