THE DISTRICT COURT.

Another Setting of Law Cases Made by Judge Merritt Today.

PRATT-PARSONS CONTROVERSY.

Further Hearing of the King Divorce Suit—Ritchie's Solicitor Postponed.

It had been the intention of Judge Merritt to move another setting of criminal cases this morning, but Assistant District Attorney Howat not being quite ready, the matter was so moved over until this afternoon. The first case was the four previously set by the court for the opening of the term upon Attorney Homer E. Rigdon, who was indicted a week or so ago on a charge of criminal libel. The defendant's brother and also his counsel were present, but Rigdon himself was not, and after explanations had been offered that the defendant was called to be on hand at that time.

It was quite to remember that when the case of Simon Bloom was once called. The defendant was not there, but Judge Bennett, of counsel in the matter, rose to explain. He stated that Assistant District Attorney George Sutherland was not ready for the case, was in Provo, and would not return for two or three days, and he asked to be granted a few days more in which to prepare.

Assistant District Attorney Howat offered no objection, saying he was willing to let Mr. Bloom go.

There were no other preliminary matters before his honor, and the divorce suit of Fred King vs. Jennie M. King came on for further hearing. A brief review of the case has previously appeared in these columns. The ground upon which the action is based is adultery, and the name side of such a nature that reputable newspapers can well afford to pass them lightly by. The case was partly heard in Salt Lake some time ago, when the bill of exceptions was made, prior to Mr. King being called to the witness stand for cross-examination. Judge Merritt stated that all persons not concerned in the case be excluded from the court room.

Judge Merritt.

Chief Justice Merritt has a large session, made up for the most part of matters of the bar, for the first half of the term. The opening of his branch of the District court this morning, the month of this was a further setting of the cases for the April term, before of which was given on Saturday.

MONDAY, APRIL 8TH.

Gas Plumbing Supply Co. vs Jas. B. Rossiter et al.

Mount Pleasant vs Park City Bank.

J. L. B. Parmelee vs M. A. Fullmer.

TUESDAY, APRIL 9TH.

J. J. Carlson vs M. E. Cummings et al.

S. S. Blackburn et al vs Mt. Ice & Fuel Co.

J. H. Rossford vs Peter A. H. Fullmer.

Andrew C. Bitzen vs Wm. Gloucester et al.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10TH.

Henry J. Goldberg et al vs Mt. Ice & Fuel Co.

Henry Cohn, etc, vs Peter A. Hawley.

Frederick Wanlass vs F. A. Mitchell et al.

THURSDAY, APRIL 11TH.

Julius Gauer vs Moses Hallenstein.

Leo Jensen vs S. L. Boyle T. Co.

Thomas C. Pattee vs E. S. Hansen et al.

FRIDAY, APRIL 12TH.

Richard A. Lowe vs Elizabeth Stowell.

Ben Ferguson vs National Building and Loan Association.

E. G. M. Stewart vs National Building and Loan Association.

MONDAY, APRIL 15TH.

Joseph Underhill vs S. L. City Railroad Co.

Walter Bros. & Tyler Co. vs M. A. Hill et al.

J. A. Matthews vs Consumers' Trading Co.

TUESDAY, APRIL 16TH.

Benjamin Sullivan, admr., vs Salt Lake City.

E. Weis vs Consumers' Trading Co.

S. L. & L. A. Ry. Co. vs Ill. Trust & C. Bk. et al.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17TH.

Geo. F. Castleton vs John A. Lawrence et al.

William E. Wills vs John C. Carter et al.

F. N. Sonnberg vs Peter Larsen.

THURSDAY, APRIL 18TH.

Charles Caldwell Jr. vs Dallas Gold Min. & Milling Co.

Chas. G. Brown vs Chas. E. Nelsenson.

Mason & Co. vs L. C. Mortensen.

FRIDAY, APRIL 19TH.

L. Hromsky vs A. Jacobson et al.

Theodore Barmester vs John A. Smith.

O. W. Powers vs G. L. & Ogden Gas & L. Co.

MONDAY, APRIL 22ND.

L. Hirsh Iverson vs Salt Lake City.

Wm. P. Allred vs S. L. City R. R. Co.

Warren N. Walker vs S. L. City R. R. Co.

TUESDAY, APRIL 23RD.

W. A. Hughes vs Samuel P. Spencer et al.

L. W. Dillman vs W. P. O'Meara.

L. A. Linder vs Salt Lake City.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24TH.

A. C. Nowell vs Ira Cache Tullo.

Danville Malcolm et al vs Edgar C. Dalbeyre.

