

ACQUITS BURNS MEN IN THE FRANK CASE

Jury Finds No Subornation of
Perjury—Deliberates for
Fifteen Hours.

HAIL VERDICT WITH JOY

Regarded by Frank's Friends as
Complete Answer to Charge of
Corrupt Use of Money.

Special to The New York Times.

ATLANTA, Jan. 31.—The jury in the case of Dan S. Lehon, Southern manager for the Burns Detective Agency; C. C. Tedder, a former Burns operative, and Attorney Arthur Thurman, charged with subornation of perjury in an effort to obtain a new trial for Leo M. Frank, convicted of the murder of Mary Phagan, brought in a verdict of not guilty at 1:50 o'clock this afternoon.

The jury had been out about fifteen hours and had great difficulty in reaching a verdict. It was said that two or three jurors were at first in favor of conviction and agreed to a verdict of acquittal just before 1 o'clock.

Lehon, Tedder, and Thurman were accused of bribing the Rev. C. B. Ragsdale and R. L. Barber to make an affidavit that they had overheard the negro, Jim Conley, confess to another negro that he (Conley) had murdered Mary Phagan. This affidavit was used in the extraordinary motion for a new trial made by the attorneys for Frank.

Ragsdale and Barber afterward repudiated the affidavit and swore that they had been bribed to make it by Lehon, Tedder, and Thurman. Lehon, Tedder, and Thurman were indicted and placed on trial several days ago.

Solicitor General Dorsey in his address to the jury charged that there had been "crooked work" in the interest of Frank and that it had been done by the Burns agents. It was generally believed, however, that the State had failed to make out a strong case against Lehon, Tedder, and Thurman and the verdict of not guilty was not unexpected.

The three men were in court when the verdict was rendered, and they were overjoyed. Each of them asserted that the case against him had been "framed up" by the Atlanta detectives.

Judge Arthur Powell, leading counsel for the three men, said that it was highly gratifying to know that his clients had been "tried before a jury which was universally conceded to be of the highest personnel of any jury that ever had sat in Fulton County."

The attorneys for Frank and his friends are greatly pleased over the verdict. They call it a complete answer to the charge, generally circulated, that vast sums of money have been spent in a corrupt manner in his interest.

Generally the verdict is considered as indicating a reaction from the high state of public excitement which prevailed while Frank was being tried and for some months after his conviction.

The New York Times

Published: February 1, 1915

Copyright © The New York Times