

THE COURTS. Penalty of Playing the Game of Confidence.

A REAL ESTATE DISPUTE. The Right to Assess Church Property.

Judge Donohue gave his decision yesterday on a motion made on Wednesday to amend the answer in the suit brought by Michael Noonan against the city to recover a balance claimed to be due for the construction of a sewer in Fourth avenue. The motion was urged on the ground that Noonan, when he accepted his last payment, signed a release of the entire claim. The motion was denied on the ground that no denial had been made of the allegation made by Mr. Noonan that the Comptroller told him he would not be defrauded from bringing suit.

Judge Donohue gave his decision yesterday on a motion made on Wednesday to amend the answer in the suit brought by Michael Noonan against the city to recover a balance claimed to be due for the construction of a sewer in Fourth avenue. The motion was urged on the ground that Noonan, when he accepted his last payment, signed a release of the entire claim. The motion was denied on the ground that no denial had been made of the allegation made by Mr. Noonan that the Comptroller told him he would not be defrauded from bringing suit.

Judge Donohue gave his decision yesterday on a motion made on Wednesday to amend the answer in the suit brought by Michael Noonan against the city to recover a balance claimed to be due for the construction of a sewer in Fourth avenue. The motion was urged on the ground that Noonan, when he accepted his last payment, signed a release of the entire claim. The motion was denied on the ground that no denial had been made of the allegation made by Mr. Noonan that the Comptroller told him he would not be defrauded from bringing suit.

Judge Donohue gave his decision yesterday on a motion made on Wednesday to amend the answer in the suit brought by Michael Noonan against the city to recover a balance claimed to be due for the construction of a sewer in Fourth avenue. The motion was urged on the ground that Noonan, when he accepted his last payment, signed a release of the entire claim. The motion was denied on the ground that no denial had been made of the allegation made by Mr. Noonan that the Comptroller told him he would not be defrauded from bringing suit.

Judge Donohue gave his decision yesterday on a motion made on Wednesday to amend the answer in the suit brought by Michael Noonan against the city to recover a balance claimed to be due for the construction of a sewer in Fourth avenue. The motion was urged on the ground that Noonan, when he accepted his last payment, signed a release of the entire claim. The motion was denied on the ground that no denial had been made of the allegation made by Mr. Noonan that the Comptroller told him he would not be defrauded from bringing suit.

Judge Donohue gave his decision yesterday on a motion made on Wednesday to amend the answer in the suit brought by Michael Noonan against the city to recover a balance claimed to be due for the construction of a sewer in Fourth avenue. The motion was urged on the ground that Noonan, when he accepted his last payment, signed a release of the entire claim. The motion was denied on the ground that no denial had been made of the allegation made by Mr. Noonan that the Comptroller told him he would not be defrauded from bringing suit.

Judge Donohue gave his decision yesterday on a motion made on Wednesday to amend the answer in the suit brought by Michael Noonan against the city to recover a balance claimed to be due for the construction of a sewer in Fourth avenue. The motion was urged on the ground that Noonan, when he accepted his last payment, signed a release of the entire claim. The motion was denied on the ground that no denial had been made of the allegation made by Mr. Noonan that the Comptroller told him he would not be defrauded from bringing suit.

Judge Donohue gave his decision yesterday on a motion made on Wednesday to amend the answer in the suit brought by Michael Noonan against the city to recover a balance claimed to be due for the construction of a sewer in Fourth avenue. The motion was urged on the ground that Noonan, when he accepted his last payment, signed a release of the entire claim. The motion was denied on the ground that no denial had been made of the allegation made by Mr. Noonan that the Comptroller told him he would not be defrauded from bringing suit.

Judge Donohue gave his decision yesterday on a motion made on Wednesday to amend the answer in the suit brought by Michael Noonan against the city to recover a balance claimed to be due for the construction of a sewer in Fourth avenue. The motion was urged on the ground that Noonan, when he accepted his last payment, signed a release of the entire claim. The motion was denied on the ground that no denial had been made of the allegation made by Mr. Noonan that the Comptroller told him he would not be defrauded from bringing suit.

Judge Donohue gave his decision yesterday on a motion made on Wednesday to amend the answer in the suit brought by Michael Noonan against the city to recover a balance claimed to be due for the construction of a sewer in Fourth avenue. The motion was urged on the ground that Noonan, when he accepted his last payment, signed a release of the entire claim. The motion was denied on the ground that no denial had been made of the allegation made by Mr. Noonan that the Comptroller told him he would not be defrauded from bringing suit.

