

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

~~BALTIMORE CITY.~~

65 B 65

1925

ARNETT BROWN

VS.

HARRIETT BROWN

1646 E. Madison St.

BILL FOR DIVORCE

B 8 303

Mr. Clerk: -

Please file.

Davis & Evans

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF.

J. STEWARD DAVIS

ATTORNEY AT LAW

215 SAINT PAUL PLACE

BALTIMORE, MD.

Ad 26 Jan 1925

ARNETT BROWN : IN THE CIRCUIT COURT
VS. : OF
HARRIETT BROWN : BALTIMORE CITY.

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

Your Orator complaining respectfully represents;

1. That he was married to his wife, Harriett Brown on the 19th day of August, 1916 and with whom he resided until about the 23rd day of January, 1921 when the defendant deserted the plaintiff.
2. That though the conduct of your Orator toward the said Harriett Brown, has always been kind, affectionate and above reproach, she has without any just cause or reason abandoned and deserted him and has declared her intentions to live with him 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 the said Harriett Brown has on divers days and times since said marriage, committed the crime of adultery with divers, lewd and abandoned men, whose names to your Orator are unknown, and said offense has not been condoned by your Orator.
4. That your Orator has not lived or co-habited with the said defendant since said desertion.
5. That there are two children born as result of said marriage; Zebedee, age seven years and Floyd, age five years, for whom your Orator prays the custody.
6. That both your Orator 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 Orator may be divorced A Vinculo Matrimonii from the said Harriett Brown.

(b) That he may have the custody of the said infant children, Zebedee and Floyd.

(c) That he may have such other and further relief as his case may require.

May it please your Honor to grant unto your Orator the Writ of Subpoena directed against the said Harriett Brown, 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.

Davis & Evans.

SOLICITORS FOR COMPLAINANT.

991

65
1925 *B* Docket No. 65 Ct. Ct.

Brown

vs.

Brown

1646 E Madison St

SUBPOENA TO ANSWER BILL OF COMPLAINT

No. *B^{Pr}-28303*

*Wrong
address
1-21-25*

(2) *(3)*

Filed *11 Feb* 192
8 June 5

Harist Evans SOLICITOR
215 St Paul Pl.

*John E Potee
Sherriff*

*Ann Est.
(Moylan)*

5/15-1925

REISSUED TO *June* *RECALL DUTY 192*
John E Potee

*Ann Est.
(Moylan)*

*John E. Potee
Sherriff*

3/13/2/18

The State of Maryland
JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT

EQUITY SUBPOENA

The State of Maryland

To

Harriett Brown

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 *February* next cause an appearance to be entered for you and your answer to be filed to the complaint of

Arnett Brown

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 *Jan* 192 *5*
26 day of *Jan*, in the year 192 *5*

Issued the

Chas R Wheelford

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)

EQUITY SUBPOENA

The State of Maryland

To

Harriett Brown

5/15 1925

REISSUED TO *June* Return Day, 1925

Chas R Whitford
Clerk

Copy Seal

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 *February* next cause an appearance to be entered for you and your answer to be filed to the complaint of

Arnett Brown

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 *12th* day of *Jan* 1925
Issued the *26th* day of *Jan*, in the year 1925

Chas R Whitford 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)

65
1925

Ct. Ct.
Docket B 65

Arretto Brown

vs.

Harriet Brown

Decree Pro Confesso.

Dapp

No.
B 28303
4

Filed 18th Mch 1926

Arnett Brown

vs.

Harriett Brown

IN THE
Circuit Court

OF
BALTIMORE CITY.

Mar

Term, 1926

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 *18* day of *March* in the year nineteen hundred and twenty *six* 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.

Nunc Pro tunc as of the 14th of March 1926
James P. Gorter

Doc. B $\frac{65}{1925}$

In the Circuit Court,
OF BALTIMORE CITY

DEPOSITIONS

Arnett Brown

vs.

Harriett Brown

No. 28303B
25

PLAINTIFF'S COSTS

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

DEFENDANT'S COSTS

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

Ad 30 Aug 1926

Arnett Brown

vs.

Harritt Brown

In the Circuit Court

OF BALTIMORE CITY.

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 fourteenth day of March 1926, met on the fourteenth day of March in the year nineteen hundred and twenty-six at my office, in the city of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland, and assigned the fifteenth day of March in the same year at two-thirty o'clock in the afternoon 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:—

8-4-8

ARNETT BROWN

VS.

HARRIETT BROWN.

