

1934 Supplement  
To  
**Mason's Minnesota Statutes**  
1927

(1927 to 1934)  
(Superseding Mason's 1931 Supplement)

Containing the text of the acts of the 1929, 1931, 1933 and 1933-34 Special Sessions of the Legislature, both new and amendatory, and notes showing repeals, together with annotations from the various courts, state, federal, and the opinions of the Attorney General, construing the constitution, statutes, charters and court rules of Minnesota



Edited by

WILLIAM H. MASON, Editor-in-Chief  
W. H. MASON, JR. }  
R. O. MASON } Assistant Editors  
J. S. O'BRIEN }

CITER- DIGEST CO.  
SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA.  
1934

or other receptacle, or any part thereof. It shall be unlawful for any person, company or corporation to adopt or use any brand or mark, which has already been designated, appropriated or obtained under the provisions of this act. It shall be unlawful for any persons other than the rightful owner thereof, or his lawful agent, to use any can, cask, keg, barrel or other receptacle marked or branded as herein provided. Any person other than the owner, or his lawful agent, having in his possession any such can, cask, keg, barrel or other receptacle marked or branded as herein provided shall be deemed guilty of having violated the provisions of this law. Provided: Nothing in the section shall apply to transportation companies or their agents during the time that such can, cask, keg, barrel or other receptacle marked or branded as herein provided is being transported to and from the owner or his lawful agent. It shall be unlawful for any other person than the rightful owner, or his lawful agent, to deface or remove any such brand, mark or stamp put upon any such can, cask, keg, barrel or other receptacle as herein provided. (Act Apr. 25, 1931, c. 366, §2.)

The title of the act: "An act providing for the registration of brands on containers for dairy products: providing for the registration thereof; and providing penalties for violation thereof," may not be sufficient to cover the opening sentence of this section with respect to sanitation.

Department may require registration of dairy containers from other states found in milk plants in this state. Op. Atty. Gen., Oct. 2, 1933.

**8335-3. Violations—penalties.**—Any person or persons who shall violate any provision of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof before a court having jurisdiction in such cases, shall be fined for each and every offense in the sum of not less than fifteen dollars nor

more than one hundred dollars. (Act Apr. 25, 1931, c. 366, §3.)

Where inspector of department of agriculture, dairy and food filed complaint under this act, fine imposed was properly remitted to county treasurer. Op. Atty. Gen., July 9, 1932.

**8335-4. Commissioner of agriculture to enforce act.**—The agriculture, dairy and food commissioner of the state is charged with the proper enforcement of all of the provisions of this act. (Act Apr. 25, 1931, c. 366, §4.)

**8335-5. Effective June 1, 1931.**—This act shall take effect and be in force from and after June 1, 1931. (Act Apr. 25, 1931, c. 366, §5.)

#### DECISIONS RELATING TO TRADE-MARKS AND TRADE-NAMES IN GENERAL

##### 1. In general.

Evidence held to sustain holding that name "De Guile" was a trade-name. Jarvaise Academy of Beauty Culture v. S., 183M507, 237NW183. See Dun. Dig. 9670.

A trade-name is not strictly a trade-mark, but is generally governed as to its use and transfer by the same rules as a trade-mark. Jarvaise Academy of Beauty Culture v. S., 183M507, 237NW183. See Dun. Dig. 9670.

##### 2. Unfair competition.

Evidence held not to show any unfair competition in use of trade-name. Jarvaise Academy of Beauty Culture v. S., 183M507, 237NW183. See Dun. Dig. 9670.

##### 3. Sale and transfer.

The sale or transfer of the property and good will of an established and going business includes trade-names and trade-marks used in that business, unless the contrary is shown. Jarvaise Academy of Beauty Culture v. S., 183M507, 237NW183. See Dun. Dig. 9670.

In the absence of restrictive covenants, the vendor of an interest in a partnership business and good will may engage in a rival business and solicit trade by lawful and fair means, but may not privately solicit the customers of the former partnership. Gibbons v. H., 185M 290, 246NW901. See Dun. Dig. 4046.

