

and boarding-houses, and all the decisions bearing upon the subject are carefully referred to, but the whole is worked up into the form of a narrative, in which legal principles and decisions are stated in conversational language. We confess that we do not look with much favor upon this plan of sugar-coating the maxims of the law. Those who dislike the dryness of legal studies will be apt to find the vein of story rather thin, and to lawyers, the work, we venture to think, would have been more valuable without the anecdotes and gossip. However, we recognize that tastes may differ in this matter as in others, and we must say that if any one could make us fall in love with the amusing style of writing law-books, Mr. Rogers would be likely to do so. Of the real ability displayed by the author it is difficult to speak too warmly. Mr. Rogers brings to his task an ample knowledge of the subject. The various topics are treated in a masterly manner, and if those who take up the book with the idea of merely finding amusement persevere to the end, they will certainly have gained a fair insight into an important branch of the law. The work is admirably printed and bound, and is published by an American house, but Mr. Rogers, as many of our readers are no doubt aware, is a Canadian barrister, practising at Kingston.

NOTES OF CASES.

SUPERIOR COURT.

MONTREAL, Oct. 25, 1879.

GRANT V. BEAUDRY.

Public Officer—C. C. P. 22—Notice of suit must state where the act of defendant complained of was committed, and the residence of plaintiff's attorneys.

MACKAY, J. In February last the plaintiff sued the defendant, Mayor of Montreal and a Justice of the Peace, for damages for false arrest, for having illegally caused the arrest of plaintiff on 12th July, 1878. The declaration has a very long introduction, stating the history, objects and constitution of the Loyal Orange Association. It is formed (so says the declaration) of persons desirous of supporting the principles of the Christian religion; they meet together

periodically, in honor of William, Prince of Orange, whose memory they hold in reverence, &c. The declaration goes on to charge the defendant with having, in abuse of his authority, gotten one Murphy to make an affidavit on that 12th of July, charging plaintiff and others with having unlawfully assembled for the purpose of walking in procession through public streets of the city, thereby provoking a breach of the peace, the affidavit praying for plaintiff's arrest; it is said that plaintiff thereupon was arrested, and had to give bail; and afterwards defendant caused an indictment to be preferred against plaintiff and others for unlawfully assembling on that 12th of July; that a true bill was found, the defendant having obtained it by abuse of the process of law; that on the 14th of October the plaintiff was tried, and found not guilty. The declaration then proceeds to charge defendant with having also gotten plaintiff, with others, indicted in October, 1878, for an unlawful combination and confederacy, the members of it taking an oath not authorized by law; that by abuse of law the defendant got "true bill" found upon this indictment; that afterwards plaintiff was tried upon it, but acquitted; damages are alleged, and \$10,000 are sued for.

On the 23rd of October, 1878, notice of action was served upon defendant in the words and form following:

"DISTRICT OF MONTREAL, }
" Superior Court.

"David Grant, plaintiff, vs. Hon. J. L. Beaudry, defendant.

"To the Hon. J. L. Beaudry, Mayor of Montreal:

"SIR,—We give you notice that David Grant, of the City of Montreal, salesman and trader, will claim from you personally, the sum of ten thousand dollars damages, by him suffered from the abuse made of your authority in causing his arrest illegally and for no cause, on the twelfth day of July last (1878), and that unless you make proper amend and reparation of such damages within a month, judicial proceedings will be adopted against you.

"Yours,

"DOUTRE, BRANCHAUD & McCORD,

"Advocates f. pliff.

"Montreal, 19th October, 1878."

The defendant pleads four special pleas, and the general issue.

By the first he says that he is sued as a public officer, and therefore was entitled to a month's notice of action before suit; that this notice ought to have stated the causes of action, and