

driving of a motor car": *White v. Jackson*, 84 L.J.K.B. 1900, following *Ex p. Symes*, 103 L.T. 428, and *Brown v. Crossley*, [1911] 1 K.B. 603.

Allowing a motor car to stand on a highway so as to cause an unnecessary obstruction thereof does not constitute an offence "in connection with the driving of a motor car": *Rex v. Yorkshire, Ex. p. Shackleton*, [1910] 1 K.B. 439.

Failing to have the back plate of a motor car illuminated during the period prescribed by statute is an offence indorsable on the license: *Brown v. Crossley*, [1911] 1 K.B. 603.

Driving a motor car in a public park at a speed exceeding the limit fixed by a park regulation is such an offence: *Rex v. Plowden, Ex. p. Braithwaite*, [1909] 2 K.B. 269.

Unlawfully using a motor car on a public highway, on which the identification mark was not in conformity with the regulations, the letters and figures of the identification not being of the size prescribed, is an indorsable offence: *Rex v. Gill, Ex. p. McKin*, 100 L.T. 853 22 Cox C.C. 118.

Driving recklessly, driving at a speed dangerous to the public, and driving in a manner dangerous to the public, are separate offences: *Rex v. Cavan Justices* (1914), 2 Ir. R. 150, following *R. v. Wells*, 66 J.P. 392.

The period of suspension of a license for a violation of the Motor Car Act dates from the time of conviction, and the giving of notice of appeal does not have the effect of deferring the operation of the order of suspension: *Kidner v. Daniels*, 102 L.T. 132, 22 Cox C.C. 276.

In a prosecution for a violation of the Act the prosecution must prove that the warning or notice of the intended prosecution required by the statute was given to the accused; a conviction without such proof is bad: *Dickson v. Stevenson* (1912), 8 C. (J.) 1.

Where a defendant, knowing that his identity was to be the subject-matter of an inquiry, intentionally absented himself therefrom, the identity of his name and address and the number and place of issue of his license, and those of a person previously convicted, is evidence upon which the identity of the defendant with such person may be held to be established. The words "proof of the identity" do not mean conclusive proof, but evidence upon which a tribunal may find that the identity has been proved: *Martin v. White*, [1910] 1 K.B. 665.

The driver of a motor car was convicted of driving his car over a measured distance at a speed exceeding the speed limit, the only evidence being that of two constables who had been stationed at either end of the measured distance, and who deposed, the one to the time at which the car entered, the other to the time of which it passed out of the measured distance. An objection to the sufficiency of the evidence, on the ground that as each of these times was a fundamental fact in the charge it could not be established by the uncorroborated testimony of a single witness, was repelled and the conviction sustained: *Scott v. Jamson*, [1914] S.C. (J.) 187.

On a charge against the owner of a motor car, it is unnecessary to do more than allege generally than the driver has committed an offence under the statute. The conviction is good although it does not particularize which of the offences enumerated in the statute the driver had committed: *Ex parte Beecham* [1913] 3 K.B. 45.