

Master of the Crown Office as to whether the respondent had been duly served with notice. The Act authorizing the appeal provided that the appellant should give "notice of such appeal to the other party." The solicitors who acted for the respondent had accepted service of the notice, and it appeared by evidence that they had authority to give such acceptance. Lord Coleridge, Avery, and Atkin, JJ., held that the service on the solicitor was sufficient, as the Act did not expressly require that the service should be personal.

ILLEGITIMATE CHILD—WILFUL NEGLECT OF CHILD—LIABILITY OF FATHER—PERSON "HAVING CUSTODY, CHARGE AND CARE"—CHILDREN'S ACT, 1908 (8 EDW. VII. c. 67), s. 12 (1); s. 38 (2)—(CRIMINAL CODE, s. 241.)

Liverpool Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children v. Jones (1914), 3 K.B. 813. This was a prosecution under the Children's Act, 1908, for neglecting four children. It appeared that the children were illegitimate, and living with their father and mother; and the question raised was whether the father could be made liable under the Act. The Divisional Court (Lord Coleridge, and Avery, and Atkin, JJ.) held that the fact that their mother, who was their sole legal parent and guardian, was living in the house, did not prevent the father from having jointly with her the custody and care of the children within the meaning of the Act, so as to render him liable, if he wilfully neglected them. See Criminal Code, s. 241.

HIGHWAY—PREMISES ABUTTING ON STREET—RIGHT OF ACCESS
ADVERTISEMENT ON WALL OF PREMISES—INTERFERENCE
WITH RIGHT—DAMAGE—INJUNCTION.

Cobb v. Saxby (1914), 3 K.B. 822. In this case the defendant set up a counter claim for relief against the plaintiff for interfering with his access to an outer wall of his premises. The facts were, that the plaintiff and defendant were owners and occupants of adjoining premises both abutting on a street, but the building of the defendant projected a short distance beyond the plaintiff's building. There was no door or opening into this side wall, but it was useful to the defendant for placing advertisements thereon. The plaintiff erected a hoarding so as to prevent the defendant from having access from the street to his wall, which was the grievance complained of. The action was tried by Rowlatt, J., who held that the defendant's right of access to the street as owner of his premises was not limited to the mere right of ingress and