

Important Decision

Delivered by Judge Scott at the March Term of the District Court at Raderburg, M. T.

R. W. Jeffries vs. D. V. Sherman and E. H. Wilson.

This case is submitted upon motion to make R. Parker a party, also a demurrer to the complaint, for the following reasons or causes:

1st.—For a misnomer of cause of action.

2nd.—Joiner, or blending of law and equity.

3rd.—Want of sufficient facts.

4th.—Ambiguity of pleading.

If the laws and Practice Act of this Territory shall prevail, it is believed, that the complaint is sufficient, and that in making a mortgage the amount claimed for which the security given is sought to be foreclosed or enforced, may be ascertained by the court, and perhaps brought to a reason or causes if demanded. That for any balance which may remain unsatisfied from such security, the amount thereof may be docketed on the real estate of the mortgagor, but that no execution can issue thereon under the present law. But if the Chancery practice shall prevail, then no such proceeding will be had, but the debt and the demurser should be sustained. To determine which, we must determine the character of Territorial courts, and also the legal or constitutionality of Territorial legislation.

The question upon which the various governments for portions of the United States have been organized has never been decided, as to what individuals or units the powers of self-government, consistent with the supremacy and supervision of National authority, and with certain fundamental principles established by Congress. Every American citizen, when he becomes a resident of a Territory, carries with him so much of the common law as is applicable to his condition, and that becomes the law of the Territory until modified or repealed by or under laws specially derived from the United States. Such was the doctrine applied to the English colonies on this continent, and the same has been applied to all the Territories of the United States.

I have heretofore somewhat reflected upon the question presented by this demurser; and since its able presentation and defense, I have given the subject well my research and thought, and am now of opinion; and I hope that there is no Superior Court of the United States in a Territory, nor is there any District Court of the United States in a Territory in the sense of the Constitution. This question was originally decided by the Presidents of the United States, under an act of Congress, but this does not make the courts they are authorized to hear in United States cases. There was long ago decided, and the case is reported in 9 Howard's U. S. Reports.

These courts are the legislative courts of the Territory, and are created by virtue of that clause of the Constitution which authorizes Congress to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territories belonging to the United States. This was decided in the last of the cases, and has never been reversed in my judgment.

The case of Noonan, vs. Lee (decided in 2d Black), is not in conflict with the decision in the 1st Peters. That was a case of a claim against a Territory, and it is true, never the less, that it was the changing power of the court that was involved in that case; and that too, before the adoption of rule 62 of the United States Supreme Court, originating as it does, from the holding in the case of Orchard vs. Hughes, where no execution could issue, for any balance found due after exhausting the mortgage security, and for that reason alone, was the decree of reversal. The court, then, did not decide that the District Courts in a Territory were United States Courts in all cases except where they were so invoked, the rule in chancery practice must be observed."

Neither is the holding in the case of Durphy vs. Kleinichmidt in conflict with the one in the first, in that case did not hold "that it was incompetent for the Territorial Legislature to establish chancery practice." It only held in that regard that the Territorial Legislature had no power to legislate in contravention of the Constitution of the United States (and I would enquire what legislative body has?) or which shall deprive the Supreme and Appellate Courts of jurisdiction of chancery as well as common law jurisdiction. In none of the cases above referred to is the Legislature prohibited from regulating the judiciary. They simply prohibit the Legislature from taking away and annihilating chancery and common law jurisdiction. This is just what the Organic Act of this Territory expressly reserved to the Territory, and nothing more. It did not prohibit the Territorial Legislature from enacting other modes of exercising that jurisdiction, except in a few cases where the laws of the United States are sought to be enforced under chancery and common law jurisdiction.

Four distinct jurisdictions are given under the Organic Act of the Territory of Montana and they are:

"First.—What may be limited by law." What law? Why the law of the Territory?

Second and third: "It shall possess chancery as well as common law jurisdiction."

Fourth: "And each of said courts (referring to the District Courts of the Territory) shall have and exercise the same jurisdiction in all cases arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States as is vested in the District and Circuit Courts of the United States." And it further provides that the first six days of every term of said courts (if necessary) shall be appropriated to the trial of causes arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States; and when Chief Justice Marshal held that none of these Territorial Courts had jurisdiction over the same, in which the judicial power conferred by the Constitution on the general government could be deposited, he not only held right, but that holding was never been reversed. The public power which these courts were clothed in is part of that judicial power which is defined in the third article of the Constitution, but is conferred by Congress, in the exercise of their general powers which that body possesses over the Territories of the United States.

