

No. 12531

Supreme Court of Illinois

Gardner.

vs.

People

71641  7

Pleas before the Honorable
John S. Thompson Judge of the tenth Judicial
Circuit of the State of Illinois. At a Circuit
Court began and held at the Court House in
Monmouth within and for the County of
Warren and State of Illinois. On ^{the 1st} Monday in
the Month of March in the Year of our Lord
one thousand eight hundred and fifty seven
It being the sixteenth day of said Month.

Present Hon John S. Thompson Judge
James H. Stewart States Attorney
William Laferty Clerk
Charles M. Mills Sheriff

The Circuit court for Warren County Illinois
was opened at Eleven O'clock A.M. When the
Sheriff of Warren County returned into Court
the Venia facias Issued by order of the Board
of Supervisors for Warren County and State of
Illinois at their December Term A.D. 1856. By
the Clerk of the County Court, and Ex officio
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors. Which
said Venia facias is in the Words and
figures following to Wit,

State of Illinois,

Warren County } The people of the State of
Illinois to the Sheriff of said County Greeting

You are hereby Commanded to Summon
the following persons from the different Towns
in said County to be and appear before the
Judge of our Circuit Court at the hour of
Eleven O'clock A.M. on the first day of the
Term thereof to be commenced and holden
at the Court House in Monmouth on the second

Monday in the Month of April A.D 1857 to
 serve as Grand Jurors for said term, viz,
 Greenbush Cornelius Chatterton & Isaac Butler
 Berwick Allen Wood & John S Sterling, Floyd
 Harrison Meacham & Samuel A Bond, Cold Brook
 Samuel Fair & William Bicketh, Kelly Bazil
 Watson & Thomas McCluhan, Swan B A Reed
 Point Pleasant R T King, Roseville John Riggs
 Senoy Ephraim Smith, Mommouth Samuel
 Douglass Thomas Struthers & John Kendall,
 Spring Grove Ryan G Smith, Ellison Kemmer
 Brent & Hiram Ward, Tompkins Cyrus Bate
 Hale John Brown, Summer Samuel Graham
 And have you then and there this writ with
 your return thereon in what manner you
 have executed the same,

Witness Ephraim S Swinney Clerk of the
 County Court of the County of Warren and
 State aforesaid and the Seal of said Court
 at my office in Mommouth this 19th day of
 December A.D 1856

Ephraim S Swinney Clerk
 And on the back of the foregoing Venia facias
 is the following return made by the Sheriff
 of Danvers County Illinois

I do hereby Certify that I have served by reading
 the within Venia facias to all the within
 named persons, between the 8th day of December
 A.D 1856, and the 16th day of March A.D 1857

C M. Mills Sheriff

The persons named in the foregoing Venia facias
 were severally called by order of the Court,
 when the following persons, answered to their names

and gave their attendance To Wit, John Brown
 Isaac Butler, Allen Wood, John S Sterling, Harrison
 Meacham, Samuel A Bond, William Bickett,
 Bazil Watson, Samuel McCluhan, B A Reed,
 R T King, John Riggs, Ephraim Smith, Samuel
 Douglass, Thomas Struthers, John Kendall,
 Ryan L Smith, Kemner Brent, Cyrus Bute,
 and Samuel Graham, and then not being
 a sufficient number present to constitute a
 full Grand Jury, It was ordered by the Court
 that the Sheriff summon three persons from
 among the bystanders. Whereupon the Sheriff
 summoned Harman Straw, Samuel Morso &
 Cornelius Wise of like good and lawful
 men who gave their attendance upon the present
 Term of the Court, And by order of the Court
 John Brown was appointed and sworn off fore-
 man, and the Grand Jurors aforesaid having
 been duly sworn and charged, Retired in
 charge of an officer to consider of their presen-
 tments and Indictments

And afterwards to Wit, on the Fifth day of said
 Term the Grand Jury examined at the
 an Indictment was filed in said Court
~~present term~~ ~~came into Court and presented~~
 the following bill of Indictment, Which said
 Indictment reads as follows to Wit;

State of Illinois } ss

Warren County } Of the March Term of the
 Warren County Circuit Court in the year of
 our Lord 1857,

