

were three servants in the house, witness his wife; witness was in bed, and saw the man in white shirts; made an effort to go out, when his head was out of the window, one of the party pointed to witness, that he was sleeping; it was on a moonlight night; they opened light, but objected to it; witness followed, to go to the back part of the room; the party asked for the man of the house, but he told he was not within; the servants' bed was examined for witness; D— said, search for the bed with the bayonet; witness's wife said not to kill the children; one of the party said, "let us burn the house about them, we can't get Hartnett;" the prisoner at the bar pointed witness by the leg, and said, that he had Hartnett, who brought him to the kitchen and flogged him with a thong whip; witness got several strokes as he was going to the kitchen; D— said, shoot him unless he gives up the bundle he took from Mr. Hoskins; witness was sworn to surrender William Doolan's land, or to drag him between horses, and burn the house; the prisoner (Shaughnessy) held witness the whole time whilst he was flogging; he saw him by the moonlight; two shots were fired; the following night, witness and family left the house, and after crossing two fields, they saw the house in flames.

Cross-examined by Counsellor O'Connell.— Witness put in a presentment for £150, for the burning of his house; there are two windows in the house; not one in the kitchen; four panes of glass are in the windows; when witness went to the road, he travelled at his own expence; was several years absent, and married in England; witness can't tell how long he is in Mr. Hoskins's employ; of no trade; can't swear that he is not a tailor; witness was to get £20 for bog raising from Mr. H., four of which he was to pay an assistant; witness lodged informations before Mr. Hoskins.

Catherine Hartnett examined by Counsellor O'Connell.— This witness is the wife of the prosecutor; her testimony was nearly a repetition of the former. On her cross-examination, she received Mr. Odell suggesting to Counsellor O'Connell a question, when she exclaimed, "It is no good for you, Mr. Odell—it is no good for you; you are a great r— and a great radical."—(Roars of laughter, and it was for some time before the Court was tranquillised.) O'Connell then put the question to witness, on her oath, what it was that she called Mr. Odell? After a great pause, she was obliged to answer—"I called him, Sir, a great Radical." James Johnson proved, that he, with Henry Woodburn, and a party of the Police, took the prisoner at his father-in-law's house, and brought him before Mr. Vokes, a Magistrate. In the cross-examination of this witness, nothing was elicited, except that he had a wish to gain Mr. Hoskins's good will, and that he wanted a presentment or reward.

Mr. Vokes, Magistrate, proved that part of the country to be in a state of disturbance several months.

For the Defence—James Slattery was produced, who stated, that he saw the prosecutor and family going through his ground, with a blanket and a pot, and saw Hartnett's house on fire.

Daniel Hartnett, to prove an Alibi, swore that the prisoner slept with him on the night of the attack on Hartnett. In his cross-examination, it came out that he was brother-in-law to the prisoner.

The Jury retired for a considerable time, and brought in a Verdict of—Guilty.

The Learned Judge then addressed the unhappy prisoner in nearly the following words:

"Michael Shaughnessy, you have been found guilty on the clearest evidence, which has not left a doubt on the minds of every one who heard it. If any thing was wanted to supply that evidence, it was done by the witness who was produced for your defence. The offence of which you are found guilty, is one of the deepest dye. It is one which is part of that system in this County, which has been carrying on this time back; the strong arm of the law must, therefore, interpose itself; rigorous measures must be adopted in order to restore peace and good order to save the lives and properties of the community from the lawless band of law breakers, who mark their progress in desolation and blood. The prosecutor was guilty of taking a farm, and for this crime you have lacerated him, drove into his house at night, and afterwards burnt consumed. Are we living in a Christian country? Are we living in times

CITY CRIMINAL COURT.

MURDER OF LIEUTENANT KENT.

Thomas Hiffernan and Cornelius Dwyer were put to the Bar, on an indictment for the wilful murder of Lieut. Michael Kent, late of the 60th Regiment, at Saint Francis's Abbey, in the County of Limerick, on the night of Saturday, the 4th of August last, by firing a pistol shot at him, the ball from which entered his left temple, of which he languished till the evening of the next day, and died at his lodgings in Clare-street, in the Liberties of Limerick.

James Coomey proved his having been at Saint Francis's-Abbey on the night stated in the indictment, in company with Mr. Kent; that witness had charge of some premises under distress for rent, and which were in the hands of Under-Tenants; Mr. Kent was the immediate Tenant; that in the early part of the evening, witness and Kent were in company, and had drunk some punch and porter; that a dispute arose between Mr. Kent and young Ryan, who occupied some of the premises under distress, at which some blows were given at both sides, but they were separated, and witness took Kent away; Kent returned some time after and lingered about the premises with witness; he had in his hand an iron tong; about twelve o'clock, Kent took witness into a house in the lane leading to the Abbey, where he sat down; and in a short time after got up, with the tong in his hand and a candle in the other, and said to witness "come here till I shew you where all my property was taken out." Kent went into an inside room and pointing the tong to the floor over his head, a shot was immediately fired from above which struck Kent over the left eye, and passed out at his jaw. He immediately fell; there was an instant cry of murder by witness, and the neighbourhood was alarmed; witness saw Kent removed from the place where he received the shot to Clare-street, and he died there on Sunday evening.

Mr. Mathew Kelly sworn. - Was at supper in the house of Mrs. Ryan, at the Abbey, on the night of Kent's murder; all the family were in the parlour, and also Mr. William Humphries; while at supper, three men rushed into the room, the prisoners, Hiffernan and Dwyer, were among them; Hiffernan had a pistol, and Dwyer a short sword, which he brandished, while Hiffernan exclaimed "I have shot him." Witness asked was there a bullet in the pistol? the prisoner said there was; "Oh! you villain, then you have committed murder." Witness desired the doors to be shut, and demanded the prisoners to surrender their arms, which they refused, saying they were the only things they had to protect their lives. In a few seconds after several men were flung in at the door, and some person outside called out that if the family did not make their escape all would be murdered. The parlour door was then opened and the men rushed out. The family also, from the alarm, got away.

Mr. William Humphries was next examined, and fully corroborated Mr. Kelly's testimony.

Alderman Wilkinson proved the arrest of Hiffernan and Dwyer, in arms, at night, at the head of the Canal, under the circumstances heretofore stated in the Chronicle of the 8th ult. and a written confession of Hiffernan.

Mr. William Carroll also proved the arrest of the prisoners, in company with Alderman Wilkinson and Mr. Kelly, and some expressions made use of by them touching the murder.

Surgeon Thwaites proved that the wound which Mr. Kent received was the cause of his death.

There were no witnesses for the defence, which merely depended upon the cross-examinations, from which nothing favourable to the prisoners was elicited.

The Learned Judge charged the Jury at great length, and laid down the law in a clear and comprehensive point of view, discriminating between premeditated murder, and that arising out of circumstances unconnected with malice, and concluded by recommending the Jury to give the case the most serious inquiry, and to remove from their minds any impression which the previous knowledge of the affair might have made.

The Jury retired for about two hours, and returned with a verdict of GUILTY against both the prisoners. The awful sentence of the law was immediately pronounced by the Judge, and the unfortunate prisoners were executed on Friday.