GOULD-GORDON.

Final Earnest and Fierce Opening of the Legal Battle.

One Story as Told in Two Ways by Two Men, and Piles of Affidavits and Counter-Affidavits Stoutly Backing Up the Dual Story-Tellers—Confusing Contradictions, Making Confusion Worse Confounded—Horace Greeley Has His Say and Wm. M. Tweed His—An Erie Railroad Pass and the Coronet of an English "Milord."

The now famous Gould-Gordon case came up for hearing again yesterday in the Supreme Court, before Judge Brady. Jay Gould occupied a back seat in the court during the proceedings, but the *soi-disant* Lord Gordon did not put in an appearance. Messrs. David Dudley Field, Henry E. Knox and Elihu Root appeared for Jay Gould, and Messrs. John H. Strahan and ex-Judge Porter for Gordon.

Mr. Strahan was about to commence reading the affidavit of Gordon, which bore on all three cases at issue—namely, in the case of Gordon against Gould, to show cause why a receiver should not be appointed, and in the two cases of Gould against Gordon, to show cause why an order of arrest granted against Gordon by the Court should not be vacated.

Mr. Field asked if it was the intention of the Court to argue the three cases together.

The Judge said that it was with that intention that he had set the case down for to-day.

Mr. Strahan then proceeded to read the complaint in the case of Gould against Gordon, setting forth that Gould had delivered over to Gordon, on the 1st of last March, 600 shares of capital stock of the Erie Railroad, to enable him to purchase with the proceeds of such stock a farm of eighty acres in Chappaqua (opposite to Horace Greeley's farm). Having read the complaint he read

AN AFFIDAVIT OF GORDON,

the defendant, which went on to state that he always signed himself G. Gordon. That he knew Gould and had read his affidavit. That affidavit was in every particular wholly false. There never was anything said to defendant by Gould with regard to the purchase of any land, and the defendant never had any such transaction with the plaintiff as was mentioned in Gould's affidavit. He never received any stock from Gould for such an object. He never had any such relations with Gould except as follows:—

On the 7th of February last, at the Westminster Hotel, where the defendant Gordon was then stopping, Mr. Lewis Roberts and Mr. Horace Greeley were breakfasting with him. The conversation turned on where the defendant was to spend the summer. Mr. Roberts said that he had a house and grounds in Tarrytown and that he would be very happy to put it at his disposal. Mr. Greeley spoke very much of a farm which was opposite his in Chappaqua and said that the defendant ought to purchase it. After Greeley and Roberts left the hotel he revolved the project of buying the farm in Chappaqua over in his mind, and on the 9th of February he resolved to buy it. He handed over $25,000 to Mr. John V. Sears, of the New York *Tribune*, who was in the room when the original conversation took place about the purchase of the land. He subsequently instructed his counsel, Mr. Strahan, to make the purchase. All this time he did not even know the plaintiff. He met him for the first time on March 2, 1872. Before that time the defendant was, and is now, an extensive stockholder in the Erie Railroad, owns now sixty thousand shares of Erie, and is interested in a much larger amount of stock. He formed a connection with other stockholders and they entered into negotiations to procure a change in the management of the road. On March 2 he procured an introduction to Jay Gould. Gould asked for an interview with him, which he granted. We came to the Metropolitan Hotel, where he was then stopping. The defendant in that interview told Gould that a change in the management was demanded; that the line should be given up to the stockholders, and that the various aggressive law suits in which the line was engaged should be stopped. Gould said, in reply, that he would do all this; that the line was in every branch in better condition than the stockholders imagined; that it was able to pay a dividend of seven per cent, and that it was in as good condition as the New York Central. The defendant then said that if this were true Gould had nothing to fear. He added that he would vote for Gould's re-election himself and he would ask his friends to do so. However, he told him that more than words were necessary to convince him that what Gould said was true. Gould said that he could give him proofs and that if Gordon would give him his assistance he would put his resignation in his (Gordon's) hands. On the Monday after he called on the defendant again, and remained for dinner. He there repeated all the promises he had made at the former meeting. The defendant then told him that the guarantee must come from him. Gould said that the balance sheet of the company would show that what he had said was true. He proposed that Gordon should join him in buying stock, as there was no doubt that there would be an immense rise in the price of stock when this state of things became known. Gordon refused at that time, and subsequently Gould again asked him to buy stock with him, as there must be a rise. Gordon said, "That is testing my credulity and my pocket." On March 6 Gould again called on him and said that there was a division in the Board of Directors, and he believed that Lane was at the head of it. He complained that everybody was going against him. He added, however, that he could vote on $30,000,000 worth of stock. Gordon then said he would speak to his friends, and if Gould could vote on $30,000,000 worth of stock, between them they could very easily secure the majority. Gordon then spoke to Belden, with whom he was acquainted, about buying stock with Gould, and he said that if he had any transactions with Gould they ought to be in "puts" and "calls." We then invested $10,000 each in two "calls" and took "puts" for the same amounts. Just then Horace Greeley happened to come in, and the proposed change in the administration of Erie was talked over and Gould and Gordon's co-operation fully explained. Greeley congratulated Gould, told him that he ought to, as Gordon had laid out for him and "cut" Wall street. Mr. Greeley told Gordon that he ought to inquire into the condition of the questionable companies which were connected with Erie. Gould said he would afford facilities for such inquiries. Gould afterwards sent a package of shares of each of the companies connected with Erie, accompanied by a note asking Gordon to take the shares as a guarantee of good faith, and to show that "his credulity and his pocket were not being tested together." Gordon wrote back a note of acknowledgment, and Gould wrote back in reply, saying that "it was the first time he had ever done anything for anybody for which he got an acknowledgement." At their next meeting Gould said that Gordon's calls would be worth a quarter of a million in a short time. Gordon said he hoped so; and Gould, in reply, said that he would give half a million for them. The aggregate value of the packages which Gould had sent to Gordon was $140,000. Gould said that he would give the rest in currency. Gould then made a memorandum of the different values of the shares which he had sent to him in the packages. After Gould went away Gordon saw a mistake in the calculation against himself, and he wrote to Gould informing him of the error and telling him that if he gave $200,000 instead of $140,000 the transaction could be concluded. Gould brought the currency, certain other shares and 600 shares of Erie instead of $20,000 in currency. Gordon then delivered over to him $40,000 worth of "puts and calls" in Erie. Gould at once put his resignation in Gordon's hands. Gordon invited Gould for the next day to meet Horace Greeley. He came, and they spoke about the farm adjoining Greeley's, at Chappaqua. This was the only occasion on which he talked about the purchase of this farm in Gould's presence. He saw Gould on the 10th, 11th and 12th of March, and did not see him again until the 25th of March. That was the day on which Belden came into his room and stated that Gould, Tweed, Judge Shandley and Kelso were in room No. 112, Tweed's room, at the Metropolitan Hotel, and that they had a warrant for his (Gordon's) arrest. He handed over to Belden the $200,000 in currency and the other stock which he had got from Gould, and he gave an order on his Philadelphia brokers to give up the Allegheny and Oil Creek stock which they were about to sell for him. He submitted to this extortion because he feared outrage. In the evening Belden came to his room and apologized. He told Gordon that the parties in the next room were surprised that the money and stock had been so easily given up. He was afterwards watched and followed through the streets. On the 9th of April he was arrested by Deputy Sheriff Jarvis, who immediately went away and left him in the charge of specials. Mr. Roberts came to go bail for him, but Jarvis could not be found. They searched for Under Sheriff Stevens, but he would not take one name on the bond, but after midnight Mr. Horace F. Clark came and went his bail. He subsequently telegraphed his Philadelphia brokers not to give the stock to Gould. He now has some one always with him, as he is in fear of his life.

