Motion for Directed Lendict The Degendant mones the coef to While I a verdict in favor of the Defendant in this cause on the following grands:

1. Dhe flainligh has failed to
offer any evidence of any nephylane
on the part of the Defendant. 2. There is no eindeuse of an nepliget conduct on the at the time and place Complained Olcoson Stone 3 Charan li: John Earle Olceson Bay Renelle, Alchan. Filed; Aulgg, 1973. Dered delfore y mostod

STATE OF ALABAMA

BALDWIN COUNTY

TO ANY SHERIFF OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA:

You are hereby commanded to summons SUMAR CONTRACTORS, 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 ALBERT L. MONTGOMERY and KENNETH MEIKLEJOHN d/b/a M & M Enterprises.

Witness my hand, this the 2/ day of April, 1972.

Chinie B. Blakmon

ALBERT L. MONTGOMERY and KENNETH MEIKLEJOHN d/b/a M & M ENTERPRISES, X IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF Plaintiffs, X BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA vs. I AT LAW SUMAR CONTRACTORS, INC., X CASE NO. 10 351 a Corporation, Defendant. X 1.

The Plaintiffs claim of the Defendant the sum of SEVEN
THOUSAND (\$7,000.00) DOLLARS, due from it by account on the 31st
day of October, 1971, which sum of money, with the interest thereon
is still unpaid.

2.

The Plaintiffs claim of the Defendant the sum of SEVEN EHOUSAND (\$7,000.00) DOLLARS, due from it for work and labor done, and material furnished for the Defendant by the Plaintiffs, at its equest, between the 1st day of October, 1971 and the 31st day of October, 1971, which sum of money, with the interest thereon is extill unpaid.

WILTERS & BRANTLEY

1 arry

Defendant may be served:

Raymond T. Gamble

Superintendent for Sumar Contractors, Inc., Gulf Shores

Attorneys for Plaintiff

491

MR 21 1972

Received of the winds of the wi

Dumar Contractors, Sne. acorp.

de la companya de la

APR 2 1 1972

EUNICE B. BLACKMON CIRCUIT

We the Juny Visual

for the plaintiff

in This come The

amount of Tooo. 00

Justin le vige

Voicement

Wilters + Brantley

Shoriff claims // miles at Jon Cents par miles for Jones (IAY) WILLIAMS, Shoriff

Serving signing Cult Stores

43 Manci, Frank J., Mech, Eng. Palmer & Baker Eng. 101 N. Engleside Dr. Fairhope,

45. Olivere Mrs. E. C. Restruant Mgr. P. O. Box 344. Raishope

46. Owess, Thomas O., Eng. Ride St. Hwy Dept. 1504 Moog Av. Bay Minette

47. Becker, Earl V., Mailman, 509 Hall Av. Bay Minette

48. Becker, Ina H., Chf. Clk. Tax Assessor, 509 Hall Av. Bay Minette

49. Grubbs, Carlton, Custom Barm Service, Rt. 1 Robertsdale

44. Martin, A. C., Civil Service, Rt 1 Box 113C, Robertsdale, Pensacola

51. Bettis, Carrie, Housewife, 412 B. Anderson Blvd. Bay Minette D

-52. Bill; WIIIIam D., Jr. C.P.A. P. O. Box 162 Robertsdale, P/D

PXXXXX XXXX

_50. Boeschen, Arthur, Farmer, Rt. 2 Box 308 Bay Minette

ALBERT L. MONTGOMERY and KENNETH MEIKLEJOHN, d/b/a	X	
M & M ENTERPRISES,	X	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
Plaintiff,	X	IN IM CIRCUIT COURT OF
•	X	BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA
vs.	X	BALDWIN COUNTY, ALADAMA
	X	AT LAW NO. 10,35
SUMAR CONTRACTORS, INC.,	X	
Defendant:	X	
	•	
SUMAR CONTRACTORS, INC.,	X	
Plaintiff,	X	
	X	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
vs.	X	
	X	BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA
ALBERT L. MONTGOMERY and	ĭ	
KENNETH MEIKLEJOHN, d/b/a		AT LAW NO. 10,519
M & M ENTERPRISES	X	
Defendant.	X	

