

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

628837
BALTIMORE CITY.

EUNICE VENNY *1923*

VS.

MATTHEW VENNEY

BILL FOR DIVORCE

Mr. Clerk:-

Please file.

J. Stewart Davis
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF.

26349

(1) (2)

J. STEWARD DAVIS

ATTORNEY AT LAW

215 SAINT PAUL PLACE

BALTIMORE, MD.

131 Dec 1923

EUNICE VENNEY : IN THE CIRCUIT COURT
VS. : OF
MATTHEW VENNEY : BALTIMORE CITY.

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

Your Oratrix complaining respectfully represents:

(1)

That she was married to her husband, Matthew Veney on the 15th day of November, 1916 and with whom she resided until about the 26th day of April, 1920, when the defendant deserted the plaintiff.

(2)

That though the conduct of your Oratrix toward the said Matthew Veney 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 is one child, Leroy Veney, age five years born as issue of said marriage.

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 Lancaster County, Virginia.

TO THE END THEREFORE:

- (a) That your Oratrix may be divorced a Vinculo Matrimonii from the said Matthew Veney.
- (b) That she may resume her maiden name (PENN).
- (c) That she may have such other and further relief as her case may require,

May it please your Honor to grant unto your Oratrix the Order of Publication directed against the said Matthew Veney, a non-resident of the State of Maryland aforesaid, commanding and requiring him to be and appear in this Court on some day certain to be named therein to answer the premises and abide by and perform such decree or order as may be passed therein.

AND as in duty bound, etc.

J. Steward Davis
SOLICITOR FOR COMPLAINANT.

J. STEWARD DAVIS, SOLICITOR
215 ST. PAUL PLACE

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALTIMORE CITY

EUNICE VENNEY VS. MATTHEW VENNEY

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 15th day of November, 1916 and lived together until about the 26th day of April, 1920, when the defendant deserted the plaintiff. That there is one child, Leroy Veney, age five years, born as result of said marriage. That the defendant is a non-resident of the State of Maryland and when last heard of was in Lancaster County, Virginia. That the defendant deserted his wife without any just cause or reason and has declared his intentions to live with her no longer; that said abandonment has continued uninterruptedly for more than three years and is deliberate and final, and the separation of the parties is beyond any reasonable expectation of reconciliation. That the plaintiff has been a citizen of the State of Maryland for more than three years prior to the filing of this bill of complaint.

IT IS THEREUPON this ³¹ day of ^{December} ~~January~~ 192³, ordered by the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, that the plaintiff by causing a copy of this order to be published in Baltimore City once in each of four successive weeks, before the ⁴ day of ^{February} 1924, give notice to the absent defendant, Matthew Veney, 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 ²⁰ day of ^{February} 1924 to show cause, if any he may have, why a decree should not be passed as prayed.

Charles F. Davis

837 B63 Ct. Ct.
192 3 Docket

Vener

vs.

Vener

Decree Pro Confesso.

B26349

No.

4

Filed

21 Feb 1924

Eunice Veney

vs.

Matthew Veney

IN THE
Circuit Court

OF
BALTIMORE CITY.

January Term, 1924

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 ~~21st~~ ^{25th} day of *February* in the year nineteen hundred and twenty *four* 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. Owen

837
192. ~~3~~ B 63

Docket No.

SALEABLE
SCHOOL PROPERTY
110 LAMONT AVENUE
N. 1423 E. CLARK STREET
AND THE SIMPLE
PROGRAMS

Vener

vs.

Vener

Certificate of Publication

B26349
(3)

THE DAILY RECORD
Filed..... 21 day of July 1924

THE DAILY RECORD

THE DAILY RECORD

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

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALTI-
MORE CITY—(63—B—837—1923)—Eunice
Veney vs. Matthew Veney.

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 15th day of November, 1916, and lived together until about the 26th day of April, 1920, when the defendant deserted the plaintiff. That there is one child, Leroy Veney, age five years, born as result of said marriage. That the defendant is a non-resident of the State of Maryland and when last heard of was in Lancaster County, Virginia. That the defendant deserted his wife without any just cause or reason and has declared his intentions to live with her no longer; that said abandonment has continued uninterruptedly for more than three years and is deliberate and final, and the separation of the parties is beyond any reasonable expectation of reconciliation. That the plaintiff has been a citizen of the State of Maryland for more than three years prior to the filing of this bill of complaint.

It is, thereupon, this 31st day of December, 1923, ordered by the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, that the plaintiff, by causing a copy of this order to be published in Baltimore City once in each of four successive weeks, before the 4th day of February, 1924, give notice to the absent defendant, Matthew Veney, 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 20th day of February, 1924, to show cause, if any he may have, why a decree should not be passed as prayed.

CHARLES F. STEIN.

True Copy.—Test:

CHAS. R. WHITEFORD,

Clerk.

ja3,10,17,24

Baltimore, JAN 24 1924, 192.....

