

## Syllabus.

## DOUGHERTY v. NEVADA BANK.

ERROR TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

No. 98. Argued and submitted December 6, 1895. — Decided December 9, 1895.

*Wood v. Brady*, 150 U. S. 18, affirmed and applied to this case.

THIS was an action brought by the plaintiff in error to foreclose a municipal tax or street assessment lien. In a brief filed for defendant in error it was stated that the judgment here sought to be reversed involved the validity of precisely similar extensions to those sought to be reversed in *Wood v. Brady*, 150 U. S. 18, and under the same statute. This statement was not denied or challenged by the counsel for the plaintiff in error.

*Mr. J. C. Bates* for plaintiff in error submitted on his brief.

*Mr. James G. Maguire* for defendant in error.

*Mr. John Garber*, *Mr. John H. Boalt*, and *Mr. Thomas B. Bishop* filed a brief for defendant in error.

MR. JUSTICE FIELD: The writ of error is dismissed on the authority of *Wood v. Brady*, 150 U. S. 18.

*Writ dismissed.*

## TOWNSEND v. VANDERWERKER.

APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

No. 78. Argued November 20, 1895. — Decided December 16, 1895.

A court of equity in the District of Columbia may take jurisdiction of a bill brought against the administrator and heirs of an intestate, alleging a verbal agreement between the intestate and the plaintiff by which the plaintiff was to contribute one half of the cost of a tract of land and of a dwelling-house to be erected thereon, and the intestate, after entering on the property, was to convey to him a half interest therein,