

## The Legal News.

VOL. X. FEBRUARY 12, 1887. No. 7.

To represent a person as more youthful than he really is, would not generally be considered a very grave offence, and still less if the person be of the fair sex. However, in England, an action has arisen from an inaccuracy of this nature, the facts of which are given by the *Law Journal*, as follows:—“The action brought against Messrs. Stevens, the publishers of the ‘Law List,’ by a solicitor, the date of whose admission had been post-dated ten years, is of much interest. The plaintiff had been described in two issues of the ‘Law List’ as admitted in 1879 instead of 1869, although between the two publications he had drawn the attention of the publishers to the error. He complains that his apparent youthfulness has deprived him of the profits of two Chancery actions, and much sympathy will be felt for him. Messrs. Stevens, of course, had not acted maliciously, and even if they had, it was held in *Miller v. David*, 43 Law J. Rep. C. P. 85, that an injurious statement, although combined with falsity and malice, will not make a libel, unless the words are defamatory. The words, no doubt, were not in accordance with the fact, but it does not hold a man up to ridicule and contempt to say that he was admitted a solicitor ten years after the real date. Reliance was placed on the case of *Archbold v. Sweet*, 5 C. & P. 219. Mr. Archbold had sold his copyright in his “Criminal Pleading” to Mr. Sweet, but Mr. Sweet had published a third edition under the title “Criminal Pleading by Archbold, third edition.” Mr. Archbold complained that blunders had been made in editing this edition, and contended that as the name of no new editor was affixed to it, there was a representation that the edition was by him. The jury gave Mr. Archbold 5l. damages, Lord Tenterden reserving to the defendant leave to move to enter a nonsuit. No advantage was taken of this permission, but the case is distinguishable from the

present, on the ground that the blunders in criminal law made in the book were of a kind likely to bring Mr. Archbold into contempt with reviewers and others.”

Superior to the power of steam, more potent than electricity, more marvellous than mind-reading, are the achievements of the collecting association and the law directory people. One of the latest circulars that has come to hand, undertakes to give the “legal ability,” the “reliability,” the “financial worth,” &c., &c., of the sixty thousand lawyers in the United States and Canada!

A curiosity in the way of “corrections” appears in the *Quebec Official Gazette* of Feb. 5, in which it is stated that “the proclamation dated the 27th January 1887, inserted in an extra of the *Official Gazette* of the 29th January, 1887, respecting the putting into force of the Act 49-50 Victoria, chapter VII, intituled: ‘An act to further amend the law respecting the constitution of the Superior Court,’ was published in error.”

The Tribunal Civil de la Seine, in *Loisellier v. Rouet*, 29 December 1886, has given a decision with reference to the marriage of priests, opposed to that of the Amiens Court noticed in 9 L. N. 80. The Court declares such marriage to be a nullity, the reason given being,

“Attendu qu’il résulte des art. 6 et 26 de la loi organique du Concordat du 18 germinal an X, que les prêtres catholiques sont soumis aux canons qui étaient alors reçus en France et par conséquent à ceux qui prohibaient le mariage aux ecclésiastiques engagés dans les ordres sacrés, et prononçaient la nullité du mariage contracté au mépris de cette prohibition;

“Attendu que la loi organique du Concordat de germinal an X n’a jamais cessé d’être considérée comme loi de l’Etat et que le Code civil ne renferme aucune dérogation à cette législation spéciale;

“Déclare nul et de non effet le mariage célébré à Londres, etc.”