

We the grand jury find the accused, Sheldon Lam, guilty as charged in the indictment and for his membership of this court and for his fine of \$20.00

W. E. Lucas

STATE 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 June term, 1921, upon their oaths, do present that Sheldon Lam within one year next prior to the finding of this indictment, in the said county of Rockingham, did unlawfully manufacture, sell, offer, keep, store and expose for sale, give away, transport, dispense, solicit, advertise and receive orders for ardent spirits, against the peace and dignity of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Commonwealth
v.
Indictment

This indictment is found on the testimony of

L. H. Bruce,

W. E. Lucas, a witness sworn in court and sent before the grand jury to give evidence.

Richard Bradley told Mr. W. E. Lucas that he had bought many quarts of liquor of Lam.

We the jury find the accused, Sheldon Lam,
guilty as charged in the indictment and
find his punishment at three months imprisonment
in jail and a fine of \$250.00.

J. B. Coffman
Foreman

COUNTY OF ROCKINGHAM, VA.

In the Circuit Court of said County:

The Grand Jurors in and for the body of said

D. W. Farman
Commonwealth's Attorney

Commonwealth
v.) Indictment

Sheldon Lam
Misdemeanor
Viol. Prohibition Act

June term, 1921

True Bill

G. R. Eastman
Foreman

We the jury find
the accused guilty
and give his punishment
3 months ~~\$250.00 fine~~

J. B. Coffman
Foreman

W. E. Lucas

Grand Jury to give evidence.

Sheldon Lam
Jury to give evidence.

State Normal School, Harrisonburg, Virginia

CHEMICAL LABORATORIES

REPORT OF ANALYSIS

Sample Beverage (obtained from Selden Lam)

Presented for Analysis by Sheriff W. L. Dillard

For Determination of Kind and Percentage of Alcohol Date June 21, 1921

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS

Sample "C"

Sample showed ethyl(grain) alcohol present to the extent of 56.54%

Discussion and Interpretation of Analysis:

In terms of "proof" the strength of the alcoholic sample presented would read 113.08 proof.

I hereby certify that the above is correct to the best of my knowledge.

Date June 26, 1921

James C. Johnston
ANALYST

State Normal School, Harrisonburg, Virginia

CHEMICAL LABORATORIES

REPORT OF ANALYSIS

Sample Beverage (obtained from Sealed Can)

Presented for Analysis by Sheriff W. E. Miller

For Determination of Kind and Percentage of Alcohol

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS

Sample C

Sample showed ethyl (grain) alcohol present to the extent of 35.5%

Detection and Interpretation of Analysis:

In terms of "proof" the strength of the alcoholic sample pre-

pared would read 71.0 proof.

I hereby certify that the above is correct to the best of my knowledge.

[Handwritten Signature]

Deanne M. 19 21

Arrest Warrant

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA, } TO WIT:
ROCKINGHAM COUNTY,

To W. J. DeLived Sheriff, a Constable of said County:

Whereas, W. B. Lucas of the said County, has this day made complaint and information on oath before me, W. H. Bruce, a Justice of the said County,

that Selden Lane

of the said County, on the 18 day of June 1921, in the said County, did unlawfully transport for sale and in possession and sent for to Law.

These are therefore, in the name of the Commonwealth of Virginia, to command you forthwith to apprehend and bring before me, or some other Justice of the said County, the body of the said

Selden Lane
to answer the said complaint and to be further dealt with according to law. And you are required to summon

to appear and give evidence in behalf of the Commonwealth, on the examination touching the said offence.

Given under my hand and seal this 18 day of June, in the year 1921.

W. H. Bruce J. P. (Seal)

June 1921

Commonwealth

vs.

Arrest Warrant

Executed the within warrant by arresting
and delivering the body of

Seldem Sam

before
a Justice of Rockingham County, and by sum-
moning the within named witnesses in person,

this 18 day of June 1921

Wesley S. S.

Constable of Rockingham County.

for W. S. S. S.
Sheriff Rockingham
County Va

See how Sam brought before me all the
other of the same of others found him guilty
and then his day last the defendant is want the
return of the body of Rockingham County
Samuel S. S. 18 May
June 1921 -
Cash 20.00
S. S. S. 1.50
S. S. S. 1.50
S. S. S. 4.50
S. S. S. 47.00
W. S. S. S. 10

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
COUNTY OF ROCKINGHAM, To-wit:

To the Sheriff of Rockingham County, Greeting.

