

she ran away from her husband and stole his money. The Magistrate, after hearing the evidence, decided that two women, one at the foot of a pair of stairs and the other at the top, were equally guilty, so he dismissed the charge and ordered all parties home.

The business was soon finished at the Police Court this morning. The two prisoners charged with drunkenness on the street. One was fined five and the other \$4.

An air of mystery prevails in Police circles this morning. The officers of the force look wise, solemn and grave. Reporters are cautioned by the Chief as they enter the court to say nothing about it. A request to know what "he" means is answered thus: "I will explain all when we see the consumption of our plan."

More mystified than ever they interview the chief detective, the clerk, the regular attendant, but all to no purpose. When the Chief sees the realization of his hopes, the success of his plan, the entrapment of an offender against the law by his shrewdly woven net, the public shall know it.

James Thompson, who spells his name with a p, was charged with being drunk and disorderly at the Ferry Landing. He confessed and was fined \$5.

Hugh McCormick, "old Hugh" as he is called, went to the station for protection. He did not want to go to the Alms House, as he had a good boarding house, so with a caution, he was allowed to depart.

Two prisoners occupied the Dock this morning. Daniel Maloney was charged with drunkenness in Charlotte Street and fined the charge. "You'll pay \$4. A boy of 20 years of age! You ought to be ashamed of yourself," said the Magistrate.

Albert G. Phillips was given in charge by Capt. W. Donaghy of the brigantine Robin for being drunk and disorderly on board the vessel yesterday afternoon. From the Captain's statement it appeared that Phillips, who is first mate, was on shore and, when he came back, was the worse for liquor. He wanted some money and to go on shore again, but the Captain refused to give him the money. Phillips went on shore, as they had in Halifax pulled him out of the water, where he had fallen while drunk. The mate in command, resisted the authority of the Captain, and was so noisy that he was confined to his room. He broke the door open, struck the Captain, was put in irons and handed over to the police. "He's a good man," said the Captain in Court. "No man can be a good man who gets drunk," responded the Magistrate, and fined Phillips \$20 for assaulting his Captain. The money was at once paid.

The dock this morning had very few occupants for Monday. Some streets were not in, but the parties were not in the Station, peculiar circumstances. Of this number were Wm. Bailey, who was sent home to his family on a petition being received from his wife, and Wm. Cleaveland, who was let go under other circumstances.

Patrick Higgins was arrested in Charlotte Street and fined \$5.

John Thomas drank and shouting in Brussels street, was fined the same sum.

William Quirk, arrested in Waterloo, Robert Smith, in Union, and John McShall, in King street, were each fined \$2.

A Strange Affray in Kentucky.

A preliminary examination has just been concluded in the court in Harrodsburg, Ky., which gave the particulars of one of the most bloody trials consequent upon the habits of carrying concealed weapons, which has ever occurred in the States. For many years the Thomasons and the Davises had been friends, but at last they fell out, and that bitter enmity which always follows when friends disagree. In November last both families were interested in a law suit regarding money which was tried in Harrodsburg. Each testified point blank against the other, and the testimony of neither was true; the members of the other family were most famous scoundrels. In the cool Northern country such things might be done and blood not flow. But Kentucky spirit was stirred and the result was a most bloody trial. Each party was armed, and the testimony showed they were in the habit of being armed. Even while the trial was progressing, there in the very presence of the Court the fight began. A shot was fired, but by whom no one was able to swear. Then followed a fusillade in which the Thomasons and the Davises all took a hand. Three were three dead Davises, a father and two sons, and several wounded Thomasons. In the mean time the spectators rapidly disappeared, some through the windows, and others behind the stoves or benches. There was none left to testify as to what they had seen, though many could swear to much that they had heard. The judge took refuge behind his desk, and there a brawling ruffian, with a pistol in hand, fell across him, both lastly yelling "For God's sake don't shoot."

Now four Thomasons have been brought into court upon the charge of murder. Doctors have testified, and bloody garments have been exhibited. Ten witnesses have been occupied and the absent count upon general principles has been found that it was a free fight, and nobody was to blame, though upon the specific action of chasing young Theodore Davise two blocks, and then shooting him in the back, the elder Thompson has been held in the sum of five thousand dollars bail, which was promptly furnished, while his three sons were discharged.

Autographic Telegraphy.

