

The Bradford Reporter.

S. W. ALVORD, Publisher.

TOWANDA, BRADFORD COUNTY, PA., MAY 28, 1874.

NUMBER 52

PROFESSIONAL CARDS.

SMITH & MONTAGNE, ATTORNEYS AT LAW. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

D. T. B. JOHNSON, PHYSICIAN AND DRUGGIST. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

D. R. C. M. STANLEY, DENTIST. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

D. R. S. WOODRUM, Physician and Surgeon. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

FOYLE & MOPPERSON, ATTORNEYS AT LAW. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

H. B. McKEAN, ATTORNEY AT LAW. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

H. W. PATRICK, ATTORNEY AT LAW. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

W. H. CARNOCHAN, ATTORNEY AT LAW. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

W. H. KELLY, DENTIST. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

MADILL & CALIFF, ATTORNEYS AT LAW. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

OVERTON & ELDRIDGE, ATTORNEYS AT LAW. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

JOHN W. MIX, ATTORNEY AT LAW. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

M. R. D. L. DODSON, OPERATIVE AND MECHANICAL DENTIST. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

PECK & STREETER, ATTORNEYS AT LAW. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

E. C. GRIDLEY, ATTORNEY AT LAW. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

DOCTOR O. LEWIS, A GRADUATE of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York City. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

DR. D. M. SMITH, DENTIST. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

PEET & DAVIES, ATTORNEYS AT LAW. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

MERCUR'S BLOCK. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

HALE & PATTON, AGENTS FOR CONNECTICUT MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

P. A. QUICK, M. D., GRADUATE of the University of Buffalo, N. Y. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON. Office—corner of Main and Third Streets, opposite Porter's Drug Store.

Selected Poetry.

DEPARTURE DAY.
"Maudie, dear little Maudie,
Mid the flower-dotted plume I stand,
Daring little in my hand,
Comrades in my soldier-grave
Sleeps the bravest of the brave?"
Is it he who seeks to rest
With his colored round his breast?
Friends and man his tomb a shrine;
Garlands tell; ask not more.

One low groan, you trees beneath,
Bears no cease, wear no breath;
Ever no heart more light or warm
Ever dead the battle-tomb.

Never gleamed a prouder eye
In the front of victory,
Never foot had firmer tread
On the field where hope lay dead.

And so bid within this tomb
The angel of peace pass on;
And no stone, with figural leaves,
Mocks the earthly loneliness.

Youth and beauty, dainties well,
Dreams that life could never fulfill,
Here lie buried; here in peace
Wrongs and woes have found release.

Turning from my comrades' eyes,
Kneeling where a woman lies,
Of the traces of the grave
Of the bravest of the brave.

—Scribner.

WHICH MASTER?

"Remember, I must have the bride on Monday," said Mr. Harcourt, as he turned to leave a shop where he had been giving some orders about the wedding.

"I beg your pardon, sir," said Mr. Benson, the master, coming forward; "but it will not be possible to get it done by Monday."

"Not possible," returned Mr. Harcourt, shortly. "What nonsense! Why there is all to-morrow."

"To-morrow is Sunday, sir," returned the shopman, firmly but respectfully.

"Well, what of that?"

"We do not work on a Sunday, sir."

"Then I shall go to those who do. You can put the bride in the carriage," added Mr. Harcourt, turning to the man to whom he had given the order.

"We get it done by Tuesday, sir," returned Mr. Benson.

"Tuesday will be too late," returned Mr. Harcourt; and then, without another word, he stepped out of the shop, and his horse and groom took the bride from the shop to her apartment and drove off, muttering to himself, "The old hump!"

Mr. Benson had lost Mr. Harcourt's custom. He felt sure that he was a new customer just recommended to him by a person whom he greatly desired to oblige; and he was a man who knew what good work was, and who did not mind what he paid for it, and paid promptly too; and he was sure that he had been given in vain to Mr. Benson.

It was some few hours after Mr. Harcourt had left the shop, that Mr. Wilson, a clever pushing saddle who lived on an adjoining street, came home with a consignment of goods.

"Well, Benson," said he, as he rubbed his hands over the other with uncommon glee, "you have done it, that is all."

"Done what?" inquired Benson, as he sat up quickly, making a guess, however, as to his visitor's meaning.

"Knocked down your own luck with one hand, and given it to me with the other."

"You mean, I suppose, that Mr. Harcourt drove on from my shop?"

"Exactly; and I thought the least I could do was to come and thank you, and tell you how happy I should be to work for so many more as you like to send for me."

"I need not tell you I shall not send you those that I can keep," replied Mr. Benson, trying hard not to show that he was annoyed; "but, God helping me, I will never go against my conscience—not for any man nor any money."

"Well, every one to his taste," said Wilson, "I know my own advantage a little too well to refuse good work when it is offered."

"There is no one in the house," said Benson, "it ever struck you," asked Wilson, "that a man may be out of his calculations when he thinks himself wiser than his Maker?"

"But," returned Wilson, "if a man wants to get on in this world, he must be ready to risk something to carry his point."

"I think he risks more who goes against God's laws, than he who conforms to them," said Benson. "Keep God's commands, and never fear but He will keep you. It is a safe line of action, and I am not afraid to hold to it."

"And from this you would argue," said Wilson, "that I am to throw up Mr. Harcourt's orders, affront him, and lose a first rate customer; thank you, no!"

"I am not arguing on the point," replied Mr. Benson. "You asked me why I did not undertake Mr. Harcourt's order, and I have told you. I will not pretend to deny to his honor or to the honor of my shop, but I have no choice in the matter; I have but one course before me—to obey God. He that serves Him serves a good Master. He never forgets the payment, and he never forgets to wait for his wages; it is only that the money is being put over to better interest than we can get here. What is good for a man to have made up to him some time or other. As for what is not good for him, let him take care of that. There is no doubt about that."

