STATE OF ALABAMA)
*
BALDWIN COUNTY)

TO ANY SHERIFF OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA:

You are hereby commanded to summon Connecticut General
Life 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 Charles E. Floyd.

WITNESS my hand this 3/sfday of leaguet, 1972

The defendant may be served by service on the Superintendent of Insurance, Montgomery, Alabama.

CHARLES E. FLOYD,

Plaintiff,

VS.

CONNECTICUT GENERAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendant.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA

AT LAW 10,586

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff claims of the defendant Nine Thousand Nine
Hundred Dollars (\$9,900.00) for that heretofore on to-wit, May 5,
1965, the defendant issued to plaintiff a monthly income insurance
policy in which defendant insured plaintiff against loss resulting
directly and independently of all other causes from accidental
bodily injuries sustained while the said policy was in force and,
also, agreed to pay to the plaintiff an additional monthly indemnity
for disability due to injuries which did not arise out of or occur
in the course of employment for wage or profit. Plaintiff further
avers that the said policy provided that if, commencing while the
policy was in force, such injuries, directly and independently of
all other causes, shall wholly and continuously disable the insured
and completely prevent him from performing the duties of his occupation, that the company would pay monthly indemnity at the rate

STATE OF ALABAMA)
*
BALDWIN COUNTY)

TO ANY SHERIFF OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA:

You are hereby commanded to summon Connecticut General Life 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 Charles E. Floyd.

WITNESS my hand this 3/sf day of leggest, 1972

Glerich B. Blackmon

The defendant may be served by service on the Superintendent of Insurance, Montgomery, Alabama.

CHARLES E. FLOYD,

Plaintiff,

VS.

CONNECTICUT GENERAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendant.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA

AT LAW 10,586

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff claims of the defendant Nine Thousand Nine
Hundred Dollars (\$9,900.00) for that heretofore on to-wit, May 5,
1965, the defendant issued to plaintiff a monthly income insurance
policy in which defendant insured plaintiff against loss resulting
directly and independently of all other causes from accidental
bodily injuries sustained while the said policy was in force and,
also, agreed to pay to the plaintiff an additional monthly indemnity
for disability due to injuries which did not arise out of or occur
in the course of employment for wage or profit. Plaintiff further
avers that the said policy provided that if, commencing while the
policy was in force, such injuries, directly and independently of
all other causes, shall wholly and continuously disable the insured
and completely prevent him from performing the duties of his occupation, that the company would pay monthly indemnity at the rate

of \$300.00 each month for the lifetime of the insured. Plaintiff avers that he was on to-wit, October 9, 1966, injured and such injuries, directly and independently of all other causes, wholly and continuously disabled plaintiff and completely prevented him from performing the duties of his occupation and that notice of the said injury was given to defendant in accordance with the terms of the said policy. Plaintiff avers that the premiums on the said policy were paid at the time of the said accident on to-wit, October 9, 1966; that the said policy was the property of plaintiff; that the terms of the policy and the policy itself were in force on the date of the said injury and that since said time plaintiff has been wholly and continually disabled; that he is permanently disabled as a result of the said accident and although the said company was given written notice of the said accident in accordance with the terms of the said policy, the said defendant has failed and refused and continues to fail and refuse to make the payments due or compensation due to plaintiff. Plaintiff aver\$ that there is due under the said policy the sum of Nine Thousand Nine Hundred Dollars (\$9,900.00) from October 9, 1968, to June 9, 1971, for his disability, hence this suit.

Attorney\for Plaintiff

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury of said cause.

Attorney for Plaintiff

FILED

AUG 3 1 1972

EUNICE B. BLACKMON CIRCUIT

#10,586

the within on Supering Supering Supering Supering Supering Supering Supering Sheriff of Montgomery County

M. S. Butler,

M. D. S.

CHARLES E. FLOYD, Plaintiff,

VS:

CONNECTICUT GENERAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendant

FILED

AUG 3 1 1972

EUNICE B. BLACKMON GIRGUIT, GLERK

AUB 3 1 WK

MINIMA MONY

James R. Owen, Attorney for Plaintiff

M. S. Buller, Sheriff of Montgomery,
County, Alabama, Claim \$1.50 each for
serving _____ process(es) and \$1.00
travel expense on each of
process(es) or a total of ______

. Deputy Sheriff

CHARLES E. FLOYD,)			
Plaintiff,) IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF			
=vs=	(BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA			
CONNECTICUT GENERAL LIFE) AT LAW			
INSURANCE COMPANY,	(CASE NUMBER 10,586			
Defendant.)			

