

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT
NO. 2
BALTIMORE CITY.

578
1920

Mamie E. Mitchell

vs.

William E. Mitchell.

1224 Argyle Ave.

-BILL FOR DIVORCE.-
A VINCULO MATRIMONII.

Mr. Clerk:--

Please file &c.,

No. 19812 B.

Roy S. Bond
Sol. for Complainant.

ROY S. BOND
ATTORNEY AT LAW
215 ST. PAUL PLACE
BALTIMORE, MD.

FILED

28th October 1920

Manie E. Mitchell

vs.

William E. Mitchell

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT
NO. 2
BALTIMORE CITY.

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:
Your Oratrix complaining respectfully says:

FIRST: That the parties hereto were married in Baltimore City, State of Maryland, on or about the 27th day of October 1918, and lived together as man and wife until on or about the 17th day of October 1920.

SECOND: That both parties are residents of Baltimore City, State of Maryland, and have been for more than two years prior to the filing of this Bill of Complaint.

THIRD: That though the conduct of your Oratrix towards her said husband has been kind, affectionate and above reproach, he without any just cause or reason abandoned and deserted her and has been guilty of the crime of adultery in Baltimore City with divers lewd women, whose names will be disclosed on the day of trial, and that the said acts were committed without her procurement, connivance, or consent, and that she has not lived or cohabited with the said defendant since she discovered the same.

FOURTH: That there are no children as issue of said marriage.

FIFTH: That your Oratrix is without means to defray the expenses of this litigation and that the defendant is a man of means engaged as as a Railroad Porter, with a permanent income of about Twenty Five (\$25) Dollars, per week and that she is advised by Counsel that she is entitled to have an order passed by this Honorable Court, awarding her a certain sum as alimony during the progress of this suit, and a further sum to compensate her solicitor for his services in the same.

WHEREFORE YOUR ORATRIX PRAYS:

- a- A divorce, A Vinculo Matrimonii,
from the defendant.
- b- Counsel fee and alimony Pendente
lite.
- c- That she may be allowed to re-
sume her maiden name, Mamie E. Dashields..
- d- Such other and further relief as the
case may require.

May it please your Honor, to grant unto your Oratrix,
the writ of subpoena, directed unto the said defendant, command-
ing him to be and appear in this Court, on some day certain to
be therein named and perform such decree as may be passed in
the premises.

As in duty bound, etc., _____

Mamie E. Mitchell
.....
Complainant.

Roy Bond
.....
Sol. for Complainant.

State of Maryland
Baltimore City -to wit

I hereby certify that on this *29th* day of *October*.....
19*20*, before me the subscriber, a Notary Public, of the State
of Maryland, in and for Baltimore City, personally appeared
Mamie E. Mitchell
....., the Complainant, in the
foregoing proceedings, and made oath in due form of law, that
the matter contained in this, her bill of complaint, is true to
the best of her knowledge and belief.

Witness my hand and Notarial Seal.

Eleanor A. Wright
.....
Notary Public.

198

Ct. Ct. No. 2

578
1920

B
Docket No. 29

Mitchell

vs.

Mitchell

Subpoena to Answer Bill of Complaint

Pro

No.

19812 B
2

Copy "deposited"

Filed *S. Youngkin*, 1920

By B Bond

Solicitor.

10

*Summond and a copy of the Process left
with the defendant
(Kelly) 10/30/20
Thomas F. McWhitty
Sheriff
Lumpkin*

EQUITY SUBPOENA
The State of Maryland

To

William E Mitchell

1224 Spingale Ave

of Baltimore City, Greeting:

WE COMMAND AND ENJOIN YOU, That all excuses set aside, you be in your person before the Circuit Court No. 2 of Baltimore City, at the Court House in said city, on the second Monday of *November*, 1920, to answer the complaint of

Mamie E Mitchell

HEREOF fail not, as you will answer to the contrary at your peril: against you in said Court exhibited,

WITNESS, the Honorable MORRIS A. SOPER, Chief Judge of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City, the *14* day of *September*, 1920

Issued the *29* day of *October* in the year 1920

John Pleasant

Clerk.

