

MORE DAMAGING EVIDENCE.

Liveringhouse Has to Admit Some More Very Peculiar Expenditures

FATAL "QUIETING" OF A PATIENT.

Noble Patient Ziegler Died After Taking a Dose of Medicine—Dr. Test's Irregular Calls on the Inmates.

LINCOLN, Neb., June 27.—(Special to the Bee.)—The investigation into the conduct of the Hastings asylum and the performance of the Hastings insane asylum was resumed this morning before the board of public lands and buildings. All the members of the board were present. Governor Thayer was a most interested auditor throughout the session.

Liveringhouse was placed on the stand and was examined regarding the signing by employees of a payroll which was introduced. The names on it were those which have appeared in connection with duplicate vouchers. The witness said that none of the employees in question had signed the roll presented and that some of their names had been written by himself. He could not state exactly when the payroll was drawn, but thought it was about the middle of April. He had never notified the board about the drawing of the duplicate vouchers until he admitted it a short time ago. He introduced the sum of \$425 which appeared in the cash account, he had no vouchers to present, having been called away too soon from the asylum. It was shown by the witness that he was notified at 5 o'clock on Wednesday and didn't leave Hastings till 2:30 o'clock next day.

Liveringhouse was asked if he had hired his mother-in-law's horse to haul the mail, and had paid divers sums amounting to about \$100 for the same; that he hired a driver from a man named Pierce, and for a month kept at the asylum a horse belonging to Druggist Hurst. The state at the time had a horse of its own.

The board then asked explanation of two vouchers for \$70 and was told that they were by way of payment on a claim. The witness then admitted that the warrant for the duplicate vouchers, \$54.02, had been put into his personal account at the bank in Hastings.

The investigation then turned in the direction of the overdose of medicine to the patient Ziegler. Witness has heard it rumored that a patient named Ziegler had died of an overdose of medicine. There was no record of the investigation. Governor Thayer, Dr. Stone and Mrs. Smith had, he claimed, investigated the charge and concluded that Ziegler had died from natural causes. The attending physician administered the dose, was still at the asylum.

Witness didn't remember that a woman named Hingham had been found one morning dead in bed, although he had heard that the inquiry showed that Ziegler had been given thirty drops of paraldehyde and Dr. Stone said that for only three or four days the latter had administered a teaspoonful and a half.

Does the night watch prescribe for the patients? No, I know nothing except from hearsay. Dr. Stone said that thirty drops of paraldehyde would produce from four to seven hours' sleep.

The witness then stated that he knew George Smith of Beatrice, who was at one time an attorney, but that he had heard that Loofbourrow, the man who administered the overdose to Ziegler, was still employed at the asylum.

Secretary Allen—How are we to know how many employes there are at the asylum if the employes don't sign the payroll. They do sign the payroll, but not all the rolls except the one you have there.

Mr. Darnell then asked the witness to detail the duties he performed at the asylum. Witness did so claiming that he did everything except attend to the medical work. Heady had been bookkeeper and received \$50 per month for his services with board, washing and lodging, and witness had heard that if witness had not worked as he had it would have cost the state much more. He had an assistant for only three or four days, a cost to the state of only \$75. For all of this work witness received pay only as steward.

He then claimed that in 1885, \$1,365.35, which it was claimed the institution had paid for drugs the last six months, the amount ought to be divided as follows: Interest, \$53.24; drugs, \$1,312.11; and for other than drugs, \$616.35; wines and liquors, \$101.55.

He then went over a couple of vouchers showing many of the items included in the foregoing were glass, putty, paints and oils, and other articles not kept in stock by the merchants of Hastings, which the druggist could order.

The witness then stated that he had made a comparative showing of the cost of the Hastings and the cost of the Lincoln. The expense of the former for the time in question was \$28,267.63 and of the latter \$19,365.35. In the expense of the Hastings institution over and above that of Norfolk was owing to the deficiency with which the former had been placed, and which if rightly considered ought to make a difference of \$12,000. He said further that because of the deficiency, goods cost a great deal more than they do in the latter.

The coal subject was then introduced, the Nebraska fuel company claiming that Steward Liveringhouse had formerly been a coal merchant, and that he had estimated and consequently did not afford them a chance to compete.

Mr. Liveringhouse admitted that they had received bids for the coal, and that at one time Mr. Klipp of Hastings had refused to furnish groceries because of the absence of money. Witness said that he had made some coal purchases as he did in his own affairs. Several times merchants had kicked because he had cut down some of their overcharges. He disclaimed all intention of acting disrespectfully to the board by not appearing before when first written to.

