

# LLOYD'S LIST LAW REPORTS

Reprinted (with additions) from "LLOYD'S LIST and SHIPPING GAZETTE."

## EASTER AND TRINITY SITTINGS, 1924.

Edited by
J. A. EDWARDS,
of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law.

Vol. 19.

LONDON:
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY LLOYD S
AT THE BOYAL EXCHANGE, B.C. 3.

1924

## CONTENTS.

		1	PAGE
Adams v. Dessen & Co	***		184
Adler, The			112
Admiralty v. Brock & Co.'s "Crystal Palace" Fireworks			290
4: 1 (24) 37 1			10
			255
Anghelatos v. Northern Assurance Co Anglo-Polish Steamship Line v. Vickers, Ltd., and Others		9, 88,	
			6
Anglo-Saxon Petroleum Co. v. Steaua Romana Soc. Anon. and		9.20	
Ansaldo S.A.: - Khedivial Mail Steamship & Graving Dock Co. v.		356,	
Ant, The	***	***	211
Apsleyhall, The		***	227
Arbonne, The	***	***	253
Argonaut Marine Insurance Co.: - Mathie v		4 - 4	64
Arraiz, The	***	235,	
Artemisia, The	•••	***	159
Arthrude Press v. Eagle, Star & British Dominions Insurance C	0		373
Ashton, The	***		394
Asia and Port of London Authority:-Lee v	***		221
Attorney-General v. Brock & Co.'s "Crystal Palace" Firework	s		290
v. Forsikrings A/S National (of Copenhagen)	***		32
Australia, The			49
Autocar Fire & Accident Insurance Co. v. London Joint City	& Midla	nd	
Bank and Another			292
Aron, The			74
Ayrcough v. Sheed, Thomson & Co., Ltd			104
all the same of th			
Baltic Insurance Association of London, Ltd.:-Williams v			126
	**	***	99
Banco de Portugal:Montagu & Co. v		•••	99
Bankers & Shippers Insurance Co. of New York v. Liverpo	ooi mari	ne	995
& General Insurance Co	***		335
Barnett v. Elliot-Smith	***	***	219
:-Sous Secrétaire d'Etat, &c. v	***		120
Baron Blantyre, The	***	***	114
Benson v. Dorset (owners of)	***		60
Beynon & Co. v. Suzuki & Co			375
Bird's Cigarette Manufacturing Co. v. Rouse and Others	***	301,	353
Riesbosch, The			389
Bjornstad and Another v. Ouse Shipbuilding Co			7
Board of Trade :- Commercial and Estates Co. of Egypt v	***	173,	275
Bolands, Ltd. v. London & Lancashire Fire Insurance Co			1
Bolton : Liberty National Bank of New York v			299
Bors, The		241,	
Boston, Mayor and Corporation of :- Witham Outfall Board			356
Bothwell, The			162
			28
Bracewell, Ltd.:—Frankel v			394
Bretagne, The			
Breynton (Owners of) v. Theodoridi & Co			409
Brightman & Co. v. Bunge y Born	175,		
British Hispano Line v. Pittard and Another			181
British India Steam Navigation Co.:-Muir v			198
Brock & Co.'s "Crystal Palace" Fireworks:—Admiralty v			290
:-Attorney-General	₹.		290
Brocklebank, Ltd. v. Crown	***	327,	375

CON					
	TENTS—continued.				PAGE
	Brown, J. & A.: - Chellew v	***		129,	167
	Brown, McFarlane & Co., Ltd.: -Potts & Co., Ltd., v			202,	365
	Buchanan and Others: - Industrial Guarantee Corporation	V.			89
	Bunge y Born: -Brightman & Co. y		175,	324,	384
	Canford Chine Steamship Co., In re		220,	253,	304
	Caplan: - Western Assurance Co. v			***	207
	Capulin The				230
	Carisbrooke Castle, The				117
	Carlisle Steam Navigation Co. In re				30
	Carolina E. de Pérez, The				21
	Catherine Ethel. The				69
	Cayton Insurance Co. In re				
	Cover Irving & Co :- Cramptone Itd v	•••			
	Cayser, 11 vine a co — cramptons, 10a. v	•••		153,	
	Cento, The	•••	***		
	Chartered Trust and Executor Co. v. London & Scottish A			***	
	Chellew v. J. & A. Brown	***		129,	
	Chibbett (H.M. Inspector of Taxes) v. Robinson & Sons  Chivichiaga, The  Christel Vinnen, The  City Equitable Fire Insurance Co., In re	***	***	***	
	Chivichiaga, The	***	***		
1	Christel Vinnen, The	• • • •	• • •	203,	
	City Equitable Fire Insurance Co., In re	***		93,	225
	Comite Française du Kavitaillement (London) : Ci	e. Con	tinenta	ale	
	d'Importation v	***			
	d'Importation v			173,	275
	Commissioners of Inland Revenue. See Inland Revenue Commissioners	ommissi	oners.		
	Cie. Continentale d'Importation v. Com. Française du	Ravita	ailleme	nt	
	(London)				351
	Compania Naviera Martiartu v. Royal Exchange Assurance				95
	Comptoir d'Escompte de Mulhouse and the Westminster				
	Commercial & Industrial Bank v				312
	Conifer, The		***		
	Constructive Finance Co. v. English Insurance Co			31,	
	Corporation of Lloyd's: -Industrial Guarantee Corporation	nn v			
	Cramptons, Ltd. v. Cayzer, Irvine & Co	/41 1			
	Composition of the contract of				
				397	375
	Crownikow Itd . Loopeld Walford (London) Itd	• • •		327,	
	Crown: -Brocklebank, Ltd. v			327,	
					354
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v				354 35
	Defferary & Sons: Mann & Co. v Den Norske Afrika og Australie Linie v. Port Said Salt	 Associat	ion		354 35 355
	Defferary & Sons: Mann & Co. v Den Norske Afrika og Australie Linie v. Port Said Salt	 Associat	ion		354 35 355 184
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat	ion		354 35 355 184 420
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat	ion	197	354 355 355 184 420 9, 58
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat	ion	 197 29	354 355 355 184 420 9, 58 60
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat	ion	197, 29	354 355 355 184 , 420 9, 58 60 233
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat	ion	 197 29	354 355 355 184 420 9, 58 60
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat	ion	197	354 355 355 184 420 9, 58 60 233 286
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat	 ion  	197, 29	354 35 355 184 420 9, 58 60 233 286
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat e Press	ion v.	 197, 29	354 35 355 184 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat e Press	ion v.	197, 29	354 355 355 184 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat e Press n & Co.	ion v.	197, 29	354 35 355 184 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419 219
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat e Press n & Co.	ion v.	197, 29	354 35 355 184 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419 219 157
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat	ion v.	197, 26	354 35 355 184 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419 219 157 , 144
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Association of the control of the co	ion	197, 29	354 355 184, 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419 219 157 144 84
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Association of the control of the co	ion	 197, 29     31	354 355 355 184 , 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419 219 157 , 144 84 , 346
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Association of the control of the co	ion	 197, 29     31	354 355 184, 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419 219 157 144 84
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associate	v	 197, 29     31	354 355 355 184 , 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419 217 7, 144 84 , 346 25
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associated Services of the Co  Vredob	v	197, 21	354 355 355 184 , 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419 157 , 144 84 , 346 25
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat	v	 197, 29     31   297	354 355 355 184 420 233 286 373 242 419 219 157 , 144 84 , 346 25 24 , 414
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat	v	 197, 29  31  303	354 355 355 184 420 233 286 373 242 419 157 , 144 84 , 346 25 24 , 414 32
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat	v	 197, 24     303	354 355 355 184 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419 157 , 144 84 , 346 25 24 , 414 32 26
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Association of the control of the co	v	 197, 24     303	354 355 355 184 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419 157, 144 84 4, 346 25 24 414 32 26 419
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat  e Press n & Co Vredob deneral	v. v	 197, 24     303	354 355 355 184 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419 157 , 144 84 , 346 25 24 , 414 32 26
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat	v		354 355 184 , 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419 219 157 , 144 , 346 25 24 , 414 32 26 , 419 28
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat	v. v	197, 2:	354 355 184 , 420 9, 58 60 2233 286 373 242 419 157 , 144 84 , 346 25 24 , 414 32 26 , 419 28 , 359
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat  e Press n & Co Vredob General	v	 1977, 297  303  297 	354 355 184 , 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419 157 7, 144 84 346 25 24 414 32 26 419 32 419 346 419 35 419 414 32 419 419 419 419 419 419 419 419 419 419
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	e Press n & Co.  Vredob  deneral	v. v v v		354 355 184 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419 157 , 144 84 , 346 25 24 , 414 32 26 , 419 28 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat	v. v		354 355 184 , 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419 157 7, 144 84 346 25 24 414 32 26 419 32 419 346 419 35 419 414 32 419 419 419 419 419 419 419 419 419 419
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	Associat	v. v	197, 2:	354 355 184 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 219 157 144 32 26 419 25 24 419 32 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	e Press n & Co.  Vredob  deneral  renue  renue  renue  renue	v. v		354 355 184, 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419 157 1, 144 346 25 24 414 32 28 419 7 8 107 7 9 107 7 9 107 107 107 107 107 107 107 107 107 107
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	e Press n & Co.  Vredob  deneral  renue  renue  renue  renue	v. v	197, 2:	354 355 184 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419 157 , 144 84 , 346 25 26 414 32 26 414 32 26 417 32 26 417 32 26 417 32 26 417 32 26 417 32 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	e Press n & Co.  Vredob  deneral  renue  renue  renue  renue	v	303 297 303 303 305	354 355 184 420 9, 588 60 233 286 373 242 419 157 , 144 84 32 26 419 28 , 359 107 , 397 214
	Defferary & Sons:—Mann & Co. v	e Press n & Co.  Vredob  in the control of the	v. v	303 297 303 303 305	354 355 184 420 9, 58 60 233 286 373 242 419 157 , 144 84 , 346 25 26 414 32 26 414 32 26 417 32 26 417 32 26 417 32 26 417 32 26 417 32 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54

