

FRIDAY'S SPECIAL SALE

Dr. Warner's Abdominal Corsets, sizes 20 to 32, \$1.50 to \$1.75 each, at choice. Ball Knitting Silk, all colors, worth 25c each, Friday they go two for 25c. Large bottle of Witch Hazel, 15c. Perfumed Ammonia, 10c bottle. Large Perfumes, Lilliput, White Rose, Lily of the Valley, Heliotrope, Jockey Club, Tang-Tang, etc., one ounce.

MADAME PHELPS

will return from the Eastern fashion centers and open her

DRESSMAKING PARLORS

Monday, Sept. 16

L. S. Ayres & Co.

CONSIDER CARPETS

It will be a great consideration if you come to us, for we have more carpets than anybody, and the style of them! the wear of them! Oh, but you get your money's worth when you buy of us!

LIBRARY LAY OUT

You supply the books, and with which we supply there is a complete library.

We supply the furniture. Some of it may be seen in the show window. Come inside and see more.

EASTMAN, SCHLEICHER & LEE.

Window Bargain Sale Every Monday.

ART EMPORIUM.

Telephone 500.

Frames, Pictures, Looking Glasses

THE H. LIEBER COMPANY, 33 South Meridian Street.

DON'T FORGET US!

We are prepared to meet the great demands that will be made on us during State fair week.

MARCY'S, 38 West Washington St

LADIES, ATTENTION!

Gordon & Co.'s celebrated English Walking Hats (fall styles) have arrived. Please call and see them.

DALTON, High-Class Hatter, Bates House.

USED "ROUGH ON RATS."

Charles Worfield Accused of Attempting to Poison John Clark.

Charles Worfield, colored, of 299 Lafayette street, spent last night in the police station with the serious charge of administering poison with the intent to kill against his name on the slate.

Worfield firmly asserts that the affair is a scheme concocted by Susan Biffel, his housekeeper, and John Clark, who boards at his house, to get him out of the way.

Worfield is a bricklayer, and has been working on a house on Twenty-fifth street, which, he claims, causes him to get up and eat his breakfast early. His story is that yesterday morning he was sitting in his yard reading a handbill, when he remembered that it was time for him to start for his work, and that he hurried into the house, calling for a slice of Mrs. Biffel to bring his breakfast. He passed through the kitchen in going to the dining-room. He had not been at the table long when Mrs. Biffel rushed in with a dinner bucket in her hand, exclaiming: "What made you get poison in Mr. Clark's dinner bucket?"

Worfield replied that he had not put anything in the bucket, and asked Mrs. Biffel if she had seen him place anything there. The woman said that she had not, but asserted that there was no one else in the kitchen. Worfield claims that the woman was in the kitchen when he passed through, and that if he had been there he would have seen her.

The police department was notified and upon investigation a quantity of "Rough on Rats" was found in the food which had been placed in the bucket. Clark was advised to answer out a warrant for Worfield, which he did, the man being arrested by detectives McGuff and Thornton.

The parties have not been living in perfect harmony for some time, and each is ready to charge the other with all sorts of crimes. Worfield says that until Clark came to live at his house all went well, but that of late the woman has taken a liking to the young man. He says that about two weeks ago she told him that if he did not leave the house she would poison him, and more recently threatened to split open his head with a hatchet. Consequently Worfield has been attempting to get Clark to leave the place, but has been unsuccessful and the woman and Clark claim that Worfield finally tried to poison him.

The Jewish New Year will be observed in this city on Wednesday evening, Sept. 18, and the Thursday morning following with services at the Market-street Temple by Rabbi Messing. The celebration will be made the occasion of introducing the new ritual.

Office Desks of all styles.—Wm. L. Elder.

TAKING THE EVIDENCE

FIRST WITNESSES EXAMINED IN THE TRIAL OF THE COFFINS.

Teller Robinson Begins the Tedious Work of Tracing Out the Various Transactions.

The government called two witnesses yesterday to testify against Percival B. and Francis A. Coffin, charged with having conspired with others to wreck the Indianapolis National Bank. The first witness was bank examiner, of Pittsburgh, was the first witness. Lewis J. Robinson, late receiving teller of the Indianapolis National Bank, was the other.

