

## Special Business Notices.

**Flowerings at Reading's**  
At Eastern prices.

**Native Pearl Versus Porcelain.**  
Dentist's ware is a poor substitute for Nature's. Let those who so believe, use the SOZODONT, which, if daily applied, will prevent all necessity for false teeth by keeping the real ones sound and healthy.

**SALT LAKE CITY,**  
October 28, 1876.

Having disposed of our edition of "Life of Brigham Young," or, Utah and her Founders," to Mr. James Dwyer, this is to give notice that from this date (until further notice to the contrary) the work can only be procured from him.

**TULLIDGE & CRANDALL.**

**Carpet of every style and shade**  
from 20c. per yard upwards. Chinese and Cocoa Matting; Linoleum, a first-class and durable material for covering halls, counting-rooms, offices, etc., together with Mats, Rugs and English and American Oil Cloths, can be found in endless variety at Z. C. M. I.

**Hyacinths at Reading's.**

Those ACCRETIONS upon the scalp which are termed dandruff are promptly removed by GLENN'S SULPHUR SOAP, which by opening the pores promotes the natural moisture of the hair.

**Tulips at Reading's.**

**200 new patterns of wall paper**  
from 10 cents to \$2.00 per roll at H. Dinwoodey's.

**HAGAN'S MAGNOLIA BALM**  
is an unfailing prescription for a faultless complexion. Blemishes, roughness, sunburn, moth patches, freckles, discoloration, dark spots, unwholesome paleness, tan, pimples, eruptions, redness and every other kind of blemish disappear like magic by the use of Hagan's Magnolia Balm. A few applications applied with a soft linen cloth will leave the delicate hues of refined beauty and youthful bloom. Its application need not be detected, and it is absolutely free from all possible harm, warranted purely a vegetable extract from the flowers of Southern France.

**Narcissus at Reading's.**

**FOR WM. CULLEN BRYANT'S**  
New Work, in parts, finely illustrated, responsible Canvasers and General Agents wanted. J. B. Ford & Co., New York.

**Call at Z. C. M. I. and examine**  
new bills of French and American Wall Papers, from 12c. to \$2.00 per roll; also fresh novelties in Ceiling Decorations, Fresco Borders, etc.

**RED CANYON AND ROCK**  
SPRINGS COAL.—The only reliable market for lump, assorted and egg coal. Large stock always on hand, and full weights guaranteed. Prices low, and special attention given to suit the wants of the public. Office, 65 Main Street.

**ROBERT SMITH,**  
Agent.

**Z. C. M. I. Carpet Dept. displays**  
a rare and choice assortment of Carpets and Curtain Materials, Prints and Blinds, Trimmings, Upholstering Goods, etc., etc.

**FOR SALE, one First-class mile-**  
age ticket, in book form, for 1,000 miles, over the Chicago and North-western Railway; apply at this office.

**Ranunculus at Reading's.**

**the Relief Society Woman's Mercan-**  
tile Association

Is opening a store for the sale of home manufactures in the building lately occupied by the Woman's Centennial Territorial Fair, known as the Old Constitution Building, opposite Z. C. M. I. store.

We are now ready to receive home-made useful and ornamental articles of all kinds, which we will sell on commission.

Many of our citizens have felt the want of a place devoted exclusively to Utah productions, and now that we are in accordance with the wishes of President Young, uniting our humble efforts in this direction, we confidently trust that we shall not only have the support of all branches of the Relief Society throughout the valleys of the mountains, but also of our brethren and all others who feel an interest in the future welfare and prosperity of Utah.

Commencing as we do without capital, we wish it distinctly understood that at present we can only sell on commission.

**ELIZA R. SNOW, President.**

**PRISCILLA M. STAINES,**  
Vice President.

**ELIZABETH DAVIS,**  
Secretary.

**Anemone at Reading's.**

**FOR RENT, a HOUSE,** containing six rooms, Two Blocks from Main Street, good well and other conveniences, apply to John B. Kelly, News Office, or on the premises.

**LYON'S KATHARON.**

Lyon's Katharon is an invigorating tonic vegetable preparation, positively free from any mineral or deleterious substances. It is the most delightful of all hair dressing—cooling the head, allaying irritation, curing dandruff and throbbing temples, making the hair strong, fragrant, glossy and obedient to control, so clearly to you that it will not soil the finest fabric, causing the hair to grow luxuriantly and beautifully, removing dandruff and pimples. No man or woman can become bald who properly uses the Lyon's Katharon properly.

