

ELECTION RETURNS

Pringle and Landreville Successful

Two Precincts in No. 1 and Eleven in No. 2 Yet to be Heard From.

But little change has occurred in the election returns as given in the special edition of the Nugget yesterday evening other than the reporting of additional precincts in No. 2 district. In the Dawson district, as also in No. 2, a representative of the Nugget has taken the returns from those of the returning officers in each instance, checked and re-checked them and the figures contained in the following tables may be taken as absolutely correct in so far as the various precincts have reported. In this district the election of Dr. Thompson and J. A. Clarke is conceded beyond all doubt though two precincts are yet to be heard from.

NO. 1 DISTRICT.

Table with 5 columns: Precinct Name, Pringle, Landreville, Boucher, etc. Rows include No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, No. 4, No. 5, No. 6, No. 7, Fortymile, Glacier, Boucher.

Nineteen of the 30 precincts in No. 2 district have been heard from which return results as given below. The election of Pringle and Landreville is admitted though their majorities may be cut down considerably when the balance of the returns are received. Pringle will hold his own in the Stewart river country where he is well known and so will Landreville, there being a large French vote on Duncan. Wilson should poll a heavy vote on Henderson, but not enough to save him as Landreville has a lead over him now of 98 votes. The remainder of the precincts are unimportant and can not possibly change the result one way or the other. The wire being down today no returns have been had from No. 3 district, but it is assumed that Robert Lowe has been elected because of his shadow of a doubt. The returns to date from No. 2 district are as follows:

NO. 2 DISTRICT.

Table with 5 columns: Precinct Name, Henderson, Landreville, Pringle, White-Fraser, Wilson. Rows include Indian River, Ogilvie, Henderson, Stewart, Scroggie, Clear Creek, Stewart Crossing, Gold Bottom, Upper Discovery, Dominion, Caribou, Dominion, No. 7 below lower, Dominion, No. 38 below lower, Dominion, No. 24 below lower, Dominion, No. 27, Gold Run, No. 2 below, Sulphur, No. 12 below, Quartz, Eureka, No. 80 below, All Gold, Grand Forks, No. 13 below, Bear, No. 80 below, Hunker, No. 8 above, Last Chance, McQuesten, Gordon Landing, Discovery, Duncan, No. 38 below, Duncan, Thistle, Ogilvie Bridge, No. 68 below, Bonanza, No. 29 below, Bonanza.

AGAINST JUMPER.

Claims Not Lost on Mere Legal Technicality.

The gold commissioner has made another ruling against the parties who jumped a claim upon a mere technicality that, although the assessment work had been done the grant had not been renewed at the exact moment the law prescribes. This was in the case of Henry Kohlwick and Emil Schock against Walter E. Koney and Fred Crough, and was for possession of No. 9 Victoria gulch. The commissioner says in his judgment: 'This claim was first staked on August 10th and recorded August 11th, 1897. The claim was represented four years in succession and renewed to August 11th, 1903. The delinquents relocated the upper and lower halves respectively on September 3rd, and recorded September 4th last. The plaintiffs bring protest on the ground that the representation work had been done the year previously

FIRE IN CHICAGO

Hotel Somerset Destroyed and Four Lives Lost.

Special to the Daily Nugget. Chicago, Jan. 13.—Four persons lost their lives in the Hotel Somerset yesterday. The victims are Mrs. E. T. Perry, her two daughters, and Miss Ethel Saunders. It is believed the fire was caused by the carelessness of William Clemons, the hotel porter.

Personation Charges

Special to the Daily Nugget. Ottawa, Jan. 13.—Judge Deacon of Pembroke has been appointed to investigate the charges of personation in connection with the referendum vote at Ottawa.

Coal Bunkers Destroyed

Special to the Daily Nugget. Providence, Jan. 13.—The Eastern Coal Company lost by fire 3,000 tons of coal today, and the pocket was also destroyed. Loss, \$75,000.

Arrested for Body Snatching.

Indianapolis, Jan. 13.—Hamilton West, Nobleville, Ind., farmer, has been arrested for body snatching. Other arrests will follow.

Killed the Sheriff

Madison, Cal., Jan. 13.—Sheriff Thurman was last night shot by a burglar whom he apprehended raiding his own home.

Burned Six Months

Jerome, Ariz., Jan. 13.—Fire in the United Verde mine near Jerome has been smothered after burning six months.

