(1)

Hurst's Standard Forms, Annotated. } No. 35a.

Indictment for Retailing Liquor.

[Acts 1897-98, p. 71; Code, §537.]

} Hurst & Company, Pulaski City, Va.

Commonwealth of Virginia,

COUNTY OF Rockingham, *TO-WIT:*

IN THE COUNTY COURT OF SAID COUNTY:

The jurors of the Commonwealth of Virginia, in and for the body of the County of Rockingham, *and now attending the said Court at its* January *term, in the year* 1902, *upon their oaths present that*

Waller Cape Lark

between the 1st day of February, *in the year* 1900, the 1st day of February 1901 and *in the said County, did unlawfully sell, by retail, at* his then place of business on the South side of East Market Street in the town of Harrisonburg, in what is known as the Nicholas Building, *in said county, wine, ardent spirits, malt liquors, and mixtures thereof, not to be drunk where sold, he the said* Waller Cape Lark *not then and there having a license from the state of Virginia so to do, against the peace and dignity of the Commonwealth of Virginia.*

Upon the evidence of Jim Snyder, + Pil Philips, Sam Davis *witness sworn in open Court and sent to the Grand Jury to give evidence.*

, *Clerk.*

[By a recent act (Acts 1897-98, p. 71), the distinction between a retail liquor dealer's license and a bar-room license is abolished; and but for the fact that a license for a malt liquor saloon limits the sales to be drunk where sold, the phrase "not to be drunk where sold" might be omitted—it might be, anyway, but is added in eminent precaution. If the sale is, to be drunk where sold, erase "not" in the phrase "not to be drunk where sold." Under the general revenue law, it is not necessary to name the person to whom the liquor was sold—2 Va. Cas. 26; 5 Leigh, 724; 1 Grat. 553-4. The above form may be used for sales under the local option law (Code, §537); but the phrase "not to be drunk where sold," may be entirely omitted, and the naming of the person to whom sold or the place where sold will be a sufficient description. But where the entire county has not "voted dry," allege the district in which the sale was made.]

Vernon (1)

No. 35a.

Commonwealth

vs.

INDICTMENT

FOR RETAILING LIQUOR.

Walter Capehart

A TRUE BILL.

C L Hedrick

Foreman.

We the jury find the Defendant guilty, as charged in the Indictment, and impose a fine of $65.00.

L. D. Loakley - Foreman.

We the jury find the defendant Walter Capehart guilty in manner and form as charged in the Indictment and assess his fine at sixty five dollars.

L. D. Loakley Foreman.

Commonwealth of Virginia,

County of Rockingham, to wit:

In the County Court of said County:

The jurors of the Commonwealth of Virginia, in and for the body of the County of Rockingham, and now attending the said Court at its January term, in the year 1902, upon their oaths present that Walter Capehart between the 2nd day of February, in the year 1901 and the 23d day of January 1902, other than on the 25th day of December 1901 and other than on the 15th day of December 1901 and other than the 5th day of November 1901, in the said County, did unlawfully sell, by retail, at his present place of business in what is known as the Greiner Building on the South side of East Market Street in the town of Harrisonburg, in said county, wine, ardent spirits, malt liquors, and mixtures thereof, not to be drunk where sold, he the said Walter Capehart not then and there having a license from the State of Virginia so to do, against the peace and dignity of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Upon the evidence of Jno Carter - bot liquor Jan 11 1902
Ed Holler, Jacob Bitenman, F. B. Wilcher
Sam Davis - Pil Philips

_____

witness__ sworn in open Court and sent to the Grand Jury to give evidence.

_____, Clerk.

(2)

Commonwealth

vs

Indictment for
Retailing Liquor

Walter Caper Lant -

A true bill

A L Hedrick
Foreman

Demurrer

Commonwealth of Virginia,

COUNTY OF Rockingham, *TO-WIT:*

IN THE COUNTY COURT OF SAID COUNTY:

The jurors of the Commonwealth of Virginia, in and for the body of the County of Rockingham, *and now attending the said Court at its* January *term, in the year* 1902, *upon their oaths present that* Waller Cape Earl

on the 5th *day of* November, *in the year* 1901, *in the said County, did unlawfully sell, by retail, at* his present place of business, in what is known as the Grimm Building on the South side of East Market Street, ~~in~~ in the town of Harrisonburg, *in said county, wine, ardent spirits, malt liquors, and mixtures thereof, not to be drunk where sold, he the said* Waller Cape Earl *not then and there having a license from the state of Virginia so to do, against the peace and dignity of the Commonwealth of Virginia.*

Upon the evidence of .....

