

A BIG ITEM.

Shops Employes to be Increased.

Concentration of Work in the Big City.

Territory of Master Mechanic Smith Greatly Increased.

PROCEEDINGS DISTRICT COURT.

From Monday's Daily.

Yesterday the Cit. n. was put into possession of facts to the effect that Albuquerque would receive another branch of the Santa Fe Railway...

The news came from a source which could not be denied, but a order to have the report thoroughly substantiated. The Citizen representative called this morning on G. W. Smith, the well-known and popular master mechanic...

After pointing to him the substance of the rumor, Mr. Smith promptly confirmed the news as true, and, during the conversation, stated that notices have been issued appointing him master mechanic of the Rio Grande division of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe railway...

This means that the Santa Fe Pacific shops at this city are expected to overhaul and keep up the repairs on all engines and cars from Las Vegas to El Paso, and from all trains to Albuquerque, constituting the Santa Fe Pacific, Southern California and San Francisco & San Juan Valley rail roads.

Less than a year ago the territory dependent upon the Albuquerque shops was on the Santa Fe Pacific from this city west to Mohave, Cal., a distance of only about 800 miles. A short time afterwards the Southern California was added, later the San Francisco & San Juan Valley and now the Rio Grande division of the Santa Fe railway, making a territory extending over 2,500 miles, and all under one master mechanic, G. W. Smith, of this city.

The facilities of the local shops will be greatly increased in the near future, and several hundred more employes will soon be added to the working force of the shops.

Another change. C. M. Taylor, the efficient master mechanic for the Santa Fe at Hialeah, was here on business yesterday, returning north last night. Mr. Taylor has had jurisdiction somewhat enlarged, and will operate, on and after May 1st, from Dodge City to La Junta, La Junta to Las Vegas and La Junta to Denver, with his headquarters in the future at La Junta.

The master mechanic for the Santa Fe at La Junta was Mr. Charan. He resigns on May 1st, and will take back his former position as shop foreman at Pueblo.

It is also reported that a new division will be created in the territory, called the western division, with headquarters at La Junta, and that John W. Dean, the present trainmaster at La Junta, will be appointed division superintendent.

Mr. Taylor's present headquarters are at Las Vegas.

By this change, La Junta on the north, and Albuquerque on the south will become two of the greatest and most important centers, on the main line of the great Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe railway.

Will be tried at Las Cruces. Albert B. Watson, accused of fraudulent use of the mails.

Judge Boardman of El Paso on Saturday granted the application for a writ of habeas corpus for Albert B. Watson, now under indictment by the United States grand jury for the alleged use of the mails for fraudulent purposes.

Watson made a hard fight against going back to New Mexico. He will be out of habeas corpus before Judge Parker. Otherwise he must remain in the Las Cruces jail until the United States court meets in October, as he is without means to furnish bail.

Cases disposed of to-day. Verdict rendered in favor of T. P. Robinson vs. Palatine Insurance company.

The jury in the case of T. P. Robinson vs. Palatine Insurance company, after having been out from Saturday morning until late last night, returned into court this morning a verdict in favor of the plaintiff for \$1,800, with interest at 6 per cent from October, 1898.

The plaintiff sued for the payment of \$2,000 insurance on a building burned in Gallup last year. The defendant first set up the claim that the building was burned by the connivance of the plaintiff, but evidence introduced on this point being insufficient to implicate the plaintiff, the court ruled out the testimony. The second point made by the defense was that the building had been vacant for more than 18 days previous to the fire, which the plaintiff answered that the building had not been vacant 18 days and was a waterman had been provided.

The defendant further alleged that the plaintiff failed to furnish within the proper time proof of the fire. This

HE WILL HANG!

Ruiz, the Murderer, to Swing into Eternity.

His Earthly Career Will End on June 1.

Judgment of Lower Court Confirmed by Supreme Court.

HE MURDERED PATRICO O'BANNON.

From Friday's Daily.

