

513  
1975 B-65

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF  
BALTIMORE CITY.

LAWRENCE CORDERY

VS.

MAMIE E. CORDERY

---

BILL OF COMPLAINT

---

*Mr. Glenn!*

*Please file, etc*

*Charles Goldberg*

*B-29195*

---

CHARLES F. GOLDBERG  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
423 CALVERT BLDG.?  
BALTIMORE, MD.

*(1)*

*to 30 June 1975*

LAWRENCE CORDERY :  
 VS. :  
 MAMIE E. CORDERY :  
 : : : : : : : : : : :

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF  
 BALTIMORE CITY

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:-

Your Orator complaining respectfully says:-

1. That he is a resident of the City of Baltimore, State of Maryland, and has resided in the said City and State, for more than two years preceding the filing of this his Bill of Complaint.

2. That on September 1, 1920, he was married to the Defendant, the said Mamie E. Cordery, in Baltimore City, State of Maryland, by a religious ceremony.

3. That your Orator and the said Defendant lived together as husband and wife until April, 1922, when the said Defendant, without any just cause or reason, deserted and abandoned your Orator, and her whereabouts are now unknown.

4. That the said abandonment upon the part of the Defendant, Mamie E. Cordery, is deliberate and final, and has continued uninterruptedly for more than three years, and the separation of the parties is beyond any reasonable hope or expectation of reconciliation.

5. That your Orator has always conducted himself as a faithful, and affectionate husband.

6. That there were no children born as the result of said wedlock,

TO THE END THEREFORE:-

(a) That your Orator may be divorced a vincolo matrimonii from the said Mamie E. Cordery, Defendant.

(b) That your Orator may have such other and further relief as the nature of his case may require.

And your Orator prays for the following process:-

That an order of Publication may be passed in the usual form, giving notice to the non-resident Defendant, of the object and substance of this Bill of Complaint, and warning her to be and appear, either in person or by Solicitor, in this Honorable Court on some day certain to be named in said Order, and show cause, if any she may have, why a Decree should not be passed as prayed.

AND, as in duty bound, etc.

Charles J. Goodberg  
Solicitor for Complainant

Lawrence Cordery,  
Complainant.

STATE OF MARYLAND:

TO WIT:

CITY OF BALTIMORE:

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 29<sup>th</sup> day of June, 1925, before me, the subscriber, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, in and for Baltimore City aforesaid, personally appeared Lawrence Cordery, the Complainant herein named, and he made oath in due form of law, that the matters and facts herein set forth are true and bona fide.

WITNESS my hand and Notarial Seal.

Adelaide H. Lindenberg  
Notary Public.

*B 513*  
IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF  
BALTIMORE CITY.

---

Lawrence Cordery

vs.

Manie E. Cordery

---

ORDER OF PUBLICATION

---

*B 29195*  
*(1)(2)*

---

CHARLES F. GOLDBERG  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
423 CALVERT BLDG.  
BALTIMORE, MDP.

*Ch. F. Goldberg*



cessive weeks, before the 4 day of August, 1925, giving notice to the absent Defendant, Mamie E. Cordery, of the object and substance of this Bill, warning her to be and appear in this Court, either in person or by solicitor, on or before the 20 day of August 1925, and show cause, if any shemay have, why the Decree should not be passed as prayed.

True Copy

Just  
Chas R Whiteford  
OR

George A. Salby

Aug 3, 10, 17, 24

513  
1925

Docket No.....

*Cordery*

vs.

*Cordery*

---

---

Certificate of Publication

---

---

*B* 29195  
(3)

THE DAILY RECORD

Filed *19* day of *aug* 192*5*

*J*  
188

# THE DAILY RECORD

Baltimore, JUL 24 1925, 192

We hereby certify that the annexed advertisement of Order Publication Circuit Court

of Baltimore City, Case of

Lawrence Cordery  
vs. Mamie E. Cordery

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

4th day of August 1925

First insertion July 3rd, 1925

THE DAILY RECORD

Per Hubel

Charles F. Goldberg, Solicitor,  
423 Calvert Building.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALTIMORE CITY—(B—513—1925)—Lawrence Cordery vs. Mamie E. Cordery.