..... *witness* ... *sworn in open Court and sent to the Grand Jury to give evidence.*

....., *Clerk.*

[By a recent act (Acts 1897–98, p. 71), the distinction between a retail liquor dealer's license and a bar-room license is abolished; and but for the fact that a license for a malt liquor saloon limits the sales to be drunk where sold, the phrase "not to be drunk where sold" might be omitted—it might be, anyway, but is added in eminent precaution. If the sale is, to be drunk where sold, erase "not" in the phrase "not to be drunk where sold." Under the general revenue law, it is not necessary to name the person to whom the liquor was sold—2 Va. Cas. 26; 5 Leigh, 724; 1 Grat. 553–4. The above form may be used for sales under the local option law (Code, §537); but the phrase "not to be drunk where sold," may be entirely omitted, and the naming of the person to whom sold or the place where sold will be a sufficient description. But where the entire county has not "voted dry," allege the district in which the sale was made.]

No. 35a. (3)

Commonwealth

vs. { INDICTMENT FOR RETAILING LIQUOR.

Walter Capshaw

A TRUE BILL.

C L Hedrick

Foreman.

3/

Hurst's Standard Forms, Annotated. } No. 35a.

Indictment for Retailing Liquor.

[Acts 1897–98, p. 71; Code, §537.]

Hurst & Company, Pulaski City, Va.

Commonwealth of Virginia,

COUNTY OF Rockingham, *TO-WIT:*

IN THE COUNTY COURT OF SAID COUNTY:

The jurors of the Commonwealth of Virginia, in and for the body of the County of Rockingham, *and now attending the said Court at its* January *term, in the year* 1902, *upon their oaths present that* Walter Capehart

on the 5th *day of* November, *in the year* 1901, *in the said County, did unlawfully* ~~*sell, by retail, at*~~ between sunset of the day preceding and sunrise of the day succeeding that day, an election being then held in said County, sell wine ardent spirits and malt liquors, *in said county,* ~~*wine, ardent spirits, malt liquors, and mixtures thereof, not to be drunk where sold, he the said*~~

~~*not then and there having a license from the state of Virginia so to do,*~~

against the peace and dignity of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Upon the evidence of

witness sworn in open Court and sent to the Grand Jury to give evidence.

, *Clerk.*

(4) No. 35a. 4

Commonwealth

vs.

INDICTMENT

FOR ~~RETAILING~~ Selling LIQUOR. on election day

Walter Capehart

A TRUE BILL.

G L Hedrick

Foreman.

Certify to Justice

2/

B. G. Miller
S. A. Davis
Horace Buck
Henry Pettigrew
Isaac Lewis

Hurst's Standard Forms, Annotated. No. 35a.

Indictment for Retailing Liquor.

[Acts 1897–98, p. 71; Code, §537.]

Hurst & Company, Pulaski City, Va.

Commonwealth of Virginia,

COUNTY OF Rockingham, *TO-WIT:*

IN THE COUNTY COURT OF SAID COUNTY:

The jurors of the Commonwealth of Virginia, in and for the body of the County of Rockingham, *and now attending the said Court at its* January *term, in the year* 1902, *upon their oaths present that*

Waller Cafe Lart

on the 25th *day of* December, *in the year* 1901, *in the said County, did unlawfully sell, by retail,* ~~at~~ what is known as the "Greiner Building", on the South side of East Market Street in the town of Harrisonburg, *in said county, wine, ardent spirits, malt liquors, and mixtures thereof, not to be drunk where sold, he the said* Waller Cafe Lart *not then and there having a license from the state of Virginia so to do, against the peace and dignity of the Commonwealth of Virginia.*

Upon the evidence of .....

..... *witness* ... *sworn in open Court and sent to the Grand Jury to give evidence.*

....., *Clerk.*

No. 35a.

Commonwealth

vs. { INDICTMENT FOR RETAILING LIQUOR.

Waller Capel Lark

A TRUE BILL.

G L Hedrick

Foreman.

Commonwealth of Virginia,

COUNTY OF Rockingham, *TO-WIT:*

IN THE COUNTY COURT OF SAID COUNTY:

The jurors of the Commonwealth of Virginia, in and for the body of the County of Rockingham, *and now attending the said Court at its* January *term, in the year* 1902, *upon their oaths present that*

Waller Cape Lail

on the 15th ~~15th~~ *day of* December, *in the year* 1901, *in the said County, did unlawfully sell, by retail, at* the store ~~house~~ now occupied by him and J. P. Lawman which store house is sometimes called the "Brunner Building" on the South side of East Market Street in the town of Harrisonburg, *in said county, wine, ardent spirits, malt liquors, and mixtures thereof, not to be drunk where sold, he the said* Waller Cape Lail *not then and there having a license from the state of Virginia so to do, against the peace and dignity of the Commonwealth of Virginia.*

Upon the evidence of .....

.....

..... *witness sworn in open Court and sent to the Grand Jury to give evidence.*

....., *Clerk.*

No. 35a.

Commonwealth

vs. { INDICTMENT FOR RETAILING LIQUOR.

Walter Cape Lal

A TRUE BILL.

C. L. Hedrick

Foreman.

Hurst's Standard Forms, Annotated. } No. 35a.

Indictment for Retailing Liquor.

[Acts 1897–98, p. 71; Code, §537.]