ORDER

This day came the attorneys for Sumar Contractors, Inc., a corporation, and move the Court for a consolidation of the above styled causes for trial and it appearing to the Court that said causes are, in all respects, such that the same are entitled to be consolidated for trial; it is, therefore,

ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that each of the cases hereinabove styled are consolidated for the purpose of trial at the next term of this Court or at any subsequent time to which the same shall be continued.

WITNESS my hand this 6 day of April, 1973.

Defair A. Mallebure Circuit Juage

H. WILTERS

```
ALBERT L. MONTGOMERY and
                           χ
KENNETH MEIKLEJOHN, d/b/a
                               IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
                           χ
M & M ENTERPRISES,
                               BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA
         Plaintiffs, X
                                        AT LAW
                           χ
   vs.
                                  CASE NO. 10,357
SUMAR CONTRACTORS, INC.,
                           χ
a corporation,
          Defendant
```

Comes now Kenneth Meiklejohn, and for answer to the Interrogatories heretofore propounded to him says:

- 1. M & M Enterprises was a partnership.
- 2. At the time the contract was entered into M & M Enterprises was a partnership composed of Albert L. Montgomery and Kenneth Meiklejohn, each owning an undivided one-half interest, since the suit was filed the partnership was dissolved, and Kenneth Meiklejohn assumed all the liabilities.
 - 3. This is not a corporation.

5.

- (a) Clay, 1878 yards, \$3,286.50.
- (b) Site preparation, installation of base material for golf cart path; labor, approximately \$4,000.00.
 - (c) Yes.

6.

- (a) Yes.
- (b) Yes.
- (c) No, due to non payment on the work done in accordance with the terms of the contract.

7.

- (a) Same as 5 (b).
- (b) Clay
- (c) Yes.
- (d) No. (same as 6 (c).
- (e) I do not understand this question.
- 8. Yes, \$7,000.00.
- 9. Yes, \$7,000.00, for the 30% estimate due under the terms of the contract.

- 10. By check
- 11. It was not included in the parties 1972 income tax return.
 - 12. Yes.
- 13. All services were rendered by the Plaintiffs, or performed by their agents, servants or employees.

Kenneth Meiklejohn / Kenneth Meiklejohn

STATE OF ALABAMA

BALDWIN COUNTY

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared Kenneth Meiklejohn, who after being by me first duly sworn, deposes and says: That he has read the foregoing answers to the interrogatories propounded to him in the said cause, and that the answers are true to the best of his knowledge, information and belief, and that he does believe them to be true.

Kenneth Mublifulus
Kenneth Meiklejohn

Sworn to and subscribed before me on this the 31st day of May, 1973.

Notary Public,

MAY 3 1 1973

FILED

EUNICE B. BLACKMON CLERK

Commended to the South of the

I do he eby ce thy that I have not as \$1,000.

1972, served a copy of the strong phastic of sell to at parties to this proceeding by many the table. I have a fixed State. Mail, properly addressed, and first class pestage properly.

WUITERS & BRANTLEY

Tay Justa J

ALBERT L. MONTGOMERY and KENNETH MEIKLEJOHN, d/b/a) IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
M & M ENTERPRISES,) BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA
Plaintiffs,	AT LAW
v.))
SUMAR CONTRACTORS, INC., a corporation,) CASE NO. 10,357
Defendant	\ \

INTERROGATORIES TO THE PLAINTIFFS

Comes now the defendant, Sumar Contractors, Inc., a corporation, in the above styled cause, and desiring the testimony of the plaintiffs propound to the plaintiffs the following interrogatories as provided under Section 47, et seq., of Title 7 of the Code of Alabama, to wit:

