COUNTERFEITING.

Continuation of the Trial of Miner, the Alleged Counterfeiter.

EXTRAORDINARY DEVELOPMENTS.

Colonel Whitley, Chief of the Secret Service Department, Going Bail for a Convicted Seller of Bogus Money.

The trial of Joshua D. Miner, charged with having counterfeit money and counterfeit plates for printing the same in his possession, was resumed yesterday in the United States Circuit Court, before Judge Bendict. The court room was very much crowded throughout the day.

Mr. Pierrepont, Mr. Purdy and Mr. De Kay conducted the prosecution on behalf of the government, and Miner was defended by Mr. Fullerton and Mr. Benjamin K. Phelps.

CONTINUATION OF THE EVIDENCE OF HENRY C. COLE.

Henry C. Cole was recalled and further examined for the prosecution by Mr. Pierrepont. In reply to questions by that gentleman he said:—I have sold counterfeit money; I did not pass it; always sold it to wholesale dealers; I went to Miner's stable some time in June last; he told me that his wife died at eleven o'clock that day; I bought of him that evening $24,000 in counterfeit money, and paid him $1,900 for it in good money the following day; I believe his wife was lying dead in the house when he paid me the money; I went to Montgomery county, Pennsylvania, to reside two years ago last July; I have a farm there now; Miner did not come there; I think I made Miner's acquaintance up at his house a little over eight years ago; I have met him a great many times.

Cross-examined by Mr. Fullerton—I resided at Albany when I was convicted and sentenced to the State Prison; before that I resided in Orleans county, New York, several years, seven or eight I think; my age is forty-seven; I have resided in Genesee county, New York; I was born there; I think I lived one winter, in 1851, in Buffalo; I think I have now stated all the places I have resided in before I was convicted at Albany; I do not think I was charged with crime before I was convicted at Albany; I decline to answer if I had been charged with counterfeiting before the counterfeiting for which I was convicted at Albany; I resided at Thirty-seventh street, New York, three or four months; then I went to Fifty-ninth street; lived there eight or nine months; after that I lived six or seven months at Sixty-seventh street; I think I went next to Fifty-seventh street; then I went to Eighty-ninth street; that was in 1863, and I lived there until 1868; in 1868, I think, I went to Pennsylvania, and resided there until April, when I came to New York, and lived in Eighty-fourth street; I object to answer as to how long I had been out of prison before I again commenced counterfeiting; I think I got acquainted with Miner about eight years ago, but I have no distinct recollection of it; I do not know a man of the name of Thomas Ballard; saw a man at 32 Bleecker street, who was pointed out to me as Ballard, on the night of Miner's arrest; I was not arrested that night; on the 10th of October I was arrested in my house at 310 Eighty-fourth street, by Colonel Whitley and two of his men, for passing counterfeit money; I was arrested in the night time; 32 Bleecker street is Colonel Whitley's office; I remained three nights in Colonel Whitley's office; I gave bail before

JOHN L. DAVENPORT

in Colonel Whitley's office;

COLONEL WHITLEY BECAME BAIL

for me in the sum of $10,000; I did not hand him money, but gave him

SECURITY OF A HOUSE AND LOT

situated in Eighty-fourth street; my wife did not execute the deed; she was living with me at the time;

ONE OF COLONEL WHITLEY'S MEN DREW THE DEED,

which is recorded; the house and lot are valued at $10,000; Davenport drew the bail bond; Colonel Whitley promised me to have my liberty if I executed the deed; he said I would not be prosecuted; I think there were some persons present then, but I am not sure.

Q. Do you believe that, in case Miner is convicted, you will be discharged? A. I did not promise to convict him; I cannot answer that question; I do not intend to claim anything about protection if Miner is convicted; this

ARRANGEMENT WAS MADE WITH WHITLEY

between the 10th and 13th of October, and the first thing I told him, in pursuance of that arrangement, was from whom I got the counterfeit money; on the evening of the 10th of October I received from David Keene, at my house, $700 of good money, that was marked.

Q. Were you not convicted and sent to the State Prison in Pennsylvania? A. No, sir; I was never confined in Pittsburg Penitentiary for any crime; I never was in Sing Sing Prison.

Q. What time in the evening of the 25th October did you go to Miner's house? A. At about ten minutes before seven; arrived at the stable at ten minutes before seven, the time I agreed to meet him; being ahead of time, and it raining hard, I went down to Miner's house; the arrangement to meet him at the stable was made at his house on Sunday, the 22d of October; Mr. Miner was not there when I got to the house; I saw his wife and Charles Miner, and I think Mr. Slivey and his wife; Mr. Miner came home about twelve o'clock that day; I remained in the house some three or four hours, and as I was going away made the arrangement to meet him at the stable on the following Wednesday evening.

Q. Did you tell Miner that you had put up $10,000 with Whiteley, and that you could not get it back unless you returned some plates? A. No; no conversation occurred in Miner's house that day between Mr. Miner and myself and a Mr. Fox to the effect that I had got into a scrape with regard to Whiteley, and that I wanted Miner to get me out of it; on that day Miner said he could get the plates for $1,500, and that he would meet me at the stable; he did not say he would give me the plates; had asked him before that, while he was making a sewer in Ninth avenue, what he would give me the $10 and $2 plates for; he said he could not say, but would see his man and find out; again, before Sunday, the 22d, I saw him and he told me the plates could not be got under $2,000; I said that was too much, and would give him $1,600 for them; when I went to the house, on the 25th of October, Mr. Elliott did not open the door for me, I think; some one came to the door and let me in; when I entered the house I had not that ten dollar plate in my possession; I never had it in my possession; as I went into the front basement I saw a policeman speaking to Miner about a cart standing up in the street; Miner and I left the kitchen, and he walked out and down the street towards Sixty-second street, near Broadway; Miner asked me to drop behind; we met one of Whiteley's officers, Kennoch, on the sidewalk we were on.

To the Court—I went first into the basement from the street, and turned into the first room; Charles Miner was there; I then went into the kitchen; Mr. Miner was there, sitting at the stove; he put on his coat and came out with me into the street; did not meet a man at the gate of Miner's house as we passed out; I do not remember meeting persons named Van Houghton and Wessel, or them walking with myself and Miner; when we were walking down the Boulevard Miner asked me to fall behind him; I did not get behind Miner at the time; I fell back without his requesting me to do so. He walked on fast and got twenty-five or thirty feet ahead of me; he went in the neighborhood of Sixty-second street; I was walking then towards Fifty-ninth street towards the Boulevard.

