

In the Back number of
No. 89 ^{out} $\frac{1055}{570}$

State of Maryland
to the use of
Clarence Overton

to

Harry Brooks
Box # 1013

Order in the first

Mr. Clerk Pleasant

(Steward Davis)

J. Stewart Davis
DAVIS & BISHOP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
BANNEKER BUILDING
14 E. PLEASANT STREET
BALTIMORE, MD.

STATE OF MD. TO THE USE OF
CLARENCE OVERTON

IN THE BALTO. CITY COURT

VS

OF

HARRY BROOKS

BALTIMORE CITY.

The State of Maryland for the use of Clarence Overton by J. Steward Davis his Attorney sues Harry Brooks in trespass for that the said Clarence Overton is the father of Clarice Overton (deceased) a female infant, that on or about 6th day of October in the year 1921, the said defendant Harry Brooks while driving a gasoline propelled automobile, in a ^{westerly} ~~southerly~~ direction on East Madison St. in Baltimore City, ^{Street used} did negligently and carelessly drive aforementioned automobile so that the said automobile did violently strike and knock down the aforementioned Clarice Overton (deceased). To her great physical damage, that the aforesaid Clarice Overton died as a result of injuries received because ^{of} being struck by defendants' car. The said plaintiff says the injuries to the said plaintiff's infant daughter Clarice Overton (deceased) which injuries resulted in the death of the aforesaid Clarice Overton (deceased) were directly caused by the negligence and want of care of the defendant and without negligence or want of care on the part of the aforesaid Clarice Overton (deceased) thereunto contributing: and that the plaintiff has been permanently deprived of the services of his infant daughter (deceased).

WHEREFORE the plaintiff claims ten thousand (\$10,000) dollars damages, therefore.



ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF.

STATE OF MARYLAND TO THE USE OF

CLARENCE OVERTON

IN THE BALTO. CITY COURT

VS

OF

HARRY BROOKS

BALTIMORE CITY.

.....

THE PLAINTIFF ELECTS TO HAVE THE ABOVE CASE TRIED
BEFORE A JURY.



ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF.

STATE OF MD. TO THE USE OF
CLARENCE OVERTON

IN THE BALTO. CITY COURT

VS

OF

HARRY BROOKS

BALTIMORE CITY.

The State of Maryland for the use of Clarence Overton by J. Steward Davis his Attorney sues Harry Brooks in trespass for that the said Clarence Overton is the father of Clarice Overton (deceased) a female infant, that on or about 6th day of October in the year 1921, the said defendant Harry Brooks while driving a gasoline propelled automobile, in a ^{westerly} ~~southerly~~ direction on East Madison St. in Baltimore City ^{State of Md.} did negligently and carelessly drive aforementioned automobile so that the said automobile did violently strike and knock down the aforementioned Clarice Overton (deceased). To her great physical damage, that the aforesaid Clarice Overton died as a result of injuries received because being struck by defendants' car. The said plaintiff says the injuries to the said plaintiff's infant daughter Clarice Overton (deceased) which injuries resulted in the death of the aforesaid Clarice Overton (deceased) were directly caused by the negligence and want of care of the defendant and without negligence or want of care on the part of the aforesaid Clarice Overton (deceased) thereunto contributing: and that the plaintiff has been permanently deprived of the services of his infant daughter (deceased).

WHEREFORE the plaintiff claim ten thousand (\$10,000) dollars damages, therefore.

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF.

Mo. 8. 18. 18. 18. 18.

*M. J. ...
June 20, 1878*

*...
...
...*

STATE OF MARYLAND TO THE USE OF

CLARENCE OVERTON

IN THE BALTO. CITY COURT

VS

OF

HARRY BROOKS

BALTIMORE CITY.

.....

THE PLAINTIFF ELECTS TO HAVE THE ABOVE CASE TRIED

BEFORE A JURY.

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF.

Defendants address
Berkentown ~~Pa~~
Md.
To Buesels Grocery Store

TRUE COPY. TEST:
J. M. [Signature]
[Signature]

1885
512

No. 89 2/27/11

Return Day, 19.....

No.

Notice to the person summoned :—

You have been summoned to appear in The Baltimore City Court

the second Monday of.....

NOV 1921, 19.....

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

RENEWAL ¹⁰⁵⁵

no 1194 51

No. *89* Nov. R. D. 192/
Pat 171-238

Baltimore City Court.

State of Maryland

vs

Clarence Overton

vs.

Harry Brooks

(Reisterstown, Md.)

9, Bussels Grocery Store

WRIT OF SUMMONS

Copy of Nar and Notice to plead
within to be served on defendant.

J. Stewart Davis
Attorney for Plaintiff

Filed *9th* day of *Jan* 192*2*

16



*Thomas J. M. Gully
Sheriff*

3rd Return.

now Esth.

(Parks)

now Esth.

Thomas

J. M. Gully

Sheriff

RENEWFD TO DEC. R. D. 1921

25 Nov 1921

now Esth.

Thomas J. M. Gully

(Parks)

Sheriff

RENEWFD TO JAN. R. D. 1922

Dec. 19 1921

WRIT OF SUMMONS

STATE OF MARYLAND

BALTIMORE CITY, To wit.

To the Sheriff of Baltimore City, Greeting:

You are commanded to summon.....

Harry Brooks

of Baltimore City, to appear before the Baltimore City Court, to be held at the Court House in the same city, on the second Monday of Nov. next, to answer an action at the suit of

State of Maryland for the Use of Clarence

Overton

and have you then and there this writ.

JAMES P. GORTER

Witness the Honorable MORRIS A. SOPPE, Chief Judge of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore

City, the 13th day of Sep. 1921

Issued the 19th day of Oct. in the year 1921

Geo. Carey Lindsay Clerk.

In The Baltimore
City Court.

State of Maryland
vs
Charles
Overton

vs
Harry Brooks

Order of Satisfaction

Mr Clerk please file

[Signature]

The State of Maryland
to the use of
Clarence G. Weston

In The Baltimore

vs
Harry Brooks

City Court

Mr. Clerk.

Please enter the above case, ^{agreed} ^{he paid by} ^{settled}
and satisfied with costs to ^{the} defendant

plaintiff.

P. ~~Frank~~ ^{Frank} ^{Frank}
attorney for plaintiff

O'Meara Tangelman
attys for Defendant

Order for Appearance.

State of Maryland
use of Clarence Overton

VS.

Harry Brooks

Baltimore City Court.

No. _____ Return Day 192

MR. CLERK: Enter one appearance for the

Defendant in this case.

O. Macard Tugelmin Attorney.

Filed MAY 29 1922 192