

SPOKANE VAL. LAND & WATER CO. v. MADSON. 565

212 U. S.

Per Curiam.

*The Attorney General and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Fowler* for the United States.

There was no appearance or brief filed for defendant in error.

*Per Curiam:* The judgment is affirmed on the authority of *Hodges v. United States*, 203 U. S. 1.

MR. JUSTICE MOODY did not sit.

---

SPOKANE VALLEY LAND & WATER COMPANY v.  
MADSON.

SAME v. SAME.

ERROR TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON.

Nos. 202, 231. Motion to dismiss.—Submitted January 18, 1909.—Decided January 25, 1909.

Writs of error to review judgments of the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, 40 Washington, 414; *S. C.*, 91 Pac. Rep. 1, involving the right of a patentee of the United States to construct a dam across an arm of a lake in the State of Washington, dismissed for want of jurisdiction; plaintiff in error claiming such right under the Desert Land Act of March 3, 1877, c. 107, 19 Stat. 377, and defendant in error claiming that there was no Federal question, or if any existed, it was raised too late.

*Mr. S. C. Hyde and Messrs. Gallagher & Thayer* for defendants in error, in support of the motion.

*Mr. Albert Allen* for plaintiff in error, in opposition to the motion.

*Per Curiam:* Writs of error dismissed for want of jurisdiction. *Hardin v. Shedd*, 190 U. S. 508; *Mutual Life Insurance Co. v.*

*McGrew*, 188 U. S. 291; *Hulbert v. City of Chicago*, 202 U. S. 275; *Spokane Land & Water Co. v. Madson*, 40 Washington, 414; *Same v. Same*, 91 Pac. Rep. 1.

---

FRESHMAN *v.* UNITED STATES.

ERROR TO THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

No. 298. Motion to dismiss or affirm.—Submitted January 10, 1909.—Decided January 25, 1909.

Writ of error to review a judgment of conviction for liquor selling without having first paid the special Federal tax therefor, dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Plaintiff in error contended that the indictment was found on evidence improperly obtained.

*The Attorney General* and *The Solicitor General* in support of motion to dismiss.

No brief filed in opposition.

*Per Curiam*: Writ of error dismissed for want of jurisdiction. *Adams v. New York*, 192 U. S. 585; *Radford v. United States*, 129 Fed. Rep. 49; *McGregor v. United States*, 134 Fed. Rep. 187.

---

GOON SHUNG, *alias* NG SHUNG *v.* UNITED STATES.

ERROR TO THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS.

No. 85. Submitted January 14, 1909.—Decided January 25, 1909.

A judgment of the District Court of the United States, affirming an order of deportation of a Chinese person, affirmed without opinion.