

Electrical uses. — An employee of a telephone company, who attempts to string wires over those of an electric-light company, is held, in *Mitchell v. Raleigh Electric Co.* (N. C.) 55 L. R. A. 398, to have a right to presume that the latter company has complied with an ordinance requiring its wires to be insulated, and to be bound to look for patent defects only.

Parent and Child. — The *Central Law Journal* of July 18th contains an article, which may be read with profit, on the liability of a parent at common law for manslaughter for negligently omitting to furnish medical attendance to a child from a religious standpoint, because of disbelief in the efficacy of medicine. Amongst the cases discussed are several published in this Journal and in the Canadian Criminal Cases.

Negligence. — A boy twelve years old who is injured by collision with a slowly moving team in a public street is held, in *Gleason v. Smith* (Mass.) 55 L. R. A. 622, to have no right to recover, where, without care or precaution to avoid collision with vehicles, he is using the street as a playground, and comes in contact with the team in attempting to catch another boy, although the driver is negligent in having his attention diverted from his horses to a vehicle behind him.

Embezzlement by Attorney having lien. — A peculiar question was raised in behalf of an attorney charged with embezzlement by a contention that, as the funds which he was charged with embezzling were subject to a lien for compensation, he could not be prosecuted for embezzlement of the funds so long as his compensation remained unpaid. The case was one in which an attorney received by check the sum of \$20,500, which it was claimed by the prosecuting witness he was to use first for the payment of about \$12,000 of the client's debts, and the balance was to belong to the attorney upon his conveyance of certain mining interests. The prosecution was for embezzlement of these funds by converting them to his own use without complying with the conditions on which the funds were received. There was a claim on the part of the defence that the attorney was entitled to the sum of \$2,000 for services as attorney, and that he had a lien on these funds therefor, which must be satisfied before he could be charged with embezzling the funds. This raised an unusual question, but the court did not discuss or refer to it, but by implication held that it was not well taken, as the conviction was affirmed. The case is that of *State v. Hoshor* (Wash.) 67 Pac. 386. — *Case and Comment.*