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

of Baltimore City, Case of.....

Eunice Veney
vs. Matthew Veney

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 February, 1924

First insertion Jan. 3rd, 1924

THE DAILY RECORD

Per Alexander Ottzel

Doc. B 887
1923

In the Circuit Court,
OF BALTIMORE CITY

DEPOSITIONS

Eunice Tenney

vs.

Matthew Tenney

No. 26349B

PLAINTIFF'S COSTS

Examiners..... \$ 8.00

Copies.....

Sheriff.....

Stenographer.....

\$ _____

DEFENDANT'S COSTS

Examiners..... \$ _____

Copies.....

Sheriff.....

Stenographer.....

At 3 March 1924

3/15/24

Eunice Tenney

vs.

Matthew Tenney

In the Circuit Court

OF BALTIMORE CITY.

Decees 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-first* day of *February* 19*24*, met on the *twenty-first* day of *February* in the year nineteen hundred and *twenty-first* at my office, in the City of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland, and assigned the *twenty-first* day of *February* in the same year at *three* o'clock in the *after-*noon and the office of *J. Stewart Davis, Esq.* in the City and State aforesaid, as the time and place for such examination of witnesses in said cause; at which last mentioned time and place I attended, due notice of such meeting having been given, and proceeded in the presence of the Solicitor.....of the *plaintiff* to take the following depositions, that is to say:—

Veney,

v.

Veney.

Testimony taken at the office of Mr. Davis,
Baltimore, Maryland, February 1924, at three
O'clock P. M.

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

By the Examiner :

1 Q. State your name residence and occupation?

A. Eunice Veney, 5010 Biergard Avenue, Baltimore,
Maryland; house work.

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

A. I am the Plaintiff and my husband is the De-
fendant.

By Mr. Davis:

1 Q. When were you married?

A. 15th., November 1916.

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

A. Yes.

3 Q. In Baltimore City?

A. Yes.

4 Q. By a Religious ceremony

Eunice Veney.

A. Yes

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

A. Yes.

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

A. One.

7 Q. Name and age?

A. Leroy, six years old.

8 Q. Have you the custody of the child?

A. Yes.

9 Q. Do you want his custody?

A. Yes.

10 Q. Are you able and willing to support, educate and rear these children?

A. Yes.

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

A. I treated him as a wife should treat a husband.

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

A. Yes; I was.

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

A. No sir

Eunice Veney.

14 Q. Which left the other; did you leave him or did he leave you?

A. He left me.

15 Q. When?

A. April 26th., 1920.

16 Q. Did he have any just cause or reason to abandon and desert you at that time?

A. No sir.

17 Q. What did he say and what did he do at that time?

A. Why, he was always disagreeable and did not want me any more.

18 Q. And what did he say at the time he left you?

A. He said that he did not want me any more, and did not intend to live with me any more, and said that he was going to leave.

19 Q. Did he leave?

A. Yes

20 Q. Did you try to reason with him and get him to stay with you and do as a husband should at the time he left you?

A. Yes.

21 Q. Notwithstanding that, you say he left you?

A. Yes.

Eunice Veney.

22 Q. After that time did you go to him and try to get him to come and live with you and do as a husband should?

A. Yes.

23 Q. Did he refuse or consent to do so?

A. He refused.

24 Q. Has he provided or offered to provide a home for you since he abandoned and deserted you?

A. No sir.

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

A. No sir.'

26 Q. Has his abandonment and desertion of you continued uninterruptedly since 26th., April 1920?

A. Yes.

27 Q. State whether or not his abandonment was deliberate and final?

A. Yes; it was.

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

A. No sir.

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

Eunice Veney.

A. Non-resident.

30 Q. Of what State is he a resident?

A. Virginia.

31 Q. In the event of divorce, do you desire to resume the use of your maiden name?

A. Yes.

32 Q. What is your maiden name?

A. Pinn.

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
Ernie Perry

Leroy Pinn, a witness of lawful age, produced on behalf of the Plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, deposes and saith as follows, that is to say:

By the Examiner:

1 Q. State your name residence and occupation?

A. Leroy Pinn, 5010 Biergard Street, Baltimore, Maryland; I am working for an auctioneer.

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

A. Yes.

By Mr. Davis:

1 Q. Are they related to you?

A. Yes; she is my daughter.

2 Q. Are the parties to this suit husband and wife?

A. Yes.

3 Q. Did they live together as husband and wife and were they always known and recognized in the community in which they lived as husband and wife?

A. Yes.

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

A. Yes.

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

A. One.

Leroy Pinn.

