

and May v. Werden, 17 P.R. 530. Motion dismissed, with costs to the plaintiff in the cause, without prejudice to any application to the Court as in McCabe v. Bank of Ireland, 14 App. Cas. 415. C. F. Ritchie, for the applicant. J. P. MacGregor, for the plaintiff.

---

PHILLIPS v. LAWSON—MASTER IN CHAMBERS—JAN. 23.

*Discovery—Production of Documents—Impeaching Affidavit of Documents—Examination for Discovery—Relevancy of Documents—Further and Better Affidavit.*.]—Motion by the plaintiff for an order requiring one or more of the defendants to make further and better affidavits on production of documents. Two of the defendants were further examined for discovery after the decision of the Master, ante 390; and the present action was based on the examination of the defendant Lawson, which had not been completed, but had been adjourned sine die. The Master said that the only grounds on which an affidavit on production of documents was required, was that the defendant R.W. Co., ante 420. Counsel for the plaintiff contended that Lawson's examination entitled the plaintiff to the production of various documents relevant to the case; and the Master considered that the only point for present consideration was, whether these documents or some of them should appear in Lawson's affidavit. The Master set out the facts at some length; he referred to Blake v. Albion Life Assurance Co., 4 C.P.D. 941; Bray's Digest of the Law of Discovery, ed. of 1904, sec. 6, p. 2, and ed. of 1885, p. 18; and said that, without passing on the other affidavits at present, he thought that the defendant Lawson should make a further affidavit. Order accordingly. Costs of the motion to the plaintiff in any event. J. P. MacGregor, for the plaintiff. C. A. Moss, for the defendants.

---

WILSON v. SUBURBAN ESTATE CO.—MASTER IN CHAMBERS—  
JAN. 23.

*Discovery—Examination of Plaintiff—General Questions—Relevancy.*.]—Motion by the defendants for an order requiring the plaintiff Wilson to attend for further examination for discovery and answer questions which he had declined to answer upon his original examination. The action was for damages