

1906 - 029

Nansemond Co (Suffolk) Chancery Causes: Walter L. Bradshaw vs Vivian L. Bradshaw

Harrell, Pearce, Cross, Speight, Rawles

\$ 5'36 cclk
120 shell

\$ 6.50



March. 4. 1907

Receipt of RARawler act

Seif $\frac{50}{100}$

Dollars

in full of clerk's costs mit tax & sheriff
costs in W. L. Bradshaw in V. F. Bradshaw.

A. J. Gomey D.C.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,

TO THE SHERIFF OF NANSEMOND COUNTY—Greeting:

YOU ARE HEREBY COMMANDED TO SUMMONS

*J B Voight- to appear
at the office of R H Rawles in Suffolk Virginia
at 10 O'clock A.M.*

~~to appear before the Judge of the Circuit Court of Nansemond County, at the Courthouse of said County, on the~~
16th day of *February 1907*, to testify ~~and the truth to say~~ on behalf of

~~in a certain matter of controversy in our said Court depending and undetermined between~~

W L Braashaw

Plaintiff

and

against

Vivian A Braashaw

Defendant

And this the witness shall in no wise omit, under the penalty of \$100 each. And have then and there this summons.

WITNESS, R. R. SMITH, Clerk of our said Court, at his office, this *7th* day of *February*
190*7*, in the *31st* year of the Commonwealth.

R R Smith

CLERK.

By A J Gomez D.C

I have executed the within summons by delivering a true copy thereof to J. B. Vought in person in my county of Nantsemond on the 8th day of February 1907.

A. H. Baker Siff
J. B. Vought & Co. Depts

W. L. Bradshaw
vs. J. B. Vought
J. B. Bradshaw

1907
Feb. 16th,

Nantsemond
Circuit Court

THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,

TO THE SHERIFF OF NANSEMOND COUNTY—Greeting:

YOU ARE HEREBY COMMANDED TO SUMMONS

J B Voight - G M
Shinner Nardy Holland Marvel Pierce
and William Speight

at the Office of R ^{Rawley} Nawles Notary Public in Suffolk Va

to appear before the Judge of the Circuit Court of Nansemond County, at the Courthouse of said County, on the
12th day of *January* 1907, to testify and the truth to say on behalf of

W L Bradshaw

in a certain matter of controversy (~~in our said Court~~) depending and undetermined between *Said*

W L Bradshaw

Complainant Plaintiff

and

W A Bradshaw

Defendant

And this the witness shall in no wise omit, under the penalty of \$100 each. And have then and there this summons.

WITNESS, R. R. SMITH, Clerk of our said Court, at his office, this *7th* day of *January*
190-*7*, in the *31st* year of the Commonwealth.

R R Smith
CLERK

on Saturday

I have executed the within summons by delivering a true copy here in person to G. M. Skinner, Hardy Holland, and Marvel Pierce in my County of Mansfield on the 9th day of January 1807: and by delivering a true copy here to Ethel Wright the wife of J. B. Wright and a true copy here to Elizabeth Speight wife of William Speight and giving them into their hands of its meaning, in my said County on the 9th day of January 1807.

Attest
By R. E. Norford Depy

R. H. Rawles / pg
W. L. Bradshaw
vs } Spa
W. L. Bradshaw

1907
Jan 12th
Ethel Wright
Elizabeth Speight

Mansfield
Circuit Court

CHANCERY SUMMONS

THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,

TO THE SHERIFF OF NANSEMOND COUNTY—Greeting:

YOU ARE HEREBY COMMANDED TO SUMMON *Norian F. Bradshaw*

to appear at the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Nansemond County, at the Rules to be held for the said Court, on the *First* Monday in *December 1906*, to answer *a* Bill in Chancery, exhibited against *her* in the said Court by *Walter L. Bradshaw*

And have then and there this summons.

Witness, R. R. SMITH, Clerk of our said Court, at his office, this *30th* day of *November*, 190*6*, in the 13/^{*sk*}*th* year of the Commonwealth.

A copy—Teste :

},
_____, CLERK.

Teste :

R R Smith, CLERK.

By J. A. Gomez Deputy Clerk

R. H. Rawles, p. q.

Walter L. Bradshaw

vs. }

IN CHANCERY.

Vivian L. Bradshaw

1906

December Rules.

First Monday.

NANSEMOND CIRCUIT COURT.