AFFIDAVIT OF JOHN V. SEARS.

The affidavit of John V. Sears, of the *Tribune*, was then read. It stated that he had received $25,000 from Gordon, which he gave to Mr. Strahan for the purchase of the farm adjoining Chappaqua. His relations were such with Gordon that he would know if there was any such arrangement about the purchase of the farm between Gould and Gordon, as stated in Gould's affidavit. He did not hear of such an arrangement.

AFFIDAVIT OF HORACE GREELEY.

An affidavit of Horace Greeley, which has already been published in full in the HERALD, was then read. He corroborated the affidavit of Gordon as to the conversations which took place when he was present. He had seen and known that Gordon was watched through the streets of New York.

AFFIDAVIT OF HENRY MARSH.

Next in order was read the affidavit of Henry Marsh, the room clerk of the Metropolitan Hotel. He knew Belden, and saw him at the hotel on the 25d of March. Belden then told him that Gordon was a fraud. He said that Gould found out that it was so. He said that Gould was then in the billiard room of the hotel. Belden asked the deponent to send the detective of the hotel to Superintendent Kelso and ask him to come over without being seen by Gordon. The deponent then went to room No. 112. Belden's card was sent up to Gordon's room at one o'clock. In half an hour he came back to the office, and he said that it was all fixed. Marsh asked him what was fixed, and he said that Gordon had given back the stocks and the money, amounting in all to $500,000. He added:—

"You should have seen Tweed and Gould when they saw it. They looked surprised. They never expected to succeed."

In the evening Marsh went to Gordon's room, and to his surprise saw Belden there. Belden then said that they in the next room never expected the money, and that Gordon ought to have some one in his room with him, as it was not the first time that a man had been put out of the way by the "Ring" or knocked down and disabled.

AFFIDAVIT OF SUPERINTENDENT KELSO.

Superintendent Kelso's affidavit stated that he was at dinner in the hotel when he was summoned to room No. 112, where he had often been before. Seeing Judge Shandley he believed they had a warrant for Gordon's arrest, and he told Officer Kerch to arrest him if required.

AFFIDAVIT OF JOHN STEERS.

