Total Clerk's Fees,

18 Damages, Total Judgment,

Interest and Damages, Grand Total,

W.C.BEEBE H.M.HALL J.P.BEEBE

BEEBE, HALL & BEEBE LAWYERS BAY MINETTE, ALABAMA

NOVEMBER 2, 1939.

Hon. F. W. Hare, Monroeville, Alabama.

Dear Judge:- IN RE: ELLA GILES VS. R. LEON JOHES MOTOR CO.

We have reached an agreement whereby the above matter will be settled upon the payment by the Defendant to Mrs. Giles of \$150.00.

We have also agreed that I would withdraw the demand for a jury and that you would enter a consent judgment for the \$150.00. Mr. Blackburn, as attorney for the Defendant, is also writing you a letter.

We are requesting Miss Thompson to forward the docket sheet, together with our letters, to you, so that the proper entry may be made.

Yours very truly,

HMH/J

J.B.BLACKBURN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
BAY MINETTE, ALABAMA

NOVEMBER 2, 1939.

Judge F. W. Hare, Monroeville, Alabama.

Re: Ella Giles v. R. Leon Jones Motor Company:

Dear Judge Hare:

Hubert and I have agreed on a disposition of the above case which is as follows:

The Plaintiff will withdraw her demand for a jury, to which the Defendant will consent and then the Defendant will consent to a judgment by the Court in favor of the Plaintiff for \$150.00. The Defendant will, of course, pay the costs in addition to the judgment for \$150.00.

Very truly yours,

B. BLACKBURN.

JBB:0S

ELLA GILES.

Plaintiff,

VS.

R. LEON JONES MOTOR COMPANY, INC., a Corporation,

Defendant.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA.

AT LAW.

DEMURRER.

Comes the Defendant in the above entitled cause and demurs to each count of the Complaint filed herein, separately and severally, and for grounds of demurrer sets down and assigns separately and severally, the following:

- l. That it does not state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against Defendant.
- 2. For that negligence is therein alleged merely as a conclusion of the pleader.
- 3. For that it is vague, indefinite and uncertain, in that it does not apprise this Defendant with sufficient certainty against what act or acts of negligence defendant is called on to defend.
- 4. For that it does not appear with sufficient certainty what duty, if any, defendant may have owed to the Plaintiff.
- 5. For that it does not appear with sufficient certainty wherein defendant violated any duty it may have owed to the Plaintiff.
- 6. For that it does not sufficiently appear that the Defendant owed any duty to the Plaintiff which Defendant negligently failed to perform.
- 7. For that the averments set up, if true, do not show any liability on the part of the Defendanthherein.
- 8. For that the pleader sets out in what said negligence consisted, and the facts so set out do not show negligence.

- 9. For that there does not appear sufficient causal connection between Defendant's said breach of duty and Plaintiff's injuries and damages.
- 10. It affirmatively appears that the alleged negligence on the part of the Defendant was not the proximate cause of the injury.
- 11. It affirmatively appears that there was an intervening, direct and efficient cause with which the Defendant was not connected that produced the injury.
- 12. It affirmatively appears that the Plaintiff was charged with notice of the situation and condition of Defendant's wrecker in time to have avoided the collision by the exercise of reasonable care or precaution.
- 13. For aught that appears the Plaintiff ascertained the dangerous condition of Defendant's wrecker in ample time to have avoided the accident but failed to exercise reasonable care or precaution to avoid same.
- 14. For aught that appears the Plaintiff continued to be guilty of negligence after discovering her peril or danger and such subsequent negligence was the proximate cause of her injury and death.
- 15. Because, for aught that appears the Plaintiff, by the exercise of reasonable care, could have avoided her injury.
- 16. No facts are alleged to show that the alleged negligence of the Defendant proximately contributed to the alleged injury.
- 17. Because the averment "that said injuries to Plaintiff were proximately caused by the negligence of the defendant" is but the conclusion of the pleader and no facts are averred to sustain such conclusion.
- 18. No sufficient facts are alleged to show that Defendant or his agents, servants or employees were guilty of any negligence which proximately contributed to the alleged injury.

Attorneys for Defendant.

