(p. 9) Monday, June 7th, 1847
Present: Amos Clark, Judge of the said court; Thos. W. Shedd, District Attorney; Samuel B. Pryor, District Clerk; John Hewitt, Sheriff of said county.
Jurors to serve for June term of this court:
Thomas Mounts, Ellis C. Thomas, Jacob Helms, Morris Ferris, George L. Leonard, Powell M. Narboe, J. C. Harris, Jesse N. Everett, John Cook, Josiah S. Philps, A. W. Perry, J. Langley, William B. Elam, James Cole, Daniel Harris, Jesse Cox, Jones Greene, Abraham Hart, Richard Bruton, William Morris, Isaac B. Webb, M. M. Miller, Thomas Cheshire, M. Perry, William Cox, Harrison C. Marsh, Alexander Thomas, Andrew J. Mannin, J. Leake, Hiram Vail, Albert B. Danks, Robert McCullough. Making in all thirty?two. Of the original venire, Thomas King, Peter Narboe, R. Applegate and John Clark not found in the county and the following failed to answer the summons: Jones Greene, M. M. Miller, James Cole, Harrison C. Marsh and John Leak. The following fifteen chosen to serve: William Cox, William Morris, Jacob Helms, William B. Elam, Abram Hart, Alexander W. Perry, Albert B. Danks, George L. Leonard, Thomas Cheshire, Isaac B. Webb, Ellis C. Thomas, Josiah G. Phelps, Jesse N. Everet, Daniel Harris, John Langley.

(p. 10)
George L. Leonard, foreman. Madison Bennett, bailiff.

Joseph Mather vs Jefferson Tilley. In Assumpsit.
Now at this time the death of the plaintiff being suggested and appearance of Ulysses Matthiessen and Henry D. Wordsworth executors of the last will and testament of the plaintiff was entered by G. A. Everts, Atty for plaintiff. [Note: Page torn and part of Everts name missing.]

Elizabeth Varner vs Robert Sloan. In Debt.
Now at this time came the plaintiff aforesaid by her attorney and on his motion the sheriff had leave to amend his return herein.

William M. Simpson vs Ellis C. Thomas. Trespass to Try Title.
Leave given sheriff to amend his return.

William M. Simpson vs Alexander Thomas. Trespass to Try Title.
Leave given sheriff to amend his return.

(p. 11) Monday June 7, 1847
William M. Simpson vs William Cox. Trespass to Try Title.
Plaintiff by his attorney; leave granted sheriff to amend return.

Sarah Pendleton vs Robert Pendleton. Petition for Divorce.
Plaintiff by her attorney; and motion granted to sheriff to amend his return.
Bush & Gouger vs Huitt & Tilley. In Debt.
Plaintiffs represented by their attorney and on his motion the Coroner had leave to amend his return herein.

Thomas Shirley as principal and John N. Bryan, James B. Bryan, Charles H. Durgin and William Myers, securities came into court. Acknowledged themselves indebted unto J. Pinckney Henderson, Governor of the State of Texas and his successors, in the sum of $500.
Smith Elkins, Esq., filed petition to be admitted to practice as attorney in the District and all inferior courts in the State of Texas and produced testimonials of good moral character and a license signed by two circuit judges of Indiana. He was admitted and took oath.

(p. 12) Tuesday, June 8th, 1847
Joseph Mather vs Jefferson Tilley. In Assumpsit. Two parties represented by their attorneys. Defendant by his attorney
files a Demurrer. The jury made up of the following: Stephen McCommas, William Traughber, John C. McCommas, John B. Hibbert, William James, Robert McCullough, Morris Ferris, Middleton Perry, Andrew J. Mannon, John Cook, J. C. Harris and Richard Bruton. A new suit was to be filed and the plaintiff to pay all costs.

(p. 13)
Elizabeth Varner vs Robert Sloan. In Debt. Plaintiff by her attorney, the defendant failing to appear. On motion of
said plaintiff's attorney, a nisi is granted against the defendant to show cause why the final judgement should not be granted.