### ORDER OF PUBLICATION.

The object of this bill of complaint, filed in the above entitled case, is to procure a divorce a vinculo matrimonii by the plaintiff, Lawrence Cordery, from the defendant, Mamie E. Cordery. The bill states in substance that the parties were married in the City of Baltimore, State of Maryland, on September 1, 1920, by a religious ceremony; that the said parties resided together as husband and wife until April 30, 1922, when the defendant, without any just cause, or reason, abandoned and deserted the plaintiff and has declared her intention to live with him no longer. That the abandonment is deliberate and final, and has continued interruptedly for more than three years; the separation of the parties is beyond any reasonable hope or expectation of reconciliation. The plaintiff has always conducted himself as a faithful and affectionate husband and that there are no children born of said marriage.

It is thereupon this 30th day of June, 1925, ordered by the Circuit Court of Baltimore City that the plaintiff, by causing a copy of this order to be inserted in some daily newspaper published in Baltimore City, once each week for four successive weeks, before the 4th day of August, 1925, giving notice to the absent defendant, Mamie E. Cordery, of the object and substance of this bill, warning her to be and appear in this Court, either in person or by solicitor, on or before the 20th day of August, 1925, and show cause, if any she may have, why the decree should not be passed as prayed.

GEORGE A. SOLTER.

CHAS. R. WHITEFORD,

Clerk.

True Copy—Test:

JF3,10,17,24

20 Aug



5/3

Ct. Ct.

1925

Docket

Lawrence Cordery  
vs.

Mamie E. Cordery

Decree Pro Confesso.

B 2 9/95

No.

Saf (4)

Filed

2 Aug 1925

*Sapp.*

658  
513

*Lawrence Cordery*

vs.

*Mamie E. Cordery*

IN THE  
**Circuit Court**  
OF  
BALTIMORE CITY.

*July* Term, 1925

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 *24* day of *August* in the year nineteen hundred and twenty *two* 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.

*Charles F. Stuenkel*

Doc. B  $\frac{513}{1925}$

**In the Circuit Court,**  
OF BALTIMORE CITY

**DEPOSITIONS**

*Lawrence Cordery*

vs.

*Mamie E. Cordery*

No. 209195-6

**PLAINTIFF'S COSTS**

Examiners..... \$.....

Copies.....

Sheriff.....

Stenographer.....

\$           

**DEFENDANT'S COSTS**

Examiners..... \$.....

Copies.....

Sheriff.....

Stenographer.....

\$           

*For 9 Sept 1925*

Lawrence Cordery

vs.  
Mamie E. Cordery

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 twenty-fourth day of August 1925, met on the twenty-third day of August in the year nineteen hundred and twenty-fifth at my office, in the city of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland, and assigned the thirty-first day of August in the same year at one o'clock in the afternoon and the office of Charles F. Goldberg 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:—

8-4A

LAWRENCE CORDEREY  
VS.  
MAMIE F. CORDEREY.

Testimony taken before me, A. deRussy  
Sappington, Examiner, at my offices in the Title  
Building, Baltimore, Maryland on August 31, 1925 at  
1.00 o'clock in the afternoon.

--

Thereupon---

LAWRENCE CORDEREY,  
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:

1Q Please state your name, residence and occupation?

A Lawrence Corderoy, 2415 McCulloh Street,  
carpenter.

2Q Do you know the parties to this suit or  
either of them?

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

BY MR. GOLDBERG:

1Q When, where and by whom were you married?

A September 1, 1920 by Reverend Frederick Douglas, in Baltimore City.

2Q Did you live with your wife after that?

A Yes, sir.

3Q Are you living together now?

A No, sir.

4Q Which left the other and when?

A She left me in April, 1922.

5Q What did she say and do on the day she left?

A I was at work and when I returned she had gone and I have not heard from her since.

6Q Did you give her any just cause or reason to abandon you in this manner?

A No, sir.

7Q How did you always treat her?

A I always treated her right.

8Q Were you a kind, affectionate and faithful husband to her?

A Yes, sir.

9Q Have you been a resident of the City of Baltimore State of Maryland for more than two years prior to

Lawrence Corderoy

4

the filing of this bill?

A Yes, sir.

10Q Is your wife a resident of Maryland?

A No, sir, I understand from Mrs. Gross that she lives in New York. I have not heard from her.

11Q Is this separation deliberate and final and beyond any reasonable hope or expectation or reconciliation?

A Yes, sir.

12Q Any children?

A No, sir.

13Q Where were you living at the time of the separation?

A 2415 McCulloh Street. I have never moved.

14Q Then your wife always knew where she could have located you had she wanted to return?

A Yes, sir.

15Q And you say she has never returned to you?

