the the ping find the veryed and formiting of landing the land of the pink his maintained and for his paint of the paint o

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,

COUNTY OF ROCKINGHAM, to-wit:

In the Circuit Court of said County:

The grand jurors in and for the body of said County of Rockingham, and now attending said Court at its October term, 1923, upon their oaths do present that Andrew J. Crawford within one year next prior to the finding of this indictment, in the said County of Rockingham, did unlawfully and feloniously manufacture, sell, offer, keep, store and expose for sale, give away, transport, dispense, solicit, advertise and receive orders for ardent spirits, and the and the said Error before committee the science of the said county of the said co

This indictment is found on the testimony of W. T. Rexrode, J. L. Dirting, and L. H. Bruce, witnesses sworn in Court and sent before the grand jury to give evidence.

against the peace and dignity of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

We the juny find the occurred and level for his puilty as charged in this indictment and few his principles and a fine of \$100.00 ments at four committee in juil and a fine of \$100.00 preman

COMMUNICATION VIRGINIA.

Viol. Pro.Act

: Jiw-of , MAHRHIADOH TO YTHUO

In the Clicuit Court of said County:

The grand Jurors in and for the body of said County,

A PRESENT OF THE COUNTY AT ITS COLORER term,

A PRESENT OF THE COUNTY AND THE COUNTY AN

cally printed contribution of the contribution

Personal Communication of the Communication of the

. shing tive passes and dignity of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

.T .W to gnomifest on the testimony of W. T.

oreste, J. L. Diritog, and L. W. Gruns, withdeaps twork in Court

. consider oving of the fresh our excled thes his

Commonwealth vs. Crawford Commonwealth vs. Carper.

MEMO. OF THE COURT.

These two cases heard on motion of defendant in each case to set aside the verdict of guilty and grant him a new trial, on the ground that the evidence on which he was convicted was inadmissible because obtained by an illegal search, made in each instance under an illegal search warrant.

In neither case was the affidavit upon which the search warrant issued produced in evidence. The warrant itself does not have to show the grounds of the complaint, or of affiant's belief, so I cannot say whether the warrants were founded on a sufficient affidavit or not, unless it can be said that the matter appearing on the face of the warrants shows affirmatively that they were issued without probable cause. I don't remember what the warrants show in this respect, and for present purposes it is unimportant, because the motion will be denied for other reasons.

In the Crawford case there is a reason for denying the motion for a new trial that does not exist in the Carper case. The evidence was that as the officers approached Crawford's house to execute the search warrant, and before the house was entered or the warrant was read, Crawford ran from the house carrying a guano sack which contained the cans or fruit jars of "moonshine" whiskey, and that he was about to throw them down, apparently to break them, when the officers, seeing his movements and distinguishing the imprint of the jars on the bag, seized him and took the bag away from him; and the jars which were in the bag, and the liquor contained in them, were the jars and liquor produced in court. Crawford was here violating the law in the presence of the officers, in the unlawful possession and transportation of ardent spirits, and the court is of opinion that the violation of

Commonwealth vs. Crawford Commonwealth vs. Carper.

THUOD RET TO . OHEM

considering the arrest of derives as not included to each to are the substant in each case to set uside the verdict of guilty and grant him a new trial, on the ground that the evidence on which he was convicted was inadminable because obtained by an illegal search, made in each instance under an illegal search, made in each instance under

In neither case was the affidavit upon which the search warrant induced produced in evidence. The warrant itself does not have to another the produced in evidence. The warrant is efficient, so I can about the grounds of the countries of the countries of a surficient affidavit.

The case warrants was about affidable the warrants about without our case of the warrants show in this productive cause. I don't remember what the warrants show in this respect, and for present purposes it is unimportant, because the motion will be denied for other respect.

In the Crawford case there is a reason for denying the motion for a new trial that does not exist in the Carper case. The cridence was that or the officers approached Crawford's house to encoute the case that or the officers the house was entered or the warrant was factor warrant, and before the house partysing of gashe each trian contains an affective and their house partysing of gashe that the trian contains of them when the contains of the trian about to throw them sown, superently to break them, when the officers, secting his movements and distinguishing the imprise of the jars on the last, said the movements and distinguishing the imprise of the jars which were in the bar; and the liquor contained in them, were the jars and year in the bar; and the liquor contained in them, were the jars and liquor produces in about. Oresford was here violating the law in the progress of the officers, in the unlawful possession and transportation of argent apprise of the origins, and the court is of opinion that the violation of

the law was sufficiently apparent to the officers to justify them in arresting without a warrant of any sort.