Shot His Brother

Middleport, Ont., Jan. 13.—Samuel Watson has been committed for trial on the charge of shooting his brother Wesley.

STAKED CARELESSLY.

Mrs. Leake's Hillside Stakes Over Lapped Creek Claim.

In several decisions recently handed down by Gold Commissioner Senkler, in connection with the stampee to concession grounds thrown open for relocation, he has made no order as to costs. This was the judgment in the case of Jimmie T. Leake against Maud C. Emery, which was handed down this morning. It was one of the numerous Lovett gulch cases, growing out of the stampee when the ground was thrown open and was in regard to a hill claim on the right limit of No. 4 below. The judgment reads: 'This is a case where both plaintiff and defendant obtained a record of the above claim after staking at 12 o'clock noon on October 6th last. It is admitted that the plaintiff placed his stakes 1000 feet from the base line of the gulch, allowing for the ground that would come within the creek claim and that the defendant staked at the base of the hill sixty-three feet from said base line. The defendant is, therefore, only entitled to an undivided one-half interest in sixty-three feet of the down hill end of the Leake location. On October 6th all ground within what is known as the Philipp concession was thrown open for location. (Creek claim No. 4 below on Lovett) also the hill claim on its right limit; were open for location. The present regulations allow a creek claim 1000 feet on each side of the base line. A large number of miners staked the creek claim at the same time that the defendant staked, and the creek claim was divided among them. I do not think that the defendant would be entitled to share pro rata that portion of the creek claim that was staked by her as a hill claim. She was staking a hill claim and should have confined herself to ground that did not conflict with the creek claim, especially when creek and hill ground came open for location at the same time. As stated above, I think the defendant is entitled to an undivided one-half interest in 63 feet at the down hill end of the Leake location. No order as to costs.'

CUSTOMS RECEIPTS

At New York Total Large Sum.

New York, Jan. 2.—The official returns of the commerce of the port of New York for 1902 show a material gain in the aggregate volume of business as compared with 1901. Some idea of the increase may be had from the fact that nearly \$18,000,000 more in duties was collected than in the previous year. Imports of merchandise, exclusively, were larger by about \$28,000,000, but domestic merchandise exports declined to the extent of \$24,000,000 approximately. The imports of gold and silver in 1902 were about \$9,900,000 less than in 1901. The exports of foreign gold and silver were somewhat greater in 1902 than during the previous year while exports of domestic gold and silver were in round numbers \$36,000,000 less. Barrett has the best candied egg-special inducements in large lots.

RELOCATION DECISION

When Proper Work Has Been Done

Gold Commissioner Senkler has handed down his decision in the case of William Bond Baptist versus Thomas P. Hanlon, which had reference to the restaking of a fraction of hill claim, upper end, left limit, 73c below lower on Dominion. The decision was in favor of the plaintiff, but owing to his neglect to fulfill the requirements of the law he was ruled out in the costs. The decision is as follows: 'The plaintiff was the former owner of this property, holding it under a grant that expired on the 21st of October, 1903. Subsequent to that date the defendant relocated the ground and obtained a grant thereon on the 6th of December, 1902. On the 17th of December this protest was filed in the office, and upon the hearing of the case it is evident that the plaintiff had done ample work upon the property, during the year that expired on the 21st of October, to represent the claim; two men working for about six months, and a third for about three months on the property. They swear that they took out about 6000 buckets of pay dirt and cleaned it up in the spring of 1902, and that a large dump of tailings was left upon the property that might have been seen by any person who came to relocate the ground. The evidence of the defendant is to the effect that he examined the ground but did not see any work that could be considered work done during the year previous to October 21st. He admits that he saw two cabins on the property and that one of them was locked. As I have already held in several cases, when the representation work has been done, I do not think the ground is open for relocation and the defendant's grant should therefore be set aside. The only question is that of costs. The plaintiff relied upon his brother's proving the representation work on the property and his brother, on the other hand, relied upon him. The work having been completed by the plaintiff in the spring of 1902, in November, even if there was no snow on the ground, it would be difficult to say whether this work was done the previous year or not, and I am inclined to think that the plaintiff should suffer for not attending to the renewal of his claim by paying the costs of this protest before he obtains a renewal grant for the ground. These costs must be paid within one month from the time that the cost of this protest are taxed, otherwise the defendant shall be allowed to retain his grant to the property. The question raised by the defendant that this is a case that would follow the decision of Hartley v. Matson is, I think, without doubt not correct. In Hartley v. Matson, any right of action that the plaintiff might have had arose after the lease had been granted to the defendant, but in this case the plaintiff's rights were in existence at the time the grant was issued to the defendant, and I think there is no doubt that he has a perfect right to enforce his rights in court under such circumstances without the necessity of making the crown a party to the action. As to the costs incurred by the defendant in bringing machinery to the ground, I do not think that the plaintiff should be saddled with such costs. When the plaintiff was on the ground he saw that the cabin situated thereon was locked, and that, in addition to the fact that there would be some doubt as to whether the work he saw was done during the previous year, was sufficient to put him on inquiry before he went to any expense in preparing to work the property.'