408-3		OR COMPANY,	1 COURT OF Y, ALABAMA.	ust 37937 web growth on	U. B. BLACKBURN ATTORNEY AT LAW BAY MINETTE, ALABAMA	
* RECOLDED	ELLA GILES,	VS. R. LEON JONES MOTOR COMPANY	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA.			
		A control of the cont				

STATE OF ALABAMA,
BALDWIN COUNTY.

TO AMY SHERIFF OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA:

You are hereby commanded to summon R. LEON JONES MOTOR COMPANY, INC., a Corporation, 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 ELLA GILES.

WITNESS my hand this ____ day of July, 1938.

Desluch
Clerk.

ELLA GILES,

Plaintiff,

VS.

R. LEON JONES MOTOR COMPANY, INC., a Corporation,

Defendant.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA,

AT LAW.

ONE: The Plaintiff claims of the Defendant FIVE THOUSAND (\$5,000.00) DOLLARS, as damages, for that heretofore, on to-wit, June 13th, 1938, Plaintiff was a guest in an automobile riding along a public highway, commonly known as the Montgomery-Mobile Highway, at a point approximately twelve miles North of Bay Minette, in Baldwin County, Alabama; Plaintiff avers that Defendant, acting by and through its agents or servants, who were then and there acting within the line and scope of their employment, so negligently operated an automobile truck or wrecker and equipment, on said highway, as to block or obstruct said highway at said point; Plaintiff further avers that in an effort on the part Then sees there of the driver of said automobile, to avoid running upon, against or into said automobile truck or wrecker and equipment and thus greatly endangering the lives of the Plaintiff and the other occupants of the said automobile, the said automobile was wrecked or turned over and Plaintiff was thrown to the ground with great force, doing her great and serious bodily harm; that her right arm was broken, shoulder bruised, both knees bruised and lacerated, right thigh was bruised and lacerated, and she was otherwise bruised about the body and head; that as a proximate consequence of said injuries, Plaintiff suffered much physical pain and mental anguish, and will continue to suffer much physical pain and mental anguish for a long time to come, was caused to lose much time from her business or profession and will continue to lose much time from her business or profession in the future, was permanently injured and rendered permanently disabled to earn a livelihood, incurred heavy expenses for medicines, medical, surgery and hospital services, all to the damage of the Plaintiff in the sum herein sued for;

Plaintiff avers that said injuries to Plaintiff were proximately caused by the negligence of the Defendant, acting by and through its agents or servants, who were then and there acting within the line and scope of their employment, in so operating an automobile truck or wrecker and equipment as to block or obstruct the passage along said highway at said point.

TWO: The Plaintiff claims of the Defendant FIVE THOUSAND (\$5,000.00) DOLLARS, as damages, for that heretofore, on to-wit, June 13th, 1938, Plaintiff was a guest in an automobile riding along a public highway, commonly known as the Montgomery-Mobile Highway, at a point approximately twelve miles North of Bay Minette, in Baldwin County, Alabama; Plaintiff avers that Defendant, acting by and through its agents or servants, who were then and there acting within the line and scope of their employment, so negligently operated an automobile truck or wrecker and equipment, on said highway, as to block or obstruct said highway at said point; Plaintiff further evers that in an effort on the part of the driver of said automobile to avoid running upon, against or into said automobile truck or wrecker and equipment and thus greatly endangering the lives of the Plaintiff and the other occupants of the said automobile, the said automobile was wrecked or turned over and Plaintiff was thrown to the ground with great force, doing her great and serious bodily harm; that her right arm was broken, shoulder bruised, both knees bruised and lacerated, right thigh was bruised and lacerated, and she was otherwise bruised about the body and head; that as a proximate consequence of said injuries, Plaintiff suffered much physical pain and mental anguish, and will continue to suffer much physical pain and mental anguish for a long time to come, was caused to lose much time from her business or profession, and will continue to lose much time from her business or profession in the future, was permanently injured and rendered permanently disabled to earn a livelihood, incurred heavy expenses for medicines, medical, surgery and hospital services, all to the damage of the Plaintiff in the sum herein sued for;

Plaintiff avers that Plaintiff's injuries and damages were proximately caused by the negligence of the Defendant, acting by and through its agents or servants, who were then and there acting within the line and scope of their employment, in that it so negligently operated an automobile truck or wrecker and equipment as to block or obstruct said highway at said point and negligently failed to have and maintain proper signals or other warnings that said highway was so blocked or obstructed at said point, and as a proximate consequence of said negligence, the said automobile in which the Plaintiff was riding as a guest as aforesaid was wrecked or turned over, and Plaintiff/injured, as hereinabove set out, hence this suit.

