
	Commercial 326
	You have been summoned to appear in COURT the second Monday of 191
	No. 172,43 Personal attendance in Court on the day named is not required; but, unless within such number of days thereafter as the law limits, legal defense is made to this suit, a judgment by default may be entered against you.
	No. / defense is made to this suit, a judgment by default may be entered
Sct. 19 19 19 tte of tte o	
Sct. 19 e State of e state of eientiously re books of cents, and above make this a affix my	- Mar AMI
	BOX NO. 90/
and and is no over the state of	IN THE
Seal Seal Oath is horized by har y har	
Great Seal of the Control of affirm, on the additional oath is not additional oath is not afforcesaid. Set my hand or afforcesaid. The afforcesaid.	Baltimore City Court.
	0 00 0
owing a d dul	J. Cumugham
day of under the esiding in peared declare and declare and mexed of the cated. In the following tiff and dutated. I hereunto lay and year and yea	Poultry les., a
day t, under residing ty declar ng by my ty declar ng by miff an stated. tion, the foll ntiff an stated. tin here day and	
of All on and on an and on an and on an analysis of an analy	Corp.
de ty al iii Pa	Planty
ters Parenalif angely and we and we said res there where whe	
by Letters I and duly qual said, persons said, persons sincerely and ustly due and ustly due and dollars and dollars and the Plaintiff be a nt of the said matters the Timony Whe seal Notarial.	M. RLaugley
by Letter and duly essaid, per essaid duly essaid belie ent of the ent	
S H S H S H S H S S S S S S S S S S S S	
ary Public, missioned a State afor aw, on the id solemnly, nat there is ned case, to ned case, to ned case, to le,) the sun le, the sun le is the Ag' ledge of th In TES	
2 2 3 2 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	
on this lotary F lotary F commission he State was aid sold aid sold lamed can lamed can lamed can lamed by the ist be set to b	MR. LINDSAY,
	Clerk of Baltimore City Court.
That on the oper, Notary commiss in the State of law, wath, did selite); that the thin named aid cause,) Of his knowledgal knowledgal knowledgal knowledgal	Issue in this case, and send copy of the declaration and notice with the writ
	to be served on the Defendant and
	make the writ returnable on the second
as at the control of	Monday of, 191
2 2 4 4 5 1 6 2 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	
s by hor un te le	Real Altournand
I HER Defore me Mose, (he Mose, (he Mose, (he (with inte all discoun And h affidavit, a	Attorney for Plaintiff \$ 5-33,79
I and m and m werten Moses. Moses and m all disable affidave A A A A A Affidave affi	-0 1917
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Dilad = FRALUE

In the Baltimore City Court.

