

LAST EDITION

5 O'CLOCK.

DESERET EVENING NEWS.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1892.

FRAGMENTS.

The City Council will meet again tonight to further revise ordinances.

The Legislature of the winter has had the effect of a long vacation for this session.

The Eighth session of Edens will meet in the Eighteenth ward on Monday evening at 7 o'clock.

Dan Clark was arrested today at the instance of Mr. Bentz on a charge of violating the sanitary ordinances.

The board of lady managers of the World's Fair passed out the following order to all construction buildings: "Orders from 6 till 12 o'clock."

The Religion of our early ancestors, Brahmins, will be the subject of Rev. Mr. Ulrich's sermon tomorrow morning at the Tabernacle. Everybody invited.

THEME DANCE will put out the following notice: "The theme dance will be held Saturday evening at 8 o'clock, in the Tabernacle, Street and Waterworks, Salt Lake, Utah, tickets \$1."

EDEN'S BOOZ TAX COLLECTOR GALLAGHER had warrants issued this afternoon for the arrest of a number of prominent citizens for keeping unlicensed saloons.

At Legion yesterday the last ball game between the Agricultural college and the University of Utah took place.

The award of the \$100,000 school bonds, mention of which is made in another part of this paper, was to be made by the minister committee of the board of education at a meeting tomorrow.

In the course of this afternoon search was made upon the premises of Hyatt's Wash, who had planned going to auditory; was detained upon application till the 1st Tuesday in January, next.

The Tabernacle, the Auditorium, the concert hall, the Chester, will furnish, in an hour, information that it would be impossible to acquire without trouble or trouble. The girls club will render a new and useful service.

The remains of Sister Elizabeth Carter-Wallace will be on view at her residence, 20 south First. Was stricken with heart disease yesterday morning and will not open tomorrow. Sunday services will not be opened.

CITY AUDITOR Rutherford announces that he is now prepared to record those portions of the special sidewalk tax bill, which in case of the court's confirmation, will be assessed on the 1st of December, 1892, & 1st of January, 1893.

The Tabernacle, the Auditorium, the concert hall, the Chester, will furnish, in an hour, information that it would be impossible to acquire without trouble or trouble. The girls club will render a new and useful service.

Since the late and "snap" at several overcast robberies have been reported to the police that the thieves are still at large and are plying their trade in the city, the police are on the alert. "There should be more," said one of the officers.

CITY AUDITOR Rutherford announces that he is now prepared to record those portions of the special sidewalk tax bill, which in case of the court's confirmation, will be assessed on the 1st of December, 1892, & 1st of January, 1893.

A claim of \$10,000 for the alienation of a wife's affection.

A strange story of domestic woes told by the husband, reached the skirts of the Third district court this afternoon, when Edward W. Rhoadbeck sought suit against Francis Clark, his mother-in-law, from whom he claims \$10,000 in costs for the alienation of his wife's affection.

Plaintiff, in his complaint, says that on October 1st, 1891, he was married to Jessie Clark, in this city. Some time after the marriage his wife was being tried in a suit for divorce, and he found that Mrs. Rhoadbeck's mother, conscious of plans whereby she could separate her husband and wife, succeeded in alienating his wife's affection from him, and induced her to leave him. He, however, remained with his wife, and she continued to remain with him till March of the present year.

About this time plaintiff was temporarily absent from home on account of his work as a foreman for his wife and infant child. Thereupon, in pursuance of her original design, the defendant came upon the scene, and sought to separate them. She persuaded his wife to leave him, and he returned to his wife and remaining child. His wife, without any cause whatever, on this occasion carried away all the household goods from the home and took him entirely. When plaintiff found the place "deserted and empty," he went home the next day to come and see his wife at her mother's house. He went, but the defendant refused him admittance, and further threatened to shoot him if he set foot upon premises. She would not allow him to speak to his wife. By reason of her conduct, he says, his home has been broken into, he has been deprived of his wife's services, and of her and their children's company. He is now, and remains, under the control of her mother, and live with him.

As a solace for his sorrow, Mr. Rhoadbeck demands the \$10,000.

Barlow Parsons is the plaintiff attorney.

Alleged Breach of Agreement.

Thomas Brown this afternoon, through his attorney, L. W. Stoye, filed a complaint in the Third District Court against Joseph Martin.

Plaintiff filed suit Nov. 19, 1892, entered into a contract with the defendant to construct a tunnel on a drainage of the house of Valley Hill, in the Eighteenth Ward, and continuing a certain distance westward. The tunnel was to be 12 feet wide, 12 feet in length, the length, however, to depend upon the discovery of a certain amount of water in the tunnel.

The same day he entered into a contract with the defendant to construct a tunnel on a drainage of the house of Valley Hill, in the Eighteenth Ward, and continuing a certain distance westward. The tunnel was to be 12 feet wide, 12 feet in length, the length, however,

F. M. Sawyer is the man indicted by the state grand jury on a charge of enlarging the house of Valley Hill, in the Eighteenth Ward, and continuing a certain distance westward.

The same order was entered in the suit of Martin. Parrot v. Co. vs. Sawyer et al.

In the case of W. M. Perry et al. vs. A. C. Thompson, the "assessment method" was the entry made on the court's record.

The case of the United States vs. the

SATURDAY IN COURT.

The Jury Awards H. Thomas Five Dollars for the bite of a Dog.

ARRAIGNMENT OF PRISONERS.

The Salt Lake Brewing Co. appears as Defendant in a Number of Criminal Matters—Settings of Civil Cases.

There was a large attendance of attorneys in the Third District court this morning, it having been previously announced by Chief Justice Jones that he would, at 10 o'clock, make a setting of civil cases for the remainder of the present term. This part of the morning's session occupied rather less than half-an-hour, and the following cases were set:

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 1.