A No, sir

16Q Has the separation continued uninterruptedly for more than three years prior to the filing of this bill?

A Yes, sir.

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

Lawrence Cordery,



Thereupon---

DOROTHY GROSS,

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:

1Q Please state your name, residence and occupation?

A Dorothy Gross, 1420 McCulloh Street, Baltimore, maid.

2Q Do you know the parties to this suit or either of them?

A Yes.

BY MR. GOLDBERG:

1Q Do you remember when they were married and lived together as husband and wife?

A Yes.

2Q Were they known and recognized in the community as husband and wife?

A Yes, sir.

3Q Did you visit them frequently while they lived together?

A Yes, sir.

Dorothy Gross

7

4Q Are they living together now?

A No, sir.

5Q Which left the other and when?

A She run away from him because I seen her the night before she left and she told me she was going.

6Q When did she leave?

A I seen her about April 29, 1922 and the next day she left.

7Q You say you visited them frequently?

A Yes.

8Q How did Mr. Corderey always treat his wife?

A Nice and kind, and he always provided for her.

9Q Was he a kind, affectionate and faithful husband to her?

A Yes, sir.

10Q Did he give her any just cause or reason to abandon him?

A No, sir.

11Q Is the plaintiff a resident of the City of Baltimore, State of Maryland, and has he been for more than two years prior to the filing of this bill?

Dorothy Gross

8

A Yes, sir.

12Q Is his wife a resident of Maryland?

A No, sir; the last I heard of her she was in New York.

13Q Has the separation continued uninterruptedly for more than three years prior to the filing of this bill of complaint?

A Yes.

14Q Any children as result of their marriage?

A No, sir.

15Q Is the separation deliberate and final and beyond any reasonable hope or expectation of reconciliation?

A Yes, sir.

16Q Where were they living when the separation took place?

A 2415 McCulloh Street. Mr. Corderoy has never moved.

17Q His wife always knew where to locate him then, had she wanted to come back with him?

A Yes, sir.

18Q But you say she has not lived nor cohabited with him since April, 1922?

A No, sir, she has not.

Dorothy Gross

9

19Q Did Mrs. Corderey tell you of any reason why she was going to leave?

A Yes, she said she did not love him and she was not happy and was going away and never coming back again. I begged her not to go.

20Q What other evidence have you that she is away?

A I have gotten two or three postal cards from her from New York.

21Q When did you last hear from her?

A About three years ago, shortly after she left, she sent me a postal card from New York.

22Q Any children as result of the marriage?

A None.

**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

Dorothea Gross.

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.....*9th*..... day of *September*..... in the year of Our Lord nineteen hundred and.....*Twenty-five*.....at the City of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland.

*A. de Russy Sappington* (SEAL).  
Examiner.

There are.....*no*..... Exhibits with these depositions, to wit:  
Plaintiff's..... Exhibit.....*/*.....

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

*A. de Russy Sappington*  
Examiner.

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.....

*A. de Russy Sappington*  
Examiner.

Circuit Court 65 B  
513

19

Docket No. ....

Lawrence Cordery

vs.

Mamie E. Cordery

Order of Reference  
and Report

*coe*

No. B 29195  
(6)

Order Filed 10 day of Sept 1925

Report Filed 24 day of Sept 1925

3/15/2/44

Lawrence Bondary

vs.

Mamie E. Bondary

IN THE  
Circuit Court

OF  
BALTIMORE CITY

May Term, 1925

This case being submitted, without argument, it is ordered by the Court, this 10 day of September, 1925, that the same be and it is hereby referred to Ward B. Cow, Esq., Auditor and Master, to report the pleadings and the facts, and his opinion thereon.

Robert F. Stanton

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 secs. 37-42.

Defendant proceeded against as a non-resident and her non-residence proven.

Plaintiff's residence in Baltimore City for more than two years proven.

The marriage proven.

The abandonment for three years, its finality and the irreconcilability of the parties proven.

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

Case ready for decree.

Ward B. Cow

Auditor and Master.

September 24, 1925.



1  
CIRCUIT COURT

B. 513  
1925 No. Docket

LAWRENCE CORDERY

VS.

MAMIE E. CORDERY

Recorded

File 218 1925

Decree of Divorce

B No. 29195

(7)

Ad. 24<sup>th</sup> September 1925.

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

Hand B. Cus  
Auditor and Master.

Decree of Divorce

IN THE

**Circuit Court**

OF

BALTIMORE CITY

LAWRENCE CORDERY

VS.

