



GEORGE V.DAVIS

VS. OF LILLIE DAVIS : BALTIMORE CITY

· •

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

Your Orator complaining respectfully says:

That he was married to his wife, Lillie Davis, on the 20th I. day of March, 1900 in the City of Baltimore, State of Maryland; that on or about the 5th day of May 1923 your Orator and the respondent purchased for the amount of \$1850.00, subject to a mortgage of \$1500.00, as tenants by the entireties, a two and a half story brick dwelling known as I4I4 E.Honument St, in Baltimore City, State of Maryland, subject to an annual ground rent of twelve (\$12.00) dollars. That your Orator and the respondent are still possessed as tenants by the entireties of the aforementioned property. I cipy of the deal to the portestothis s well be filed with the proceedings here of to be mother exhibit 2. That because of irreconcilable differences that have arisen between your Orator and the respondent the interests of the respondent and your Orator are in immediate danger of being destroyed by virtue of the non payment of the weekly instalments due or to become due on the aforementioned mortgage; that the nature of the property is such that it can not be divided in kind; that by virtue of the aforementioned irreconcilable difference, the parties to this suit are unable to arrive at any common understanding as to the uses enjoyment or disposition of this common property.

TO THE END, WHEREFORE, YOUR ORATOR PRAYS:

a- That a receiver or receivers may be appointed by this Honorable Court to take charge of the joint property, I4I4 E. Monument St. in order to properly preserve same during the pendency of this suit.

That a Trustee or Trustees be appointed with power (b) and authority to sell same property and to divide the proceeds remaining out of the purchase prices, after payment of all legal charges and costs against the property, between the respondent and your Orator.

May it please your Honor to grant unto your Orator the Urit of Subpoena directed against the said Lillie Davis, commanding and requiring her 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 therein.

AND as in duty bound, etc.

Nais Hors FOR PLAINTIFF

STATE OF MARYLAND, BALTIMORE CITY, to wit:-

I HE'EBY CERTIFY, that on this  $\mathcal{I}$  day of March, in the year pne thousand nine hundred and twenty seven, before me, the subscriber, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland in and for the City aforesaid, personally appeared GEORGE W.DAVIS made oath in due form of law that the matters and facts in the foregoing petition are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

AS WITNESSmy hand and Notarial Seal.

1414 E Monument 3 Ct. Ct. 120 6 192 7 Docket No. A-67 00 George W. Davis 0 vs. Lillie Davis R SUBPOENA TO ANSWER BILL OF COMPLAINT b le. 5 2 No. 14 Z X 1927. Filed. Dagis & Evans MARS SOLICITOR S N

## EQUITY SUBPOENA

## The State of Maryland

Tu

Lillie Davis, 1414 E. Monument St.

## 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 ofMarchcause an appearance to be entered for you and your answer to be filed to the complaint of

George W. Davis

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	10.th		day of	January	192 <b>7</b> •
Issued the	_2nd	day of	Marc	h,	in the year 192 <b>7</b> .

Chan. 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.

(General Equity Rules 11)

next

Ct. Ct. Docket 67A 120 192 ] L'én c George W. Aris Sillie Dais Decree Pro Confesso. RNo. 4848 23) Filed Juliane 1927

IN THE Googe W. Davis vs. **Circuit Court** OF BALTIMORE CITY. May\_\_\_\_\_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 hundred and twenty 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.

H. arthur Stump