The Grand Jurors chosen selected and sworn
 in and for the County of Warren in the name
 and by the authority of the people of the State

of Illinois upon their Oaths present That
William H Gardner late of the County of
Warren and State of Illinois on the first day
of January in the year of our Lord one thou-
sand eight hundred and fifty seven at and
within the County of Warren and State of Illin-
ois One gill of Whiskey the same Whiskey
being then and there being spirituous liquors
and a less quantity than one gallon to one
Green Merrifield then and there being then
and there unlawfully did sell to the said
William H Gardner, not having then and
there a legal license to keep a grocery
Contrary to the form of the Statute in such
Case made and provided, and against the
peace and dignity of the same people of the
State of Illinois, And the Grand Jurors
aforesaid in the name and by the authority
of the people aforesaid upon their oaths
aforesaid further present that the said
William H Gardner late of the County and
State aforesaid on the day and year afores-
aid and at and within the County and State
aforesaid one gill of spirituous liquors
the same spirituous liquors then and there
being a less quantity than one gallon to
one Green Merrifield then and there being
then and there unlawfully did sell to the
said William H Gardner not having then and there
a legal license to keep a Grocery Contrary to the
form of the Statute in such Case made and pro-
vided and against the peace and dignity of the same
people of the State of Illinois, J. H. Stewart States Attorney

57

And on the Back of the foregoing bill of
Indictment is the following viz

The People
vs

William H Gardner

Indictment for Selling liquor &c

A True Bill. John Brown

Foreman of the Grand Jury

Witnesses. Green Merrifield

Capias Instantur Bail \$100.

J. S. Thompson

Filed Mar. 21st 1857

Wm Laferty clk

The People of the State of Illinois

vs

William H Gardner

Indictment for Selling liquor

A True bill John Brown

Foreman

Ordered by the Court that a capias issue
herein Instantur Returnable to the present
term of this Court. and That the said defend-
ant be held to Bail in the sum of One
hundred dollars,

And afterwards to wit on the Seventh day
of said Term the following record was made
in the above entitled Cause,

The People of the State of Illinois

vs

William H Gardner

Indictment for Selling liquor

This day came the People by James
H Stewark their Attorney and on his Motion
it was ordered by the Court that an Alias

20

Capias issue herein directed to the Sheriff of Warren County, and Returnable to the next term of this Court, to which time this case be continued & that the said defendant be held to bail in the sum of One hundred dollars,

Pleas before the Honorable John S Thompson Judge of the tenth Judicial Circuit of the State of Illinois. At a circuit Court began and held at the Court house in in Mornmouth within and for the County of Warren and State of Illinois on the third Monday in the Month of September, In the Year of our Lord One thousand eight hundred and fifty Seven, It being the 21st day of said Month

Present Now John S Thompson Judge
James H Stewart States Attorney
William Laferty Clerk
Charles M Mills Sheriff

The People of the State of Illinois

20

vs

William H Garand

} In for Selling liquor

And afterwards to wit on the 8th day of said term the following record was made in the above entitled cause, to wit:

The People of the State of Illinois,

vs 20

vs

William H Garand

} Indictment for Selling liquor

This day came the People by James H Stewart States Attorney and the defendant in his own proper person as well

7
as by his Counsel, who being arraigned at the
Bar of this Court, for plea saith not guilty,
and for trial puts himself upon the Country.
Thereupon Came a jury to Wit^t C. Dewese,
Wm C Butler, Josiah Whitman, J. B. Ray,
Maximilian Jamison, Simon Deike, J. H.
Murphy, Jonathan Paddock, Thompson Brooks
Chambers Wick, Saml Woods, Benj^m Tinkham
who being elect^d tried and sworn well and
truly to try the issue joined herein, and
after hearing the evidence and argument of
Counsel, Retired to consider of their verdict,

And afterwards to Wit on the 9th day of said
Term the following record was made in the
above entitled Cause to Wit

The Peoples of the State of Illinois,

20

v

William H Gardner

} Selling Liquor

This day again this cause
coming on for a hearing, and the jury that
was impeached & sworn herein on Yesterday
came into Court with the following verdict
to Wit: "We the jury find the defendant guilty
in manner and form as charged in the second
Count of the Indictment." Thereupon Came the
defendant by his Counsel, and enters his
motion for a new trial herein, which was
heard and overruled by the Court. Also, the
said defendant by his Counsel enters his
motion in arrest of judgment herein,

