A TREATISE ON THE LAW OF WATERCOURSES: WITH AN APPENDIX, CONTAINING FORMS OF DECLARATIONS, ETC. (SECOND EDITION)

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649067824

A Treatise on the Law of Watercourses: With an Appendix, Containing Forms of Declarations, Etc. (Second Edition) by Joseph Kinnicut Angell

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

JOSEPH KINNICUT ANGELL

A TREATISE ON THE LAW OF WATERCOURSES: WITH AN APPENDIX, CONTAINING FORMS OF DECLARATIONS, ETC. (SECOND EDITION)



TABLE OF CASES. .

AMERICAN CASES

CITED AND REFERRED TO IN THE FOLLOWING TREATISE.

			4	١.							
Adams v. Pease	(4)		***						4.	18	, 200
Anonymous .				8		28		1.0			105
Anthony v. Lapham			400		o.c		6345			0.03	26
Anthony v. Lawborne		4.7	521		353	200	100			7120	124
Arnold v. Munday	e Tare			3.70	120	7.00	•			0.5	4
Arnold v. Foot .	100	40	53750			#33			- 1	18	5, 28
Arthur v. Case		276	2.4	25	2	200			- 27		4, 52
Attorney General v. T	1171	nin	3.5		2.5		3.9	170	•		125
Avery a Van Deusen	335	0.1203		565		· **		15			125
Axtell v. Coombs		1	50	**	100	98	0.00	*	**		123
			1	3.		9					
Ball v. Slack .		83				1000		849		8148	4
Baldwin v. Calkins	¥.						22	68	81.	150	, 170
Barker v. Sanderson		840		34043	1						, 172
Barnham v. Webster			20		48		1-2			-	194
Barnet v. Ihrie .				40	40	- 1		43	-	92	141
Barden v. Crocker	æ		276		*8		84	75.5	*3		163
Belknap v. Trimble				**		-	577		-	171	, 173
Bemis v. Upham	•		172.0					100	200		.173
Bemis v. Clark .			105				750		5%		192
Beidleman v. Foulke		(7)				Č		207	4.0		150
Beissel v. Scholl .	PÅ.		320	3			y23		10	1	3, 14
Bent v. Wheeler					22		32			0.07	94

TABLE OF CASES.

Berry v. Carle						::		20		201
Biglow v. Battel	21 10	68°	0	76	٠.	99	0	- 53	-	82, 145
Birch v. Alexande	ı	100		2		35	50	- 20		83
Blanchard v. Bake			1000				8	5.	14.	27, 28, 68
Blane's Lessee v.	Charr	bers		ş		82				40
Blake v. Clark	- 5		2		30				·	41
Bliss v. Rice		- 52							1	5, 45, 103
Blunt v. Aikin	93		20		75		8		100	151
Bolivar Manufac.	Co. v	. Ner	eno	et h	danu	fact	aric	g C	ο.	79, 170 .
Boston Water Pou								~	82	173
Boynton v. Rees	-66	34		1			1	4, 1	6, 2	0, 45, 105
Bradley v. Ames			8					•	×.	151
Bradley v. Rice	•	16				96		20		11
Brown v. Kennedy		•3			: 24				34	2
Bridges v. Purcell						0.4				87
Bullen v. Runnels			60		96	68			360	14, 23
Bullet v. Winstons	3	re-				-		-		126
Buddington v. Bra	dlev		4.0		190				13, 5	23, 68, 78
Butz v. Ihrie						52.	68,	95.	108	111, 131
				J.						
Canal Commission	ers v	Peo	ple		•					, 2, 4, 10
Case v. Haight		•				•			48	3, 52, 177
Canal Commission	ers v	. Can	al A	lpp:	aise	TB			•	201
Carson v. Blazer						•				. 205
Cates v. Wadding					80		٠			904
Chalker v. Dickas	on			4				(4)		63, 196
Charles v. M. & F	. Ma	nufac	. Co	э.						110
Claremont v. Carle	eton									3, 4, 48
Clement v. Durger	ο.				25					128
Coalter v. Hunter		40				*		14		. 68
Colburn v. Richar	dв	9	ě		Ç.			99	. 8	14, 25, 27
Coleman v. Moody	1		¥00		100				72	127
Cook v. Hull		99								27, 68
Cook v. Stearns	9		20		100		4		(4)	115
Commonwealth v.	Chap	in				9		93		181, 192
v.	M'Ca	rdy	::: ::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::		8					194
v	Rugg	les		4					191,	194, 195
v.	Ellis		800		*		800		118,	120, 121
	Shaw									201