"Perley" writes from Washington to the Boston Journal:

A gentleman is here with a wonderful improvement in the manner of transmitting information by telegraph. Whatever is written on a sheet of prepared paper and placed on the surface of a cylinder connected with the transmitting instrument is duplicated on similar paper on the cylinder of the receiving instrument by means of my own manuscript sent off, and afterwards received an exact copy of it with creases, punctuation, &c., which had been made by the electric current after it had passed through twenty miles, at least, of wire. The discovery was originally made by a Mr. Bakewell of England, but it has been greatly improved on and perfected by the gentleman who has it here, but who is not willing to have much said about it until he has secured letters patent abroad and at home. It is a marvellous improvement in the art of telegraphy.

The Chicago Inter-Ocean has gone into the conundrum business. It wants to know "What is money?" which reminds us of the Irishman's definition of salt, being the stuff that spoils potatoes if they don't have any on. Money is the blessing that brightens as it takes its leave.

### SPECIAL INDUCEMENTS.

#### PREMIUMS.

#### CLUBS!

In order to secure as many new subscribers to THE WEEKLY TRIBUNE as possible during the month of January, and give our subscribers the full benefit of commissions usually paid by publishers to agents and travellers, we have decided to make the following rates to clubs:

We will send THE WEEKLY TRIBUNE for one year to clubs at the following rates, the papers to be sent to separate addresses or in bundles to one address, at the option of the subscribers:

For Clubs of five,	\$ 4.50
do ten,	8.00
do fifteen,	11.50
do twenty,	15.00

These Clubs may be made up of old and new subscribers, and the cash or P. O. order, must accompany the names.

In addition to these liberal rates we will present to the agent who sends the largest list of names (not under fifty) between now and the first day of March, respectively:

A FINE SILVER HUNTING CASE WATCH costing \$25.

To the agents who send the second, third and fourth largest lists we will send prizes costing \$15.00, \$10.00, and \$5.00, respectively.

Agents who intend competing for the prizes will please inform us, and an acknowledgment will be kept with each order, and a fair decision may be made at the expiration of the time named.

For sample copies of THE WEEKLY TRIBUNE, and such information as may be desired, address

M. McLEOD,  
51 Prince Wm. street.

## Weekly Tribune.

WITH SUPPLEMENT.

ST. JOHN, N. B., JAN. 20, 1874.

The desperate efforts of the Government to defeat every man of brains who is likely to criticize their acts in Parliament excite suspicion. Why this morning's resolution in Court? "No man can be a good man who gets drunk," responded the Magistrate, and fined Phillips \$20 for assaulting his Captain. The money was at once paid.

A Strange Affray in Kentucky.

A preliminary examination has just been concluded in the court in Harrodsburg, Ky., which gave the particulars of one of the most bloody trials consequent upon the habits of carrying concealed weapons, which has ever occurred in the States. For many years the Thomasons and the Davises had been friends, but at last they fell out, and that bitter enmity which always follows when friends disagree. In November last both families were interested in a law suit regarding money which was tried in Harrodsburg. Each testified point blank against the other, and the testimony of neither was true; the members of the other family were most famous scoundrels. In the cool Northern country such things might be done and blood not flow. But Kentucky spirit was stirred and the result was a most bloody trial. Each party was armed, and the testimony showed they were in the habit of being armed. Even while the trial was progressing, there in the very presence of the Court the fight began. A shot was fired, but by whom no one was able to swear. Then followed a fusillade in which the Thomasons and the Davises all took a hand. Three were three dead Davises, a father and two sons, and several wounded Thomasons. In the mean time the spectators rapidly disappeared, some through the windows, and others behind the stoves or benches. There was none left to testify as to what they had seen, though many could swear to much that they had heard. The judge took refuge behind his desk, and there a brawling ruffian, with a pistol in hand, fell across him, both lastly yelling "For God's sake don't shoot."

Now four Thomasons have been brought into court upon the charge of murder. Doctors have testified, and bloody garments have been exhibited. Ten witnesses have been occupied and the absent count upon general principles has been found that it was a free fight, and nobody was to blame, though upon the specific action of chasing young Theodore Davise two blocks, and then shooting him in the back, the elder Thompson has been held in the sum of five thousand dollars bail, which was promptly furnished, while his three sons were discharged.

Autographic Telegraphy.

