INTERROGATORIES ON THE PART OF THE RESPONDANTS TO WITNESSES

1st. Do you reside in the city of Baltimore, and what is your occupation?

2d. Are you acquainted with Henry Stump, Judge of the Criminal Court of Baltimore city, and have you knowledge of the conduct of said Judge in his official character?

The evidences of witnesses examined by the Joint Committee on the part of Henry S. Stump, Judge of the Criminal Court for Baltimore city, February 14th, 1860.

John S. Pontier sworn.

John S. Pontier, a witness on the part of said Stump, being duly sworn, deposeth and saith as follows:

To the 1st interrogatory. I do, and I have been Deputy Sheriff under Mr. Creamer for the last two years.

To the 2d interrogatory. I do not know that Judge Stump is in the habit of using intoxicating drinks while in the discharge of his duty on the bench, I have never seen him intoxicated on the bench, I have not known him to adjourn for that purpose. I have known him to adjourn the Court for 15 or 20 minutes, but I do not know whether it was for that purpose or not, I have known him to adjourn at the request of the Jurors. I have never known him to be vulgar and undignified on the bench.

To the 3d interrogatory. He never gave me any instructions upon the subject.

I have known bawdy house keepers to be indicted at every term of the Court in the year. Mary White was fined three times for the year 1858, as appears by the receipts here produced. She paid two of them in full and ten dollars on the other.

This money was paid by me to the Sheriff's book keeper.

These cases were not tried in Court, the fines were fixed in the Sheriff's office and the parties paid them without trial.

To the 4th interrogatory. I never informed him of any Juror being drunk.