Process Book No. 3

Page 23

I hereby acknowledge sufficient and legal service
of the within notice or summons this 1st day of
December 1906,
Vivian L. Bradshaw,

Witness:
L. D. Jacobs.

To Mrs. Vivian F. Bradshaw

TAKE NOTICE that I shall, on the 16th day of February 1907,
at the office of R. H. Rawles on Washington
Square
in Suffolk Virginia

between the hours of 8 A. M. and 6 P. M., on that day, proceed to take the depositions
of Harry Beamon and others, to be read in evidence in my
behalf, in a certain suit in Equity
depending in the Circuit Court for the County
of Nassau where you are
defendant and I am plaintiff;
and if, from any cause, the taking of the said depositions be not commenced on that day, or, if
commenced, be not concluded on that day, the taking of the same will be adjourned and continued
from day to day, or from time to time, at the same place and between the same hours, until the
same shall be completed.

Respectfully yours,

W. L. Bradshaw
by R. H. Rawles, Counsel.

Presented in the
City of Norfolk
this 11th day of
February 1907
by serving a copy
here of on
Mrs. Nina, Bradshaw

J. A. Lawley, Supt
City of Norfolk
by J. W. Lynn
Supt

Return to R. H. Rawles
Suffolk Va.
Says can be so & parcel
return you so & in stamp
city m. o. p.

The depositions of J. M. Pierce and others taken before me, Robert W. Withers, a Commissioner in Chancery of the Circuit Court for the County of Nansemond, and State of Virginia, at the office of R. H. Rawles, in Suffolk, Virginia, on the 12th day of January, 1907, between the hours of 8 A. M. and 6 P. M., to be read as evidence in behalf of the Plaintiff, W. L. Bradshaw, in a certain suit in Equity depending in the said Court, wherein said W. L. Bradshaw is Plaintiff and Vivien F. Bradshaw is Defendant.

Present:

R. H. Rawles, Counsel for Plaintiff,

The Defendant did not appear there in person,
or by Counsel,

F. W. Lloyd, Stenographer.

J. M. Pierce, being duly sworn, deposes and says as follows:

Examined by Judge Rawles.

Q. State your name, age, residence, occupation and if you know the parties to this suit?

A. J. M. Pierce, age 26, live at Whaley Station, Nansemond County, Virginia, am a merchant, and know the parties to this suit.

Q. How long have you known the defendant, Vivien F. Bradshaw, who was formerly Vivien F. Harrell?

A. I have known her all my life. We went to school together.

Q. Did you know her previous to her marriage to Mr. Bradshaw, after she had become a grown young woman?

A. Yes, sir, I did.

Q. Did you ever visit her and take her riding and driving, and pay her social attentions?

A. Yes, sir, I have.

Q. What was her general conduct towards young men; I mean was she modest and retiring, or was she inclined to be bold and fast?

A. Well, at my first going with her she was modest, but towards the last I found out she was fast.

Q. Will you tell us why you ceased going with her and paying her

social attentions?

A. Well, I found out that she was fast and not of my standing, and I was man enough to quit.

Q. Do you mean by that, that in your opinion she would let gentlemen take improper liberties with her?

A. I thought she might.

Q. When you heard a short time ago that she had married young Mr. Bradshaw, what remark did you make?

A. Well, I made this remark: "That trap was set for me, but I was man enough to keep out of it."

Q. From your knowledge of her, and from reports of her in the community in which she resided, do you think that she was a proper party to become the wife of any decent young man?

A. No, I do not think she was.

And further this deponent saith not.

J M Pierce

Z. V. Cross, being duly sworn, deposes and says as follows:

Examined by Judge Rawles.

Q. State your name, age, residence, occupation and if you know the parties to this suit?

A. Z. V. Cross, age 27, live in Gates County, North Carolina, am a huckster, and know the parties to this suit.

Q. Did you know Vivien F. Bradshaw while she was Vivien F. Harrell?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long had you known her previous to her marriage to Mr. Bradshaw?

A. How long?

Q. Yes?

A. About seven years.

Q. Did you ever visit her and take her riding and driving, and pay her social attentions?

A. Yes, sir,,I have.

Q. State what was her general conduct towards young men; I mean was she modest and retiring, or was she bold and fast?

A. Well, from my experience, she was inclined to be fast.

Q. Will you state whether or not she has permitted you, without objection on her part, to put your hands on her naked person?

A. Yes, sir, she has.

Q. And you mean by that, of course, that you have placed your hands, without objections, on her private parts?

A. That is what I mean.

Q. Did you not, on one occasion, make a proposition to her to allow you to have sexual intercourse?

A. Yes, sir, I did.

Q. And did she not consent that you might?

A. Yes, she did say I might at another time.

Q. Was it not the fact that she put it off because there were so

many people present on the occasion?

A. Yes, that is the truth. It was at a social gathering at Mr. Joe Ben Speight's.

Q. From your knowledge and experience with her before her marriage do you think she was a fit and proper person to become the true and virtuous wife of any decent young man?

A. I certainly do not.

And further this deponent saith not.

Z. V. Cross

W. C. Speight, being duly sworn, deposes and says as follows:

Examined by Judge Rawles.

Q. State your name, age, residence, occupation, and if you know the parties to this suit?

A. W. C. Speight, age 24, live at Whaleyville, farmer, and know both parties to this suit.

Q. Did you know the Defendant before her marriage to Mr. Bradshaw?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you known her? A. About four or five years.

Q. Did you ever have occasion to visit her and pay her social attentions?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. From your experience with her, would you say whether she was a modest and retiring girl, or bold and fast?

A. Well, I took her to be fast.

Q. Was she a girl that would allow young men to take undue liberties with her?

A. She was..

Q. State, on your oath, whether she ever permitted you to put your hand on her naked person without objection on her part?

A. Yes, sir, she has permitted me to do so.

Q. And by that you mean that you placed it on her private parts?

A. Yes, sir, that is what I mean.

Q. Do you believe, from your knowledge of her and your experience with her, that she was fit and proper to be the true and virtuous wife of any decent young man.

A. I think not.

And further this deponent saith not.

W. C. Speight

L. F. Bradshaw, being duly sworn, deposes and says as follows:

Examined by Judge Rawles.

Q. State your name, age, residence, occupation, and if you know the parties to this suit?

A. L. F. Bradshaw, age 28, live at Nurneyville, Nansemond County, Virginia, Postmaster and Merchant, and know the parties to this suit. The Plaintiff is my younger brother.

Q. How old is Plaintiff?

A. He is just 21 years old. Just become of age.

Q. How old is Vivien F. Bradshaw, the Defendant?

A. To the best of my judgment she is about 27 years old. That is what she claims to be.

Q. How long have you known her?

A. About seven years.

Q. Did you ever visit her and pay her any social attentions?

A. Yes, sir, I have.

Q. What was her general conduct and deportment when in the presence of young men?

A. She was a very lively girl, full of go-ahead.

Q. Did you ever see anything modest about her?

A. I never saw much modesty about her.

Q. Would she allow you and others to take undue liberties with her person?

A. She certainly did allow me to do so.

Q. Please state any fact you may know which tends to show what her conduct and deportment was towards the male sex?

A. She has allowed me to feel of her nakedness.

Q. Please explain when, and how, and where this occurred?

A. It was during the Spring of the year 1906 at my father's home at the well about nine o'clock one night. One evening she walked down to the store and she came in and asked me to let her talk to her brother in Suffolk, and after she got through talking, she told me that Linwood was gone and for me to come down home (my father's)

that night, and I told her I would if I got off, so about half past eight I closed up and went down there. When I got home, I sat down in the room for a few minutes, and she said to me "let's go get some water," so when we got to the shelf where the water bucket sat, she said we had better go out to the well. After we got to the well out there talking and she throwing herself around me, and from one thing to another we got to talking about fast women, and her conduct aroused my passions to the highest pitch, in fact almost set me crazy. About the time I was feeling of her nakedness we heard a noise of cornstalks breaking in the field nearby, and at that we stopped and began walking towards the house. We knew someone was coming through the field. I told her that she was as old as I was, and that I was as old as she was, and that I could not lead her astray, and about that time, while we were halfway between the well and the house, Linwood walked up.

Q. Then from what you say the Defendant is about six or seven years older than the Plaintiff?

A. Yes, sir, about seven years older.

Q. When you were taking these liberties with her, did she seek to repel you or drive you off, or did she rather encourage you to keep on?

A. She did not do anything but just give right away, just as if you would lay a stick of wood down.

And further this deponent saith not.

L. F. Bradshaw

R. H. Rawles, being duly sworn, deposes and says as follows:

My name is R. H. Rawles, I am 56 years of age, live at Suffolk, Virginia, am an Attorney at Law, and know both of the parties to this suit. I feel that I ought to make a statement in this case in justice to both of the parties. After I had been employed to bring this suit, I heard that the Defendant would probably pass through Suffolk about December 1st on her way to Norfolk. On Dec. 1st. I heard she was in Suffolk. I had papers ready to serve on her. I sent for her to come to my office. I did not know whether she would come or not, but she did come. I told her that I had been employed to bring suit for divorce against her, and was ready for the Sheriff to serve the papers on her, but I explained to her that if she was perfectly willing to do so, she could accept service, both of the processes and of the notice to take depositions. She said she was perfectly willing to do so, and would rather that the Sheriff would not serve the papers, as she wished to avoid as much publicity as possible. She then voluntarily accepted service of both papers. In reply to questions, she told me that she was on her way to the Florence Crittenden Home for fallen women in Norfolk, that her father had made arrangements for her to be confined there, that she expected to give birth to a child in less than two months, probably in one month from that date. I explained to her the nature of the suit. She asked me when the trial would come off. I told her I thought about the January Court. She said that she knew that she had done wrong, and that if Mr. Bradshaw wanted a divorce she thought he was entitled to it. She said she did not expect to appear at the trial, and she would be glad to have as little said about it as possible. I asked her if she was willing to make a statement to that effect in writing, and told her she need not do so unless she so wished, as it was left entirely with her. She said she was perfectly willing to make such a statement. I then prepared the statement, which is herein filed, and she signed and acknowledged it in the presence of

the subscribing witness, although the witness did not know anything of the contents of the paper. I say this in justice to the subscribing witness.

I have known the parents of both these parties for a great many years. They have always resided in Virginia; both Plaintiff and Defendant were domiciled in this State at least one year next preceding the commencement of this suit, and they have been continuously domiciled in Virginia, resided in this State and County for several years past, and are still both residents of this County. They last cohabited in this County, but I am informed that they did not live together for more than 24 hours after marriage. (I have no personal knowledge of what I am now going to say, and I only wish it to be weighed for what it is worth, but I heard from authentic sources, that she gave birth to a child about January first.)

And further this deponent saith not.

R. H. Rawles.

VIRGINIA,

To-wit:

NANSEMOND COUNTY.

I, Robert W. Withers, a Commissioner in Chancery of the Circuit Court of Nansemond County, do hereby certify that the foregoing depositions of J. M. Pierce, Z. V. Cross, W. C. Speight, ^{R. H. Rawles} and L. F. Bradshaw, were duly taken, subscribed and sworn to before me at the office of R. H. Rawles, in Suffolk, on the 12th day of January, 1907.

Given under my hand this 12th day of January, 1907.

Robert W. Withers
Commissioner in Chancery.

See next pages.

Suffolk Va. Dec. 1st 1906.

Walter L. Bradshaw and myself were married on the 20th day of November 1906. I am expecting to give birth to a child now within a short time perhaps less than two months. My husband has filed a suit for divorce against me asking that the said marriage be annulled and set aside. I shall offer no opposition to a decree granting him a divorce as I realize that under all the circumstances of the case he is entitled to one. Witness my hand and seal this 1st day of December 1906.

Virian L. Bradshaw. 

Witness:

L. D. Jacobs.

NOTE:

9.

A fact may be as clearly proven by circumstantial as by positive evidence. And our inferences may be drawn from any fact proven. One charge in this case is that the Defendant was a prostitute before marriage. Has this fact been proven by fair inferences?

THE LAW:

"It is not requisite that there should be direct proof of this crime, for if that were the rule there is not one case in a hundred where such proof would be attainable. The crime is almost invariably clandestine, and committed only when every precaution is taken to exclude the possibility of its discovery. Familiar Indicia of it are: First, loss of attention that was due to and was bestowed upon its legitimate object, and the bestowal of attention upon an unlawful object; stolen interviews; private correspondence; amorous and passionate utterances; personal freedom; indecent familiarity; compromising situations." HURTZIG v. HURTZIG, 44 N. J. 329.

"It is very rarely indeed that the parties are surprised in the direct fact of sexual intercourse. In every case almost, the fact is inferred from circumstances that lead to it by a fair inference as a necessary conclusion; and unless this were the case, and unless this were so held, no protection could be given to marital rights. The only general rule by which we can be guided, is that the circumstances must be such as would lead the guarded discretion of a reasonable and just man to the conclusion; it is not to be a matter of artificial reasoning, judging upon such things differently from what would strike the careful and cautious consideration of a discreet man. The facts are not of a technical nature; they are facts determinable upon grounds of reason; and Courts of justice would wander very much from their proper offices of giving protection to the rights of mankind, if they let themselves loose to subtleties and remote artificial reasoning upon such subjects. The reasoning should be rational and the legal *x interpretation* must be the same." LOVDEN v. LOVDEN, 4th ENGLISH ENCY. 461.

