SUPERIOR COURT, 1853-4.

et que les mots, "dépens de l'action" n'exprimaient pas les frais de l'action telle qu'introduite "amount demanded" mais seulement les "frais du montant recouvré" "amount recovered" vide le dersiep acte de judicature passé en mil l'uit cent quarante-neuf.

Lafrenaye & Cresso, pour le Demandeur. Cartier & Cartier, pour le Defendeur.

No. 1693.

Attorney General v. Ryan and al.

MOTION FOR RULE OF COURT ON NOTARY TO SEND UP A BOND SQUS. SEING PRIVÉ THAT HAD BEEN FYLED IN HIS OFFICE, AND OF WHICH HB HAD MADE & MINUTE.

The Plaintiff had placed a bond sous seing privé in the hands of a notary for safe keeping, and the notary had made a minute of it, and granted copies. The Plaintiff had taken out an action on the bond, and was desirous of procuring it to fyle as an exhibit in support of his action; but the notary relused to give it up unless ordered to do so by the Court. The Plaintiff thereupon moved for a rule of Court commanding the notary to send up the bond.

Drummond & Dunlop, for Plaintiff.

Day. J., 'The Court has no power to grant a rule to oblige a notary to send up one of his minutes. A subpæna duces tecum might perhaps answer the Plaintiff's purpose.

Motion dismissed.

P

ti

W Ll Co

al ci ju

in

es tli

oi S

is

to

ni

ta

No. 2298.

Macfarlane v. Worrall and the Principal Officers of Her Majesty's Ordinance, 'I'. S.

PROCEDURE :- EXCEPTION A LA FORME .- FYLING OF.

Motion to reject exception à la forme on the ground that four days from the return of the writ had elapsed before it was fyled. Held, that the four days allowed by the Statute amending Judicature Act count even while the records is en délibéré.

In this case the Plaintiff had arrested before judgment a certain sum of money belonging to the Defendant in the hands of the said Tiers. Saisi. The writ of saisi arrêt directed the *Tiers Saisi* to come before the Justices "of" our Superior Court to answer in the premises.

The said writ returnable on the 24th day of October, 1853. On the same day after the return the Defendant moved to quash the writ and process, as the writ ought to have summoned the Tiers Saisi to appear before "our Justices in our Superior Court." This motion was taken en délibéré, and judgment was rendered on the 18th day of December last; dismissing the motion, the Court observing that a