



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Author and Title

Bennett, Edmund H

Fire insurance cases,

Call Number	KF 1196 A513	Vol. 1	Copy
-------------	--------------------	-----------	------

THIS BOOK DOES NOT CIRCULATE  
OUTSIDE THE BUILDING

Name	Location

Bennett, Edmund H  
Fire insurance cases.

KF  
1196  
A513

Vol.  
1

# **FIRE INSURANCE CASES:**

**BEING**

**A COLLECTION OF ALL THE REPORTED CASES  
ON FIRE INSURANCE, IN ENGLAND, IRELAND,  
SCOTLAND, AND AMERICA,**

**FROM**

**THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE PRESENT TIME,**

**"CHRONOLOGICALLY ARRANGED.**

**VOL. I.**

**COVERING THE PERIOD FROM 1729 TO 1839.**

**WITH NOTES AND REFERENCES.**

**BY**

**EDMUND H. BENNETT.**

**NEW YORK:  
PUBLISHED BY HURD AND HOUGHTON.**

**Cambridge: Riverside Press.**

**1872.**

NC  
KF  
1175  
A513  
1.1

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1872, by  
EDMUND H. BENNETT,  
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

RIVERSIDE, CAMBRIDGE:  
PRINTED BY H. O. HOUGHTON AND COMPANY.

To

**HON. REUBEN ATWATER CHAPMAN, LL. D.,  
CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS,**

**This Volume**

**IS RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED**

**BY THE EDITOR.**

## PREFACE.

---

THAT the actually adjudged cases are the only original and authoritative sources of the common law, and that text-books are at best often unreliable, is recognized by all. That these reported cases, scattered through so many hundred and even thousand volumes, are practically inaccessible to the great body of the profession is equally true. The only mode therefore by which the lawyer can be brought in direct contact with the primary sources of the law is to collect and present together the reported decisions upon its various branches. The publication of leading or selected cases, though extremely valuable, yet lacks the important element of completeness. If the lawyer is *assured* that he has before him every reported case upon the subject he is investigating, he has the satisfaction of knowing that no further research in that direction is necessary.

This collection is designed to embrace all the reported cases upon fire insurance on land, gleaned from the English, Scotch, Irish, and American reports, including the British Provinces, chronologically arranged. The present volume covers a period of over one hundred years, from 1729 to 1839. Possibly some cases have been omitted, which should have been inserted; if so, the Editor would be obliged to any one informing him of the fact; but it was not designed to include every case remotely connected with insurance, such as the obligation to insure, the division and apportionment of insurance money, etc., but only those cases which discuss the rights and remedies directly connected with the policy itself. The recent insolvency of so many insurance com-

panies seemed to render it specially appropriate to include the cases upon insolvent companies, and the powers and duties of receivers. The cases as to assessments by mutual companies, even during the period covered by this volume, will, for the sake of convenience, be found together in the second volume. The chronological arrangement is on the whole the best, since an arrangement by subjects is impracticable, as many cases present so many different points for decision. The opinions of the court are given in full, but the arguments of counsel have sometimes been condensed or omitted. The marginal notes have often been rewritten, and the reporter's statement of facts in some cases has been abbreviated. It is hardly necessary to add that the citations in both text and notes have been carefully verified.

Some notes and references have also been added; but from the nature of the cases they cannot be much extended without danger of repetition. They are generally in explanation of the true ground of the decision, as in *Austin v. Drewe*, p. 104, or a collection and examination of analogous principles and cases on other branches of the law, as in *Scott v. The Phoenix Assurance Company*, p. 122; or a reference to subsequent decisions confirming, modifying, or overruling the case to which they are annexed.

The second volume is already in press and will soon be published.

EDMUND H. BENNETT.

Boston, May 1, 1872.

## TABLE OF CASES REPORTED.

---

	PAGE
<b>ÆTNA FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY vs. TYLER.</b>	
(Insurable Interest — Equitable Owner — Certificate of Loss)	576
<b>ALCHORNE vs. SAVILLE.</b>	
(Policy — Liability of Directors)	110
<b>ALDERMAN vs. WEST OF SCOTLAND INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Notice of Loss — Affidavits — Conditions)	144
<b>ALLIANCE MARINE ASSURANCE COMPANY vs. LOUISIANA STATE INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Reinsurance — Subrogation — Prior Insurance)	471
<b>ANDREWS vs. ELLISON.</b>	
(Policy — Liability of Directors)	108
<b>AUSTIN vs. DEWE.</b>	
(Policy — Construction — Loss by Heat, not by Fire)	102
<b>BORDEN vs. HINGHAM MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Valued Policy — Rule of Damages)	539
<b>BOYD vs. DUBOIS.</b>	
(Concealment — Material Fact — Increase of Risk)	94
<b>BRADEN vs. LOUISIANA STATE INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Loss payable to Agent — Set-off)	320
<b>BRAINE vs. GLOBE INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Insolvent Company — Receivers — Set-off)	561
<b>BRIGHTA vs. NEW YORK LAFAYETTE INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Assignment — Effect of — Goods on Commission)	282
<b>BRUGNOT vs. LOUISIANA STATE MARINE AND FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Fraudulent Loss — Pleading — Evidence)	663
<b>BUFE vs. TURNER.</b>	
(Policy — Concealment — Condition of Property)	92
<b>CARPENTER vs. AMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Misrepresentation — By Agent — Valuation)	762
<b>CATLIN vs. SPRINGFIELD FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Notice of Loss — Warranty of Occupation — Loss by Design)	436
<b>CHRISTIE &amp; others, pursuers; NORTH BRITISH INSURANCE COMPANY, defenders.</b>	
(Insurance — Application — When Contract complete)	145
<b>CITY FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY vs. CORLIES.</b>	
(Proximate Cause — Gunpowder — Storing)	753



CLARY <i>vs.</i> PROTECTION INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Policy — What it covers — Wearing Apparel — Watch) . . . . .	432
COLUMBIAN INSURANCE COMPANY <i>vs.</i> LAWRENCE.	
(Insurable Interest — Equitable Owner — Misdescription) . . . . .	264
COLUMBIAN INSURANCE COMPANY <i>vs.</i> LAWRENCE.	
(Mortgagee's Interest — Notice of Loss — Misrepresentation) . . . . .	512
CORNELL <i>vs.</i> HOPE INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Condition Precedent — Certificate of Loss — Pleading) . . . . .	141
CORNELL <i>vs.</i> LE ROY & RAPELYE.	
(Notice of Loss — Certificate of Magistrate — Burden of Proof) . . . . .	408
CURRY <i>vs.</i> COMMONWEALTH INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Policy — Misdescription — Increase of Risk — Apportionment) . . . . .	333
DANIEL <i>vs.</i> ROBINSON.	
(Misdescription — Pleading) . . . . .	168
DAWES <i>vs.</i> NORTH RIVER INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Notice of Loss — Waiver of — Power of President) . . . . .	201
DE FOREST <i>vs.</i> FULTON FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Insurable Interest — Goods held in Trust — Usage) . . . . .	223
DELONGUEMARE <i>vs.</i> TRADESMEN'S INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Description — Warranty — Construction — Hazardous Trades) . . . . .	289
DE PEYSTER <i>vs.</i> AMERICAN FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Insolvent Company — Priority of Claims) . . . . .	652
DOBSON <i>vs.</i> SOTHEY.	
(Keeping and Depositing — Habitual and not merely single Use) . . . . .	199
DONALDSON <i>vs.</i> MANCHESTER INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Goods in Trust — Other Insurance — Parties — Receipt) . . . . .	524
DRINKWATER <i>vs.</i> CORPORATION OF THE LONDON ASSURANCE.	
(Policy — Loss by Mob — Usurped Power) . . . . .	12
DUNCAN <i>vs.</i> SUN FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Policy — Construction — Storing — Gunpowder) . . . . .	340
ELLICOTT <i>vs.</i> UNITED STATES INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Action — Policy payable to Bearer — Negotiability) . . . . .	610
FARMERS' INSURANCE AND LOAN COMPANY <i>vs.</i> SNYDER.	
(Warranty — Description — Increase of Risk — For the Jury) . . . . .	594
FLETCHER <i>vs.</i> COMMONWEALTH INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Concealment — Materiality — Title of Insured) . . . . .	556
FOWLER <i>vs.</i> ÆTNA FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Fraud — Evidence — Warranty — Misdescription) . . . . .	179
FOWLER <i>vs.</i> ÆTNA FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Warranty — Usage — New Trial) . . . . .	363
FRIEDLANDER <i>vs.</i> LONDON ASSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Trial — Evidence — Contradicting Witness) . . . . .	420
FRIEDLANDER <i>vs.</i> LONDON ASSURANCE COMPANY.	
(House — Meaning of — Misdescription) . . . . .	421
GOLDSTONE <i>vs.</i> OSBORN.	
(Arbitration Clause — Effect of) . . . . .	129
GRANGER <i>vs.</i> HOWARD INSURANCE COMPANY OF NEW YORK.	
(Policy — Suit by Assignee — Pleading) . . . . .	322