THREE: Plaintiff claims of the Defendant FIVE THOUSAND (\$5,000.00) DOLLARS, as damages, for that heretofore, on to-wit, June 13th, 1938, Plaintiff was a guest in an automobile riding along a public highway, commonly known as the Montgomery-Mobile Highway, at a point approximately twelve miles North of Bay Minette, in Baldwin County, Alabama; Plaintiff avers that Defendant, acting by and through its agents or servants, who were then and there acting within the line and scope of their employment, so negligently and unlawfully parked or left an automobile truck or wrecker on said highway at said point, in such manner that less than fifteen feet of the main traveled portion of the highway opposite the said parked or standing automobile truck or wrecker and equipment was left for the free passage of other vehicles; that in an effort on the part of the driver of said automobile to avoid running upon, against or into said automobile truck or wrecker and equipment and thus greatly endangering the lives of the Plaintiff and the other occupants of the said automobile, the said automobile was wrecked or turned over and Plaintiff was thrown to the ground with great force, doing her great and serious bodily harm; that her right arm was broken, shoulder bruised, both knees bruised and lacerated, right thigh was bruised and lacerated, and she was otherwise bruised about the body and head, and as a proximate result of said injuries she suffered much physical pain and mental anguish, and will continue to suffer much physical pain and mental anguish for a long time to come, was caused to lose much time from her business or profession, and will continue to lose much time from her business or profession in the future, was permanently injured and rendered permanently disabled to earn a livelihood, incurred heavy expenses for medicines, medical, surgery and hospital services, all/the damage of the Plaintiff in the sum herein sued for;

Plaintiff avers that said injuries to Plaintiff were proximately caused

by the negligence of the Defendant, acting by and through its agents or servants, who were then and there acting within the line and scope of their employment, so negligently and unlawfully parked or left standing the said automobile truck or wrecker and equipment, in such manner that less than fifteen feet of the main traveled portion of the highway opposite the said parked or standing automobile truck or wrecker and equipment was left for the free passage of other vehicles, and as a proximate consequence of said negligence, the said automobile in which the Plaintiff was riding as a guest, as aforesaid, was wrecked or turned over and Plaintiff was injured, as hereinabove set out, hence this suit.

FOUR: Plaintiff claims of the Defendant FIVE THOUSAND (\$5,000.00) DOLLARS, as damages for that heretofore, on to-wit, June 13th, 1938, Plaintiff was a guest in an automobile riding along a public highway, commonly known as the Montgomery-Mobile Highway, at a point approximately twelve miles North of Bay Minette, in Baldwin County, Alabama; Plaintiff avers that Defendant, acting by and through its agents or servants, who were then and there acting within the line and scope of their employment, negligently and unlawfully parked or left standing an automobile truck or wrecker and equipment, on said highway, at said point, so as to block or obstruct passage along said highway; Plaintiff further avers that in an effort on the part of the driver of said automobile, to avoid running upon, against or into said automobile truck or wrecker and equipment and thus greatly endangering the lives of the Plaintiff and the other occupants of the said automobile, the said automobile was wrecked or turned over and Plaintiff was thrown to the ground with great force, doing her great and serious bodily harm; that her right arm was broken, shoulder bruised, both knees bruised and lacerated, right thigh was bruised and lacerated, and she was otherwise bruised about the body and head, and that as a proximate consequence of said injuries, she suffered much physical pair and mental anguish, and will continue to suffer much physical pain and mental anguish for a long time to come, was caused to lose much time from her business or profession, and will continue to lose much time from her business or profession in the future, was permanently injured and rendered permanently disabled to earn a livelihood, incurred heavy expenses for medicines, medical, surgery and hospital services, all to the damage of the Plaintiff in the sum herein sued for;