Sarah Pendleton vs Robert Pendleton. Divorce.
Plaintiff, by her attorney, appeared and by the sheriff's return the process in this suit had been duly served by publication for eight successive weeks in The Bonham Sentinel, a newspaper published in Fannin County, the same being the nearest one published to the county of Dallas, there being no newspaper published in Dallas County. Robert Pendleton was three times called, comes not. The plaintiff, Sarah Pendleton, is entitled to a decree, but final judgement to be stayed until next term of this court.

Hillery Bush and Henry Gouger In Debt.
vs John Hewitt & Jefferson Tilley.
The defendants failing to appear, a nisi was granted to show cause why judgement should not be granted against them at the next calling of this cause.
(p. 14)
Mary Ann Carver vs Solomon Carver. Divorce. Plaintiff, by her attorney; the defendant's attorney did not appear.
Plaintiff entitled to a divorce and the final judgement stayed until the next calling.

(p. 15) Wednesday June 9th, 1847
State of Texas vs James B. Shannon. Indict for Murder. Jurors called: Andrew J. Huitt, Western Perry, William Payne, Daniel
Murry, James Armstrong, Preston Witt, Gabriel B. Knight, Harrison Hustead, William Mooneyham, James Mooneyham, Henderson Couch, Charles G. Newton, Sanders Elliott, Robert McCullough, William Bemis (or Burris??), Hiram Wilburn, J. W. Gorbit, John C. Cook,

Charles Troop, John A. Leonard, Morris Ferris, George W. Glover, Adam Haught, William P. Carder, Stephen B. McCommas, John C. McCommas, James Shelley, Archibald Greathouse, William James, Robert Sloan, Amariah Hanna, James B. Parker, William J. Walker, William Leonard, Edward Cook, A. G. Collins. Two were excused for not being a citizen of Texas for twelve months.

State of Texas vs James B. Shannon. Indictment for Murder. Defendant pleaded not guilty to the charges. Jury selected: William
Payne, Daniel Murry, James Armstrong, Preston Witt, J. Wesley Gorbit, John A. Leonard, Adam Haught, Stephen B. McCommas, John C. McCommas, William James, Robert Sloan, Amariah Hanna. After hearing evidence, retired to consult their verdict; failing to agree were permitted to disperse and return tomorrow at 8 ½ o'clock.

(p. 16)
State of Texas vs William A. Pruitt. Indictment for Gaming. Plaintiff pleads guilty. Jurors called: John Skurlock, Jefferson Tilley,
William P. Carder, William Traughber, John B. Hibbert, Robert McCullough, Morris Ferris, Middleton Perry, Andrew J. Mannon, John Cook, John Harris, Richard Bruton. Defendant found guilty and fined $50; and imprisonment for one day and to stand the court costs.

State of Texas vs George W. Glover. Gaming. Defendant withdrew his pleas and permitted to plead again.

(p. 17) Thursday June 10th, 1847
State of Texas vs Samuel Webb. Indictment for Gaming. Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is
therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.
State of Texas vs John Skurlock. Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs David Bradshaw. Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Thomas Langley Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs James Cole Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Morris Ferris Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

(p. 18)
State of Texas vs Edward Young Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Nathaniel Ward Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Elijah Carder Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs William Masters Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.
State of Texas vs Andy J. Manning Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Archibald Greathouse Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs William Baker Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

(p. 19)
State of Texas vs Jefferson Tilley Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Jackson Hewitt Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Charles Troupe Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs John Newton Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs William Hickling Indictment for Gaming.

Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs James J. Beeman Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.
State of Texas vs Joseph Jackson Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

(p. 20)
State of Texas vs William West Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Samuel Tucker Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Henderson Couch Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Samuel G. Newton Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Hiram Wilbourn Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs John Howe Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs William Shelton Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

(p. 21)
State of Texas vs Samuel Cornet Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is
therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Cornelius Vernoy Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the

court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Peter Haught Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs William W. Conover Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Charles Durgin Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs John C. McCoy Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

(p. 22)
State of Texas vs John N. Bryan Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs James Bryan Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Henry C. Long Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Calvin G. Cole Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs King Custer Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs John McGarrah Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

(p. 23)
State of Texas vs James Miller Indictment for Gaming.

Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Crawford Brown Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Alfred G. Walker Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs William James Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs William Carder Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Thomas Manning Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.
(p. 24)
State of Texas vs Joseph Sikes Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs James F. Reddin Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Thomas McConnel Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Blackgrove H. Baily Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs Thomas Vernoy Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

State of Texas vs James M. Patterson Indictment for Gaming.
Attorney on behalf of State will no longer prosecute herein, it is therefore considered by the court that the defendant go hence without delay.

(p. 25)
Mary Ann Carver vs Solomon Carver. Divorce.
Jury called: Stephen B. McCommas, William Traughber, John C. McCommas, John B. Hibbert, William James, Robert McCullough, Morris Ferris, Middleton Perry, Andrew J. Manning, John Cook, J. C. Harris, Richard Bruton. Jurors found the allegations to be true. Complete divorce was granted. Solomon Carver to pay costs of suit.

State of Texas vs George W. Glover. Indictment for Gaming. Acquitted.

(p. 26)
State of Texas vs James B. Shannon. Indictment for Murder. Jury returned the following verdict: not guilty.

State of Texas vs William A. Pruitt. Indictment for Gaming. Judgement from yesterday to be set aside and case discharged.

State of Texas vs James Bird. Indictment of Assault & Battery with Intent to Kill. State attorney will no longer prosecute but asks the court to hold said
defendant in custody by the sheriff. Hiram Wilburn and others, his securities surrendered the defendant and the securities were exonerated from further responsibility.

(p. 27)
State of Texas vs Jefferson Tilley. Indictment for Betting.
State Attorney will no longer prosecute and defendant ordered into the custody of the sheriff. Moved to quash the indictment and defendant is discharged.

State of Texas vs Morris Ferris. Indictment for Betting.
State Attorney will no longer prosecute and defendant ordered into the custody of the sheriff. Moved to quash the indictment and defendant is discharged.

(p. 28)
State of Texas vs Samuel West Indictment for Betting.
State Attorney will no longer prosecute and defendant ordered into the custody of the sheriff. Moved to quash the indictment and defendant is discharged.

State of Texas vs William P. Carder. Indictment for Shooting Hog.
(maliciously)
Cause continued until next term of court.

State of Texas vs Solomon Carver & Elinor Wilcox. Indictment for
Adultery.
Cause to be continued until next term of court.

(p. 29)
The Grand Jury presents the following bills of indictment, signed by George L. Leonard, foreman:

Samuel West Betting
William J. Hickling & Thomas Shirley Affray
Morris Ferris Betting
James Bird Assault with Intent to Kill
William P. Carder Maliciously shooting a hog
George Norval Larceny
John Cole Disturbing an Election
Solomon Carver & Elinor Wilcox Adultery
George W. Glover & William Hickling Affray
Jefferson Tilley Betting on Election

Grand Jury was discharged.

State of Texas vs James Riley Assault & Battery.
Case dismissed.

State of Texas vs John Thomas Assault with Intent to Kill.
Case dismissed.

State of Texas vs John McCommas Indictment for Challenging
Elijah Carder.
Case dismissed.

(p. 30) Thursday June 10th, 1847
William M. Simpson vs Ellis C. Thomas. Trespass to Try Title.
Ordered that the premises in dispute be surveyed by the deputy surveyor for Dallas District, a correct return with field notes and plats be made to this court at its next term.

William M. Simpson vs Alexander Thomas. Trespass to Try Title.
Ordered that the premises in dispute be surveyed by the deputy surveyor for Dallas District, a correct return with field notes and plats be made to this court at its next term.

William M. Simpson vs William Cox. Trespass to Try Title.
Ordered that the premises in dispute be surveyed by the deputy surveyor for Dallas District, a correct return with field notes and plats be made to this court at its next term.

John Nelson vs James S. Baker. On Appeal.
Defendant to show cause why he had not sent up a more complete record. Ordered that plaintiff give security for costs.

(p. 31) Friday June 11th, 1847
State of Texas vs William J. Hicklin Indictment for an Affray.
and Thomas Shirley.
Attorney for the state and the defendants in their own person, on motion to try defendants

separately.