The affidavit of the Clerk of the Essex Market Police Court, John Steers, showed that no warrant for Gordon's arrest had been issued from that Court. Warrants were only issued on sworn complaints.

OPPOSING AFFIDAVITS.

In opposition to the above, Mr. Root read a large number of affidavits, occupying several hours in the reading. Of course it would be out of the question to give them all. First in importance is an additional

AFFIDAVIT OF JAY GOULD,

denying positively the accuracy or general truth of the averments of Gordon's affidavit as to the transactions between them, and denying positively any transactions with him in puts and calls, and states that the securities and money—the latter being more than Gordon stated—were a deposit only. His answer, read as an affidavit, sets out that Gordon represented himself as owning more than 60,000 shares of Erie; that he asked Mr. Gould information as to the collateral companies; that he thereupon sent the note and stocks mentioned by Gordon; that he does not know what occurred between Belden and Gordon; that Gordon represented himself as Lord Gordon, Earl of Aberdeen, absolute owner of thirty millions of Erie stock and controlling other twenty millions, thus controlling a majority of the stock, and further controlling all movements of the English stockholders in Court and before the Legislature; that he represented that he was satisfied with his (Gould's) management, that it was upright and efficient, but that it would be for the interest of the stockholders to change the remainder of the Board; that, relying on his statements, entered into negotiations with him for a reorganization of the management, and that, as a condition of co-operating, Gordon saying that he had been at an expense of about a million on behalf of the English stockholders, requested at least one-half should be advanced to him, Gordon insisting that said sum was a legitimate expense; that he represented that arrangements had already been made by him that a majority of the directors should resign and their places filled by men to be named by himself and Horace Greeley; that thirty millions of certificates were on their way from Heath & Raphael, they having been acting as his agents; that on their arrival the Heath & Raphael suits would be discontinued, and the legislation would be withdrawn. Gordon therefore requested him to advance him in stocks and money $500,000, as a pledge of his (Gould's) good faith, promising not to use them, and return them on the completion of the settlement, and that he (Gould) on this understanding, delivered the stocks named and $200,000 in currency—and that on discovering how he had been deceived he at once took legal steps for the recovery of his property.

AFFIDAVIT OF WILLIAM BELDEN.

We give the affidavit of this gentleman in full:—

"William Belden, being first duly sworn, says as follows:—I know the parties to this action; I have known the defendant for nearly four months last past; he was introduced to me as Lord Gordon, and afterward represented himself to be the Earl of Aberdeen, a Scottish nobleman, and one of the peers of Great Britain; he told me that he had taken his seat as a member of the House of Lords of Great Britain when he was only twenty-two years of age, then being the youngest member of that body; during an acquaintance, which has continued until his true character was revealed, as narrated by Mr. Jay Gould in his foregoing affidavits which I have read, I saw a great deal of him; at one time he passed about a month with me as my guest in this city; he was always known to me and addressed by me as Lord Gordon, and has thus been constantly addressed in my presence by others, who were either in his employ or who happened to be visiting him, when I have been with him; in the course of my acquaintance with him he has talked with me by the hour concerning his titles, his actions and speeches in the House of Lords, his service for his country on most difficult and delicate missions on the Continent and elsewhere, and concerning his vast estates, which had descended to him as the Earl of Aberdeen, in Scotland and in England; his vast wealth, which he represented as producing for him an annual income of $3,000,000, and his investments and transactions in this country; he has frequently made to me the statements and representations set forth in Mr. Gould's affidavit, and a great many others of the same general character, all calculated to lead me to suppose, and they did lead me to suppose, that he was a man not only of vast wealth, but of a most distinguished social position and of high character, and possessed of great influence; soon after my first acquaintance with him, he began to talk of the Erie Railway, of his own great interest therein, which he represented to be $30,000,000 of the stock, which he owned in his own right, and he said that he represented and controlled the interest of the other English stockholders, certainly controlling $20,000,000 more of the stock, and that he controlled all the proceedings which had been or would be taken by the English stockholders, or any persons ostensibly acting for them in the Courts, the Legislature or elsewhere in relation to said Company; I obtained for him a free pass from Mr. Gould and presented it to him; a copy of the pass is contained in Mr. Gould's affidavit; he wrote it in my presence—the bill acknowledging the receipt of the pass, a copy of which is also in Mr. Gould's affidavit; I was first led to distrust him by noticing that he was in the habit of making irreconcilable and contradictory statements at different times concerning the same matter; after I began to make inquiries concerning him I learned that he was an impostor, and that his statements and representations concerning himself, his estate, his wealth, his influence, his interest in and control over the Erie Railway stocks were false and had been made for the purpose of misleading and defrauding Mr. Gould; in short, I learned that the man Gordon was a most consummate liar and an accomplished swindler; he has recently stated to me that he held the stocks placed in his hands by Mr. Gould, and the $200,000 for Mr. Gould, and that they were to be and would be returned to him; he returned the $200,000 in money to me, remarking to me that it was the same money which he had received from Mr. Gould, and some of the securities; he promised to return the balance, and gave an order for them on persons whom he said had them; he has since countermanded said order.

