

possible delay, and not having done so, were liable for the demurrage claimed.

DEFAMATION — LIBEL — PUBLICATION — LETTER ADDRESSED
TO ONE PERSON; OPENED BY ANOTHER.

Powell v. Gelston (1916) 2 K.B. 615. This was an action for libel, and the sole question involved was whether or not there had been a publication of the libel. The plaintiff advertised his house for sale and the advertisement was answered by H. W. Pollard who contemplated purchasing the house, and who requested his son to write to the defendant to make certain inquiries about the plaintiff. The son F. W. Pollard accordingly wrote to the defendant asking for the information, and promising not to let the plaintiff know that the defendant had written. The defendant sent a reply containing the alleged libel addressed to F. W. Pollard at his own residence, but the father H. W. Pollard who happened to be staying with his son received the letter in his son's absence and opened and read the contents, and it was not seen or read by F. W. Pollard. Bray, J., who tried the action, held that the unauthorized opening of the letter by the father did not amount to a publication for which the defendant was liable.

PRIZE COURT—SEIZURE OF CARGO—RELEASE OF PROCEEDS—
CLAIM FOR FREIGHT—JURISDICTION.

The Corsican Prince (1916) P. 195. In this case the Corsican Prince was a British ship with a cargo of barley consigned to Hamburg from Odessa. On its arrival at Falmouth the cargo was seized and sold by order of the Prize Court and the proceeds paid into Court. On an application for condemnation an order was made for payment out of the proceeds to a Russian Bank and others of the net proceeds of their portions of the cargo, subject to the payment of the charges of the shipowners for freight. An application was then made to transfer the proceedings to the Commercial Court to adjust the right of the cargo owners and shipowners in respect of the balance of the proceeds. Evans, P.P.D., however held that the Prize Court having once acquired jurisdiction was competent, and had exclusive jurisdiction to deal with incidental questions affecting the subject matter of the seizure, notwithstanding there may have been a voluntary release before the incidental question arose.