TENTS-			64	L PL	ink P	1-1-	T		C-		
Hamilton										***	•••
Hamlet (							• • •	***	***	***	
Hansen v						***	***	***	***	***	201,
Harris v.										***	303,
V.											5,
Hartford											
Hartmut,								***			
Helical H	ar & Ens	rineerin	g Co.	:-W	alford	Lines	٧.				***
Holendre	cht, The				***	***	***		***		***
Howden							***	***			
Howlett v								***		***	
Hull Cen											Ltd.
Industria	Guaran	tea Co	rporat	ion v	Buck	nanan	and	Other	a		***
			Porm	v	Corr	oratio	n of	Llove	l's		
				-:-	Mond	oratio					
Inland R	evenue C	ommiss	ioners	:G1	anvill.	Entho	oven	& Co.	٧.		
				- v. N	ew Y	ork &	Paci	fic Ste			***
				- v. T	urnbu	ll, Sco	tt &	Co.			
Itria v.	Koursk									***	***
Tames											
James, /					***	***	***	***	***	***	***
	v. Union					***	***	***	***		940
	Oceanic &					• • • •	***	• • •		***	249
							***	***	***	40 11	n 999
Jupiter,	тие		***	****	***		***		***	90, 11	0, 232
Kaparika	The		***			***					
	d, The			•••		***			***	***	***
Kelvin S								***	***	***	***
	The								***		•••
	Mail Sta										353
	-Itria v.			-			***				
Laird Li	ne, Ltd.,	and Cl	an Li	ne St	eamer	Ltd.	:V	Vogan	∀		***
	Port of								***		•••
	sia and F							***	***		
	The										***
Liberty	National	Bank	of Ne	w Yo	rk v.	Bolton				***	
Lilly B,	The	***	***	***	***			***			
Liverpoo	Marine	& Ger	neral 1	Insura	nce (	co.:—E	Banke	ers &	Shipp	ers In	sur-
	Co. of ]										
	The							***			
	Corporat									***	***
	& Lancas										***
London	k Scottish	Assur	ance C	orpn.	:Ch	artered	Tru	st and	Exec	utor C	
	General 1										***
London	Joint City	y & Mi	dland	Bank	:A1						
					_		. ▼.	***		***	***
-					- v. N	Torther	n As	suran	e Co.	***	•••
MaCault	n Di-	- F C	o /T	n d \	T 4.3						
	y v. Dixo							***	***	***	2
Malant	t:-Harr	18 ∀.	Ω					***	***	•••	5
Manne	g v. Evs	LOS &C	UO.		***	***	***	***			
	Co. v. I									***	***
	- and									٧.	***
	eaf Milli										***
	Salvors,						. (20	10)	***	***	•••
								•••	***	***	46
Mathie v		INVITE V					***	•••	***	***	
Mathie Melanie		-			***	Grahas	Io	nt Sto	ok Shi	inning	Co
Mathie Melanie Menai,	The			o T	hd			DUCO ULL		SHIRL	
Mathie Melanie Menai, Merchan	The ts' Marin	e Insur	ance (								
Mathie Melanie Menai, Merchan	The ts' Marin v	e Insur	ance (		***			***		(1)000	a) w
Mathie Melanie Menai, Merchan	The ts' Marin	e Insur	ance (		***			***		(Orite	2) ₹.
Mathie Melanie Menai, Merchan Ltd. Mersey	The ts' Marin v Docks & l	e Insur  Harbou	rance (  ir Boa	rd :—	Pacific	Steam		***		(Orite	
Mathie Melanie Menai, Merchan Ltd. Mersey Modern	The ts' Marin v Docks & I Transpor	e Insur Harbou	rance ( ir Boa v. Ter	rd :-	Pacific	Steam	n Na	***	on Co.	1	2) ▼. 75, 204
Mathie Melanie Menai, Merchan Ltd. Mersey Modern Modern Mond v.	The ts' Marin v Docks & l	Harbou	rance ( ir Boa v. Ter	rd :—	Pacific n & I poratio	Steam	n Na	vigatio	 on Co.	1	2) ▼. 75, 204
Mathie Melanie Menai, Merchan Ltd. Mersey Modern Mond v. Montagu	The ts' Marin v Docks & l Transpor Industri & Co. v.	Harbou t Co. al Gua Banco	rance ( r Boa v. Ter rantee de Po	rd :— nstro	Pacific m & I porational	Steam Roos	m Na	vigatio	 on Co.	1	2) ▼. 75, 204 
Mathie Melanie Menai, Merchan Ltd. Mersey Modern Mond v. Montagu Meuntst	The ts' Marin v Docks & l Transpor Industri	t Co. al Gua Banco	r Boa v. Ter rantee de Po	nstroi Corportuga	Pacific m & I porational m's, I	Steam Roos on	m Na	vigatio	 On Co.		2) ▼. 75, 204 