NOTICE TO THE PERSON SUMMONED:

“Personal attendance in Court on the day named in the above Writ is not required; but unless within such number of days thereafter as the law limits, legal defense is made to the above mentioned suit a judgment by default may be entered against you.”

“The Defendant is required to file his Answer or other Defense in the Clerk’s Office within fifteen days after the return day.”

SERVE ON

William E Mitchell
1224 Argyle Ave

B

Docket

Circuit Court No. 2

Mitchell

vs.

Mitchell

Order Counsel Fee and Alimony
Pendente Lite

ORDER *29 October 1920*

No. *19812* B.
3

Copy - Leaped

Filed *29 October* 19*20*

10

*Copy of the within Order of Court served on
William E Mitchell on the 30th day of October 1920
in presence of John B Kelly.*

Thomas J McWaltz
Sheriff

IN THE
CIRCUIT COURT No. 2

OF

BALTIMORE CITY

September TERM, 19 20

Mamie E Mitchell

vs.

William E Mitchell

ORDERED BY THE COURT, this 29 day of October, 19 20

that the defendant William E Mitchell

pay to the plaintiff Mamie E Mitchell

the sum of Eight

Dollars per week, during the continuance of this suit as Alimony, **pendente lite**, unless cause to the contrary be shown on or before the 13th

day of November, 19 20, provided a copy of this Order be served on the said defendant

William E Mitchell on or before the 3rd

day of November, 19 20, the question of Counsel fee being reserved for the

further determination of this Court.

Walter P. Dawkins

TRUE COPY—TEST:

\$25. per week

No charges

Clerk.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT

No. 2.

OF

Baltimore

Coty.

B 578
1920

Mamie E. Mitchell

vs.

William E. Mitchell

ANSWER.

Mr. Clerk,
Please file.

Davis Bishop

Solicitors for Respondent.

No 19812 B
H

DAVIS & BISHOP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
118 E. LEXINGTON STREET
BALTIMORE, MD.

Feb. 10 November 1920

Ray & Bond

No 128

✓

113

578. Cir. Ct. No. 2
191 Docket No. 29B.

Mamie E. Mitchell
vs.

Wm. E. Mitchell

MOTION FOR HEARING

No. 19812 B
5

Filed, 27 November 1920

Lewis & Bishop

Mamie E. Mitchell

vs.

Wm E. Mitchell

IN THE
CIRCUIT COURT No. 2
OF
BALTIMORE CITY

The

plaintiff Mamie E. Mitchell

by

her

Solicitor applies to have the above entitled cause placed in the

Trial Calendar for hearing on

the question of Alimony &

Counsel Fee

In conformity with the First Equity Rule.

Solicitor for

R. P. B. B. B.
Solicitor for Plaintiff

Serve on

Lavis and Bishop
Robertson

76128

Cir. Ct. No. 2

578
1920

B

Docket No. 29

Mitchell

vs.

Mitchell

NOTICE AS TO HEARING

No. 19812 B
16

Copy kept

Filed 27 November, 1920

Copy of the within notice served on Lavis and Bishop
Solicitors by service on Stewart Lavis Solicitor
on the 29th day of November 1920 in presence
of Harry B Evans
Charles J. McHulty
Sheriff.

Mamie E Mitchell

vs.

Wm. E Mitchell

IN THE
CIRCUIT COURT, No. 2
OF
BALTIMORE CITY.

Upon application made by the Solicitor for the

Plaintiff

the above entitled cause has been placed upon the Trial Calendar in accordance with the provisions of the First Equity Rule, and the same will stand for hearing on

the question of

Alimony

when reached in due course on the said calendar.

JOHN PLEASANTS,

Clerk Circuit Court No. 2.

Ct. Ct. No. 2 29 B. ⁵⁷⁸/₁₉₂₀

Mamie E. Mitchell

vs.

