

8467

No. _____

Supreme Court of Illinois

Shanfieldt

vs.

Green & Green

71641  7

State of Illinois } In the Circuit Court of Marion County
Marion County } August term A. D. 1862.

John Shuffelt }
v }
Daniel K Green }
William J Green } C. Appeal

Be it remembered that on Tuesday
the 19th of August 1862 Henry C Goodnow
the atty of Daniel K Green in open court
moved the court for a continuance of this
cause until the next term of this court
for the reasons in the affidavit of the s^r
Goodnow in the word and figures followi
ng to wit. H. C. Goodnow comes and being
duly sworn deposes and says that he is
one of the attys for the dependant in
the above entitled cause and that said
dependant is now in the military
service of the State of Illinois and that his
presence is necessary for a full and fair
defence as affiant is informed and
believes and affiant asks that said cause
may be continued

Sworn to and signed
August 19th 1862

H. C. Goodnow

J. O. Chance, Clerk

Which motion the S^r by resisted upon the grou
nds that the S^r Green was then in the town
of Salem in Marion County Illinois where

court was held and the S. court not being sufficiently advised granted leave to S. plf to make proof of that fact and passed the cause for further action on S. motion. And whereas on the 21st day of S. August in court the S. plf filed the following affidavit of Thos J Black and Smith Saraner in words & figures following to wit: Thos J Black and Smith Saraner upsw and says that they saw Daniel R Green one of the Depts in the case of John Sharfett vs Daniel R Green and William J Green on Tuesday last the 19th inst in the town of Salem in Marion County Illinois.

Sworn to & subscribed this } Smith Saraner
21st day of August A.D. 1862. } J Black

J C Chancel, clk
And on the 22nd day of August the S. Dept filed his further affidavit for a continuance in S. cause in these words and figures to wit: H B Goodnow of Basett comes and being duly sworn deposes and says that Willard & Goodnow are the attorneys for the defendant in the above entitled cause that said defendant is now in the military service of the state of Illinois that said defendant Daniel R Green called upon

said attorneys on Monday morning of this
of ~~the~~ week and employed them to defend
said cause That said defendant informed
said attorneys that he expected to leave this
place on said Monday evening or Tuesday
morning for Chicago his place of duty for
said State That affiant has been informed
that said defendant was unavoidably dete-
-ined till Tuesday evening of this week, ^{that} affi-
-ants are informed and believe that said
defendant is now at this time of making
of this affidavit absent on Military duty
of this State That this cause was not
set for hearing until Wednesday of this
week the day after said defendant must
have left this place That affiants do
not know what defence said defenda-
nt has in said cause and that said
defendants presence is necessary that said
attorneys may make for said defendant
a full and fair defence for said
defendant and further affiants says
not but ask that said cause may
be continued &c

Sworn to and signed } James Bassett
before me this August } H B Goodson
22th 1862. } O Chance, clerk

To which the De pty filed his objections to a
continuance in words & figures following

to wit: And now this day comes the sd. J^{dy} Orndorff
& Merritt his attys and objects to the court sustaining
the motion of S^d Deft for a continuance of
this cause and demurs to the affidavits of
attys of S^d Deft Daniel R Green to wit the
1st affd of Goodnow & Bassett^{1^c} because the sd
affidavits do not disclose any defence nor the
~~nature~~^{nature} or kind of defence ~~whatsoever~~ so
that the court can decide upon whether
he has a defence or not & that his presence
is necessary? because no defence is disclosed
so that the p^{ty} might have the opportunity
of admitting the same and ^{with} arraigning his
suit, or taking judgment for the residue
& because of other misapprehensions
Orndorff & Merritt
Attys for S^d

And the court being sufficiently advised
thereof now sustained the motion of S^d
Deft for the cause so assigned as aforesaid
to which decision p^{ty} by his counsel at
the time excepted for therefore at the
request of counsel ~~at~~ both for the p^{ty} S^d
defts & the undersigned Judge of the
circuit court of the 2nd Judicial circuit
of the State of Illinois do certify the
forgoing to be a true ^{record} ~~words~~ of the
facts with the decision of the court

thereunto ^{the end} that the opinion of the
suprem court may be taken thereon
as to whether there is or not any error
in the record appearing

all of which I do certify

Silas L Bryan Judge Cir ^{Circuit}

State of Illinois }
Marion County } I do hereby
Certify the within
to be a true and correct copy
from the original papers in the above
title case as recently filed in
my office

Given under my hand
and Seal of said Court
This 7th day of November
AD 1862

J O Chance Cir Clerk
J S Chance Deputy

And the ^{officer} in error for assumption of error
says that the judgment of the Court in sustaining
the motion of Deft for a continuance, was
contrary to Law, as the affidavits filed.

