THE WARD'S ISLAND TRAGEDIES.

The Coroner's Inquiry Into the Cause of Death of Ornell and Seymour.

A SICKENING STORY.

How the Helpless Lunatics Are Kicked, Cuffed and Jumped Upon by Their Brutal Keepers.

THRILLING TESTIMONY.

Particulars of the Identification of Farrell by His Victim.

The Post-Mortem Examination of the Colored Patient.

VERDICT OF THE JURY AGAINST FARRELL.

The Prisoner Sent to the Tombs to Await the Action of the Grand Jury.

Yesterday there was great excitement in the city regarding the inquest which was to be held on the deaths of John Ornell and Horatio Seymour, both inmates of the Insane Asylum on Ward's Island, and who died, as was alleged, through violence received at the hands of Thomas Farrell, one of the keepers of Ward M. A considerable number of curious spectators gathered in the office of the Coroner, and before the hour for the opening of the proceedings a large number of people were lounging about the benches in the City Hall Park, feeding upon the suspense which precedes the first climax in a sensation.

THE PRISONER.

A few moments before eleven o'clock the prisoner was brought into the room by a policeman, and took a seat in the corner, near the desk of the Coroner. He had been in the Tombs since his arrest, yet, although he wore a look of slight pallor, his expression was quite bright and buoyant. He is not a person of very prepossessing appearance, and has a large lump over his left eye, which will add to his evil look. There is a vestige of sinister motive in his eyes, and the whole contour of his face is of the determined, unscrupulous type, which never conveys a very pleasing impression. On several occasions during the investigation he betrayed some excitement, rising excitedly in his seat and asking to be heard. But each time he was silenced. When the verdict was at length given a sudden flush overspread his features, and he looked about the room with nervous perturbation. Apart from these incidents his demeanor was stolid and indifferent, and he frequently gave play to a cunning smile, intended to create a profound impression on the jury.

Coroner Keenan soon afterwards made his appearance, accompanied by Dr. Wooster Beach, his assistant, and the proceedings were formally opened. The jury were by this time all in their seats, and the Coroner in a few words explained to them the salient features of the case, as they presented themselves before investigation. After they were sworn the first witness was immediately called. His name was Edward Burke.

TESTIMONY OF EDWARD BURKE.

In answer to questions he said:—I am a warden in the Lunatic Asylum on Ward's Island; I know very little about this case, as I was absent at the time of its occurrence; Dr. Echeverria had inquired into it, and on Monday, on returning from Philadelphia, I understood that some patients had been abused by an attendant whose name was Thomas Farrell; the patient who was injured was John Ornell; I was told that he died in consequence of abuse.

Q. Did you take any action in the matter? A. No; the resident physician took all the action and had already taken the depositions of the keepers in the case; I had Farrell arrested and locked up in the Twelfth precinct station house; I notified the Coroner that evening that it was a case for his investigation, and stated the supposed cause of death.

THE DEATH OF SEYMOUR.

Q. Have you heard of any other death since? A. Yes; that of Horatio Seymour.

Q. When was that? A. It was the evening before last—Monday evening.

Q. Did you know anything about the cause of his death? A. I supposed it to be the same as that of the other patient, that is from injuries inflicted by Thomas Farrell; Ornell was admitted to the asylum May 23, 1872, and he died September 12; Seymour was admitted July 31, and he died September 16.

Q. What ward were they in? A. Ward M.

Q. Both? A. Yes, sir; not all the time, however; they had been in other wards and were transferred to that some weeks before.

Q. What keepers were attendants in that ward? A. Edward Ball was one; there were three at the time of this occurrence—Edward Ball, Patrick McLaughlin and Thomas Farrell.

Q. How long had Farrell been attendant? A. He was appointed on the 29th of July, 1872.

Q. Have you ever heard of any complaints against Farrell before this time? A. No, not against Farrell; there had been a complaint against a man in the same ward, named Faulkner, for assaulting one of the patients.

Q. Who made the complaint? A. I made the complaint, but it was on circumstantial evidence; one of the patients reported it to me; Faulkner said that he had done it in self-defence; I recommended his discharge and the Commissioners restored him; I have seen

BRUISES ON PATIENTS,

but as far as I could ascertain they were inflicted by other inmates; sometimes a black eye or a scratch on the face.

Q. You have not been able to trace by whom the wounds were inflicted? A. No, sir.

Q. What is the duty of the attendant? A. To see that patients are kept clean; attend to their meals; regulate the hour of their retiring, &c. They are all on duty at the same time; we have two keepers in each ward, and three in ward M, which is the hardest ward to take care of, and where the filthiest patients are confined; the keepers must be on duty in the hall, and are not permitted in the ward; they are on duty one at a time.

Q. Do they have any directions in regard to

RESTRAINING THE PATIENTS?

A. They most always report first to the resident physician, and, without instructions, patients cannot be restrained; they have no power to punish or to strike them, except in the most extreme cases of self-defence.

