

0.1533928

CIVIL FORM 45

0.1533928

SUPERIOR COURT
Los Angeles County
California

Paul T. Farrell

VS.

In this action the

Defendant

Herbert Price Jarrist

having been regularly served with process, and having failed to appear and answer the plaintiff's complaint, on file herein, and the time allowed by law for answering having expired, the default of said Defendant, in the premises is hereby duly entered according to law.

ATTEST: My hand and the seal of the Court this 30 day of MAY 1937

L. E. LAMPTON, County Clerk

By *Charles H. Hensley*, Deputy

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

No. _____
Space below for filing
Stamp 1937

L. E. LAMPTON,

SUMMONS

ROBERT FRANK BRUSH,

Defendant

JUNE MATHENS,

Attorney for Plaintiff

1937 MAR 30 AM 10 52
L. E. LAMPTON, CLERK
DEPUTY

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
County of Los Angeles ss.

JUNE MATHENS being sworn, says: I am and was at the time of the service of the summons herein, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within entitled action; I personally served the within Summons on the hereinafter named defendants, by delivering to and leaving with each of said defendants personally, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, at the address and the time set opposite their names, a copy of said Summons attached to a copy of the Complaint referred to in said Summons.

Name of Defendants Served	City and Street Address	Date of Service
ROBERT FRANK BRUSH	107 W. 42nd Street, Los Angeles, Calif.	March 18th, 1937.

My fees for services are, \$.50 for 4 miles actually traveled at 25 cents per mile,
\$ 1.00 Total, \$ 1.50

(Signed) June Mathens

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 18th day of March, 1937.


Deputy Public in and for the County of Los Angeles,
State of California

L. E. LAMPTON,
County Clerk and Clerk of the Superior Court of the State of
California, in and for the County of Los Angeles

By _____ Deputy.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

H. H. RAUST,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DOROTHY EREES RAUST,

Defendant.

No. 0453474

Action brought in the Superior Court of the
County of Los Angeles, and Complaint
filed in the Office of the Clerk of the
Superior Court of said County.

SUMMONS

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SEND GREETINGS TO:

DOROTHY EREES RAUST

Defendant.

You are directed to appear in an action brought against you by the above named plaintiff... in the Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the County of Los Angeles, and to answer the complaint therein within ten days after the service on you of this Summons, if served within the County of Los Angeles, or within thirty days if served elsewhere, and you are notified that unless you appear and answer as above required, the plaintiff... will take judgment for any money or damages demanded in the Complaint, as arising upon contract, or will apply to the Court for any other relief demanded in the Complaint.

Given under my hand and seal of the Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, this 10th day of March, 1937.

(SEAL SUPERIOR COURT
LOS ANGELES COUNTY)

L. E. LAMPTON,
County Clerk and Clerk of the Superior Court of the State of
California, in and for the County of Los Angeles.

By [Signature] Deputy.

NOTICE

APPEARANCE: "A defendant appears in an action when he answers, demurs, or gives the plaintiff written notice of his appearance, or when an attorney gives notice of appearance for him." (Sec. 1014, C. C. P.)

Answers or demurrers must be in writing, in form pursuant to rule of court, accompanied with the necessary fee, and filed with the Clerk.

DEPT _____

NO _____

SPACE BELOW FOR FILING STAMP ONLY

COMPLAINT

H. H. PAUST,

Plaintiff

DIAGNOSTIC WORKS, INC.,

Defendant

LEE D. MATHEWS
STORY BUILDING, 610 SO. BROADWAY
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
PHONE VANDINE 2125

Attorney for _____

RECEIVED COPY OF THE WITHIN _____

THIS _____ DAY OF _____ 1937

ATTORNEY FOR _____

1937 MAR 18 PM 1 15
L. L. MATHIAS, CLERK
BY _____
DEPUTY

FILED

STATE OF CALIFORNIA }
County of Los Angeles }

ss.

H. H. PAUST,

being by me first duly sworn, deposes and says: That he is the plaintiff

in the above entitled action; that he has heard read the foregoing complaint

and knows the contents thereof; and that the same is true of his own knowledge, except as to the matters which are therein stated upon his information or belief; and as to those matters that he believes it to be true.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this

day of March, A. D. 1937

Arthur J. Pearson

NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

(SEAL)

My Commission Expires March 4, 1941

H. H. Paust

1 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

3
4 R. H. FAUST,

5 Plaintiff,

No. 0153928

6 vs.

