THE COURTS.

Important Decisions by the Supreme Court, General Term.

NEILL DOGHERTY'S WILL

General Sickles Taking a Flyer in Western Railroad Stock.

UNRELIABILITY OF EXPERTS.

The Supreme Court General Term Judges yesterday—Chief Justice Davis and Judges Brady and Daniels on the bench—handed down a large batch of decisions, mainly of cases argued at the January term of the Court. There is given below epitomes of the more important opinions.

Leading off the cases—at least in the length of the opinion given, which covers over seventy pages of closely written foolscap—is the one in the proceedings brought to disbar William H. Gale. The circumstances which brought Mr. Gale so conspicuously before the Court in a proceeding of this necessarily painful character have already been fully given in the HERALD. As will be remembered, he was employed some two years ago by Alonzo Megarge to prosecute a suit for divorce against Mary A. Megarge. No imputation was cast upon the conjugal fidelity of Mrs. Megarge, but incompatibility of temper led to disagreement, and for this reason Mr. Megarge sought to have their marital relations dissolved. Mrs. Megarge's story is that Gale induced her to go to the Grand Union Hotel upon the representation that it was necessary for her to see a party there in regard to the pending suit for divorce; that he detained her throughout the evening in apartments, consisting of a parlor and bedroom, under pretence that he was momentarily expecting the person in question; that her desires to leave the hotel were opposed, and, finally, that he locked her in the room with himself and detained her through the night against her remonstrance, he retiring to bed and she sitting upon the lounge in the outer room until set at liberty in the morning. Upon evidence of criminal misconduct on her part, and proof that she remained there at the hotel with a person other than Mr. Gale, a decree of divorce was granted against her. Judge Daniels writes the opinion of the Court. He reviews at great length the testimony showing that on the night of the 5th of November, 1874, Mrs. Megarge was at the hotel with some person who registered as James H. Baldwin and wife, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. He then discusses the question whether Mr. Gale was such person or whether through deceiving her he made out a fictitious case of guilt against her. Upon careful sifting of the testimony he arrives at the conclusion that the story told by Mrs. Megarge is the truth. Judge Daniels concludes his opinion as follows:—The case has been searched in vain for some circumstance that would justify such a degree of distrust of the evidence tending to support the charge as would result in the creation of so much doubt as to render its dismissal proper on the ground of failure of proof. The serious consequences that cannot fail to follow the confirmation of the referee's report have induced a careful and critical investigation for that purpose. But, instead of developing that result, the more the evidence has been considered the stronger the conviction has become of the respondent's guilt. And upon that being found to be established, it has not, as it could not, be denied that his misconduct has been such as to require that he should no longer remain in the profession he has compromised. He has degraded as well as disgraced himself to such an extent as to render it the duty of this Court, under the authority for that purpose conferred upon it by the statute of the State, to strike his name from the list of its professional officers and annul the license heretofore issued to him. An order should be entered confirming the report of the referee and directing that the name of William H. Gale, the respondent, be stricken from the roll of attorneys and counsellors of this Court, that his license be annulled and delivered up to the clerk and cancelled.

A remembrance of the late George J. Hoffman and his pecuniary troubles in Europe, following his marriage to Bonfanti, the danseuse, the full details of which have already been given in the HERALD, is called up in a decision given in the suit brought by Hugh McCulloch & Co. against Orin C. Hoffman to recover upon a draft for £585 11s. 11d., drawn in London on July 11, 1873, upon George Hoffman, at that time President of the Irving National Bank of this city, and the father of George J. Hoffman. This draft, which is also signed by Orin C. Hoffman, was paid by Mr. Pulston, one of the members of the above firm of London bankers. George J. Hoffman, who was also sued, interposed no defence. Orin C. Hoffman put in an answer admitting his signature to the bill of exchange, but alleging as a defence that his father had refused to make pecuniary advances to his son, George J. Hoffman, owing to his alleged excesses and improprieties, and would probably accept the draft, but would be more likely to do so should he sign it himself, but with the understanding that if he did sign it—which he did without any consideration whatever—plaintiffs would not hold him personally responsible. These facts were partly proven on the trial of the action, but proof of the circumstance connected with Orin C. Hoffman signing the bill was excluded on the ground that the defendant could not in that way contradict a bill of exchange. The decision of the Court is mainly based upon the question of a want of consideration. In order to establish this defence the Court holds that it was proper to prove the facts and circumstances under which Orin C. Hoffman signed the bill, and upon this ground the judgment of the Court below is reversed and a new trial ordered.