8

And afterwards to Wit on the 16th day of said term
the following record was made in the above
entitled Cause to Wit,

The People of the State of Illinois,

20

vs

William H. Garland,

} In for Selling liquor

This day again this cause coming
on for a hearing on the motion made herein
in arrest of Judgment, which said motion
was heard and overruled by the Court,
Whereupon it was ordered by Court, that judg-
-ment be entered against the said defendant
upon the verdict of the jury herein, therefore
it is ordered and adjudged by the Court,
that the said defendant be fined in the
sum of Ten dollars and cost of Prosecution.
Therefore it is considered by the Court that
the said Plaintiff have and recover of and
from the said defendant, the sum of Ten
dollars fine, together with their cost by
them in this suit expended and may
have Execution Therefor.

And now comes the said defendant by his
counsel and ~~prayed~~ an appeal to the
Supreme Court which is allowed on the
condition that the said defendant with
Joseph Beaver as security, to be filed
to day,

AN ORDINANCE,

RELATING TO SPIRITUOUS, VINOUS, MALT, FERMENTED, AND INTOXICATING LIQUORS.



SEC. 1. *Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Monmouth, That the introduction, storing, depositing, or keeping in store, in deposit, or on hand, or having in possession, within the corporate limits of said city, of any spirituous, vinous, malt, fermented, mixed or intoxicating liquors, for the purpose of selling, bartering, or exchanging the same, or for any species of traffic therein, except as hereinafter provided, is hereby declared to be a nuisance; and every person guilty thereof, and each and every person knowingly aiding and assisting therein, as agent, clerk, servant or otherwise, shall upon conviction forfeit and pay to said City of Monmouth, the sum of not less than ten nor more than fifty dollars; and if the person or persons owning or having the charge or possession of said liquors, shall fail or neglect to remove the same without and beyond the corporate limits of said city within twenty-four hours after their conviction every such person shall further forfeit and pay to said city of Monmouth the sum of ten dollars for every twenty-four hours that said liquors shall remain within said corporate limits after their conviction.*

§ 2. Any person who shall sell, barter, or exchange any spirituous, vinous, malt, fermented, mixed, or intoxicating liquors, within the corporate limits of said city, except as hereinafter provided, or who shall, upon the sale, barter, or exchange of any goods, chattels, wares, merchandise, property, chose in action, or upon any promise, contract, or agreement, expressed or implied, except as hereinafter provided, deliver or furnish, or cause to be delivered or furnished, or knowingly suffer to be taken or received, any spirituous, vinous, malt, fermented, mixed, or intoxicating liquors, shall be considered and adjudged guilty of a nuisance; and every such person shall, upon conviction thereof, forfeit and pay to said City of Monmouth the sum of twenty dollars for each and every offense.

§ 3. Whenever any resident of said city shall complain on oath before the Police Magistrate of the City of Monmouth, that he has good reason to believe and does verily believe, that any spirituous, vinous, malt, fermented, mixed or intoxicating liquors, are stored or deposited, or held or kept in store, in deposit or on hand, in any store, warehouse, dwelling, room, or building, or in any cellar or place within the corporate limits of said city, for the purpose of selling, bartering, or exchanging the same, or for any species of traffic therein, except as hereinafter provided, or for the purpose of furnishing or delivering the same in violation of this ordinance, it shall be the duty of said Police Magistrate to issue a warrant under his hand, directed to the Marshal of said city, reciting the substance of said complaint, and commanding him to forthwith examine the place mentioned in said complaint; which process the said Marshal shall execute and return, with his endorsement thereon, showing how he has executed the same; and if upon such examination he shall find any of the liquors aforesaid, which he has good reason to believe are stored, deposited, or held or kept in store or deposit, or on hand, for any of the purposes aforesaid, he shall make his return accordingly, stating the name or names of the person or persons owning the same, and in whose possession, or charge or care the same shall be; and thereupon such suits and prosecutions may be instituted against said persons as in other cases of violation of the first section of this ordinance.

§ 4. Whenever judgment shall be rendered against any person or persons for the penalty above provided, for introducing, storing, depositing, or holding or keeping in store, in deposit, or on hand, any of the liquors aforesaid, or having the same in their possession, and such person or persons shall fail or neglect to remove said liquors without and beyond the corporate limits of said city, within three days after said conviction, it shall be the duty of the City Marshal to remove the same, and he shall immediately notify the person or persons from whose possession or charge the same have been taken, where the same have been deposited.

