

May 1867

State

vs

Shores, Stephen

Freinholt, Gustavus

Marcus, M

Dawthett, M. A

Playing billiards on Sunday

The State of Missouri
Superior Judicial Circuit

In the Circuit Court of
Jefferson County at the May
term A.D. 1865 - The State
James of the State of Missouri
upon this oath present
that Stephen Shores - Mr. Marcus a clerk of Court
Mr. A. Santhrett Gustavus
Greenholt

at the Court of Jefferson on the
third day of March 1865 then
and there being on the first day
of the week commonly called
Sunday - then and there with
each other and with other per-
sons to the persons of said un-
known, unlawfully did play
at and upon a certain
gambling device called Billy
boards - adapted devised -
and designed for the pur-
pose of playing games of
chance for money or property
against the peace and dig-
nity of the State

Smith C. Atty.

Piering Willard and
Sunder

2361

State of Mo

John Shivers quoted

~~Mr. A. D. Smith~~

Geo. Churchill 1-3

Mr. Mercer 2-3

W. H. H. H.

Stephen Harrison

William Barnes

made in the ground
with the egg - was made
with the egg - was made

A large pile

William H. H. H.

St. Louis

Filed May 9th 1867
G. J. H. H. H.

COUNTY OF JEFFERSON, Sct.

THE STATE OF MISSOURI,

To the Sheriff of the County of Jefferson—Greeting :

We Command you to take

Stephen Shores

if he be found in your County, and *him* safely keep, so that you have *his* body before the Honorable Judge of our Circuit Court *on the 4th day of November 1867*

at Hillsboro, within and for the County of Jefferson, then and there to answer unto an Indictment found against *him* by the Grand Inquest for the body of the County of Jefferson, for

Playing Billiards on Sunday

contrary to the form of the Statute in such case made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the State.

E. H. Hone

WITNESS, *SAMUEL A. REPPY*, Clerk of our said Circuit Court,

with the Seal thereof hereto affixed, at Office, this

29th day of *May*

A. D. 1867

Elias Hone

Clerk Circuit Court.

By C. H. Hone Reppy

Shores
John Williams

*The undersigned, Elias Hone, not being
the within named Stephen Shores
not found in my County the 4th 1867*

State
vs
Stephen Sharred
John Wilkins
Henry Lee 50



The State of Missouri
 Stephen^{rs} Shore,
 ——— Marcus
 A. Donihett, &
 Gustavus Grænholt, - Defts,

In Circuit Court
 of Jefferson County,

The Defendants move to quash
 the Indictment in the above cause for the
 following reasons:

- 1- The Indictment does not allege that the Grand Jurors of any County were empaneled, sworn, and charged to enquire within & for any County.
- 2- It does not allege that the Grand Jurors of Jefferson County found the indictment

A. Green
 for Defts

State
is.

Stephen Snow,
Monroe, Vt.

Provision
to grow

Filed Nov 27 1867
C. A. Snowy Clerk

The State of Missouri
against
Stephen L. Hoes, M. Marcus
W. A. Southett & Gustavus Fremholt
Defendants

Now comes the defendants by their attorney
& moves to quash the indictment against the
above named defendants for the following reasons

- 1 The indictment does not allege any offense
to have been committed.
- 2nd It does not state any place where said offense
was committed.
- 3 The indictment on its face shows that it was
framed under two different provisions of the
Statute & does not allege that any offense was
committed under either.

J. Leonard

Says atty.

State of Missouri

as yet

Superior Shore State

Providence Church

Filed Nov 1867

E. J. Dancy, clerk

State of Missouri
Against
Stephen Shore
M.A. Southett.
Mauers & Gust Hornhold.
Defendants

Now comes the defendants
Martin Mauers. and Augustus Hornhold
and moves the Court for an arrest
of judgment and new trial in the above
indictment for the reasons following.

First that while a motion was pending
and undetermined to quash said indictment
the defendants above named were wrongfully
induced by the Circuit Attorney, to render
a plea of guilty

2nd That the Court sustained the motion to
quash the indictment for the reason that
no offense was charged in said indictment

3rd The judgment should be arrested for
the reason that no offense is charged in the
indictment on which this judgment is
rendered -

Gran. Leonard

Atty, for Defs

State of Missouri
against

Stephen Shore et al

For the violation of
Judicial process

Filed Nov 9th 1869
E. H. Conway cl^k

State of Missouri }
Jefferson County } 38

On this 11th day of Nov.
1867 personally appeared before me the Augustus
Fromhold. Robert Allen John Hamel & Martin
Marcus and each being duly sworn deposes and
says that they and each of them were led to plead
guilty to an indictment in the Circuit Court of Jef-
ferson County ^{at the present term thereof} for playing billiards on Sunday on
the representations made to them by the Circuit
Attorney Smith that while a motion had been
made and argued to quash said indictment
for insufficiency and that no offense was alleged and
before the same had been determined by the Court
the Court had told the parties that they could go
home and appear by Attorney the next day
after they had left the Court room and were
about leaving the Court house the Circuit Attorney
followed them up and told them that unless
they came back & stand or plead guilty he
would have their recognizance forfeited and
make them trouble that they were induced ~~by~~
~~anxiety to get home~~ and the threats of the Circuit
Attorney as aforesaid to plead guilty which they
would not have done ~~if it had not been~~ otherwise.

Subscribed & sworn to
before me this 11th day of
Nov 1867. Ira Edward
Notary Public

August Fromhold
Robt. Allen
John C Hamel
Charlie Marcus

Levin's Receipt
Lafayette County

State of Wisconsin

ago
August Nineteenth 21
A.D.

affd

Filed Nov 11th 1897
E. F. Devery atty



The State of Missouri
Against
Stephen Shores, - Marcus,
A. Douthett, & Muscavus
Frumholdt.

In the Circuit Court
of Jefferson County.

The Defendants come and move the
Court to quash the Indictment in the above
Cause, for the following reasons,

- 1 - Because the Indictment does not allege
that the Grand Jurors were empaneled, sworn
and charged to enquire within and for the
body of the County of Jefferson.
- 2 - It does not charge that any offense was
was committed
- 3 - It does not charge the offense with suf-
ficient certainty - as it refers to two dif-
ferent classes of offenses, and does not show
which is meant,
- 4 - The Indictment is framed in part on two sections
of the Statute (embracing different offenses) and
does not charge an offense upon either.

Abner Green
Attorney for Defendants

State

13,

Shore State,

Prothon

to South Street
ment