Law Courts.

SUPREME COURT—In Equity—*Margaret Burdell, by her next friend, vs. John Burdell.*—It appears from the testimony that the complainant married the defendant in the town of Greenburgh, Westchester County, on the 1st of May, 1844, and lived with him as his wife until about the month of April, 1846, when he left her without any cause, and without any provocation on her part, and has never since cohabited with her, or any of the issue of the marriage, or contributed to their support or maintenance. He has visited her at her residence, at all hours of the night, and at all times, and walked out with her by day and by night, and she has been with her as often and as freely as he came to see the children, and he has never since the marriage, I have no doubt, therefore, doubted that she was his wife. Decree for the complainant.—Mr. Hall for the defendant to be committed to the custody of the Sheriff.

[*Extract from Judge Edmond's Decree.*

☞ It appears that the father has not been able to obtain the child, or not, on account of their being secreted from his knowledge and out of the County.

The father, who resides at No. 2 Union square, would feel thankful if any one who would drop him a line informing him of their whereabouts.

COURT OF OYER AND TERMINER.—*Jacob Heifer* was arraigned on a charge of assault in having killed Patrick Colgan, aged 14 years, a driver, corner of Fourth-avenue and Thirty-third-st., with a club. He was young, rather genteel looking man, about 21 or 22 years of age. He put in a plea of "Not Guilty."—Mr. Hall and Col. Jack appeared for the prisoner. Owing to the want of time on the part of counsel for preparation, the trial was postponed.

SUPERIOR COURT—Before Judge Sandford.—*Samson Carter vs. Stephen Johnson and Rob. Lowden.*—Action which was tried before the referee, Mr. Hoffman, to recover damages, amounting to 1,000 gallons, sent on freight to Rotterdam, but gas arrived, and the question was whether or not board of test. The jury awarded they had been broken on board on board Rotterdam's vessel.—Mr. Mead appeared for the plaintiff, and Mr. *Brown & Livingston* for the defendants.—*Mr. Mead vs. Brown & Livingston.*—In this case the whole amount the value of a quantity of goods, and sailing thereby paid the freight, and in the course of R. & L. at the time it was thrown by the great fire on Broad-st. in 1845. R. & L. having thereby paid the freight, and the goods were so damaged by the fire and water damage. It is contended by plaintiff that R. & L. were bound to have them insured, instead, it being a carrier, and that there was a special agreement to insure for those parties. A verdict was rendered for the plaintiff.—Mr. Mead appeared for the plaintiff, and Mr. Brown for the defendants.

SUPERIOR COURT—Before Judge Sandford.—*Samson Carter vs. Stephen Johnson and Rob. Lowden.*—Action which was tried before the referee, Mr. Hoffman, to recover damages, amounting to 1,000 gallons, sent on freight to Rotterdam, but gas arrived, and the question was whether or not board of test. The jury awarded they had been broken on board on board Rotterdam's vessel.—Mr. Mead appeared for the plaintiff, and Mr. *Brown & Livingston* for the defendants.—*Mr. Mead vs. Brown & Livingston.*—In this case the whole amount the value of a quantity of goods, and sailing thereby paid the freight, and in the course of R. & L. at the time it was thrown by the great fire on Broad-st. in 1845. R. & L. having thereby paid the freight, and the goods were so damaged by the fire and water damage. It is contended by plaintiff that R. & L. were bound to have them insured, instead, it being a carrier, and that there was a special agreement to insure for those parties. A verdict was rendered for the plaintiff.—Mr. Mead appeared for the plaintiff, and Mr. Brown for the defendants.

CIRCUIT COURT—Before Judge Edwards.—*In the matter of the will of Mary Hogan.*—This was a legacy case to contest the validity of the will of the late Mrs. Hogan, who died a bachelorette. It appeared on the ground that Mr. Tweed was for 40 years the agent of the deceased, and that he was a person of great influence over her, and that after obtaining the will and that a power of attorney, he was the earliest recorded; that he was the agent of the deceased, and that he was the earliest recorded; that he was the agent of the deceased, and that he was the earliest recorded; that he was the agent of the deceased, and that