w pos	mingham Toultry Co., a bodes
<i>V.</i>	
	•
Recliar	Afterenson ets
- Attorney si	ue L
2.	Rhaugley
	of auguly
	by the Defendant to the Plaintiff rgained and sold by the Plaintiff to the Defendant
-	done and materials provided by the Plaintiff for the Defendant, at h reques
	ey lent by the Plaintiff to the Defendant
•	y paid by the Plaintiff for the Defendant, at h request.
	ey received by the Defendant for the use of the Plaintiff
them.	y found to be due from the Defendant to the Plaintiff, on accounts stated between
	the Defendant -, on the day of 19
	comissory note now overdue, promised to pay to the Plaintiff, \$
<u> </u>	after date, but did not pay the same.
•	
8. And for that	one
n the	day of 19, by h promisso
1	promised to pay the Defendant, or order, \$after lat
OFA DOW OVERNIE	
	endorsed the same to the Plaintiff, and the said note was duly presented f
nd the Defendant ayment, and was d	lishonored, whereof the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same.
nd the Defendant ayment, and was d 9 And for that	lishonored, whereof the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. the Plaintiff, on theday of19
nd the Defendant ayment, and was d 9 And for that y h bill of exch	lishonored, whereof the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. the Plaintiff, on the
nd the Defendant ayment, and was d 9 And for that y h bill of exch the Plaintiff \$	lishonored, whereof the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. the Plaintiff, on the
nd the Defendant ayment, and was dependent of that yet he bill of exchance the Plaintiff \$ 100.000 and the Defendant accessions.	lishonored, whereof the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. the Plaintiff, on the
ad the Defendant ayment, and was dependent of the Plaintiff \$100 and for that according to the And for that	lishonored, whereof the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. the Plaintiff, on the
nd the Defendant ayment, and was dependent of the Plaintiff \$\text{me Defendant accessors} 10. And for that \text{y he bill of exchessors} 11. And for that \text{y he bill of exchessors}	lishonored, whereof the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. the Plaintiff, on the
nd the Defendant ayment, and was d 9 And for that y h bill of exch the Plaintiff \$ he Defendant accord 10 And for that y h bill of exch equired	the Plaintiff, on the
nd the Defendant ayment, and was d 9 And for that y h bill of exch ne Defendant acco 10. And for that y h bill of exch equired	lishonored, whereof the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. the Plaintiff, on the
ayment, and was d 9 And for that y h bill of exch the Plaintiff \$ ne Defendant acco 10. And for that y h bill of xch equired the pay Plaintiff \$ ne said bill was duly office but did not	the Plaintiff, on the day of 19 nange now overdue, directed to the Defendant, required the Defendant to percent the said bill, but did not pay the same. The Defendant, on the day of 19 nange directed to days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had depay the same.
nd the Defendant ayment, and was d 9 And for that y h bill of exch the Plaintiff \$ the Defendant according to the Plaintiff \$ the Defendant according to the pay Plaintiff \$ the pay Plai	days after date, any presented for acceptance, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. the Plaintiff
ad the Defendant ayment, and was dependent of the Plaintiff \$ 10. And for that we have being a pay Plaintiff \$ 10. And for that we have been pay Plaintiff \$ 10. And for that we have been pay Plaintiff \$ 10. And for that we have been pay Plaintiff \$ 10. And for that we have been pay Plaintiff \$ 10. And for that we have been pay Plaintiff \$ 10. And for that we have been pay Plaintiff \$ 10. And for that we have been pay Plaintiff \$ 10. And for that we have been pay Plaintiff \$ 10. And for that we have been pay Plaintiff \$ 10. And for that we have been pay Plaintiff \$ 10. And for that we have been pay Plaintiff \$ 10. And for that we have been pay Plaintiff \$ 10. And for that we have been pay Plaintiff \$ 10. And for that we have been pay Plaintiff \$ 10. And for that	days after date, and y presented for acceptance, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. days after date, and y presented for acceptance, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had depay the same.
ayment, and was d 9 And for that y h bill of exch the Plaintiff \$ ne Defendant acco 10. And for that y h bill of xch equired the pay Plaintiff \$ ne said bill was duly office but did not	days after date, and y presented for acceptance, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. days after date, and y presented for acceptance, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had depay the same.
nd the Defendant ayment, and was dependent of that yellow the Plaintiff \$100. And for that yellow he bill of exchange pay Plaintiff \$100. And the Plaintiff claim of the Plaintiff clai	days after date, and y presented for acceptance, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. days after date, and y presented for acceptance, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had depay the same.
nd the Defendant ayment, and was dependent and was dependent acceptance of the Plaintiff \$100. And for that ye he bill of exchange pay Plaintiff \$100. And the Plaintiff claim of the Plaintiff claim of the Defendant \$100. And the Defendant \$100. And the Plaintiff claim of the Defendant \$100. And the De	days after date, any presented for acceptance, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. the Plaintiff
