STATE OF ALABAMA

BALDWIN COUNTY

TO ANY SHERIFF OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA:

You are hereby commanded to summon Southeastern Fidelity Insurance Company, to appear within thirty days from the service of this writ in the Circuit Court, to be held for said County at the place of holding the same, then and there to answer the complaint of John W. Seales.

WITNESS my hand this 27 day of Mae, 1969

Service may be had on defendant by serving Mr. Joe H. Casehere, 1400 South 21st Street, Birmingham, Alabama, as the designated agent of said defendant.

JOHN W. SEALES

Plaintiff

X

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

X

BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA

SOUTHEASTERN FIDELITY INSURANCE X

COMPANY

Defendant

X

-1-

The plaintiff claims of the defendant Southeastern

Fidelity Insurance Company Two Thousand Two Hundred (\$2,200.00)

Dollars, the value of an automobile, to-wit, 1 - 1968 Ford

Custom, 2 Dr. Sedan with standard equipment, Serial No.

8A30C231559 which the defendant on the 23rd day of May,

1968, insured against the loss or injury by fire or other

perils in the policy of insurance mentioned for the term of

one year, which automobile was wholly destroyed by fire or

collision and upset on the 15th day of November, 1968, of which

the defendant had notice.

_2 _

The plaintiff claims of the defendant, the sum of One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000.00), the value of renting an automobile for transportation required by the plaintiff

pending the settlement of plaintiff's insurance claim against the defendant as the result of a policy issued to the plaintiff by the defendant on to-wit, May 23, 1968, for the term of one year, said automobile insured under the policy aforesaid having been wholly destroyed or damaged by fire or collision on the 15th day of November, 1968, of which the defendant has had notice.

Attorney for plaintiff

FILED

MAY 2 7 1969

ALDE & BOOK CLERK REGISTER

24/ 5-29-69

Southeastern Fidelity Unsurance lo.

MAY 29 1969

MAY 27 1965

by leaving a copy of within with

MELVIN BAILEY, Sheriff Jefferson County, Alabama

W St. E. Moore Joe H, Casebert The

Melvin Bailey, Sheriff of

Jefferson County, Alabama, claims \$1.50 each for serving trayel expense on each of

process(es) or a total of moore

Deputy Sheriff.

Moore C.L. Thompson

JOHN W. SEALES and FORD MOTOR CREDIT CORPORATION,)	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
PLAINTIFFS,)	BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA
vs.)	AT LAW
SOUTHEASTERN FIDELITY INSURANCE COMPANY,)	
DEFENDANT.)	CASE NO. 8720

PLEA

Comes now the Defendant and for answer to the Complaint as last amended alleges the following:

- (1) No guilty.
- (2) That the allegations of the Complaint are untrue.
- (3) In Count One the Defendant confesses that it had issued an insurance policy to the Plaintiff insuring his automobile against loss or injury by fire or otherperils and it further confesses that said automobile was totally destroyed by fire, collision or upset, but as a matter of avoidance alleges that the reasonable market value of said automobile at the time of the accident was not more than \$2,000.00.
- (4) In Count Two the Defendant admits that it issued an insurance policy to the Plaintiffs on, to-wit: May 23, 1968 and in said policy there is a section designated Loss of Use by Theft-Rental Reimbursement, and that the first paragraph of this section of the insurance policy is set out verbatum in Count Two; but as a matter of avoidance the Defendant alleges the following: That the remaining two paragraphs of said section of the insurance policy reads verbatum as follows:

"Reimbursement is limited to such expense incurred during the period commencing seventy-two hours after such theft has been reported to the company and the police and terminating regardless of expiration of the policy period, on the date the whereabouts of the automobile becomes known to the insured or the company or on such earlier date as the company makes or tenders settlement for such theft.

Such reimbursement shall be made only if the stolen automobile was a private passenger automobile not used as a public or livery conveyance and not owned and held for sale by an automobile dealer."