RELOCATION DECISION

Ground Not Open to Relocation Although Grant to It Has Expired.

Gold Commissioner Senkler has handed down his decision in the case of William Bond Baptist versus Thomas P. Hanlon, which had reference to the restaking of a fraction of hill claim, upper end, left limit, 73c below lower on Dominion. The decision was in favor of the plaintiff, but owing to his neglect to fulfill the requirements of the law he was ruled out in the costs. The decision is as follows: 'The plaintiff was the former owner of this property, holding it under a grant that expired on the 21st of October, 1903. Subsequent to that date the defendant relocated the ground and obtained a grant thereon on the 6th of December, 1902. On the 17th of December this protest was filed in the office, and upon the hearing of the case it is evident that the plaintiff had done ample work upon the property, during the year that expired on the 21st of October, to represent the claim; two men working for about six months, and a third for about three months on the property. They swear that they took out about 6000 buckets of pay dirt and cleaned it up in the spring of 1902, and that a large dump of tailings was left upon the property that might have been seen by any person who came to relocate the ground. The evidence of the defendant is to the effect that he examined the ground but did not see any work that could be considered work done during the year previous to October 21st. He admits that he saw two cabins on the property and that one of them was locked. As I have already held in several cases, when the representation work has been done, I do not think the ground is open for relocation and the defendant's grant should therefore be set aside. The only question is that of costs. The plaintiff relied upon his brother's proving the representation work on the property and his brother, on the other hand, relied upon him. The work having been completed by the plaintiff in the spring of 1902, in November, even if there was no snow on the ground, it would be difficult to say whether this work was done the previous year or not, and I am inclined to think that the plaintiff should suffer for not attending to the renewal of his claim by paying the costs of this protest before he obtains a renewal grant for the ground. These costs must be paid within one month from the time that the cost of this protest are taxed, otherwise the defendant shall be allowed to retain his grant to the property. The question raised by the defendant that this is a case that would follow the decision of Hartley v. Matson is, I think, without doubt not correct. In Hartley v. Matson, any right of action that the plaintiff might have had arose after the lease had been granted to the defendant, but in this case the plaintiff's rights were in existence at the time the grant was issued to the defendant, and I think there is no doubt that he has a perfect right to enforce his rights in court under such circumstances without the necessity of making the crown a party to the action. As to the costs incurred by the defendant in bringing machinery to the ground, I do not think that the plaintiff should be saddled with such costs. When the plaintiff was on the ground he saw that the cabin situated thereon was locked, and that, in addition to the fact that there would be some doubt as to whether the work he saw was done during the previous year, was sufficient to put him on inquiry before he went to any expense in preparing to work the property.'

