

REVIEW OF CURRENT ENGLISH CASES.

(Registered in accordance with the Copyright Act.)

LANDLORD AND TENANT—PAYMENT OF RENT—DEDUCTION BY TENANT OF PROPERTY TAX PAID BY HIM—PROOF OF PAYMENT BY TENANT.

North London and General Property Co. v. Moy (1917) 2 K.B. 617. The simple question involved in this case was whether a tenant who pays the property tax to the collector, when he seeks to deduct such payment from his rent, is bound to take the collector's receipt to his landlord, or whether the landlord must seek his tenant in order to inspect the receipt, if he wishes to see it. Low, J., who tried the action, which was brought by the landlord to recover rent, held that it was the tenant's duty to take the receipt to his landlord, and as the defendant had refused to do this before action he was ordered to pay the costs.

CRIMINAL LAW—EVIDENCE—CHARGE OF GROSS INDECENCY WITH BOYS—EVIDENCE OF POSSESSION OF POWDER PUFFS, AND INDECENT PHOTOGRAPHS OF BOYS.

The King v. Thompson (1917) 2 K.B. 630. In this case the defendant was indicted for committing acts of gross indecency with boys and in the commission of such acts it was proved that powder puffs were used. The accused was apprehended by a police constable in the street at a place where some boys alleged he had made an appointment with them, he gave them money and told them he had business that day and had no time and that they were to go away. He struck the police constable and endeavoured to run away. He was identified by the boys as the person who had committed the indecent acts charged, and on his person were found powder puffs, and in his rooms were also found indecent photographs of boys, and the question was whether the proof of his possession of these articles was admissible and the Court of Criminal Appeal (Lord Reading, C.J., and Darling, and Avory, JJ.) held that it was.

HUSBAND AND WIFE—AGREEMENT BETWEEN HUSBAND AND WIFE THAT ALL WEARING APPAREL WORN BY WIFE SHALL BE HUSBAND'S ABSOLUTE PROPERTY—JUDGMENT AGAINST WIFE.

Rondeau v. Marks (1917) 2 K.B. 636. In this case judgment had been recovered against the defendant who was a married