

April 1925

Masthead Volume 31, Issue 3

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/wvlr>

Recommended Citation

Masthead Volume 31, Issue 3, 31 W. Va. L. Rev. (1925).

Available at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/wvlr/vol31/iss3/1>

This Prefatory Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the WVU College of Law at The Research Repository @ WVU. It has been accepted for inclusion in West Virginia Law Review by an authorized editor of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact ian.harmon@mail.wvu.edu.

West Virginia Law Quarterly

And THE BAR

Published by the Faculty of the College of Law of West Virginia University, and issued in December, February, April and June of each academic year. Official publication of The West Virginia Bar Association.

Subscription price to individuals, not members of The West Virginia Bar Association, \$2.00 per year. To those who are members of the Association the price is \$1.50 per year and is included in their annual dues. Single copies, 50 cents.

Editor-in-Charge

CLIFFORD R. SNIDER

Managing Editor

BENJAMIN G. REEDER

Faculty Board of Editors

JOSEPH WARREN MADDEN	JAMES RUSSELL TROTTER	THOMAS P. HARDMAN
LEO CARLIN	EDMUND C. DICKINSON	CLIFFORD R. SNIDER

Student Board of Editors

HARRY L. SNYDER, JR., <i>Chairman</i>		
ARCHIBALD M. CANTRALL	ROBERT T. DONLEY	FRANCIS L. WARDER
JAMES G. JETER, JR.	ABRAHAM PINSKY	COLUMBUS L. WETZEL
CHARLES M. LOVE, JR.	HALE J. POSTEN	JAMES H. WHITE

DEMURRER AS A METHOD OF OBJECTING TO SEPARATE ITEMS OF DAMAGE ALLEGED.—In the recent case of *Ohio-West Virginia Co. v. Chesapeake & Ohio Ry. Co.*,¹ certified to the Supreme Court of appeals of West Virginia on a question of the sufficiency of the declaration, the plaintiff, owner and operator of a service station, alleged that it received from the defendant in a tank car a consignment which was described in the freight bill delivered by the defendant to the plaintiff as gasoline; that, relying upon the defendant's representation as to the contents of the car, the plaintiff emptied the contents into its gasoline tanks, which were already partly filled with gasoline; that the tank car, in fact, was filled not with gasoline, but with kerosene, and the combination resulting from the mixture of the two fluids in the gasoline tanks was valueless. The plaintiff claimed damages (1) for loss of the gasoline and kerosene so mixed; (2) for loss of profits caused by sales of the mixture, before its nature became known to the plaintiff, to customers who became dissatisfied and ceased to deal with the

¹ 124 S. E. 587 (W. Va. 1924).