<b>HARRIS vs. EAGLE FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Valued Policy — Rate of Damages) . . . . .	85
<b>HARRIS vs. OHIO INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Subsequent Insurance — Notice of — Conditions) . . . . .	425
<b>HARRIS vs. OHIO INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Subsequent Insurance — Notice of — Conditions) . . . . .	444
<b>HARRIS vs. PROTECTION INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Burden of Proof — Hazardous Employment — Ratable Loss) . . . . .	445
<b>HERCULES INSURANCE COMPANY, pursuer; JOHN HUNTER, defender.</b>	
(Arbitration — Overvaluation — Fraud) . . . . .	507
<b>HERCULES INSURANCE COMPANY, pursuer; JOHN HUNTER, defender.</b>	
(Evidence — Damages — Actual Value) . . . . .	542
<b>HERCULES INSURANCE COMPANY, pursuer; JOHN HUNTER, defender.</b>	
(Fraud — Overvaluation — Intent to defraud) . . . . .	631
<b>HOLBROOK vs. RECEIVERS OF THE AMERICAN FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Insolvent Company — Set-off — Unliquidated Claim) . . . . .	564
<b>HOLTZMAN vs. FRANKLIN INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Policy — What it covers — Damage by Removal) . . . . .	431
<b>INMAN vs. WESTERN FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Notice of Loss — Forthwith — Thirty-eight Days) . . . . .	457
<b>JACKSON vs. MASSACHUSETTS MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Subsequent Insurance — Effect of — Alienation) . . . . .	764
<b>JEFFERSON INSURANCE COMPANY vs. COTHEAL.</b>	
(Evidence — Opinions — Warranty — Parties) . . . . .	354
<b>JOHNSTON (or DUNCAN), pursuer; WEST OF SCOTLAND INSURANCE COMPANY, defenders.</b>	
(Policy — Loss by Fire — Fall of Building) . . . . .	259
<b>JOLLY'S ADMINISTRATORS vs. BALTIMORE EQUITABLE SOCIETY.</b>	
(Alterations — Increase of Risk — For the Jury) . . . . .	187
<b>LANE vs. MAINE MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Alienation — Oral Lease — Continuing Policy) . . . . .	482
<b>LANGDALE vs. MASON.</b>	
(Policy — Construction — Riot — Civil Commotion) . . . . .	16
<b>LAURENT vs. CHATHAM FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Rule of Damages — Leased Property) . . . . .	213
<b>LEADBETTER vs. ÆTNA INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Certificate — Condition Precedent — Nearest Magistrate) . . . . .	539
<b>LE ROY vs. GLOBE INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Insolvent Company — Dividend — Right of Stockholders) . . . . .	549
<b>LEVY vs. BAILLIE.</b>	
(Fraudulent Claim of Loss — Effect of — New Trial) . . . . .	337
<b>LONDON ASSURANCE COMPANY vs. SAINSBURY.</b>	
(Riot — Remedy of Insurance Company — In whose Name) . . . . .	24
<b>LOUNSBURY vs. PROTECTION INSURANCE COMPANY.</b>	
(Pleading — Notice of Loss — Carpenter's Shop — Hazardous Business) . . . . .	369

**LOWENE vs. AMERICAN FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.**

(Insolvent Company — Priority of Claims — Insured and Stockholders) . . . . . 648

**LUCAS vs. JEFFERSON INSURANCE COMPANY.**

(Double Insurance — Contribution) . . . . . 173

**LUCIANI vs. AMERICAN FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.**

(Policy under Seal — Renewal — Covenant or Assumpsit) . . . 629

**LYNCH vs. DALZEL.**

(Alienation of Property — Assignment of Policy) . . . . . 1

**MASON vs. SAINSBURY.**

(Loss by Riot — Remedy of Insurer — Hundred) . . . . . 19

**MAYALL vs. MITFORD.**

(Warranty — Mills worked by Day only) . . . . . 640

**M'DONNELL vs. CARR.**

(Policy — Payment of Premium — Subsequent Payment) . . . 434

**MCEVERS vs. LAWRENCE.**

(Notice of Loss — Waiver — Receiver) . . . . . 757

**MCGIVNEY vs. PHENIX FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.**

(Insurable Interest — Contract for Purchase) . . . . . 211

**MECHANICS' FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY vs. NICHOLS.**

(New Trial — Proof of Loss — Amount recoverable) . . . . . 678

**MERRIAM vs. MIDDLESEX MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.**

(Alteration — Materiality of — Increase of Risk) . . . . . 687

**MILLAUDON vs. ATLANTIC INSURANCE COMPANY.**

(Policy — What it covers — Joint Property) . . . . . 497

**MILLAUDON vs. WESTERN MARINE AND FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.**

(Valued Policy — Subsequent Insurance) . . . . . 502

**MOADINGER vs. MECHANICS' FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.**

(Policy — Stock in Trade — Fixtures — Damages) . . . . . 285

**MOLIERE vs. PENNSYLVANIA FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.**

(Misdescription — Mistake of Agent — Effect of) . . . . . 451

**NEWCASTLE FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY vs. MACMORRAN.**

(Warranty — Effect of — First or Second Class) . . . . . 95

**NEW YORK BOWERY FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY vs. NEW YORK FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.**

(Reinsurance — Notice of Loss — Concealment) . . . . . 654

**NEW YORK EQUITABLE INSURANCE COMPANY vs. LANGDON.**

(Hazardous Articles — Storing — What is) . . . . . 348

**NEW YORK GAS-LIGHT COMPANY vs. MECHANICS' FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.**

(Policy — What it covers — Parol Evidence) . . . . . 279

**NICOLET vs. NEW ORLEANS INSURANCE COMPANY.**

(Policy — What it covers — Apportionment of Loss — Interest) . 382

**NORTON vs. RENSSELAER AND SARATOGA INSURANCE COMPANY.**

(Notice of Loss — Sufficiency — Gross Statement) . . . . . 204

**PARKS vs. GENERAL INTEREST ASSURANCE COMPANY.**

(Policy — Goods held in Trust — Consignment) . . . . . 184

PEDDIE <i>vs.</i> QUEBEC FIRE ASSURANCE COMPANY. (Amount of Loss — Rule of Damages) . . . . .	138
PERKINS <i>vs.</i> WASHINGTON INSURANCE COMPANY. (Agreement to insure — Powers of Agent) . . . . .	148
PHENIX FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY <i>vs.</i> GURNEE. (Policy — Mistake — Reforming) . . . . .	257
PHENIX FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY <i>vs.</i> PHILIP. (Fraud — Overvaluation — Evidence) . . . . .	468
QUIN <i>vs.</i> THE NATIONAL ASSURANCE COMPANY. (Representations — Warranty — Evidence — Opinions) . . . . .	689
RECEIVERS OF THE GLOBE INSURANCE COMPANY, <i>In re.</i> (Insolvent Company — Receivers — Duties of) . . . . .	535
REGNIER <i>vs.</i> LOUISIANA STATE MARINE AND FIRE INSURANCE COM- PANY. (Fraud — Proof of — Circumstantial Evidence) . . . . .	670
ROBERT <i>vs.</i> TRADERS' INSURANCE COMPANY. (Assignment — Subrogation — Subsequent Insurance) . . . . .	600
ROUMAGE <i>vs.</i> MECHANICS' FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY. (Notice of Loss — Certificate of Magistrate — Waiver) . . . . .	389
ROUTLEDGE <i>vs.</i> BURRELL. (Conditions — Application — Certificate of Loss) . . . . .	33
SADLERS' COMPANY <i>vs.</i> BADCOCK. (Interest of Insured — Assignment of Policy) . . . . .	7
SALVIN <i>vs.</i> JAMES. (Policy — Construction — Duration of Risk) . . . . .	67
SCOTT <i>vs.</i> EAGLE FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY. (Insolvent Company — Rights of Stockholders — Claim of Policy- holders) . . . . .	682
SCOTT <i>vs.</i> PHENIX ASSURANCE COMPANY. (Agreement to arbitrate — Effect of) . . . . .	118
SCOTT <i>vs.</i> PHENIX ASSURANCE COMPANY. (Notice of Loss — Condition Precedent) . . . . .	277
SCOTT <i>vs.</i> QUEBEC FIRE ASSURANCE COMPANY. (Policy — Construction — Warranty) . . . . .	106
SHAW <i>vs.</i> ROBBERS. (Misdescription — Alteration — Negligence) . . . . .	621
STEBBINS <i>vs.</i> GLOBE INSURANCE COMPANY. (Representation — Warranty — Usage) . . . . .	316
STETSON <i>vs.</i> MASSACHUSETTS MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY. (Alienation of Property — Alteration — Increase of Risk) . . . . .	81
STRONG <i>vs.</i> MANUFACTURERS' INSURANCE COMPANY. (Insurable Interest — Alienation — Misdescription) . . . . .	326
SULLIVAN <i>vs.</i> MASSACHUSETTS MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY. (Alienation — Recovery of Deposit Money — Demand for) . . . . .	76
SUN FIRE OFFICE COMPANY <i>vs.</i> WRIGHT; <i>In re</i> CHARLES WRIGHT and CHARLES POLE. (Policy — Business — Loss of Profits) . . . . .	449
SWORDS <i>vs.</i> BLAKE. (Insolvent Company — Set-off — Assignment of Policy) . . . . .	643