At the session of the territorial supreme court in Santa Fe yesterday, Jose P. Ruiz, whose appeal to the supreme court was affirmed by that court that Ruiz was indicted for the murder of Patricio O'Bannon, was convicted in the district court in Bernalillo county on the 20th of October, 1898, under an indictment returned by the grand jury on October 3rd of the same year, charging him with having murdered little Patricio O'Bannon in the month of May, 1898. The facts in the case, which were printed in detail in The Citizen at the time of the horrible tragedy, are briefly related in the following:

Jose P. Ruiz was engaged in the cattle industry on the ranges west of this city, and came to Albuquerque with a companion for the purpose of disposing of a bunch of cattle. When he received the money he and his companion started out to enjoy themselves and have a generally good time. They indulged freely and after drinking and eating around at the various resorts in old town all of one night they wound up at the saloons in the southern part of this city at noon the next day.

At about 5 o'clock in the evening they started south through Bernalillo for their ranches. While passing through that settlement, riding their ponies in a drunken and reckless manner, Ruiz indulged and levelled his revolver at several persons along the way, and upon reaching the residence of O'Bannon, at the bend near the bridge, he again leveled his pistol and fired into the faces of three innocent little children, aged from 1 to 9 years, who were playing around a pump in the back door yard. Two shots were fired, the first of which pierced the heart of Patricio O'Bannon, whose age was about 7 years, and the second bullet grazed the scalp of another little one.

After the shooting an alarm was given, Sheriff Hubbell was notified and was soon in his pursuit of the murderer. Ruiz crossed the Bernalillo bridge, changed horses with his companions, threw away his revolver and started west over the sand hills and mesa. He was followed by his man, and after riding him securely to the bottom of a wagon, by great luck drove through the angry and infuriated mob, which had assembled in Bernalillo, and landed at the county jail.

Ruiz is a young Mexican, 24 years of age, weighs about 125 pounds, and apparently does not possess a great deal of intelligence. Upon his trial he seemed to have the utmost indifference as to the result of the case, and upon the return of a verdict appeared not much perturbed. His attorneys, at the trial, endeavored to introduce testimony to the effect that there was a streak of insanity in the defendant, but a man could not be drunk as he was and kill one child and wound another, as Ruiz did, without knowing what he was doing.

The defense was ably represented by Attorney Summers Burkhardt. Judge W. C. Heacock assumed District Attorney Finlay in the prosecution.

At the trial of Ruiz, the evidence was as follows: The Livestock, London and Globe Insurance Company, plaintiff in error, vs. Martin, Perrin & Co., defendants in error. Judgment of lower court in favor of defendants in error affirmed. Opinion by Judge Laguarda.

Marcelino Garcia, auditor, plaintiff in error, vs. H. O. Burson, defendant in error. Judgment reversed, with instructions. Motion for new trial denied. Opinion by Judge Crumpacker.

Thomas S. Hubbell, appellant, vs. Orange County Fruit Exchange, appellee. Judgment of lower court affirmed. Opinion by Chief Justice Mills.

Fuencio de Nambu, et al., appellants, vs. Epimeno Miera, et al., defendants in error. Judgment of lower court affirmed. Opinion by Judge Crumpacker.

Thomas S. Hubbell, appellant, vs. the Rio Grande Loan and Irrigation Company, appellee, known as the Elephant Butte dam case, was commenced before Chief Justice Mills and Associate Justices Mills and Crumpacker, and Parker both being disqualified on account of having heard the case in the lower court, and was in progress at 4 o'clock. Hon. W. B. Childers, United States attorney, represents the government, and James A. H. and John Franklin are the attorneys for the appellee.

The Mutual Protection society of Old Albuquerque will give a grand ball on May 15 at their new hall. Herman Day is the attorney for the plaintiffs, and the committee for the event has been quite successful in the undertaking. Everybody should aid the society in this affair, as all money collected will be turned over to a committee to have charge of the public improvements at the old town. A new park is being established and will be surrounded by a five-foot cement sidewalk. Trees and grass will be planted and all money that can be secured will be expended on these improvements.