A decision of interest to members of our volunteer militia regiments is that given in the case of George Perault, who was expelled from the Seventh Regiment for non-attendance at drill, having then one year to serve of the seven required before he would be entitled to discharge. Subsequently on a mandamus he was reinstated, and he then claimed that he was entitled to his discharge, because more than the year which he would have been required to serve if not expelled had expired. Judge Davis, who writes the opinion, holds that what the statute requires is actual and not constructive service, and that as Perault had not rendered actual service for seven years the Court below was right in denying the application on its merits. In the injunction proceedings brought by Perault to prevent his retrial upon the same charges upon which he had been dismissed Judge Daniels writes a lengthy opinion. The continuation of the injunction is refused on the ground that the laws have created the tribunals which have been invested with jurisdiction to try military misconduct.

Among the decisions given is also one in the suit, or rather two suits, brought by Marcus Cicero Stanley against Benjamin Wood and others, growing out of claims by the plaintiff for money alleged to be due him from the defendants in connection with the running of various lottery enterprises in several of the Southern States. Judge Davis sustains the action of the Court below refusing to strike out certain portions of the complaint. One of the allegations sought to be stricken out was that the lottery business in question was conducted in a manner consistent with sound policy and public morality. Judge Davis said that this allegation "aggrieved" nobody, and, although it may be immaterial, one would naturally suppose both parties would be anxious to have it proved. The motion to compel the plaintiff to file a bill of particulars is also denied. Upon this point Judge Davis says that there was an abundant answer to the motion in the statement that all the books of the business and its management were under the control and in the possession of the defendants, and in short that the details sought to be set out in the bill of particulars were altogether in their hands.

The Hebrew Benevolent Orphan Asylum, assessed for building a sewer on Seventy-seventh street, brought suit to have such assessment set aside, claiming that there was never any valuation placed upon the property, and that their case falls directly within the decision made by the Court of Appeals in June last in the matter of the Second Avenue Methodist Church. The Court holds, Judge Brady writing the opinion, that the case cited does not affect this case at all and affirms the order appealed from, denying a motion to vacate the assessment. In the matter of the St. Joseph's Asylum, in which an appeal was taken from an order of the Court below, denying a motion to vacate the assessment, the Court, Judge Davis writing the opinion, affirms the previous order.

The suit of the Christopher and Tenth Street Railroad Company against the Central Cross Town Railroad Company comes up before the Court on appeal from an order of the Special Term, denying a motion to amend the findings of the Court and the judgment entered therein. The amendment was asked for on the ground that the findings had not declared the right of the defendant to lay the tracks of its road with sufficient definiteness. The General Term refers the matter back to Judge Van Brunt, with directions to make whatever order in the premises he may think fit.

In the case of Kerwin Finnerty, discharged from the police on the ground of being absent from his post, the Court, upon writ of certiorari, declares, through Judge Brady, who writes the opinion, that his discharge was illegal and orders his reinstatement. In this particular instance "the woman in the case" who charges Finnerty with having absented himself from his post in order to go away with her is considered from her antecedent history unworthy of belief.

DOHERTY AMERICAN INSTITUTE.

There has already been published in the HERALD the will of Neil Doherty, who, at the time of his decease, was a resident of Kings county and left an estate valued at some $45,000. After a legacy of $1,000 to the Roman Catholic Orphan Asylum and other minor bequests Mr. Doherty directed that the residuum of his estate be converted into money and be given to the Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Raphoe, parish of Rye, county of Donegal, Ireland, and his successors forever, for the erection and maintenance of a school house for the benefit of poor Roman Catholic children in that parish. He further directed that the school shall be under the management of twelve respectable farmers, who are to serve without pay and be appointed by the bishop. His final direction in regard to the school is that the same shall be called "The Doherty American Institute." The nearest of kin of the testator, two second cousins and a child of one of them, contest the will. An action was brought for the construction of the will in Kings county. In the General Term of that department there was a disagreement as to the construction of the will, and the case was thereupon transferred to the General Term of this department, where the case came up yesterday for argument before Chief Justice Davis and Judges Brady and Daniels. Messrs. Jesse Johnson and Abraham Lott are counsel for Bishop McDevitt, who was the Roman Catholic bishop at Raphoe at the time the will was executed and is still the bishop there. Messrs. S. P. Nash appears for the executor, James J. Garvey.