## Crown Imperials at Reading's.

**GEO. C. FERGUSON, watch maker,**  
11, First South St., a few doors east of Commercial St.

**House Plants at Reading's.**

**THE RAPID popularity gained**  
in this Territory by the OLIVER CHILLED PLOW during the short time it has been introduced here is something marvelous. This splendid plow has distanced all competition, and now stands at the head of the list, unequalled by any implement of the kind ever brought to Utah. With the Oliver Plow FLYING PLOWING can be done QUICKLY and EASILY, and WITHOUT IRRIGATION, no matter how hard and dry the soil. It is offered on the most favorable terms by Howard Seabrook, at the Main Wagon Depot, one-half block south of Theatre.

**THE SALE.**—According to the advertised notice of the special commissioner A. K. Smith, appointed by Judge Schaeffer, in the Third District, to sequester and sell, without bonds, certain property of President B. Young, defendant in the suit of Young vs. Young, in divorce, the sale took place at eleven a. m. to-day, in front of Mulloy's stable, second South Street. The sequestration order was to obtain forcible satisfaction of a former order directing the payment of between \$3,000 and \$4,000 alimony pendente lite. Immediately preceding the commencement of the sale, Mr. James Jack, as President Young's agent, forbade its progress and notified all parties who should purchase that they would do so at their peril.

After this notification Mr. Fred. Carter, the auctioneer, read the notice of sale of the bondless and irresponsible commissioner and sequester, and then commenced selling the property, which went off as follows:

A very valuable close large carriage, to Mr. Fitzgerald, for \$375.  
A close spring wagon, to Pat Lamm, for \$125.  
A Victoria carriage, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$300.  
A close wagon, to J. M. Allen, for \$250.  
A lumber wagon, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$25.  
A wagon, to Mr. J. E. Tyler, for \$25.  
A wagon, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$25.  
A valuable span of large mules, to Richard Lounsbury, for \$125.  
A span of horses, to Mr. Brewer, for \$150.  
A double set of Concord harness, to Richard Lounsbury, for \$25.  
A cow, to James Shovel, for \$20.  
A cow, to George H. Cannon, for \$25.  
A cow, to Mr. McIntyre, for \$20.  
The proceeds of the sale only foot up to \$1,175.

**An Infamous Proceeding.**—It will be recollected that a short time since the attorneys of the plaintiff in the suit of Young vs. Young, in divorce, applied for an execution against the defendant to satisfy an order directing the payment by the latter of alimony pendente lite, and obtained it. In pursuance of this execution United States Marshal Leavelle on certain property of President Young, the latter in the meantime raising the question of the jurisdiction of the Court in the case, notifying the Marshal that if he proceeded further and sold the property suit would be entered against him for damages. The officer very prudently concluded not to proceed further until indemnified by the plaintiff, but the attorneys of the latter flatly refused to secure the marshal against damage, and the matter being brought before the Court, Judge Schaeffer ruled that the officer was entitled to an indemnity bond, but, notwithstanding this decision, the plaintiff's attorneys still held out and would not give the security demanded, and the Marshal, therefore, after having levied upon certain property, returned the execution unsatisfied.

The refusal by these attorneys to give the bond required to secure the officer was undoubtedly caused by their knowing that when the matter could be properly adjudicated it must go against them. It was a tacit admission that they believed there were courts in the country that would not aid or encourage a scheme for legal theft. Had they believed in the legality and justice of their own cause they would not have hesitated, but they have, in our opinion, just about as much confidence in that regard as everybody else of understanding.

They sought for the remedy by execution and obtained it from the Court, but after getting it they stopped its progress and sought another, and obtained that also, the Court subsequently granting them a writ of attachment against the defendant to show cause why he should not be paying for contempt in not obeying the order directing him to pay alimony pendente lite, the same order the execution was issued to satisfy; and when the defendant appeared personally in Court to show cause, instead of considering that order the Court further ordered the sequestration of the property of the defendant that had already been levied on by virtue of the aforementioned execution, and appointed a commissioner to proceed, without bonds, to take possession of the property, sell it at auction and apply the same in satisfying the order for alimony pendente lite, and if that proved insufficient to make complete satisfaction, to levy on other property until the amount, including expenses, should be realized.

