

parent in preference to the schoolmaster. In the case in question a schoolmaster—the Warden of Radley College—caned a boy for remaining at home longer than the school regulations permitted, but under express parental sanction. Such chastisement could not be justified, and the case resulted in a verdict of £10 against the schoolmaster—a light enough verdict, but fortunately the caning was light.—*Solicitors' Journal*.

The Divisional Court has just disposed of the rule for the issue of a writ of attachment which was granted last week in *Re Hobbs v. National Steam Car Co. (Limited)*; *Rex v. Levy* (*Times*, 18th inst.). It appears that the defendant Levy's brother was summoned on a jury, but was unable to attend, so the defendant good-naturedly took his place—and presumably decided the point at issue, just as his brother would have done. But an aggrieved party found out the personation, and moved for his attachment, on the ground that he had committed a substantive contempt. When the preliminary ex parte application was made last October, Bray, J., was at first inclined to think that the circumstances disclosed a common law offence—perhaps obtaining the jury fee by false pretences, or illegal usurpation of a public duty. But in any case the existence of such an offence could not purge the contempt of court, or prevent a writ of attachment from issuing; the maxim *nemo debet bis vexari* does not apply where one alleged wrong is civil and the other is criminal. The Court has now held that a contempt had clearly been committed, and has ordered the defendant to pay costs, allowing the writ to be withdrawn on tender of an apology. Clearly the course of justice is interfered with if an unauthorized person adjudicates upon a case; and if he does so wilfully his conduct amounts to a contempt.—*Solicitors' Journal*.