Provision in partnership agreement between medical men not to engage in practice in limited territory for 5 years after withdrawal from partnership is valid. Shaleen v. S., 246NW744. See Dun. Dig. 4046, 8436.

## CHAPTER 66

### Homestead Exemption

#### 8336. Dwelling place exempt—Exceptions.

Overvold v. N., 186M359, 243NW439; notes under §8719.

##### 1. Nature.

Judgment for an amount loaned for the purchase of a homestead upon husband's fraudulent promise to give a mortgage on the homestead after acquired, cannot be declared a lien on the homestead. 171M431, 214NW467.

There was a violation of a promise of future action rather than of an existing duty and so is not one for the imposition of a lien to enforce a trust ex maleficio. 171M431, 214NW467.

Use by brothers, joint tenants, of a farm for partnership farming, did not destroy their homestead rights therein. 172M200, 214NW793.

The Fraudulent Conveyance Act (Chapter 415, Laws 1921) did not modify or repeal any part of the homestead law. 173M576, 218NW108.

##### 5. No limitation on use.

Illegal use and occupancy of a homestead does not render it subject to sale on execution. Ryan v. C., 185 M347, 241NW388. See Dun. Dig. 4207.

##### 8. Debts due laborers or servants.

An award under the Workmen's Compensation Act is not a "debt incurred to any laborer or servant for labor or service performed," within the meaning of Const. art. 1, §12, and is not a lien upon the employer's homestead. 175M161, 220NW421.

Constitutional provision does not create liability against the homestead of one who is not the master or employer of the laborer or servant although he has by some collateral contract with the employer made himself liable for the payment of the debt. 175M389, 221 NW534.

##### 14. Alienation.

An oral agreement made by one spouse, while both are living, to give a mortgage on the family homestead, is not merely voidable, but is wholly void under our homestead laws. Kingery v. K., 185M467, 241NW583. See Dun. Dig. 4211(7).

Son advancing money to mother to pay in part mortgages on family homestead upon which mother and father resided was not entitled to subrogation to rights of mortgagees or to any lien upon the homestead, though mother orally promised to give mortgage. Kingery v. K., 185M467, 241NW583. See Dun. Dig. 9037(12).

#### 8339. Title may be in husband or wife—Equitable title exempt.

Kingery v. K., 185M467, 241NW583; note under §8340.

#### 8340. No alienation without consent of spouse—Exceptions.

Use by joint tenants of a farm for partnership farming did not destroy homestead rights therein, where the wife of one of them refused to join in a conveyance of the farm to the partnership. 172M200, 214NW793.

On foreclosure mortgage covering a homestead, and land conveyed to a purchaser by the mortgagor's trustee in bankruptcy subject to existing liens, the judgment correctly directed the land sold by the trustee to be first subjected, and the homestead last. 172M529, 215 NW850.

Where the wife does not sign a contract to convey the homestead the contract is a nullity, but a broker may recover a commission from the husband, there being a presumption that he can perform his contracts. 179M 42, 228NW339.

Son advancing money to mother to pay in part mortgages on family homestead upon which mother and father resided was not entitled to subrogation to rights of mortgagees or to any lien upon the homestead, though mother orally promised to give mortgage. Kingery v. K., 185M467, 241NW583. See Dun. Dig. 9037(12).

An oral agreement made by one spouse, while both are living, to give a mortgage on the family homestead, is not merely voidable, but is wholly void under our homestead laws. Kingery v. K., 185M467, 241NW583. See Dun. Dig. 4211(7).

#### 8342. Sale or removal permitted.

##### 1. Sale and removal.

Finding against abandonment of homestead held sustained by the evidence. 172M200, 214NW793.

##### 2. Notice of claim—Abandonment.

No "abandonment" of wife's homestead results from fact that husband makes a lease thereof to third party, not joined in or authorized by wife. 173M576, 218NW108.

There is no "abandonment" of a homestead until the owner removes therefrom and ceases to occupy the same as his home, intention to remove therefrom at some future time not being sufficient. 173M576, 218NW 108.