

No. 12913

Supreme Court of Illinois

Safford et al

---

vs.

Vail

---

71641  7

STATE OF ILLINOIS, } ss. The People of the State of Illinois,

SUPREME COURT

To the Sheriff of the County of McHenry

Greeting:

Because, In the record and proceedings, and also in the rendition of the judgment  
of a plea which was in the Circuit Court of McHenry  
County, before the Judge thereof, between Micah Vail

plaintiff, and Franklin Safford and Norman S. Safford

defendant \$, it is said that manifest error hath intervened, to the injury of the said

Defendants

as we are informed by their complaint, ————— the record  
and proceedings of which said judgment we have caused to be brought into our Su-  
preme Court of the State of Illinois, at Ottawa, before the Justices thereof, to correct  
the errors in the same, in due form and manner, according to law; Therefore, We  
Command You, That by good and lawful men of your County, you give notice to the said

Micah Vail —————

that he be and appear before the Justices of our said Supreme Court, at the next  
term of said Court, to be holden at Ottawa, in said State, on the first Tuesday after the  
third Monday in April next, to hear the records and proceedings aforesaid, and  
the errors assigned, if he shall see fit; and further to do and receive what said  
Court shall order in this behalf; and have you then there the names of those by whom  
you shall give the said Micah Vail —————

notice, together with this writ.

Witness, The Hon. JOHN D. CATON, Chief Justice  
of our said Court, and the Seal thereof at Ottawa,  
this 30<sup>th</sup> — day of August in the  
Year of Our Lord One Thousand Eight Hundred  
and Fifty-Eight.

L. Leland  
Clerk of the Supreme Court.

J. B. Rice Deputy

(From my reading to the within  
named Michael ~~Heath~~<sup>Heath</sup> the 7<sup>th</sup> day  
of September A.D. 1858 John Eddy Sub  
J. M. & Harry Conklin  
By O. D. Smith Jr.

Sum FEE sum 36  
N.Y. 12- 60  
R.R. 10  
\$1.00

Franklin Bufford et al  
102 or  
Recd for

Recd for

102

Rec'd Sept. 17 1858  
J. Cleveland Bell



# STATE OF ILLINOIS, SUPREME COURT,

THIRD GRAND DIVISION.

APRIL TERM, A. D. 1859.

## *McHenry Circuit Court.*

MICAH VAIL VS. FRANKLIN SAFFORD AND NORMAN J. SAFFORD.

### A S S U M P S I T.

### ABSTRACT OF THE RECORD.

Declaration filed, March 4th, 1858.

1st count on promissory note, \$720, made by defendants payable to the order of plaintiff, and plaintiff ordered it to be paid to himself. Note dated 5th Feb., 1857: *One year after date at 10 per cent. after due.*

2d count; common, \$800.

Money paid out, &c.	}	<i>Ad damnum.</i> \$1,500.
Had and received.		
Goods, &c., sold and delivered.		
Work and labor.		
Account stated.		

Pleas filed in vacation, 20th March, 1858, by defendant as follows:

1st. General issue by both to whole declaration.

2d. *As to \$220.00 of said promissory note. That the \$720 note was given for \$500, borrowed two years before and 20 per cent. per annum, interest amounting to \$220, and for no other consideration.*

April 22.—Defendant, by leave of the Court, withdrew the general issue.

April 29.—Plaintiff demurs to special plea, and defendants join in demurrer. Defendants then move for judgment for a discontinuance.

Plaintiff enters cross motion for judgment against defendants by default.

May 5, 1858.—The court allows the cross motion for judgment by default, but gives judgment for defendant for the *costs* of the cross motion. The Court also sustained the demurrer to the special plea and adjudges against defendants' costs on demurrer. Also that plaintiff recover his damages.

The proofs were then submitted to the Court, and the Court assessed the plaintiff's damages at \$738, and judgment for that and costs.

Defendant excepted.

Bill of exceptions sets all this out again.

SUPREME COURT:

SAFFORD & SAFFORD }  
vs. } Error to McHenry.  
M. VAIL.

And now come said plaintiffs in error and say that, in said record and proceedings, there is manifest error, and ask that said judgment and proceedings may be set aside and for naught held, and assign as points of error the following:

COON & ROGERS, Plff's. Att'ys.

---

POINTS OF ERROR.

1st. The Court erred in sustaining the motion of the plaintiff below for default, after the defendants had applied for a discontinuance.

2d. The Court erred in giving judgment for part of the costs of said motions and not for the whole of said costs.

3d. The Court erred in sustaining the demurrer to defendant's special plea.

4th. The Court erred in the assessment of damages without the intervention of a jury or the Clerk.

5th. The Court erred in assessing the damages in gross.

6th. The Court erred in proceeding in the case without disposing of defendant's motion for a discontinuance.

7th. The Court erred in not giving judgment for defendants below.

