

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

BALTIMORE CITY.

*B 400  
1926*

MARGARET HALL

VS.

CHARLES HALL

*1144 Myrtle Ave.*

BILL FOR DIVORCE.

*B 31029*

Mr. Clerk:-

*(1)*

Please file.

*Sept. 19*

*Davis & Evans*

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF.

DAVIS & EVANS

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

*Filed 8 Sept 1926*

MARGARET HALL

:

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT

VS.

:

OF

CHARLES HALL

:

BALTIMORE CITY

---

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

Your Oratrix complaining respectfully represents:-

- I. That she was married to her husband, Charles Hall, on the 18th day of November 1915 and with whom she resided until the 5th day of February, 1917 when the defendant deserted the plaintiff.
2. That though the conduct of your Oratrix toward the said Charles Hall has always been kind, affectionate and above reproach, he has, without any just cause or reason, abandoned and deserted her and has declared his intentions to live with her no longer, and that such abandonment has continued uninterruptedly for more than three years and is deliberate and final and the separation of the parties is beyond any reasonable expectation of reconciliation.
3. That your Oratrix has not lived or co-habited with the said defendant since said desertion.
4. That there are no children born as result of said marriage.
5. That both your Oratrix and the defendant are citizens of the State of Maryland, having resided in Baltimore City for more than three years prior to the filing of this Bill of Complaint.

TO THE END, THEREFORE:

- (a) That your Oratrix may be divorced A Vinculo Matrimonii from the said Charles Hall.
- (b) That she may resume her maiden name BELL.
- (c) That she may have such other and further relief as her case may require.

May it please your Honor to grant unto your Oratrix the Writ of Subpoena directed against the said Charles Hall, commanding and requiring him to be and appear in this Court on some day certain to be named therein to answer the premises and abide by and perform such decree or order as may be passed wherein.

AND as in duty bound, etc.

*Davis & Conrad*

---

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF.

P 710

B400  
1926

Ct. Ct.

Docket No.

Wall

vs

Wall

**SUBPOENA TO ANSWER BILL OF COMPLAINT**

No.

<sup>Prd</sup>  
B 31029  
(2)

Filed

13 Sept, 1926  
Davis and Evans.

SOLICITOR

(10)

Summoned and a copy of the Process left  
with the defendant

Wachy  
9/8/26

Fees \$ 1.80

John E. Potee  
Sheriff

EQUITY SUBPOENA

The State of Maryland

To

Charles Hall  
#1144 Myrtle Ave.

of Baltimore City, Greeting:

WE COMMAND AND ENJOIN YOU, That all excuses set aside, you do within the time limited by law, beginning on the second Monday of September next cause an appearance to be entered for you and your answer to be filed to the complaint of

Margaret Hall

against you exhibited in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City,

HEREOF fail not, as you will answer the contrary at your peril.

WITNESS, the Honorable JAMES P. GORTER, Chief Judge of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore

City, the

12

day of

July

1926

Issued the

8<sup>th</sup>

day of

September

, in the year 192

6

Chas R Whiteford

Clerk

MEMORANDUM: You are required to file your answer or other defense in the Clerk's Office, room 206, in the Court House, Baltimore City, within fifteen days after return day.

B400

Ct. Ct.

1926

Docket

Margaret Hall

vs.

Chas Hall

Decree Pro Confesso.

Papp

B 31029

No. (3)

Filed

4<sup>th</sup> Meh

192

Margaret Hall

vs.

Chas Hall

IN THE  
**Circuit Court**  
OF  
BALTIMORE CITY.

January Term, 1927

The Defendant having been duly summoned (~~notified by Order of Publication~~) to appear to the Bill of Complaint, and having failed to appear thereto, according to the exigency of the writ, (~~said Order~~).

It is thereupon this 4<sup>th</sup> day of March in the year nineteen hundred and twenty seven. *Seven* by the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, ADJUDGED, ORDERED and DECREED, that the complainant is entitled to relief in the premises, and that the bill of Complaint be and is hereby taken pro confesso against the defendant. But because it doth not certainly appear to what relief the Plaintiff is entitled, it is further *Adjudged*, and *Ordered*, that one of the Examiners of this Court, take testimony to support the allegations of the bill.

