

WAR—CROWN—ROYAL PREROGATIVE—DEFENCE OF REALM—
RIGHT OF CROWN TO TAKE POSSESSION OF LAND AND BUILD-
INGS WITHOUT COMPENSATION.

De Keyser's Royal Hotel v. The King (1919) 2 Ch. 197. This was a petition of right claiming compensation for land and buildings taken possession of by the Crown under the Defence of the Realm Act. Peterson, J., dismissed the petition, but the Court of Appeal (Eady, M.R., and Warrington and Duke, L.J.J.) have reversed his decision (Duke, L.J., dissenting). The case is very elaborately dealt with by all the Judges, the majority of the Court drawing a distinction between lands and buildings taken by the Crown for administrative purposes as was the case in this matter, and lands entered upon for the purpose of raising bulwarks or other defences against an expected invasion.

JUDICIAL INQUIRY—DOMESTIC FORUM—ACCUSER ACTING AS JUDGE
—JUDGE—BIAS.

Law v. Chartered Institute of Patent Agents (1919) 2 Ch. 276. This was an action to restrain the defendants from carrying out a resolution expelling the plaintiff as a member of the defendants' Institute. The plaintiff had been accused by officers of the Admiralty of the alleged disclosure to the plaintiff of a secret naval invention. This was referred to the defendants' discipline committee to ascertain if the plaintiff, who was a member of the Institute, to ascertain if he had been guilty of "disgraceful professional conduct" under Rule 31 of their charter. The committee formulated a charge against the plaintiff and then applied, under Rule 19 of the Register of Patent Agents Rules, to the Board of Trade to strike the plaintiff's name off the Register of Patent Agents. This application ultimately failed. The Council of the defendants then proceeded under Rule 32 of their Charter to expel him from membership in the defendants' Institute. At the meeting when his conduct was to be investigated, the plaintiff by his counsel objected to the jurisdiction of the Council in so far as it was composed of members who had taken part in the previous application to the Board of Trade. This objection was overruled by the President and the plaintiff and his counsel then retired from the meeting. The Council then passed resolutions finding the plaintiff guilty of disgraceful conduct as a patent agent and expelling him from membership. The plaintiff claimed that in these circumstances the resolution was *ultra vires*. Eve, J., who tried the action, held that the Council in the investigation under Rule 32 had acted in the performance of a judicial duty, as