
Pennsylvania v. Wheeling and Belmont Bridge Co. et al.

*The salvage on the largest claim would be only 1,136.80, and would have to be paid by J. S. Vedder, [*528 the consignee, in order to prevent a sale of his part of the cargo. From its being under \$2,000, as we before said, he could not appeal, nor any other person for him, so as to confer jurisdiction on us.

It follows, then, that, as no one person, either in his own right or in the right of some other person or firm, and as no one lot of the goods, or owner of the vessel, was subject by the decree to pay as much as \$2,000 in salvage, the appeal must be dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

Were this result more doubtful, we should feel averse to sustain jurisdiction, unless clearly bound to, in a class of appeals like this, not entitled to favor, unless, in the language of Chief Justice Marshall in *The Sibyl*, 4 Wheat., 98, "it manifestly appeared that some important error had been committed."

ORDER.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Texas, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this court, that this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, COMPLAINANT, v. THE WHEELING AND BELMONT BRIDGE COMPANY, WM. OTTISAN, AND GEORGE CRAFT.—*Bill in Chancery*.¹

A day assigned for the argument, at the next term, of a cause upon the original docket of this court.

ORDERED, that the time for taking testimony in the above cause by the commissioner appointed by the order entered 29th May, 1850, and for making the report to this court therein provided for, be extended till the further order of the court: and, that the authority to take testimony in said cause since the first day of the present term be, and the same is hereby, confirmed.

¹ Further decision, 13 How., 518.

Gill v. Oliver's Executors et al.

And now comes the complainant by her counsel, and moves the court to assign a day during the present term of this court for a final hearing upon the bill, answers, exhibits, testimony, and commissioner's report in this case.

C. DARRAGH, *Attorney-General of Pennsylvania.*

*The motion filed by Mr. Walker, the 18th instant, for the hearing of this cause, was argued by *Messrs. Stanton and Walker*, in support of, and by *Messrs. Stuart and Johnson*, in opposition to the same.

The report of the commissioner appointed at the last term having been returned on Thursday, the 13th instant, it is thereupon ordered by the court, that the case be continued to the next term, with leave to each party to file exceptions to the commissioner's report on or before the first Monday of July,—the exceptions to stand for argument on the second Monday in December next. If no exceptions shall be filed by either party, then the case to stand for final hearing on the day last mentioned.

GEORGE M. GILL, TRUSTEE, &C., OF LYDE GOODWIN, v.
ROBERT OLIVER'S EXECUTORS, AND GLENN AND PER-
RINE, TRUSTEES.

In 1839 a treaty was made between the United States and Mexico, providing for the "adjustment of claims of citizens of the United States on the Mexican republic."

Under this treaty a sum of money was awarded to be paid to the members of the Baltimore Mexican Company, who had subscribed money to fit out an expedition against Mexico under General Mina, in 1816.¹

The proceeds of one of the shares of this company were claimed by two parties, one as being the permanent trustee of the insolvent owner of the share, and the other as being the assignee of the provisional trustee and afterwards the assignee of the insolvent himself.

The judgment of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, that the latter claimant is entitled to the money, is not reviewable by this court under the twenty-fifth section of the Judiciary Act.²

THIS case came up by writ of error to the Court of Appeals for the Western Shore of Maryland, being the highest court

¹ See *McBlair v. Gibbs*, 17 How., 232, 239; *Williams v. Gibbs*, Id., 249; *White*, 24 Id., 320; *Millingar v. Hartup*, 6 Wall., 262.

² FOLLOWED. *Williams v. Oliver*,