AFFIDAVIT OF WILLIAM M. TWEED.

From the list of sworn statements we also give that of William M. Tweed in full. It is as follows:—

W. M. Tweed, of the city and county of New York, being duly sworn, says:—On Saturday, March 23, 1872, Jay Gould and Wm. Belden called on me at my office, No. 85 Duane street, in the city of New York, as Mr. Gould especially was in the habit of doing quite frequently; in the course of conversation on other matters Mr. Gould mentioned to me that he had about made up his mind that he had been swindled by a man named or called Gordon, of whom I had heard before casually in connection with recent transactions relating to the Erie Railway, but of whom I knew nothing, and he said that he thought he would have to arrest him. I told Mr. Gould that if he wanted to make an arrest he might as well speak about it to Judge Shandley, who was in the next room waiting to see me on business. I then called Judge Shandley in and told him that Mr. Gould had a matter which he would explain; they entered into conversation, and I paid no attention to what they said, and no further attention to the matter. They soon left. They didn't ask me to go, and I didn't go. Nothing further, as far as I can remember, was said either by or to me about the matter. So far as I was concerned and as far as I have any knowledge the meeting of Messrs. Gould and Belden with Judge Shandley was entirely accidental, and resulted solely from the idea which occurred to me at the moment when Mr. Gould spoke of an arrest. When I had finished my business at my office I went, as is my daily custom, to the Metropolitan Hotel. I think this must have been nearly three o'clock in the afternoon. I found in my room at the hotel Messrs. Gould, Belden and Shandley. As I first entered the room I saw lying on the sofa two packages, which Mr. Belden told me contained $100,000 in greenbacks each, and had been returned by Gordon, with the statement that he was willing to do whatever was right. I knew nothing about what was right in the matter and paid very little attention to it. I stayed at my room about half an hour and left. Superintendent Kelso was not at my room while I was there. I neither saw nor had any communication with him on that day.

WILLIAM M. TWEED.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 7th day of May, 1872—GEO. T. HANNING, Notary Public New York county.

LORD GORDON'S COMPLIMENTS.

In connection with the above, and as forming part of the case on Mr. Gould's side, was submitted the following letter addressed to Gould by Gordon, with the monogram "G. H. H." and a coronet on the seal:—

Lord Gordon presents compliments and begs to acknowledge receipt of complimentary pass on the Erie road, of which he will be happy to avail himself in the event of his passing over the line.

WESTMINSTER HOTEL.

TIME FOR RESPONSIVE AFFIDAVITS.

Upon Mr. Root concluding the reading of his affidavits, Judge Porter asked time to put in responsive affidavits. Some considerable discussion followed this request. Mr. Gould's counsel asked that Mr. Gordon be examined in open court, which the latter's counsel strenuously objected to. Judge Brady granted a week's time in which to submit counter affidavits, on the condition that at the end of this time, both Gould and Gordon be examined in open court, but not in the presence of one another. With this understanding, to the great relief of all parties, the Court having been in session five hours, an adjournment of the case was ordered for one week.

THE COURTS.

The Russian Princess' Lost Laces—Defaulting Sureties—Custom House Undervaluation Suit—Charge of Dealing in Counterfeit Money—Alleged Smuggling—The Mandamus Against the Board of Education—A Lesson to Absenting Jurors—Decisions—Business in the Court of General Sessions.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT.

The Russian Princess' Lost Laces—Action Against Two Railroad Companies.

Before Judge Shipman.

Yesterday an action was brought by a Russian Princess—Olga de Maluta Fraloff—against the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Companies to recover damages for the loss of valuable laces. It appeared that the Princess, who is wife of Colonel Fraloff, of the Russian service, travelled in this country in 1864 for the benefit of her health. She was accompanied by an attendant and brought with her a large quantity of laces which she claimed had been heirlooms in her family for many years. These articles the lady had in her trunk on the journey between New York and Niagara Falls; but after her arrival at the Falls she discovered that the trunk had been broken open and the laces—which are valued by the plaintiff at $100,000—entirely abstracted. These laces, it is further alleged, were in the trunk when checked at Albany and were therein in good order.

The trial of this case, all the particulars of which as to the loss of the valuable property in question has been published at full in the HERALD, is creating great interest, inasmuch as one phase of the defence is that the laces were not of the value they were represented to be by the plaintiff. In addition, all the averments of the plaintiff are denied. A number of experts in laces are subpœnaed on the trial. Baron Osten Sacken, the Russian Consul at this port, will be among the witnesses examined. The case will be resumed this morning. Messrs Buckley and Gerard for plaintiff; Messrs. Strong and Walber for defendants.

Suit Against Defaulting Sureties.