TARLETON <i>vs.</i> STANIFORTH.	
(Policy — Forfeiture by nonpayment of Premium)	37
THAYER <i>vs.</i> MIDDLESEX MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Oral Evidence — Contract to insure — When complete)	329
THURTELL <i>vs.</i> BEAUMONT.	
(Fraud — Arson — Sufficient Proof of — New Trial)	131
TRADERS' INSURANCE COMPANY <i>vs.</i> ROBERT.	
(Assignment — Rights of Assignee — Acts of Assignor)	414
TRADERS' INSURANCE COMPANY <i>vs.</i> ROBERT.	
(Assignment — Right of Assignor — Subrogation)	428
WALDEN <i>vs.</i> LOUISIANA INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Concealment — Threats of Burning — Effect of)	668
WALLACE <i>vs.</i> INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Valued Policy — Right to rebuild)	412
WATCHORN <i>vs.</i> LANGFORD.	
(Policy — Lien — What it covers)	91
WATERS <i>vs.</i> MERCHANTS' LOUISVILLE INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Loss by Fire — Negligence — Explosion)	614
WELLES <i>vs.</i> BOSTON INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Stock in Trade — Property sacrificed to save Insured Property)	209
WHITEHEAD <i>vs.</i> PRICE.	
(Policy — Construction — Working by Day only)	488
WOOD <i>vs.</i> WORSLEY.	
(Policy — Application Part thereof — Condition Precedent)	44
WORKMAN <i>vs.</i> LOUISIANA INSURANCE COMPANY.	
(Policy — Construction — House)	378
WORSLEY <i>vs.</i> WOOD.	
(Policy — Certificate of Loss — Condition Precedent)	53
WRIGHT and POLE, <i>In re.</i>	
(Policy — Business — Profits)	449

## TABLE OF CASES CITED.

	PAGE		PAGE
A.		Baker v. Ludlow	352
Abbott v. Hampden Mut. Fire		Ball v. Manning	698, 737
Ins. Co.	769	Bank of Columbia v. Administra-	
v. Howard	697	tors of Patterson	155
Acer v. Merchants' Ins. Co.	593	Bank of Columbia v. Hagner	466
Acey v. Fernie	44	Barker v. Marine Ins. Co.	234
Adair v. Shaw	554	v. Phoenix Ins. Co.	208
Adams v. Rockingham Mut. Ins.		Barndollar v. Tate	455
Co.	769	Bartlett v. Pickersgill	134, 136
Addison v. Louisville Ins Co.	327	v. Walter	233
Ætna Fire Ins. Co. v. Miers	66, 213	Beal v. Simpson	493
Ætna Ins. Co. v. Jackson	769	Bean v. Stupart	599, 707
v. Tyler	23, 66, 213	Beany v. Turner	50
Agar v. Macklew	128	Beatty v. The Mar. Ins. Co.	203, 204
Alchorne v. Saville	110, 113-115, 117	Bell v. Ansley	256
Alcorn v. Westbrook	51	Benfield v. Petrie	133
Alderman v. West of Scotland		Berry v. Young	466
Ins. Co.	66	Berthon v. Loughman	359, 360, 698, 705, 720, 721
Alexander v. Gibson	424	Bigler v. New York Central Ins.	
Allegre v. Maryland Ins. Co.	127	Co.	768
Allen v. Hudson River Mut. Ins.		Bilbie v. Lumley	528
Co.	420	Bilbrough v. Metropolis Ins. Co.	66
Andree v. Fletcher	657	Bishop v. Hayward	51
Andrews v. The Union Mut. Fire		v. Pentland	521, 620, 625
Ins. Co.	106	Bishop of London v. The Mercers'	
Appleton v. Crowninshield	540	Co.	49
Archer v. Merchants' & Manuf.		Bize v. Fletcher	599, 697, 706, 707
Ins. Co.	12	Blackhurst v. Cockell	583
Arnold v. Sandford	603	Booth v. Booth	376
Astor v. Union Ins. Co.	186	Boynton v. Clinton & Essex Mut.	
Athey's Ex'x v. Collins	191	Ins. Co.	420
Atlantic Ins. Co. v. Storrow	588	Bowie v. Duvall	612
Attorney General v. Bowman	182	Bradish v. Bliss	138
v. Woodhead	134, 136	Bradley v. Ricardo	423, 424
Austin v. Drewe	104, 105, 201	Braunstein v. The Accidental	
Avery v. Hoole	375	Death Ins. Co.	126
v. Scott	127	Brice v. Carre	111
Ayres v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co.	769	Brichta v. New York Lafayette	
B.		Ins. Co.	11
Babcock v. Montgomery County		Broadhead v. Marshall	681
Ins. Co.	106	Brown v. Overbury	128
Bagley v. Francis	540	Buck v. The Chesapeake Ins. Co.	237
		Bufe v. Turner	697, 742
		Buffalo Steam Engine Works v.	
		Sun Mut. Ins. Co.	420

Bumstead v. Dividend Mut. Ins. Co.	209	Cushman v. The Northwestern Ins. Co.	91
Burbank v. Rockingham Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	769	D.	
Busk v. The Royal Exchange Assurance Co.	521, 617-619, 625-628	Darby v. Whittaker	128
Butman v. Hobbs	677	David v. Hartford Ins. Co.	768
Butts v. Collins	541	Davis v. Hardy	698
C.		v. Mure	51, 57, 59, 540
Caballero v. Home Mut. Ins. Co.	106	Dawes v. North River Ins. Co.	392, 397, 541, 760
Camden v. Cowley	698	Deacon v. Allen	680
Campbell v. French	57-60, 540	De Forest v. Fulton Fire Ins. Co.	284, 499
v. Hamilton Mut. Ins. Co.	769	De Hahn v. Hartley	583, 641, 707
v. International Life Assurance Society	44	Delonguemare v. Tradesmen's Ins. Co.	317
v. Rickards	698, 716-722	Den v. Geiger	680
Carey v. Pitt	470	r. Wintermute	680
Carpenter v. Providence Washington Ins. Co.	11, 23, 768	De Peyster v. The American Ins. Co.	685
Carter v. Boehm	662, 698, 703, 716, 719, 723	Dimsdale v. Robertson	124, 126
v. The United Ins. Co.	12, 324	Dobson v. Sotheby	353, 625, 627, 641, 697, 710
Case v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co.	431	Dodge County Mut. Ins. Co. v. Rogers	689
Caulker v. Banks	665	Doe v. Laming	352, 467
Chandler v. Worcester Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	628	Doughty v. Neal	57, 540
Chapman v. Walton	698, 720, 722	Dow v. Hope Ins. Co.	486
Charleston Ins. Co. v. Neve	420	Drinkwater v. London Assurance Co.	17, 755
Chase v. Hamilton Mut. Ins. Co.	593	Duff v. Budd	191
City Fire Ins. Co. v. Corlies	15	Duncan v. Lyon	568, 571
Clark v. Blything	22, 588	v. Sun Fire Ins. Co.	465, 754
v. Hamilton Mut. Ins. Co.	670	Durrell v. Bederley	359, 698, 703, 704, 716, 720, 721, 723, 742
v. New Eng. Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	768, 769	E.	
v. Wilson	23	East v. Essington	51, 487
Cohen v. Hannam	256	Edes v. Hamilton Mut. Ins. Co.	420
Collins v. Gibbs	51, 52	Edmunds v. Mut. Safety Fire Ins. Co.	769
Columbian Ins. Co. v. Lawrence	213, 327, 337, 392, 398, 401, 406, 427, 455, 541, 583, 584, 590, 616, 757	Edwards v. Baltimore Ins. Co.	467
Condon v. Southside Railroad Co.	127	Elliott v. The Royal Exchange Assurance Co.	126
Connecticut Life Ins. Co. v. The New York & N. H. Railroad Co.	23	Elmaker v. Franklin Ins. Co.	451
Conover v. Mut. Ins. Co.	769	Elsmore v. The Inhabitants of St. Briavells	698, 699
Cooke v. Cooke	124, 126	Elton v. Larkins	698
Copper v. Wells	128	Erwin v. Saunders	454
Cormack v. Gladstone	196	Everett v. London Assurance Co.	106
Cornel v. Leroy	66, 459, 460, 465, 466	Ewer v. Ambrose	423, 424
Cornell v. Hope Ins. Co.	385	F.	
Cornish v. Rowley	466	Feise v. Parkinson	136
Courtney v. New York Ins. Co.	11	Fenner v. Meares	325
Craufurd v. Hunter	254		
Cray v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co.	127, 128		
Crisp v. Bunbury	128		
Crowley v. Cohen	450		
Curry v. Commercial Ins. Co.	590, 670		