It was hot, tedious work for all connected with the case yesterday. The atmosphere of the federal court room was stifling in the afternoon the heat was almost unbearable, and everybody who did not have to stay fled from the room to cooler retreats. The lawyers mopped the perspiration from their faces and worked in as scant attire as the dignity of the court would permit.

The members of the jury each carried a palm-leaf fan when they fled into the box at 2 o'clock, and managed to keep themselves reasonably comfortable.

Elmer Corr, assistant district attorney, made the opening statement for the government, at 9 o'clock yesterday morning, taking up two hours and a half. He covered in detail the history of the Indianapolis National Bank and its unfortunate connection with the Indianapolis Cabinet Company. Mr. Corr's statement was substantially as follows:

The records of the bank show that the Indianapolis Cabinet Company has been indebted to it for about \$200,000. Notwithstanding a federal law which forbids a national bank to loan to any one company to the amount of more than 10 per cent. of the bank's capital stock, yet in 1884 the bank had loaned the cabinet company \$30,000, which was above the 10 per cent. limit.

The members of the jury each carried a palm-leaf fan when they fled into the box at 2 o'clock, and managed to keep themselves reasonably comfortable.

Elmer Corr, assistant district attorney, made the opening statement for the government, at 9 o'clock yesterday morning, taking up two hours and a half. He covered in detail the history of the Indianapolis National Bank and its unfortunate connection with the Indianapolis Cabinet Company. Mr. Corr's statement was substantially as follows:

The records of the bank show that the Indianapolis Cabinet Company has been indebted to it for about \$200,000. Notwithstanding a federal law which forbids a national bank to loan to any one company to the amount of more than 10 per cent. of the bank's capital stock, yet in 1884 the bank had loaned the cabinet company \$30,000, which was above the 10 per cent. limit.

The members of the jury each carried a palm-leaf fan when they fled into the box at 2 o'clock, and managed to keep themselves reasonably comfortable.

Elmer Corr, assistant district attorney, made the opening statement for the government, at 9 o'clock yesterday morning, taking up two hours and a half. He covered in detail the history of the Indianapolis National Bank and its unfortunate connection with the Indianapolis Cabinet Company. Mr. Corr's statement was substantially as follows:

The records of the bank show that the Indianapolis Cabinet Company has been indebted to it for about \$200,000. Notwithstanding a federal law which forbids a national bank to loan to any one company to the amount of more than 10 per cent. of the bank's capital stock, yet in 1884 the bank had loaned the cabinet company \$30,000, which was above the 10 per cent. limit.

The members of the jury each carried a palm-leaf fan when they fled into the box at 2 o'clock, and managed to keep themselves reasonably comfortable.

Elmer Corr, assistant district attorney, made the opening statement for the government, at 9 o'clock yesterday morning, taking up two hours and a half. He covered in detail the history of the Indianapolis National Bank and its unfortunate connection with the Indianapolis Cabinet Company. Mr. Corr's statement was substantially as follows:

The records of the bank show that the Indianapolis Cabinet Company has been indebted to it for about \$200,000. Notwithstanding a federal law which forbids a national bank to loan to any one company to the amount of more than 10 per cent. of the bank's capital stock, yet in 1884 the bank had loaned the cabinet company \$30,000, which was above the 10 per cent. limit.

The members of the jury each carried a palm-leaf fan when they fled into the box at 2 o'clock, and managed to keep themselves reasonably comfortable.

Elmer Corr, assistant district attorney, made the opening statement for the government, at 9 o'clock yesterday morning, taking up two hours and a half. He covered in detail the history of the Indianapolis National Bank and its unfortunate connection with the Indianapolis Cabinet Company. Mr. Corr's statement was substantially as follows:

The records of the bank show that the Indianapolis Cabinet Company has been indebted to it for about \$200,000. Notwithstanding a federal law which forbids a national bank to loan to any one company to the amount of more than 10 per cent. of the bank's capital stock, yet in 1884 the bank had loaned the cabinet company \$30,000, which was above the 10 per cent. limit.

The members of the jury each carried a palm-leaf fan when they fled into the box at 2 o'clock, and managed to keep themselves reasonably comfortable.

