

Barnett &amp; Williams,

LAWYERS.

Room 4.

180 Clark Street

PENSION CLAIMS PROSECUTED.

Chicago. February 23rd, '93. 1892.

Judge Tourgee,

Mayville, N.Y.,

My dear sir:-

Your letter was received this day, and my partner and I, feel under many obligations to you for your very helpful advice. We have weighed the matter very carefully, and from the first felt as you do, that it would be a serious mistake to begin the case and then lose it. We have talked very freely with Miss Wells and she has now a letter from us asking for details of the matter to enable us to proceed further.

So far as I am personally concerned, I have the strongest faith that the libelous article was wholly without foundation. Mr. Williams shares with me the same belief. I have talked with many people from Memphis, and I have not found a single one who does not firmly charge that the publication was untrue and that no such facts exist as the writer would be compelled to prove.

Barnett &amp; Williams,

LAWYERS.

Room 4.

180 Clark Street

PENSION CLAIMS PROSECUTED.

Chicago. 1892.

If I remember correctly, the charge for which the action for libel would lie, specifically mentions a co-respondent, and it would therefore be necessary to prove that charge as made. I am certain that could not be done. I do not think that the defendant would be allowed to plead in justification of his libel a single indiscretion entirely disconnected with the libel. I do not mean by this statement to intimate that there is any such possibility in this case ~~but~~ shall find out before we take any steps in the matter. We have great faith that she would be able to prove her case, but will act very carefully in the premises, as you so kindly suggest.

Yours very respectfully,

F. L. Barnett