	Commercial										
COL	NTENTS -continued.										PAGE
	Naamlooze Vennootsc	hap. &c	Vred	obert	v. Eu	ropea	n Sh	ipping	Co.		84
	Nedencs, The										74
	Neville Shipping Co., New York & Pacific S	In re		***	***	* * *	0.4	***	***		30
	New York & Pacific S	Steamship	Co. :-	-Com	ntission	ners c	f Inl	and Re	evenue	V.	150
	Newtownards, The									52	. 71
	Manalan A Sailan and Ann	stralia Ti	min m	Dont	Soid	G-14	A	intion			355
	Norske Afrika og Au	strame Di	mie v.	LOL	Daid	Dall	ASSOC	1201011	000		
	Northern Assurance	Co.:—An	ghelat	OB V.	***						255
		:-Lon	don J	oint C	ity &	Midla	nd B	ank v.			255
											295
	Nouvelles Huileries A	nversoises	D.A.	A. TATS							
	No. 3, The			***					49.0		237
	Ossania Steam Vaniga	tion Co	Ton	100 17						249,	948
	Oceanic Steam Naviga										
	Ohlson Steamship, Lte										5%
	Ontario Metal Produc	ts Co., Lto	1.:-N	Iutual	Life In	sura	nce Co	o, of Ne	w York	v.	32
	(A-ia- Mb-	00 001, 20							175	904	
	Orita, The	***	* * *	***	***	***			110	, 202,	040
	Ottur Jarl, The		***	* * *	***			***		53,	240
	Ouse Shipbuilding Co	.:-Biorr	istad	and A	Another	. V.			***		7
	D 10 01 N 1		10.1		1.5	D		TT - 1	D		
	Pacific Steam Naviga	ition Co.	(Urste	2) V.	Mersey	Doc	ks &	Harbo	ur Bos	ird	
										, 204,	
	Paludina, The								***		13
											00
	Pederson & Co.:-Fo	rt Snippi	ng Co	). V.	* * *				***		26
	Pelton Steamship Co. Petersen v. Devlin v. Hammond	(Zelo):-	-Marit	time S	alvors,	Ltd.	. V.			9	, 41
	Petersen v Devlin									197,	
	TOUCISCH V. DOVINI				***						
	v. Hammond	***	* * *			***	***	***	***		117
	Pittard and Another:	-British	Hispa	ano Li	ne v.						181
	Poland and Another	-Santer	v								29
	Poland and Another Port of London Autl	· Delioci									
									***	***	197
		- v. May	or, A	lderme	en and	Coun	cillor	s of We	polwich	103,	305
	Port Said Salt Associ										
	Potts & Co., Ltd. v. E								***	202,	
	Poverty Bay Farmers'	Meat Co	. ::-Tl	omsor	n, Wat	son &	Co.	V			421
	President van Buren,						***				185
	A T CORDORS DUST DUTCES	, AMC	***	***	***	***	***	***	***		200
	Reporto, The							***			114
			***			***		***			11.30
	Rex. See Crown.										
	Robinson & Sons:-Cl	hibbett (1	I.M.I	nspect	tor of	Taxes	) v.				195
	Robinson & Sons :- C									•••	
	Ropner Shipping Co.,	Ltd. :- "	' Vitri	ivia "	Steam	ship	Co	Ltd. v.			223
	Ropner Shipping Co.,	Ltd. :- "	' Vitri	ivia "	Steam	ship	Co	Ltd. v.			223
	Ropner Shipping Co.,	Ltd. :- "	' Vitri	ivia "	Steam	ship	Co	Ltd. v.			$\begin{array}{c} 223 \\ 406 \end{array}$
	Roper Shipping Co., Rouen, The Rouse and Others:—	Ltd.:-' Bird's Ci	'Vitru	ivia ''  e Man	Steam  ufactu	ship  ring	Co.,  Co. v	Ltd. v.		 301,	223 406 353
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouen, The Rouse and Others:— Royal Commission on	Ltd.:-' Bird's Cip Sugar Su	'Vitru	e Man	Steam  ufactu ding Sc	ship  ring ociety	Co., Co. v Kwil	Ltd. v.  k-Hoo-7	  Cong v	 301, . 90,	223 406 353 343
	Roper Shipping Co., Rouen, The Rouse and Others:—	Ltd.:-' Bird's Cip Sugar Su	'Vitru	e Man	Steam  ufactu ding Sc	ship  ring ociety	Co., Co. v Kwil	Ltd. v.  k-Hoo-7	  Cong v	 301, . 90,	223 406 353 343
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouen, The Rouse and Others:— Royal Commission on Royal Exchange Assu	Ltd.:-' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co	'Vitru  garette pply : rporat	e Man Trac	Steam  ufactu ding Sc -Compa	ring ociety ania	Co., Co. v Kwil	Ltd. v.  k-Hoo-7 era Mai	 Cong v	 301, . 90,	223 406 353 343 95
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rousen, The Rouse and Others: Royal Commission on Royal Exchange Assu Ruapehu, The	Ltd.:-' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co	'Vitru  garette pply : rporat	uvia '' e Man —Trac ion :—	Steam  ufactu ding Sc -Compa	ring ociety ania	Co., Co. v Kwii Navie	Ltd. v.	Cong v	 301, . 90, v.	223 406 353 343 95
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rousen, The Rouse and Others: Royal Commission on Royal Exchange Assu Ruapehu, The Russian Commercial	Ltd.:-' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust	Yitru  garette pply : rporat 	e Man Traction: Bank	Steam  nufactu ding So -Compa  v. Le	ring ociety ania	Co., Co. v Kwii Navie  ptoir	Ltd. v k-Hoo-7 ra Man d'Esco	Cong v	 301, . 90, v. 193, de	223 406 353 343 95 406
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rousen, The Rouse and Others: Royal Commission on Royal Exchange Assu Ruapehu, The	Ltd.:-' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust	Yitru  garette pply : rporat 	e Man Traction: Bank	Steam  nufactu ding So -Compa  v. Le	ring ociety ania	Co., Co. v Kwii Navie  ptoir	Ltd. v k-Hoo-7 ra Man d'Esco	Cong v	 301, . 90, v.	223 406 353 343 95 406
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rousen, The Rouse and Others: Royal Commission on Royal Exchange Assu Ruapehu, The Russian Commercial	Ltd.:-' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust	Yitru  garette pply : rporat 	e Man Traction: Bank	Steam  nufactu ding So -Compa  v. Le	ring ociety ania	Co., Co. v Kwii Navie  ptoir	Ltd. v k-Hoo-7 ra Man d'Esco	Cong v	 301, . 90, v. 193, de	223 406 353 343 95 406
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouen, The Rouse and Others Royal Commission on Royal Exchange Assu Ruapehu, The Russian Commercial Mulhouse and the	Ltd.: Bird's Cip Sugar	Yitru garette pply: rporat  trial	e Man Trac ion: Bank Bank	Steam  uufactu ding Sc -Compa v. Le	ring ociety ania Com	Co., Co. v Kwii Navie  ptoir	Ltd. v.  k-Hoo-T ora Mai  d'Esco	 Cong v rtiartu  ompte	301, . 90, v. 193, de 63,	223 406 353 343 95 406
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouen, The Rouse and Others Royal Commission on Royal Exchange Assu Ruapehu, The Russian Commercial Mulhouse and the San Onofre v. Melani	Ltd.:' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi	Yitru garette pply: rporat crial	e Man Trac ion: Bank Bank	Steam uufactu ding Sc -Compr v. Le	ring ociety ania	Co., Co. v Kwil Navie  ptoir 	Ltd. v v k-Hoo-7 bra Mai d'Esco	Cong v	 301, . 90, v. 193, de 63,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouen, The Rouse and Others Royal Commission on Royal Exchange Assu Ruapehu, The Russian Commercial Mulhouse and the San Onofre v. Melani	Ltd.:' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi	Yitru garette pply: rporat crial	e Man Trac ion: Bank Bank	Steam uufactu ding Sc -Compr v. Le	ring ociety ania	Co., Co. v Kwii Navie  ptoir	Ltd. v.  k-Hoo-T ora Mai  d'Esco	 Cong v rtiartu  ompte	301, . 90, v. 193, de 63,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rousen, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another	'Vitru	e Man Trac ion :— Bank Bank	Steam uufactu ding Sc -Compa v. Le	ring ociety ania	Co., v. Co. v Kwill Navie ptoir	Ltd. v.	Cong v	 301, . 90, v. 193, de 63,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rousen, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another	'Vitru	e Man Trac ion :— Bank Bank	Steam uufactu ding Sc -Compa v. Le	ring ociety ania	Co., v. Co. v Kwill Navie ptoir	Ltd. v.	Cong vrtiartu	301, . 90, v. 193, de 63, 	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouse, The Rouse and Others Royal Commission on Royal Exchange Assu Ruapehu, The Russian Commercial Mulhouse and the San Onofre v. Melani Santer v. Poland and Saxieava, The Schmoll fils & Co., In	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co	'Vitru	e Man Traction: Bank Bank	Steam uufactu ding Sc-Compa v. Le	ring ring ociety ania	Co., will Co. will Kwill Navie ptoir	Ltd. v.	Cong vrtiartu	301, 90, v. 193, de 63, 46,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouse, The Rouse and Others: Royal Commission on Royal Exchange Assu Ruapehu, The Russian Commercial Mulhouse and the San Onofre v. Melant Santer v. Poland and Saxieava, The Sachmoll fils & Co., In Scottish Metropolitan	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another c. v. Scri	'Vitru	e Man Trac ion: Bank Bank	Steam unfactuding Sc-Compa	ring ociety ania i	Co., Co. v Kwill Navie ptoir	Ltd. v.	Cong vrtiartu	301, . 90, v. 193, de 63, 	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouse, The Rouse and Others: Royal Commission on Royal Exchange Assu Ruapehu, The Russian Commercial Mulhouse and the San Onofre v. Melant Santer v. Poland and Saxieava, The Sachmoll fils & Co., In Scottish Metropolitan	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another c. v. Scri	'Vitru	e Man Trac ion: Bank Bank	Steam unfactuding Sc-Compa	ring ociety ania i	Co., Co. v Kwill Navie ptoir	Ltd. v.	Cong vrtiartu	301, 90, v. 193, de 63, 46,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouse, The Rouse and Others: Royal Commission on Royal Exchange Assu Ruapehu, The Russian Commercial Mulhouse and the San Onofre v. Melant Santer v. Poland and Saxieava, The Sachmoll fils & Co., In Scottish Metropolitan	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another c. v. Scri	'Vitru	e Man Trac ion: Bank Bank	Steam unfactuding Sc-Compa	ring ociety ania i	Co., Co. v Kwill Navie ptoir	Ltd. v.	Cong v	301, . 90, v. 193, de 63, 46,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 118
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouen, The	Ltd.:—'. Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another c. v. Scri Assuranc —Schmoll 7. Kelvin	'Vitru	e Man —Trac ion:  Bank Bank   ros. & Ltd. Co ping (	Steam uufactu ding Sc -Compe v. Le	ring ociety ania : Com	Co., v. Kwil Navie ptoir	Ltd. v. k-Hoo-Tora Man d'Esco	Cong vrtiartu	301, . 90, v. 193, de 63, 46,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 118
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouse, The	Ltd.:—'. Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another c. v. Scri Assuranc —Schmoll td.:—Ur	'Vitru garette pply:- rporat  trial linster  ven B & Co., fils & Shippion C	e Man—Tracion:— Bank Bank  ros. & Ltd. Co ping (astle)	Steam uufactu ding Sc -Compr v. Le Co Co. Mail S	ring ociety ania : Com	Co., Co. v Kwill Navie ptoir	Ltd. v k-Hoo-Tra Man d'Esco	Cong v	301, . 90, v. 193, de 63, 	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 118 170 251
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouse and Others: Rouse and Others: Royal Commission on Royal Exchange Assu Ruapehu, The Russian Commercial Mulhouse and the San Onofre v. Melant Santer v. Poland and Saxieava, The Schmoll fils & Co., In Scottish Metropolitan Scriven Bros. & Co.: Seed Shipping Co. x. Sena Sugar Estates, I Shaw, Savill & Albion	Ltd.:—'. Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another c. v. Scri Assuranc —Schmoll v. Kelvin Ltd.:—Ur	yarette pply: garette pply: rporat rial linster ven B se Co., Ship lion C lowlete	Bank Bank  Co., Ltd., Co., Co., astle	steam uufactu ding Sc -Compa v. Le Co. v. Gr Inc. v. Co. Mail S	ring ociety ania i Com	Co., Co. w Kwill Navie ptoir	Ltd. v.  k-Hoo-Tora Man  d'Esco   Co v.	ompte	301, . 90, v. 193, de 63, 	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 118 170 251 176
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouse and Others: Rouse and Others: Royal Commission on Royal Exchange Assu Ruapehu, The Russian Commercial Mulhouse and the San Onofre v. Melant Santer v. Poland and Saxieava, The Schmoll fils & Co., In Scottish Metropolitan Scriven Bros. & Co.: Seed Shipping Co. x. Sena Sugar Estates, I Shaw, Savill & Albion	Ltd.:—'. Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another c. v. Scri Assuranc —Schmoll v. Kelvin Ltd.:—Ur	yarette pply: garette pply: rporat rial linster ven B se Co., Ship lion C lowlete	Bank Bank  Co., Ltd., Co., Co., astle	steam uufactu ding Sc -Compa v. Le Co. v. Gr Inc. v. Co. Mail S	ring ociety ania i Com	Co., Co. w Kwill Navie ptoir	Ltd. v.  k-Hoo-Tora Man  d'Esco   Co v.	ompte	301, . 90, v. 193, de 63, 	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 118 170 251
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouen, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co  & Indust e Westmi  Another  Co. v. Scri Assuranc —Schmoll  Kelvin Co.:—'Bo  Co., Ltd.:-	yarette pply: rporat crial linster ven B se Co., fils & Shipl lion C lowlete —Ayso	e Man—Tracion:— Bank Bank Bank Co Co ping (pastle)	Steam uufactuding Sc -Compress v. Le v. Gc v. Gr Inc. v. Co. Mail S	ring ociety ania in Com Com coom coo	Co., Co. v Kwil Navie ptoir	Ltd. v. kHoo-Tora Man d'Esco	Cong v	301, . 90, . 90, . 193, de 63, 	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 118 170 251 104
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouen, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co	ven Bee Co., fils & Shippion Cowlett	e Man—Tracion:— Bank Bank Co ping (astle) tv. cough	Steam unfactu ding Sc-Comps v. Le Co. v. Gr-Inc. v. Co. Mail S v.	ring ociety ania : Com oom teams	Co., Co. v Kwiil Navie ptoir chip (	Ltd. v. k-Hoo-Tra Man d'Esco	Cong vrtiartu	301, 90, 90, 90, 193, de 63,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 170 251 176 104 47
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouse, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co  & Indust e Westmi ie I Another c. v. Scri Assuranc —Schmoll T, Kelvin Ltd.:—Ur Co.:—H co., Ltd.:-	yarette pply: rporat crial linster ven B se Co., fils & Shipl lion C lowlete —Ayso	e Man—Tracion:— Bank Bank Bank Co Co ping (pastle)	Steam uufactuding Sc -Compress v. Le v. Gc v. Gr Inc. v. Co. Mail S	ring ociety ania in Com Com coom coo	Co., Co. v Kwil Navie ptoir	Ltd. v. kHoo-Tora Man d'Esco	Cong v	301, . 90, . 90, . 193, de 63, 	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 170 251 176 104 47
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouen, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co  & Indust e Westmi ie I Another c. v. Scri Assuranc —Schmoll T, Kelvin Ltd.:—Ur Co.:—H co., Ltd.:-	ven Bee Co., fils & Shippion Cowlett	Bank Bank  Co  ping (pastle)	Steam unfactu ding Sc-Comps v. Le Co. v. Gr-Inc. v. Co. Mail S v.	ring ociety ania : Com oom teams	Co., Co. v Kwiil Navie ptoir chip (	Ltd. v. k-Hoo-Tra Man d'Esco	Cong vrtiartu	301, 90, 90, 90, 193, de 63,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 170 251 176 104 47
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouse and Others:— Royal Commission on Royal Exchange Assu Ruapehu, The Russian Commercial Mulhouse and the San Onofre v. Melant Santer v. Poland and Santer v. Schmoll fils & Co., In Scottish Metropolitan Scriven Bros. & Co.:—Seed Shipping Co. Seed Shipp	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co  & Indust e Westmi ie c. v. Scri Assurance —Schmoll v. Kelvin Ltd.:—'Ur co.; Ltd.: —Gray v.	'Vitru	Bank Bank Bank Co	Steam unfactu ling Sc-Comps v. Le Co. v. Gr Inc. v. Co. Mail S	ring ociety cociety co	Co., Co. v Kwiil Kwiil Navie ptoir	Ltd. v.  kHoo-Tora Man  d'Esco   Co v.	Cong vrtiartu	301, 90, v. 193, de 63,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 170 251 176 104 47 154 59
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouen, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co  & Indust e Westmi ie d Another Assuranc —Schmoll r. Kelvin a Co:—Boo, Ltd.:— —Gray v.	'Vitru	ros. & Ltd. Co. ping (sastle tv. cough	Steam unfactu ding Sc-Comps v. Le Co. v. Gr-Inc. v. Co. Mail S v	ring cociety and a cociety and	Co., Co. v Kwill Navie ptoir	Ltd. v. kHoo-Tora Man d'Esco	Cong vrtiartu	301, 90, v. 193, de 63,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 170 251 176 104 47
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouse and Others:— Royal Commission on Royal Exchange Assu Ruapehu, The Russian Commercial Mulhouse and the San Onofre v. Melant Santer v. Poland and Santer v. Schmoll fils & Co., In Scottish Metropolitan Scriven Bros. & Co.:—Seed Shipping Co. Seed Shipp	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co  & Indust e Westmi ie d Another Assuranc —Schmoll r. Kelvin a Co:—Boo, Ltd.:— —Gray v.	'Vitru	ros. & Ltd. Co. ping (sastle tv. cough	Steam unfactu ding Sc-Comps v. Le Co. v. Gr-Inc. v. Co. Mail S v	ring cociety and a cociety and	Co., Co. v Kwil	Ltd. v. kHoo-Tora Man d'Esco	Cong vrtiartu	301, 90, 90, 90, 193, de 63,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 170 251 176 47 154 59 414
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouen, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co  & Indust e Westmi ie d Another Assuranc —Schmoll r. Kelvin a Co:—Boo, Ltd.:— —Gray v.	'Vitru	ros. & Ltd. Co. ping (sastle tv. cough	Steam unfactu ding Sc-Comps v. Le Co. v. Gr-Inc. v. Co. Mail S v	ring cociety and a cociety and	Co., Co. v Kwil	Ltd. v. kHoo-Tora Man d'Esco	Cong vrtiartu	301, 90, 90, 90, 193, de 63,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 170 251 176 104 47 154 59
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rousen, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another C. v. Scri Assuranc —Schmoll To. Kelvin Ltd.:—Un Co.;—H —Gray v	'Vitru	ros. & Ltd. Co ping (Sastle tv. cough	Steam v. Le V. Gr. Inc. v. Co. Mail S Steam	ship	Co., Kwil Navie ptoir	Ltd. v k-Hoo-Tora Man d'Esco	Cong vrtiartu	301, 90, v. 193, de 63, 46,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 170 251 176 104 47 154 414
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouse, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co  & Indust e Westmi ie I Another c. v. Scri Assuranc Schmoll v. Kelvin Ltd.:—'Ur Co.:—'H o., Ltd.:  —Gray v.  at, &c. v.	'Vitru	ros. & Ltd. Co. Ltd.	Steam w. Le co. v. Gr. Inc. v. Go. Mail S v. Steam	sship	Co., Kwil Navie ptoir	Ltd. v.  k-Hoo-Tora Man  d'Esco   Co v.   aving D	Cong vrtiartu	301, 90, v. 193, de 63,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 176 251 176 47 154 47 418 120
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouse, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another c. v. Scri Assuranc —Schmoll V. Kelvin Ltd.:—Ur Ltd.:—' Gray v	'Vitru	ros. & Ltd. Co  Co  Co  Co  Late of the control of the	Steam unfactu ding Sc -Comps v. Le Co. v. Gr Inc. v. Co. Mail S Steam	ship	Co., Kwil Navie ptoir	Ltd. v k-Hoo-Tora Man d'Esco	Cong vrtiartu	301, 90, v. 193, de 63, 46,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 181 118 131 176 176 47 154 59 414 418 120 237
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rousen, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another C. v. Scri Assuranc -Schmoll 7. Kelvin Ltd.:—'H 0., Ltd.:Gray v lddo:—Kh at, &c. v.	'Vitru	wia '' Bank Bank	Steam v. Le Co. v. Gr. Inc. v. Co. Mail S Steam	sship	Co., Kwil kwil kwil kwil kwil kwil kwil kwil k	Ltd. v.  k-Hoo-Tora Man  d'Esco   Co v.   aving D	Cong vrtiartu	301, 90, v. 193, de 63,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 176 251 176 47 154 47 418 120
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rousen, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another C. v. Scri Assuranc -Schmoll 7. Kelvin Ltd.:—'H 0., Ltd.:Gray v lddo:—Kh at, &c. v.	'Vitru	wia '' Bank Bank	Steam v. Le Co. v. Gr. Inc. v. Co. Mail S Steam	sship	Co., Kwil kwil kwil kwil kwil kwil kwil kwil k	Ltd. v. k.Hoo-Tora Man d'Esco	Cong vrtiartu	301, v. 193, de 63,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 181 118 131 176 176 47 154 59 414 418 120 237
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouse, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another C. v. Scri Assuranc —Schmoll td.:—Ur to.; Ltd.:— —Gray v at, &c. v. Anon. and	'Vitru	ros. & Ltd. Co. pring (Castle tv. cough	Steam v. Le V. Gr. Inc. v. Co. Mail S Steam Anglo-	sship	Co., ptoir	Ltd. v.  kHoo-Tora Man  d'Esco   Co v.  aving D   rodeum	Cong vrtiartu		223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 118 170 251 176 104 47 415 414 418 420 237 419 6
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouse, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another c. v. Scri Assuranc Schmoll To. Kelvin Ltd.:—'Ur Co.:—'B o., Ltd.: —Gray v sldo:—Kh at, &c. v.	'Vitru	ros. & Ltd. Co Co Castle t v. cough Latter t v. cough	Steam unfactulding Sc. Comps v. Le Co. v. Gr. Inc. v. Co. Mail S Steam Anglo-	sship	Co., Kwil kwil kwil kwil kwil kwil kwil kwil k	Ltd. v.	Cong vrtiartu	301, v. 193, de 63,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 170 251 176 47 154 418 120 237 419 6 61
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouse, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another c. v. Scri Assuranc Schmoll To. Kelvin Ltd.:—'Ur Co.:—'B o., Ltd.: —Gray v sldo:—Kh at, &c. v.	'Vitru	ros. & Ltd. Co Co Castle t v. cough Latter t v. cough	Steam unfactulding Sc. Comps v. Le Co. v. Gr. Inc. v. Co. Mail S Steam Anglo-	sship	Co., ptoir	Ltd. v.  kHoo-Tora Man  d'Esco   Co v.  aving D   rodeum	Cong vrtiartu		223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 118 170 251 176 104 47 415 414 418 420 237 419 6
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouse, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another C. v. Scri Assurance Schmoll T. Kelvin Ltd.:—'Ur I Co.:—'B o., Ltd.:  —Gray v d States if	'Vitru	ros. & Ltd. Co  Co  Castle t v. cough  It Mail Mail mett  Ing Bo	Steam unfactuling Sc. Comps v. Le Co. v. Gr. Inc. v. Co. Mail S v Steam Anglo-i	sship	Co., Co. v Kwil Navie ptoir	Ltd. v. k.Hoo-Tora Man d'Esco  co v aving D coleum	Cong vrtiartu	301,, v. 193, de 63, 46,	223 406 353 353 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 170 176 104 477 159 414 418 120 237 419 6 61 412
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouen, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another C. v. Scri Assuranc -Schmoll 7. Kelvin Ltd.:—'H Co.:—'H Co., Ltd.: Anon. and d States if	'Vitru	ros. & Ltd. Co  Ltd. Co  ping (pastle) t v. cough   l Mail	Steam unfactu ding Sc -Compo v. Le Co. v. Gr Inc. v. Co. Mail S Steam Steam Anglo-i ard v.	sship	Co., Co. v Co. v Kwil Navie ptoir	Ltd. v. k.Hoo-Tora Man d'Esco	Cong vrtiartu	301, v. 193, de 63, 46,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 170 257 164 47 154 418 120 237 419 61 412 333
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouen, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another C. v. Scri Assuranc —Schmoll T. Kelvin Ltd.:—'Ur Ltd.:—'Ur Ltd.:—'H Ltd.:—'Kh at, &c. v Anon. and d States f con & Co.	'Vitru	wia '' Bank Bank ros. & Ltd. Co ping (Castle) tv l Mail mett	Steam unfactuling Sc. Comps v. Le Co. v. Gr. Inc. v. Co. Mail S v Steam Anglo-i	sship	Co., Co. v Kwil Navie ptoir	Ltd. v. k.Hoo-Tora Man d'Esco  co v aving D coleum	Cong vrtiartu	301,, v. 193, de 63, 46,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 176 47 154 47 418 120 237 419 6 6 611 412 333 375
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouse, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi ie I Another C. v. Scri Assuranc —Schmoll T. Kelvin Ltd.:—Ur Ltd.:—Ur Co.;—Ho Ltd.:—  Gray v Anon. and Anon. and Anon. and Oph & Co.	'Vitru	ros. & Ltd. Co  Ltd. Co  ping (pastle) t v. cough   l Mail	Steam unfactu ding Sc -Compo v. Le Co. v. Gr Inc. v. Co. Mail S Steam Steam Anglo-i ard v.	sship	Co., Co. v Co. v Kwil Navie ptoir	Ltd. v. k.Hoo-Tora Man d'Esco	Cong vrtiartu	301, v. 193, de 63, 46,	223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 1618 131 176 104 477 419 414 418 120 237 419 6 61 412 333 375 164
	Ropner Shipping Co., Rouen, The	Ltd.:—' Bird's Cip Sugar Su rance Co & Indust e Westmi e I Another c. v. Scri Assuranc —Schmoll r. Kelvin Ltd.:—Ur co.;—H co.; Ltd.: —Gray v Anon. and d States f con & Co.	'Vitru	wia '' Bank Bank ros. & Ltd. Co ping (Castle) tv l Mail mett	Steam v. Le v. Gr. Inc. v. Co. Mail S Steam Anglo ard v.	sship	Co.,	Ltd. v.  kHoo-Tora Man  d'Esco   Co v.   aving D   roleum	Cong vrtiartu		223 406 353 343 95 406 312 174 29 166 118 131 176 47 154 47 418 120 237 419 6 6 611 412 333 375