Elmer Corr, assistant district attorney, made the opening statement for the government, at 9 o'clock yesterday morning, taking up two hours and a half. He covered in detail the history of the Indianapolis National Bank and its unfortunate connection with the Indianapolis Cabinet Company. Mr. Corr's statement was substantially as follows:

The records of the bank show that the Indianapolis Cabinet Company has been indebted to it for about \$200,000. Notwithstanding a federal law which forbids a national bank to loan to any one company to the amount of more than 10 per cent. of the bank's capital stock, yet in 1884 the bank had loaned the cabinet company \$30,000, which was above the 10 per cent. limit.

The members of the jury each carried a palm-leaf fan when they fled into the box at 2 o'clock, and managed to keep themselves reasonably comfortable.

Elmer Corr, assistant district attorney, made the opening statement for the government, at 9 o'clock yesterday morning, taking up two hours and a half. He covered in detail the history of the Indianapolis National Bank and its unfortunate connection with the Indianapolis Cabinet Company. Mr. Corr's statement was substantially as follows:

The records of the bank show that the Indianapolis Cabinet Company has been indebted to it for about \$200,000. Notwithstanding a federal law which forbids a national bank to loan to any one company to the amount of more than 10 per cent. of the bank's capital stock, yet in 1884 the bank had loaned the cabinet company \$30,000, which was above the 10 per cent. limit.

The members of the jury each carried a palm-leaf fan when they fled into the box at 2 o'clock, and managed to keep themselves reasonably comfortable.

Elmer Corr, assistant district attorney, made the opening statement for the government, at 9 o'clock yesterday morning, taking up two hours and a half. He covered in detail the history of the Indianapolis National Bank and its unfortunate connection with the Indianapolis Cabinet Company. Mr. Corr's statement was substantially as follows:

The records of the bank show that the Indianapolis Cabinet Company has been indebted to it for about \$200,000. Notwithstanding a federal law which forbids a national bank to loan to any one company to the amount of more than 10 per cent. of the bank's capital stock, yet in 1884 the bank had loaned the cabinet company \$30,000, which was above the 10 per cent. limit.

The members of the jury each carried a palm-leaf fan when they fled into the box at 2 o'clock, and managed to keep themselves reasonably comfortable.

Elmer Corr, assistant district attorney, made the opening statement for the government, at 9 o'clock yesterday morning, taking up two hours and a half. He covered in detail the history of the Indianapolis National Bank and its unfortunate connection with the Indianapolis Cabinet Company. Mr. Corr's statement was substantially as follows:

The records of the bank show that the Indianapolis Cabinet Company has been indebted to it for about \$200,000. Notwithstanding a federal law which forbids a national bank to loan to any one company to the amount of more than 10 per cent. of the bank's capital stock, yet in 1884 the bank had loaned the cabinet company \$30,000, which was above the 10 per cent. limit.

The members of the jury each carried a palm-leaf fan when they fled into the box at 2 o'clock, and managed to keep themselves reasonably comfortable.

Elmer Corr, assistant district attorney, made the opening statement for the government, at 9 o'clock yesterday morning, taking up two hours and a half. He covered in detail the history of the Indianapolis National Bank and its unfortunate connection with the Indianapolis Cabinet Company. Mr. Corr's statement was substantially as follows:

The records of the bank show that the Indianapolis Cabinet Company has been indebted to it for about \$200,000. Notwithstanding a federal law which forbids a national bank to loan to any one company to the amount of more than 10 per cent. of the bank's capital stock, yet in 1884 the bank had loaned the cabinet company \$30,000, which was above the 10 per cent. limit.

The members of the jury each carried a palm-leaf fan when they fled into the box at 2 o'clock, and managed to keep themselves reasonably comfortable.

Elmer Corr, assistant district attorney, made the opening statement for the government, at 9 o'clock yesterday morning, taking up two hours and a half. He covered in detail the history of the Indianapolis National Bank and its unfortunate connection with the Indianapolis Cabinet Company. Mr. Corr's statement was substantially as follows:

The records of the bank show that the Indianapolis Cabinet Company has been indebted to it for about \$200,000. Notwithstanding a federal law which forbids a national bank to loan to any one company to the amount of more than 10 per cent. of the bank's capital stock, yet in 1884 the bank had loaned the cabinet company \$30,000, which was above the 10 per cent. limit.

The members of the jury each carried a palm-leaf fan when they fled into the box at 2 o'clock, and managed to keep themselves reasonably comfortable.

