

Q Don't you consider it bad to hear that a man is in the Penitentiary? A I never knew anything of it.

Q Did you ever know anything about that? A No, sir.

Q You are under oath? A I am well aware of the fact.

Q Have you been convicted of any crime? A No, sir; never; never arrested in my life.

Q Never arrested in your life? A No, sir.

Q Where is your place of business? A 162 West 106th street.

Q Do you own a house there? A No, sir.

Q What have you got, a flat? A Yes, sir.

Q Your office is there? A Yes, sir; receive all my mail there.

Q Where do you do this general trucking? A All over the city.

Q How many trucks have you? A I have got four trucks and four carts.

Q Do you own them yourself? A Yes, sir.

Q Where is the stable? A 410 East 72nd Street.

Q Is it 408 or 410? A Either one, I ain't sure of the number, it takes in two or three lots.

Q How long did this defendant work for you? A Two or three winters, on and off, driving an ash cart and working around the stable.

CASE #623A

Q When was the last time? A About two years ago.

Q Have you seen him since? A Yes, sir.

Q When have you seen him last? A I met him on and off on different occasions; I could not swear when I seen him last.

Q Do you know where he lives -- where did he live when he worked for you? A In 72nd Street.

Q Do you know where? A Some place between First and Second Avenue, I don't know the address.

Q Did you ever discuss this man's reputation with anybody?
A No, sir.

Q Never talked about him to anybody? A No, sir.

Q So you are giving us your opinion, isn't that all, how he worked for you? A He worked for me and worked honest; I let him go in and out of Vanderbilt's house, carrying out ashes, and never seen him do anything wrong.

MR. CORRIGAN: I object to that and move to strike out the witness' testimony.

THE COURT: I will let it stay in for what it is worth.

Q What name did you know him under? A William Lang.

Q How did you happen to come down here? A His wife sent up and asked me to come down.

Q Have you talked to anybody about the case? A No, sir.

CASE #623A

Q Did you ever know him under any other name but Lang?

A No, sir.

Q As William Williams, William Smith or Buttermilk Bill?

A No, sir.

Q None of those names? A No, sir.

Q He worked for you as William Lang? A Yes, sir.

Q Have you a pay roll? A I never kept a pay roll.

Q How is he entered in your book? A William Lang -- I never carried the men's names on my book since I entered into business.

Q His name is entered as William Lang? A He ain't entered on no book.

Q Why you just told me he was entered in your book as William Lang. A I said I never put a man's name down that ever worked for me.

Q You said he was entered as William Lang? A I said he worked under the name of William Lang; I never kept no men's names on a book; I did not understand the question rightly; if you put it to me in a more distinct manner I would answer you in a more distinct way.

BY MR. HANSEN:

Q You say he had been working for you off and on and you sent him up to the Vanderbilt house? A That is my business, private ash man, where he goes into all these kind of houses.

CASE # 623A

ANNIE WILLIAMS, a witness called on behalf of the defendant, being duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. HANSEN:

Q Are you the wife of the defendant at the bar here?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, you have got to speak up so that we can hear you. A Yes, sir.

Q You are? A Yes, sir.

Q Where do you live? A I live at 140 West 112th Street.

Q Look at the jury and speak out loud. A 140 West 112th Street.

Q How long have you been married? A 16 years.

Q 16 years? A Yes, sir.

Q Where did you live on October 4th, 1906?

A In 72nd Street.

Q What number? A I lived at No. 537 East 72nd Street.

Q Do you remember if during the month of October, your husband was absent from his home during the night-time any night? A No, sir; he was at home.

Q He was at home every night? A Yes, sir.

Q In October? A Yes, sir; he was at home for about seven months right along; he has not been out that I know of.

Q What time would he come home in the evening?

MR. CORRIGAN: I object to that question as incom-

CASE #623A

petent, immaterial and irrelevant.

A He would come home --

THE COURT: Objection sustained.

MR. HANSEN: May I address the Court?

THE COURT: No, sir, you cannot by way of argument .
Ask a question.

MR. HANSEN: Well, may it please the Court --

THE COURT: Put another question, sir.

MR. HANSEN: I don't know what question to put to
this witness.

THE COURT: I will not hear any argument. If you
have no further questions dismiss the witness and call
another.

BY MR. HANSEN:

Q Are you sure that your husband was at home during
the night, every night during the month of October?

A Yes, sir.

MR. CORRIGAN: Objected to.

THE COURT: That may be answered.

Q It has been testified here that on October 4th, 1906,
he was in some saloon uptown at about three o'clock in the
morning. Do you know of your own knowledge whether your hus-
band was absent from his home during the morning of the 4th
of October, at about three o'clock in the morning? A No, sir;

CASE #623A

THE WITNESS: I don't know, I can't say.

MR. CORRIGAN: It is conceded.

THE COURT: It is received by consent.