Q. What did you first see when you fell behind? A. I saw a man standing on the south side of Sixty-first street with a package in his hand; he was on the unfinished side of the street; I saw the man standing there; I did not see him come up to the place; the package was done up in a buff cover.

Q. When you first saw the man with the buff package in his hand, how far was he from you? A. About sixty feet; the night was dark and rainy; I could see very distinctly; Miner approached this man and held his umbrella over him; I did not see this man hand a package to Miner; they remained together about a minute, when Miner came towards me and handed me the buff package; I do not know who the other man was; as Miner came toward me I went to the lamp at the east side of the street; he wanted to give me the package, but I told him to keep it until I got him the money; as he was about to hand me the money the officer seized him; Minor got the money, but I did not get the plates; the green covering on the package now is not the covering that I saw on the package that night; I do not recollect swearing yesterday that the green cloth is the same that I saw that night; I had retired about one hundred feet from the officer and Miner when they were struggling; think Minor threw the officer on the start; did not hear Mr. Miner say, "Do you want to rob me?" the officer, Kennock, had overpowered Miner before the other officer, Applegate, came up; I never had that package in my possession and never threw it down at the feet of Miner while the struggle was going on; I never saw Ballard until I was arrested on the 25th of October; never was acquainted with Ballard; Miner has been a contractor, to my knowledge, for about two years; I never made overtures to a man named Salmon, an inspector on the works, that he could do better by going into the counterfeiting business; never made an offer to him that he could do better by putting a package in Miner's house, and Salmon never made the reply, "Do you think I am a damned fool?"

Q. Was your wife ever arrested for passing counterfeit money? A. I object to answer that question.

Q. Was your son ever arrested for that offence? A. I have no son.

Q. Your stepson? A. He may have been, I do not know; in 1869 I went over to Taylor's Hotel, Jersey City, and had a conversation with Colonel Wood about my wife and son, who were arrested for counterfeiting; that conversation was in December, 1869; they were not arrested for passing counterfeit money printed from this $10 and this $2 plate.

Q. Did you not say to Wood that you would deliver up this $10, $2 and $20 plate and a fifty cent currency plate if he would let your wife and son go? A. No; nor did I ask Wood for money to buy out the interest of other persons in these plates; Wood, in any of these interviews, did not, I think, mention the name of Miner. The witness was here cross-examined as to the various times he bought counterfeit money from Miner. On one occasion he said he took a man named John Shoner up with him to Miner's works to see what transpired between the witness and Miner in reference to the purchase of counterfeit money; he did not tell him what his object was in bringing him up, and the package of bogus money that Miner threw into witness' wagon was marked by Shoner with his initials. [One package of counterfeit money, containing $5,000, was here handed to witness, and he said he could not identify it as the one he got from Miner on the 17th of October.] He had neither counted nor marked the money; the understanding was that he was to give witness a package of $10 counterfeit bills, and he could not say whether there were any $2 or $20 bills among them; the twos were generally stuck into the middle of the package; on the following day he paid Miner $500 for the bills; that good money was not marked; I got that $500 from David Keene by a check, payable to bearer, on the Grocer's National Bank, in Barclay street; I think I got that money from the bank on the 18th of October, between ten and two o'clock; I am sure that the money I got from the bank I paid to Miner; I think I drew $700 on the 18th of October, and $500 of that I gave to Minor; I did not intend to sell any of this counterfeit money, and I gave this $500 to Miner to be even with him; I got from Miner $10,000 counterfeit money on the 3d of October; I paid him $1,000 for it in good money.

Q. Where did you get that money? A. I decline to answer that question.

The COURT—You must answer it.

WITNESS—I got the money from David Keene and also from a man named Paine; Keene was arrested on the 6th of October, and he was subsequently set at liberty, and after that he gave me the check. Witness made other statements on this point.

Q. Your evidence is this:—That after his arrest for passing counterfeit money he paid you $700 in consideration of counterfeit money you had sold him? A. Yes.

Q. And after your arrest? A. Yes.

Q. What are you reading from? A. Memorandum.

Q. When did you make it? A. A few days ago; I can't say.

Q. Is it in your handwriting? A. I think not.

Q. Whose is it? A. It is Shoner's; I had another memorandum, but I tore it up; it might be over two months, more or less, since I made this other memorandum; I wanted to know how much conterfeit money I had bought of Miner; I cannot assign any reason for making such a memorandum; I know a man named James Calvert, and have spoken with him; first became acquainted with him in New York in 1863; I have no recollection of buying or selling him counterfeit money; I do not know anything of his occupation at all; heard he was a counterfeiter; I do not know Dutch Charlie; I do not know Charles Ulrich; he never engraved a plate or die for me; I first learned at Miner's house from Miner of the printing of those $10 counterfeit bills about two years and eight months ago; I never was in partnership with this James Calvert.

Q. What has been your occupation since you left the State Prison, besides passing counterfeit money? A. Boating in the summer season on the Erie Canal; have followed the water as a boatman twenty years, off and on; I have owned a boat, the Catharine Winters.

Re-direct—When I was at the Boulevard, at the time Miner was arrested, there were lamps lighted; when the package containing the plates was taken down to Colonel Whitley's office it had, I think, the same buff cover on it; when I went up to Miner's house, for the purpose of entrapping him, I did not see Mr. Fox, a lawyer, or Van Houghton or Wessel there; never saw such people.

Counsel then asked questions as to what had become of the original memorandum witness had made of the amounts of counterfeit money he had sold Miner. Witness replied the memorandum had got worn out in his pocket, and then Shoner made the memorandum produced from the old one—witness calling off to him the amounts and figures; had been to Miner's stables and saw these horses, which he understood were "fast horses;" had heard that a man named Elliott, alias Hank Hall, had been indicted or, as charged in this Court, for counterfeiting; had seen him several times at Miner's house.

To Mr. Fullerton—I never disclosed to Shoner the fact that I was dealing in counterfeit money; he did not know that the amounts in the memorandum were amounts I had received from Minor; I saw the package examined in Colonel Whitley's office, but I did not examine the plates.

TESTIMONY OF SARAH A. WILLIS.

