

stolen. By Royal Proclamation £5 gold pieces had been declared to be current coin. The thief had taken it to Moss, who was a second-hand clothes dealer who had given him five sovereigns for it, without making any inquiry. It was contended that as the £5 piece was current coin, no order for restitution could be made. But the Divisional Court (Darling and Channell, JJ.) came to the conclusion that the gold piece had not been passed into circulation as current coin, but was rather the subject of sale as an article of vertu, and that therefore an order for its restitution under the circumstances could properly be made. Channell, J., it may be said thinks that on the facts stated the court might properly infer that the piece was not taken bona fide by Moss, and that he acquired no better title to it than the thief.

LICENSING ACTS - INNKEEPER PROVIDING PIANO FOR USE OF GUESTS.

In *Brearley v. Morley* (1899) 2 Q.B. 121, it was decided by Day and Lawrence, JJ., on a case stated by magistrates, that where an innkeeper provides a piano in the public smoking-room for the free use of his guests, who were in the habit of playing thereon, for the amusement of themselves and others resorting thereto, the innkeeper cannot properly on that account, be convicted for having kept or used the room for public entertainment, within the meaning of the Licensing Acts.

Four cases in the August number of the Law Reports of decisions under the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897 serve to show how prolific of litigation that enactment has been, but the Act not having as yet been adopted in Canada it is not necessary here to refer to them any further.

ADMINISTRATION - LACHES - PROCEEDINGS TO COMPEL REFUNDING OF ESTATE AFTER ADMINISTRATION BY COURT.

In *Mohan v. Broughton* (1899) P. 211, the plaintiff sought to revoke a prior grant of administration, and to obtain a grant to herself as next of kin of the deceased, on the ground that the previous grant had been made to a person who was not really next of kin of the deceased. Under the previous grant the administrator had taken proceedings in the Chancery Division in which the estate had been duly administered and distributed under the order of the court. The object of the present proceedings was to enable the plaintiff to reopen the administration proceedings and