The United States vs. The Sureties of Moritz Gutt.—The defendant, who is in the tobacco trade, had given a bond in the sum of $3,000 for the purpose of securing the payment to the government of all taxes and assessments that might be due them in regard to the defendants' transactions. He did not comply with the provisions of the bond, and the result was a suit against his sureties. When the case was called yesterday the sureties were not forthcoming, and a judgment was rendered by default for the government.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT.

The Jute Bag Case.

Before Judge Blatchford.

In the case of the United States vs. Williamson & Goodhue, for alleged undervaluation on imported jute bags, the jury returned a verdict for the government for $59,700.

Condemnations of Goods.

On the return of process, and no claimants appearing, 745 pounds of black silk, imported by John Coleman, were condemned by default, as were also two bottles of cognac, five bottles of mustard and forty-six cases of absinthe, imported by Payne Brothers. The goods in question had been seized at the Custom House.

UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS' OFFICE.

Charge of Dealing in Counterfeit Money.

Before Commissioner Shields.

The United States vs. Patrick Kelly.—The defendant is charged with dealing in counterfeit money. It is alleged that he is an old offender, and not long since was arrested on a charge similar to the above, when, as report stated, he attempted to cut his throat. He is understood to be the owner of a brown stone house and a person of considerable means. The Commissioner held him in default of $10,000 bail to await examination.

Charge of Attempted Rape.

John Walters, who had been a steerage passenger on board the British steamer Idaho, was brought before Commissioner Shields on a charge of having attempted to violate the person of Bothilda Nilson, a fellow passenger. The Commissioner said he had no jurisdiction in the case, and told the woman that she must look to the British Consul for redress.

Alleged Smuggling of Lace Shawls.

The United States vs. Isaac Park.—The defendant, who had been arrested by Samuel Barclay, a Custom House officer, on a charge of having smuggled on shore lace shawls, supposed to have been brought from England on board the steamship City of Washington, was held in $3,000 for examination.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS.

The Mandamus Against the Board of Education.

Before Judge Ingraham.

Ex rel. John Hogan.—This motion came on to be heard yesterday. Mr. James M. Sheehan, who appeared for the relator, showed by the affidavit of Mr. Hogan that he was a freeholder worth $50,000 above all his liabilities, and a dealer in granite; that he bid for the granite work of the new City College, according to the advertisement of the Board—was the lowest responsible bidder—that he tendered his bid in proper form, with sufficient sureties; that the defendants ignored his offered contract, giving the contract to a bidder who was some $850 higher than the relator, thus robbing the taxpayers of the city and imputing to a responsible citizen the suspicion that he could not be trusted to do the necessary work. "To make the question short," said Mr. Sheehan, "the time is past when officials can extract from the citizens with impunity one cent above their well paid salaries."

Mr. Vanderpoel, who appeared for the defendants, insisted that the mandamus cannot lie, because, he said, there was a lower bidder than Mr. Hogan, and the defendants reserved the "right to reject all and any bids" under their notice.

Relator's counsel as strenuously insisted that that notice was wholly illegal and not worth the paper it was written on, and boldly took the ground that no reason could be shown by the defendants why the relator should not have his mandamus except that the difference was to be expended for somebody's benefit. He deprecated the attempt to cheat the city out of over $1,000, because some irresponsible person in the interest of the defendants put in a bogus lower bid than the relator.

The Court took the papers.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS.

Decisions.

By Judge Ingraham.

J. B. Tallman vs. Charles E. Breslin.—Motion granted.

Essex County National Bank vs. Frank B. Hill et al.—Same.

Amelia Levy et al. vs. Virginia Levy.—Same.

Thomas Varney vs. United States Blasting Oil Company.—Same.

Man & Wilcox Co. vs. Edward L. Wilson.—Same.

Wm. H. J. Wood vs. Willard Hansee.—Same.

Charles A. Pangerbiter vs. John H. Nagdell.—Same.

H. D. Townsend vs. C. H. Well.—Same.

Atlantic National Bank of New York vs. Alonzo G. Armstrong.—Same.

Alvin L. Decamp vs. Morritz Uges.—Same.

Oliver Farren vs. William L. Wilbour.—Same.

Peter Smith vs. A. C. Brownell.—Same.

David Frost et al. vs. Conrad Hubner.—Same.

John Vasteen vs. John T. Barwick.—Same.

Sherman Parris vs. Oscar T. Earle.—Same.

Theodore M. Davis vs. Charles C. Eaton.—Same.

Gustavus Isaacs vs Albert G. Lawson.—Same.

William O'Brien vs Jacob Pecare.—Same.

H. B. Claflin vs. Philip Fisher.—Same.

John W. Day et el. vs. John B. Mount.—Same.

E. R. Kirk vs. Clemens Dicks et al.—Same.

W. H. Arnoux vs. John O'Connell.—Same.

Charles Roe et al. vs. Jeremiah T. Smith.—Same.

M. G. Lane vs. Theodore Losee.—Motion denied.

Kendrick vs. Douner.—Same.

