

HOME MATTERS.

Local News.—There was great scarcity of local news in this city yesterday. The only items of interest transacted at the Court House.

COURT NEWS.

SUPERIOR COURT.—Present, a full bench. Schmitzberger vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Nos. 4 and 43, 1852, Allegheny County.

In the matter of the estate of F. W. Weak, deceased, No. 92, 1852, Allegheny County.

Jenkins & Son for cause; Chadwick's Adm'rs; Nos. 19, 1852, Allegheny county.

Judgment of non prosequi.

Casey vs. F. W. Weak, deceased, No. 92, 1852, Allegheny County.

Casey, argued by Mr. Adams for plaintiff and by Mr. Hamilton for defendant.

In the matter of the incorporation of the Pennsylvania Manufacturing Co., 1852, Allegheny County.

Casey, argued by Mr. Hamilton for plaintiff and by Mr. White for defendant.

Pearce vs. Torrence, No. 45, 1852, Allegheny County.

Casey, argued by Mr. Adams for plaintiff and by Mr. Arthur for defendant.

Oneal vs. Pearson's Adm'r, No. 35, 1852.

Argued by Mr. White for defendant.

Magruder vs. Rafferty, No. 62, 1852.

Argued by Mr. Geddes for plaintiff and by Mr. Patterson for defendant.

Trustees of Mahon vs. Pease, No. 64, 1852.

Argued by Mr. McDonald for defendant.

Casey, argued by Mr. McDonald for defendant.

Casey vs. Whitehead, J. K. Moore, head, David Campbell, Rody Patterson and Sam'l Jones, Esq., he and they are hereby appointed to represent the Western Pennsylvania for the ensuing two years.

Greer, impaled, vs. Logan & Kennedy, No. 1.

Court of Queen's Sessions.—Before the Hon. Judge McCaffrey, President; and Associate, Adams and Boggs.

Judge McCaffrey sat in the jury in the former case, and the members, after a short trial, returned a verdict of not guilty, the prosecutor, William Glanton, to pay costs.

Mr. Wright, the defendant, was honorably discharged.

Commonwealth vs. James Donan, Indianapolis, passing a five dollar counterfeiter bill across a man's face, \$1000 fine.

The trial of George Miller, for killing his wife, Mary, was adjourned.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. August Otto, Indianapolis, for stealing two prancing colts, valued at five dollars, from the stable of John H. Miller, to the value of \$1000, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.

The defense, Mr. R. D. Miller, argued that he had committed no violent act.

Commonwealth vs. John McLean, Indianapolis, for shooting a gun at a man, and for the same.