Sarah A. Willis, a lady dressed in deep mourning, residing at 225 West Fifty-third street, deposed that Thomas Ballard resided in the same house, and that on some occasions a person with shoulders like those of Miner came there to see Ballard. On cross-examination she replied that she could not state Miner was the man.

At the request of Mr. Fullerton Cole was here called into court. He was desired to stand up, and did so. Mrs. Willis was asked to look at him and say if Cole was the man she saw at the house. She could not say, though her impression was that she had seen a person of a very singular appearance calling for Ballard. [Cole is a singular-looking person, with eyes deeply sunken, and of cadaverous appearance.] She could not, however, identify Cole.

TESTIMONY OF OFFICER KENNOCH.

Officer Kennoch, of the Secret Service Department, was examined at some length respecting the facts of Miner's arrest. The witness' direct examination having closed,

The Court adjourned until eleven o'clock this morning.

A FRIEND OF MINER IN TROUBLE.

Taylor C. Walman, of 157 Orchard street, was arraigned before Justice Shandley, at Jefferson Market, yesterday morning, upon complaint of William T. Gilsbery, of 26 Bleecker street, who charges that he passed a counterfeit $20 bill on him. He was remanded to the United States Court for trial.

THE DROWNING OF MR. HALL.

Supposed to Have Been Accidentally Drowned.

Coroner Keenan yesterday commenced an investigation in the case of Mr. William M. Hall, the gentleman whose dead body was found in the dock at pier 36 North River, as heretofore published in the HERALD. Mr. William C. Dunham, of Brooklyn, testified that he was well acquainted with deceased, who was a member of the firm of Messrs. Wilder & Co., of Lawrence, Mass.; deceased arrived in the city on Friday last, and put up at the St. Nicholas Hotel; witness identified the remains at the Morgue as those of Mr. Hall. In the opinion of Mr. Dunham and those of his friends, deceased must have been down on the pier looking after some freight which he was shipping East, when he fell overboard and was accidentally drowned. Mr. Hall was a man of excellent habits and possessed superior business qualifications. His father was formerly a member of the Massachusetts Legislature. At eight o'clock on the evening Mr. Hall met his death he was to have taken the train for home. The investigation is not yet concluded.

Yesterday afternoon the remains of Mr. Hall were taken on to Massachusetts.

The News in Boston—Mr. Hall's Business Connections.

LAWRENCE, Mass., Dec. 12, 1871.

The intelligence of the death by drowning, in New York, on Saturday, of Mr. William M. Hall, of this city, has cast a gloom over our community, by whom he was highly esteemed. For several years he has been connected with the firm of William Russell & Sons, extensive paper manufacturers. He went to New York on Friday of last week, intending to return on Saturday night. He had completed his business during the forenoon of Saturday, and, it is supposed that, while going on board the boat that evening, to return, he slipped, or was crowded from the plank into the dock. Mr. Hall was a son of the late Mr. William Hall, of Bradford. He was about thirty-five years of age, and leaves a wife and child.

THE CENTRE STREET HOMICIDE.

Coroner Schirmer yesterday held an inquest at the Sixth precinct station house on the body of Patrick Black, late of 87 Baxter street, who, it is alleged, was fatally beaten by Frank Eagan in Centre street on the afternoon of the 3d inst. The two had a slight misunderstanding when Eagan struck deceased a blow in the face with his fist. Below will be found the facts in brief as developed before the Coroner:—

Hugh McGuire, of 15 City Hall place, deposed that on Sunday, the 3d instant, deceased and himself entered Frank Eagan's saloon, in Centre street; deceased had a bowl of soup and paid for it, after which he said to Eagan that the soup was not good; deceased, in leaving, said something which sounded like "go to hell with the soup;" Eagan started out on the sidewalk after deceased, who stopped, and they exchanged blows; deceased bled from the nose, and, with the witness, went to a liquor store to stop the bleeding; deceased subsequently went home and complained of pain in his head.

Eagan in his testimony admitted that he "touched" deceased on the left side of the face, under the chin, with his hand.

Other witnesses were examined, but their evidence contained no facts of importance.

Deputy Coroner Cushman, M. D., and Dr. E. T. T. Marsh, made a post-mortem examination on the body and found that death was caused by compression of the brain from extravasation of blood, the result of external violence.

Deceased also had a fracture of the nose.

The case was then submitted to the jury, who found that Patrick Black came to his death by compression of the brain from extravasation of blood caused by a blow at the hands of Frank Eagan, in front of 38 Centre street, on Sunday, December 3, 1871.

On the above verdict Eagan was committed to the Tombs to await the action of the Grand Jury. He is thirty-eight years of age, and born in Ireland.

He had nothing to say to the charge preferred against him.

Deceased was forty years of age, and also a native of Ireland.

Hugh McGuire, the principal witness, was sent to the House of Detention by Coroner Schirmer. Both Eagan and McGuire will be released from custody if they have friends able and willing to go bail for them.

THE COURTS.

Alleged Smuggling—The Appleton Divorce Suit Again; Important Ruling Therein—The Bowling Green Savings Bank—Business in the Court of Oyer and Terminer—Another Black Friday Suit—Decisions.

UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS' COURT.

Charge of Smuggling.

Before Commissioner Shields.

The United States vs. John Hartley and Frederick Tall.—The defendants were brought before the Commissioner on a charge of smuggling from Canada into Port Huron, Michigan, 10,000 yards of silk. About one-fourth of this quantity, worth $5,000 or $6,000, was recovered. The portion that was not recovered was estimated to be of the value of $12,000. The defendants were held to await an order of removal from the District Court.

SUPREME COURT—SPECIAL TERM.

The Appleton Divorce Suit—The Next Friend of a Lunatic May Conduct a Suit in His Name—Important Ruling.

Before Judge Cardozo.

Samuel F. Appleton vs. Amelia Warner, Otherwise Known as Amelia Appleton.—This well-known divorce suit, begun six years ago, came to the surface again in this Court yesterday. The defendant, it will be remembered, was married in 1841 to William Warner. He left her, according to her story, went to California, and there, as she supposed, died. In 1864 she instituted a divorce suit against him in Indiana, and on April 26 of the same year obtained a decree of divorce. Previous to this time, however, as the friends of the plaintiff allege—that, is on March 19, 1869—she was married to the latter, and shortly afterwards the first husband turned up alive. Mr. Appleton became insane and his brothers had him placed in an asylum and commenced a suit for divorce in his name. A memorable feature connected with the suit is the fact that the late James T. Brady made nearly his last argument in the case. The matter came up on two motions—one by the defendants to strike out the complaint as not being authorized by the plaintiff, and the other by Daniel S. Appleton, a brother of the plaintiff, to be appointed his next friend to conduct the suit. The following contains all the material points of

THE JUDGE'S OPINION.