Judge Donohue gave his decision yesterday on a motion made on Wednesday to amend the answer in the suit brought by Michael Noonan against the city to recover a balance claimed to be due for the construction of a sewer in Fourth avenue. The motion was urged on the ground that Noonan, when he accepted his last payment, signed a release of the entire claim. The motion was denied on the ground that no denial had been made of the allegation made by Mr. Noonan that the Comptroller told him he would not be defrauded from bringing suit.

Judge Donohue gave his decision yesterday on a motion made on Wednesday to amend the answer in the suit brought by Michael Noonan against the city to recover a balance claimed to be due for the construction of a sewer in Fourth avenue. The motion was urged on the ground that Noonan, when he accepted his last payment, signed a release of the entire claim. The motion was denied on the ground that no denial had been made of the allegation made by Mr. Noonan that the Comptroller told him he would not be defrauded from bringing suit.

DECISIONS. SUPERIOR COURT—CHAMBERS. By Judge Lawrence. Loder vs. Loder, et al. vs. Hart; Anderson vs. Anderson; in the matter of How; Memoranda for counsel.

By Judge Lawrence. Loder vs. Loder, et al. vs. Hart; Anderson vs. Anderson; in the matter of How; Memoranda for counsel.

By Judge Lawrence. Loder vs. Loder, et al. vs. Hart; Anderson vs. Anderson; in the matter of How; Memoranda for counsel.

By Judge Lawrence. Loder vs. Loder, et al. vs. Hart; Anderson vs. Anderson; in the matter of How; Memoranda for counsel.

By Judge Lawrence. Loder vs. Loder, et al. vs. Hart; Anderson vs. Anderson; in the matter of How; Memoranda for counsel.

By Judge Lawrence. Loder vs. Loder, et al. vs. Hart; Anderson vs. Anderson; in the matter of How; Memoranda for counsel.

By Judge Lawrence. Loder vs. Loder, et al. vs. Hart; Anderson vs. Anderson; in the matter of How; Memoranda for counsel.

By Judge Lawrence. Loder vs. Loder, et al. vs. Hart; Anderson vs. Anderson; in the matter of How; Memoranda for counsel.

By Judge Lawrence. Loder vs. Loder, et al. vs. Hart; Anderson vs. Anderson; in the matter of How; Memoranda for counsel.

By Judge Lawrence. Loder vs. Loder, et al. vs. Hart; Anderson vs. Anderson; in the matter of How; Memoranda for counsel.

By Judge Lawrence. Loder vs. Loder, et al. vs. Hart; Anderson vs. Anderson; in the matter of How; Memoranda for counsel.

By Judge Lawrence. Loder vs. Loder, et al. vs. Hart; Anderson vs. Anderson; in the matter of How; Memoranda for counsel.

By Judge Lawrence. Loder vs. Loder, et al. vs. Hart; Anderson vs. Anderson; in the matter of How; Memoranda for counsel.

By Judge Lawrence. Loder vs. Loder, et al. vs. Hart; Anderson vs. Anderson; in the matter of How; Memoranda for counsel.

JEFFERSON MARKET POLICE COURT. Before Judge Kasimir. THE INFLUENCE OF SPIRITUALISM. Mrs. Louisa M. Cowley, of 419 West Twenty-second street, preferred a charge of grand larceny against William H. Brown, whom she accused of stealing a pocketbook containing \$40 on the 10th of February. Mrs. Cowley alleged that on that day she left her pocketbook in the kitchen, and that when she was in her room, she saw a man who was then in her employ, was the only person who was in the room at the time. On the 11th of February, she discovered that the pocketbook was missing, and she immediately reported the matter to the police. The man, William H. Brown, was arrested yesterday by Officer Cain, of the Sixteenth precinct, and was committed by Judge Kasimir in \$1,000 bail to answer.

MORE POLICY DEALERS. Chief Miesner, of No. 4 Delancey street, preferred a charge of selling lottery tickets against Louis Parker, of No. 43 Mercer street, and George Warren, of No. 108 Wooster street. The prisoners, who were arrested by Officers Sleyn and Henderson, of the Fifteenth precinct, were held in \$500 bail each to answer.

