

WHERE TO GET THE EXAMINER. R. H. Mason, Post Office, Charlottetown. J. McIntyre, Main Street, Charlottetown. C. Paul, Lower Spring Street, Charlottetown. W. M. Coffin, Station Street, Charlottetown. R. Carter & Co., Queen Street, Charlottetown. G. Gray, News Stand, P. E. I. Railway and on the train. B. J. Wood, Upper Station St. R. K. Brown, Upper Station St. H. H. Brown, Upper Station St. H. H. Brown, Upper Station St. Evans & Son, Cor. of Prince and Richmond St.

LOCAL AND OTHER ITEMS.

ARE YOU READY?—Read Bee Bros. ad. I. O. O. F.—Wibley Lodge tonight. OBIST DIVISION, S. of T., meets this evening at 8 o'clock in Masonic Temple. Members take notice. Visitors welcome. THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE will meet tomorrow (Saturday) at 4 p. m. in the Y. M. C. A. rooms, to arrange for the meetings of the week of prayer.—T. C. James, sec'y.

FOR DEMERARA—Steamer Coila will sail for Demerara on her return from Boston about 10th December. For freight space, apply to D. Farquharson & Son, P. S.—Still room for a few more horses.

STEAMER COILA leaves Charlottetown next week for Boston, and leaves Boston about 4th December for Charlottetown. As this is the last direct boat of the season, shippers will please take notice. Apply in Boston to DeLong & Sisson, & Central Wharf, or here to D. Farquharson & Son.

THE BETHANY BAND Tea and Fancy Sale in the Y. M. C. A. yesterday was well attended and proved very successful, the net receipts being in the vicinity of \$75 or \$100. The arrangements throughout were very complete, and at the close the receipts remaining over \$4 were "auctioned off" by Mr. L. E. Frowe, M. L. A.

A SUCCESS—The Thanksgiving Sale and Tea in St. Paul's Schoolroom last evening was a success in every respect. The tables were well filled with the various articles brought good prices. There was a large attendance. The room was appropriately decorated with art maslin and hunting. The affair was under the auspices of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavour.

RUNAWAY—A horse took fright and ran away on Queen Street this forenoon. He was the London Horse corner he was captured, not, however, before he had upset the express wagon to which he was hitched, damaging it somewhat and breaking the harness. The contents of the wagon—a carcass of pork, a box of eels and some feed for the horse—were spilled about the street.

BOARD OF HEALTH—The Board of Health met on Wednesday evening, Nov. 22. Mr. Laird being the only absentee. Two bills of Dr. Richard Johnson, for professional services rendered in connection with his duties as Health Officer, amounting in all to \$16, were ordered to be paid. The bills range from January, 1892, to date. Two bills for similar services from Dr. H. D. Johnson, amounting to \$52, were also ordered to be paid.

NEW DEBATING CLUB—The Watchman says: The younger members of the Benevolent Irish Society are organizing a debating and social club for the winter months. It is their intention to open the season on the 22nd December and close in the latter part of April. The fee is \$2, and persons who are not members of the B. I. S. are eligible for membership. Persons residing outside the city will become members on payment of \$1. The club room will be open every week night, and it is the intention to have a debate one night in the week.

MARRIED IN BOSTON—Two well-known Charlottetownians—Miss Martha Alice Carr and Mr. George J. Carr—were recently united in marriage at Boston. The ceremony was performed at the Cathedral on Sunday the 11th inst. by Rev. Father Walsh. Miss Winifred Anderson, of Roxbury, was the maid of honor, and the groom was supported by Mr. Edward McLeod, lately of Charlottetown. The bride is a daughter of the late Dr. Frank Cox, of Morrell. After returning from a brief wedding trip, Mr. and Mrs. Carr will make their home in Boston. THE EXAMINER extends congratulations.

