

Signal Corps Report—August 4, 1880.

Table with columns: TIME, BAR, WIND, SEA, TEMPERATURE. Rows for 4:30 A.M., 5:30 A.M., 6:30 A.M., 7:30 A.M., 8:30 A.M., 9:30 A.M., 10:30 A.M., 11:30 A.M., 12:30 P.M., 1:30 P.M., 2:30 P.M., 3:30 P.M., 4:30 P.M., 5:30 P.M., 6:30 P.M., 7:30 P.M., 8:30 P.M., 9:30 P.M., 10:30 P.M., 11:30 P.M., 12:30 M.

Weather Probabilities. WASHINGTON, August 14.—For California: Clear and partly cloudy weather.

ADVERTISEMENTS MENTIONED.

H. S. Deas—Candidate for County Treasurer. P. A. Miller—Candidate for County Treasurer. Knights Templar—Sacramento Commission, to-night.

LOCAL INTELLIGENCE.

TRULY REFRESHING.—Among the multitudinous applications for reductions of assessments before the Board of Equalization, a refreshing breeze in the opposite direction occurred yesterday in the form of an application from E. R. Parvin, of Grand Island, to have the assessment upon his land increased.

CHINESE THEATER CASE.

The Superior Court sustains the lower court—it is a nuisance.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION.

The Board of Equalization met yesterday at 10 o'clock a. m., and the following additional applications for reduction of assessments were filed:

From H. W. Schacht, for reduction on city property from \$10,200 to \$8,400.

J. B. Rogers, to have assessment reduced on 10 acres of land east of the city, from \$125 to \$75.

Peter Shay, improvements on lots 5, 6 and 7, between G and R Second and Third streets, from \$80 to \$65 per acre.

A. J. Oakley, to have 840 acres of land reduced from \$6 to \$5 per acre.

M. A. Margary, 16 1/2 acres east of city, from \$2,400 to \$1,700.

J. H. Keut, 402 acres, from \$8,050 to \$6,057.

Comelia Toomey, 184 acres in Rancho Rio de los Americanos, from \$15 to \$12 per acre.

M. M. O'Neil & Son, city property and land, from \$1,200 to \$825.

C. Chandler, 40 acres land near beet factory, from \$8,000 to \$1,600.

Thomas Miller, 388 acres in Rancho San Jose de los Mochuelones, from \$15 to \$12 per acre.

J. H. Herzog, 48 acres and improvements, from \$7,450 to \$3,850.

Mrs. Mary Norris, part of lot 5, between J and K and Eleventh and Twelfth streets, and city and county lots, from \$1,000 to \$1,000.

C. Perkins, 250 acres of land, from \$7,000 to \$5,180.

The Third street corner, from \$1,150 to \$1,200.

Daniel Flint, lot 3, between N and O and Sixth and Seventh streets, from \$9,000 to \$5,000.

Estate of A. H. Van Freis, deceased, lands to be sold, from \$1,200 to \$825 to \$5,400.

J. W. Wilson, on part of lot 7, between L and M and Second and Third, and part of lot 8, between N and O, Eleventh and Twelfth streets, from \$4,150 to \$3,250.

E. Figg, on city property, from \$35,000 to \$29,800.

Thomas Kenney, on improvements on lot 7, between N and O and Twelfth and Thirteenth streets, from \$1,800 to \$1,500.

Mrs. Nancy Miller, improvements on lots 3 and 4, between Second and Eighth and H and I streets, from \$7,000 to \$6,000.

National Gold Bank, D. O. Mills & Co., 65 acres of land in Sutter township, from \$150 to \$100 per acre.

H. Hyman, city property, from \$5,650 to \$5,250.

Andrew and Rosa Black, city property, from \$1,200 to \$1,000.

P. W. Coffery, on 11 acres, reduced from \$1,225 to \$1,000.

H. H. C. Miller, part of lot 6, between L and M and Sixth and Seventh streets, from \$8,000 to \$3,000.

E. H. Russell, improvements on lot 5, between G and H and Twelfth and Thirteenth streets, from \$8,000 to \$4,000.

S. Gotlieb, reductions on city property to amount of \$650.

H. Wachsner, on city property, from \$8,800 to \$4,800.

W. H. Herberg, on lands and improvements, from \$17,800 to \$10,100.

PETITIONS ACTED UPON.

Petitions for reduction of assessments were considered as follows:

A. Hamberger, improvements on lot 2, between N and O, Third and Fourth, reduced from \$2,000 to \$1,700. Balance of petitions rejected.

