

could now be treated as making such a motion, it could not be granted. In this case, there were no allegations such as were made in *Lafrance v. Lafrance*, 18 P.R. 62, at p. 64, line 13. Without them, no doubt, the decision in *Atwood v. Atwood*, 15 P.R. 425, would have been applicable. There was, therefore, no ground for acceding to the plaintiff's application; and an order must issue as asked by the defendant; costs of the motion to be costs in the cause. Shirley Denison, K.C., for the defendant. The plaintiff in person.

---

GRILLS v. CANADIAN GENERAL SECURITIES CO.—MASTER IN CHAMBERS—MAY 3.

*Discovery—Production of Documents—Practice—Deposit of Documents in Central Office—Motion for.*—The facts of this case appear sufficiently in the note of a previous motion, ante 982. A further affidavit on production was made by the defendants, as directed by the order made upon that motion; but the documents therein set out were not deposited in the central office. The plaintiff now moved to have this done. The Master said that the usual order was made requiring the production of all relevant documents and their deposit with the Clerk of Records and Writs; and the subsequent order did not in any way relieve the defendants from the previous direction. Neither in the first affidavit was there any ground stated why the order should not be obeyed, nor was any such set up in the further affidavit. At least this should have been done, if it was not intended to comply with the order. Instead of so doing, the defendants' solicitors gave notice on the 14th April that the documents produced could be inspected at their office, on the 16th, between 2 and 4 p.m. The plaintiff made affidavit that he attended at that time and at other times before and since, but without any satisfaction, owing to the conduct of the defendants. He also said that he was put off with promises that statements would be prepared; but that such were not forthcoming on the 25th April, and that since the 16th April he had been refused access to the books. It appeared from the affidavit of the defendants' book-keeper, filed in answer to this motion, that the necessary statements would take a long time to prepare, and that he could take this up only after office hours. He estimated the time on the 16th April at ten days or more. On the 26th April he said that the extracts would be ready "early next