

0589
1922

6518

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

BALTIMORE CITY.

CARRIE PAIGE

VS.

JAMES A. PAIGE.

B-2934

BILL FOR DIVORCE.

Mr. Clerk:-

Please file.

Davis Evans

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF.

(1) (2)

DAVIS & EVANS,

~~Attorneys at Law~~
ATTORNEY AT LAW,

215 SAINT PAUL PLACE

BALTIMORE, MD.

Filed July 1922

BAUMGARTEN & CO., INC.

CARRIE PAIGE : IN THE CIRCUIT COURT
VS. : OF
JAMES A. PAIGE : BALTIMORE CITY.

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

Your Oratrix complaining respectfully represents:

1. That she was married to her husband, James A. Paige on the 20th day of October, 1920 and with whom she resided until the 4th day of July, 1922 when the defendant deserted the plaintiff.
2. That though the conduct of your Oratrix toward the said James A. Paige, has always been kind, affectionate and above reproach, he has, without any just cause or reason abandoned and deserted her and has declared his intentions to live with her no longer, and 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 born as issue of said marriage.
5. That your Oratrix is a citizen of the State of Maryland having resided in Baltimore City for more than three years prior to the filing of this Bill, but that the defendant is a non-resident and when last heard of was in Washington, D.C.

TO THE END, THEREFORE:

- (a) That your Oratrix may be divorced a Vinculo Matrimonii from the said James A. Paige.
- (b) That she may have such other and further relief as her case may require.

(c) *That she may resume her maiden name (Bell)*

May it please your Honor to grant unto your Oratrix the Order of Publication directed against the said James A. Paige, 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.

Davis T. Evans

SOLICITORS FOR COMPLAINANT

DAVIS & EVANS, SOLICITORS

215 ST. PAUL PLACE

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALTIMORE CITY.

CARRIE PAIGE VS. JAMES A. PAIGE.

*Original
B 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 20th day of October, 1920 and lived together until the 4th day of July, 1922 when the defendant deserted the plaintiff. That there are no children as issue of said marriage. That though the conduct of your Oratrix toward the said defendant has always been kind, affectionate and above reproach, he has, without any just cause or reason abandoned and deserted her and has declared his intentions to live with her no longer and the separation of the parties is beyond any reasonable expectation of reconciliation. That your Oratrix is a citizen of the State of Maryland *and has been for more than 3 yrs. prior to filing this bill* but that the defendant is a non-resident of the State of Maryland.

It is thereupon this 28th day of *July* 1925 ordered by the Circuit Court of Baltimore City that the plaintiff by causing a copy of this Order to be published in *in a newspaper published in* Baltimore City *once in* each of four successive weeks before the 28th day of *August* 1925 give notice to the absent defendant, James A. Paige 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 17th day of *September* 1925 to show cause, if any he may have, why a decree should not be passed as prayed.

John R. Bond

True Copy First

*Clas R. Whiteford
Clerk,*

July 29 1925

578

1925

Docket No. 1865

Carrie Paige

vs.

James A. Paige

Certificate of Publication

B 29346
[3]

THE DAILY RECORD

Filed 15th day of Oct. 1925

THE DAILY RECORD

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

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALTI-
MORE CITY — (65B—598—1925) — Carrie
Paige vs. James A. Paige.

ORDER OF PUBLICATION.

The object of this bill 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 20th day of October, 1920,
and lived together until the 4th day of
July, 1922, when the defendant deserted
the plaintiff. That there are no children
as issue of said marriage. That though
the conduct of your oratrix toward the
said defendant has always been kind, af-
fectionate and above reproach, he has,
without any just cause or reason abandon-
ed and deserted her and has declared his
intentions to live with her no longer and
the separation of the parties is beyond any
reasonable expectation of reconciliation.
That your oratrix is a citizen of the State
of Maryland and has been for more than
three years prior to filing this bill, but
that the defendant is a non-resident of
the State of Maryland.

It is thereupon this 28th day of July,
1925, ordered by the Circuit Court of Bal-
timore City, that the plaintiff by causing
a copy of this order to be published in
a newspaper published in Baltimore City
once in each of four successive weeks be-
fore the 28th day of August, 1925, give
notice to the absent defendant, James A.
Paige, 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 17th day of September, 1925, to
show cause, if any he may have, why a
decree should not be passed as prayed.

DUKE BOND.

True Copy—Test:

CHAS. R. WHITEFORD,

Clerk.

fy29, au5, 12, 19

Baltimore, AUG 19 1925, 192...