Wm. Curtis, reduction on 120 acres land and improvements, from \$40 per acre, and \$2 acre \$20 acre, the office of the Secretary, at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

E. Grubler, improvements on lot 5, between A and B, Fifteenth and Sixteenth streets, reduced from \$2,000 to \$3,000. Balance of petition rejected.

Mrs. C. Grubler, reduction on improvements on lot 8, between M and F, Fifteenth and Sixteenth streets, from \$3,500 to \$3,000. Balance of petition rejected.

State of Jas. H. Hooker, reduction of \$600 on improvements, balance rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

A REPUBLICAN CAUCUS.

Large Meeting in Preparation for the Primaries.

The Fourth Ward Republican Club met at Central Hall last night, to which all Republicans in the ward were invited. There was a very large attendance, and the liveliest interest manifested. S. C. Denison, President of the club, presided, and stated the object of the meeting to be the selection of candidates for the primaries.

He believed that it was the desire of all to have a fair, full and free expression of the will of the Republicans of the ward. There were several tickets in the field, there would be a contest. He was glad of it; it would bring out a full expression, and he hoped those defeated, as some must be, would acquiesce in the result. He was glad of it; he hoped there would be an open and manly contest, and perfect harmony of proceeding.

The committee had been appointed to see that the voting was fairly done, and that it was done by Republicans and with regard to the rights of the primaries. The committee was a candidate, Mr. Parker, and declined, properly, to act on the committee. In his place, therefore, A. S. Hopkins would act.

C. H. Cummings offered resolutions to the effect that names be placed in nomination and recorded, to be held for five or ten days of the election from the 4th precinct, and from 4th precinct; that all the voters be taken down by the Secretary, so that the ballots be counted and compared with the tally-list, and each ballot be counted by the voters.

Mr. Cummings asked wherein Mr. Clinch's plan differed from his. The chair explained the resolutions in detail. Mr. Cummings denied that he had put up any ticket or had had anything to do with any preparation of tickets.

Mr. Cummings asked wherein Mr. Clinch's plan differed from his. The chair explained the resolutions in detail. Mr. Cummings denied that he had put up any ticket or had had anything to do with any preparation of tickets.

Mr. Cummings asked wherein Mr. Clinch's plan differed from his. The chair explained the resolutions in detail. Mr. Cummings denied that he had put up any ticket or had had anything to do with any preparation of tickets.

Mr. Cummings asked wherein Mr. Clinch's plan differed from his. The chair explained the resolutions in detail. Mr. Cummings denied that he had put up any ticket or had had anything to do with any preparation of tickets.

Mr. Cummings asked wherein Mr. Clinch's plan differed from his. The chair explained the resolutions in detail. Mr. Cummings denied that he had put up any ticket or had had anything to do with any preparation of tickets.

Mr. Cummings asked wherein Mr. Clinch's plan differed from his. The chair explained the resolutions in detail. Mr. Cummings denied that he had put up any ticket or had had anything to do with any preparation of tickets.

Mr. Cummings asked wherein Mr. Clinch's plan differed from his. The chair explained the resolutions in detail. Mr. Cummings denied that he had put up any ticket or had had anything to do with any preparation of tickets.

Mr. Cummings asked wherein Mr. Clinch's plan differed from his. The chair explained the resolutions in detail. Mr. Cummings denied that he had put up any ticket or had had anything to do with any preparation of tickets.

Mr. Cummings asked wherein Mr. Clinch's plan differed from his. The chair explained the resolutions in detail. Mr. Cummings denied that he had put up any ticket or had had anything to do with any preparation of tickets.

Mr. Cummings asked wherein Mr. Clinch's plan differed from his. The chair explained the resolutions in detail. Mr. Cummings denied that he had put up any ticket or had had anything to do with any preparation of tickets.

Mr. Cummings asked wherein Mr. Clinch's plan differed from his. The chair explained the resolutions in detail. Mr. Cummings denied that he had put up any ticket or had had anything to do with any preparation of tickets.

Mr. Cummings asked wherein Mr. Clinch's plan differed from his. The chair explained the resolutions in detail. Mr. Cummings denied that he had put up any ticket or had had anything to do with any preparation of tickets.

Mr. Cummings asked wherein Mr. Clinch's plan differed from his. The chair explained the resolutions in detail. Mr. Cummings denied that he had put up any ticket or had had anything to do with any preparation of tickets.

Mr. Cummings asked wherein Mr. Clinch's plan differed from his. The chair explained the resolutions in detail. Mr. Cummings denied that he had put up any ticket or had had anything to do with any preparation of tickets.

Mr. Cummings asked wherein Mr. Clinch's plan differed from his. The chair explained the resolutions in detail. Mr. Cummings denied that he had put up any ticket or had had anything to do with any preparation of tickets.

