

diction asserted did not appear with sufficient clearness to warrant the issue of an order of prohibition, and, therefore, in the exercise of discretion in such circumstances, the order should be refused.

Upon these grounds, as well as upon the ground that a second motion for prohibition does not lie in the existing circumstances, the motion is dismissed with costs.

CARSON V. MIDDLESEX MILLS CO.—FALCONBRIDGE, C.J.K.B.—
APRIL 12.

Injunction—Interim Order—Terms.]—Motion by the plaintiff for an interim injunction restraining the defendants from selling mortgaged lands. The motion was heard at the London Weekly Court. FALCONBRIDGE, C.J.K.B., in a written judgment, said that, in addition to the usual terms of an injunction order, on the plaintiff undertaking to keep the mill running until the trial of this action, at his own expense, the injunction should be granted until the trial, and leave should be reserved to the defendants to move to dissolve in case of default on the part of the plaintiff. Costs of the motion to be costs in the cause unless the Judge at the trial should otherwise order. P. H. Bartlett, for the plaintiff. J. B. McKillop, for the defendants.

ASH V. ASH—FALCONBRIDGE, C.J.K.B., IN CHAMBERS—APRIL 14.

Parties—Joinder of Parties and Causes of Action—Several Claims—Unity.]—Action by Hester Ash against William R. Ash, William J. Ash, and Samuel J. Ash, to set aside, as fraudulent and void as against the plaintiff, a conveyance of lands made by the defendant William R. Ash to the defendant William J. Ash, and a conveyance of lands made by the defendant William R. Ash to the defendant Samuel J. Ash; for a declaration that the plaintiff was entitled to an inchoate right of dower in the said lands; in the alternative for damages; and also against the defendant William R. Ash for alimony. Upon the application of the defendants William J. Ash and Samuel J. Ash, the Local Judge at Sandwich made an order staying proceedings in the action until the plaintiff should elect which of the causes of action she would proceed with. The plaintiff appealed. The appeal was heard by the learned Chief Justice, who, in a written judgment, said that he thought there was enough unity of action and of parties to justify the maintenance of the action as it was launched. Appeal allowed—costs here and below to the plaintiff in any event. A. C. Heighington, for the plaintiff. A. W. Langmuir, for the defendants.