(The signature referred to is marked people's
Exhibit A)

Q What is your husband's business? A In the horse
business.

Q Horse dealer? A Yes, sir.

Q Buys and sells horses? A Yes, sir.

Q Any other business? A No, sir.

Q Where is his place of business? A He is working all
over for people; he has not got any place of business now.

Q He was a horse dealer, he was not a truckman?

A He used to be in the truck business too, sell a wagon now
and then.

Q Was he an ash man? A No, sir; well, he used to be
in the truck business.

Q How long ago is that? A Well, he has been in it
since I have known him.

Q Do you know the last witness who was on the stand?

A No, sir -- the last witness?

Q The last man who testified here? A Yes, sir.

Q How long have you known him? A I have known him for
some time.

Q Do you know the first witness who was on to-day for

CASE #623A

the defense, Mr. Hurst? A Yes, sir; I know him to work for this man.

BY MR. HANSEN:

Q Do you know that your husband was born in the house 513 that he testified he lived at; did you know he was born there? A Well, I knew he lived in one of these houses down there, 513, but the address I could not tell you.

Q You don't know that he was born in 513, and lived there up to the time that he married you? A Yes, sir.

BY MR. CORRIGAN:

Q Now, you say you remember the 4th of October?

A Yes, sir.

Q What day of the week was that?

MR. HANSEN: Objected to on the ground that there is no testimony to the effect that this lady remembers the 4th of October. She testified that her husband was home every night during October and, therefore, could not have been absent on the 4th.

BY MR. CORRIGAN:

Q What day of the week was it? A I don't remember, sir.

Q What day of the week was the 1st of October?

A I don't remember that.

Q Was your husband working at that time? A Yes, sir.

CASE # 623A

Q For whom was he working then? A He was working for Mr. Gormley.

Q Who is he? A The witness that was standing up here last.

Q The last witness? A Yes, sir.

Q Working for him? A To my knowledge.

Q What time would he go to work in the morning?

A 7 o'clock in the morning.

Q What was he doing for Gormley? A Well, he used to--

MR. HANSEN: I object to this unless it be shown that this witness was present at the time when he worked.

Q What was he doing for Mr. Gormley? A I don't know; he had charge of carts and horses there, that is all I know.

Q That is all you know about it? A Yes, sir.

Q Who have you talked to about this case? A Just spoke to Mr. Gormley; asked him to come down, that is all.

Q Who else? A No one else.

Q You have talked to the counsel, haven't you?

A No, sir.

Q Your husband's counsel? A No, sir.

Q Haven't you talked to him? A No, sir.

Q Didn't you tell him that you were going to testify that your husband had not been away any night during October?

A I just simply said he was home; that is all.

CASE # 623A

Q Who was that? A I told it to Mr. Gormley.

Q Who else did you tell it to? A That is all I did.

Q Didn't you tell it to Mr. Hansen? A I told him in regard to the case, yes, sir.

Q Then you did talk to Mr. Hansen about the case?

A Told him he was home that night, all that month, told him he was home then.

Q Told Mr. Hansen that? A Yes, sir.

Q Why did you deny it when I asked you first? A I did not deny it; I did not deny it; I just simply said he was home.

Q You denied talking to Mr. Hansen about it, didn't you? A I did not tell him this story --

Q To whom? A To Mr. Hansen.

Q Didn't you tell me a minute ago that you had not spoken to Mr. Hansen when I first asked you that? A He asked me where he was that night and I told him he was home; he had been home.

Q When did you first hear about the 4th of October?

A The night after Christmas when I got word he was arrested.

Q You got word he was arrested? A Yes, sir.

Q Who told you he was arrested? A He sent me word.

Q Where was he living at that time? A In the Tombs.

Q I mean before he had been in the Tombs, where was he

CASE #623A

living? A West 112th Street; I was 140 West 112th Street; I was living there after I heard he was arrested; he had lived in 72nd Street when he was arrested; I had to break up house-keeping.

Q Where were you living at the time you heard he was arrested? A 537 East 72nd Street.

Q Where was the defendant living? A He was living with me.

Q You don't mean to say that he was home every day during the month of November and December, do you; did he come there every day? A Yes, sir.

Q Are you sure about that, Madam? A Yes, sir.

Q Every day during November and December? A November and December up until the 26th, till I heard he was arrested, that is all.

Q Had he been home every day before that? A Yes, sir.

Q Where was he working at that time? A With Mr. Gormley

Q Right up to the time of his arrest? A Yes, sir, to my knowledge.

Q Sure about that? A Yes, sir.

Q Wasn't he working in Hoboken? A Well, that I don't know.

BY MR. HANSEN:

Q First you testified that you had not spoken to Mr.

CASE # 623A

Hansen, and then you testified that you had spoken to Mr. Hansen. Can you pick Mr. Hansen out in this court-room. Is he in here? Just point out Mr. Hansen to us. A No, sir; I cannot.