Elmer Corr, assistant district attorney, made the opening statement for the government, at 9 o'clock yesterday morning, taking up two hours and a half. He covered in detail the history of the Indianapolis National Bank and its unfortunate connection with the Indianapolis Cabinet Company. Mr. Corr's statement was substantially as follows:

The records of the bank show that the Indianapolis Cabinet Company has been indebted to it for about \$200,000. Notwithstanding a federal law which forbids a national bank to loan to any one company to the amount of more than 10 per cent. of the bank's capital stock, yet in 1884 the bank had loaned the cabinet company \$30,000, which was above the 10 per cent. limit.

The members of the jury each carried a palm-leaf fan when they fled into the box at 2 o'clock, and managed to keep themselves reasonably comfortable.

Elmer Corr, assistant district attorney, made the opening statement for the government, at 9 o'clock yesterday morning, taking up two hours and a half. He covered in detail the history of the Indianapolis National Bank and its unfortunate connection with the Indianapolis Cabinet Company. Mr. Corr's statement was substantially as follows:

The records of the bank show that the Indianapolis Cabinet Company has been indebted to it for about \$200,000. Notwithstanding a federal law which forbids a national bank to loan to any one company to the amount of more than 10 per cent. of the bank's capital stock, yet in 1884 the bank had loaned the cabinet company \$30,000, which was above the 10 per cent. limit.

The members of the jury each carried a palm-leaf fan when they fled into the box at 2 o'clock, and managed to keep themselves reasonably comfortable.

Elmer Corr, assistant district attorney, made the opening statement for the government, at 9 o'clock yesterday morning, taking up two hours and a half. He covered in detail the history of the Indianapolis National Bank and its unfortunate connection with the Indianapolis Cabinet Company. Mr. Corr's statement was substantially as follows:

The records of the bank show that the Indianapolis Cabinet Company has been indebted to it for about \$200,000. Notwithstanding a federal law which forbids a national bank to loan to any one company to the amount of more than 10 per cent. of the bank's capital stock, yet in 1884 the bank had loaned the cabinet company \$30,000, which was above the 10 per cent. limit.

The members of the jury each carried a palm-leaf fan when they fled into the box at 2 o'clock, and managed to keep themselves reasonably comfortable.

Elmer Corr, assistant district attorney, made the opening statement for the government, at 9 o'clock yesterday morning, taking up two hours and a half. He covered in detail the history of the Indianapolis National Bank and its unfortunate connection with the Indianapolis Cabinet Company. Mr. Corr's statement was substantially as follows:

The records of the bank show that the Indianapolis Cabinet Company has been indebted to it for about \$200,000. Notwithstanding a federal law which forbids a national bank to loan to any one company to the amount of more than 10 per cent. of the bank's capital stock, yet in 1884 the bank had loaned the cabinet company \$30,000, which was above the 10 per cent. limit.

The members of the jury each carried a palm-leaf fan when they fled into the box at 2 o'clock, and managed to keep themselves reasonably comfortable.

Elmer Corr, assistant district attorney, made the opening statement for the government, at 9 o'clock yesterday morning, taking up two hours and a half. He covered in detail the history of the Indianapolis National Bank and its unfortunate connection with the Indianapolis Cabinet Company. Mr. Corr's statement was substantially as follows:

The records of the bank show that the Indianapolis Cabinet Company has been indebted to it for about \$200,000. Notwithstanding a federal law which forbids a national bank to loan to any one company to the amount of more than 10 per cent. of the bank's capital stock, yet in 1884 the bank had loaned the cabinet company \$30,000, which was above the 10 per cent. limit.

The members of the jury each carried a palm-leaf fan when they fled into the box at 2 o'clock, and managed to keep themselves reasonably comfortable.

Elmer Corr, assistant district attorney, made the opening statement for the government, at 9 o'clock yesterday morning, taking up two hours and a half. He covered in detail the history of the Indianapolis National Bank and its unfortunate connection with the Indianapolis Cabinet Company. Mr. Corr's statement was substantially as follows:

The records of the bank show that the Indianapolis Cabinet Company has been indebted to it for about \$200,000. Notwithstanding a federal law which forbids a national bank to loan to any one company to the amount of more than 10 per cent. of the bank's capital stock, yet in 1884 the bank had loaned the cabinet company \$30,000, which was above the 10 per cent. limit.

organization of the cabinet company and its branches. The articles of association of each of the concerns were read to the jury.

