IN *Mitchell* v. *Commonwealth*, Kentucky Court of Appeals, March 12, 1889, it was held that a cellar under a dwelling-house, though entered only from the outside, is within the statute of burglary. The Court said: "The evidence shows that the property was taken out of a cellar under the dwelling-house, there being no internal communication between them. It was necessary to go out of the house into the yard to enter the cellar. The door to it opens out into the open air. It had no fastenings, but could not be opened without the use of force. It is therefore now urged that the cellar was no part of the dwelling-house, and that the accused, if guilty, is only so of a trespass and petit larceny. There is a diversity of decision as to what does and what does not in law constitute a part of a dwelling-house. Some cases include all within the curtailage, and this, according to Blackstone, appears to have been the common-law rule; while others are made to turn upon the use. It has been said that burglary may be committed by breaking into a dairy or laundry standing near enough to the dwelling-house to be used as appurtenant to it, or into such outbuildings as are necessary to it as a dwelling. *State* v. *Langford*, 1 Dev. 253. Also by breaking into a smoke-house opening into the yard of a dwelling-house and used for its ordinary purposes. And cases are to be found holding that if an outhouse be so near the dwelling proper that it is used with it as appurtenant to it, although not within the same inclosure even, yet burglary may be committed in it. *State* v. *Twitty*, 1 Hayw. (N.C.) 102. It need have no internal communication with the dwelling proper to give it this character. In *Rex* v. *Lithgo*, Russ. & R. 357, the breaking was into a warehouse. There was no internal communication between it and the dwelling of the owner, but they were contiguous, inclosed in the same yard and under the same roof, and it was held to be burglary. Mr. East says: "It is clear that any outhouse within the curtilage or same common fence as the mansion itself must be considered as parcel of the mansion. * * * If the outhouses be adjoining to the dwelling-house and occupied as parcel thereof, though there be no common inclosure or curtilage, they may still be considered as parts of the mansion." 2 East P. C. 493. It is difficult to lay down any general rule upon the subject, owing to the nice distinctions to be found in some of the cases. It seems to us, however, that both the use and the situation should be considered. Can the place which has been entered, considering both its situation and use, be fairly considered as appurtenant to and parcel of the dwelling-house, or as the older writers say "a parcel of the messuage"? If so, then burglary may be committed by breaking into it. The dwelling-house of a man has peculiar sanctity at common law. It is his castle. The law intends its protection, because it is the family abode. The object is to secure its peace and quiet, and therefore the burglar has always been liable to severe punishment. The law throws around it its protecting mantle, because it is the place of family repose. It is therefore proper, not only to secure the quiet and peace of the house in which they sleep, but also any and all outbuildings which are properly appurtenant thereto, and which, as one whole, contribute directly to the comfort and convenience of the place as a habitation.