

ANSWER 20 - REASONS FOR PARDON

On November 23, 2011, President Obama granted “pardons” to two turkeys named “peace” and “liberty.” The ceremony was part of a widely covered Thanksgiving ritual that has been faithfully carried on by presidents for some time. But, while doing so, the President noted that Thanksgiving is “the one day that is ours ... the one day that is truly American.”

With some irony, the President had quoted a convicted felon, one William Sydney Porter. Porter spent just over three years in a federal penitentiary, in the late 1800s. He then emerged to become one of the most famous, and most loved, American authors: **O. Henry**. Of greater importance, for purposes of this application, Porter’s conviction was his first and his last. He never had another brush with the law. He went on to live an honorable, productive life, earning the respect and admiration of those around him. He died an individual accomplished enough to be quoted by a modern-day president of the United States, a citizen respected and honorable enough to be commemorated by the *U.S. Postal Service*.

Petitioner P.S. Ruckman, Jr. requests that the President of the United States grant a posthumous presidential pardon to Porter. This request is made with the very highest respect for the clemency powers granted the President in *Article II, Section 3* of the *U.S. Constitution* and with additional desire that presidents generally make greater use of said power.

I believe the weight of this request is greatly enhanced when one considers the fact that O. Henry was imprisoned for a first (and last) offense. He was clearly rehabilitated, in every sense of the language, by any reasonable measure. In addition to rehabilitation, his life was characterized by personal accomplishment that was beneficial to society. Finally, it my contention that, while times and clemency practices change, O. Henry is an excellent candidate for clemency by today’s standards and practices, and would certainly have also been an excellent candidate for clemency by the standards of his own day.

I. WILLIAM PORTER LED AN EXEMPLARY, LAW-ABIDING LIFE BEFORE HIS CONVICTION.

Porter was 32 years old at the time of his conviction. It was the first time he had been convicted and it was the last.¹ His life, of course, has been meticulously researched by a host of writers. What is also notable is the fact that Porter worked in positions of considerable responsibility before coming to *First National*, but showed no signs of dishonesty or corruption. His reputation as an employee was without spot or blemish.

At age 19, for example, Porter completed his apprenticeship and was registered as a licensed pharmacist. He practiced in that profession, without controversy, in his uncle’s pharmacy in North Carolina (*W.C. Porter and Company Drug Store*) and in Texas (*Morely Brothers Drug Store*).

Porter also served for two years – without incident - as a bookkeeper for the real estate firm *Maddox Brothers and Anderson* (Austin, Texas).

¹ Porter died at the age of 47, in 1910.

Finally, just previous to his employment with *First National*, Porter served as a draftsman in the *General Land Office* of the State of Texas, a government position that he held for four years. In the *Land Office*, Porter was considered a “master” with respect to sketching and writing. He left the position only because there was a change in administrations.

II. WILLIAM PORTER’S OFFENSE WAS MINOR.

Despite his literary fame, William Porter’s embezzlement convictions do not appear in books on “great” crime or “famous” trials. He didn’t misappropriate funds as bank president to the tune of \$200,000 and cause a general financial panic.² He wasn’t president of a defunct bank missing almost \$1 million.³ He wasn’t convicted on twelve counts in a case involving \$125,000 in suspicious loans, \$17 million in liability and the complete and utter collapse of a bank.⁴ That is to say, William Porter was most certainly not the Charles Ponzi, Bernie Madoff, Jeffrey Skilling or Ken Lay of his generation.

No, Porter was a mere teller, convicted on three counts of “embezzlement” amounting to just over \$1,100. In addition, it should be remembered that the prosecution did not make the case that the money ended up in Porter’s pocket. It was only argued that he was responsible for the books, something he himself admitted.

One gets a further sense that Porter’s offense was considered minor by the fact that Judge Maxey handed down only the minimum sentence required by law (see discussion in note 24, below).

