

Mrs Lillie Ardis and
James P. Ardis
vs
Luke Halley

Comes now James P. Ardis
and shows unto this Court that
if Mrs Lillie Ardis was present
in Court she would testify as
follows:

That she and James P. Ardis
were the joint owners of a
crop of cotton bean plants
and other plants situated upon
the W^{1/2} N^{1/2} E^{1/4} and W^{1/2} E^{1/4}
N^{1/2} 4th Sec 2 Tp 1 N R 4 East in
Bull Run County Ala. on May
8th - 1954. That the defendant
Luke Halley is the driver of
ago has had custody and
control of the following described
cattle 1³ head of range cattle
marked crop and half crop in
one bar and 2 shallow forks
and under in other car brand
2⁶ and that Luke Halley
did permit said cattle to go
unhindered upon said crop
of the plaintiffs and said
cattle did trample down and
destroy said crop. That on
the morning of May 12th 1954
at about day light she saw
Luke Halley and one other
man drive 10 head of

said Cattle out of her pasture.
That neither she nor James P.
Coles have converted said
Cattle, that she is not indebted
to Luke Hally in any amount.
That she has not had possession
of said Cattle since they were
removed 10 by Luke Hally
and the other 13 by her ~~husband~~
a bond

Sworn to and
Subscribed before
me this 17th day
of Sept. 1954
at the County
Court House
Pulaski County, Ala.

James P. Cole's

Given

Ardis

vs

Hadem



I charge you gentlemen of the jury to sustain a recovery for the conversion of property, it is necessary for the aggrieved party to either show the destruction of his property, or such interference therewith as to amount to a disregard or a defiance of the owner's rights in such property.

It is true that a conversion need not extend to a physical taking of the property, but there must be at least some positive or tortuous act that prevents the owner of the property from exercising dominion or control over the same.

*Emi
W. H. H. H.*

I charge you gentlemen of the jury that before the plaintiffs are entitled to recover, that you and each of you must be convinced by a preponderance of the evidence that the Defendant did permit said cattle to go uncontrolled upon the crop of said Plaintiffs.

*Revised
1/17/1904
J. W. P.*

#6/

I charge you gentlemen of the jury that if you believe from the evidence the Plaintiffs herein by some positive act or acts interfered with Luke Hadley as the owner of said cattle from exercising dominion or control over his said cattle that such interference amounts to conversion.

*Wm
H. Jones
Jr.*

#2 ✓

I charge you gentlemen of the jury that a conversion need not extend to a physical taking of the property but if there be some positive or tortuous act that prevents the owner of the property from exercise of dominion or control over his cattle then a conversion has been committed.

*Gami
Mistake
Mistake*