We hereby certify that the annexed advertise-
ment of Order Publication Circuit Court
of Baltimore City, Case of _____

Carrie Paige
vs. James A. Paige
was published in THE DAILY RECORD, a daily news-

paper published in the City of Baltimore, once in each of
_____ successive weeks before the

four
28th day of August, 1925

First insertion July 29, 1925

THE DAILY RECORD

Per George C. Laur

598 Ct. Ct.
1925 Docket B 65

Carrie Paige
vs.

James A. Paige

Decree Pro Confesso.

Says
B29346
No. 47

Filed 15th October 1925

Carrie Paige

vs.

James A. Paige

IN THE
Circuit Court
OF
BALTIMORE CITY.

September

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 15th day of October in the year nineteen hundred and twenty five 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.

James P. Gorter

STATE OF MARYLAND,
BALTIMORE CITY, SCT :

I hereby certify that on this _____ day of _____ 19____ before me, the subscriber, a Notary Public, of the State of Maryland, in and for the City aforesaid, personally appeared _____ and made oath in due form of law that her (his) husband (wife) the defendant in the above entitled case is not in the Military or Naval service of the United States Government, to the best of her (his) knowledge, information and belief.

As Witness my hand and Notarial Seal.

Notary Public.

Doc. B

589
598
1925

In the Circuit Court,
OF BALTIMORE CITY

DEPOSITIONS

Carrie Paige

vs.

James A. Paige

No. 29346B

PLAINTIFF'S COSTS

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

DEFENDANT'S COSTS

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

Fd 27 Nov 1925

3/15/2/48

Carrie Paige

vs.

James A. Paige

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 viture of an order of the above named Circuit Court, passed in said cause on the *fifteenth* day of *October* 19*25*, met on the *fifteenth* day of *October* in the year nineteen hundred and *twenty-five* at my office, in the city of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland, and assigned the *sixteenth* day of *October* in the same year at *two-thirty* o'clock in the *after*-noon and the office of *Adel Sappington, 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:—

P-4-D
2

CARRIE PAIGE

VS.

JAMES A. PAIGE.

Testimony taken before me, A. deRussy
Sappington, Examiner, at the offices of George
Evans, Esquire, Baltimore, Maryland, on October
16, 1925, at 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon.

--

Thereupon---

CARRIE PAIGE,

the plaintiff, of lawful age, produced on her
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 Carrie Paige, 956 Harford Avenue,
Baltimore; insurance business.

2Q Do you know the parties to this suit?

A I am the plaintiff and the defendant

is my husband.

By Mr. Evans:

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

A October 20, 1920, in Washington, D.C. by Reverend Capp, a Minister of the Gospel.

2Q Did you live with your husband after the marriage?

A Yes.

3Q Which one left the other, and when?

A He deserted me July 4, 1922, at 89 "P" Street, Washington, D.C.

4Q What did he say and do on the day he left?

A The morning he left--he had been dissatisfied all along, and I asked him for some money to get something for breakfast and he said he had made other arrangements and he went out and brought a wagon back and took everything and moved, and left me with nothing.

5Q Did you give him any cause to desert you?

A No, I did not.

6Q Were you always a kind, affectionate and true wife?

A I was. I did my duty and had his meals ready and fixed his clothes and everything.

7Q How did he treat you?

A He was a regular nagger--he was very hard to get along with. He did not want to support me, and his mother interfered.

8Q What about his mother?

A His mother didn't want us to get married because he was her main support. She just kept up a disturbance between he and I and he became dissatisfied and left.

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

A Yes, sir.

10Q Any children?

A No, sir.

11Q Have you lived or cohabited with your husband since he left you on the 4th of July, 1922?

A No, sir.

12Q Have you made any demands upon him for support?

A No, I have not seen him.

13Q Is the separation deliberate and final and beyond any hope of reconciliation?

A It is.

14Q If a decree is granted you, do you desire to resume your maiden name?

A Yes, my maiden name of Bell.

15Q Is your husband a resident of Maryland?

A No, sir, when I last heard of him he lived in Washington, D.C.

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

Carrie Paige

Thereupon---

JOHNNIE E. BELL,

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 State your name, residence and occupation?

A Johnnie E. Bell, 956 Harford Avenue, housewife.

2Q Do you know the parties to this suit?

A Yes, the plaintiff is my daughter.

