







1892 and O'Shaugnessy are precluded by their conduct and  
O'SHAUG- acquiescence from disturbing Ball in the exercise of  
NESSY his rights on these booms as they claim to be entitled  
v. to do in this case. I need on this point but refer to  
BALL. the remarks I made in the previous case.  
Taschereau

J.

*Appeal dismissed with costs.*

Solicitor for appellants: *M. Honan.*

Solicitor for respondent: *P. N. Martel.*

---