TABLE (550		=(3)					xvii	
Commonwealth v. Faris .		14		•		94		125	
Corning v. Gould .			+				58, 6	8, 82	
Cooper v. Williams								35	
Corporation of Memphis v. Ove	rto	3					ij.,	202	
Crocker v. Bragg		2					5	, 170	
Crenshaw v. Slate River Co.	•			15	25,	178	, 197	, 203	
Crews v. Pendleton .		90.2		8.6		¥.		1	
Criswell v. Clugh .	*3		÷		80		201	, 213	
Curtis v. Jackson						14,	16, 5	3, 68	
Cutler v. Tufts	80		×		•	- 33		49	
	D.								
Dawson v. Moons		100		1990				126	
Deerfield v. Arms		101		070	-	196	215	, 221	
Dexter v. Haven					٠	949	~10	85	
Dotson v. Sybert	9	305					1000	127	
Dygert v. Matthews	0.7		23		- 7		•	50	
		-		3000				00	
	E.								
Emerson v. Taylor .	35		15		30		110	221	
Eppes v. Crawle				(190E		:83		125	
Eubank v. Pence .			•		٠		82	126	
	F.								
Farrar v. Stackpole .	10							41	
Fiske v. Framingham Man. Co.				100			117	, 145	(6)
Foot v. Colvin					0		3753	1	
Fowler v. Holbrook				12	55.	25	100	122	
		(7)		97		100		•••	
	G.								
Gardner v. Newburgh (Village o	f)			2, 3	5,	167,	173,	176	
Gates v. Blancoe		ş.						173	
Gavit v. Chambers .			ŭ.				¥	206	
Gay v. Bartlett		28				20	93,	204	
Gay v. Wells	*		34					121	
Gayette v. Bethune		88		100		20		68	
Georgetown (City of) v. Alexand	Iria	Cana	10	0.		201.	213,	214	
Gilman v. Tilton .						,		3, 95	
Giraud v. Hughes		40		74		200	0.5	215	- 12
Gleason v. Gray .	90		34		40	68.	137,	3831 DIBI	
. c	.50		7.2		0.0	,			
5	50								
w:									

xviii

TABLE OF CASES.

Gould &. James										145	, 190
Graves v. Fisher		8		•		1				•	5
			j	ł.							
Hall v. Bennen			22		-		- 22		1520		40
Haight v. Proprietors	of I	Mor	ria .	Agu	educ	t	-83	6	7. 68	77	, 178
Handley's Lessee v. A						-	121	ੌ		- 50	219
Harramond v. M'Glau				23		18			350	-	9
Hatch v. Dwight	i.,				-	1. 7	21.	48	. 53.	115	, 148
Hart v. Hill .		68					2		3 14		, 184
- v. Mayor of Alb	any		12		40		342		850		201
Hathorn v. Stinson				-01		9					58
Hays' Executor v. Box	wnt	n.s					100		3. 5	. 48	, 201
Haywood v. Mason				433		8			307 8		24
Hazard v. Robinson			9.		¥6.		55	5. 5	7. 58	. 94	, 103
Hepburn v. M'Dowell								9			7, 94
Hill v. Crosby			*:								6, 69
Hodges v. Raymond				10000				94			, 137
Hogan v. Zanesville (Can	al C	o.						0.00		94
Holmes v. Drew		30		•3		*		100			119
v. Moore			e e e				200				148
Howell v. M'Coy	TC:	77*		20		296		¥11	1	5, 2	0, 42
Hooper v. Cummings					*10				0.00		4
Hoy v. Sterritt .		22		*00				140		4, 1	5, 23
Hughes v. Mung	20		2.5		•						150
			-	I.					*		
Inhabitants, &c. v. So	oth	wic			35						97
v. Ds				100			100		878		123
Ingraham v. Hutchins			:					220	13. 2	8. f	8,71
- v. Wilkinso				23		:					8, 67
v. Threadgi	11				•						206
Feder Will WY Cold			1	ſ.							
Jackson v. Halstead		100								43	, 183
v. Lawrence).					53	1163	11/20	50
v. Vermilyes				\$6.		0.0	8		1333	49	, 108
Jennings Ex parte	90		8	- "			5.	6	7. 95		, 201
Jewell v. Gardner	10	2,6		•33			- 6	1,	, ,		97
T. Laurence Tamba										ैं	7.0