H. D. Johnson, the architect, contacted his office from the Grant block yesterday to the rooms above the San Jose market.

At the session of the territorial supreme court in Santa Fe yesterday, Jose P. Ruiz, whose appeal to the supreme court was affirmed by that court that Ruiz was indicted for the murder of Patricio O'Bannon, was convicted in the district court in Bernalillo county on the 20th of October, 1898, under an indictment returned by the grand jury on October 3rd of the same year, charging him with having murdered little Patricio O'Bannon in the month of May, 1898. The facts in the case, which were printed in detail in The Citizen at the time of the horrible tragedy, are briefly related in the following:

Jose P. Ruiz was engaged in the cattle industry on the ranges west of this city, and came to Albuquerque with a companion for the purpose of disposing of a bunch of cattle. When he received the money he and his companion started out to enjoy themselves and have a generally good time. They indulged freely and after drinking and eating around at the various resorts in old town all of one night they wound up at the saloons in the southern part of this city at noon the next day.

At about 5 o'clock in the evening they started south through Bernalillo for their ranches. While passing through that settlement, riding their ponies in a drunken and reckless manner, Ruiz indulged and levelled his revolver at several persons along the way, and upon reaching the residence of O'Bannon, at the bend near the bridge, he again leveled his pistol and fired into the faces of three innocent little children, aged from 1 to 9 years, who were playing around a pump in the back door yard. Two shots were fired, the first of which pierced the heart of Patricio O'Bannon, whose age was about 7 years, and the second bullet grazed the scalp of another little one.

After the shooting an alarm was given, Sheriff Hubbell was notified and was soon in his pursuit of the murderer. Ruiz crossed the Bernalillo bridge, changed horses with his companions, threw away his revolver and started west over the sand hills and mesa. He was followed by his man, and after riding him securely to the bottom of a wagon, by great luck drove through the angry and infuriated mob, which had assembled in Bernalillo, and landed at the county jail.

Ruiz is a young Mexican, 24 years of age, weighs about 125 pounds, and apparently does not possess a great deal of intelligence. Upon his trial he seemed to have the utmost indifference as to the result of the case, and upon the return of a verdict appeared not much perturbed. His attorneys, at the trial, endeavored to introduce testimony to the effect that there was a streak of insanity in the defendant, but a man could not be drunk as he was and kill one child and wound another, as Ruiz did, without knowing what he was doing.

The defense was ably represented by Attorney Summers Burkhardt. Judge W. C. Heacock assumed District Attorney Finlay in the prosecution.

At the trial of Ruiz, the evidence was as follows: The Livestock, London and Globe Insurance Company, plaintiff in error, vs. Martin, Perrin & Co., defendants in error. Judgment of lower court in favor of defendants in error affirmed. Opinion by Judge Laguarda.

Marcelino Garcia, auditor, plaintiff in error, vs. H. O. Burson, defendant in error. Judgment reversed, with instructions. Motion for new trial denied. Opinion by Judge Crumpacker.

Thomas S. Hubbell, appellant, vs. Orange County Fruit Exchange, appellee. Judgment of lower court affirmed. Opinion by Chief Justice Mills.

Fuencio de Nambu, et al., appellants, vs. Epimeno Miera, et al., defendants in error. Judgment of lower court affirmed. Opinion by Judge Crumpacker.

Thomas S. Hubbell, appellant, vs. the Rio Grande Loan and Irrigation Company, appellee, known as the Elephant Butte dam case, was commenced before Chief Justice Mills and Associate Justices Mills and Crumpacker, and Parker both being disqualified on account of having heard the case in the lower court, and was in progress at 4 o'clock. Hon. W. B. Childers, United States attorney, represents the government, and James A. H. and John Franklin are the attorneys for the appellee.

