RECENT DECISIONS.

the conditions of sale of the conveyance under which the vendor held,-viz. a void conveyance from a railway company,- the purchaser forfeited his deposit on refusing to complete, notwithstanding that the vendor had only a bare possession, and was assuming to sell by a right similar to that of a disseisor Jessel, M. R. says,--"The or trespasser. title of a disseisor is in this country a freehold be true, would reasonably lead any ordinarily title, and therefore, although the vendor had a very bad title, and a title liable to be defeated, he had still a title good against all the world, except against those who might be crime imputed." The question of reasonable proved to have a better one. simple fact is that the vendor had a possession upon the actual existence, but upon the reain this case, so that a fair sale of that possess-sonable bona fide belief in the existence of ion is perfectly good." adds,--"If the defendant had had nothing, justification of the course pursued in making or if he had had only a revocable license or the accusation complained of - no matter easement, then, as he professed to sell free- whether this belief arises out of the recollechold land, what he professed to sell would tion and memory of the accuser, or out of not correspond with that which the plaintiff information furnished to him by the accused Two of the judges also observed that it was not necessary to decide whether or not the vendor had sufficient possession to ripen into a title under the statute of limitations, though they were of opinion that he had.

The March numbers of the Law Reports are now reached, comprising 8 Q. B. D. p. 165-318; and 19 Ch. D. p. 207-310, the former of which we propose to review in part in our present issue.

ACTION FOR MALICIOUS PROSECUTION.

Hicks v. Faulkner, p. 167, being the argument of a rule for a new trial, on the ground of misdirection in an action of malicious prosecution, contains a long and instructive judgment of Hawkins, J., upon the nature of such an action, of which the following summary, framed for the most part in the actual words of the learned Judge, appears to give the drift: -To succeed in an action for malicious prosecution, the plaintiff must allege and establish two things: (i.) absence of reasonable and probable cause, and (ii.) malice.

affirmative of these allegations is upon him-Failing to establish both of them, he fails (i.) Reasonable and probable altogether. cause may be defined to be-"(a) An honest belief in the guilt of the accused. (b) based upon a full conviction, (c) founded upon reasonable grounds, of the existence of a state of circumstances, (d) which, assuming them to prudent and cautious man, placed in the position of the accuser, to the conclusion that the person charged was probably guilty of the The and probable cause depends in all cases, not And Brett, L. J. such a state of things as would amount to 8 And the distinction between facts proper and fit and admissible as evidence to establish actual guilt, and those required to establish & bona fide belief in guilt, should never be lost sight of in considering cases of alleged malic-Many facts admissible to ious prosecution. prove the latter would be wholly inadmissible to prove the former; (ii.) as to malice, though it is true as a general proposition, that want of probable cause is evidence of malice, this general proposition is apt to be misunderstood In an action for malicious prosecution the question of malice is an independent one of fact purely -- and altogether for the considers tion of the jury, and not at all for the judge The malice necessary to be established is not even malice in law such as may be assumed from the intentional doing of a wrongful act (see Bromage v. Prosser, 4 B. & C. 255, per Bayley, J.); but malice in fact—malus animus indicating that the party was actuated either by spite or ill-will towards an individual, or by indirect or improper motives, though these may be wholly unconnected with any uncharit-Want of res The lable feeling towards anybody.