RELOCATION DECISION

When Proper Work Has Been Done

Gold Commissioner Senkler has handed down his decision in the case of William Bond Baptist versus Thomas P. Hanlon, which had reference to the restaking of a fraction of hill claim, upper end, left limit, 73c below lower on Dominion. The decision was in favor of the plaintiff, but owing to his neglect to fulfill the requirements of the law he was ruled out in the costs. The decision is as follows: 'The plaintiff was the former owner of this property, holding it under a grant that expired on the 21st of October, 1903. Subsequent to that date the defendant relocated the ground and obtained a grant thereon on the 6th of December, 1902. On the 17th of December this protest was filed in the office, and upon the hearing of the case it is evident that the plaintiff had done ample work upon the property, during the year that expired on the 21st of October, to represent the claim; two men working for about six months, and a third for about three months on the property. They swear that they took out about 6000 buckets of pay dirt and cleaned it up in the spring of 1902, and that a large dump of tailings was left upon the property that might have been seen by any person who came to relocate the ground. The evidence of the defendant is to the effect that he examined the ground but did not see any work that could be considered work done during the year previous to October 21st. He admits that he saw two cabins on the property and that one of them was locked. As I have already held in several cases, when the representation work has been done, I do not think the ground is open for relocation and the defendant's grant should therefore be set aside. The only question is that of costs. The plaintiff relied upon his brother's proving the representation work on the property and his brother, on the other hand, relied upon him. The work having been completed by the plaintiff in the spring of 1902, in November, even if there was no snow on the ground, it would be difficult to say whether this work was done the previous year or not, and I am inclined to think that the plaintiff should suffer for not attending to the renewal of his claim by paying the costs of this protest before he obtains a renewal grant for the ground. These costs must be paid within one month from the time that the cost of this protest are taxed, otherwise the defendant shall be allowed to retain his grant to the property. The question raised by the defendant that this is a case that would follow the decision of Hartley v. Matson is, I think, without doubt not correct. In Hartley v. Matson, any right of action that the plaintiff might have had arose after the lease had been granted to the defendant, but in this case the plaintiff's rights were in existence at the time the grant was issued to the defendant, and I think there is no doubt that he has a perfect right to enforce his rights in court under such circumstances without the necessity of making the crown a party to the action. As to the costs incurred by the defendant in bringing machinery to the ground, I do not think that the plaintiff should be saddled with such costs. When the plaintiff was on the ground he saw that the cabin situated thereon was locked, and that, in addition to the fact that there would be some doubt as to whether the work he saw was done during the previous year, was sufficient to put him on inquiry before he went to any expense in preparing to work the property.'

RELOCATION DECISION

When Proper Work Has Been Done

Gold Commissioner Senkler has handed down his decision in the case of William Bond Baptist versus Thomas P. Hanlon, which had reference to the restaking of a fraction of hill claim, upper end, left limit, 73c below lower on Dominion. The decision was in favor of the plaintiff, but owing to his neglect to fulfill the requirements of the law he was ruled out in the costs. The decision is as follows: 'The plaintiff was the former owner of this property, holding it under a grant that expired on the 21st of October, 1903. Subsequent to that date the defendant relocated the ground and obtained a grant thereon on the 6th of December, 1902. On the 17th of December this protest was filed in the office, and upon the hearing of the case it is evident that the plaintiff had done ample work upon the property, during the year that expired on the 21st of October, to represent the claim; two men working for about six months, and a third for about three months on the property. They swear that they took out about 6000 buckets of pay dirt and cleaned it up in the spring of 1902, and that a large dump of tailings was left upon the property that might have been seen by any person who came to relocate the ground. The evidence of the defendant is to the effect that he examined the ground but did not see any work that could be considered work done during the year previous to October 21st. He admits that he saw two cabins on the property and that one of them was locked. As I have already held in several cases, when the representation work has been done, I do not think the ground is open for relocation and the defendant's grant should therefore be set aside. The only question is that of costs. The plaintiff relied upon his brother's proving the representation work on the property and his brother, on the other hand, relied upon him. The work having been completed by the plaintiff in the spring of 1902, in November, even if there was no snow on the ground, it would be difficult to say whether this work was done the previous year or not, and I am inclined to think that the plaintiff should suffer for not attending to the renewal of his claim by paying the costs of this protest before he obtains a renewal grant for the ground. These costs must be paid within one month from the time that the cost of this protest are taxed, otherwise the defendant shall be allowed to retain his grant to the property. The question raised by the defendant that this is a case that would follow the decision of Hartley v. Matson is, I think, without doubt not correct. In Hartley v. Matson, any right of action that the plaintiff might have had arose after the lease had been granted to the defendant, but in this case the plaintiff's rights were in existence at the time the grant was issued to the defendant, and I think there is no doubt that he has a perfect right to enforce his rights in court under such circumstances without the necessity of making the crown a party to the action. As to the costs incurred by the defendant in bringing machinery to the ground, I do not think that the plaintiff should be saddled with such costs. When the plaintiff was on the ground he saw that the cabin situated thereon was locked, and that, in addition to the fact that there would be some doubt as to whether the work he saw was done during the previous year, was sufficient to put him on inquiry before he went to any expense in preparing to work the property.'