Q. Is it left to them to determine when they shall use violence? A. Well, it is left to be judged afterwards; if we think they have done wrong we report them to the resident physician, and they are dismissed if guilty.

The jury did not wish to ask this witness any questions and he was sent away. Their foreman was reading a copy of yesterday's HERALD during the foregoing testimony.

The witness said further, before leaving the stand, that a woman who works in ward M had told him in the morning that she had seen one of the patients kick Ornell; her name was MacInrogue.

DR. GONZALES ECHEVERRIA

was next called to the stand. He said:—I am the resident physician of the New York City Lunatic Asylum at Ward's Island; I have been connected with it since the opening of the asylum in December of 1871.

Q. What do you know in connection with this case? A. I was absent from the institution during the month of August and returned on the 1st of September; I then heard that charges had been published in some of the daily papers concerning the brutal treatment received by the patients in ward M; I also received the same complaints from some of the relatives of the patients and the patients themselves; I found that the condition of the patients in ward M was very different from that of those who were there when I left; they were very filthy and covered with marks in the face and body, decidedly proceeding from violence; I remonstrated with the attendant, Wall or Ball (Warden Burke—his name is Wall, but we had him on our books as Ball) about the condition of the ward, and told him that

THE PATIENTS WERE EVIDENTLY ILL-TREATED

and that he should prevent it; on Monday morning, the 9th of September, as I was passing along on my visit, my attention was called by Ball to the condition of John Ornell, who was then lying in bed perfectly naked; I had seen Ornell the day previous, and he looked very well; I found him in bed in a state of collapse; he was quite cold, perspiring, with a clammy moisture on his flesh, and bearing, in one word, all the signs of having received a violent shock; he had a black eye; his right shoulder was bruised; he had a recent long red mark on the right side of the chest; his left side was also marked.

THE VICTIM IDENTIFIES FARRELL.

He could hardly be aroused, yet still he was rational and understood my questions; he had his right hand across his stomach at the time, and I asked him if he had been hurt, and he replied that the men in the hall had hurt him; I asked him if they were the attendants, and he replied, "Yes;" I asked him again if he could say which of the attendants had hurt him, and he replied, "The tall man;" Commissioners Bowen and Frear came that morning to the asylum and I reported to them the stated facts and the critical condition of Ornell; they at once instituted an investigation and had attendants Ball and Farrell examined; both denied that they had hurt Ornell; thereupon the Commissioners left the investigation open and directed me to conduct the examination of Ornell and of the case, and to see if I could prove the guilt of Farrell in a more positive manner; about one o'clock in the afternoon of the same day (Monday) Ornell seemed to revive, and I took the three attendants in the ward and presented them to him; I requested him to answer "Yes" or "No" to the questions which I should ask him in regard to which of them had injured him; I presented to him first Ball, and he replied, "No;" I presented to him McLaughlin, and he answered, "No;" I then presented Farrell, and he answered, "Yes;" then Farrell said, "He doesn't understand," and Ornell again said, "Yes;"

FARRELL LAUGHED AT HIM,

and then Ornell again said, "Yes; you did it; you jumped on my body."

Farrell, while this testimony was being given, sat in the corner of the room, smiling.

Dr. Echeverria, proceeding, said:—Ornell said, "You hurt me, hopping on my body; yes, you did; I will tell it to everybody; I will tell no lie;" I took down his words on a piece of paper and sent the result of the above examination, signed by the three attendants, McLaughlin, Ball and Farrell, to the Board, and Farrell was dismissed on Wednesday; Ornell died on Thursday afternoon, about two o'clock; he was rational from Monday until a very few moments before his death; I visited him three or four times every day, and every time I questioned him in regard to the man who had hurt him he answered, "The tall man—the man who was swollen in the eye—is the one;" he was rational at the time he made these statements and understood perfectly well every question I asked him.

Q. What do you know in reference to

THE CASE OF SEYMOUR,

Doctor? A. About nine A. M. on Saturday, after I returned from the Court in Harlem, I was informed by the assistant resident physician that Horatio Seymour, in ward M, was in a dying condition, and that, as it appeared, from the treatment received at the hands of Farrell, according to the statement of a man in the same ward; I went and examined Seymour, and found him with symptoms of acute peritonitis; he told me then that he had been

KICKED AND ILL TREATED BY FARRELL,

and gave a very rational account of the manner in which he had been kicked and struck. He repeated the same statement every time I saw him until his death, and on one occasion he told me that "that man, with the lump on the eye, he kicked me hard." In this way he identified Farrell, not knowing the name.

Q. Do you consider his statement entitled to belief? A. I do, so far as I could judge; he died on Monday evening.

Q. Can you state what you found upon examination of his remains? A. I can read it to you.

THE POST MORTEM EXAMINATION

was made about twenty-four hours after death.