Plaintiff avers that Plaintiff's injuries and damages were proximately

caused by the negligence of the Defendant, acting by and through its agents or servants, who were then and there acting within the line and scope of their employment, in parking or leaving standing the said automobile truck or wrecker and equipment, so as to block or obstruct passage along said highway at said place and negligently failed to have and maintain proper signals or other warnings that said highway was so blocked or obstructed at said point, and as a proximate consequence of said negligence, the said automobile in which the Plaintiff was riding as a guest, as aforesaid, was wrecked or turned over, and Plaintiff was injured, as hereinabove set out, hence this suit.

Bulled a Reche
Attorneys for Plaintiff.

Plaintiff demands a trial by Jury.

Bealesdall Beele
Attorneys for Plaintiff.

BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA, IM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF INC., a Corporation, VS. AT LAW. Defendant. Plaintiff, R. S. Dack

ELIA GILES,

Plaintiff,

VS.

R. LEON JONES MOTOR COMPANY, INC., a Corporation,

Defendant.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA,

AT LAW. ...

🐴 egyper e na pagagijang ng gjarajar e e e e e ng partijang ke e egyper trej at e

And now comes the Plaintiff in the above styled cause and for demurrer to Pleas 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and to each, separately and severally, says:

- 1. That said plea sets out no facts which constitute a defense to the Plaintiff's cause of action.
- 2. That said plea attempts to charge the decedent with the negligence of the driver of the automobile without setting out any grounds therefor.
- 3. That said plea attempts to impute the negligence of the driver of the automobile to the decednet without showing a sufficient relationship between the decedent and the driver of the car.
- 4. That said plea fails to aver or show that the decedent negligently did or omitted to do anything.
- 5. That the said plea fails to aver that the decedent had any control over the automobile in which she was riding.
- 6. That said plea fails to allege or aver that the decedent had any control over the driver of the automobile in which she was riding.
- 7. That said plea fails to show that the decedent had charge or control of the operation of the automobile in which she was riding.
- 8. That said plea alleges negligence as a mere conclusion without setting up facts to support the averment.
- 9. That the facts set out in said plea are the conclusion of the pleader and do not of themselves constitute a defense to the Plaintiff's cause of action.
- 10. That the said plea fails to allege or aver that the decedent knew and appreciated the danger set out in said plea and voluntarily put herself in the way of it.
- 11. That said plea fails to allege that the decedent appreciated or was conscious of the danger that might result from the acts or conditions set out in said plea.
- 12. That said plea fails to aver that the decedent appreciated the danger under the surronding conditions and circumstances and did not exercise reasonable

care in the premises and with such knowledge and appreciation put herself into the way of danger.

Berberteer Bube Attep for Plaintiff CONTROLL F-1/15-

ELLA GILES,

Plaintiff,

VS.

R. LEON JONES MOTOR CO., INC., a Corporation,

Defendant.

BALDETH COURTY, ALABEMA, IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

AT LAW.

ELLA GILES,

Plaintiff.

VS.

R. LEON JONES MOTOR COMPANY, INC., a Corporation,

Defendant.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA.
AT LAW.

PLEAS.

Now comes the Defendant in the above cause, and for pleas to counts 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the Complaint, each separately and severally says as follows:

- 1. Not guilty.
- 2. The Defendant says that the said Plaintiff was guilty of negligence which proximately contributed to her alleged injury in that she knew, or by the exercise of ordinary care could have known, that the Ford Coupe in which she was riding was overloaded and that it was being operated over a public highway with brakes that were inadequate to control the movement of and to stop and hold such vehicle and without two separate means of applying the said brakes to at least two wheels and was not so constructed that no part which was liable to failure should be common to two, and notwithstanding the knowledge thereof on the part of the said Plaintiff, she negligently failed to do anything toward having the said defective brakes repaired.
- 3. The Defendant says that the said Plaintiff was guilty of negligence which proximately contributed to her alleged injuries in that she knew that the Ford Coupe in which she was riding was loaded with five or more people; that it was being driven with defective brakes and at a speed which greatly exceeded fifteen miles per hour, and that notwithstanding the knowledge thereof on the part of the said Plaintiff, she negligently failed to do anything toward having the driver of the automobile in which she was riding slow down or do anything to avoid the alleged injuries although she had ample time to do so after she knew or by the exercise of reasonable care and diligence, could have known, that an accident

was imminent.