THE RANGER CASE—The case of Bowen Smith vs. the schooner Ranger was before Justice Tuck in the court yesterday. The case is as follows: Captain Purchase, of the schooner Ranger, agreed with Bowen Smith, of Coosige, to carry a cargo of lumber from Coosige to New Glasgow. Instead of following instructions, he went to Summerside, P. E. I., and sold the cargo. He then brought the vessel to Point de Chene, where he left her and cleared out with the proceeds of the cargo. Plaintiff Smith had the vessel seized and brought claim against her for \$156.29. The case went by default, and the court ordered the vessel to be sold on Tuesday next to satisfy the claim.—St. John Gazette.

LIGHTNING'S PRELUDE—During the last seven years five horses have been killed by lightning on a single knoll on the French farm which lies on the road leading from Flint to Fanning, Mich., and nearly every tree on the same farm is said to be the marks of the "forked jery." An open lot at East Great Plains, Ct., has been "hit by thunderbolts," as an old resident of that place expressed it, since the first times since the spring of 1857, and a piece of wood not more than half a mile away has been literally riddled by the electric shaft. At West Heath, Mass., a hill near the village schoolhouse has been struck by lightning so often that the old settlers have tried trying to keep a record of the singular occurrence.

A PRETTY MARRIED—Mr. D. K. Dolbe, foreman of the Guardian Printing office, and Miss Alta A. Walden, of this city, were united in marriage on Wednesday evening at the residence of Miss Ada A. Walden, Queen Street. The ceremony was performed by Rev. C. W. Corey. Miss Ethel Armour was bridesmaid, and Mr. Geo. Wilely groom. The bride was presented with a china tea set by the members of the Baptist choir and the teachers of the Sabbath School, and the members of her Sabbath school class presented her with a silver orange spoon in plush case. The groom was presented with a handsome clock by the Guardian compositor, accompanied by an address of congratulation. The happy couple have THE EXAMINER'S best wishes.

Kris Kringle is on his way to Charlottetown. Are you ready for him. We have placed on sale in our Millinery Room at 20c. and 30c. a large number of pretty Fancy Articles suitable for you know what. BEER BROS. We are giving very low prices on Children's Fur Collars. THE WEATHER—Moderate winds and fair.

LOCAL AND OTHER ITEMS.

ISLAND PRODUCE—The Herald reports that there are a great many P. E. Island produce-laden schooners at Halifax and Dartmouth. Thirty-five cents is asked for potatoes. MORE COIL—The steamer Coila arrived from Sydney this afternoon with a cargo of coal for & Lyons & Co. The Jasper Embree has also arrived with a cargo of coal for the same firm.

SCOTT ACT.—Two summonses were served this afternoon, one on George Off and the other on Enoch Carmody. On a summons is returnable on Monday, viz. Carmody's on Wednesday.

THE RULING PASSION, ETC.—Mr. James Liddle, editor of the Press, is, Times, committed suicide last week by throwing himself on the track before a moving train. Before committing the rash act, he wrote a report of his suicide for publication in his own paper.

A SPANISH DOLLAR. Malcolm Campbell, of Pictou, has quite a curiosity in the shape of an old Spanish dollar, dated 1804, which he has had in his possession for 46 years. These coins were largely used in P. E. Island a number of years ago and the centre is cut a hexagonal hole about the size of a five cent piece.—Exchange.

IS STILL AT LARGE—A young man named Michael Madden, who was serving a term for drunkenness, was released from jail a few days ago on condition that he would ship on a vessel about to leave port. After getting a new pair of boots and some other things, he quietly gave the shipping master the slip and at latest accounts was still at large.

THANKSGIVING DAY.—Yesterday was generally observed in the stores and public offices, and the usual services were held in the churches. The weather in the early morning was wet and disagreeable. During the forenoon it cleared up somewhat, and the sun shone brightly for a time; but early in the afternoon it turned cold, and there was a slight flurry of snow.

POLICE COURT.—Yesterday forenoon Edgar McCarron, for being drunk and incapable, was fined \$1 or four days; and several young lads charged with corner leaning and annoying persons in their dwellings, were admonished and discharged. Today Edgar McCarron was again arraigned, this time the charge being drunk and disorderly. He was fined \$10 or 50 days' hard labor. Henry Clinton, for being drunk and loitering on the corner, was fined \$3 or 40 days. William Gregory, for being drunk and disorderly, was fined \$4 or 20 days.