§ 5. This ordinance shall not apply to the sale of any spirituous, vinous, malt, fermented, mixed or intoxicating liquors, made by any established apothecary or druggist, his agents, clerks, or servants, for sacramental, chemical, mechanical or medicinal purposes; provided the same are sold in good faith, under the prescriptions of a physician, or upon satisfactory assurances made by or upon behalf of the person or persons purchasing the same, in respect to the use thereof; and provided further, that said apothecary or druggist shall furnish to the clerk of the City Council under oath, within ten days after the expiration of each quarter of the year after this ordinance is in force, a statement in writing of all spirituous, vinous, malt, fermented, mixed, or intoxicating liquors sold by him, his agents, clerks or servants, during the previous quarter, mentioning therein the kind and quantity, when and to whom sold, and upon whose prescription or assurance; and every apothecary or druggist neglecting or failing to furnish such statement shall upon conviction forfeit and pay to the said City of Monmouth, a sum not less than fifty dollars, and not more than one hundred dollars for each and every offense.

§ 6. Whenever judgment shall be rendered for any penalty imposed by this ordinance, and an execution issued thereon shall be returned unsatisfied for the want of property whereon to levy and satisfy the same, and the defendant or defendants shall fail to pay the said judgment and costs, the magistrate who rendered such judgment shall commit the said defendant or defendants to the county jail; provided that such defendant or defendants shall not be imprisoned for a longer period than eight hours for each and every dollar of said judgment and costs; and provided further, that such defendant or defendants shall be discharged whenever said judgment and costs shall be paid.

§ 7. The City Marshal is hereby authorized to call to his aid, in executing this ordinance, all such persons as the nature of the case may require. All suits, prosecutions and trials, in cases arising under this ordinance, shall be commenced and proceeded in, and if demanded and their fees previously paid, a jury impaneled therein, as in other cases under the city ordinances; and appeals may be taken from all judgments rendered therein as in other cases.—So much of any ordinance heretofore passed relative to the sale of spirituous, vinous, mixed or intoxicating liquors, as conflicts with the provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed.

§ 8. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after the 25th day of June, A. D. 1854.

Dated at Monmouth, this 12th day of June, A. D. 1854.

EPHRAIM S. SWINNEY, Mayor.
B. F. CORWIN, Clerk City Council.

(Copy of Bill of Exceptions)
 The People & Co. v. Hannu Circuit Court September Term 1887
 vs. Indictment for Selling Liquor
 William H. Garaford

Be it remembered that on the trial of this case the people & Co. proved by Green Merrifield that he bought Spirituous liquor of the defendant in the Month of March last. That he told the defendant before he bought the liquor. that he was not very well. That the defendant then set out the liquor and he drank some of it. a small quantity less than one gill for which he paid the defendant ten cents. That he was not very well at the time. That the defendant kept a Drug Store where he got the liquor in the City of Mommouth. in Hannu County Illinois. and that he never bought liquor of any kind of the defendant but once. which is the time referred to.
 The People here rested their case

The defendant proved by John T. Morgan that he was at the time of trial and acted in the Capacity of City Clerk to the City Council of the City of Mommouth in Hannu County Illinois. and was in possession of by virtue of his said office & kept the papers and records of said City. That a Book he then and there Exhibited contained the actings and doings of the City Council of said City of Mommouth and also the Ordinances which were passed from time to time by said City Council.

of said City of Monmouth, That it appeared
from said Book that the following ordin-
ance had been passed on the 12th day
of June A D 1854 by said City Council
of said City to Wit



To which said Ordinance was attached the official Seal of said City,

The defendant further proved by Charles K. Smith that he had been printer and publisher of a Weekly public Newspaper called the "Monmouth Atlas" for the last 10 years in said City of Monmouth that he published the said Ordinance which is heretofore in this Bill of Exceptions set out see verba, on the sixteenth day of June A.D. 1854 in said Newspaper which number of said Newspaper was published in said City of Monmouth, and publicly distributed therein. Here the Witness exhibited a file of said Newspaper showing as appeared from the date &c of the paper that said Ordinance had been published at the time and place stated by the Witness.

