

## CRIMINAL TRIALS.

Charles Thorne Now Puts In His Plea of Not Guilty.

## A MOTION FOR A NEW TRIAL.

Quinal and Eddy Re-appeared Today.—Naturalization by Judge Morris.—Civil Matters.

Criminal business formed the staple trade in Judge Harlan's division of the Third district court again today. Chief Justice Merritt turned out new citations during almost the entire forenoon, mostly to the vexation of a number of attorneys, who patiently waited to bring up cases on the law and motion table.

## QUINN'S CASE SET.

Don Quinal, the keeper of a saloon on State street, and who was mixed up in the recent Collier Park "Roulette" plant not guilty in an indictment, was arraigned this morning, having been accused by H. F. Walker with a deadly weapon, towns loaded pistol, on Aug. 13, 1893, with intent to do bodily harm. The case was set for trial Tuesday next.

## A NOSEDGE CRIMINAL.

Loren Wright, a nosey little expert, who claimed he was innocent, was another youth having trouble with the second hand store of Alfred Egan, on March 18th of the present year, came up for sentence.

After brief argument, Attorney Howett thought this was a case in which the Reform school might be substituted for the penitentiary.

After briefly inquiring the defendant

Judge Harlan declared that he be taken into custody and held until his trial there remained until 23 years of age.

## W. H. HOWETT—ONE YEAR.

Wm. M. Shawan, convinced yesterday of his guilt, went to justice, and was sentenced to one year in the penitentiary, the judge remarking that the circumstances showed this case to be an aggravated one, even though some provocation might have been offered.

## WANTS ANOTHER TRIAL.

In accordance with previous arrangement, Arthur G. Jones, the counsel for a new trial in the case of Samuel Jernett, the youth who on Wednesday last was convicted of grand larceny, the stealing of a horse, buggy and harness, was arraigned this morning, it will be remembered, having given up his right, for a time Attwood's recovery was doubtful.

The defendant, who at one time held the position of postman at St. Louis, Mo., was sentenced to one year in the penitentiary, the judge remarking that the circumstances showed this case to be an aggravated one, even though some provocation might have been offered.

## WEWER COUNTY GRAINS.

Union horses, valued at \$10, the property of Davis T. Stewart, attorney for the defense, was delivered by direction of the court.

## AGAIN DEFERRED.

In the case of Fort Simpson, the Roberts school boy, whom the board of managers seem not to have sent to the penitentiary even out and out incorrigible, went over unto tomorrow morning, the request of Prosecuting Attorney Harlan.

## CIVIL MATTERS.

In the case of H. C. Overgaard vs. the Root and Grosskopf Mining Company, judgment on the pleading was rendered for the sum of \$25,000.

John W. Johnson, attorney for Miners vs. The mines of Hawaiian & Colorado were set as counsel for the defendants, on motion of Marshall & Ray, attorneys for the defendants.

## JOHN HOWERTH'S CRIMINAL.

Union Commercial and Savings bank vs. Salt Lake Driving Park Association et al., time extended to Oct. 15, to answer suit.

H. R. Hayes. Hearing on motion of receiver to be allowed to compromise certain claims and accounts, to give up.

## NATURALIZED CITIZEN.

Duncan A. Gillis, Canada, Andrew Holbrook, Old P. Anderson, George L. Johnson, George L. Johnson, Thomas E. C. Chapman, Wm. Newman, Gus Bungen, John Baker, Martin Moray, England, Mike Corra, Italy, Carl J. G. Weil, Germany.

James Dwyer, Francis Green, Joseph Grimes, Mr. H. Ayres, Jas. Bailey, Wm. G. Blodgett, Moran Oliver, Wm. Maynard, H. J. Becking, The Dealer, Jas. F. Bassett, Charles W. Bassett, Jas. Loveland, Walter L. Barnes, Samuel Cox, John Deegan, Edward Dunn, Jr., English, John D. Farnsworth, Richard H. Swanson, Hugh Ryan, Canada, George Linton, England, John Neuman, Michael Anderson, Matt Hayes, England, Eric O'Gorman, Ireland, Eugene Ross, Wales, Bill Maier, John Schneider, Wm. Rohrbach, Germany, H. Manning, A. S. Donisthorpe, Ireland, James Eggers, Switzerland, John F. Farnsworth, New Peter Hayes, John Dempsey, Joseph Merven, Italy.

## REPORT AND COMPARISON OF THE YIELD THIS SEASON.

*Editor Deseret News:*

I herewith submit an accurate account of grain products of Hamblen and Far West precincts, Weber county, for the year 1893.

The sixty-three jobs threshed gave a yield of 11,071 bushels of wheat from 2,400 acres, 3,018 bushels oats, when harvested, 3,000 bushels barley, 1,200 bushels rye, and a decrease of 5,749 bushels from 1800, which was 23,744 bushels, being the largest yield ever realized here. The population of the United States census as taken by your reporter amounted to 18,930 souls, and was 18,930 in 1890, while the same taken in 1891 by the same enumerator was 19,053 souls. On this ratio our population is now about 700 souls. For seed, threshing, oil, and feed for teams will take from 11 to 12 bushels, or not less than 10 bushels of wheat on the average, thus leaving in the phototheca banks about 10,253 bushels of wheat, giving an average 300 bushels per acre, giving about 340 bushels of wheat to the acre, the way out of the phototheca, minus 225 bushels of flour in each acre, I will leave it for other people to draw their conclusions to the amount of wheat required to supply the community needs, and this from a strong community.

I have received a report from the postmaster at Huntsville which estimates the grain per acre about the same.

The report from Plain City and Manti shows a larger yield per acre than the above, according to the phototheca.

Willard has asked Mr. Coxey to be proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—the trial of

Johnson affidavit was by John W. Hale, of the county jail, and here date September 28th, 1894. Affidavit says that about the month of July Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it." He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion, and Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would throw aside altogether the evidence of Johnson at the trial of the "Manti" case.

Attorney Coxey—The ground upon which the defense was based was that Johnson was innocent of the charge of grand larceny, and that he was guilty, and that Johnson had "nothing whatever to do with it."

He further stated that he told Detective Slosson that at the time of the arrest.

The prosecution opposed the motion.

Judge Harlan asked Mr. Coxey why he proposed to prove, and cannot understand that if a new trial was had it would