

office at Simcoe, in the county of Norfolk. The writ was not served, and on the 4th March, 1915, an order was obtained on behalf of the plaintiff, on an ex parte application to one of the Local Judges at Hamilton, in the county of Wentworth, renewing the writ. On the 19th March, 1915, the writ was served upon the defendants. On the 26th March, 1915, on the application of the defendants, an order was made by MIDDLETON, J., in Chambers, setting aside the order for renewal and the service of the writ, upon the ground that the Local Judge at Hamilton had no jurisdiction, the action not having been begun in the county of Wentworth. The present application was then made—after the lapse of a year from the issue of the writ and long after the lapse of the six months allowed by the Workmen's Compensation for Injuries Act. The application came before Mr. N. F. Paterson, K.C., Registrar of the Appellate Division, holding Chambers in lieu of the Master in Chambers. The learned Registrar referred to *Doyle v. Kaufman* (1877), 3 Q. B. D. 7, 340; *Hewett v. Barr*, [1891] 1 Q.B. 98; *In re Kerly Son & Verden*, [1901] 1 Ch. 467; and said that he did not regard the cases cited as deciding that a limitation enactment was an absolute bar to a renewal, but rather as recognising a discretion to grant or refuse relief where the statute would be a bar to a new action. The power to grant an order for renewal was perhaps doubtful; but the case was one in which relief should be granted if there was power. The plaintiff did all he could to have the writ served; the blame for delay was attributable solely to his solicitors, who had offered no excuse for their negligence. Order made allowing the writ to be renewed and served, as asked by the plaintiff; costs in the cause. A. W. Langmuir, for the plaintiff. J. W. Morison, for the defendants.