The defendant then offered the said ordinance in evidence and the Court allowed the ordinance to go to the jury.

This was all the evidence in the case

The court then gave the following instructions on the part of the plaintiffs as follows, to wit:

"The court will instruct the Jury that if they believe from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that defendant sold Spirituous Liquors to Green Merryfield in a ~~less~~ quantity less than one Gallon within Eighteen Months prior to the finding of the Indictment they will find the defendant Guilty, Although they may also believe that said Liquor was sold in the Town of Monmouth if they also believe said Liquor was sold in the County of Warren and State of Illinois if the same was not so sold in good faith in conformity with an ordinance of the said City of Monmouth

That if they believe from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that defendant sold the Liquor in manner and form as charged in the 2nd Count of the Indictment they will find the defendant Guilty Although they may believe defendant was a Druggist, unless they also believe from the evidence that defendant sold the Liquor in good faith for purely Medicinal, Mechanical or Sacramental purposes

To the foregoing of which the defendant then and there excepted

The Court then gave the following instructions on the part of the defendant to wit:

Depts Instructions

It is the duty of the People of the State of Illinois in criminal prosecutions like the present to make out a clear case against the Defendant, in order to convict him, and if the Jury believe from the evidence that there is a reasonable doubt in regard to his guilt they will find the defendant not guilty.

If by the ordinances of the City of Mounds as introduced in evidence the defendant was justifiable in selling the Signor to Greenfield the Jury will find the defendant not guilty provided they further believe that the Signor ~~was~~ was sold within the bounds of the City of Mounds.

And the Jury found the following verdict to wit:

"We the Jury find the Defendant Guilty as charged in the second count of the indictment"

The defendant then moved for a new trial which said motion was as follows to wit:

14
The People } Warren C. Court
vs } Sept Term 1857
Wm H Gardner } Ind. for Selling Liquor

The said defendant comes and moves
the Court to grant a new trial for the
following reasons, to wit:

1. The Verdict of the Jury is against Law
- 2 The Verdict is against the evidence
- 3 The Verdict is against the law & the evidence

A G Keenepatrick
Deft, atty.

Which motion for a new trial was over-
ruled by the Court, to which decision
the defendant then and then excepted

The defendant then moved in arrest
of Judgment for the following reasons
to wit:

The People } Warren Circuit Court Sept term 1857
vs } Indictment for Selling liquor
Wm H Gardner }

The said defendant comes and
moves the Court to arrest the judgment
in this case for the following reasons to wit:

- 1 There is no jurisdiction in this Court in
this case because the City of Monmouth has
exclusive jurisdiction in cases of this kind

within the City limits)

3 It appears from the evidence offered by the Defendant in this case that the City Council of the City of Mommouth have passed an Ordinance under ~~the~~ act of incorporation regulating & Restraining the Sale of Spirituous liquors under which Ordinance the Defendant is liable to be fined for the same offence for which he has been tried here in this Court

3 Want of Jurisdiction in this Court to enter Judgment against the Defendant in this case because the legislature has granted exclusive Jurisdiction to the City Council of the City of Mommouth to pass Laws to restrain license or prohibit the Sale of Spirituous liquors within the City limits.

A. C. Kirkpatrick

Deft. Atty

But the Court overruled the motion in arrest of Judgment. to the overruling of which motion the Defendant then and there in open Court Excepted. And the Court rendered Judgment against the said Defendant. And the Defendant then and there in open Court Excepted. which said Exceptions were all made on the trial of said Cause and are now reduced to writing & allowed & signed & Sealed by the Court

John S. Thompson (Seal)

Know all men by these presents that we William H Gardner and Joseph Weare of the County of Warren and State Illinois are held and firmly bound unto The People of the State of Illinois in the penal sum of Two hundred dollars for the payment of which well and truly to be made we and each of us bind ourselves our heirs, executors and administrators jointly and severally, and firmly by these presents, Sealed with our seals and dated at Moundville this Eighth day of October Anno Domini one thousand Eight hundred and fifty seven, The condition of the above obligation is such that Whereas The People of the State of Illinois did on the Eighth day of October 1857, in the Circuit Court at Moundville within and for the County of Warren and State of Illinois obtain a Judgment against the above bounden William H Gardner for the sum of ten dollars and cents, and costs of suit from which the said William H Gardner has prayed for and obtained an appeal to the Supreme Court of said State, Now if the said William H Gardner shall duly prosecute said appeal and shall moreover pay the Amount of the Judgment, costs, interests and damages rendered and to be rendered against him the said William H Gardner in case the said Appeal shall be affirmed in the said Supreme Court then the

above obligation to be null and void
otherwise to remain in full force and
virtue