"Perley" writes from Washington to the Boston Journal:

A gentleman is here with a wonderful improvement in the manner of transmitting information by telegraph. Whatever is written on a sheet of prepared paper and placed on the surface of a cylinder connected with the transmitting instrument is duplicated on similar paper on the cylinder of the receiving instrument by means of my own manuscript sent off, and afterwards received an exact copy of it with creases, punctuation, &c., which had been made by the electric current after it had passed through twenty miles, at least, of wire. The discovery was originally made by a Mr. Bakewell of England, but it has been greatly improved on and perfected by the gentleman who has it here, but who is not willing to have much said about it until he has secured letters patent abroad and at home. It is a marvellous improvement in the art of telegraphy.

The Chicago Inter-Ocean has gone into the conundrum business. It wants to know "What is money?" which reminds us of the Irishman's definition of salt, being the stuff that spoils potatoes if they don't have any on. Money is the blessing that brightens as it takes its leave.

### MEN AND THINGS AT OTTAWA.

#### Local Politics—Photographic Pictures—Ottawa Politicians—The Contest—Electoral—Prospects of the Campaign.

[FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.]

OTTAWA, JAN. 14.

The capital has not yet partaken of the intensity of election feeling which exists further West. As regards the contest for the Local Legislature one would scarcely know such a thing was going on, unless his eye chanced to light upon some aspirant's card in the papers. For the House of Commons only one candidate, J. M. Currier, one of the late members, has yet published his card. He is a staunch Liberal-Conservative, a straightforward politician, a man of large experience and liberal views, and who will oppose the un-British policy of the Gt. Government, in which our dispute with the United States is being carried on. He will probably run with Currier. Lewis is a lawyer and an honest man. He thought not to be in politics. He is too conscientious, and constantly perplexed as to how he will vote because he is a Liberal-Conservative, and no measure introduced, or ever likely to be introduced, will appear to him to be exactly right in every particular. This political peculiarity in his constitution leaves him open to the charge of being "on the fence." It is an unjust suspicion. He is never "on the fence," or even near enough to his vicinity to tell which side he is on. He will not allow anybody else to make a mistake, and "all right" and entitled to recognition by the McMillenites. He has not yet announced to elect another, but to keep his company. Upon being interviewed he said that he would not be a candidate for the Liberal-Conservative; that he never was a Grit, and never can be; that Mackenzie's policy is a political mistake, and that he would not be a Grit, and never can be; that Mackenzie's policy is a political mistake, and that he would not be a Grit, and never can be.

W. FRANK COCHRAN.

The heart being a great muscular organ, requires vigorous nervous force to sustain the nervous element, it will always strengthen the heart weakened through loss of this element.

THE INVENTOR.

CREWIT COURT.

January 19.

The evidence of Mr. Nugent on Saturday concluded the case for the plaintiff in the case of *dos den McKenzie vs. Mosher*.

Dr. Barker moved for a nonsuit on several grounds. He claimed that the marriage of James Swin had not been proved, that the whole case was a mere sham, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

### King's County Meeting.

#### An enthusiastic meeting of industrial electors was held in the King's County Court House on Saturday.

J. B. S. Barker occupied the chair, and opened the meeting with a short but stirring speech in which he announced the object of the meeting, viz.—to select a good candidate for the Dominion Parliament—namely, a man as Mr. Donville. A number of other speakers in favor of Mr. Donville, who was declared the nominee of the Convention, and committees for the different parishes were chosen to conduct the canvass. The members of the committee were perfectly satisfied that they will elect Mr. Donville against all comers, whether one or more.

W. FRANK COCHRAN.

HEART DISEASE.

HALIFAX, Feb. 10th, 1872.

Mr. JAMES H. FELLOWS.—Dear Sir: In order to be able to do business on Saturday, you are at liberty to give this letter publicity.

In 1859 I was taken ill with Disease of the Heart, accompanied by violent palpitation, and from that time I have suffered from this disease, standing continued professional attendance, up to a few weeks ago, when your "Heart Disease" was sent me, and it was recommended to me. The use of it during a very short time enabled me to resume my usual work, and now I am as well, fat and hearty as I could wish to be.

Yours very truly,

W. FRANK COCHRAN.

The heart being a great muscular organ, requires vigorous nervous force to sustain the nervous element, it will always strengthen the heart weakened through loss of this element.

THE INVENTOR.

CREWIT COURT.

January 19.

The evidence of Mr. Nugent on Saturday concluded the case for the plaintiff in the case of *dos den McKenzie vs. Mosher*.

Dr. Barker moved for a nonsuit on several grounds. He claimed that the marriage of James Swin had not been proved, that the whole case was a mere sham, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.

He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ. He also claimed that the writ was null and void, and that the parties were not the parties named in the writ.