tribunals of the United States to revise and correct it, and not for a State court. And as regards the decision of the District Court, it had exclusive and final jurisdiction by the laws of the United States; and neither the regularity of its proceedings nor the validity of its sentence could be called in question in any other court, either of a State or the United States, by *habeas corpus* or any other process.

But although we think it unnecessary to discuss these questions, yet, as they have been decided by the State court, and are before us on the record, and we are not willing to be misunderstood, it is proper to say that, in the judgment of this court, the act of Congress commonly called the fugitive slave law is, in all of its provisions, fully authorized by the Constitution of the United States; that the commissioner had lawful authority to issue the warrant and commit the party, and that his proceedings were regular and conformable to law. We have already stated the opinion and judgment of the court as to the exclusive jurisdiction of the District Court, and the appellate powers which this court is authorized and required to exercise. And if any argument was needed to show the wisdom and necessity of this appellate power, the cases before us sufficiently prove it, and at the same time emphatically call for its exercise.

The judgment of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin must therefore be reversed in each of the cases now before the court.

LLOYD N. ROGERS, ADMINISTRATOR OF ELIZA PARK CUSTIS, EDMUND L. ROGERS, IN HIS OWN RIGHT, AND AS ADMINISTRATOR OF ELIZA L. ROGERS AND ELEANOR A. ROGERS, APPELLANTS, *v.* JOSEPH E. LAW, BY MARY ROBINSON, HIS NEXT FRIEND.

After an appeal has been docketed and dismissed under the 63d rule of court at a prior term of the court, the same case cannot again be docketed without a new appeal.

THIS was an appeal from the Circuit Court of the United

States for the District of Columbia, holden in and for the county of Washington.

The dates of the several steps taken with respect to the appeal are stated in the opinion of the court.

Mr. Justice McLEAN delivered the opinion of the court.

The facts, as they appear of record, on the motion to dismiss this appeal, are as follows:

The decree of the Circuit Court was pronounced 21st January, 1856. An appeal was prayed from said decree, and granted the same day, 21st January, 1856. This appeal was docketed and dismissed under the 63d rule of this court, at December term, 1856, to wit: 27th February, 1857; and a writ of *procedendo* was issued 19th May, 1857.

The appellants filed this record and docketed the case 3d April, 1857. The record in this case stated that an appeal had been prayed and allowed, but does not give any date. There is no statement of any prior appeal in this record. The appeal bond is dated 4th February, 1856. There is no citation in this record.

The appellants filed the citation and bond, 30th April, 1857, and directed the clerk to docket this case, to transfer the record filed in the last case to this, to attach said citation and bond to said record, and to print all the papers in this case. There is no statement of any other appeal than that set out; and this seems to be the appeal that was docketed and dismissed 27th February, 1857.

As the record now stands, it is not perceived how this appeal can be sustained.

JOHN W. BRITTAN, APPELLANT, *v.* WILLIAM A. BARNABY, CLAIMANT OF THE SHIP ALBONI.

The freight upon a shipment of goods is payable, according to general rules, when the merchandise is in readiness to be delivered to the person having a right to receive it, and when the consignee has had the opportunity to exam-