following, in the main, the lines of the Master of the Rolls' judgment in *Burr* v. *Theatre Royal, Drury Lane* (96 L.T. Rep. 447; (1907) 1 K.B. 544). The judge there said that the basis underlying the doctrine appeared to be that under the circumstances the injured person must be taken to have accepted the risks involved by putting himself in juxtaposition with other persons employed by the same employer whose presence is incidental to the occupation in which he is engaged, and cannot complain of that which is a necessary or reasonable incident of the situation in which he has voluntarily placed himself. The rule so laid down appears to meet the difficulty with which Mr. Justice Bray was much pressed in *Coldrick's Case*, viz., that the injured workman was not in the same grade of employment as the person by whose negligence the injury was caused, though they were both employed by the same employer. But His Lordship thought that, by looking at the ultimate object of the employment, both persons might be regarded as fellow-workmen, though not engaged in the same class of work. As Chief Baron Pollock said in *Morgan* v. *Vale of Neath Railway Company* (13 L.T. Rep. 564; L. Rep. 1 Q.B. 149), the common object of the employment of different classes of employees is but the furtherance of the business of the master. Yet it might be said with truth that no two had a common immediate object. This shews that we must not over-refine but look at the common object, and not at the common immediate object.—*Law Times*.

An interesting case recently came before the Maryland (U.S.) Court of Appeal justifying persons, under certain circumstances, in taking the law into their own hands. In the case in question as noted in the *American Law Review*, the right of a landlord to cut down a telephone pole erected on his premises without authority was sustained. The pole in question was erected on an alley adjoining defendant's lot after the company had asked permission of the defendant and the latter had refused to grant it. The landowner at first brought a bill in equity to require the company to remove the pole, but before the trial,