## TABLE OF CASES CITED.

xv

Flinn v. Headlam	697	Hanson, <i>ex parte</i>	567
v. Tobin	697	Hardy v. Union Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	768
Flint v. Flemmyng	450	Hare v. Cutbush	726
Folsom v. Belknap Co. Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	769	Harris v. Columbia Co. Mut. Ins. Co.	259
Foster v. Equitable Mut. Ins. Co.	420	v. Eagle Ins. Co.	413
Fowler v. Aetna Ins. Co.	298, 455, 465, 583, 584	Harrison's case	26
Francis v. Ocean Ins. Co.	397, 405	Hart v. Western Railroad Corporation	23
Franklin Fire Ins. Co. v. Hewitt	259	Harvey v. Wood	571
French v. Conelly	761	Hastie v. De Peyster	657
Frisk v. Ryan	127	Hayward v. London and Liverpool Fire and Life Ins. Co.	106
Fuller v. Boston Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	91	Henckle v. Royal Exch. Ass. Co.	456
G.		Herbert v. Champion	528
Gale v. Belknap Ins. Co.	768	Herrick v. Belknap	127
Gardiner v. Piscataquis Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	689	Hesketh v. Gray	57, 62, 540
Gates v. Madison County Mut. Ins. Co.	353, 628, 689	Hibbard v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co.	768
Georgier v. Mieville	612	Hickman v. Fernie	711
Glover v. Black	328	Higginson v. Dall	301, 454
Goddard v. Garrett	761	Hill v. Mose	127
Godin v. London Assurance Co.	427	Hillier v. Alleghany County Mut. Ins. Co.	431
Godsall v. Boldero	587, 608	Hodgson v. Richardson	698
Goit v. National Protection Ins. Co.	11	Hoffman v. Aetna Fire Ins. Co.	209
Gordon v. Bowne	571	v. Western Empire Ins. Co.	677
v. Parmlee	138	v. Western Mar. Ins. Co.	138
Gove v. Farmers' Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	628	Holbrook & Fernie's case	645
Gracie v. New York Ins. Co.	587	Holbrook v. American Ins. Co.	769
Graham v. Russell	573	Holdsworth v. Wise	625
Granger v. Howard Ins. Co.	12	Hollis v. Carr	111
Graves & Barnewall v. The Boston Marine Ins. Co.	234	Holmes v. Charlestown Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	91
Gray v. Wilson	127	Horton v. Sayer	125, 126
Griffith v. Goodhand	39	Hotham v. East India Company	50, 51, 52, 58, 60, 62, 375, 376
Grim v. Phoenix Ins. Co.	754	Howard v. The Kentucky, &c. Mutual Ins. Co.	689
Grosvenor v. Atlantic Fire Ins. Co.	420	Hoxsie v. Providence Mut. Ins. Co.	420
Gruit v. Purnel	57, 540	Huckins v. People's Ins. Co.	628
Gurney v. Langlands	470	Hucks v. Thornton	191
H.		Hughes v. Union Ins. Co.	196
Haff v. The Marine Ins. Co.	207	Huguenin v. Rayley	742
Haggart v. Morgan	127	Hulse v. Young	253
Hale v. Mechanics' Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	420	Hunter v. King	30
Halfhide v. Fenning	123, 126	Hurst v. Litchfield	127
Hallock v. Commercial Ins. Co.	167	Hyde v. Bruce	107
Hamilton v. Cummings	761	v. Cogan	27
v. Lycoming Mut. Ins. Co.	333	Hynds v. Schenectady County Mut. Ins. Co.	353
v. Mendes	608	I.	
v. Sheddou	711	Illinois Mut. Fire Ins. Co. v. Fix	420
Hammond v. American Mut. Life Ins. Co.	44	Inman v. Western Ins. Co.	583, 761
		Insurance Co. v. Woodruff	23
		Ives v. Easton	665



## J.

Jackson v. Farmers' Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	768
Jacobs v. Equitable Ins. Co.	768
Jefferson Ins. Co. v. Cotheal	454
Jenkins v. Law	120
Jessel v. Williamsburg Ins. Co.	12
Jessup v. Cook	680
Johnson v. Berkshire Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	628
Johnston v. Columbian Ins. Co.	404
Jones v. St. John's College	129
Jordan v. Sawkins	122

## K.

Kane v. Columbian Ins. Co.	196
Kellar v. Merchants' Ins. Co.	327
Kenniston v. Merrimack Ins. Co.	106
Kenny v. Clarkson & Van Horn	212
Kensington v. Inglis	352
Kenyon v. Berthon	599, 707
Kernochan v. N. Y. Bowery Fire Ins. Co.	23
Ketchum v. Protection Ins. Co.	128
Kill v. Hollister	119, 120, 122, 123, 127, 130
King v. Baldwin	454
v. The State Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	23
Kingsley v. New England Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	467
Kingston v. Girard	196
v. Preston	47, 51
Kohne v. Ins. Co. N. A.	662

## L.

Laidlaw v. Organ	191
Lamb's case	52
Lancashire v. Killingworth	467
Langdale v. Kennett	31
v. Mason	755
Laroche v. Oswin	196
Lauman v. Young	129
Lavabre v. Wilson	83
Lawrence v. Holyoke Ins. Co.	420
v. The Ocean Ins. Co.	209
Lazarus v. Commonwealth Ins. Co.	483
Leadbetter v. Aetna Ins. Co.	66
Le Cras v. Hughes	226
Lee v. Page	126
Leeds v. The Mechanics' Ins. Co.	167
Leggett v. Aetna Ins. Co.	353
Leonard v. House	127
Leonardo v. Phoenix Ins. Co.	451

Le Roy v. The Globe Ins. Co.	650
Lester v. Garland	466
Lewis v. Rucker	87, 90
Lightbody v. The North American Ins. Co.	167
Lindenau v. Desborough	698, 715, 742
Lister v. Mundell	604
Livingston v. Maryland Ins. Co.	191
v. Ralli	128
Loring v. Manufacturers' Ins. Co.	420
Lowe v. Korner	665
Lowndes v. Earl of Stamford	124
Lucas v. Nockells	494
Lucena v. Crawford	226, 228, 241, 254
Lycoming Ins. Co. v. Mitchell	414
Lyman v. State Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	689
Lynch v. Dalzel	140, 215, 235, 283, 516, 586