RELOCATION DECISION

When Proper Work Has Been Done

Gold Commissioner Senkler has handed down his decision in the case of William Bond Baptist versus Thomas P. Hanlon, which had reference to the restaking of a fraction of hill claim, upper end, left limit, 73c below lower on Dominion. The decision was in favor of the plaintiff, but owing to his neglect to fulfill the requirements of the law he was ruled out in the costs. The decision is as follows: 'The plaintiff was the former owner of this property, holding it under a grant that expired on the 21st of October, 1903. Subsequent to that date the defendant relocated the ground and obtained a grant thereon on the 6th of December, 1902. On the 17th of December this protest was filed in the office, and upon the hearing of the case it is evident that the plaintiff had done ample work upon the property, during the year that expired on the 21st of October, to represent the claim; two men working for about six months, and a third for about three months on the property. They swear that they took out about 6000 buckets of pay dirt and cleaned it up in the spring of 1902, and that a large dump of tailings was left upon the property that might have been seen by any person who came to relocate the ground. The evidence of the defendant is to the effect that he examined the ground but did not see any work that could be considered work done during the year previous to October 21st. He admits that he saw two cabins on the property and that one of them was locked. As I have already held in several cases, when the representation work has been done, I do not think the ground is open for relocation and the defendant's grant should therefore be set aside. The only question is that of costs. The plaintiff relied upon his brother's proving the representation work on the property and his brother, on the other hand, relied upon him. The work having been completed by the plaintiff in the spring of 1902, in November, even if there was no snow on the ground, it would be difficult to say whether this work was done the previous year or not, and I am inclined to think that the plaintiff should suffer for not attending to the renewal of his claim by paying the costs of this protest before he obtains a renewal grant for the ground. These costs must be paid within one month from the time that the cost of this protest are taxed, otherwise the defendant shall be allowed to retain his grant to the property. The question raised by the defendant that this is a case that would follow the decision of Hartley v. Matson is, I think, without doubt not correct. In Hartley v. Matson, any right of action that the plaintiff might have had arose after the lease had been granted to the defendant, but in this case the plaintiff's rights were in existence at the time the grant was issued to the defendant, and I think there is no doubt that he has a perfect right to enforce his rights in court under such circumstances without the necessity of making the crown a party to the action. As to the costs incurred by the defendant in bringing machinery to the ground, I do not think that the plaintiff should be saddled with such costs. When the plaintiff was on the ground he saw that the cabin situated thereon was locked, and that, in addition to the fact that there would be some doubt as to whether the work he saw was done during the previous year, was sufficient to put him on inquiry before he went to any expense in preparing to work the property.'

RELOCATION DECISION

When Proper Work Has Been Done

Gold Commissioner Senkler has handed down his decision in the case of William Bond Baptist versus Thomas P. Hanlon, which had reference to the restaking of a fraction of hill claim, upper end, left limit, 73c below lower on Dominion. The decision was in favor of the plaintiff, but owing to his neglect to fulfill the requirements of the law he was ruled out in the costs. The decision is as follows: 'The plaintiff was the former owner of this property, holding it under a grant that expired on the 21st of October, 1903. Subsequent to that date the defendant relocated the ground and obtained a grant thereon on the 6th of December, 1902. On the 17th of December this protest was filed in the office, and upon the hearing of the case it is evident that the plaintiff had done ample work upon the property, during the year that expired on the 21st of October, to represent the claim; two men working for about six months, and a third for about three months on the property. They swear that they took out about 6000 buckets of pay dirt and cleaned it up in the spring of 1902, and that a large dump of tailings was left upon the property that might have been seen by any person who came to relocate the ground. The evidence of the defendant is to the effect that he examined the ground but did not see any work that could be considered work done during the year previous to October 21st. He admits that he saw two cabins on the property and that one of them was locked. As I have already held in several cases, when the representation work has been done, I do not think the ground is open for relocation and the defendant's grant should therefore be set aside. The only question is that of costs. The plaintiff relied upon his brother's proving the representation work on the property and his brother, on the other hand, relied upon him. The work having been completed by the plaintiff in the spring of 1902, in November, even if there was no snow on the ground, it would be difficult to say whether this work was done the previous year or not, and I am inclined to think that the plaintiff should suffer for not attending to the renewal of his claim by paying the costs of this protest before he obtains a renewal grant for the ground. These costs must be paid within one month from the time that the cost of this protest are taxed, otherwise the defendant shall be allowed to retain his grant to the property. The question raised by the defendant that this is a case that would follow the decision of Hartley v. Matson is, I think, without doubt not correct. In Hartley v. Matson, any right of action that the plaintiff might have had arose after the lease had been granted to the defendant, but in this case the plaintiff's rights were in existence at the time the grant was issued to the defendant, and I think there is no doubt that he has a perfect right to enforce his rights in court under such circumstances without the necessity of making the crown a party to the action. As to the costs incurred by the defendant in bringing machinery to the ground, I do not think that the plaintiff should be saddled with such costs. When the plaintiff was on the ground he saw that the cabin situated thereon was locked, and that, in addition to the fact that there would be some doubt as to whether the work he saw was done during the previous year, was sufficient to put him on inquiry before he went to any expense in preparing to work the property.'

