

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

BALTIMORE CITY

62 B 128

BESSIE BOARD

(1923)

VS.

ELI CLARENCE BOARD

BILL FOR DIVORCE

Mr. Clerk:-

Please file.

B 24976

J. Steward Davis
ATTORNEY FOR COMPLAINANT
(1712)

J. S. DAVIS & BISHOP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
BANNER BUILDING
14 E. PLEASANT STREET
BALTIMORE, MD.
25 St. Paul Place.
10/19/23

BESSIE BOARD : IN THE CIRCUIT COURT
VS. : OF
ELI CLARENCE BOARD : BALTIMORE CITY.

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

Your Oratrix complaining respectfully represents:-

- (1) That she was married to her husband, Eli Clarence Board on the 28th day of August 1918, in Indianapolis, Indiana, and with whom she resided until about the 4th day of February 1920.
- (2) That though the conduct of your Oratrix toward the said Eli Clarence Board has always been kind, affectionate and above reproach, he has, without just cause or reason abandoned and deserted her and has declared his intention 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 as issue of said marriage.
- (5) That your Oratrix is a citizen of the State of Maryland, residing 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.

TO THE END, THEREFORE:

(a) That your Oratrix may be divorced a Vinculo Matrimonii from the said Eli Clarence Board.

(b) That she may have such other and further relief as her case may require.

(c) That she may have the right to resume her maiden name (Crawford).

May it please your Honor it be granted unto your Oratrix the Order of Publication directed against the said Eli Clarence Board, a non-resident of the State of Maryland aforesaid, 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.

J. Steward Davis
SOLICITOR FOR COMPLAINANT.

J. STEWARD DAVIS, SOLICITOR 215 ST. PAUL PLACE

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALTIMORE CITY

BESSIE BOARD VS ELI CLARENCE BOARD

The object of this suit is to procure a divorce a Vinculo Matrimonii by the plaintiff from the defendant.

The bill recites that the parties were married on the 28th day of August, 1918 and that they lived together until about the 4th day of February 1920 when the defendant deserted the plaintiff. That there are no children as result of said marriage. That the defendant is a non-resident of the State of Maryland and that he deserted his wife without any just cause or reason and has declared his intention to live with her no longer; that the 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 expectation of reconciliation. That the plaintiff has been a citizen of the State of Maryland for more than three years prior to the filing of this Bill of Complaint.

It is thereupon this ²⁷ day of *February* 1923 ordered by the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, that the plaintiff by causing a copy of this order to be published in Baltimore City once in each of four successive weeks, before the ³⁰ day of *March* 1923, give notice to the absent defendant, Eli Clarence Board, 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 ¹⁶ day of *April* 1923 to show cause, if any he may have, why a decree should not be passed as prayed.

Henry Duffey

128
1923

Docket No.....

Board

vs.

Board

Certificate of Publication

B24976
3

THE DAILY RECORD

Filed *27* day of *april* 1923

THE DAILY RECORD

J. Steward Davis, Solicitor,
215 St. Paul Place.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALTI-
MORE CITY—(B-128 — 1923) — Bessie
Board vs. Eli Clarence Board.

ORDER OF PUBLICATION.

The object of this suit is to procure a
divorce a vinculo matrimonii by the plain-
tiff from the defendant.

The bill recites that the parties were
married on the 28th day of August, 1918,
and that they lived together until about
the 4th day of February, 1920, when the
defendant deserted the plaintiff. That there
are no children as result of said marriage.
That the defendant is a non-resident of

the State of Maryland and that he deserted
his wife without any just cause or reason
and has declared his intention to live
with her no longer; that the said aban-
donment has continued uninterruptedly for
more than three years and is deliberate
and final, and the separation of the parties
beyond any reasonable expectation of rec-
onciliation. That the plaintiff has been a
citizen of the State of Maryland for more
than three years prior to the filing of this
bill of complaint.

It is thereupon this 27th day of Febru-
ary, 1923, ordered by the Circuit Court
of Baltimore City that the plaintiff by
causing a copy of this order to be pub-
lished in Baltimore City once in each of
four successive weeks, before the 30th
day of March, 1923, give notice to the ab-
sent defendant, Eli Clarence Board, 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
16th day of April, 1923, to show cause, if
any he may have, why a decree should
not be passed as prayed.

HENRY DUFFY.

True Copy—Test:
f28.m7.14.21

CHAS. R. WHITEFORD,
Clerk.

Baltimore, March 21, 1923.