I am furthermore of opinion, as applicable to both cases

(considering the arrest of Crawford as not justifiable as for an

offense committed in the presence of the officers), that evidence

obtained in the execution of a defective or illegal search warrant or

without warrant is not inadmissible on the trial of the accused because

of such defect or illegality.

This view of strongly sustained by Professor Wigmore. III Wigmore on Evid. sec. 2183 and notes, page 2955 and seq. Same volume, sec. 2264 and notes, pages 3125 - 3127.

Mr. Wigmore attributes the decisions contrary to his view to an expression he says is an object dictum in Boyd v. U. S., 116 U. S. 616; (29 L. Ed. 746), which dictum he says is erroneous though the decision itself was right, since in that case the evidence which consisted of private papers of the defendant, in which the government had no interest and which were of value only as evidence, was produced from the possession of the accused atthe trial, by an order of the Court, so that the defendant was in truth required to give evidence against himself in violation of his privilege under the 5th amendment. See sec. 2264, and note 4 on pages 3125 and 3126.

In support of the proposition that evidence obtained on a search under a defective search warrant, or a search warrant issued without a sufficient affidavit, should be excluded on the trial of the accused, I have been referred to Weeks v. U. S., 58 L. ed. 652; Gouled v. U. S., 255 U. S. (65 L. ed. 647); Amos v. U. S. 25x MXXXX 255 U. S., (65 L. ed. 654).

These cases were grounded upon the dictum in Boyd v. U. S., supra, which is assailed by Mr. Wigmore in the sections and notes above referred to.

the law was sufficiently apparent to the officers to justify them in arresting without a warrant of any nort.

I am furthermore of opinion, as applicable to both cases

consisted in the presence of the officers), that evidence
obtained in the execution of a defective or illegal search warrant or
without warrant is not inadmissible on the trial of the accused because
of such defect or illegality.

This view of strongly sustained by Professor Wigmore. III Wigmore on Ewid. sec. 2183 and notes, page 2055 and seq. Same volume, sec. 2264 and notes, pages 3125 - 3127.

as expression to says is an phitor dictum in Boyd v. U. S., 116 U. S., old; (as if the first the first dictum in Boyd v. U. S., 116 U. S., old; (as if the first the forestant the first the first the secured and which were of value only as evidence, was produced from the possession of the secured at the trial, by an order of the fourt, so that the defendant was in truth required to give evidence against himself in violation of his privilege under the 5th amendment. See see, 2264, and note 4 on pages 3125 and 3126.

In support of the proposition that evidence obtained on a search under a defective search warrant, or a search warrant issued without a warrant at the title of the accessed, and the brist of the accessed, it have been referred to Weeks v. U. S., 58 L. ed. 652; Gouled v. U. S., 255 U. S., (65 L. ed. 647); Amos v. U. S. Marskysk 255 U. S., (65 L. ed. 654).

These cases were grounded upon the dictum in Bayd v. U. S., suprawhich is assailed by Nr. Wignore in the sections and notes above referIn the case of Gouled v. U. S., 65 L. ed. 647, the court on page 653, deals with the question of the application of the 5th amendment, in answer to "the fourth question." The fourth question as there set out reads as follows:

"If such papers, so taken, are admitted in

"evidence against the person from whose house or

"office they were taken, such person then being on trial

"for the crime for which he was accused in the affidavit

"for warrant, -- is such admission in evidence a violation

of the 5th amendment." -- (Italics or underscoring mine).

To this question the court answered as follows:

"The same papers being involved, the answer to this

"question must be in the affirmative; for, they having

"been seized in an unconstitutional search, to permit

"them to be used in evidence would be, in effect as

"ruled in the Boyd case, to compel the witness to become

"a witness against himself."

In the Gouled case, there was no search warrant at all, but
the papers were obtained by a federal officer without a search warrant.

