

## DESERET EVENING NEWS.

Thursday, August 4, 1892.

## NO WARD MEETINGS.

In view of the fact that arrangements have been made for Dr. Parker and Mrs. Parker, of Boston, to deliver addresses in the Tabernacle on Friday evening, August 10th, at a service, the Bishop will please hold no services in the ward meeting houses on that date, in order to give the people an opportunity to hear these distinguished speakers.

ABRAHAM M. CARMAN,  
JOSEPH E. TAYLOR,  
CHARLES W. PEPPER,  
President of the Stake.

## LOCAL BREVIETIES.

Mrs. Mary Nixon and family have gone to San Francisco, Calif., for a summer outing.

George Burton, of Spencer Cowens, & Co., has gone to Soda Springs, Idaho, for vacation.

The Second Ward Sabbath School, under the direction of Elder C. D. Coffin, having West and North Temple at 8:30 a.m.

TERMINAL ACTION PLATE, BOSTON.—Elders H. C. Blackmore and G. C. Coffin have sold their interest in the Terminal Hotel, having sold the Union Pacific.

CONFIRMATION CHURCHMAN was unable to get off for Boston to attend meetings there, so he has written to his pastor, the Stake President, asking him to forward the whole of his Home's judgment.

SACRAMENTO ACTION PLATE, SACRAMENTO.—A special train will leave Sacramento at 8 a.m. and return leaving Pueblo at 4 p.m.

RENTAL AGREEMENTS having been secured from Judge Miller's office before the Supreme Court of the Territory, the judge has issued a general order that all rental agreements be returned to him. The general order was affixed to the door of the office below.

M. E. Flock and W. C. Phaneuf, plaintiffs and respondents, vs. the National Bank of Commerce, defendant.

The original action was brought by plaintiffs against defendant to recover damages alleged to have been caused to them by defendant's failure to honor plaintiff's check drawn on him.

It is alleged, said bank, on deposit to the bank sufficient to pay the sum.

A verdict was rendered in favor of defendant.

The judgment of the lower court was affirmed and a new trial granted,

with costs, discharging goods to the extent of \$175.47. The jury found for the plaintiff on the trial in the court of appeals, and the court remanded the case to the lower court for a new trial. Hence the appeal.

In the case of Edward N. Jenkins, appellant, vs. Judicial Battalions, respondent, (an appeal from the 2nd District Court) it was also affirmed. The action was instituted to recover the value of an American barge damaged in a collision with another vessel on the Columbia River near Oregon City.

The trial court tended to establish

that the barge was worth \$2000, the value claimed in the complaint.

The court held that the

plaintiff relied upon justified the defendant in killing plaintiff's dog while running at large without being responsible according to the evidence.

In the case of E. C. Chase, appellant, vs. Judicial Battalions, respondent, (an appeal from the 2nd District Court) it was affirmed.

Victoria, Aug. 4.—Court of Justice Minot's court, plaintiff originally brought suit to recover eighty acres of land in the state of Minnesota from the State of Minnesota, defendant.

Defendants filed an answer of denial and a cross-complaint against the defendant for a part of the land for certain acts performed by the defendant.

Plaintiff's claim was affirmed.

In the case of H. C. Stevens, plaintiff, vs. A. J. White et al., defendants, and Stephen J. Coffin, defendant, vs. the Third District Court, it was affirmed.

Judge Zane's opinion was affirmed with costs.

The court held that the defendant's

cross-complaint against the plaintiff was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

claim was well founded.

The court held that the plaintiff's

&lt;p