	TAB	LE	07	C	AB	28.					xix
Johnson v. Rand	134					846				85	46
- v. Kittredge							7540		117	. 11	18, 120
			**								
Kent v. Waite .			K.								
Kennedy v. Scofield	10			٠				•			38
King v. King .	\$17		•		•						44, 68
v. Tiffany	43			*		•		٠		2.0	5
Kilheffer v. Herr	*2		•		•		79		*:		13
Knowler v. Ward			40	•				*		•	173
Mowier v. Ward	*				20				:0		175
			L.								
Le Fevre v. Le Fevre				***						85.	90, 98
Leonard v. White			į.		• 1					-0.40	41
Lehigh Bridge Co. v.	Lebig	h I	Vav.	C).						201
Lindsay v. Charleston	Com	mis	sion	era		35		7.0		99	31
Lisle v. Richards	- 3.00gg		10000			7,5			12		140
Livesay v. Gorgas	- (8) - (8)		39	50		383		•		•	140
Lowell v. Spring	- 52 100		3		76		750		2	11	8, 121
Lunt v. Holland	48		00	•		(5)				**	8, 52
	•		Ť.		٠		8		•		0, 04
			M.								
Makepeace v. Warden	8		•		9		•		Ø.,		44
Manning v. Smith	. 7		33						5	7,	68, 82
M'Affee (heirs of) v. I	Cenne	dy			(.)		¥.				126
M'Almont v. Whitakes				30		•			12, 1	3,	23, 94
M and B. Man. Co. v.	. Full	er					•				120
M'Cullough v. Aten	*					. 3				7	9
Martin v. Bigelow					16		*		100		23
Mayo v. Quimby	- 20			•00		93		19		90	4
- v. Turner		,	-62		×		100		1000		126
Mead v. Haynes .			33	-58				*		910	4, 126
Melville v. Whiting					2.					18	7, 190
Memphis (Corp. of) v.	Over	ton	i								206
Merritt v. Parker	•		o				11.	. 14	. 98.	13	8, 212
v. Brinkerhoff	:0: 97 • 01		:0 000 #:			•00	2251259				2, 100
M'Kellip v. M'llbenny			170			200					9, 172
Miller v. Scofield					100		7.0		- T- 12-6	277772	44
Mitchell v. Paschall	ş 10					15.55		520		73.5	42
- v. Walker	7. F	9/5	er Ç		100		0.00		2.7		31, 68
Morgan v. Bunta		52	- 1	4		1999	1	(5)			, 130
Mountjoy v. Oldham		- 15			200		105				125

XX

TABLE OF CASES.