Of course, if the plaintiff were sane, the motion to strike from the files would necessarily fail, and the real question presented to me is what should be done upon the substantially conceded fact that the plaintiff was, when the suit was instituted, and still continues to be, insane. The question has given me more trouble than almost any that has ever been presented to me, principally because of the doubt that I entertained as to the propriety of allowing any one but the plaintiff himself to elect on a matter which seems so personal to him and to concern his individual happiness, whether his marriage should be declared void or not. This objection was strenuously urged by the defendant's counsel, and I felt the point to be one of great delicacy and importance, and the researches of the learned counsel on either side fail to supply me with any case bearing on that view. Within the last few days, however, I have found a case in which the question was directly presented and decided by Sir Wm. Scott in Parnell vs. Parnell (2 Haggerty's Condensed Reports), which was a suit brought to obtain a divorce on the ground of the adultery of the wife. The bill was filed on the part of the husband, who was a lunatic, by his committee. It was, among other things, argued that the Court "would not entertain a complaint of this nature which depends so much on the acts and dispositions of the husband in a suit instituted by any other person;" but Sir Wm. Scott allowed it to be prosecuted in the name of the committee and cited the case of Fust vs. Bowman, a suit to cancel a marriage. As a precedent, he said, if any other rule applied the wife of a lunatic would have free license to commit adultery, and that no injury could ensue from allowing the suit to proceed because the lunatic, if he recover, may either condone the offence or stand on what has been done for him. Reference to certain case, Portsmouth vs. Portsmouth, in which a similar course was taken, is made in Bowden vs. Bowden, 2 Seval & Frist, 417. It follows from these cases that the Court will permit the action to be prosecuted on behalf of the lunatic by some one representing him, although it is a case in which it seems that he has to make an election, and that being so the motion to appoint next friend should be granted, the cause to proceed in the name of the lunatic by his next friend, and upon that being done the motion to strike from the files should be denied. Ordered accordingly.

COURT OF OYER AND TERMINER.

Before Judge Ingraham.

This Court met at eleven A. M. yesterday, the court room, as usual, being crowded.

William Palmer, a colored man, was first placed on trial, the charge against him being burglary and stealing clothing from 124 West Thirty-first street. The evidence, which was somewhat curious and conflicting, created a strong doubt as to his guilt, and he was consequently acquitted.

William H. Poole pleaded guilty to stealing a box of tea. He was employed as porter, and said he was intoxicated when he committed the theft. His employer interposed in his behalf and his sentence was made light in consequence—one year and six months in the Penitentiary.

George Edwards pleaded guilty to larceny from the person. He said he was only seventeen; that he came from Philadelphia to this city to get employment and could get none; that he was compelled to steal in consequence, and that this was his first offence. He was sent to the Penitentiary for one year.

Charles Ullman was tried on a charge of stealing $20 from George Black on the 2d of November last, the money being taken from his coat pocket. He was acquitted.

James Norton, for stealing a box of tea, was sentenced two years to State Prison.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS.

The Bowling Green Savings Bank.

Before Judge Cardozo.

In the Matter of the Bowling Green Savings Bank.—Application was made by the Receiver for leave to commence suits and proceedings to collect the assets of the bank. The application was granted.

Decisions.

By Judge Cardozo.

In the Matter of John G. Lamberson.—The exceptions are overruled.

Mary Bronson vs. John Townsend et al.—The motion is too late. Denied, without costs.

In the Matter of the Application of Levi Gray et al.—Motion granted to extent of $500; no costs.

Topping et al. vs. Ferguson et al.—Motion granted.

In the Matter of Ellen M. B. Connolly.—Application granted for confirmation of sale.

Merwin vs. Merwin et al.—Confirmed by default.

Amelia A. Dietz vs. John Dietz.—Motion granted for payment of counsel fee and alimony.

Pomeroy vs. Mortimer.—Motion granted.

Same vs. Same.—Motion to amend granted on payment of $10 costs.

Mary E. White vs. William E. White.—Motion denied, with leave to renew on further proofs.

Same vs. Same.—The father should be permitted to visit the children. Time and place will be designated in the order.

Pendergast et al. vs. Bolst.—Findings and decree settled.

Luke vs. Harrington et al.—Motion granted arresting injunction.

Luy et al. vs. Thompson.—Plaintiff may enter judgment; levy to stand as security. Default to be opened, and cause set down for next Friday. Defendant to pay $7, cost of motion.

In the Matter of the Petition of Fanny M. Ormsby.—Memoranda for counsel.

Graham vs. Meyer et al.—Same.

Gosslil vs. Heath.—Motion granted on payment of $10 costs.

Ingersoll vs. Roe.—Memoranda for counsel.

Chase vs. Winant.—Motion granted without costs.

In the Matter of the Petition of Patrick Tracy to Vacate Assessment.—Memoranda for counsel.

Andreas vs. Church et al.—Motion denied. Costs to abide event.

In the Matter of the Petition of Robert McCarter et al. to Vacate Assessment.—Memoranda for counsel.

Winch vs. The Mayor et al.—Taxation correct.

Hawley vs. Dorman.—Motion denied. Costs to abide event.

Valentine, Receiver, vs. Thistle et al.—Referred back.

Snow et al. vs. Rice.—Motion granted unless paid within five days.

Fettritch vs. McKay.—Motion granted.

Brown vs. Ellis.—Costs of motion to abide event.

Malcolm vs. Allen.—Motion denied; costs to abide event.

Butler vs. Torbet et al.—Order granted.

Lowden et al. vs. Lowden et al.—Findings settled.

Littell vs. Quackenbush.—Order granted.

Low vs. Goodridge.—See memoranda of decision.

In re Wilmerding et al. vs. M. H. Fowler.—Same.

By Judge Brady.

Smith vs. Davis.—See memoranda of decision.

SUPERIOR COURT—SPECIAL TERM.

The Tampering with the Jury in the Black Friday Case.

Before Judge Freedman.