FORTY HOURS' DEVOTION.—The Forty Hours' Devotion in St. Dunstan's Cathedral began with Mass of Exposition on Tuesday morning at 8 o'clock, and closed with Mass of Exposition on Thursday morning at the same hour. During the devotion about 2,500 persons approached the Holy Table. The Cathedral staff were assisted on the occasion by the following clergymen: Very Rev. Mgr. Gillis, Inland River; Rev. Dr. Doyle, Vernon River; Rev. J. Macdonald, Hope; Rev. Allan J. Macdonald, Port Augustus; Rev. Michael McMillan, St. Teresa's; Rev. P. Curran, Tracadie; Rev. J. J. Macdonald, Kinkora; Rev. Alexander McLaughlin, Morrell; Rev. Ignatius Macdonald and Rev. A. J. McDougall, St. Dunstan's College.

RETAIL MARKET PRICES.—The fine weather of today brought a very large crowd to the market. The supply inside was good, while that outside, of pork and produce, was very large and moved quietly with a fair demand. We quote the general articles as follows:—Beef (quarter), 4 to 7 cents; butter (1-lb) 21 to 23 cents; cabbage (per dozen) 25 to 35 cents; carrots (per bushel) 25 cents; egg (per dozen) 15 to 20 cents; ducks (per pair) 50 to 55 cents; fowl, 35 to 45 cents; geese, 50 to 65 cents; lamb (per quarter) 40 to 50 cents; oatmeal (per cwt) \$2.50; pork (small) 10 to 12 cents; turnips, 10 to 12 cents; turkeys, 80c to \$1; hay, 30 to 35 cents; oats, 32 to 33 cents; potatoes, 20 to 25 cents; codfish, 3 to 7 cents; and pork carcass 55 to 57 cents.

Avoid Being Too Late. A Cough or Cold, simple at first, may develop into something serious if not stopped in time. Johnson's Cough Syrup CURES COUGHS. Price 15 cents.

Johnson & Johnson, THE RELIABLE DRUGGISTS. Cor. Kent and Prince Streets. Cor. Queen and Richmond Streets. nov23

All Men Lie. SOME lie in the newspapers, but all must lie at night. Lying is just as important as eating. If you want to lie in the fashion you want MATTRESSES. We Make MATTRESSES!

HAIR MOSS " PINE FIBER " COCCA " FLOCK " TOP EXCELSIOR STRAW " SPRING " "Without a word of lie" we are Headquarters for Mattresses.

MARK WRIGHT & CO., LTD. Who Sell at Selling Prices. nov23

Kris Kringle is on his way to Charlottetown. Are you ready for him. We have placed on sale in our Millinery Room at 20c. and 30c. a large number of pretty Fancy Articles suitable for you know what. BEER BROS. We are giving very low prices on Children's Fur Collars. THE WEATHER—Moderate winds and fair.

SUPREME COURT.

FRIDAY, NOV. 23. The Supreme Court met at 11 o'clock today to deliver judgment in the controversial case of John Hughes to quash a conviction had before the Stipendiary Magistrate of Charlottetown for a breach of the Canada Temperance Act. The facts of the case, and the conviction of Hughes, appear to be that Hughes was per orally served with a summons to appear before the Magistrate to answer a breach of the Act. This summons was not signed by the Magistrate, and convicted Hughes did not appear, and the officer who served the summons none swore to the service as a properly signed one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served with a summons. At the return of the certiorari, and on the hearing of an application to quash the conviction, the service of the unsigned summons was admitted, but it was alleged that at or about the time of its service another copy of the summons was served on Hughes, and that he did not appear, and the officer who served the summons a sufficient one. The Magistrate then proceeded to hear evidence on the charge, and convicted Hughes. An application was then made to the Chief Justice for a certiorari upon the ground that Hughes had never been served