<u>D</u> <u>E</u> <u>M</u> <u>U</u> <u>R</u> <u>R</u> <u>E</u> <u>R</u>

Comes now the Defendant, Connecticut General Life Insurance Company, and without waiving its right to enjoin the Plaintiff from proceeding herein as prayed for in Case No. 5756-69 now pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Alabama, demurs to the complaint heretofore filed in the above styled cause, and as grounds therefor assigns, separately and severally, the following:

- 1. The complaint fails to state a cause of action against this Defendant.
- 2. The allegation that the Defendant insured Plaintiff against loss is vague, indefinite and uncertain.
- 3. The complaint does not allege the risk of loss Defendant is alleged to have insured Plaintiff against.
- 4. The complaint does not allege the occurrence of the loss Defendant is alleged to have insured Plaintiff against.
- 5. The reference in the complaint to an alleged agreement by the Defendant to pay to the Plaintiff an additional monthly indemnity is vague, indefinite and uncertain.
- 6. The reference in the complaint to a monthly indemnity at the rate of \$300 each month for the lifetime of the insured is vague, indefinite and uncertain.
- 7. The allegation that the Plaintiff was injured is vague, indefinite and uncertain.

- 8. The allegation that the Plaintiff was injured is a mere conclusion of the pleader.
- 9. For aught that appears, the Plaintiff's alleged injury arose out of or occurred in the course of his employment for wage or profit.
- 10. For aught that appears, the Plaintiff has not demanded of the Defendant payments allegedly due the Plaintiff under the terms of the alleged policy of insurance.
- 11. For aught that appears, the Plaintiff has not notified the Defendant of his alleged disability.
- 12. For aught that appears, the Plaintiff has notified the Defendant of his alleged accident and injuries, but has not notified the Defendant of his claim of alleged disability under the terms of the policy.
- 13. For that the complaint is vague, uncertain and indefinite in that it affirmatively appears that the Plaintiff has been wholly and continually disabled since the time of his alleged accident and injuries, but the complaint states that the terms of the policy require that the Plaintiff be wholly and continuously disabled as a prerequisite to the existence of any obligations on the part of the Defendant.
- 14. For aught that appears, the alleged policy was not in force at the time of the alleged accident.
- 15. For that it affirmatively appears that the Plaintiff was not wholly and continuously disabled from the date of the alleged accident as no claim is made for the period from October 9, 1966 to October 9, 1968.
- 16. For aught that appears, the Plaintiff was not wholly and continuously disabled from the date of the alleged accident

as no claim is made for the period from October 9, 1966 to October 9, 1968.

17. The allegation that the premiums on the policy were paid at the time of the alleged accident is vague, indefinite and uncertain.

JOHNSTONE, ADAMS, MAY, HOWARD & HILL

By Brook B. Hondon
Attorneys for Defendant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that I have on this _____ day of October, 1972, served a copy of the foregoing on counsel for all parties to this proceeding by mailing the same by United States mail, properly addressed, and first class postage prepaid.

Brod B. Dordon

FILED

OCT 6 1972

EUNICE B. BLACKMON CIRCUIT

JOHNSTONE, ADAMS, MAY, HOWARD AND HILL

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

C.A.L.JOHNSTONE, JR.
R.F. ADAMS
JAMES L.MAY, JR.
ALEX T. HOWARD. JR.
J. JEPTHA HILL
CHARLES B. BAILEY, JR.
BROCK B. GORDON
BEN H. HARRIS. JR.
WILLIAM M. HARDIE, JR.
DOUGLAS INGE JOHNSTONE
E. WATSON SMITH

JACK MCLENDON PATE

DAVID C. HANNAN

CHARLES A. BENTLEY, JR.

NINTH FLOOR MERCHANTS NATIONAL BANK BUILDING POST OFFICE BOX 1988

MOBILE, ALABAMA 36601

TELEPHONE 432-7682 AREA CODE 205

January 23, 1973

GESSNER T. MCCORVEY (1882-1965) BEN D. TURNER (1886-1968)

Honorable Eunice B. Blackmon, Clerk Circuit Court of Baldwin County Baldwin County Courthouse Bay Minette, Alabama 36507

Re: Charles E. Floyd v. Connecticut General

Life Insurance Company At Law Case No. 10,586

Dear Mrs. Blackmon:

I shall very much appreciate it if you will advise me of the current status of the above case. If a dismissal has occurred, please let me know the date thereof.

