

THE LOCAL NEWS BUDGET.

Monday Fly in the King Block at Twelfth and Farnam.

NOTHER STREET CAR ROBBED.

Talk With a Driver—How it Has Been Done in the Past—The Ha-beas Corpus Case—Other City News.

A Noonday Blaze.

The employees had been "candling" eggs all day in Morony's commission house, No. 309 South Twelfth street, and when the noon hour arrived and the inspection suspended, one of the men took the candle against a thin wooden partition in the center of the large store-room on the first floor. The candle was short and burned down to the wick, setting fire to the partition. The framework was light, and a large number of boxes and packages about offered ready fuel, so that when the two boys who were alone in the store first discovered the fire, it had advanced to a brisk blaze.

The alarm was at once turned in, and the department responded with its usual despatch. When the first trucks dashed to the scene, however, the flames had gathered furious headway, and were shooting from the front doors of Twelfth street, and the smoke rolled in heavy volumes through the communicating doors into the various establishments which occupied the block, and out into Farnam street. The prompt and intelligent service of the firemen held the flames at bay and checked them within Morony's building. No. 309 is the extreme south door of the two-story brick block on the south corner of Twelfth and Farnam, and is composed of No. 5's 1121 and 1123 Farnam street and No. 5's 305, 307 and 309 Twelfth street. The first two are occupied below stairs by the commissioners Branch & Co., and the tobacconist M. Tofft. On the second floor Julius Meyer has his private apartments, from which the furniture was promptly taken at the first alarm. No. 505-7 are storerooms of Branch & Co. Above Morony's, Klopp & Bartlett have a job printing office, and this last shares heavily Morony's load, as the flames penetrated the floor, the water reaching the stock and fixtures. Although the entire block was filled with smoke the last mentioned parties are the only losers. Morony's loss will reach \$300, insured, and the printing concern will suffer by an equal amount, also covered. Branch & Co. have slight loss by water.

The building is the property of Wm. R. King, resident in St. Louis and represented here by Leavitt Burnham. Three hundred dollars will cover the damage to the building.

Nearly all the occupants of the block were away at the time and surprises doubtless await some of the many lodgers on the upper floor when they reach home this evening. As ever the fire department and the chiefs are to be complimented for their work.

"HANDS UP, JEHU!"

Another Street Car Robbed Last Evening—How it Has Been Done.

Another bold street car robbery occurred last evening about 9:30 o'clock on Park avenue, the circumstances of which were very nearly similar to the robbery committed Monday evening. The driver of car No. 7 was confronted by a stranger, a revolver placed to his head and he was ordered to hold up his hands. He complied with the demand, while the robber proceeded to go through the cash box, securing \$15 in cash and \$2 worth of tickets, the usual contents of the box. The thief then made his escape with the plunder.

FACTS AND REMINISCENCES.

On his way to the office after hearing of the robbery, the newspaper man boarded a street car.

"Do you carry a gun?" asked the reporter as he took the liberty of occupying the front platform by the driver's side.

"No. Why do you ask?"

"I thought perhaps it might strike you as a good plan after the recent adventures which befall two of your brother drivers."

"Well say, pard, it's pretty plain to me that you never experienced much with crooks and agents." Now what good end a shooter do me? and the John drew out this query with such a contemptuous swaggering air that the reporter at once apologized for being about and modestly confessed his ignorance of the utility of firearms. "Do you think for a minute that, if a duck walks up to me shoot and guys me to do it, I'll be afraid to do it? I'll be afraid to do it in oblige 'em, well, we've got to do it. John, if you do it, you'll be in the way to the metropolis of the Black Hills—Deadwood.

They came in a private conveyance from Chadron, their object being to look over the road and set the points of interest that are necessary to a better understanding of the wants of the people they now have the charge of in transporting the necessities of life and transportation to. These gentlemen live alternately in the Black Hills and the road in this vicinity, and will, after this trip, be still more conversant and impressed with our resources and needs.

After looking over Rapid they will leave for Deadwood, and will arrive here this afternoon or evening.

GRAND ISLAND AND WYOMING CENTRAL.