The Defendant further alleges that there is another provision in

C. G. C.

- 1 -

said insurance policy dealing with theft, set out verbatum as follows:

"Theft (Broad Form): To pay for loss of or damage to the automobile hereinafter called loss, caused by theft, larceny, robbery or pilferage."

The Defendant alleges that said automobile was not stolen but was removed by an independent insurance adjuster with the consent of the Plaintiff, John Seales to an enclosed storage place so that various items and parts would not be stolen from his wrecked vehicle.

The Defendant further alleges that the theft, if any, of said automobile was not reported to it and the police in accordance with the second paragraph of the section of the insurance policy designated Loss of Use by Theft-Rental Reimbursement.

Defendant further alleges that both the Plaintiff, John W.

Seales and it knew the whereabouts of said automobile at all times which precludes any payments to the Plaintiffs in accordance with the second paragraph of the section designated Loss of Use by Theft-Rental Reimbursement.

Attorney for Defendant

I hereby certify that I have mailed a copy of the above Plea to the Honorable C. LeNoir Thompson, attorney of record for the Plaintiffs, by placing the same, properly addressed, postage prepaid in the U.S. Post Office in Foley, Alabama, on this 17th day of February, 1970.

Charles H. Sims, III



Attorney at Law-

CHARLES H. SIMS III ASSOCIATE

February 9, 1970

P. O. DRAWER 458 216 W. LAUREL AVENUE FOLEY. ALABAMA 36535 PHONE 205/943-3171

Mrs. Alice Duck Clerk of the Circuit Court Baldwin County Courthouse Bay Minette, Alabama

Re: John W. Seales and Ford Motor

Credit Corporation vs. Southeastern

Fidelity Insurance Company

Dear Mrs. Duck:

Enclosed please find Demurrer in the above-styled cause. Please file.

Yours very trul

Charles H. Sims, III

CHS, III: vd Enc.



Attorney at Law

CHARLES H. SIMS III ASSOCIATE

February 17, 1970

P. O. DRAWER 458 216 W. LAUREL AVENUE FOLEY, ALABAMA 36535 PHONE 205/943-3171

Mrs. Alice J. Duck Circuit Clerk Baldwin County Bay Minette, Alabama 36507

RE: Seales vs. Southeastern Fidelity, Case No. 8720

Dear Mrs. Duck:

Enclosed please find Plea in the above style cause, a copy of which I have this day mailed to the Honorable C. LeNoir Thompson, attorney of record for the Plaintiffs. Please file immediately as this case is set for Thursday, February 19, 1970.

Yours very truly

Charles H. Sims, VIII

CHS, III:ec enc:

JOHN W. SEALES and FORD MOTOR CREDIT CORPORATION,	χ	
	χ	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
Plaintiffs,	χ	BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA
Vs.,	χ	AT LAW
SOUTHEASTERN FIDELITY INSURANCE COMPANY,	χ	CASE NUMBER: 8720
Defendant.	χ	

Come the plaintiffs in the above styled cause and join issue on the following pleas:

- l. Plea One
- 2 Plea Two
- 3. Plea Three
- 4. And for further replication as to Plea Three shows that the reasonable market value of specific automobile was in the amount of Two Thousand Six Hundred Ninety-five (\$2695.00) Dollars immediately prior to the accident, which destroyed said automobile, basis of this suit.
- 5. As to Plea Four, your plaintiffs join issue therewith and for further replication show that the said automobile was removed without the knowledge or consent of the said plaintiffs and its possession was not tendered back to said plaintiffs at any time.