- 1. State what type of legal entity M & M Enterprises is.
- 2. If M & M Enterprises is a partnership, state the percentages owned by each of the plaintiffs.
- 3. If M & M Enterprises is a corporation, state the following:
 - (a) State in which incorporated.
 - (b) Date of incorporation.
 - (c) If it is not an Alabama corporation, state whether or not it is qualified to do business in Alabama.
- 5. In Count 1 of plaintiffs' complaint, you claim \$7,000.00 by account, with regard to this account, state the following, giving specific details as to amounts and cost:
 - (a) What materials were supplied?

- (b) What services were rendered?
- (c) Whether or not this account arose out of a contractual relationship between the plaintiffs and the defendant.
- 6. If the answer to Interrogatory 5(c) is affirmative, then state the following:
 - (a) Was the contract written?
 - (b) Were there any obligations made after the contract was entered into?
 - (c) Do plaintiffs claim they performed all of their obligations under said contract?
 - (d) If the answer to Interrogatory 6(c) is affirmative, then state what obligations plaintiffs performed.
- 7. In Count Two of plaintiffs' complaint, you claim \$7,000.00 for work and labor done, and materials furnished, with reference to this count, state the following:
 - (a) What work and labor was done?
 - (b) What materials were furnished?
 - (c) Did the claim in Count Two arise out of a contractual relationship between the plaintiffs and defendant?
 - (d) If the answer to Interrogatory 7(c) is affirmative, then state whether or not plaintiffs claimed they performed all the obligations under the contract.
 - (e) If the answer to Interrogatory 7(c) is negative, then state what obligations the plaintiffs failed to perform under the contract.
- 8. Have the plaintiffs received any monies from the defendant, if so, how much?
- 9. Have the plaintiffs made any demand on the defendant for the amount claimed, if so, when and how was such demand made?

- 10. If the answer to Interrogatory 8 was affirmative, then state the following, how did the defendant pay the plaintiffs?
- 11. How was the account alleged in Count One of plaintiffs' complaint handled on plaintiffs' 1972 Income Tax Return?
- 12. State whether or not the plaintiffs personally performed the services rendered as alleged in Count Two of their complaint?
- 13. If the answer to Interrogatory 13 is negative, then state who did perform the said services and their relationship to the plaintiffs.

DOMINICK, FLETCHER, YEILDING, DOMINICK, AND ACKER, P. A.

CHASON, STONE, AND CHASON

Attorneys for Defendant

Dominick, Fletcher, Yeilding, Dominick, and Acker, P. A. 927 Brown-Marx Building Birmingham, Alabama 35203

Chason, Stone and Chason P. O. Box 120 Bay Minette, Alabama 3-507 FILED

MAY 22 1973

Of Counsel

Serve occey al for Kermillo Meil Elinick Br. BLACKMON GIRCUIT The January 3/14/23 sker atterny

STATE OF ALABAMA)

JEFFERSON COUNTY)

Before me, the undersigned authority in and for said County, in said State, this day personally appeared J. Fred Wood, Jr. who is known to me and who by me is first duly sworn, upon oath deposes and says that he is one of the attorneys for the defendant in the above entitled cause, and as such is authorized to make this affidavit; and that the answers of the plaintiff to the foregoing interrogatories when well and truly made and filed will be material for the defendant on the trial of this cause.

Notary Public

FILED

Thus Home

MAY 22 1973

EUNICE B. BLACKMON CLERK

	SUMAR CONTRACTORS, INC., a corporation,	χ	
	Plaintiff,	χ	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
	VS.	χ	BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA
	ALBERT L. MONTGOMERY and	χ	AT LAW
	X	CASE NO. 10,519	
	Defendants	X	
	a military in the many of the same and	χ	

Comes now the Defendants in the above styled cause, and for answer to the Complaint, says:

That they deny that the Plaintiff was damaged for breach of contract in the amount of \$30,000.00. Defendants further say that the contract agreed on by and between the Plaintiff and Defendants amounted to approximately \$24,000.00. further say that they did not complete the contract because of the non-payment on the part of the Plaintiff, and that they were at all times ready, able and willing to complete the contract had the Plaintiff paid them in accordance with the same. The Defendants deny all other allegations contained in count 1.

