

Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. Hyland & Zabriskie, for appellant. Francis M. Scott, Corp. Counsel, for appellee. Dismissed, pursuant to the sixteenth rule, for failure to docket.

---

---

BOLLES v. OUTING CO., Limited. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit. April 28, 1897.) In Error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. Wells, Waldo & Snedeker, for plaintiff in error. John R. Abney, for defendant in error. Affirmed on the opinion filed on former decision. 23 C. C. A. 594, 77 Fed. 966.

---

---

BOYLE, Attorney General, et al. v. MUTUAL LIFE INS. CO. OF NEW YORK. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit. May 26, 1898.) No. 1,020. Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Kansas. David Overmyer, David Martin, Louis C. Boyle, and Webb McNall, for appellants. B. P. Waggener, Albert H. Horton, George J. Barker, and E. F. Ware, for appellee. Dismissed, per stipulation of parties, at costs of the appellee. See 82 Fed. 705.

---

---

CHICAGO SUGAR REFINING CO. v. CHARLES POPE GLUCOSE CO. et al. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit. June 10, 1898.) No. 517. Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois. C. K. Offield, H. S. Towle, and C. C. Linthicum, for appellant. L. L. Coburn, for appellees. Dismissed. See 28 C. C. A. 594, 84 Fed. 977.

---

---

THE CHILIAN. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit. January 20, 1897.) No. 85. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. Wilcox, Adams & Green, for appellant Berwind-White Coal-Min. Co. Convers & Kirlin, for appellees, claimants of the Chilian. Dismissed on consent, pursuant to the twentieth rule. See 58 Fed. 697.

---

---

CITY OF POUGHKEEPSIE v. NATIONAL METER CO. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit. November 19, 1896.) No. 94. Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. Dickerson & Brown, for appellant. Gifford & Bull, for appellee. No opinion. Affirmed. See 75 Fed. 405.

---

---

CITY RY. CO. v. CITIZENS' ST. RY. CO. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit. June 9, 1898.) No. 243. Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Indiana. A. C. Harris, Bryon K. Elliott, and William F. Elliott, for appellant. Benjamin Harrison, W. H. H. Miller, Ferdinand Winter, and John B. Elam, for appellee. Dismissed on motion of appellant.

---

---

CLEVELAND CO-OPERATIVE STOVE CO. et al. v. HESS. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit. October 4, 1898.) No. 624. Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Eastern Division of the Northern District of Ohio. Thurston & Bates, for appellants. Charles R. Mills and Albert E. Lynch, for appellee. Dismissed per stipulation.

CONSOLIDATED ELEVATOR CO. v. NICHOLS et al. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit. October 3, 1898.) No. 523. Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois. S. P. Wheeler, for appellant. Joseph S. Laurie, for appellees. Dismissed on motion of appellant.

---

---

DANIELS et al. v. LEFAVOUR et al. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit. November 6, 1896.) No. 3. Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. Abram Kling, for appellants. Holmes & Adams, for appellees. Dismissed upon settlement of the case.

---

---

DAVIDSON v. MEXICAN NAT. R. CO. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit. April 30, 1895.) No. 41. In Error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York. Parsons, Shepard & Ogden, for plaintiff in error. Evarts, Choate & Beaman, for defendant in error. No opinion. Reversed, pursuant to answer of the supreme court on certificate. 157 U. S. 201, 15 Sup. Ct. 563.

---

---

DE LIMA v. UNITED STATES. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit. March 15, 1897.) Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. Robert Weil, for appellant. Wallace Macfarlane, U. S. Atty. Dismissed, pursuant to the sixteenth rule, for failure to docket.

---

---

DIECKERHOFF v. UNITED STATES. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit. May 22, 1893.) Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. Curie, Smith & Mackie, for appellant. Edward Mitchell, U. S. Atty. Dismissed by consent, pursuant to the twentieth rule.

---

---

DIXON-WOODS CO. v. UNITED GLASS CO. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit. March 18, 1897.) Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York. Charles A. Talcott, for appellant. Cookingham & Sherman, for appellee. Dismissed on consent, pursuant to the twentieth rule.

---

---

DULUTH TRUST CO. v. GREAT WESTERN MFG. CO. et al. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit. May 2, 1898.) No. 1,078. Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota. Jed L. Washburn, for appellees. Docketed and dismissed, with costs, pursuant to the sixteenth rule, on motion of appellees.

---

---

THE ELDORADO. THE FLORENCE. (Circuit Court of Appeals. Second Circuit. April 20, 1896.) No. 159. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. Chas. H. Tweed, for appellant claimant of the Eldorado. Robinson, Biddle & Ward, for appellee Clyde S. S. Co. Carpenter & Park, for appellee claimant of the Florence. No opinion. Affirmed. See 68 Fed. 940.