

The Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXV.

APRIL 16, 1889.

No. 7.

A SPECIAL sitting of the Divisional Court of the Chancery Division has been appointed to be held in the month of June, commencing on the 10th of that month.

HEREAFTER, in the Chancery Division, all appeals from Reports may be set down for hearing in Court on Thursdays, and appeals from Orders will continue to be set down for hearing on Monday in Chambers.

IN *Fox v. The Hamilton Provident and Land Society and Seabra Beaman*, it appeared that the defendant Society had obtained a judgment and execution against the present plaintiff Fox, and the defendant Beaman, for a debt which was owing by the plaintiff Fox to the Society, and for which the defendant Beaman was surety. The defendant Beaman, on judgment and execution being obtained against him and the plaintiff Fox, paid the amount of the claim to the Society and took an assignment, and then proceeded to enforce the execution against the defendant Fox. This action was brought by the plaintiff Fox, who alleged that before the assignment to the defendant Beaman, he had made an arrangement with the Society whereby the Society agreed to extend the time for payment, and he claimed damages and an injunction against the defendants for proceeding under execution. Statement of claim was delivered to the two defendants. The defendant Beaman put in his defence in the ordinary course, but no defence was ever filed by the Society. The plaintiff discontinued wholly against the Society whereupon the defendant Beaman moved to set aside the discontinuance. In support of the motion, it was contended that under Consolidated Rule 641, the plaintiff could not discontinue against one defendant without the leave of a Court or a Judge: *Carlisle v. Belfast*, 10 L.R. 36 (Ireland C.L.S.). The Master in Chambers set aside the notice of discontinuance upon the ground that the plaintiff was not entitled under the practice to discontinue against one defendant without leave, and ordered the plaintiff to pay the cost of the application in any event.

IN *Reg. ex rel Stonhouse v. Hill*, an appeal was made to the Master in Chambers by the relator under Con. Rule 854, pending the taxation of costs by