By Mr. Evans:

1Q Were they married and did they live together as husband and wife?

A Yes, sir.

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

A They were.

3Q Do you know anything about the separation?

A Yes, I was present right in the house at 89 P Street, Washington, on July 4, 1922, when

he left. They were talking about money matters-- she wanted some money to get food and he told her he had made other arrangements, and he pretty soon showed what the arrangements were, because he went off and got a wagon and moved to his Mother's.

4Q Did she give him any cause to leave?

A None, at all.

5Q Did you visit them frequently?

A I did.

6Q Was she a good, kind, affectionate and true wife?

A Yes, sir, she was.

7Q Have the parties lived or cohabited together since July 4, 1922?

A No, she has not seen him.

8Q Any children as result of the marriage?

A No, sir.

9Q Is the defendant a resident of Maryland?

A No.

10Q Where was he when last heard of?

A Washington, D.C.

11Q Has the plaintiff been a resident of Baltimore, Maryland for more than two years prior to the filing of this bill?

A She has.

12Q Is this separation deliberate and final and beyond any reasonable hope of reconciliation?

A It is.

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

Johnnie E. Bell.

Thereupon---

HUDSON BELL,

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 State your name, residence and occupation?

A Hudson Bell, 956 Harford Avenue, barber.

2Q Do you know the parties to this suit?

A Yes, she is my daughter.

By Mr. Evans:

1Q You know they were married and lived together as husband and wife in Washington?

A Yes, sir.

2Q Which left the other?

A He left her on July 4, 1922, at 89 "P" Street, N.W. I was there.

3Q What did he say and do?

A They were talking about money; my daughter

asked him for money for food and he said he had made other arrangements, as she stated, and he went and got a wagon and moved everything out

4Q Was Mrs. Paige always a good, kind affectionate and faithful wife to him?

A She was.

5Q Has she lived or cohabited with him since the separation?

A No, sir.

6Q Has the plaintiff been a resident of Baltimore, Maryland, for more than two years prior to the filing of this bill?

A Yes, sir, she has.

7Q Is the defendant a resident of Maryland?

A No, sir, the last I heard he lived in Washington, D.C.

8Q Do you think the separation is deliberate and final and beyond any reasonable hope or expectation of reconciliation?

A I do.

9Q Has the separation continued uninterruptedly for more than three years prior to the filing of this bill?

A Yes, ever since he left her.

10Q Any children as result of their
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. Yes -

Hudson Bell

No other witnesses being named or produced before me, I then, at the request of the Solicitor.....of the.....
closed the depositions taken in said cause and now return them closed under my hand and seal, on this.....day of.....
in the year of Our Lord nineteen hundred and.....at the City of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland.

Plaintiff
27th day of *November*
Twenty-six
A. de Russy Sappington (SEAL).
Examiner.

There are 70 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 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

589
1925

Docket No. 1865

Carrie Paige

vs.

James A. Paige

Order of Reference
and Report

Leyons

B No 29346
(6)

Order Filed *30* day of *Nov* 19 *25*
Report Filed *9* day of *Dec* 19 *25*

Carrie Paige

vs.

James A. Paige

IN THE
Circuit Court
OF
BALTIMORE CITY

Nov Term, 1925

This case being submitted, without argument, it is ordered by the Court, this 30th day of November, 1925, that the same be and it is hereby referred to *Wm 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 wife against her husband on the ground of abandonment. Code Art. 16, Sec. 37-42.

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

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 ready for decree.

William P. Lyons

December 8, 1925

Auditor and Master

CIRCUIT COURT

B 589
1925 No. Docket

CARRIE PAIGE

VS.

JAMES A. PAIGE

Recorded

Folio 3461925

Decree of Divorce

B No. 29346

(11)

Ed. 15" December 1925

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

William P. Lyons
Auditor and Master.

28739

Circuit Court

Decree of Divorce

IN THE

Circuit Court

OF

BALTIMORE CITY

.....CARRIE PAIGE.....

VS.

.....JAMES A. PAIGE.....

.....November.....Term, 19 25.

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

It is thereupon, this 15th day of December - - - -, A. D. 1925, by the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, Adjudged, Ordered and Decreed, that the said

----- CARRIE PAIGE, -----
the above named Complainant be and she is hereby DIVORCED A VINCULO MATRIMONII from the Defendant, JAMES A. PAIGE:

AND it is further ordered that the name of the Complainant, Carrie Paige, be and the same is hereby changed to Carrie Bell.

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

