

LAND OFFICE HAS FIGURES COMPILED

Report on Receipts Ready to Be Forwarded to Higher Circles.

WHAT HAS BEEN TAKEN UP

Coal Districts Brought Most Money in With Mineral Ground Running Poor Second.

Figures on the business done by the local land office during the fiscal year, ending June 30, 1908, were obtained this morning. Owing to the generous proportions of the land grant made Utah, the receipts are not so high as they are in other offices where no more business is done. The figures on the money to be turned over to the government are:

Homestead entries, 267, \$4,231.04, \$3,953.83; acres, desert, 552, \$13,637.85, \$4,559.27; mineral, 187, \$27,855, \$3,955.53; coal, 25, \$99,677.80, \$1,153.88; final desert, 3, \$320.50; final homestead, 73, \$447.96; state selections, 664, \$2,348; 185,483; mineral applications, 114, \$1,140; mineral protests, 21, \$210; timber and stone, 3, \$330, 360; state desert selection under Carey act, 2, \$1,146, 91,509.90; coal declaration, 50, \$150; fees for testimony, plates, transcripts, etc., \$431.87.

WHAT WHISKY DID.

A Drunken Barkeeper Jailed for Outrage on Salt Lake Automobileists.

(Special to the "News.") Farmington, Utah, July 28.—Bert Burton, a barkeeper, employed at Balderson's saloon in Kayville, was arrested on Tuesday, charged with assault and malicious mischief. The arrest was made by Sheriff Ware, and Burton was brought before Judge Ezra Richards. He pleaded guilty and was promptly sentenced to pay a fine of \$10 and to serve 30 days in the county jail at Farmington. He is now under guard in his sentence.

The assault took place nearly a month ago, and was committed on an automobile party consisting of George T. Odell and wife, J. Fred Odell and wife, and Lewis Schoppe and wife who were returning from a visit to the Hermitage. The night was dark and the car was running about 12 miles an hour, when it was approached by a vehicle containing three or four people, one of whom deliberately raised a bottle full of beer, and threw it at the car. It struck the auto and the bottle was smashed, the beer being scattered over the ladies and portions of the heavy bottle remaining in the car. It was one of these that led to the detection of the guilty party, for the piece of glass was picked up by the proprietor of Sheriff Ware who located where it was sold and who bought it, thus running down the culprit. The affair was worked up by Sheriff Emery, and Deputy Sheriff Sharp of Salt Lake county, and Sheriff Ware of Davis county, who are entitled to credit for the bringing to justice the perpetrator of the outrage. Some of the parties in the automobile had a very narrow escape from serious injury.

The sheriff decided that the other parties in the party, although their names are known, should not be prosecuted, as they took no part in the actual assault. Whiskey is said to have been responsible for Burton's actions.

George T. Odell confirmed the news contained in the above dispatch and said that he was highly gratified that the authorities had taken the guilty party. He added with emphasis that he wished the sheriff's office and prosecuting attorney in Tooele county could do something about the machine mowers who are stealing a McCormick mower from the premises of the Consolidated Wagon & Machine company in Tooele on June 9. The machine mysteriously disappeared, although a reward had been offered, no tidings had been received of its whereabouts.

BEATEN BY NEGRO.

Robert Walker Tells Unusual Story to Police.

A man giving the name of Robert Walker, living at 217 West South Temple street, was brutally beaten about 1:30 o'clock this morning at the rear of his residence. He claims he was also robbed of \$14 by a negro. The man was taken to the emergency hospital where his wounds were dressed. He had cut his head, which indicated he had been beaten by a blunt instrument. At 6:40 this morning, Sergeant Johnston and Officer Johnson arrested a colored man named William Davis on suspicion of having committed the battery and robbery. The man is being held pending a full investigation of the case.

AGED WOMAN IN JAIL.

Mary Mullen Taken at Salt Palace After Struggle.

It required the combined efforts of Officers Harris, Gillespie and Rhodes last night to place under arrest a Mrs. Mary Mullen at the Salt Palace. The woman was ingloriously drunk, and created considerable disturbance by her shrieks and incoherent babbling. All the way to the station, the woman screamed and fought the officers. She was locked up in the women's ward, and kepteping until this morning, but managed to get out into the hallway and smash all the windows on the second floor of the jail. She also broke a window in the front door of the jail when being dragged to a cell.

The police believe the woman to be demented from drink, and her condition this morning was such that she was unable to be brought into court. Her cries could be heard from the jail and she persisted in trying to

It's Trying Weather Now

KRUG'S LIFE MALT is the finest health builder. Aids digestion, repairs waste tissue, improves the appetite, soothes the nerves, produces healthful sleep.

25c a bottle, Three for 65c
\$2.50 a dozen.

Our Prescription Charges Are Always Reasonable.

DRUG STORE.

The Pure Drug Dispensary
112-114 So. Main Street.

smash things generally. She will be charged with drunkenness and destroying property. The woman is about 50 years of age. At a late hour this morning, relatives called at the police station and the Mullen woman was released on the assurance being given that she would be taken care of. They will report tomorrow morning to the police officers as to her mental condition.

DANES MEET AT LAGOON.

Noted Scandinavian Editor Addresses Large Party of Excursionists.