"The commissioner shall proceed without bonds to take possession, and without bonds." Why without bonds? Evidently that, so far as possible, the defendant should be deprived of a remedy by which he could get after his despoilers. It would not do for a responsible officer to execute the judicial, nay, as we certainly believe, the extra-judicial process, but it must be an irresponsible party, without bonds. Anybody that can not see through such business method is enveloped in the most impenetrable mental fog. The Marshal is a responsible officer and he need not proceed with the execution, for the defendant could sue him and most likely obtain redress against him. But that must be remedied next time, a special officer must be appointed to execute process and he must be irresponsible, without bonds. And this sequestration procedure, a "relic of barbarism," was granted after the plaintiff had full and complete opportunity of remedy by execution.

**More Litigation.**—In pursuance of the notification given by Mr. James Jack, at the sequestration sale to-day, writs of replevin against the purchasers of the property were obtained, and doubtless some of them have been served this afternoon.

**THE SALE.**—According to the advertised notice of the special commissioner A. K. Smith, appointed by Judge Schaeffer, in the Third District, to sequester and sell, without bonds, certain property of President B. Young, defendant in the suit of Young vs. Young, in divorce, the sale took place at eleven a. m. to-day, in front of Mulloy's stable, second South Street. The sequestration order was to obtain forcible satisfaction of a former order directing the payment of between \$3,000 and \$4,000 alimony pendente lite. Immediately preceding the commencement of the sale, Mr. James Jack, as President Young's agent, forbade its progress and notified all parties who should purchase that they would do so at their peril.

After this notification Mr. Fred. Carter, the auctioneer, read the notice of sale of the bondless and irresponsible commissioner and sequester, and then commenced selling the property, which went off as follows:

A very valuable close large carriage, to Mr. Fitzgerald, for \$375.  
A close spring wagon, to Pat Lamm, for \$125.  
A Victoria carriage, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$300.  
A close wagon, to J. M. Allen, for \$250.  
A lumber wagon, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$25.  
A wagon, to Mr. J. E. Tyler, for \$25.  
A wagon, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$25.  
A valuable span of large mules, to Richard Lounsbury, for \$125.  
A span of horses, to Mr. Brewer, for \$150.  
A double set of Concord harness, to Richard Lounsbury, for \$25.  
A cow, to James Shovel, for \$20.  
A cow, to George H. Cannon, for \$25.  
A cow, to Mr. McIntyre, for \$20.  
The proceeds of the sale only foot up to \$1,175.

**An Infamous Proceeding.**—It will be recollected that a short time since the attorneys of the plaintiff in the suit of Young vs. Young, in divorce, applied for an execution against the defendant to satisfy an order directing the payment by the latter of alimony pendente lite, and obtained it. In pursuance of this execution United States Marshal Leavelle on certain property of President Young, the latter in the meantime raising the question of the jurisdiction of the Court in the case, notifying the Marshal that if he proceeded further and sold the property suit would be entered against him for damages. The officer very prudently concluded not to proceed further until indemnified by the plaintiff, but the attorneys of the latter flatly refused to secure the marshal against damage, and the matter being brought before the Court, Judge Schaeffer ruled that the officer was entitled to an indemnity bond, but, notwithstanding this decision, the plaintiff's attorneys still held out and would not give the security demanded, and the Marshal, therefore, after having levied upon certain property, returned the execution unsatisfied.

The refusal by these attorneys to give the bond required to secure the officer was undoubtedly caused by their knowing that when the matter could be properly adjudicated it must go against them. It was a tacit admission that they believed there were courts in the country that would not aid or encourage a scheme for legal theft. Had they believed in the legality and justice of their own cause they would not have hesitated, but they have, in our opinion, just about as much confidence in that regard as everybody else of understanding.

They sought for the remedy by execution and obtained it from the Court, but after getting it they stopped its progress and sought another, and obtained that also, the Court subsequently granting them a writ of attachment against the defendant to show cause why he should not be paying for contempt in not obeying the order directing him to pay alimony pendente lite, the same order the execution was issued to satisfy; and when the defendant appeared personally in Court to show cause, instead of considering that order the Court further ordered the sequestration of the property of the defendant that had already been levied on by virtue of the aforementioned execution, and appointed a commissioner to proceed, without bonds, to take possession of the property, sell it at auction and apply the same in satisfying the order for alimony pendente lite, and if that proved insufficient to make complete satisfaction, to levy on other property until the amount, including expenses, should be realized.

