

*D. Van Voorhis*, while the real name of the plaintiff was *William H. Van Voorhis*. The proof upon the trial, however, showed that the plaintiff was also known in the town as *Henry Van Voorhis*, and that he was the person intended to be charged with the payment of the tax. *Brown, J.*, said: "In respect to the presence of the letter *D.* between the words *Henry* and *Van Voorhis* upon the tax roll, it is to be regarded as surplusage upon the well known rule that the law recognizes but one Christian name. There was no proof offered to show that there was any other person in the town of *Fishkill*, known by the name of *Henry Van Voorhis*, or *Henry D. Van Voorhis*, to whom the charge might have referred, so that there could be no confusion and no uncertainty in regard to the person whose duty it was to pay the tax."

In *Stewart v. Colter*, 31 Minn. 385 (1884), the question was as to the sufficiency of certain tax certificates to vest titles in the plaintiff. *Berry, J.*, said: "The objection that the certificates run to *Nannie Stewart* and not to *Nannie W. Stewart*, the name by which the plaintiff sues, is disposed of by the familiar rule that the law does not, except perhaps in special circumstances, recognize a middle name or its initial as a necessary part of a person's legal name."

The rule has also been frequently applied in criminal prosecutions.

In *Miller et al. v. People*, 34 Ill. 457 (1866), the indictment charged the robbery to have been committed on *Isaac R. Randolph*; it was proved that it was committed on *Isaac B. Randolph*, to whom the stolen money belonged. Counsel for defendant contended that although it was unnecessary to insert the initial *R.* in the name of the party robbed, yet, as it was inserted, and it was not proved he was as well known by the one name as the other, the variance was fatal.

*Mr. Justice Breese* said: "We are not of this opinion. The middle initial might, as counsel admits, have been wholly omitted in the indictment, and it would have been good if the real *Randolph* was intended to be named in it as the owner of the property stolen. In law the middle letter of a name is no part of the name. It may be dropped and resumed or changed at pleasure, and the only inquiry is one of substance—was he the real party robbed?"