INDEX TO CASES DECIDED IN LOWER CANADA, REPORTED IN THIS VOLUME.

ACTION, institution of, within C.S.C. cap.	APPEAL 7.—See MUNICIPAL ACT.
23. Ennis and Grand Trunk Rail-	APPEARANCE.—It is not necessary for the
way113	defendant to give notice of his ap-
ACTION, right of, in district where per-	pearance to the opposite party, in
sonal service is made. See SEPA-	an appealable Circuit Court cause.
ration de Biens.	Duvernay v. Corporation of St.
ADVOCATE.—An advocate of Lower Ca-	Barthelemy
nada, acting as attorney of record	Appearance.—When an appearance is
for himself in a suit to which he	once filed, it can only be rejected
is a party, is entitled to the "at-	from the record on motion by the
torney's fees," as fixed by the	plaintiff in Court. Duvernay v.
tariff. Gugy v. Brown 222	Corporation of St. Barthelemy 36
AGENT.—See OPPOSITION.	ARCHITECT.—An architect who has agreed
APPEAL IN FORMA PAUPERIS.—Held, that	to superintend the erection of a
an appeal in forma pauperis will	house for the proprietor, violates
not be allowed to the Court of	such agreement and renders it null
Queen's Bench sitting on the Ap-	and void by subsequently under-
peal Side. Legault and Legault. 10	taking to watch over the con-
APPEAL 2.—Held, that there is no appeal	tractor's interests for a pecuniary
from a judgment rendered under	consideration. Fahrland and Ro-
the Municipal Act of 1860. Grouls	
and The Corporation of St. Lau-	Assignee.—Action brought by assignee
APPEAL TO PRIVY COUNCIL 3.—The delay	to recover back usurious interest
	paid by assignors. Dorion and Kierzkowski
of six months fixed by C. S. L. C.	Kierzkowski
c. 77, s. 53, during which execution on the judgment is suspended,	tour and Gauthier
is not absolute, but directory only,	BORNAGE, ACTION EN. O'Heir and Le-
and the Court of Appeal may re-	moine
fuse to order the record to be re-	BY-LAW OF MUNICIPAL COUNCIL, held to
mitted to the Court below to the	be null. St. Barthelemy and De-
intent that execution may be sued	. 10
out, where the appellant has	CAPIAS AD RESPONDENDUM.—An Affida-
lodged his appeal before the Privy	vit for Capias ad Respondendum,
Council soon after the expiration	alleging that the Defendants ille-
of the six months. Jones and Le-	gally hold in Lower Canada pro-
moine	perty of the Plaintiffs illegally ob-
APPEAL 4.—A judgment dismissing an in-	tained, and that they are secreting
scription en faux on a défense en	the same, is sufficient. Royal In-
droit, is an interlocutory judgment	surance Company v. Knapp 189
in the cause, and the appeal there-	CAPIAS.—A person who brings stolen pro-
from must be prosecuted as from	perty into Lower Canada and there
an interlocutory judgment. Beau-	illegally withholds it from the
dry v. Corporation of Montreal . 231	owner, is not liable to be impri-
APPEAL 5.—No appeal lies to the Privy	soned under a capias, because the
Council from a judgment imposing	cause of action arose out of Lower
a fine of £10 for contempt of Court.	Canada. Royal Insurance Com-
Ramsay v. Regina 231	pany v. Knapp 201
APPEAL 6.—A judgment of the Court of	CARRIER.—Right to store, if consignee be
Review rejecting the inscription of	not ready to receive cargo. Watt
a cause for hearing in review, is	and Gould
final, and can only be appealed	CARRIER.—The liability of a Steamboat
from as a final judgment. Taylor	Company as common carriers does
v. Mullin	not extend to articles of wearing