

—There is no
urt of General
Peace from an
of a complaint
against a city by
the authority
Municipal Act,

ferred to in s.
"The Ontario
ctions Act,"
against the
om the infor-
plaint is laid,
clude an order

Public School

tion of—*Jur-*
isdiction Order—
55-56 *Vict.*,
884 (D.).]—
rman of the
of the Peace
of dismissal of
the conviction
gistrate, with
by the clerk of
formal order
pursuance of

rtificate of the
ount of such
uent order of
neral Sessions
es warrant to
of the same
and must be

order had is-
e might have
ugh the appell-

ant was bound by recognizance
conditioned to pay them.

Freeman v. Read (1860), 9 C.
B.N.S. 301, specially referred to.

Held, also, that in view of s.
880 (e) (f) of the Criminal Code,
55-56 *Vict.*, ch. 29 (D.), the for-
mal order might have been drawn
up at any future sittings of the
Court of General Sessions and
the costs included therein *nunc*
pro tunc if necessary, the power
to determine the amount of such
costs not being, as it is in Eng-
land, confined to the justices at
the same General Sessions at
which the appeal is heard.

Where proceedings are taken
by the chief of police of a town
and in his name for an offence
against a by-law of the town,
his name and not that of the
town should appear throughout
the proceedings as the informant.

Re Bothwell and Burnside,
695.

SOLICITOR.

Assignment of Mortgage —
Fraud of Solicitor.]—*See* MORT-
GAGE, 2.

SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE.

Land out of Ontario —
Jurisdiction.]—The plaintiff, a
resident of Buffalo, United
States, agreed in writing with
the defendant, to exchange cer-
tain land situate in Buffalo for
land of the defendant situate in
Ontario; and brought this action
for specific performance of the
contract:—

Held, that the plaintiff having
brought his action in this Court,
thereby submitting to its jurisdic-
tion, the Court would decree
specific performance.

Montgomery v. Ruppensburg,
433.

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.

See LIMITATION OF ACTIONS.

STATUTES.

35 <i>Vict.</i> ch. 80, ss. 11, 13, (O.)	679
<i>See</i> COMPANY, 4.	
42 <i>Vict.</i> ch. 78, s. 7, (O.)	679
<i>See</i> COMPANY, 4.	
43 <i>Vict.</i> ch. 28, (D.)	386
<i>See</i> CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, 1.	
48 <i>Vict.</i> ch. 13, s. 8, (O.)	423
<i>See</i> REFLEVIN, 1.	
R.S.O. 1877, ch. 167	154
<i>See</i> BENEVOLENT SOCIETIES, 1.	
R.S.O. 1887 ch. 25	54, 529
<i>See</i> CROWN, 1, 2.	
51 <i>Vict.</i> ch. 29, ss. 173, 183, 187	367
<i>See</i> RAILWAYS, 1.	
51 <i>Vict.</i> ch. 29, s.s. 227, 290, (D.)	367
<i>See</i> RAILWAYS, 2.	
51 <i>Vict.</i> ch. 29, s. 246, (D.)	663
<i>See</i> RAILWAY COMPANY, 1.	
55 <i>Vict.</i> ch. 42, s. 496, s.s. 10	124
<i>See</i> MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS, 2.	
55 <i>Vict.</i> ch. 96, (O.)	29
<i>See</i> ASSESSMENT AND TAXES, 1.	
55-56 <i>Vict.</i> ch. 29, s. 880, (e) (f)	695
<i>See</i> SESSIONS, 2.	
56 <i>Vict.</i> ch. 27, s. 1, (D.)	267
<i>See</i> RAILWAYS, 1.	
R.S.O. ch. 24	240
<i>See</i> REVENUE, 1.	
R.S.O. ch. 29	529
<i>See</i> CROWN, 2.	