

MASTER AND SERVANT—MONTH'S NOTICE BY SERVANT—WRONGFUL DISMISSAL DURING CURRENCY OF NOTICE—MEASURE OF DAMAGES—LOSS OF BOARD AND LODGING.

Lindsay v. Queen's Hotel Co. (1919) 1 K.B. 212. This also was an action by a servant to recover damages for wrongful dismissal. In this case the servant had given a month's notice of leaving. But six days before the month had expired the defendants wrongfully dismissed her. The County Court Judge allowed the plaintiff wages up to the time she would have left, and also an extra month's wages for dismissal without notice. On appeal by the defendants a Divisional Court held that although a master is entitled to dismiss a servant without notice on payment of a month's wages, that that was not the measure of damages in this case, but that it was merely the actual loss which the plaintiff had suffered, which the Court held was simply her wages for the six days and also an allowance for board and lodging for that period.

RAILWAY—TRAVELLING WITHOUT PAYING FARE—INTENT TO AVOID PAYMENT OF FARE—PURCHASE OF NON-TRANSFERABLE TICKET FROM ANOTHER PASSENGER—(R.S.C., c. 37, s. 281).

Reynolds v. Beasley (1919) 1 K.B. 215. This was a case stated by a magistrate. The defendant was summoned for breach of the Regulation of Railways Act, 1889, which provides that if any person travels or attempts to travel on a railway without having paid his fare, and with intent to avoid payment thereof . . . he shall be liable on conviction to a fine. The defendant had purchased a non-transferable ticket from another passenger which he tendered to the collector. The Justices were of opinion that no intention to avoid payment of fare had been disclosed; but a Divisional Court (Darling, Coleridge and Shearman, JJ.) held that the defendant had no right to travel on the non-transferable ticket, and was guilty of a breach of the Act. See R.S.C., c. 37, s. 281.

MEDIC MAN—MEDICAL ASSOCIATION—INTERFERENCE BY ASSOCIATION WITH PRACTICE OF A PROFESSION—UNLAWFUL MEANS—THREATS—BOYCOTT—DEFAMATION—CORPORATION—MALICE—RESTRAINT OF TRADE.

Pratt v. British Medical Association (1919) 1 K.B. 244. This was an important case and one deserving of careful consideration.