FIRM OF BOOKMAKERS—ILLEGAL ASSOCIATION—ACTION FOR RECOVERY OF MONEYS PAID FOR BETS LOST—GAMING ACT, 1835 (5-6 W. IV. c. 41) s. 2—(R.S.O. c. 217 s. 3.)

O'Connor v. *Ralston* (1920) 3 K.B. 451. The plaintiffs, a firm of bookmakers sued *inter alia* to recover a sum of money paid for a lost bet made with the defendant. Darling, J., following a dictum of Moulton, J., in *Hyams* v. *Stewart King* (1908) 2 K.B. 696, 718, held that the plaintiffs being "an association for the purpose of carrying on a betting business" the action brought by them would not lie as no such partnership is possible under English law, therefore they had no *locus standi* and he dismissed the action. In the recent case of *Jeffery v. Bamford*, 151 L.T. Jour. 214, McCardi , J., refused to follow this case.

NEGLIGENCE—RAILWAY COMPANY—MOVING STAIRCASE UNPROTECTED—CHILDREN TRESPASSING—CHILDREN WARNED OFF AND DRIVEN AWAY.

Hardy v. *Central London Ry. Co.* (1920) 3 K.B. 459. The plaintiff was a child who was injured by getting his hand caught in a rubber band, being the part of an apparatus of a moving staircase. The plaintiff claimed damages on the ground that the defendants were negligent in that they took no precaution to prevent children from playing in the booking hall where the rubber band was, and on and with the staircase and permitted the plaintiff to be in the hall. But it appeared by the evidence that the railway policeman always drove children away from the booking hall when he saw them there, and that on the day of the accident he drove children away and with them the plaintiff who was in charge of an older boy. Before going into the hall again the older boy looked around to see if the policeman was there, and being absent he proceeded to play on the staircase, leaving the plaintiff in the hall where he put his hand in such a position that it was caught by the band and seriously injured. Shearman, J., who tried the action, thought the case was similar to the well known case of *Cooke* v. *Midland Great Western Ry.* (1909) A.C. 229; but the Court of Appeal (Bankes, Warrington and Scrutton, L.JJ.) dissented and held that the plaintiff was a trespasser and not entitled to recover.