Jones vs. Selden et al.—Memoranda for counsel.

Thomas Varney et al. vs. New Jersey Blasting Oil Company.—Same.

The Freehold National Banking Company vs. Samuel T. Corlies et al.—Motion denied, with leave to defendant to answer; costs to plaintiff, $10.

L. S. Dovarin vs. Samuel Stevens.—Motion granted, with $10 costs.

Eleazer M. Couse vs. Joseph F. Cropsey.—Motion granted for third Friday in May.

Lewis Perrins vs. William H. Andrews.—Motion granted and allowance of five per cent.

MARINE COURT—PART II.

Fines Imposed Upon Absent Jurors.

Before Judge Joachimsen.

In consequence of difficulties in obtaining the attendance of regularly summoned jurors in this Court, Judge Joachimsen, sitting for the present term, has directed jurymen to be fined $10 each day that they fail to answer to their names without being excused by the Court. The following named jurors were fined for absence on Monday and yesterday:—

Joseph H. Doncourt, 828 Third avenue; Joseph Adelsdorfer, 51 Leonard street and 66 West Fiftieth street; Joshua Miner, 73 Eighth avenue and 554 Hudson street; John M. Stuart, 144 East Thirtieth street and 144 Broadway; Patrick Fallen, 298 West Thirty-second street; Oscar Varet, 181 West Eleventh street; E. Pouvert, Jr., 29 Thirty-eighth street and 45 South street; E. P. Fuller, 702 Third avenue and 418 West Forty-fourth street; A. G. Benniger, 473 East Nineteenth street; H. N. Taylor, 185 Greenwich street and 33 West Thirty-third street; William B. Flowery, 111 Broadway and 119 First avenue.

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS.

A Notorious Young Criminal Sent to the Penitentiary for Five Years.

Before Recorder Hackett.

The first case disposed of by the jury yesterday was an indictment against Charles Brown, William Thompson and Thomas Tracy, charging them with stealing a pocketbook containing $64, on the 10th of April, from the store of Magdalena Euscher, 24 Eldridge street. The money was found upon the person of Thompson by the officer shortly after the larceny was committed. As there was not legal evidence against the youths Brown and Tracy they were acquitted, but Thompson was pronounced guilty.

His counsel stated that Thompson's mother died the evening before and asked that the sentence be postponed, in order that he might attend the funeral in the company of an officer. His Honor said that the officer informed him that Thompson's father positively refused to interfere in behalf of his erring boy; that he was so bad that he had been mainly instrumental in causing his mother's death. Thompson was arrested before for crime, and judgment was suspended by Judge Ingraham. The Recorder sent him to the Penitentiary for five years.

A Dishonest Domestic Sent to Sing Sing Prison for Two Years.

Bridget Doyle, a domestic in the employ of Mrs. Murphy, 541 Washington street, was tried upon a charge of grand larceny. The complainant missed $1,200 in large bills, which she kept in a bolster slip, on the 15th of April, and for some reason or other suspected Bridget, who, when accused of the theft, first denied it, but subsequently said she had the money sewed up in her dress. She was sworn in her own behalf and said that she found the money on the floor, and did not know the real amount of the bills. The jury rendered a verdict of guilty, with a recommendation to mercy. His Honor said he believed her to be a thief, but would respect the recommendation of the jury, and, instead of sending her to the State Prison for four years, sent her there for the period of two years.

The Statute of Limitations Invoked to Save a Prisoner Charged with Larceny.

Thomas Peterson was arraigned, charged with stealing some property from Nelson J. Crawford, on the 15th of February, 1868. The complainant informed His Honor that he understood Peterson was out of the State during the last four years, but could not positively swear that he was. That being the case the jury were instructed to acquit the defendant, on the ground that the Statute of Limitations debarred the prosecution from trying him.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY.

SUPREME COURT—CIRCUIT—Part 1—Held by Judge Van Brunt.—Nos. 395, 277, 225, 1289, 241, 1531, 1059, 2693, 1327, 1563¼, 855, 2767, 17½, 989½, 1281, 1905, 1291, 1455, 1457, 1491. Part 2—Held by Judge Barrett.—Nos. 656, 188, 176, 318, 590, 770, 60½ R. C., 684½, 686, 688, 690, 692, 694, 696, 698, 700, 702½, 704, 706, 708.

SUPREME COURT—SPECIAL TERM—Held by Judge Brady.—Case on. No calendar. Chambers—Held by Judge Ingraham.—Nos. 64, 70, 90, 91, 92, 96. Call, No. 98.

SUPERIOR COURT—TRIAL TERM—Part 1—Held by Judge Sedgwick.—Nos. 1381, 1657, 1587, 1751, 1595, 1265, 1661, 493, 1133, 1577, 1753, 1755, 1765, 1769, 1771. Part 2—Held by Judge Curtis.—Nos. 762, 1086, 1780, 1826, 476½, 1172, 1186, 12, 726, 862, 1264, 1266, 1268, 1270, 1278.