8th. The Court erred in giving judgment in favor of plaintiff below.

Errors assigned by

COON & ROGERS,  
by T. L. DICKEY, Proxy.

# STATE OF ILLINOIS, SUPREME COURT,

THIRD GRAND DIVISION.

APRIL TERM, A. D. 1859.

## *McHenry Circuit Court.*

MICAH VAIL VS. FRANKLIN SAFFORD AND NORMAN J. SAFFORD.

### A S S U M P S I T.

#### ABSTRACT OF THE RECORD.

Declaration filed, March 4th, 1858.

1st count on promissory note, \$720, made by defendants payable to the order of plaintiff, and plaintiff ordered it to be paid to himself. Note dated 5th Feb., 1857: *One year after date at 10 per cent. after due.*

2d count; common, \$800.

Money paid out, &c.	} <i>Ad damnum.</i> \$1,500.
Had and received.	
Goods, &c., sold and delivered.	
Work and labor.	

Account stated.

Pleas filed in vacation, 20th March, 1858, by defendant as follows:

1st. General issue by both to whole declaration.

2d. *As to \$220.00 of said promissory note. That the \$720 note was given for \$500, borrowed two years before and 20 per cent. per annum, interest amounting to \$220, and for no other consideration.*

April 22.—Defendant, by leave of the Court, withdrew the general issue.

April 29.—Plaintiff demurs to special plea, and defendants join in demurrer. Defendants then move for judgment for a discontinuance.

Plaintiff enters cross motion for judgment against defendants by default.

May 5, 1858.—The court allows the cross motion for judgment by default, but gives judgment for defendant for the *costs* of the cross motion. The Court also sustained the demurrer to the special plea and adjudges against defendants' costs on demurrer. Also that plaintiff recover his damages.

The proofs were then submitted to the Court, and the Court assessed the plaintiff's damages at \$738, and judgment for that and costs.

Defendant excepted.

Bill of exceptions sets all this out again.

SUPREME COURT:

SAFFORD & SAFFORD }  
vs. } Error to McHenry.  
M. VAIL.

And now come said plaintiffs in error and say that, in said record and proceedings, there is manifest error, and ask that said judgment and proceedings may be set aside and for naught held, and assign as points of error the following:

COON & ROGERS, Plff's. Att'y's.

---

POINTS OF ERROR.

- 1st. The Court erred in sustaining the motion of the plaintiff below for default, after the defendants had applied for a discontinuance.
- 2d. The Court erred in giving judgment for part of the costs of said motions and not for the whole of said costs.
- 3d. The Court erred in sustaining the demurrer to defendant's special plea.
- 4th. The Court erred in the assessment of damages without the intervention of a jury or the Clerk.
- 5th. The Court erred in assessing the damages in gross.
- 6th. The Court erred in proceeding in the case without disposing of defendant's motion for a discontinuance.
- 7th. The Court erred in not giving judgment for defendants below.
- 8th. The Court erred in giving judgment in favor of plaintiff below.

Errors assigned by

COON & ROGERS,  
by T. L. DICKEY, Proxy.

STATE OF ILLINOIS, } ss. The People of the State of Illinois,  
SUPREME COURT, |  
To the Clerk of the Circuit Court for the County of McHenry Greeting:

Because, In the record and proceedings, as also in the rendition of  
the judgment of a plea which was in the Circuit  
Court of McHenry County, before the Judge thereof, between  
Micah Dail

plaintiff, and Franklin Safford & Norman Safford

defendants, it is said mani-  
fest error hath intervened, to the injury of the aforesaid Defendants

as we are informed  
by Your complaint and we being willing that error should be  
corrected, if any there be, in due form and manner, and that justice be done  
to the parties aforesaid, command you that if judgment thereof be given,  
you distinctly and openly, without delay, send to our Justices of the Su-  
preme Court the record and proceedings of the plaint aforesaid, with  
all things touching the same, under your seal, so that we may have the  
same before our Justices aforesaid, at Ottawa, in the County of La  
Salle, on the first Tuesday after the third Monday in April next, that  
the record and proceedings, being inspected, we may cause to be done therein,  
to correct the error, what of right ought to be done according to law!

Witness, The Hon. John D. Caton, Chief  
Justice of our said Court, and the Seal  
thereof, at Ottawa, this 30<sup>th</sup> day of  
August in the Year of Our Lord  
one thousand eight hundred and fifty-eight  
L. Leland

Clerk of the Supreme Court.  
by J. B. Rice Deputy

Franklin Safford et al  
vs

Micah Dail

Writ of Error

This writ of Error is made  
a supersedens and as  
such should be obeyed  
by all concerned.