William E. Mitchell

Final Order, Counsel Fee and Alimony

Pendente Lite,

No. 19812 B.
17

Filed *B. December* 1920

Mamie E. Mitchell

vs.

William E. Mitchell

IN THE
CIRCUIT COURT No. 2
OF
BALTIMORE CITY.

The petition for Alimony pendente lite and Counsel fee and the answer thereto in the above entitled cause coming on for final hearing and the respective parties having been heard;

It is Ordered by the Circuit Court No. 2 of Baltimore City this ^{3rd} day

of December 1920, that the respondent William E. Mitchell

pay to the complainant Mamie E. Mitchell

~~the sum of _____ Dollars, as Counsel Fee~~

~~for the Solicitor of the _____ and that he~~

~~further pay~~ the sum of six Dollars per week,

during the continuance of this suit, ~~to the said~~ for a period not exceeding six weeks

as Alimony pendente lite accounting from the 3rd day of December 1920

payable through the Prisoners Aid Association

If however through no fault of plaintiff Case should take longer, alimony to continue

Walter J. Danko's

Circuit Court No. 2

378
191

Docket. 29B-

..... Mamie E. Mitchell

vs.

..... William E. Mitchell.

Japp
Petition for leave to take
Testimony and Order of
Court thereon.

No. 19812 B
8

Filed *7 Dec 1920* 1920

..... Mamie..... Mitchell.....

.....

vs.

..... William E. Mitchell.....

.....

IN THE

Circuit Court No. 2,

OF

BALTIMORE CITY.

**To the Honorable the Judge of the
Circuit Court No. 2 of Baltimore City:**

THE PETITION OF..... Mamie E. Mitchell, Plaintiff.....

in this case, respectfully shows that she desire s to take testimony in this case, and respectfully prays that leave be granted her to do so before one of the Standing Examiners of this Court.

W. E. Bond
Attorney for Plaintiff

ORDERED, this..... 7..... day of..... December..... 1910; that leave be granted to the parties to the cause, to take testimony, as prayed, before any one of the Standing Examiners of this Court.

Walter S. Rawkins

CIRCUIT COURT

578

402

19

Docket No. 29B-

Mitchell

vs.

Mitchell

ORDER OF APPEARANCE

Mr. Clerk

Please File

Sol. for

No. 17812 B

9

Filed 13 day of July 1922

Mitchell

vs.

Mitchell

IN THE
Circuit Court
OF
BALTIMORE CITY

Term, 19

Mr. WHITEFORD, Clerk.

Enter my appearance for Defendant

Henry B. Wolf

Solicitor

578
191

Cir. Ct. No. 2.

Docket No. 29B

Mamie E. Mitchell

William E. Mitchell.

SUBMISSION FOR DECREE.

No. Deposition

Mr. Clerk,

Please file,

W. E. Mitchell

Solicitor for Plaintiff.

No. 19812 B
" "

Filed 26 January 1921

Mamie E. Mitchell

vs.

William E. Mitchell.

**In the Circuit Court No. 2
Of Baltimore City.**

_____ TERM 191_____

To the Honorable

_____ The _____

Judge of Said Court:

The above cause is respectfully submitted for
decree and the 43rd General Equity Rule is hereby waived.

Raymond Bond

Solicitor for Plaintiff.

Henry B. Wolf

Solicitor for Defendant.

Ct. Ct. No. 2

578
1920

Docket No. 29

Mitchell

vs.

Mitchell

**Order of Reference
and Report**

Roberts

No. 19812 B
12 13

Order Filed 26th day of Jan'y 1921
Report Filed 3rd day of Feb'y 1921

CLERK OF COURT
BALTIMORE CITY

IN THE
Circuit Court No. 2
OF
BALTIMORE CITY

Maura E. Mitchell

vs.

Mellian E. Mitchell

January Term, 1921

This case being submitted, without argument, it is ordered by the Court, this 27 day of January, 1921, that the same be and it is hereby referred to N. B. Robertson, Esq., Auditor and Master, to report the pleadings and the facts, and his opinion thereon.

