

On these facts being admitted before the Magistrate he reserved the following question for the decision of the Supreme Court:—

“ Has the accused broken sections 21 and 22 of Law 10 of 1889 by using the café or bar after the hour, prescribed for ceasing to sell intoxicating liquors, although he does not offer for sale or permit to be consumed any intoxicating liquor after that hour, at which hour he locks up all intoxicating liquors in his cellar ? ”

For Police the *Assistant Attorney-General*.

For Accused *Paschalis*.

Court: We find that no breach of the law has taken place. There has been no sale or exposure for sale within the meaning of the law during prohibited hours contrary to sections 21 or 22 of Law 10 of 1889. We advise the Magisterial Court accordingly and dismiss the charge against the accused.

NETTLETON,
C.J.
&
GRIMSHAW,
P.J.
POLICE
v.
GEORGHOS
KOUMAS

[NETTLETON, C.J. AND GRIMSHAW, P.J.]

POLICE

v.

NEOFYTOS CHRISTOFI KOROGONGOU.

KNIVES LAW—CARRYING A KNIFE IN A SADDLE-BAG.

Accused was convicted and sentenced by a Magisterial Court (2 judges) to six months imprisonment for carrying a pointed knife outside his premises.

Accused had the knife inside a vourga in the saddle-bag of the animal he was riding.

Accused appealed against the conviction.

For Appellant *Theodotou* and *Paschalis*.

For Police the *Assistant Attorney-General*.

Paschalis: Accused was not carrying the knife within the meaning of the law—not carrying the knife on himself.

HELD: The conviction was right.

Appeal dismissed.

NETTLETON,
C.J.
&
GRIMSHAW,
P.J.
1925
December 8