& N.W.R., 10 M.R. 143, 12 M.R. 57, 9 M.R. 388, 10 M.R. 106. Charlebois v. Great N.W. Ry., 11 M.R. 135.

The Receiver of a railway company must make production in an action, Maxwell v. Manitoba and N.W. Ry., 11 M.R. 149. As to status of a Receiver, see Simpson v. Ottawa, 1 Chy.

Ch. R. 99, Grant v. Willoughby, 17 Gr. 627.

Generally see Lloyd v. Medway (1905), 2 K.B. 359, McLean v. Allen, 14 P.R. 84,

As to necessity for fi. fa. being returned, see Stewart v. Grobb, 15 A.R. 299; Thompson v. Cushing, 30 O.R. 123, 388.

The possession of the Receiver is the possession of the Court, so that damages for the detainer of goods by a Receiver cannot be recovered, Peruvian v. Dreyfus (1892), A.C. 166.

The appointment of a Receiver does not disturb the paramount title of the party in possession; if there is no paramount title the Receiver takes possession, Wallace v. Wallace, 11 P.R. 508. His possession is the possession of all parties to the suit according to their titles. If the holder of the title paramount is not in possession, that of the Receiver cannot be interfered with. Coleman v. Blandell, 18 Gr. 44.

Penalty for Contempt. Fox v. Nipissing, 29 Gr. 11. See Gardener v. Burgess, 13 P.R. 250.

The right of a Receiver to production and inspection of documents under his order does not extend to his solicitor, Desaulniers v. Johnston, 15 W.L.R. 205.

SECTION 26 (p).—Damages in Lieu of Injunction.

Damages. Where a plaintiff can be compensated in damages it does not always follow that (at least) an interim injunction will be refused. Thompson v. Baldry, 19 W.L.R. 773, and in Winnipeg Saturday Post v. Couzens, 21 M.R. 562, 19 W.L.R. 25, an injunction was granted and the plaintiff not left to his remedy in damages, sed yide Cass v. Couture, 14 M.R. 458.

Refused where plaintiff's tenants from month to month seek to prevent the carrying on of a nuisance on other parts of the premises, McKenzie v. Kayler, 15 M.R. 660.

SECTION 26 (r).—Effect of Giving Time to a Principal Debtor.

Watson Mfg. Co. v. Bowser, 16 W.L.R. 505, Blackwood v. Percival, 14 M.R. 217.