H BURGLARY. TURNED FOR TRIAL ORRESPONDENT.)

held in Nehkali on Tuese e night of the Sth ult. the shop of Mrs. Rohan, and taken goods and e capture of the prisoners iting chase at the time. hy Messas Corbett and Repectively. ucted the prosecution. examined was Sergeant ione that on the morning received information of ed Mrs. Rohan's publicated, the noticed the mande ingue of the socket into it was also bent, and he he dood step; the constant of the window was down, as broken. The window utside hy bars, but pressure the bars would bend them, Mrs. Rohan's to the house it was both to the Mrs Rohan's to the house it was about 5.15 a m, and it was about 5.15 a m, and lirectly as the door was unmanher was not jinside give of Mulcaby, who gas edded to an empty shed, in William street, where in in a handkerchief. 23 acco, and in a second overed 11s, together with insequently saw Danagher; they seatched him, and e containing 18 and a sixin it, together with fifteen prisoner had also a white contained two anymones prisoner had also a white contained two summones ion veying the prisoner to ked. "Liuppose I will get is"; winess examined the Mrs Rohan's premises, and eet leading in the direction cupied shed; the masure-s, feet corresponded with knew both prisoners, who e measured the footprints constable McLoughlin were s feet had the appearance of

Mr Corbett-Danagher had

Mr Gleeson—The footprints 's shop to the empty shed

street, gave evidence that shed in Williamsgreet; at night of the 8th of March, y with her daughter, into cows; when she got to the key-cart which had been fall knocked down; she saw shed, and she sked them inot do so; she was unable onen were the prisoners.

shed, and sheasked them inot do so; she was unable o men were the prisoners, there of the last witness, idence.

eary, Mrs Bohan's shop hat on the morning of the true about 4.15, and went the shop which she found in d by the sergeant; she locked the previously in a tin box in he remembered contained a hole in it, as well as a numices, two of which were the two threepenny pieces these which she remarked put some coppers, including len box; all were taken; a was staying in the house, of his placed under the was lying on the floor broken; a considerable was taken from the shop; wrapping up portion of the ethe same as that now proin the habit of fastening ther with tacks; sile thought ther with tacks; she thought seed) resembled that taker

orbett witness said she could ify the two battered three-

Reidy proved that he dis-ding in a hay-rick at Bene-we, and when arrested and ind to have in his possession k with a farthing solled up in

ghlin deposed to finding ad-f tobacco, as well as a razor the unused shed, led Major Waring that the r had lost his razor in Mrs sumably taken from the bag

arrest of the accused hav-Crown case closed.
I to have the case against

admit that the case against my strong, but there is the was away from home on the secondly, that he is found in oin; and lastly, that he had lay on his feet.

marks of clay more righting

REMITTED ACTION FOR \$200. (FROM OUR CORRESPONDENT.)

A rather interesting remitted action at the instance of Sergeant Larkin, RIC, to recover

instance of Sergeant Larkin, RIC, to recover from stame and a sergeant larkin, RIC, to recover from stame and another bounds of seven in dicted on plaintiff's and a boy of shout nine years of age, through defendant's neglect, and for assault, also stated to have been committed on the youth came on for hearing at the Nenagh Quarter Sessions, before his Honor, County Court Judge Anderson, and the following special jury—Edward Coyne, IF W Day, Joseph Glesson, Richd T Jones, J Hogarty, and J Ryan. The occurrences complained of lwere stated to have taken place on the 12th of December, at Lorrha, where plaintiff, who is now in charge of the Birdhill, Barracks, was stationed. Proceedings were brought in the Superior Court to recover damages, but the action was remitted before the Chairman and a special jury.