Isaac O. Davis et al. vs. Henry L. Smith et al.—In this case—the famous Black Friday suit—in which James Fisk, Jr., and Jay Gould are the leading defendants, preliminary steps were taken yesterday to set aside the verdict of the jury. Mr. David Dudley Field submitted an affidavit of one of his clerks, setting forth that James O'Brien, the juror charged by his associate jurors with being bribed, but which accusation he denied at the recent investigation before Judge McCunn, had been asked to make an affidavit in the matter, but refused to do so. It was urged that such affidavit was essential to make a motion to set aside the verdict, and application was made for the appointment of a Referee to take the deposition of Mr. O'Brien for the purpose of being used in such motion. The Judge granted the application and appointed Mr. Joseph Meeks such Referee and with the same issued an order directing Mr. O'Brien to attend before such Referee at such time and places as the latter may designate, to make the deposition required.

SUPERIOR COURT—TRIAL TERM—PART I.

More Black Friday Suits on the Tapis.

Before Judge Monell.

Following in the wake of the late suit brought by I. O. Davis, agent of Fisk and Gould, are sixteen other suits of similar character against the same parties waiting trial. The case of John Trevoir, the first on the list, will be commenced to-day in this court. This is a liveliness in the way of litigation that Fisk and Gould, with all their experience in the courts, have never experienced heretofore.

SUPERIOR COURT—SPECIAL TERM.

Decisions.

By Judge Jones.

Frederick R. Shettler et al. vs. Lawrence Shuster Smith.—Judgment for plaintiff. See opinion.

Henry C. Hill vs. Harvey Spencer.—Memoranda for counsel as to settlement of case.

Peter C. Anthony vs. Asher & Atkinson.—Judgment for plaintiff. Findings settled. Let them be engrossed and settled.

Eugene K. Courtney vs. Elizabeth Blozam.—See opinion.

The Board of Water Commissioners for the City of Detroit vs. Henry A. Burr et al.—Memoranda for counsel as to settlement of case.

By Judge Freedman.

James Masterson vs. William C. Rogers et al.—Order granted in the three suits.

Robert Palmer vs. Robert Kelly.—Same.

Joseph H. Logan vs. Louis L. Tood et al.—Same.

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS—SPECIAL TERM.

Decisions.

By Judge Larremore.

Fowler vs. The Pittsburg, Cincinnati and St. Louis Railroad Company.—It does not appear that the action is brought by a citizen of this State. Motion denied.

Weir vs. Sherlock.—Motion to amend papers granted.

Elliot vs. Elliot.—Reference ordered.

O'Farrell vs. Marshall.—Motion denied.

Lomis vs. Clausen.—Motion denied.

Smith vs. The Soldiers' Business and Messengers' Despatch Company.—Judgment for plaintiff, with leave to amend.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY.

SUPREME COURT—CIRCUIT—Part 1—Held by Judge Van Brunt.—Nos. 191, 329, 685, 689, 705, 251, 219, 609, 1023, 211, 217, 281, 395, 553, 591, 637, 223½, 635, 657. Part 2—Held by Judge Brady.—Nos. 1474, 642, 142, 646, 794, 378, 418, 420, 424, 426, 432, 432½, 414½, 434, 436, 438, 440, 442.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS—Held by Judge Cardozo.—Nos. 183, 204.

COMMON PLEAS—GENERAL TERM—Held by Judges Daly, Robinson and Loew.—Nos. 105, 110, 78, 74, 5, 12, 19, 21, 30, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44, 79, 80, 104, 111, 18, 50.

COMMON PLEAS—TRIAL TERM—Part 1—Held by Judge J. F. Daly.—Nos. 345, 393, 1027, 327, 946, 947, 1136, 1801, 876, 1028, 1829, 68, 192, 514, 332, 408, 467½, 1130, 772, 751, 122, 993, 1048, 1086, 241, 932, 847, 1134, 506, 527, 1034, 1064½, 1065½, 1127.

SUPERIOR COURT—TRIAL TERM—Part 1—Held by Judge Monell.—Nos. 585, 1645, 805, 1007, 157, 589, 1221, 1225, 1081, 1537, 1235, 869, 1151. Part 2—Held by Judge Spencer.—Nos. 882, 816, 1030, 1038, 1040.

MARINE COURT—TRIAL TERM—Part 1—Held by Judge Alker.—Nos. 7043, 7054, 7219, 7415, 7117, 7419, 7426, 7464, 8144, 8275, 8165, 7507, 7508, 7509. Part 2—Held by Judge Shea.—Nos. 7354, 7331, 6580½, 7044, 6134, 7391, 7460, 7040, 7330, 7522, 7506, 7510, 6485, 7514. Part 3—Held by Judge Joachimsen.—Nos. 8233, 8265, 7627, 8248, 8260, 8137, J. vs. P., L. vs. W., A. vs. B.

BROOKLYN COURTS.

UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS' COURT.

Counterfeit Money.

Before Commissioner Winslow.

Thomas Martin was arrested on the charge of having passed or attempted to pass a counterfeit $2 note of the Westchester County National Bank at L. H. Hawkin's store, at the corner of Court and Union streets. He was held to answer.

SUPREME COURT—GENERAL TERM.

The Buckbout Case.

Before Judges Barnard, Gilbert and Tappen.

This case was up again yesterday on the appeal for a new trial, when the Court decided that it must be heard during the present term. It was agreed by counsel to submit the case without argument, the points to be submitted before the 23d inst.

SUPREME COURT—SPECIAL TERM.

Decisions.

Before Judge Pratt.

Aaron A. Degraw vs. James H. Elmore.—Motion to amend granted on condition that the defendant stipulate to tax no costs in Court of Appeals in case of reversed judgment.

Charles Meissner vs. Mary C. Meissner.—Motion on plaintiff's stipulation to refer and take short notice for alimony denied. Fifty dollars counsel's fee allowed.

William A. Coit vs. Edwin Wilcox et al.—Motion denied, with $10 costs.

Charles E. Moon vs. The Wilder Salamander Safe Company.—Motion in order to show cause for injunction. Motion denied, plaintiff not appearing; $10 costs.

CITY COURT—CRIMINAL BRANCH.

A Young Desperado Sent to the State Prison for Ten Years—Attempting to Murder a Man in His Own Bedroom.

Before Judge Neilson.