The argument in the case occupied a considerable portion of the day and was listened to with great interest by the large number of lawyers and others present. It was claimed on behalf of Bishop McDevitt that the will expresses a carefully considered scheme for the founding and maintenance of a school in Ireland for the education of poor children of the Roman Catholic faith, and that the execution of the trust was devolved upon a bishop of that Church, and that such bishop, as such trustee, aided by the equity powers of the Court, possesses all the quality of succession necessary to perpetuate the charity. It was further insisted that under the law of Ireland Bishop McDevitt is competent to take and administer the trust declared in the will; that after his death the trust will devolve on the Court of Chancery, which will appoint further trustees as from time to time may be necessary. In reply to the argument that the bishop cannot take because he can have no successors, it was insisted that it must be proven that he can have no successors, and especially when the nature and character of the office he holds is considered. The Court takes judicial cognizance of the Christian religion. Of its own knowledge it recognizes the meaning of the term "Roman Catholic Bishop of Raphoe," and that this title represents a person claiming title to his office through a succession of bishops. The Court must presume the Bishop of Raphoe will have successors certain and ascertainable. If the Court finds he can have no successors, yet, as the designated payee under the will, he is entitled to take and execute the charity so long as he lives, leaving the question of subsequent equities to be determined when and where they arise. It will presume that the laws of Ireland are sufficient and proper for the administration of this charity; that the bequest is good under the laws of Ireland, and that there is no embarrassment in the case by any of the old penal statutes against the Roman Catholic faith, such acts having happily all been repealed. It was contended in opposition, Mr. Chauncy Shaffer, Abel Crook, G. H. Baddau and John S. Harkin being among the opposing counsel, that the claim that the estate has vested in the Bishop of Raphoe cannot be maintained; that the devise of real estate to an alien is void; that the bishop would not have been capable of taking lands directly under the will; that no such estate could be created through the instrumentality of a power in trust; that the scheme fails under the Irish law, and is void under the laws of the State of New York.

The argument having finally been concluded, the Court took the papers, reserving decision.

GENERAL SICKLES' RAILROAD STOCK.

In the suit brought by General Daniel E. Sickles, Benjamin F. Stevens, the executors of John Bower and others, against Benjamin Richardson, John A. Elwell, the Chicago, Saginaw and Canada Railroad Company, Ashbel Green, William Bond and others, there was a brief argument yesterday before Judge Lawrence, in Supreme Court, Chambers, on a motion to continue the injunction recently granted by Judge Donohue, prohibiting the sale or other disposition of 3,574 bonds of the railroad company, the claim being that such bonds have been illegally issued.

At the conclusion of the argument Judge Lawrence took the papers, reserving his decision.

A RAP AT EXPERTS.

In a decision given yesterday by Judge Van Brunt upon a case tried before him, at Supreme Court, Special Term, he gives a pretty frankly outspoken opinion of the unreliability of the testimony of experts. The suit was brought by W. D. Andrews against W. J. Ryan, and the point involved was the value of buildings torn down on the expiration of a lease. After reciting the facts Judge Van Brunt winds up his opinion as follows:—I cannot dispose of this case without criticism upon some of the expert testimony offered upon the trial of this action. Two of the witnesses for the defendant swore that the lumber composing these buildings was worth $2,200 and $2,300, respectively, if taken away and sold as second hand. It appeared from the evidence in the case that the total cost both for labor and material for these buildings was but $2,200. In view of this circumstance I think it is apparent that these witnesses either wilfully testified falsely when they stated that they knew what the value was of those materials to be removed and sold for second hand lumber, or they wilfully testified falsely to the valuation which they placed upon such lumber. The same criticism is equally applicable to the witness upon the part of the plaintiff who swore that this lumber was not worth $25. It would have undoubtedly brought more than that if sold for firewood. The inference seems necessary to follow that expert testimony is never to be relied upon.

NORTHAMPTON BANK ROBBERY.

William Connors, the alleged Northampton Bank robber, was brought again yesterday before Judge Brady, in the Court of Oyer and Terminer, upon habeas corpus. As upon former occasions the court room was crowded with friends of the prisoner and persons who appeared to take considerable interest in the case. Shortly after the Court opened the prisoner was brought in by the Sheriff and took a seat in front of the bar by the side of his counsel, Messrs. Charles W. Brooke and William F. Kintzing. There was present upon behalf of the bank Messrs. Clarence Seward, John R. Fellows and Henry C. Allen. Before proceeding to argument Mr. Brooke offered to prove by a dozen witnesses that the prisoner was not a fugitive from justice, and that at the time of the commission of the alleged offence he was in the city of New York, and consequently innocent of the crime charged against him. This was objected to by Mr. Fellows, and Judge Brady refused to hear the testimony, holding that this was matter of defence to be introduced upon the trial. Mr. Brooke then proceeded to argue at great length a number of propositions of law, which, he contended, went to show that the proceedings against the prisoner were irregular, that the warrant and testimony were insufficient and that the prisoner should be discharged. Mr. Fellows followed on behalf of the bank, arguing as to the sufficiency of the warrant and that abundant testimony had been offered identifying Connors as the person named in the warrant wanted by the Massachusetts authorities. Judge Brady said he was not prepared to render a decision then, but would render his decision on next Thursday, and in the meantime he remanded the prisoner to the custody of the Sheriff. He was then handcuffed and taken back to Ludlow Street Jail accompanied by a number of friends.

THE DOUBLE SALARY GRAB.