There was a large attendance yesterday, at Lagoon, in honor of its being Danish day, which proved a great success. The festivities began after the arrival of the 4 o'clock train and lasted until late in the evening. A special engine of the day was the address by Editor Ivar Kirkegaard of the Norden, of Racine, Wis., who spoke in Danish. He called attention to the fact that George Washington, the Danish descent, as were not a few of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. Extended reference was also made to the Danish conquest of England in the tenth century, and their rule there for many years. It was during this period that the Danes furnished at least one-third of the words of the Anglo-Saxon language. The speaker referred to Danish influence on the Normans and the exploits of the Danish knights who accompanied William the Conqueror. The history of Denmark was then an important part in shaping the destinies of the United States was continued down to the Civil war and the Spanish war and Mr. Kirkegaard gave a detailed account of a little settlement in Michigan made up wholly of Danes in 1851. He said there were just 12 able bodied men in this settlement who had been sent to the States only two years. Of these, he said, six went to the war and five gave their lives for the country of their adoption. These examples he gave of the Danes in military life.

THE DANES IN AMERICA.
Mr. Kirkegaard made special reference to the introduction of the Danish dairy system into this country, spreading from Wisconsin all over the United States. In closing the orator urged his countrymen to preserve their language and keep in touch with the fatherland.

President Anthon H. Lund was intending to be present and speak, but was prevented by other engagements. The history of Denmark was then an important part in shaping the destinies of the United States was continued down to the Civil war and the Spanish war and Mr. Kirkegaard gave a detailed account of a little settlement in Michigan made up wholly of Danes in 1851. He said there were just 12 able bodied men in this settlement who had been sent to the States only two years. Of these, he said, six went to the war and five gave their lives for the country of their adoption. These examples he gave of the Danes in military life.

STEWART ASSUMES POWER.

Does Away Entirely With Portion of License Ordinance.

The police department, Councilman Stewart and license inspectors are all together today these days over the enforcement of an ordinance which prohibits vendors of popcorn, etc., from selling their wares within a certain district known as the restricted district. A few days ago Lieut. Hempel arrested a foreigner named George Cornell for selling popcorn on State and Second South street. The man was charged with violating the license ordinance and when the matter was brought up in Judge Diehl's court, he gave the ordinance as developed that Councilman Stewart had been "butting in" again, and once more trying to run the city government according to his own will. It developed that he had given the license inspectors instructions to permit vendors of popcorn to stand within certain districts that are restricted Hempel could not see the difference in the same light and arrested Cornell.

It was shown this morning that Inspector Godman told the defendant he could sell his wares at the point named, but Hempel developed that he placed the man under arrest. Mr. Godman stated in court this morning that he had been instructed by Mr. Stewart to permit the defendant to sell his wares at the point named, but Hempel developed that he placed the man under arrest. Mr. Godman stated in court this morning that he had been instructed by Mr. Stewart to permit the defendant to sell his wares at the point named, but Hempel developed that he placed the man under arrest. Mr. Godman stated in court this morning that he had been instructed by Mr. Stewart to permit the defendant to sell his wares at the point named, but Hempel developed that he placed the man under arrest.

FIRE DEPARTMENT BUSY.

The fire department has established a record this year and especially for the month of July. Up to date there have been more alarms this month than there were in July of last year. There have been 44 alarms this month as against 42 in the month of July, 1907. Since the first of the year there have been 211 alarms answered and the boys at headquarters are predicting a record-breaker before the year closes.

NEW SUIT GROWS OUT OF OLD ONE

United States Mining Company Files Action Against Bondsmen in Forgotten Case.

BANKERS ARE DEFENDANTS

They Signed for Fifty Thousand to Be Paid to Corporation to Cover Damage.

An outgrowth of a suit that began in 1902, is the suit filed yesterday against W. S. McCormick and M. H. Walker by the United States Mining company, the United States court. McCormick and Walker, of Salt Lake, the biggest bankers went on \$50,000 worth of bonds in a suit waged by numerous individuals and the United States Mining company in an old dispute over certain mining claims. The two men went on bonds as explained, to insure the payment of damages to the U. S. company should it be victorious in the suit. It was, but for reasons which are not given in the plaintiff's papers just filed, Mr. Walker and McCormick have refused to turn over the amount called for by the bonds.

CASE'S CHRONOLOGY.

The simplest way of telling the whole story is to tell it in chronological fashion. The suit was commenced June 3, 1902, by Leonidas M. Lawson, W. J. Harvey, Edward Balbach, Enos A. Wall, the United States Mining company and others to quiet the title to mining claims in the West Mountain mining district, Salt Lake county. The U. S. Mining company's complaint, just filed, says it was the owner of the ground and the owners of the mineral interests were false, untrue and unfounded in fact. March 23, 1903, a decree was made by the U. S. court ordering the cause dismissed at the plaintiff's cost. March 25, 1903, plaintiff appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the defendant appealed to the circuit court of appeals. Nov. 23, 1904, the United States court's order was reversed and the circuit court directed that a decree for the plaintiff be made. Oct. 16, 1905, the supreme court issued a writ of certiorari directing that a review of the decision of the circuit court of appeals be made. Oct. 16, 1905