James P. Gorter

3/13/34

Doc. B  $\frac{400}{1926}$

In the Circuit Court,  
OF BALTIMORE CITY

DEPOSITIONS

Margaret Hall  
vs.  
Charles Hall

No. 31029B  
147

PLAINTIFF'S COSTS

Examiners ..... \$ .....  
Copies .....  
Sheriff .....  
Stenographer .....  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_

DEFENDANT'S COSTS

Examiners ..... \$ .....  
Copies .....  
Sheriff .....  
Stenographer .....  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_

Ed 8 Sept 1927



Margaret Hall

vs.

Charles Hall

In the Circuit Court

OF BALTIMORE CITY.

A Decree Pro Confesso having been passed in said cause 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 fourth day of March 1927, met on the fourth day of March in the year nineteen hundred and twenty-seven at my office, in the city of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland, and assigned the fourth day of March in the same year at two-thirty o'clock in the afternoon and the office of Adell Sappington Esq in the City and State aforesaid, 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:—

MARGARET HALL )

VS. )

CHARLES HALL )

----- )

In the Circuit Court of

Baltimore City.

Testimony taken before me, A. deR. Sappington,  
Examiner, in my offices in the Title Building,  
Baltimore, on March 4, 1927, at 2:30 P. M.

---

Thereupon---

MARGARET HALL,

the plaintiff, of lawful age, produced on her own  
behalf, after having been first duly sworn according  
to law, was examined and testified as follows:

By the Examiner:

Q State your name, residence and occupation?

A Mrs. Margaret Hall, 2226 Etting Street, Baltimore,  
general housework.

Q Do you know the parties to this suit?

A Yes, I am the plaintiff and my husband is the  
defendant.

BY MR. EVANS:

Q When, where and by whom were you married?

A On November 18, 1915, in Baltimore City,  
by the Rev. Williams on George Street.

Q How long did you live with your husband after  
your marriage?

A A little over a year.

Q Was it until February 5, 1917?

A Yes.

Q Which left the other?

A I left him.

Q Why did you leave?

A I left him because he would not support me and  
drank and was mean to me.

Q Did he strike you?

A No.

Q Did he ever threaten you?

A Yes, he got so high as to talk about killing me  
and I had to protect myself and I had him locked up for it.

Q You had him arrested for threatening you?

A Yes.

Q Is that what caused the separation?

A Yes, because he said he would kill me and I thought he meant what he said.

Q After you had him to the Station House, did you live with him anymore?

A No, Sir.

Q Did he work regularly?

A No, he did not, just picked up around the market and what little he made he drank it up.

Q Did you support yourself?

A Yes.

Q And him?

A Yes, I had to buy him something to eat.

Q How did you treat him?

A Like a wife should treat a husband?

A Were you a kind, faithful and affectionate wife?

A Yes.

Q Was your conduct above reproach?

A Yes.

Q Did you give him any cause or reason to abandon you or threaten you or act as he did?

A No, I did not, all I would do was ask him for money to pay the rent, like any other wife would do.

Q That would make him mad?

A Yes.

Q Has the separation continued uninterruptedly for more than three years prior to the filing of your Bill of Complaint?

A Yes.

Q Have you lived or cohabited with him since February 5, 1917?

A No.

Q Is the separation final and deliberate?

A Yes.

Q Is there any hope of a reconciliation?

A No, never.

Q How long have you been a resident of the City of Baltimore, State of Maryland?

A Ever since 1909.

Q Is your husband a resident of the City of Baltimore, State of Maryland?

A Yes.

Q How long has he been a resident of the City of Baltimore, State of Maryland?

A He was born here so far as I know.

Q Were any children born as a result of the marriage?

A No.

Q Do you wish to resume your maiden name?

A Yes.

Q What is your maiden name?

A Margaret Bell.

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*

*Morgan - Italy*

Thereupon---

RACHEL HITCHENS,

a witness, of lawful age, produced on behalf of the plaintiff, after having been first duly sworn according to law, was examined and testified as follows:

By the Examiner:

Q State your name, residence and occupation?

A Rachel Hitchens, 756 Dolphin Street, Baltimore, waitress.

Q Do you know the parties to this suit?

A Yes, both of them, I have known her for years.

BY MR. EVANS:

Q Did you attend their wedding?

A Yes, I was her bridesmaid.

Q You know they were married?

A Yes.

Q By whom were they married?

A By the Rev. Williams on George Street in Baltimore.

Q Are they living together now?

A No.

Q When did they separate?

A February 5, 1917.



Q Which left the other?

A She left him because he threatened to kill her.

Q Did she have him arrested?

A Yes.

Q Was he taken to the Station House?

A Yes.

Q Do you know what happened at the Station House?

A I don't know.

