

WHIPPLE CONE TO MEXICO

Authorities Think the Crawford Bank Wrecker Has Left the Country.

LAST ARRANGEMENTS OF THE FUGITIVE

Some of His Property Was Shipped to Cheyenne, but Was Attacked by Creators Before It Could Be Secured.

LINCOLN, Jan. 2.—(Special.)—A. P. Brink, at present receiver of the broken bank of Crawford, was at the state capital today. To a representative of the Bee he said that it was popular opinion around Crawford that Albert Whipple, the absconding cashier, had fled to some point in Mexico. Brink said that Whipple was traced to a point in Scotts Bluff county, where all trace of him had been lost. It was known that he hired a livery team at Crawford and drove to Marsland, where he purchased a quantity of stationery. From there he drove to Gering, dismissed the livery, which went back to Crawford, and disappeared. Quite an amount of goods, consisting of books, pictures, papers, etc., two boxes, known to have belonged to Whipple, had been sent to Cheyenne from Crawford. They had been taken possession of and amount in value to about \$350. Some one in St. Louis had subsequently telegraphed Union Pacific officials to ship the goods to St. Louis. Mr. Brink had not learned the exact location of Lincoln had already sent out 2,000 postal cards bearing the photograph of Whipple to a large number of police and detective agencies in the United States. This morning Victor M. Sinclair of Kearney, recently appointed to succeed Judge Silas A. Holcomb in the Twelfth judicial district, went to the office of the secretary of state and was sworn in as judge in that district.

DEPARTURE OF DISTRICT JUDGES.

District Judges Hall, Tibbets and Holmes have adopted a measure concerning the crowds of lawyers who solicit business of prisoners. They have jointly entered up an order that hereafter in cases where prisoners charged with offenses are unable to employ attorneys to defend them the court would not regard the wishes of the prisoner nor pay attention to the application of attorneys, but would appoint from the bar of the county on its own motion and whom it deemed proper.

City Attorney Abbott has handed to the mayor, in response to a request for an opinion as to the powers and duties of policemen in making arrests, especially in the matter of making arrests without warrants. The opinion states that the County Attorney Collins, who recently held that a policeman had no right to break in a door without a warrant.

Taking advantage of an unlocked door this morning in the residence of D. A. Campbell, clerk of the supreme court, at 1702 K street, a sneak thief walked in. Extending his explorations up to the second floor, he discovered a watch. When he descended a domestic saw him and gave chase. The thief is still at large.

Five new members of the Lincoln police force have been inducted into office and armed with the customary gun and club. They are now under the supervision of Sergeant Kinney, and are by no means an awkward squad.

RAILROAD LABORER KILLED.

A recent train from the northwest territory brought into town a lot of horses who had been working on the Burlington for some time. All had been drinking and not a few were intoxicated. Two miles from Germantown one of the horses, owned by Kinney, and driven by one of the men, was thrown from the car, and soon afterward he was killed. It is said that the roadmaster, who was riding on the rear of the train, saw the horse and tried to stop it. When the train was brought to a stop a party of section men went in search of the victim and found him dead. The man's name was R. J. Kinney, and he was from Rury, Lancashire, England. The coroner of Germantown held an inquest on the remains today.

The Mechanics' Savings, Loan and Building Association of Omaha, with Cadet Taylor as secretary, today received a certificate from the state banking board authorizing it to commence business.

ASHLAND FAMILY REUNION.

Home of J. T. Anghe the Scene of an Interesting Gathering.

ASHLAND, Jan. 2.—(Special.)—At the home of J. T. Anghe yesterday occurred the largest family reunion ever held in Ashland. There were present three grandsons, eight grandchildren and five children, all of whom are in good health. After partaking of dinner the entire gathering had their photographs taken as a souvenir of the occasion. Mrs. J. T. Anghe, who is now 85, came to Nebraska in 1859 with her husband, who died in 1870, landing at Plattsmouth, and moved from there to the old Ashland, one mile north of Ashland, where they have since resided.

