

detailed study of the whole case would have to be made by referring to the Records Bureau, to make a determination as to whether or not the alleged consumer was arrested or not. If the consumer was not arrested, which could have been the case, then a study of the SSB files would be necessary to determine if an affidavit was taken from the consumer in which it would be demonstrated she admitted consuming beer on the premises in violation of the law. I also pointed out that the charged alleged on the case report referred to the Criminal Code, which we would have to look up to be certain this was what Ruby was actually charged with, as it appeared on the surface.

We went to the Records Bureau and checked the files there on the names of the two alleged witnesses which appeared on the arrest report, which they showed me they had a copy of in their possession. A check of the Records Bureau files showed nothing on the two girls, named Schultz and O'Brien. I then took them to the Jail Office, where I obtained the Jail Copy of Vernon's Statutes. I looked up the specific code with which Ruby was charged, Section II article 667-19, paragraph 16. It is the "catch-all" code in the malt liquor section, in which it states the licensee can be charged for violating any section of the Liquor Law, including Liquor Board regulations. They copied the information from the book. They asked me if there was a possibility that this could have led to the dismissal of the case, because of insufficient information or evidence. I told them I would not presume to state the fine legal points involved, and that this was the proper duty of the D. A.'s office. I stated that it appeared to me that one or both of us (Blankenship and I) observed the beer on the table at 1:30 am on a Sunday morning, which as I understood the law, was a violation