

WANGARATTA POLICE COURT:

Friday, 24th July.

(Before Mr Lowther P.M.)

SELLING SPIRITS WITHOUT A LICENSE.—Charles Meyer v Henry Bligh. Mr Norton for plaintiff. The defendant admitted the charge. There being no previous conviction against the defendant, he was fined £5, with 15s 6d costs.—Charles Meyer v Mary Devery—similar charge. Mr Thompson for defendant. Mr Norton for prosecutor. Charles Meyer, sworn: Am a common informer: visited the house of the defendant on Tuesday, the 14th inst.; her house is at Tarrawingee; it seems to be a public-house; it has been a public-house to my knowledge: Charles Longwood was with me: he called for two glasses of brandy hot; there was a bar, and decanters on the shelves: Longwood paid Mrs Devery 2s for the drinks, and called for two glasses more of brandy hot. By Mr Thompson: It was the first place at which we called: I was quite sober: believe defendant has a beer license: Longwood and I were in league: expect to get my portion of the fine: Longwood asked for brandy: I know Mrs Devery some time: I was once a member of the police force: it was not ginger wine we had: I was present when Longwood paid the money. Charles Longwood corroborated last witness's evidence. By Mr Thompson: We had brandy and water; it was good brandy: I am a good judge of it; we called at some places before we went to Tarrawingee: I did not say I was an informant: Mrs Devery served us: I expect to get my portion of the fine: I will swear it was not ginger wine: it was U.V. we had. Mr Thompson said he had a little to say in defence. His client was the holder of a beer license. She had informed him that it was ginger wine hot they got, and not brandy. Fined £5, with 15s 6d costs.—Henry Scruby was similarly charged. The defendant said the informers had only peppermint at his house, but on being pressed he said he gave them gin. (The evidence was almost precisely similar in this case.) Fined £5, with 15s 6d costs.—Charles Miller Lowe, of Estcourt, was similarly charged. Mr Thompson for defendant. Mr Norton for prosecution. Defendant pleaded not guilty. (The evidence was the same as in the two last cases. Fined £5, to enable defendant to appeal, with 23s costs.—Patrick Cuncen, Chiltern Road, was similarly charged. Mr Thompson for defence: Mr Norton for prosecution. The evidence was again the same in this case. Mr Thompson said there was a discrepancy in the evidence of the informers: the one said he had bread and butter, and the other bread only. Fined £5, with 25s 6d costs.—James Smith, Chiltern Road, was similarly charged. Mr Thompson for defendant: Mr Norton for prosecution. Same evidence as in former cases. This case was adjourned till Friday next for the production of evidence for the defence.—Charles Cozens, of the Chiltern Road, was similarly charged. Mr Thompson for defence: Mr Norton for prosecution. Same evidence. Mr Thompson took an exception to the summons. This was overruled by the Bench. Fined £5, with 25s 6d costs.