III. WILLIAM PORTER HAD AN EXEMPLARY PRISON RECORD.

Porter stepped into the federal penitentiary at Columbus, Ohio, on April 25, 1898. Chief physician **John M. Thomas** said that, after looking back over his experience with over ten thousand prisoners, he had never known a man who was “so deeply humiliated by imprisonment. As a result, said Thomas, Porter’s record was “clear in every respect.” Indeed, there was not a single demerit against him.⁵ Thomas also said of Porter, “He was a ‘model prisoner,’ willing, obedient, faithful.”⁶

Porter worked directly under night physician **Dr. George W. Willard** who considered him “careful and conscientious.” Porter’s shift was from six at night until six in the morning, but Willard often left him “in charge,” knowing things would be run “regularly and effectively.”⁷ Willard also remembered that “nearly every” drug clerk at the prison was “at some time or

² Like Charles W. Morse, whose 15-year sentence for misapplication of bank funds was commuted by William Howard Taft on January 18, 1921.

³ Like Gideon W. Marsh, whose 12-year and three month sentence for conspiracy, misapplication of bank funds and making false reports was commuted by Theodore Roosevelt on December 8, 1902.

⁴ Like James D. Fish, whose 10-year sentence for misapplication of bank funds, false entries and intent to deceive a bank and bank examiners was commuted by Grover Cleveland on January 29, 1889.

⁵ C. ALPHONSO SMITH. *O. HENRY*. 147 (1916).

⁶ RICHARD O’CONNOR. *O. HENRY*. 66 (1970).

⁷ *Id.* at 68-9.

another" guilty of petty trafficking in drugs or whiskey. But Porter was "always above reproach."⁸

These assessments of Porter had amazing consequences. The Ohio Penitentiary was located downtown. But some of its administration offices were actually in separate buildings, on the same street, but a great distance away ... *outside* of the prison walls. Only a few trusted prisoners were allowed to work in these offices. And Porter was one of them. He once wrote:

I am about as near as free as possible ... I sleep outside at the office and am absolutely without supervision of any kind. I go in and out as I please. At night I take walks on the street or go down to the river and walk along the paths there.⁹

Looking over Porter's prison history, one might very well judge his behavior to be that of a man who 1) never should have been in prison to begin with 2) was certainly no "criminal at heart" or 3) had rehabilitated in every sense of the language. With two years' time taken off for "good behavior," Porter's walked out of prison on July 24, 1901.

IV. PORTER'S PRISON AND POST-PRISON LIFE CLEARLY INDICATE THAT HE WAS REHABILITATED.

If William Porter's exemplary prison record is not enough to convince skeptics that rehabilitation had already occurred, his life after prison (in addition to that record) should. He lived the remainder of his life – a life carefully scrutinized by numerous authors - without incident. Consequently, the conviction for his work at *First National* was his first and his last.

Indeed, it is my contention that the admiration and respect Porter accrued by the life he lived, and his considerable talent and accomplishments were primarily responsible for the momentum behind the view that he may not have ever been guilty in the first place. Courtney agrees with this view noting:

The offense, however, was mitigated in the eyes of friends and acquaintances because of the inherent nature of the short-story writer. Many who knew him would not admit his guilt because they felt that basically there was no purposeful design of wrong doing. This attitude toward a man who was without doubt technically guilty is a tribute of high order. When one considers all the facts which indicate O. Henry's guilt, one is best able to understand the conduct of a man innately good at heart.¹⁰

It is important to understand that this application is *not* based on the view that Porter was innocent. The compelling evidence of his rehabilitation and his life of accomplishment are more than enough to support our request. The strong belief among many that Porter *was* innocent

⁸ *Id.* at 69.

⁹ *Id.* at 72.

¹⁰ LUTHER E. COURTNEY. *O. Henry's Case Reconsidered*. 14 AMERICAN LITERATURE 361 (1943) at 371.

simply constitutes additional compelling evidence of the incredible positive transformation that took place in his life.

