

Cases Omitted in the Reports.

trial, there was a judgment against the city. And the city is now plaintiff in error, and seeks the reversal of the last judgment.

Counsel have labored with much zeal and ability to satisfy the court that, upon the former hearing, "One important and controlling fact was misapprehended, or did not sufficiently appear in the case at that time." But we are not convinced that there was any such misapprehension, or that any important fact escaped the observation of the court.

The judgment of the Circuit Court, therefore, must be *Affirmed*.

Under the circumstances of the case, however, we cannot say that it was prosecuted merely for delay.

The motion for affirmance with ten per cent damages must, therefore, be denied.

Mr. John W. Cary for plaintiff in error. *Mr. Wm. P. Lynde* for defendant in error.

DOWNING v. McCARTNEY.

APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS.

No. 163. December Term, 1869. — Decided April 11, 1870.

An appeal by one of three complainants from a joint decree, without notice to the others and without their refusing to join in it, is dismissed.

THE case is stated in the opinion.

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE CHASE delivered the opinion of the court.

The decree below was joint against the three complainants. One only has appealed; and there is nothing in the record showing that the other complainants had notice of this appeal, or that they refused to join in it.

The appeal, therefore, must be *Dismissed*.

Mr. W. C. Goudy for appellant. *Mr. James Hughes, Mr. J. W. Denver, Mr. Charles F. Peck and Mr. L. Janin* for appellees.

WOOD v. RICHARDS.

ERROR TO THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DIS-
TRICT OF ALABAMA.

No. 215. December Term, 1869. — Decided April 30, 1870.

The hearing on a motion for additional security on a writ of error, supported by affidavits but without notice to the opposite party, is postponed in order that notice may be given.