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS—TRIAL TERM—Held by Judge Loew.—Nos. 1015, 1854, 1855, 1858, 506, 421, 1268, 1514, 1090, 374, 659.

MARINE COURT—TRIAL TERM—Part 1—Held by Judge Shea.—Nos. 8741, 8743, 8927, 8932, 9072, 7649, 8676, 8831, 8843, 8845, 8846, 8853, 8902, 8941, 8871, 8366, 8962, 8971, 8975, 9099. Part 2—Held by Judge Joachimsen.—Nos. 8558, 8881, 7913, 8882, 8495, 8996, 8920, 8925, 8926, 8959, 8963, 8969, 8997. Part 3—Held by Judge Tracey.—Nos. 7695, 8731, 8734, 9245, 9374, 9673, 9691, 9696, 9697, 9699.

COURT OF APPEALS CALENDAR.

NEW YORK, May 7, 1872.

The following is the calendar of the Commission of Appeals for Wednesday, May 8:—Nos. 233, 273, 276, 280½, 281½, 286, 298, 300, 302, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309 and 315.

COURT OF SPECIAL SESSIONS.

The Threatened Jail Delivery Avoided—Resentence of Eleven of the Prisoners Recently Brought from the Island.

The names of fourteen of the prisoners recently brought from Blackwell's Island by their counsel, Mr. William F. Howe, for a new trial under the late decision of Judge Brady, appeared on the calendar of the Court of Special Sessions yesterday morning, as follows:—Martin Schmidt, Charles Smith, Charles A. Hamilton, Charles Schultz, Charles Brown, Henry Furlong, Michael Roach, Walter Egan, George Thompson, James Howard, Peter McDonald, Thomas Ryan, Michael Murray and James O'Brien.

Charles Smith was the first one called, and he pleaded not guilty to a charge of petit larceny. Mr. Howe said he wished to move for a discharge of not only this prisoner, but the whole fourteen, on the ground that the present Court had no jurisdiction in the case, the prisoners having been tried and convicted once for the crimes they were alleged to have committed.

The Court overruled the motion, whereupon Mr. Howe moved for a stay of proceedings in the case; but this motion met with the same fate which had overtaken the other. The irrepressible counsel then requested that the stenographer make a note of his motion, which was done.

Assistant District Attorney Stewart said he thought that if these prisoners came here and pleaded guilty, thereby saving the Court a deal of trouble, the fact of their having already served some time in prison should be taken into consideration by the Court in passing sentence, but if they pleaded not guilty and threw themselves back on their legal rights they should be sentenced regardless of any former imprisonment for the same offence.

Mr. Howe wanted to know if this sort of thing was to be done for the purpose of terrifying the prisoners; if so he should most strenuously protest.

After some little further sparring between counsel the trials progressed, and resulted in the discharge, or rather suspension of sentence, on three of the prisoners, and the taking off of from one to two months of the original sentence of the others.

MARRYING A WHOLE FAMILY.

Trouble in the Smith Family—A Woman Charged With Marrying a Father, Son and Nephew.

James Smith, a young man with hair cropped short, face covered with scratches, and wearing a blue flannel shirt, was arraigned before Justice Cox, at Jefferson Market, yesterday afternoon, upon complaint of a woman giving her name as Eliza Brownell, of 238 Greene street, who charges he assaulted and beat her with his fists. George J. Smith, an attorney-at-law, also marshal of the First District Civil Court, and an ex-captain of the Sixth precinct, appeared and gave bonds for his son's appearance for trial.

The elder Smith stated in Court that about three years ago the woman, who formerly kept a "female boarding house," married his nephew, Alexander Orells, and went on a wedding tour to New Orleans with him, where they put up at a first class hotel. The woman being recognized by some persons in that city, and her actions in the hotel, compelled the authorities to inform her they would allow her a certain time to leave. She stood not upon the order of going, but immediately departed with her husband for this city. They lived together but a short time as man and wife, in consequence of the woman's obtaining a divorce from him. This so incensed the discarded lover that he visited the house of the woman one night and, producing a large knife, flourished it over her head and threatened to annihilate her in case she refused to live with him again. Being afraid he would carry his threat into execution she consented, when he allowed her to roam about the house at leisure. She secured the services of an officer and had him arrested. At the conclusion of his trial he was sentenced to the Island for one year and to pay a fine of $500.

While he was serving out his sentence she formed the acquaintance of George J. Smith, uncle to her first husband, and, after a few weeks' courtship, was married to him. She remained with him only about three months, when she took a sudden fancy to his son (the prisoner) and proposed marriage to him. The couple, unbeknown to the irate Smith, one day suddenly started for New Haven, and she was again married to a member of the family. She soon got tired of the son, and abandoning him succeeded through some means in procuring a divorce from him. The elder Smith upon hearing the facts of the case became greatly incensed at the conduct of his son, and refused to countenance or assist him in any way as long as he remained with or had anything to do with his wife. The elder Smith is reported to be wealthy, and at the time of his marriage to the woman was a widower. He states he was anxious to purchase a hotel and start his son in business, but his infatuation for the woman had completely unmanned him for any business. Upon his giving the required bonds the father and son left the court room together, the former declaring he had a good mind to send them both to State's Prison.