Gessler Lee, formerly a supervisor and an attendant of the asylum, knew the patient, Ziegler, who had died from an overdose of medicine. The latter had been making a noise. Loofbourrow came into witness' room for a spoon, but could get none. He took a fens cup and poured into it a stream of medicine, and gave it to Ziegler—a dose so that he wouldn't make any more noise tonight.

Next morning the patient was unconscious. Gessler Lee died at 12:30 p. m. Witness in the morning reported the condition of the patient to Pinckney, the supervisor whose duty it was to report to Dr. Test. The latter did not call upon the unconscious man until 11 o'clock in the morning. The doctor was called irregularly in his case for five days lapsing without his visiting the wards. The witness claimed that about a pint of beef iron and wine would be used by the main inmates three days, and that three pints of whiskey would last for a month.

This feature seemed to make it difficult to account for the wine and liquor ordered. Lee was cross-examined by Darnell, but was not shaken in his statements. The board took a recess until 1 p. m.

Lee stated that he had left the institution of his own free will, and had asked and received a recommendation from Dr. Test, and still retained it.

Attorney general—At the Maudsley insane asylum, where you formerly worked, how often did the physicians visit the wards daily? Lee—Twice every day.

How often did Dr. Test visit them? Sometimes four or five days would elapse and he would not come in the wards.

Yes, I said that to some people I thought the drugs were the cause of his death.

How much beef wine and iron was used? The last month I was there, about one pint was used on the male side every three days.

How much meat? None.

This was introduced because Liveringhouse has previously stated that in the liquor bill malt was probably included.

How much whiskey? Three pints of whiskey in about a month.

How many male patients? About seventy-five.

The witness also stated that there was a report at the asylum that a patient had been killed in it, also that Loofbourrow was coarse

DRESS GOODS DEPT.

Dress Robes, camel's hair, chevrot, with rich trimmings, cost \$12, for \$3.50. A lot of wool stripes and checks we have always retailed at 25c and 30c, our moving price 12c.

Arlington Checks, 54 inches wide, the regular price of which is 40c, our moving price 19c.

One-half wool Challis we sold at 20c and 25c, moving price 14c.

All Wool Challis, our regular price 65c, now 47c.

Printed Mohairs, worth 45c, moving price 19c.

Printed Canton Crepe, lovely designs, strictly all wool, 37c; regular price 65c.

SILK DEPT. Our 75c Colored Satin, moving price 25c. Very useful for children's dresses.

22-inch Colored Surah Plaids, sold by us at \$1 and \$1.35, for 50c and 65c.

China Silks, our 50c quality for 20c. Figured China Silks, \$1 a yard, will be sold at 62c.

Cheney Brothers' best 24-inch goods for 90c.

Cheney black ground colored figures, 32 inches, regular price \$1.50, in this sale \$1.15.

Colored Satin Rhadames, our \$1.25 quality for 75c.

Our \$1 Black Silk Grenadine will be sold for 65c.

One piece 48-inch slightly imperfect. Regular price \$3, will be sold at \$1.50.

A lot of Colored Failles at 65c, worth \$1.50.

Also a lot of Black Gros Grain Silks at similar sweeping reductions.

BLACK GOODS. Black Silk Warp Henriettes, never sold less anywhere than \$1.25, in this sale 75c. We guarantee these goods perfect in every respect.

Our 75c Nun's Veiling, with side band, 42c.

LINEN DEPT. Damask Table Cloths, ranging in price from \$3 to \$8, will go at \$3.95.

Damask Table Cloths, \$9 to \$12, will go at \$5.75.

Damask table cloths \$12 to \$20, will go at \$8.75.

20c Huck Towels, 6 for \$1.

30c Huck Towels, 10c each.

\$1.25 Bed Spreads at 97c.

\$1.75 Bed Spreads at \$1.29.

\$4 Bed Spreads at \$2.63.

WASH GOODS DEPT. 75c challis and prints at 24c.

10c dress gingham at 5c.

10c satins at 5c.

15c novelty suitings at 10c.

15c 36-in baize at 10c.

15c satines at 8c.

35c satines at 15c.

40c milanese, black and white and black, with colored figures, at 25c.

WASH GOODS DEPT.

75c challis and prints at 24c.

10c dress gingham at 5c.

10c satins at 5c.

15c novelty suitings at 10c.

15c 36-in baize at 10c.