## M.

Madame Colsson v. The Consolidated Association	664
Mann v. Herkimer County Mut. Ins. Co.	12
Mansfield v. Doolin	127
Marsden v. Reid	455
Maryland Ins. Co. v. Le Roy	194, 196
Mason v. Harvey	209
v. Sainsbury	22, 26-31, 588, 756
Masters v. Madison Co. Mut. Ins. Co.	769
Mayall v. Mitford	710, 711
Mayor of New York v. Hamilton Ins. Co.	353
v. Lord	756
McConnell v. Delaware Ins. Co.	677
McCullough v. Eagle Ins. Co.	333
McEvers v. Lawrence	204, 467
McIntosh v. Great Western Railway Co.	127
McLaren v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co.	769
M'Morran v. The Newcastle Fire Insurance Company	705
Mellen v. Hamilton Ins. Co.	11
Menzies v. North British Ins. Co.	451
Merriam v. Middlesex Fire Ins. Co.	337
Merry v. Prince	657
Mexborough v. Bower	123
Millaudon v. New Orleans Ins. Co.	106
Miller v. Pierce	665
Milligan v. Equitable Ins. Co.	213
Milner v. Field	127
Mitchell v. Harris	123
Monongahela Nav. Co. v. Fenlon	127
Moore v. The Protection Ins. Co.	353
Morgan v. Mitchell	665

Moser v. Church-wardens, &c.	59	Peoria M. & F. Ins. Co. v. Whitehill	66
Motteux v. The London Assurance Company	258, 456	Percival v. Herbemont	127
Mumford v. Hallett	217	v. Hickey	443
Munn v. The Commission Co.	155	Perry v. Merchants' Ins. Co.	11
Munson v. Atwood	138	Perry Ins. Co. v. Stewart	769
Murdock v. Chenango Mut. Ins. Co.	689	Peters v. Craig	127
Mut. Benefit Life Ins. Co. v. Ruse	44	Petris v. Milles	133
N.		Philbrook v. New Eng. Mut. Ins. Co.	768
Nantes v. Thompson	484	Philips v. Merrimack Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	91
National Fire Ins. Co. v. Crane	259	Phoenix Ins. Co. v. Lawrence	378, 769
Newcastle Fire Ins. Co. v. Macmorran	299, 346, 641, 698	v. McLoon	91
New England Fire & Mut. Ins. Co. v. Wetmore	420	Pierson v. Dunlop	681
New York Central Ins. Co. v. National Protection Ins. Co.	467	Pole v. Harrobin	57, 540
New York Firemen's Ins. Co. v. Walden	583	Pollard v. Somerset Mut. Ins. Co.	420, 769
New York Ice Co. v. North Western Ins. Co.	259	Poucher v. Livingston	470
Niblo v. North American Ins. Co.	451	Pritchard v. Merchants' Life Assurance Co.	44
Nicolet v. New Orleans Ins. Co.	381	Protection Ins. Co. v. Pherson	66
Noonan v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co.	66	Pupke v. Resolute Fire Ins. Co.	420
North Lebanon Railroad Co. v. McGrann	127	R.	
Norton v. Rensselaer, &c. Ins. Co.	459	Racey v. McCallum	119
O.		Rafael v. Nashville Mar. & Fire Ins. Co.	257
Ocean Ins. Co. v. Francis	590	Rafferty v. New Brunswick Fire Ins. Co.	353
Oldman v. Bewicke 48, 51, 57, 60, 278, 460, 461, 464		Raine v. Bell	196
Oliver v. Green	232	Ralston v. Barclay	665
O'Neil v. The Buffalo Fire Ins. Co.	66, 353	Randal v. Chesapeake Canal Co.	127, 128
O'Reilly v. Kerns	127	Randall v. Van Vechten	155
Orrell v. Hampden Fire Ins. Co.	769	Ranger v. Great Western Railway Co.	127
Ory v. Winter	665	Ratliffe v. Eden	27
Osborne v. Etheridge	569	Reab v. M'Alister	568
Osgood v. De Groot	576	Remsen v. Isaacs	604
Owen v. Farmers' Joint Stock Ins. Co.	467	Revett v. Broham	470
P.		Rice v. Tower	769
Parkhurst v. Van Cortlandt	454	Richardson v. Allan	424
Parkinson v. Collier	698	Rickards v. Campbell	732
Pasteur v. Mezieres	119	v. Murdock	698, 705, 716, 721, 723
Patasco Ins. Co. v. Coulter	521, 620	Rising Sun Ins. Co. v. Slaughter	687
Pattison v. Hull	454	Ritchie v. United States Ins. Co.	427
Pawson v. Barnevelt	599, 707	Rix v. Mutual Ins. Co.	388
v. Watson	295, 312, 335, 361, 362, 583, 706	Roache v. Pendergast	191
Peoria Ins. Co. v. Frost	23	Robertson v. French	250
VOL. I.		Robinson v. Georges' Ins. Co.	127
		Rockingham Mut. Fire Ins. Co. v. Barker	23
		Roe v. Haugh	51
		Rollins v. Columbian Fire Ins. Co.	769
		Roumage v. Mechanics' Fire Ins. Co.	66

Roper v. London	125	Stirling v. Vaughan	226
Ross v. Nesbit	127	St. Johns v. American Ins. Co.	628
Routledge v. Burrell	48, 57, 60, 63, 64, 312, 460, 461	St. Louis Ins. Co. v. Glasgow v. Kyle	628 467
Rowe v. Williams	127	Stone v. Dennis	127
Ruan v. Perry	181, 182	Street v. Rigby	123
Russell v. Pellegrini	128	Suckley v. Furse	352
		Suffolk Fire Ins. Co. v. Boyden	23
		Syers v. Bridge	703, 704
S.		T.	
Sadlers' Co. v. Badcock	140, 215, 586	Tarleton v. Staniforth	72
Salteston v. Payne	30	Tattersall v. Groote	122, 128
Sanborn v. Fireman's Ins. Co.	16	Taylor v. Merchant's Ins. Co.	333
Gray,	443, 448	Taylor v. Curtis	191
Sands v. Lyon	44	v. Glazer	631
Sayles v. Northwestern Ins. Co.	320	Teat's case	39
Schenck v. Mercer Co. Mut. Ins. Co.	768	Tebbetts v. Hamilton Mut. Ins. Co.	320
Schermerhorn v. Vanderheyden	454	Thompson v. Buchanan	662
Schmidt v. New York Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	138	v. Charnock	119-121, 123, 125, 126
Scott v. Avery	123-126	v. Ketcham	281
v. Liverpool	124, 127	Thornton v. Royal Exchange As- surance Co.	698
v. Phoenix Assurance Co.	66, 122, 501	Thurnell v. Balbirnie	128
v. Shepherd	443	Thurtell v. Beaumont	677
Scripture v. Lowell Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	106	Tillou v. Kingston Mutual Ins. Co.	420
Seaman v. Fonereau	698	Tittlemore v. Vermont Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	769
Shaw v. Robberds	641, 679, 710	Tobey v. Bristol	127
Sheppard v. Sheppard	680	Tomlinson v. Monmouth Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	769
Sheppard v. Union Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	769	Toulmin v. Inglis	625
Sheriffs of Norwich v. Bradshaw	30	Traders' Ins. Co. v. Robert	11, 327, 765
Shirley v. Wilkinson	662	Trask v. State Fire Ins. Co.	467
Shore v. Bentall	625	Tredwen v. Holman	126
Simpson v. Accidental Death Ins. Co.	44	Trevelian v. Seccomb	172
v. Clayton	698	Trumbull v. Portage Co. Mut. Ins. Co.	769
Siter v. Morris	257	Trustees of Vernon v. Hill	684
Smith v. Boston, Concord, &c. Rail- road	127	Turley v. North American Ins. Co.	66
v. Brush	680	Turner v. Stetts	257
v. Monmouth Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	769	Tyler v. Ætna Ins. Co.	213
v. Saratoga County Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	11		
Snodgrass v. Gavitt	127	U.	
Stacey v. Franklin Fire Ins. Co.	427, 768	Ughtred's case	52
State Mut. Fire Ins. Co. v. Roberts	420		
Stebbins v. The Globe Ins. Co.	337, 687, 688	V.	
Steinback v. The Columbia Ins. Co.	680	Van Deusen v. Charter Oak Fire & Mar. Ins. Co.	769
Stetson v. Mass. Mutual Fire Ins. Co.	182, 196, 373, 483	Vernon v. Hankey	681
Stillwell v. Staples	257		

## TABLE OF CASES CITED.

xix

Vogel v. People's Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	353	Whitehead v. Tuckett	155
Vos v. Robinson	204, 404, 590, 760	Wightman v. Western Marine Ins. Co.	677
W.		William v. Hill	20
Wadsworth v. Smith	129	Williams v. Millington	253
Wainwright v. Bland	698, 715	v. New England Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	628
Walker v. Maitland	521, 618, 620	Wilmot v. Horton	27
Wallis v. Hersch	128	Wilson v. Aetna Ins. Co.	128
Want v. Blunt	44	v. Hill	11
Wardell v. Eden	* 604	Wood v. Dummer	554, 683
Warren v. Litchfield	484	v. Worsley	66, 278
Warwick v. Bruce	134	Woodbury Savings Bank v. Charter Oak Ins. Co.	167
Washington Union Ins. Co. v. Wilson	67	Wookey v. Pole	611, 612
Waters v. Merchants' L. Ins. Co.	754	Workman v. Louisiana Ins. Co.	385, 388
v. Monarch Fire Ins. Co.	257	Worsley v. Wood	312, 373, 374, 391, 393, 401, 460, 461, 541, 583
v. Travis	466	Wrightman v. Western Mar. & F. Ins. Co.	138
Weir v. Aberdeen	697	Y.	
Wellington v. Mackintosh	123	Yates v. Whyte	22
West Branch Ins. Co. v. Helfenstein	11	Young v. Eagle Fire Ins. Co.	769
White v. Republic Ins. Co.	431		
Whitehead v. Price	641, 642		



## FIRE INSURANCE CASES.

---

ROGER LYNCH and JOHN LYNCH, appellants, *vs.* ROBERT DALZEL,  
HENRY CARTWRIGHT, and JOHN EVERETT, respondents.<sup>1</sup>

(House of Lords, 13th March, 1729.)