The Defendants admit the allegations contained in count 2 pertaining to them entering into a contract as mentioned. Defendants further aver that 60% of the work had been completed, but the Plaintiff had only paid them for 30% of the work, and that under the terms of the contract they were to be paid monthly. Defendants admitt that the Plaintiff paid them \$7,000.00 less the credits allowed, but that on October 31, 1971, there was due the Defendants an additional sum of \$7,000.00. Defendants further say that they continually told the Plaintiff that they would complete the contract as soon as this amount was paid. Defendants deny that the Plaintiff was injured or damaged by their failure to perform the contract. Defendants further allege that they were at all times, ready, able and willing to complete the contract; that in fact they had left their equipment on the job in anticipation

of the Plaintiff paying them the complete amount due.

WILTERS & BRANTLEY

ALBERT L. MONTGOMERY and KENNETH MEIKLEJOHN, d/b/a	X	
M & M ENTERPRISES,	χ	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
Plaintiffs,	X	
vs.	X	BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA
	χ	
SUMAR CONTRACTORS, INC., a corporation,	X	AT LAW CASE NO: 10,357
Defendant.	Υ.	

DEMURRER

Now comes the Defendant, Sumar Contractors, Inc., a corporation, and demurs to the Complaint heretofore filed in the above styled cause and to each count thereof separately and severally, and for grounds of said demurrer sets down and assigns the following grounds, separately and severally:

- 1. Said count does not state a cause of action against the Defendant.
 - 2. Said count is vague, uncertain and indefinite.
- 3. Said count does not state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against the Defendant.
- 4. Said Complaint does not state what rate of interest the Plaintiffs are claiming of the Defendant.

From Johnson States Constitution

JUL 10 1972

EUNICE B. BLACKIMON CIRCUIT CLERK

7+

Attorneys for Defendant

Defendant demands trial of

this cause by a jury.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

i certify that a copy of the functions bleading has been served upon counsel for all parties to this proceeding, by mailing the same to each by First Cales United States Mail, properly addressed and postage prepaid on this / Cay

of July 19/2

Ü

SUMAR CONTRACTORS, INC., a Corporation, X Plaintiff, IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF χ vs. BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA χ ALBERT L. MONTGOMERY and AT LAW KENNETH MEIKLEJOHN, d/b/a χ M & M ENTERPRISES, CASE NO. 10,519 χ Defendants, χ

DEMURRER

Comes now the Defendants in the above styled cause and files the following demurrers to the Plaintiff's complaint to each count thereof seperately and severally, and for grounds thereof, says:

1.

That counts one and two do not state a cause of action.

2

That count one does not state in what manner the Defendants work was performed negligently, or in an unworkmanlike manner.

3.

Count one fails to allege the terms and conditions of the said contract.

Count two alleges that a copy of the contract is attached as Exhibit "A", and incorporated therein, but there is not a copy of the contract attached to the original complaint, or to the copies of the complaint.

WILTERS & BRANTLEY

Attorneys for Kenneth Md/b/a M & M Enterprises for Kenneth Meiklejohn

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I do hereby certify that I have on this Aday of

1977, served a copy of the foregoing pleading on counsel for at parties to this proceeding by mailing the same by United States Mail, properly addressed, and first class postage prepaid. aylor D. Wilkins, Attorney

for Albert L. Montgomery FILED

SEP 14 1972

WILTERS & BRANTLEY

EUNICE B. BLACKMON CIRCUIT