At Leland Bank  
by J. D. Rice Deputy

Filed August 30<sup>th</sup> 1885

L Leland  
Bank



Know all men by these presents  
that we Franklin Safford Norman  
S. Safford Henry Knowles & Anson  
P. Rogers of the County of McHenry a  
State of Illinois are held & firmly  
bound unto Micah Vail of the  
same place in the penal sum of  
Eighteen hundred dollars which  
sum well & truly to be paid we  
bind ourselves our heirs executors  
& administrators jointly severally  
& firmly by these presents - Sealed  
with our seals this 21<sup>st</sup> day of  
August A.D. 1858.

The condition of the above  
obligation is such that whereas the  
above named Micah Vail did  
at the April Term of the McHenry  
County Circuit Court A.D. 1858  
obtain a judgment against the above  
bounden Franklin Safford a Norman  
S. Safford for the sum of seven  
hundred & thirty eight dollars from  
which judgment the said Franklin  
Safford & Norman S. Safford have  
prosecuted a writ of error out of  
the supreme court of the state of  
Illinois directed to the said McHenry

county circuit court. And the  
Honorable John D. Caton chief  
justice of the Supreme Court of  
the state of Illinois having ordered  
that said writ of error be made  
a supersedeas on said judgment  
Now of said T. & A. S. Safford shall  
prosecute that said writ of error  
with effect & in case said judg-  
ment is affirmed shall pay  
said judgment & all interest costs  
& damages, then this obligation  
to be void otherwise to remain  
in full force & effect

In presence of

AB Coons

H. Safford Seal  
A. Safford Seal  
H. Knowles Seal  
A. P. Rogers Seal

State of Illinois } is afferson P. Rogers being duly sworn  
McHenry County } cloth depose and say that he signed the  
above bond and that he is a resident <sup>two</sup> ~~three~~  
of this County and is now worth at least ~~three~~ <sup>two</sup>  
Thousand dollars over and above all his debts  
hobbies & Household exemptions that the principal part  
of his property consists in improved unenclosed Real estate  
situate in this Co and further doth not

Subscribed and sworn to before me  
This 21 day of August A.D. 1838

AB Coons Notary Public

A. P. Rogers

State of Illinois,  
McHenry County } Herry Knowles being duly sworn witness  
depose and say that he is a Resident of  
this County and is now worth at least  
two Thousand Dollars over and above his last  
and last exemptions, that his property is mainly  
in improved unincorporated Real Estate - that he has  
read the above affidavit of Anna P. Rogers, and there  
only believes the same to be true and further saith that  
Subscribed and Sealed to before me  
the 1st day of August A.D. 1835 -

H. Knowles  
Notary Public

102 - 16

F & M. Safford

vs

Meek v/c

Appeal Bond

Filed August 30, 1888  
S. Leland  
Clerk

Pufall

# STATE OF ILLINOIS, SUPREME COURT,

THIRD GRAND DIVISION.

APRIL TERM, A. D. 1859.

## *McHenry Circuit Court.*

MICAH VAIL VS. FRANKLIN SAFFORD AND NORMAN J. SAFFORD.

### ASSUMPSIT.

#### ABSTRACT OF THE RECORD.

Declaration filed, March 4th, 1858.

1st count on promissory note, \$720, made by defendants payable to the order of plaintiff, and plaintiff ordered it to be paid to himself. Note dated 5th Feb., 1857: *One year after date at 10 per cent. after due.*

2d count; common, \$800.

Money paid out, &c.	}	<i>Ad damnum.</i> \$1,500.
Had and received.		
Goods, &c., sold and delivered.		
Work and labor.		
Account stated.		

Pleas filed in vacation, 20th March, 1858, by defendant as follows:

1st. General issue by both to whole declaration.

2d. *As to \$220.00* of said promissory note. That the \$720 note was given for \$500, borrowed two years before and 20 *per cent. per annum*, interest amounting to \$220, and for no other consideration.

April 22.—Defendant, by leave of the Court, withdrew the general issue.

April 29.—Plaintiff demurs to special plea, and defendants join in demurrer. Defendants then move for judgment for a discontinuance.

Plaintiff enters cross motion for judgment against defendants by default.

May 5, 1858.—The court allows the cross motion for judgment by default, but gives judgment for defendant for the *costs* of the cross motion. The Court also sustained the demurrer to the special plea and adjudges against defendants' costs on demurrer. Also that plaintiff recover his damages.

The proofs were then submitted to the Court, and the Court assessed the plaintiff's damages at \$738, and judgment for that and costs.

Defendant excepted.

Bill of exceptions sets all this out again.

Safford and Norman Safford defendants  
who are summoned etc. in a plew of trespass

SUPREME COURT:

SAFFORD & SAFFORD }  
vs. } Error to McHenry.  
M. VAIL.

And now come said plaintiffs in error and say that, in said record and proceedings, there is manifest error, and ask that said judgment and proceedings may be set aside and for naught held, and assign as points of error the following:

COON & ROGERS, Plff's. Att'y's.

