

domicile mentioned in art. 600 of our Code cannot be obtained by a foreigner in France without such authorization; nor can the domicile mentioned in art. 96 of our C. C. P. be obtained there without authorization, unless it be considered that the word "domicile" in that article means what it meant by the expression domicile *de fait* in the French jurisprudence, which means a domicile of actual residence at which a party may be summoned and called upon to answer for any complaint that may be made against him or acts committed in that place.

If that be the domicile of art. 96 of the C. C. P., it ceases when the party ceased to reside in the place and did not exist when the proceedings in this case were commenced. It is absolutely and clearly according to French jurisprudence that the French courts would not take jurisdiction between foreigners over events which happened when those two foreigners were living in this country and had no legal domicile in France.

**LAPIERRE v. BARIL et autre, ces derniers en
garantie, et TOBIAS et autre.**

**Revision—Dépôt—Action principale et en garantie—
C. proc., art. 1196, 1197.**

MM. les juges Fortin, Guerin, et Lamothe.—Cour de revision.—No 2717.—Montréal. 24 octobre 1916.—Jacobs, Hall, Couture et Fitch, avocats du demandeur et défendeurs en garantie.—Baril et Roch, avocats des défendeurs et demandeurs en garantie.