- 4. The Defendant says that the said Plaintiff was guilty of negligence which proximately contributed to her alleged injuries in that she knew and saw that the Ford Coupe in which she was riding contained five or more people; that its brakes were defective and that its driver was driving at an excessive rate of speed and negligently failed to do anything toward repairing the said brakes or making the driver of the car in which she was riding repair the said brakes or slow down to a reasonable rate of speed.
- 5. The said Plaintiff was guilty of negligence which proximately contributed to her alleged injuries in that she knew and saw that the driver of the car in which she was riding was driving at a speed which exceeded fifteen miles per hour when approaching within fifty feet of and in traversing the intersection of the paved Perdido Highway with U. S. Highway Number 31 when the said driver's view was obstructed and negligently failed to do anything toward stopping the car or making the driver of the car in which she was riding stop or slow down to a speed of fifteen miles per hour.
- The Defendant says that the said Plaintiff volun-6. tarily assumed the risks of the injuries which she received in this, to-wit: That the Plaintiff and four or more other persons, on the afternoon on which the said Plaintiff was injured, went together in a Ford Coupe automobile driven by a member of the family, to attend the funeral of the Plaintiff's mother and were returning therefrom; that the said automobile had only one main seat and one rumble seat, and that the driver and at least two other persons were seated upon the said main seat, and that the said Plaintiff voluntarily rode in the said car with knowledge that it was overloaded; that it had defective brakes; and continued to ride in it while it was being driven at a reckless, dangerous and excessive speed which resulted in the alleged injuries to the Plaintiff. Defendant avers that the said Plaintiff, with knowledge that the said car was loaded above its capacity, that it was being operated

with defective brakes and at an excessive rate of speed and with knowledge that the highway over which the car was being driven was frequently used by automobiles, other vehicles and pedestrians, willingly and voluntarily rode in such car under such conditions and with the knowledge, thereby assumed such risks.

- 7. The Defendant says that the said Plaintiff voluntarily assumed the risks of the injuries which she received in this: That she knew and saw or by the exercise of ordinary care could have known and seen that the driver of the car in which she was riding was driving at a speed which exceeded fifteen miles an hour when approaching within fifty feet of and in traversing the intersection of the paved Perdido Highway with U. S. Highway 31, when the said driver's view was obstructed and she failed to exercise such care by not doing anything toward stopping the car or making the driver of the car in which she was riding slow down to a ppeed of fifteen miles an hour, and willingly and voluntarily rode in such car under such conditions and with the knowledge thereby assumed such risks.
- 8. The Defendant says that the said Plaintiff voluntarily assumed the risks of the injuries which she received in this: That she knew and saw, or by the exercise of ordinary care could have known and seen, that the car in which she was riding was being operated over a public highway with brakes that were inadequate to control the movement of and to stop and hold the said vehicle and without separate means of applying said brakes to at least two wheels and was not so constructed that no part which was liable to failure should be common to two, and failed to exercise such care by not doing anything toward repairing the said brakes, and willingly and voluntarily rode in such car under such conditions and with the knowledge thereby assumed such risks.

Richard D. Merritt. J. 73. Blackburn Attorneys for Defendant.