Mr A Nolem, solr, appeared for the plaintiff, and Mr X M Glesson, solr, for the defendant:
The first witness called was the boy, James Joseph larkin, who, after satisfying the Chairman as to his knowledge of the nature of an oath gave evidence that on the day in question he left school at 3.3d, in company with his brother, John Thomas, and another boy named Dwyer; they went to play in a laneway, through which defendant was drawing corn with a horse and car and donkey bar; defendant had no one assisting him to guide the animals; a gap led from the laneway to the haggard, and witnesses brother was on the wall by the gap, but got down when he saw defendant coming; detendant left the donkey with its load standing in the middle of the lane, while he led the horse through the gap up to the stack; defendant then plasted on to the fried, but came, back and told witness to get out of the place; witness and his arm was broken, and defendant carried him to the barrack.

Oross-examined by Mr Glesson — Witness stated he did not see another man helping defendant; I fell behind; the load; when I was getting on the wall I said "I bet he will not turn in down."

John Thomas Lackin deposed that the defendant had nobody but himself

getting on the wall I said "I bet he will not turn ine down."

John Thomas Lerkin deposed that the defendant, had nobody but himself guiding the horse and donkey on the occasion, his better was on the wall at the gap, and when the load passed through he saw his brother lying on the ground; the defendant passed on to the rick and returned in about two minutes, during which witness's brother was on the ground; a policeman took the injured boy to the barrack; defendant went on when he saw his witness's brother the same is witness, brother tall, and he did not return for about two minutes; witness denied having heard his brother offer to be think defendant would not put him off the wall; defendant did not turn witness off the wall.

Thomas Dwyer, who was accompanying the

bet that defendant would not pith him off the wall; defendant did not turn witness off the wall.

Thomas Dwyer, who was accompanying the young Jarkins on the occasion, gave evidence touching the distails of the occurrence as deposed to by the other witnesses; he did not know whether it was possible for defendant to have seen young Larkin on the fence just as the load of corn was being taken through the gap; it was possible he could not see the boy; half a minute had not clapsed from the time the boy fell until defendant came to him; he felt his arm, and ran to the barrack to tell Sergeant Larkin of what had occurred.

The plaintiff was then examined. He gave evidence that he knew the scene of the occurrence he bolisyed that if the defendant had used duc caution he should have seen the boy on the fence and prevented the injuries.

Cross-examined by Mr Gleeson, plaintiff said the boy was injured on the 12th of December, but Dr Boxwell was not sent for until the 22hd of February, Dr Boxwell pronounced the apprenent injury, and plaintiff sent for a bonester; defendant was not very friendly with the plaintiff is before the occurrence, but plaintiff always spoke to him witness did not tell Dr Boxwell that the injury was the result of an accident.

His Honor-Whether it was an accident or not

before the occurrence, but plaintiff always spoke to him, witness did not tell Dr Boxwell that the injury was the result of an accident.

His Honor-Whether it was an accident or not does not alter the case.

Cross-examination continuel—It was owing to my wife's illness that no action was taken in the matter; when she got better proceedings were commenced.

Dr Hoxwell deposed that he was called in to see the boy; he ordered the arm to be put in a sling, and when he colled again he found a bandage on it, having heard that the boy had been attended by a bonesetter, he took no further interest in the ease, but before that, on discovering that the arm was fractured, he ordered it to be bandaged; there was, in his opinion, a likelihood of the arm being permanently injured, but t might be made all right if rebroken and set again.

Cross-examined—If properly treated at first it would not be a permanent injury—it would not beas bad as it is at present.

This conteleded the evidence of the plaintiff, and

to have the case against to have the case against to have the case against dimit that the case against and examined. He gave evidence that the boy should have tallen off the wall on the laneway when the car might have gone over his arm without his (defendant) having noticed it.

In reply to Mr Nolan, he said he knew the children were playing about the place, and the children were playing about the place, and took every precaution to prevent an accident; he did not see the boy on the wall at the gap.

The interfletioners days of Polemary the 20th we have the control of the principal of the control of the contro

THE SUPPLEMENTO MILITARY CANTEENS