H. Arthur Plump

Report of Auditor and Master

Bill filed by husband against wife for divorce a Vinculo Matrimonii on the ground of adultery Code Article 16, S. 56.

The defendant summoned and answers. Proof shows marriage, residence and adultery of defendant. Plaintiff to be permitted to resume her maiden name. Submitted and ready for decree.

N. B. Robertson,
Auditor & Master.

Circuit Court No. 2

Q 578
1920 B No. Docket

Mamie E. Mitchell

vs.

William E. Mitchell

DECREE OF DIVORCE.

H February 1921

Qd. R ✓

No. 19812 B ✓

Copy - kept

Filed H February 1921

DECREE OF DIVORCE.

IN THE

Mamie E. Mitchell

Circuit Court No. 2

vs.

OF

William E. Mitchell

BALTIMORE CITY.

January TERM, 192*1*.

This is a proper decree. Alex. H. Ashbaugh, Auditor & Master.

This cause standing ready for hearing and being duly submitted, the proceedings were by the Court read and considered.

It is thereupon, this *4* day of *February*, Anno Domini, one thousand nine hundred and *twenty-one* by the CIRCUIT COURT No. 2 OF BALTIMORE CITY, Adjudged, Ordered and Decreed, that the said

Mamie E. Mitchell

the above named complainant be, and she is hereby DIVORCED A VINCULO MATRIMONII, from the defendant.

William E. Mitchell, and that the plaintiff be permitted to resume her maiden name, Mamie E. Dashields.

And it is further Ordered, that the said *Defendant* pay the cost of this proceeding.

H. Arthur Plump

I, JOHN PLEASANTS, Clerk of the Circuit Court No. 2 of Baltimore City, do hereby certify that the above is a true copy of the decree taken from the record of proceedings in said cause.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand and affix the seal of the said Court, this.....day of.....192.....

Clerk Circuit Court No. 2 of Baltimore City.

3/12/14/5
Doc. B ⁵⁷⁸
1920

In the Circuit Court, *No. 2,*
OF BALTIMORE CITY

DEPOSITIONS

Marnie E. Mitchell

vs.

William E. Mitchell

No. *198,127B*

PLAINTIFF'S COSTS

Examiners.....\$.....
Copies.....
Sheriff.....
Stenographer.....
\$ _____

DEFENDANT'S COSTS

Examiners.....\$.....
Copies.....
Sheriff.....
Stenographer.....
\$ _____

Ed. 18 January 1921

Mamie E. Mitchell

.....

vs.

William E. Mitchell

.....

In the Circuit Court No. 2

OF BALTIMORE CITY.

The above cause being at issue

and notice having been given me by the Solicitor for the plaintiff

of a desire to take testimony in the same, I, A. de RUSSY SAPPINGTON, one of the Standing Examiners of the Circuit Courts of Baltimore City, under and by virtue of an order of the above named Circuit Court, passed in said cause on the

seventh day of December 1920, met on

the eighteenth day of December in the year nineteen

hundred and twenty at my office, in the City of Baltimore, in the State

of Maryland, and assigned the twentieth day of December

in the same year at two-thirty o'clock in the after-noon and the

office of Coyle Bond, Esq. in the City and State

abovesaid, as the time and place for such examination of witnesses in said cause;

at which last mentioned time and place I attended, due notice of such meeting

having been given, and proceeded in the presence of the Solicitor..... of the

plaintiff to take the following depositions, that

is to say:—

8-1

1

Mitchel,

v.

Mitchel.

Testimony taken at the office of Roy S. Bond, Esq.,
115 St. Paul Place, Baltimore, Maryland, *Mon.-Dec. 20th., 1920,*
at 2.30 O'clock P. M.