POINTS OF ERROR.

1st. The Court erred in sustaining the motion of the plaintiff below for default, after the defendants had applied for a discontinuance.

2d. The Court erred in giving judgment for part of the costs of said motions and not for the whole of said costs.

3d. The Court erred in sustaining the demurrer to defendant's special plea.

4th. The Court erred in the assessment of damages without the intervention of a jury or the Clerk.

5th. The Court erred in assessing the damages in gross.

6th. The Court erred in proceeding in the case without disposing of defendant's motion for a discontinuance.

7th. The Court erred in not giving judgment for defendants below.

8th. The Court erred in giving judgment in favor of plaintiff below.

Errors assigned by

COON & ROGERS,  
by T. L. DICKEY, Proxy.

102

Safford et al  
v  
M. Vail  
abstet. & Peff's  
Pount.

Filed Apr. 26. 1859  
Steland Eh.

Case No. 102  
Plaintiffs in error, against the State of Colorado,  
and the State Tax Commission, for an assessment of  
a tax on the value of their real estate, situated in  
the County of Larimer, State of Colorado, for the  
year 1857, amounting to \$1,700.

Plaintiffs in error, against the State of Colorado,  
and the State Tax Commission, for an assessment of  
a tax on the value of their real estate, situated in  
the County of Larimer, State of Colorado, for the  
year 1857, amounting to \$1,700.  
Plaintiffs in error, against the State of Colorado,  
and the State Tax Commission, for an assessment of  
a tax on the value of their real estate, situated in  
the County of Larimer, State of Colorado, for the  
year 1857, amounting to \$1,700.

McAllvan  
at

Franklin Safford } Supreme Court  
Norman S Safford }

April 1<sup>st</sup> 1859

Ernest W. Thayer

And the said defendant in error  
by Church & Burr his attorneys  
comes and depoests &c and says  
that there is no such error or  
orders in the record in this case  
as is in and by the said plenary  
~~affidavit~~ of errors supposed  
and this he is ready to affix -  
Church & Burr  
Attest for Plaintiff

Safford and Norman Safford Defendants

102

Open Comt.  
etc from 1859

beach nail

at

santoku Saff

green Saff

Ind - i errd

File Appl. 19. 1859.

S. Edwards  
Clark

beach & green

Tuesday April 20. A.D. 1858  
United States of America

State of Illinois, *S. C.* Pleas before the  
McHenry County *J. C.* Honorable Isaac G.  
Wilson Judge of the Thirteenth Judicial  
Circuit of the State of Illinois, and Pre-  
siding Judge of the McHenry County  
Circuit Court, at a Circuit Court begun  
and held at the Court House in Woodstock  
in said County on Tuesday the twentieth  
day of April in the year of our Lord  
Eighteen hundred and fifty eight

Present

Attest  
Geo. T. Kappa C. M.

Hon. Isaac G. Wilson  
Judge  
John Eddy Sheriff

Micah Vail

J

A. Sampson

or  
Franklin Safford  
Norman J. Safford

And it is to wit on the 4<sup>th</sup> day of  
March A.D. 1858 the Plaintiff in this suit  
filed his declaration in the Office of Clerk of  
the Circuit Court of said County aforesaid  
which said declaration is in the words and  
figures following to wit:

McHenry County Circuit Court in Vacation  
before the April Term A.D. 1858  
State of Illinois *S. C.* Micah Vail Plaintiff  
McHenry County *J. C.* in this suit by Aaron  
Sherry his Attorney complaining of Franklin  
Safford and Norman Safford Defendants  
who are summoned etc. in a plew of trespass

on all cases of infirmities. At the same time  
the doctor's student had to be the  
doctor of his patients. And the first  
of his patients was his mother.  
He began his studies at the age of  
fourteen, and he studied medicine  
at the University of Paris, where he  
graduated in 1782. He then  
went to the University of Leiden,  
where he studied medicine under  
the famous physician Dr. Janus  
Janus. He graduated in 1785.  
After graduation he became  
a doctor of medicine in Paris,  
and he practised medicine in  
Paris for many years. He  
was a very good doctor, and  
he was highly regarded by  
his patients. He died in  
1812, at the age of 67.

3

were indebted unto the Plaintiff in a large sum of money to wit eight hundred dollars, dollars for money before that time lent and advanced to and paid laid out and expended for said Defendants by said Plaintiff at said Defendants request; and for money before that time had and received by said Defendants to and for the use of the said Plaintiff; and also in like sum for goods wares and Merchandise before that time sold and delivered by said Plaintiff to said Defendants at like special instance and request; and also in like sum for the labor care and diligence of said Plaintiff before that time done and performed by said Plaintiff for said Defendants and at the like special instance and request of said Defendants and also in like sum then and there found due and owing said Plaintiff on an account stated between them and being so indebted said Defendants in consideration thereof then and there undertook and promised to pay said Plaintiff said last mentioned sum of money whereto affidavids requested.

