THE STATE OF ALABAMA BALDWIN COUNTY

	Circuit	Court,	Baldwin	County	
No	************	•			
				TERM,	19

TO ANY SHERIFF OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA:

You Are Hereby Commanded to Summon RESTER & COLEMAN ENGINEERS, INC. and
HENRY DUKES, d/b/a DUKES CONSTRUCTION COMPANY
to appear and plead, answer or demur, within thirty days from the service hereof, to the complaint
filed in the Circuit Court of Baldwin County, State of Alabama, at Bay Minette againstRESTER.&
COLEMAN ENGINEERS, INC. & HENRY DUKES, d/b/a Defendant
by GEORGE E. IOHNSON
Plaintiff
Witness my hand this 26 day of Suffer 197
anie D. Blackmon Clerk

2/9-1-71

VOL 71 P/GE 807

8868-9 Z	Henry Dukes 1418 Forrest Avenue Saraland สินตร Alabama
THE STATE OF ALABAMA BALDWIN COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT	Defendant lives at Rester & Coleman Engineers, Inc. 66 Midtown Parkway West Mobile, Alabama Received In Office AUG 271971
GEORGE E. JOHNSON Plaintiffs Rester,	I have executed this summons this by leaving a copy with
SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT Filed 1971 Clerk	do not a limit of the state of
UNICE B. BLACKMON CLERK AUG 27 1971	This or the property of the pr
Taylor Wilkins Ar. [[] [] [] [] [] Plaintiff's Attorney 'V''	Deputy Sheriff Moore Printing Co Bay Minette, Ala.

GEORGE E. JOHNSON (IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

PLAINTIFF (BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA

VS (AT LAW

RESTER & COLEMAN ENGINEERS, (INCORPORATED, and HENRY DUKES, d/b/a DUKES CONSTRUCTION CO., (CASE NO: /0,008)

DEFENDANTS (CASE NO: /0,008)

I.

The Plaintiff claims of the Defendants, ONE THOUSAND (\$1,000.00)

DOLLARS damages for a trespass by the Defendant, Rester & Coleman Engineers, Incorporated, a corporation, by and through the Defendant, Henry Dukes, who was at the time of said trespass doing business under the name and style of Dukes Construction Company, on the following tract of land, viz: That real property located on the West side of the intersection of Alabama Highway #225 and U. S. Highway #31, lying in Baldwin County, Alabama, and being in the possession of the Plaintiff, and for proximately injuring said real property as follows, to-wit: Damaging and destroying shrubbery belonging to the Plaintiff and leaving a sunken depression upon said real property in the course of constructing a water or sewer line access the property in possession of the Plaintiff on, to-wit, September 25, 1970.

II.

The Plaintiff claims of the Defendants, ONE THOUSAND (\$1,000.00) DOLLARS as damages for a trespass by the Defendant, Henry Dukes, who was at the time of said trespass doing busi ness under the name and style of Dukes Construction Company, and who was at the time of the trespass acting by and through his employees, agents or servants who were acting within the line and scope of their employment on the following tract of land, viz: That real property located on the West side of the intersection of Alabama Highway #225 and U.S. Highway #31, lying in Baldwin County, Alabama, and being in the possession of the Plaintiff, and for proximately injuring said real property as follows, to-wit: Damaging and destroying shrubbery belonging to the Plaintiff and leaving

a sunken depression upon said real property in the course of constructing a water or sewer line across the property in possession of the Plaintiff, on, to-wit, September 25, 1970.

Taylor Wilkins, Jr Attorney for Plaintiff

Plaintiff respectfully demands a trial

of this cause by jury.

FILED

AUG 26 1971

EUNICE B. BLACKMON CIRCUIT

GEORGE E. JOHNSON,

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

Plaintiff

BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA

VS.