Attorney for Plaintiffs

FILED

FEB 1 9 1970

ALRE J. DOLK REGISTER

John W. Scales and Grandin In Ihr Circuit Court of VS. Kaintiffs Baldwin Country Southastur Ficklify
Insurance Company,

Spiralant) at Las Comes now the defendant and for answer to the Plantiffs Replication alleges the following (1) Not juilty (2) That the allegations of the hydreation on Untive of (3) In answer & paragraphs 3 pot 3 milty Hat the allegations of said Recaggiffer are untrul Charles Horneston ALGE J. BILLY CLERK REGISTER

VOL 63 PAGE 839

JOHN W. SEALES and FORD IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF MOTOR CREDIT CORPORATION, BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA Plaintiffs, AT LAW vs. SOUTHEASTERN FIDELITY INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 8720

DEMURRER

Comes now the Defendant in the above-styled cause and demurs to the Complaint as last amended filed herein and to each and every count thereof separately and severally, and as grounds for such demurrer, assigns, separately and severally, as follows:

- 1. It does not state a cause of action.
- The allegations of the Complaint are vague, indefinite, and uncertain.
 - 3. Said count does not allege a breach of contract.
- 4. Said count does not allege the contract with sufficient certainty so as to apprise the matters it is called upon to defend.
- In count one, the Plaintiffs describe the automobile 5. involved as having standard equipment and this is not sufficient to apprise the Defendant of any extra equipment on said vehicle such as power steering, air conditioning, V-8 engine and automatic transmission.
- 6. Count two does not allege a promise or facts implying a promise by the Defendant.
- 7. Count two does not allege what the Plaintiffs gave or did or promised to do in exchange for and in consideration of the Defendant issuing the insurance policy.
- 8. Count two does not allege a breach of contract by the Defendant.
- 9. Count two does not allege a breach by the Defendant of any promise in the insurance contract.
- 10. Count two does not apprise the Defendant of the breach of contract on its part.

834 A

- ll. Count three does not sufficiently allege a promise or facts implying a promise by the Defendant.
- 12. Count three does not sufficiently allege the promise of the Defendant.
- 13. Count three does not allege what the Plaintiffs gave or did or promised to do in exchange for and in consideration of the Defendant's issuing the insurance policy.
- 14. In count three the Plaintiffs have not alleged that they or one of them have complied with all of the provisions of the contract dated May 23, 1968, on their part nor tendered their performance, nor alleged that they were ready, willing and able to perform the conditions of said contract.
- 15. Count three does not set out the breach of contract by the Defendant with sufficient certainty.
- 16. Count three does not allege a breach by the Defendant of any promise in the insurance contract.

Actorney for Defendant

I hereby certify that I have personally served a copy of the above Demurrer on the Honorable C. LeNoir Thompson, attorney of record for the Plaintiffs, on this 13th day of February, 1970.

Charles H. Sims, III



JOHN W. SEALES and FORD MOTOR CREDIT CORPORATION, X IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF PLAINTIFFS, X BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA VS.. AT LAW X SOUTHEASTERN FIDELITY INSURANCE COMPANY, χ CASE NUMBER: 8720 DEFENDANT χ

COMPLAINT AS LAST AMENDED:

Come the plaintiffs in the above syled cause and amend the complaint as last amended heretofore filed to read as follows:

-1-

The plaintiffs claim of the defendant, Southeastern Fidelity Insurance Company, Two Thousand Six Mundred Ninety-five (\$2,695.00) Dollars, the value of an automobile, to-wit, one 1968 Ford Custom, tow-door sedan with standard equipment, Serial No. 8A30C231559, which the defendant on the 23rd day of May, 1968, insured against the loss or injury by fire or other perils in the policy of insurance mentioned for the term of one year, which automobile was wholly destroyed by fire or collision and upset on the 15th day of November, 1968, ofwhich the defendant had notice.

-2-

The plaintiff claims of the defendant Two Thousand (\$2,000.00) Dollars damages for the breach of agreement entered into by him on May 23, 1968, in substance as follows:

"II. Loss of Use by Theft--Rental Reimbursement:
The company, following a theft covered under this policy of the entire automobile, shall reimburse the insured for expense not exceeding \$5 for any one day nor totaling more than \$150 or the actual cash value of the automobile at time of theft, whichever is less, incurred for the rental of a substitute automobile, including taxicabs. Such reimbursement is payable by the company in addition to the applicable limit of liability of this policy."

