

water gained access into the tank where the goods in question were stored, instead of into the ballast tank, as the officer intended. It was held by Walton, J., that this was within the above mentioned exception, and therefore that the plaintiff's action failed.

LICENSING ACTS—PUBLIC HOUSE NOT AN INN—RIGHT OF LICENSE HOLDER OF PUBLIC HOUSE TO REQUEST PERSON TO LEAVE LICENSED PREMISES.

Sealey v. Tandy (1902) 1 K.B. 296, was a case stated by a police magistrate. The plaintiff charged the defendant with assault under the following circumstances, and the question was whether the defendant was liable. The defendant was licensee of a public house, not being an inn, and the plaintiff, who was not a traveller and had misconducted himself on previous occasions, entered defendant's premises. The defendant requested him to leave, and on his refusing to do so, ejected him, using no unnecessary violence. The Divisional Court (Lord Alverstone, C.J., and Darling and Channell, JJ.) held that the defendant acted within his rights and the charge should be dismissed.

ADMIRALTY—ACTION IN REM—AVOIDING COLLISION—LOSS OCCASIONED BY.

In *The Port Victoria* (1902) P. 25, Jeune, P.P.D., held that where a vessel slipped her anchor and put to sea to avoid a collision with another vessel which had been negligently allowed to drag down upon her and foul her chain, the owners of the former vessel had an action in rem to recover the loss incurred thereby.

FRIENDLY SOCIETY—LIFE POLICY OF FRIENDLY SOCIETY—ASSIGNMENT ON POLICY—NOMINATION OF BENEFICIARY.

In *Re Griffin, Griffin v. Griffin* (1902) 1 Ch. 135, the Court of Appeal (Williams, Romer and Cozens-Hardy, L.JJ.) have overruled the decisions of Kekewich, J., in *re Redman* (1901), 2 Ch. 471, and of Phillimore, J., in *Cuddick v. Highton* (1901), 2 Ch. 476 *n* (noted ante vol. 37, p. 841), and held that a life policy issued by a friendly society is assignable in the ordinary way, as well as by nomination under the Friendly Societies Act. The Court of Appeal, however, do not in any way commit themselves as to what would be the legal effect of an assignment for value, followed by a nomination, at variance with such assignment.