15c satines at 8c.

35c satines at 15c.

40c milanese, black and white and black, with colored figures, at 25c.

25c Oriental crepe, 15c.

40c wash crepe 25c.

40c French Gingham at 25c.

35c French mulls at 25c.

25c Scotch gingham at 10c.

\$7.50 French zephyr robes at \$4.68.

25c tussah cloth at 15c. This is the latest novelty.

WHITE GOODS DEPT. 12c nainsooks at 5c.

25c black and white figured batiste, 15c.

12c printed India linens at 9c.

18c printed India linen at 12c.

25c dimities at 15c.

Our 30c black silk band India linens at 19c.

10c white India linens at 8c.

15c white India linen at 10c.

20c white India linen at 12c.

25c white India linen at 15c.

30c white India linen at 20c.

35c white India linen at 25c.

And all our black India linens reduced in the same proportion.

GLOVE DEPT. 25c gloves at 5c.

50c gloves and mitts at 25c.

\$1 gloves and mitts at 50c.

\$1.25 to \$1.50 fine silk mitts and gloves in this sale at 75c.

RIBBONS, RIBBONS.

All Silk Ribbons at 24c a yard. The regular price of these is 12c.

15c Ribbons for 9c.

17c Ribbons for 9c.

200 pieces of Nos. 12 and 16, at 13c.

The regular prices of these are 23c and 27c.

HANDKERCHIEFS. Ladies' sheer open work and hemstitched at the extraordinary price of 3c.

would be awful cheap at 10c.

12c Handkerchiefs for 6c.

25c Handkerchiefs for 12c.

50c Handkerchiefs for 25c.

75c Handkerchiefs for 37c.

LACES. LACES. Laces at 24c.

Laces at 5c.

Laces at 7c.

Laces at 10c.

Laces at 12c.

Laces at 18c.

Laces at 25c.

Laces at 35c.

All reduced from 20 to 33 1/2 per cent.

MILLINERY DEPT. Special clearance sale of Millinery commencing Monday, June 29th.

We will place on sale all our trimmed Hats and Bonnets, including the remainder of our French Pattern, at one-third less their former price.

Untrimmed Hats are also included in this sale.

DRAPERY DEPT. Chenille Curtains, 3 1/2 yards long, with heavy fringe top and bottom, \$3.75 a pair; worth \$5.50 a pair; all colors.

IRISH POINT CURTAINS 3 1/2 yards long, \$4.15 a pair; worth \$6.50 a pair.

OPAQUE WINDOW SHADES 36 inches wide, 7 feet long, with spring rollers, 43c each, worth 60c.

FALCONER. MOVING SALE. FALCONER. MOVING SALE. FALCONER. MOVING SALE.

in his language and profane to the patients, and that he had been reprimanded for his profanity by Dr. Hall, an assistant physician. Whisky had been used when the patients were in the asylum, and stimulants, opium, etc., were required. The night watch was not allowed to prescribe medicine. The only way the witness could account for the same facts regarding the dosing of that patient as did Lee. He was a room mate of the doctor and he and Lee were in bed in their room when Loofbourrow came in looking for a tea spoon. At 5:30 next morning Ziegler could not be roused. If he were raised up he would throw up like a rag and died at 12:35 p. m. He afterwards talked with Dr. Stone and Dr. Test about the occurrence. A month since, both curements, Lee and Lee had made duplicate affidavits and sent a copy to the governor setting forth the facts of Ziegler's death. In Kalamazoo for nearly four years, Newberg, asylum, Cleveland, O., asylum at Traverse City, Mich. Attorney General—What medicine was administered to Ziegler? The witness said that he did not get test in this manner he would get him in some other way. But he denied that he had ever written Smith in that manner. He admitted that he had told Dr. Test that he did not think Ziegler had died from the effects of the medicine, because he felt if he hadn't done so he would have been discharged. At the time that he told Dr. Test that, he knew it was not true, but he did not want to lose his job. He never signed the affidavit, but he had reported that he had reported that the latter had been discharged for using intoxicating liquors, but Dr. Stone had not such a report in the case. Secretary Allen—After leaving the asylum did you report the Ziegler case to anyone? Lee—Yes, to Governor Thayer. I gave him an affidavit the 23d of May. With what result? He returned the affidavit to me and said the matter had been investigated by Dr. Stone and Dr. Test and that Ziegler had died from natural causes. And as they were physicians he left them to decide. The defendant's attorney wanted to know how he could testify against Dr. Test when the latter had given the witness a recommendation on his own request when he left. Lee said he thought it only what he was entitled to. He also admitted that he had told Dr. Test that he didn't want to remain if he (the doctor) was to be succeeded by Dr. Johnson. The latter, however, heard of the witness' fear of being discharged and told him that he need have no fear of that and assured him of a position. It was sought to be shown that the witness had left because the matron had been discharged, and the institution was expelled. Reports regarding the matron had gone to Governor Thayer and he didn't like them. Witness was then excused. The examination was resumed in the afternoon and Gessler Lee asked to be placed on the stand again. He did so for the purpose of removing any doubt from the mind of the board that he had left in any manner written to Smith to the effect that if he did not get Dr. Test in this manner he would in some other way. Secretary Allen—Did you know of any trouble between Mr. Liveringhouse and Dr. Test? I heard jumped immediately, to his feet and said he had had an understanding with the