If that officer was acting under an order of the court in which the
defendant was on trial at the time (and the question is predicated
upon the fact that the accused was then on trial), then the ruling
would fall within the principle stated by Mr. Wigmore, which as he
says justifies as right the decision in the Boyd case, though the
obiter dictum in that case was wrong. But if the court meant to
say in that case that it would be in contravention of the 5th
amendment to admit in evidence on a trial of the accused evidence which
was obtained by a search warrant which was unlawful because in violation
of the 4th amendment, concerning searches and seizures, then, with
all deference to that great court, I should have to reject the authority

Lo the case of Couled v. U. S., 65 L. ed. 647, the court on
page 655, deale with the question of the application of the Uth
Landward, is consistent with the perfected and page 6550.

ni bejdimbs ers , meint os tarens als sintited in

"office they were taken, and parson then being on trial
"office they were taken, and parson then being on trial
the orine for which he was accused in the affidavit

"for variant, -- is such admission in evidence a violation

"Tuled in the Boyd case, to compel the witness to become "Tuled in the Boyd case, to compel the witness to become "Tuled in the Boyd case, to compel the witness to become "Alesman bandage special ".

In the Course war obtained by a rederal officer without a search warrant. It that officer was noting under an order of the court in which the fer that officer was noting under an order of the court in which the fer that of the tree the question is predicated for the free that the feet that the accused wer then on trial), then the ruling feet the free that the accused wer then on trial), then the ruling feet the feet the decision in the Royd case, though the feet free distance as right the decision in the Royd case, though the case that case that it would be in contravention of the Sta court meant to remain to that case that it would be in contravention of the Sta court watch was an a trial of the accused evidence which was unlawful because in violation of the 4th accused in violation was unlawful because in violation of the 4th accused to the carriers which at the 4th accused to the court, I should have to reject the authority all descence to that great court, I should have to reject the authority

of that decision in a case where it was not of binding force. I should have to reject it because it is manifest that, so far as the 5th amendment is concerned, and the corresponding provision in our own Bill of Rights, by which the privilege of being exempt in any criminal proceeding from giving evidence against himself is guaranteed to the accused, it can make no sort of difference whether the evidence offered was obtained under a valid or an invalid search warrant. The question of whether one is being required to give evidence against himself can not depend on any such consideration as that, for in either case the evidence is obtained against his will, on a search made in invitum, and this is as true in case of a valid search warrant as it is in the case of an invalid search warrant, for he is as much compelled to give evidence against himself in the one case as in the other. There can be no valid process of any kind to compel a man to give evidence against himself.

The conclusion is necessary and irresistable that if the evidence found in the execution of a search warrant would be admissible if gotten under a valid search warrant, it cannot be rejected as in contravention of the 5th amendment when gotten in an illegal search; the evidence produced by a search under an illegal search warrant can no more be evidence given by the accused against himself than the same evidence would be if produced under a valid search warrant. If such evidence is excluded, it must be solely on the ground that evidence gotten under a search warrant issued in violation of the 4th amendment relative to searches and seizures is inadmissible.

As to the admissibility in evidence of evidence gotten under an illegal search warrant, or by an officer without any warrant, thirty-four states are tabulated in X Virginia Law Review, p. 153, which hold contrary to the Supreme Court of the United States in Amos Weeks cases, supra, with eleven states holding the same as the U.S.Supreme

there is reject to because it to pentites that, so the so the fell to be in reject to because it to pentites that, so the set to be fell to be referred as the set to the fell to the set t

The semiliation to negenerary and irreprinted that if the evidence

The processes of these previous areas as to estimate below before any or the process of the proc

As to the administrative in exthems of exthems gottin under in illigion descent users. In the season users to by an extiner vithout any versus, thirty-cour exacts are tabulated in X Virginia Law Herica, p. 155, which hald something in the Supreme Court of the United States in Ance To United States in the U.S. Supreme

Court. Among the thirty-four is Virginia, which in Lucchesi v. Commonwealth, 122 Va. 872, expressly rejected the authority of Weeks v. U. S., 58 Law ed. 652, which after the Boyd case is the foundation authority relied on in the Gouled and Amos cases.

The Lucchesi case is parallel in its facts to the Crawford case now under consideration.

