# WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION CASES: BEING REPORTS OF CASES DECIDED UNDER THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT. VOL IV.

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

### ISBN 9780649736058

Workmen's Compensation Cases: Being Reports of Cases Decided Under the Workmen's Compensation Act. Vol IV. by R. M. Minton-Senhouse

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd. Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

# R. M. MINTON-SENHOUSE

# WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION CASES: BEING REPORTS OF CASES DECIDED UNDER THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT. VOL IV.



DWX RA N. Y

# WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION CASES.

VOL. IV.

# WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION CASES:

BEING

### REPORTS OF CASES

DECIDED UNDER THE

## WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACTS,

PRINCIPALLY TAKEN FROM THE

LAW TIMES REPORTS AND THE TIMES LAW REPORTS.

VOL. IV.

### EDITED BY

### R. M. MINTON-SENHOUSE,

OF THE INNER TEMPLE AND OXFORD CIRCUIT, ESQUIRE, BARRISTER-AT-LAW,
AUTHOR OF "ACCIDENTS TO WORKMEN"S
COMPENSATION CASES," AND OF OTHER LEGAL TEXT-BOOKS.

. REFURD LIBRARY

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

BUTTERWORTH & CO., 11 & 12, BELL YARD, TEMPLE BAB.

\*\*Law Publishers.

1904.

### PREFACE.

For those who are not familiar with this series of Reports, it may be advisable to point out that, in each case, the original is mentioned at the head, and other reports are cited at the end. The headnotes are my own, but, save as to this, the originals are not interfered with in any material respect. Superfluous matter only has been excised: such as the provisions of sections of the Act or the affirmative and negative statements of counsel of an argument that is fully dealt with in the judgments.

Now that we have arrived at the fourth volume, it is thought that a complete digest of all the cases would be useful. I have therefore prepared one, and propose to publish it, with wide margins for notation, under the name of "A Digest of Workmen's Compensation Cases."

THE EDITOR.

October, 1902.

1.

### ELEVENTH EDITION.

Just Published. Post 8vo. Price 5s. net. Postage 3d. extra.

### THE

# WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1906,

WITH NOTES, BULES, ORDERS AND REGULATIONS

W. ADDINGTON WILLIS, LL.B. [LOND.], Barrister-at-Law.

BEING THE

ELEVENTH EDITION

WILLIS'S WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACTS.

This Edition has been specially prepared with a view to compactness. On thin paper, in flexible binding, it forms an ideal pocket companion.

BUTTERWORTH & CO., 11 & 12, BELL YARD, TEMPLE BAB, W.C.

# INDEX OF CASES.

	AGE   PAGE
Albion Coal Co., John v	15 ELLIOTT v. Liggins 11
Armitage v. Lancashire &	Ellis v. Cory & Sons 62
Yorkshire Ry. Co	5   Ellison v. Longden & Son . 69
Adams and Co Cotton	
Atlantic Transport Co., Catter-	Evans v. Penwyllt Dinas Silica
mole v	28 Brick Co 101
Ayres v. Buckeridge	120
23 - 1 121 E 122 E 1	Field v. Longden & Sons . 20
BARCLAY, Curle, & Co., Osborne	Fitzpatrick v. Hindley Field
or McKinnon v	49 Colliery Co
Bartell v. Gray & Co	95 Fletcher v. London United
Bartlett v. Tutton (or Sutton)	
& Sons	133 Tamways, Ltd
Bath, Jesson v	9 5 5 6
	10 GRANTHAM Co-operative So-
	ciety, Hunt v 67
Boardman v. Scott & Whit-	Over & Co Restell at 05
worth	L Great Control Dr. Co. Tonour. 99
	Chart Monthon Dr. Co
Burnett v. Drury Lane Theatre	
Bush v. Hawes	
	Great Northern Ry. Co. v.
CATTERMOLE v. Atlantic	Whitehead & Co 39
Transport Co	28 Green, Clatworthy v 152
Chattle Vesser	49
Chattle, Veazey v.	HARMSWORTH Brothers, Cheek
Cheek v. Harmsworth	
Brothers	29   44   4   6   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1
Clatworthy v. Green 1	52 Hawes, Bush v
Clover, Clayton, & Co.,	Hindley Field Colliery Co.,
	38 Fitzpatrick v
Cooper & Crane v. Wright .	75 Hoare v. Truman, Hanbury,
Cortonwood Collieries Co.,	Buxton & Co 58
	32 Howells v. Vivian & Sons . 106
Cory & Sons, Eilis v	62 Hunt v. Grantham Co-opera-
	10 tive Society 67
	Technological and the technique results
Cubitt & Co., Knight v	42
ARROTTO DECISION STREET, AND STREET ADVISORS.	Jesson v. Bath 9
DRURY Lane Theatre, Bur-	John v. Albien Coal Co 15
nett v	56 Jones v. Great Central Ry.
Dunham v. Clare 1	02   Co 23
manuscription () () () () ()	

