

## SHOWN BY DETECTIVE.

CHARGES MADE BY MR. J. L. HENDRICK, OF BRUNSWICK.

NOW IN THE PETERSBURG JAIL

Charged With Wounding L. C.

Mitchell on Election Day—Criminal

Assault Case in Chesterfield—Cock-

ade City Police Commissioners—

Sad Case of Riddle.

PETERSBURG, VA., September 24.—

(Special).—Mr. John L. Hendrick, a former

citizen of Mecklenburg county, now

residing with his family in Danville, was

brought to the jail in this city this morning

by Sheriff Turnbull, of Brunswick

county, where, it is understood, he is

wanted to answer the charge of shoot-

ing and wounding Mr. C. L. Mitchell.

The prisoner is 35 years old, and is him-

self a badly shot man, and suffering much

from his wounds.

On the 17th of July, the day of the con-

gressional primary election in this dis-

trict, Mr. Hendrick, who was in Law-

renceville visiting his son, became in-

volved in trouble, according to his state-

ment, with Mr. Mitchell, and both men

used their pistols. The result was that

Mr. Mitchell was shot in the hand, one

of his fingers being broke, and Mr. Hen-

drick was shot in the breast and arm,

and in the right hip. The ball entering

the last wound has not yet been removed.

WENT TO A RALEIGH HOSPITAL.

Mr. Hendrick says that on account of his

injuries he was allowed to go to his

son's residence, where he was placed

under nominal guard. On the same night

he eluded his guard and walked fifteen

miles to the home of a friend in Meck-

lenburg, whence, after resting, he left

for Raleigh and went into a hospital.

There he remained for several days,

and then went to the home of his wife's

sister, in Hamlet, N. C., remaining there

"cooperating until his whereabouts were

discovered.

Mr. Hendrick further states that De-

tective Peltz, the younger of the Nor-

folk and Western railway service, ap-

peared at his sister-in-law's house in

Hamlet on the 1st of September, saying

that he had a warrant for his arrest,

and displaying a pistol, demanded his sur-

render.

Hendrick says he demanded to see the

warrant, and, refusing to submit to ar-

rest, was shot by the detective as he

was turning from the latter. The ball

entered his back near the spine, passed

through the lung, and made its exit

through the breast. His wound was such

that he could not be removed, and he

was allowed to remain under guard until

he was taken in charge yesterday by

Sheriff Turnbull and brought to Virginia.

On account of the better conditions of

the jail here, he was brought to Peters-

burg, to await his trial in Brunswick.

Hendrick has been travelling for Wood

&amp; Co., nurserymen, of Richmond. He says

that during the war he served for four

months in the 101st Central Postal Directory,

and exhibited an ugly dent in his head

caused by shot received in the battle at

Yellow Tavern.

The above details were related by Mr.

Hendrick to the Dispatch correspondent,

who visited him in the jail. He was

CHARGED WITH CRIMINAL ASSAULT.

Justices Vaughan, Dunston, and Lewis,

three magistrates of Chesterfield county,

are sitting as a court at Matoaca, hear-

ing a case which has attracted much in-

terest. The case is that of Joseph E.

Holt, charged in a warrant sworn out by

Mr. Drew S. Sadler with alleged criminal

assault upon the latter's wife, which is

said to have been attempted some time

ago. The court began its session at 10

o'clock yesterday morning, and will con-

tinue its sitting on Friday, to which day

an adjournment was had. On ac-

count of the delicate nature of the case,

the public was excluded from the court-

room, and only one witness was allowed

in at a time.

The defendant is represented by Judge

D. A. Hinton, of this city. The Com-

monwealth's Attorney of Chesterfield ad-

vocates for the prosecution, and Mr. Charles

T. Lassiter, of this city, represents Mr.

Sadler.

The case has attracted much interest,

as both the plaintiff and defendant are

well-known residents of Matoaca.

ORDINANCE TO BE CHANGED.

At the meeting of the Common Coun-

cil on the 1st of October, the ordinance

creating and defining the powers and du-

ties of the Board of Police Commissioners

will be so amended as to bring it

into harmony with the new Constitu-

tion. This ordinance gave practical con-

trol of the Police Department to the

commissioners, and a contention arose be-

tween the Mayor and the commissioners

as to the right to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has

the power to suspend or remove an

officer for misfeasance in office or neglect

of duty. The matter was referred to City

Attorney Mason, who in a carefully pre-

pared paper gave it as his opinion that

the Constitution the Mayor has