

212 U. S.

Syllabus.

THORNTON v. CITY OF NATCHEZ.

ERROR TO THE SUPREME COURT OF MISSISSIPPI.

No. 462. Motion to dismiss or affirm.—Submitted November 16, 1908.—
Decided November 30, 1908.

Writ of error to review judgment of state court, 88 Mississippi, 1, dismissed for want of jurisdiction under § 709, Rev. Stat., without opinion.

Mr. Robert H. Thompson, Mr. Thomas A. McWillie and Mr. William C. Martin for defendants in error in support of the motion.

Mr. Wade R. Young for plaintiffs in error in opposition to motion to dismiss.

Per Curiam: Writ of error dismissed for want of jurisdiction. *Thornton v. Natchez*, 88 Mississippi, 1; *S. C.*, 129 Fed. Rep. 86, 87; *S. C.*, 197 U. S. 620; *Harrison v. Myer*, 92 U. S. 111; *Moran v. Horsky*, 178 U. S. 205; *New Orleans Water Works Co. v. Louisiana Sugar Refining Co.*, 125 U. S. 18; *St. Paul Gas Light Co. v. St. Paul*, 181 U. S. 142, 148; *Beals v. Cone*, 188 U. S. 184; *Winona & St. Peter Railroad Company v. Plainview*, 143 U. S. 371, 390; *Hammond v. Johnston*, 142 U. S. 73.

SHAW v. UNITED STATES.

APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR
THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

No. 426. Motion to dismiss or affirm.—Submitted November 16, 1908.—
Decided November 30, 1908.

American Sugar Refining Co. v. United States, 211 U. S. 155, which held that a direct appeal from the Circuit Court would not lie in a case

denied did not go to its jurisdiction as a Federal court as such, but its jurisdiction was denied on the ground that the state court where the proceedings started had no jurisdiction, a direct appeal on the jurisdictional question will not lie to this court under § 5 of the judiciary act of 1891."