MAMIE E. CORDERY

Term, 19.....

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

✓ It is thereupon, this 24<sup>th</sup> day of September, A. D. 1925.

by the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, Adjudged, Ordered and Decreed, that the said  
- - - - - Lawrence Cordery - - - - -  
the above named Complainant be and he is hereby DIVORCED A VINCULO MATRIMONII from the  
Defendant, the said Mamie E. Cordery.

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

*James P. Gorten*



Serve on  
Lawrence Cordery  
2415 McCulloh St

IN THE  
CIRCUIT COURT  
OF  
BALTIMORE CITY

513  
1925  
B 513  
1925

LAWRENCE CORDERY

Vs

MAMIE E. CORDERY

B 29195

Petition to vacate  
decree, etc

MR. CLERK:

Please file, etc

*George W. Evans*  
Attorney for Mamie E. Cordery

GEORGE W. EVANS  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
508 ST. PAUL STREET  
BALTIMORE, MD. EVANS  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Ed 30 March 1932

Copy of the Authn Petition and Cordery Court  
Served on Lawrence Cordery on the 30th day  
March 1932. in Presence of Joseph E. Lynch

*Joseph E. Lynch*  
Sheriff

File fo. 75

LAWRENCE CORDERY

\*

IN THE

VS

\*

CIRCUIT COURT

MAMIE E. CORDERY

\*

OF

\*

BALTIMORE CITY

\* \* \* \*

PETITION TO VACATE DECREE

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

I.

Your Petitioner, Mamie E. Cordery, represents that she is the defendant in the above entitled cause and that a decree of divorce was entered against her on the 24th day of September 1925, as will more fully appear from papers filed at the suit of Lawrence Cordery vs Mamie E. Cordery, at page 513, Docket 65B, 1925, of Circuit Court of Baltimore City.

II.

Your petitioner further represents that the first notice she received of the decree or the pendency of any divorce proceeding, was on or about the 21st day of March, 1932, when, on being advised that her husband was about to get married, she had the records searched to find if he had started divorce proceedings.

III.

Your petitioner further represents that she has been informed that the Bill of Complaint alleged that she abandoned Lawrence Cordery, the Complainant, April, 1922, and that her whereabouts were unknown. Your petitioner says that these allegations are untrue and unfounded in fact, and were made for the purpose of deceiving the Court and denying unto your petitioner

the right to be summoned and interpose her defense. Your petitioner says that she was married to the Complainant on the 1st day of September, 1920 and lived with him in Baltimore City, as man and wife until about November 1930, when he constructively deserted her at 2415 McCulloh Street.

IV.

Your petitioner says that at the time of the filing of the Bill and the granting of a decree, she and her husband were living together as man and wife at 2415 McCulloh Street, but that she was temporarily away in New York working, having gone there by agreement and arrangement with her husband for the purpose of working, and help pay for the home; that while away she was in constant communication with her husband and that on at least six different occasions he visited her at 173 West 140th Street, New York City; that on said visits they lived and cohabited together as man and wife, and that she came home once during her employment in New York City, and that as soon as her work was finished she returned to Baltimore and lived with her husband as man and wife until the month of November 1930 when he constructively deserted her.

V.

Your petitioner says that she always behaved herself as a faithful, chaste, and affectionate wife toward her husband.

VI.

That for a long time prior to the separation of the parties, and up to November, 1930, Lawrence Cordery, pursued a course of conduct towards the petitioner by means of threatening, constant bickering, argument, faultfinding, and profanity, to such an extent as to , and in matter of fact did, endanger the

health, person, and security of your petitioner to such a degree that made it, with due regard for her person and general welfare, virtually unsafe for your petitioner to further cohabit with the said Lawrence Cordery, that he drove her from their home in November, 1930; wherefore your petitioner says that Lawrence Cordery abandoned and deserted her and that he should not be entitled to a divorce.

WHEREFORE, your petitioner prays:

- (1) That said decree of divorce entered on the 24th day of September, 1925, be vacated and leave be given your petitioner to enter her appearance in said cause and answer the charges made in the Bill of Complaint.
- (2) And such other and further relief as the case may require.

And as she will ever pray, etc.

*George Evans*  
Attorney for Mamie E. Cordery

*Mamie E. Cordery*  
Petitioner

STATE OF MARYLAND, CITY OF BALTIMORE, to wit:

I HEREBY CERTIFY, That on this <sup>28<sup>th</sup></sup> day of March, 1932, before me, the subscriber, a <sup>Justice of the Peace</sup> ~~Notary Public~~ of the State of Maryland, in and for Baltimore City aforesaid, personally appeared, Mamie E. Cordery, the petitioner herein, and made oath in due form of law that the matters and facts stated in the foregoing petition are true to the best of her knowledge, information and belief.

