

THE COURTS.

Important Law Proceedings Yesterday.

A Bankrupt Perjury Case—Counterfeiting—Frauds on the Revenue—Minty at Sea—The Robber Policemen—The Case of the Patent Divorce Man—A Domestic Quarrel.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT.

Alleged Perjury Bankruptcy Case.

The United States vs. John M. Moorhead. The defendant in this case was arrested on a warrant issued on the affidavit of Domestics G. Scodell, under the following circumstances, as set forth in an affidavit:—Scodell, in the month of February, 1868, died a natural bankrupt, which was duly heard and judgment entered thereon; that in the month of March following he died his further petition for discharge according to the provisions of the act of bankruptcy, the creditors being duly apprised of the proceedings in the matter; that on the 29th day of April was assigned for the hearing of the petition and that on the day of such return one of the creditors, George Scodell, a resident of the town of New York, appeared and opposed his discharge, and on the hearing of said case produced the defendant, Moorhead, a witness in support of the allegations set forth in his affidavit.

UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS' COURT.

The Patzer Counterfeiting Case.

Courad Patzer, Sr., the lithographer, at No. 212 William street, who was charged with having been engaged in printing large quantities of counterfeit stamped checks, has waited an examination and held to answer the action of the Grand Jury, His son, Courad Patzer, Jr., who was charged with his father, but allowed to go on his own recognizance, will probably be used as a government witness in the trial.

Charge of Blanking False Entries—A Distillery Case.

A warrant was yesterday issued for the arrest of a rectifying distiller, doing business in Brooklyn, on the affidavit of revenue agent Koop, and which charges that the party named therein did make and sell counterfeit spirits, and that he had provided to be kept by the rectifying book law. The warrant was placed in the hands of the proper officers.

Alleged Offense on the High Seas and Counterfeiting Charge.

The defendant examined into the charge of assault and cruelty preferred against W. Heath, mate of the clipper ship Gamecock, was continued yesterday. A number of witnesses were examined, but no evidence establishing the mate or any of the officers was adduced; but, on the contrary, it was shown by the testimony of the witnesses for the defendant that the mate was a man of good character and necessary, the crew being in a state of mutiny. On this showing Mr. W. H. Stephens, counsel for the mate, moved for a discharge, and the purpose of hearing the case was postponed regarding the competency of the complainants in the dock to swear the officers and seize the ship.

SUPREME COURT—SPECIAL TERM.

A Stay of Proceedings to the Policemen Sentenced to Sing Sing for Five Years Deceased.

The People vs. Manning and Remsen.—Judge Carozzo delivered the opinion of the court in this case yesterday. He said:—The principal ground upon which the prisoners rely is the supposed error in the charge upon the subject of the effect to be given to the evidence of good character. The whole charge is to be taken together, and I think it can hardly be said that the jury could have been misled. The learned Judge charged the proposition of the prisoner's counsel, that the charge is to be considered by the jury like every other fact in the case, no matter what the other testimony may be. It is not to be taken as a fact, but as a circumstance which may be taken into consideration by the jury, and it is only in cases where you have a reasonable doubt, a doubt logically arrived at, that evidence of good character steps in, and then it becomes your duty, unless you are directed to the contrary, to give a verdict in favor of the prisoner. It is not to be taken as a fact, but as a circumstance which may be taken into consideration by the jury, and it is only in cases where you have a reasonable doubt, a doubt logically arrived at, that evidence of good character steps in, and then it becomes your duty, unless you are directed to the contrary, to give a verdict in favor of the prisoner.

JAMAICA.

The Jamaica Church Disestablished and Dissolved—Dismissal of the Clergy—Change in Jurisdiction of Courts.

On Friday last the country was startled by the somewhat unexpected intelligence that the Church in Jamaica would be completely disestablished and dissolved. The news was first given on that day (Friday) the Governor in his place in the Legislative Council officially announced the fact, and that the Secretary of State for the colonies had decided that no measures should be introduced into the Jamaica Legislature which would, in effect, confer any rights or privileges on the Church of England not equally enjoyed by all other denominations in the country. The effect of this decision is that in a little more than three weeks every officiating minister, not excepting those who were left to provide for themselves, their claims upon the public treasury ceasing at the end of the year. The incumbents will be permitted to die out or be purchased off. The catechists, school teachers and clergy generally, with the few exceptions referred to, will now have to make their own way, and their past dependence upon the Government, have not been such as to render them favorites among the people or deserving of any special consideration.

