

of a contract for a lease to the plaintiff, or in the alternative for damages, and for an injunction restraining the defendants until after the trial from leasing the premises in question to any other person than the plaintiff. One of the defendants was an infant. Day, J., granted an interlocutory injunction against the adult defendant, and from this order an appeal was taken to the Court of Appeal (Lindley and Smith, L.JJ.), and the order was reversed, the Court of Appeal being of the opinion that an interlocutory injunction can only be properly granted as ancillary to relief which the court may grant at the trial; and inasmuch as the court could not grant specific performance of the contract, owing to the infancy of one of the defendants, the plaintiff's only remedy was by way of damages.

LANDLORD AND TENANT—NOTICE TO QUIT, SUFFICIENCY OF.

In *Bury v. Thompson*, 1, (1895) 1 Q.B. 696; 14 R. May 259, the Court of Appeal (Lord Esher, M.R., and Lopes and Rigby, L.JJ.) have affirmed the decision of the Divisional Court (noted *ante* p. 197), as previously intimated. The Court of Appeal hold the case is governed by the previous decision of the Court of Appeal in *Ahearn v. Bellman*, 4 Ex. D. 201. It may, therefore, be taken to be definitely settled, as far as the Court of Appeal can settle the point, that a notice to quit is not rendered bad by the addition of an intimation that the person giving it is willing to make a new agreement with the person to whom it is given.

CRIMINAL LAW—DEMANDING MONEY WITH MENACES—LARCENY ACT, 1861 (24 & 25 VICT., c. 96), s. 44—(CR. CODE, s. 403).

*The Queen v. Tomlinson*, (1895) 1 Q.B. 706; 15 R. Mar. 397, was a case stated by Lawrance, J. The prisoner was tried and convicted under the Larceny Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict., c. 96), s. 44 (see Cr. Code, s. 403), of having sent a letter to the prosecutor demanding money, and threatening, if the demand was not complied with, to let his wife and friends "know of his doings" with a certain woman who was named. The defendant had been dismissed from the prosecutor's employ for being discovered in an act of immorality with the same woman. The counsel for the prisoner contended that the menaces contemplated by the statute were menaces of violence or injury to the person or property, or of accusations of crime within ss. 46 and 47 (see Cr. Code, ss. 405, 406); but the court (Lord Russell, C.J., and Pollock, B., and Wills, Charles, and Lawrance, JJ.) were unanimously of