"The fact need not be proved by direct testimony, but it may be inferred from circumstances that lead to it, by fair inferences as a necessary conclusion." RICHARDSON v. RICHARDSON, 4 PORTER 467 ALA.

NOTE:

I have filed ^{her} a voluntary statement. I can truthfully say it was not obtained by any collusion whatever, ^{there} ~~that~~ is no collusion. The statement was made voluntarily, freely and without the knowledge of the Plaintiff, who was not even present when it was made. The Plaintiff is proceeding in this case independently of any action on the part of the Defendant. It is true that cases of this kind cannot be determined on admissions or confessions alone, but such admissions are competent testimony, and taken in connection with the other testimony it is most persuasive of the truth of the allegations in the bill, and the truth of the testimony of other witnesses. It leaves no room for doubt.

THE LAW.

"I take the rule to be that if the proofs in a case, irrespective of the confession of the criminated party, well nigh demonstrate the fact charged, but do not entirely satisfy the ^{Conscience} ~~confidence~~ of the Court, the confession may be permitted to decide the otherwise doubtful judgment of the Court." SUMMERBELL v. SUMMERBELL, 37 N. J. 603.

"Although the policy of the law prohibits a decree of divorce from being granted upon the admissions or confessions of the parties alone, they are not for that reason inadmissible in evidence where they have been voluntarily made and are relevant, free from suspicion, and corroborated by circumstances, they are ranked with the safest proof". MACHING v. MACHING, 6 Pa. 332.

"When connected with other evidence, a confession or admission may be entitled to the highest consideration." FULLERTON v. FULLERTON, 11 SCOTCH LESS. CAS., 72.

Can there be any rational doubt as to the guilt of this Defendant? Can any other rational conclusion be reached? What are the facts? Here is a woman 27 years of age, full grown, matured, both in body and mind, character fully formed, and yet, knowing right from wrong, she has voluntarily permitted her person to become the common property of the young gentlemen of her community, a living example of social impurity. As is usual in such cases, and from her conduct, it must have become speedily known of all men that she was one ^{with} ~~from~~ whom any and all kinds of improper liberties might be taken. This case ought to be viewed in the light of human nature and of reason. A woman who would permit such liberties as have been proven in this case, would not stop there. The young gentlemen who testified in this case were unwilling witnesses. They would not come to Court until they were forced by legal processes. And perhaps they ~~are~~ to be commended for this. The truth had to be dragged out of them, and while I believe they told the truth, I have serious doubts whether some of them told the whole truth. There is more between the lines than is written.

This is a hard case. A young man barely 21 caught in the meshes of an adventuress many years his senior. Knowing her chances of marriage, owing to her reprehensible conduct, were growing small indeed, she set the trap for this youth and caught him. Is she fit to be the pure wife of a decent young gentleman? How would he feel to be yoked up to her the remainder of his life, looked on with contempt by all her paramours, and all his companions. Leading a child through life whose parentage could be claimed by half the men in the community. He would better be in his grave. It would be infinitely better for both these people to be forever separated, and infinitely better for the community.

To Vivian F. Bradshaw

TAKE NOTICE that I shall, on the 12th day of January 1907
at the office of R. H. R. Reeves on Washington
Square
in Suffolk Virginia

between the hours of 8 A. M. and 6 P. M., on that day, proceed to take the depositions
of J. M. Pierce and others, to be read in evidence in my
behalf, in a certain suit in equity
depending in the Circuit Court for the County
of Naumond County wherein you are defendant
and I am plaintiff;

and if, from any cause, the taking of the said depositions be not commenced on that day, or, if
commenced, be not concluded on that day, the taking of the same will be adjourned and continued
from day to day, or from time to time, at the same place and between the same hours, until the
same shall be completed.

Respectfully yours,

Walter L. Bradshaw by
Counsel.

I hereby acknowledge legal and sufficient
service of the within notice to take depositions,
Dec. 1st 1896.

Virian F. Bradshaw.

Witness:

L. H. Jacobs.

Definitions

W. S. Bradshaw

vs. } In Chancery

V. F. Bradshaw.

W. L. Bradshaw

v's

V. F. Bradshaw

} In Chancery.

