will never plague anyone else; I have taught them a lesson." It was denied that McGough had ever been annoyed by fellow-workmen.

The defence was that the offences were committed during a post-epileptic state. Medical evidence was given in support of this view. Dr. F. C. Logan, of Prestwich Mental Hospital, said that the pressure of McGough's cerebro-spinal fluid was much increased.

The accused was found "Guilty but Insane," and the usual order for detention was made.

The apparently indiscriminate and motiveless violence in this case is very suggestive.

Easton *v.* Potts and Johnson.

The Plaintiff, Mrs. Jane Easton, brought an action against Dr. W. A. Potts, of Birmingham, and Dr. A. V. Johnson, of Aldridge, Staffs, for alleged negligence in certification. The Master had refused an application by the defendants that the action should be stayed, and Mr. Justice Finlay had affirmed this decision. On December 18 the matter came before Lord Justice Scrutton and Lord Justice Greer in the Court of Appeal.

Lord Justice Scrutton, in giving judgment, stated the facts of the case. In 1926 Mrs. Easton was staying with a friend in Staffordshire. This friend, as also the plaintiff's sister, who was sent for, took a serious view of the plaintiff's mental condition. The defendants were called in; they certified the plaintiff, and she was removed to an institution. There was evidence that she had a delusion to the effect that people could, by means of hypnotic influence, have carnal knowledge without touching each other, and that a man whom she saw for the first time had done this some time before. She also had the idea that everyone had some kind of aura of smell, and stated that she could smell one of the doctors prior to his entering the room.

The Lord Justice said that the jurisdiction which the Court was asked to exercise presented great difficulty. The liberty of the individual must be protected. On the other hand, it was equally important that doctors should be protected in the performance of a public duty imposed upon them by the law. Recent cases had shown that doctors might be unwilling to certify persons who should have been under care and control. In this particular instance no jury ought to find that the plaintiff was not reasonably certified. Both the Judge and the Master had found that there was no lack of honesty on the part of the defendants. The only question was whether the defendants had acted with reasonable care. He decided that they had done so, and that there was no evidence upon which a jury could reasonably find otherwise.

Lord Justice Greer concurred. The appeal was, accordingly, allowed, and the action was stayed.

The decision may serve as an antidote to the effect of certain recent cases, which have, undoubtedly, occasioned disinclination on the part of doctors to sign certificates.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.76.312.118 Published online by Cambridge University Press