

no other inquiry was made regarding the plaintiff's financial standing than one addressed to the plaintiff himself on the 7th February, which elicited the answer that he was without means. As to the existence of a good defence on the merits, the defendant alleged that he had arrested the plaintiff on a telegram from a License Inspector, and detained him in the lock-up or police station at Orillia until a constable from Belleville should arrive with warrants of commitment issued to enforce two convictions under the Liquor License Act, when he passed him over to the latter's charge, and that he believed that he had the right to do as he did, and that he acted in good faith and without malice or any improper motive. The Master held that the motion failed upon both of these essential points. *Quære*, whether sec. 16 of the Act entitles any officer other than a Justice of the Peace to security for costs. Motion dismissed with costs to the plaintiff in any event. H. S. White, for the defendant. J. B. Mackenzie, for the plaintiff.

---

TOUGH OAKES GOLD MINES LIMITED v. FOSTER—KELLY, J.  
—APRIL 22.

*Company—Directors—Motion to Restrain from Acting as such—Ownership and Control of Shares—Interim Injunction.*]—Motion by the plaintiffs for an interim injunction restraining the defendants from acting or assuming or attempting to act as directors of the plaintiff company, and for other relief. The motion was heard in the Weekly Court at Toronto. The learned Judge (in a written opinion) said that the question of the right to vote at what was said to have been a meeting of the shareholders of the plaintiff company upon or in respect of two blocks of the capital stock of the company, one of 25,000 shares and the other of 15,000 shares, at one time owned by Myrtice Oakes and Winnifred Robins respectively, the ownership of which had passed from them, was material to the determination of the present application. The plaintiffs asserted that, by virtue of an injunction order issued in an action pending in England, the plaintiffs in that action had reserved to them the right to direct as to the voting in respect to these shares, which, with others, were at the time the subject of litigation pending in the English Courts; and that at what they said was a meeting of the plaintiff company's shareholders held on the 26th January, 1916, that right was exercised by direction of Mr. Burt, who, they asserted, sufficiently represented the English company for that purpose. The learned Judge was not convinced that there was sufficient warrant, on a motion of this kind, for interference with the administration of the company's affairs, such as by the injunc-