"The commissioner shall proceed without bonds to take possession, and without bonds." Why without bonds? Evidently that, so far as possible, the defendant should be deprived of a remedy by which he could get after his despoilers. It would not do for a responsible officer to execute the judicial, nay, as we certainly believe, the extra-judicial process, but it must be an irresponsible party, without bonds. Anybody that can not see through such business method is enveloped in the most impenetrable mental fog. The Marshal is a responsible officer and he need not proceed with the execution, for the defendant could sue him and most likely obtain redress against him. But that must be remedied next time, a special officer must be appointed to execute process and he must be irresponsible, without bonds. And this sequestration procedure, a "relic of barbarism," was granted after the plaintiff had full and complete opportunity of remedy by execution.

**More Litigation.**—In pursuance of the notification given by Mr. James Jack, at the sequestration sale to-day, writs of replevin against the purchasers of the property were obtained, and doubtless some of them have been served this afternoon.

**THE SALE.**—According to the advertised notice of the special commissioner A. K. Smith, appointed by Judge Schaeffer, in the Third District, to sequester and sell, without bonds, certain property of President B. Young, defendant in the suit of Young vs. Young, in divorce, the sale took place at eleven a. m. to-day, in front of Mulloy's stable, second South Street. The sequestration order was to obtain forcible satisfaction of a former order directing the payment of between \$3,000 and \$4,000 alimony pendente lite. Immediately preceding the commencement of the sale, Mr. James Jack, as President Young's agent, forbade its progress and notified all parties who should purchase that they would do so at their peril.

After this notification Mr. Fred. Carter, the auctioneer, read the notice of sale of the bondless and irresponsible commissioner and sequester, and then commenced selling the property, which went off as follows:

A very valuable close large carriage, to Mr. Fitzgerald, for \$375.  
A close spring wagon, to Pat Lamm, for \$125.  
A Victoria carriage, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$300.  
A close wagon, to J. M. Allen, for \$250.  
A lumber wagon, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$25.  
A wagon, to Mr. J. E. Tyler, for \$25.  
A wagon, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$25.  
A valuable span of large mules, to Richard Lounsbury, for \$125.  
A span of horses, to Mr. Brewer, for \$150.  
A double set of Concord harness, to Richard Lounsbury, for \$25.  
A cow, to James Shovel, for \$20.  
A cow, to George H. Cannon, for \$25.  
A cow, to Mr. McIntyre, for \$20.  
The proceeds of the sale only foot up to \$1,175.

**An Infamous Proceeding.**—It will be recollected that a short time since the attorneys of the plaintiff in the suit of Young vs. Young, in divorce, applied for an execution against the defendant to satisfy an order directing the payment by the latter of alimony pendente lite, and obtained it. In pursuance of this execution United States Marshal Leavelle on certain property of President Young, the latter in the meantime raising the question of the jurisdiction of the Court in the case, notifying the Marshal that if he proceeded further and sold the property suit would be entered against him for damages. The officer very prudently concluded not to proceed further until indemnified by the plaintiff, but the attorneys of the latter flatly refused to secure the marshal against damage, and the matter being brought before the Court, Judge Schaeffer ruled that the officer was entitled to an indemnity bond, but, notwithstanding this decision, the plaintiff's attorneys still held out and would not give the security demanded, and the Marshal, therefore, after having levied upon certain property, returned the execution unsatisfied.

The refusal by these attorneys to give the bond required to secure the officer was undoubtedly caused by their knowing that when the matter could be properly adjudicated it must go against them. It was a tacit admission that they believed there were courts in the country that would not aid or encourage a scheme for legal theft. Had they believed in the legality and justice of their own cause they would not have hesitated, but they have, in our opinion, just about as much confidence in that regard as everybody else of understanding.

They sought for the remedy by execution and obtained it from the Court, but after getting it they stopped its progress and sought another, and obtained that also, the Court subsequently granting them a writ of attachment against the defendant to show cause why he should not be paying for contempt in not obeying the order directing him to pay alimony pendente lite, the same order the execution was issued to satisfy; and when the defendant appeared personally in Court to show cause, instead of considering that order the Court further ordered the sequestration of the property of the defendant that had already been levied on by virtue of the aforementioned execution, and appointed a commissioner to proceed, without bonds, to take possession of the property, sell it at auction and apply the same in satisfying the order for alimony pendente lite, and if that proved insufficient to make complete satisfaction, to levy on other property until the amount, including expenses, should be realized.

