RAILWAY CARRIERS OR WAREHOUSEMEN.

sonable time has been allowed to do so." Patscheider v. G. W. R. Co., 3 Ex. Div. 153. In that case it appeared that a lady's maid was travelling with her mistress on the defendant's line. On arrival at the station the plaintiff saw her box taken from the luggage van and placed on the platform with other luggage of her mistress. She then told the porter of her hotel to take the luggage to the hotel, but the box was not among the luggage brought up by him. The evidence as to what took place after the box was taken from the van and placed upon the platform was conflicting, but the jury found that there had been no delivery. The defendants were held to be liable as carriers. Cleasby, B., in giving judgment, said : "As far as regards any question of law to be laid down upon the subject, I should have no hesitation in saying that the mere throwing the box out upon the platform, mixed, as it might be, with other luggage, was not a delivery, or a discharge of the defendant's obligation. It can hardly be contended that could be so; but it must be placed there and kept until the passenger has the opportunity of calling for it and receiving it." See also the following cases taken from an article in the Am. Law Reg. vol. 24, p. 181: Vanhorn v. Kermit, 4 E. D. Smith, 453; Ross v. M. K. & T. Rd., 4 Mo. App. 583; Roth v. Rd. 34 N. Y. 548; Louisville Rd. v. Mahan, 8 Bush. 184; Holdridge v. Rd., 56 Barb. 191; Jones v. Transportation Co., 50 Barb. 193; Minor v. C. & N. M. W. Rd., 19 Wis. 40; Louisville Rd. v. Mahan, 8 Bush. 184; Fairfax v. N. Y. C. Rd., 37 N. Y. (S. C.) 516, 43 Id. (S. C.) 18 : Warner v. Rd., 22 Iowa, 166 ; Bartholomew v. Rd., 53 Ill. 227 ; Curtis v. Rd., 49 Barb. 148; Burnell v. N. Y. C. Rd., 45 N. Y. 184; Ouimet v: Henshaw, 35 Vt. 604.

The subsequent case of Hodkinson v. The London and North Western R'y Co., L. R. 14 Q. B. Div. 228, is more instructive. The head note is as follows: "The plaintiff arrived at a station on the defendant's railway with her luggage contained in two boxes, which were taken from the luggage van by a porter in the employ of the company. The porter asked the plaintiff if he should engage a cab

69