We hereby certify that the annexed advertise-
ment of Order Publication Circuit Court

of Baltimore City, Case of _____

vs. Bessie Board
Eli Clarence Board

was published in THE DAILY RECORD, a daily news-
paper published in the City of Baltimore, once in each of

four successive weeks before the

30th day of March, 1923

First insertion February 28th, 1923

THE DAILY RECORD

Per William B. Butch

128 *163* Ct. Ct.
1912 *3* Docket

Board

vs.

Board

Decree Pro Confesso.

824976
Sept

No.

4

Filed *17 June* 1912 *3*

[Decree Pro Confesso.]

Bessie Board

vs.

Ele Board

IN THE
Circuit Court
OF
BALTIMORE CITY.

Term, 1943

The Defendant having been duly summoned to appear to the Bill of Complaint, and having failed to appear thereto, according to the exigency of the writ

It is thereupon this 19 day of April in the year nineteen hundred and Twenty three 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 said 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.

Henry Daffy

3/13/112

Doc. B ¹²⁸
1923

In the Circuit Court,
OF BALTIMORE CITY

DEPOSITIONS

Bessie Board

vs.

Eli Clarence Board

No. 24976D

PLAINTIFF'S COSTS

Examiners.....\$ 8⁰⁰
Copies.....
Sheriff.....
Stenographer.....
\$ _____

DEFENDANT'S COSTS

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

fd 12 June 1923

Bessie Board

vs.

Eli Clarence Board

In the Circuit Court

OF BALTIMORE CITY.

Secre Pro Confess 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
seventeenth day of *April* 19*23*, met on
the *first* day of *May* in the year nineteen
hundred and *twenty* at my office, in the City of Baltimore, in the State
of Maryland, and assigned the *second* day of *May*
in the same year at *three* o'clock in the *after*-noon and the
office of *J. Stewart Davis, 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:—

8-13

Board,

v.

Board.

Testimony taken at the office of Mr. Davis,
Baltimore, Maryland, 1923, at three O'clock
P. M.

Bessie Board, the Plaintiff in this case,
produced on her own behalf, having been first duly
sworn, deposes and saith as follows, that is to
say:

By the Examiner:

1 Q. State your name residence and occupation?

A. Bessie Board, 1214 Druid Hill Avenue; Clerk
in a drug store.

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

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

By Mr. Davis:

1 Q. When were you married?

A. 28th., August 1918.

2 Q. Were you married by a Minister of the Gospel?

A. Yes.

3 Q. In Baltimore a City?

A. In Indianapolis, Indiana.

4 Q. Were you married according to a Religious
Ceremony?

Bessie Board.

A. Yes.

5 Q. Have you been a resident of Baltimore City, State of Maryland, for at least two years prior to the filing of this suit?

A. Yes.

6 Q. Has the Plaintiff been a resident of Baltimore City, State of Maryland, for at least two years prior to the filing of this suit?

A. Yes.

7 Q. Are there any children as the result of this marriage?

A. No.

8 Q. What was your conduct towards your husband while living together; how did you treat him?

A. Well, I suppose as good as any wife should treat a husband.

9 Q. State whether or not you were always a kind, affectionate and faithful wife?

A. Yes.

10 Q. Are you and your husband living together now?

A. No sir.

12 Q. Which left the other?

A. He left me.

13 Q. When?

A. Februaryy 4th., 1920.

Bessie Board.

14 Q. What did he say and what did he do on that day?

A. On that occasion we were living in Baltimore, and we had an argument two or three days before he left me, and on the day that he left me he told me that he was going to his parents home in the West, and I did not know for sure whether he was leaving me or not, but I thought that probable he would come back, but he never did.

15 Q. Since that time has he provided or offered to provide a home for you?

A. He has not.

16 Q. Was there anything to prevent him doing so if he had wanted to?

A. No sir.

17 Q. Has he shown by his acts that he does not intend to come back any more?

A. He has.

18 Q. Has his abandonment of you continued uninterrupted since February 4th., 1920.

A. Yes.

19 Q. That is, have you lived or cohabited with him since that time?

A. No sir.

Bessie Board.

20 Q. State whether or not his abandonment of you was deliberate and final; did he deliberately and finally abandon and desert you?

A. Yesz

21 Q. Is he a resident or a non-resident of the State of Maryland?

A. Non-resident.

22 Q. Of what state is he a resident?

A. Indiana.

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.P.P.

no
Mrs Bessie Board

Mary Goldring, 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. Mary Goldring, 1554 Argyle Avenue; house work
- 2 Q. Do you know the parties to this suit?
- A. Yes.

By Mr. Davis:

- 1 Q. Are they husband and wife?
- A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Did they live together as husband and wife and were they always known and recognized in the community in which they lived as husband and wife?
- A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Are there any children as the result of this marriage?
- A. No.
- 4 Q. What was her conduct towards her husband while living together; how did she behave herself?
- A. Beautifully.
- 5 Q. State whether or not she was always a kind, affectionate and faithful wife?
- A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Are the parties to this suit living together now?
- A. No sir.