} Hurst & Company, Pulaski City, Va.

Commonwealth of Virginia,

COUNTY OF Rockingham, *TO-WIT:*

IN THE COUNTY COURT OF SAID COUNTY:

The jurors of the Commonwealth of Virginia, in and for the body of the County of Rockingham, *and now attending the said Court at its* January *term, in the year* 1902, *upon their oaths present that*

Walter Capehart

on the 15th ~~14th~~ *day of* December, *in the year* 1901, *in the said County,* Between 12 o'clock of the Saturday night preceding and sun rise of the ~~did unlawfully sell by retail, at~~ Monday morning succeeding that day, did unlawfully sell to one Philip Phillips a certain intoxicating liquor ~~in said county, wine, ardent spirits, malt liquors and~~ at the Storehouse on the South side of East Market ~~Street~~ in the town of Harrisonburg, known as the Greiner Building *+ mixtures thereof,* ~~not to be drunk where sold, to the said not then and there having a license from the state of Virginia so to do.~~

against the peace and dignity of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Upon the evidence of

witness sworn in open Court and sent to the Grand Jury to give evidence.

, Clerk.

[By a recent act (Acts 1897–98, p. 71), the distinction between a retail liquor dealer's license and a bar-room license is abolished; and but for the fact that a license for a malt liquor saloon limits the sales to be drunk where sold, the phrase "not to be drunk where sold" might be omitted—it might be, anyway, but is added in eminent precaution. If the sale is, to be drunk where sold, erase "not" in the phrase "not to be drunk where sold." Under the general revenue law, it is not necessary to name the person to whom the liquor was sold—2 Va. Cas. 26; 5 Leigh, 724; 1 Grat. 553–4. The above form may be used for sales under the local option law (Code, §537); but the phrase "not to be drunk where sold," may be entirely omitted, and the naming of the person to whom sold or the place where sold will be a sufficient description. But where the entire county has not "voted dry," allege the district in which the sale was made.]

Same as #

No. 35a.

Commonwealth

vs.

INDICTMENT

FOR ~~RETAILING~~ selling LIQUOR, on Sunday

Walter Capehart

A TRUE BILL.

G. L. Hedrick

Foreman.

Commonwealth

vs

Walter Leafchart

No 7.

1902
January 6th To Fdg Indictment .15. Docktg .10. Entg Atty 10. Summons & Copy 30. 3 Spas. 30. Certifying 3 witnesses 90. Judgt 36. Taxg Costs 20. Fdg Papers 20. Certifying fine 1ca 3.61

Sheriff	1.10
Atty.	5.00
Witnesses.	3.00
	$12.71

No 7

Commonwealth.

Walter Seafehart } No. 6.

1902.

Jany 1st. To Filg Indictment 15. Docktg 10. Entg attag 10 Summons & Copy 30. Certifying 3. witnesses 90. Judgt 36. taxg Costs 20. filg papers 20. Certifying fees 1.00 $3.61

Sheriff	1 10
Atty	10 00
witnesses	3 00
	$17.71

No. 6.

Commonwealth.

1902. Walter Lafehart. No. 5.

Jany 1st To Filg Indictment .15 Docketg 10. Entg Atty 10. Summons & Copy 30. Certifying 3 witnesses 90. Judgt 36. Taxg Costs 20. Filg papers. 20. Certifying fine 1.00 361

Sheriff	110
Attorney	1 00 00
Witnesses	308
	$17.79

No 5.

Commonwealth

vs

Walter Capehart

No. 3.

1902.

Jany 1st

To filg Indictment 15. Docktg 10. Entg atty 10. Summons & Copy 30. Certifying 3. witnesses 90. Judgt 36. taxg Costs 20. filg papers 20. Certifying Fine 1 00 $3.61

Sheriff 1 00

Atty. 10 00

Witnesses 3 00

$17.71

No 3

Commonwealth.

vs. } Upon an Indictment No 2.

Walter Capehart.

1902.

Jany 1st. Filg Indictment 15. Docktg 10. Entg atty 10. Summons & Copy 30. 3 Subs 30. Certifying 3 witnesses 90. Judgt 36. taxg Costs 20. Filg papers 20. Certifying fine 1st $3.61

Sheriff	1 10
Attorney	10 00
Witnesses	3.00
	$17.71

No 2.

Commonwealth.

vs. } Upon an Indictment. No 1.

Walter Lapehart.

1902.
Jany Ct. 3 Spas. & 25. Copies. before the Grand Jury. $3.10 Certifying 16 witnesses before the Grand Jury. $4.80. Filg Indictment 15. Docktg 10. entg atty 10. Summons & Copy 30. 1 Spa & 3 Copies 50. Certifying 3 witnesses. 90¢. Jury &c. 75. Judgt 36. taxg Costs 20. filg papers 20 Certifying fine $1.00

Clerk.	$12.46
Sheriff	7.10
Attorney.	10.00
Jury.	18.20
Witnesses	12.58
	$60.34

No 1.