Testimony taken before me, A. deRussy
Sappington, Examiner, at the offices of George
Evans, Baltimore, Md. on March 15, 1926, at 2.30
o'clock in the afternoon.

--

Thereupon---

ARNETT BROWN,

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

By the Examiner:

Q Please state your name, residence and
occupation?

A Arnett Brown, 743 George Street, steel
work.

Q Do you know the parties to this suit?

A Yes; I am the plaintiff and the defendant is my wife.

By Mr. Evans:

Q When, where and by whom were you married?

A On August 19, 1916, at Carrollton, Virginia, by Reverend D. A. Blake, a Minister of the Gospel.

Q Are you living with your wife now?

A No, sir.

Q Which one left the other, and when?

A She left me on January 23, 1921.

Q Did you give her any just cause?

A No, sir.

Q State whether or not you were always a kind, affectionate and faithful husband?

A I was.

Q State the circumstances surrounding the separation?

A She stayed out late at nights and I told her about it and she said she was going to leave,

and she took her clothes and left.

Q Did you ask her to stay and do better?

A Yes, but she said she was going.

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

A It has, since January 23, 1921 when she left.

Q Is the separation deliberate and final and beyond any reasonable hope or expectation of reconciliation?

A Yes, sir, it is.

Q Have you been a resident of the City of Baltimore, State of Maryland for more than two years prior to the filing of this suit?

A Yes, sir.

Q Are there any children living as result of your marriage?

A Two; Zebedee, 7, and Floyd, 5. They are with my Mother, but I want their custody.

Q Are you able and willing to support, rear and educate the children if they are awarded to you?

A Yes, sir, I am.

Q Have you talked to your wife about the children?

A I asked her about coming back and taking care of the children and she said she wasn't thinking of the children.

Q Where is your Mother?

A At Carrollton, Virginia.

Q Have you been supporting these children?

A I have.

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

Arnett Brown

Thereupon---

HOWARD GOODWIN,

a witness of lawful age, produced on behalf of the plaintiff, 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 Howard Goodwin, 743 George Street, acetylene burner.

Q Do you know the parties to this suit?

A I do

By Mr. Evans:

Q Do you know that they were married and lived together at one time as husband and wife?

A I do.

Q Were they known and recognized in the community in which they lived as husband and wife?

A Yes, sir.

Q Are they living together now?

A No, sir.

Q Did you visit them while they lived together?

A I did.

Q Which one left the other, and when?

A She left him on January 23, 1921.

Q Did he give her any just cause to leave?

A No, sir.

Q State whether or not he was a kind, affectionate and faithful husband?

A Yes, sir, he was.

Q State the circumstances surrounding the separation?

A She went out at nights and he spoke to her about it and she left him. He asked her to stay but she refused.

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

A It has.

Q Do you think the separation is deliberate and final and beyond any reasonable hope or expectation of reconciliation?

A Yes, sir.

Q Has he been a resident of the City of Baltimore, State of Maryland for more than two years prior to the filing of this suit?

A Yes, sir.

Q Are the names and ages of the children properly given by the father in his testimony?

A Yes, sir.

Q Do you think he is a fit and proper person to have the custody of the children?

A I do.

Q Is he able and willing to support, rear and educate the children?

A Yes, he is. He is always talking about the children, saying that he wants them.

Q Were you at his house when his wife left?

A Yes. We went in and the door was open and she and her things were gone.

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 Howard Goodwin

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 thirtieth day of August in the year of Our Lord nineteen hundred and twenty-six at the City of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland.

A. de Russy Sappington (SEAL).
Examiner.

There are 20 Exhibits with these depositions, to wit:
Plaintiff's..... Exhibit 1

Defendant's..... Exhibit 1

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

65
1995

Docket No. B65

Arnett Browne

vs.

Harriet Brown

**Order of Reference
and Report**

Lyon

B No. 28303
(6)

Order Filed 4 day of Sept 1926

Report Filed.....day of.....19

Arnett Brown

vs.

Harrett Brown

IN THE

Circuit Court

OF

BALTIMORE CITY

July Term, 192*6*

This case being submitted, without argument, it is ordered by the Court, this *4th* day of *September*, 19*26*, that the same be and it is hereby referred to *Wm. Payson*, Esq., Auditor and Master, to report the pleadings and the facts, and his opinion thereon.

Henry B. B. B.

Report of Auditor and Master

Lined area for the report of the Auditor and Master.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

BALTIMORE CITY.

65-1925 B 65-1926

ARNETT BROWN

VS.

HARRIETT BROWN

B 28303

P E T I T I O N

Mr. Clerk:-

Please file.