"The commissioner shall proceed without bonds to take possession, and without bonds." Why without bonds? Evidently that, so far as possible, the defendant should be deprived of a remedy by which he could get after his despoilers. It would not do for a responsible officer to execute the judicial, nay, as we certainly believe, the extra-judicial process, but it must be an irresponsible party, without bonds. Anybody that can not see through such business method is enveloped in the most impenetrable mental fog. The Marshal is a responsible officer and he need not proceed with the execution, for the defendant could sue him and most likely obtain redress against him. But that must be remedied next time, a special officer must be appointed to execute process and he must be irresponsible, without bonds. And this sequestration procedure, a "relic of barbarism," was granted after the plaintiff had full and complete opportunity of remedy by execution.

**More Litigation.**—In pursuance of the notification given by Mr. James Jack, at the sequestration sale to-day, writs of replevin against the purchasers of the property were obtained, and doubtless some of them have been served this afternoon.

**THE SALE.**—According to the advertised notice of the special commissioner A. K. Smith, appointed by Judge Schaeffer, in the Third District, to sequester and sell, without bonds, certain property of President B. Young, defendant in the suit of Young vs. Young, in divorce, the sale took place at eleven a. m. to-day, in front of Mulloy's stable, second South Street. The sequestration order was to obtain forcible satisfaction of a former order directing the payment of between \$3,000 and \$4,000 alimony pendente lite. Immediately preceding the commencement of the sale, Mr. James Jack, as President Young's agent, forbade its progress and notified all parties who should purchase that they would do so at their peril.

After this notification Mr. Fred. Carter, the auctioneer, read the notice of sale of the bondless and irresponsible commissioner and sequester, and then commenced selling the property, which went off as follows:

A very valuable close large carriage, to Mr. Fitzgerald, for \$375.  
A close spring wagon, to Pat Lamm, for \$125.  
A Victoria carriage, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$300.  
A close wagon, to J. M. Allen, for \$250.  
A lumber wagon, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$25.  
A wagon, to Mr. J. E. Tyler, for \$25.  
A wagon, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$25.  
A valuable span of large mules, to Richard Lounsbury, for \$125.  
A span of horses, to Mr. Brewer, for \$150.  
A double set of Concord harness, to Richard Lounsbury, for \$25.  
A cow, to James Shovel, for \$20.  
A cow, to George H. Cannon, for \$25.  
A cow, to Mr. McIntyre, for \$20.  
The proceeds of the sale only foot up to \$1,175.

**An Infamous Proceeding.**—It will be recollected that a short time since the attorneys of the plaintiff in the suit of Young vs. Young, in divorce, applied for an execution against the defendant to satisfy an order directing the payment by the latter of alimony pendente lite, and obtained it. In pursuance of this execution United States Marshal Leavelle on certain property of President Young, the latter in the meantime raising the question of the jurisdiction of the Court in the case, notifying the Marshal that if he proceeded further and sold the property suit would be entered against him for damages. The officer very prudently concluded not to proceed further until indemnified by the plaintiff, but the attorneys of the latter flatly refused to secure the marshal against damage, and the matter being brought before the Court, Judge Schaeffer ruled that the officer was entitled to an indemnity bond, but, notwithstanding this decision, the plaintiff's attorneys still held out and would not give the security demanded, and the Marshal, therefore, after having levied upon certain property, returned the execution unsatisfied.

The refusal by these attorneys to give the bond required to secure the officer was undoubtedly caused by their knowing that when the matter could be properly adjudicated it must go against them. It was a tacit admission that they believed there were courts in the country that would not aid or encourage a scheme for legal theft. Had they believed in the legality and justice of their own cause they would not have hesitated, but they have, in our opinion, just about as much confidence in that regard as everybody else of understanding.