V. PORTER EMERGED FROM PRISON NOT ONLY AS A LAW-ABIDING CITIZEN, BUT AS ONE OF AMERICA’S MOST BELOVED AUTHORS.

As a federal prisoner, William Porter wrote fourteen short-stories which critics have rated “among his best.”¹¹ With the publication of *Cabbages and Kings* (1904), Porter, writing as “O. Henry,” received favorable press and public praise that soon translated into a “ready market” for his work.¹² Two years later, with the publication of a collection of stories entitled *The Four Million*, he established himself as “the head of American short-story writers” so far as “popularity with the masses” was concerned.¹³

Writing in 1914, Rollins observed O. Henry had been “the most popular short-story writer in America” for “several years.”¹⁴ Significantly, his writings were in “enormous vogue” among “all classes of Americans.”¹⁵ By 1916, O. Henry had passed beyond the status of a “one-nation” writer and became a best seller in England.¹⁶

Writing in 1917, Beaty observed that O. Henry’s popularity in the United States seemed “established” and his “fame assured” as “the American writer.”¹⁷ Collected volumes of O’ Henry became a “staple in middle-class American homes” and any library of consequence contained his works.¹⁸

In the decade following his death, no other short-story writer except Kipling sold better in hardcover.¹⁹ Eventually, O. Henry was translated in French, German, Spanish, Russian, Japanese, Swedish and Norwegian.²⁰ In 1953, his writings accounted for one-quarter of all of the books published in the Soviet Union that were written by American writers.²¹

Smith observes:

It is O. Henry’s distinction that he has enlarged the area of the American short story by enriching and diversifying its social themes. In his hands the short story has become the organ of a social consciousness and more varied and multiform than it had every expressed before.”²²

¹¹ O’CONNOR, *supra* note 5 at 70.

¹² HYDER E. ROLLINS. *O. Henry*. 22 THE SEWANNE REVIEW 213 (1914) at 219.

¹³ *Id.* at 219-20.

¹⁴ *Id.* at 232.

¹⁵ JOHN BEATY. *O. Henry’s Life and Position*. 25 THE SEWANEE REVIEW 222 (1917) at 237.

¹⁶ *Id.*

¹⁷ *Id.* at 239.

¹⁸ O’CONNOR, *supra* note 5 at 232.

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ *Id.*

²¹ *Id.* at 234.

²² SMITH, *supra* note 4 at 204-5.

Rollins notes:

[O. Henry] was perhaps unique in that every story he wrote, including several fragmentary and unfinished ones, was published either in a magazine or book form or both.²³

If necessary, O. Henry's claim to permanence in American literature could be based, like Poe's on his mastery of the short-story form, for in this respect no other American writer has excelled him ... I do believe that he will always be counted as one of the best American writers of the short story."²⁴

Writing in 1999, Harold Bloom, Sterling Professor of Humanities at Yale University said:

William Sydney Porter is a central figure in American popular literature. He has a huge, permanent audience ...²⁵

VI. BY THE STANDARDS OF HIS DAY, WILLIAM PORTER WOULD HAVE BEEN AN EXCELLENT CANDIDATE FOR CLEMENCY, HAD HE BUT ONLY APPLIED.

In considering the merits of this application, I believe that it is particularly fair – if not absolutely necessary – to consider clemency practices during William Porter's post-prison life. To do so, I collected original data on clemency in the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, who served as President of the United States from September of 1901 (just after Porter left prison), to March of 1909 (just before Porter died).

Using microfilm data of clemency warrants granted in this time period,²⁶ and the *Annual Report of the Attorney General*,²⁷ I uncovered twenty-seven presidential pardons and commutations of sentence involving banking-related offenses (see enclosed attachment summarizing some of the particulars of each warrant). Offenses addressed in the warrants include: embezzlement of funds of a national bank, violation of the national banking laws, false entries in the books of a national bank, misapplication of funds of a national bank and abstracting funds of a national bank. See attached **Figure 1**, below. While I did not have the time and resources to study the individual circumstances of each and every case, aggregate data do say a great deal about banking offenses, sentencing for banking offenses and clemency practices in that day.

First, I note that the average prison sentence in the twenty-seven cases is 60 months – the exact amount of time that Porter was given by Judge Maxey. Indeed, although the length of sentences in the data ranges from 12 to 147 months, the 60-month mark appears to have been boiler plate

²³ ROLLINS *supra* note 11 at 220.

²⁴ *Id.* at p. 232.