### *Alienation of Property. — Assignment of Policy.*

The party insured must own the property at the time of the loss. If before the loss he has sold the property, and after the loss assigns the policy to the purchaser, without the consent of the company, the latter is not liable to the assignee.

ABOUT the year 1709, some persons observing that great benefit accrued to the public by insurances made in the cities of London and Westminster against losses of houses by fire, but that such insurances did not extend to other parts of England, nor were there any insurances against losses of goods by fire, they formed a society for that purpose which was called the Sun Fire Office; and the undertaking was, from that time, so successfully carried on that hundreds of families have been thereby saved from ruin.

The society being sensible that such an extensive undertaking might give great opportunities for frauds, took all possible precaution for preventing them; and, therefore, their policies for insurance were so framed as to be contracts only between the office and the persons insuring; the loss secured against being thereby restrained and confined to the contracting persons only; and the policies referred to certain printed proposals containing the essential terms and conditions between the insurers and the insured, copies of which proposals were always delivered with the policies.

By these proposals the office insured houses, warehouses, goods, wares, and merchandise, except some particular things therein specified. And although it is essential to insurances that the persons insuring should have a property in the things lost, yet, to

<sup>1</sup> 3 Brown, P. C. 497; 4 Id. 431; Marsh. on Ins. 698.

Reinsurance. — Subrogation. — Prior Insurance.

opinions of witnesses were worth no more than the individual opinions of the jurors themselves, and would be very loose testimony upon which to convict a man of fraud and false swearing.

The evidence offered as to the amount of stock in the plaintiff's shop was equally loose and unsatisfactory. It was the mere opinion of others that other dealers in the same articles had much less stock, and hence the jury were to infer that the plaintiff had been guilty of a fraud. Fraud is not to be proved by surmises or suspicions.

I think the superior court decided correctly, and their judgment should be affirmed.

*Judgment affirmed.*

ALLIANCE MARINE ASSURANCE COMPANY vs. LOUISIANA STATE INSURANCE COMPANY.<sup>1</sup>

(Supreme Court, Louisiana, March Term, 1835.)

*Reinsurance. — Subrogation. — Prior Insurance.*

Property shipped from New Orleans to Liverpool was insured by the owners in London about the time of its shipment, but owing to an accident to the ship was relanded and stored in New Orleans and was there again insured by the consignors at another office on account of whom it might concern. Being destroyed by fire while so stored, the London office paid the loss and brought suit for indemnity against the New Orleans office. *Held*, they could not recover; for they had neither authorized the second insurance nor ratified it before the loss, and there was no privity between them.

The plaintiffs, an insurance company in London, insured 323 bales of cotton in New Orleans, for £2,000. Subsequently the defendants, an insurance company in New Orleans, insured the same and other cotton "for whom it might concern," by a policy which by its terms was void in case of any "prior insurance not ratified and expressed therein." A loss occurring, the plaintiffs paid the amount and sued the defendants to recover the same. *Held*, that as the owner of the 323 bales could not have recovered of the defendants more than the amount of the loss which was not covered by the plaintiffs' policy in London (because of the want of notice of said prior insurance), the plaintiffs had no higher rights by way of subrogation than such owner possessed, and consequently could not recover.

THE chairman and directors of the Alliance Marine Assurance Company of London instituted suit against the Louisiana State Insurance Company in New Orleans, for the recovery of an indemnity of two thousand pounds sterling, or eight thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight dollars and eighty-eight cents, on a claim of reinsurance.

<sup>1</sup> 8 Louisiana (Curry), 1.

The plaintiffs allege, that at London, on the 25th of June, 1830, they insured Joseph Smith & Son on three hundred and twenty-three bales of cotton, shipped on board the ship *Aurora*, at and from New Orleans to Liverpool, against the usual risks and perils of the sea, the insurance amounting to two thousand pounds sterling; that the ship sailed from New Orleans the 3d of July, 1830, with the cotton on board, but was stranded at the Balize, returned to the city to repair, and stored the cotton in a warehouse or cotton-press. The consignees and agents of the ship and cargo, acting for the benefit of all concerned, or whom it might concern, made insurance at the office of the Louisiana State Insurance Company, on the 16th of July, 1830, on one thousand one hundred and twenty-seven bales of cotton, including the three hundred and twenty-three bales of Smith & Son, against fire, for the sum of forty-one thousand dollars; that said cotton was insured as stored in the cotton-press of James Freret, in New Orleans, and while the risk continued was wholly consumed and destroyed by fire, on the 1st of August, 1830.

They further allege they have paid two thousand pounds sterling on their own policy of insurance to Joseph Smith & Son, and that by reason of said payment, and under the policy taken out of the Louisiana State Insurance Company, they are entitled to be indemnified, and claim the said sum of two thousand pounds, equal to eight thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight dollars and eighty-eight cents, on the reinsurance.

They further allege that the Louisiana State Insurance Company has paid to others, under the same policy, the amount of their loss, and to Smith & Son the balance of the value of their cotton not covered by the policy in London, but refuse to indemnify and pay them (the plaintiffs) on the ground that they have no right to claim indemnity under the same policy or any other.

The defendants pleaded the general issue; and in their answer except to the plaintiffs' right to maintain their action; that they have not complied with the conditions of their policy of insurance, and particularly the eighth article, which relates to notice and proof of loss. They admit the execution of the policy sued on, but deny they are in any manner liable under it.

Upon these pleadings the parties went to trial on the merits. The evidence shows that the ship *Aurora* was consigned to the



house of Tayleur, Grimshaw & Sloane in New Orleans. Her cargo consisted chiefly of one thousand one hundred and twenty-seven bales of cotton, among which was three hundred and twenty-three bales shipped by the consignees to Joseph Smith & Son in Liverpool. The ship sailed from New Orleans the 2d July, 1830, and was stranded at the Balize, returned to the city, relanded her cargo, and the one thousand one hundred and twenty-seven bales of cotton were stored in the cotton-press of James Freret.

On the 16th July, 1830, Tayleur, Grimshaw & Sloane, the consignees of the vessel and cargo, caused insurance against fire to be made in the office of the Louisiana State Insurance Company, on the cotton thus stored, for one month. The policy expressed that the insurance was made "on one thousand one hundred and twenty-seven bales of cotton, being part of the cargo of the ship *Aurora*, stranded at the Balize, *for account of whom it may concern.*" The policy also contained a clause which says: "In case the buildings or goods herein mentioned have been already, or shall be hereafter insured by any policy issued from this office, or by an agent for this office, or by any other insurance company, or by any private insurers, such other insurance must be made known to this office, and mentioned in or indorsed on this policy, otherwise this policy to be void."

On the 1st of August, 1830, the cotton-press with the cotton stored in it, was consumed and destroyed by fire. The three hundred and twenty-three bales shipped to Joseph Smith & Son in Liverpool, was covered in part by a marine policy, taken out of the office of the plaintiffs in London, by the owners, on the 25th of June, 1830, "upon certain cotton, the property of Smith & Son, at and from New Orleans to Liverpool, to sail on or before the 1st of August, 1830." On preliminary proof of the loss of the cotton in New Orleans by fire being made, the plaintiffs paid the loss, amounting to two thousand pounds sterling. They now seek to recover this amount from the defendants.