RELOCATION DECISION

When Proper Work Has Been Done

Gold Commissioner Senkler has handed down his decision in the case of William Bond Baptist versus Thomas P. Hanlon, which had reference to the restaking of a fraction of hill claim, upper end, left limit, 73c below lower on Dominion. The decision was in favor of the plaintiff, but owing to his neglect to fulfill the requirements of the law he was ruled out in the costs. The decision is as follows: 'The plaintiff was the former owner of this property, holding it under a grant that expired on the 21st of October, 1903. Subsequent to that date the defendant relocated the ground and obtained a grant thereon on the 6th of December, 1902. On the 17th of December this protest was filed in the office, and upon the hearing of the case it is evident that the plaintiff had done ample work upon the property, during the year that expired on the 21st of October, to represent the claim; two men working for about six months, and a third for about three months on the property. They swear that they took out about 6000 buckets of pay dirt and cleaned it up in the spring of 1902, and that a large dump of tailings was left upon the property that might have been seen by any person who came to relocate the ground. The evidence of the defendant is to the effect that he examined the ground but did not see any work that could be considered work done during the year previous to October 21st. He admits that he saw two cabins on the property and that one of them was locked. As I have already held in several cases, when the representation work has been done, I do not think the ground is open for relocation and the defendant's grant should therefore be set aside. The only question is that of costs. The plaintiff relied upon his brother's proving the representation work on the property and his brother, on the other hand, relied upon him. The work having been completed by the plaintiff in the spring of 1902, in November, even if there was no snow on the ground, it would be difficult to say whether this work was done the previous year or not, and I am inclined to think that the plaintiff should suffer for not attending to the renewal of his claim by paying the costs of this protest before he obtains a renewal grant for the ground. These costs must be paid within one month from the time that the cost of this protest are taxed, otherwise the defendant shall be allowed to retain his grant to the property. The question raised by the defendant that this is a case that would follow the decision of Hartley v. Matson is, I think, without doubt not correct. In Hartley v. Matson, any right of action that the plaintiff might have had arose after the lease had been granted to the defendant, but in this case the plaintiff's rights were in existence at the time the grant was issued to the defendant, and I think there is no doubt that he has a perfect right to enforce his rights in court under such circumstances without the necessity of making the crown a party to the action. As to the costs incurred by the defendant in bringing machinery to the ground, I do not think that the plaintiff should be saddled with such costs. When the plaintiff was on the ground he saw that the cabin situated thereon was locked, and that, in addition to the fact that there would be some doubt as to whether the work he saw was done during the previous year, was sufficient to put him on inquiry before he went to any expense in preparing to work the property.'