But as Wilson doubted to his own shop, he had considerable doubts on the point, and thought his neighbor a great fool and himself a very clever man. He was not content with obeying Mr. Harcourt's order. The harness was sent home on the Monday; the money was promptly paid, a fresh order given, and Wilson again congratulated himself on his good luck.

Some weeks after, and they had been weeks of great trouble to Benson, that another carriage stopped at the door of his shop; a well-appointed dark green brougham, drawn by a comfortable sleek-looking horse, and driven by a coachman who well-to-do appearance was quite in keeping with that of the equipage.

While Benson was wondering who his visitor might be, the carriage door opened quickly, and a fine looking man in military attire, got out and walked into the shop with an air of decision, as if he was accustomed to giving his orders, and he promptly obeyed. Glancing around the shop with an eye bright with lurking humor, he took in its arrangements, and made his own felt sure that he was certain the man did not intend to injure the window, and he was mistaken on both occasions, and had seen nothing. My aunt had not this time ventured to give any opinion. Much to my disgust, they

A HALLUCINATION.

My aunt and cousins were going to Brighton several weeks, and had asked me down to see them. As I was not certain on which day they intended to leave London, I thought I should call at my uncle's house, in West-end square, and inquire. When I rang the bell the door was opened by a tall woman respectably dressed in gray. She did not look at all like a servant, and seemed between forty and fifty. Her features were good, but masculine, and she was very pale, but her pale eyes were not unkindly. To my inquiry if Mrs. Benson was at home, she said, "No; they have gone;" and before I had time to ask when they left, the door was shut. I knew that my uncle did not intend leaving town till the dissolution of Parliament, and that, with his family, he was at home. He had been staying at the Palace Hotel; so I went in search of him. I found he was staying there, but was not in. I then went to his club, but was unable to find him. I wished to know where he was, but I should be welcomed at any time, my chief reason in looking for him was to find out who the strange woman was that was taking care of his house, as I could not get her face out of my head. I did not see him, however, and the next day I left for Brighton. I took the earliest opportunity of asking my aunt in whose charge she left her house, she said, "It is locked up."

I then told her that I had gone to the house and described the woman who had opened the door, adding that she was not the strange looking woman I had ever seen. My aunt said I must be mistaken, as it was quite impossible there could be any one there. My cousins agreed with her, and asked me, among other things, whether I had dined before going to the house.

"I know what he has done," cried Amy, a smart child of eight—"This is a rascal's wrong bell!" The theory appeared to receive general acceptance; but I was not to be done out of my estimate of the woman. My family to my original assertion. My favorite cousin, Annie, was the only one who took my part, and said, that for all they knew, some one might have got into the house.

If any one had gone into the house, it is not likely that it is quite evident that they would not open the door to any person who came to it.

"But," pleaded Annie, "if they were there for no harm."

"Nonsense," said one of her sisters—"It is an hallucination. At this age she has laughed, and I joined them, though I was in no laughing mood. As Annie had taken my part, she did not desert me, but telegraphed to her papa to go to their house and ring the bell, knock at the door three times, and say 'Open the same.' When she told us her message, she added: 'If there is any one in the house, they are certain to come for that; to which we all agreed. My uncle, who would do anything for his daughter, did as he was requested, and telegraphed back that all his efforts had made no impression on the door. I was then left alone. Annie sided with the rest in telling me I had made a mistake. I was unwilling to believe that she was the person of the strange appearance of the person who had opened the door made me feel very uncomfortable. I made some excuse to go up to town the next day, and determined to investigate the matter myself. On my return to London, I went at once to my uncle's house. I rang the bell, but no answer. I knocked, but all was still. I again rang furiously, and even kicked the door, but in vain. I began to think that I must, on the former occasion, have gone to the wrong door. I went out some distance to look at it before leaving. The blinds were all down; but just as I was turning to go away I saw a hand holding the bottom of one of them, and which was at once raised to the top, and I saw, for an instant that I was merely for a moment, and I saw, and I felt, feeling rather sick.

I returned to Brighton the next day, and told what I had seen. I could not, however, affirm that I had seen the hand with the same confidence as I had spoken about the woman on the former occasion, but I was certain that I might have been deceived, so that when my cousins began to cross-examine me on the subject, and show its unlikelihood, I rather wavered. When I admitted that I had rung and knocked at the wrong door, my aunt, on my coming, they evidently thought I was mistaken on both occasions, and had seen nothing. My aunt had not this time ventured to give any opinion. Much to my disgust, they

BRADFORD COUNTY CASES ARGUED AT THE SUPREME COURT.

Wm. Patterson et al. vs. Mary A. Lanning. 10. Watts 135. In Error.
In a partition between tenants in common, who derive their estate by descent, there is an implied warranty of title. Hence in an action of ejectment brought by one of the tenants, for a part of the land allotted to him, another of those who were tenants in common, is not a competent witness for the plaintiff.

Baldwin, for plaintiff in error.
Williston, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas in a proceeding which originated before two justices of the peace, by a landlord to obtain possession of a tenement, it is competent for the defendant to set up as a defense, that the title of the landlord had expired by its own limitation, or that it had been divested during the term, and that he had the right from the owner, whose title had accrued pendente lite, to remain in possession.

Overton and Greenough, for plaintiffs in error.
Williston and Nowell, for defendant in error.

Allen vs. Elmer Gibbs. 1. W. & S. 486. In Error.
Upon a trial in the Common Pleas