THE MAY ANNIVERSARIES.

The Reform Leaguers at Steinway Hall—The Howard Mission and Home for Little Wanderers at the Academy—Session of the Temperance Commission—The Society for the Relief of Cripples—May Anniversaries to Come Off.

REFORM LEAGUE.

Anniversary Meeting in Steinway Hall Yesterday Afternoon—Slim Attendance, but Spirited Speech-Making.

The anniversary meeting of the Reform League was held yesterday afternoon at Steinway Hall. Weeks ago it had been hoped that Wendell Phillips and other stars of the iconoclastic school would be present, and under the influence of these expectations the big hall had been engaged. These anticipations, however, were disappointed, and consequently, although the League had to pay for the big hall, they thought it best, in consideration of the small audience which they drew together, to assemble in the smaller chamber. Only about sixty or seventy persons were present.

After the usual inaugural speech, in which the various social evils of the day—including the greatest of all, the evil of fallen women—were discussed with extreme freedom—

MRS. DAVIS addressed the meeting on behalf of woman's rights. She said that twenty-four years ago, in 1848, Lucretia Mott and E. Cady Stanton called the first Woman's Rights Convention at Seneca Falls. And nobly had those two women and their adherents since worked for the emancipation of womanhood, though they had been the target of abuse from all over the country, from the press, the pulpit and the stump. Sometimes the battle had seemed to be almost won; and yet, just at this crisis, there seemed to come up a new form of antagonism. This antagonism was threefold in its character—from the scientific, political and theological worlds. Professor Youmans had in a recent pamphlet argued against woman suffrage, basing his objection on the assumption that if women should give her attention to political questions it would remove her from her own peculiar sphere and detract from her usefulness as a mother. He had said that so soon as this were successfully accomplished the race would certainly die out. That was one view, but all women who understood the history of woman would at once and utterly reject it. Both Mrs. Stanton and Mrs. Mott were mothers of large families. Another class of scientific men took the position that woman, in the very beginning of things, was made subordinate to man. This was what we were told in a wonderful book entitled "Universology," which said that the feminoid was by nature derived from the masculoid and much more of the same sort—among other things that man was the image of God and woman the image of the footstool, or the world. Then there were the positivists, many of whose doctrines were undoubtedly true and benevolent. About woman, however, they said that they should be treated in the old chivalric manner. She should not think of rights, but should employ herself with her duties. The political world again, it was clear, was in the midst of a great crisis. When it was plain that the two great parties would break up, many women had taken heart, and, inspired by the adopted name of reformers, had hoped that justice would be done to their sex. A woman had, therefore, gone to Cincinnati—Mrs. Gordon, from California. The first day the Convention had listened patiently to her until she used the phrase, "Grant her rights," when she was overwhelmed with derision, and denied a seat as a delegate. The second day, a lady who had been one of the original laborers in the cause of woman's suffrage, Susan Anthony, had appeared on the platform, and although she had merely whispered for a moment in the ear of the chairman, there was at once a general titter and a storm of hisses. It was to be hoped for the credit of human nature that this was not true; but if it were, what could be hoped for from political parties? The third class of opponents were theological. A noble, sweet Quakeress had so alarmed the Presbyterian Church by speaking in public, that they had required the General Assembly to forbid churches to license or ordain women to officiate in the churches under their supervision. They gave as their reason the mere assertion that it was not woman's function to officiate publicly in the Church, and that she was merely called upon to be a helper. They added:—"God had made woman subject to her husband, and, therefore, if a woman were a pastor her husband would be greater than the pastor"—a clear absurdity. Nothing could be more insulting, and she (the speaker) predicted that this action would drive out of the Presbyterian Church many of the noblest and best women in it. There were many objections brought against woman's suffrage *per se*—for instance, that the exercise of political rights would break up the peace of families. Such a statement was simply absurd. The justice of woman's suffrage, would, on the contrary, bring harmony, not discord, and would unite closer than ever before husband and wife and brother and sister. When woman was the equal of man, and the mother stood side by side with the father in authority, family quarrels and bickerings would cease. It was also sometimes said that not only good women, but base women, would exercise the right of suffrage if it were granted. But she rejoiced that in the future these downtrodden sisters would be endowed with the rights of citizenship—ay, even the basest and lowest—and commence the work of self-respect by knowing that she was recognized as an American citizen. So, too, the working women and the wives of drunkards would then be able to ask their brothers to protect them from the grinding hand of usury and the cruel hand of oppression. Just so long as women were held subordinate they would be ground into the dust. The hand of injustice was laid lightly upon women who were joined to noble men, who were better than the laws; but when you went down into the lower classes of society man exerc