Witness

A. G. Kirkpatrick

}
}
}

W. St. Gardner LL

Joseph Weaver LL

State of Illinois }
Warren County }

William Safety
Clerk of the Circuit Court within and
for said County and State do hereby
certify that the above and foregoing
is a full, true and correct copy of the
proceedings and Record, in said case
as appears to me from the Record and
files of said Court,

Given under my hand and the
Seal of said Court at Moundville
this 31st day of March AD 1858.
clerk



State of Illinois ~~Grand~~ Division
Supreme Court April Term 1858.
William H. Gardner,
vs } Appeal from Warren
The People } }

And now comes William H. Gardner the appellant herein by his attorney and says that manifest error hath intervened in the case and proceedings whereof the foregoing is a record and for reason therein he assigns the following to-wit:

1st The Circuit Court erred in refusing a new trial

2^d The Circuit Court erred in refusing to correct the judgment

3^d The proceedings are otherwise informal and erroneous

Wherefore he prays that this may be required of by the Court and the judgment reversed, &c

A. G. Kirkpatrick

Gandy of Judd

Appellants Attorneys

14
Wm H. Gardner

The People's

Record &
History of our

Filed April 22, 1855

Edmund
Clark

Due for Record \$5.00

Plaintiff in Error }
The People ^{vs} Defendants in Error } Error to
Warren County

^{vs} The ~~General Law~~ 132 Section
of the Criminal Code is not repealed
nor suspended within the limits of
the Town of Ironmouth by virtue of
the act of Incorporation of said Town
and in support of this position the
defendants would respectfully refer the
Court to the following authorities —

Village of Rochester vs Harrington
& Hubbard 10th Wendell Page 547
13th Same " 335

^{vs} The Trustees of Clintonville vs Keating
4th Allen Page ————— 344

Sloan vs The State 8th Blackford 361

Harrington vs the State 9th Missouri 525

Baldwin vs Green 10th Same 400

J. B. Hanly

Sent 10th 6th Circuit
for depts in Error

14

Gardner
 by
 The People } Appeal from Worcester

Where the Legislature authorised towns to prohibit dogs from running at large & they have exercised that power it repeals a former law on the same subject within the limits of the towns. The Legislative power is delegated.

Eaton in Graham H. M. 670

14.

Gardner

The People

additional Brief.

97—

The enactment of a law providing for a new penalty, by law repeals the old penalty.

Sullivan vs People, 15 W. 234, Hamilton

The repeal of the law & authority granting license to keep a grocery repeals likewise ~~the~~ section 132 of the Criminal Code providing a penalty for selling liquor without license.

Sullivan vs People 15 W. 234, Hamilton

Hence it is insisted that the license law being by legislative authority & the ordinance in pursuance of that authority having suspended & in effect repealed the license law within the limits of the City of Monmouth, the indictment will not lie for selling liquor without license when the law refuses to give a license.

The ordinance provides a justification of selling liquor unknown to the general law of the State & the City having established a new regulation conflicting with the State law, the ordinance in so far repeals the law of the State.

Woodward v. Lumbull 3 Decm 1.

II. A new trial should have given for the further reasons, to-wit,

1. The Indictment was filed March 21, 1857 & the witness testified that he bought liquor once sometime in March 57, but it does not appear that the purchase was made before the finding of the Indictment.

2. The proof shows that the sale was made for medicinal purposes & hence the sale was justified by the ordinance.

III.

The judgment should have been arrested because it does not appear that the indictment was returned by the Grand Jury into open Court.

Gardner vs People 3 Scam 302.

Noble vs People 4 Gil. 435.

IV.

The Instructions given for the People are not law, because it fails to say that the sale must be with a legal license to keep a grocery, and directs the Jury to find him guilty if they believe he sold liquor.

14
William H. Gardner
vs
The People
Appeal from Warren
County & brief for
Appellant by
Gordy & Good

14 = 97

Lavender
w
People

14 P D

12531

1858

~~X~~
Prepared