included in the lot, as marked out by him, land which should not have been so included, and S., misled thereby, effected improvements upon the land so erroneously included.

Held, on recovery of the said land by the rightful owner that S was entitled to compensation for the said improvements under R S.O., ch. 51, ss. 29, 30. Plumb v. Steinhoff, 2 O.R., 614