nd the Defendant ayment, and was dependent, and was dependent according to the Plaintiff \$\), and for that yellow below the Defendant according to the Plaintiff \$\), and the Plaintiff claim of the Defendant according to the Defendant acc	the Plaintiff, on the day of 19 nange now overdue, directed to the Defendant, required the Defendant to possible the said bill, but did not pay the same. The Defendant, on the day of 19 nange directed to the Defendant days after date, and the Defendant, on the day of 19 nange directed to days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had depay the same. It is a days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had depay the same. It is a days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had depay the same. It is a days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had depay the same. It is a days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had depay the same. It is a days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had depay the same. It is a days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had depay the same. It is a days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had depay the same. It is a days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had depay the same.
nd the Defendant ayment, and was dependent, and was dependent according to the Plaintiff \$\), and for that yellow below the Defendant according to the Plaintiff \$\), and the Plaintiff claim of the Defendant according to the Defendant acc	days after date, and the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. the Plaintiff, on the
nd the Defendant ayment, and was dependent according to the Plaintiff \$ 10. And for that yellow he bill of exchange pay Plaintiff \$ 10. And for that yellow he bill was duling the Plaintiff claim of the Plaintiff claim of the Defendant was a controlled to the Defendant was a con	days after date, and the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. the Plaintiff, on the
nd the Defendant ayment, and was dependent, and was dependent according to the Plaintiff \$\), and for that yellow below the Defendant according to the Plaintiff \$\), and the Plaintiff claim of the Defendant according to the Defendant acc	days after date, and the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. the Plaintiff, on the
nd the Defendant ayment, and was dependent, and was dependent according to the Plaintiff \$\), and for that yellow below the Defendant according to the Plaintiff \$\), and the Plaintiff claim of the Defendant according to the Defendant acc	days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. the Plaintiff, on the day of 19 days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had depay the same. days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had depay the same. Company the day of your appearance to this action in the BALTIMORE CITY COURT, you will be required to plead to see the Plaintiff of the Plaintiff of the day of your appearance to this action in the BALTIMORE CITY COURT, you will be required to plead to see the Plaintiff of the day of your appearance to this action in the BALTIMORE CITY COURT, you will be required to plead to see the Plaintiff of the day of your appearance to this action in the BALTIMORE CITY COURT, you will be required to plead to see the Plaintiff of the Plaintiff of the day of your appearance to this action in the BALTIMORE CITY COURT, you will be required to plead to see the Plaintiff of the Plaint
nd the Defendant ayment, and was dependent, and was dependent according to the Plaintiff \$\), and for that yellow below the Defendant according to the Plaintiff \$\), and the Plaintiff claim of the Defendant according to the Defendant acc	days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. The Plaintiff, on the day of days after date, and epted the said bill, but did not pay the same. The Defendant, on the day of days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had do pay the same. It is a support the same of the Defendant of the Defendant had do pay the same. It is a support the same of the same of the same of the same. It is a support the same of the same of the same of the same. It is a support the same of the same of the same of the same of the same. It is a support the same of the same o
nd the Defendant ayment, and was designed was designed. And for that yellow the Plaintiff \$\frac{1}{2}\$, the Defendant access to pay Plaintiff \$\frac{1}{2}\$, the paid bill was dult of the Plaintiff claim of the Plaintiff claim of the Plaintiff claim of the Defendant was dult to the Defendant was determined to the De	days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. the Plaintiff, on the day of 19 nange now overdue, directed to the Defendant, required the Defendant of pay days after date, and epted the said bill, but did not pay the same. the Defendant, on the day of 19 nange directed to days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had depay the same. laim \$ 000 Lillow Heleveurse Attorney for Plaintiff the day of your appearance to this action in the BALTIMORE CITY COURT, you will be required to plead to a house of the Act of 1886, Chapter 184, or Judgment by default will be entered against you. IN THE BALTIMORE CITY COURT. Language In Plaintiff elect to have this case. The Plaintiff elect to have this case.
nd the Defendant ayment, and was designed was designed. And for that yellow the Plaintiff \$\frac{1}{2}\$, the Defendant access to pay Plaintiff \$\frac{1}{2}\$, the paid bill was dult of the Plaintiff claim of the Plaintiff claim of the Plaintiff claim of the Defendant was dult to the Defendant was determined to the De	days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had due notice, but did not pay the same. The Plaintiff, on the day of days after date, and epted the said bill, but did not pay the same. The Defendant, on the day of days after date, and was dishonored, of which the Defendant had do pay the same. It is a support the same of the Defendant of the Defendant had do pay the same. It is a support the same of the same of the same of the same. It is a support the same of the same of the same of the same. It is a support the same of the same of the same of the same of the same. It is a support the same of the same o

