

INDEX TO PRINCIPAL MATTERS.

ix

	PAGE
that the error in the description of the house was made by the agent of the insurers, and that the increased number of tenants were not in the house either at the time of the effecting of the Policy, or at that of the fire. (<i>Somers vs. Athenæum Insurance Society, S. C.</i>).....	67
INSURANCE:—The true description of the premises need not be alleged in the declaration, nor the error alluded to. (Do.).....	67
“ :—An answer to a plea by defendant alleging the misdescription may be made, admitting the misdescription, but charging the error upon the Plaintiff's agent, and it is no departure. (Do.).....	67
“ :—The parol testimony of the Agent is sufficient to sustain the answer and sustain the action. (Do.).....	67
“ :—It makes no difference that the policy was for a year before the fire in plaintiff's possession unobjected to, with a printed notice upon it to examine it and see if it was correct. (Do.).....	67
“ :—Or, that the diagram to which reference was made, both in the interim receipt and in the policy, corresponded with the description in the policy. (Do.).....	67
“ :—Under a clause in a policy of Insurance, that if there appear fraud in the claim made to a loss, or false swearing or affirmation in support thereof, the claimant shall forfeit all benefit under such policy, the Court will reject the claim of the Policy holder, if the Company establish that the claim is unjust and fraudulent, and far in excess of the actual loss to the knowledge of the policy holder. (<i>Grenier et vir, vs. The Monarch Fire and Life Assurance Company, S. C.</i>).....	100
“ :—In a case such as the above general evidence may outweigh positive testimony, where the latter is not consistent, and where there are presumptions against its truth. (Do.).....	100
“ :—The condition of a policy imposing the penalty of a forfeiture of all remedy upon it, in the event of any fraudulent overcharges is not comminatory, but will be carried out, if such overcharge be proved. (<i>Thomas et al., vs. The Times and Beacon Fire Assurance Company S. C.</i>).....	162
“ :—A promissory note payable to the order of a Mutual Insurance Company given in payment of premium of Insurance, is negotiable. (<i>Wood et al. vs. Shaw, S. C.</i>).....	169
“ :—A memorandum at the foot of such a note indicating its consideration does not limit its negotiability. (Do.).....	169
“ :—The indorsement of such a note by the Secretary of the Company, in that capacity, is sufficient to pass the title to the note when an implied authority in him to do so has been shown by proof of the ordinary course of business of the Company, that the directors had effected the arrangements with the holders of which the transfer of the note formed part, and that the Company had received the consideration of such transfer. (Do.).....	169
INTERVENTION:—When allowed, the party intervening may plead to the action, and this, notwithstanding that the plaintiff may have pleaded to the Intervention. (<i>Beaudry vs. Laffamme, and Davis Intervening party, S. C.</i>).....	253
JUDGE in banco may revise and reverse the rule of another Judge of the Court sitting at Enquête. (<i>Scott et al., vs. Scott et al., S. C.</i>).....	134
JUDGMENT OF DISTRIBUTION may be contested, before its homologation, on cause being shewn, and on payment of costs. (<i>Prévost vs. De Lesdarmiers, and Whittingham, Opposant, contesting, S. C.</i>).....	165
JUDICIAL SALE:— <i>Vide ACTION RÉVOCATOIRE.</i>	