

public, la portée possible et probable de ses engins; s'assurer que la direction de ses engins était régulière et ne pouvait permettre aucun accident. Ce ne peut être que par la faute ou la négligence de Honoré ou de ses agents que la fusée qui a blessé le demandeur a pu venir l'atteindre. Honoré doit donc être responsable des conséquences de cet accident du moment où il n'établit pas que c'est par un cas de force majeure que le fait s'est produit.

Honoré ayant interjeté appel, la Cour a confirmé le jugement du Tribunal.

(*Journal de Paris. Rapport de Maître Albert.*)

INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, April 10.

Judicial Abandonments.

Joseph Cléophas Brault (Brault & Co.), Sherbrooke, April 5.

Sophonie Boulois, *marchande publique*, Chambly Canton, April 2.

Josephine Paquette, *marchande publique* (M. Paquette & Cie.), Pointe Claire, March 23.

Sylvester Dunn, confectioner, St. John's, April 7.

Amable Godin, trader, St. Michel d'Yamaska, Apr. 3.

Lucien Godin, baker, St. Michel d'Yamaska, Apr. 3

Duncan King, innkeeper, Portage du Fort, March 26

Curators appointed.

Re Bruno Brodeur, Richelieu.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, April 7.

Re Desmarais & Frère.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, April 5.

Re Magloire Gascon.—John Ogilvie and W. R. Adams, Montreal, curator, March 24.

Re Phileas Guillet.—J. O' Cain, St. John's, curator, April 7.

Re Joseph E. Labrecque, undertaker, Quebec.—H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator, April 7.

Re Josephine Paquette.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator, April 8.

Re Joseph Pariseau.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, April 6.

Re Benjamin M. Pettes.—John E. Fay, Knowlton, curator, March 26.

Re Alexander Waters. Tp. of Melbourne.—F. J. Penfold, Richmond, curator, April 1.

Dividends.

Re Cléophas Langhan.—At office of C. A. Parent, Quebec, curator, April 5.

Re Savage & Lyman, Montreal.—Final div. at office of J. M. M. Duff, curator, Montreal.

Separation as to Property.

Dame Caroline Trudeau vs. Joseph Dalpé dit Pariseau, trader, Belœil, April 3.

Cadastral Deposited.

St. Louis Ward, Montreal East, plan of sub-division comprising 152-1, 152-2, 152-3, 152 A 1, 152 A 2, 152 A 3 and 152 A 4.

GENERAL NOTES.

PUNISHMENT IN OLDEN TIME.—At the risk of wearying readers with a repetition of what has already been printed in the *Courant*, the following brief record is reprinted from this paper under the date of September 7, 1861: Last week, David Campbell and Alexander Pettigrew, were indicted before the Superior Court, sitting in this town, for breaking open and robbing the house of Mr. Abiel Abbot, of Windsor, of Two Watches, to which indictment they both plead guilty, and were sentenced each of them to receive 15 Stripes, to have their Right Ears cut off, and to be branded with a Capital Letter B on their Foreheads; which punishment was inflicted upon them last Friday. Pettigrew bled so much from the Amputation of his Ear that his Life was in Danger.—*Hartford Courant, March 9.*

A CURIOUS VERDICT.—Probably one of the most curious and remarkable cases on record of a verdict rendered by a jury and sustained by the Court against the evidence produced on the trial has just been disposed of by the Queen's Bench in England. It was a suit against an accident insurance company that refused to pay a policy on the ground that the person insured had killed himself. The latter was a commercial traveller who had met his death while a passenger on a Great Eastern train. Besides himself there were but two persons—a young girl and her brother—in the car in which he was travelling. They testified that between the two named stations he suddenly got up from his seat, arranged his papers, put his head out of the window, looked up and down the road, then opened the door and jumped out. When found he was insensible and soon after died. There was no other direct evidence. The two eyewitnesses who testified as above were not contradicted; they were not impeached. Nevertheless the jury found that the man had not deliberately jumped out of the car, and accordingly rendered a verdict against the company. This verdict might be explained on the theory that corporations are often mulcted by juries without regard to the weight of evidence. But the most curious aspect of the case is the view taken by the appeal judges who sustained the verdict. Justice Stephen believed that "there was a strong antecedent probability that the man would not commit suicide," while Justice Grove thought it "inexplicable that a person should kill himself in the manner and under the circumstances described by the two witnesses." Neither judge questioned the veracity of the witnesses, but both thought that "they must be mistaken in their observation." The theory of the Court was that the man had not jumped out of the car, but had accidentally fallen out, and on this ground the verdict was sustained.—*N. Y. Herald.*