See cases cited X Va. Law Review 154; also Williams v. State, 28 S. E. 624; 53 S. E. 814; 29 S. E. 527; 122 Va. 872; 3 Wig. Ev. secs. 2183, 2264; and same secs. in V Wigmore; and, also, CYC, 1211; 8R.C. 2.196.

In answer to "The 5th Question," on page 653, 65 L. ed., in the Gouled case, the court implies if it does not say that evidence obtained under an illegal search warrant can not only not be used against the defendant when brought to trial for the offense on suspicion of which the search was made, but that evidence so obtained could not be used against him when on trial for a different offense. says that evidence obtained under a valid search warrant could be used against the same party when on trial for a different offense, and implies strongly that it could not be so used if the search warrant was invalid. From the language of the court, and as a logical result of the decision in the Amos case, at least, it would appear that if an officer searched a house for stolen property or counterfeit money under an invalid search warrant (or without any warrant), and in the course of his search found the dead body of a murdered man, this discovery would not be admissible in evidence on the trial of the occupant of the home for murder, because it was obtained under an invalid search warrant under the 4th amendment, and was inadmissible also under the 5th amendment, as compelling the defendant to give evidence against himself. I cannot think it would be so held in Virginia or anywhere else.

The case of Zimmerman v. Bedford, 134 Va. 787, has been referred to by counsel for defendants as tending to support his position. I do

Court. Among the thirty-four is Virginia, which in Idochosi v. Commonwealth, 122 Ve. 872, expressly rejected the authority of Weeks v. U. S. 58 Law ed. 680, which after the Bird Shift Sh

The Lucchest case is parallel in its facts to the drawford case new under consideration.

See cases cited X Va. Law Seriew 154; also Williams V. State. 28 S. H. 624; 53 S. E. 614; 29 S. H. 527; 122 Va. 672; 3 Wig. Ev. secs. 2185, 8264; and case secs. in Y Wignore; and, also, CYC, /27/ 8/R. C. /2

In answer to The 5th Question," on page 653, 65 L. ed., in the Gouled case, the court implies if it does not say that syldence obtaintenters bean ed fon vino fon meo fuerraw Morses lenelli ne rebut be waste saidlies and seek there to mented the seek of suit select the first which the search was made, but that evidence so obtained could not be used stainet him when on trial for a different offense. The court best of bluce fratter dorses bilar a telet beniside conclive Jani ayee against the same party when on trial for a different offense, and . Sperrey flowers sift if beau os ad for blugs it toil vignories salignit was invalid. From the language of the court, and as a logical result or the decision in the Ames case, at least, it would appear that if an Tebus venom fishtefauco to viregorq nelodu tol esuod a hemotees teolilo on two little search warrant (or without any warrant), and in the course th found the dead body of a purchased, wan, thin, dispersion, suit to inaqueso ent to laint ent no soushive ni eldissimbs ed ton banus home for murder, because it was obtained under an invalid search warrant -buend fitt and rebow only single table that the fits amend-I . Remind tentage consists ovin of turbustab edt antileques as . Juan . onle erestype to chilgril al bled on se blucy it helds formed

The case of Simmerman v. Bedford, 154 Vs. 78V, has been referred to by scussel for defendants as tending to support his position. I do

not think it does. The court does point there to the fact that sec. 10 of our Constitution, relating to searches and seizures, is not identically the same as the 4th amendment, and while it says the act of 1920 relating to search warrants (Acts 1920 p. 516) puts into our statute law much of what is in the 4th amendment to the U. S. Constitution, but it does not follow that the court would give to a mere statute the construction that it would give to the same or a similar provision in the Constitution, or that, if it were to do so, it would adopt the construction given by the U. S. Supreme Court to the 4th amendment to the Federal Constitution, a construction which our Court and many others have disapproved and rejected.

Act of 1920, relating to search warrants, that evidence obtained under an illegal of defective search warrant should not be receivable at the trial, if that had been the intention. It did not so declare, but it did not neglect to provide a sanction for the law; it declares that the penalty or consequence shall be for violating it, providing heavy penalties for an officer who searches without a warrant, and for a justice of the peace who issues a search warrant without the required affidavit. Expressio union Exclusio allerius lal.