AT LAW

RESTER & COLEMAN ENGINEERS, INCORPORATED, and HENRY DUKES, d/b/a DUKES CONSTRUCTION CO.

d/b/a DUKES CONSTRUCTION CO.,

Defendants

CASE NO. 10,008

DEMURRER

Comes now the Defendant, Rester & Coleman Engineers, Incorporated, one of the defendants in the above styled cause, and demurs to the plaintiff's complaint and each count thereof, separately and severally, and as grounds for said demurrer, assigns the following, separately and severally:

- 1. For the complaint is vague, indefinite and uncertain in that the statement "by and through" does not adequately describe the relationship between the defendants joined in this cause.
- 2. For the complaint fails to allege that this defendant was acting through its agents, servants or employees who were then and there acting within the line and scope of their authority as agents, servants or employees of this defendant at the time of the alleged trespass.
- 3. For the complaint does not allege that the defendant Henry Dukes was an agent, servant or employer of this defendant.
- 4. For the land upon which the trespass is alleged to have been committed is not described with sufficient certainty.
- 5. For the complaint fails to allege in what manner this defendant committed trespass upon property in the alleged possession of the plaintiff.
- 6. For that Count II totally fails to state a cause of action against this defendant.

7. For that Count II totally fails to identify this defendant as one which committed the alleged trespass claimed by the plaintiff.

> TONSMEIRE & MCFADDEN 2210 First National Bank Building Mobile, Alabama 36602

Ray G. Riley, Jr. Attorney for Defendant, Rester & Coleman Engineers, Incorporated

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing demurrer has been served on Taylor Wilkins, Jr, attorney for plaintiff, by mailing a copy of same to him at his office in Bay Minette, Alabama, on this the

Zell, 1971.

SEP 9 1971

EUNICE B. BLACKMON CLERK

2.50 2.50	197
en j	© ⊙

GEORGE E. JOHNSON,)	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
Plaintiff,)	TO A I DY LITHY COLINTENS. AT A TO ANALA
VS.)	BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA
RESTER & COLEMAN ENGINEERS,)	AT LAW
INCORPORATED, and HENRY DUKES, d/b/a DUKES CONSTRUCTION CO.,)	
Defendants)	CASE NO 10 008

DEMURRER

Comes now the Defendant, HENRY DUKES, d/b/a DUKES CONSTRUCTION CO., one of the Defendants in the above styled cause, and demurs to the Plaintiff's complaint and each count thereof, separately and severally, and as grounds for said demurrer, assigns the following, separately and severally:

- 1. For the complaint is vague, indefinite and uncertain in that the statement "by and through" does not adequately describe the relationship between the defendants joined in this cause.
- 2. For the land upon which the trespass is alleged to have been committed is not described with sufficient certainty.
- 3. For the complaint fails to allege in what manner this defendant committed trespass upon property in the alleged possession of the Plaintiff.

Ralph Kennamer, Attorney for Defendant, HENRY DUKES, d/b/a DUKES CONSTRUCTION CO.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing demurrer has been served on Taylor Wilkins, Jr., Attorney for Plaintiff, by mailing a copy of same to him at his office in Bay Minette, Alabama, on this the 16th day of September, 1971.

P/SE 810

,\JL

GEORGE E. JOHNSON	(IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
Plaintiff	(BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA
vs	(AT LAW
RESTER & COLEMAN ENGINEERS, INCORPORATED, and HENRY DUKES, d/b/a DUKES CONSTRUCTION CO.		
Defendants		CASE NO: 10.008

AMENDED COMPLAINT

Comes now the Plaintiff in the above cause and amends his bill of complaint heretofore filed by striking therefrom, Count II of said bill of complaint by this amendment, and amending Count I as follows:

I.

The Plaintiff claims of the Defendants, jointly and severally, the sum of ONE THOUSAND (\$1,000.00) DOLLARS, as damages for a trespass by the Defendants, their agents, servants or employees, who were acting within the line and scope of their employment, on the following tract of land, viz.:

Commencing at the center of Section 30, Township 4 South, Range 2 West, Baldwin County, Alabama, run South a distance of 142.6 feet to a point on the North right of way line of U.S. Highway #31' thence along the North right of way line of U.S.

Highway #31, run North 69° 16' East a distance of 608.95 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING of the property herein described; thence run North, 20° 44' West a distance of 150 feet; thence run North, 69° 16' East a distance of 200 feet; thence run South 20° 44' East a distance of 150 feet to a point on said North right of way line of U.S. Highway #31; thence run South, 69° 16' West a distance of 200 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING, Baldwin County, Alabama, including that portion of land now in possession of the Plaintiff lying between the North right of way line of U.S. Highway #31, and U.S. Highway #31 itself,

and being in the possession of the Plaintiff, and for approximately injuring said real property as follows, to-wit: damaging and destroying shrubery belonging to the Plaintiff and leaving a sunken depression upon said real property in the course of the construction of a water or sewer line across the property in possession of the Plaintiff, on, to-wit, September 25, 1970.