MAMIE E. MITCHEL, the Plaintiff in this case,
produced on her own behalf, having been first duly
sworn, deposeseth and saith as follows, that is to say:

BY THE EXAMINER:

1 Q. State your name residence and occupation?

A. Mamie E. Mitchel, 1215 Myrtle Avenue; hair
dresser.

2 Q. Do you know the parties to this suit?

A. I am the Plaintiff and my husband is the
Defendant.

BY MR. BOND:

1 Q. When, where and by whom were you married?

A. October 27th., 1918 by the Reverend Mr. William
H. Weaver.

2 Q. Where?

A. 1215 Myrtle Avenue.

3 Q. When do you say they were married?

A. October 17th., 1918.

Mamie E. Mitchel.

- 4 Q. In what City and State.
- A. Baltimore, Maryland.
- 5 Q. Was the Reverend Mr. Weaver a Regular Ordained Minister of the Gospel?
- A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Connected with what Faith?
- A. Presbyterian.
- 7 Q. When did you separate?
- A. October 17th., 1920.
- 8 Q. Did he leave you or did you leave him?
- A. He left me.
- 9 Q. When did he leave you? Did you give him any cause or reason to leave you.
- A. None whatever.
- 10 Q. Have both you and your husband been residents of Baltimore City, State of Maryland, for more than three years prior to the filing of this suit?
- A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And the suit was started on the 28th., October 1920.
- A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Are there any children living as the result of this marriage?
- A. No.

Mamie E. Mitchel.

13 Q. How did you always treat your husband?

A. Very good.

14 Q. Were you always a kind, affectionate and true wife towards your husband?

A. Yes.

15 Q. Has your conduct been above reproach both before and since the separation?

A. Yes.

16 Q. You have alleged that your husband has committed adultery?

A. Yes.

17 Q. With whom?

A. Lula Anderson.

18 Q. Tell us how you know it; tell us on what date it was and what you saw.

A. On October 5th., I went to this house 1310 Pennsylvania Avenue, and I stood at the door and listened about twenty minutes, at their conduct in the bed, and then there was a large round hole in the door, and I looked in through the door, and I saw the woman lying on the side of the bed with him.

19 Q. Who?

A. My husband and this Lula Anderson, and I

Mamie B. Mitchel.

rapped on the door, and he said "Who is there" and I said "It is me" and he said "Who is you", and I said "I am your wife", and I used my nick name,- I said "Peggy your wife"; and he said "What do you want" and I said "I want you to get out of that bed room with that woman; if you dont I will get an officer that will take you out, and I saw through the door that he had absolutely nothing on but his coat to his pajamas, and he ordered me to come downstairs, and he came downstairs.

20 Q. Have you known him to live with this woman at any other place than on Pennsylvania Avenue?

A. I can not say that I have, only---

COUNSEL INTERRUPTING: Did you have occasion to visit him on McMechen Street.

WITNESS: Yes; I visited him on McMechen Street; I went to No. 543 McMechen Street, and there they stayed as husband and wife under an assumed name.

22 Q. And when was that.

A. That was October,- Let me see now; I can not think of the date; October 8th., I think; it was on a Thursday night,- the 8th.

23 Q. What year?

A. 1920.

Mamie E. Mitchell.

24 Q. And was this same woman living with him there.

A. Yes; this same woman.

25 Q. Have you forgiven or consented to it,- to this sort of conduct on his part?

A. No sir.

26 Q. Was this adultery committed without your procurement and consent.

A. Yes; I did not know anything about it at all.

27 Q. Have you lived or cohabited with your husband since you found out that he was living with this woman?

A. No sir.

28 Q. Now, Mrs. Mitchell relate the circumstances relative to the separation of you from your husband.

A. On the 9th., of August was when he left, and around about---

COUNSEL INTERRUPTING: What did he do on the 9th., of August?

WITNESS: He moved.

29 Q. Did he take his personal belongings?

A. Yes; he took his belongings; personal belongings.

30 Q. That was on the 9th., August 1920?

A. Yes; 9th. August 1920.

31 Q. And then what happened; when did he come back to the house.

A. He came back on the 17th., of September.

Mamie E. Mitchell.