Q Have you ever spoken to me in your life before?

A No, sir.

Q Have you ever spoken to this gentleman, Mr. Michaelson?

A No, sir.

Q I ask you have you or have you not? A No, sir.

Q What did you mean when you said you had spoken to Mr. Hansen? A I was speaking to a gentleman by the name of Hansen.

Q Well, I am Mr. Hansen. A I never spoke to you.

Q Did you ever have a conversation with me? A No, sir.

Q Did you ever have a conversation with this man?

A No, sir.

Q Did I ever write you a letter? A No, sir.

Q Did you ever come to the office of Carl Fischer-Hansen?

A No, sir.

Q Did you ever see anybody from our office in connection with this case or any other case? A No, sir.

Q Has anybody from my office conversed with you to-day or yesterday? A No, sir.

BY MR. CORRIGAN:

Q The question is this: This witness has testified +

CASE # 623A

she spoke to Mr. Hansen. Who was the Mr. Hansen that you testified you spoke to? A Well, a friend of my husband's, not the counsellor.

Q Didn't you tell me that you had talked to your husband's counsel, Mr. Hansen, yes or no. A I said yes, but I was --

Q Was that true? A No, sir.

Q Why did you tell an untruth. Don't you know, Madam, that you are under oath?

MR. HANSEN: Objected to.

THE COURT: I am going to give you a chance to question further.

Q Why, Madam, did you tell me an untruth?

Objected to. Objection overruled. Exception.

Q Answer that question. A Well, I thought it was the lawyer I spoke to one day outside, that's why.

Q Now, Madam, is that the truth now? A Yes, sir.

Q How do you know that it was not the lawyer you spoke to outside? A No, sir; I don't know.

Q You don't know anything about it, do you?

A No, sir.

Q Wasn't the reason you told me an untruth because you thought it would help your husband? A No, sir.

Q Did you think it would hurt him? A I don't know.

CASE # 623A

BY MR. HANSEN:

Q Now, you mean to say to the jury that you spoke to somebody out in the hall this morning? A No, sir.

THE COURT: You are leading this witness.

BY THE COURT:

Q Who did you talk to, if any one? A I spoke to a man; I thought it was Mr. Hansen; he was not introduced to me as Mr. Hansen but I thought it was.

WILLIAM LANG, the defendant, called in his own behalf, being duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. HANSEN:

Q What is your business, Lang? A Dealer in horses.

Q Lang, you are the defendant here? A Yes, sir.
BY THE COURT:

Q You have heard the testimony against you, haven't you? A Yes, sir.

Q Did you rob the complaining witness? A No, sir; I never seen him.

Q What, if anything, did you do to him? A Never seen him in my life.

Q Then his story of your attacking him and robbing him is false from beginning to end, isn't it? A Yes, sir.

Q You deny every word of it? A Yes, sir; never remember seeing the man in my life.

CASE #623A

THE COURT: Isn't that about all you want to prove?

MR. HANSEN: This is a very serious charge, your Honor.

THE COURT: I know the penalty of robbery.

BY MR. HANSEN:

Q Well, did you ever live in the house No. 513 East 72nd Street? A I was born there 43 years ago.

Q How long did you live there? A Till about 15 years ago.

Q And 15 years ago did you marry? A 16 years ago.

Q You married? A Yes, sir.

Q Have you been in the horse and truck business ever since? A Yes, sir; off and on all my life I have been in the horse business; I ran horse stables and trucking.

Q Did you work for the two men who testified in your behalf this morning? A Yes, sir; several times; several different occasions for both gentlemen.

Q Did you write to these men to come down and testify to your character?

Objected to.

A I did.

Objection sustained.

Q Now, on the 4th day of October, 1906, were you up in the saloon at 160 East 91st Street? A No, sir.

CASE #623A

Q You were not? A No, sir. Where did you say?

Q Lexington Avenue and 125th Street? A No, sir.

Q The hotel where it was testified you had been drinking with somebody? A No, sir.

Q On the morning of the 4th? A No, sir; I was not there.

Q Have you ever met or seen the complaining witness before? A Never in my life, not to my knowledge.

Q You do not know him? A No, sir; never knew him.

Q When did you first see him? A In Police Headquarters.

Q Tell me the circumstances under which you saw him?

A Well, I was arrested in the 54th Street Court by the officer in this case; he brought me down to Police Headquarters from 54th Street Court, took me between two men, called in this complainant; he came over and put his hand on my shoulder, and that is all, he did not say anything at all; he just put his hand on my shoulder.

Q Did you hear any conversation between the police officer and the complaining witness? A No, sir.

Q Down in Police Headquarters? A No, sir; didn't see them speak at all.

Q Now, what is the date when you were arrested?

A What was the date?

Q When you were arrested? A The 26th, Wednesday the

CASE # 623A

26th of December.

Q Where were you arrested? A 29th Street and Eighth Avenue.