FIFTY-SEVENTH STREET COURT. Before Justice Murray. THE LAST CASE OF ALLEGED ANON. Abraham H. Keene, hatter, was yesterday arraigned on suspicion of firing the premises No. 422 Third avenue, on Tuesday night last. As previously stated in the HERALD, the fire originated in the room occupied by Keene, and it was the fire which destroyed the premises. The fire broke out at 11 o'clock on the night of the 10th of February, and it was not until 11:30 o'clock that the fire was extinguished. The fire caused a loss of \$100,000. The fire was caused by a candle which was left burning in the room. The fire was caused by a candle which was left burning in the room.

COURT OF ARBITRATION. The following letter was sent to the Legislature in favor of the Court by one of our most distinguished citizens and leading merchants: New York, Feb. 9, 1875. Hon. William H. Morgan, Chairman Judiciary Committee, Senate Chamber, Albany.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY. SUPERIOR COURT—CHAMBERS—Held by Judge Lawrence. Nos. 70, 83, 95, 115, 161, 190, 255, 263, 264, 295, 120.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY. SUPERIOR COURT—CHAMBERS—Held by Judge Lawrence. Nos. 70, 83, 95, 115, 161, 190, 255, 263, 264, 295, 120.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY. SUPERIOR COURT—CHAMBERS—Held by Judge Lawrence. Nos. 70, 83, 95, 115, 161, 190, 255, 263, 264, 295, 120.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY. SUPERIOR COURT—CHAMBERS—Held by Judge Lawrence. Nos. 70, 83, 95, 115, 161, 190, 255, 263, 264, 295, 120.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY. SUPERIOR COURT—CHAMBERS—Held by Judge Lawrence. Nos. 70, 83, 95, 115, 161, 190, 255, 263, 264, 295, 120.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY. SUPERIOR COURT—CHAMBERS—Held by Judge Lawrence. Nos. 70, 83, 95, 115, 161, 190, 255, 263, 264, 295, 120.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY. SUPERIOR COURT—CHAMBERS—Held by Judge Lawrence. Nos. 70, 83, 95, 115, 161, 190, 255, 263, 264, 295, 120.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY. SUPERIOR COURT—CHAMBERS—Held by Judge Lawrence. Nos. 70, 83, 95, 115, 161, 190, 255, 263, 264, 295, 120.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY. SUPERIOR COURT—CHAMBERS—Held by Judge Lawrence. Nos. 70, 83, 95, 115, 161, 190, 255, 263, 264, 295, 120.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY. SUPERIOR COURT—CHAMBERS—Held by Judge Lawrence. Nos. 70, 83, 95, 115, 161, 190, 255, 263, 264, 295, 120.

OUR WORLD'S FAIR. THE EXHIBITION OF AMERICAN FURNITURE. FIFTEEN THOUSAND SQUARE FEET APPLIED FOR—EXPOSITION OF TELEGRAPH AND RAILWAY APPARATUS SPAIN ASKS FOR SEVENTY THOUSAND SQUARE FEET—THE REPRESENTATION OF DUTCH ART.

THE EXHIBITION OF AMERICAN FURNITURE. FIFTEEN THOUSAND SQUARE FEET APPLIED FOR—EXPOSITION OF TELEGRAPH AND RAILWAY APPARATUS SPAIN ASKS FOR SEVENTY THOUSAND SQUARE FEET—THE REPRESENTATION OF DUTCH ART.

THE EXHIBITION OF AMERICAN FURNITURE. FIFTEEN THOUSAND SQUARE FEET APPLIED FOR—EXPOSITION OF TELEGRAPH AND RAILWAY APPARATUS SPAIN ASKS FOR SEVENTY THOUSAND SQUARE FEET—THE REPRESENTATION OF DUTCH ART.

THE EXHIBITION OF AMERICAN FURNITURE. FIFTEEN THOUSAND SQUARE FEET APPLIED FOR—EXPOSITION OF TELEGRAPH AND RAILWAY APPARATUS SPAIN ASKS FOR SEVENTY THOUSAND SQUARE FEET—THE REPRESENTATION OF DUTCH ART.

THE EXHIBITION OF AMERICAN FURNITURE. FIFTEEN THOUSAND SQUARE FEET APPLIED FOR—EXPOSITION OF TELEGRAPH AND RAILWAY APPARATUS SPAIN ASKS FOR SEVENTY THOUSAND SQUARE FEET—THE REPRESENTATION OF DUTCH ART.

