IN THE CIRCUIT COURT - LAW SIDE BALDWIN COUNTY)

TO ANY SHERIFF OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA:

You are hereby commanded to summon Harry L. Linden and Donald C. Linden, individually and doing business as partners under the firm name and style of Linden Construction Company, and Donald E. Cooper 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 same, then and there to answer the complaint of Eula Hammac.

Witness my hand this 27 day of October, 1960.

EULA HAMMAC,

Plaintiff

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF

VS

BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA

HARRY L. LINDEN and DONALD

C. LINDEN, individually and
doing business as partners
under the firm name and style
of LINDEN CONSTRUCTION COMPANY
and DONALD E. COOPER,

Defendants

COUNT ONE

The plaintiff claims of the Defendants the sum of Thirty
Five Thousand Dollars (\$35,000.00) as damages for that on, to-wit,
November 20, 1959, the defendant, Donald E. Cooper, who was then
and there the agent, servant or employee of the defendants, Harry
L. Linden and Donald C. Linden, individually and doing business
as partners under the firm name and style of Linden Construction
Company and while acting within the line and scope of his employment as such agent, servant or employee so negligently operated

a motor vehicle which he was then and there driving on Armstrong Avenue, a public street in Baldwin County, Alabama, within the city limits of Bay Minette, Alabama, at the point where Armstrong Avenue intersects with U. S. Highway 31 as to cause or allow such motor vehicle to run into or against an automobile in which the plaintiff was riding at said time and place and which was then and there being driven along U. S. Highway 31, where the plaintiff had a right to be, and as a proximate result of the negligence of such defendants the plaintiff was injured in this: she sustained a fracture of her left clavicle; a fracture of her 5th metatarsal, left foot; she suffere d severe ligamentous injuries; she suffered a fracture to the left great toe; she suffered multiple contusions and abrasions to her body; she developed paeumonia with alectectsis; she suffered residual arthritis; she was caused to suffer and still does suffere severe physical and mental pain and anguish; she was permanently injured; she was caused to incur large medical and hospital bills in an effort to heal and to cure her injuries and she was rendered permanently less able to earn a livelihood, all to the great damage of the plaintiff in the sum aforesaid, hence this suit.

ATTORNESS FOR PLAINTING

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury.

7/Dan (

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

FILED

OCT 27 1960

ALICE I, DUCK, REGISTER

11-1-60 TAYKOR WILKINS Sheriff EULA HAMMAC,

Plaintiff

VS.

HARRY L. LINDEN and DONALD C. LINDEN, individually and doing business as partners under the firm name and style of LINDEN CONSTRUCTION COMPANY and DONALD E. COOPER,

Defendants

SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT

OCT 27 100)

HUGH M. CAFFEY, JR.

BREWTON, ALABAMA

Ten Cents per mile Total \$ / Ten Cents per mi

EULA HAMMAC,)	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF
Plaintiff,)	BALDWIN COUNTY, ALABAMA
Vs	Ĵ	
HARRY L. LINDEN AND DONALD D. LINDEN, individually and)	AT LAW
doing business as partners under the firm name and style)	
of LINDEN CONSTRUCTION COMPANY and DONALD E. COOPER,)	
Defendants.)	NO 4466
)	

Come now the defendants, and demur to the plaintiff's complaint and to each count thereof, and as grounds for said demurrer set down and assign the following separately and severally:

- 1. Said count fails to allege the violation of any duty owed by these defendants to the plaintiff.
- 2. Said count fails to allege facts showing the violation of any duty owed by these defendants to the plaintiff.
- 3. For aught that appears from said count, the accident did not occur on a public street.
- 4. For aught that appears from said count, the plaintiff was not at a place where she had a legal right to be at the time and place complained of.
- 5. For aught that appears from said count, the damages suffered by the plaintiff were not the proximate result of any act or failure to act on the part of these defendants.
 - 6. For that there is a misjoinder of causes of action.
 - 7. For that there is a misjoinder of parties.

FIED

NOV 18: \$260

ME I. DUCK, ELEAKER

J. B. Blackburn, Attorney for Defendants

Lyons, Pipes and Cook, Attorneys for Defendants