Affid the said Defendants notwithstanding their said promises and undertakings but contriving &c, although often requested so to do have not paid said Plaintiff either of said sums of money above mentioned or any part thereof but so to do hath hitherto wholly neglected and refused and still doth neglect and refuse to the the damage of said Plaintiff of Fifteen Hundred dollars and therefore he brings this suit

Anson Sperry  
Plffs. Atty.

Copy of Instrument and account filed on

\$720.00 Muncy Feby. 5<sup>th</sup>. 1857

One year after date we promise  
to pay to the order of M. Vail Seven hundred  
& Twenty dollars at ten per cent. after due  
value received

(Signed) "F. & N. S. Safford"

The note declared on within & of which the  
above is a copy is the plaintiff's sole &  
only cause of action

F. & N. S. Safford

To Micah Vail Dr.

To money lent and advanced	\$ 00.00
To money expended and paid out for.	\$ 00.00
To money received for use of.	\$ 00.00
To Goods, Wares and Merchandise	\$ 00.00
To labor & services	\$ 00.00
To balance on account stated	\$ 00.00

(Endorsed) Filed this 4<sup>th</sup> day of March 1858  
G. J. Kepner Clerk.

And thereafter to wit on the 5<sup>th</sup> day of March  
aforesaid a summons was issued from the  
Clerk's office aforesaid which said summons  
is in the words & figures following to wit:

State of Illinois } vs.  
McHenry County } vs. The People of the State  
of Illinois, to the Sheriff  
of said County greeting  
You are hereby commanded to summon  
Franklin & Norman S. Safford if to be  
found in your County to answer the

5

Declaration of Micah Vail in action  
of assumpsit damage claimed Fifteen  
Hundred Dollars; which said declaration  
was filed in the Office of the Clerk of  
the Circuit Court of McHenry County on the  
4<sup>th</sup>. day of March A.D. 1858. Now  
unless the said Defendant shall within  
thirty days from the date hereof plead  
to or otherwise answer said declaration according  
to Law Judgement will be entered against  
him by default.

Witness George T. Kasson Clerk  
of the McHenry County  
Circuit Court and the Seal  
thereat at Woodstock in  
said County this 5<sup>th</sup>. day  
of March A.D. 1858

G. T. Kasson Clerk

(Endorsed)

Served by reading to the within named  
Franklin Jafford & Norman J. Jafford & by delivering  
a copy of the declaration with each of them  
the 10<sup>th</sup> day of March A.D. 1858

John Eddy Sub.

By D. L. Smith Dpty

Fees 2 Sos. 1.00. 2 copy's 1.00. 24 mls 1.20. Rtu 10.  
43.34

Filed March 15, 1858

G. T. Kasson Clerk.

And thereafter to wit on the twelfth day of  
March A.D. 1858 the Defendants by C. W.  
& Roger their Attorneys and file in the Clerk's  
Office aforesaid their Pleas in this cause  
which are in the words and figures following  
that is to say.

before April Term A.D. 1858

State of Illinois, &c.  
McHenry County, &c.

Nicah Van  
Franklin Safford &  
Norman S. Safford

And the said  
Defendants by Covan  
& Rogers their attorneys come and defend

the wrong & injury wherein, and say that they  
did not undertake and promised in manner  
and form as the said Defendants hath above  
herein complained against them and of  
this they put themselves upon the Country  
By Covan & Rogers their Atty's.

And for a further plea on this behalf  
the said Defendants by Covan & Rogers their  
Attorneys come and defend the wrong and  
injury wherein, and say actis now (as  
to two hundred and twenty dollars part am-  
pound of said promissory note in said  
declaration mentioned) because they say that  
heretofore to wit, before the making of said  
promissory note in said declaration mentioned  
Viz. on or about the 5<sup>th</sup> day of February 1854  
to wit at Meneno in said County in  
consideration that the said Plaintiff would  
lawn and advance and give day of pay-  
ment of five hundred dollars to one Henry  
H. Stevens for and during the Term of One  
year from that date he the said Henry H.  
Stevens then and there agreed to and with  
the said Plaintiff that in consideration of  
said lawn and forbearance and giving day  
of payment of said five hundred dollars

