LAW CASES.

CASE OF A RUNAWAY SLAVE. An important trial was recently held in the United States district court at Philadelphia, before judges Baldwin and Hopkinson, in which were involved some interesting questions touching runaway slaves. The case is reported in the Pennsylvanian of Saturday.

It arose out of the seizure, in 1822, of a runaway slave in the state of Pennsylvania, by his owner from New Jersey, without a warrant. The owner took the runaway by force from his place of service, and had put him in a wagon, when the person in whose service the slave was at the time employed, with the assistance of his neighbors, assaulted the owner (Mr. C. Johnson) and his party, released the slave, and after having wounded Mr. J. seriously in the scuffle, took him and his friends prisoners to jail, and had him indicted for felony before the county court, at which he was tried and acquitted.

The present suit was brought under the act of congress by Mr. *Johnson*, against one *Kindernine*, with whom the runaway was residing, and who had been active in the attacks. The damages were laid at $10,000.

Judge Baldwin charged decidedly in favor of the plaintiff, and his remarks are quoted as "a striking commentary upon the recklessness of those who assert that the north is interfering with the peculiar property of the south." He expressly directed the jury "that a master has the right of arresting his slave, *without a warrant*, and carrying him before any competent tribunal, in order to prove his property; that he is not required to answer the questions of any one, except those of the legal magistrates, and that parol evidence is sufficient to show the validity of his claims in the absence of a bill of sale."

The jury found for the plaintiff—*four thousand dollars damages.*

CASE OF MR. M. M. NOAH. A case was recently decided in the vice chancellor's court, which may be of interest to those who buy and sell newspaper establishments. It was on an application of Mr. Noah, to cancel a bond which he had given not to publish a newspaper for eight years. In 1829, Noah sold to Webb and Tylee, the New York Enquirer, and entered into an obligation in a penal sum of $20,000, not to publish a paper in this city for eight years. In 1831, Tylee sold back his interest to Noah, who entered upon the same as joint proprietor; and, in 1832, Mr. Noah sold out his moiety to Mr. Webb, but did not renew the stipulations of the bond, and finally, Webb, to meet some embarrassments, assigns all his interest to trustees. Mr. Noah prayed that his bond may be cancelled, with a view of establishing a paper himself, and on the ground that, having purchased back the interest of Mr. Tylee, the bond became null and void. The vice chancellor, in a very learned opinion, admitted, that the parties had no redress at law, and could not recover on the bond, should Mr. Noah establish a paper; but he held that it was a delicate point for a court of equity to cancel an agreement without pressing causes, that did not exist in this case; and he was of opinion, that the parties had an equitable right in the bond, although the subsequent arrangement had deprived them of legal redress, and thought that the court could restrain Mr. Noah from publishing a paper, should he be so disposed.

The court was full, as the case was one of interest; and Mr. Noah, though flattering himself that he was somewhat of a "veteran editor," has discovered that he has still four years of his apprenticeship to complete. [*N. Y. Gaz.*

CASE OF A REWARD OFFERED FOR ABUSE! A curious suit was recently tried in one of the ward courts of New York, against a candidate for the office of alderman at the late election in that city. It was an action for services performed for eight days at five dollars a day, for writing electioneering handbills, songs, and abusive paragraphs, *against* the defendant's election. The plaintiff undertook to prove that the defendant made a contract to pay for being abused in this way, thinking it would benefit his election! There was no doubt that the candidate had expressed this opinion, but he denied the contract, and asserted the expressions to be merely jocular, and the jury found a verdict in his favor.