The following paper was then read:—

Post-mortem examination of Horatio Seymour, a negro, made about twenty-four hours after death, September 17, 1872:—

The body was not emaciated; had well-marked muscular development; cadaverous rigidity was manifest. There was a cut on the top of the head, a little to the right side, and close to it a mark of another cut, fully healed. An abscess of old duration was opened in the right ear. There were two abrasions over the right shoulder. One of them was entirely healed. On the back of this right shoulder there were two superficial, longitudinal dark marks, one inch and a half long and one-eighth of an inch wide. There was a very slight superficial and diffuse discoloration of the skin on the lower part of the right side of the chest. An abrasion was also found on left leg, just below the knee, midway between the knee and fock. There was a large suppurating ulcer on the external part of the right heel. Under the skin, and in the middle of the front of the chest, on a line with the third rib, there was a very recent extravasation of blood, of oval shape, about the size of a silver dollar. The fourth left rib was fractured about one inch from the cartilage, the fragments being disunited and surrounded by suppuration. The eighth and ninth ribs of the left side were also broken, about three inches from the cartilage, both fractures appearing of recent occurrence. On the right side the sixth and seventh ribs were fractured, the sixth about one inch and a half from the cartilage and the seventh two inches from the cartilage. The ends of the fragments of the sixth right rib were surrounded by a thick gelatinous serosity. There were slight adhesions extending over the whole of both lungs, which otherwise appeared healthy, with the exception of a very distinct circumscribed spot of inflammation beneath the fractured ribs, on the right side, corresponding to the upper portion of the lower lobe of the right lung. The heart was rather large, but healthy. The liver, stomach and spleen were natural. The intestines, distended by gas, did not seem inflamed. The kidneys were pale and enlarged and looked as though in an early stage of fatty degeneration, with a few small, superficial transparent cysts. A recent extravasation of blood, the size of a silver half-dollar, existed under the skin of the forehead, over the right eye. There was a large, doubtful sub-cutaneous mark also on the left side of the back of the head. On opening the skull the blood gushed out from the right side and a film of recently extravasated blood covered almost the whole brain. This blood was superficial to the brain under the duramater, as usually observed in cases of severe violence on the head. Over the right and upper part of the head the blood was more firmly coagulated than in any other parts. There was no fracture of any of the bones of the skull, which were very thick. No rupture of the membranes of the brain or collection of serum or extravasation of blood was discovered in the brain, which showed a healthy looking consistency and appearance in every other respect.

HEEL PRINTS ON SEYMOUR'S HEAD.

Q. What kind of violence was administered, do you think? A. Kicks; the marks seemed on the head to show the form of a heel; I forgot to say before that there were marks of pus on the walls of the ward; Corden told me that this man Farrell slapped Seymour once so hard on the side of the head that he burst an abscess and the matter gushed out on the wall; the marks are seen there now.

THE STORY OF SAMUEL CORDEN.

The testimony of Dr. Echeverria was here ended, and the next witness, Samuel Corden, was called. He is an old man, with a perfectly white head, weak, trembling and emaciated—a very picture of death. He said:—I reside at 131 Newark avenue, Jersey City; I was recently an inmate of the insane asylum on Ward's Island; two weeks ago the resident physician considered me recovered; I had been three months in the institution; I was in ward H part of the time—about six or seven weeks—and part of the time was in ward M.

Q. Is your memory good and clear of what has happened in the last two weeks? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you remember seeing either Ornell or Seymour while they were living? A. O, yes; I remember Mr. Ornell, an elderly man, coming there the same day that I did.

Q. Do you remember Seymour? A. Yes, sir; I remember his coming in.

Q. Did you see either Ornell or Seymour receive any injuries from any one? A. Yes, sir; Ornell had been in for some days; he hopped around to get to his meals; then he seemed to fail in strength; was fond of lying down on the floor; I saw Farrell kick him while he was on the floor on several occasions, but not badly.

Q. In what part of the body? A. Either on the arm or side.

Q. Did you ever see blood on him after he was kicked? A. No, sir, I never did.

Q. Did you see him every time that he kicked him? A. No, sir; he might have kicked him when I did not see him.

Q. Did you ever see any one kick or abuse Seymour, the colored man? A. Yes, sir; he was struck on the right ear with the hand,

BREAKING AN ABSCESS;

I saw Farrell, on one occasion, stamp on him after he had knocked him down.

Farrell, seated in the corner of the room, here arose and said hurriedly—"Gentlemen, will you allow me to speak for one moment?"

The Coroner—Please sit down; you will find an opportunity.

Q. Why did Farrell knock him down? A. I know no occasion for his knocking him down; he was

A HARMLESS MAN;

Farrell made the remark to him, after stamping upon him, "You wouldn't mind entering a den of tigers, would you?" Seymour said, "No, sir;" I saw him strapped sometimes—

BEATEN WITH A STRAP;

with a Saratoga trunk strap. [Laughter.]

The Coroner here commanded silence.

A Juryman—Who used the strap? A. Thomas Farrell.