So to be bound to him as aforesaid to  
make execute and deliver to the said Plaintiff  
his certain promissory note, in writing, for six  
hundred dollars payable to said Plaintiff  
in one year from the date thereof, with Franklin  
Safford one of the Defendants herein to sign  
the same as Security, and the Defendants  
aver that in pursuance of such corrupt  
and treasonous agreement so made as  
aforesaid the said <sup>Plaintiff</sup> did at the time and  
place aforesaid loan and advance to the  
said Henry H. Stevens said sum of five  
hundred dollars and did forbear to and  
give day of payment of the same for  
the term of one year thereafter And in  
consideration thereof the said Henry H.  
Stevens then and there made executed  
and delivered to said Plaintiff his certain  
promissory note in writing, for six hundred  
dollars payable to said Plaintiff one  
year from the date thereof with Franklin  
Safford (one of the defendants herein) as a  
Signer and Security on and for the same  
which promissory note so made executed and  
delivered as aforesaid was then and there  
accepted and received by the Plaintiff in  
consideration of said loan of five hundred  
dollars so made and forbore as aforesaid  
and for no other and different consideration  
whatever, And the Defendants further  
aver that after the making and delivery  
of the aforesaid promissory note and  
after the day on which the money therein  
mentioned became due and payable to wit  
on the 5<sup>th</sup> day of February A.D. 1854 at  
Hartford in said County in consideration  
that the Plaintiff would give further day  
of payment of said note of six hundred  
dollars to the said Henry H. Stevens

and the said Franklin Safford for and during  
the term of one year thereafter it was  
corruptly and usuriously sued against the  
form of the Statute in such case made  
and provided agreed by and between the  
said Plaintiff and the said Henry A. Stevens  
& Franklin Safford that the said Plaintiff  
should and would extend the time of the  
payment of said note for one year  
thereafter and in consideration therefor  
the said defendants should make out  
specie and deliver to the said Plaintiff  
their certain promissory note in writing payable  
to said Plaintiff in one year from the date  
thereof for the sum of Seven Hundred and  
Twenty dollars And the defendants aver  
that in pursuance of the aforesaid corrupt  
and usurious agreement, the said Plaintiff  
did then and there extend the time and give  
day of payment of said Six hundred Dollars  
for one year from the date thereof and for  
and in consideration of such extension of  
and giving day of payment as aforesaid  
the said defendants then and there made  
specie and delivered to the said Plaintiff  
said note in said declaration mentioned  
and for no other or different consideration  
whatever And the defendants aver that  
said note in said declaration mentioned  
was then and there accepted and received  
by the plaintiff for the aforesaid consideration  
and none other And of this they are  
ready to verify wherefore they pray they  
may be allowed said sum of two hundred  
Twenty dollars lawful and usurious  
interest so agreed to be paid as aforesaid  
together with whatever interest may be  
due by the terms of said note in said

9

declaration mentioned

Count Roger's I. & O. Atty.

State of Illinois }  
McHenry County }  
Franklin Safford

One of the Defendants  
in the above cause being duly sworn doth  
depose and say that he verily believes  
the defendants have a defense upon the  
merits to a part of the Plaintiff's cause  
of action to wit in the amount of Two  
Hundred and twenty dollars & the interest on  
said promissory note mentioned that their  
defense is set forth on their special plea  
filed herein. And that he knows the contents  
of said plea and the facts therein stated  
are true and correct.

Subscribed & sworn to before me this 15 day  
of March 1858  
John J. Safford J.P.

(Endorsed) Filed March 20. '58

Gro. T. K. Brown Clerk.

And thereafter to wit on Thursday the 22<sup>nd</sup> day  
of April AD 1858 being one of the days  
of the April Term of said Court for the  
year last aforesaid the further proceedings  
in the above entitled cause were had to wit

Nicholas Vail

Franklin Safford & Affumpit  
Norman S. Safford

and

now comes the  
Defendant by leave his attorney  
and by leave of the Court withdrawing  
the plea of the general issue heretofore

by him filed herein.

And thereafter to wit on the 29<sup>th</sup>. day of April in the year last aforesaid being another of the days of said April Term of said Court aforesaid, the following proceedings were had to wit;

Micah Vail      S. A. Sampson  
or  
Franklin Safford  
Norman S. Safford

And now

comes the Plaintiff by Sperry his Attorney and files his demurrer to the Special plew of the defendants herein in which the Defendants by Coon joint  
And thereupon the Defendants by Coon their Attorney enter their motion for a discontineuance of this Suit. and the Plaintiff datus also his crasp motion for a judgement against the said Defendants by default.

And thereafte to wit on the 5<sup>th</sup>. day of May in the year last aforesaid being also one of the days of the April Term of Court last aforesaid the following further proceedings were had in the above entitled cause to wit

Micah Vail      S. A. Sampson  
or  
Franklin Safford  
Norman S. Safford

And the Court being fully advised upon the crasp motion formerly entered herein by the Plaintiff for judgement by default against the Defendant sustains the same but doth

further order and adjudge that the Defendants  
have and recover of the Plaintiff their costs  
and charges about said cross motion so  
allowed as aforesaid expended and that  
they have execution therefor. And the Court  
being fully advised upon the Demurrer of the  
Plaintiff to the special plea of the Defendants  
herein sustains the same. It is therefore ordered  
and considered that the Plaintiff have and  
recover of the Defendants his costs and charges  
about his Demurrer expended and that he have  
execution therefor. It is therefore ordered that  
the Plaintiff have judgment for his damages  
and the proofs being submitted to the Court  
and the Court being fully advised thereon  
assess the Plaintiff's damages at the  
sum of Seven hundred and thirty eight  
dollars. It is therefore ordered and considered  
that the Plaintiff have and recover  
of the Defendants the sum of Seven hundred  
and thirty eight dollars his damages so  
assessed as also his costs and charges  
herein expended and that he have execution  
therefor to which ruling of the Court the  
Defendants by counsel have and have except.

