The Legal News.

Vol. III. AUGUST 21, 1880. No. 34.

INJUNCTION BY TELEGRAPH.

An interesting case, illustrating the authority accorded to telegrams, came before the Master of the Rolls on the 16th July. In *Tonkinson* v. *Cartledge*, a motion was made to commit for contempt the defendant as well as her solicitor and an auctioneer for disregarding an injunction. Certain effects which had been seized under a distress for rent were about to be sold at 2 p.m. on the 2nd July, at Newcastle-under-Lyme. An *ex parte* order of injunction was obtained that day in London, and between eleven and twelve o'clock notice of the injunction was telegraphed to the auctioneer and the defendant's solicitor. The auctioneer, after consulting with the defendant and the solicitor, continued the sale, and the motion was based on this contempt. The auctioneer made an affidavit that he believed the telegram to be a forgery. This, on the authority of *Ex parte Langley*, L. R., 13 Ch. D. 110, was held just sufficient to absolve him from costs (the motion was not pressed except as to costs). But as to the solicitor, the Master of the Rolls certainly thought that he had acted with imprudence. It was his plain duty, if he had any doubt as to the authenticity of the telegram, to have telegraphed to the plaintiff's solicitors, and to have asked them whether it was genuine or not. There was ample time before the sale to have done this, but he did nothing until next day, when the sale was over. The next day he did write to the plaintiff's solicitors, with whom he evidently was acquainted, and asked them whether the telegram was genuine or not, and at once received the answer that it was. He was, therefore, condemned in costs, as well as his client who took the risk of allowing the sale to go on, though she did not even swear in her affidavit that she believed the telegram to be a forgery.

TITLES.

The *Albany Law Journal*, referring to the case of *Bradley* v. *Logan* (p. 200 of this volume), in which the title of "Esquire" was considered, cites Abbott's Law Dictionary: "It is familiarly employed in the United States, but is a title of courtesy merely"; and Webster to the effect that it is "a general title of respect in addressing letters." Our contemporary appends an extract from a recent issue of the *Solicitors' Journal* (London), showing that the English judges are not quite in harmony about their titles. "A few days ago a Queen's counsel, while moving in a case in the Exchequer Division, addressed one of the learned judges as 'Sir Fitzjames Stephen,' whereupon his lordship corrected the title to Mr. Justice Stephen. Counsel, in apologizing for the error, mentioned that he had been led into it by the fact that another learned judge wished to be styled Sir Henry Hawkins; and he might have added that yet another learned judge appears to desire to drop the 'Mr.,' and to share with a once eminent financier and many foreign potentates the title of 'Baron.' To any other learned judge who may be in search of some designation distinguishing him from his brethren we would respectfully commend the title by which the court is frequently addressed in petitions drafted by native pleaders in India—'The Presence.'"

While upon this subject, we should like to hear some authority for the title which is constantly given to our Quebec judges on the records of the Superior Court and of the Court of Queen's Bench, namely: "The Honorable Mr. Justice." Several of the learned judges have in time past held office as Ministers of the Crown, and thereby became entitled to the designation of Honorable; but the title is now commonly given to all judges without distinction.

RIGHTS OF MORTGAGEE.

The U. S. contemporary quoted above refers also to the Montreal case of *Black & The National Insurance Co.* (3 Legal News, p. 29; 24 L. C J. 65), in which the question was whether the rights of a mortgagee, to whom a policy of insurance had been made payable, could be defeated by the subsequent acts of the mortgagor, and the majority of the Court of Appeal held that they could not be so defeated. Our contemporary says of this decision that it "seems opposed to the present doctrine in our State