be disassociated to some extent has a common law right to profrom plaintiffs' goods, and hence tection against a competitor usnot calculated to create the im- ing the same or some similar pression in the mind of the pub- name, only upon making proof lie that the defendants' fly poi- either of fraud or deception as son was the same as that of the regards such use, and of prejuplaintiffs.

Held, that the word "pads" had become in such a measure ment has extended over a numpublici juris that the defendants ber of years, the fact that there were entitled to call their poison is no proof of anyone having sheets "pads," especially as the been deceived during that period general appearance was differ- is very material. ent, and the word "pads" on defendants' packages was not given any undue prominence likely to mislead purchasers.

Judgment of Rose, J., affirmed.

Wilson v. Lyman, 325.

4. Sale of Business-Right to Use After Expiry of Fixed Period.]-Where the proprietor of a trade name sells the business and good-will thereof, together with the right to use the trade name for a fixed period, and after that period the purchaser continues to use, the proprietor cannot restrain the use of such trade name by the purchaser after the expiry of the fixed period, when he neither carries on nor intends to carry on a business under that firm name.

Love v. Latimer, 373.

5. Place of Manufacture -Common Law Right-Proof of Deception.] - A manufacturer, whose goods are generally known to the public by a certain name, -144.

dice resulting therefrom.

Where the alleged infringe-

Judgment of Davidson, J., reversed.

Pabst v. Ekers, 391.

USER.

1. First. Prime Essential of Trade Mark.]-454.

See REGISTRATION(9).

2. Not Necessary by Party Before Registration : but Must Follow Registration.]-425.

See REGISTRATION(7).

3. What Required to Make Descriptive Words Valid Trade Mark.]-409.

See DESCRIPTIVE WORDS(5).

WELL-KNOWN NAME.

Not Subject of Trade Mark.]