Mary Goldring.

7 Q. Which left the other?

A. He did.

8 Q. When was that?

A. About February 4th., 1920.

9 Q. They were living in the same house with you at that time, were they not?

A. Yes.

10 Q. What did he say and what did he do on the day that he left her.

A. Well, their family differences - of course, I tell you the positive truth, I did not know, but he just said goodbye to her and he left ; I did not know that they were even angry , but he left .

11 Q. You mean to say that you did not know that he was abandoning and deserting his wife at the time he left her?

A. No; I did not.

12 Q. You do not know anything about this abandonment that Mrs. Board has testified about, do you?

A. No.

13 Q. However, you do know that he left his wife at your house February 4th., 1920.

A. Yes.

14 Q. And how long did she continue to live in that

Mary Goldring.

house after he abandoned and deserted his wife?

A. A few months.

15 Q. Did he return to her in those few months?

A. No sir.

16 Q. After she moved away from your house, did you keep in touch with her?

A. Yes.

17 Q. Has he returned to her?

A. No sir; I have not seen them living together since that time.

18 Q. Has he provided for her or offered to provide a home for his wife since he abandoned and deserted her?

A. No sir; not as far as I know.

19 Q. Was there anything to prevent him doing so if he had wanted to?

A. Nothing that I know of.

20 Q. Could he have returned and lived with his wife if he had wanted to.

A. Yes.

21 Q. Has his abandonment of his wife continued uninterruptedly since February 4th, 1920; that is, have they lived or cohabited together since that time?

A. No sir.

22 Q. State whether or not his abandonment of her was deliberate and final; did he deliberately and finally

Mary Goldring.

abandon and desert her?

A. He went of his own accord.

23 Q. state whether or not there is any reasonable expectation of a reconciliation; do you ever expect them to make up and live together again?

A. No sir; I dont; I wish they would.

24 Q. Is he a resident or a non-resident of the State of Maryland, as far as you know.

A. Out of Maryland.

24 Q. Where did he tell you that he was going when he said goodbye.

A. The last that I heard of him he was in Arizona,- some place out West.

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.---

Yes

Mary E. Goldsby

1/20/1911

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 12th day of June in the year of Our Lord nineteen hundred and Twenty Three at the City of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland.

A. de Russey Sappington (SEAL).
Examiner.

There are *no*..... Exhibits with these depositions, to wit:

Plaintiff's..... Exhibit */*.....

Defendant's..... Exhibit */*.....

A. de Russey 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 Russey Sappington
Examiner.

128 a63
19 23

Docket No. _____

Board

Board ^{vs.}

Order of Reference.

B
24976
(L) ✓
Robertson.

Filed 13 day of June 1943

128
1923

Bessie Board
vs.
Chas. Board

IN THE
CIRCUIT COURT

OF

BALTIMORE CITY

May Term, 1923

This case being submitted, without argument, it is ordered by the Court, this 13 day of June 1923, that the same be and is hereby referred to Alex H. Robertson Esq., Auditor and Master, to report the pleadings and the facts, and his opinion thereon.

Henry Duffey

Report of Auditor and Master

Bill filed by wife against husband for a divorce a vinculo matrimonii for abandonment for three years and to be permitted to resume her maiden name. Code Art. 16, Sec. 36.

Order of publication against defendant as a non-resident, no answer, decree pro confesso, thirty days elapsed.

Proof shows marriage, residence of plaintiff and non-residence of defendant and abandonment for three years, continuous, deliberate, final and without hope of reconciliation and that the plaintiff be permitted to resume her maiden name.

Case ready for decree.

Alex H. Robertson
Auditor and Master.

CIRCUIT COURT

B 122
1923

No. 33 Docket

Bessie Board

vs.

Eli Clarence Board

Recorded

July 155 1923

Decree of Divorce

B 24 976

B No.

(7)

18 June 1923

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

Ray Robertson
Auditor and Master.

Decree of Divorce

IN THE

Circuit Court

OF

BALTIMORE CITY

Bessie Board

VS.

Eli Clarence Board

May

Term, 19 *23*

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

It is thereupon, this *18* day of *June*, A. D. 1923.

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

Bessie Board

the above named Complainant be and she is hereby DIVORCED A VINCULO MATRIMONII from the Defendant, *the said Eli Clarence Board.*

And that the plaintiff be permitted to resume her maiden name,

Bessie Crawford.

And it is further Ordered, That the said *plaintiff* pay the cost of this proceeding.

Henry Duffey