IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
BALTIMORE CITY
B369
NAOMI SMITH 1928
vs.
SYLVESTER SMITH
P4.22
BILL FOR DIVORCE.
Mr.Clerk: (/) (2) Please file.
Isteward Davs ATTORNEY: FOR PLAINTIFF
DAVIS & EVANS ATTORNEYS AT LAW
79 5 Oct 1928

NAOMI SMITH

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT

VS.

:

OF

SYLVESTER SMITH

BALTIMORE CITY

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

- (I) That she was married to her husband, Sylvester Smith, on the 9th day of August, I923 and with whom she resided until the 7th day of July, I924 when the defendant deserted the plaintiff.
- (2) That though the conduct of your Oratrix toward the said defendant 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 said abandonment has continued uninterruptedly for more than three years and is deliberate and final and the separation of the parties is beyond any reasonable hope 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 your Oratrix is a citizen of the State of Mary-land, having resided in Baltimore City for more than three years prior to the filing of this Bill of Complaint but that the defendant is a non-resident of the State of Maryland and when last heard of was in Ambler, Pennsylvania.

TO THE END, THEREFORE, YOUR ORATRIX PRAYS:

- (a) That she may be divorced A Vinculo Matrimonii from the said Sylvester Smith.
- (b) 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 Order of Publication directed against the said Sylvester Smith, 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 therein.

AND as in duty bound, etc.

ATTORNEY. FOR PLAINTIFF

DAVIS & EVANS, SOLICITORS 215 ST.PAUL PLACE, IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALTIMORE CITY. NAOMI SMITH VS.SYLVESTER SMITH ORDER OF PUBLICATION

The object of this Bill is to procure a Divorce A

Vinculo Matrimonii by the plaintiff, Naomi Smith from the defendant, Sylvester Smith.

The bill recites that the parties were married on the 9th day of August, 1923 and lived together until the 7th day of July, 1924 when the defendant deserted the plaintiff. That the plaintiff has been a resident of Baltimore City for more than three years prior to the filing of this Bill of Complaint, but that the defendant is a non-resident of the State of Maryland. That your Oratrix has always been kind, affectionate and above reproach toward the said defendant, but that the defendant has deserted and abandoned her without any just cause or reason and has declared his intentions to live with her no longer and said abandonment has continued uninterruptedly for more than three years and is deliberate and final and the separation of the parties is beyond any reasonable hope of reconciliation. That your Oratrix has not lived or co-habited with the said defendant since said desertion; that there are no children born as result of said marriage.

It is the reupon ordered by the Circuit Court of Baltimore City this 5 day of Cotolor 1928 that the plaintiff by causing a copy of this order to be inserted in some daily newspaper published in Baltimore City once a week for four successive weeks before the 6 day of Mounta 1928, give notice to the absent defendant of the object and substance of this bill, warning him to be and appear in this Court in person or by Solicitor on or before the 21 day of Mounta 1928 to show cause, if any he may have, why a decree should not be passed as prayed.

Muyemes Duny

192.8 19 Docket No. 369
Smith 1928
vs.
f
Dmith.
Contificate of Dutiestics
Certificate of Publication
B 33290

THE DAILY RECORD

Davis & Evans, Solicitors,
215 St. Paul Place.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALTI-

MORE CITY — (B-369—1928) — Naomi Smith vs. Sylvester Smith.

ORDER OF PUBLICATION.

The object of this bill is to procure a divorce a vinculo matrimonii by the plaintiff, Naomi Smith, from the defendant, Sylvester Smith.

The bill recites that the parties were married on the 9th day of August, 1923, and lived together until the 7th day of July, 1924, when the defendant deserted the plaintiff. That the plaintiff has been a resident of Baltimore City for more than three years prior to the filing of this bill of complaint, but that the defendant is a non-resident of the State of Maryland. That your oratrix has always been kind. affectionate and above reproach toward the said defendant, but that the defendant has deserted and abandoned her without any just cause or reason and has declared his intentions to live with her no longer and said abandonment has continued uninterruptedly for more than three years and is deliberate and final and the separation of the parties is beyond any reasonable hope of reconciliation. That your oratrix has not lived or cohabited with the said defendant since said desertion; that there are no children born as result o said marriage.