CONTENTS—continued.		PAGE
Ternstrom & Roos: - Modern Transport Co. v		345
Thames & Creek Motor Boat Co.:—Fenn Lighterage Co. v	***	24
Theodoridi & Co.: -Breynton (Owners of) v		409
Thomson, Watson & Co. v. Poverty Bay Farmers' Meat Co	***	421
Tokufuku Maru. The		191
Town Line, In re		197
Trading Society Kwik-Hoo-Tong v. Royal Commission on Sugar Su	pply 90	343
Turnbuil, Scott & Co.:-Commissioners of Inland Revenue v		194
Ugo Bassi, The		188
Ulster Bank and Others :- Howden Bros. v		199
Union Castle Mail Steamship Co. v. Sena Sugar Estates, Ltd		251
Union Lighterage Co.:—Johnson v		134
Union Marine Insurance Co.:-Murphy v		372
United States Shipping Board v. Strick & Co		412
v. Westrope & Co		246
** ***********************************		20
Vickers, Ltd., and Others: -Anglo-Polish Steamship Line v	9, 88	3, 121
"Vitruvia" Steamship Co., Ltd. v. Ropner Shipping Co., Ltd.	0,00	223
The area considered to a second consequence con the constant consequence con the constant consequence con the constant consequence con the constant consequence constant consequence conse		240
Walford Lines w. Helical Bar & Engineering Co		420
W-16-1 (T-3-) T43 - C:L T43		354
Washington Many Who	***	398
	***	207
Western Assurance Co. v. Caplan	***	
Westrope & Co.:-United States Shipping Board v	***	246
Williams v. Baltic Insurance Association of London, Ltd	***	126
Witham Outfall Board v. Mayor and Corporation of Boston		356
Wogan v. Laird Line, Ltd., and Clan Line Steamers, Ltd		221
Woolwich, Mayor, Aldermen and Councillors of:-Port of	London	_
Authority v	103	3, 305
Tagaland Was		900
Zaanland, The	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	399
Zelo, The	***	9, 41