I am enclosing a duplicate copy of this letter together with a stamped pre-addressed envelope for your convenience in sending us a reply.

Very truly yours,

Brock B. Dordon

Brock B. Gordon

BBG:dk

Enclosures

cc: James R. Owen, Esq.

JOHNSTONE, ADAMS, MAY, HOWARD AND HILL ATTORNEYS AT LAW NINTH FLOOR MERCHANTS NATIONAL BANK BUILDING POST OFFICE BOX 1988 MOBILE, ALABAMA 36601

C.A. L.JOHNSTONE, JR. R. F. ADAMS JAMES L.MAY, JR. ALEX T. HOWARD, JR. J. JEPTHA HILL CHARLES B. BAILEY, JR. BROCK B. GORDON BEN H. HARRIS. JR. WILLIAM H. HARDIE.JR. DOUGLAS INGE JOHNSTONE E WATSON SMITH JACK MCLENDON PATE CHARLES A. BENTLEY, JR.

DAVID C. HANNAN

TELEPHONE 432-7682 AREA CODE 205

February 15, 1973

GESSNER T. MCCORVEY (1882-1965) BEN D. TURNER (1886-1968)

Honorable Eunice B. Blackmon, Clerk Circuit Court of Baldwin County Baldwin County Courthouse Bay Minette, Alabama 36507

> Re: Charles E. Floyd v. Connecticut General Life Insurance Company At Law Case No. 10,586

Dear Mrs. Blackmon:

Would you please indicate on the enclosed copy of this letter whether the above case has yet been dismissed, and if so, please state the date thereof.

Very truly yours,

Brock B. Dordon

Brock B. Gordon

BBG:dk Enclosure

cc: James R. Owen, Esq.

cc: Honorable William J. O'Connor, Clerk United States District Court (Re: Civil Action No. 5756-69)

Callin mind

STATE OF ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE

±, 0110 amound 8.100, an orania -	f Insurance for the State of Alabama,
hereby certify that on the 6th day of	September , 1972, I
sent by registered mail in an envelope as Connecticut General Life Insurance Company	
900 Cottage Grove Road Bloomfield, Connecticut	REGISTERED MAIL RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
bearing sufficient prepaid postage, a copy	of a summons and complaint served upon
me by the Sheriff of Montgomery County, Al	abama, in a cause styled as follows:
Charles E. Floyd	, Plaintiff CASE NO. 10,586
in the VERSUS	Circuit Court of Baldwin County
	(Name of Court)
Connecticut General Life Insurance Company	
Connecticut General Life Insurance Company And that on thellth day of	, Defendant
	September, 1972, I received
And that on the <u>llth</u> day of	September , 1972, I received signated addressee of said envelope on
And that on the <u>llth</u> day of the return card showing receipt by the des	September , 1972, I received signated addressee of said envelope on, 1972.
the return card showing receipt by the des	September , 1972, I received signated addressee of said envelope on, 1972.
And that on the llth day of	September , 1972, I received signated addressee of said envelope on, 1972.

and the same of	3 9	Account No. 2	6198	•		
Note No	Film	Account 140,			•	1
Dated	S	Soc. Sec. No.				
\$ 1135.72		Tax Ident. No.				1
For value received, I/We or order, the sum of	jointly and seve	erally, promise to	pay to the Scott S	outhern Division I	Employee's Credit	Union,
	s, with interest o	n the unpaid bala	nce at the rate of o	one per cent per n	nonth, payable in i Dollars each; th	install- e first
payment to be made on has been paid. Said install	ments shall be	, and payable at Scott	the same amount ev Southern Division			
As further security for the payment of t shares and payments on shares which I/We ments on shares to share the shares which I/We in the shares of the shares	ker, endorser or guarantor to pay all costs of collecti narantor, endorser or other constitution or laws of Alal out notice to them of such son whose name is signed as shall sign the same, as and year first above writter	, severally waives presentm lons whether incurred by su	ent for payment, demand, prot it or otherwise, including a re Illy walves and renounces, eac e United States, as against this his note without condition, res thout any reservation or cond	ests and notice of protests are asonable attorney's fee which	dishonor of the same. The the shall in no event be less nomestead or exemption right of; and the undersigned here is to any other person havin or otherwise.	makers, than ten
of Crownett		Murray P.	Byank H. (L.S.)	 :	ADDRESS	
		· v	(L.S.)			
		* VOL	70 MUE (LS)	7		