AS WITNESS my hand <sup>and</sup> ~~and~~ Notarial Seal.

*Wm. A. Shoberg, J. P.*  
Notary Public  
*Justice of the Peace*

O R D E R

Upon the foregoing Petition and Affidavit, it is ORDERED by the Court this 30<sup>th</sup> day of March, 1932, that the ~~decree of this Court, dated September 24, 1925, at the suit of Lawrence Cordery vs Mamie E. Cordery, be, and the same is hereby vacated~~ *and set aside, unless cause to the contrary be shown on or before the 1<sup>st</sup> day of April, 1932, provided a copy of this Order be served on the said Lawrence Cordery on or before the 8<sup>th</sup> day of April 1932.*

*Richard F. O'Brien*

---

In the  
Circuit Court  
of  
Baltimore City  
513 B Docket 65  
1925

---

Lawrence Cordery  
vs

Mamie E Cordery

~~B 29195~~

Appearance  
(9) (10)

---

Mr Clerk:-  
please file etc.

Ed 6 June 1932



Laraine Cordery

In the Circuit  
Court

vs  
Maurice E Cordery

of Baltimore Co.

513

Docket 6513 1925

Mr Charles R Whitford, Clerk:

Please strike my appearance  
~~for~~ Attorney for Plaintiff in this  
case

Charles F. Goedberg  
Attorney for Plaintiff

Mr Clerk:-

Please enter my appearance  
for the plaintiff

John H Hampton,  
Attorney for plaintiff

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT

513 OF B65  
1925 BALTIMORE CITY *Docket*

LAWRENCE CORDERY

VS

MAMIE CORDERY

*B29195*

*111*  
Petition and Affidavit

MR. CLERK:

Please file, etc.

*John A. Hampton*  
Attorney for plaintiff

*14 S. Pleasant St.*

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

*Fd6 "June 1932"*

L  
LAWRENCE CORDERY

\*

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT

VS

\*

OF

BAITIMORE CITY

MAMIE CORDERY

\*

\* \* \*

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

The petition of Lawrence Cordery, respectfully shows:

I.

That on or about the <sup>I.</sup> 25<sup>th</sup> day of *Sept.* 1925, he was divorced from the defendant, Mamie Cordery as will more fully appear from the proceeding at the suit of Lawrence Cordery vs Mamie Cordery, Docket B 1925 page 513 of the Circuit Court of Baltimore City.

II.

That a petition to vacate that decree was filed by the defendant on or about the 30th day of March, 1932.

III.

That permission of Court having been first obtained the petition was ordered dismissed, the parties consenting.

IV.

That in the petition to dismiss the defendant prayed that she be permitted to resume her maiden name Barnes, to which your petitioner assented.

WHEREFORE your petitioner prays:

- A. That the decree of divorce granted at the suit of Lawrence Cordery vs Mamie E. Cordery, dated the 25th day of September, 1925 and recorded in B Docket 65, 1925 at page 513, be amended to read as follows:

That the said Lawrence Cordery, the above named Complainant, be, and he is hereby divorced a vinculo matrimonii from the defendant, the said Mamie E. Cordery; and it is further Ordered and decreed that the defendant be and she is hereby authorized to resume her maiden name Barnes.

(b) Such other and further relief as the cause may require.

Lawrence M. Cordery

John H. Hampton  
Attorney for Lawrence  
Cordery

STATE OF MARYLAND, CITY OF BALTIMORE, to wit:

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 3rd day of June, 1932, before me, the subscriber, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, in and for Baltimore City aforesaid, personally appeared Lawrence Cordery and made oath in due form of law that the matters and facts contained in the foregoing petition are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

AS WITNESS my hand and Notarial Seal.

Lewis D.razier  
Notary Public.

I Assent to the amendment as prayed.

Mamie E. Cordery

George W. Boars  
Atty for Mamie E.  
Cordery

513  
1925

IN THE CIRCUIT  
COURT OF  
BALTIMORE CITY

65B  
Docket

LAWRENCE CORDERY

VS

MAMIE E. CORDERY

B 29/195  
12

Petition, Aff'dt. Consent  
and order of Court thereon

MR. CLERK:

Please file, etc.