LETTER FROM THE LATE EDWIN M. STANTON.

His Self-Reliance and Firm Trust in Providence. The following letter of Edwin M. Stanton, written to his friend James Kennedy Moorhead, late Representative in Congress from the Pittsburg (Pa.) district, on the 17th of November, was read by Mr. Moorhead at a recent meeting in that city:—My strength restored, I shall need help from no one beyond the vigorous cordial of friendship and good wishes of good people like yourself, of which, thank God, I have no lack. In respect to the subscription you mention and the generosity of the people of Pittsburg, I have no doubts of their promptness to respond; but I know of no opportunity to evince it; but I know of no opportunity that could reconcile me to it while I am dependent for my daily bread by daily labor and short of starvation of my family. To such extremity I hope never to reach. Although my health and the short term of service that I may enjoy, and my professional prosperity and social comfort, have been lost, I have not to be without my "good to march on," however rugged the path may be. I am, however, firmly convinced that you and yours is the earnest prayer of your sincere friend, To Hon. J. K. MOORHEAD.

SUPREME COURT—GENERAL TERM.

Examinations of Husband and Wife—A Domestic Quarrel.

On Monday last the court heard the examination of the defendant in the case of the Patent Divorce Man, who was charged with having been engaged in printing large quantities of counterfeit stamped checks, and who was charged with having been engaged in printing large quantities of counterfeit stamped checks, and who was charged with having been engaged in printing large quantities of counterfeit stamped checks.

Supervisors vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

FINANCIAL AND COMMERCIAL.

Monday, Jan. 3—P. M.

To-day being the first business day of the new year much curiosity was manifested as to the course which the different markets would take.

COURT OF GENERAL SESSION.

Opening of the January Term—A Commercial Traveller Charged with Embezzlement and Heur to the State Prison.

Before Judge Hoeford.

The January term of this Court was opened yesterday, His Honor Judge Hoeford presiding. Assistant District Attorney Fellows appeared for the prosecution.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT.

Alleged Perjury Bankruptcy Case.

The United States vs. John M. Moorhead. The defendant in this case was arrested on a warrant issued on the affidavit of Domestics G. Scodell, under the following circumstances, as set forth in an affidavit:—Scodell, in the month of February, 1868, died a natural bankrupt, which was duly heard and judgment entered thereon; that in the month of March following he died his further petition for discharge according to the provisions of the act of bankruptcy, the creditors being duly apprised of the proceedings in the matter; that on the 29th day of April was assigned for the hearing of the petition and that on the day of such return one of the creditors, George Scodell, a resident of the town of New York, appeared and opposed his discharge, and on the hearing of said case produced the defendant, Moorhead, a witness in support of the allegations set forth in his affidavit.

UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS' COURT.

The Patzer Counterfeiting Case.

Courad Patzer, Sr., the lithographer, at No. 212 William street, who was charged with having been engaged in printing large quantities of counterfeit stamped checks, has waited an examination and held to answer the action of the Grand Jury, His son, Courad Patzer, Jr., who was charged with his father, but allowed to go on his own recognizance, will probably be used as a government witness in the trial.

Charge of Blanking False Entries—A Distillery Case.

A warrant was yesterday issued for the arrest of a rectifying distiller, doing business in Brooklyn, on the affidavit of revenue agent Koop, and which charges that the party named therein did make and sell counterfeit spirits, and that he had provided to be kept by the rectifying book law. The warrant was placed in the hands of the proper officers.

Alleged Offense on the High Seas and Counterfeiting Charge.

