

coat where he had hung it, relying on the defendant guarding it safely during his temporary absence.

On the evidence submitted in this action I find that defendant was on 2nd October, 1906, the keeper of a common inn, known as the Clark House, in the village of Georgetown; that plaintiff on that day was a traveller and became a guest at the said inn, and that the relation of landlord and guest was established between them; that plaintiff, by hanging up his coat where he did, placed it *infra hospitium*, that is, in the custody of defendant as innkeeper; that plaintiff's coat was in defendant's charge and under the protection of defendant's inn at the time of its loss; that plaintiff had no notice of any intention or desire on the part of defendant to limit his common law liability; that the plaintiff was not guilty of negligence in hanging up his coat and leaving it where he did.

The amount sought to be recovered as damages for the loss of the overcoat, gloves, and handkerchief is \$20. There was no evidence on the value of the articles except plaintiff's. Judgment will be entered for plaintiff against the defendant for \$20 damages and costs.

Lest it may be thought I have overlooked the Liquor License Act and the Innkeepers' Act, I may say they do not bear upon the question in this action.