If the fruits of a search made under a defective warrant, or defective affidavit, are to be excluded from evidence, the effect will be far reaching; for such warrants, and the affidavits on which they are issued, are often prepared by unskilled persons, and their defects, as often as not, are due to ignorance or want of skill rather than to insufficient grounds in point of fact.

The motions to set aside the verdicts are denied.

(Copy)

(Signed). T. N. H.

not think it does. The court does point there to the fact that see . 10 of our Constitution, relating to searches and seizures, is not identified the ways as the test and seizures, is not of 1950 relating to search warrants (Acts 1950 p. 516) puts into our statute law much of what is in the Ath smendment to the U. S. Constitution, but it does not follow that the court would give to a mere statute the construction that it would give to the same or a similar provision in the Constitution, or that, if it were to do so, it would adopt the construction given by the U. S. Supreme Court to the 5th adopt the construction given by the U. S. Supreme Court to the 5th and many others have disapproved and rejected.

It would have been easy for the General Assembly to declare in the source of the testing of the colors of the second second of the source of the second of t

If the fruits of a search made under a defective varrent, or defective officers, one to be encluded from evidence, the effect will be far reaching; for such varrants, and the affidavits on which they are lesued, are often prepared by unskilled persons, and their defects, as often as not, are due to ignorance or want of skill rather than to insufficient grounds in point of fact.

The notions to set seids the verdicts are denied.
(Very)

Commonwealth of Virginia, Rockingham County, To-wit:

Br It Remembered that on the 2/ day of July 192 3
BE IT REMEMBERED that on the 2/ day of July 1923, L. F. Farr, andrew Crawford
came before me HWBertrain Bail Commain
of the said county of Rockingham, and severally and respectively acknowledged themselves to be in-
debted to the Commonwealth of Virginia, in manner and form following, that is to say: the said
J. f. Jan in the sum of
Oue Hours and Dollars
good and lawful money of the United States, and the said and the Caufurd coan
in the sum of _Oue HousandDollars of like good and lawful money, to be
respectively made and levied of their several goods and chattels, lands and tenements, and they
severally waived the benefit of their Homestead Exemption as to this obligation, and also waived any
claim or right to discharge any liability to the Commonwealth arising under this recognizance with
coupons detached from the bonds of this State, to the use of the Commonwealth of Virginia if the said Shall make default in the performance of the
conditions underwritten.
The condition of the above recognizance is such that if the above bound J. J. Fau-
do and shall personally appear before the Circuit
Court of Rockingham on theday of theTerm next
thereof, being the Lo day of August 1923, at the Court-house thereof,
and then and there answer the Commonwealth of Virginia concerning a certain Musclement where-
of the said_ Z. A. Fann stands charged, and shall not
depart thence without the leave of said Court, then the above recognizance shall be void and of no
effect, otherwise to remain in full force and virtue.
Taken and acknowledged before me, the day and year first above written.

Commonwealth of Virginia, To-wit:

From the state of
Be It Beausiesens that on the A
anno metoro mo At Il Acederar Mark Commercia
of the said county of Rockingham, and severally and respectively acknowledged themselves to be in-
debted to the Commonwealth of Virginia, in manner and form following, that is to say: the said
author
good and lawful money of the United States, and the said (Con Clear Claure
good and iswint money of the vinite course of the good and lawful money, to be
wall have atmosphered from the state of the
respectively unde and levied of their several goods and chattels, lands and tenements, and they
severally waived the benefit of their Homestead Exemption as to this obligation, and also waived any
claim or right to discharge any liability to the Commonwealth arising under this recognizance with
coupons detached from the bonds of this State, to the use of the Commonwealth of Virginia if the said
shall make default in the performance of the
conditions underwritten.
The condition of the above recognizance is such that if the above bound
The countries
Court of Reckingham on the Aday of the There will
thereof, being the 2 day of 200 care thereof,
and then and there answer the Commonwealth of Virginia concerning a certain for schools where-
or the saidstands of the said
depart themee without the leave of said Court, then the above recognizance shall be void and of no
effect, otherwise to remain in full force and virtue.
Taken and seknowledged before me, the day and year first above written.