## LLOYD'S LIST LAW REPORTS.

REPRINTED (WITH ADDITIONS) FROM

## LLOYD'S LIST

AND

### SHIPPING GAZETTE.

Edited by J. A. EDWARDS, of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law.

Vol. 19. No. 1]

THURSDAY, MAY 22, 1924.

BY SUBSCRIPTION

### HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, May 1, 1924.

BOLANDS, LTD. v. LONDON & LANCASHIRE FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY, LTD.

Before Viscount Finlay, Lord Atkinson, Lord Summer, Lord Blanesburgh and Lord Darling.

Insurance—Burglary and theft—Loss in consequence of riots excepted — Incidents essential to constitute a riot.

Their Lordships to-day allowed the appeal of the London & Lancashire Fire Insurance Company, Ltd., which raised the question whether Belands, Ltd., Dublin, were entitled to recover notwithstanding the exception of "riot" in a policy of insurance. Four armed men entered the respondents' premises, held up with revolvers the employees there present, and took possession of cash amounting to £1250.

A condition of the policy was that the insurance did not cover loss directly or indirectly caused by or happening through or in consequence of invasions, hostilities, acts of foreign enemy, riots, strikes, civil commotions, &c. The arbitrators found that on the evidence it had been sufficiently proved that the loss did not in any way arise under or through civil commotion, but, being of opinion that the facts in regard to the circumstances in which the money was stolen constituted a riot within the legal definition of the word, found that the claimants were not entitled to recover. The King's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice in Southern Ireland held that the arbitrators were not justified in so finding. This decision was affirmed (13 Ll.L. Rep. 413) by the High Court of Appeal for Ireland.

Mr. S. L. Brown, K.C., and Mr. Herbert Samuels (instructed by Messrs. Hoey & Denning, Dublin, and Mr. W. C. Crocker, London) appeared for the appellants; respondents were represented by Mr. Gerald FitzGibbon, K.C., and Mr. T. G. Marnam (instructed by Messrs. D. & T. Fitzgerald, Dublin, Messrs. Dyson, Bell & Co., agents).

#### JUDGMENT.

Viscount Finlar, in moving that the appeal should be allowed, said: My Lords, 'his is a case stated by arbitrators for the opinion of the Court; and it now comes before your Lordships by way of appeal. The action is one brought upon a policy of insurance. It is expressed to be a policy against loss by burglary, housebreaking and theft of certain cash mentioned in the policy, being £5,000 in cash in the cashier's office of the assured's bakery known as the City of Dublin Bakery. And then follows the proviso:—

Provided that this insurance does not cover loss directly or indirectly caused by or happening through or in consequence of (a) Invasions, hostilities, acts of foreign enemy, riots, strikes, civil commotions, rebellions, insurrections, military or usurped power or martial law or the burning of property by the order of any public authority; (b) Incendiarism, directly or indirectly connected with any of the circumstances or causes above mentioned in (a).

Now, my Lords, the circumstances under which this loss occurred are compendiously stated in the case. The arbitrators set out the terms of the policy in the case; and then in par. 3 they state at some length the circumstances in which the loss occurred. They say that the watchman of the premises heard a knock at the side door. He opened it; and four men entered, none of whom was disguised, pushed in the watchman and ordered him to go down the yard. Then they searched him and one of them directed him to put up his hands and kept him in that position until the robbers left. The others rushed into the office, shouted

"Hands up." covering all who were present with revolvers; and then the names of those present were given. They asked where the telephone was, and cut it. The cashier, seeing a hand presenting a revolver at him from outside his office window, had left the cash office enclosure, but at the door of the outer office was held up by one of the armed men who ordered him to put up his hands and stand further up the room. Then the money was taken away by one of the men and certain other money which was being counted up. One of the armed men came to where the cashier had been directed to stand and asked him to point out the safe, saying: " Have the contents of this (revolver) or give me the keys of the safe." The cashier pointed out the safe, which was open. It had been locked before the last vanman had arrived but had been opened to put away the cash received. Two of the robbers went to the safe and took what money they found there but overlooked the larger banknotes and a quantity of Treasury notes. The robbery occupied about ten minutes; and the employees present were warned not to leave the premises for a quarter of an hour. The men were not disguised and the cashier thinks he can identify two of them.

Now, my Lords, the circumstances as there stated seem to me to constitute what in the legal sense of the term would be a riot. Whether one looks at the acts that were done or threatened, or at the number of persons present, or the whole surroundings, one is forced to the same conclusion that it would be perfectly impossible to say that all the essentials for the constitution of the offence of riot at law did not exist. There was a riot beyond all question.

Now it is said that the exception in the policy of loss by riot does not apply to this case because the riot was in truth the theft itself under another name. The theft was conducted by a number of persons after considerable violence and threats of greater violence; and it is contended that where riot is the very offence of theft itself owing to the manner in which it was carried out the exception does not apply. For the purpose of answering the question that arises on that, one must look at the words of the proviso: " Provided that this insurance does not cover loss directly or indirectly caused by happening through or in consequence of (a) invasions, hostilities, acts of foreign enemy..." These are mentioned for the purpose of excluding all idea of anything done in the way of taking money by a foreign enemy or in the course of anything that might be described as an invasion, and in the case of hostilities generally for the purpose of excluding the idea that that would be a theft within the meaning of the policy. While that is perfectly true, it is also true that these words are introduced for the purpose of excluding thefts which might take place in the confusion incidental to any of the things that are there enumerated under the three heads to which I have just referred-invasion, hostilities, acts of foreign enemies -if they were directly or indirectly caused by or happened through or in consequence of any of these things.

Then we come to the head of riots. I pass that by for the moment but will return to it when I have run through the other heads.

"Strikes." Strikes are mentioned 1 presume because, unfortunately, strikes are sometimes attended with a good deal of disorder; and it may happen that thefts of money take place in the course of some disorder that originated out of a strike.

disorder that originated out of a strike.
"Civil commotions." That we are not at liberty to deal with on this case, in my opinion, because the case is stated in a very special manner. The appellants deny liability on the ground of riot and civil commotion. As to the latter ground.

We find (that is, the arbitrators) that on the evidence the claimants proved sufficiently that the loss did not in any way arise under or through civil commotion but being of opinion that the facts... hereof in regard to the circumstances in which the money was stolen constituted a riot within the legal definition of the word...

they so find and award; and leave as a question for the Court whether upon the facts therein stated they were justified in so finding. That I take to mean this. The question for the Court is whether in point of law the arbitrators could come to the conclusion they did as to the effect of the clause so far as riot is concerned. I do not read the reference to the Court as extending at all to the question of civil commotion. That the arbitrators dealt with. They saw their way to decide that right off and they did not state any case with regard to the effect of the words "civil commotion"; and it is quite impossible for us in the absence of any reference to the Court as to whether in point of law the finding of the arbitrators can be supported, and in the absence of any power of the Court or of your Lordships' House to draw inferences of fact, to say whether in our opinion the arbitrators were right or wrong in the conclusion of fact to which they came. The question of civil commotion is entirely beyond the province assigned to your Lordships; and this appeal is one upon which we have to deal only with the question stated; and that is the question with regard to the word "riots." I have gone into that as my reason for not saying anything further about civil commotion as one of the heads in the proviso of the policy.

Then it goes on: "rebellion, incendiarism, military or usurped power or martial law or the burning of property by the order of any public authority." Then, "(b) incendiarism directly or indirectly connected with any of the circumstances or causes above mentioned in (a)." I need not go again through the considerations to which I have adverted in dealing with any of the earlier heads in this department. They equally apply to the heads to which I have just referred in the latter part of the paragraph.

Now, in those circumstances, the question put to the Court and with which your Lordships have on appeal to deal is whether on the facts herein stated the arbitrators were justified in finding that the loss was caused by or happened through or in consequence of a riot within the meaning of the said policy and the claimants are not entitled to recover any sums of money from the respondents in respect of the said loss. I certainly am not prepared to find that the arbitrators were not justified in coming to that conclusion. On the contrary, I think they were right. We have been told that the word "riot" should not be read in its legal sense. In the course of the arguments I myself asked several times that if we were not to take the legal sense of the word then what was the sense in which the word was to be read. I confess I have heard no satisfactory answer to that question put either by me or by the other members of your Lordships' House who have taken part in this consideration; and, so far from thinking or saying that the arbitrators were wrong, I am bound to say they were perfectly right. I do not see how it can be read satisfactorily in any other way.

Now, reference has been made to the very pointed passage delivered by Ronan, L.J., in the case of Boggan v. Motor Union Insurance Co., Ltd., [1922] 2 Ir. Rep. 184. at p. 189. The Lord Justice says this:—

In dealing with this case we must consider whether the robbery occurred during a riot or whether we must take Clause 2 and Exception (c) together, and read Clause 2 as "loss or damage by burglary, housebreaking or theft, except where such burglary, housebreaking or theft constitutes a riot in law." That seems to me to be inconsistent with the policy as a whole. The meaning of the policy seems to be if while a riot is in progress or if there has been a riot and in consequence of it a theft takes place the company is free; but the mere fact that the crime of theft itself contains elements of riot at law does not exclude the right of the insured under the policy. In that case, every robbery for which on indictment the accused would technically be convicted also for riot would be outside the policy.