In May, 1873, Joseph C. Pinckney was appointed Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, which position he filled until the end of the succeeding year, the salary of such clerkship then being fixed at $7,500 per annum. The salary, however, was not paid, and suit was brought to recover $12,278 22, being the amount claimed for services during the time Mr. Pinckney held the office. In answer it was set up by the city that during the time mentioned the plaintiff was clerk of the Common Council, and that under the statute of 1873 he was required to discharge the duties of clerk of the Board of Supervisors without additional compensation. Judge Van Brunt gave judgment for the city.

DEATH OF JUDGE SMALLEY.

Circuit Judge Johnson yesterday morning, sitting in equity, adjourned his branch of the Court on account of the death of Judge David A. Smalley, of Vermont. Judge Blatchford also adjourned the criminal branch of the Court on the same account.

Judges Johnson and Blatchford then proceeded to the Circuit Court, presided over by Judge Wallace, when Judge Johnson took the chair. The death of Judge Smalley was then formally announced by E. J. Phelps, who, after a brief address highly eulogistic of the deceased jurist, moved the adjournment of the Court.

Mr. E. W. Stoughton seconded the motion for adjournment, and was followed by Mr. L. H. Chittenden. After a few remarks by the Presiding Judge the Court was adjourned and the cause thereof ordered to be entered on the minutes of the Court.

SUMMARY OF LAW CASES.

Cornelia Kennedy Van Meerbeke has brought a suit for divorce against her husband, Julius Francis Van Meerbeke, on the ground of alleged adultery. Judge Freedman yesterday ordered a reference in this case.

In the suit of Augustus E. Masters against the Eclectic Life Insurance Company the referee appointed to examine into the question of the validity of a policy for $5,000 claimed by Mary Stuart Huff has reported to the Court of Common Pleas in her favor, and the report was yesterday confirmed.

Mrs. Ethelonda V. Allen, daughter of the late Commodore Vanderbilt, yesterday, through her counsel, formally filed her objections to the will, with a demand that all the witnesses to the will and codicil shall be called to the stand and examined, as required by the statute.

Benson Sherwood, one of the producers of "Baba," the spectacular drama, late of Niblo's, was adjudicated a bankrupt some time ago. There are six creditors, three of whom proved claims amounting to more than $500. The bankrupt applied for a discharge, and one of the creditors, whose claim was $35, assented, and one whose claim was $282 opposed the discharge, and the third, whose claim was $186, neither opposed nor assented. The application for discharge was denied.

The case of the United States against Messrs. Boyd & Hill, on trial before Judge Blatchford, was called up yesterday. A question arose as to the advisability of a book showing transactions between Golson & Eastman and the defendants. The defence contended that the evidence was not admissible until an agency between the parties was proved, and that an agency cannot be proved until there is proof of conspiracy. The Court so held and then adjourned.

The suit of the Emma Silver Mining Company was resumed yesterday in the United States Circuit Court, Equity Branch. Professor Benjamin Silliman testified that he was engaged to examine the Emma Mine; that his compensation was not contingent upon his report; that he at first refused to give up his class at Yale College unless he was paid liberally, and that accordingly he demanded $5,000 in advance. The court then adjourned, in consequence of the death of Judge Smalley.

A decision was rendered yesterday by Judge Freedman in the matter of the application of John H. Platt, the assignee in bankruptcy of Ephraim S. Snow, for leave to sue Henry S. Pierson, Jr., a receiver appointed by the Superior Court. A motion was made to have the order granting the application given ex parte set aside. Judge Freedman grants the motion, but allows the assignee in bankruptcy to bring such suit as he may be advised.

A decision was given yesterday by Judge Van Brunt in the suit of Mary C. Ketcltas against the executors of William A. Ketcltas, the suit being brought for the construction of the will and to settle the question whether the plaintiff is entitled to any part of the residuary estate. Judge Van Brunt overrules the demurrer interposed in the case, but with leave, on payments of costs, to answer.

Paulina Sands, widow of David Sands, the druggist, who died in 1859, and administratrix of the estate, petitions the Supreme Court for leave to expend $30,000, in her hands and those of her co-executor, Mr. Ferris, in improving property belonging to the estate in West Eighteenth street, near Fifth avenue. Judge Lawrence yesterday appointed Frank F. Vandervoer referee to examine the facts of the case.

In his decision given yesterday in the suit of George W. Busteed against Richard G. Busteed, being a suit upon a deed claimed to have been given for legal services, Judge Van Brunt holds that all transactions between attorneys and clients by which the former is benefited will be set aside unless clearly shown by the attorney to have been either just and fair or purely voluntary upon the part of the client. He gives the plaintiff judgment, with costs.

In the suit of Albert Draper against the Chase Manufacturing Company, Judge Van Brunt decided, yesterday, that in order to overcome a presumption that the defendants intended by indorsing the note in suit to become liable as second indorsers, and so not liable to the payee, the latter must show the note was thus indorsed to give credit to the note with him. He sustains the demurrer, with leave to the plaintiff to amend upon payment of costs.