Davis & Evans

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

DAVIS & EVANS

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Filed 10 Sept 1926

ARNETT BROWN

:

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT

VS.

:

OF

HARRIETT BROWN

:

BALTIMORE CITY

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

The petition of Arnett Brown respectfully represents unto your Honor:

1. That on or about the 26th day of January, 1925 your petitioner filed a bill for divorce A Vinculo Matrimonii against one Harriett Brown.
2. That on or about the 18th day of March, 1926 a Decree pro Confesso was filed and testimony taken under said decree. That said testimony was duly filed and referred to the Master. It appears from the docket entry that the defendant has not been summoned.
3. That your petitioner desires to have the decree pro confesso and order of reference and report stricken out that he may duly summon the defendant, Harriett Brown.

WHEREFORE YOUR PETITIONER PRAYS:

- (a) That the decree Pro Confesso filed the 18th day of March, 1926, be stricken out.
- (b) That the Order of Reference and report filed the 4th day of August, 1926 be stricken out.
- (c) Such other and further relief as the case may require.

May it please your Honor to grant unto your Orator
the Writ of Subpoena directed against the said Harriett
Brown, 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, e tc.



ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF.

Ordered by the Court this 10th day of September, 1926
that the decree pro confesso filed the 18th day of March, 1926
and the Order of Reference and Report filed the 4th day of
August 1926, be and the same are hereby stricken out and it
is further ordered that the plaintiff be granted the Writ of
Subpoena directed against the defendant as prayed.

Charles W. Owen

P721

Ct. Ct.

B65
192

Docket No.

Brown

vs

Brown
1846 E Madison St.

SUBPOENA TO ANSWER BILL OF COMPLAINT

No.

pd
B 28303,
(7) (8)

fd 11 Oct 1926

Filed 14 Sept 1926

Davis & Evans.

SOLICITOR

p-6

Non Est

John E. Potter
Sheriff

15 Sept 1926

REISSUED TO

Return Day, 1926

Colton
Charles Whitford

John E. Potter
Sheriff
Clerk

Non Est
(McKinley)

EQUITY SUBPOENA

The State of Maryland

To

Harriett Brown

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

Arnett Brown

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

Issued the

11¹² day of July 1926
11¹² day of September, in the year 1926

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.

EQUITY SUBPOENA

The State of Maryland

To

Harriet H Brown

REISSUED TO *October* ^{15th Sept 1926} Return Day, 1926
Charles Whiteford
Clerk

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

Anneth Brown

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

Issued the

12 day of *July* 1926
11th day of *September* in the year 1926

Charles 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.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

BALTIMORE CITY

B 65
7926

65
7925

ARNETT BROWN

VS.

HARRIETT BROWN

ORDER OF PUBLICATION

B 28303

Mr. Clerk:-

(9)

Please file.

Davis Evans
ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

DAVIS & EVANS
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

7d 23 Oct 1926

DAVIS & EVANS, SOLICITORS
215 St. Paul Place,
IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALTIMORE CITY

ARNETT BROWN VS. HARRIETT BROWN
ORDER OF PUBLICATION

65
1925

The object of this Bill is to procure a divorce A
Vinculo Matrimonii By the plaintiff from the defendant.

The bill recites that the parties were married on the
19th day of August 1916 and lived together until on or about the
23rd day of January, 1921 when the defendant deserted the plaintiff.
That though the conduct of the plaintiff was kind, affectionate
and above reproach the defendant deserted him without any just
cause or reason and declared her intentions to live with him no
longer and that the separation of the parties has continued un-
interruptedly for more than three years and is deliberate and
final and beyond reconciliation. That your Orator has not lived
or co-habited with the said defendant since said desertion. That
there are two children born as issue of said marriage; Zebedee,
age seven years and Floyd, age five years for whom your Orator
prays the custody.

The Bill recites also that both parties are residents of
Baltimore City but that two summons sent to the defendant's last
known residence have been returned non est by the Sheriff of
Baltimore City.

It is thereupon ordered by the Circuit Court of Baltimore
City this 18th day of October 1926 that the plaintiff by causing a
copy of this order to be inserted in some daily newspaper publish-
ed in Baltimore City, once a week for four successive weeks
before the 23rd day of November 1926 give notice to the absent defen-
dant of the object and substance of this bill, warning her to be
and appear in this Court in person or by Solicitor on or before
the 10th day of December 1926 to show cause, if any she may have, why
a decree should not be passed as prayed.

E. Frank

65
1925

Ct. Ct.
Docket B 65

Arnett Brown

vs.