Folio. Baltimore, Z 30 J. L. Cunningham, Wholesale Bealer in Poultry, Game and Eggs PRIVATE COLD STORAGE PLANT ON PREMISES. We Buy and Sell Car-Lots. 12J-123 South Charles Street. 52/4 38 33



Hon E st.

Thomas of Me Multi

Baltimore City Court.

Joulty Court.

vs.

W. K. Jangley Bradway Market

WRIT OF SUMMONS

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

RH Sevent

Filed 2 day of Feb 19

4

STATE OF MARYLAND

BALTIMORE CITY, To wit:

To the Sheriff of Baltimore City, Greeting:

You are commanded to summon
W. I I alou
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 Let Med, to answer an action at the
suit of Chamina ham Coult Co
Journal on the second
a body corporate
and have you then and there this writ.
Witness the Honorable MORRIS A. SOPER, Chief Judge of the Supreme Bench of Bal-
timore City, the day of Scale 1917
Issued the 10 day of Feb. in the year 1917
Leo Carey Lindsay Clerk.

Baltimore City Court. P. Cunninglyan Poulties WRIT OF SUMMONS Copy of Nar and Notice to plead within to be served on defendant. Attorney for Plaintiff Filed 12 day of Mar 1917.

STATE OF MARYLAND

BALTIMORE CITY, To wit:

To the Sheriff of Baltimore City, Greeting:

You are comman	nded to summon		
	·	^	
	M. R. Lo	angley	•
		J. 11	
			,
of Baltimore City, to appear before	the Baltimore City Court	, to be held at the Court Hou	se in the sa me
city, on the second Monday of	Mar.	next, to answer an	action at the
suit of J. P. Lun	ungham (Poultry Co.	······································
	a t	ody corporate	·
and have you then and there this w	vrit.	\checkmark \emptyset	·
Witness the Honorable	MORRIS A. SOPER, O	Chief Judge of the Supreme	Bench of Bal
timore City, the	day of	Jaw 1917	
Issued the	19" day of	Fils in the	year 191 7
	le Dan		
	SUS MU	y/ Mudsa	Clerk

body corporate Workindson, Clark afford A Reformer + cell « cabe of coursel. witted Min J. STEWARD DAVIS ATTORNEY AT LAW COURTLAND BUILDING 215-217 COURTLAND ST. BALTIMORE

W)

FILED MAR 9 1917

(PLEA AND AFF'T OF DEFENCE.)	
J. V. Chunglan	
Vouetry Co, abody	
corporate	
Baltimore City Cour	t
S. I. Vacage	
	7
OP 0	191
And the said W. R. Lauger	
0 for 0	
the Defendant in this action, by Wowan war	
h w attorney, says: For a first plea that h never was indebted as alleged; and for a	second
plea says: That h \(\alpha\) did not promise as alleged	
A T	***********
(Town Davis Attorney for Defend	dant .
STATE OF MARYLAND, City of Baltimore, to wit:	
On this 8 day of March, in the year nineteen h	undred
and Account term before me, the subscriber, a Justice of the Peace of the State of Maryle	
and for Baltimore City, personally appeared W. R. Langley	
(enc-of) the above-named Defendant and made (affirm	nation)
oath in due form of law, that every plea so pleaded by the Defendant true, and	
admits Now head and any they lockers of the Plaintiff's claim to be due and owing stone has been and structured; and further that he the affiant verily be	g, and
the Defendant will be able at the trial of the cause, to produce sufficient evidence to support the	e said
pleas (as to the portion disputed) and that he is advised by counsel to file the said pleas.	
0.1-11	
I HEREBY CERTIFY, that I advise the W.R. Fauley making the	
I HEREBY CERTIFY, that I advise the Ov. (making the	above
oath, (affirmation) and filing said pleas to do the same. Attorney for Defend	dant
[20] 아이트 아이들의 [10] 아이들은 아이들은 아이들은 아이들은 아이들은 아이들은 아이들은 아이들은	· ·
And the Defendant elects to have this case tried before a Jury.	
Defendant > At	torney.