CHINESE THEATER CASE.

The Superior Court sustains the lower court—it is a nuisance.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

The People vs. Ah Tim and Ah Luck.—This is an appeal from a judgment of the Police Court of the City of Sacramento, imposing fines upon said defendants upon a verdict finding them guilty of disturbing the peace. The defendants are performers or actors in a Chinese theater, situated upon Third street, between G and H streets, and the noise constituting a disturbance were those made in the ordinary course of a performance in such theater.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

The case in which the tumult in the Chinese theater was declared by the Police Court to be a nuisance, and which was appealed to the Superior Court, was decided yesterday.

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION.

The Board of Equalization met yesterday at 10 o'clock a. m., and the following additional applications for reduction of assessments were filed:

From H. W. Schacht, for reduction on city property from \$10,200 to \$8,400.

J. B. Rogers, to have assessment reduced on 10 acres of land east of the city, from \$125 to \$75.

Peter Shay, improvements on lots 5, 6 and 7, between G and R Second and Third streets, from \$80 to \$65 per acre.

A. J. Oakley, to have 840 acres of land reduced from \$6 to \$5 per acre.

M. A. Margary, 16 1/2 acres east of city, from \$2,400 to \$1,700.

J. H. Keut, 402 acres, from \$8,050 to \$6,057.

Comelia Toomey, 184 acres in Rancho Rio de los Americanos, from \$15 to \$12 per acre.

M. M. O'Neil & Son, city property and land, from \$1,200 to \$825.

C. Chandler, 40 acres land near beet factory, from \$8,000 to \$1,600.

Thomas Miller, 388 acres in Rancho San Jose de los Mochuelones, from \$15 to \$12 per acre.

J. H. Herzog, 48 acres and improvements, from \$7,450 to \$3,850.

Mrs. Mary Norris, part of lot 5, between J and K and Eleventh and Twelfth streets, and city and county lots, from \$1,000 to \$1,000.

C. Perkins, 250 acres of land, from \$7,000 to \$5,180.

The Third street corner, from \$1,150 to \$1,200.

Daniel Flint, lot 3, between N and O and Sixth and Seventh streets, from \$9,000 to \$5,000.

Estate of A. H. Van Freis, deceased, lands to be sold, from \$1,200 to \$825 to \$5,400.

J. W. Wilson, on part of lot 7, between L and M and Second and Third, and part of lot 8, between N and O, Eleventh and Twelfth streets, from \$4,150 to \$3,250.

E. Figg, on city property, from \$35,000 to \$29,800.

Thomas Kenney, on improvements on lot 7, between N and O and Twelfth and Thirteenth streets, from \$1,800 to \$1,500.

Mrs. Nancy Miller, improvements on lots 3 and 4, between Second and Eighth and H and I streets, from \$7,000 to \$6,000.

National Gold Bank, D. O. Mills & Co., 65 acres of land in Sutter township, from \$150 to \$100 per acre.

H. Hyman, city property, from \$5,650 to \$5,250.

Andrew and Rosa Black, city property, from \$1,200 to \$1,000.

P. W. Coffery, on 11 acres, reduced from \$1,225 to \$1,000.

H. H. C. Miller, part of lot 6, between L and M and Sixth and Seventh streets, from \$8,000 to \$3,000.

E. H. Russell, improvements on lot 5, between G and H and Twelfth and Thirteenth streets, from \$8,000 to \$4,000.

S. Gotlieb, reductions on city property to amount of \$650.

H. Wachsner, on city property, from \$8,800 to \$4,800.

W. H. Herberg, on lands and improvements, from \$17,800 to \$10,100.

PETITIONS ACTED UPON.

Petitions for reduction of assessments were considered as follows:

A. Hamberger, improvements on lot 2, between N and O, Third and Fourth, reduced from \$2,000 to \$1,700. Balance of petitions rejected.

Wm. Curtis, reduction on 120 acres land and improvements, from \$40 per acre, and \$2 acre \$20 acre, the office of the Secretary, at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

E. Grubler, improvements on lot 5, between A and B, Fifteenth and Sixteenth streets, reduced from \$2,000 to \$3,000. Balance of petition rejected.

Mrs. C. Grubler, reduction on improvements on lot 8, between M and F, Fifteenth and Sixteenth streets, from \$3,500 to \$3,000. Balance of petition rejected.

State of Jas. H. Hooker, reduction of \$600 on improvements, balance rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres of land, reduced from \$200 to \$100 per acre. Balance of petition rejected.

James B. Haegle, application for reduction of assessment on 300 acres