Q Now, will you tell the jury the circumstances under which you came to be arrested? A I was leaving some friends about five o'clock Wednesday morning on the 26th of December, the day after Christmas; I was walking up along Eighth Avenue and in 29th Street I went in to have a drink in a saloon, 29th Street and Eighth Avenue.

Q In a saloon? A Yes, sir; the corner saloon; and when I walked into the saloon --

Q About what time? A Five o'clock in the morning.

Q What date? A When I walked into the saloon there was a bar-room like in the back room; seemed to me that there was some young fellows in a muss in there; I didn't know any of them; and it seemed to me one young fellow got hit; there was a half a dozen in it, and they wanted to go out through the side door and some of the friends of the man who got licked, beat up, went out, and got an officer. While he was out for the officer two other men came in and had a drink at the bar; the man that got beat came back with two policemen in uniform and they placed us under arrest, would not leave us go out.

Q December? A Yes, sir.

CASE # 623A

Q What date? A The 26th, Wednesday morning.

Q What happened then? A So there was two together that went to go out, one said he was going and these two would not let him go out and so he insisted on going out and one of these officers hit him across the head, split his head open.

Q What did they do to you? A They beat us after they put us all under arrest.

Q Where did they take you? A To the West 37th Street station house.

Q What happened there? A They took my name and address; I gave in the name of William Lang there.

Q What did they charge you with? A There was no charge only disorderly conduct that I saw; there was no complainant against me.

Q What happened in the case? A I was -- the case was discharged the next morning in court.

Q Were you discharged? A Yes, sir; I was discharged.

Q Where were you arrested then? A Mr. Meehan arrested me in 54th Street court.

Q You were arrested in the court? A Yes, sir; I was arrested in the court.

Q After being discharged you were taken down? A Yes, sir.

Q Then where were you taken? A To Police Headquarters;

CASE # 623A

I went down in the car with Mr. Meehan.

Q That is how you came to be arrested in this case?

A Yes, sir.

CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. CORRIGAN:

Q Ever been convicted of any crime? A Never.

Q What is that? A Never been convicted of any crime.

Q Did you ever plead guilty? A No, sir.

Q Never been locked up? A Several times.

Objected to. Objection sustained.

Q Were you ever convicted of anything, whether you believed it to be a crime or not? A No, sir; never convicted of crime in my life.

Q What have you been convicted of, if anything?

A I was convicted about four years ago in the Special Sessions of petty larceny, I believe.

Q Isn't that a crime? A A conviction? I don't know.

Q What do you call a crime? A I thought you meant here before a jury.

Q I mean any place? A No, sir.

Q Were you ever convicted of anything anywhere?

A Outside of this time in the Special Sessions.

Q What else? A Nothing else.

Q What punishment did you get in Special Sessions?

CASE # 623A

A Three months over on the island.

Q For petit larceny? A Yes, sir.

Q Under what name? A I believe it was my right name, William Williams.

Q What is your right name? A William Williams.

Q How long ago was it that you were convicted in Special Sessions? A About four years ago I think, in May, I don't just remember -- or September.

Q Did you ever give any other name beside William Lang and William Williams? A No, sir.

Q Don't they call you Buttermilk Bill? A No, sir; never heard of it; never knew of it; it is a pretty healthy name but I was never known by it.

Q When did you last work for Gormley? A I worked for Mr. Gormley off and on, several times, at different times for the last five years.

Q When was the last time you worked for him?

A The last time?

Q Yes? A Over a year ago to my knowledge.

Q Now, you heard your wife testify here that you worked for him? A My wife don't know who I worked for.

Q She don't? A No, sir.

Q When did you last work for Hurst? A Well, three years or more.

Q Three years or more ago? A Yes, sir; since I have

CASE #623A

worked for him.

Q Since you have worked for him? A Yes, sir.

Q What were you working at when arrested? A I was speculating, dealing in horses at Bulls Head.

Q 24th Street? A Buying and selling horses around 24th Street.

Q At five o'clock in the morning what had you been doing? A I had been for 25 years -- I was over along Eighth Avenue and had been drinking.

Q What were you working at when you were arrested?
A I thought you meant up to the time I was arrested; I wasn't working at anything when I was arrested; I had been drinking.

Q How long had you been drinking? A From Christmas morning about 10 o'clock, I started in to drink; the first I drank in eight months.

Q Before that what did you work at? A Dealing in horses.

Q Speculating? A Yes, sir.

Q Why did you tell the officer that you had been working in Hoboken? A Not that I know of; I never spoke to the officer.

Q Didn't you tell Meehan that? A Not that I know of.

Q When Meehan arrested you didn't you say you had been in

CASE # 623A

Hoboken? A Not that I know of; I don't remember telling him; I was drunk.

Q Why did you give a false name in the Magistrate's Court? A From my being arrested in a bar room fight over on Eighth Avenue; one man was sent to the hospital from there.