BEFORE THE JUDGE-AT-LARGE NO. 4

4th-3 Weeks September Term 1917

(BEGINNING MONDAY, NOVEMBER 12TH, 1917)

BALTIMORE CITY COURT.

J. P. Euningham Poulty 6.

W. R. Langley

Jury Sworn November 12th 1917

Walter J. Hammond Foreman

2	Ernest	T	Salzer	

- 3 John M Bennett
- 3 E Robert Groeber
- 5- Emile Coonan

Junius H Gary

Albert F Preston

Frederick Henning

Gastav A Eitel

Walter J Lynch

Samuel C Holmes

6 Robert A Ilgenfritz

James H Snyder

Joseph A Henderson

7 Richard P Simpson Jr

& Wm A Hellwig

9 Edwin M Lilly

Joseph Herman

6 Charles L Didlake

Chas F Hanson Sr

Jacob Brown

// James Caulfield

Wm L. Johnson

/2 Charles Levis

Walter G Hammond)

Moses Daniel

712 Newington Ave

2016 E Baltimore St

1832 N Broadway

409 E 20th St

1508 Mulberry Şt

1216 Aisquith St

610 S Kenwood Ave

1521 N Caroline St

2437 Francis St

 $440 \to 20$ th St

126 S Washington St

609 W Lee St

2616 N Calvert St

1727 N Caroline St

2212 E North Ave

2001 Homewood Ave

Plymouth Hall Apts

1007 N Stricker St

514 E 21st St

2704 W Baltimore St

613 N Wolfe St

1213 N Stricker St

3407 Clifton Ave

1520 Linden Ave

Marlborough Apts

Clerk, A Schumacher & Co

Retired

Supt, Mutual Life Ins Co

Salesman, A. W. Owens

Stock Man, Crown Cork & Seal Co

Car Inspector, PRR

Cutter, Henry Sonneborn Co

Manufacturer

News Dealer

Bookkeeper, T J Shryock & Co

Engineer, G B S Brewing Co

Patternmaker, Propellor Mfg Co

Buyer, Baltimore Bargain House

Bartender

Stenographer, Standard Oil Co

Accountant, Baltimore Audit Co

Merchant

Carpenter, J P Doyle

Clerk, Phoenix Pad Mfg Co

Retired

Plumber

Lather, Jos Hooper

Real Estate

Contractor

Wholesale Shoes

No. 326

J. P. Cumingham
Poultry Co.

W. R. Langley

MOTION FOR JUDGMENT UNDER ACT 1894, CH. 173

ORDER OF COURT

Filed 12 to day of November 1917

J. P. Curringham Poultry Co. (o bog copute)

IN THE

No. Return Day, 1917 191 7

The Plaintiff the Court to enter up Judgment in this case against the Defendant moves for the sum of \$ 250. 700. and costs to this date, (as provided by the Act of 1894, ch. 173) the said sum of \$ 2 50 700 being admitted by the Defendant to be due and owing in the affidavit to the pleas filed in this cause of the flaintiff from it on Defendants Plan, or to amount disputed. Michael H Stevenson

Plaintiff's Attorney.

Let Judment be entered as prayed.

Walter J. Dawkins

Cadalata Lan Louis

FUED MAY 2 1 1921

J. P. CUNNINGHAM POULTRY CO., a bocy corporate,

vs.

W. R. LANGLEY,

IN THE BALTIMORE CITY COURT.

Please enter the judgment in the above entitled case "Satisfied", upon payment of costs.

Attorney for plaintiff.