²⁵ HAROLD BLOOM. *BLOOM'S MAJOR SHORT STORY WRITERS: O. HENRY*. 1999, at 9.

²⁶ Microfilm Set T967, National Archives, Washington DC.

²⁷ 1902-1909.

(a mandatory minimum) in such cases. Twenty-one (or 78 percent) of those receiving clemency for such violations were given a 60-month sentence.²⁸

Second, I note that twenty-three (or 85 percent) of the warrants in this time period are actually commutations, reducing the length of the original sentences. As a result, while the average prison sentence for the commutation warrants was almost five-and-a-half years, the average length of time between sentencing and the granting of a commutation of sentence²⁹ was only 2.3 years.³⁰ Recall, Sydney Porter served 3.2 years in prison before being released for good behavior.

With respect to pardons, the data are less informative. All four of the pardon recipients received sentences of 5 years. While their pardons were granted, on average, 4.7 years after sentencing, the range of distances is 2.6 to 6.3 years. Porter, again, served longer than 2.6 years and lived longer than 6.3 years after sentencing.

Finally, in order to provide some insight into the logic behind the twenty-seven pardons and commutations of sentence with offenses and sentences quite similar to Porter's, I perused the *Annual Report* of the attorney general for explanations of Roosevelt's decisions.³¹ In the figure below, I provide examples of explanations which are relevant to Porter's case:

Warrant No.	
1	A number of banks officers implicated. He fled, but eventually turned himself in.
2	Fugitive for seven years. Voluntarily returned.
3	Established himself in business more than 2 years. Supported by community.
5	Officers of the bank tried to have the prosecution stopped.
6	Supported by bank officers.
7	Embezzled several thousand dollars. Supported by bank officials.
9	Had been leading an upright life and trying to reestablish himself.
13	Served term less the allowances for good conduct
17	Had a child being cared for by a friend.
19	First offense.
20	Supported by bank officials. Clemency would fulfill redemptive purpose of law.
23	Another bank official involved.

²⁸ Page 69 of the *Annual Report* of the Attorney General of the United States refers to “the usual punishment of 5 years’ imprisonment” in a case involving three indictments related to “violation of the national banking laws.” On page 111 of the *Annual Report* for 1903, a judge is said to have lamented the fact that “the law” would not permit him to impose a “much less sentence” than 60 months. See also page 134, *Annual Report* for 1904, case of Fred E. Harvey; Page 78, *Annual Report* for 1906, cases of James H. Ekas and Norman M. Downey.

²⁹ I was unable to determine the date of sentencing for William S. Jewett, of Massachusetts (warrant 11 in our data), whose 84-month sentence was commuted June 20, 1905.

³⁰ If we look only at commutations for persons receiving 60-month sentences (N=17), the average length of time between sentencing and commutation is only 2.0 years. If we look at pardons and commutations for persons receiving 60-month sentences (N=21), the average length of time between sentencing and clemency is 2.5 years.

³¹ No explanation whatsoever was provided for the commutation of sentence given to S. J. Spotts on May 28, 1905 (warrant 10 in our data).

From these data, I conclude that, given the clemency environment, Sydney Porter would have been an excellent candidate for a commutation of sentence, had he only applied. He was in prison for a first offense. His prison record was excellent. He had the support of bank officials and members of the community. His wife was dead and his young daughter needed him. Etc. Likewise, given his accomplishment, reputation and clear record after prison, a pardon should have been well within reach.

Indeed, one author suggests – without explanation - that, while in prison, Porter "lived in constant expectation of a pardon."³²

VII. BY THE STANDARDS OF TODAY, WILLIAM PORTER IS AN EXCELLENT, WELL-DESERVING CANDIDATE FOR CLEMENCY.

Admittedly, the clemency environment has changed considerably since the time of Theodore Roosevelt. President Roosevelt granted almost 500 pardons and commutations of sentence as he finished out the term of William McKinley. In his own first full term, Roosevelt cleared that mark. But no president has passed the 1,000 mark since the administration of Lyndon Johnson (1961-1963). Today, commutations of sentence – quite common in the late 1800s and early 1900s – are a rare, if not almost freak, occurrences. And, for most of American history, presidents and Department of Justice officials have discouraged or, at least, refrained from granting posthumous pardons.³³