Q Why did you say you lived at 513 East 72nd Street and lived there for 35 years? A Well, I have lived there up until when I got married and took up house for myself.

Q 16 years ago you were married? A Yes, sir.

Q Why did you say you lived there now? A Why did I say it?

Q In the Magistrate's Court? A Well, I don't know said that I lived at 513 when I was arrested or in the Magistrate's Court.

Q Did you live at 513 when arrested? A No, sir; 537 East 72nd Street; I was born at 513.

Q What did you say to the officer just before you were sworn there? A What officer?

Q That officer standing there? A He asked me what was my name and I said "My right name is William Williams."

Q Why did you go on the stand and have yourself sworn as Lang? A I was under the name of Lang here.

Objected to. Objection overruled.

MR. CORRIGAN: I move to amend the indictment by

CASE # 623A

inserting the true name of the defendant.

THE COURT: Yes. Amend the indictment.

WILLIAM M. TIVOLI recalled:

BY MR. HANSEN:

Q Do you know this man Peyser you were talking to in the saloon on the morning of the 4th of October, 1906?

A I met him a few times.

Q Do you know where he lives? A No, sir.

Q Have you made any attempt to find him? A No, sir.

Q You have not tried to find him? A No, sir.

Q Did you inform the District Attorney?

Objected to.

Q Have you seen Peyser since the night or morning of October 4th, 1906?

MR. CORRIGAN: I object to that question.

THE COURT: He may answer.

Q Have you? A Yes, sir; I have seen him a few times since.

Q You have? A Yes, sir.

Q Did you ask him to come down and testify to the effect that you had been talking with him that morning? A I did not.

Q Why didn't you? A Well, I didn't know it was needed.

Q The most material witness to substantiate your story

CASE #623A

in New York?

THE COURT: That is your testimony.

MR. HANSEN: That is all.

MR. CORRIGAN: I want to ask to re-open the case, I would like to put Peyser on the stand for one question. I would like to call him in rebuttal.

THE COURT: If this case goes over, gentlemen, it goes over until Monday morning.

J O S E P H P E Y S E R, a witness for the people in rebuttal, being duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CORRIGAN:

Q Where do you live, Mr. Peyser? A 134 East 125th Street.

Q What is your occupation? A I work in the race track.

Q Bookmaker? A No, sir; clerk.

Q Clerk for a bookmaker? A Yes, sir.

Q Do you remember the 4th of last October? A I don't remember the date.

Q Do you remember being in a saloon on 125th Street and Lexington Avenue with Tivoli, the complainant?

A That is the first night I ever met him.

Q The first night you ever met him? A Yes, sir.

Q Do you remember the night he was robbed, or do you

CASE #623A

remember that he was robbed? A I don't know if he was robbed or not; I just met him in there.

Q Do you remember having a conversation with him there?

A Sitting in another part of the room.

Q Did you see the defendant there that night? A No, sir.

Q Are you sure about that? A Yes, sir.

Q Do you know the defendant? A Certainly.

Q How long have you known him? A Known him for ten years, I guess.

CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. HANSEN:

Q You are sure he was not in that room that night?

A No, sir.

Q So when the complaining witness testified here that he was talking with you and that this man was sitting next he testified to what was not so? A He was talking to me on the other side of the room; he was sitting talking to me.

Q You knew this man at that time? A Yes, sir; I knew him.

Q Could he have been there without your seeing him?

A No, sir.

BY MR. CORRIGAN:

Q Did you see the robbery on the street? A No, sir.

CASE # 623A

Q So you don't know who committed it? A No, sir.

BY MR. HANSEN:

Q One more question: Do you remember if the complaining witness on that particular morning was under the influence of liquor? A Why he was terribly drunk.

Q He was terribly drunk? A Yes, sir; didn't know what he was doing.

BY MR. CORRIGAN:

Q Still he knew enough to talk to you? A Yes, sir.

THE COURT: If you wish to sum up this case it must go over until Monday morning. If you will submit it I will give it to the jury now.

MR. HANSEN: I feel that I ought to do justice to my client.

THE COURT: I must be fair not only to the jury but to the witnesses who are in court and who have been here awaiting the trial of this case which has been protracted beyond the length of time I supposed it would take.

MR. HANSEN: I prefer to have the case go over because I desire to sum up.

THE COURT: Well, gentlemen, you have to be here Monday morning any how and we have sentences and ex parte matters which will occupy the entire afternoon. If I

CASE # 623A

gave you the case late in the afternoon it would result, perhaps, in your being kept together until a late hour. Do not talk about this case among yourselves or form or express any opinion thereon until the case is finally submitted to you. I must ask you to take your places promptly at 11 o'clock Monday morning.

(The Court then adjourned the further trial of the case until Monday morning, January 28th, 1907, at 10:30 o'clock).

CASE # 623A

People vs. Lang.

New York, January 28th, 1907.

Trial resumed.