32 Q. For what purpose.

A. He just came, and I asked him what he intended to do.

33 Q. Was'nt there somebody dead in the family at that time.

A. Yes; my mother's brother was dead at the time.

34 Q. And did he stay with you on September 17th; September 17th., what took place.

A. He stayed there for a while; a couple of hours or so and then he went on.

35 Q. That was while there was death in the family?

A. Yes.

36 Q. Did you ask him to remain?

A. Yes

37 Q. What did he say?

A. He said that he would not return.

38 Q. With whom did he say that he was rooming?

A. He said that he was rooming with a friend on Etting Street, and I investigated and I found that it was this woman, and then I traced him to 1310 Pennsylvania Avenue, I think the number is, and then on the 5th., October was when I peeked through the door and saw him in there with this woman.

39 Q. And when was it that they lived on McMechen Street?

Mamie E. Mitchell.

A. That was the 9th., of October they moved there , I think.

40 Q. When did you have occasion to see your husband again?

A. He came on the 17th., of October.

41 Q. What year?

A. 1920.

42 Q. Tell what took place then.

A. And I told him that I really did not want him any more, and that his conduct was such, that I did not think that he was treating me right, and that I thought a change should be made.

43 Q. Did you tell him to stay away from there?

A. Yes; I told him to go.

44 Q. The last time that you lived or cohabited with your husband was when?

A. In September.

45 Q. Was it about the 15th., of September when he was there?

A. Yes.

46 Q. While there was a relative dead in the family?

A. Yes; my Uncle Doctor Weaver.

47 Q. Have you lived or cohabited with your husband since the 17th., of September 1920?

A. No sir.

Mamie S. Mitchell.

48 Q. And it was the 17th., of October that you told him not to come there any more?

A. Yes.

49 Q. Then in your former answer where you say that the final separation between you and your husband occurred October 17th., 1920, you mean that was when you actually told him to stay away from the house?

A. Yes.

50 Q. But it was in September 1920 that you actually separated and ceased to live and cohabit together as husband and wife?

A. Yes.

51 Q. From the 17th., September 1920 to October 17th., 1920, what time, if any, did he spend in the house?

A. None.

52 Q. Then from September 17th., 1920 to October 17th., 1920 he was not at your house at all.

A. No.

53 Q. Until October 17th., 1920 when he returned to your home and you refused him admittance; that is, I mean to say, you complained to him that you had caught him in adultery and you told him to keep away from the house?

A. Yes; I did. On October 17th., 1920, he was only there about ten minutes, because I told him to get out.

GENERAL QUESTION

Do you know or can you state any other matter or thing that may be to the benefit or advantage of the parties to this suit, or either of them, or that may be material to the subject of this, your examination, or the matters in question between the parties? If so, state the same fully and at large in your answer.

A.---

No

Mamie E. Mitchell,

FANNIE DASHIELDS, a witness of lawful age, produced on behalf of the Plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, deposeseth and saith as follows, that is to say:

BY THE EXAMINER:

1 Q. State your name residence and occupation?

A. Fannie Dashields, 1215 Myrtle Avenue; dress-making.

2 Q. Do you know the parties to this suit?

A. Yes.

BY MR. BOND:

1 Q. Are you related to Mrs. Mitchel?

A. I am her mother.

2 Q. Were you present at the wedding.

A. I certainly was.

3 Q. When were they married?

A. October 27th., 1918.

4 Q. By whom.

A. The Reverend Doctor William H. Weaver.

4 Q. In what City and State?

A. Baltimore, Maryland.

5 Q. Are they living together now?

A. No sir.

6 Q. Did he leave her or did she leave him?

A. He left her.

Fannie Dashiels.