It is thereupon ordered, by the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, this 5th day of October, 1928, that the plaintiff, by causing a copy of this order to be inserted in some daily newspaper published in Baltimore City once a week for four successive weeks before the 5th day of November, 1928, give notice to the absent defendant of the object and substance of this bill, warning him to be and appear in this Court, in person or by solicitor, on or before the 21st day of November, 1928, to show cause, if any he may have, why a decree should not be passed as prayed.

True Copy—Test: CHAS. R. WHITEFORD. Clef

369-1928 13369 Ct. Ct. Docket Naoni Smith Sylnes To, Sunh Decree Pro Confesso B No. 33290 Filed 14 March 1929

Eylnester Smith

IN THE

OF

BALTIMORE CITY

Term, 192

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

14th day of March, It is thereupon this in the year nineteen hundred and twenty with 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.

The Les Living laten Nov. 26, 1988, is considered nume soo hine as of this date Such Mong

In the Circuit Court,

OF BALTIMORE CITY

DEPOSITIONS

Caonii Smith gloester Smith

No. 3

PLAINTIFF'S COSTS

Examiners \$.....\$ Copies

Sheriff Stenographer

DEFENDANT'S COSTS

Examiners \$.....\$ Copies

Sheriff

Stenographer

10 11 april 1929

NAONI SMITH	In the Circuit Court			
vs.	OF BALTIMODE CITY			
SYLVESTER SMITH	OF BALTIMORE CITY.			
A decree pro confesso havi	ng been issued in the above cause			
3				
and notice having been given me by t	he 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 nam (Nunc pro tunc) fourteenth	ded Circuit Court, passed in said cause on the			
	day of November in the year nineteen			
	ny office, in the city of Baltimore, in the State			
of Maryland, and assigned the	twenty-sixth day of November			
in the same year at 1:45	o'clock in the after- noon and the			
office ofThe Examiner	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:—				

:

NAOMI SMITH : In the Circuit Court of

VS.

SYLVESTER SMITH : Baltimore City.

Testimony taken before me, A. deRussy Sappington, Examiner, in my offices in the Title Building, Baltimore, on March 14th, 1929, at 1:45 P. M.

Mr. J. Steward Davis appeared for plaintiff.

Thereupon---

NAOMI SMITH,

the plaintiff, of lawful age, produced on her own behalf, being duly sworn, testified as follows:

By the Examiner:

- Q State your name, residence and occupation?
- A Naomi Smith, 1806 Madison Street, Baltimore, no occupation at present.
 - Q Do you know the parties to this suit?
- A Yes, sir, I am the plaintiff and my husband is the defendant.

By Mr. Davis:

- Q When, where and by whom were you married?
- A On August 9th, 1923, in Washington, D. C., by a Minister of the Gospel.
 - Q How long did you live with your husband?
 - A Until July 7th, 1924.
 - Q Which one of you left the other?
 - A I left him.
 - Q Why did you have to leave him?
- A Because he was cruel to me and didn't provide for me.
 - Q What do you mean by cruelty to you?
- A He beat me and struck me a number of times and I was afraid of him.
- Q Did that treatment continue all through your married life?
 - A Yes, sir, the whole year.
 - Q Did you have to work and support yourself?
- A Yes, sir, I had to go elsewhere for food and clothing and support myself.
- Q How did you treat him were you kind, faithful and affectionate to him?
 - A Yes, sir, I tried to be a good wife to him.

- Q Did you give you any cause or reason to fail to support you or strike you and be cruel to you?
 - A No, sir.
 - Were any children born as a result of the marriage?
 - A No. sir.
 - Q Is there any hope of reconciliation between you and your husband?
 - A No. sir.
 - Q Is his abandonment deliberate and final?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q Has it continued uninterruptedly from July 7th, 1924, up to the present time?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Has he contributed anything towards your support since he left you on July 7th, 1924?
 - A No, sir.
- Q Have you been a resident of Baltimore, Maryland, for more than two years prior to the filing of this Bill?
 - A Yes, sir.
 - Q Is your husband a resident of Maryland?
- A No, sir, he was living in Ambler, Pennsylvania, the last I heard of him.

