

interlocutory judgment of the Superior Court, Montreal, Sept. 15, 1891.—C. A. V.

*Duffy & Miller*.—Heard on appeal from judgment of the Superior Court, Montreal, de Lorimier, J., Oct. 16, 1891.—C. A. V.

*Ontario Bank & Riddell*.—Motion for leave to appeal from an interlocutory judgment. C. A. V.

*Parker & Langridge*.—Appeal from judgment of the Superior Court, Montreal, Loranger, J., Oct. 15, 1890.—C. A. V.

Tuesday, Nov. 24.

*Robidoux & Bruce*.—Motion for leave to appeal from an interlocutory judgment.—Rejected without costs.

*Ontario Bank & McCaffrey*.—Motion for leave to appeal from an interlocutory judgment granted.

*Stanton & Canada Atlantic R. Co.*—Motion to take up the *instance* rejected.

*Parker & Langridge*.—Hearing resumed and concluded.

*Lejeunum & Veronneau*.—Heard on appeal from judgment of the Superior Court, Montreal, Mathieu, J., June 27, 1889.—C. A. V.

*Banque Jacques Cartier & Leblanc*.—Part heard on appeal from judgment of the Superior Court, Montreal, de Lorimier, J., March 8, 1890.

Wednesday, Nov. 25.

*Shaw & Norman*.—Motion for leave to appeal from an interlocutory judgment granted.

*Villeneuve & Kent*.—Heard on appeal from judgment of the Superior Court, Montreal, de Lorimier, J., Dec. 30, 1889.—C. A. V.

*Merchants Bank & Cunningham*.—Heard on appeal from judgment of the Superior Court, St. Francis, Brooks, J., Feb. 11, 1890.—C. A. V.

*Cie. de C. F. Atlantique Canadien & Trudeau*.—Appeal from judgment of the Superior Court, Beauharnois, Belanger, J., Jan. 14, 1889.—Part heard.

Thursday, Nov. 26.

*Anglo-Continental Guano Works & Emerald Phosphate Co.*—Reversed.

*Bazinot & Gadoury*.—Confirmed with a modification.

*McNaughton & Exchange National Bank*.—Judgment on opposition confirmed (but for

different reasons), and judgment on collocation reversed.

*Walbank & The Protestant Hospital for the Insane*.—Confirmed.

*Cie. de Chemin de Fer Atlantique Canadien & Trudeau*.—Hearing resumed and concluded.—C. A. V.

*Banque Jacques Cartier & Leblanc*.—Hearing resumed and concluded.—C. A. V.

*Bedard & Cusson*.—Heard on appeal from judgment of the Superior Court, Montreal, Mathieu, J., Feb. 22, 1890.—C. A. V.

*Corporation of Dissident School Trustees, Village Cote St. Paul & Brunet*.—Part heard on appeal from judgment of Superior Court, Montreal, Davidson, J., Dec. 5, 1889.

Friday, Nov. 27.

*The Queen v. Bourdeau*.—Conviction maintained.

*O'Connor & Inglis*.—Reversed.

*McVey & McVey*.—Reversed.

*Bourgeau & Brodeur*.—Confirmed.

*Lavolette & Gilmour*.—Appeal dismissed for default to proceed within the year.

*Corporation Dissident School Trustees, Village Cote St. Paul & Brunet*.—Hearing resumed and concluded. C. A. V.

The Court adjourned to Jan. 15.

#### A TECHNICAL LIBEL.

The case of *Tichborne v. Roberts*, tried some time ago at the Manchester Assizes, is of some interest. The plaintiff, who is notorious as the claimant of the Tichborne Estates, sought to recover damages for libel from the defendants, who are the printers and proprietors of *Illustrated Bits*. The comments in the newspaper to which the plaintiff objected referred to the latter's candidature for Stoke, and this paragraph was headed, 'Impudent pretensions of a humbug,' and he was then described as a 'convicted felon,' 'an ex-denzin of Portland,' and a 'released gaol-bird.' Counsel for the prosecution pointed out that the defendants pleaded that the whole of the facts were true, except so far as they had described the plaintiff as a convicted felon, whereas he was a misdemeanant. The defendants were not justified in calling the plaintiff a lately released gaol-bird, or a gaol-bird at all, a term which was generally