James Grimshaw (of the house of Tayleur, Grimshaw & Sloane), witness for plaintiffs, sworn, says, "that he effected the insurance on the cotton mentioned, in the office of the Louisiana State Insurance Company; that the three hundred and twenty-three bales of cotton specified in the bill of lading an-

## Reinsurance. — Subrogation. — Prior Insurance.

nexed to the policy of insurance, belonging to Joseph Smith & Son, were shipped by witness's house on board the ship *Aurora*, and after she was stranded at the Balize, were brought to the city and stored in the cotton-press of James Freret, Jr., and destroyed by fire on the 1st of August, 1830. The house of Tayleur, Grimshaw & Sloane acted as the agents of all parties interested in the cargo.

This witness also proved that he made the requisite preliminary proof of the loss of the cotton, and the insurance on it by the defendants. In an affidavit which he made for this purpose, on the 16th March, 1831, he makes the following statement: "That the insurance effected by him of the whole cargo of cotton was made without reference to any particular ownership, and expressly to secure the property against such risk, until it could be reshipped on behalf of whoever might be interested in it, owners or underwriters, whether any part or all was covered by marine policies in England."

"That Joseph Smith & Son were covered by a marine policy to the amount of two thousand pounds sterling, which this deponent claims of the Louisiana State Insurance Company on behalf of the underwriters, who were insured by this deponent against the risk of fire on the same. And the balance of the value or cost of said cotton, to wit: two thousand six hundred and ninety-one dollars and eighty-four cents, deponent claims as the agent of Joseph Smith & Son."

It further appeared that the Louisiana State Insurance Company paid the losses on this policy, which were not covered by the policy of the London office. But in making this payment, the insurers expressly say it is made on the value of the property destroyed, "less the amount insured thereon, in Great Britain or elsewhere."

Frederick Secretan, superintendent of the Alliance Marine Assurance Company in London, a witness examined by commission, on the part of the plaintiffs, in answer to cross-interrogatories, says, "that by the law of England, it is clearly and well established that a question of *reinsurance* can never become the subject of litigation; that a reinsurance, unless occasioned by the *failure* of the previous underwriters, is clearly illegal and void."

In answering the cross-interrogatory requiring him to state all

## Reinsurance. — Subrogation. — Prior Insurance.

he knew in relation to the legality and validity of a contract like this, the witness says, "that he believes a contract like the one sued on is a lawful contract by the law of England;" and "that he has laid the facts of this case before Mr. Thomas Hale, a gentleman of great experience at Lloyd's Coffee-house, as an arbitrator and adjuster of claims, and who has made the following observations in writing on this question, in which this deponent entirely concurs:

"When ships put into port with such damage as to require being unloaded, it is usual to insure cargoes against fire in warehouses; and in the adjustment of the expenses, the charge for such insurance is always placed to the cargo, consequently the first assurers on the respective goods pays this premium in consideration of having been relieved from such risk. It generally happens that the greater part, or perhaps the whole of the cargo is insured, and if the assurers at the intermediate port are to avail themselves of this circumstance, it of course follows that they take a premium erroneously. I am sure a case will not be found where the premium or any part of it has been returned. I expect a precedent for such a plea as that set up by the Louisiana State Insurance Company cannot be found. Such assurances being considered special, do not mix up with other insurances, and I have no doubt the sentiments of every insurance company are, that they would not make any inquiry respecting other insurances. First assurers being in the habit of paying premiums to second assurers, give such insurances very much the appearance of reinsurances. But, in the present case, the first assurers have not been paid the premium, neither have they in any respect been privy to the second insurance being made, so that the insurance effected by the Louisiana State Insurance Company is not a reinsurance; and, in my opinion, the point of law they appear so desirous of availing themselves of, completely fails them, as it ought to do."

The policy on which the assurance in London at the office of the plaintiffs was effected, has the following clause: "The said company bind themselves for the true performance of the premises, confessing themselves paid the consideration due unto them for the assurance by the assured, at and after the *rate of twenty-five shillings per cent.*"

---

Reinsurance. — Subrogation. — Prior Insurance.

---

On the evidence of the case, the district judge, who tried it in the first instance, came to the conclusion "that the defendants insured for the benefit of all concerned, whether owners or marine underwriters; that the plaintiffs having paid Joseph Smith & Son, are subrogated to their rights; that this is not a case of double insurance or reinsurance, but one which stands on its own peculiar circumstances. The defendants received the premium for the risk they ran, and no good reason of law or justice excuses them from paying the loss."

Judgment was rendered for the plaintiffs, from which the defendants appealed.

*Pierce & Hennen*, for the plaintiffs.

1. The plaintiffs must recover in this case, because there was no fraud; and that it was a *bond fide* loss is admitted by the defendants, as they have paid the owners of the cotton the amount uncovered by the London office.

2. This is not a case of reinsurance, and the plaintiffs could not have been reinsured, expressly, as a reinsurance; for at the time, in England, this policy had not been executed.

3. If it amounts to a reinsurance, yet the rule of law requiring the insurance to be expressly effected, as such, ceases, under the circumstances of this case. To protect owners, insurers, or any person who might lose if the cotton was burnt, was the object of Tayleur, Grimshaw & Sloane in effecting this insurance; but they could not say who would be the parties interested, and this the defendants well knew.

4. For a case to amount to a reinsurance, it ought to be coextensive with the original insurance. This is certainly the law as to double insurance, and prevents it from being a double insurance.

5. The court has the most exact testimony from witnesses of great experience and respectability, as to the nature of the contract entered into by the defendants; and Tayleur, Grimshaw & Sloane were acting on a sudden emergency, for the benefit of they knew not whom. The reasons why this case is not classed under the branches of either a reinsurance or a double insurance are given, and the legality and frequency of cases similar to the present, and their astonishment at the objections of the defendants, it is true, yet with such seriousness as shows the opinion to have been well considered before uttered.

6. In conclusion of this argument, the court is respectfully referred to the authorities for a definition of reinsurance and of the assured. Phillips on Insurance, 56, 57, 60.

7. Lord Mansfield could never have here intended that two insurances on the same ship, not for the same entire risk, was a double insurance; and if not, the case before the court cannot be deemed one of that description. 1 Johns. 289.

*Eustis*, for the defendants.

1. There has been no compliance with the conditions of the policy, as to the proof of loss; these are conditions precedent. 3 Martin N. S. 223; Marshall on Insurance, 811.

2. In fire assurances the contract is one of mere indemnity, and there must be a real interest in the insured at the time of the loss. Hughes on Insurance, 506; Marshall, 784, 787, 803.

3. If the present contract be a double insurance, it is void by the terms of the policy.

4. But the contract as declared on is a case of reinsurance; that is, one by which the insurers alleged themselves to have been insured. Has such a contract been made by the defendants?

5. The present contract must be governed by the law of insurance as it is settled in the United States. 5 Martin N. S. 543; 4 Louisiana Rep. 291; 5 Cranch, 331.

6. By the law merchant of the United States a contract of reinsurance *must be express*; it is not construed by the general description of assured, "on account of whom it may concern." Phillips on Ins. 74; Hughes, 46; 2 Mass. 186; 3 Caines, 190; 3 Vincent, Legislation Commerciale, 566.

7. The plaintiffs cannot claim to be insured in this case, because they were without an insurable interest in the property. It is not the case of a double insurance. And to be a reinsurance it must be expressly made as such. Pothier on Assurance, 96, Notes to 34; 3 Pardessus, 240, No. 764, 765; Curia Phil. 516, No. 5; 2 Valin, 65; 2 Mass. 776; 3 Kent's Com. 226.

MATHEWS, J., delivered the opinion of the court.

This suit is brought to recover from the defendants eight thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight dollars and eighty-eight cents, which the plaintiffs allege to be owing to them on account of having paid that amount to certain persons styled Joseph Smith & Son, in consequence of a marine policy of assurance by them

---

Reinsurance. — Subrogation — Prior Insurance.

---

subscribed, in favor of said Smith & Son, on the 24th day of August, 1880, in the city of London, etc. They obtained judgment in the court below, from which the defendants appealed.

