BUFFALO BILL'S WILD WEST CO. v. ROSER. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit. March 11, 1896.) No. 591. In Error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. S. L. Samuels, for plaintiff in error. R. H. Landale, for defendant in error. No opinion. Reversed in open court.

BURT v. GLENN. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit.) No. 315. Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. George Zabriskie, for appellant. B. N. Harrison, Charles Marshall, and A. H. Masten, for appellee. No opinion. Decree affirmed, with costs, on opinion in Furnald v. Glenn, 12 C. C. A. 27, 64 Fed. 49.

CANADA SHIPPING CO. v. HASKELL. (Circuit Court of Appeals, First Circuit. November 28, 1896.) No. 133. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts. Edward S. Dodge, for appellant. Frederic Cunningham, for appellee. Dismissed pursuant to stipulation of counsel, without costs to either party.

CENTRAL R. CO. OF NEW JERSEY v. WIEGAND et al. WIEGAND et al. v. CENTRAL R. CO. OF NEW JERSEY. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Third Circuit. February 22, 1897.)

CARRIERS OF PASSENGERS-LIABILITY AS TO BAGGAGE.

In Error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

For opinion, see 75 Fed. 370.

Samuel Dickson, for Central R. Co. of New Jersey. Webster A. Melcher, for Wiegand.

Before ACHESON and DALLAS, Circuit Judges, and WALES, District Judge.

PER CURIAM. The judges by whom this case was heard, including the late Judge WALES, had, some time previous to his death, all agreed upon the disposition to be made of it. The survivors of those who then constituted the court do not deem it necessary, under the circumstances, to do more than announce the judgment which had thus been unanimously determined upon. In accordance therewith the judgment of the court below is affirmed.

CHASE v. CATLIN. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit. December 20, 1895.) No. 526. Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. W. P. Preble, Jr., for appellant. Knevals & Perry, for appellee. No opinion. Ordered dismissed.

EX Parte CITIZENS' NAT. BANK OF DES MOINES, IOWA. SPARKS V. NATIONAL MASONIC ACC. ASS'N OF DES MOINES, IOWA. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit. December 8, 1896.) No. 7, original. Peti-

tion in the alternative for writ of mandamus to compel the allowance of a writ of error and supersedeas by the circuit court of the United States for the Southern district of Iowa, or for the allowance of a writ of error and supersedeas by the circuit court of appeals. Clark Varnum, for petitioner. No opinion. Denied.

CITY OF HASTINGS, NEB., v. THOMAS. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit. January 18, 1897.) No. 825. Error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska. Harry S. Dungan, for plaintiff in error. Lionel C. Burr and Charles L. Burr, for defendant in error. No opinion. Affirmed, with costs.

CITY OF HUMBOLDT v. JACKSON et al. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit. December 9, 1896.) No. 665. Error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Kansas. L. W. Keplinger, for plaintiff in error. C. E. Epler, B. P. Waggener, David Martin, James W. Orr, W. C. Perry, and John H. Crain, for defendants in error. Dismissed, with costs, pursuant to stipulation of the parties.

CITY OF OMAHA et al. v. NEW ENGLAND LOAN & TRUST CO. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit. May 13, 1896.) No. 746. Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska. W. J. Connell, for appellants. E. D. Samson, for appellee. No opinion. Dismissed, with costs, pursuant to twenty-third rule, for failure to print record, on motion of appellee.

COCKRILL v. WOODSON et al. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit. December 8, 1896.) No. 883. Error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri. Ben. J. Woodson, for defendants in error. No opinion. Docketed and dismissed, with costs, pursuant to the sixteenth rule, on motion of counsel for defendants in error.

## CROSSLEY v. DUGGAN.

(Circuit Court of Appeals, Third Circuit. February 22, 1897.)

PATENTS-APPARATUS FOR MOLDING EARTHENWARE.

Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

For opinion, see 71 Fed. 967.

Francis T. Chambers and F. C. Lowthrop, for appellant.

James Buchanan, for appellee.

Before DALLAS, Circuit Judge, and BUTLER and WALES, District Judges.

PER CURIAM. The judges by whom this case was heard, including the late Judge WALES, had, some time previous to his death, all agreed upon the disposition to be made of it. The survivors of those who then constituted the court do not deem it necessary, under the circumstances, to do more than announce the judgment which had thus been unanimously determined upon. In accordance therewith the decree of the court below is affirmed.