

## WANGARATTA POLICE COURT.

Monday, 9th May.

(Before Mr A. C. Wills, P.M.)

### SLY Grog Cases.

William Thomas v John Murdoch.—Selling liquor without a license, on the 3rd April. Mr Norton for the prosecution. The plaintiff stated he was assistant to the revenue officer. He visited the defendant's store at Grata, and asked for a glass of brandy. Was served with the brandy, for which he paid one shilling. Defendant's place looks like a general store. He holds no license of any description.—The defendant stated that plaintiff had obtained the brandy from him by means of false pretences.—Fined £7, with 26s costs.

Thomas v William Shields.—Selling liquor without a license. Mr Lamont for defendant; Mr Norton for prosecution.—The plaintiff stated that he knew defendant's residence at Tarrawingee. Visited his place on the 6th April last.—At this stage the defendant pleaded guilty. Mr Lamont said his client held a beer license. The informer stated that the nearest public house was within two hundred yards.—Fined £5, with 26s costs.

Thomas v George Clancy.—A similar charge. Mr Norton for the prosecution; Mr Lamont for the defence.—The plaintiff stated that he had visited the defendant's place at Oxley on two occasions. On the 14th March last had a glass of gin, which was served by the defendant, for which he paid a shilling. In answer to Mr Lamont, witness said that he did not know whether the defendant held a beer license. Did not ask for a bottle of soda water, and request defendant to add a little gin to it. Paid a shilling for the

a little gin to it. Paid a shilling for the gin. Had gin on two occasions.—The defendant said he was the holder of a beer license, and had kept a public house for ten years. The nearest hotel to his place was within a mile. Ceased to hold a publican's license about two years ago.—Edward Dowling stated that he was at Clancy's on the 14th March, and recollected Thomas coming in on the date mentioned; he asked for a bottle of soda water, which he paid sixpence for. Thomas afterwards said he was bad, and asked for a little gin in the soda water. Mr Clancy gave him a little gin; this was about eight o'clock in the evening. In answer to Mr Norton, witness said he lived at Oxley, in Clancy's house. Thomas might have been there at four o'clock in the afternoon without his seeing him.—The informer stated that the previous witness had sworn falsely, but was not positive whether Clancy served him at four o'clock or not. If he did not serve him Mrs Clancy did.—The defendant stated he had not sold the plaintiff any liquor at all.—The bench thought the evidence unsatisfactory, and dismissed the case.

Thomas v Merrington.—A similar charge.—Mr Norton for the prosecution, Mr O'Donnell for the defence.—In answer to Mr O'Donnell, the informer said the case had been postponed, not dismissed, on a former occasion.—Mr O'Donnell said the case had been dismissed, and defendant could not be tried again for the same offence.—The bench overruled the objection.—The plaintiff deposed: Visited the defendant's place, the Railway Restaurant, in Reid-street, Wangaratta, on March 30th. Asked for a glass of brandy. Mr Merrington supplied me with the brandy. Mr Moore, the barber, went in with me. There

the barber, went in with me. There were others in the bar. I had brandy for myself. I paid 3s 6d altogether. I shouted for Mr Moore and Mr Merrington. The defendant's wife is the holder of a beer license. The house has a bar like a public-house. Have known the place for three months. There are public-houses all round it. Moore does not know what I drank.—John Moore was called, but refused to come without a summons. He was afterwards summoned, and put in the witness box. He deposed that he knew Mr Thomas—he had good reason to know him, as he got his hair cut and shaved without paying for it. Remember going in with Thomas to Merrington's, on a certain date (on a Monday). Was not with him on a Wednesday. The plaintiff complained of being sick. Remember paying Mrs Merrington rent. Always paid the rent on a Monday. The plaintiff asked for gin. The defendant said he had no spirits. The plaintiff drank from the same cask that he drank from, and he had beer.—By Mr Norton: I have been a hairdresser for 24 years. I have lived in London, Melbourne, and Sandhurst. I served my time to hair-dressing. I did not serve my time somewhere else. I am not afraid of being prosecuted for perjury. This witness said he would rather break stones than turn informer.—William Hayden deposed that he recollected Wednesday, 30th March. Mr Merrington did not serve drinks on that date, as he was indisposed.—The bench thought there was no moral doubt but that the Railway Restaurant was a sly-grog place, but on the evidence produced, he would have to dismiss the case.

Thomas v Sarah Powell — A similar