

212 U. S.

Syllabus.

Per Curiam: Writs of error severally dismissed for want of jurisdiction. *Tullis v. Lake Erie & Western R. R. Co.*, 175 U. S. 348, and cases cited; *Pittsburg &c. Ry. Co. v. Lightheiser*, 168 Indiana, 438; *Same v. Collins*, 168 Indiana, 467; and *Same v. Ross*, 80 N. E. Rep. 845.

In re JONES.

PETITION FOR MANDAMUS AND MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE
THE SAME.

Submitted December 7, 1908.—Decided December 14, 1908.

Leave to file petition for mandamus to direct a suit against a corporation incorporated under act of Congress to be remanded to the state court, refused.

Mr. S. P. Jones for petitioner:

There was no appearance for any of the other parties.

Per Curiam: Motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus denied.

[As to the right of the Texas & Pacific Railway Co. to remove a case, on the ground that it is a corporation organized under an act of Congress, see *Matter of Dunn*, ante, p. 374.]

GAINES v. KNECHT.

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

No. 52. Argued December 11, 1908.—Decided December 14, 1908.

Writ of error to review decision of Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia on appeal from Commissioner of Patents, 27 App. D. C. 530, dismissed on authority of *Frasch v. Moore*, 211 U. S. 1.

VOL. CCXII—36

Per Curiam.

212 U. S.

Mr. James L. Hopkins, Mr. Daniel W. Lindsey and Mr. Alfred A. Eicks for plaintiff in error.

Mr. Arthur E. Wallace for defendant in error.

Per Curiam: Writ of error dismissed for want of jurisdiction. *Frasch v. Moore*, 211 U. S. 1. See act of February 20, 1905, for the registration of trade-marks, c. 592, 33 Stat. 724, §§ 9, 16, 17, 18, *et passim*.

[The headnote in *Frasch v. Moore* also appears as a note to *Atkins v. Moore*, *ante*, p. 285; and see *ante*, p. 290, for reference to point decided in *Gaines v. Knecht*.]

CLEVINGER, TRUSTEE IN BANKRUPTCY, *v.* CHANEY.

SAME *v.* LYLE.

SAME *v.* NICHOLS.

APPEALS FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH
CIRCUIT AND APPLICATIONS FOR WRITS OF CERTIORARI.

Nos. 221, 222, 223. Motions to dismiss or affirm and applications for certiorari submitted December 7, 1908.—Decided December 14, 1908.

Appeals from the Circuit Court of Appeals affirming orders and decrees of the bankruptcy court dismissed for want of jurisdiction without opinion on authority of *Chapman v. Bowen*, 207 U. S. 89.¹

Mr. E. E. Clevinger and *Mr. Cook Danford*, for appellants.

Mr. A. H. Mitchell for appellees.

Per Curiam: Appeals dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Applications for certiorari denied. *Chapman, Trustee, &c., v. Bowen*, 207 U. S. 89.

¹ The headnote in *Chapman v. Bowen*, 207 U. S. 89, is as follows: