The State of Alabama,	No	Circuit Court					
To Any Sheriff of the State of Alabama:		Spring January					
You are hereby commanded to summon.	A. J. Wath	es					
	ent.						
	7	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
to appear and plead, answer or demur, within t	hirty days from the service h	ereof, to the Complaint filed in the Circuit					
Court of Baldwin County, State of Alabama, at 1	Bay Minette, against	him Defendant					
7	i man a sa s						
by Brown & Brown, a partne	rsalpcomposed_or	wilton b. Brown and					
Chas. H. Brown	***************************************	Plaintiff					
*****	en e	and T					
Witness my hand	. ^	April 1919.					
	Jav?	acuro Clerk					
COMPLAINT							
Brown & Brown, a partner-							
ship composed of Milton 1.	****	A. J. Mathes					
Brown and Chas. H. Brown.	Plaintiff Versus	Defendent.					
The Plaintiff claims of the Defendar	the sum of	•					
One Hundred Eighty-nine an	oe.esi\$1.00/10e_b	Dollars due 37					
from him by account on the	to-wit: April ls	t, 1919.					
The Plaintiff claims	of the Defendant .	the sum of One Hundred 1					

The Plaintiff claims of the Defendant the sum of One Hundred and Eighty-nine and 90/100 (\$189.90) Dollars due by account stated between the Plaintiff and the Defendant on the to-wit: April 1st, 1919.

The Plaintiff claims of the Defendant the sum of One Hundred Eighty-nine and 90/100 (\$189.90) Dollars for merchandise, goods and chattels sold by the Plaintilf to the Defendant on the to-wit: Between November 1st, 1918, and April 1st, 1919, which sum of money is still due and unpaid.

PAGE & MOORER

Plaintiff's Attorney.

#1489 Original 121 "Her in affice april 3d/9/9 and Executed april 4th 1919 By Serving a copy of the Withen Summondo ag maren and Complaint on af mather OBSacherson Sheriff Feled 1/2/919. Two Redurant Occas

The Sta . Alabama, MOBILE COUNTY

yr ac ann an an air an an an air ann an an ann an an an air an
Before me, JOS. F. BULLOCK, a Notary Public, in and for aforesaid State and County
personally appeared of I-1 Muckle, Lice of
michael Lyon gro to- a corporation
and the said. O - W. L. having been by me first duly sworn
on oath, says: That the annexed statement against
Sanhope, ala
amounting to Mill Millars Spifter Horel pollars (\$ 303)
in favor of Michael & Ly Oho 400 is correct as stated;
that the said amount has not been paid nor any portion thereof, nor has the same been in any
way secured to be paid, but the whole thereof is now justly due and owing to the said
anchael of your on so
e. A. Muck
Subscribed and sworn to before me the ZM.day of
Jos J. Bulloge
Notary Public, Mobile County, Ala.

The State of Alabama,	}_	ourt /	t	
BALDWIN COUNTY.	No		\sim	A. Marian
		More	g juri	191.7
To Any Sheriff of the State of Alabama:	, A		en e	Asin
You are hereby commanded to summon	A. J. Wattn	es		
	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			***
		······		<u></u>

o appear and plead, answer or demur, within t	hirty days from the serv	ice hereof, to the	Complaint file	d in the Circuit
ourt of Baldwin County, State of Alabama, at E	Say Minette, against			Defendant
wichael & Lyons Gro	. Co., a corpor	ration	1997	i dag
,				
Witness my hand	this 2nd day o	e Apri	<u></u>	1919.
		U Re	conor	Clerk.
	COMPLAINT	mgha ni shikha in Maiddd Madaindd Mar a th' Shir (A Shir Maidd Shir Ann an Anna a shir Ann	The Market Control of the Control of	
Michael & Lyons Gro. Co.,	·	AJ_	Mathes,	,
a corporation.	Plaintiff Versus	· 	efendant	
The Plaintiff claims of the Defendan				
Three Hundred Fifty-three	and 00/100 (\$3	53 . 00)		Dollars due 😽
from him by account on the				in the state of th
The plaintiff claims	•			e Hundred
Fifty-three and 00/100 (\$3				
tween the plaintiff and de				
-	*			
The Plaintiff claim	•			
red and 00/100 (\$353.00) D	N .			
sold by the Plaintiff to t				
ber 1st, 1918 and April 1s	t, 1919, which	sum of mor	ley withi	nterest
thereon is still due and u				
Plaintiff alleges	that an itemize	ed verified	stateme	nt is
filed herewith and made a p	part of this co	mplaint.	and the second	
		<i>₩</i> .		
253	\$367	@A		
232	XX 30)	~/	•	
12 8.2 Y	•			W V

PAGE & MOORER Plaintiff's Attorney.