Commonwealth of Virginia, To-wit:

Commonwealth of Virginia, To-wit:

He is the meaning that on the - 2 f - day of J 192 8.
andy levery of 1/2 & level
came inform me WH free -
Certific County of the County and of the County of the sound
amore that we will get I am
See and lawful money of the United States, and the said t L L
Si Zor sum of The Maria money, to be
red controls made and levied of their several goods and chartels, lands and tenements, and they
Justify waived the benefit of their Homestead Exemption as to this obligation, and also waived any
of the or right to discharge my fiability to the Commonwealth arising under this recognizance with
continue detached from the bonds of this States to the use of the Commonwealth of Virginia if (Ed said
The object of the participant of the shall make default in the partornames of the
Laditions andorwrition.
The condition of the above recognizance is such that if the above bound.
London the Circuit
ther union to the state of the
moreon heing the An Hay of Grey Court Line 3, at the Court-house thereof,
and then and there answer the Componwealth of Virginia concerning a certain Machene-
depart though without the leave of said Court, then the above recognizance shall be void and of no
Taken and astrowiedged before me, the day and you first above written

Commonwealth of Virginia—City, County of, Packing hanto-wit:

To the Prohibition Inspectors, Sheriffs, Sergeants, and all Police Officers and Constables of the State of

Virginia—Greeting:
WHEREAS IN, Brown, a state Inspectan of the said City County
has this day made complaint and information on oath before me, R. N. Bridges Title.
of the said City that he verily believes, that in the said City and State:
(a) That Ardent Spirits are being unlawfully manufactured, sold, kept, stored, possessed, held, used and
(a) That Ardent Spirits are being undurant.
concealed in a certain dwelling house Pout buildings (Here describe the place, house, room or boat, as the offe may be)
by one and Crawford, located new Et Rton, (Give name, if name unknown, say, "Whose name is to the informant unknown")
(b) A still, still cap, worm, tubs, fermenters and other appliances connected with such still and used, and
mash and other substances, capable of being used, in the manufacture of Ardent Spirits, are unlawfully
in the possession of, and unlawfully used by one (Give name; if name unknown, say, "Whose name is to the information unknown")
in a certain (Here describe place as in (a) above)
(c) Ardent Spirits are being unlawfully kept, held, stored, concealed, used, sold, and unlawfully trans-
ported in certain baggage or a certain vehicle, to-wit: a certain (Here describe vehicle, auto, wagon, carriage, buggy, boat, baggage or what not)
by one(Here give name, or describe as in (a) above)
And there being reasonable cause for such belief:
THESE ARE, THEREFORE, IN THE NAME OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA, to com-
mand you, with all necessary and proper speed and assistance, to search the house, place, baggage, boat or
vehicle herein designated, either in day or night, and seize such ardent spirits and their containers and
other things apparently possessed or used in violation of law, and bring the same and the person or per-
sons, in whose possession they are found, and also any person resisting, impeding, obstructing, or in any
manner hindering or delaying you in the execution of this warrant before me, or some other officer having
jurisdiction of the case, to be disposed of and dealt with according to law; and make return of this warrant
showing all acts and things done thereunder, with a particular statement and sufficient description of the
things seized and the name of the person in whose possession found, if any, and if not found in the possession
sion of any one, so state in your return, and post a true copy of this warrant and the return thereof, as re
quired by law.
Given under my hand and seal this 29th day of 1923 (SEAL)
(SEAL)

DIRECTIONS

- the Magistrate shall fix a time not less than ro nor more than 30 days from the date of return, for the hearing of said return. If no claimant appear, the Ardent Spirits and articles are to be forfeited to Commonwealth. Any person claiming any of same must file a written claim stating particularly the character and extent of his interest therein, whereupon the Magistrate shall certify the warrant, written claim and articles claimed, to the Circuit or Corporation Court, as the case may be, for determination, and declare the unclaimed articles forfeited.
- 2. If still, still cap. worm, tubs, heater, fermenters, or any appliance connected with a still and used, or mash or other substance capable of being used, in the manufacture of Ardent Spirits, be seized, the mash (after taking a sample) shall be destroyed, and the facts and articles seized reported to the Prohibition Commissioner and Commonwealth's Attorney. (A copy of this warrant and proper return will be a sufficient notice and report.) Ardent Spirits and containers disposed of as in No. 1 above.
- 3. If Ardent Spirits are being transported in an automobile, boat, wagon buggy, or other vehicle, the Ardent Spirits and containers shall be preserved and the vehicle shall be delivered to the Sergeant of the City, the facts reported to the Prohibition Commissioner and Commonwealth's Attorney and Ardent Spirits and containers disposed of as provided in No. 1 above. (A copy of this warrant and proper return will be a sufficent report.)
- 4. A copy of this warrant and the return thereon must be posted at the front door of the house, or on the door of the room, or on the premises at the place the Ardent Spirits may be found.