*George W. Evans*  
Attorney for Petitioner

GEORGE W. EVANS  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
508 ST. PAUL STREET  
BALTIMORE, M.D. GEORGE W. EVANS  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

*Filed June 1932*

LAWRENCE CORDERY

\* IN THE CIRCUIT COURT

VS

\* OF

MAMIE E. CORDERY

\* BALTIMORE CITY

\* \* \*

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

The petition of Mamie E. Cordery, Defendant, respectfully says:

I.

That on or about the 25th day of September, 1925, a decree of divorce was granted the plaintiff against the defendant service having been by order of publication.

II.

That on the 30th day of March, 1932, your petitioner filed a petition in the proceeding praying among other things that the decree be vacated.

III.

That a Nisi Order was passed requiring the plaintiff in the original Bill to show cause on or before the 15th day of April, 1932, why the decree should not be vacated.

IV.

That the time for the filing of an answer has long since expired; and no answer has been filed on the part of the plaintiff.

V.

That certain property rights were involved in the cause are being amicably adjusted between the parties.

1.

VI.

That your Petitioner desires to dismiss the petition on the filing of a consent decree, subject to the order of this Honorable Court. And for the purpose of the amendment and dismissal your petitioner, Mamie E. Cordery, submits to the jurisdiction of this Court as of the time when this action was pending.

TO THE END THEREFORE; your petitioner prays:

1. That the petition filed March 30, 1932, to vacate decree of divorce in this cause be dismissed.
2. That the decree of divorce be <sup>amended</sup> ~~annulled~~ so that your petitioner be permitted to resume her maiden name Barnes.

Such other and further relief as the case may require.

Mamie E. Cordery  
Petitioner

J. George Evans  
Attorney for petitioner

STATE OF MARYLAND, CITY OF BALTIMORE, towit:

I HEREBY CERTIFY, that on this 2nd day of June, 1932, before me, the subscriber, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, in and for Baltimore City aforesaid, personally appeared Mamie E. Cordery, and made oath in due form of law that the matters and facts contained in the foregoing petition are true to the best of her knowledge and belief.

AS WITNESS my hand and Notarial Seal.

Linnwood Crayce  
Notary Public

I, Lawrence Cordery, plaintiff in the above proceeding, have read and fully understand the matters and facts set forth in the foregoing petition, and do by these presents assent to the dismissal of the petition therein mentioned and the amendment of the decree as prayed.

Lawrence M. Cordery

STATE OF MARYLAND, CITY OF BALTIMORE, to wit:

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 3rd day of June, 1932, before me, the subscriber, a Notary Public of the State of Maryland, in and for Baltimore City aforesaid, personally appeared Lawrence Cordery, and made oath in due form of law that the above consent is his act and deed.

AS WITNESS my hand and Notarial Seal.

Linwood Frazier  
Notary Public



O R D E R

Upon the forgoing petition, affidavit and consent, it is ORDERED by the Court this 6<sup>th</sup> day of June, 1932, that the petition to vacate decree of divorce entered on the 25th day of September, 1925, be and the same is hereby dismissed, and the parties hereunto are authorized to submit an amended decree acceptable to the parties for the change of the name of the respondent to Barnes.

*Robert F. Shea*

---

513  
1925  
65B docket

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT  
OF

BALTIMORE CITY

LAWRENCE CORDERY

VS

MAMIE E. CORDERY

B29195

(13)

Amended Decree of Divorce

MR. CLERK:

Recorded

Folio 122 1932

Please file, etc.

DAVIS & ...  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Filed June 1932

LAWRENCE CORDERY

VS

MAMIE E. CORDERY

\*

\*

\*

\* \* \*

IN THE

CIRCUIT COURT

OF

BALTIMORE CITY

This cause standing ready for hearing and being duly submitted, the proceedings were by the Court read and considered, and the defendant having duly appeared in this action and submitted to the jurisdiction of this Court and consented to this amended decree.

It is thereupon this *6<sup>th</sup>* day of June A.D., 1932, by the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, ADJUDGED, ORDERED, and DECREED, that the said Lawrence Cordery, the above named Complainant, be, and he is hereby divorced a Vinculo Matrimonii from the Defendant, the said Mamie E. Cordery; and it is further ORDERED and DECREED that the defendant be and she is hereby authorized to resume her maiden name Barnes; and it is further ORDERED and DECREED that the plaintiff pay the costs of this proceeding.

*Charles F. Stone*

---