Writs returned in Circuit Court.

No.	PLAINTIPP.	DEFENDANT.	OCCUPATION.	RESIDENCE.	RETURNED.	AMOUNT.	ATTORNEY.	REMARKS.
I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	D Sleeth U Gelinas 3 Gale V J E Bronillet Archibald et al 1 Hogan 1 Hogan V Bolduc V Bolduc V Bolduc V Bleau N Boy Precourt do do do be Ethier Poulin S Norman Lavallee Lavallee Auxon Bros Mg Co. F reedman V B C Sanche et vir	P J Mount & American Cigarette Co. T.S. Fred. Cooper & Sicily Asphaltum P. Co. T.S. Fierre Michelin F X Roy John Dumbull Jos A Laferrière Andrew T Keegan Léon Cardinal Wm Charette Lambert Bélanger Adjutor Gingras. Jos E Normandeau. Henri Brault. Stan Corbeil Triffé Martineau Felix Lamarche Alfred Migneault De E M H Lomer et vir. Telesphore Crevier Wilfrid Roy. Clement St Julien Arm Dufort. J E Dion.		do do do do do do Malsonneuve Berthierville Montreal Mile-End Ste Cunegonde St Henri Coteau St Louis St Henri Montreal St Henri Montreal St Henri Montreal St Rose Montreal St Rose Montreal St Rose Montreal St Rose Montreal	7 Aug do	5 000 10 000 63 000 86 000 63 000 21 000 22 000 32 000 32 000 32 000 32 000 32 000 32 000 23 000 25 000 25 000 21 000	Laurendeau R Doutre, J B do Maréchal, L Th. Jeannotte, H J Gagnon, A do do do	Sai aft. judgt.

Executions issued in Circuit Court.

0.	PLAINTIFF.	DEFENDANT.	OCCUPATION.	RESIDENCE.	Issued.	AMOUNT.	ATTORNEY.	REMARKS
88	A A Valiquette	Mary McGarty.		Montreal	7 Aug	:1 00	Charbonneau, N	-
-		Théop. Senécal et al		Ste Cunegonde	do	21 00	Dalbec. A	
			****** **** * ****					

		***** **** ****** ***** ****						

COURT OF REVIEW.

JUDGEMENT.

Labelle vs. Didier-Johnson, Ch. J.-The plaintiff by his action claimed a balance of \$125.53 for work upon the defendant's house in Berri Street, and also for work done to the wing of the convent at Ste. Marie de Monnoir.

The defendant pleaded that the work upon the convent had not been finished, and the plaintiff had no action until all the work he had undertaken was terminated. The judgment went for plaintiff for \$52 and costs, as in an action for that amount, without costs of enquete.

We confirm that judgment to that extent: but then it proceeded to condemn the plaintiff to pay the defendant his costs for the difference between the sum recovered, and that for which the action had been brought, as if the defendant had raised a distinct contestation as to the exact amount by offering what he admitted to be due.

The case of Daoust and Dumouchel (p. 40, vol. 6, M. L. R.), and Clermont v. McLeod, same volume, p. 36; and the case of Couture v. Canadian Pacific Railway Company, decided 30th December, 1890, leaves us no choice, unless this court is ready to abdicate its authority in such matters, as to the conclusion we must come to with respect to the latter part of the judgment in the case before us and we have therefore to reverse it in that particular.

The plaintiff, however, who inscribes the case wants to get more than the \$52 awarded him. As to that we find the jugdment in all respects conformable to the evidence; so that it is confirmed except as to the condemnation of plaintiff to pay the defendant's cost, where there is no tender or distinct issue as to the amount actually due. The plaintiff is entitled to his costs in review.

SHERIFF'S SALES.

857 J M Lamothe v. Honoré Belleau, Sheriff's Off., Aug. 14th, 11 a.m.

A piece of land, occupied as one lot, St James ward, bounded in front by Maple Street with buildings.

1081 Chs Lefebvre v. Dme Marie L Peltier, Laprairie, Aug. 14th, 10 a.m.

A piece of land, Laprairie Village, with a house, store etc.

2575 Le Credit Foncier Franco Canadian v. Ed Marcil, jr, St Isidore, Aug. 14th 11 a.m.

Four lots, St Isidore, Seigniory of Chateauguay, with buildings.

2641 La Banque Nationale v. Toussaint Aubertin and E Desrochers

2644 Same v. Eusebe Desrochers, and Thomas, Aubertin.

553 La Banque J Cartier v. Toussaint Aubertin, Longueuil, August, 14th, 10 a.m. Lot No. 34, Longueuil fronting on St Law-rence river with a house, barn, etc., erected.

Province of Quebec, District of Montreal.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT. No 2595.

DME JULIE LEMOINE, of the city and district of Montreal.

EDOUARD LEFEBVRE, of the same place.

Defendant.

An action for separation as to property has been institu-An action
ted this day.
Montreal, July 4th, 1891.
Montreal, July 4th, 1891.
BERNARD & LAROSE, Attys for Plaintiff.
7-9-16-23-30. 8.—11.

Province of Quebec, District of Montreal. IN THE SUPERIOR COURT.

MARY DELANEY, of the Town of St Henry, District of Montreal, wife of JOHN P. SEYBOLD, trader and butcher, of the same place, duly authorized to stee en justice d leftet des présentes.

Plaintiff.

The said JOHN P. SEYBOLD, trader and butcher, of the said Town of St. Henry, said District, Defendant.

An action en séparation de biens has been instituted in this cuseon the Twentieth day of July Instant.

Montreal 24th July 1831.

F. LEFEBYRE, atty for Plaintiff.

7. 28. 8. 6-11-18-29.