Defendants Veris is
error
H C Goodnow
Atty for Defts

H K S & others
T. E. Martin,

~~40~~ 40

John Shampell
ref in error

James K Green
& Wm J Green
Dyts in error.

Error from previous

Filed Nov. 11 - 1862 -
N. Johnston City
Paid by Ouelvey \$5.00

Ouelvey

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS,

FIRST GRAND DIVISION ----- NOVEMBER TERM, 1862.

ABSTRACT.

John Schenefelt, Plaintiff in Error, }
 VS. }
 Daniel K. Green and William J. Green } Error to Marion County.
 Defendant in Error.

Page.

This case is brought here under the the certificate of the Judge of the 2nd Judicial circuit, by virtue of Sec. 17, P. 311, 1st Purple's Statute.

1 August 19, H. C. Goodnow, Defendant's Attorney, moved the Court for a continuance on his affidavit which alleges that Defendant, Daniel K. Green, is now in the military service of the State of Illinois, and that his presence is necessary for a full and fair defence.

1-2 We resisted on the ground that said Defendant was then in the town of Salem, and time being given to make affidavit of that fact, same was done 21st Aug., 1862. Aug. 22d Defendant's Attorneys filed their further affidavit to-wit: That said Green is now in the military service of the State, is now at this time of making of this affidavit on military duty of the State. That aff-
 2-3 ants do not know what defense said Defendant has in said cause, and that said Defendant's presence is necessary that said Attorney may make for said Defendant a full and fair defense.

3-4 Plaintiff resisted the motion for continuance, 1st, because no defense or the character of de-
 fense is discovered

4 The Court sustained the motion of Defendant for a continuance, and gave judgment that the
 4 cause stand continued, to which judgment Plaintiff's Counsel excepted at the time.

ERRORS.

- 1st. The Judgment of the Court was contrary to the law.
- 2nd. The Court should have overruled Defendant's motion for a continuance.

BRIEF.

John Schenefelt, }
 V. S. } BRIEF.
 Daniel K. Green & William Green, }

1st. The nature of the defense must be stated before a Court can be satisfied that the presence of the party is or is not necessary. Laws 1861, extra session, page 26.

2nd. The defense should be set out so that Plaintiff may admit it, and take Judgment for the residue if any, or dismiss his suit if the defense be full and complete.

3d. Unless this is the law, the Plaintiff may have his cause continued for years, and in the case of death of the Defendant be compelled to pay all costs of the continuance, and file his demand against the estate of deceased.

H. K. S. O'MELVENY,
 T. E. MERRITT,

For Plaintiff in Error.

John Sheufield vs

Daniel K Green & William Green
Defts in error

Brief & Abstract

for Plaintiff in error.
T. E. MERRILL,
H. E. S. OMBELVENY.

Filed Nov. 12. 1862 -
N. Johnston Clk
4

JOHN SHEUFIELD, Plaintiff

Daniel K. Green and William J. Green vs Plaintiff
John Sheufield, Plaintiff in error.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS.

NOVEMBER TERM 1862.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS,

FIRST GRAND DIVISION-----NOVEMBER TERM, 1862.

ABSTRACT.

John Schenefelt, Plaintiff in Error, }
 VS. }
 Daniel K. Green and William J. Green } Error to Marion County.
 Defendant in Error.

Page.

This case is brought here under the the certificate of the Judge of the 2nd Judicial circuit, by virtue of Sec. 17, P. 211, 1st Purple's Statute.

1 August 19, H. C. Goodnow, Defendant's Attorney. moved the Court for a continuance on his affidavit which alleges that Defendant, Daniel K. Green, is now in the military service of the State of Illinois, and that his presence is necessary for a full and fair defence.

