

if a judge so orders, but this order will not be made except upon good cause shewn by the party attacking the notice, as, for instance, that only questions of law are involved.

Where issues of fact are raised upon the pleadings which must be settled before the question of liability or non-liability can be ascertained it is a wrong exercise of his discretion on the part of the Chambers judge to strike out the jury notice and such exercise of discretion is a proper subject for review. *Hunt v. Chambers*, 20 Ch.D. 365.

Where it appears from the affidavits read that a strong feeling exists in the county in which the venue is laid which will make it difficult to obtain a jury with no interest in the matters involved, the court will order the venue to be changed to a county in respect to which no such difficulty exists.

Where the defendant seeking a change of venue was a railway company the order granting the change was made conditional upon the defendant affording free transport for the plaintiff and his witnesses to and from the place to which the venue was changed.

J. L. Ralston, for plaintiff. *Henry*, K.C., for defendant.

Book Reviews.

Current English decisions appertaining to Indian law. Edited by S. SRINIVASA AIYAR, B.A., B.L.

This is a new venture from Madras, intended to supply a desideratum to Indian lawyers, giving them current English decisions of questions analogous to those arising for decision in India. It saves the time of ordinary practitioners in India, and obviates the necessity for the complete reports of English cases, most of which would be of no value to such practitioners. The journal published in connection with this series contains interesting extracts, notes and reviews about the law and the profession, and has other interesting and useful information.