On the night of the 13th of October last James Curry, a young desperado and a member of the notorious Tillary street gang, broke into the residence of Mr. Jerome Canfield, an old gentleman, at 152 Henry street, and in his search for plunder entered the apartment in which Mr. Canfield was sleeping. Curry had removed his shoes on entering the room, but his movements awakened Mr. Canfield, who arose in his bed. Curry thereupon drew a pistol and discharged it at the old gentlemen, but the ball missed him and lodged in the wall at the head of the bed. The burglar then escaped from the room and thence into the street. In his flight he dropped one of his shoes, which was taken charge of by Captain Joel Smith, of the Washington police station, who detailed Detective Curson to work up the case.

The arrest of Curry was brought about in a somewhat singular manner. A day or two after his visit to Mr. Canfield's house a woman, who gave the name of Curry, called upon Captain Smith and complained of her son, who, she said, was in the habit of remaining out all night, and acting in a very suspicious manner. He always carried a pistol, and, as the woman stated, frequently threatened her with violence if she did not furnish him with money. On the Friday night previous he was absent from home, she said, and did not return until morning, when he had but one shoe on. Upon hearing this statement Captain Smith was convinced that he had found his man. The detective was immediately sent down to Mrs. Curry's house, in Tillary street, where he subsequently arrested Curry and found the odd shoe and the pistol. The bullet removed from the wall in Mr. Canfield's room fitted precisely in the muzzle of the pistol, and the shoe left by the burglar corresponded with the one found at the house in Tillary street.

Young Curry, who is only about nineteen or twenty years of age, was tried and convicted in the City Court yesterday. Judge Neilson sentenced him to the State Prison for ten years and six months.

Highway Robbery by Daylight.

Cæsar Hicks and Edward T. Moore (colored) were placed on trial for assaulting and robbing one Williams, also colored. On the 13th of September last Williams was passing the corner of Bridge and Johnson streets, when he was accosted by Moore and Hicks, the former of whom knocked him down, after which the latter stole his pocketbook. The prisoners swore that their characters were good, but on the cross-examination Moore admitted that he had been in the Penitentiary about twenty times. The jury convicted both, and the Court sentenced each to the State Prison for two years and six months.

A Darky Burglar.

Richard Treadwell, a darky, broke into and robbed the tailor shop of Samuel J. Howard, at No. 119 High street, on the night of the 5th of November. He was afterwards arrested, with several coats, which he had stolen, in his possession. He was convicted yesterday and remanded for sentence.

John King's Trouble—Married While Drunk.

John King, a little red-haired individual of Celtic birth, was placed on trial on a charge of bigamy. Mary King swore that she was married to the prisoner by Father Quinn, at St. Peter's church, over three years ago, but that her husband lived with her only a short time. Then Kate King appeared, with a healthy babe in her arms, and swore that she had been married to the prisoner for the past two years. In the face of this evidence King mounted the stand and declared that on the occasion of his introduction to Mary—some four years ago—they all got gloriously drunk, and he had the privilege of toting the festive damsel to her little bed. During one of their subsequent orgies the prisoner said he got so drunk that he did not know what he was about, and while in that condition they had him married to Mary. He denied that he ever lived with the woman as his wife, but acknowledged his marriage to Kate.

The jury evidently believed King, for they acquitted him and he was discharged.

Miscellaneous.

Joseph Bose, an old man, was sentenced to the State Prison for ten years and six months for committing an indecent assault on a little girl four years old.

Benjamin Jackson, charged with assaulting Nicholas Dillon with a razor at the corner of Marcy and Gates avenues on November 5, was acquitted.

THE ALLEGED BROOKLYN CONSPIRACY

The Abduction of Michael Reynolds and His Second Will.

The Accused Before Justice Buckley, in Brooklyn—Officer Lyons Held on a Charge of Perjury.

The examination in the case of ex-patrolman Thomas Lyons, Justice John Lynch, Louis Goldsmith, John McArdle, Edward Hare and John Dimon, took place yesterday afternoon in Brooklyn, before Justice Buckley. The accused are charged with conspiracy in causing the arrest and imprisonment of Mrs. Elizabeth Reynolds and her daughter Rosanah, for the purpose of abducting Michael Reynolds, husband of Mrs. Reynolds, from his house in Bergen street, Brooklyn.

Mr. GOLDSMITH, who is a counsellor-at-law, moved that the charge against him be dismissed on the ground that the only way in which he could be implicated in the case was for the

DRAWING UP OF THE WILL

of Mr. Reynolds, which he contended he had a right to do in the exercise of his profession.

Justice BUCKLEY denied the motion.

Mrs. Elizabeth Reynolds was then called and testified as follows:—I live at 1,329 Bergen street; lived there on the 27th of November; I had a husband, Michael Reynolds; on that day Mr. Lyons, the prisoner, and another gentleman came to my house; I think the other gentleman who came with him was this gentleman sitting next to me; on the day after they came again and talked with Father Creighton and my husband; I don't know what they talked about, but they went out and brought in Judge Lynch, as I understood it to make a second will; Justice Lynch asked me if he could talk with my husband in private; I said yes, and left him alone with him; my daughter went in and, at the request of her father, gave Judge Lynch the will which her father had made about a year before; he looked over the will, but did not say anything; he left the room, and I returned back and told Judge Lynch there would be no new will made there that day; Mr. Lyons asked my husband to make a will, and said he had a lawyer there to do it; "to-morrow," my husband said, and the poor man was hardly able to speak; he was hardly able to speak, having got a paralytic stroke the night before; he had been sick and suffering for two years before this, but worked off and on; they all went into the front room and asked Lyons what was between him and my husband, and said if you are an honest man you will tell me; he did not tell me; on the Monday following Mr. Lyons and two strange men came to my house and asked to see Mr. Reynolds; I said he was down stairs; they went down stairs and me and my daughter followed them; Lyons said

MIKE, WE HAVE A CARRIAGE

for you now; my daughter asked what the carriage was for; Lyons said it was to take him to the hospital; my daughter said he should be attended to in his own house; they tried to get him into the carriage, and me and my daughter got him back again; my husband walked to the carriage, and then we got hold of him; when my husband went to the carriage he walked all alone; when I took my husband in all the men with Lyons went away, and soon after they came back with a warrant to arrest me and my daughter for assault on my husband; the officer read the warrant to me and my daughter and arrested us and took us to Judge Lynch's Court; Mr. Goldsmith asked Justice Lynch to keep us under arrest until those parties got away, and we were kept there; Justice Lynch adjourned the hearing of the case till the 11th of this month; I could not tell how long I was in Court before I was let out; I went home and found that in my absence my husband had been taken away, and I never saw him again until his body was

BROUGHT HOME TO ME A CORPSE;

I have seen Lyons before, but never knew that he was a relation of my husband; my husband never told me that he was.