They sought for the remedy by execution and obtained it from the Court, but after getting it they stopped its progress and sought another, and obtained that also, the Court subsequently granting them a writ of attachment against the defendant to show cause why he should not be paying for contempt in not obeying the order directing him to pay alimony pendente lite, the same order the execution was issued to satisfy; and when the defendant appeared personally in Court to show cause, instead of considering that order the Court further ordered the sequestration of the property of the defendant that had already been levied on by virtue of the aforementioned execution, and appointed a commissioner to proceed, without bonds, to take possession of the property, sell it at auction and apply the same in satisfying the order for alimony pendente lite, and if that proved insufficient to make complete satisfaction, to levy on other property until the amount, including expenses, should be realized.

"The commissioner shall proceed without bonds to take possession, and without bonds." Why without bonds? Evidently that, so far as possible, the defendant should be deprived of a remedy by which he could get after his despoilers. It would not do for a responsible officer to execute the judicial, nay, as we certainly believe, the extra-judicial process, but it must be an irresponsible party, without bonds. Anybody that can not see through such business method is enveloped in the most impenetrable mental fog. The Marshal is a responsible officer and he need not proceed with the execution, for the defendant could sue him and most likely obtain redress against him. But that must be remedied next time, a special officer must be appointed to execute process and he must be irresponsible, without bonds. And this sequestration procedure, a "relic of barbarism," was granted after the plaintiff had full and complete opportunity of remedy by execution.

**More Litigation.**—In pursuance of the notification given by Mr. James Jack, at the sequestration sale to-day, writs of replevin against the purchasers of the property were obtained, and doubtless some of them have been served this afternoon.

**THE SALE.**—According to the advertised notice of the special commissioner A. K. Smith, appointed by Judge Schaeffer, in the Third District, to sequester and sell, without bonds, certain property of President B. Young, defendant in the suit of Young vs. Young, in divorce, the sale took place at eleven a. m. to-day, in front of Mulloy's stable, second South Street. The sequestration order was to obtain forcible satisfaction of a former order directing the payment of between \$3,000 and \$4,000 alimony pendente lite. Immediately preceding the commencement of the sale, Mr. James Jack, as President Young's agent, forbade its progress and notified all parties who should purchase that they would do so at their peril.

After this notification Mr. Fred. Carter, the auctioneer, read the notice of sale of the bondless and irresponsible commissioner and sequester, and then commenced selling the property, which went off as follows:

A very valuable close large carriage, to Mr. Fitzgerald, for \$375.  
A close spring wagon, to Pat Lamm, for \$125.  
A Victoria carriage, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$300.  
A close wagon, to J. M. Allen, for \$250.  
A lumber wagon, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$25.  
A wagon, to Mr. J. E. Tyler, for \$25.  
A wagon, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$25.  
A valuable span of large mules, to Richard Lounsbury, for \$125.  
A span of horses, to Mr. Brewer, for \$150.  
A double set of Concord harness, to Richard Lounsbury, for \$25.  
A cow, to James Shovel, for \$20.  
A cow, to George H. Cannon, for \$25.  
A cow, to Mr. McIntyre, for \$20.  
The proceeds of the sale only foot up to \$1,175.

**An Infamous Proceeding.**—It will be recollected that a short time since the attorneys of the plaintiff in the suit of Young vs. Young, in divorce, applied for an execution against the defendant to satisfy an order directing the payment by the latter of alimony pendente lite, and obtained it. In pursuance of this execution United States Marshal Leavelle on certain property of President Young, the latter in the meantime raising the question of the jurisdiction of the Court in the case, notifying the Marshal that if he proceeded further and sold the property suit would be entered against him for damages. The officer very prudently concluded not to proceed further until indemnified by the plaintiff, but the attorneys of the latter flatly refused to secure the marshal against damage, and the matter being brought before the Court, Judge Schaeffer ruled that the officer was entitled to an indemnity bond, but, notwithstanding this decision, the plaintiff's attorneys still held out and would not give the security demanded, and the Marshal, therefore, after having levied upon certain property, returned the execution unsatisfied.

The refusal by these attorneys to give the bond required to secure the officer was undoubtedly caused by their knowing that when the matter could be properly adjudicated it must go against them. It was a tacit admission that they believed there were courts in the country that would not aid or encourage a scheme for legal theft. Had they believed in the legality and justice of their own cause they would not have hesitated, but they have, in our opinion, just about as much confidence in that regard as everybody else of understanding.