Parley S. Dupaix vs J. Heath et al.

THURSDAY, APRIL 25TH.

Cunnington & Co. vs Thomas W. Jennings et al.

George J. Thomas vs James Gleadhing.

PRATT VS PARSONS.

When the store list had been made up Judge Merritt and a jury settled comfortably down to listen to the further details in the suit brought by Prosecuting Attorney Rawlins against Police Patrolman Parsons on C. H. Mineral U. D. Pratt, to which he was asked to render a sum of money for services alleged to have been rendered by Mr. Pratt as a deputy marshal. Opening for the defendants was Mr. Parsons on a counterclaim. The facts of the case were fully stated in the News when the hearing began last Friday.

The case went to the jury at about 4 o'clock, and it was quite late when all for the session adjourned. It is understood that the jury stood nine for the plaintiff and three for the defendant. It is said strong and the Supreme Parsons engaged in argument.

CASE DISMISSED.

Sarah F. Darling vs Daniel R. Darling. Order of dismissal entered on motion of plaintiff.

Huntington, Johnson & Co. vs Salt Lake City. Same order, on plaintiff's motion.

CRIMINAL CALENDAR.

J. R. Blair arraigned on a charge of subornation of perjury.

Judge Merritt has whatever make another setting of criminal cases for trial during the early part of the April term of the Third district court—Good Friday excepted, of course.

J. R. Blair waived the reading of the indictment and plead not guilty to an information charging subornation of perjury. Blair was the administrator of the estate of George Kilpatrick, deceased, concerning which matter so many trouble arose in the probate court between Hon. Joseph Anthony J. E. Benson. The offense now charged against the defendant is that he procured George Kilpatrick to give his personal property to him that he was never entitled to, and then swore to the allegations. Elias Smith appeared for the defendant in the case.

Assistant District Attorney Howat moved that the indictment be quashed, on the ground that it was not signed by the foreman of the grand jury, and that the name of the foreman was not indorsed on the indictment as a witness. The motion was argued by Mr. Howat and Mr. Smith, the former contending that the omission was a mere technicality, and the latter that the omission was a fatal error. The court took the matter under advisement, and ordered the case to be set for trial on the 15th inst.

Charles Ritchie, charged with the crime of rape, was arraigned on a bench warrant issued by the Supreme court, and he was given until the 15th inst. to plead to the information. Mr. Ritchie is now in the penitentiary serving a term for a similar offense committed in Weber county, and he was brought down to this city by the Sheriff of Weber county to answer the charge now preferred against him. Mr. Ritchie's counsel, Messrs. Bennett and Rawlins, stated that the defendant desired to be on hand at that time, and that they had the assurance of Prosecuting Attorney Rawlins that the case would be set for that date. Mr. Rawlins, however, stated that he had not made any such promise, but that he would do so if the court would allow it. The case will be set for the 15th inst.

There seems to be Convention at various times in the history of this country, one which has all the great and glorious of its sort, somewhere else, but Revolutionary Convention are limited to one of the greatest interests America ever knew. Would gentlemen think it was fair, right or reasonable to say that the right of suffrage should be each man at Cox Ridge and Gallinger? (Tumultuous applause.) We had an idea that we could come to the equal basis of suffrage, but we came the delegates opposed to that proposition to start on a ride and quit it in other times. (Laughter.)

Mr. Morrow said he was full of jests, and the speaker not to ask, will hold, now long must the prohibition part in order to establish harmony? He called if Utah's joke. Hear, hear, hear! (Laughter.) Mr. Morrow said he would give the Liberal party even also every other and answer? (Voices: "Yes.") Mr. Morrow said the people in here cannot bring the Republicans here to agree to anything. (Voices: "Yes.") Mr. Morrow said he would be satisfied to let the people in here decide the question, and he would be satisfied with the form in Bennett county or the Gulch? (Laughter and applause.)

Mr. Morrow said: "We will "The Wilson collector movement is coming down the country of Utah, gentlemen, and you may as well as you are from Lehi, and Lehi is the lady in the lady." (Great applause.)

The Convention then took a recess until 1 p. m.

THIS AFTERNOON'S PROCEEDINGS.

The Woman suffrage Resolution Brought Warm Debate.

On reconvening this afternoon Carlton moved resolutions intended to introduce a resolution bearing in view the opening of all debate up to 5:30 with the exception of 15 minutes to allow the gentlemen to speak the privilege of speaking for the remainder of the day.

Hoyt moved that the resolution be considered with the text.

Lambert, of Salt Lake, said quite the contrary, and said he was in favor of the resolution