

STAUNTON V. KERR—BOYD, C.—DEC. 6.

Solicitor—Costs—Company.]—An action by a solicitor to recover the amount of a bill of costs. At the trial judgment was reserved as to whether the plaintiff was entitled to recover against the defendant company. It was said that he was retained by the company as it existed prior to the sale of all the stock and assets to the company as now constituted, which assumed the liabilities of the old company as they stood on the books at a certain date. The Chancellor held that the plaintiff's claim did not fall within the terms of the engagement. Action dismissed as against the company without costs. W. M. Douglas, K.C., for the plaintiff. N. W. Rowell, K.C., for the defendant company.

FELKER V. MCGUIGAN CONSTRUCTION CO.—MEREDITH, C.J.C.P.,
IN CHAMBERS—DEC. 7.

Pleading—Embarrassing Reply.]—The order of the Master in Chambers, ante 224, was affirmed on appeal with costs to the defendants in any event. J. H. Moss, K.C., for the plaintiff. R. H. Parmenter, for the defendant company. A. W. Ballantyne, for the other defendants.

RACHAR V. MCDOWELL—MASTER IN CHAMBERS—DEC. 8.

Pleading—Want of Precision.]—A motion by the defendant to strike out part of the amended statement of claim as embarrassing, because not sufficiently precise, was dismissed with costs to the plaintiff in the cause. J. King, K.C., for the defendant. A. McLean Macdonell, K.C., for the plaintiff.