

AUDLEY HAD MANY DUTIES

Engineer, Veterinary Surgeon, Manufacturer and Confidential Adviser.

HIS SUIT AGAINST THOS. H. PRATT

A Motion to Have the Plaintiff Go Into a More Specific Enumeration of His manifold Labors Denied by Judge Robinson.

One of the interesting cases in the short calendar in the Superior Court today was that of George T. Audley vs. Thomas H. Pratt, the rich young resident of Clinton.

The suit is an action brought by the plaintiff to recover his back pay for services rendered to the defendant as his general factotum up to the latter part of 1899. Mr. Pratt is very well known to New Haven people.

The case came up today on the motion of Attorney Wolfe that the plaintiff's "more specific statement be made more specific." And this was where a subdued laugh came in the court room, for the plaintiff had already filed a statement in the case which enumerated him as one of the most-remarkable all-round employees to be found in the State.

The original statement was read in court and made the laugh. It recited in part as follows:

"The services rendered the defendant by the plaintiff were made under an oral agreement between them that the plaintiff would act as the defendant's confidential adviser, private secretary and business manager for a salary.

"The nature of the work was to take care of the personal affairs of the defendant, including the building of a house, half finished, commencing August 24, 1899; laying out the lawns, paying the joiners, etc., making trips to New York in January, 1899, to take depositions in behalf of the defendant in the case of Eaves vs. Pratt; selling and purchasing horses; attending to banking business for the defendant; taking the entire superintendency of the building of the house of defendant, burned on September 22, 1896; going to the State of Kentucky in relation to a law suit in which the defendant was interested; selling witch hazel (the product manufactured by the defendant); traveling at times at the request of the defendant from Springfield to Newark; attending the building of the house and stable belonging to the mother of the defendant; superintending the building of a witch hazel factory; paying the wages of a crew on a yacht, paying bills after marriage of the defendant; superintendency of the building of a dam; acting as engineer, veterinary surgeon, and manufacturer of witch hazel; superintending the bottling of the same; operating the engine, getting in the hay and the oats on the farm; breaking in horses, and doing other things too numerous to mention."

No time was fixed for the payment of said services except that from time to time the defendant promised to have an accounting.

Plaintiff admits having received \$570 in payment from his services from September, 1894, to March, 1899. The exact amount of the payments the plaintiff is unable to furnish in consequence of the loss and destruction by fire of his books of account.

Judge Robinson denied the motion for a more specific statement.