024)

STATE OF ALMHAMA

BALDWIN CARTT.

damage of the Plaintiffs.

TO ART DEEDLET OF THE STATE OF ALLEADERS

ually and as partners composing the partnership of TAIST HALLY COMPANY, to appear within thirty days from the persise of this writ in the Circuit Court, to be head by said County, at the place of bolding the same, then and there to answer the complaint of JAMES A. COUNTY and H. M. COUTTY.

Tours my head this La day of Jamery, 1342.

Roser.

JAMES A. COUTEIN and H. M. CODEIN, Plaintiffs, VB.

R. S. MATRON and B. J. WATEON, individually, and as pertners composing the partnership of WATEON WARRINGARE COMPANY, Defendants.

IS THE CÉRCUIT COURT OF DALIFIE COUNTY,

ALARAMA, AT LATT.

The Plaintiffs claim of the Defendants Seven Aundred Fifty (\$750.00) Dollars damages, for that heretofere on to-wi, December 15, 1941, the Plaintiffs were driving their automobile truct along the Rabon - Ferdido nights, a public read in Maldwin County, Alabama, at a point approximately two miles forth of Rabon; that on said date and at said place the Defendants, acting by and through their agent, servent or employee, who was then and their acting within the line and scope of his employment, negligently ran or drove an automobile truct which the were then and their operating along said highway, into or against the automobile truck of the Plaintiffs was damaged as follows: fenders bent and broken; the hood bent; the panel bent and broken; the door bent and broken; the windsheild broken; the body bent; and said automobile truck was otherwise damaged, all to the

The Flaintiffs allege that the damage to the automobile truct was the proximate result of the negligence of the Defendants, who were then and there acting through their agent, servant, or employee, who was acting within the line and scope

2.

Dollars damages for that heretofore on to-wit; December 15, 1841, the egont, servant or employee, of the Defendants, who was then and there acting within the line and scope of his employment so negligently operated an automobile truck which he was driving on or along the Rabon - Perdado highway, a public highway in Beldwin County.

Alabama, approximately two miles borth of Rabon; that he cause said automobile truck to run into employment highway, and a a proximate result of the negligence of the said there upon said highway, and a a proximate result of the negligence of the segent, servent, or subject of the Defendants, who was there said automobile truck which he was then and there driving, the automobile truck of the Plaintiffs was seriously damaged as follows: the fenders cent and roken; the head tent; the panel tont and orders, the door bent and broken; the windshield broken, the body bent; and said automobile truck was otherwise damaged, all to the damage of the Plaintiffs.

The Plaintiffs allege that said damage to the automobile track of the Plaintiffs was the proximate result of the negligence of the agent, servant or employee of the Defendants, who was then and there acting within the line and scope of his employment, in and about the operation or driving of the automobile truck which he was then and there driving or operating.

BEESE & RALL

Attacker For Marian

composing the partnership of HÂRDWARE ÇOHPANY, Defendants

Clark-Register

BEEBE & HALL, Bay Minette, Alabama

Defe leve in alierran

Was the waste of the

(3) (4)

All the second s

and the other

50013

* OF TOTAL

The second of the second

JAMES A. GODWIN AND M. H. GODWIN,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

R. B. WATSON AND B. J. WATSON, Individually, and as partners composing the partnership of WATSON HARDWARE COMPANY,

Defendants.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA.

AT LAW.

DEMURRER

Come the Defendants in the above entitled cause and demur to each count of the complaint filed herein, separately and severally, and for grounds of demurrer set down and assign, separately and severally, the following:

- l. That the Complaint does not state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against the Defendants.
- 2. For that negligence alleged in the Complaint is therein alleged merely as a conclusion of the pleader.
- 3. For that the Complaint filed in this cause is vague, indefinite and uncertain in that it does not apprise the Defendants with sufficient certainty against what act or acts of negligence Defendants are called upon to defend.
- 4. For that it does not appear with sufficient certainty what duty, if any, Defendants may have owed to the Plaintiffs.
- 5. For that it does not appear with sufficient certainty wherein Defendants violated any duty which they may have owed to the Plaintiffs.
- 6. For that it does not sufficiently appear that the Defendants owed any duty to the Plaintiffs which Defendants negligently failed to perform.
- 7. For that the averments set up, if true, do not show any liability on the part of the Defendants herein.
 - 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 casual connection between Defendants' said breach of duty and Plaintiffs' injuries or damages.
- 10. It affirmatively appears that the alleged negligence on the part of the Defendants was not the proximate cause of the injury.
- ll. No facts are alleged to show that the alleged negligence of the Defendants proximately contributed to the alleged injury.
- 12. It is duplications in that one count contains two distinct causes of action.

a. 4 Elliott

Attorneys for Defendants.

Defendants demand a trial of said cause by jury.

a 14 Ellist

ttorneys for Defendants.

DEMURRER

JAMES A. GODWIN AND M. H. GODWIN,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

R. B. WATSON AND B. J. WATSON, Individually, and as partners composing the partnership of WATSON HARDWARE COMPANY,

Defendants.

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

Film Deb 7/442. De Duck-

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