The facts of the case are the following: Insurance was effected by Smith & Son on merchandise to be shipped from New Orleans to Liverpool (to be laden on the ship *Aurora*, which was to sail from the former port, on or before the 1st of August, 1880), to the amount of two thousand pounds sterling. Cotton belonging to the assured was put on board of this vessel, by their factors and agents, Tayleur, Grimshaw & Sloane, to the value of eleven thousand dollars and upwards. The ship left the port *a quo* on the 3d of July, but met with an accident before she reached the Gulf of Mexico, which caused so serious an injury as to compel her to return and unload for the purpose of being repaired. Her cargo, which consisted of cotton, was taken out, by order of the shippers, and placed in stores or warehouses; that belonging to Smith & Son, together with a larger quantity, was put into the warehouse or cotton-press of James Freret, Jr., where it was insured against fire, by a policy obtained from the defendants at the instance of the consignees of the ship, on the 14th of July, 1880, to continue in force until the 16th of August following. During this period, namely, on the 1st of August, the cotton of Smith & Son, thus insured, was destroyed by fire, and a claim for indemnity in behalf of the insured was made on the insurers; payment was, however, delayed until the latter discovered that, against the greatest portion of the loss suffered by the owners of the cotton, they were secured by a marine policy obtained from the plaintiffs, having effect from the 25th of June, 1880; in pursuance of which they paid the sum of two thousand pounds sterling, equal to eight thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight dollars and eighty-eight cents, to the assured, and now claim this amount from the defendants.

The record contains bills of exceptions to the manner in which commissions to take the testimony of witnesses in England were executed; also objections to the preliminary proof offered by the plaintiffs, necessary to entitle them to support their action, etc. But, in consequence of our conclusions drawn from the entire facts of the case, we deem it unnecessary to examine these matters.

In the argument of this cause, there was much disputation as to the character of the contract sued on ; whether it is a reinsurance or a double insurance, or whether it is neither, and only simply aleatory ; not subjected to the rules which govern in either of the former.

We consider it important to settle these questions, as the rights of the parties must be influenced by the nature of the contract under which the plaintiffs claim. It cannot be considered as sole and simple, for two policies existed, subscribed by distinct insurers, and both, according to their terms, covering risks on the property insured, at the time of its destruction and loss ; that made by the plaintiffs having effect from the 25th of June, 1830 ; and the one executed by the defendants, from the 14th of July of the same year. The latter can therefore be viewed in no other light than as a double insurance, or reinsurance, according to the interest which the plaintiffs had in the things insured, at the time when the defendants assumed the risk for the former. It is not pretended that they were owners, either absolute or *sub modo* ; consequently, as such they had no insurable interest. They were concerned and interested only as having assumed the risks to which the property was exposed by the owners. From these premises, one of two conclusions necessarily follows ; either that no insurance was effected for them, or that the policy subscribed by the Louisiana State Insurance Company was a reinsurance, intended to shift the risk from the Alliance Insurance Company, and place it on the last insurers, to the amount of property covered by the policy of the first ; for they had no interest or concern in its safety, except as insurers. According to the first of these hypotheses, the plaintiffs are without a semblance of claim against the defendants. We have, therefore, only to inquire into the truth of the second, namely, whether a contract of reinsurance was validly made.

A contract of assurance, although aleatory in its nature, is nevertheless synallagmatic and consensual, as containing evidence of reciprocal obligations. To render it valid the mutual consent of the contracting parties is necessary, given either by themselves or persons authorized by them to give such consent. In this respect it differs not materially from all other kinds of consensual contracts. The terms in which a contract of insurance is fre-

## Reinsurance. — Subrogation. — Prior Insurance.

quently made, in favor of the applicant and all other persons concerned or interested in the property insured, to support it, requires proof of interest in the person acting or his authority to act for others who may be interested, previously given, or their sanction and ratifications of his acts, subsequently made, and prior to the loss of the things insured. See Baldasseroni's *Treatise on Insurance*, vol. 1, p. 193, *et seq.* 1 Phillips, 58, 59.

The authority of factors, consignees, and other general agents in relation to property committed to their care, and over which they exercise a qualified ownership, having power to buy, sell, or ship, on account of the real owners, to insure for the latter, need not be inquired into in the present case; because, according to the principles already assumed, the plaintiffs cannot be considered as owners in any shape. Admitting, then, the right and authority of Tayleur, Grimshaw & Sloane to act for Smith & Son in effecting the insurance which they did with the defendants, as legally consequent and resulting from their power as factors and shippers, without special authorization from the owners to this effect, it does not follow that they had any power or authority to act for the insurers in England, whom it cannot be pretended they represented, as factors or general agents. They could, therefore, proceed to obtain a reinsurance only under special authority given for that purpose. Any conclusion different from this would lead to the most absurd improbabilities. It would sanction a belief of extraordinary capriciousness on the part of the foreign assurers. That company appears to be composed of wealthy persons who formed their association for the sole purpose of taking risks in consideration of premiums; and the more they take, the better for the interests of the institution; what can be imagined more improbable than the taking an ordinary and fair risk on one day, and, without any apparent cause, desiring on the next to shift it from themselves on to others, by paying a premium to the latter?

The persons who acted in obtaining the policy from the defendants had no authority to represent the plaintiffs, previously granted; nor was their agency subsequently sanctioned by ratifying and confirming their acts in relation thereto, before the loss of the property insured. We therefore consider the contract, so far as the plaintiffs claim any benefit in it directly, to be wholly null and void.



It is readily seen that our opinion in the present case differs *toto cælo* from that of the learned gentlemen of Lloyd's Coffee-house, as disclosed in the testimony of the witness Secretan. The opinions, however, entertained at Lloyd's, in relation to legal questions, are not, in themselves, entitled to any great consideration; they certainly ought to weigh very light in comparison with such as might be pronounced in Westminster Hall.

Hitherto we have considered the case only in relation to rights claimed by the plaintiffs, resulting directly from the contract entered into by the defendants, as having been made for the benefit of the former. But it was contended for them in argument, that, although they may not be entitled to sue directly on the policy, yet, having paid more than a ratable portion of the loss occasioned by the destruction of the property insured (in a risk taken both by themselves and the defendants), they are, of right, subrogated to the actions and claims of the owners, and should have refunded to them a ratable portion of the sum which they have paid in consequence of the loss. This would be to consider the contract sued on in the nature of a double insurance, which the pleadings do not authorize.

But if they did, it would not benefit the plaintiffs, for the sixth article of the general conditions of insurances, as established by the Louisiana State Insurance Company, was not complied with at the time the policy was subscribed; consequently, the owners themselves could not have recovered from the last insurers more than the amount of loss not covered by the assurers in London.

The plaintiffs certainly cannot justly pretend or claim to be subrogated to rights and claims which the owners had not themselves acquired. This proposition is so self-evident that the notice of it might well have been omitted.

It is therefore ordered, adjudged, and decreed, that the judgment of the district court cannot be avoided, reversed, and annulled; and it is further ordered, adjudged, and decreed, that judgment be here entered for the defendants and appellants, with costs in both courts.

LANE vs. MAINE MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.<sup>1</sup>

(Supreme Court, Maine, April Term 1835.)

*Alienation. — Oral Lease. — Continuing Policy.*

A prohibition against "alienation" in a policy on a store and goods therein is not violated by an oral lease of the store and a sale of the goods to the lessee, who after about six months retransfers the store and remaining goods to the insured.

A policy on a stock of goods in a store to the amount of \$600, for a period of six years, covers any goods therein during that time, although purchased after the date of the policy; and a clause against alienation does not prevent a recovery.

An allegation in a declaration that the plaintiff's store was consumed is sufficient after verdict, without any other averment of ownership.

An omission to allege any value to the property destroyed is good after verdict.

THIS was an action of assumpsit on a policy of insurance, wherein the defendants insured the plaintiff against fire to the amount of two hundred dollars on his store, and the like sum on the goods in said store, for six years from the 17th day of January, 1832, promising, "according to the provisions of their act of incorporation, to pay the plaintiff the said sum within three months next after said buildings, etc., should be burnt." The store and its contents were consumed by fire on the night of the 7th of June, 1834.

In the eighth section of the act of incorporation, referred to in the policy, is the following provision, namely, "When the property insured shall be *alienated* by *sale or otherwise*, the policy shall thereupon be void, and be surrendered to the directors of said company to be cancelled; and upon such surrender the assured shall be entitled to receive his deposit note, upon the payment of his proportion of all losses and expenses that have accrued prior to such surrender."

It was proved that one James Dunn hired the store of the plaintiff, and purchased all the goods therein in May, 1833; put his son into the store, who traded there and continued to hold exclusive possession until November of the same year, when the plaintiff took back the store and goods under an agreement with Dunn to allow him a certain sum for his services, and to pay the debts and receive the dues of the store. From this time, the plaintiff continued in the exclusive occupation of the store, and traded therein until it was burned.

<sup>1</sup> 12 Maine, 44.