

SECOND EDITION.

DESERET EVENING NEWS.

Saturday, June 4, 1892.

LOCAL BREVIETIES.

There was no business of public importance transacted at the County Court this morning.

We are requested to inform that the Mrs. Matilda Alfred Ford, of the New York City, is not the Mrs. Matilda Alfred Ford, of the eighth ward.

Meade Nichols for the spring meeting of the Driving Park Association was elected president of the society, C. W. Husted, first vice-president.

The success of the Women's Life will be the life of St. Mary's church as the women become more numerous.

At 11 o'clock yesterday United States Circuit Court, Justice Thomas, issued a marriage license to Henry Billie, agent of Frank Jordan, and Matilda P. Christie, aged 20, of American Fork.

The police department of the City Hall is to be cleaned, repaired and put in an orderly condition. The work necessary and should have been done long ago.

A large pair of black, undressed, and gartered and gold fly swatters were picked up in Library Park today and can represent the owner or owners of the Police station.

June 4th is the day that marks the students of the University of Utah their entrance to "Academic life." The students will be admitted to the classes of the students' faculty.

The D. & R. Western will hold its regular meeting at the State Bank building at 10 o'clock tomorrow for the examination of its superintendents. The examining date will be revised by the board.

In the person who carried off a good number of the books of the University College of the state, one of the last to leave the institution, instead, will call at this office and make the authorities know he will be apprehended.

Dr. George H. Root, of Salt Lake City, who has been away for a great part of his vacation, has been traveling to Mexico for two years. He now returns to town and occupies a suite of rooms over the Equitable Corp., 11 Market street.

Moses McDowell and Elmer, members of the Utah World's Fair committee, who are engaged in the construction of the pavilion, have been engaged at this office and make the authorities know he will be apprehended.

Mr. Clark, of Salt Lake City, who has been away for a great part of his vacation, has been traveling to Mexico for two years. He now returns to town and occupies a suite of rooms over the Equitable Corp., 11 Market street.

This was an exciting runaway on Main street, between First and Second streets, between the First and Second blocks, attached to an ordinary motor, started south near the Emporia curve, at which point it had been curiously left, and continued on its course until the engine had stopped into the Utah National Bank. The car was stopped by a fireman from the rear, but did not stop. No one was hurt, but several narrow escapes from collision occurred along the route of the runaway.

Challenge.

The cadets of the Ogden Military Academy in early challenges the cadets of the Utah University or any other amateur company of Utah, to a competitive drill any time within ten days from June 4, 1892.

M. A. HENSON, Jr.
Capt. Cadet Corps.

An Enjoyable Time.

There was a most enjoyable gathering in the Keweenaw Ward Assembly Room last night in honor of Elmer Scherck, son of Bishop Martin who is about to depart on a mission. A large number of members of the ward were present. Refreshments were served, and singing, dancing and speaking indulged in. Addresses were made by Councilor Joseph E. Taylor and W. F. Penrose, and President W. H. Young gave one of the clearest and most forcible addresses. His maiden speech was warmly applauded. Elder Thomas Dynon presented the benediction and the gathering dispersed.

Latest Court News.

This afternoon Judge Zane overruled the motion for a new trial in the case of William Beattie vs. the Pleasant Valley Coal company.

In the case of Chris Hindlebacher vs. the Rio Grand Railway company, in which the jury had found for the plaintiff, Judge Zane granted the motion for a new trial. Judge Marshall presided for the company and Judge Powers for the plaintiff.

W. H. Cassidy vs. L. E. Cassidy, defendant to complainant, argued and submitted.

The suit of John W. Young vs. H. Lightfoot was dismissed on plaintiff's failure to furnish security for costs.

In the case of the Union Pacific Railroad vs. W. A. Williams and W. H. Shinn, an answer and demur to complaint was filed this afternoon. The action has been brought to recover costs and interest on a principal amount.

Edward P. Noville brought suit today against the Lake City to recover \$100,000 in damages for the loss of his property in the fire of January 1st.

W. H. Cassidy vs. L. E. Cassidy, defendant to complainant, argued and submitted.

The suit of John W. Young vs. H. Lightfoot was dismissed on plaintiff's failure to furnish security for costs.

