

rities, and the plaintiff a bona fide holder without notice, it does not require any citation of authorities to show that the defense is not available. The plaintiff not being a party to the proceeding brought to enjoin the collection of the tax levied to pay the bonds, the judgment in that case in no manner affected his rights.

For the foregoing reasons, the several defenses pleaded are unavailing, and judgment should be entered for plaintiff for the amount due on the several coupons set forth in the petition.

---

UNITED STATES v. BUNTING et al.

(District Court, E. D. Pennsylvania. September 21, 1897.)

CONSPIRACY TO DEFRAUD THE UNITED STATES—INDICTMENT.

An applicant for a government clerkship filed a sworn application in the form required for an examination by the civil service commission, and was afterwards notified by postal card to appear for examination at a time stated. By previous arrangement, another person, impersonating the applicant, presented himself for examination, and filled out a paper known as the "Declaration Sheet," which contained questions concerning the applicant, and signed the applicant's name thereto. Held, that these two persons were indictable, under Rev. St. §§ 5440, 5418, which denounce respectively the offense of conspiring to commit any offense against the United States or to defraud the United States, and the offense of falsely making, altering, or forging various enumerated papers, including affidavits or other writings, for the purpose of defrauding the United States.

The defendants in this case were charged with conspiracy together to defraud the United States in making and presenting a false writing. The indictment was framed under Rev. St. U. S. § 5440, as amended by Act May 17, 1879 (21 Stat. 4), which in its amended form is as follows:

"If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States or to defraud the United States in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such parties do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy all the parties to such conspiracy shall be liable to a penalty of not more than ten thousand dollars, or to imprisonment for not more than two years or to both fine and imprisonment in the discretion of the court."

The fraud upon the United States was alleged under Rev. St. U. S. § 5418, which provides as follows:

"Every person who falsely makes, alters, forges, or counterfeits any bid, proposal, guarantee, official bond, public record, affidavit, or other writing, for the purpose of defrauding the United States, or utters or publishes as true any such false, forged, altered, or counterfeited bid, proposal, guarantee, official bond, public record, affidavit, or other writing, for such purpose, knowing the same to be false, forged, altered, or counterfeited, or transmits to or presents at the office of any officer of the United States any such false, forged, altered, or counterfeited bid, proposal, guarantee, official bond, public record, affidavit, or other writing, knowing the same to be false, forged, altered, or counterfeited, for such purpose, shall be imprisoned at hard labor for a period not more than ten years, or be fined not more than one thousand dollars, or be punished by both such fine and imprisonment."

From the facts as set forth in the indictment and as developed at the trial it appeared that the defendant Bunting was an applicant for a position as clerk in the post-office service, and on July 22, 1897, filed an application for examination before the United States civil

service commissioners at an examination which was to be held at Philadelphia. This application blank was in the usual form, containing questions relative to the name, date and place of birth, citizenship, residence, occupation, etc., of the applicant, which the applicant was required to fill out and file with the secretary of the local board before taking the examination. The application which was filled out by the defendant Bunting was sworn to by him, and lodged in due form with the proper official on July 23, 1897. On the 29th of July, 1897, the secretary of the board notified the defendant Bunting by postal card to appear before the board on August 5th, for the purpose of examination. At this time the defendant Delaney presented himself at the room in which the examination was conducted, gaining admission by means of the postal card theretofore mailed to Bunting, none but those possessed of such cards being admitted to the room. After gaining access to the room by this means the defendant Delaney was handed a paper known as the "Declaration Sheet," which paper contained questions concerning the applicant, the correct answers to which could only be made by the person who made the application or by some one fully cognizant with its contents. The answers to the questions on the declaration sheet were then filled in by Delaney who signed at the end thereof the name of the defendant Bunting. When this paper was handed to the secretary, Delaney was recognized and placed under arrest. Bunting was subsequently arrested, and both were indicted. The defendants pleaded guilty to the indictment.

James M. Beck, U. S. Atty., and Michael F. McCullen, Asst. U. S. Atty.

John P. Gibbs, for defendant Delaney.

John V. Ripperger, for defendant Bunting.

BUTLER, District Judge (orally). When this case first came before me, I was under the impression that the defendants were indicted under the old law, charged with conspiracy to defraud the United States, and as it was not shown that either of them had defrauded the government of money or other property, I was in doubt whether the statute covered the charge. Since that time, however, I have carefully examined the bills of indictment as well as the sections of the Revised Statutes under which the defendants are charged, and am of opinion that the offense comes within their terms.

Section 5418 literally as well as in spirit covers the case. The offense charged is a grave one; an attempt to prejudice the rights of the United States in the administration of the civil service statutes. Had the defendants been successful one of them would have obtained a privilege which would have placed him in a favored class and have entitled him to an advantage over others in the appointment to office.

The privilege is a valuable one, and the fraud of the defendants was therefore in prejudice of the government.

The sections under which the defendants are indicted are broad and sweeping and the offense I think is within their provisions.

## In re CHRISTIAN.

(Circuit Court, W. D. Arkansas. October 3, 1897.)

**1. CRIMINAL LAW—DISCHARGE FOR VOID SENTENCE—REMOVAL TO DISTRICT OF TRIAL FOR RESENTENCE.**

The petitioner was indicted and convicted in the Central district of the Indian Territory, and sentenced to imprisonment at Detroit, Mich. While the marshal of that district was en route with the prisoner to the prison at Detroit, he sued out a writ of habeas corpus before the circuit court of the United States for the Western district of Arkansas, and was discharged because the sentence pronounced against him was void. Upon being rearrested under section 1014 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, he sued out a second writ of habeas corpus before the same court. *Held*, that the proceeding under section 1014 of the Revised Statutes of the United States was irregular and unauthorized, and the defendant is discharged without prejudice to the United States to take any lawful measures to have the petitioner sentenced according to law upon the verdict of guilty against him.

**2. SAME—PROCEDURE.**

*Held*, further, that the proper proceeding for the removal of the prisoner to the Central district of the Indian Territory was for the United States court for that district, under section 716 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to issue its warrant, addressed to the marshal of the Western district of Arkansas, to arrest the defendant and deliver him to the marshal of the Central district of the Indian Territory to abide the action of that court.

(Syllabus by the Judge.)

Winchester & Martin and Tom W. Neal, for petitioner  
W. J. Horton, U. S. Dist. Atty.

ROGERS, District Judge. The petitioner heretofore sued out from this court a writ of habeas corpus against J. P. Grady, United States marshal for the Central district of the Indian Territory. On the hearing he was discharged, but without prejudice to the right of the United States to take any lawful measures to have the petitioner sentenced in accordance with law upon the verdict of guilty against him, or to correct the judgment, if the same was, by misprision of the clerk, erroneously entered. 82 Fed. 199. Immediately upon his release the United States attorney for the Central district of the Indian Territory caused to be filed before Stephen Wheeler, United States commissioner in this district, a copy of an indictment found and duly returned by the grand jury of the Central district of the Indian Territory, and filed in the United States court at Antlers, in said district and territory, whereupon said commissioner issued a warrant for the arrest of said petitioner, and committed him to jail, under section 1014 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to be held for trial at Antlers, in the Indian Territory. Immediately upon his commitment to the United States jail at this place by S. F. Stahl, the marshal of the Western district of Arkansas, petitioner sued out of this court this writ of habeas corpus, returnable forthwith, against the said marshal of the Western district of Arkansas. The petitioner alleges that he is unlawfully held by S. F. Stahl, in the jurisdiction of this court, by virtue of a warrant issued by Stephen Wheeler, a United States commissioner; that at the May term of 1897 of the United States court