

**CONTEMPT OF COURT—PUBLICATION TENDING TO PREJUDICE FAIR TRIAL—
CAUSE NOT PENDING IN HIGH COURT—JURISDICTION OF HIGH COURT.**

The King v. Parke (1903) 2 K.B. 432, is a case deserving the careful attention of newspaper men. The proceedings were instituted to attach the defendant for contempt of court for publishing statements calculated to prejudice the fair trial of the miscreant Dougal, who had been arrested for forgery and was brought before the Petty sessions on that charge and remanded. After the prisoner's remand and before his committal for trial the injurious statements were published by the defendant. A rule was obtained calling on him to shew cause why he should not be committed for contempt, and on the return of the rule the defendant's counsel objected that the King's Bench Division of the High Court had no jurisdiction, because the contempt, if any, was a contempt of the Assize Court. This objection was overruled by the Court (Lord Alverstone, C.J., and Wills, and Channell, JJ.) and the defendant fined £50 and ordered to be imprisoned until the fine was paid.

COMPANY—WINDING UP PETITION—PRACTICE—COSTS—APPEAL—CONTRIBUTORIES—CREDITOR.

In re Ibo Investment Co. (1903) 2 Ch. 373, was an application by a shareholder for the winding up of a limited company. It was opposed by the company and two sets of contributories. The petition was dismissed, and one set of costs allowed to the opposing contributories. The petitioner appealed and the appeal was dismissed with costs. As originally drawn up by the registrar, the order only allowed one set of costs to the contributories. Some of the contributories moved to vary the minutes, claiming to be allowed their full costs of the appeal. After consulting the registrar as to the practice, the Court of Appeal (Williams, Romer, and Cozens-Hardy, L.JJ.) held that as the appellant had not in any way notified the contributories that he did not seek to interfere with the disposition made by the order appealed from as to costs the contributories were entitled to, in the absence of such notice they were entitled to appear to support the order, and to get full costs, whereas if such notice had been given they might have been limited to one set of costs.