

SPRING ASSOCIATES

[illegible]

United Counties, for ten da

United Counties, for ten days, for the purpose to be sworn, as a witness, in a case pending before the Defts. as such Justices of the Peace. The Bible upon which was pasted a cross—the Defts, refusing to swear on any other. To recover against the Defts., it was necessary to show that the Defts. were committing the Plff. to Gaol for non-payment of the Defts. The Defts. were influenced, by malicious motives, to commit the Plff. but the evidence failed to substantiate any such charge of malice. Judgment for the Defts. W. M. Shaw and F. MacDonald, for Plff. J. Deacon for Defts.

Cameron et al..—Action for breach of contract, and for work and labor agreed to be performed by the defendants, contractors on the B. & N. P. R. Referred by consent of parties to arbitration and award of Indep. Men.

Ronald Atty. for Defts.

Sullivan vs. Kennedy—Action of Re-
 verdict for Plff. —Wm. M. Shaw,
 D. McMartin for Defs.

Donaldson vs. Condie—Action for breach
 of marriage—brought by
 Plff., an unmarried female, residing
 at the Village of Almonte, against
 the Defendant, who resides in the
 Township of Westmeath.—The pliff.
 being the of the breach of promise, be-
 lieving to the Jury that both parties
 were well advanced in years, they
 held that the plff. had not suffered
 from the loss of her fiancé a verda-
 dent misfortune. Mr. Driscoll, Atty. ad-
 vocat. genl., counsel for D. Fraser

Clyman vs. Grant et al.—Action
 against the Defendants, as usual
 payment of lent, reserved in a
 the pliff. to sue for a long a verda-
 dent the Village of Almonte.
 contained a promise that if the
 nam should not give to the pliff. a
 within three months previous
 of March, A.D. 1861, that she
 should then determine, and that she
 had not been given a verda-
 dent proof. The jury, moved subsequ-
 ent period. The Plff. proved the
 Birmingham gave a notice of his inte-
 tinue the lease, but not three mo-
 the 9th of March 1861. Verdict
 \$299.42, subject to the opinion
 at Toronto, on the 10th inst.

J. B. Lewis Attorney, and J.
 Counsel for Defs.

Lindsay et al.—This was an ac-
 tion hit by the Plff. against the Defen-
 dants, one Neil McKillop the other
 expenses of board, and
 McKillop, she hit him
 from her husband upwards of
 £100.—The defense was that she
 from her husband voluntarily.
 at any fault on the part of her hus-
 support this defense, a good
 to be an agreement, a good
 at the trial, the jury found
 extraordinary one. The
 verdict for the Plff. for £100 & costs.
 The Judge reserved leave to set
 the Court at Toronto, to set
 D. Macmartin, for Plff. W. Dris-

Baker.—An action by a man
 his clerk for goods sold and

d clerk. The defence was

indebted to the debt, for two years, in an amount equal to the sum of the jury did allow the amount of the debt claimed by him, and found a verdict for the Plaintiff, Dr. M. Shaw for Piff., J. Dean, Defendant.

As Bain vs. James Thompson, Sheriff.—An action brought by Plaintiff against defendant as Sheriff, in which the Plaintiff alleged that the defendant had sold and delivered to him certain goods and chattels alleged to be the property of the plaintiff. On this case as follows: On the 23rd 1881, an execution was placed in the hands of the Sheriff, against the defendant as Sheriff, against the goods and chattels of the defendant, to the value of \$218 54 74, on the previous said Alex. Bain, for borrowed documents, made a copy of what is called the larger mill by his brother, Archibald, Bain, in the city of Ottawa; on the 24th of the same month, the said Alex. Bain promises to James Bain, Alex. Bain then sold to the said James Bain, a quantity of goods to the value of \$1,000, and some young cattle, a quantity of number and other property. The said James Bain then sold the property, by plaintiff to the said Alex. Bain, in this case was that the defendant in embarrassed circumstances

being in embarrassed cir-