Q. Do you know of his being hurt elsewhere? A. His head was hurt when he came into the asylum.

Q. You know of no accident where he received a violent blow upon the head? A. No, sir.

Q. You say that he has been black and blue sometimes? A. Yes, sir; I've seen him black and blue all over from beating by a keeper whom they call Jerry, in ward H.

Q. You didn't see any one strike the deceased, except Farrell—neither keepers nor inmates? A. No, sir; except one inmate, named Dennis O'Brien, whom I saw at several different times strike Seymour in the back with his fist and shove him to his seat; there are no weapons in the ward that could be appropriated.

A Juryman—Would you judge that the force with which Farrell struck Seymour would cause death? A. I should say that it was dangerous, and could not say that it would cause death; the last time I saw either of the patients beaten was about two weeks ago; he was put to bed a week before he died.

EDWARD WALL'S TESTIMONY.

The next witness was Edward Wall, who explained that his name had been misspelled on the books of the asylum. He said:—I am an attendant in the New York Asylum for the Insane on Ward's Island.

Q. Please state what you know of this case? A. John Ornell was a man whom I knew very well; when he first came there he had an iron shoe attached to his body, his leg being distorted; Ornell was such a person as would frequently, when passing through the ward, strike patients with his right hand. His left, I think, was paralyzed; he was of a mischievous disposition; some time during the month of August he was transferred from Ward I to Ward M; he was very feeble at the time; sometimes he would come to his meals and at other times he would refuse them; about three or four days previous to his going to bed he became very filthy; about two weeks ago, perhaps, on the morning that he was first confined to his bed, he got up as usual and dressed himself, and McLaughlin called my attention to his condition, and I immediately put him to bed; he had his clothes on; I reported the case to Dr. Echeverria; Dr. Echeverria then made mention that he thought this man Ornell was abused; had been knocked down; I told the Doctor that I thought he could not be knocked down, as he was not able to stand; Ornell was not asked if I was the man who did it, nor, to the best of my knowledge, did the Doctor ask that question in regard to McLaughlin; in my presence there was no man but Farrell himself put to the test before the dying man.

Q. Did Ornell say that Farrell struck him? A. Ornell said that

FARRELL "HOPPED" ON HIM;

we understood that he meant Farrell.

Q. Do you know yourself of any injuries received by Seymour or Ornell? A. I know of Ornell being injured by a patient; we had a man named Charles Conklin who died eight or nine days ago; he was a very foracious man—not violent, but voracious in eating. On going into the dining room at dinner time he ran against Ornell and knocked him against the door, and that accounts, in my opinion, for his black eye; I am not aware of any other injuries received by Ornell or Seymour in any way.

Q. How much of the time are you in the ward? A. I am supposed to be there at all times unless business calls me away; I am in and out at all hours; I am the principal attendant; it is impossible for me to see all that goes on there; I do not think that either Ornell or Seymour are entitled to belief; a day or two before Ornell died Mrs. Barker, the matron, said to me that he had told her when she asked him if Farrell had "hopped" on him, "Yes, he hopped on me once

IN A LAGER BEER SALOON IN FOURTH STREET;"

Seymour said to one of the physicians in my presence that his injuries had been inflicted six months ago.

Q. You are not on duty at night? A. No, sir; the wards are then in charge of the watchmen; there are opportunities at night for the patients to injure one another.

Patrick McLaughlin was the next witness. He said that he was a keeper in ward M.

Q. Have you seen anything in relation to these cases more than was stated by the last witness? A. My impression is that Farrell was brought forward in a way which would induce his identification; he was pressed forward; I was not brought forward at the time at all, and if I had been I really believe I would as soon have been identified as Farrell.

Q. Do you think that Ornell meant that Farrell beat him? A. I could not say, as I was not brought forward and he being the only man who was brought forward; he meant Farrell when he said, "He hopped on my body;" I do not think his statement is entitled to belief.

Q. Is that your signature on the paper (showing him Dr. Echeverria's memoranda)? A. Yes, sir, that is correct.

The paper was read to McLaughlin, who said:—The words of Ornell there are correct.

THE DEPOSITION OF THE DEPUTY CORONER

was then made.

Dr. Beach—I have made a post-mortem examination on the bodies of Ornell and Seymour, with the resident physician; in the case of Seymour I concur with the opinion of Dr. Echeverria; Ornell had a disease of the brain, which might have proved fatal at any time, yet death could have been accelerated by very slight injuries.

The jury were about to retire. The prisoner again asked to say a few words, but was refused.

The jury then went out to deliberate upon the evidence. While they were absent there was a busy hum of voices. Farrell's fellow keepers held subdued conversation with one another, and Dr. Echeverria consulted in an under tone with Dr. Beach. At forty minutes past one the jury returned, walked quickly to their seats and handed the written verdict in each case to the Coroner, which was read aloud.

THE VERDICTS.

"Horatio Seymour came to his death from injuries received at the hands of Thomas Farrell."

"The death of John N. Ornell was accelerated by injuries inflicted by Thomas Farrell."

