

REVIEW OF CURRENT ENGLISH CASES.

(Registered in accordance with the Copyright Act.)

**FOREIGN JUDGMENT—ENFORCEMENT—FINAL JUDGMENT—APPEAL
—JUDGMENT IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDING.**

Harrop v. Harrop (1920) 3 K.B. 386. This was an action on a foreign judgment and the case turned on the point whether it could be regarded as a final judgment. The judgment in question was recorded in the State of Perak in these circumstances: By the law of that State, if any person neglects or refuses to maintain his wife or child, a magistrate may order him to make her a monthly allowance, and if he disobeys the order may by warrant direct the amount to be levied in the manner provided by law for levying fines, or may sentence him to imprisonment; and on the application of a person in whose favour such an order is made, on proof of change of circumstances of such person or his wife or child may make such alteration in the allowances ordered as he may think fit. By the judgment of a judicial Commissioner of Perak dated December 13th, 1916, which affirmed with a variation an order made by a magistrate in pursuance of the law above mentioned, it was adjudged that the defendant should pay to the plaintiff, his wife, as from August 9th, 1916, a certain sum per month for the maintenance of the plaintiff and a child of the marriage. In October, 1916, the parties having come to England, the plaintiff brought the present action, claiming five monthly payments alleged to be due under the judgment of the Judicial Commissioner. Mr. Justice Sankey, who tried the action, held that it was not a final and conclusive judgment within the doctrine of English law, which enables judgments of foreign Courts to be enforced in England, and therefore that the plaintiff could not recover. Its want of finality being in the opinion of the learned Judge due to the fact that it could not be enforced without a further application to the Court which pronounced it, and on such an application owing to altered circumstances was liable to be changed.

**ACTION FOR DECLARATION—PUBLIC OFFICER SUED AS AN INDIVIDUAL
—CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION OUT OF PUBLIC FUNDS.**

Bombay & Persia Steam Navigation Co. v. Mooloy (1920) 3 K.B. 402. This was an action against the defendant who, was H.M. Controller of Shipping. By orders of the defendant lawfully given a vessel belonging to the plaintiffs was diverted from