The following has been filed with the secretary of state:

We, C. H. Hodges, J. G. Taylor, C. D. Norman, C. J. Green, P. S. Eastis, J. D. Macfarland, T. M. Marquett, for the purpose of becoming a body corporate under the laws of the state of Nebraska, with all the rights, powers, privileges and immunitiess of a railroad corporation do hereby, under our hands, make and execute this certificate:

1. The name of this corporation shall be the Grand Island & Wyoming Central Railroad.

2. The railroad of the said company shall commence at the town of Grand Island, in the county of Hall, and state of Nebraska, and shall run thence northwest, through parts of Hall, Buffalo, Sherman, Custer, Blaine and Logan counties, and northwesterly, through unorganized territory, thence northwesterly through Cheyenne, Sheridan, Dawes and Sioux counties, to a point on the Nebraska-Wyo Union line, in Sioux county, with branches that may be hereafter determined upon.

3. The capital stock of this corporation shall be seven million six hundred thousand dollars (\$7,600,000), which may be increased from time to time, as authorized by law.

4. This certificate may be amended in any or all of the above particulars by a majority of the stockholders at any regular or special meeting, provided the holders of a majority of all the stock shall give their written assent to such amendment.

Twenty Thousand Dollars Damages.

Jacob Hahn, a laborer resident in South Omaha, yesterday afternoon, through his counsel, N. J. Burnham, Esq., asked the judgment of the United States court to the amount of \$20,000 in his favor against the Union Pacific railway company.

He is the frequent victim of drivers when on a lonely stretch of the line to put the greater portion of the cash in their pockets or hide it in the folds of their wraps, so that if they are robbed of the box the loss will not be so heavy. About two weeks ago, one of the drivers who carries a pistol was stopped on Saunders street by two men. The driver answered the summons by blazing away at one of the robbers, and the bronchos, taking flight, laid the car out of further danger before the bandit could recover from their surprise and alarm.

Drivers are paid from \$30 to \$45 a month. Upon entering service they are requested to deposit \$15 as a trust guarantee and fifteen days' pay is always held back on them, so that the company is protected on each driver by at least \$30, and it seldom occurs that the fare box at once disappears.

The frequent habit of drivers when on a lonely stretch of the line to put the greater portion of the cash in their pockets or hide it in the folds of their wraps, so that if they are robbed of the box the loss will not be so heavy. About two weeks ago, one of the drivers who carries a pistol was stopped on Saunders street by two men. The driver answered the summons by blazing away at one of the robbers, and the bronchos, taking flight, laid the car out of further danger before the bandit could recover from their surprise and alarm.

Two years ago this winter one of the street cars was assaulted by a number of foot passengers, who demanded their passage by shooting the driver. The bullet hit the man in the head and but for the fortunate circumstances that his hat was too large and he had stuffed the band full of scrap leather and heavy paper it would have been "all day" with him. As it was, the shock stretched him out and the robbers rilled the box. Green car No. 10, which was pulled the other

night, has been particularly unlucky. That was the third time that highwaymen have taken its box in the past year and a half.

If one of the drivers ever has the good luck to kill a highwayman of the street car "hold up" variety, the city will without doubt vote him a purse.

An Important Decision.

Judge McCulloch rendered his decision yesterday in the celebrated habeas corpus case of Robert Poland. He decided to release the prisoner, and accordingly the somewhat notorious "Windy Bob" is free to go where he listeth.

This decision is not so important in itself, as in its effect upon the method of procedure heretofore practiced in police court in banishing criminals from the city. Judge McCulloch, in reviewing the decision, held as follows: The judge entered criminal judgment against the prisoner and passed sentence upon him. He then entered by way of notation a statement to the effect that the prisoner could leave town at once and avoid the execution of the sentence. He then issued a mittimus and placed it in the officer's hands for service, providing the prisoner should be found in the city after a certain time. Now, the judge, in rendering his decision, must be of course and certain. There must be no alternative. In placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the mittimus in the hands of the officer and allowing the officer to rearrest Poland, after his return to this city, the judge really vested that officer with judicial power to determine whether the conditions of release have been complied with. This is manifestly wrong. Further, no police judge has a right to banish a man from town. And after he has been done and the officer returns to rearrest him, the judge, in placing the