

suffered from gangrene in the leg, which rendered her, during the last ten days of her life, helpless. No one but the niece knew of her condition. The niece continued to live in the house at the cost of her aunt, and took the food supplied by the tradespeople, but did not give any to the deceased, nor procure any medical or nursing attendance. Her death was caused by the gangrene, but was accelerated by the lack of food and nursing and medical attendance. All these wants would and could have been supplied had any of her neighbours been notified of her condition. Lord Coleridge, C.J., and Hawkins, Cave, Day, and Collins, JJ., were of opinion that the niece was properly convicted.

RAILWAY COMPANY—NEGLIGENCE—ROBBERY OF PASSENGER—REFUSAL TO DETAIN TRAIN—OVERCROWDING CARRIAGES—DAMAGES—REMOTENESS.

*Cobb v. Great Western Railway Co.*, (1893) 1 Q.B. 459, we have already referred to *ante* p. 239; and it is perhaps only necessary here to say that the ground on which the Court of Appeal (Lord Esher, M.R., and Bowen and Smith, L.JJ.) affirmed the decision of Day and Collins, JJ., was principally this: that although the suffering of a carriage to be overcrowded might be evidence of negligence on the part of a railway company, yet that the robbery of a passenger was not a necessary consequence of such overcrowding, and therefore that damage was too remote. From the observations of Lord Esher, M.R., it would appear that if the company's servants had known that the plaintiff was being assaulted or robbed, it would be their duty to interfere to protect him; but when a passenger has been assaulted and robbed in the course of the journey, it is no part of the duty of the company's servants to assist him in any way to obtain redress. Owing to the mode of constructing English railway carriages, the company's servants can have very little oversight over passengers while the train is in motion, and it is a wonder that long before this the American pattern of railway carriages has not been adopted there.

SCHOOLMASTER—PUNISHMENT OF PUPILS FOR ACTS DONE ON THE WAY TO SCHOOL.

*Cleary v. Booth*, (1893) 1 Q.B. 465, was a case stated by justices. The defendant was the headmaster of a board school, and had corporally punished the plaintiff, a pupil, for fighting with another boy on his way to school. It was claimed by the