And Plaintiff says that he complied with all its provisions on his part and that the defendant has failed to comply with its provisions thereof, viz. That the said automobile was

removed without the consent of said plaintiff by said defendant, its agent, servant or employee and the said defendant has failed or refused to reimburse said plaintiff subsequent to the action complained of concurring on the 20th day of November, 1968.

-3-

The plaintiff claims of the defendant specific reimbursement under that certain policy No. PB701954 the sum of Two Thousand Six Hundred Ninety-five (\$2,695.00) Dollars as damages fue and for the breach of said insurance agreement entered into by said defendant, to-wit, May 23, 1968, and said automobile insured by said Policy No. PB701954 was damaged on November 15, 1968, and the plaintiff duly notified the defendant. The defendant without the consent of plaintiff removed said automobile from Baldwin County and failed or refused to comply with the provisions provided for the payment of damages suffered by the said plaintiff, to-wit:

"L. Coverage A--Collision or Upset: To pay for direct and accidental loss of or damage to the automobile, hereinafter called loss, caused by collision of the automobile with another object or by upset of the automobile.

ATTORNEX FOR PLINTIFF.

FEB 1 8 1970

ALGE & BEEN GOSTER

VOL

JOHN W. SEALES and FORD MOTOR CREDIT CORPORATION,)	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
Plaintiffs,)	BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA
)	AT LAW
vs.)	
SOUTHEASTERN FIDELITY INSURANCE COMPANY,)	
Dofondant	`	CASE NO 9790

DEMURRER

Comes now the Defendant in the above styled cause and demurs to the Amended Complaint filed therein and to each and every count thereof separately and severally, and as grounds for such demurrer, assigns, separately and severally, as follows:

- 1. It does not state a cause of action.
- 2. The allegations of the Complaint are vague, indefinite, and uncertain.
 - 3. Said count does not allege a breach of contract.
- 4. Said count does not allege the contract with sufficient certainty so as to apprise the matters it is called upon to defend.
- 5. In count one, the Plaintiffs describe the automobile involved as having standard equipment and this is not sufficient to apprise the Defendant of any extra equipment on said vehicle such as power steering, air conditioning, V-8 engine and automatic transmission.
- 6. Count two does not allege a promise or facts implying a promise by the Defendant.
- 7. Count two does not allege a promise or facts implying a promise by the Defendant to the effect that it will pay \$1,000.00 for renting an automobile for transportation pending a settlement of the Plaintiffs' insurance claim.
- 8. Count two does not allege what the Planitiffs gave or did or promised to do in exchange for and in consideration of the Defendant issuing the insurance policy.
- 9. In count two the Plaintiffs have not alleged that they or one of them have complied with all of the provisions of the contract dated May 23, 1968 on their part nor tendered their performance, nor alleged that they were ready, willing and able to perform the conditions of said contract.

C. G. C.

- 10. Count two does not allege a breach of contract by the Defendant.
- 11. Count two does not allege a breach by the Defendant of any promise in the insurance contract.
- 12. Count two does not apprise the Defendant of the breach of contract on its part.
- 13. Count three does not sufficiently allege a promise or facts implying a promise by the Defendant.
- 14. Count three does not sufficiently allege the promise of the Defendant.
- 15. Count three does not allege what the Plaintiffs gave or did or promised to do in exchange for and in consideration of the Defendant's issuing the insurance policy.
- or one of them have complied with all of the provisions of the contract dated May 23, 1968 on their part nor tendered their performance, nor alleged that they were ready, willing and able to perform the conditions of said contract.
- 17. Count three does not set out the breach of contract by the Defendant with sufficient certainty.
- 18. Count three does not allege a breach by the Defendant of any promise in the insurance contract.
- 19. Count four does not allege the promise of the Defendant with sufficient certainty.
- 20. Count four does not allege what the Plaintiffs gave, did or promised to do in exchange for and in consideration of the Defendant's issuing the insurance policy.
- 21. In count four the Plaintiffs have not alleged the breach of contract by the Defendant with sufficient certainty.
- 22. In count four the Plaintiffs have not alleged any breach of a promise by the Defendant with sufficient certainty.