Today, the typical act of federal executive clemency is a pardon granted simply to restore the civil rights of the recipient. In most cases, the recipient's offense was minor (usually non-violent) and it occurred many years (if not decades) ago. The recipient has also undergone a background check conducted by the Department of Justice and the FBI. If an applicant beats the long odds, and receives a pardon, the conventional wisdom is that a life of productivity and evidence of integration back into society won the day. In recent years, it is also the case that - notwithstanding official pronouncement by the Department of Justice – presidents have been willing to grant posthumous pardons.³⁴

This pardon application, on behalf of William Porter – while clearly ripe for the early 1900s - fits more than comfortably into the current clemency paradigm. In addition to being a first offense, Porter's was non-violent, minor, and certainly committed many years ago. Porter's post-prison life was one of hard work, accomplishment, financial reward and wide-spread (and positive) repute. And, importantly, Porter remained a well-respected, thoroughly law-abiding citizen.

³² SMITH, *supra* note 4 at 154.

³³ The pleadings of supporters of O. Henry, Dr. Samuel Mudd, detective Ellis H. Parker and black separatist Marcus Garvey notwithstanding. It is our understanding that attempts were made to secure a pardon on Porter's behalf in the administrations of Woodrow Wilson, Dwight Eisenhower and Ronald Reagan. See Edith Evan Asbury. "For O. Henry, a Hometown Festival." *New York Times*, April 13, 1985.

³⁴ Bill Clinton granted the first posthumous presidential pardon to Lt. Henry O. Flipper (February 19, 1999). George W. Bush granted the second to Charlie Winters (December 23, 2008).

It makes sense that, if the President of the United States finds William Porter important enough, respectable enough, and of such relevance as to quote him during a high-profile public relations gig (like the pardoning of turkeys at Thanksgiving), then Porter is worthy of serious consideration as a candidate for federal executive clemency. If the U.S. Postal Service deemed the 150th anniversary of Porter's birth worthy of a commemorative stamp, this application, and the arguments therein, deserves more than a cursory, inartful rejection.

VIII. THE PARDON OF WILLIAM PORTER WOULD A WELL-DESERVED SYMBOLIC GESTURE

William Porter was deeply shamed by his conviction and he took just about every measure to put it as far behind him as possible. We may never know, with certainty, why he never applied for a pardon himself. But the fact that his conviction was hidden from his own daughter until well after his death says a great deal.

It is also easy to imagine Porter feeling a keen sense of agony as his prison mate Al Jennings paraded around the earth proclaiming innocence and securing a presidential pardon from Theodore Roosevelt,³⁵ all the while writing books which took credit for all kinds of Wild West outlaw behavior.³⁶

O'Connor notes Porter lived with threats of "disclosure" and/or "blackmail."³⁷ With some irony, the enthusiastic efforts to argue his innocence only redoubled insistence to prove his guilt. Either way, the focus on Porter's obvious rehabilitation has been lost.

In speaking to a Town Hall in Tampa, Florida, in January of 2010, President Obama said:

"This is part of my faith, my religious faith, but you don't have to be religious to, I think, believe in the idea of redemption, that people can get a second chance, that people can change."³⁸

In December of 2010, *ABC News* reported that, when the owner of the Philadelphia Eagles decided to give talented quarterback Michael Vick (just out of prison) a chance to play profession football once again, President Obama called. The owner related that the President was:

"... was happy that we did something on such a national stage that showed our faith in giving someone a second chance after such a major downfall."³⁹

The President could realize and illustrate these sentiments in no better way than with a posthumous pardon of one of America's most beloved writers.

³⁵ February 7, 1907.

³⁶ AL JENNINGS, *BEATING BACK*. 1913.

³⁷ O'CONNOR, *supra* note 5 at 137.

³⁸ "President Obama Touches Nerve, Praising Michael Vick's Second Chance." *ABCNews.com*, December 27, 2010.

