

ceiver to use the assets of the company of which as debenture holder the plaintiff was mortgagee, for the purpose of carrying on proceedings adverse to the interests of the Vesteys for whom he was a bare trustee. The order was supported by the second mortgagees, who contended that the purchase by the Vesteys of the debenture of Tzowko, was merely a scheme to protect themselves as purchasers at the alleged fraudulent sale of the company's assets. Eady, J., held that the question was one entirely for the discretion of the Court and in the circumstances the order in question was properly made.

GAMING—LOTTERY—PURCHASE OF CHANCE FOR PRIZE—GIFT OF PRIZE—MONEY PAID FOR CHANCE NOT APPLIED TO PURCHASE OF PRIZE—GAMING ACT, 1802 (42 GEO. 3, c. 119), s. 2—LOTTERIES ACT, 1823 (4 GEO. 4, c. 60), s. 41—(CR. CODE, s. 236).

*Bartlett v. Parker* (1912) 2 K.B. 497, was a case stated by justices. Tickets bearing different numbers were sold to any one who would purchase them at 6d. a piece upon the terms that the purchaser of a ticket bearing a number to be subsequently drawn by an independent person should be entitled to a bicycle. The bicycle was presented as a gift by a firm of bicycle makers as an advertisement of their goods, and no part of the purchase money of the tickets was applied to purchase or provide the prize. The question was whether this sale of tickets constituted a lottery within the meaning of the Lottery Act, 1823, s. 41. (see Cr. Code, s. 236). A Divisional Court (Ridley, and Lawrance, JJ.), held that it did, because each purchaser of a ticket bought a chance, and the holder of the winning ticket was determined by chance, and therefore the scheme constituted a lottery within the meaning of the Act.

MOTOR CAR—USER AT NIGHT WITHOUT LIGHT TO ILLUMINATE IDENTIFICATION PLATE—MOTOR CAR ACT, 1903 (3 EDW. VII. c. 36), s. 2 (4)—(MOTOR VEHICLES ACT, ONT. (2 GEO. V. c. 48), s. 8 (3)).

*Printz v. Sewell* (1912) 2 K.B. 511, was also a case stated by justices. The appellant was charged under the English Motor Car Act, with using a motor cycle at night on a public highway without having a lamp burning on the cycle so contrived as to illuminate every letter or figure on the cycle as required by the regulations made under the Act, and it was held by a Divisional Court (Lord Alverstone, C.J., and Pickford, J.), that it was