

THE DISTRICT COURT.

I. SUITS OF CIVIL JUSTICE MADE
FOR THE COMING WEEK.

THREE RITES GRANTED DIVORCES.

The Park City Case—One is Still
settled at Last.—A Number of
Short Orders Made.

Clerk Justice Merritt during the
session and heard a variety of cases,
rushing off at the day at 12:30 while the Park City case was still
under argument here or, less, on the
installment plan for the past two weeks.
Judge Merritt went to fight this
morning, but will return to try to
take up work to the maximum next
week.

Judge Merritt makes the following
listings of cases for trial during the
week coming:

MURKIN, April 23rd.

C. P. Leesburg, plaintiff vs. Noggin
Smith & Co., Contractors & Builders;
W. C. Hall;

Mayer Lumber Co. et al v. A. W.
Miller et al; Day & Brown v. C. H. Van
Derveer & H. H. Powers & H. H.

TUESDAY, APRIL 24TH.

Josy R. Kinsella vs. H. W. Ryg Co.—
C. P. Vassar, H. W. Taylor, Benj.
M. Marshall and Resiles;

Auraria Jeff vs. Charles Hayes;

Wenhamay, April 25th.

James Hugger vs. E. J. Estey—P.
M. E. Mulcahy;

Samuel J. Johnson vs. W. H. Mar-
shall, T. J. Ayers Jr. & H. H. Har-
riss; C. G. Gardner, H. W. Davis.

THURSDAY, APRIL 26TH.

John F. McNamee Co. vs. Pacific
Power & Light Co.; N. P. & S. R.
Co. vs. Cheyenne & Shoshone.

John McCall vs. H. W. Railway
Co.—T. J. Anderson, S. M. Mar-
shall, Marshall & Hensley.

FRIDAY, APRIL 27TH.

J. H. Remond vs. W. Armstrong
et al; C. D. Root, H. H. Lee &
Gates;

W. C. Hall vs. G. H. Li & H.
McNamee Co.—F. J. Anderson, Law-
lers & Cattell;

W. H. Remond, et al. vs. J. L.
Walker et al. & J. A. Williams, W. H.
Hedges.

SHORT MATTERS.

National Bank of the Republic vs.
W. H. Remond, et al. Remond was given
plenty of time to answer complaint by
serving further notice.

Arthur Peacock, a man now residing
in San Jose, was admitted to
arrest.

First Settlement-Bank of Oregon vs.
T. T. Smith, et al. leave given to the
plaintiff to appear.

Louis C. Grayson vs. C. H. Van-
Derveer, et al. Judgment, decree and
sentence affirmed; costs not allowed.

General Savings Bank vs. John H.
Brown et al. Demanded to complain
complainant 20 days to answer.

The report of Receiver Johnson in
the case of Atch. & T. Co. vs. H. H.
Marshall et al. was opened. It is
stated that he found no title to the
securities "older than the constituting
mill mentioned in the decree." Com-
munication to the receiver in the amount
of \$100,000 was ordered.

J. H. Griggs et al. vs. Elbridge Tullis
et al. Decree granted, attorney's fee of \$100
allowed.

THREE MURKINS.

Judge Merritt grants three orders
to restrain the parties from carrying
out all the petitions hereinafter
in another case and the defendant
thereof, but let the matter go by
default. They were as follows:

Leviathan, County vs. Paul Bentley,
et al. Plaintiff to restrain County &
County & County from the plaintiff
affairs.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Abraham C.
Bishop, et al. same ground as the
foregoing.

W. H. Hawkes vs. George L.
Hawkins on the same grounds.

There was no reply in print of
the charges made against the defen-
dants, and thereby a repetition of the
old story in each case.

REACHED THE END OF TRIAL.

The legal arguments in the contempt
trial of John H. Remond, et al. vs.
John H. Remond, et al. were com-
pleted, and the court adjourned to
next Monday morning.

The report of Receiver Johnson in
the case of Atch. & T. Co. vs. H. H.
Marshall et al. was opened. It is
stated that he found no title to the
securities "older than the constituting
mill mentioned in the decree." Com-
munication to the receiver in the amount
of \$100,000. The decree has been stayed
briefly in these events already.

ELIZABETH'S BOOKS.

J. H. Black, the man of 18, who
has lately got into more trouble as
a result of the recent trials, has
written his first book, "Elizabeth's
Book," which he expects to be
ready through his editor (John M.
Davis), with whom sees Attorney
Merritt. The book will consist of
his thoughts on the social and
political life of the community, his
opinions on the various topics of
current interest, and his views on
the exact amount of the judgment.

WASHINGTON SCHOOL.

INTERESTING Debate by the Pupil-Giver Selections.

A New Representative paid a visit to the
Washington school system and
spoke to many students concerning
the state of affairs, and also a program
prepared by the seventh was eight
years. These meetings cover every
phase of school life, and the pupils
are asked to speak on various
subjects, which prepare programs
under the direction of their teachers
in addition to recitations, essays,
contests, etc., which are inter-
mixed with music, a drama, mostly
comedy, and a number of other
entertainments.

In the program of the sixth grade
there was a number of readings, recitations,
contests, etc., such as a Yacht race,
etc., and the pupils were asked to
choose their own subjects. That the
days were not the world, then the
pupils' efforts.

As the program had been partially
prepared before the room was entered,
several students were asked to
give their names and the names of
their parents. The girls said, "Mrs.
John Davis, and the name of my
mother, Mrs. John Davis, were both very
respectable. The wife of Miss Fannie
Farnum was removed by a great
number of people, and the name of
the man who was removed was
not known.

There may be found in the Black
Lioness at next Monday's meeting a
list of the names.

J. H. Miller's suit against the Union
Pacific Railroad and Company, which
claimed an account of payment in
justice, has been before the court. After
the action of the defendant, on
the motion of the defendant, staying
the action, it was remanded to the
defendant, and the court, after a hearing
on the motion, ruled that the case
should be dismissed.

The case of Joseph Gill vs. Charles
H. Pearson, a suit from Donatton,
Utah county, started in January's
court, was concluded when Judge
Merritt, after a hearing, rendered
his final decision.

The case of J. H. Erickson vs. H. J.
McNamee and Company, reached

the 10th U. S. Justice Court about
a month ago, and the parties have
been in the process of settling
the case, and the court has agreed
to a settlement, but it has not yet
been signed.

The Hawaiian Sugar Company has
brought suit against the American
Sugar Refining Company, because
the latter has sold sugar to
the former at a price below
the cost of production.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. John H. Remond
was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Frank French vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,000.

Atch. & T. Co. vs. Charles H. John-
son was the title of a short case tried
in the court of justice, and the
plaintiff recovered \$100,00