the education of my children; and at her death, or on her marriage, to be divided among them." He left but little cash, but had a large amount of personal property, leaseholds, and freeholds. *Held*, that all the personal property and leaseholds passed by the bequests, but not the freeholds.—*Prichard* v. *Prichard*, L. R. 11 Eq. 232; 7 C. L. J. N.S. 105.

3. Testatrix gave certain pecuniary legacies and a house (which was leasehold), "and all the rest to be divided" between the daughters of A. *Held*, that "all the rest" included all the other property, real as well as personal—*Attree* v. *Attree*, L. R. 11 Eq. 280; 7 C. L. J. N. S. 195.

Husband and Wife.—The defendant's wife, without his knowledge, bought of the plaintiff goods, such as a gold pencil-case, cigar-case, glove-box, scent-bottle, guitar, music, purse, and the like, to the value of £20. The defendant was a clerk, with a salary of £400 a year. *Held*, that the wife's authority to bind her husband extended only to contract for things suitable to his style of living so far as they were within the domestic department, and that the defendant was not liable.—*Phillipson* v. *Hayter*, L. R. 6 C. P. 38.

Master and Servant.—1. A clerk of a railway company gave the plaintiff into custody, upon a charge that he attempted to rob the till at a station, after the attempt had ceased. *Held*, that as the clerk was not acting in protection of the company's property, he had no implied authority to give the plaintiff into custody, and that the company were not liable for false imprisonment.—*Allen* v. *London and South Western Railway Co.*, L. R. 6 Q. B. 65.

2. At B. three railway stations were open to one another, and the whole area was used as common ground by the passengers of all. The plaintiff, on his way to the booking-office of another company, was standing on the defendants' platform waiting for luggage, when a porter of the defendants' drove a truck laden with luggage so negligently that a trunk fell off and injured the plaintiff. *Held*, that the defendants were liable for the misfeasance of their servant, although the plaintiff was not a passenger on their line.—*Tebbutt* v. *Bristol and Exeter Railway Co.*, L. R. 6 Q. B. 73.

Registry Law—Priority—Notice.—Where the registered owner of land had parted with his interest therein by an unregistered deed, a person who afterwards fraudulently took and registered a conveyance from such registered owner, prior to the Registry Act of 1864, knowing or believing that his grantor had parted with his interest, was held not entitled to maintain his priority over the true owner, though he did not know, or had no correct information, who the true owner was.—*McLennan* v. *McDonald*, 18 Grant, 502.

MAGISTRATES, MUNICIPAL, INSOLVENCY & SCHOOL LAW.

NOTES OF NEW DECISIONS AND LEADING CASES.

Criminal Law.—1. The prisoners indecently exposed their persons in a urinal which was on a public foot-path in Hyde Park, and open to the public. *Held*, that the jury rightly found that the urinal was a public place.—*Reg.* v. *Harris*, L. R. 1 C. C. 282

2. Indictment that the prisoner "knowingly and without lawful excuse feloniously" had in his possession a die impressed with the resemblance of a sovereign. He ordered two dies of a maker, who communicated with the mint and received permission to let the prisoner have them, which he did. *Held*, that there was no evidence of lawful excuse, and that the prisoner's intention had nothing to do with the offence.—*Reg.* v. *Harvey*, L. R. 1 C. C. 284.

3. It was the prisoner's duty as servant of H. to pay his workmen; by fraudulent representations of the amount due he obtained from his master's cashier 2*s.* 4*d.* more than was really due, and appropriated it to his own use. *Held*, that the money delivered to the prisoner was in the constructive possession of his master, and that the misappropriation of it was larceny.—*Reg.* v. *Cooke*, L. R. 1 C. C. 295.

4. The prisoner induced A. to purchase a chain from him by a statement that it was fifteen carat gold, knowing that the statement was untrue. *Held*, that a conviction for obtaining money on false pretences was good.—*Reg.* v. *Ardley*, L. R 1 C. C. 301.

Liability of City for Defective Street.—The fact that, when a resident of a city was injured by a defective way which the city was bound to keep in repair, he was driving at a "faster rate than six miles an hour," in violation of a city ordinance, is no bar to his right to recover damages for such injury, if such driving did not in any way contribute to produce it.

The fact that the jury failed to agree upon the answer to the question whether the plaintiff was driving at a faster rate than six miles an hour, does not render it reasonably certain that a general verdict for the plaintiff, in such action, is