

BENJ. H. BRISTOW.
WILLIAM PEET.
WM S. OPDYKE.
DAVID WILLCOX.
WM B. BRISTOW.

Bristow, Peet & Opdyke,
20 Nassau St. New York.

Bullock -vs- Bullock.

March 18, 1895.

Dear Major,

Here is the opinion of Van Brunt, J., at General Term upon our appeal from the order denying our motion for a bill of particulars. You will see that the Judge entirely ignores the argument and the authorities cited by me, which should have been absolutely conclusive of the question. This is exasperating, but so common in that Court that we are never surprised at anything done there. Under a recent opinion of the Court of Appeals the Judge who wrote this opinion at General Term was described as "ignorance posing for wisdom". Unfortunately, however, we cannot go to the Court of Appeals in this particular matter, - I mean upon the order denying our motion for a bill of particulars. But after all, notwithstanding the brutal stupidity of the Judge upon the question of practice, the opinion gives us the right to a limited bill of particulars which we could not have secured except by this appeal, and besides it lays down the law in respect to so-called common law marriages in accordance with