Five savings banks of Providence have brought suit against the individual members of the firm of Hoyt, Sprague & Co., on a joint and general bond, the facts of which have already been published. The executors of Mr. Hoyt demurred to the complaint on the ground that the plaintiffs have no legal capacity to sue, and the complainant does not state sufficient grounds of action. The case came up for argument yesterday on this demurrer before Judge Van Brunt, Messrs. De Costa, Tracy & Arnold appearing for the savings banks, and Messrs. Butler, Stillman & Hubbard for the defendants. It was contended for the plaintiffs that the banks in question were mere sequestrators of the effects and not receivers under proceedings to declare a corporation at an end. Judge Van Brunt took the papers.

Frances A. Moulton has brought a suit against her husband, Gustavus A. Moulton, for divorce on the ground of adultery. The petition of the plaintiff filed yesterday in Supreme Court, Chambers, is very brief in its statements. It simply avers that the parties were married in Paris in April, 1868; that the defendant has since the commencement of the present year committed adultery at various times with an unknown woman at a house in West Sixteenth street. It is further stated that the last known residence of the defendant was at the Windsor Hotel, but that his present whereabouts is unknown. Under these circumstances Judge Lawrence yesterday directed a service of the summons by publication.

DECISIONS.

SUPREME COURT—GENERAL TERM.

By Presiding Judge Davis and Judges Brady and Daniels.

Christopher and Tenth Street Railroad Company vs. Central Cross Town Railroad Company.—Order modified as suggested in opinion and affirmed as modified, without costs to either party on their appeal. Order to be settled by Judge Davis on two days' notice. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Mohr and another vs. Felt.—Judgment and order affirmed. Opinion by Judge Brady.

Maher vs. Hunt &c.—Order reversed, with costs; further hearing directed by the Surrogate. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

Sandford vs. Wheeler.—Judgment affirmed. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Rosenbach vs. Manufacturers and Builders' Bank.—Order affirmed, with $10 costs and disbursements. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Park, Jr., vs. Spaulding and another; Park et al. vs. Simmons and another.—Judgment on plaintiff's appeal reversed. Judgment on appeal of defendant. Alexander Spaulding and William L. Simmons affirmed, with costs. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Sullivan vs. Fosdick and another.—Judgment affirmed, with costs. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Duyfield, &c., vs. Horton.—Judgment reversed; judgment directed for plaintiff for $566 96, with costs of court below and of this appeal to be adjusted. Opinion by Judge Davis.

People ex rel. Perault vs. Turner.—Order affirmed, with $10 costs and disbursements. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Matter of the habeas corpus of Jennings.—Proceedings affirmed and certiorari dismissed.—Opinion by Judge Brady.

Union Dime Savings Bank vs. Clark.—Order affirmed, with $10 costs and disbursements. Opinion by Judge Brady.

Bergen vs. Raymond and another.—Order modified as suggested in opinion and affirmed as modified, without costs. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Cahoone vs. Lecht.—Order affirmed, with $10 costs and disbursements. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Loaners' Bank vs. Jacoby and another.—Order reversed, with $10 costs and disbursements to abide event. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Barnett vs. Meyer et al.—Order affirmed, with $10 costs and disbursements. Opinion by Judge Brady.

National Steamship Company vs. Sheridan.—Order reversed without costs on defendant stipulating not to sue. Opinion by Judge Brady.

Perault vs. Rand.—Order affirmed, with the usual costs and disbursements. Opinion by Judge Daniels, Judge Brady taking no part.

Barbey vs. Ludington.—Motion denied; costs and judgment ordered for defendant. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

People ex rel. Zugler vs. Court of Special Sessions.—Conviction affirmed. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

Spears et al. vs. The Mayor, &c.—Judgment reversed; judgment ordered in favor of plaintiffs in conformity with opinion, to be settled by Judge Davis on three days' notice, costs of the city in court below to be deducted for the fine, plaintiffs to have costs of court below and of this appeal against the defendant Matthews. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Wilkinson vs. Gill.—Judgment affirmed. Opinion by Presiding Judge Davis.

In the matter of the Second Baptist Church of Harlem.—Order affirmed, with $10 costs and disbursements. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Maguire vs. Lloyd, &c.—Judgment affirmed. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

Colt vs. Heard, &c.—Order reversed, with costs; order entered directing letters of administration, with will annexed, to be issued to Mary Louise Colt, appellant. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

Peyser et al. vs. Wendt and others.—Order affirmed, with the usual costs and disbursements. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

Matter of Foster, &c.—Order reversed. Rehearing ordered, with costs to appellant to abide event. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

Buchan and another vs. Rinton.—Order affirmed, with costs. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Purdy, &c., vs. The Mayor, &c.—Judgment affirmed. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

Gopsill vs. Decker and another.—Judgment affirmed. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

Whiteside vs. Hyman.—Judgment reversed; new trial ordered, costs to abide event. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

Washington Life Insurance Company vs. Fleischam.—Order affirmed, with $10 costs and disbursements. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

In re petition of the Hebrew Benevolent Orphan Society, &c.—Order affirmed, except as to assessment for the sewer in Seventy-seventh street, and as to that reduced to the proper sum, without costs to either party. Opinion by Judge Brady.

