

HON. MR. JUSTICE LENNOX:—The motion will be dismissed with costs. It would perhaps prejudice the trial of the interpleader issue were I to go minutely into my reasons for thinking that the learned Master-in-Chambers was not wrong in making Mrs. Brent plaintiff in the proceedings. The way in which the property was acquired, was dealt with, and was found, to say nothing of the circumstances of a lady in Mrs. Brent's position investing in two automobiles, I think quite justifies the order made.

---

HON. MR. JUSTICE LEITCH.

SEPTEMBER 5TH, 1913.

RE BARTHELMES AND CHERRY.

5 O. W. N. 27.

*Vendor and Purchaser—Satisfaction of Objection to Title—Right of Way—Conveyance—Costs.*

Motion for an order declaring that the objection to title of vendor to land in question has not been satisfactorily answered by vendor and that same constitutes a valid objection to the title.

A. Singer, for the purchaser.

G. Ritchie, for the vendor.

HON. MR. JUSTICE LEITCH:—The only difficulty now outstanding seems to be the right of way. I think this is cured by the conveyance from Cranfield to Barthelmes.

No costs.

---

HON. MR. JUSTICE KELLY.

SEPTEMBER 18TH, 1913.

LECKIE v. MARSHALL.

5 O. W. N. 29.

*Master—Sale by Court—Default in Completion—Re-Sale—Reserve Bid—Action for Deficiency—Costs.*

KELLY, J., held, that where a mining property had been sold at a Court sale and the purchaser had defaulted in completing the purchase, the same should be again offered for sale, subject again to a reserve bid to be fixed by the Master.

Motion by plaintiffs for order directing sale of mining properties in question, giving directions for conduct thereof, etc., excepting direction to sell property subject to reserve bid.