The death of Daniel Sweeney occurred yesterday in his home at Ashland. He was 72 years of age. Mr. Sweeney has been a resident of Saunders county for over twenty-five years.

Yesterday evening Mr. and Mrs. Dr. W. Merridith gave a delightful party at their elegant home in honor of their children, George B. Merridith, Miss Mary, and Miss Cathie. Who are at some spending their vacation, being students at the University of Nebraska. The evening was spent in dancing and games. The guests present from abroad were: Miss Louise Heptner, instructor in German at the university, and Jessie Jury, student of Lincoln, and H. Leo Singer of Council Bluffs.

Yesterday evening Mrs. S. S. Foles gave a 6 o'clock tea party in honor of her daughter, Carrie, to which twenty-five guests were invited.

Mr. and Mrs. J. R. Howard last evening gave a very enjoyable affair called "A Salagram" party with about fifty guests.

The leading features of the affair were the decorations, which were very extensive.

Grafton Notes and Personal.

GRAFTON, Neb., Jan. 2.—(Special.)—Rev. John Giffen of Omaha visited his parents here over Sunday, preaching in the Methodist church in the morning and the Congregational in the evening.

Miss Madge Eckley is spending the week at Janata.

Mrs. Warren and Miss Grace Keeler have been visiting friends in Lincoln.

The Catholic church will hold last evening, which was well attended.

Mrs. Stannard, a highly respected widow, died very suddenly Sunday night of heart disease. She was in robust health and was within a half hour of death. She leaves a numerous family. The funeral was held today.

The Methodists are soliciting aid for the drought stricken settlers in the west.

County Mortgage Record.

PLATTSMOUTH, Neb., Jan. 2.—(Special.)—Cass county's mortgage record for the month of December is as follows: Farm property, filed \$23,626.65; released, \$17,718.43; town property filed, \$5,565.88; released, \$14,559.65; chattel mortgages filed, \$19,443.46; released, \$1,510.48. The total amount of mortgages for the month is \$529,969.92; released, \$457,548; town property filed, \$77,560.11; released, \$115,019.96; chattel mortgages filed, \$19,443.46; released, \$1,510.48.

Judge Chapman, Judge of the Second Nebraska district, has fixed the terms of court for 1895 as follows: Cass county, February 11, May 6 and September 29; Otoe county, April 2, June 10 and November 18. The May term in Cass and the June term in Otoe are for the trial of equity cases without a jury.

Milford Matters.

MILFORD, Neb., Jan. 2.—(Special.)—Revs. Fay Smith and Foreman are holding a revival in the Congregational church, with good effect.

Troop A, Nebraska National Guards, was given a reception by the Young People's Society of Christy and other acts and entertainers at the last of the year. Some 200 invited guests were present. An interesting

NEBRASKA BLAZES.

Buildings and contents of kind Cloud and York Damaged. RED CLOUD, Neb., Jan. 2.—(Special Telegram.)—A fire was discovered in a store room occupied by the general merchandise stock of R. M. Martin & Son, in the Moon block, at 3:30 last night. Their loss by fire, smoke and water is nearly total. The stock was valued at \$1,200 and was insured for \$500, as follows: German of Preppert, \$300; Hartford Fire, \$200; Springfield of Massachusetts, \$300. The photograph gallery of J. H. Wegman in the second story was gutted. Loss, \$700; insured for \$300 in the Queen. The state normal school at York and the Lincolnshire for \$250 and in the Lincolnshire for \$250.

The records and files were removed from the county judge's office on the second floor, which were in jeopardy. The origin of the fire is unknown. Considerable damage was done to the other merchants in the block by water from the Martin cellar precipitating through the walls into the other cellars.

The sheriff seized the remnants of the Martin stock this morning on a tax warrant for \$320.

