

The petitioner asked for a writ of prohibition against the Judges of the District Court to prohibit them from making any order in the admiralty court withdrawing in favor of the bankrupt estate any of the proceeds of the sale in admiralty until the maritime liens were paid.

Mr. de Lagnel Berier for petitioner contended that under § 688, Rev. Stat., this court had jurisdiction to issue the writ, and that it was no objection thereto that the occasion arose in a collateral matter. *Re Rice*, 155 U. S. 396. Also that the admiralty court had full jurisdiction over the proceeds after the receiver relinquished the vessels, but it had no jurisdiction to pay over moneys in its registry to a stranger, or for non-maritime liens, and that the receiver's expenditures and commissions were non-maritime liens (*The Mary K. Campbell*, 31 Fed. Rep. 840; *The Monte*, 12 Fed. Rep. 333; *The Oceano*, 148 Fed. Rep. 131); and if there was any lien under the bankrupt act it did not follow the proceeds into the admiralty court.

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

MATTER OF FRANK McWILLIAMS, PETITIONER.

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF PROHIBITION
DIRECTED TO THE JUDGES OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE
UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY.

No. —. Original. Submitted February 23, 1909.—Decided March 1,
1909.

Leave to file petition for writ of prohibition similar to that applied
for in preceding case refused.

THIS case arose out of the same facts as the preceding case

214 U. S.

Statement of the Case.

and affected the proceeds of one of the vessels, and the same contention was made for petitioner.

Mr. Richard D. Currier for petitioner.

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

SASS & CRAWFORD v. THOMAS.

ERROR TO THE CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH
CIRCUIT.

No. 122. Submitted March 15, 1909.—Decided March 22, 1909.

On authority of *Laurel Oil Co. v. Morrison*, 212 U. S. 291,¹ writ of error to review a judgment of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit in a case coming from the United States court for the Indian Territory dismissed.

THIS case was commenced in the United States court for the Southern District of the Indian Territory and resulted in a

¹ The headnote in *Laurel Oil Co. v. Morrison* is as follows:

"Where a statute provides for an appeal or a writ of error to a specific court it must be regarded as a repeal of any previous statute providing for an appeal or a writ of error to another court. *Brown v. United States*, 171 U. S. 631.

"Decisions of the Court of Appeals of the United States for the Indian Territory are final except as made subject to review by some express statutory provision.

"The provisions in § 12 of the act of March 3, 1905, c. 1479, 33 Stat. 1081, for appeals and writs of error from the United States courts in Indian Territory to the United States Court of Appeals in the Indian Territory, and from that court to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit are exclusive; and there is now no appeal or writ of error in such cases from the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Eighth Circuit to this court."