They sought for the remedy by execution and obtained it from the Court, but after getting it they stopped its progress and sought another, and obtained that also, the Court subsequently granting them a writ of attachment against the defendant to show cause why he should not be paying for contempt in not obeying the order directing him to pay alimony pendente lite, the same order the execution was issued to satisfy; and when the defendant appeared personally in Court to show cause, instead of considering that order the Court further ordered the sequestration of the property of the defendant that had already been levied on by virtue of the aforementioned execution, and appointed a commissioner to proceed, without bonds, to take possession of the property, sell it at auction and apply the same in satisfying the order for alimony pendente lite, and if that proved insufficient to make complete satisfaction, to levy on other property until the amount, including expenses, should be realized.

## THE SALE.

According to the advertised notice of the special commissioner A. K. Smith, appointed by Judge Schaeffer, in the Third District, to sequester and sell, without bonds, certain property of President B. Young, defendant in the suit of Young vs. Young, in divorce, the sale took place at eleven a. m. to-day, in front of Mulloy's stable, second South Street. The sequestration order was to obtain forcible satisfaction of a former order directing the payment of between \$3,000 and \$4,000 alimony pendente lite. Immediately preceding the commencement of the sale, Mr. James Jack, as President Young's agent, forbade its progress and notified all parties who should purchase that they would do so at their peril.

After this notification Mr. Fred. Carter, the auctioneer, read the notice of sale of the bondless and irresponsible commissioner and sequester, and then commenced selling the property, which went off as follows:

A very valuable close large carriage, to Mr. Fitzgerald, for \$375.  
A close spring wagon, to Pat Lamm, for \$125.  
A Victoria carriage, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$300.  
A close wagon, to J. M. Allen, for \$250.  
A lumber wagon, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$25.  
A wagon, to Mr. J. E. Tyler, for \$25.  
A wagon, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$25.  
A valuable span of large mules, to Richard Lounsbury, for \$125.  
A span of horses, to Mr. Brewer, for \$150.  
A double set of Concord harness, to Richard Lounsbury, for \$25.  
A cow, to James Shovel, for \$20.  
A cow, to George H. Cannon, for \$25.  
A cow, to Mr. McIntyre, for \$20.  
The proceeds of the sale only foot up to \$1,175.

**An Infamous Proceeding.**—It will be recollected that a short time since the attorneys of the plaintiff in the suit of Young vs. Young, in divorce, applied for an execution against the defendant to satisfy an order directing the payment by the latter of alimony pendente lite, and obtained it. In pursuance of this execution United States Marshal Leavelle on certain property of President Young, the latter in the meantime raising the question of the jurisdiction of the Court in the case, notifying the Marshal that if he proceeded further and sold the property suit would be entered against him for damages. The officer very prudently concluded not to proceed further until indemnified by the plaintiff, but the attorneys of the latter flatly refused to secure the marshal against damage, and the matter being brought before the Court, Judge Schaeffer ruled that the officer was entitled to an indemnity bond, but, notwithstanding this decision, the plaintiff's attorneys still held out and would not give the security demanded, and the Marshal, therefore, after having levied upon certain property, returned the execution unsatisfied.

The refusal by these attorneys to give the bond required to secure the officer was undoubtedly caused by their knowing that when the matter could be properly adjudicated it must go against them. It was a tacit admission that they believed there were courts in the country that would not aid or encourage a scheme for legal theft. Had they believed in the legality and justice of their own cause they would not have hesitated, but they have, in our opinion, just about as much confidence in that regard as everybody else of understanding.

They sought for the remedy by execution and obtained it from the Court, but after getting it they stopped its progress and sought another, and obtained that also, the Court subsequently granting them a writ of attachment against the defendant to show cause why he should not be paying for contempt in not obeying the order directing him to pay alimony pendente lite, the same order the execution was issued to satisfy; and when the defendant appeared personally in Court to show cause, instead of considering that order the Court further ordered the sequestration of the property of the defendant that had already been levied on by virtue of the aforementioned execution, and appointed a commissioner to proceed, without bonds, to take possession of the property, sell it at auction and apply the same in satisfying the order for alimony pendente lite, and if that proved insufficient to make complete satisfaction, to levy on other property until the amount, including expenses, should be realized.

