

by others shall not be given to the public under that name. It is just that it should be so, for the benefit derived from such name can only be obtained by faithful service in furnishing articles of recognized value. Moreover, if the trade-mark name might be adopted by others, inferior articles might then be produced and sold under it; and thereby the value to manufacturers of the reputation of the name used by them as a trade-mark would be destroyed.

There will be the usual decree for an injunction and an accounting.

---

#### RECENT U. S. DECISIONS.

*Partnership.*—The question whether land standing in the individual name of one member of a partnership concern belongs to him or to the firm is to be governed by the intention of the partners, in respect to which parol evidence is competent in the absence of written evidence.—*Goldthwaite v. Janney*, (Ala.) 28 L. R. A. 161.

*Carrier.*—A constructive, if not an actual, fraud to obtain cheap rates of freight, which relieves the carrier from liability for loss of the goods, is shown where an intelligent man ships in a basket with a rope around it valuable goods, such as silks, satins, laces, curtains, and other things, most of which are kept for sale by his wife, and remains silent when he hears them designated as "household goods," on which the rate is much less than on merchandise.—*Shackt v. Illinois Cent. R. Co.*, 94 Tenn. 658.

*Trespass.*—A person who had entered a railroad yard in violation of rules, was ordered off by a different route from that by which he entered. It was held that a person may be a trespasser when passing over private grounds by a dangerous route which the owner directs him to take in leaving the premises.—*Kansas City, Ft. S. & M. R. Co. v. Cook* (Mo.) 28 L. R. A. 181.

*Criminal law—Evidence.*—The fact that a grand juror gives testimony in favor of the indictment does not render the indictment void. *Commonwealth v. Hayden* (Mass.) 28 L. R. A. 318. With this case is found an extensive note on the competency of evidence before a grand jury.

*Jurisdiction.*—The remission of a portion of a debt by voluntary credits, in order to bring a claim within the jurisdiction of an inferior court, is valid.—*Hunton v. Luce* (Ark.) 28 L. R. A. 221.