

were liable to skid, and, if they did skid, it was impossible to control them, and so the motor bus company were liable for placing a nuisance on and for negligently using the highway. On these findings the Divisional Court held that they could not interfere. In *Walton v. Vanguard Motor Bus Company, Limited* (25 Times L. Rep. 13), the court pointed out that where a vehicle which should be in the roadway knocked down a permanent structure on the pavement that is evidence of negligence on the part of the driver. The last decision on this question was *Parker v. London General Omnibus Company, Limited* (100 L.T. Rep. 409), where the Divisional Court laid it down that the skidding of a motor bus on a greasy road, where there is no negligence on the part of the driver, and the skidding is due to the precautions taken by the driver to avoid an accident, is no evidence that the particular vehicle is a nuisance for the placing of which on the highway the owners are responsible. This last decision has been taken to the Court of Appeal, so some definite pronouncement may be expected as to how far a skidding motor is a nuisance, for the cases hitherto decided have depended largely on special facts or findings.

There have been a few other decisions which should be borne in mind. In *Bastable v. Little* (96 L.T. Rep. 115; 21 Cox C.C. 354), an information was laid against the respondent, under s. 2 of the Prevention of Crimes Amendment Act, 1885, for wilfully obstructing the police in the execution of their duty, he having warned motor-car drivers of the existence of a police trap. It was found by the justices that the drivers of the cars might have been enabled to avoid travelling at an illegal speed in consequence of the respondent's warnings, but it was not found that the motor-cars were in fact exceeding the speed limit at any time, or that he was acting in concert with any of the drivers. The Divisional Court held that the justices, under the circumstances, were right in dismissing the information, but they pointed out that obstruction may exist within s. 2 of the Act of 1885, without physical obstruction. On this point it would appear that if the warning is to prevent a breach of the law, it would not be