It was not till the solemn result was announced that the prisoner betrayed any strong symptoms of emotion. His face turned a violent red, and when he looked around the room it wore an expression of fear. Every gaze was bent upon him.

He was called before the Coroner, who asked,

"What is your name?"

"Thomas Farrell; I reside in 110th street, between Tenth and Eleventh avenues. I am a stairbuilder by trade; but have been a keeper in the Insane Asylum, on Ward's Island. I have nothing to say, only that I am not guilty of this charge at all."

He signed his name with a firm hand and was remanded to the Tombs to await an investigation by the Grand Jury.

THE INGERSOLL BAIL BONDS.

Examination of His Sureties—The Father of the Great Chair Maker Gives a Schodule of His Property—A Partner of the Latter, the Other Proffered Security, also Gives a Statement of His Worldly Effects.

That famous suit, in legal phraseology designated the suit of the People vs. Tweed, Ingersoll, Garvey and Underwood, but popularly known as the O'Conor suit, instituted to recover from the parties named $6,000,000, alleged to have been stolen by them from the city, after a prolonged respite in the courts, has again given evidence of vitality in proceedings yesterday morning before Judge Leonard, holding Supreme Court, Chambers, touching justification of the sureties offered for James H. Ingersoll. The parties appearing on his bail bond, which was for $500,000, it will be remembered, were William W. Watson and Lorin Ingersoll, the latter being the father of Mr. Ingersoll, and the two being partners in business. They were required to justify in $500,000 each. Mr. Wheeler H. Peckham appeared for the people and Mr. Elihu Root for Mr. Ingersoll.

MR. WATSON'S PROPERTY.

Mr. Watson was first examined. He said that he owned a half interest in real estate on the Bowery and on Chrystie street, worth $250,000; property on Beekman street, worth $35,000; property on Sixty-fifth street, worth $25,000; a farm in New Jersey, worth $20,000, and about $210,000 in bonds and mortgages. All this property he owned free of debts or encumbrances.

Q. Is this all the property you own? A. I own personal property besides of the value of about $150,000.

Q. How much of your property was conveyed to you in order to enable you to justify in the full amount named in your bond? A. About one hundred and twenty thousand dollars; this was conveyed to me absolutely for a nominal consideration and without any agreement or understanding as to a reconveyance; Tammany bonds, a mortgage on Fifth avenue property and 140 shares of insurance stock were put in my hands for this purpose; Mr. Ogilby conveyed the property to me; I was not a partner with the defendant, Ingersoll, but with his father.

Q. Would you return the property given you for the purpose stated, if this bond was out of the way? A. I don't know whether I would or not; I have made no agreement for its reconveyance.

INGERSOLL'S FATHER TELLS WHAT HE IS WORTH.

Mr. Ingersoll testified that he owned the other half of the property on Bowery and Chrystie street mentioned by Mr. Watson. He owned in addition to this property in Twenty-third street, between Seventh and Eighth avenues, worth $500,000; property in Beekman street of the value of $17,500; one-third interest in dock property at the foot of East Twenty-sixth street, of the value of $90,000; property in Morrisania worth $30,000; stocks, bonds, mortgages and other personal property, worth about $300,000.

Q. How much do you consider yourself worth altogether above your debts and liabilities? A. Between $900,000 and $1,000,000.

Q. Which, if any of the above property, was conveyed to you to enable you to justify for the full amount named in your bond? A. The property in West Twenty-third street.

Q. Was this given to you absolutely? A. It was.

Q. In case of Mr. Ingersoll responding when his case was called for trial would you give back this property? A. I don't know.

Q. Do you mean to say you do not know whether in such case you would reconvey the property? A. I mean just what I have said, I don't know.

ARGUMENT OF COUNSEL.

The above examination concluded, the long cross-examination of both developing nothing new or important, the counsel argued the case at some length. Mr. Peckham insisted that the parties could not properly justify, inasmuch as a portion of the property sworn to by each, or owned by them respectively, was only nominally theirs and given them for this purpose. He did not consider that accepting these men as sureties under the circumstances would be in full compliance with the requirements of the statute.

Mr. Root urged that the property in question belonged absolutely to Messrs. Ingersoll & Watson; that they could sell, give away or will away the same, or do with it as they pleased. The whole question lay with the conscience of the Judge. This property was liable with the rest in case Mr. Ingersoll, the defendant, did not respond. He asked permission to send up a decision of Judge Cardozo in the Tweed case covering precisely the same point.

"Considering Judge Cardozo's late career," interrupted Mr. Peckham, "I don't think his opinion amounts to much."

"A kick at a dead lion," whispered a lawyer.

"It will do for an argument," said the Judge, looking at the counsel over his spectacles.

"And a good argument it will be found," observed Mr. Root.

DECISION POSTPONED.

Judge Leonard made a few general observations upon the matter, which seemed to indicate a disposition to accept the sureties. He, however, thought the subject was one requiring a careful examination of all the facts, and therefore would take the matter under advisement. He would try to render his decision to-day.