In re Strikee's petition to have State assessment for opening streets vacated.—Order affirmed, without costs. Opinion by Judge Brady.

Prouty vs. Swift and another.—Order affirmed, with $10 costs and disbursements. Opinion by Judge Brady.

Jaffray vs. Brown, &c.—Judgment reversed, new trial ordered, costs to abide event. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

Graham vs. Smith.—Order affirmed, with $10 costs and disbursements. Opinion by Judge Brady.

Jacobs vs. Miller.—Order affirmed, with $10 costs and disbursements. Opinion by Judge Brady.

People ex rel. Finnerty vs. Board of Police Commissioners.—Judgment reversed and relator reinstated.

Sullivan vs. Walkill National Bank.—Judgment and order affirmed, with costs. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

Phillips, &c., vs. Melville.—Judgment reversed, new trial ordered, costs to abide event. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

Youngs, &c., vs. Carter.—Judgment affirmed, with costs. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

Nichols vs. Nussbaum.—Judgment reversed, new trial ordered, costs to abide event. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

Gilhooly vs. Odell.—Order affirmed, with $10 costs and disbursements. Opinion by Judge Brady.

Sutphen vs. Lash.—Order affirmed denying motion to set aside judgment, with costs, &c. Order denying for readjustment of costs reversed unless, &c., stated in the opinion; order to be settled. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

Sanchez vs. Morris.—Judgment reversed, new trial ordered, costs to abide event. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

Chase vs. Sperling.—Order affirmed, with $10 costs and disbursements. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Matter of St. Joseph's Asylum.—Order affirmed, with $10 costs and disbursements. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Allen vs. The People.—Conviction affirmed. Opinion by Judges Davis and Brady.

Wilson and another vs. Dean.—Judgment affirmed, with costs. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Barnescotta and another vs. The People.—Judgment and conviction affirmed. Opinion by Judge Davis.

The People ex rel. Lorillard vs. Clyde &c.—Order reversed, with $10 costs and disbursements. Motion to quash entire return denied, with $10 costs, relator to be at liberty to demur, or, in such forms as he may be advised, take issue with the allegations of the return. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Carrigan vs. Sheffield.—Verdict set aside, new trial ordered, costs to abide event. Opinion by Judge Brady.

Stanley vs. Wood et al.; Same vs. Same.—Order affirmed, with costs. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

McKay vs. Jamieson.—Order affirmed, with $10 costs and disbursements. Opinion by Judge Brady.

Connors, &c., vs. Titus.—Order affirmed, with $10 costs and disbursements. Opinion by Judge Brady.

Matter of Central Presbyterian Church to vacate, &c.; matter of the Congregation Sheari Zedek.—Orders affirmed, without costs. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Matter of Walsh.—Order affirmed, without costs. Opinion by Judge Brady.

People ex rel. Smith vs. Commissioners of Taxes; People ex rel. Keuwick vs. Same.—Proceedings affirmed. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

People ex rel. Myers vs. Green.—Order affirmed. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Horman vs. Lyons.—Order affirmed, with $10 costs and disbursements. Opinion by Judge Brady.

People ex rel. Skahan vs. Board of Police Commissioners.—Proceedings affirmed; writ dismissed, with costs. Opinion by Judge Davis, Judge Brady dissenting.

People ex rel. Willis vs. Court of Special Sessions.—Judgment reversed. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Obermann vs. World Mutual Life Insurance Company.—Judgment reversed, new trial ordered, costs to abide event. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Cullosh vs. Hoffmann.—Judgment reversed, new trial ordered, costs to abide event. Opinion by Judge Davis.

Matter of Gale.—Order to be entered confirming referee's report and directing that the name of William H. Gale, the respondent, be stricken from the roll of attorneys and counsellors of this Court, and that his license be annulled and delivered to the Clerk and cancelled. Opinion by Judge Daniels.

Clock vs. Chadesgue.—Decree reversed, proceedings remanded to the Surrogate for new hearing upon the petition and account, with leave to interpose the plea of the statute, costs to abide event. Opinion by Judges Davis and Daniels.

People ex rel. Murphy vs. Gedney.—Proceedings reversed; judgment of restoration ordered in favor of relator, costs against the landlord.

Hubbell vs. Weston.—Judgment affirmed. Opinion by Judge Davis.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS.

