

and costs, the defendant did leave \$5 per week of his salary in the hands of his employers for the purposes of the said declaration, but which sum was never deposited in Court;

“Considering that it appears certain that the plaintiff in that cause did obtain the said several sums of money from defendant’s employers, and that said judgment debt was wholly extinguished;

“Considering that the present plaintiff did under the terms of art. 1147a file his claim upon the said proceedings in said case of *Fontaine v. Fleury*, in 1909;

“Considering that the pretended declaration made in this case on the 20th September, 1912, in the said case of *Fontaine v. Fleury*, was illegal and ineffectual to prevent the plaintiff from issuing the saisie-arrêt in this case;

“Considering, however, that it had been proved that plaintiff has received from defendant various sums of money which he should have credited to defendant upon seizure issued in this case, and has not done so, and which reduced the amount due to plaintiff to the sum of \$704.06, with interest thereon from the 11th November, 1911;

“Considering that, although the present proceedings concern the interest of the plaintiff’s attorneys, yet they have a right to conduct these proceedings in the name of the plaintiff himself;

“Considering that the fact that the writ of saisie-arrêt was issued for a greater sum than was due to the plaintiff by the defendant, does not nullify the writ altogether, but only authorizes the defendant to contest the same and have it reduced to the proper amount;

“Considering, therefore, that the writ of saisie-arrêt in this case issued was not illegally issued;