THE INSTALMENT PLAN

Trial of the Case of the Harris Furniture Company Against C. H. Le Bell.

DECISION IN THE HAYES DAMAGE SUIT.

Affirming the Judgment of Lower Court—Mrs. Mary Ess Files a Divorce Suit Against F. G. Ess.

Judge Christy and a jury have been engaged today trying the issues in the case of the Harris Furniture and Carpet company against C. H. Le Bell. Frank Stephens appeared for plaintiff and Evans and Hoppaugh represented the defendant.

This action was brought for the recovery of personal property consisting of household furniture, which it is claimed unlawfully withheld or detained in March, 1896, or for the use in case the every cannot be had and for $50 as damages for the detention.

The defendant in his answer admits that he made a contract with the Harris company by which household goods consisting to $1,87.47 were to have been furnished him.

Three hundred dollars, it is alleged, was paid on the purchase and the agreement was that the balance should be paid by instalments. It is further alleged that the defendant violated the contract by turning defendant who refused goods. The parties carried their contract into effect, it is alleged, for a time, when the defendant became behind and the goods were taken and demanded but the law were sent and demand for the kitchen range, locked and which belonged to the defendant. At the earlier hearings was ruled and which belonged to the defendant. At the earlier hearings was ruled and which belonged to the defendant. At the earlier hearings was ruled