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sufficiently proved the Court would have annulled the marriage. In Lyon v. Lyon, 230 Ill. 366, 82 N. E. 850, 13 L. R. A. (N. S.) 996, it was held that a false representation that defendant had not had an attack of epilepsy for eight years is not sufficient to warrant the annuling of the marriage. In a dictum in Reynolds v. Reynolds, 3 Allen 605, 606 Chief Justice Biglow said: "No misconception as to . . . health . . . however brought about, will support an allegation of fraud on which a dissolution of the marriage contract, when once executed, can be obtained in a Court of Justice."

Positive authority against the conclusion in the principal case can be found in Richardson v. Richardson, 140 N. E. (Mass.) 73, holding that if the wife prior to marriage concealed the fact that she was afflicted with epilepsy, an incurable disease, nevertheless it would not be a ground for annuling the marriage.

All that can be said after reviewing the cases is that the Courts are in conflict without enough cases being decided on one side or the other to establish a clear line of authority.

H. C. A., '27.
that the Oregon Hardware Co. might obtain its indebtedness. The
decision was for the plaintiff, on a trial by the court without a jury,
and Ben appealed.

The Supreme Court held that as a general rule one partner has
no authority to bind the partnership or his co-partner by such a con-
tract; and that the burden of proof is on the party alleging the con-
tract to show express or implied authority, or a ratification by the
other partner. Such ratification would, of course, bind the firm, and
might be either express or implied, from circumstances and conduct
or express statements. But here, the court held, M. Abrams had
implied authority, and Ben knowingly ratified; for the father trans-
acted the main part of the business, and kept the firm bank account
in his own name; and furthermore Ben paid a portion of the indebted-
ness in merchandise on a date subsequent to the agreement, and ac-
cordingly acknowledged its validity, as he acted with knowledge of all
the facts, as a conversation relating to the matter had been carried
on in his presence immediately prior to that time. Thereafter, he made
no objection for a long time, and even though he did not actually
intend to ratify, it is a presumption of law that a person intends the
ordinary consequences of his voluntary act. The decision of the lower
court was therefore affirmed.

The general rule, as stated by the Supreme Court of Oregon, is
borne out by numerous cases. It was held in Rollins v. Stevens (1850),
31 Me. 454, in Olive v. Morgan (1894), 8 Tex. Civ. App. 654, 28 S.
W. 5/2, and in First Nat. Bank v. Farson et al. (1919), 226 N. Y.
218, 123 N. E. 490, that a member of a commercial partnership has no
implied authority to bind the firm as surety or guarantor for another.
This seems to mean, however, not so much that there is no implied
authority whatever, as that any implied authority must be implied
from the circumstances of the particular case, as the rule of Seufert v.
Gille (1910), 230 Mo. 453, 131 S. W. 102, 31 L. R. A. (N. S.) 471,
is that a partner has no implied authority to bind the firm by contracts
of suretyship, either for himself individually or for strangers to the
firm, and the holder of such an obligation must show special authority
to make the contract, or an implied authority from the common course
of business of the firm, or previous course of dealing between the
parties. It is nevertheless interesting to note that the Supreme Court
of Oregon rested its decision in point of emphasis, not so much on an
implied authority, or on the ingenious argument of the plaintiff that
the contract was to the interest of the partnership, as on a ratification
by Ben at a subsequent time.