

## Police Court.

In the local Police Court on Friday last, before Mr. R. H. V. Allnut, P.M., Paul Smirnoff, a foreigner, was charged with that being a reputed cheat, he did loiter in certain premises licensed under the Liquor Act, 1912, and did have in his possession certain instruments for gambling. The accused, who was undetained, pleaded guilty, and was sentenced to one month's imprisonment with hard labor in Maitland Gaol.

The police also proceeded against two first offenders for engaging in a game of chance, to wit, card playing, at the same time and place. The defendants pleaded guilty. Senior-Sergt. Fortescue, who prosecuted, said as the offence was the first of its kind under the Act since he came to Scone, he had no desire to press for a heavy penalty. A nominal amount covering costs would suit the case. However, in the interest of the public and persons in charge of licensed premises he desired to make it clear that under the Vagrancy Act, card-playing on licensed premises, for drinks as well as money, was illegal, and both players and licensee were liable for severe punishment. He only made those remarks so that all concerned might be placed on their guard. The defendants were sentenced till the rising of the Court, with 6s Court costs. The Court rose immediately.

John Francis McCarthy, a young man, was charged with having conspired to serve Henry Luke White

man, was charged with having con-  
tracted to serve Henry Luke White,  
at Belltrees, and having entered into  
such service, did absent himself  
without reasonable cause before the  
term had expired. A plea of  
guilty was entered.

Mr. J. A. K. Shaw, who ap-  
peared for plaintiff, informed the  
Bench that the lad had been engaged  
through a city office, and had been  
brought to Belltrees at the expense  
of plaintiff, who had decided to take  
the present action because he con-  
sidered that that sort of thing was  
much too prevalent, and that some-  
thing should be done to put a stop  
to it. The plaintiff did not wish to  
press for a heavy penalty, especially  
in view of the fact that the defend-  
ant had been in the lockup over-  
night, his one desire being to let it  
be seen that persons having entered  
into a contract could not break it at  
their own sweet will, and so cause  
inconvenience to the employer, whose  
arrangements were thereby upset.

No professional costs being ap-  
plied for, the P.M., in inflicting a  
fine of 20s, with 6s Court costs, indi-  
cated that the defendant was liable  
to a fine of £10.

(The fine was paid by the plaintiff,  
and the defendant was liberated).