

71
LEROY B. YOUNG
LAWYER
FIRST NATL BANK BLDG.
BRIGHAM CITY, UTAH

September 15th, 1923.

Board of Pardons,
Capitol Bldg.,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

Gentlemen:-

In Re: C. C. Monroe, Frank Angle.
William B. Eaton

Application for parole.

Replying to yours of the 10th inst., permit me to
advise you as follows:

Frank Angle and C. C. Monroe were convicted by the jury in the First Judicial District of grand larceny of wheat, the evidence presented showed that a truck stopped in the night by a pile of wheat belonging to a farmer in Blue Creek, this county, and loaded on a load of wheat. While the owner went to a neighbor's for assistance the truck left and was tracked some distance. Telephone calls were sent out ahead and people were on the look out for the truck. Finally a truck passed a given point sometime later, during the same night and when overtaken was found to be loaded with wheat and driven by two defendants above named. There was a great deal of very convincing evidence offered to show that the wheat these defendants had in the truck was part of the grain belonging to the state's witness. There was a peculiar kind of sewing of the sacks which was positively identified. There was also barley in the wheat which made the identification almost positive. At any rate the defendants were found guilty. As I recall it, there was about forty sacks of wheat taken.

After the defendants were convicted they appealed to the Supreme Court. Messrs. J. D. Call and B. C. Call were their Attorneys. Unfortunately for these defendants, J. D. Call became ill while the case was pending on appeal and he died before the case was heard. It also appears that he neglected to serve his Bill of Exceptions within the time allowed by Law, and the Order of the Court and the Bill of Exceptions was stricken on appeal and decided on the judgment roll. I do not believe that this was caused through his sickness as it was sometime prior to the time when he became ill that he allowed the time to pass. Nor do I believe there was any merit to the appeal, but of course the defendants had a right to have their case reviewed by the Supreme Court had the appeal been perfected in time.