This cause came on this day to be heard on the Bill, the depositions of J. M. Pira and other witnesses taken after due notice to the defendant and was argued by Counsel.

On Consideration whereof, it appearing to the Court from the testimony filed in the cause that the defendant had been a prostitute before her marriage with the plaintiff without the knowledge of her husband the plaintiff: and it further appearing that this Court has jurisdiction in this cause, the Court doth order adjudge and decree that the marriage heretofore solemnized between the plaintiff and the defendant be and the same is hereby wholly annulled and set aside and that a divorce a vinculo mat-
rimonii be, and the same is hereby granted the plaintiff from his said wife, the defendant: and nothing fur-
ther appearing necessary to be done in this cause it is ordered that the same be stricken from the docket.

Final Decree.

W. S. Bradshaw
vs. } In Chancery
V. F. Bradshaw

To the Honorable Robert R. Prentiss
Judge of the Circuit Court of
Haucesmond County:-

Humbly Complainant sheweth unto
the Court your orator Walter H.
Bradshaw of Haucesmond County
the following case:

Your orator says that on the 20th
day of November 1906 he was married
in Haucesmond County Virginia to
his present wife Vivian F. Horrell as
will appear by the records in the
clerk's office of said county.

He further says that within a few
days after the said marriage he
discovered that his wife was with
child by some person other than
himself; this led him to making
inquiries and seeking information and
he soon discovered that his said
wife previous to said marriage was
not what she ought to have been;
in other words he discovered that prior
to said marriage and without his
knowledge his wife had been a
prostitute and that other men had
known her carnally. Upon learning
this sad state of affairs he charged

his said wife with these affalling facts
and she confessed they were true.
Your orator thereupon immediately left
his said wife and informed her
that he would never live with her
again or ever recognize her as
his wife, and he says that after he
had knowledge of the above facts
he has not since cohabited with
his said wife. He then charges
that previous to his marriage his said
wife had been guilty of adultery: that
she was with child by some person
other than himself: and that she
was a prostitute. He further says
the said acts on her part have not
occurred more than five years before
the institution of this suit. He further
says that after he left his said wife,
she left her father's home and went
to be confined in the Crillenden's Home
in New York and that she is now tem-
porarily residing there, though her
residence is in this County. Your orator
further says that he has been domiciled in
this state for many years, in fact all
his life and therefore more than one
year preceding the commencement of

this suit and that he is still domiciled here and was at the time of bringing this suit. He further says he and his said wife have cohabited in the County of Nassau and that both he and she reside in said County and have both resided here all their lives.

In tender consideration whereof and presuming as your orator is remediless in the premises save by the aid of a Court of equity when such matters are done and fully cognizable your orator prays that the said Vivian F. Bradshaw may be made a party defendant to this bill and required to answer the same though an answer under oath is waived: that proper process may issue: that all proper accounts and disbursements may be taken and that a divorce a vinculo matrimonii may be granted your orator and the said marriage wholly annulled and set aside: and for all such other further and general relief as his case may require or which to equity may seem meet and he will ever pray &c.

Walter L. Bradshaw

Virginia: Nausumund County to wit: I, R. H. Cawder a
Notary Public for the County aforesaid in the State of Vir-
ginia do certify that Walter L. Bradshaw whose
name is signed to the foregoing bill: for this day
personally appeared before me in my County aforesaid
and made oath that the facts contained
in said bill are coming of his own knowledge
are true: and all other facts therein contained
are coming from knowledge or information de-
rived from others he believes to be true,
Given under my hand this 1st day of
December 1906: My term of office expires
Jan. 28. 1907. R. H. Cawder N.P.

Bill.

Filed Dec. 3. 1906

W L Bradshaw
vs J In Chancery
W H Bradshaw
Chancery Notes

1906 Novr 30th. Process issued returnable
to Deer Rules First Monday.
" Decr. 3rd Process returned service
accepted by defendant
Bill filed and Decree nisi
against said defendant.
" " 17th Decree nisi confirmed
and Cause set for hearing

Chancery
Notes.

W. S. Bradshaw

vz } In Chancery

v. F. Bradshaw.

Costs
Clerk 3.86
Tax 1.50
Shff. 1.20
Sergt-P. 50
Atty 18.00
\$22.06
Comm.

R. H. Rawles p.g.

W L Bradshaw

vs In Chancery

V F Bradshaw.

Make out bill of costs
on bill. See in all
sheriffs fees + atty fees

1906