RELOCATION DECISION

When Proper Work Has Been Done

Gold Commissioner Senkler has handed down his decision in the case of William Bond Baptist versus Thomas P. Hanlon, which had reference to the restaking of a fraction of hill claim, upper end, left limit, 73c below lower on Dominion. The decision was in favor of the plaintiff, but owing to his neglect to fulfill the requirements of the law he was ruled out in the costs. The decision is as follows: 'The plaintiff was the former owner of this property, holding it under a grant that expired on the 21st of October, 1903. Subsequent to that date the defendant relocated the ground and obtained a grant thereon on the 6th of December, 1902. On the 17th of December this protest was filed in the office, and upon the hearing of the case it is evident that the plaintiff had done ample work upon the property, during the year that expired on the 21st of October, to represent the claim; two men working for about six months, and a third for about three months on the property. They swear that they took out about 6000 buckets of pay dirt and cleaned it up in the spring of 1902, and that a large dump of tailings was left upon the property that might have been seen by any person who came to relocate the ground. The evidence of the defendant is to the effect that he examined the ground but did not see any work that could be considered work done during the year previous to October 21st. He admits that he saw two cabins on the property and that one of them was locked. As I have already held in several cases, when the representation work has been done, I do not think the ground is open for relocation and the defendant's grant should therefore be set aside. The only question is that of costs. The plaintiff relied upon his brother's proving the representation work on the property and his brother, on the other hand, relied upon him. The work having been completed by the plaintiff in the spring of 1902, in November, even if there was no snow on the ground, it would be difficult to say whether this work was done the previous year or not, and I am inclined to think that the plaintiff should suffer for not attending to the renewal of his claim by paying the costs of this protest before he obtains a renewal grant for the ground. These costs must be paid within one month from the time that the cost of this protest are taxed, otherwise the defendant shall be allowed to retain his grant to the property. The question raised by the defendant that this is a case that would follow the decision of Hartley v. Matson is, I think, without doubt not correct. In Hartley v. Matson, any right of action that the plaintiff might have had arose after the lease had been granted to the defendant, but in this case the plaintiff's rights were in existence at the time the grant was issued to the defendant, and I think there is no doubt that he has a perfect right to enforce his rights in court under such circumstances without the necessity of making the crown a party to the action. As to the costs incurred by the defendant in bringing machinery to the ground, I do not think that the plaintiff should be saddled with such costs. When the plaintiff was on the ground he saw that the cabin situated thereon was locked, and that, in addition to the fact that there would be some doubt as to whether the work he saw was done during the previous year, was sufficient to put him on inquiry before he went to any expense in preparing to work the property.'

RELOCATION DECISION

When Proper Work Has Been Done

Gold Commissioner Senkler has handed down his decision in the case of William Bond Baptist versus Thomas P. Hanlon, which had reference to the restaking of a fraction of hill claim, upper end, left limit, 73c below lower on Dominion. The decision was in favor of the plaintiff, but owing to his neglect to fulfill the requirements of the law he was ruled out in the costs. The decision is as follows: 'The plaintiff was the former owner of this property, holding it under a grant that expired on the 21st of October, 1903. Subsequent to that date the defendant relocated the ground and obtained a grant thereon on the 6th of December, 1902. On the 17th of December this protest was filed in the office, and upon the hearing of the case it is evident that the plaintiff had done ample work upon the property, during the year that expired on the 21st of October, to represent the claim; two men working for about six months, and a third for about three months on the property. They swear that they took out about 6000 buckets of pay dirt and cleaned it up in the spring of 1902, and that a large dump of tailings was left upon the property that might have been seen by any person who came to relocate the ground. The evidence of the defendant is to the effect that he examined the ground but did not see any work that could be considered work done during the year previous to October 21st. He admits that he saw two cabins on the property and that one of them was locked. As I have already held in several cases, when the representation work has been done, I do not think the ground is open for relocation and the defendant's grant should therefore be set aside. The only question is that of costs. The plaintiff relied upon his brother's proving the representation work on the property and his brother, on the other hand, relied upon him. The work having been completed by the plaintiff in the spring of 1902, in November, even if there was no snow on the ground, it would be difficult to say whether this work was done the previous year or not, and I am inclined to think that the plaintiff should suffer for not attending to the renewal of his claim by paying the costs of this protest before he obtains a renewal grant for the ground. These costs must be paid within one month from the time that the cost of this protest are taxed, otherwise the defendant shall be allowed to retain his grant to the property. The question raised by the defendant that this is a case that would follow the decision of Hartley v. Matson is, I think, without doubt not correct. In Hartley v. Matson, any right of action that the plaintiff might have had arose after the lease had been granted to the defendant, but in this case the plaintiff's rights were in existence at the time the grant was issued to the defendant, and I think there is no doubt that he has a perfect right to enforce his rights in court under such circumstances without the necessity of making the crown a party to the action. As to the costs incurred by the defendant in bringing machinery to the ground, I do not think that the plaintiff should be saddled with such costs. When the plaintiff was on the ground he saw that the cabin situated thereon was locked, and that, in addition to the fact that there would be some doubt as to whether the work he saw was done during the previous year, was sufficient to put him on inquiry before he went to any expense in preparing to work the property.'