By Judge Lawrence.

Pidgeon vs. Walsh; Richardson vs. Walsh, and Myers vs. Walsh.—Motions denied, without costs.

Porter vs. Morris.—Memorandum for counsel.

Lamb vs. McKinley.—What is the value of the property which is the subject of this action?

Matter of Sands; Phillips vs. Wood; matter of the Elastic Truss Company; Cowley vs. Rowe, and Fusser vs. Hardenbrook.—Granted.

Jackson vs. Bayles et al.—The motion is denied, with costs.

Harris vs. Hutchins.—Order granted.

Fuller vs. Hunt.—Memorandum.

Bowne vs. O'Brien.—The amendment asked for will be allowed upon the plaintiff paying all the costs of the action up to the present time, with the disbursements and $10 costs.

Moser vs. Stryker.—The adjustment of the Clerk must stand. Memorandum.

Buskey vs. Copps, &c.—Reference ordered to C. C. Suydam. Memorandum.

Mott vs. Mott.—The counsel for the purchasers is right in his position. Memorandum.

The Commercial Bank vs. Newman.—The plaintiff should be allowed to enter his judgment, and upon his doing so a stay of fifteen days will be allowed to enable the defendant to make a case. The order is made on condition that no further stay shall be asked for.

Ballone vs. The First National Bank.—Motion granted, with costs. Memorandum.

Cummings vs. Butler.—Motion for judgment granted, with costs. Memorandum.

Mott vs. Mott.—The same disposition is made of this motion as of the motion relating to Covett's purchase.

COURT CALENDARS—THIS DAY.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS—Held by Judge Lawrence.—Nos. 51, 91, 104, 106, 119, 128, 152, 183, 187, 199, 201, 202, 203, 204, 214, 229, 234, 238, 276, 277, 307, 310, 313, 315.

SUPREME COURT—GENERAL TERM—Held by Judges Davis, Brady and Daniels.—Nos. 80, 134, 136, 137, 140, 141, 142, 134, 65, 69, 70, 71, 112, 119, 122, 139, 77, 85, 95, 105, 118.

SUPREME COURT—SPECIAL TERM—Held by Judge Van Brunt.—Nos. 148, 67, 87, 82, 62, 86, 95, 46, 150, 103, 205, 149, 38, 332, 153, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165.

SUPREME COURT—CIRCUIT—Part 1—Held by Judge Barrett.—Nos. 777, 2364, 2849, 2943, 2995, 3007, 3009, 1657, 1583, 1436, 1437, 2769, 2913, 3079, 3211, 1963, 3175, 3205, 2895, 2719, 3145, 2763, 3179, 3085. Part 2—Held by Judge Donohue.—Nos. 1096, 1880, 1749, 1398, 1062, 1694, 1510, 826½, 1742, 1928, 1932, 1341, 2404, 3582, 1512, 500, 2786, 1944, 1960, 1964, 1978, 2006, 960, 961, 1988, 1992, 2024, 2058, 878, 3760, 1810, 2086, 2088, 2094, 2098, 2102, 2134, 2158, 2162, 3941, 1846, 3486, 1862, 3304, 1864, 1870, 1872, 1942, 1966, 1972, 1642, 1958, 2056, 2178, 2182, 2186, 2188, 2190, 2192, 2194, 2204, 2210. Part 3—Held by Judge Donohue.—No day calendar until Wednesday.

COMMON PLEAS—GENERAL TERM—Held by Judges C. P. Daly, Larremore and J. F. Daly—Nos. 15a, 16, 17, 18, 19, 35, 37, 46, 24c, 12, 41, 39, 45, 40, 61, 66.

SUPERIOR COURT—GENERAL TERM—Held by Judges Curtis, Sedgwick and Spear.—Nos. 17, 29, 35, 37.

SUPERIOR COURT—SPECIAL TERM—Held by Judge Freedman.—Nos. 11, 16, 6, 20, 21, 55, 10, 12.

SUPERIOR COURT—TRIAL TERM—Part 1—Held by Judge Van Vorst.—Nos. 631, 300½, 878, 450, 435, 401, 442, 480½, 877, 456, 393, 482, 244, 971, 972, 620, 1177, 756, 572, 573, 743, 314, 549, 1104, 1138.

COMMON PLEAS—EQUITY TERM—Held by Judge Larremore.—No day calendar.

COMMON PLEAS—TRIAL TERM—Part 1—Held by Judge Robinson.—Nos. 2, 3, 771, 1342, 1223, 352, 892, 284, 1103, 362, 355. Parts 2 and 3.—Adjourned for the term.