Whereas W. E. Lucas appeared before me,

W. H. Payne, a Justice of the Peace in and for the said County,
and made complaint on oath that he has reason to believe that ardent spirits are being trans-
ported in a certain Ford Car Operated by Selden Lewis

These are therefore in the name of the Commonwealth to command you forthwith to search said

Ford Car
for ardent spirits and if such ardent spirits are found, to take them into your possession and also
to take said car into your possession and bring the said ardent spirits and the person or per-
sons in whose possession they are found before me, or some other Justice of said County, to
answer the said complaint and to be further dealt with according to law.

Given under my hand this 18 day of June, 1921.

W. H. Payne (SEAL)
J. P.

39 gto

Search Warrant for Cars

COMMONWEALTH

vs.

Selden Lam

Essex and

found a lot of

Armed spirits and

Armed soldiers

Lam before L.H. Burr

a justice

W. E. Lucas Depy

Shuff. for 2nd. Bell

Shuff. of Robinson Co.

June 18/97

INSTRUCTION NO. _____

The Court instructs the jury that in this case, as in all criminal cases, the prisoner's plea of not guilty raises a presumption of innocence in his favor and puts upon the Commonwealth the burden of proving his guilt beyond reasonable doubt. If therefore, upon a consideration of the whole case, the testimony of the witnesses and the circumstances proven in evidence, there exists in the minds of the jury a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the accused, they should find him not guilty.

The Court instructs the jury that in this case, as in all criminal cases, the prisoner's plea of not guilty raises a presumption of innocence in his favor and puts upon the Commonwealth the burden of proving his guilt beyond reasonable doubt. If therefore, upon a consideration of the whole case, the testimony of the witnesses and the circumstances proven in evidence, there exists in the minds of the jury a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the accused, they should find him not guilty.

June 23, 1921

To J. F. Blackburn, Clerk of the Court,
Rockingham County, Virginia:

Commonwealth vs. Selden Lam

To Analysis of Beverage.....\$3.50

James C. Johnston
Analyst

June 23, 1921

To J. F. Blackburn, Clerk of the Court,
Rockingham County, Virginia;

Commonwealth vs. Selben Lam

To Analysts of Beverages.....\$5.50

James C. Johnston
Analyst

Commonwealth

vs

Seldon Lane

L. J. Strickler ←

H. G. Huffman ←

Jas E. Liskey ←

" W. F. Spitzer ←

O. W. W. ~~W. W.~~ ←

J. B. Coffman ←

~~Thomas B. B. B.~~

~~W. W. W. W.~~

L. L. Huffman ←

Umschreiben

Schreiben

H. J. Schreiber

K. H. Hoffmann

Prof. Dr. Schreiber

H. J. Schreiber

Schreiber

H. J. Schreiber

~~Schreiber~~

~~Schreiber~~

H. J. Schreiber

1

INSTRUCTION NO. _____

The Court instructs the jury that they are the judges of the credibility of the witnesses, and that in determining the weight to be given to the testimony of the different witnesses they are authorized to consider their interest in the result of the case, if they have any; their relationship to the parties concerned; their temper, feeling, or bias, if any has been shown; their demeanor while testifying; their intelligence; their means of information; the reasonableness or unreasonableness of their statements; and all other circumstances appearing on the ~~trial~~^{trial}; and to give such credit to the testimony of the different witnesses as under all the circumstances the jurors think they are entitled to.

The Court instructs the jury that they are the judges of the credibility of the witnesses, and that in determining the weight to be given to the testimony of the different witnesses they are authorized to consider their interest in the result of the case, if they have any; their relationship to the parties concerned; their temper, feeling, or bias, if any has been shown; their demeanor while testifying; their intelligence; their means of information; the reasonableness or unreasonableness of their statements; and all other circumstances appearing on the ^{trial} record; and to give such credit to the testimony of the different witnesses as under all the circumstances the jurors think they are entitled to.

Revised

INSTRUCTION NO. _____.