In the case of the Union Pacific Railroad vs. W. A. Williams and W. H. Shinn, an answer and demur to complaint was filed this afternoon. The action has been brought to recover costs and interest on a principal amount.

A suit for \$200 was filed this afternoon in the Third District Court by L. M. Hansen against Martin McDaniel.

The Great Salt Lake and Rio Grande Railway are the plaintiffs and the Union Pacific and the Rio Grande Railways are the defendants. The suit was brought today in the Third District Court, asking out of the filing of a writ of garnishee, the defendant to furnish security for a judgment of \$200.

Thomas T. Fatten has planted a suit against E. R. Hansen, F. W. Hansen and the Union Pacific, claiming \$100,000 with interest for alleged wrongfull extraction of quartz.

LAST DAY IN THE WASATCH.

The Courts Will Be Held in the New Quarters.

A "SKIRMISH" AT EAST MILL CREEK.

A boy of seven sat in the Reform school as an out-and-out "insurgent."

Chief Justice Zane got through a lot of work this morning, arriving early out-of-doors of various kinds but there was nothing of a startling character as the result of all that came to his notice.

REST TO THE DISAPPOINTED.

About a week ago Freddie Daniels, a bright looking boy of eleven, was ordered by Police Justice Kester to be taken before Judge Zane, to be dealt with as an "insurgent."

This morning the lad appeared before his Honor, with a view to his being committed to the Reform school. The father of the boy, Thomas Daniels, is a policeman at the Rio Grande, in this city, and at Assistant County Attorney Hinman's request he went upon the witness stand and made a statement concerning the young boy's behavior. His mother is dead, and it seems that he has become wholly unmanageable at home. He has lately been addicted to thieving money from the house belonging to his father, having taken and spent on occasions as much as \$1. He also takes horses and luggage from the streets during the brief absence of the owner, drives them away and then them up in another part of the town. He would then go and demand two or three dollars from the neighbors for the restoration he had "stolen" them. The boy would not go to school when sent, and is altogether irresponsible.

Mr. Murphy was perfectly willing that the defendants should go on their own recognizance, and the boy of seven was freed at \$25.

THE "HERALD'S" THREATENERS.

Mrs. Logie is a sister of the man for whom she was killed about a year ago. She was a member of the family of the late James Logie, who was a member of the Legislature. She was a woman of means, and the Logies were well known in the community. Mrs. Logie, and it is now said that an action for criminal libel will be the result. Attorney Hamilton has been instructed in the matter on behalf of the boy, and the boy's parents will be represented. It is whispered that \$50,000 will be claimed as damages.

AMONG THE CROOKS.

Capture of a Suspected Burglar.—An Alleged Female Robber—General Police News.

Sergeant of Police and City Detective At. Echard, last night arrested an individual of mystery and suspicious movements, in the Lincoln Lodging House, opposite the Tabernacle, on a charge of having burglarized his possession. Information has been furnished the officers by an individual who had full access to the felon's room that a miscellaneous lot of tools such as are used by professional crooks were stored there.

This statement proved to be correct and when the officers entered his room they found the entire kit scattered about on the floor. Among the outfit were three plain only one of which, however, was named. The felon appeared to be very much surprised at the sudden appearance of the officers, nevertheless taken to the City jail, with all of his jewels, mugs, brass, traps, dice, keys, candle, watch, purse, furs, service and personal property, etc. At police headquarters he gave his name as Thomas Daniels. He will be arraigned this afternoon.

John Johnson, alias "Dovey" Austin, an adult female who comes over the Tabernacle restaurant on Commercial Street, is in custody on a charge of having burglarized his home in the city. The felon was captured on the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

F. C. Gandy vs. J. M. Kennedy et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. Proceedings in this matter were delayed until the security for costs had been given, on demand.

MOTION TO DISMISS.

E. C. Gandy vs. J. M. Kennedy et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.

CHARLES W. COOPER vs. O. F. Carlson et al. The motion of plaintiff-in-the-cause to dismiss the suit was granted by reason of the other side of the court house on a charge of reference to the present.