YORK, Neb., Jan. 2.—(Special Telegram.)—At 6 o'clock this evening fire was discovered in the Werks block, in the room occupied by S. E. Mansfield's meat market. After a short delay it was extinguished. The damage to the stock was about \$200, with no insurance. The building was damaged to about the same amount.

SHORT SEVERAL HUNDRED.

BROKEN BOW'S MISSING POSTMASTER CHECKED UP BY AN INSPECTOR. BROKEN BOW, Neb., Jan. 2.—(Special Telegram.)—Up to date there is no clew to Broken Bow's missing postmaster. The inspector has completed an investigation of his books and finds him short in his accounts with the government \$1,700. His bondsmen came in today and appointed E. C. Dickinson to take charge of the postoffice temporarily. Already there are a number of candidates for the appointment and the action of the bondsmen and Inspector Sinclair in putting Dickinson in charge is not meeting the approval of the other candidates. Dickinson is a young man, who recently located in the city, having come here less than two months ago from Illinois, and has no acquaintances here except his cousin, Attorney H. W. Dickinson. It is claimed that the bondsmen were influenced by place giving in Dickinson in charge by him offering to furnish money to make good the deficiencies of Gilmore. If this be true Dickinson may find that he has paid dear for his whistle, as the fixtures and contents of Blackwell & Co. for purchase of which Gilmore's successor will have to pay or he will have a postoffice without boxes or furniture.

PLAINVIEW POSEUR KILLED.

Richard Smith Meets Death in Mysterious Manner. PLAINVIEW, Neb., Jan. 2.—(Special Telegram.)—Richard Smith, an old and respected citizen of this county met his death in a mysterious manner yesterday. Smith lived south of this place in Willow Creek township, and Monday started for Pierce, the county seat, a distance of eighteen miles. He did not arrive at home that night. Becoming alarmed, his family instituted a search, and his body was found this morning on the road about two miles from home. Life was not extinct when found, but he never regained consciousness. The cause of death is not known. Smith's team was found a grove some distance from his body. Many theories are advanced in regard to his death, but all are mere conjectures. One is hinted at, as Smith was quite wealthy. It is not known whether he had any money on his person when he left Pierce, but none was found on his person when his body was found. He was one of the pioneers of Pierce county.

ARGABRIGHT ON THE STAND.

Tells His Story of the Shooting of William AUBURN, Neb., Jan. 2.—(Special Telegram.)—The defendant in the Argabright trial was on the stand the entire day. His recital of the tragedy does not differ from the other witnesses except in minor details. He claims that when the shot was fired he was being viciously assaulted by Smelzer and others and that he had his left arm raised above his head in front of the crowd, and that with his right hand down by his side he fired at Smelzer, intending to hit him in the left arm. The witness testified that the cross examination conducted by Mr. Cornell, was very severe and searching, but the witness behaved well under it. The defense was not quite so good.

Supreme Court Proceedings.

LINCOLN, Jan. 2.—(Special.)—The supreme court met today pursuant to adjournment. George M. Spurlock, esq. of Cass county, E. P. Brown, esq. of Lancaster county, and J. R. Dean, esq. of Custer county were admitted to practice. State against Hill, death of defendant, John Fitzpatrick, on motion; McClary against Stull, on motion; Griswold against Hazels, on motion; Hendes against Hayden, on motion; Grant against Houston, on motion; McClary against Stull, on motion; McClary against Spencer, on motion; McClary against Stull, advanced; Griswold against Hazels, motion to advance overruled; Krebs against State, diminution of record allowed.

Court adjourned until tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.

Wedding Bells at Shubert.

SHUBERT, Neb., Jan. 2.—(Special Telegram.)—A pleasant wedding was celebrated at this place at 5 o'clock p. m. The contracting parties being Mr. G. A. Tipton, a prosperous young business man of Albany, and Miss Agnes Dalby, the only child of J. L. Dalby, the editor of the Shubert Citizen. Only the intimate relatives of the couple and a few select friends witnessed the ceremony. There was an elegant wedding supper prepared. The happy couple took the train for their future home in Albany.