Before the jury can convict the accused they must be satisfied from the evidence that he is guilty of the offence as charged in the indictment beyond all reasonable doubt. It is not sufficient that they should believe his guilt probable only, or more probable than his innocence. No degree of probability merely will authorize a conviction, but the evidence must be of such a character and tendency as to produce a moral certainty of the prisoner's guilt, to the exclusion of reasonable doubt.

Page 2

INSTRUCTION NO. _____

Before the jury can convict the accused they must be satisfied from the evidence that he is guilty of the offence as charged in the indictment beyond all reasonable doubt. It is not sufficient that they should believe his guilt probable or more probable than his innocence. No degree of probability merely will authorize a conviction, but the evidence must be of such a character and tendency as to produce a moral certainty of the prisoner's guilt, to the exclusion of reasonable doubt.

Revised

INSTRUCTION NO. _____.

The court instructs the jury that the law presumes every person charged with crime, to be innocent until his guilt is established by the Commonwealth beyond a reasonable doubt, and this presumption of innocence goes with the prisoner through the entire case and applies to every stage thereof;

Revised

INSTRUCTION NO. _____.

Every man in the eye of the law is innocent until he is proved guilty; and not only is the burden of proving the guilt of a person charged with crime, on the Commonwealth, but to warrant a conviction his guilt must be proved to the exclusion of every reasonable hypothesis consistent with his innocence. Circumstances of mere suspicion are not sufficient, in other words, the rule as often stated is, that before the jury can convict, they must be satisfied, not only that the circumstances are consistent with the prisoner having committed the crime charged, but they must also be satisfied that the facts are such as to be inconsistent with any other rational conclusion, than that he is guilty.

Revised

INSTRUCTION NO. _____.

Every man in the eye of the law is innocent until he is proved guilty; and not only is the burden of proving the guilt of a person charged with crime, on the Commonwealth, but to warrant a conviction his guilt must be proved to the exclusion of every reasonable hypothesis consistent with his innocence. Circumstances of mere suspicion are not sufficient, in other words, the rule as often stated is, that before the jury can convict, they must be satisfied, not only that the circumstances are consistent with the prisoner having committed the crime charged, but they must also be satisfied that the facts are such as to be inconsistent with any other rational conclusion, than that he is guilty.

Reference

INSTRUCTION NO. _____

Every man in the eye of the law is innocent until he is proved guilty; and not only is the burden of proving the guilt of a person charged with crime, on the Commonwealth, but to warrant a conviction his guilt must be proved to the exclusion of every reasonable hypothesis consistent with his innocence. Circumstances of rare magnitude are not sufficient in other words, the rule as often stated is, that before the jury can convict, they must be satisfied, not only that the circumstances are consistent with the prisoner having committed the crime charged, but they must also be satisfied that the facts are such as to be inconsistent with any other rational conclusion than that he is guilty.

Revised

INSTRUCTION NO. _____.

The court instructs the jury, that the burden is upon the Commonwealth to prove every fact or circumstance necessary to convict the accused of every offence whatever, and if they have any reasonable doubt as to any fact or circumstance necessary to convict the accused as aforesaid, they are bound to give him the benefit of such doubt and find him not guilty and the court tells the jury that a reasonable doubt is, "that state of the case, which after the entire comparison and consideration of all of the evidence, leaves the minds of the jurors in that condition that they cannot say that they feel an abiding conviction to a moral certainty of the truth of the charge."

Page 2

INSTRUCTION NO. _____

The court instructs the jury, that the burden is upon the Commonwealth to prove every fact or circumstance necessary to convict the accused of every offense whatever, and if they have any reasonable doubt as to any fact or circumstance necessary to convict the accused as aforesaid, they are bound to give him the benefit of such doubt and find him not guilty and the court tells the jury that a reasonable doubt is "that state of the case, which after the entire comparison and consideration of all of the evidence, leaves the minds of the jurors in that condition that they cannot say that they feel an abiding conviction to a moral certainty of the truth of the charge."

7

Revised

INSTRUCTION NO. _____.

The court instructs the jury, that to warrant the conviction of the person accused of crime every fact necessary to establish his guilt must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt, and especially is this so, when as here, a conviction is sought upon circumstantial evidence alone, which is always to be acted upon with the utmost caution. It is not sufficient therefore that the evidence creates a suspicion of guilt. The accused is entitled to an acquittal unless the fact of guilt is proved to the actual exclusion of every reasonable hypothesis of his innocence.