THE EXHIBITION OF AMERICAN FURNITURE. FIFTEEN THOUSAND SQUARE FEET APPLIED FOR—EXPOSITION OF TELEGRAPH AND RAILWAY APPARATUS SPAIN ASKS FOR SEVENTY THOUSAND SQUARE FEET—THE REPRESENTATION OF DUTCH ART.

THE EXHIBITION OF AMERICAN FURNITURE. FIFTEEN THOUSAND SQUARE FEET APPLIED FOR—EXPOSITION OF TELEGRAPH AND RAILWAY APPARATUS SPAIN ASKS FOR SEVENTY THOUSAND SQUARE FEET—THE REPRESENTATION OF DUTCH ART.

THE EXHIBITION OF AMERICAN FURNITURE. FIFTEEN THOUSAND SQUARE FEET APPLIED FOR—EXPOSITION OF TELEGRAPH AND RAILWAY APPARATUS SPAIN ASKS FOR SEVENTY THOUSAND SQUARE FEET—THE REPRESENTATION OF DUTCH ART.

THE EXHIBITION OF AMERICAN FURNITURE. FIFTEEN THOUSAND SQUARE FEET APPLIED FOR—EXPOSITION OF TELEGRAPH AND RAILWAY APPARATUS SPAIN ASKS FOR SEVENTY THOUSAND SQUARE FEET—THE REPRESENTATION OF DUTCH ART.

THE EXHIBITION OF AMERICAN FURNITURE. FIFTEEN THOUSAND SQUARE FEET APPLIED FOR—EXPOSITION OF TELEGRAPH AND RAILWAY APPARATUS SPAIN ASKS FOR SEVENTY THOUSAND SQUARE FEET—THE REPRESENTATION OF DUTCH ART.

THE EXHIBITION OF AMERICAN FURNITURE. FIFTEEN THOUSAND SQUARE FEET APPLIED FOR—EXPOSITION OF TELEGRAPH AND RAILWAY APPARATUS SPAIN ASKS FOR SEVENTY THOUSAND SQUARE FEET—THE REPRESENTATION OF DUTCH ART.

THE EXHIBITION OF AMERICAN FURNITURE. FIFTEEN THOUSAND SQUARE FEET APPLIED FOR—EXPOSITION OF TELEGRAPH AND RAILWAY APPARATUS SPAIN ASKS FOR SEVENTY THOUSAND SQUARE FEET—THE REPRESENTATION OF DUTCH ART.

THE EXHIBITION OF AMERICAN FURNITURE. FIFTEEN THOUSAND SQUARE FEET APPLIED FOR—EXPOSITION OF TELEGRAPH AND RAILWAY APPARATUS SPAIN ASKS FOR SEVENTY THOUSAND SQUARE FEET—THE REPRESENTATION OF DUTCH ART.

THE EXHIBITION OF AMERICAN FURNITURE. FIFTEEN THOUSAND SQUARE FEET APPLIED FOR—EXPOSITION OF TELEGRAPH AND RAILWAY APPARATUS SPAIN ASKS FOR SEVENTY THOUSAND SQUARE FEET—THE REPRESENTATION OF DUTCH ART.

THE POLICE COMMISSIONERS. CHARGES PREPARED AGAINST THEM FOR VIOLATION OF LAW AND OFFICIAL OFFENSE—THE MAYOR TO ACT PROMPTLY IN THE MATTER.

THE POLICE COMMISSIONERS. CHARGES PREPARED AGAINST THEM FOR VIOLATION OF LAW AND OFFICIAL OFFENSE—THE MAYOR TO ACT PROMPTLY IN THE MATTER.

THE POLICE COMMISSIONERS. CHARGES PREPARED AGAINST THEM FOR VIOLATION OF LAW AND OFFICIAL OFFENSE—THE MAYOR TO ACT PROMPTLY IN THE MATTER.

THE POLICE COMMISSIONERS. CHARGES PREPARED AGAINST THEM FOR VIOLATION OF LAW AND OFFICIAL OFFENSE—THE MAYOR TO ACT PROMPTLY IN THE MATTER.

THE POLICE COMMISSIONERS. CHARGES PREPARED AGAINST THEM FOR VIOLATION OF LAW AND OFFICIAL OFFENSE—THE MAYOR TO ACT PROMPTLY IN THE MATTER.

THE POLICE COMMISSIONERS. CHARGES PREPARED AGAINST THEM FOR VIOLATION OF LAW AND OFFICIAL OFFENSE—THE MAYOR TO ACT PROMPTLY IN THE MATTER.

