

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.

Plaintiff in error claimed to be entitled to trial by jury and that he had been denied due process of law.

Mr. Thomas J. Barry, Mr. Harry J. Jaquith and Mr. Benjamin Dellheim for plaintiff in error.

The Attorney General and The Solicitor General for defendant in error.

Per Curiam: Judgment affirmed. Act of September 13, 1888, 25 Stat. 476, § 13; Act of May 5, 1892, 27 Stat. 25, §§ 3, 6; Act of March 3, 1893, 28 Stat. 7, § 1; Treaty of 1904, 33 Stat. 2215; Act of April 27, 1904, 33 Stat. 394; *United States v. Lee Yen Tai*, 185 U. S. 213; *Chin Bak Kan v. United States*, 186 U. S. 193; *Lip Hop Fong v. United States*, 209 U. S. 453; *Fong Yue Ting v. United States*, 149 U. S. 698.

CONVERSE v. MINNESOTA THRESHER MFG. CO.

SAME v. FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF SUFFIELD.

ERROR TO THE SUPREME COURT OF ERRORS OF CONNECTICUT.

Nos. 75, 76. Argued January 14, 1909.—Decided January 25, 1909.

A judgment of the highest court of Connecticut, involving the liability of stockholders under provisions in the constitution of Minnesota, reversed on the authority of *Bernheimer v. Converse*, 206 U. S. 516.¹

[¹ The leading headnote in *Bernheimer v. Converse*, 206 U. S. 516, referred to, is as follows:

“The court in this case followed the judgment of the highest court of the State in determining that a corporation was not within the exception,