State of Illinois } v. McHenry County Circuit  
McHenry County } Court April Term ad 1858

Micah Vail

or  
Franklin Safford &  
Norman S. Safford

Be it remembered

7  
that on this twenty second  
day of April ad 1858, said day being  
one of the days of said Term the defendant  
by leave of the Court here to fore obtained

withdrew the general issue here before filed  
in this cause, afterwards to wit on the 29<sup>th</sup>  
day of April said day being one of  
the days of Said Term the Plaintiff filed  
his demurrer in said cause to the Defendant,  
plea which demurrer was in the words  
and figures following to wit:

Micah Vail

as  
H. & A. Safford

And now comes the said  
Plaintiff by Sperry &  
Kulbat his Atty. and  
as to the plea by the said Defendants specially  
above pleaded says that the matters and  
things in said Plea pleaded, are not  
Sufficient in Law to bar and preclude  
the said Plaintiff as to any part of his  
said action and that the said Plaintiff  
is not by the Law of the land bound to  
answer further there to: and this he is ready to  
verify &c. wherefore he prays Judgment of  
the said Plea &c

Sperry & Kulbat  
Plffs. Atty's

Abr. 24. 1858

And the said Defendant says that said Plea  
is sufficient in law

Cowan & Rogers  
Atty's for Def't.

in which demurred the Defendants joined  
Thereupon the Defendants by their counsel  
moved or discontinuance of this suit, and  
the Plaintiff, afterwards on the same day  
entered his cross motion for judgment for  
default - Afterwards to wit, on the 5<sup>th</sup>  
day of May said day being one of  
the days of Said Term, the Court being,

3.

fully advised allowed said cross motion  
at the Plaintiff's costs of said motion to which  
ruling by the Court the defendants by their  
Counsel then and there excepted - It afterward  
to wit on the same day the Court being  
fully advised upon the ~~demurrer~~ heretofore  
filed in this cause sustained the same  
rendered judgment for Plaintiff upon the  
demurrer & damages assessed by the  
Court upon the state in evidence at least  
hundred and thirty eight dollars to which  
finding by the Court & sustaining the  
demurrer & entering judgment upon the same  
and assessment of damages against  
the defendants by their Counsel then and  
there excepted and now pray that this Bill  
of exception may be signed and sealed  
by the Court and make a part of the record  
of this cause which is done

Signed Isaac G. Wilson Seal

State of Illinois J. G. Wilson  
McHenry County J. G. Wilson  
Clerk of the Circuit

Court is and for said County in the State aforesaid  
do hereby certify that the above and foregoing  
is a true and complete copy of the record  
of this Court in a cause wherein Micah  
Vail is Plaintiff and Franklin Safford  
and Elizurman Safford <sup>defendants</sup> as appears  
by a diligent examination of the same

Witness my hand & seal  
of said Court at Woodstock  
this 19<sup>th</sup> day of July A.D. 1858

J. G. Wilson Clerk



Let a supersedies issue in this cause bond  
in the sum of Eighteen hundred dollars with  
Henry Knowles & Anson Rogers security  
Aug 27 1858,

I D Catt  
Ch Just

Micah Vail

of  
F. Safford  
A. S. Safford.

copy Record -

<sup>102</sup>  
Franklin Dafford et al  
by

Micah Vail

Transcript of Record  
& assignt. of Errors

Filed August 30<sup>th</sup> 1858  
S. Leland  
Clerk

Micah Vail }  
ads } Supreme Court  
Franklin Safford } April term 1859  
Norman S Safford } Error to U.S. Circuit

By leave of court the defendant in error submits the following suggestions

1. The court below ruled properly in sustaining the cross motion for judgment. This rule of practice has already been established by this court in Warren vs Kesson  
3<sup>rd</sup> Scam. 38-41

2. The assessment of damages by the court without the intervention of the Clerk or jury was regular and in accordance with the act regulating practice in 13 judicial circuit.

Scales Statute Page 637  
Sess Laws 1857 par 29

The declaration contains <sup>two</sup> counts to the amount of \$800 bonds a special count on note \$720. The defendant

sued <sup>for</sup> \$600 note for one year from that date & that defendant

below by withdrawing plea of Gen.  
issue own left in default to  
the whole amount claimed in  
the declaration except \$220.