Father Creighton testified as follows:—I knew Michael Reynolds, deceased, and was frequently in his house; I was there on the 14th of November, and prepared him for death; he was sick, and I gave him the

THE LAST PRAYER OF THE CHURCH;

I had been looking for his death for the last year past; never saw Mr. Lyons at the house; the first place I saw him was in the station house in Spring street, New York; he was a policeman; had a few words with him, and he acknowledged before the captain that he brought Reynolds to his own place, 429 East Houston street, New York; the Captain asked why he brought him there, and he acknowledged that he had executed a will in his (Lyons') favor at 429 East Houston street; the will, to the best of my knowledge, was drawn up by counsellor Mott; the Captain asked him if he had ever heard tell of a mortgage on the property, and he said no.

By the JUDGE—Who first said anything about the mortgage?

WITNESS—The property was said to be worth about three thousand dollars; the mortgage was not drawn until the next day; I heard nothing about the mortgage until Lyons was on trial, and then he said he had taken a mortgage on the property; should not think the property was worth over $1,200; went to get a copy of the affidavit and warrant and was then told that a second will had been drawn up; Lyons wanted Justice Lynch to draw up the will, and he

WAS TO GET TWENTY-FIVE DOLLARS FOR IT,

but he only got twenty-five cents for the warrant.

Cross-examined by Mr. O'Brien—Prepared Mr. Reynolds for death on the 14th of November; did not think he was sane at the time, for he could not speak; read the prayers to the dying.

Mrs. Elizabeth Reynolds recalled—Did not hear the conversation between her husband and Mr. Lyons, but the boy heard Lyons say that he wanted him to sign a will.

By the JUDGE—Did you see Mr. Lyons that day before you went to Court? A. Yes, sir; I was present all the time.

Q. Did you strike your husband on that day? A. No, sir; I never struck my husband to my knowledge.

Rosanah Reynolds testified as follows:—I was present the day my father was taken away; was there at the time Lyons was in the house; was out of the house about fifteen minutes while Lyons was there, and don't know what he said to father during that time; the boy McMannus came out and told me that Lyons had a will in his pocket; asked Lyons what it was he had in his pocket; never struck my father.

James McMannus testified that he was in the house when Lyons was there, and told Rosanah about the will; Mr. Reynolds did not tell Lyons that he had been

ASSAULTED AND DRAGGED ABOUT THE ROOM.

Cross-examined—Remained in the house until Mr. Lyons came back with the warrant; heard Mr. Reynolds tell Mr. Lyons that he had not had anything but a cup of tea; did not make the tea for him.

At this point John McArdle, Edward Hare and John Dimon were discharged, as the evidence did not implicate them.

Edward Hare was then called as a witness and testified to going to Reynolds' house, in Bergen street, on the 27th of November, with Officer Lyons; Lyons came to his place of business and asked him to go over and witness the execution of a will of a cousin of his; he did not give any name at the time; heard it said that the will had been drawn up by lawyer Mott; when Mr. Reynolds saw Mr. Lyons he ran out to meet him and said he was willing to sign the will but his wife and daughter would not let him do so; Lyons did not say what was in the will; heard him say that he had been

SADLY ABUSED BY HIS FAMILY;

it was only two days before they had pushed him over the stove, and his daughter said, "Well, you were not burned;" he told Lyons that all he had for his breakfast was a cup of water; he appeared to be well and talked vary sensibly; went to the court room and saw Lyons swear to the warrant; Mr. Reynolds expressed a wish to go with Mr. Lyons and never go back to his home again; he would not speak to his wife; Justice Lynch gave him his choice as to whether he would go with his family or with Mr. Lyons; he preferred to go with Mr. Lyons; on going out he thanked God that he was away from his own home; came down the following morning and heard the will read to Mr. Reynolds; he objected to the clause giving his wife $800, but said since it was in they might let it remain.

Several other witnesses were examined, when the case was closed. Mr. Goldsmith was discharged and the charge of conspiracy was dismissed. Judge Lynch was also acquitted, and ex-patrolman Lyons was held on a charge of perjury, in procuring the arrest of Mrs. Reynolds and her daughter.

Assistant District Attorney Pearsall appeared for the prosecution.

IRON SHIPBUILDING IN THE WEST.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., Dec. 12, 1871.

The lower house of the Legislature to-day adopted concurrent resolutions calling upon Congress to aid in establishing an iron shipbuilding yard at some point on a Western river, in conformity with the suggestion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The House also adopted a joint resolution to donate the reports of the Supreme Court and a copy of the acts of the session to the Chicago Library Association. The Senate referred the same resolution to the Committee on Ways and Means.

THE GREAT SOCIAL EVIL.

Another Vindication of the Law for the Punishment of the Crime of Abortion.

Conviction of Mrs. Byrnes, the Female Rosenzweig.

Sentenced to the State Prison for Seven Years.

The sleepless Nemesis which pursues crime always, whether through the officers of the law and the sentence of offended justice, or by the more terrible agency of a remorseful conscience, has just overtaken another of the fearful pests of our social system—a professional abortionist. Yesterday, in the General Sessions, Recorder Hackett, before which tribunal Dr. Wolff, Lookup Evans and Rosenzweig were tried, convicted and sentenced to the State Prison, Anne E. Byrnes, one of that horrible fraternity of abortionists, was also tried, convicted and sentenced. The testimony in the case was not confined to the circumstances attending the death of the young, erring and unfortunate Mary Russell, whose death was laid to the charge of the prisoner, but extended to other cases, bearing, however, on the principal charge, showing the wide range to which the accused carried on her horrible and murderous practice.

The prosecution was most ably conducted by Assistant District Attorney Fellows, whose address to the jury in summing up was really a most impressive forensic display—scathing, solemn and affecting in his review of the testimony and in his denunciation of the crime and its attending circumstances, with which the accused stood charged.

The court room was crowded from the opening of the doors, but through the censurable nonattendance of one of the jurors at the proper hour some delay occurred in resuming the trial. Recorder Hackett read a lesson to the temporarily absent juror, which, it is hoped, will be not only a lesson to him, but to all jurors sworn on the trial of a case, to be obedient to the instructions of the Court requiring an early attendance on their part.