MARINE COURT—Trial Term—Part 1—Held by Judge Sinnott.—Nos. 6117, 3908, 3561, 6155, 4544, 1034, 3157, 5319, 7815, 7900, 7916, 7914, 6758, 7921, 7923. Part 2—Held by Judge Goepp.—Nos. 5917, 5918, 5575, 4295, 4973, 2552, 5818, 5853, 4932, 5928, 5023, 5629, 5948, 5949, 5813, 5710, 9199, 1788, 5847, 7717, 3739, 2542, 4562, 7520, 6121, 5528, 5239. Part 3—Held by Chief Justice Shea.—Nos. 7576, 5751, 2946, 8063, 7703, 7772, 9182, 7009, 7097, 7691, 4531, 8855, 7866.

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS—Part 1—Held by Judge Sutherland.—The People vs. Theron J. Thompson, assault and battery (continued); Same vs. Adam Deidrich, receiving stolen goods; Same vs. William O. Day, grand larceny; Same vs. Cannile Dupont, grand larceny; Same vs. Theophile Dezer, grand larceny; Same vs. John Donnelly, petit larceny; Same vs. John Becker, petit larceny; Same vs. Patrick Duffy, petit larceny. Part 2—Held by Judge Gildersleeve.—The People vs. John Donohue, robbery; Same vs. Henry Green, burglary; Same vs. James McPhillips, burglary; Same vs. William Cary, grand larceny; Same vs. John Dougherty, receiving stolen goods; Same vs. Isaac Atron, Dennis Kelly and Major Lamont, petit larceny; Same vs. George Carroll, felonious assault and battery; Same vs. Artuur Tinker, felonious assault and battery; Same vs. Samuel Jese, felonious assault and battery; Same vs. George A. Townsend, felonious assault and battery; Same vs. August Quinns, felonious assault and battery.

KINGS COUNTY'S SURROGATE.

An order was granted yesterday by Justice Gilbert, of the Kings County Supreme Court, compelling Walter A. Livingston to furnish a bill of particulars in the action brought by ex-Judge A. H. Dailey to contest his right to the position of Surrogate of Kings county.

BROOKLYN WILLS PROVED.

The will of Cyrus P. Smith, deceased, was admitted to probate in the Kings County Surrogate's Court by Mr. Walter L. Livingston. Bryant H. and Theodore E. Smith, sons of deceased, qualified as executors. Mr. Smith, who was for many years President of the Union Ferry Company, left an estate said to be worth nearly $1,000,000.

The will of the late Charles Lowery, who was at the time of his death Secretary of the Dime Savings Bank, was also proved yesterday in the Surrogate's Court.

AN UNWORTHY SCOTT.

A very respectable looking young man, about twenty-five years of age, named Albert H. Scott, from Cincinnati, was arraigned before Judge Murray, at the Washington Place Police Court, yesterday, on a charge of obtaining $200 from two different firms on false representations. On the 2d of March the prisoner went into the store of Faulkner & Co., dealers in haircloth at Nos. 62 and 64 Greene street, and represented himself as Robert Mitchell, Jr., son of Robert Mitchell, President of the Mitchell & Ramelsberg Furniture Company, of Cincinnati. His knowledge of Mr. Mitchell's business was such, and his knowledge of the furniture business generally so complete, that Edward D. Faulkner firmly believed he was the person he represented himself to be; and when Scott, alias Mitchell, said he was short of funds and wanted to draw $100, accepted his draft on the firm of Mitchell & Ramelsberg and gave him a check for $100 on the Mechanics' National Bank in return. On the 5th of March Albert Scott went into the establishment of Robert Weinberg, dealer in trimmings, at No. 814 Broadway, and, after making the same representation, procured a loan of $100 from him in the shape of a check for that amount on the East River Bank. A few days ago Mr. Albert Mitchell, the genuine son of Mr. Robert Mitchell, of Cincinnati, came to this city, and went to the same business houses that Scott had visited, and thus the fraud was discovered. Scott was held in $2,000 bail to answer on two separate charges.

BROWN AND THE POLICE.

They were riding in a Sixth avenue horse car one morning two weeks ago—Brown and the police—the former represented by Mr. Robert C. and the latter by Roundsman Lester Lewis, of the Broadway squad. It is not on record what started the conversation, but it is a matter of fact that Brown turned to a companion and casting a meaning eye upon the roundsman sitting opposite expressed his opinion in decided terms that $1,200 a year was altogether too much salary for policemen.

The roundsman glared and instinctively felt for his club, but it was not by his side. He thereupon resorted to his tongue and gave the envious Brown an oral castigation. They left the car sworn enemies.

Time passed around, and Brown had begun to forget the incident, when yesterday he met the roundsman in the street, resplendent in hat, buttons and baton. Brown was freezingly polite, Lewis sneeringly sarcastic.

"Did you speak to me, sir?" said Brown loftily.

"No, sir. I did not speak to you, sir; and what's more, sir, I don't care to speak to you, sir," answered the sarcastic Lewis.

"Perhaps, sir, you would like to know, sir,"