

Gregoire & Gregoire.—Judgment reversed, Monk, J., diss.

Willett & Gilmour & Marchand.—Motion to dismiss appeal rejected without costs. Motion to unite appeal and cross appeal, rejected without costs.

Reinhardt & Davidson.—Motion for completion of record dismissed with costs.

Duranceau & Larue.—Petition for leave to appeal granted.

Ross & Ross.—Motion to dismiss appeal granted.

La Banque d'Epargne & La Banque Jacques Cartier.—Judgment reversed. Motion for appeal to Privy Council, granted by consent.

Citizens Insurance Co. & Bourguignon.—Judgment reversed.

Kieffer & Whitehead.—Heard on motion to dismiss appeal. C. A. V.

McShane & Byron et al.—Heard on motion for leave to appeal from interlocutory judgment. C. A. V.

Ross & Stearns.—Heard on merits. Judgment confirmed.

Ross & Pringle.—Heard on merits. C. A. V.

Great North Western Telegraph Co. & Archambault, & cross appeal.—Hearing on merits commenced.

January 26.

Macdougall & Demers.—Hearing *de novo* concluded. C. A. V.

Great North Western Telegraph Co. & Archambault, and cross appeal.—Hearing continued.

January 27.

Kieffer & Whitehead.—Motion for dismissal of appeal, granted for costs.

McShane & Byron.—Motion for leave to appeal from interlocutory judgment, rejected.

Daigneau & Levesque.—Judgment confirmed.

De Blois & La Corporation de St. François du Lac.—Judgment confirmed.

Monette & La Société St. J.-Bte. de Valleyfield.—Judgment confirmed.

Evans & Monette.—Judgment confirmed, Ramsay and Cross, JJ., diss.

Corner & Byrd.—Judgment reformed and damages reduced to \$2,500. Ramsay and Cross, JJ., diss., were for reversing wholly and dismissing action. Appeal and cross appeal to P. C., granted by consent.

Brunet & L'Association Pharmaceutique de la Province de Québec.—Judgment reversed.

Redfield & La Banque d'Hochelaga.—Motion to dismiss appeal. C. A. V.

Petelle & St. Louis.—Motion for leave to appeal from interlocutory judgment. Rejected.

Great North Western Telegraph Co. & Archambault; and Archambault & Great North Western Telegraph Co.—Hearing on merits concluded. C. A. V.

The Court adjourned to March 15.

SUPERIOR COURT—MONTREAL.*

Libel—Mercantile agency—Privileged communication—Damages.

The defendant, a mercantile agency, sent a circular to its subscribers with the words "call at office," in reference to the plaintiffs, dry goods merchants of Montreal. Those who enquired at the office, including a newspaper correspondent who was not a subscriber, were informed that the plaintiffs had applied for an extension of time on a large indebtedness to their English creditors. This information was untrue, and was based upon a rumour which the defendant had not verified. The report injured the plaintiffs' credit, and embarrassed them in their business.

Held:—That the reports of a mercantile agency to its subscribers are not privileged communications, though made in good faith, and from information upon which it relies; and such agency comes under the general rule which makes every person capable of discerning right from wrong responsible for the damage caused by his fault to another, whether by positive act, imprudence, neglect or want of skill.

2. The defendant having been guilty of gross neglect in circulating a report of an injurious nature without verifying it, the damages, though no special amount was proved, were assessed at \$2,000. *Carsley et al. v. The Bradstreet Company.* Loranger, J., Nov. 20, 1885.

Evocation—Jugement de la Cour Supérieure—Validité de l'évocation admise—Renvoi subséquent du dossier à la Cour de Circuit.

Jugé:—1o. Qu'un jugement de la Cour Supérieure ne peut être révisé par la même

* To appear in Montreal Law Reports, 2 S. C.