CONTINUATION OF THE TESTIMONY.

Dr. Bliven was recalled by Assistant District Attorney Fellows, and testified that the prisoner had the reputation of being a professional abortionist.

TESTIMONY OF A VICTIM.

Mary Richardson said that about eighteen months ago she went to the house of the defendant, in Clinton street, for the purpose of having an abortion produced, and that Mrs. Byrnes performed it by an instrument for $10.

Mr. Howe objected to this testimony, but the Recorder admitted it, simply for the purpose of impeaching the credibility of Mrs. Byrnes, who swore that she never performed an abortion upon any person.

Officer Parrish and Dr. Roberts testified that the accused was reputed to be a professional abortionist.

The case being closed on both sides Mr. William F. Howe then renewed the legal objections to the panel of jurors and other technical points, and proceeded to address the jury upon the facts. In an eloquent and forcible argument he maintained that the medical and other testimony adduced failed to establish the guilt of his client.

SUMMING UP FOR THE PROSECUTION.

Assistant District Attorney Fellows made a powerful appeal in behalf of the people, claiming that the evidence clearly showed that Mrs. Byrnes was a notorious abortionist and that she performed an operation upon Mary Russell, whose dying statement corroborated the testimony for the prosecution. When Colonel Fellows portrayed in fervid and eloquent language the awful crime which professional abortionists in New York committed, the audience could scarcely refrain from giving expression to their approbation in demonstrations of applause. The conviction of Drs. Wolff, Evans and Rosenzweig had tended greatly to suppress this crime in our midst, and the prosecuting officer urged the jury to convict Mrs. Byrnes, who represented the female abortionists.

THE CHARGE.

Recorder HACKETT proceeded to deliver his charge, and after defining the law under which the prisoner was indicted, instructed them that in order to justify a conviction the evidence must have established the fact that on or about the 23d of August the prisoner employed some instrument or other means to produce the miscarriage of Mary Russell; that the use of such instrument or other means was not necessary to preserve her life, and that the employment of an instrument or other means by the prisoner directly superinduced Mary's death, which occurred on the 3d of September last. His Honor read copious extracts from his minutes of the evidence taken on the trial, and in conclusion said that to his apprehension the case presented no features of difficulty, the law defining the offence being simple and comprehensive. It was for the jury to say whether the evidence had satisfied them of the guilt of the prisoner beyond any reasonable doubt, and if so their duty under their oaths demanded a verdict of guilty.

THE VERDICT.

The jury were only absent about eight minutes, when they returned with a verdict of "Guilty."

Colonel FELLOWS moved for judgment.

Mr. HOWE moved an arrest of judgment upon the ground that the record showed in the case that the Court had no jurisdiction.

THE SENTENCE.

Recorder HACKETT denied the motion, and in sentencing the prisoner said:—"There is a strange coincidence in your case. On the 23d of August last a professional abortionist, by the name of Dr. Rosenzweig, performed an operation upon the person of a young girl, Alice Bowlsby, and caused her death, and on that very same day and about the same hour you performed a similar operation upon this young woman, Mary Russell, which superinduced her death. Your indifference to the result of your brutal crimes is shown by the fact that both you and your confidential friend, Mrs. Conch, in whose house you were a tenant when Dr. Lookup Evans, another professional abortionist, had been tried and convicted in this Court, and you were warned of the danger; you paid no regard to it, but right in the face of that warning you perpetrated this crime upon this poor young girl, Mary Russell. It would be a waste of time, in my opinion, to expatiate upon the brutal crimes and murders which your conscience must have charged you with committing at this and other times. The only duty remaining with the Court is to send you to the State Prison for seven years, that being the highest penalty that can be inflicted."

THE PRISONER

manifested considerable mental excitement at the speedy determination of the case by the jury, and the prompt sentence of the Recorder, which sends her to the State Prison for seven years—as the Recorder said, the heaviest penalty the law allowed.

ANOTHER PRISONER "NEWKIRKED" AT JEFFERSON MARKET.

On Monday night Officer Patrick Fay, of the Eighth precinct, arrested an unfortunate named Nellie Richardson, aged eighteen, of 164 Wooster street, for disorderly conduct. After being confined in the station house all night the woman was arraigned before Justice Shandley, at Jefferson Market, yesterday morning. While arraigned before the Justice her language towards the latter and the officer was not of a very refined nature, in consequence of which Justice Shandley committed her. As the officer was taking her across the bridge to her new home in the prison she made some remark which so enraged him that he took her by the back of the neck and threw her headlong down the long and steep flight of stairs. Providentially the unfortunate woman, when near the bottom of the stairs, seized the iron railing, and prevented herself from falling on the stone pavement in the court yard. One day last week this same officer arrested a female for stealing $15 in money from a man. Upon conveying the parties to the above Court he locked the complainant up in the court ice box and allowed the prisoner to sit among the audience. Before the arrival of the Justice the prisoner quietly slipped from the court room and has since failed to come back.

COURT OF APPEALS.

ALBANY, Dec. 12, 1871.

The following decisions were rendered in the Court of Appeals to-day:—

Judgments affirmed with costs—Delap vs. Woodbury; The National Bank of Salem vs. Thomas; Hawkins vs. Baker; Mallory vs. The Traveller's Insurance Company; Fox vs. Dunckel; Thompson vs. The American Tontine Life and Savings Insurance Company; Siitenrich vs. Heminez.

Judgment reversed and new trial granted, costs to abide events—Gibson vs. Tobey; Simmons vs. Cloonan; Kruider vs. Ellison.

Judgment reversed and proceeding dismissed with costs against the plaintiff—Clark vs. Wise.

Special Judgments—Stoddard vs. Whiting; Hall vs. Augsbury; Comstock vs. Johnson; Young vs. Kent.

Order granting new trial reversed and judgment on report of referee affirmed with costs—Richardson vs. Carpenter.

Orders affirmed with costs—Pike vs. Johnson; Harland vs. Lilienthal.

Appeals dismissed with costs—Stienburg vs. House.

Motion denied with $10 costs—Brookman vs. Hamil.

CALENDAR.

The following is the Court of Appeals day calendar for December 13:—Nos. 422, 458, 462, 433, 376, 431, 466, 474.