So that even if the special plea  
as to the \$220 had been good the  
plaintiff was entitled to his assess-  
ment of damages and judgment  
thereon to the amount of the decla-  
-ration not answered by the plea  
which was much more than he  
did recover

3

But the plea was bad and the  
Demurrer properly sustained

The money set up by the plea  
was a supposed agreement made  
by one Henry H. Stephens with the plain-  
tiff below to pay \$600 in one year  
for the sum of \$500 and that Stephens  
gave his note with security for  
\$600, and after the year of per-  
iod this debt is assumed by the  
defendants below and they give  
them note for \$720 payable in  
a year and Stephens was of

com released from his power  
The Saffords having assumed  
to perform his promise and also  
a New one of their own which  
they also set up as assurances

It would certainly be a great hard  
ship on Boail who had trusted  
to Stephens' integrity to perform  
his promise by the payment of the  
first note and released that prom-  
ise on its being assured by the  
Saffords if they were now to be  
allowed to avail themselves of  
any legal objection that Stephens  
might have made but which he  
probably from motives of honor  
and humanity would not have  
made, It would be bad moral  
and I think equally bad law  
that would allow them to do so  
They are not merely his debtors but  
have assumed the payment in his  
stead of what he considered an honest  
debt which it is to be presumed he  
intended to pay honestly and would  
have paid without seeking to cover  
himself of any such defense as there

<sup>7</sup> and \$600 note for one year  
from that date & that defendant

below by withdrawal, etc., etc.  
Parties are urging  
as to the fact usury at up in  
the plea there was no proviso between  
the parties to the suit. And the  
Plea being "as to \$220" and the  
facts material in the plea not  
distinguishing that entirely, the  
Plea is bad on demurrer  
It will be seen also that the first  
usurious contract is alleged to have  
been made pursuant to the act of 1857  
upholding all forfeitures etc.

The abstract furnished by the  
Plaintiff does not set out the  
plea properly as pleaded.

The court is therefore requested  
to read the plea itself.

This court has decided that  
"a plea of usury being in the  
nature of a penal action much  
strictness is required in pleading  
it."

Hancock et al vs Hodgson  
I Scam 333  
Prostgall submitted

L S Church

Atty for deft

Dickey's answer to the above

Supreme Court of Illinois  
Sufford v. M. Nail } Ernest McHenry -

The only ~~subject~~ I desire to discuss is the error as we allege in sustaining the demur to the special plea of Spafford, defendant in error, complaining of our State ~~in the abstract~~ of this plea - we therefore here state it more at large. It begins on page 4 of the record.

Franklin Safford & Norman Safford the defendants below - pleaded as to § 220 - That on 5<sup>th</sup> Feb 1856 - plaintiff lent to one Stevens \$500 for one year under an agreement that for ~~that~~ consideration he would give his note for \$600 payable to Nail at one year from date - with Franklin Safford (one of the defendants below) as security of Stevens - & Stevens & Franklin Safford as his security gave the \$600 note -

After the maturity of the 1<sup>st</sup> note, it was agreed by Nail with Stephens & Franklin Safford that Nail would extend the payment of said \$600 note for one year from ~~that~~ date & that defendants,

(the two Saffords) would give  
to plaintiff thin note at one year  
for the sum of \$720 - & in pur-  
suance of said agreement the note  
in declaration file was given  
& claims that by reason of the  
~~undesirable~~ ~~as~~ usury - the debt  
claims a deduction of \$220  
being simply the amount of  
said usury.

To avoid this the attorney  
for Nail insists - that the  
Saffords can not complain  
of the usury in the 1st Note - because  
they are not parties - & that Stevens -  
alone can set up that defence.  
It is the law - that a security  
can make any defence which  
his principal might make -

I insist that these parties are  
parties & may set up the defence  
If Franklin Safford had been  
sued upon the \$600 - he could  
have objected to the usury therein  
~~whether Stevens consented~~  
that he should do so or not -

~~that~~ being the basis of the  
note in suit - Franklin Safford  
can certainly set up this defence  
Norman S. Safford is merely  
the security of Franklin Safford  
& may therefore make the same  
defence - It is erroneously  
affirmed by Mr. Church that Stevens

was discharged from his promise  
for \$ 600 - the ~~pled~~ does not say  
so & the facts stated in the ~~pled~~  
would still leave Stevens liable  
to be sued upon the \$ 600 - & if  
he failed to set up any - being  
made to pay it - All his fancy  
work about the Morals on this  
feature of the case are mythical  
& would not affect the law  
if real

D. Lyle Dillier  
for plffs in error

102

Supreme Court  
April term 1859

Franklin Safford  
Norman S Safford  
vs

Micah Vail

Gifts by Comt  
~~andward~~

Filed April 22. 1859  
L. Leland  
Clerk

L. Church