

containing an option to the proposed lessee to purchase the reversion in fee. After the testator's death the proposed lessee, having become entitled to a lease, in 1899 gave notice of exercising his option to purchase the fee; but he died in 1899 insolvent, and without having carried out the purchase, and the testator's trustees had subsequently, pursuant to the terms of the agreement, re-entered on the premises. By the testator's will the testator's residuary real and personal estates were disposed of to different persons, and consequently it became of moment to determine whether or not there had been a conversion of the realty included in the agreement into personalty, by reason of the notice to exercise the option, and Eve, J., held that the giving of the notice of exercising the option worked a conversion, and the subsequent failure to carry out the purchase, and the re-entry by the trustees of the will, had not the effect of reconverting the property into realty as against the legatees of the personal estate.

WILL—BEQUESTS TO CHILDREN—ADVANCES TO SON—DIRECTION
IN CODICIL TO BRING INTO HOTCHPOT ADVANCES APPEARING
IN BOOKS—ENTRIES BEFORE AND AFTER CODICIL.

In re Deprez, Henriques v. Deprez (1917) 1 Ch. 24. By the will in question dated in 1899, and a codicil dated in 1909, the testator made bequests to his children, and provided by the codicil that the advances to his son appearing in his books of account should be brought into hotchpot. The testator died in 1915 and it was then found that his books contained entries, made before and after the codicil, of advances to his son. Neville, J., who tried the action, held that the entries of advances made prior to the codicil were incorporated in the will, and were conclusive, but the subsequent entries were not receivable as part of the will, or as evidence, and as to them there must be an inquiry.

MARRIED WOMAN—RESTRAINT ON ANTICIPATION—PARTIAL RE-
LEASE OF RESTRAINT ON ANTICIPATION BY CESTUI QUE TRUST
WHILE DISCOVERT—DIRECTION TO TRUSTEES.

In re Chrimes, Locovich v. Chrimes (1917) 1 Ch. 30. This case, we believe, is one of first impression, at all events no previous authority is cited on the point in question. The facts were simple. The plaintiff was entitled to a reversionary share under a will bequeathed to her while a spinster, but subject to a restraint against anticipation in case she married. She subsequently