"The commissioner shall proceed without bonds to take possession, and without bonds." Why without bonds? Evidently that, so far as possible, the defendant should be deprived of a remedy by which he could get after his despoilers. It would not do for a responsible officer to execute the judicial, nay, as we certainly believe, the extra-judicial process, but it must be an irresponsible party, without bonds. Anybody that can not see through such business method is enveloped in the most impenetrable mental fog. The Marshal is a responsible officer and he need not proceed with the execution, for the defendant could sue him and most likely obtain redress against him. But that must be remedied next time, a special officer must be appointed to execute process and he must be irresponsible, without bonds. And this sequestration procedure, a "relic of barbarism," was granted after the plaintiff had full and complete opportunity of remedy by execution.

**More Litigation.**—In pursuance of the notification given by Mr. James Jack, at the sequestration sale to-day, writs of replevin against the purchasers of the property were obtained, and doubtless some of them have been served this afternoon.

**THE SALE.**—According to the advertised notice of the special commissioner A. K. Smith, appointed by Judge Schaeffer, in the Third District, to sequester and sell, without bonds, certain property of President B. Young, defendant in the suit of Young vs. Young, in divorce, the sale took place at eleven a. m. to-day, in front of Mulloy's stable, second South Street. The sequestration order was to obtain forcible satisfaction of a former order directing the payment of between \$3,000 and \$4,000 alimony pendente lite. Immediately preceding the commencement of the sale, Mr. James Jack, as President Young's agent, forbade its progress and notified all parties who should purchase that they would do so at their peril.

After this notification Mr. Fred. Carter, the auctioneer, read the notice of sale of the bondless and irresponsible commissioner and sequester, and then commenced selling the property, which went off as follows:

A very valuable close large carriage, to Mr. Fitzgerald, for \$375.  
A close spring wagon, to Pat Lamm, for \$125.  
A Victoria carriage, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$300.  
A close wagon, to J. M. Allen, for \$250.  
A lumber wagon, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$25.  
A wagon, to Mr. J. E. Tyler, for \$25.  
A wagon, to Mr. Bamberger, for \$25.  
A valuable span of large mules, to Richard Lounsbury, for \$125.  
A span of horses, to Mr. Brewer, for \$150.  
A double set of Concord harness, to Richard Lounsbury, for \$25.  
A cow, to James Shovel, for \$20.  
A cow, to George H. Cannon, for \$25.  
A cow, to Mr. McIntyre, for \$20.  
The proceeds of the sale only foot up to \$1,175.

**An Infamous Proceeding.**—It will be recollected that a short time since the attorneys of the plaintiff in the suit of Young vs. Young, in divorce, applied for an execution against the defendant to satisfy an order directing the payment by the latter of alimony pendente lite, and obtained it. In pursuance of this execution United States Marshal Leavelle on certain property of President Young, the latter in the meantime raising the question of the jurisdiction of the Court in the case, notifying the Marshal that if he proceeded further and sold the property suit would be entered against him for damages. The officer very prudently concluded not to proceed further until indemnified by the plaintiff, but the attorneys of the latter flatly refused to secure the marshal against damage, and the matter being brought before the Court, Judge Schaeffer ruled that the officer was entitled to an indemnity bond, but, notwithstanding this decision, the plaintiff's attorneys still held out and would not give the security demanded, and the Marshal, therefore, after having levied upon certain property, returned the execution unsatisfied.

The refusal by these attorneys to give the bond required to secure the officer was undoubtedly caused by their knowing that when the matter could be properly adjudicated it must go against them. It was a tacit admission that they believed there were courts in the country that would not aid or encourage a scheme for legal theft. Had they believed in the legality and justice of their own cause they would not have hesitated, but they have, in our opinion, just about as much confidence in that regard as everybody else of understanding.

They sought for the remedy by execution and obtained it from the Court, but after getting it they stopped its progress and sought another, and obtained that also, the Court subsequently granting them a writ of attachment against the defendant to show cause why he should not be paying for contempt in not obeying the order directing him to pay alimony pendente lite, the same order the execution was issued to satisfy; and when the defendant appeared personally in Court to show cause, instead of considering that order the Court further ordered the sequestration of the property of the defendant that had already been levied on by virtue of the aforementioned execution, and appointed a commissioner to proceed, without bonds, to take possession of the property, sell it at auction and apply the same in satisfying the order for alimony pendente lite, and if that proved insufficient to make complete satisfaction, to levy on other property until the amount, including expenses, should be realized.

"The commissioner shall proceed without bonds to take possession, and without bonds." Why without bonds? Evidently that, so far as possible, the defendant should be deprived of a remedy by which he could get after his despoilers. It would not