JLLITY.

Iortgage," 7.

EVIDENCE.

tances under which hould be admitted to ate deed the operation between the parties liscussed.

ews v. Holmes, 1. fic Performance," 1.

RTIES.

this court would for the purpose of eriff to convey proan execution; but e execution debtor has been sold must

m v. Smith, 203. Conveyance."

ERSHIP.

tners carried on the roker on his own at capacity received f several sums of s and proceeds of ntiff, as the price of ry notes, and the e broker paid into partnership funds. s discovered that been all forged by absconded, and the executed a deed all the joint effects benefit of all their a bill filed for that neld that the plainpaid his claim out assets. [Spragge,

v. James, 163. l partners, engagει wheat and flour, interest to a third ne other partner, all the funds used

in the transactions of the firm, as | made for an order pro confesso against was not, by what had taken place, constituted a partner of the plaintiff, and the court dismissed the bill as against him with costs: but directed an account as against the other defendant with costs to the hearing.

Mair v. Bacon, 338.

PAYMENTS.

(APPLICATION OF.)

The debtor of a mercantile firm being desirous of extending his transactions with his creditors, executed to them a mortgage to secure the sum of £2000: Subsequent transactions between the parties to a large amount took place, and during one year alone the sums charged to the debtor, in. cluding the sum due on the mortgage, amounted to £30,000; and after four years' dealing between the parties, from the time of executing the mortgage, an account was delivered to the debtor, showing a balance of £1641 against him. Upon a bill filed to foreclose the mortgage for this amount, the court held that the transactions which had taken place discharged the mortgage debt.

Buchanan v. Kirby, 332.

The ruling in Re Brown reported ante vol. 2, page 590, affirmed. Il.

PRACTICE.

1. A married woman had been served with an office copy bill as well as her husband, but no joint answer was put in, and an order was obtained and served upon her directing her to answer separately and apart from her husband; no answer having been put in after the expiration of a month from

sented, and a loss having occurred her. The court refused to make the upon a re-sale, he filed a bill against order, and directed a second office the original co-partner, and his vendee copy of the bill, together with an order for an account and payment by them to be served upon her directing her of one half of the loss sustained on to answer separately from her husband such resale. Held, that the vendee within a time limited after service of that order.

Miller v. Gordon, 145.

2. A defendant having allowed the plaintiff to proceed with his suit in this court as well as at law for the same object, afterwards applied for an order on the plaintiff to elect in which court he would proceed; the court granted the order, but directed the defendant to pay so much of the costs at law as had been incurred after defendant became aware that the relief sought in both suits was the

Ausman v. Montgomery, 175.

3. Where a cause was brought on to be heard at the suit of The Attorney General for the repeal of a grant of land alleged to have been issued in mistake, and the evidence adduced did not sufficiently establish the mistake, the court directed the cause to stand over for the purpose of adducing further evidence.

Attorney General v. Garbutt, 181.

4. Where a plaintiff in a redemp. tion suit moves for a summary icierance, and seeks to deprive the mortgagee of his costs, a case should be made for that relief upon the pleadings, and the question of costs should be included in the reference to the Master.

Long v. Glenn, 208.

Where a case has been referred to arbitration and an award made, such award must in all cases be made an order of the Court, before any other order in the cause can be made.

Wadsworth v. McDougall, 290.

6. Where a mortgage was created the service of that order, a motion was by husband and wife upon lands of