board that nothing was to be introduced except what was covered by the notice. The defendant's attorney might be immaterial but he could see no objection to its going in. Darnell objected again, but finally it was decided to hear the witness. Stoen—It was about Dr. Test and Mrs. Liveringhouse. Mr. Liveringhouse came to me and asked if I thought that Mrs. Liveringhouse and Dr. Test were acting just right. What did you tell him? I said I didn't think that they were. Dr. Test called a meeting one night afterwards and settled it all. Who attended the meeting? Two or three employes, Loofbourrow, Mrs. Smith, Miss Baugh and Mrs. Sinter. This meeting was sometime in October, 1890. This testimony caused a calm to pervade the room which was only the pretension of another outbreak in the part Darnell when the attorney general announced he had two lady witnesses, Mrs. Vanderpool and Mrs. Woodland, whom he wished to place on the stand. The defendant's attorney asked for an adjournment till Monday, because he wanted the defense to publish the story with that of the ladies in question. He said it was unfair on the part of the board to insist on matters outside the meeting. To this the attorney general replied that it was not unjust. The notice included the subject upon which they proposed to examine the witness, and to prove it by the notice. Darnell claimed that was not the notice served on them—but could not prove the assertion. Finally an adjournment was taken till Tuesday after Frank Darling had testified he had bought goods from Liveringhouse, belonging to the state, payment for which had been taken out of his wages. He did not know, however, that Liveringhouse had not turned the cash for them to the state. MAY LOSE HIM. Dr. Duryea Considering Some Very Liberal Offers. It is practically settled that the First Congregational church of Omaha is about to lose its talented pastor, Rev. Dr. Duryea. For three years Dr. Duryea has filled the pulpit of this church and has been one of the most popular of the divine teachers in the west, and is acknowledged one of the most scholarly and brilliant of the country. For some months, however, the impression has prevailed that the doctor was not altogether satisfied with his work, and now comes the announcement that he has received two very flattering calls to other fields, one from San Francisco and one from St. Louis. It is known that the doctor is considering these calls. He had made arrangements to leave Omaha during the present summer months, but has cancelled this engagement and will visit St. Louis and San Francisco instead. The offer from the San Francisco congregation, it is understood, amounts to \$12,000 a year and the manse, and the St. Louis proposition is equally as liberal. Exposition Goes. Omaha will have an exposition this fall. Yesterday afternoon the new coliseum association held a meeting and elected officers as follows: John A. Wakefield, president; M. S. Lindsay, secretary; L. D. Poland, treasurer; George W. Hornlund, vice president, and M. L. Roeder, manager. It is proposed to pay off the debt of the old association and arrange for a monster exposition to run from September 1 to 28. There will be a fourth of July celebration in Adams county.

MARRIAGE DECLARED VOID. Judge Hall Hands Down a Remarkable Decision. WERE LEGALLY MARRIED IN MISSOURI. But Did Not Observe the Nebraska Law—Edney-Baum Controversy—Odds and Ends. LINCOLN, Neb., June 27.—(Special to the Bee.)—Judge Hall of the district court has decided that the marriage of S. G. Owen to Mrs. Jennie Dasch was illegal and void, because the lady had been divorced from her first husband six months at the time of her marriage to Owen. As the marriage occurred in Kansas City, and was perfectly legal according to the laws of Missouri, the opinion of Judge Hall has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple went, who were united. Judge Hall, however, has created more surprise and discussion than probably any decision that has been handed down in the district court for years. It has been generally understood that a marriage that was legal in the state where it was performed was legal wherever the couple