THE POLICE COMMISSIONERS. CHARGES PREPARED AGAINST THEM FOR VIOLATION OF LAW AND OFFICIAL OFFENSE—THE MAYOR TO ACT PROMPTLY IN THE MATTER.

THE POLICE COMMISSIONERS. CHARGES PREPARED AGAINST THEM FOR VIOLATION OF LAW AND OFFICIAL OFFENSE—THE MAYOR TO ACT PROMPTLY IN THE MATTER.

THE POLICE COMMISSIONERS. CHARGES PREPARED AGAINST THEM FOR VIOLATION OF LAW AND OFFICIAL OFFENSE—THE MAYOR TO ACT PROMPTLY IN THE MATTER.

THE POLICE COMMISSIONERS. CHARGES PREPARED AGAINST THEM FOR VIOLATION OF LAW AND OFFICIAL OFFENSE—THE MAYOR TO ACT PROMPTLY IN THE MATTER.

THE POLICE COMMISSIONERS. CHARGES PREPARED AGAINST THEM FOR VIOLATION OF LAW AND OFFICIAL OFFENSE—THE MAYOR TO ACT PROMPTLY IN THE MATTER.

THE POLICE COMMISSIONERS. CHARGES PREPARED AGAINST THEM FOR VIOLATION OF LAW AND OFFICIAL OFFENSE—THE MAYOR TO ACT PROMPTLY IN THE MATTER.

THE POLICE COMMISSIONERS. CHARGES PREPARED AGAINST THEM FOR VIOLATION OF LAW AND OFFICIAL OFFENSE—THE MAYOR TO ACT PROMPTLY IN THE MATTER.

THE POLICE COMMISSIONERS. CHARGES PREPARED AGAINST THEM FOR VIOLATION OF LAW AND OFFICIAL OFFENSE—THE MAYOR TO ACT PROMPTLY IN THE MATTER.

THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN. STREET CLEANING—SNOW PLOUGHS AND CARTRIDGE BILLS—THE MAYOR AND THE RIVERSIDE PARK IMPROVEMENT.

THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN. STREET CLEANING—SNOW PLOUGHS AND CARTRIDGE BILLS—THE MAYOR AND THE RIVERSIDE PARK IMPROVEMENT.

THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN. STREET CLEANING—SNOW PLOUGHS AND CARTRIDGE BILLS—THE MAYOR AND THE RIVERSIDE PARK IMPROVEMENT.

THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN. STREET CLEANING—SNOW PLOUGHS AND CARTRIDGE BILLS—THE MAYOR AND THE RIVERSIDE PARK IMPROVEMENT.

THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN. STREET CLEANING—SNOW PLOUGHS AND CARTRIDGE BILLS—THE MAYOR AND THE RIVERSIDE PARK IMPROVEMENT.

THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN. STREET CLEANING—SNOW PLOUGHS AND CARTRIDGE BILLS—THE MAYOR AND THE RIVERSIDE PARK IMPROVEMENT.

THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN. STREET CLEANING—SNOW PLOUGHS AND CARTRIDGE BILLS—THE MAYOR AND THE RIVERSIDE PARK IMPROVEMENT.

THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN. STREET CLEANING—SNOW PLOUGHS AND CARTRIDGE BILLS—THE MAYOR AND THE RIVERSIDE PARK IMPROVEMENT.

THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN. STREET CLEANING—SNOW PLOUGHS AND CARTRIDGE BILLS—THE MAYOR AND THE RIVERSIDE PARK IMPROVEMENT.

THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN. STREET CLEANING—SNOW PLOUGHS AND CARTRIDGE BILLS—THE MAYOR AND THE RIVERSIDE PARK IMPROVEMENT.

THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN. STREET CLEANING—SNOW PLOUGHS AND CARTRIDGE BILLS—THE MAYOR AND THE RIVERSIDE PARK IMPROVEMENT.

THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN. STREET CLEANING—SNOW PLOUGHS AND CARTRIDGE BILLS—THE MAYOR AND THE RIVERSIDE PARK IMPROVEMENT.

THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN. STREET CLEANING—SNOW PLOUGHS AND CARTRIDGE BILLS—THE MAYOR AND THE RIVERSIDE PARK IMPROVEMENT.

THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN. STREET CLEANING—SNOW PLOUGHS AND CARTRIDGE BILLS—THE MAYOR AND THE RIVERSIDE PARK IMPROVEMENT.