

notice. In this case an injunction had been granted to restrain the defendant from committing a breach of a covenant contained in a lease, whereby defendant had bound himself not to use, or permit to be used, certain premises let to him, in such a way as to be an annoyance to the plaintiff or his tenants. It was proved that the defendant had used the demised premises for the purpose of boxing exhibitions, which caused a serious nuisance to the plaintiffs' other tenants. Murray, one of the persons against whom the motion to commit was made, was present at the trial of the action, and informed by the defendant of the judgment when given; and he afterwards actively assisted the defendant in committing a breach of the injunction. North, J., held that he was liable to be committed for breach of the injunction on the same ground that a servant or agent of the party enjoined is liable. The Court of Appeal, though affirming the committal of Murray, put their judgment, not on the ground of his having been guilty of a breach of the injunction, but on the ground that as he had been actively assisting in the breach of an injunction of which he had notice, he was guilty of a contempt of Court in interfering with, or obstructing the course of justice.

NUISANCE—VACANT LAND—DEPOSIT OF FILTH ON VACANT LAND BY THIRD PARTIES—COMMON LAW DUTY OF LAND OWNER—INJUNCTION.

*Attorney General v. Tod Heatly* (1897) 1 Ch. 560, is a case which shows that the owner of land owes duties to the public, which, if neglected, may be enforced by process of law. Among these duties is one which requires him not only to refrain from making his premises a nuisance to his neighbours, but also to prevent strangers from so doing. The defendant in this case was the owner of a vacant piece of land in London. He had surrounded it by a hoarding, but people threw filth and refuse over, and broke up the hoarding so that the land became in such a condition as to constitute a continuing public nuisance, and the action was brought to compel the defendant to abate the nuisance, the vestry of the parish being the relators. The action was tried before Kekewich, J.,