a distinct transaction.—Raymond v. The State, 54 Miss. 562.

Statute.—The court refused to declare a Private statute void, without further evidence than the agreement of counsel that it was passed without the notice required by the Constitution.—Gatlin v. Tarboro, 78 N. C. 119.

Surety.—1. The official bond of a sheriff was conditioned that he should account for moneys collected by him within a certain time. Afterwards, the time was extended by statute. Held, that the sureties on the bond were not discharged.—Prairie v. Worth, 78 N. C. 169.

2. Action against the sureties on an official bond. Plea, that before the making of the bond the officer had held the same office, and had embezzled moneys, and was a defaulter; of all which the obligee at the time of making the bond had notice, but the sureties had not. Held, good.—Sooy v. The State, 10 Vroom, 135.

Tax.—1. By force of an amendment to a city charter, changing the limits of the city, lands which were subject to a lien for unpaid city taxes were brought outside the new city limits before the day fixed for their sale. Held, that the lien was lost.—Deason v. Dixon, 55 Miss. 585.

- 2. The Constitution provides that all property shall be taxed in proportion to its value. A statute enacted that every owner or harbourer of any dog should pay one dollar for the privilege of keeping him. *Held*, that dogs were not property, nor such payment a tax, within the meaning of the Constitution—*Ex parte Cooper*, 3 Tex. Ct. App. 489.
- 3. A foreign coal-mining corporation sent coal by rail through the State to tide-water, whence it was shipped to other States. All its business was done at an office in another State, where all orders were taken. Held, that the State could not tax it, either on the coal awaiting shipment at tide-water, or on that delivered from its cars in the State, direct from the mines, on orders transmitted through the foreign office.—State v. Carrigan, 10 Vroom, 35.

Trespass.—One who was in possession of land, under a parol contract to purchase it, dug clay from open pits on the land, and made it into bricks. Held, that he was not liable as a trespasser for so doing, though he afterwards

failed to carry out his contract to purchase.— Beattie v. Connolly, 10 Vroom, 159.

Trust.—Testator gave lands to a charitable use, under the direction of a trustee, to be appointed by a court. When the will was made, that court had no power to appoint a trustee for that purpose; but, before testator died, such power was conferred on the court by statute. Held, that the court might appoint a trustee.—Mann v. Mullin, 84 Penn. St. 297.

Verdict.—A jury, by consent of parties, returned their verdict to the clerk of court, and separated. The next morning, it was discovered that the verdict was for the plaintiff, not specifying any sum; whereupon the court reassembled the jury, and they found a proper verdict. Held, regular.—Maclin v. Bloom, 54 Miss. 365.

Warranty.—Land was conveyed with warranty; afterwards, the State, having title paramount, sold the land. Held, that the grantee might abandon the land, and sue on the covenant, though he had not been evicted or molested by the State or its grantee.—Green v. Irving, 54 Miss. 450.

Way.—A statute permitting owners of coalbeds on both sides of any stream to have a right of way either over or under such stream, between such coal-beds, for the purpose of mining the same, held, unconstitutional.—Waddell's Appeal, 84 Penn. St. 90.

Will.—1. By statute a nuncupative will is valid if made in the last sickness of the testator. Held, that it need not be shown, to establish such a will, that the testator had not time to make a will in writing, or that he had no hope of recovery.—Harrington v. Stees, 82 III. 50.

- 2. A testator erased certain clauses in his will, with the intent of revoking them only. Held (1), that the whole will was not revoked; (2), that those clauses were; (3) that the property covered by them, in the absence of any thing in the will showing a contrary intention, passed by a general residuary clause.—Bigelow v. Gillott, 123 Mass. 102.
- A will written and signed with a pencil, held, valid.—Myers v. Vanderbilt, 84 Penn. St. 510.