SUPREME COURT CALENDAR.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., Sept. 18, 1872.

The following is the calendar of the General Term of the Supreme Court for to-morrow, September 19:—Nos. 72, 73, 86, 122, 143, 9, 105, 107, 116, 130, 144, 145, 147, 148, 149, 150, 153, 156.

THE COURTS.

Charge of Violating the Shipping Act and Revenue Law—A Convict Pardoned—Action for Careless Driving—A Landlord Case—Business of the General Sessions.

UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS' COURT.

Charge of Violating the Shipping Act.

Before Commissioner Shields.

The United States vs. James Foley, William Burke and Michael Clements.—The defendants were charged with violating the Shipping law by boarding the ship Pallas without the permission of the master. The Commissioner held them in $500 bail each for examination.

Alleged Violation of the Revenue Law.

The United States vs. Jacob Plickhardt.—The defendant, who carries on business at No. 55 Clinton street, was held in $500 bail for examination on a charge of selling liquor without paying the special tax.

A Convict Pardoned.

Henry Hoffman, who had been sentenced by Judge Benedict to three years' imprisonment in Kings County Penitentiary for counterfeiting, and had served out ten months of his time, has been pardoned by the President on the recommendation of Mr. S. S. Cox.

Naturalization.

Since the 9th inst. seventy-five persons have been naturalized in the United States Courts of this city. Parties entitled to naturalization may apply to Mr. G. A. Appleton, room 31, United States Courts.

SUPREME COURT.

Decision.

By Judge Leonard.

Mary D. Bryan, Executrix of Daniel A. Baldwin.—On filing an undertaking, with the sureties approved by the Court, the plaintiff's proceeding must be stayed as I understand such an undertaking has been filed and sureties have justified; but if not so, the stay is only to commence when it is done.

Thomas Sooheef vs. Sarah Collins et al.—Motion denied.

James Dater vs. Darius Tallman.—Motion granted.

Philip Dater et al. vs. Same.—Same.

By Judge Barrett.

Theron S. Doremus et al. vs. Jacob McDowell et al.—Order settled.

SUPERIOR COURT—SPECIAL TERM.

Decisions.

By Judge Curtis.

Louisa Chaboda vs. Charles Chaboda.—Divorce granted.

The Sixth National Bank vs. Edwin A. Brooks.—Motion to set aside order denied, without costs.

Moses M. Broodwell vs. Otto Evertzbrisch.—Reference granted.

Kate Egelius vs. George Egelius.—Same.

George Harner vs. Charles E. Hill.—Default taken.

MARINE COURT—PART I.

A Case of Careless Driving.

Before Judge Shea.

Louis Guipe, Jr., by his Guardian, vs. Isaac Rodman.—In January last the plaintiff, a boy, returning from school, was crossing Third avenue at Seventy-ninth street, and while waiting for a car to pass was run down by a butcher cart belonging to the defendant, driven by one Francis McCuen, and seriously injured about the face and head. Damages to the extent of the Court's jurisdiction were claimed. Defendant's counsel sought to prove that the accident was brought about by the boy's negligence, but the principal ground of defence was that while McCuen was doing business for the defendant under a contract he was not engaged as a driver, and on this occasion had taken the wagon without permission, to go upon private business. This was testified to both by the defendant and McCuen. No evidence of weight being offered by plaintiff's counsel on this point, the Court rendered a judgment of dismissal, on the ground that sufficient evidence had not been offered to show that the relation of master and servant existed between the defendant and driver at the time the accident occurred.

"A New Way to Pay Old Debts."

Before Judge Joachimsen.

Myndert P. Van Cordt vs. Mary G. Frazer.—The plaintiff did about one hundred and fifty dollars' worth of plumbing work in the house occupied by the defendant and her husband and owned by one of them. A judgment was recently recovered against the husband, but the house turned out to be in the wife's name and the judgment good for nothing. On this trial it appeared that orders in the matter were given by the wife as well as the husband, consultations always being held between them. The husband testified that the work was done on his order, and, as he owed his wife money, he let the work go in settlement. The Judge said he could hardly approve of that way of cancelling an indebtedness, and certainly could take no cognizance of such an arrangement between husband and wife, unless some notice of it was brought home to the party doing the work. Judgment in favor of plaintiff.

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS.

Alleged Outrage Upon a Little Girl—The Accused Acquitted.

Before Judge Bedford.

The first case passed upon by the jury in this court yesterday was a charge of outrage, preferred against Martin Forrester by a girl named Hervina Galt, who said she was nearly thirteen years old. A respectable physician testified that he examined the girl, found that nothing was the matter with her, and no indication of injury upon her person. The complainant communicated a certain statement to the Judge, which was told to the doctor, who said that it was perfectly impossible for such a thing to have occurred.

Under these circumstances the jury promptly rendered a verdict of not guilty.

A Boy Burglar.