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.

Naomi I Smith

Thereupon---

MATTIE DALE

a witness, of lawful age, produced on behalf of the plaintiff, being duly sworn, testified as follows:

By the Examiner:

- Q State your name, residence and occupation?
- A Mattie Dale, 2607 Nicholas Avenue, Southeast, Washington, D. C., housewife.
 - Q Do you know the parties to this suit?
 - A Yes, sir, Naomi Smith is my daughter.

 By Mr. Davis:
 - Q Did you attend their wedding?
- A Yes, sir, they were married in Washington on August 9th, 1923.
 - Q When did they separate?
 - A on July 9th, 1924.
 - Q What happened then?
- A She was forced to leave him because of his cruelty, and non-support. He never supported her properly and she had to go elsewhere for food and living necessities many a time she had to come to me for food and things and he struck her a number of times and she was afraid of him.

- Q How did she treat him?
- A Very good she tried to get along with him.
- Q Was she a kind, faithful and affectionate wife?
- A Yes, sir.
- Q Did she give him any cause or reason to fail to support her or be cruel to her?
- A No, sir, she did everything she could to get along with him.
 - Q Has his abandonment of his wife continued uninterruptedly from July 9th, 1924, down to the present time?
 - A Yes, sir.
 - Q Do you believe it is deliberate and final and beyond any hope of reconciliation?
 - A Yes, sir.
 - Q Has your daughter, the plaintiff, been a resident of Baltimore, Maryland, for more than two years prior to the filing of this Bill?
 - A Yes, sir.
 - Q Is her husband a resident of Maryland?
 - A No, sir.
 - Q Where was he when you last heard of him?
 - A In Ambler, Pennsylvania.

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

A. --- Mattie Dale

No other witnesses being named or produced before me, I then, at the request
of the Solicitorof theplaintiff
closed the depositions taken in said cause and now return them closed under my
hand and seal, on this eleventh day of april
in the year of Our Lord nineteen hundred and twenty-nine at the
City of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland.
adot lappington (SEAL).
Examiner.
There are Exhibits with these depositions, to wit:
Plaintiff's Exhibit
Defendant's Exhibit
(21.17)-40
Cedes Topping
I, A. de RUSSY SAPPINGTON, the Examiner before whom the fore-
going 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

Circuit Court

0	03	- 00	
19	2	8	X

Docket No. 68%

Naomi Smith

vs.

Sylvester Smith.

Order of Reference and Report

B No. 33290

Order Filed // day of Chil 1929
Report Filed 2 V day of Chil 1929

Naomi Smith	\
	IN THE
VS	Circuit Court
VS.	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \
Sylvester Smith.	OF
	BALTIMORE CITY
	March Term, 1929.
This case being submitted, without argument, it is	,
day of April , 197	29. that the same be and it is hereby referred to
	Esq., Auditor and Master, to report the
pleadings and the facts, and his opinion thereon.	Delletton
Report of Audito	or and Master
Bill for divorce a vinculo matri	
her husband on the ground of abandonm	
	non-resident and his non-residence
proved.	
	re City for more than two years
prior to the filing of the bill prove	
The marriage proved.	
	three years, its finality and the
irreconcilability of the parties prov	
	gainst the defendant and more
than thirty days have since elapsed.	
Case ready for decree.	William P. Lyons
April 22, 1929.	

CIRCUIT COURT

B -369

1928

No.

Docket

NAOMI SMITH

VS.

SYLVESTER SMITH

Legarded

Falls /0/192

Decree of Divorce

B No. 33290

Fd 24 april 1929

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

Milliam Pagono Audisor and Master.

And it is further Ordered, That the said Complainant, NAOMI SMITH, - - - - - pay the cost of this proceeding.

AureRoug