



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

147 U. S. 101; reported, with extensive notes in Book 37 of the Lawy. Co-Op. Ed. p. 97. See also *Pittsburg etc. R. Co. v. Russ*, 57 Fed. Rep. 822 (6 C. C. A. 597).

But the weight of authority in the State courts is opposed to this view, and in these courts it is very generally held that a corporation is liable in punitive damages for the malicious and wanton wrongs of its servants, done in the course of their employment, though neither authorized nor ratified. This liability has been recognized in actions by passengers against railroad companies more frequently than in any other class of cases. Indeed, it is asserted by Mr. Freeman, in the note to *Spellman v. R. & D. R. Co.* cited below, that such liability has been upheld in nearly every instance in the latter class of cases.

The subject is discussed in a learned and exhaustive note to *Spellman v. R. & D. R. Co.* (So. Car.) 28 Am. St. Rep. 858, 770-883, where the authorities *pro* and *con* are collected. See further on the subject, Shearm. & Redf. on Neg. (4th ed.), sec. 749; 1 Harris Dam. by Corp. 9249; Sutherland on Dam. 750.

On the subject of punitive damages generally, see note to *Merrill v. Tariff Manuf. Co.* (Conn.), 27 Am. Dec. 682, 684-689; and note to *Austin v. Wilson* (Mass.), 50 Am. Dec. 766, 767-775; *Borland v. Barrett*, 76 Va. 128.

In *N. & W. R. Co. v. Anderson*, 90 Va. 1, a railroad company was held liable in punitive damages to a passenger, wrongfully ejected by the conductor, but on the ground that the company subsequently ratified the conductor's act. In *Lipscomb v. N. & W. R. Co.* 90 Va. 137, the court, after finding that the case was not a proper one for punitive damages at all (there being no ingredients of malice or fraud or of intentional wrong—p. 142) adopts in a *dictum* (p. 146), and without noticing the decisions to the contrary, the rule of the Supreme Court of the United States on the subject. In *N. & W. R. Co. v. Neely*, 1 Va. Law Reg. 277, the court said that an instruction that punitive damages might be recovered "if the act was wanton and oppressive, and if the company, after knowledge thereof, participated in it or ratified it, expressly or by implication," correctly propounded an abstract principle of law, but that there was no evidence upon which to base such an instruction—the wrong complained of being the result of an innocent mistake. There was no discussion of the principle, and no citation of authority.

The law on this subject cannot be said, therefore, to be settled in Virginia. The *dicta* in the two cases last cited seem to show a leaning of the Virginia court towards the Supreme Court rule, but nothing else.

GUARDIANS AD LITEM—*Admission by—consent proceedings.* It is well settled that no admission by the guardian *ad litem*, whether of record or otherwise, is binding on the infant defendant. Nor can there be a consent decree, or waiver of proofs, or the concession of any right of the infant by the guardian *ad litem*. *Dangerfield v. Smith*, 83 Va. 81, 91; *Waterman v. Lawrence* (Cal.), 79 Am. Dec. 212.

But this principle does not preclude the right of the guardian *ad litem* to consent to mere matters of procedure, for the sake of convenience, not affecting the substantive rights of the infant—as, for example, consenting to trial in vacation, or to a continuance of the cause, etc. *Morris v. Va. Ins. Co.*, 85 Va. 588, 593-4; *Kingsbury v. Buckner*, 134 U. S. 678, 681.