

April 1918

Masthead Volume 25, Issue 3

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

Recommended Citation

Masthead Volume 25, Issue 3, 25 W. Va. L. Rev. (1918).

Available at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/wvlr/vol25/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 November, January, 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, \$1.50 per year. To those who are members of the Association the price is \$1.00 per year and is included in their annual dues. Single copies, 40 cents.

Board of Editors

HENRY CRAIG JONES JAMES RUSSELL TROTTER JAMES W. SIMONTON
THOMAS P. HARDMAN LEO CARLIN

Associate Editors for Bar Association

WILLIAM P. WILLEY IRA E. ROBINSON ROBERT S. SPILMAN

Associate Student Editors

EDGAR C. GLASS JULIAN L. HAGEN WILLIAM W. WALTERS
ARTHUR G. STONE

APPORTIONMENT OF ROYALTIES ON PARTITION OF PREMISES SUBJECT TO AN OIL AND GAS LEASE.—In the recent case of *Campbell v. Lynch*,¹ it appeared that certain land, on which there was an oil and gas lease under which there had been no development, descended to the widow and six children of the deceased owner. By judicial proceedings the land was partitioned among the widow and children, the tracts being of unequal size. The partition decree did not mention the oil and gas lease. Later the lessee drilled wells on all of the tracts into which the leasehold had been partitioned except one, and produced oil in paying quantities. The complainants as owners of the undeveloped tract filed a bill in equity claiming a share of the royalties. The lower court dismissed the bill but on appeal the Supreme Court of Appeals reversed the decree, holding the royalties were not included in the partition and should be apportioned among the parties regardless as to where the oil was produced. A dissenting opinion was filed by Ritz, J., in which Miller, J., concurred.

¹94 S. E. 739 (W. Va. 1918).