The stand by the government at 2 o'clock. He came to Indianapolis July 24, 1885, in response to a telegram from the Controller of the Currency. He took possession of the Indianapolis National Bank July 28 and continued in control until Aug. 12. The witness found a large amount of paper belonging to the cabinet company, and a considerable amount was past due and he sent for Francis A. Coffin. The latter came to the bank and they discussed the affairs of the institution. The examiner called attention to \$18,000 worth of unpaid paper belonging to the cabinet company. Mr. Coffin said that on account of the tightness of the money market he had been unable to raise the money to make arrangements for credit at other banks. Mr. Coffin further declared that the Indianapolis Cabinet Company was solvent. Mr. Young remarked that it looked to a stranger, as if the cabinet company had been organized for the purpose of getting money out of the bank. Mr. Coffin said that he had made a mortgage to Theodore Haughey, as trustee, for the purpose of securing the money.

He also told Mr. Young that \$200,000 worth of bonds had been raised on the mortgage.

"I had counted the bonds," continued the witness, "and found one of two missing. Mr. Coffin said they had been sent over to London for the purpose of negotiating loans; they could not be mortgaged here."

"Did you find much unreturned paper?" asked attorney Kern.

"Oh, Lord bless you, I found lots of that," replied the witness. The approximate amount of unreturned paper of the Indianapolis Cabinet Company and the Office Furniture Company was \$37,346. All the money on the account of the Bank Examiner Young was cross-examined briefly by attorney Winter. He said that \$200,000 worth of bonds were found in the safe by bookkeeper Golt.

ROBINSON ON THE STAND.

Lewis J. Robinson, for nine years an employe of the Indianapolis National Bank, succeeded Bank Examiner Young on the witness stand. Mr. Robinson's testimony was of an expert character and a great deal of the ground covered by him in the former trial was gone over. Once during the testimony of the witness a smart tiff occurred between Mr. Winter and the court. The attorney objected to some part of the evidence and the court refused to sustain the objection in ruling on the question.

"We ask to have the court's language stricken out of the evidence," said Mr. Winter, rising abruptly.

"I didn't catch what the court said," replied stenographer Evans.

"Then I'll try to repeat it," said Mr. Winter. "I understood the court to say that he was not disposed to defeat the ends of justice by sustaining objections of a hyper-critical character."

"Counsel has misstated the court's language," interrupted Judge Baker in an annoyed tone.

"Then, will the court repeat his remarks?" asked the attorney.

"The court does not repeat, sir," retorted Judge Baker, and the case proceeded.

Mr. Robinson said that he was receiving teller of the Indianapolis National Bank July 4, 1883. He was familiar with the account of the Indianapolis Cabinet Company at that time. He was familiar with the condition of the company's account March 1, 1883. Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883. Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

Mr. Winter objected to the introduction of evidence concerning the first account of the company's account March 1, 1883.

News, and Mrs. Ross. The instrument is attested by E. M. DeFrees and Mrs. Kate O'Brien.

THE COURT RECORD.

Superior Court. Room 1—John L. McMaster, Judge. Addie M. Campbell vs. Frank Doyle et al.; foreclosure. Judgment for plaintiff for \$100.

David Comstock vs. A. M. Jackson; on note. Judgment for plaintiff for \$24.72. Joseph Stevens vs. John Gesshoff et al.; damages. On trial by jury.

Room 3—Piny W. Bartholomew, Judge. James Thacher vs. Sarah Summit; on contract. Dismissed at plaintiff's cost. S. A. Johnson vs. Street-railroad Company; damages. On trial by jury.

Circuit Court. Hon. Edgar A. Brown, Judge. City of Indianapolis vs. the Pabst Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost. City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost.

City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost. City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost.

City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost. City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost.

City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost. City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost.

City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost. City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost.

City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost. City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost.

City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost. City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost.

City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost. City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost.

City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost. City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost.

City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost. City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost.

City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost. City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost.

City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost. City of Indianapolis vs. the Terre Haute Brewing Company. Dismissed at defendant's cost.