I confess I am quite unable to accept the view which the Lord Justice seems to indicate in this passage as being that to which he inclined. This policy was drawn at a time when it seems to have been apprehended that there might be disturbances of various kinds in the country in which the cash, the subject of the insurance, was situated; and it provides against the contingency of theft which was insured against occurring during or in consequence of various things, one of them being riots. As I have said, that there was a riot here in the circumstances in which this money was taken, I think it is perfectly impossible to doubt. Force was used; and it is clear that those who were conducting the operations felt that they had force behind them

and that they could control the situation. That amounted to a riot. Why are we to say that the proviso does not apply? It seems to me that it does. Why should it apply only if the riot is a collateral event during which the theft takes place and not apply to a riot one object of which at all events was the actual committing of the theft. I cannot so cut down the nature of the policy. I read it as applying to the circumstances of the present case.

It seems to me that the only conclusion that we can satisfactorily arrive at is that the arbitrators were right in the view which they took as to the construction of the policy and the facts relating to this robbery.

Lord ATKINSON: I concur. I have only a word to add. I think during a part of the argument one would have supposed that the words "riot" and "burglary" were mutually inconsistent terms. There is no doubt that riot may be committed in connection with burglary, or burglary in the course of riot, or riot may be indulged in for the very purpose of committing a burglary. It would appear to me clear that the loss of this money on this particular night was either caused directly or indirectly or happened through or in consequence of what was done by these people on June 1. It would appear to me that if the word "riot" was to be taken in its ordinary sense, what they did in bringing about that loss amounted to a riot. The arbitrators have construed the policy; and they have held that the word "riot" where it occurs in it means riot in the ordinary sense; and they have found that the evidence given before them entirely supports and sustains that conclusion. Indeed, Mr. Fitzgibbon himself admitted that the people who were engaged in this attack on the house could have been indicted and convicted on that evidence of a riot, taking the word in its ordinary sense. Therefore, if this appeal is not to succeed you must conclude that the word "riot" is used in the proviso in a sense different from its ordinary sense, because it is admitted by Counsel for the respondent that if it is to be interpreted in its ordinary sense the finding of the arbitrators cannot be disturbed. During the progress of the argument, I think all the different members of the House on different occasions have endeavoured to find out what is the sense in which it is to be read, if it is not the ordinary sense. What is this kind of diluted sense in which the word is to be read if not the ordinary sense? We have not been shown either directly or indirectly from the nature of the document or the context how the word is to be used in other than its ordinary meaning. I think it must receive the ordinary meaning. It has received the ordinary meaning at the hands of the arbitrators. I think their position was upheld by the evidence given before them and they came to the right conclusion; and I think this appeal must accordingly succeed.

Lord SUMNER: I agree. What was said

by your Lordships in the case of Boggan (16 Ll.L.Rep. 64) or by two at least of the noble and learned Lords, and apparently with the concurrence of the others present, would not itself prevent difficulties in the way of anyone who sought to distinguish that case from the present case. I should certainly have hesitated long before setting myself to that task; but without relying exclusively on that decision I think that on a consideration of the words of the contract in question the result must be the same and the appeal ought to succeed. There has been in this case quite clearly a loss of the cash described and insured by theft. Everything therefore turns upon the proviso relied upon by the appellants as excluding the loss in question from those losses which are covered under those terms by the policy. The material words "Provided that this insurance does not cover loss" (that is to say, loss of the cash described by them) "directly or indirectly by a riot." Can it be said that this loss was not either directly or indirectly caused by a riot? I think it cannot. Can it be said that the learned arbitrators, who were in agreement upon this question and who found and awarded that the loss was caused by riot upon the facts found and stated by them, were wrong? I do not question that the contention which has been urged on behalf of the respondents and, as far as I am concerned, urged in such a way as to incline me if that were possible in their favour, is not one which so far as it goes is borne out by the language of the proviso. The proviso no doubt does include those cases where theft is facilitated by an antecedent or simultaneous matter such as enumerated there, but it is not enough to say that it includes such cases. It is necessary to show that it is confined to them; and that I see no warrant for doing. It is true that the uninstructed layman probably does not think of the word "riot" in such a sense as described in the case stated. How he would describe it I know not: but he probably thinks of something, if not more picturesque, at any rate more noisy. But there is no warrant here for saying that when the proviso uses a word which is emphatically a term of art it is to be confined in the interpretation of the policy to circumstances which are within popular notions of the subject and are not within the technical meaning of the word. That clearly must be so with regard to martial law. That clearly must be so with regard to the acts of a foreign enemy; and I see no reason at all why the word "riot" should not include its technical meaning as clearly as burglary or housebreaking do.

Furthermore, the incidents out of which this occurred comply in my view with those very tests which are put forward to us as being essential to constitute a riot within the proviso. In broad daylight a gang of armed men, having obtained entrance into premises by a trick, cow if not terrorise a superior number of persons by running into the place and shouting to them to hold up their hands and threatening them with

death if they failed to do what they were called upon to do. I should have thought that if the criminals should have had more hardihood and had had the courage to fire as apparently they had not when a couple of men of considerable nerve resisted them unarmed, not only the noise but the resulting disturbance generally might have extended very far. It appears to me that it was a tumult and certainly a disturbance of the public peace which to a layman as well as to a lawyer might well on consideration of these aspects of it be called a riot. And so it seems to have struck the learned arbitrators. Nor was it decided that had the case been tried by a jury there was a case to go to the jury on the application of the policy even in the sense of the word "riot" contended for by the respondents. It is also quite true that some of those enumerated and excepted matters are such as do not directly cause a theft, though they may do so indirectly. That is true, I take it, of strikes and burning of property by order of a public authority: and it is also true on the other hand that the direct cause of theft may be found among the enumerated matters not merely in the word riots, but also in the case of foreign enemies and also in the case of usurped powers, and I imagine also in the case of the words civil commotion. Therefore when you have a clause which is adapted to cover two classes of cases, one a class which can only operate indirectly and the other a class which can operate both directly and indirectly, the reason fails for suggesting that the proviso is really intended only to refer to circumstances which, as so well put, are circumstances in which the theft insured against was committed but are not relative to the nature or quality of the theft itself. I think, therefore, that on consideration of the construction it must be read against the assured.

It is suggested that there is some ambiguity about them and that in these circumstances one should follow the principle laid down by well-known authorities and construe this proviso which is in favour of the insurance company adverse to them. That broad principle depends upon there being some ambiguity—that is to say, some choice of an expression for those who are responsible for putting forward the clause -which leaves you unable to decide which of the two is the right one. In the present case it is a question only of construction. There may be some difficulty; there may even be some difference of opinion on the construction of this question: but it is a question which is quite capable of being solved by the ordinary rules of grammar; and it appears to me-that there is no ground for saying that there is such ambiguity as to warrant us in reading the clause otherwise than in accordance with the expressed terms; and therefore I agree with the motion which is about to be proposed from the Wooleack.

Lord BLANESBURGH: During the course of

the argument I was personally very much impressed with the view of the proviso as found in this policy taken by Ronan, L.J., in the passage of his judgment in Boggan v. Motor Union Insurance Co., sup., which has been read by the noble Lord on the Woolsack. I am constrained, however, to come to the conclusion that the answer to that view of the proviso has just been stated by the noble Lord who preceded me; and accordingly, though not without some hesitation, I concur in the view which has been expressed by the other members of the House.

Lord DARLING: I merely desire to say that I concur with the conclusions which have been reached by the noble Lords who have spoken.

The appeal was allowed.

#### HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, May 6, 1924.

HARRIS v. McROBERT.

Before Viscount Cave, Viscount Finlay, Lord Ateinson, Lord Sumner and Lord Wrenbury.

Insurance—Brokers and agents—Authority of company's agent to alter terms of fire insurance policy—Insurance on goods "in the open... but warranted not within fifty feet of... building containing fire heat"—Agreement made by agent to alter policy to cover goods in shed built on site where goods previously stored—Agreement repudiated by company—Action by assured against agent.

Their Lordships to-day began the hearing of the appeal of William George Harris, scutch mill owner, carrying on business at Lisky Mills, Killinchy, Co. Down, from a judgment of the Court of Appeal in Northern Ireland affirming a judgment of Lord Justice Moore in favour of John McRobert, 13, Wellington Place, Belfast, a district agent of the Motor Union Insurance Company, Ltd.

On Sept. 26, 1917, the appellant made a proposal to the respondent as agent for the Motor Union Insurance Company, Ltd., to insure flax and tow in and about appellant's mill against loss by fire, and subsequently a policy was issued insuring, the flax and tow for £1700 against destruction or damage by fire. The property was described in the policy as,

flax and tow, the property of the insured or held by him in trust or on commission or for which he was responsible.

and the sum of £1000 was set opposite flax and tow

in the open there, but warranted not within fifty feet of said mill or other building containing fire heat.

By Condition 2 of the policy, it was provided that

If after the insurance has been effected the risk be increased from any cause whatsoever, or if any property hereby insured be removed from the building or place in which it is described as being contained without in every case the assent or sanction of the company signified by endorsement hereon the insurance as to the property thereby effected is void.

In October, 1918, the appellant erected a shed with a corrugated iron roof on the site on which was situated the flax and tow described in the policy as "in the open there " for the purpose of storing flax and tow therein. On Dec. 13, 1918, the appellant paid the respondent the premium for renewing the policy until Sept. 29, 1919, and the respondent agreed to alter the policy so as to cover the flax and tow in the shed. On Sept. 1, 1919, a fire took place at the appellant's mill, and a quantity of flax and tow, including five tons of tow stored in the shed, was destroyed. The insurance company repudiated all liability on the ground that the respondent was not their agent for the purpose of entering into the agreement for altering or agreeing to alter any of the terms of the policy, and that he had no authority for so doing.

The appellant issued a writ against the insurance company, but on becoming aware that the respondent had no authority to bind the company by the agreement made, the action was discontinued, and a writ was issued by the appellant against the respondent, McRobert. The action was tried before Lord Justice Moore and a jury, who found for the respondent.

The Court of Appeal in Northern Ireland affirmed this judgment on the ground that there was no evidence of authority in the respondent to agree to the alleged alteration, but that the appellant had sustained no damage and that the warranty as to the 50 feet remained.

The appellant was represented by Mr. Henry Hanna, K.C., Mr. W. Martin Whitaker, and Mr. Walter O. Hume (instructed by Messrs. H. Wallace & Co., Downpatrick, Mr. Herbert Z. Deane, agent).

The respondent was represented by Sir Leslie Scott, K.C., Mr. Å. B. Babington, K.C., and Mr. S. L. Porter (instructed by Messrs. C. & H. Jefferson, Belfast, Messrs. Barlow, Lyde & Yates, agents).