The defendant examined into the charge of assault and cruelty preferred against W. Heath, mate of the clipper ship Gamecock, was continued yesterday. A number of witnesses were examined, but no evidence establishing the mate or any of the officers was adduced; but, on the contrary, it was shown by the testimony of the witnesses for the defendant that the mate was a man of good character and necessary, the crew being in a state of mutiny. On this showing Mr. W. H. Stephens, counsel for the mate, moved for a discharge, and the purpose of hearing the case was postponed regarding the competency of the complainants in the dock to swear the officers and seize the ship.

SUPREME COURT—SPECIAL TERM.

A Stay of Proceedings to the Policemen Sentenced to Sing Sing for Five Years Deceased.

The People vs. Manning and Remsen.—Judge Carozzo delivered the opinion of the court in this case yesterday. He said:—The principal ground upon which the prisoners rely is the supposed error in the charge upon the subject of the effect to be given to the evidence of good character. The whole charge is to be taken together, and I think it can hardly be said that the jury could have been misled. The learned Judge charged the proposition of the prisoner's counsel, that the charge is to be considered by the jury like every other fact in the case, no matter what the other testimony may be. It is not to be taken as a fact, but as a circumstance which may be taken into consideration by the jury, and it is only in cases where you have a reasonable doubt, a doubt logically arrived at, that evidence of good character steps in, and then it becomes your duty, unless you are directed to the contrary, to give a verdict in favor of the prisoner. It is not to be taken as a fact, but as a circumstance which may be taken into consideration by the jury, and it is only in cases where you have a reasonable doubt, a doubt logically arrived at, that evidence of good character steps in, and then it becomes your duty, unless you are directed to the contrary, to give a verdict in favor of the prisoner.

JAMAICA.

The Jamaica Church Disestablished and Dissolved—Dismissal of the Clergy—Change in Jurisdiction of Courts.

On Friday last the country was startled by the somewhat unexpected intelligence that the Church in Jamaica would be completely disestablished and dissolved. The news was first given on that day (Friday) the Governor in his place in the Legislative Council officially announced the fact, and that the Secretary of State for the colonies had decided that no measures should be introduced into the Jamaica Legislature which would, in effect, confer any rights or privileges on the Church of England not equally enjoyed by all other denominations in the country. The effect of this decision is that in a little more than three weeks every officiating minister, not excepting those who were left to provide for themselves, their claims upon the public treasury ceasing at the end of the year. The incumbents will be permitted to die out or be purchased off. The catechists, school teachers and clergy generally, with the few exceptions referred to, will now have to make their own way, and their past dependence upon the Government, have not been such as to render them favorites among the people or deserving of any special consideration.

LETTER FROM THE LATE EDWIN M. STANTON.

His Self-Reliance and Firm Trust in Providence. The following letter of Edwin M. Stanton, written to his friend James Kennedy Moorhead, late Representative in Congress from the Pittsburg (Pa.) district, on the 17th of November, was read by Mr. Moorhead at a recent meeting in that city:—My strength restored, I shall need help from no one beyond the vigorous cordial of friendship and good wishes of good people like yourself, of which, thank God, I have no lack. In respect to the subscription you mention and the generosity of the people of Pittsburg, I have no doubts of their promptness to respond; but I know of no opportunity to evince it; but I know of no opportunity that could reconcile me to it while I am dependent for my daily bread by daily labor and short of starvation of my family. To such extremity I hope never to reach. Although my health and the short term of service that I may enjoy, and my professional prosperity and social comfort, have been lost, I have not to be without my "good to march on," however rugged the path may be. I am, however, firmly convinced that you and yours is the earnest prayer of your sincere friend, To Hon. J. K. MOORHEAD.

SUPREME COURT—GENERAL TERM.

Examinations of Husband and Wife—A Domestic Quarrel.

On Monday last the court heard the examination of the defendant in the case of the Patent Divorce Man, who was charged with having been engaged in printing large quantities of counterfeit stamped checks, and who was charged with having been engaged in printing large quantities of counterfeit stamped checks, and who was charged with having been engaged in printing large quantities of counterfeit stamped checks.

Supervisors vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.

Supervisor vs. Brown.—Petitioner is entitled to an order directing the Chamberlain to pay over the amount of taxes, with interest, upon proof of the payment of the same by petitioner.