7 Q. Were you there when he left?

A. Yes.

8 Q. When did he leave?

A. October 17th., 1920.

9 Q. Did you have occasion to notice his wife's conduct towards him?

A. Yes; at times.

10 Q. How did she treat him.

A. As a wife should.

11 Q. Was she always a kind, affectionate and true wife towards her husband?

A. Yes.

12 Q. Was her conduct good and above reproach both before and since the separation?

A. It certainly has been.

13 Q. How did he treat her.

A. Anything but like a husband.

15 Q. Has she ever lived or cohabited with him or condoned this offense of going with other women, or has she ever lived with him since October 17th., 1920 when he left her?

A. No sir.

15 Q. "There are no children as the result of this marriage

Fannie Dashields.

A. No sir.

16 Q. Have both of the parties to this suit been residents of Baltimore City, State of Maryland, for at least two years prior to the filing of this suit?

A. Yes.

GENERAL QUESTION

Do you know or can you state any other matter or thing that may be to the benefit or advantage of the parties to this suit, or either of them, or that may be material to the subject of this, your examination, or the matters in question between the parties? If so, state the same fully and at large in your answer.

A. ---

W
Fannie Washfield

KATIE THOMAS, a witness of lawful age, produced on behalf of the Plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, deposeseth and saith as follows, that is to say:

BY THE EXAMINER:

1 Q. State your name residence and occupation?

A. Katie Thomas, 606 Dolphin Street; public work.

2 Q. Do you know the parties to this suit?

A. Yes.

BY MR. BOND:

1 Q. What can you tell us about the Defendant committing adultery.

A. As far as I know of him, he used to come to my house, and here about this Lula Anderson, I did not know what her name was, but it was the same woman, because I met her.

2 Q. He brought a woman there?

A. Yes.

3 Q. Was it his wife?

A. No sir.

4 Q. What house did he bring her to.

A. 606 Dolphin Street.

5 Q. What do you know about his cohabiting with this woman.

A. He pretended that he was going to see his brother upstairs, and he went upstairs, and after I found out that it was not his wife, I would not let him

Katie Thomas.

bring her there.

6 Q. When was this?

A. This was the middle of August.

7 Q. What year?

A. 1920.

8 Q. Would he be alone upstairs.

A. Sometimes his brother would be up there and sometimes the brother's wife would be up there.

8 Q. Can you state whether or not from your knowledge of the house and the location of the room, whether or not they had the opportunity to commit adultery?

A. Yes; if they wanted to.

9 Q. Were they there in the same room together?

A. Yes.

GENERAL QUESTION

Do you know or can you state any other matter or thing that may be to the benefit or advantage of the parties to this suit, or either of them, or that may be material to the subject of this, your examination, or the matters in question between the parties? If so, state the same fully and at large in your answer.

A. ---

No

Mrs Katie Thomas

SANDY McCLOED, a witness of lawful age, produced on behalf of the Plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, deposeseth and saith as follows, that is to say:

BY THE EXAMINER:

1 Q. State your name residence and occupation?

A. Sandy McCloed, 1310 Pennsylvania Avenue; public work.

2 Q. Do you know the parties to this suit?

A. Yes.

BY MR. BOND:

1 Q. What can you tell us relative to the Defendant committing adultery.

A. Well, he has committed adultery; I saw that myself, and I went up into the room; I moved there three days ahead of him.

2 Q. Where did he move.

A. I do not know when they moved; they moved up to Pennsylvania Avenue - 1310.

3 Q. When did he move there.

A. I moved there around the last of September and they moved there a few days after I got there; I did not keep account of the date. Any way I went up there one night, and when I made my arrival up there I rapped on the door, and he said "Come in" and I went in and he was sitting there, and I thought that he was a lawyer himself; he had a book, and looked important,

Sandy McCloed.

and he asked me to come in, and she walks up to him and puts her arm around him and I said "I like to see a loving couple", and he said "Yes, me and my family live fine".