See Sections 21 1-2, 22, 23, 23 1-2, 57 and 57 1-2. Acts of Assembly, 1918, Page 578.

WARRANT TO SEARCH FOR ARDENT SPIRITS, ETC.

SPIRITS, ETC.
Commonwealth of Virginia
Ovs
() crawfoul
- Mary
Executed the within warrant thisday
2
of. 192, by searching the
within stated
(Here state house, room, place,
and by seizing the following described Ardent Spirits
and other things therein found (and arresting the
above named person found in possession thereof) and
by posting a true copy of this warrant and the return
hereon on the
(Here say place, house, room, boat,
auto or baggage, or as case may be)
A CL S (D M.E.)
as front door of house, door of room or premises)
Description of Ardent Spirits and other things
seized 1/2 gallow of lequal
Execute of this 28th day
1 0 1013
1 June 1923
A (/
2.90
A Given under my hand thisday of
JAME 103
The track of
A MARINA (M
marilemanted

The following named officers as	ad a survey wetter d
The following named officers as	
me in the execution of this warrar	it:
8 757 95	

	=

0.1	
Other than above stated the	following are wit-
nesses:	
THE PERMIT	- 0

And the same of th	
This matter set for hearing or	theday
of 192	
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	3 15
No claim of ownership or inter	rest in any of the
said things seized having been file	ed harris in
said things seized having been me	ed nerein in com-
pliance with the law the same	
pliance with the law, the same are	e hereby adjudged
pliance with the law, the same are and declared confiscated and forfe	e hereby adjudged
pliance with the law, the same are and declared confiscated and forfe monwealth.	e hereby adjudged eited to the Com-
pliance with the law, the same are and declared confiscated and forfe	e hereby adjudged eited to the Com-
pliance with the law, the same are and declared confiscated and forfomonwealth. Given under my hand this	e hereby adjudged eited to the Com-
pliance with the law, the same are and declared confiscated and forfe monwealth.	e hereby adjudged eited to the Com-
pliance with the law, the same are and declared confiscated and forfomonwealth. Given under my hand this	e hereby adjudged eited to the Com-
pliance with the law, the same are and declared confiscated and forfe monwealth. Given under my hand this of	e hereby adjudged eited to the Comday
pliance with the law, the same are and declared confiscated and forfe monwealth. Given under my hand this of	e hereby adjudged eited to the Com-
pliance with the law, the same are and declared confiscated and forfomonwealth. Given under my hand this of	e hereby adjudged eited to the Comday of Magistrate.
pliance with the law, the same are and declared confiscated and forfomonwealth. Given under my hand this of, 192 Title	e hereby adjudged eited to the Comday of Magistrate.
pliance with the law, the same are and declared confiscated and forformonwealth. Given under my hand this of	e hereby adjudged eited to the Comday of Magistrate. terest having been
pliance with the law, the same are and declared confiscated and forfomonwealth. Given under my hand this of	e hereby adjudged eited to the Comday of Magistrate. terest having been herein seized, this
pliance with the law, the same are and declared confiscated and forfomonwealth. Given under my hand this of	e hereby adjudged eited to the Comday of Magistrate. terest having been herein seized, this hings in the claim
pliance with the law, the same are and declared confiscated and forfomonwealth. Given under my hand this of	e hereby adjudged eited to the Comday of Magistrate. terest having been herein seized, this hings in the claim are certified to the
pliance with the law, the same are and declared confiscated and forfemonwealth. Given under my hand this of	of Magistrate. terest having been herein seized, this hings in the claim certified to the
warrant, the said claim and the tiparticularly described, are hereby Court of this Count of this Count of this	e hereby adjudged eited to the Com
pliance with the law, the same are and declared confiscated and forfomonwealth. Given under my hand this of	e hereby adjudged eited to the Com
warrant, the said claim and the tiparticularly described, are hereby Court of this Court of this Commonwealth. Commonwealth. Written claim of ownership or in illed to certain of the said things warrant, the said claim and the tiparticularly described, are hereby Court of this termination' and the said things unadjudged and declared confiscated the Commonwealth.	of Magistrate. terest having been herein seized, this hings in the claim certified to the claimed are hereby and forfeited to
warrant, the said claim and the tiparticularly described, are hereby Court of this Court of this Commonwealth. Commonwealth. Written claim of ownership or in illed to certain of the said things warrant, the said claim and the tiparticularly described, are hereby Court of this termination' and the said things unadjudged and declared confiscated the Commonwealth.	of Magistrate. terest having been herein seized, this hings in the claim certified to the claimed are hereby and forfeited to
Written claim of ownership or in iled to certain of the said things warrant, the said claim and the the particularly described, are hereby	of Magistrate. terest having been herein seized, this hings in the claim certified to the claimed are hereby and forfeited to
warrant, the said claim and the tiparticularly described, are hereby Court of this Termination' and the said things unadjudged and declared confiscated the Commonwealth.	of Magistrate. terest having been herein seized, this hings in the claim certified to the claimed are hereby and forfeited to