MR. CORRIGAN: If your Honor please, I have had an investigation made in this case by the Detective Sergeant, and the information that he gives me indicates that there has been a great deal of untruth told in this case.

MR. HANSEN: What is that?

MR. CORRIGAN: It indicates that there has been a great deal of untruth told in this case, not only by the wife of the defendant, who has been a confession to the Detective Sergeant, but also by the defendant himself. Now, the defendant has been on the stand and has been subjected to cross examination and I ask the privilege of recalling him to ask him one or two further questions.

MR. HANSEN: No objection. May it please the Court, the District Attorney said that the wife had made a confession. Now, if any confession has been made, I don't know what he means by that, but I think that she should also be called by him.

MR. CORRIGAN: I should like to have her here.

THE COURT: I have granted the District Attorney this motion.

CASE # 623A

MR. HANSEN: Will your Honor direct the District Attorney to call the wife?

THE COURT: If you have any motion to make I will entertain it in due course.

WILLIAM LANG, the defendant, resumes the stand:
CROSS EXAMINATION CONTINUED BY MR. CORRIGAN:

Q Now, Lang or Williams, your wife has been to see you in the Tombs, almost every day, hasn't she? A Yes, sir.

Q And you asked her to come down here and testify for you, didn't you? A Yes, sir.

Q You asked her to say you had been home every night, didn't you? A I did not ask her; she knew that; I did not have to ask her.

Q Now, did you ever, in your life, live at 537 with your wife? A Yes, sir.

Q When? A For the last 15 years back.

Q Now, remember, Lang, or Williams, you are under oath?
A I was living all my life in the one street.

Q East 71st or 72nd? A 72nd Street; they don't live in no apartment houses on that side of 71st Street.

Q Did you live there with your wife? A Yes, sir.

Q In the month of October, 1906? A Yes, sir.

Q The whole month? A Yes, sir.

CASE # 623A

Q Don't you know, as a fact, that she has lived with her father for the last three or four years; and you have only lived with her off and on? A No, sir.

Q If she testified to that it is not true? A She has lived with her father -- she has lived there since I have been in the Tombs.

Q Before that? A No, sir.

Q She was living there before October? A No, sir; not in October the whole time she has not.

Q You had better tell the truth on this? A I am telling the truth; she has not lived with her people --

BY MR. HANSEN:

Q Now, Lang, this is a very serious matter. Now, I want you to be perfectly truthful with the jury. If you have made any statements here on the trial last week that you would like to retract now do so. If you have made any errors voluntarily or involuntarily? A Not that I know of.

Q I want you to be perfectly frank and truthful and tell the jury all about it. Now, we want to get at the facts?

A Yes, sir.

Q At the facts. A I don't know of any untruth that I have told.

Q I tell you, as your counsel now, that if you have concealed anything, if you have made any statements that are

CASE # 623A

false -- A Not that I know of.

Q This is your opportunity, and I advise you, as your counsel, that you tell the gospel truth to this jury and to the Court. A I have told the truth, everything I have said is the truth.

BY MR. CORRIGAN:

Q Do you mean to say that you lived at 537 East 72nd Street with the woman who testified here, as your wife, during the month of October, 1906? A Yes, sir.

Q Do you mean to say you were at home every night during that month with her? A Yes, sir; I know it, because I ain't no drinking man; I haven't drank anything in eight months.

Q Yes or no.

MR. HANSEN: I submit that the witness be permitted to answer in his own way the questions of the District Attorney. The District Attorney is no more anxious than I am to have the facts in the case and nothing else.

THE COURT: He may answer.

BY MR. CORRIGAN:

Q Didn't your wife visit you in the City Prison?

A Pretty near every day.

Q Didn't you tell her to go on the stand and say you were at home? A No, sir; I did not have to.

Q You testified that you worked for Hurst and Gormley?

CASE #623A

A Yes, sir.

Q Under what name did you work for them? A Well, they didn't know me -- they called me "Big William" around the horse business; I have been around the horses all my life, off and on, and these men are dealing in horses, didn't make it a business, I have worked for them off and on, different winters

Q Did you work for them as Big William, William Williams or William Lang? A Well, I don't know as to what name I worked under.

MR. HANSEN: The witness has answered that he gave no name in particular, he didn't have to.

THE COURT: Is there something for me to pass on or not?

MR. CORRIGAN: I don't know, your Honor.

THE COURT: Proceed, please.

BY MR. CORRIGAN:

Q Did you work for Hurst and Gormley under the name of William Williams, Big William or William Lang? A Well, they always called me Lang or William, Big William.

Q Which was it? A William.

Q Which was it? A Big Bill or Big William, all around, there never was no name, no pay roll or anything, it wasn't necessary like that; they never would put down a name that I know of.

CASE # 623A

Q For whom were you working when, as you testified, you were arrested and sent to the Penitentiary from the Court of Special Sessions? A For who was I working?