4 Q. Was this the lady (indicating Plaintiff).

A. No sir. I know the lady when I see her.

5 Q. What sort of looking woman was she.

A. A tall brown skinned woman.

6 Q. Was there a bed in the room.

A. There was one bed only.

7 Q. And he was there and the woman was there.

A. Yes.

8 Q. And do you know the woman's name.

A. I did not know her at the time, but I learned her name since.

9 Q. What was her name.

A. Anderson.

10 Q. Did you ever see them in that room again.

A. Yes. I was up there a couple of times, but not in the room; I had a pair of soft shoes on, and I crept up to the door and I looked through the hole in the door and I saw them in bed together, and he was naked, and I rapped on the door and they turned the light out, and that is the last that I saw of them.

Sandy McCloed.

11 Q. And that was the first of October 1920?

A. Yes.

12 Q. They did not live there very long before they moved away?

A. No sir; not very long.

GENERAL QUESTION

Do you know or can you state any other matter or thing that may be to the benefit or advantage of the parties to this suit, or either of them, or that may be material to the subject of this, your examination, or the matters in question between the parties? If so, state the same fully and at large in your answer.

A.---

No

Sandy a. M. Seal

FRANCES JACKSON, a witness of lawful age, produced on behalf of the Plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, deposeseth and saith as follows, that is to say:

BY THE EXAMINER:

1 Q. State your name residence and occupation?

A. Frances Jackson, 543 McMechen Street ; laundry work.

2 Q. Do you know the parties to this suit?

A. Yes.

BY MR. BOND:

1 Q. This is a divorce case in which the Plaintiff, Mamie E. Mitchel, has asked for a divorce from her husband William E. Mitchell, on the ground of adultery; tell us, if you please, what you know about the case.

A. Well, Mr. Mitchell came to my house as Mr. and Mrs. Anderson. He brought a lady there.

2 Q. About when, if you please.

A. About October the 5th., or the 6th.

3 Q. October of what year?

A. 1920.

4 Q. Now, he represented himself to be Mr. Anderson.

A. Yes.

5 Q. And he brought a girl posing as Mrs. Anderson.

A. Yes.

6 Q. And what took place?

A. I rented them a room.

Frances Jackson.

7 Q. And how long did they remain there at your house?

A. Going on two weeks.

8 Q. When was this?

A. During October 1920; the first part of August 1920.

9 Q. Was it prior to October 28th., 1920?

A. Yes.

10 Q. Now, during that time did they occupy the same room at your house,- the same bed room.

A. Yes.

11 Q. Tell us how you found out that it was not Mr. and Mrs. Anderson.

A. She came there; Mrs. Mitchel came there.

12 Q. Mrs. Mitchel came there and claimed her husband.

A. Yes.

13 Q. And then you made them get out?

A. Yes, and I made them get out.

14 Q. Where is that house?

A. 543 McMechen Street in Baltimore City.

15 Q. That is where Mr. Mitchel and this woman lived as husband and wife for two weeks?

A. Yes.

GENERAL QUESTION

Do you know or can you state any other matter or thing that may be to the benefit or advantage of the parties to this suit, or either of them, or that may be material to the subject of this, your examination, or the matters in question between the parties? If so, state the same fully and at large in your answer.

A.---

No.

Mrs Frances Jackson

Mamie E. Mitchell

.....

vs.

William E. Mitchell

.....

In the Circuit Court No. 2

OF BALTIMORE CITY.

The above cause being at issue

and notice having been given me by the Solicitor for the *plaintiff*

of a desire to take testimony in the same, I, A. de RUSSY SAPPINGTON, one of the Standing Examiners of the Circuit Courts of Baltimore City, under and by virtue of an order of the above named Circuit Court, passed in said cause on the

seventh day of *December* 19*20*, met on

the *eighteenth* day of *December* in the year nineteen

hundred and *twenty* at my office, in the City of Baltimore, in the State

of Maryland, and assigned the *twentieth* day of *December*

in the same year at *two-thirty* o'clock in the *after-*noon and the

office of *Royst Bond, Esq.* in the City and State

aforsaid, as the time and place for such examination of witnesses in said cause;

at which last mentioned time and place I attended, due notice of such meeting

having been given, and proceeded in the presence of the Solicitor.....of the

plaintiff to take the following depositions, that

is to say:—