

100 people who were not staying at the inn, dined in it every day. The plaintiff, who was in business in Liverpool, but lived outside the town, went to the inn for supper about 9 o'clock in the evening. He went into the dining-room and hung his overcoat upon a hook, where coats were usually hung. He then left the room for a short time to speak to the manageress of the inn, returned, had his supper, and, on leaving to catch a train home, found his coat was missing. It was decided that the plaintiff was a traveller and wayfarer, that he was a guest of the inn although he only came in for supper, that he was not guilty of negligence in leaving the coat in the dining-room temporarily whilst he went to speak to the manageress, that the defendants were responsible for the loss of the coat. Wills, J., in his judgment remarked: "I think a guest is a person who uses the inn, either for a temporary or a more permanent stay, in order to take what the inn can give. He need not stay the night. I confess I do not understand why he should not be a guest if he uses the inn as an inn for the purpose of getting a meal there." And further: "The innkeeper's liability is said to arise because he receives persons *causa hospitandi*. I cannot see why he receives them less *causa hospitandi* if he gives them refreshment for half a day, receiving them in the same way as other persons are received, than if they stay the night at his inn. It makes no difference that he receives a large number of people who only take a meal at the inn. He does receive them, and as an innkeeper, and his liability as an innkeeper thereupon attaches in respect of them." And Kennedy, J., remarked: "I agree that, on the facts of this case, the plaintiff was a traveller; but, apart from the question whether he was a traveller or not, I am of opinion that if a man is in an inn for the purpose of receiving such accommodation as the innkeeper can give him, he is entitled to the protection the law gives to a guest at an inn."

In *Norcross v. Norcross*, 53 Me. 163, the facts were:—The plaintiff went to the defendant's hotel on 17th September, stayed three nights, was there again from 22nd to 26th September, and again from 29th September to 1st October, and again from 13th to 19th October. He paid his bill up to the 19th. That evening another hotel in the town was burned. A great many were going in and out of the office. Plaintiff, whose coat was hanging in the place