³⁹ *Id.*

IX. THE PARDON OF WILLIAM PORTER WOULD BE MUCH MORE THAN A WELL-DESERVED SYMBOLIC GESTURE

The posthumous pardons of **Lt. Henry O. Flipper** and **Charlie Winters** were landmark events in the history of federal executive clemency, but were clearly symbolic pardons in the narrowest sense of the language. In the instance of Lt. Flipper, there was keen sense that racism had resulted in an injustice.⁴⁰ In the case of Mr. Winters, there was a desire for equal treatment of persons convicted of similar offenses.⁴¹ But neither Flipper nor Winters were nearly as well-known as O. Henry, and they never will be. While perhaps significant from a legal standpoint, neither pardon was particularly representative of the pardon power today.

Today, the conventional view of pardons (state and federal) is all too often deeply infected with a kind of cynicism that is based in ignorance. This cynicism is directed at both those wielding the power of clemency and those who benefit from it. In this view, politicians use pardons to benefit personal friends, family members, large donors and fellow partisans. Anyone outside of the ranks is assumed to be a violent criminal, being tossed into the streets to terrorize society once again. In this view, acts of clemency are seen as “gifts” (fittingly distributed around Christmastime), “gifts” which may (or may not) be deserved. Sadly, members of the media do little to better inform, or discourage, this conventional wisdom.

Of course, students of the pardon power (state and federal) know the typical act of clemency does *not* spring anyone from prison. The typical recipient has *already* served his/her time – if there ever *was* any to be served. The offenses addressed are usually minor / non-violent and the recipient has, over a *considerable* period of time, integrated back into society as a law-abiding and productive member.

In sum, the typical pardon (which usually has the effect of merely restoring rights) is not a “gift” at all. It is *earned* and *deserved*. Executives are thus not “doing favors.” They are fulfilling their constitutional duty to make sure laws are not “too sanguinary and cruel” and that – where deserved - there is “easy access” to mercy.⁴²

The posthumous pardon of William Porter can be the very first to make this critical point, educating the American public - like no other - as to the original purposes and actual usage of the pardon power. It can be a much-needed giant step toward realigning the conventional wisdom with reality. The American public needs to understand the relationship between the rehabilitative function and the pardon power and Porter’s case is the perfect vehicle.

⁴⁰ DARRYL W. JACKSON, JEFREY H. SMITH, EDWARD H. SISSON and HELENE T. KRASNOFF, *Bending Toward Justice: The Posthumous Pardon of Henry Ossian Flipper*. 74 INDIANA LAW JOURNAL 1251 (1999)

⁴¹ See Eric Lichtblau. “Jailed for Aiding Israel, But Pardoned by Bush.” *New York Times*, December 23, 2008. Two others convicted with along with Winters were pardoned: Herman “Hank” Greenspun (by President Kennedy, October 18, 1961) and Adolph “Al” Schwimmer (by President Clinton, January 20, 2001).

⁴² ALEXANDER HAMILTON, *FEDERALIST* 74.

School teachers across America could discuss rehabilitation and pardon as their students read *The Gift of the Magi* or the *Ransom of Red-Chief*. In an environment where the value of clemency is understood and appreciated, presidents and DOJ officials can exercise the pardon power more generously, and more effectively, as they should. O. Henry is considered a master of “surprise endings” and his life-story deserves a better ending.

Figure 1

Pardons and Commutations of Sentence for Banking-Related Offenses
T. Roosevelt (January 1902 to December 1908)