1-2 We resisted on the ground that said Defendant was then in the town of Salem, and time being given to make affidavit of that fact, same was done 21st Aug., 1862. Aug. 23d Defendant's Attorneys filed their further affidavit to-wit: That said Green is now in the military service of the State, is now at this time of making of this affidavit on military duty of the State. That affi-
 2 3 ants do not know what defense said Defendant has in said cause, and that said Defendant's presence is necessary that said Attorney may make for said Defendant a full and fair defense.

3-4 Plaintiff resisted the motion for continuance, 1st, because no defense or the character of de-
 fense is discovered

4 The Court sustained the motion of Defendant for a continuance, and gave judgment that the
 4 cause stand continued, to which judgment Plaintiff's Counsel excepted at the time.

RECORD.

- 1st. The Judgment of the Court was contrary to the law.
- 2nd. The Court should have overruled Defendant's motion for a continuance.

BRIEF.

John Schenefelt, }
 V. S. } BRIEF.
 Daniel K. Green & William Green, }

1st The nature of the defense must be stated before a Court can be satisfied that the presence of the party is or is not necessary. Laws 1861, extra session, page 26.

2nd. The defense should be set out so that Plaintiff may admit it, and take Judgment for the residue if any, or dismiss his suit if the defense be full and complete.

3d. Unless this is the law, the Plaintiff may have his cause continued for years, and in the case of death of the Defendant be compelled to pay all costs of the continuance, and file his demand against the estate of deceased.

H. K. S. O'MELVENY,
 T. E. MERRITT,

For Plaintiff in Error.

For Plaintiff in Error.
T. F. MERRILL,
H. K. S. O'NEILVERNY.

case of *Quinn v. The State*, 11 Ill. 401.
1st. Unless this is the law, the Plaintiff may have his case continued for years, and in the
2nd. The defense should be set out so that Plaintiff may admit it, and take judgment for the
of the party as it is not necessary. Laws 1861, extra session, page 28.
1st. The amount of the defense must be stated before a Court can be engaged that the presence

Daniel K. Green & William Green,
John Spangenberg, } BRIEF.

240
4th 10

1st. The judgment of the Court was contrary to the law.
2nd. The Court should have examined Defendant's motion for a continuance.
3rd. The Court should have examined Plaintiff's Counsel excepted as the law.
4th. The Court retained the motion of Defendant for a continuance, and gave judgment that the
case stand continued, so which judgment Plaintiff's Counsel excepted as the law.

1st. The Court retained the motion of Defendant for a continuance, and gave judgment that the
case stand continued, so which judgment Plaintiff's Counsel excepted as the law.
2nd. The Court should have examined Defendant's motion for a continuance.
3rd. The Court should have examined Plaintiff's Counsel excepted as the law.
4th. The Court retained the motion of Defendant for a continuance, and gave judgment that the
case stand continued, so which judgment Plaintiff's Counsel excepted as the law.
1st. The Court retained the motion of Defendant for a continuance, and gave judgment that the
case stand continued, so which judgment Plaintiff's Counsel excepted as the law.
2nd. The Court should have examined Defendant's motion for a continuance.
3rd. The Court should have examined Plaintiff's Counsel excepted as the law.
4th. The Court retained the motion of Defendant for a continuance, and gave judgment that the
case stand continued, so which judgment Plaintiff's Counsel excepted as the law.
1st. The Court retained the motion of Defendant for a continuance, and gave judgment that the
case stand continued, so which judgment Plaintiff's Counsel excepted as the law.
2nd. The Court should have examined Defendant's motion for a continuance.
3rd. The Court should have examined Plaintiff's Counsel excepted as the law.
4th. The Court retained the motion of Defendant for a continuance, and gave judgment that the
case stand continued, so which judgment Plaintiff's Counsel excepted as the law.

Green Defendant in Error.
David K. Green and William J. } Error to Madison County.
John Spangenberg, Plaintiff in Error.

HERALD GEORGE BILKINSON
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS
NOVEMBER TERM, 1862.

40-25

Shawfeth

n

Green & Green

Dismissed for want
of judgment below.

Cont. see on Page 529

8467