Mr. Hanna, in opening the case for the appellant, submitted that respondent warranted that he had authority to enter into an agreement to alter the terms of the policy, whereas he had no authority to do so. The warranty on which the judgment appealed against was founded was not at any time relied upon by the respondent are a ground for avoiding the policy.

Thursday, May 8, 1924.

Sir LESLIE Scorr contended for the respondent that to establish a breach it was necessary to show that the insurance company were under no obligation to the assured, but this had not been done. The Chancery action was abandoned, but either the appellant should never have commenced it or he should have continued it. If the appellant could recover from the company there had been no breach by the agent. If the agent had no warranty and the assured could not recover on other grounds, e.g., distance, then the appellant had suffered no loss, because even if the agent had full authority there was a breach of the insurance conditions. appellant had misconceived his remedy from the start. He should have had his arbitration with the insurance company.

Judgment was reserved.

#### HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, May 8, 1924.

ANGLO-SAXON PETROLEUM COMPANY, LTD. v. STEAUA ROMANA SOCIETE ANONYME POUR L'INDUSTRIE DU PETROLE AND OTHERS.

Before Viscount CAVE, Viscount FINLAY, Lord ATKINSON, Lord Sumner and Lord WRENBURY.

Procedure-Service of writ outside jurisdiction-Contract-Sale of oil f.o.b .- Claim for repayment of money had and received—R.S.C. Order XI., r. 1 (e).

Their Lordships to-day began the hearing of the appeal of the Anglo-Saxon Petroleum Company, Ltd., London, against the Steaua Romana Société Anonyme pour l'Industrie du Pétrole and other petroleum companies. The appeal arose out of an application made by the appellants to Mr. Justice Roche for leave to serve out of jurisdiction a number of Rumanian companies and a Dutch company in respect of a contract made for the purchase of about 50,000 tons of oil. The issue to be decided is whether there is an arguable cause of action shown as falling within the provisions of Order XI. of the Rules of the Supreme Court, which authorises service of writs outside the jurisdiction of the Courts.

The contract provided for delivery of the oil in equal monthly instalments. There was also provision for the deposit of a sum of £400,000 in a bank in London towards payment. Certain deliveries exhausted £225,000 of the deposit, and the respondents made no further deliveries.

It was alleged by the appellants that both the failure to present documents in Lon-don in respect of oil in excess of the quantity prepaid by the deposit and the failure

to repay the balance of £175,000, the consideration for which had failed, constituted breaches of contract in respect of which leave to serve out of jurisdiction could be granted.

The respondents contended that there had been no breach of contract within the jurisdiction; that an action for money received did not come within Order XI., Rule 1 (e): and that in any event the respondents never had or received any money at all on behalf of or to the use of the appellants.

Mr. Justice Roche accepted the appellants' contention, and dismissed the respondents' application, with costs. From this decision the respondents appealed (16 Ll.L.Rep. 3) to the Court of Appeal, who limited the writ in the action to a writ claiming money had and received on the ground that the appellants had a claim for damages in respect of the failure to deliver oil which had been paid for in advance, which could only be prosecuted in Rumania, and that it would not be right to allow the issue of a writ, the effect of which would be to split the claim for damages.

The appellants abandoned their claim for damages for non-delivery of the instalments of oil paid for in advance, and made appeal to the House of Lords, where the questions outstanding between the two parties are the right of the appellants to recover the sum of £175,000, and their right to recover damages in respect of the failure to present documents of title relating to the oil not paid for in advance.

The appellants were represented by Sir John Simon, K.C., Mr. W. A. Jowitt, K.C., and Mr. Lionel L. Cohen (instructed by Messrs. Waltons & Co.); Counsel for the respondents were Mr. R. A. Wright, K.C., and Mr. S. L. Porter (instructed by Messrs. E. F. Turner & Sons).

Sir John Simon, in opening the case for the appellants, said that the deposit of £400,000 would make about two-thirds of the total oil ordered. His case was that the respondents had never supplied quantities of oil up to the amount of £400,000, and that there was a balance of £175,000 representing oil which had been paid for but not delivered. The failure to present documents of title to the oil not paid for in advance constituted a breach of contract within the jurisdiction.

#### Friday, May 9, 1924.

Mr. WRIGHT, for the respondents, contended that the granting of leave to issue a writ for service out of the jurisdiction was a matter of discretion and not of right, and no ground had been shown for interfering with the discretion exercised by the Court of Appeal. By the contract between the parties the whole of the petroleum products were deliverable in Rumania, and therefore no part of the claim was within Order XI., rule 1, as to the serving of a

writ outside the jurisdiction. The only claim (if any) for damages for non-delivery was in respect of the oil already paid for by the deposit of £400,000. No claim had been made on the writ, or at all, for damages for failure to tender documents in London. Their Lordships reserved judgment.

#### COURT OF APPEAL.

Wednesday, Apr. 30, 1924.

BJORNSTAD AND ANOTHER V. OUSE SHIPBUILDING COMPANY, LTD.

Before Lord Justice Bankes, Lord Justice Warrington and Lord Justice Schutton.

Arbitration—Shipbuilding contract containing arbitration clause—Application by Norwegian parties to Court for appointment of arbitrator under Arbitration Act, 1889, Sect. 5—Appeal against appointment of arbitrator—Construction of statute—Discretion of Court held to be exercisable where applicant is a foreigner residing outside the jurisdiction

In this case, the Ouse Shipbuilding Company, Ltd., of Hook, near Goole, appealed from an order of Mr. Justice Talbot, affirming an order of Master Jelf, appointing Mr. D. C. Leck, K.C., as arbitrator in a dispute between the appellants and Messrs. Bjornstad & Braekhus (two Norwegians resident out of the jurisdiction) under a contract for the building of four ships. The contract contained an arbitration clause. After the ships were delivered to the Norwegians, Bjornstad, it was alleged, became bankrupt, and Brackhus took employment with another firm. They disposed of the ships, and then claimed arbitration under the terms of the building contract, alleging that the vessels were not of the contract carrying capacity. It was in these circumstances, upon an originating summons taken out by the respondents, that the order for the appointment of the arbitrator was made. the appellants it was now submitted that under Sect. 5 of the Arbitration Act there was discretion in the Court to refuse to appoint an arbitrator and power in the Court to make it a condition of any such appointment that the foreign parties seeking the appointment should give security for costs.

Mr. Clement E. Davies (instructed by Messrs. A. M. Jackson & Co., of Hull, Messrs. Pritchard & Sons, agents) appeared for the appellants; and Mr. C. T. Le Quesne (instructed by Messrs. Sanderson & Co., of Hull, Messrs. Botterell & Roche, agents) represented the respondents.

#### JUDGMENT.

Lord Justice Bankes, in giving judgment, said: This appeal raises an important

point. The parties are Norwegians on the one side and shipbuilders in this country on the other. An agreement was entered into in 1919 for the building of a number of ships by the shipbuilding company for the Norwegians. The agreement contained an arbitration clause. Disputes arose between the parties with reference to whether the ships were or were not of the contract carrying capacity; and the Norwegian parties claimed arbitration under the contract. The shipbuilding company refused to concur in the appointment of an arbitrator; and the Norwegians then made an application under Sect. 5 of the Arbitration Act, 1989, to the Court, by originating summons, asking the Court to appoint an arbitrator, all conditions precedent under the section having been complied with. That section, so far as it is material, provides :--

In any of the following cases:—(a) Where a submission provides that the reference shall be to a single arbitrator, and all the parties do not after differences have arisen concur in the appointment of an arbitrator: . . . any party may serve the other parties . . . with a written notice to appoint an arbitrator. . . .

That has been done in the present case. The section goes on:—

If the appointment is not made within seven clear days after the service of the notice, the Court or a Judge may, on application by the party who gave the notice, appoint an arbitrator. . . .

Now, the language of the section itself, apart from any judicial decision upon it, would appear to indicate that the Court has discretion in reference to the appointment of an arbitrator, because the words used are "the Court may," which are the same words as those used in Sect. 4 of the same statute and which there is ample authority for saying gives the Court a discretion.

But our attention has been called to a decision of this Court in the case of In rc Eyre and Corporation of Leicester, [1892] 1 Q.B. 136, as to the proper construction to be placed on the language of Sect. 5; and it is said that is a decision to the effect that the word "may" in Sect. 5 must always be read as "must," with the consequence that the Court, when called upon to exercise its powers under Sect. 5, has no discretion at all but must appoint an arbitrator if the conditions precedent have been complied with. Of course, if that is the effect of *In re* Eyre and Corporation of Leicester, we must follow the decision whether we agree with it or not : but in my opinion that decision does not cover the present case, and for this reason. The parties in Eyre's case were both resident in this country; and therefore the question which arises in the present case was not before the Court in Eyre's case. It may be that without that explanation the language used by Lopes, L.J., in particular, would seem to be language wide enough to cover every case; but when one considers the

facts of that case and the language used by Lord Esher, M.R., and Kay, L.J., I think it is plain that the intention of the Court was to confine its decision to the facts of that case, or, at any rate, not to deal with a case which contains the exceptional feature of the present case, namely, that it is a foreigner residing outside the jurisdiction who is seeking to claim the assistance of the Courts. Lord Esher (at p. 142) says this :-

The parties have agreed with regard to certain matters to substitute arbitration by a single arbitrator for a trial in Court; it is admitted that there is a dispute within the submission; the parties have failed to concur in the appointment of an arbitrator; and there has been a proper notice given which has not been complied with. What under these circumstances does the section provide that the Court is to do? It says that the Court " may" appoint an arbitrator. It is argued that under this provision the Court may say in this case, where it is admitted and the Court has decided that there is a dispute within the submission, that it will not force the corporation to go to arbitration, but will leave the contractor to bring an action—that is, that the Court has a discretion to say in such a case that, though one side has contracted to refer the matter to arbitration, they need not act according to their contract, and that the Court will relieve them from it, and the other side must bring their action. I do not think that that is so. I think that in such a case as this, "may" means "must," and that the Court is bound to appoint an arbitrator.

I think that those words, especially the last words, justify the Court in saying that Lord Esher was there confining his decision to the particular facts of that case. I think that Lopes, L.J., expresses himself in language which covers wider ground: but I do not think one ought to read that as language applicable to a case except the one before him. He says at p. 143:-

With regard to the language of the section, I think that in a case like the present where there is a dispute clearly within the submission and a failure to concur in the appointment of an arbitrator, and the proper notice has been given, the word "may" is equivalent to " must."