Q Yes. A Well, now, I don't know; I am positive that I was working for Mr. Hurst at the time, if I ain't mistaken, of course, I speculate a whole lot, off and on, in horses.

BY MR. HANSEN.

Q Well, you think so, but you are not sure; you would not swear exactly where you were working? A No, sir; I buy and sell horses myself.

Q Now, I want you to tell it again -- I didn't get it clear myself the other day. State to the Court and jury the circumstances under which you were arrested in this case?

A Yes, sir.

Q You remember you stated that you had been in a saloon?

MR. CORRIGAN: He stated that fully. I have it in the minutes.

MR. HANSEN: I haven't got them here.

BY MR. HANSEN:

Q Will you please re-state that to the jury? A When I was arrested this time?

Q Yes, just tell us how you were arrested in this saloon and taken to the station house. Tell us what happened in the

CASE #623A

saloon? A I was in 29th Street.

Q Will you tell us that? A I went into a saloon, corner of 29th Street and Eighth Avenue about 5 o'clock in the morning, December 26th, the morning after Christmas.

Q What happened there? A There was a fight in the back room.

Q What is that? A A fight in the back room among some young fellows in there; I was out at the bar; it was on when I walked into the place.

Q What happened? A One young man came into the back room of the bar room and he was bleeding; he had been in a fight with these friends of his in the back and they had beaten him up; he went out to get an officer. Meantime whoever he was fighting with went out the back way, or some way or other, and he came back with two policemen.

Q The man who had been beaten? A Yes, sir; he was away about two or three minutes.

Q When he came back with the police what happened?

A That is all; there was two other young men came into the saloon meantime when he was out.

Q What happened then? A They placed us all under arrest.

Q Then you were discharged the next morning? A Yes, sir; in the 54th street court.

CASE # 623A

Q You had not been in the fight in the back room at all?

A No, sir; I ain't known in the place.

Q Do you remember if any charge of robbery was made in connection with that arrest? A No, sir; there was not.

Q Simply fighting? A Yes, sir; fighting, that is all; there was no complaint made in the Police Court.

MR. CORRIGAN: Now, if your Honor please, I have sent the detective with a forthwith subpoena to produce the wife of this man. I should like to have your Honor grant me a continuance until say 12 o'clock when I think she will probably be here -- or say half past twelve.

THE COURT: Well, if you are not certain about the matter why not let this jury go until 2 o'clock.

MR. CORRIGAN: Very well.

THE COURT: Impanel another jury. We might as well save the time.

MR. CORRIGAN: I think she will surely be here by 2 o'clock. She lives in 112th Street.

THE COURT: Gentlemen, the District Attorney asks that I adjourn this case until a quarter before one; that would necessitate your losing time because we adjourn at one o'clock for recess; therefore, I will let you go until 2 o'clock. In the meantime you must not talk about this case or permit any one to talk with you

CASE # 623A

about it nor form or express any opinion thereon until the case is finally submitted to you. You may go hence about your business and return here at 2 o'clock precisely.

(The court then adjourned the case until 2 o'clock)

After Recess.

MR. HANSEN: I understood this case had been adjourned in order to give the District Attorney an opportunity to produce the wife of the defendant and not for any other purpose. He is now about to call another witness. This case was closed on Friday by both the District Attorney and myself.

MR. CORRIGAN: I sent to the house where the defendant's wife said she lived, and the report I received from the detective is that she is away and will not return until 5:30. I also sent for the janitress of the premises 537 East 72nd Street, I have her here in court and I wish to put her on the stand.

THE COURT: I will permit you to do it.

CASE # 623A

JOHANNA MAUER, a witness called on behalf of the people in rebuttal, being duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CORRIGAN:

Q Where do you live, Mrs. Mauer? A 535 72nd Street.

Q Are you the janitress for 535 and 537 as well?

A Yes, sir.

Q Did you ever see this defendant before? A No, sir; never in my house.

Q How long have you been janitress there?

A Three years.

Q Did he ever live there? A No, sir; I can show you the books.

Q See if you recognize him. Did he ever live there?

A No, sir.

Q Not in the last three years? A No, sir.

MR. HANSEN: No questions.

MR. CORRIGAN: I now rest my case, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, how long do you want to sum up your case, Mr. Hansen?

MR. HANSEN: I should say fifteen or twenty minutes.

THE COURT: proceed.

MR. HANSEN: May it please the Court, I desire to make a motion. I respectfully request the Court to direct the jury to acquit the defendant on the ground that

CASE #623A

the charge named in the indictment has not been sustained; and that it would be impossible, from a legal point of view, to render a verdict of guilty in this case. The District Attorney has produced the complaining witness and two other witnesses, and the two other witnesses have testified, under oath, and I take it he cannot impeach his own witnesses, that this man was not there.

THE COURT: That raises a question of fact for the jury. On which count do you desire to go to the jury?

