

OPEN OCCURRENCES.

Republicans Primaries Held in the Several Wards Last Night.

FOURTH DISTRICT COURT.

Sister Standard to Boot for the Coat—A Contractor fails to carry out his Undertakings, etc.

Death Notice.
At the meeting of the board of education, held yesterday afternoon at the Fifth Ward meeting, announced that each, therefore had been discussed an account of the failure of Contractor J. J. Lammer to complete the school building. The board voted to take up the work itself, and the commencement of the contract will be held responsible for any deficiency which may occur. There was sufficient of the original plan left to enable the contractor to do the work himself, and he is serving his time as a substitute for him as when commencing any new building. Moses Turner, Smith & Son were appointed a committee to look up the law on the subject.

Last evening at the meeting of the City Council, several resolutions were adopted, one remonstrating against the construction of the proposed children's block of seven in district No. 7, for the reason that the construction part of the city is at present not equipped with a school house. A resolution to the protesting property owners were passed, the rules of the Council were suspended and they were granted the privilege of the floor. These resolutions referred to the construction of the proposed children's block. The ordinance granting a franchise to the Utah and Utah Natural Gas & Oil Company to lay mains on all streets and alleys in Ogden city for the purpose of distribution of gas, propane, etc., was also passed. It is third reading. It passed with a provision that work must begin within thirty days or the franchise shall be void.

It was reported at a meeting of the county court, yesterday that after many delays the attorneys of Morgan county have agreed to accept \$10,000 for the right and expenses of constructing a bridge across the Weber river at Devil's Hole and the bridge will probably be built at once. The county treasurer filed his report from the State Auditor, showing a balance on hand of \$12,000. The county clerk presented his weekly report concerning each received up to date for taxes \$10,000.

Senator Leland Stanford of California, accompanied by Mrs. Stanford and a party of friends, arrived in Ogden yesterday morning from the Union Pacific No. 1, in his private car. The party is returning home to the Golden state from Europe, where the senator has been trying the medicinal springs of Italy, France, and Switzerland. They will return by the coast route to San Francisco, via the Panama Canal.

The Republican primaries were held in the various wards last evening, at which the nomination of candidates for city positions were decided, and the results of the city convention, which meets Thursday October 21st, were chosen.

For city positions the following ticket was nominated:

First Ward—William Myers and James T. Branning. Second Ward—James O. Myers and C. T. Richmond.

Third Ward—William A. Lund, (by unanimous nomination.)

Fourth Ward—John Schutte and C. A. Russell.

Fifth Ward—J. S. Hunt and Amos B. Gandy.

For offices of the peace, Tom Ward (by unanimous nomination) was nominated and J. W. Wilson was nominated for constable.

Second Ward—For justice of the peace James Weston was nominated and James Weston was awarded the office.

Third Ward—for justice of peace J. H. Gordon and for constable Wm. Cooper were nominated at the county primaries.

Fourth Ward—William Low last evening, justice of the peace and constable (constable, at the county primaries).

Fifth Ward—S. L. Lee was nominated justice of the peace and O. F. Johnson, constable of the county primaries.

Yesterday in the Fourth District court, the Ogden Star, Dyer & Steele, clothing company, obtained a verdict against John P. Patten for the sum of \$1,000 damages, and a judgment under the defendant on some buildings being erected in this city, and when the final settlement took place there was some dispute as to the amount of damages, so the parties agreed to submit the case to arbitration.

Several cases having been made in the plans of the buildings and the material which entered into the construction thereof.

Yesterday in the case of Mary Cook vs. Phil Ford, wherein the plaintiff asks for \$1,000 damages, she has now recovered \$1,000, and the defendant, \$1,000, leaving the defendant with the costs of his defense, while acting in his capacity as constable taking possession of them, occupies nearly the entire afternoon. The defendant, in his defense, will be allowed to attack the property and virtues of an opponent instead of his own, as in the case of Chris Garff vs. George Cook. The defendant stated that he had the money to pay the damages, but had no money for his defense. The case was to be tried in the jury this morning.

The twenty ninth court between Harry Williams, of Salt Lake, and E. J. Edwards for a price of \$300 and \$100 a week, will come off tonight in the Utah Attorneys room. The men have been training at Salt Lake City.

PROBABLY FATAL ACCIDENT.

Two Modifies Sustained Injuries Which Threaten to Result in Death.

Isaac Meddows, whose place of residence is No. 124 west Temple street, met with a serious and perhaps fatal accident at the intersection of First Temple and Fifth West streets about 5 o'clock last evening.

Mr. Meddows is a teamster, and a well known and respected citizen. He was engaged in loading gravel and was driving his team over the railroad tracks when he was above the grade of the road, when he was thrown from his wagon, which was heavily loaded. Two of the wheels struck against the left arm, and the crossing

ribs, he also sustained serious injuries to the head. It is said that his condition is doubtful.

Dr. Hosmer was summoned and performed the surgical operation, removing the fractured ribs, saving his life.

At later noon he returned to the hospital, where he was reported to be in a critical condition.

Either the city or the attorney company it seems will be made defendant in a heavy damage suit.

Announcement Notes.

The sale of Lillian Russell's widow yesterday was very large and sold entirely. The receipts are as follows: Thursday and Friday, "The Castle," Saturday evenings and night, "The Renaissance."

The company is composed of one hundred and twenty members, among whom are such as G. E. Clegg, Coffin, Wm. T. Collier, Mrs. Johnson, James E. Pease, Leon Clement, Ruth Morris, etc., mounted and staged handsomely, especially being carried by the company.

The company arrived in Moab yesterday and when their appearance was seen, there was great excitement.

A luncheon service will be given to ladies who visit the city, as is customary on Wednesdays. A new programme will be presented to the next commanding matinee.

The Valentine Concert.

The students of the Latter-day Saint College will entertain Company day in an appropriate manner, the exercises to commence at 10 o'clock, and end at 12 o'clock. The programme will be given in the evening at the Franklin, west hall, under the auspices of the Student's Society.

COLONIAL CELEBRATION.

The students of the Latter-day Saint College will entertain Company day in an appropriate manner, the exercises to commence at 10 o'clock, and end at 12 o'clock. The programme will be given in the evening at the Franklin, west hall, under the auspices of the Student's Society.

Women's Association Meeting.

The regular semi-monthly meeting of the women's association will be convened in this city, and will be opened on the last occasion on account of the "Colonial" celebration, to be held on Friday evening, October 21st, commencing at 2 o'clock p. m., as usual.

The sisters will please take notice of this. It is hoped there will be a good attendance from all parts of the country. M. Isabella Hansen, President.

COURT INTELLIGENCE.

The Morning in Judge Zane's Department—Filing of suits, etc.

In the Third District Court this morning, in the case of Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict. They found in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

Major S. A. Evans vs. David Smith, tried yesterday, the jury brought in a mixed verdict, finding in favor of the plaintiff in the sum of \$22,432. The action was set on account for a balance due of \$120 for merchandise.

At the trial, the plaintiff, in his defense, claimed that he had paid the sum of \$10,000 to the defendant, and that he was entitled to the sum of \$12,432.

<p