But when you come to the judgment of Kay, L.J., it seems to me very instructive. He says at pp. 143-4:--

I understand that in this case it is admitted that some of the matters in dispute were clearly such as came within and ought to be referred under the submission. In such a case I do not think the Court would have a discretion to say that it would not entertain the application, assuming, of course, that all the necessary preliminary steps had been taken-that is to say that there had been a sufficient

notice within the section, and no appointment had been made within the seven days. In such a case I do not think the Court ought to exercise any discretion, if it has any; its duty under such circumstances really becomes only ministerial. I, therefore, agree that for the purposes of this case the word "may" must be treated as equivalent to "must." But I do not wish to hold that in every case " may" in this section is equivalent to " must."

I think the Lord Justice is there expressing his own opinion and is explaining what, in his view, is the meaning of the language used by the other members of the Court, when he says that in such a case he did not think the Court had any discretion because he considered its duty was ministerial, but he was not prepared to say that in every circumstance the Court had no discretion.

Speaking for myself, I do not think this decision does bind us where in a case, as here, the person invoking the assistance of the Court is a foreigner resident outside the jurisdiction. With regard to such persons it is clear that Order 65, r. 6, gives the Court power to order security for costs in any cause or matter, but it may be that we should have no right to make such an order in an arbitration directly affecting the costs of that arbitration or to order that security should be given in an arbitration: but I think it is a very different matter if one has power to refuse to appoint an arbitrator at all-it is a very different matter when one comes to consider the terms on which one should exercise that discretion in favour of the applicant if it is to be exercised at all.

Therefore I begin by saying that in this particular case the Court has discretion to refuse to appoint an arbitrator in the circumstances of the case and to refuse because the applicant is a foreigner resident outside the jurisdiction. If the Court has that discretion, it seems to me it can attach any reasonable condition to the granting of the application in the exercise of its discretion.

The order of the Court will be that if the respondents within one month give security to the satisfaction of a master for the costs of the arbitration and of this appeal, then the order of Master Jelf shall stand: but, if security be not given, then the orders of Master Jelf and Talbot, J., shall be discharged. The appellants will have the costs here and before the Judge and Master in any event.

Lord Justice WARRINGTON and Lord Justice SCRUTTON concurred.

### COURT OF APPEAL.

Wednesday, Apr. 30, 1924.

ANGLO-POLISH STEAMSHIP LINE, LTD. v. VICKERS, LTD., AND OTHERS.

Before Lord Justice BANKES, Lord Justice Warrington and Lord Justice SCRUTTON.

Procedure-Postponement of trial-Application granted on conditions including payment by applicants of cost of warehousing curgo during postponement-Discretion of Trial Judge.

In this case one of three defendants, Grohnke & Co. (a German corporation), appealed from part of an order of Mr. Justice Greer postponing the trial of the action upon certain terms.

Mr. G. P. Langton (instructed by Messrs. Thomas Cooper & Co.) appeared for the appellants; and Mr. Clement E. Davies (instructed by Messrs, Lawrence Jones &

Co.) represented the respondents.

Mr. LANGTON said that Mr. Justice Greer, on the application of the appellants, postponed the trial from Apr. 9 till May 18, but imposed as a condition that they should pay the costs of and occasioned by the postponement in any event, including the costs of warehousing cargo between the original date of trial and the new date of trial. The appeal was against the latter part of this order relating to the costs of warehousing the goods, which consisted of submarine mines and high explosives, and of which the

appellants were the consignees.

The goods were shipped in October, 1923, by the defendants, Vickers, Limited, and the Anglo-Dutch Development Company, Ltd., on board the plaintiffs' steamship Warszawa, in the Thames for carriage to Danafjord, Gothenburg, or as near thereto as the vessel could safely get. The ship, in fact, went to Rifofjord, the reason alleged being that Danafjord was dangerous. While at Rifofjord the vessel drifted ashore, and certain salvage and, what were said to be general average expenses, were incurred. Ultimately, the cargo was brought back to this country and warehoused in London. The parties had, pending the trial of action, been unable to agree upon terms as to the release of the goods, upon which the plaintiffs claimed to have a lien.

Lord Justice SCRUTTON: Did you offer to

substitute money for the goods?
Mr. Langton: Yes, we offered to give security for £15,000. Counsel submitted that it ought not to be a term of the postponement of the trial that the appellants should pay the costs of warehousing the goods, thus preserving the plaintiffs' lien upon them. The appellants had since offered to give security up to £18,000.

Mr. Davies, for the respondents, submitted that it was purely a question of the Judge's discretion. If the appellants would bring £15,000 into Court, the plaintiffs would give them delivery orders in respect

of the goods.

#### JUDGMENT.

Lord Justice BANKES, in giving judgment, said: We cannot interfere with the discretion exercised by Mr. Justice Greer in this case. The appeal will be dismissed with costs.

Lord Justice WARRINGTON and Lord Justice SCRUTTON concurred.

#### COURT OF APPEAL.

Thursday, May 1, 1924.

MARITIME SALVORS, LTD. v. PELTON STEAMSHIP COMPANY, LTD. (THE " ZELO ").

Before Lord Justice BANKES, Lord Justice WARRINGTON and Lord Justice SCRUTTON.

Collision with sunken wreck-Assessment of dumages - Objections to Registrar's report-Value of expectation of salving wreck.

In this case the defendants, owners of the Newcastle steamship Zelo, appealed from a judgment (18 Ll.L.Rep. 257) of the President of the Admiralty Division (Sir Henry Duke) in substance affirming a second report of the Admiralty Registrar awarding damages to the plaintiffs, the Maritime Salvors, Ltd., upon the ground .that their chance of salving the wreck of the Finnish steamship Merkur and her cargo in Barry Roads, in September, 1920, had been frustrated by the Zelo negligently colliding with the wreck.

Mr. A. D. Bateson, K.C., and Mr. R. H. Balloch (instructed by Messrs. Botterell, Roche & Temperley, of Newcastle, Messrs. Botterell & Roche, agents) appeared for the appellants; and Mr. A. T. Miller, K.C., and Mr. Lewis Noad (instructed by Messrs. Constant & Constant) represented the respon-

When this case originally came before the Registrar he took the view that even if the Zelo had not collided with the wreck the Merkur and her cargo would never have been salved, but on appeal the President held that at the time of the collision the undertaking was not a hopeless one in the sense that a reasonable man would then have forthwith abandoned it, and his Lord ship gave the plaintiffs leave to present an amended claim to the Registrar. At the second hearing the Registrar made a report in the plaintiffs' favour of £27,500 for the Merkur and £9681 for her cargo.

Upon a further appeal to the President he held on the main issue that there was no ground for interfering with this second report of the Registrar, which he accordingly affirmed except as to £4500, being 50 per cent. of the estimated cost of docking the salved wreck, and of the extra expense which would have been involved by the suggested recovery being postponed by one month. Hence the present appeal of the defendants, on whose behalf it was argued that upon all the evidence, including that given at the second reference to the Registrar, the original conclusion was right that the Zelo had not destroyed any chance which the plaintiffs had of salving wreck and cargo.

#### Friday, May 2, 1924.

With the leave of the Court the notice of appeal was amended so as to extend the appeal to the first judgment (14 Ll.L.Rep. 266) of the President, whereby he had sent the case back to the Registrar, who originally had reported against the plaintiffs' claim.

Mr. Bateson, in further argument on behalf of the appellants, contended that this original report ought to be restored.

#### Monday, May 5, 1924.

Mr. Miller, for the respondents, said the submissions for the appellants were based upon a reading of the evidence with which he entirely disagreed, and upon an erroneous view of the whole circumstances of the case. The Merkur, when struck by the Zclo, was lying on a favourable bottom near to the shore in the Bristol Channel, and she had a small external puncture in her side. She was then in charge of extremely competent salvors, equipped with efficient salving plant. In these circumstances the answer of the wrongdoers to the present claim was, "She could not have been salved, or, at any rate, you, the plaintiffs, could not have salved her." That, submitted Counsel, was absolute rubbish.

On the question of quantum, Mr. Miller argued that at the date when the tort was committed the wreck was worth salving and that the point of falling values of ships did not arise.

Mr. Bateson replied, and their Lordships reserved judgement.

#### COURT OF APPEAL.

Wednesday, May 7, 1924.

CHARTERED TRUST AND EXECUTOR COMPANY v. LONDON & SCOTTISH ASSURANCE CORPORATION.

Before Lord Justice Bankes, Lord Justice Scrutton and Lord Justice Atkin.

Insurance (Marine)—Loss by scuttling— Judgment in favour of innocent mortgagees set aside by consent.

An application was made in this case which arose ort of the loss of the steamship General Turner, and in which an

appeal had been entered by the defendants, the underwriters, and cross-notice of appeal as to quantum had been given by the plaintiffs, the innocent mortgagees, from a judgment of Mr. Justice Roche (16 Ll.L.Rep. 150).

Mr. S. L. PORTER (instructed by Messrs. Parker, Garrett & Co.), for the appellants, said that originally there were two actions, one by the owners of the General Turner and the other by the innocent mortgagees. Mr. Justice Roche gave judgment against the shipowners, finding that the vessel had been scuttled, but in favour of the innocent mortgagees. The appeal and cross-appeal were against that judgment, the crossappeal being on the question of amount. Since that judgment the House of Lords had given their judgment in the case of the Gregorios (13 Ll.L.Rep. 211), holding that the loss in such circumstances was not by a marine risk. In view of that ruling the plaintiffs, the innocent mortgagees, had consented to the judgment of Mr. Justice Roche in their favour being set aside, and the present application was made by consent to obtain an order of the Court to that

Lord Justice Bankes: By consent the appeal of the defendants will be allowed, with costs, and the cross-appeal of the plaintiffs dismissed with costs.

### ADMIRALTY DIVISION.

(IN PRIZE.)

Wednesday, Apr. 30, 1924.

STEAMSHTP "AJAX" AND OTHER VESSELS (CONSIGNMENTS TO ALOIS SCHWEIGER & CO.).

Before the President (the Right Hon. SIR HENRY DUKE).

Prize—Goods imported by enemy domiciled in England—Part goods imported before outbreak of war—Part at sea at outbreak of war and afterwards delivered to and sold by enemy firm —Part permitted by Controller to pass into commercial use.

Mr. CECIL W. LILLEY, instructed by the Treasury Solicitor, appearing for the Procurator-General, applied for the condemnation of a sum of approximately £20,000, being the proceeds of the sale of goods laden on the Ajax, Berbera, Chyebassa, Clan Grant, Clan Macfadyen, Gascon, Golcondu, Greenland, Llandovery Castle, Manora, Malda, Mashobra, Mombassa, Nevasa, Nyanza, Poland, Stentor and Zealand, and seized under a writ. The ground of the claim was that the goods and their proceeds were enemy property. Schweiger' & Co. carried on business from a head office in Vienna and had branches in Mombassa, Turin, Manchester and other places. The names of the ships, parcels of goods and the proceeds were set out in schedules