Doctor Saved His Life.

LINCOLN, Jan. 2.—(Special Telegram.)—B. Charles Daley, 35 years old, a railroad laborer, attempted to commit suicide tonight by taking a dose of morphine. He was found suffering from the effects of the drug at 9 o'clock and a physician was called. The man, who, after an hour's hard work, succeeded in saving his life. Daley was arrested last night for being drunk and disorderly and discharged this morning for want of prosecution.

Death of a Prominent Pawnee Citizen.

PAWNEE, Neb., Jan. 2.—(Special Telegram.)—M. T. Peckham, a highly respected and honored citizen, died yesterday of a complication of diseases. His death was not expected, as he had been taken sick but a few days ago. He leaves a widow and five children, three daughters and two sons. The date of the funeral is not announced, pending the arrival of a son from South Dakota.

An A. O. U. W. Lodge has been organized at Harrisburg.

John Baker, who settled in Jefferson county in 1862, died at his home in Fairbury after a brief illness.

The eleventh annual meeting of the State Firemen's association will be held at Norfolk January 15, 16 and 17. There will be 200 delegates in attendance.

Mrs. Russell of Greeley Center, daughter of Senator Gray of Valley county, died at the home of her husband, after an illness of three hours, of enlargement of the heart.

While C. M. Sealey of Elgin was wielding a maul to act of detaching a log, a heavy hammer miscarried and struck on top of the head of W. M. Carr, knocking him

GOES TO ANOTHER TRIBUNAL.

Appeal to the Supreme Court Filed in the Maximum Rate Case.

CLAIMS OF ERROR IN THE TRIAL COURT

showing Made that the Decree Had as Many Holes as a Skimmer, After Which Judge Dundy Allows the Appeal.

John L. Webster, an attorney for defendants, filed his petition for appeal from Judge Brewer's recent decision in the maximum rate case yesterday in the federal court. Judge Dundy allowed the appeal.

The following is the full text of the petition praying for a writ of certiorari in the case known as Henry L. Higginson et al versus the Burlington Railway et al.

Now comes George H. Hastings, attorney general; John C. Allen, secretary of state; Eugene Moore, auditor, and others, defendants in the above entitled case, and complaining of the plaintiffs say:

That on the 23d day of November, 1894, said plaintiffs recovered a judgment and decree against these defendants herein in said cause and in said court, in which, among other things, it was decreed that these defendants be enjoined and restrained from entertaining, hearing or determining any complaint against said railway company, or on account of any act or thing by said company, its officers, agents, servants or employees done, suffered or omitted which may be forbidden or commanded by an act of the legislature of the state of Nebraska, entitled "An Act to Regulate Railroads, to Provide for the Transportation of Freight Upon Each of the Railroads in the State of Nebraska, and to Prohibit the Violation of This Act," approved April 12, 1893.

And in which said decree these defendants were further enjoined from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and particularly from reducing its present rates of charges for transportation of freight to the rates prescribed in said act.

And in which said judgment and decree the attorney general of the state of Nebraska was enjoined from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding by way of injunction, mandamus, civil action or indictment, or any other remedy, which may be forbidden or commanded by an act or omission on their part commanded or forbidden by the said act.

And in which said judgment and decree it was adjudged and decreed that the said act above mentioned is repugnant to the constitution of the United States in that the said railway company may not under provisions exact rates for the transportation of freight which yield to the company reasonable and just profits, and that the said act and these defendants allege that they were prejudiced by the various orders, judgments and decrees and that there is error in the said judgment and decree in that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted or prosecuted, any action or proceeding, civil or criminal, against said railway company or any of its officers, agents, servants or employees, which may be forbidden or commanded by the said act, and that the said judgment and decree is erroneous in that it enjoins and restrains the said defendants from instituting or prosecuting, or from causing to be instituted