<i>Warrant No.</i>	<i>Pres</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Recipient</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Form</i>	<i>Sent</i>	<i>Grant</i>	<i>Difference</i>	<i>Offense</i>	<i>Death</i>	<i>Prison</i>	<i>Months</i>	<i>Fine</i>	<i>Amount</i>
1	T.Roos	1s	William N. Boggs	DE	C-LD	5/10/1899	1/17/1902	2.7	embezz.funds national bank	0	1	60	1	6500
2	T.Roos	2s-	Gideon W. Marsh	PA	C-LD	12/13/1898	12/8/1902	4.0	vio.nat.banking laws	0	1	147		
3	T.Roos	2s	Herman G. Knickerbocke	IL	P-R	4/29/1898	12/23/1902	4.7	embezz.nat.bank funds	0	1	60		
4	T.Roos	3s	U.M. Henderson	CO	C-LD	3/26/1901	6/22/1903	2.2	embezz.funds of national bank	0	1	60		
5	T.Roos	4s	Fred E. Harvey	MI	C-LD	1/18/1901	3/26/1904	3.2	embezz.funds of natl.bank	0	1	60		
6	T.Roos	4s	Albert J. Schroth	PA	P	10/31/1901	6/23/1904	2.6	false entries in books of natl.bank	0	1	60	1	0.06
7	T.Roos	4s	Theodore W. Dulle	MO	C-L	4/17/1903	6/23/1904	1.2	embezz.funds of natl.bank	0	1	60		
8	T.Roos	4s	Samuel Flower, jr.	LA	C-LD	3/26/1902	6/30/1904	2.3	embezz.funds of natl.bank	0	1	60		
9	T.Roos	4s	William G. Peters	WA	P-R	6/15/1898	10/19/1904	6.3	violation of banking laws	0	1	60		
10	T. Roos	1	S.J. Spotts	TX	C-AO	3/28/1904	5/28/1905	1.2	embezz.funds national bank	0	1	60		
11	T. Roos	1	William S. Jewett	MA	C-AO		6/20/1905		vio.national bank laws	0	1	84		
12	T. Roos	1	Donald McKerracher	WA	C-AO	1/14/1902	3/1/1906	4.1	embezz.funds national bank	0	1	60		
13	T. Roos	2	Christian A. Reimers	NE	P-R	3/9/1901	6/2/1906	5.2	vio.national bank.laws	0	1	60		
14	T. Roos	2	James H. Ekas	PA	C-L(2)	10/23/1904	6/13/1906	1.6	embezz.funds nat.bank,false entries	0	1	60		
15	T. Roos	2	Norman M. Downey	MD	C-AO	1/25/1904	6/15/1906	2.4	embezz.funds national bank	0	1	60		
16	T. Roos	2	Samuel H. Morris	TX	C-AO	3/25/1904	6/15/1906	2.2	embezz.funds national bank	0	1	60		
17	T. Roos	2	Frederick W. Peterson	AL	C-AO	4/8/1904	10/3/1906	2.5	embezz.funds of natl.bank	0	1	60		
18	T. Roos	2	Jesse Baker	MD	C-LD	6/6/1904	1/5/1907	2.6	embezz.funds of natl.bank	0	1	60		
19	T. Roos	3	W.W. Lea	TN	C-AO	6/9/1902	6/20/1907	5.0	misapplication of funds of natl.bank	0	1	84		
20	T. Roos	3	Bessie L. Bond	MD	C-L	6/3/1907	8/31/1907	0.2	f.altering, passing nat.bank note	0	1	60		
21	T. Roos	3	Alan Parker	TN	C-AO	10/8/1906	2/17/1908	1.4	misapplic.of natl.bank funds--5 cases	0	1	12		
22	T. Roos	4	Ben S. Adams	MS	C-L	1/11/1907	4/6/1908	1.2	embezz.natl.-bank funds	0	1	60		
23	T. Roos	4	Alexander R. Chisolm	AL	C-L	5/7/1907	9/5/1908	1.3	embezz.funds of natl.bank	0	1	72		
24	T. Roos	4	Wm. H. White	MD	C-L	1/3/1907	9/19/1908	1.7	embezz.funds natl. bank	0	1	60		
25	T. Roos	4	Charles F. Grotefend	MO	C-L	6/3/1907	11/5/1908	1.4	embezz.funds natl.bank	0	1	60		
26	T. Roos	4	Charles Menzemer	PN	C-L	7/2/1907	12/15/1908	1.5	abstr,misapp.funds nat.bank,f.entries,	0	1	60		
27	T. Roos	4	Edward P. MacMillan	PN	C-L	7/5/1907	12/15/1908	1.4	abst.,misapp.funds natl.bank,false ent.,	0	1	72		
								1.7		0	1	60		