

194 U. S.

Statement of the Case.

SCHEFE v. ST. LOUIS.

ERROR TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI.

No. 62. Argued April 12, 1904.—Decided May 16, 1904.

Decided on authority of *Fischer v. St. Louis*, ante, p. 361.

Mr. G. N. Fickeissen, with whom *Mr. J. D. Johnson* was on the brief, for plaintiff in error.

Mr. William F. Woerner, with whom *Mr. Charles W. Bates* and *Mr. C. R. Skinker* were on the brief, for defendant in error.¹

This case is similar to *Fischer v. St. Louis*, ante, p. 361, in every material particular, and, for the reasons stated in that case, is also

Affirmed.

UNITED STATES *ex rel.* HOLZENDORF v. HAY.

ERROR TO THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

No. 210. Argued April 12, 13, 1904.—Decided May 16, 1904.

The "matter in dispute," as respects a money demand, as employed in the statutes regulating appeals from the courts of the District of Columbia, has relation to justiciable demands and must be money or some right, the value of which can be ascertained in money, and which appears by the record to be of the requisite pecuniary value.

Where the averments in a petition that a mandamus be issued directing the Secretary of State to assert for the petitioner a claim against a foreign government do not state a cause of action under the principles of law of false imprisonment in this country, and do not show that the alleged wrong was actionable in such foreign country, the right to have the claim asserted is purely conjectural, and not susceptible of pecuniary estimate, and cannot be said to have the value necessary to give this court jurisdiction, and the writ must be dismissed.

The relator, plaintiff in error, filed his petition in the Su-

¹ For abstract of arguments, see ante, p. 363.