MR. CORRIGAN: I will go on the count of robbery.

THE COURT: No other charge? *am*

MR. CORRIGAN: The other count, I believe, is larceny. I am willing to stand on the robbery -- robbery in the second degree.

THE COURT: Now, you simply wish to submit the case to the jury on the count charging robbery?

MR. CORRIGAN: I do.

THE COURT: Very well. I will submit the count charging robbery and with the District Attorney's consent the other counts are withdrawn from the consideration of the jury.

MR. HANSEN: As I understand it, the Court denies the motion?

CASE # 623A

THE COURT: Yes. "I deny your motion except in so far as it has already been granted."

MR. HANSEN: I take an exception.

Mr. Hansen closes the case on behalf of the defendant.

Mr. Corrigan closes the case on behalf of the People.

During the summing up of Mr. Corrigan he referred to the defendant as "Buttermilk Bill".

MR. HANSEN: I object to the District Attorney calling the defendant "Buttermilk Bill".

Objection overruled. Exception.

MR. HANSEN: May I ask that the District Attorney do not impeach his own witnesses before the jury. He called them as his witnesses and not ours.

THE COURT: The District Attorney will proceed.
Exception.

CASE #623A

THE COURT'S CHARGE.

FOSTER, J.

Gentlemen of the jury: The issue of fact in this case may be difficult for you to decide, because there is much of conflicting testimony here; but the law is simple.

There is but one crime charged against the defendant, robbery in its second degree, because the other counts have been withdrawn from your consideration upon the motion of the District Attorney.

Robbery is larceny that is accomplished by force and fear. It is a violent taking away, against the will of the complaining witness, of his personal property, intending to deprive him of the use and benefit of it. Force must be used, so far as this case is concerned, to constitute the crime of robbery. So that if you believe that the complaining witness had taken from his possession the property which the defendant is alleged to have stolen, and that the defendant took it by force, using force to overcome resistance on the part of the complaining witness, then convict him of robbery in its second degree.

If there is any reasonable doubt it give the defendant the benefit of it. That is all there is in the case.

CASE # 623A

gentlemen. It is with you.

MR. HANSEN: May I ask your honor to charge the jury that if they shall find, or come to the conclusion, that any witness in this case has wilfully lied, as to any material fact, they are then at liberty to disregard that witness' entire testimony.

THE COURT: Well, that is a very good rule of civil law, but the rule of the criminal law is different. Gentlemen, the amount of credence that you are to give to the testimony of the witnesses in this case is for you and you only to determine. You may refuse to believe any witness you choose. That is the rule of the criminal law. If you believe a witness is lying in one particular it is for you to say whether you will believe anything else that witness has said. If for any reason you don't believe they are telling the truth you have a right to disbelieve them. In other words, in criminal actions, the facts are all for the jury to pass upon.

MR. HANSEN : Did I understand your Honor to deny my motion?

THE COURT: I do not deny your motion. I went further than you asked me to go. The rule of the criminal law is broader than it is in the civil law.

MR. HANSEN: I ask your Honor to charge the jury that

CASE # 623A

they are to disregard, for the purpose of coming to a conclusion in this case, entirely, the evidence about former convictions.

THE COURT: The evidence touching a former conviction, gentlemen, was received as bearing upon the credibility of the defendant who took the stand in his own behalf, and it is proper for you to regard it for that purpose and that only.

MR. HANSEN: I also ask your Honor to charge the jury that good character, that is testimony as to good character may, of itself, raise a reasonable doubt.

THE COURT: Well, that is the law, of course.

MR. HANSEN: I ask your Honor to charge the jury that every accused person is presumed, in law, to be innocent until found guilty.

THE COURT: Yes, that is the law.

MR. HANSEN: I ask your Honor to charge the jury that in order to find this man guilty they must find him guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

THE COURT: I have already stated that once.

MR. HANSEN: Then may I ask your Honor to charge the jury that the District Attorney is bound by the testimony of his own witness and cannot impeach his own witness.

THE COURT: I do not think that that applies to this

CASE #623A

case. That is an abstract principle of law.
as it does not apply to this case I decline to
it.

Exception.

MR. HANSEN: May I ask your honor to charge that the
burden of proof that this man is guilty is on the Dis-
trict Attorney?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. HANSEN: And not upon the defendant?

THE COURT: Yes, that is the law.

MR. HANSEN: May I also ask your Honor to charge the
jury that when either the District Attorney, or the
attorney for the defendant, omits to call a witness that
might easily have been subpoenaed, the presumption is
that this witness, if called, would have testified ad-
versely.

THE COURT: I don't know of any proof in this case
from which that inference might properly be drawn.

MR. HANSEN: yes, sir, the employer of this man
Tivoli, whom he said he travelled with on that night.

MR. CORRIGAN: there is nothing to that effect
at all in the case.

THE COURT: I don't know where he is.

MR. HANSEN: He is not here.

CASE # 623A