William J. Meagher, a boy, was tried for burglariously entering the lager beer saloon of Adam Fries, 540 West Twenty ninth street, on the 22d of August, by getting through the fanlight. He stole the money drawer containing $10, was pursued by an officer, and, in order to escape arrest, jumped into the river at Eleventh avenue, but was subsequently captured. He was found guilty of petit larceny and sent to the Penitentiary for six months.

Two "Unfortunates" Sent to the Penitentiary.

Susan Wilson and Josephine Clark were tried and convicted of stealing $130 from Martin Brain while in their company at a disreputable house in Greene street five weeks ago. Although the prisoners were young girls of the town there were some mitigating circumstances which led the District Attorney to invoke the clemency of the Court. Judge Bedford sentenced them to the Penitentiary for one year.

Alleged Felonious Assault Upon an Officer.

William Dunn, an old man, was placed at the bar charged with attempting to kill Officer Ginley, of the Eleventh precinct, on the 12th of August by attempting to strike him with an axe. The officer's account of the occurrence differed materially from that given by the accused and his witnesses, who swore that Ginley beat the accused in a most brutal manner.

Mr. Hummel stated that he wished to prove by Dr. Nealis that the defendant was wounded, and, as the usual hour of adjournment had arrived, the Court adjourned. The case will be finished to-day.

Grand and Petit Larcenies.

Frank Hudson, who on the 2d inst. stole three pieces of velvet, the property of Sigmond S. Prager, 482 Broadway, pleaded guilty to an attempt at grand larceny, and was sent to the Penitentiary for one year.

A similar plea was accepted from Kate Ryan, who was charged with stealing, on the 13th of August, $35 from August Wilson.

Mary Ann Slavin pleaded guilty to petit larceny, the indictment charging her with stealing two pieces of lace, the property of Harris Wife.

Henry Merose, who, on the 17th of May, stole a silver watch and a coat from Henry Rausch, also pleaded guilty to the minor grade of larceny.

These prisoners were each sent to the Penitentiary for six months.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS—Held by Judge Leonard.—Nos. 38, 55, 63, 68, 70, 84, 87, 97. Call 104.

MARINE COURT—TRIAL TERM—Part 1—Held by Judge Shea.—Nos. 78, 120, 128, 152, 158, 186, 206, 210, 244, 319, 354, 356, 358, 360. Part 2—Held by Judge Joachimsen.—Nos. 67, 83, 95, 101, 137, 313, 315, 317, 321, 323, 325, 327, 329, 331, 333. Part 3—Held by Judge Curtis.—Nos. 262, 362, 364, 366, 368, 370, 372, 374, 376, 378, 380, 382, 386, 388, 346. Part 4—Held by Judge Spaulding.—Nos. 108, 27, 35, 149, 252.

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS—Held by Judge Bedford.—Burglary, David Meehan and Edward Quinn, Thomas Clark, John Madden and Peter Scanlon, James L. Watson, and Samuel S. Jackson. Forgery, Julius Hesse. Felonious assault and battery, William Walsh and Harmon Gottschalk. Grand larceny, James Donovan and Charles V. Stillman. Larceny from the person, Michael O'Brien.

BROOKLYN COURT CALENDAR.

CITY COURT.—Nos. 86 to 104, inclusive; 106.

COMMISSION OF APPEALS.

ALBANY, N. Y., Sept. 18, 1872.

The following is the Commission of Appeals day calendar for Thursday, September 19:—Nos. 256, 323, 329, 330, 356, 359, 367, 372, 379, 383, 140, 389, 390½, 413, 414.

BUSINESS OF THE LAW COURTS FOR THE COMING TERM.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT.

Judge Shipman will sit in this Court on Tuesday, October 1, and for two weeks will be engaged in the trial of persons accused of criminal offences. His Honor has at present before him the question whether the indictments found against the members of the "Whiskey Ring" are defective or not. If he decides that the indictments are good in law it is probable that the District Attorney will take up the trial of one or more of the prominent leaders of this "ring." Such trials would certainly occupy all the time now specified within which Judge Shipman is to confine his attention to the criminal calendar, and exclude the possibility of any other case of a criminal nature being entered upon during that period. If another judge be not appointed to sit, or if Congress do not empower United States Commissioners to deal finally with matters of a criminal nature the calendar will hardly ever be cleared, as the Grand Jury finds indictments much quicker than the judges are able to try them. On the third Monday in October equity cases will be taken up either by Judge Shipman or another.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT.

Business in Bankruptcy.

Judge Blatchford will sit to-day for the purpose of hearing motions in bankruptcy. The following cases are upon the calendar for this day:—

Daniel W. Pierson vs. Walter Jones.

Frederick W. Hotchkiss vs. Hiram Cohen.

Samuel N. Pike et al. vs. Matthew E. Cooke and Lawrence Daly.

Adolph Tuska vs. Joseph J. Hamburg.

Charles L. Fessenden et al. vs. William E. Rider.

