

which the defendants had procured to be transferred to them in the register, on the representation that they were transferees thereof by virtue of a judgment of a French court. The plaintiffs claimed that this transfer was improper, on the ground that the French court had no jurisdiction to deal with an English trade mark and the plaintiff claimed a rectification of the register. The Court of Appeal so held, and gave judgment for the plaintiffs, and rightly as the House of Lords held. It may be remarked that a French court had in another action held that the monks who had gone to Spain where they continued to manufacture liqueur by their secret process were entitled to use in connection therewith the name "Chartreuse." So that the present case does not in any way conflict with the judgment of the French courts.

HYPOTHETICAL CASE—COURT DECLINING JURISDICTION.

*Glasgow Navigation Company v. Iron Ore Company* (1910) A.C. 293. After the argument of an appeal in this case before the House of Lords (Lord Loreburn, L.C., and Lords Atkinson, and Shaw), it transpired that the argument had been based on an hypothetical and not an actual state of facts, the House declined jurisdiction, and refused to make any order.

FALSE IMPRISONMENT—ENTRY ON WHARF—REFUSAL TO PERMIT PLAINTIFF TO LEAVE WHARF WITHOUT PAYMENT OF TOLL—UNREASONABLE CONDUCT OF PLAINTIFF.

*Robinson v. Balmain New Ferry Co.* (1910) A.C. 295. This was an appeal from the High Court of Australia. The action was for false imprisonment; the facts being, that the defendants carried on a ferry business, and the plaintiff had contracted with the defendants to enter their wharf and stay there until the ferry should start and then be taken thereby to the opposite shore. No breach of the defendants' contract was alleged, but after the plaintiff entered the wharf he changed his mind, and wanted to leave without paying the prescribed toll for exit, and was for a time forcibly prevented. At the trial the plaintiff obtained a verdict for £100, but the High Court had set aside the verdict and nonsuited the plaintiff, on the ground that the defendants were justified in refusing to allow the plaintiff to leave the wharf without paying the toll which was reasonable and proper. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (Lord Loreburn, L.C., and Lords Macnaghten, and Collins, and Sir A. Wilson) being