

Procedure in the Case of Laulette vs. Wilson.

Complaint—Wilful and vandalistic damaging of pair of trousers while on the person of the plaintiff, value \$3.00.

Attorney for the defense R. Wilson.

Attorney for the plaintiff A. N. Grossman, B. S.

The case was opened by a clear statement of the complaint by Prosecuting Attorney Grossman. It seems that Mr. Wilson who has a reputation for being sloppy in his work, was holding in his right hand, on Friday afternoon, 4:22 P. M., a Khieldahl flask, which contained about four hundred cubic centimeters of concentrated sulphuric acid, specific gravity 1.846. The neck of this flask was slimy, and the flask slipped from his grasp, breaking, and spilling the contents upon the floor. The point at which the flask hit the floor was in the second aisle, 4.13264 meters from the slop jar, and on a line four degrees west of the northwest therefrom. This was clearly shown and proven by the physical expert, Prof. Doubt. The attorney declared that Mr. Wilson had tried to clean up the mess he had created by soaking the vitriol in a sponge and throwing the sponge into the slop jar. It was evident, however, continued Attorney Grossman, that Mr. Wilson, in throwing up the sponge, did not observe or notice that Mr. Lauletta was standing between the aforesaid sponge and the aforementioned slop jar. "The result will be proven by witnesses," concluded Mr. Grossman, amid much clapping from the curious onlookers, who consisted of Mr. Chipman.

Mr. Sieck was called to the witness stand, and sworn in by means of the Chemical Bible (Bradley—Sloughton).

The witness is questioned by Mr. Wilson, as his own attorney.

Q. Did you see the accident? A. Yes.

Q. What kind of pants were they? A. Shoddy type.

Q. What value would you put on them? A. Two bits retail.

Q. What is the cause, in your opinion, of the holes. A. Sulphuric acid or billiard chalk.

Q. Could you swear that the holes were caused by sulphuric acid? A. No.

The witness was turned over to the attorney for the plaintiff.

Q. Could you swear that the holes were not caused by sulphuric acid. A. No

Q. You know that the defendant is a sloppy chemist?

Mr. Wilson objected to the question, but was overruled.

(See Wisc. 1914, 26-64.)

A. He is unquestionably sloppy. So is the plaintiff.

Mr. Grossman hurriedly dismissed the witness. Mr. Chipman next took the stand and was examined by the defense.

Q. You know the plaintiff as a thief and a fence? A. No, sir, I am neither a thief nor a fence.

Q. You have seen him in evil places?

A. I decline to commit myself by answering the question.

Mr. Chipman was evidently an unwilling witness and was dismissed.

The Prosecution called Mr. Diemecke.

Q. Your name? A. Curt Diemecke.

Q. Residence? A. North side.

("Disreputable," observed the defense.)

Q. When did you meet the plaintiff?

A. Three years ago.

Q. Did you see the accident? A. Yes.

Q. When did it happen? A. Monday, 4:22 P. M.

Q. Did the plaintiff call your attention to the fact that his trousers were holy?

A. No.