the case is about. We have in mind one State of whose reports this last assertion is very often true. The head-note ought explicitly or inferentially to disclose whether the action is on a note or for assault and battery or specific performance, but we can show head-notes that give not the faintest glimmering of the subject of the action. Now, the office of the head-note is not to furnish a digest of legal principles, nor a summary of the Judge's reasoning, but a disclosure of the facts and the legal conclusions. In other words, what busy men want when they glance at the head-note is the point, *the point*, THE POINT, and nothing but the point. But it is not always necessary to state the facts, for sometimes a statement of the legal conclusion involves the facts—is pregnant with them, so to speak. As for example: "A mechanics' lien does not attach to railroad rolling stock;" or, "The doctrine of lateral support does not apply as between owners of adjoining gold-mining claims where the process of working is to tear down the soil and wash it;" or, "One servant may maintain an action for an injury negligently inflicted on him by a co-servant." Such statements sufficiently imply the facts, and no useful purpose would be served by adding a long and detailed statement of the particular facts, as was very likely done in the original reports from which we derive these. But sometimes it is shorter and more comprehensible to state the facts, as for example: "A boy eight years old jumped upon the steps of a passenger railway car, and sat upon the platform to steal a ride. The conductor or brakeman kicked him off the car while the train was moving some ten miles an hour, and he was injured. Held, that a recovery against the railway company was warranted;" or, "A pedestrian on a city sidewalk, at night, intentionally turned off the street to take a by-path, and was injured by falling off the projecting end of a culvert. Held, that the city was not liable by reason of not having erected a railing at that point." Sometimes a statement of the facts would be necessarily long, while the conclusion of law is simple, and in such cases the conclusion alone may be given, as for example: "The same degree of care is required of a woman as of a man." It is undoubtedly easier to make a long head-note than a short one, and, beside, it helps fill up the book, but it is not good reporting. Another common fault Judge Thompson does not refer to. That is, repetition. The average reporter puts the whole statement of facts into a head-note, then into a statement proper, and, finally, you get it all sufficiently in the opinion. Some very ingenious gentlemen also put it into the catch-lines. This is no exaggeration; we can point out instances where the catch-lines are a sufficient head-note, even a better one than the professed syllabus. The office of the catch-line is to indicate the subject, not the decision. This repetition is an intolerable fault. There may be intellects so dull that they desire to be told of a thing thrice, but, if so, let them read it thrice in the opinion. This saves space and time at least. If it is necessary or discreet to state the facts substantially in the head-note, it may well be referred to in the preliminary statement, as "The head-note states the facts," —in many cases this is sufficient—or, "The head-note and opinion show the facts." There is no peculiar sacredness in a separate statement of facts, but reporters are such creatures of imitation and habit, and frequently so little sure