6 Q. Is the name and the age of the child correctly given by the mother?

A. Yes.

7 Q. Do you think that she is the fit and proper party to have the custody of the child?

A. Yes.

8 Q. And is she able and willing to support, educate and rear this child?

A. Yes.

9 Q. What was her conduct towards her husband while living together; how did she treat him?

A. She was very kind to him.

10 Q. State whether or not she was always a kind, affectionate and faithful wife?

A. Yes.

11 Q. Are the parties to this suit living together now?

A. No sir.

12 Q. Which left the other; did he leave her or did she leave him?

A. He left her; he brought her home to me.

13 Q. When?

A. April 26th., 1920/

14 Q. You say that he brought her home to you; what did he say when he brought her home to you.

Leroy Pign.

A. He said that he did not want her any more, and that he was tired of her and would not live with her.

15 Q. Did you and your daughter try to reason with him and get him to stay and do as a husband should?

A. Yes.

16 Q. But notwithstanding that you say that he left her?

A. Yes.

17 Q. Did he have any just cause or reason to abandon and desert her?

A. No sir.

18 Q. After that time did your daughter communicate with him and try to get him to come back and live with you?

A. Yes.

19 Q. And did he refuse or consent to do so?

A. He refused.

20 Q. Has his abandonment and desertion of his wife continued uninterruptedly since April 26th., 1920?

A. Yes.

21 Q. That is, have they lived or cohabited together since that time?

A. No sir.

Leroy Pinn.

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

A. Yes.

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

A. No sir.

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

A. He is a non-resident.

25 Q. Of what State is he a non-resident.

A. Virginia.

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

Geavery Pinn

Maston T. Bast, a witness of lawful age, produced on behalf of the Plaintiff, having been first duly sworn, deposes and saith as follows, that is to say:

By the Examiner:

1 Q. State your name residence and occupation?

A. Maston T. Bast, 5000 Biergard Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland; barber business.

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

A. Yes.

By Mr. Davis:

1 Q. Are they living together now?

A. No sir.

2 Q. Which left the other; did he leave her or did she leave him?

A. He left her.

3 Q. When?

A. About April 1920.

4 Q. Did he have any just cause or reason to abandon and desert his wife at that time?

A. No sir.

5 Q. Has his abandonment and desertion of his wife continued uninterruptedly since April 1920?

A. Yes; there has been no communication to-

Maston T. Bast.

gether.

6 Q. State whether or not said abandonment was deliberate and final?

A. Yes; it was.

7 Q. State whether or not there is any reasonable expectation of a reconciliation?

A. No 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 the 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

Walter J. Best

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.....*3rd* day of *March* in the year of Our Lord nineteen hundred and *twenty-four* at the City of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland.

Alex Sappington (SEAL).
Examiner.

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

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

Alex 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.....

Alex Sappington
Examiner.

Circuit Court

837
192 23 Docket No.

Venev

vs.

Venev

Order of Reference
and Report

B 26-349

No. (6) ✓

Roberts

4 March 192 ✓

Order Filed day of 192

Report Filed day of 192

237

IN THE
Circuit Court

OF

BALTIMORE CITY

Eunice Venev
vs.
Matthew Venev

Jan Term, 192 *4*

This case being submitted, without argument, it is ordered by the Court, this
day of *March*, 192, that the same be and it is hereby referred to
Alex H. Robertson, Esq., Auditor and Master, to report the
pleadings and the facts, and his opinion thereon.

Charles F. Deane

Report of Auditor and Master

Bill filed by wife against husband for divorce a vinculo matrimonii on the ground
of abandonment for three years, Code Article 16, Section 36. Order of publication
against Defendant as a non resident. No answer. Decree pro confesso, thirty days
elapsed. Proof shows residence of Plaintiff and non residence of Defendant, marriage
and abandonment of the Plaintiff for atleast three years continuous, deliberate, final
and without hope of reconciliation. Case ready for decree.

Alex Robertson
Auditor and Master.

Circuit Court

837

B

19 23

No. 63 Docket

VENEY

vs.

VENEY

Recorded

Folio 76 1924

DECREE OF DIVORCE

B No. 26349
(7)

Filed 22nd March 1924

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

Wm. H. Roberts
Auditor and Master.

IN THE

EUNICE VENNEY,

vs.

MATTHEW VENNEY,

Circuit Court

OF

BALTIMORE CITY

MARCH Term, 1924.

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

It is thereupon, this 22nd day of MARCH Anno Domini, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-four by the CIRCUIT COURT OF BALTIMORE CITY, Adjudged, Ordered and Decreed, that the said

EUNICE VENNEY,

the above named complainant be, and she is hereby DIVORCED, A VINCULO MATRIMONII, from the defendant, MATTHEW VENNEY.

And the Plaintiff is hereby permitted to resume her maiden name, Eunice Penn.

The care and custody of the minor child, Leroy Veney, are awarded the Plaintiff.

And it is further Ordered, that the said Plaintiff pay the cost of this proceeding.

Charles F. Stem

I, CHARLES R. WHITEFORD, Clerk of the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, do hereby certify that the above is a true copy of the decree taken from the record of proceedings in said cause.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand and affix the seal of the said Court, this day of 19

Clerk Circuit Court of Baltimore City.