Harriet Brown

Decree Pro Confesso.

Sapp

Attorney 3/26

No.
B 28303.
(10)

Filed 5 Jan 1927

Arnett Brown

vs.

Harriett Brown

IN THE
Circuit Court

OF
BALTIMORE CITY.

no

Term, 1926

The Defendant *Arnett Brown* 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 *5* day of *January* in the year nineteen hundred and twenty *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.

Set the testimony taken March 15th 1926 be and the same is hereby considered as having been taken under this decree.

E. Frank

Circuit Court

65B65

1927

Docket No. _____

Arnett Brown

vs.

Arnett Brown

Order of Reference
and Report

Lyon

B No. 28303

(11)

Order Filed 22 day of Jan 1927
Report Filed _____ day of _____ 19

Arnett Brown

vs.
Harriet Brown

IN THE
Circuit Court

OF
BALTIMORE CITY

January Term, 1927

This case being submitted, without argument, it is ordered by the Court, this 22nd day of January, 1927, that the same be and it is hereby referred to William P. Lyons, Esq., Auditor and Master, to report the pleadings and the facts, and his opinion thereon.

James P. Gorter

Report of Auditor and Master

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

Defendant proceeded against as a non-resident after the return of two successive 'non ests'.

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

The marriage proven.

Abandonment uninterruptedly for three years, its finality and the irreconcilability of the parties proven.

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

Case made for awarding the guardianship and custody of the minor children of the parties to the plaintiff and charging said plaintiff with the maintenance and support of said children.

Case ready for decree.

William P. Lyons

February 7, 1927

Auditor and Master

192.....

Docket No.....

65
1925

Brown

vs.

Brown

Certificate of Publication

*B 28303
(12)*

THE DAILY RECORD

Filed.....

day of

Feb

192.....

7 *7*

THE DAILY RECORD

NOV 15 1926

Baltimore,, 192.....

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

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALTI-
MORE CITY — (B—65 — 1925) — Arnett
Brown vs. Harriett Brown.

ORDER OF PUBLICATION.

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

The bill recites that the parties were married on the 19th day of August, 1916, and lived together until on or about the 23rd day of January, 1921, when the defendant deserted the plaintiff. That though the conduct of the plaintiff was kind, affectionate and above reproach the defendant deserted him without any just cause or reason and declared her intentions to live with him no longer and that the separation of the parties has continued uninterruptedly for more than three years and is deliberate and final and beyond reconciliation. That your orator has not lived or co-habited with the said defendant since said desertion. That there are two children born as issue of said marriage; Zebedee, age seven years, and Floyd, age five years, for whom your orator prays the custody.

The bill recites also that both parties are residents of Baltimore City but that two summons sent to the defendant's last known residence have been returned "non est" by the Sheriff of Baltimore City.

It is thereupon ordered by the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, this 23rd day of October, 1926, 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 23rd day of November, 1926, give notice to the absent defendant, of the object and substance of this bill, warning her to be and appear in this Court, in person or by solicitor, on or before the 10th day of December, 1926, to show cause, if any she may have, why a decree should not be passed as prayed.

ELI FRANK.

True Copy—Test:

CHAS. R. WHITEFORD,

o25,n1,8,15

Clerk.

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

..... of Baltimore City, Case of.....

Arnett Brown
vs. *Harriett Brown*

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
23rd day of *November*, 1926.

First insertion *October 25th*, 1926.

THE DAILY RECORD

Per. *George C. Lauer*

CIRCUIT COURT

B 65
1925 No. Docket

ARNETT BROWN

VS.

HARRIETT BROWN

Recorded

Folio 37 1927

Decree of Divorce

B No. 28303
(13)

Feb 7. Feb 1927

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

William P. Lyons
Auditor and Master.

Circuit Court

OF

BALTIMORE CITY,

ARNETT BROWN

VS.

HARRIETT BROWN

January Term, 1927

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

It is thereupon, this 7th day of February, A. D. 1927

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

ARNETT BROWN,

the above named Complainant be and he is hereby DIVORCED A VINCULO MATRIMONII from the Defendant, HARRIETT BROWN;

AND it is further ordered that the guardianship and custody of Zebedee and Floyd Brown, minor children of the parties, be and the same are hereby awarded to the Complainant, Arnett Brown, and the said Complainant be and he is hereby charged with the maintenance and support of said children - all subject to the further order of this Court.

And it is Further Ordered, That the said Complainant, Arnett Brown, pay the cost of this proceeding.

H. Arnett Stump