Attorney for Defendant

I hereby certify that I have personally served a copy of the above Demurrer on the Honorable C. LeNoir Thompson, attorney of record for the Plaintiffs, on this 11th day of

February, 1970.

FEB 1 1 1970

Charles H. Sims, III

. G. C.

VOL

JOHN W. SEALES and FORD X MOTOR CREDIT CORPORATION, IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF χ PLAINTIFFS. BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA χ VS., AT LAW χ SOUTHEASTERN FIDELITY CASE NUMBER: 8720 χ INSURANCE COMPANY, χ DEFENDANT.

AMENDED COMPLAINT:

Come the plaintiffs in the above styled cause and amend the complaint heretofore filed to read as follows:

-3-

The plaintifs claim of the defendant, Southeastern Fidelity Insurance Company, Two Thousand Six Hundred Ninety-five (\$2,695.00) Dollars, the value of an automobile, to-wit, one 1968 Ford Custom, two-door sedan with standard equipment, Serial No. 8A30C231559, which the defendant on the 23rd day of May, 1968, insured against the loss or injury by fire or other perils in the policy of insurance mentioned for the term of one year, which automobile was wholly destroyed by fire or collision and upset on the 15th day of November, 1968, of which the defendant had notice.

The plaintiff claim of the defendant the sum of One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000.00), the value of renting an automobile for transportation required by the plaintiff, Seales, pending the settlement of plaintiffs" insurance claim against the defendant as the result of a policy issued to the plaintiffs by the defendant on to-wit, May 23, 1968, for the term of one year, said automobile insured under the policy aforesaid having been wholly destroyed or damaged by fire or collision on the 15th day of Movember, 1968, of which the defendant has had notice.

-3 -

The plaintiffs claim of the defendant the sum of Two Hundred Eleven and 60/100 (\$211.60) Dollars damages for the breach of the agreement entered into by the said defendant on, to-wit, May 23, 1968, by which said defendant promised to reimburse said plaintiff in accordance with that certain insurance policy serial No. PB701954 and said defendant has failed or refused to reimburse said plaintiff in accordance with the terms of said policy.

-4-

The plaintiffs claim from the defendant the sum of Two Thousand One Hundred Twenty-Five (\$2,125.00) Dollars as damages for the breach of an agreement entered into by said defendant on, to-wit, May 23, 1968, in substance as follows: That said defendant would reimburse said said plaintiffs, its insured, for any damages to the personal property named in the insurance policy No. PB701954 during the life of said policy and plaintiffs say although he complied with its provisions defendant has failed to comply with the provisions, provideing for the payment of damages suffered by the plaintiffs. And said plaintiff; John W. Seales, has been without the use of said automobile sine November 15, 1968.

Attorney for Plaintiffs

I hereby certify that I have this day mailed a copy of the above and foregoing instrument to Honorable Cecil Chason, Attorney at Law, Foley, Alabama, by depositing a copy of the same in the United States Mail properly addressed and postage prepaid.

Done this 5 day of February, 1970.

FEB 5 1970

ALIGE J. BUSK REGISTER

JOHN W. SEALES

Plaintiff

VS.

BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA

SOUTHEASTERN FIDELITY INSURANCE

COMPANY

Defendant

Defendant

DEMURRER

Comes the Defendant in the above styled cause and demurs to the Bill of Complaint heretofore filed and to each count thereof separately and severally and each grounds for demur show separately and severally the following:

- 1. The complaint does not state a cause of action.
- 2. The complaint is vague, indefinite and uncertain.
 - 3. The complaint does not sufficiently apprise the Defendant of the cause of the damage alleged.
 - 4. The complaint does not allege the place where said alleged damage occurred.
 - 5. The complaint has no allegations to show that venue is in Baldwin County, Alabama.
 - 6. The complaint does not show demand on the part of the plaintiff against the defendant.
 - 7. Terms of the policy of insurance were not sufficiently alleged.

ttorney for Defendant

JUN 25 1969

ALGE J. DUCK CLERK REGISTER