State of Texas vs William Hicklin. Indictment for an Affray
with Thomas Shirley.
Attorneys for state and defendant moved to quash the indictment and Hicklin pleads not guilty. Jury: Stephen B. McCommas, William Traughber, John C. McCommas, John B. Hibbert, William James, Robert McCullough, Morris Ferris, Middleton Perry, Andrew Mannon, John Cook, J. C. Harris and Richard Bruton. Jury finds defendant not guilty; John B. Hibbert, foreman.

(p. 32)
State of Texas vs Thomas Shirley. Indictment for an
Affray with Hicklin.
Attorneys for state and defendant moved to quash the indictment and Shirley pleads not guilty. Jury: Sanders Elliott, James Barker, Calvin G. Cole, Watts Marks, Henry C. Long, Hiram Wilburn, Thomas Keenan, Preston Witt, John Scurlock, Wesley Chenault, George W. Glover and Milford F. Fortner. Jury finds defendant not guilty; Sanders Elliott, foreman.

(p. 33) Saturday June 12th, 1847
Delinquent jurors: M. M. Miller and Harrison C. Marsh.

State of Texas vs James Bird. Indictment for A & B with Intent
to Kill and for A & B.
Thomas W. Shedd prosecuting attorney, James Bird came in his own person. Nolle prosequi on the first count. Defendant pleaded guilty on the second count. Jury: Stephen B. McCommas, William Traughber, John C. McCommas, William James, Robert McCullough, Middleton Perry, Richard Bruton, Thos. Langley, James Barker, George W. Glover, Watts Marks, Albert G. Walker. Verdict: Defendant fined $18; Albert G. Walker, foreman. Defendant also to pay court costs and remain in the custody of the sheriff until fine and costs are paid.

State of Texas vs John Cole. Indictment for Disturbing Election.
Thomas W. Shedd prosecuting attorney. Defendant pleads not guilty. Jury: Stephen B. McCommas, William Traughber, John C. McCommas, John B. Hibbert, William James, Robert McCullough, Morris Ferris, Middleton Perry, Andrew J. Manning, John Cook, J. C. Harris and Richard Bruton. Verdict: The defendant not guilty.

(p. 34)
State of Texas vs George W. Glover Indictment for an Affray.
& William Hicklin.
George W. Glover, principal; William James, his security in the sum of $500; to appear before the court on first Monday of December, 1847.
Elizabeth Varner vs Robert Sloan. Administratrix and Action of Debt.
Defendant failed to appear. Plaintiff to recover from the defendant $344.16, the principal debt and $56.20 interest thereon making a total of $400.36, together with the costs of the suit. Received of Samuel B. Pryor, Clerk of the District Court, the sum of $25.36 on the above judgement, G. A. Everts, Attorney for petitioner. [Note in margin indicates full amount paid].

(p. 35)
John Nelson vs James Barker. Appeal from Justice Appellant.
Case to be continued so the plaintiff may have further time to get security for the costs of this suit.

Madison Bennett served 4 days as bailiff for this court, paid $1.25 per day.

Court to procure a desk.

On motion of John Hewitt the sum of $45.83 is allowed him for extra services from 14th of July 1846 to 12th June 1847.

(p. 36) 28th October 1847
Samuel B. Pryor, Clerk of Dist. Ct., William M. Cochran, Clerk of Court of said county, William H. Hord, acting justice of peace of said county drew from box #1 the following names as jurors of the December term: Silas Leonard, A. Bledsoe, James J. Beeman, Thomas Langley, Joshua Leonard, John Casey, Timothy Carpenter, William W. Conover, William P. Carder, William Pruitt, Saunders Elliott, Warren A. Ferris, Alexander M. Harwood, Albert Moore, Jacob Badgley, Green Combs, Carlos Wise, Jesse Elam, William Coombs, William Barnes, James Moonaham, Aaron Overton, Archibald Greathouse, Peter Lain, Solomon Carver, William Moonaham, John Cox, James Bird, Alexander Harwood, William McCullough, John W. Wright, James McCommas, Crawfer Treece, Isaac Edwards, Nathaniel Case, Adam Haught.

Revised: March 21, 2008