William O. Headley et al. vs. Patrick Keogh, Michael S. Keogh and Sylvester R. Keogh.

In the case of Simon Salomon vs. Nathan Bach the debtor has put in an answer denying that he has committed an act of bankruptcy, and the question whether he has or not is to be determined by a jury trial.

In the matter of Edwin H. Gibbs vs. Adolph Bock, Carl Schneider, John Bechtel and Jacob Schoen the debtors have denied the bankruptcy imputed to them, and demanded a jury trial, which the Court has ordered.

The Security Bank vs. James L. Andrus and John H. Andrus.—In this case a trial by jury has also been ordered.

Theodore M. Davis vs. J. Edwin Conant and William L. Avery.—Trial by jury also ordered in this case.

Diego de Castro vs. Julius Gerson.—This case is also to be tried by a jury.

There are several other bankruptcy cases on the jury calendar, which, with the above, will be disposed of in the November term of the Court.

Business in Admiralty.

Judge Blatchford will sit on Tuesday, October 1, and then proceed to dispose of causes of admiralty. The subjoined cases are on the calendar, and will be called in their order on the 1st of October, at 11 A. M.:—

81. Thomas Kelly vs. the Ferryboat Manhassett.
24. E. R. Aumach vs. The Schooner Creole.
176. James Magienn vs. Steamer Argo.
173. John Irwin vs. Steamtug W. E. Cheney.
174. A. R. Bass vs. steamtug W. E. Cheney.
188. John Ryan vs. Richard Heckscher, Jr.
150. Mary Thomas vs. steamtug General William McCandless.
165. E. Babcock et al. vs. propeller Electra.
12. Commercial Steamboat Company vs. ferryboat America.
166. F. V. Crandall et al. vs. brig Wolfville.
139. W. Phillips et al. vs. steamboat Anna.
177. New Jersey Railroad and Transportation Company vs. propeller J. Taylor.
39. J. Johnson et al. vs. the schooner J. M. McMillan.
152. The United States vs. a lot of lumber.
136. H. W. Benedict vs. steamtug Niagara.
133. J. P. Brown vs. Samuel C. Lord.
156. B. Nickerson et al. vs. steamtug Echo.
130. C. Whitney et al. vs. ferryboat Sunswick.

MARRIAGES AND DEATHS.

GUION—CRAFT.—In Glen Cove, L. I., on Thursday evening, September 12, 1872, at the residence of the bride's parents, by Rev. Thomas MaNaby, rector of St. Paul's church, CHARLES L. GUION to GERTRUDE CRAFT, youngest daughter of Joseph and Ann Craft

MORRELL—HOBLEY.—On Monday, September 16, by the Rev. E. S. Porter, D. D., HENRY S. MORRELL to EMMA HOBLEY, all of Williamsburg. No cards.

NIXON—KINNEY.—On Monday, September 9, at Pawtucket, Rhode Island, CHARLES M. NIXON, of New York, to MISS LIZZIE J. KINNEY.

Cincinnati papers please copy.

SCHWITTER—MARTINS.—On Saturday, September 14, by the Rev. Father Karney, at the St. Patrick's Cathedral, Mr. CHARLES SCHWITTER to HENRIETTA MARTINS, both of this city.

SMITH—COLE.—On Tuesday, September 17, 1872, at Scotch Plains, N. J., by Rev. Dr. Edgar, Mr. PHILETUS SMITH, Jr., of Brooklyn, N. Y., to MISS LILLIE W., daughter of Smith Cole, Esq., of the former place.

SPRAGUE—WRIFLE.—On Wednesday, September 18, 1872, at the residence of the bride's parents, Tottenville, S. I., by the Rev. David Taylor, R. O. SPRAGUE to MISS LIZZIE A. WRIFLE, both of said place.

STONE—HALE.—At the residence of the bride's parents, on Monday, September 16, by Rev. Dr. Farley, CHARLES HENRY STONE to AUGUSTA WELLINGTON, daughter of Joseph P. Hale, of New York.

STREET—DE LA VERGNE.—On Wednesday, September 18, by the Rev. Dr. Hart, at the Church of the Advent, GEORGE W. STREET, of Brooklyn, to MISS MARY DE LA VERGNE, of New York. No cards.

STRONG—WISWELL.—On Tuesday, September 17, 1872, at Middletown, Conn., by the Rev. N. J. Squires, EDWARD D. STRONG, of Portland, Conn., to MARY E. WISWELL, of Middletown, Conn.

WILLIAMS—BASSETT.—On Wednesday, September 18, 1872, at the bride's residence, by the Rev. A. Van Houten, Mr. JOHN H. WILLIAMS, Jr., to MISS CASSIE C. BASSETT, youngest daughter of the late Ebenezer Bassett, all of this city. No cards.

Died.

AUDLEY.—On Wednesday, September 18, at a quarter past twelve A. M., JOSEPH JOHN, only child of Francis and Mary Jane Audley.

The friends of the family are respectfully invited to att