CARL FOR CONTRACTOR SALES CONTRACTOR SALES CONTRACTOR over a vymeratija in ikonernijim alempi de waali in in ganala ee ka ka ee ee . 🖎 - kan sangali samujuna malama kanangan 😽 sa sangan sangan kan a describer de region de la colòmbia de la certo de la calendar de la calendar de la calendar de la calendar d acceptage and lawners of equation so upoll may make the large somewhat large e Propagation (exercis o l'accitate) de l'élèvatif agrèce propagation de l'exercise propagation du que and the state of t BIRTH COMO (BIRTH COMO CHILA COM (A) AND TO COMOTON OUR CAMPION OF A METAL COMOTON APPROTE FROM THE STORE ASSESSED OF STOREST AND STOREST AND ASSESSED APPROPRIATE OF STOREST \hat{x}^{\bullet} . Let x = 0 be a sum of the first of the first section \hat{x} and \hat{x} anna isai, Northiopher 🕟 y ar o isgrafaidh was a transfer of a survival of the survival o The state of the s ा राज्य क्षेत्रक र जन्म । १५३० वर्ष

<u>~</u>_

Acjuste coji

e moderning van vande er op de stemule o Kanada er op de stemule op

en Lingverprofiliere. Van et 1965 in 1860 in 1 Profilerit and the contract of the contract of

unione de la companya de la company En la companya de la

el de veloció de Recesto meio el como como la mesta el como como como el como el como como el como de como de Aspesar el como de como como como el como el como el como el como que el como el como el como el como el como e A de la como como de sente como el como A de la como de la como el como el como el como el como de la como el co

e de la compositorio della compositorio de la compositorio de la compositorio della compo

Garanta Interior de com escrib

undicko coar Somers gi medić nga keloco

ELLA GILES,

Plaintiff.

VS.

R. LEON JONES MOTOR COMPANY, INC., a Corporation,

Defendant:

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA.

AT LAW.

INTERROGATORIES TO BE PROPOUNDED TO ELLA GILES UNDER SECTION 7764 OF THE 1923 CODE OF ALABAMA.

- 1. Explain in detail how you were injured in the automobile accident for which you have brought a damage suit against R. Leon Jones Motor Company, a Corporation.
- 2. What doctor or doctors attended or treated you after this accident?
- 3. Give the date or dates of all visits made by you to any doctor or doctors or any visits made to you by any doctor or doctors in connection with the injuries which you claim to have received, the name of the doctors, the amounts that they charged you for services rendered and state what services the doctor or doctors rendered to you.
- 4. Were you confined to bed by the injuries which you claim to have received? If so, when and where were you confined to bed and on what dates were you so confined?
- 5. At the time of the alleged accident in whose automobile were you riding and what was the occasion for your riding in this automobile at that time?
- 6. What kind of car were you riding in at the time of the alleged accident; where were you riding in it; how many other people were in the car at that time; and how many people were riding on the same seat with you?
- 7. Where did you leave from and where were you going at the time the alleged accident occurred?
- 8. What was the condition of the brakes on the car in which you were riding at the time of the said accident?
- 9. At what rate of speed was the car in which you were riding traveling at the time of the alleged accident?

- 10. Describe the position and location of the automobile in which you were riding on the highway, at the time you first saw the wrecker of the R. Leon Jones Motor Company.
- Il. Describe the position of the wrecker of the R. Leon Jones Motor Company at the time the car in which you were riding turned over, explain fully what highway it was located on and its position on the highway, and also explain fully where the car in which you were riding turned over and the distance between the place where your car turned over and where the Jones Wrecker was located at the time the car in which you were riding turned over.
- 12. What was the age of the car in which you were riding at the time of the alleged accident?

Richard 14- Marriet

J. T3-T3ladlum

STATE OF ALABAMA BALDWIN COUNTY

Before me, the undersigned authority, within and for said County in said State, personally appeared J. B. Blackburn, who, after being by me first duly and legally sworn, deposes and says: That he is one of the attorneys for the Defendant in the above entitled cause and that the answers to the foregoing interrogatories, if well and truly made, will be material testimony for the Defendant in the said cause.

Sworn to and subscribed before we on this the 1st day of July, 1939.

Notery Public, Baldwin County, Alabama.

Service ampted this gree 12, 1939
Bules Geles Berke
atty for Plaintiff

INTERROGATORIES TO BE PROPOUNDED TO ELLA GILES, UNDER SECTION 7764 OF THE 1923 CODE OF ALABAMA.

BLLA GILES,

Plaintiff,

VS.

R. CLEON JONES MOTOR COMPANY, INC., a Corporation,

Defendant.

BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA. IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF AT LAW.

MOUNT

clerk, " register