Handwritten signature

INVESTIGATION NO. _____

The court instructs the jury that to warrant the conviction of the defendant accused of crime every fact necessary to establish his guilt must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt, and especially is this so when as here, a conviction is sought upon circumstantial evidence alone, which is always to be acted upon with the utmost caution. It is not sufficient therefore that the evidence creates a suspicion of guilt. The accused is entitled to an acquittal unless the fact of guilt is proved to the actual exclusion of every reasonable hypothesis of his innocence.

Revised

INSTRUCTION NO. _____.

The law presumes the prisoner to be always innocent of the charge alleged against him till he is proved to be guilty, and the burden rests upon the Commonwealth to prove the guilt of the accused beyond all reasonable doubt. Nothing is to be presumed or taken by implication against him. No mere preponderance of evidence will suffice, as in the trial of a civil case, nor is it enough that by conjecture or speculation he may be supposed to be guilty, but the jury must be satisfied by the evidence that he is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Revised

INSTRUCTION NO. _____

The law presumes the prisoner to be always innocent of the charge alleged against him till he is proved to be guilty, and the burden rests upon the Commonwealth to prove the guilt of the accused beyond all reasonable doubt. Nothing is to be presumed or taken by implication against him. No mere preponderance of evidence will suffice, as in the trial of a civil case, nor is it enough that by conjecture or speculation he may be proved to be guilty, but the jury must be satisfied by the evidence that he is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

Revised

INSTRUCTION NO. _____.

The jury are instructed that where the prosecution relies upon circumstantial evidence alone for a conviction, the jury must be satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the crime has been committed by someone, in manner and form as charged in the indictment; and then they must not only be satisfied that all the circumstances proved are consistent with the defendant's having committed the act, but they must also be satisfied that the facts are such as to be inconsistent with any other rational conclusion than that the defendant is the guilty person. If there is any one single fact proved to the satisfaction of the jury by a preponderance of evidence which is inconsistent with the defendant's guilt, this is sufficient to raise a reasonable doubt, and the jury should acquit the defendant. In order to justify the inference of legal guilt from circumstantial evidence, the existence of inculpatory facts must be absolutely incompatible with the innocence of the accused upon any rational theory, and incapable of explanation upon any other reasonable hypothesis than that of his guilt.

Reference

INSTRUCTION NO. _____

The jury is instructed that where the prosecution
relies upon circumstantial evidence alone for a conviction,
the jury must be satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the
crime has been committed by someone, in manner and form as charged
in the indictment; and then they must not only be satisfied that
all the circumstances proved are consistent with the defendant's
having committed the act, but they must also be satisfied that
the facts are such as to be inconsistent with any other rational
conclusion than that the defendant is the guilty person. If
there is any one single fact proved to the satisfaction of the
jury which is inconsistent
with the defendant's guilt, this is sufficient to raise a
reasonable doubt, and the jury should acquit the defendant. In
order to justify the inference of legal guilt from circumstantial
evidence, the existence of inculpatory facts must be absolutely
incompatible with the innocence of the accused upon any rational
theory, and incapable of explanation upon any other reasonable
hypothesis than that of his guilt.

Revised

INSTRUCTION NO. _____.

The court instructs the jury that the Commonwealth must prove everything essential to the establishment of the charge in the indictment to the exclusion of a reasonable doubt; and if it fails so to do, then they must find for the defendant.

Revised

INSTRUCTION NO. _____

The court instructs the jury that the Commonwealth
must prove everything essential to the establishment of the
charge in the indictment to the exclusion of a reasonable doubt;
and if it fails to do so, then they must find for the defendant.

Carroll
v
Alfred Lane

L.J. Shuteles 2.60
 R.H. Huffman 1.50
 J.E. Fisher 1.50
 C.H. Spitzer 2.60
 C.W. Wine 1.50
 J.B. Coppenan 2.00
 D.L. Huffman 1.50

13.20
 26.40

June Term 1921

SELDON LAM

Upon an Indictment
for a Misdemeanor

ADS

COMMONWEALTH

June 28 1921
 3 months on foot
 \$250 fine

10.
 15.20
 16.02
 26.40
 42.90
 3.50
 4.00
 4.00
 \$122.02
 \$250.00

Fine

