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not be liable for any damage caused by an explosion unless fire should ensue from it.

While this policy was in effect, an explosion occurred in a structure which was some eighty feet from plaintiff's building. A fire preceded this explosion, and due to severe wind sparks were blown on the roof of plaintiff's building, causing a damage of $10. The principal damage to plaintiff's building was caused by concussion due to the explosion in the other building, and plaintiff seeks to recover for this damage.

The court held that this class of risk was not within the reasonable intendment of the parties when they made the contract, and as a result they did not contemplate that the policy should cover a loss arising from the concussion of air produced by the explosion on the premises of other persons than the insured, regardless of whether the explosion was preceded by fire. Plaintiff was given judgment for $10, the amount of the fire alone.

INTOXICATING LIQUORS—MERELY POSSESSION OF JAMAICA GINGER NOT UNLAWFUL.

*Young vs. State*, 102 So. 161.

Appellant was convicted of having intoxicating liquors upon his premises. When his saloon was searched a certain quantity of Jamaica ginger was seized by the sheriff. Subsequently he was convicted for the possession of the above. The court held that it was necessary for the state to prove, first, that the defendant sold the article, second, that the compound was intoxicating, and, third, that it was sold by the defendant as a spiritous beverage and not as a medicine. The state having failed to prove the above, and the fact that Jamaica ginger is primarily used as a medicine, its possession cannot be unlawful per se.

MASTER AND SERVANT—SPECIAL EMPLOYER OF AIRPLANE PILOT FURNISHED BY GENERAL EMPLOYER HELD LIABLE FOR INJURIES TO PILOT.

*Famous Players-Lasky Corporation vs. Industrial Accident Commission of California*, 228 Pac. 5.

The Famous Players-Lasky Corporation while engaged in the filming of a moving picture, acquired from the Williams Bros. Aircraft Corporation the use of one of their airplanes to be piloted by one of the latter's employees. While flying at a low level, due to plaintiff's orders, the pilot was injured. The court held that he could recover compensation from the plaintiff, as the Williams Corporation gave the pilot no other direction than that he should