### INDEX OF CASES.

	PAGE		100
Jones v. London & North Western Ry. Co	140	Paron, Wilmott v	66
Jones v. Rhymney Iron Co	120		115
KENNY v. Harrison & another	60		101
Knight v. Cubitt & Co	42	Powell Duffryn Steam Coal	1000
Kniveton v. Northern Em- ployers' Mutual Indemnity		Co., Rees v 17 ( Pryce v. Penrikyber Naviga-	
Co. Kynoch, Reeks v	87 14	tion Colliery Co 1	115
		REEKS v. Kynoch	14
LANCASHIRE & Yorkshire Ry.	10.000	Rees v. Powell Duffryn Steam	1
Co., Armitage v Liggins, Elliott v	11	Coal Co	(n.)
London & North Western Ry.	140	Robertson	150
Co., Jones v	140	Khymney Iron Co., Jones v	120
Ltd., Fletcher v	71		120
Longden & Son, Ellison v.	69	Rudeforth, Marshall v	55
Longden & Sons, Field v	20	Course & Williams David	
Lovatt, O'Keefe v	109	Scorr & Whitworth, Beard-	1
Lee Boardman. See Board- man.		Sutton. See Tutton.	•
Lee v. Cortonwood Collieries	2250	Tong v. Great Northern Rail-	
Co	32	way Co	40
McGrath v. Neill & Sons .	47	Truman, Hanbury, Buston, &	**
McKinnon. See Osborne.	(22)	Co., Hoare v	58
Marshall v. Rudeforth Morrisv. Northern Employers'	55	Tutton (or Sutton) & Sons, Bartlett v	133
Mutual Indemnity Co	38	T	
Morton & Co. v. Woodward .	143	VEAZEY v. Chattle	49 106
NEILL & Sons, McGrath v	47	54094510051405140065440754007007007	
Northern Employers' Mutual		WATTERS c. Clover, Clayton,	
Indemnity Co., Kniveton v.	37		138
Northern Employers' Mutual			120
Indemnity Co., Morris v	38	Whitehead & Co., Great Northern Ry. Co. v	39
O'KEEFE v. Lovatt	109	Whittaker & Sons, Wrigley v.	93
Osborne or McKinnon v. Bar-		Wilmott v. Paton	65
clay, Curle, & Co	149		143
Owen (Judge) & Robertson,	10000	Wright, Cooper & Crane v	75
Rex v	150	Wrigley v. Whittaker & Sons	93

# Syrapy Company

# THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1897.

NOVEMBER, 1901, TO JUNE, 1902.

November 13, 1901.

### BOARDMAN v. SCOTT & WHITWORTH.

Before Collins, M.R., STIRLING and MATHEW, L.JJ.

85 L. T. 502.

Accident in Ordinary Course of Work .- Sec. 1, 1.

A man lacerated the muscles of his back while lifting a heavy beam in the usual and ordinary course of his work.

Held, that the arbitrator was right in holding that the man had been injured by accident.

Lee Boardman v. Scott & Whitworth ([1901] 3 W. C. C. 33) affirmed.

This was an appeal by the respondents from the award of the County Court Judge at Manchester.

The facts appear in the report, (1901) 3 W. C. C. 33.

The respondents appealed.

A. Powell, for the appellants: The workman was doing his ordinary work in the usual way, and there was no fortuitous or unexpected event which caused the injury. The injury is not caused by "accident" unless it is caused by some VOL. IV.