

money owing to the defendants was in the hands of their agents; and the plaintiff thereupon became entitled to an immediate delivery of her goods and payment of the surplus moneys or damages to the extent of their value.—Judgment for the plaintiff against the defendants for \$1,066.40 with costs. Judgment for the defendants against the third parties for \$1,066.40 and the costs the defendants are to pay the plaintiff, including the costs to be paid to the plaintiff under the order of the 4th March, 1912, but not including the costs payable under the order of Britton, J., of the 13th March, 1911, together with the defendants' costs of defence. Judgment for the defendants against the plaintiff for \$152.16, without costs as between these parties, to be set off against the plaintiff's judgment against the defendants. W. M. Hall, for the plaintiff. Shirley Denison, K.C., for the defendants. W. Laidlaw, K.C., for the third parties.

---

MEREDITH V. SLEMIN—MASTER IN CHAMBERS—FEB. 28.

*Security for Costs—Action against Police Officers—1 Geo. V. ch. 22, sec. 16—Statement of Claim—Amendment.*—Motion by the defendants for security for costs under 1 Geo. V. ch. 22, sec. 16. Of the four defendants, three were described as police officers, and the fourth (Ashton) as a physician. The plaintiff, by the statement of claim, alleged that the defendants illegally and without warrant arrested and assaulted her, and conspired to arrest, assault, and falsely imprison her. The defence sworn to by the defendants was, that all that was done to the plaintiff was at her own suggestion and with her consent, and that they never acted or assumed to act as police officers. It was admitted that the plaintiff and her next friend were not good for costs. The Master said that, applying the test given in *Parkes v. Baker*, 17 P.R. 345, to the statement of claim, the defendants other than Ashton were being proceeded against as police officers in regard to everything charged except the assault and perhaps the conspiracy; and these three defendants could not be denied security; but the defendant Ashton was not entitled to security. Reference to *Lewis v. Dalby*, 3 O.L.R. 301, 304, and *Lane v. Clinkinbroomer*, 3 O.W.R. 613. The plaintiff should have leave to amend, if so advised. If the amendment was not made in a week, an order for security for costs of the three police officers, defendants, should issue. In either case, costs to be costs in the cause. Featherston Aylesworth, for the defendants. J. M. Godfrey, for the plaintiff.