RELOCATION DECISION

When Proper Work Has Been Done

Gold Commissioner Senkler has handed down his decision in the case of William Bond Baptist versus Thomas P. Hanlon, which had reference to the restaking of a fraction of hill claim, upper end, left limit, 73c below lower on Dominion. The decision was in favor of the plaintiff, but owing to his neglect to fulfill the requirements of the law he was ruled out in the costs. The decision is as follows: 'The plaintiff was the former owner of this property, holding it under a grant that expired on the 21st of October, 1903. Subsequent to that date the defendant relocated the ground and obtained a grant thereon on the 6th of December, 1902. On the 17th of December this protest was filed in the office, and upon the hearing of the case it is evident that the plaintiff had done ample work upon the property, during the year that expired on the 21st of October, to represent the claim; two men working for about six months, and a third for about three months on the property. They swear that they took out about 6000 buckets of pay dirt and cleaned it up in the spring of 1902, and that a large dump of tailings was left upon the property that might have been seen by any person who came to relocate the ground. The evidence of the defendant is to the effect that he examined the ground but did not see any work that could be considered work done during the year previous to October 21st. He admits that he saw two cabins on the property and that one of them was locked. As I have already held in several cases, when the representation work has been done, I do not think the ground is open for relocation and the defendant's grant should therefore be set aside. The only question is that of costs. The plaintiff relied upon his brother's proving the representation work on the property and his brother, on the other hand, relied upon him. The work having been completed by the plaintiff in the spring of 1902, in November, even if there was no snow on the ground, it would be difficult to say whether this work was done the previous year or not, and I am inclined to think that the plaintiff should suffer for not attending to the renewal of his claim by paying the costs of this protest before he obtains a renewal grant for the ground. These costs must be paid within one month from the time that the cost of this protest are taxed, otherwise the defendant shall be allowed to retain his grant to the property. The question raised by the defendant that this is a case that would follow the decision of Hartley v. Matson is, I think, without doubt not correct. In Hartley v. Matson, any right of action that the plaintiff might have had arose after the lease had been granted to the defendant, but in this case the plaintiff's rights were in existence at the time the grant was issued to the defendant, and I think there is no doubt that he has a perfect right to enforce his rights in court under such circumstances without the necessity of making the crown a party to the action. As to the costs incurred by the defendant in bringing machinery to the ground, I do not think that the plaintiff should be saddled with such costs. When the plaintiff was on the ground he saw that the cabin situated thereon was locked, and that, in addition to the fact that there would be some doubt as to whether the work he saw was done during the previous year, was sufficient to put him on inquiry before he went to any expense in preparing to work the property.'

RELOCATION DECISION

When Proper Work Has Been Done

Gold Commissioner Senkler has handed down his decision in the case of William Bond Baptist versus Thomas P. Hanlon, which had reference to the restaking of a fraction of hill claim, upper end, left limit, 73c below lower on Dominion. The decision was in favor of the plaintiff, but owing to his neglect to fulfill the requirements of the law he was ruled out in the costs. The decision is as follows: 'The plaintiff was the former owner of this property, holding it under a grant that expired on the 21st of October, 1903. Subsequent to that date the defendant relocated the ground and obtained a grant thereon on the 6th of December, 1902. On the 17th of December this protest was filed in the office, and upon the hearing of the case it is evident that the plaintiff had done ample work upon the property, during the year that expired on the 21st of October, to represent the claim; two men working for about six months, and a third for about three months on the property. They swear that they took out about 6000 buckets of pay dirt and cleaned it up in the spring of 1902, and that a large dump of tailings was left upon the property that might have been seen by any person who came to relocate the ground. The evidence of the defendant is to the effect that he examined the ground but did not see any work that could be considered work done during the year previous to October 21st. He admits that he saw two cabins on the property and that one of them was locked. As I have already held in several cases, when the representation work has been done, I do not think the ground is open for relocation and the defendant's grant should therefore be set aside. The only question is that of costs. The plaintiff relied upon his brother's proving the representation work on the property and his brother, on the other hand, relied upon him. The work having been completed by the plaintiff in the spring of 1902, in November, even if there was no snow on the ground, it would be difficult to say whether this work was done the previous year or not, and I am inclined to think that the plaintiff should suffer for not attending to the renewal of his claim by paying the costs of this protest before he obtains a renewal grant for the ground. These costs must be paid within one month from the time that the cost of this protest are taxed, otherwise the defendant shall be allowed to retain his grant to the property. The question raised by the defendant that this is a case that would follow the decision of Hartley v. Matson is, I think, without doubt not correct. In Hartley v. Matson, any right of action that the plaintiff might have had arose after the lease had been granted to the defendant, but in this case the plaintiff's rights were in existence