NOTE.—Unless warrant issued for Ardent Spirits being transported in vehicle, boat or baggage. it is to be returned to the jurisdiction from which issued. If issued for Ardent Spirits so transported, it can be executed in any part of the State, and returned to any justice in any county or city through which they were carried.

Title of Magistrate.

News-Record.	
Harrisonburg,	Va.

The rate of the Committee wealth of Allonia	oinia	of V	nonwealth	(the	of	Tame	the I	In
---	-------	------	-----------	---	-----	----	------	-------	----

То	the Sheriff of Rockingham County, Greeting:
You are hereby commanded to summon	
How are hereby commanded to summon It. T. Republe, J. L. H	intimat L. D. Bruce
to appear before the Judge of the Circuit Cour	rt of Rockingham County, at the Court
House, at 10 o'clock, a.m., on the 15th	day of Oct 1912.
to testify and the truth to say in behalf of th	
	1)
andrew O	rawford.
J. c	rawjora.
0	
And this they shall not omit und	er the penalty of £100. And have then
and there this Writ.	

witness, J. F. BLACKBURN, Clerk of our said Court, at the Court House, the gladay of Col-, 1913 and in the 148 year of the Commonwealth.

J. F. Black lucrus, Clerk.

Comr.
od.
andrew J. Crawford WZD. SHERIFF FRE 5 15.0

	the Commonwealth of Virginia: To the Sheriff of Rockingham County, Greeting:
You are hereby comm	randed to summon It. J. Regrade J. L. Desting hex, L. W. Bruce, & N. H. Woover,
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
to appear before the House thereof, at 10	Judge of the Circuit Court of Rockingham County, at the Court o'clock, a.m., on the 18th day of Lie 1925
to testify and the tri	ath to say in behalf of the Commonwealth against

who stands charged with and indicted for a felony misdemeanor.

And this they shall not omit under the penalty of £100. And have then and there this Writ.

Witness, J. F. BLACKBURN, Clerk of our said Court, at the Court House, the , 1923, and in the 148 th year of the Commonwealth.

7. G. Crawford

Lif fam a.g. eranefore Com, vs. Elsie Pence 12/19/23 ~ " C.E. Corper 12/20/23 " Brent Bournan 12/20/23 Continued " a. W. graves 12/20/23 ~ 1/2/24 Cuit & drook " milton lum 12/2//2 3- sum. 12/8/23. the his former repeted as to griph hart the

Dec 18 1923 We the jury in the oase of
all lampend fix his punishment
at four menths land shoot fine
SLE us Maremen



J. D. maury S. L. Hers December # 23 J. R. Swantz. 2.10.
Roy any 2.70
L. P. Souden . 3.50 ANDREW CRAWFORD Indictment for a Felony COMMONWEALTH 13.00 Sheriff Fu Inch womant 100 150 Brief Juny Frile Ceal 200 150 Sup Joney 18.00 Exet Xui 200