Rec in affice midwal Thyona Swe april 32-1919 and on Burna To a share Ithm Executed april 4 Mas By serving a copy of the witchen Summondo and Complaint on Filed 1/2/919. Qf mathis Two Riceman @38 Therson alote. Sheriff

The court changes from your from its They did by the creation below and by the his interestinates Soft Country Rent Son Suburder burderfeld Demonstratibles Af Rentween & Later Constitution of the Country of th Collecting date to be be desired to be a formation of the second of the and his form forming is productioned to perfect the sound of setting to the free from the second of the South of the State of the Sta Comment Comments of the Section Comments of the Section Sectio Same Commencer of the C Surface God Company Company Record Charles of All Company Control of Company C Colomoray Cof Waterberry had a - Court Charges the jury time Litermining what I ght they will give to the Umorey of a waters in is case they may look The intenst if age, and burs had in the fresut the quit when ouch lanous use grown, and eigh ship evidence in the light of out interest The court charges the gray that menosty are first solo reasonably arterfiel from the evidence that some one to recommend whose carho executed Town sodiet-should be of the

The aux charges the Jung that in the about each of any evidence to the coulton, he law presences that the children of Lives Durates Wer And Ris legillemate Asia children sud that Mely The court charges the June, that the law frequence, in the observed of evidence to the couldry that Lacis Decretto com lawfully morried to be the mocker of her chiefed reve at the time of the period Live Lika.

- facie presumption that Louis Duret was lawfully married to the mother of his children, if he had any, and this presumption could not be over turned without negligence, negativing the existence of a common law marriage between Louis Duret and the mother of his children.
- 3. The court charges the jury that there is a prima facie presumption that parents of every child are lawfully intermarried and this presumption can be over come only by clear and convincing testimony, which negatives both the existence of a marriage which had been solemnized between them and also negatives the existence of a common law marriage between them.
- 4. The court charges the jury that according to the undisputed testimony in this case, the records of the Catholic Church contain only such marriages as were solemnized in the church and the fact that there was not record of any marriage being solemnized in that church between Louis Duret and the mother of his children is not alone sufficient to over come the prima facie presumption that they were man and wife.
- 11. The court charges the jury that it appears from the evidence in this case, that the lawful heirs of Louis Duret are the true owners of the property in question.
- 13. The court charges the jury that if they believe from the evidence that some of the grantors in the conveyance to Max Collins, are the lawful heirs of Louis Duret, then they should find for the plaintiff.
- 14. The court charges the jury that under the undisputed evidence in this case, the absence of any regord in the Catholic Church of a marriage between Louis Duret and the mother of his children, does not tend to show that they were not lawfully man and wife by a common law marriage.
- 15. The court charges the jury that it is their duty to render their verdict in accordance with the evidence introduced and the charge of the court.
- 16. The court charges the jury that it was not against e law of the State of Alabama for a white man to marry a negroman, until after the Civil War.

Lace Sans

17. The court charges the jury that the facts that Louis ouret was a white man and the mother of his children, who were born was a negress, prior to the Civil War,/if these were the facts, do not prevent the aw from raising the prima facte presumption that Louis Duret and he mother of his children, were lawfully married.

18. The court charges the jury that if they believe from the evidence, that the children of Louis Duret were borm prior o the Civil War, then they cannot consider the fact that the mother of his children was a negress as showing or tending to show, that she was not his lawful wife or that his children were not his legitimate children.

Green of the state of the state

19. The court charges the jury that they have no right, like lawful, lagar normal, to return a verdict against the plaintiff in this case, because of any prejudice that they may entertain against the intermarriage between Louis Duret and the mother of his children.