The Mutual Protection society of Old Albuquerque will give a grand ball on May 15 at their new hall. Herman Day is the attorney for the plaintiffs, and the committee for the event has been quite successful in the undertaking. Everybody should aid the society in this affair, as all money collected will be turned over to a committee to have charge of the public improvements at the old town. A new park is being established and will be surrounded by a five-foot cement sidewalk. Trees and grass will be planted and all money that can be secured will be expended on these improvements.

H. D. Johnson, the architect, contacted his office from the Grant block yesterday to the rooms above the San Jose market.

U. S. LAND COURT.

Trial of Jose de Leyba Grant Case—Other Court Matters.

The United States court of private land claims met as usual Tuesday at the federal building, with Chief Justice Reed presiding, and all the associate justices present.

The trial of the Jose de Leyba grant case, involving about 16,000 acres of land in Bernalillo county, was resumed and is still in progress. Three witnesses have been examined in behalf of the claimant, Mariano F. Sosa, to establish the grant. The court has granted and will be confirmed to him, and the government is this afternoon presenting testimony to prove the contrary. It is expected that the case will be completed by the end of the month.

Mandates of the clerk of the United States supreme court in the following appealed cases were presented: In case No. 89, San Antonio de Las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 122, Rio Tesague grant, rejected by the court of last resort; in case No. 123, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 124, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 125, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 126, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 127, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 128, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 129, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 130, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 131, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 132, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 133, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 134, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 135, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 136, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 137, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 138, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 139, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 140, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 141, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 142, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 143, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 144, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 145, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 146, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 147, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 148, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 149, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 150, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 151, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 152, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 153, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 154, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 155, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 156, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 157, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 158, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 159, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 160, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 161, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 162, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 163, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 164, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 165, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 166, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 167, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 168, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 169, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 170, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 171, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 172, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 173, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 174, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 175, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 176, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 177, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

U. S. LAND COURT.

Trial of Jose de Leyba Grant Case—Other Court Matters.

The United States court of private land claims met as usual Tuesday at the federal building, with Chief Justice Reed presiding, and all the associate justices present.

The trial of the Jose de Leyba grant case, involving about 16,000 acres of land in Bernalillo county, was resumed and is still in progress. Three witnesses have been examined in behalf of the claimant, Mariano F. Sosa, to establish the grant. The court has granted and will be confirmed to him, and the government is this afternoon presenting testimony to prove the contrary. It is expected that the case will be completed by the end of the month.

Mandates of the clerk of the United States supreme court in the following appealed cases were presented: In case No. 89, San Antonio de Las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 122, Rio Tesague grant, rejected by the court of last resort; in case No. 123, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 124, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 125, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 126, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 127, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 128, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 129, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 130, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 131, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 132, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 133, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 134, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 135, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 136, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 137, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 138, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 139, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 140, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 141, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 142, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 143, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 144, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 145, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 146, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 147, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 148, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 149, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 150, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 151, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 152, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 153, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 154, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 155, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 156, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 157, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 158, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 159, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 160, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 161, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 162, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 163, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 164, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 165, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 166, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 167, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 168, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 169, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 170, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 171, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 172, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 173, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 174, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 175, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 176, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 177, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

U. S. LAND COURT.

Trial of Jose de Leyba Grant Case—Other Court Matters.

The United States court of private land claims met as usual Tuesday at the federal building, with Chief Justice Reed presiding, and all the associate justices present.

The trial of the Jose de Leyba grant case, involving about 16,000 acres of land in Bernalillo county, was resumed and is still in progress. Three witnesses have been examined in behalf of the claimant, Mariano F. Sosa, to establish the grant. The court has granted and will be confirmed to him, and the government is this afternoon presenting testimony to prove the contrary. It is expected that the case will be completed by the end of the month.

Mandates of the clerk of the United States supreme court in the following appealed cases were presented: In case No. 89, San Antonio de Las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 122, Rio Tesague grant, rejected by the court of last resort; in case No. 123, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort.

The following cases were entered into the docket: In case No. 124, San Antonio de las Huercas vs. United States, the appeal of the government dismissed by the court of last resort; in case No. 125, San Antonio de las Hu