Taylor Wilkins Jr.
Attorney for Plaintiff

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, Taylor Wilkins, Jr., do hereby certify that I have on this 2nd day of February, 1973, forwarded a true and exact copy of the foregoing amended complaint to Mr. Ralph Kennamer, Attorney at Law, Mobile, Alabama, and Ray G. Riley, Jr., Attorney at Law, Mobile, Alabama, attorneys of record for the Defendants, by mailing the same in the United States Post Office, properly addressed, with first class postage paid thereon.

Attorney for Plaintaff

FILED

FEB 5 1973

EUNICE B. BLACKMON CIRCUIT

GEORGE E. JOHNSON,

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

Plaintiff,

BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA

VS.

RESTER & COLEMAN ENGINEERS,

AT LAW

INCORPORATED, and HENRY DUKES, d/b/a DUKES CONSTRUCTION CO.

Defendants.

CASE NO. 10,008

DEMURRER

Comes now the defendant Rester & Coleman Engineers, Incorporated, one of the defendants in the above styled cause and demurs to the plaintiff's complaint as last amended and as grounds for said demurrer, assigns the following, separately and severally:

- 1. For the complaint is vague, indefinite and uncertain in that this defendant does not understand how one can "approximately" injure real property.
 - 2. For said complaint fails to state a cause of action against this defendant.
- 3. For it is not averred what duty, if any, this defendant owed to the plaintiff.
- 4. For the land upon which the trespass is alleged to have been committed is not described with sufficient certainty.

TONSMEIRE & MOFADDEI

Ray G. Riley Jr., Attorney for Rester & Coleman Engineers

Ala

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing demurrer has been se Taylor Wilkins, Jr., attorney for plaintiff, by mailing a copy of same his office in Bay Minette, Alabama, on this thex day

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing demurrer has been served Ralph Kennamer, attorney for Henry Dukes d/b/a Dukes Construction a copy of same to him at his office in Mobile, Alabama, on this

FILED

WW 7 1973

<u>uazemakan </u>

T 71 70E 813

GEORGE E. JOHNSON,

: IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

Plaintiff,

: BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA

vs.

RESTER & COLEMAN ENGINEERS

AT LAW

INCORPORATED, and HENRY DUKES, d/b/a DUKES CONSTRUCTION CO.

Defendants.

CASE NO. 10,008

DEMURRER

Comes now the defendant Henry Dukes, d/b/a Dukes Construction Co., one of the defendants in the above styled cause and demurs to the plaintiff's complaint as last amended and as grounds for said demurrer, assigns the following, separately and severally:

- 1. For the complaint is vague, indefinite and uncertain in that this defendant does not understand how one can "approximately" injure real property.
- 2. For said complaint fails to state a cause of action against this defendant.
- 3. For it is not averred what duty, if any, this defendant owed to the plaintiff.
- 4. For the land upon which the trespass is alleged to have been committed is not described with sufficient certainty.

Attorney for Henry Dukes, d/b/a

Dukes Construction Co.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing pleading has been served upon counsel for all parties to this proceeding, by mailing the same to each by First Class United States Mail, proporly addressed and pes age pre-

FILED

MAR 1 4 1973

EUNICE B. BLACKMON CIRCUIT

GEORGE E. JOHNSON, : IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

> BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA Plaintiff

vs.

RESTER & COLEMAN ENGINEERS; INCORPORATED, and HENRY DUKES, d/b/a DUKES CONSTRUCTION CO., AT LAW

CASE NO. 10,008 Defendants

ANSWER

Comes now the defendant, HENRY DUKES, d/b/a DUKES CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, one of the defendant's herein, and for answer to the bill of complaint, says:

1. Not Guilty.

2. The allegations are untrue.

Attorney for Defendant Dukes

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing pleading has been surved upon counsel for atting he middle recording by mailing the government by it. Ones United States Mail. propriy admosted and pastage preFILED

1973

MIGE B. BLACKMON CIRCUIT