

## GILBART LECTURES, 1899\*

No. IV

---

BY J. R. PAGET, ESQ., LL.D., BARRISTER-AT-LAW

---

### NOTICE OF DISHONOUR BY TELEGRAM

**W**E will now deal with notice of dishonour by telegram.

Lord Justice A. L. Smith says: "Speaking for myself, I think that the notice would be good if, on the day after the dishonour of the bill, the person giving the notice were to telegraph to the person to receive the notice in terms which sufficiently identified the bill, and intimated that it was dishonoured." Lord Justice Collins said: "Within the terms of the section that telegram was clearly not in itself a good notice, and to this my learned brothers agree." So that I understand him as referring rather to the date at which the telegram was despatched than to any question as to validity of telegraphic notice as a whole. Mr. Justice Wills, in the other case I referred to, after saying that notice of dishonour could be transmitted by post, because the post-office was the common agent of both parties, continued, "That reasoning does not apply to the Electric Telegraph Company," but I do not think he intended to lay down any rule. I think he was merely thinking of the difference between the Government department and what were then private enterprises.

### WHETHER SUFFICIENT

Now is Lord Justice Smith right? Is a telegraphic notice of dishonour sufficient?

I put aside any question of time when sent off, at any rate for the present. Nor do I think it matters whether the parties reside in the same or different places.

---

\*Published in the JOURNAL by permission of the lecturer.