Q Did she live with him after that, February 5, 1917?

A No.

Q Have you visited her since then?

A Yes, always.

Q How did he treat her?

A Very bad.

Q What did he do - did he support her?

A No.

Q Did he have a regular job?

A No, he hung around the market three days a week,  
Tuesdays, Fridays and Saturdays.

Q What did he do with the money?

A Drank it up.

Q Did he support her?

A No.

Q Did she work?

A Yes.

Q And support herself?

A Yes, and him, too.

Q How did she treat him?

A Nice.

Q Was she a kind, faithful and affectionate wife?

A Yes.

Q Was her conduct above reproach?

A Yes, she tried to do everything she could to make a man of him.

Q Did she give him any cause to treat her the way he did?

A No, Sir.

Q Has the separation continued uninterruptedly for more than three years prior to the filing of this Bill?

A Yes.

Q Has she lived or cohabited with him since February 5, 1917?

A No.

Q Were any children born as a result of the marriage?

A No.

Q Is the separation deliberate and final?

A Yes.

Q Is there any hope of a reconciliation?

A No.

Q How long has she been a resident of the City of Baltimore, State of Maryland?

A I know she has been here over ten years.

Q In Baltimore all that time?

A Yes.

Q Is he a resident of Baltimore?

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

Rachel Fitchens

No other witnesses being named or produced before me, I then, at the request of the Solicitor.....of the plaintiff:  
closed the depositions taken in said cause and now return them closed under my hand and seal, on this eight day of September in the year of Our Lord nineteen hundred and twenty-one at the City of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland.

A. de Russy Sappington (SEAL)  
Examiner.

There are no Exhibits with these depositions, to wit:

Plaintiff's Exhibit f

Defendant's Exhibit f

A. de Russy Sappington  
Examiner.

I, A. de RUSSY SAPPINGTON, the Examiner before whom the foregoing depositions were taken, do hereby certify that I was employed in assigning a day, and taking the said depositions upon two days, on both of which I was employed by the Plaintiff....., and on none by the Defendant.....

A. de Russy Sappington  
Examiner.

**Circuit Court**

400 B  
19 26

Docket No. \_\_\_\_\_

Margaret Hall  
vs.

Charles Hall

**Order of Reference  
and Report**

Lyon

B No. 31029  
(5)

Order Filed 9 day of Sept 1927  
Report Filed 5 day of Oct 1927

Margaret Hall

vs.

Charles Hall

IN THE  
Circuit Court

OF  
BALTIMORE CITY

July Term, 1927

9th

This case being submitted, without argument, it is ordered by the Court, this day of September, 1927, that the same be and it is hereby referred to Wm. S. Lyons, Esq., Auditor and Master, to report the pleadings and the facts, and his opinion thereon.

Walter S. Dawkins

Report of Auditor and Master

~~Bill for divorce a vinculo matrimonii, filed by the wife against her husband on the ground of abandonment. Code Art. 16; Sec. 37-42.~~

~~Defendant summoned but failed to answer.~~

~~Plaintiff's residence in Baltimore City for more than two years prior to the filing of the bill proved.~~

~~The marriage proved.~~

~~Abandonment uninterruptedly for three years prior to the filing of the bill, its finality and the irreconcilability of the parties proved.~~

~~Decree pro confesso was passed against the defendant and more than thirty days have since elapsed.~~

~~Case ready for decree.~~

William P. Lyons  
Auditor and Master.

Sept. 16, 1927.

1  
CIRCUIT COURT

B -400- No. Docket  
1926

MARGARET HALL

VS.

CHARLES HALL

Recorded  
Folio 2871927

Decree of Divorce

B No. 31029  
(6)

1 Ad 6 Oct 1927

The within is a proper decree to be passed in this case.

William P. Lyons  
Auditor and Master.



**Circuit Court**

OF

BALTIMORE CITY,

*September* Term, 192*7*

-----MARGARET HALL-----

VS.

-----CHARLES HALL-----

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

It is thereupon, this *6th* day of *October*, A. D. 192*7*

by the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, Adjudged, Ordered and Decreed, that the said -----  
MARGARET HALL -----

the above named Complainant be and she is hereby DIVORCED A VINCULO MATRIMONII from the Defendant, CHARLES HALL.

AND it is further ordered that the name of the Complainant, MARGARET HALL be and it is hereby changed to MARGARET BELL.

And it is Further Ordered, That the said Defendant, CHARLES HALL pay the cost of this proceeding.

*H. Arthur Stump*