Mulholland v. Brownin	ng		100				×		84		101
Murray v. Sermon	_	SE				×		9969		×	224
¥										-	
			N								
New Ipswich Woollen	F	ictor	y v.	Ba	tche	lder		5000		*	41
Neal v. Cogan	•3		18		•		98		00.00		126
Nickerson v. Bracket		*		5		20		8.5		**	194
			0								
Oliphant v. Smith	•			•	2				180		163
			P								
Palmer Co. v. Ferritt						٠		- 5		117	, 120
Palmer v. Mulligan	9				200			4, 1	6, 25	2, 48	
Pastorius v. Fisher				20						158	
Pearson v. Tenny	91										105
People v. Canal Appra	ise	rs						6.0		5, 36	,215
- v. Seymour	3 33		30		37657					569	4
v. Platt .				*						35,	201
Perkins v. Dow	8 0		**				¥		1.40		24
Perry v. Wilson .		:		20	2	8.4		(i) • (i)			32
Pettee v. Hawes	25				63						108
Platt v. Johnson .				•		•		8.0		1	4, 22
Provost v. Calder	8		3		•		•				50
			R								
Reid v. Gifford	•:		20		9.69		×		68,	175,	177
Rerick v. Kerr .		38		65		*		134		8	9, 90
Ricard v. Williams	K				(00)		*		23	6	6, 68
Richards v. Hoome		25		•0				500			126
Rogers v. Jones	•3				(0.00)						2
v. Mabe .		338		•		200		0000			68
v. Bruce			*		315		•		118	8	101
Rowe v. Granite Bridg	ge (Corp	orat	ion							214
Russell v. Scott	٠		٠					1	50, 5	3, 78	, 109
Rust v. Boston Mill D	am	Co	rpor	atic	n	٠		•		٠	221
			8	e:							
Sackrider v. Beers				•		•		٠			15
Scott v. Wilson			•		1/4				1		206
Shaw v. Cummiskey						٠				. 98,	
0 0 1											901

	TABL	E 0	F C	ASE	cs.					xxi
Shafer v. Smith .	1		22		0.5		•			145
Sherwood v. Burr		33		•		1.5		*3		3, 94
Shrunk v. Schuylkill	Nav. Co		20						198,	206
Simpson v. Seavy				*		8	31,	152,	200,	201
Slack v. Lyon .	•		4.0				٠			118
Smith v. Connelly	•	12		•				0.00		127
- v. Adams			•							173
- v. Johnson		3				•				1
- v. Miller .			•						9	180
- v. Smith	\$1 ···			(4)		9				58
Sprague v. Snow	35				•					49
Stackpole v. Healy	š.	3.00						(3)		32
Striples v. Spring	34				36			116,	141,	150
Stevens v. Morse		0				¥.			- 25	104
- v. Middlesex	Canal		¥00		~					32
Stiles v. Hooker	¥2.			0.00			•	8, 7	8, 95,	109
Storer v. Freeman	134		200							8
Story v. Odin	•0	36						17		71
- v. Hammond	94		200		*				100,	213
Stoughton (Town of)	v. Bake	r		•		*:			83,	194
Stowell v. Flagg	*							116,	119,	
Strictland v. Todd		20					1	21, 4	10, 68	, 80
Strong v. Benedict	~ ·		0*0						·	137
Sumner v. Foster	*11	200		6200						46
- v. Tileston			4.00	9	4, 96	6, 1	11.	148	, 153	, 172
						A. 200 X	:00 ne#			
	40	T								
Taylor v. Major	•									126
Tinkum v. Arnold										111
Thimmo's Ex'r. v. Co.	monw	ealtl	ı							83
Thompson v. Crocker							•		16	, 132
v. Gregory				10				50	3, 53,	103
Thurston v. Hancock	12		2							71
Tucker v. Jewett	S 82			÷		03		23,	12, 5	9, 68
Twiss v. Baldwin	20	-0				107	2		5, 77,	
Tyler v. Wilkinson	4, 5,	12.	17.	20.	22.	44	. 4	6, 6	7, 69	77.
•			200						9, 80	
		V.								
Vandeusen v. Comsto	·k	20	챙					*		116
Vandenburgh v. Van		•		::		\$3		14	, 44,	
4 THOOLDON SHE A SU	Perken				2		•	14	, 22,	104

*3