It cannot but be readily seen by a careful examination of the organic act of this Territory, that Congress, while delegating to it such power and functions as the Territorial Legislature might limit, (or course not inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States,) did not attempt to prescribe the mode of exercising those powers, jurisdictions; while in the last jurisdiction therein given, or retained, it did. For it provides "That said courts (as wherein the United States have had jurisdiction) shall have and exercise the same jurisdiction in all cases arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States, as is vested in the Circuit Courts of the United States," and it gives that jurisdiction preference over all other jurisdictions for the first six days of each term. Evidently leaving all else to be regulated by Territorial courts and the rules of Territorial courts.

For these and many other reasons, this might be assigned. I hold that the laws and practices act of this Territory are not inconsistent with the laws and practices of all other states, and that therefore the Territorial Legislature might limit, (or course not inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States,) the mode of exercising those powers, jurisdictions; while in the last jurisdiction therein given, or retained, it did. For it provides "That said courts (as wherein the United States have had jurisdiction) shall have and exercise the same jurisdiction in all cases arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States, as is vested in the Circuit Courts of the United States," and it gives that jurisdiction preference over all other jurisdictions for the first six days of each term. Evidently leaving all else to be regulated by Territorial courts and the rules of Territorial courts.

The demurser will therefore be overruled.—Sorenson, Agent Com-

ELDER AND FRIENDS
OF THE CHURCH OF
LATTER-DAY SAINTS IN UTAH TERRITORY
and adjacent Settlements.

Hannington, J. W., Missionary, Idaho.

Moore, John Christian.

Grid, N. E. Austin.

Park, M. H. Horne.

Charlton, Simon Smith.

Newton, W. C. Lewis.

Lindemann, W. W. Smith.

Hyde Park, Wm. Hyde.

Providence, M. B. Hammond.

Millsville, G. P. Finkin.

Paradise, David James.

Wellsville, Wm. H. Chapman.

Hooperville, Gilbert Lehman.

Kayville, Christopher Layton.

Paragon, John W. Hens.

Contest, Wm. Smith.

Mountain Green, Eli Spanning.

Weber City, C. S. Peterson.

Logan, W. H. Johnson.

Morgan County, W. H. Ward.

C. S. PETERSON is Presiding Bishop over the three last named places.

L. J. HERRICK, Presiding Bishop.

Ogden, L. J. Herrick.

North Ogden, John Holmes.

South Ogden, W. W. Spurlock.

Mound Fort, David Moore.

Slaterville, Thomas Richardson.

Harrisville, David Dawson.

West Weber, John L. Mart.

East Weber, A. Spaulding.

River Dale, Sanford Birmingham.

Huntington, F. A. Hammond.

Hooperville, Gilbert Lehman.

Logan, W. H. Ward.

J. NIUHOLS, Presiding Bishop over the two last named wards.

W. H. WARD is Presiding Bishop over the foregoing eighteen wards.

G. FORT, Thomas Hopper.

Logan, W. H. Ward.

W. H. P. JENSEN, Presiding Bishop, Brigham City, Alvin Nichols.

J. NIUHOLS, Presiding Bishop over the two last named wards.

W. H. WARD is Presiding Bishop over the two last named wards.

L. J. HERRICK, Presiding Bishop.

Ogden, L. J. Herrick.

North Ogden, John Holmes.

South Ogden, W. W. Spurlock.

Mound Fort, David Moore.

Slaterville, Thomas Richardson.

Harrisville, David Dawson.

West Weber, John L. Mart.

East Weber, A. Spaulding.

River Dale, Sanford Birmingham.

Huntington, F. A. Hammond.

Hooperville, Gilbert Lehman.

Logan, W. H. Ward.

J. NIUHOLS, Presiding Bishop over the two last named places.

W. H. WARD is Presiding Bishop over the three last named places.

A. G. SMITH, Presiding Bishop over the two last named places.

ABRAHAM HATCH, Presiding Bishop.

Heber City, Abraham Hatch.

Maywood, Henry Johnson.

Champagne, John Watkins.

Walsherville, Wm. E. Nutall.

RALEIGH COUNTY.

1st Ward, S. C. Clark, Wetherburn.

2nd Ward, Jacob Leach.

3rd Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

4th Ward, Wm. Thorn.

5th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

6th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

7th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

8th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

9th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

10th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

11th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

12th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

13th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

14th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

15th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

16th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

17th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

18th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

19th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

20th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

21st Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

22nd Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

23rd Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

24th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

25th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

26th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

27th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

28th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

29th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

30th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

31st Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

32nd Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

33rd Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

34th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

35th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

36th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

37th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

38th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

39th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

40th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

41st Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

42nd Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

43rd Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

44th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

45th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

46th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

47th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

48th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

49th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

50th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

51st Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

52nd Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

53rd Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

54th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

55th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

56th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

57th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.

58th Ward, W. H. Hickenlooper.