Am. Publishing Co. vs. A. Fisher, et al. Attorneys: Day & Street.

Am. Publishing Co. vs. Henry Street, et al. Attorneys: Day & Street, Blawie & Crittenden.

FRIDAY, DEC. 2.

Charles Madsen vs. Taylor, Remond & Armstrong, et al. Attorneys: W. A. Byers, J. M. Thomas, Remond & Taylor, G. C. Sutherland.

Hicks & Paul Little, Co. vs. Natural Mineral Water Co., Attorneys: Day & Street, Bennett, Marshall & Bradley.

SUNDAY, DEC. 3.

People vs. Frank Barrett, et al. People vs. Joseph Hayes.

People vs. Arthur C. Jones.

TUESDAY, DEC. 4.

People vs. H. W. Driggs, Jr., People vs. Alexander Johnson.

People vs. Frank White.

WEDNESDAY, DEC. 5.

John Anderson, et al. vs. Charles Klemm, et al. Attorneys: Shepard & Cherry & Shepard, Coal & Coal, et al. vs. John Anderson, et al. Attorneys: Evans Whiting, et al. vs. C. C. Crossman.

E. W. Williams vs. A. L. Williams, et al. Attorneys: A. B. Sawyer, Winters & Kinney.

THURSDAY, DEC. 6.

Albert Fisher, et al. vs. Charles Klemm, et al. Attorneys: Shepard & Cherry & Shepard, Coal & Coal, et al. vs. John Anderson, et al. Attorneys: Evans Whiting, et al. vs. C. C. Crossman.

FRIDAY, DEC. 7.

John Anderson, et al. vs. Charles Klemm, et al. Attorneys: Shepard & Cherry & Shepard, Coal & Coal, et al. vs. John Anderson, et al. Attorneys: Evans Whiting, et al. vs. C. C. Crossman.

SUNDAY, DEC. 9.

Thomas Jenkins vs. Charles Drury, Attorneys: Booth & Gray, et al. vs. Charles Drury.

Kansas Water Co. vs. James Nelson, Attorney: George W. Roger, Barlow Parsons.

MONDAY, DEC. 10.

Alexander S. Fowler vs. U. P. Bell, et al. Attorneys: Powers & Hale, Wilcox & Van Cleave.

Samuel Gano vs. Thomas Armstrong, et al. Attorneys: J. M. Thomas, Remond & Bradley.

Philip Neier, et al. vs. George C. Channing, Attorneys: Lee & Post, McDowell & Lyle.

TUESDAY, DEC. 11.

Wm. H. Head, et al. vs. H. B. Gilliland, Attorneys: Head & Gray, et al. vs. Head.

John C. Briscoe vs. John F. Price, et al. Attorneys: E. H. Lewis, Rollie & Kline.

A. Nix vs. John H. Brown, et al. Attorneys: Winters & Rip, Coal & Coal.

WEDNESDAY, DEC. 12.

H. A. Hess, et al. vs. Margaret White, Attucks, et al. Attorneys: H. B. Gilliland, et al. vs. Coal & Coal.

John C. Briscoe vs. Salt Lake City, et al. Attorneys: H. K. Kline, W. C. Hall.

John A. James vs. James Gordon, et al. Attorneys: C. E. Lomakow, W. G. T. Morris.

A. Nix vs. John H. Brown, et al. Attorneys: Winters & Rip, Coal & Coal.

DOMESTIC DISCORD.

MARRIED PEOPLE SHOULD BEWARE OF THE FIRST QUARTER.

Watch beginnings. There is always a point where the entering wedge breaks in, and after this the process of disintegration is easy. In the first quarter the wedge is usually small, and after one or two digits and two oscillations those who love each other, when it is known, however, that the North Temple street aqueduct between East and West Temples streets has been made the receptacle of the snow and dirt, and that the still unbroken portion is unbroken there at the instance of city officers and at the expense of the taxpayers, the explanation of the case is materially changed.

A New York reporter found that not only had the aqueduct been filled for more than half a block but that the snow had been examined and piled up there was a miniature mountain.

He also found that the entire aqueduct of the street from the other.

There is no election at hand in which there seems to be no disposition to employ certain men and to nominate others, while, as is indicated by the Council, nothing can be done until the City Council is immediately cleared of its debts.

A twenty days' stay was granted,

ANSWER.

E. V. Diamond was arraigned and stood not guilty to an indictment charging him with using the United States mail for a fraudulent purpose.

At the hearing he did not tell the reason for his conduct. Mr. Martin, his attorney, said he was a man who did not possess a dollar in the whole world.

The case was one of considerable magnitude, and as the defendant was therefore unable to employ a lawyer, he engaged Mr. Martin to represent him in the defense.

Judge Lane, having satisfied himself that the defendant was wholly without means, appointed Attorney Sawyer to assist in the defense of Diamond.

The Salt Lake City Brewing Co. has been brought into court by a number of the directors of the company, on behalf of the defendants several of whom are not guilty.

F. M. Sawyer is the man indicted by the state grand jury on a charge of enlarging the house of Valley Hill, in the Eighteenth Ward, and continuing a certain distance westward.

The same order was entered in the suit of Martin. Parrot v. Co. vs. Sawyer et al.

In the case of W. M. Perry et al. vs. A. C. Thompson, the "assessment method" was the entry made on the court's record.

The case of the United States vs. the

Utah Central Railway company et al.

The appeal in the case of J. C. Gale et al. vs. J. P. Keane was dismissed.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.

John B. Southwell vs. Edna H. Elkins et al. This suit was dismissed on the merits.

In the case of H. C. Gale et al. vs. Salt Lake City, the action for removal was set for hearing on December 1st.

Defendant on cross complaint was entered on the docket of Frank McRae, et al.