

bank's interest. The Court appealed from had held that the plaintiff was by reason of the facts aforesaid estopped from relying on the forgery, and that he was guilty of a legal wrong to the bank. The Privy Council (Lords Watson, Hobhouse, Davey and Sir R. Crouch) reversed this decision and held the plaintiff entitled to succeed. It was also held that under the provisions of a rule of Court similar in its terms to Ont. Rule 755, it is not competent for the Court to give judgment in disregard of the findings of a jury, which are not objected to, merely because it sets aside other findings which have been objected to.

The Law Reports for July comprise: (1896) 2 Q.B., pp. 1-112; (1896) P. pp. 153-209; and (1896) 2 Chy. pp. 1-278:

COUNTY COURT—JURISDICTION—BAILIFF, NEGLIGENCE OF—NEGLECT TO LEVY—ACTION AGAINST BAILIFF FOR NEGLECT—SUMMARY REMEDY—COUNTY COURTS ACT, 1888—(51 & 52 VICT., c. 43), SEC. 49—(R.S.O., c. 51, SEC. 279.)

*Watson v. White*, (1896) 2 Q.B. 9, was an action to recover damages against a bailiff of a County Court for neglect to levy an execution. It appears that by sec. 49 of the English County Courts Act, a power is given to the judge to exercise a summary jurisdiction over the bailiff for neglect to levy an execution similar to that which is conferred on judges of the Division Courts under R.S.O., c. 51, sec. 279, and the defendant claimed that the plaintiff was shut up to that remedy and could not bring an action, and he claimed a prohibition: but the Court (Lord Russell, C.J., and Wills, J.) were of opinion that the plaintiff was not deprived of his remedy by action, and refused the application for prohibition.

DETINUE—PROPERTY FOUND ON LAND OF ANOTHER—RING FOUND IN POOL OF WATER—OWNERSHIP OF CHATTELS FOUND ON PRIVATE PROPERTY.

*South Staffordshire Water Co. v. Sharman*, (1896) 2 Q.B. 44, raises an interesting question concerning the right to chattels found on private property. The defendant had been employed by the plaintiffs to clean out a pool of water on their lands, and in the course of his employment found a couple of gold rings, and the action was brought to compel him to deliver them up to the plaintiffs. The defendant claimed the right