7 DOROTHY FREES FAUST,

8 Defendant.

COMPLAINT
(For Annulment or
Divorce)

9
10 Plaintiff complains and alleges:

11 I.

12 That plaintiff is now, and for a period of more than
13 one year last past has been, a bona fide resident of the County
14 of Los Angeles, State of California.

15 II.

16 That plaintiff and defendant intermarried on or about
17 the 16th day of September, 1936, and ever since said marriage have
18 been, and now are, husband and wife.

19 III.

20 Plaintiff alleges for statistical purposes, required by
21 Section 426a of the Code of Civil Procedure of the State of Cali-
22 fornia, the following facts, to wit:

23 (a) That the state in which the parties were married
24 was the State of California;

25 (b) That the date of said marriage was September 16th,
26 1936;

27 (c) That the date of separation was March 17th, 1937;

28 (d) That the time elapsing from said marriage to said
29 separation was six months;

30 (e) That there are no children the issue of said marri-
31 age;

32 (f) That there is no community property.

IV.

That all during said marriage relationship defendant has treated this plaintiff in an extremely cruel and inhuman manner; that some of said acts of cruelty are more specifically set forth as follows:

(a) That during the last two weeks of said marriage relationship the defendant became infatuated with one, BILL TAYLOR, and has spent much of her time at his place of business, in a bird store, near 47th Street and South Broadway, Los Angeles, California, and many times during said period of time has told plaintiff that she did not love him, but was in love with the said BILL TAYLOR; that plaintiff endeavored to persuade defendant to stay away from the said BILL TAYLOR and establish a home for plaintiff and defendant, but she has continuously refused so to do;

(b) That on or about the 13th day of March, 1937, at about the hour of 1:00 o'clock A. M., plaintiff found defendant in the company of the said BILL TAYLOR; that thereafter, and at the home of plaintiff and defendant, the defendant promised that she would have nothing more to do with the said BILL TAYLOR, but on the following night plaintiff again found her in his company, at which time she told plaintiff that she did not love him, and she loved the said BILL TAYLOR, and that she was through with plaintiff;

(c) That thereafter plaintiff and defendant became reconciled, through the assistance of a mutual friend of plaintiff and defendant, and thereafter, to wit, on the 17th day of March, 1937, defendant insisted that plaintiff and defendant go to the place of business of the said BILL TAYLOR; that plaintiff remonstrated with defendant and upon defendant saying that she would go without plaintiff if he would not go, plaintiff finally consented to go with defendant to the said BILL TAYLOR'S place of business and talk to him; that while at the said place of business defendant, without cause or provocation, became enraged, evidenced a state of extreme anger,

1 toward plaintiff, told plaintiff that she did not love him but lov-
2 ed the said BILL TAYLOR, and insisted that plaintiff leave the
3 premises and that she remain there with the said BILL TAYLOR; that
4 after attempting to persuade defendant to go with plaintiff to
5 their home and being unable to persuade her to go, plaintiff final-
6 ly left the defendant with the said BILL TAYLOR.

7 That all the foregoing acts and conduct on the part of
8 the defendant were committed without the consent, procurement, con-
9 nivance, or previous knowledge of plaintiff and that they were
10 known to the relatives, neighbours, and friends of plaintiff, caus-
11 ing plaintiff great and grievous suffering and bodily injury.

12 FOR A SECOND, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT
13 CAUSE OF ACTION, PLAINTIFF ALLEGES:

14 I.

15 Plaintiff here repeats all the jurisdictional facts found
16 in Paragraphs I., II. and III. of his first cause of action, making
17 them part of this his Second Cause of Action, asking that they be
18 given full force and effect as if specifically alleged and set
19 forth in full.

20 II.

21 That plaintiff is informed and believes and upon such in-
22 formation and belief alleges that at the time of the marriage of
23 plaintiff and defendant, that the former husband of defendant was
24 living and the marriage with such former husband was then and there
25 in force, which fact at the time, was unknown to plaintiff.

26 WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays that the said marriage be de-
27 clared null and void; that in the event said marriage cannot be an-
28 nulled then that a decree of divorce be granted plaintiff, which af-
29 ter a period of one year may become final upon motion, and for such
30 other and further relief as may be just and proper to the Court in
31 the premises.

32
Lee D. Mathews

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

ORDER TO
ENTER DEFAULT

H. H. JAMES

vs.

Plaintiff,

DOUGLAS FREDERICK JAMES

Defendant

THE D. JAMES

Attorney for Plaintiff

No. D-153,028

(Charge in full for filing
within 10 days)

FILED

1957 MAR 30

AM 11 03

DEPUTY

CLERK OF COURT

CLERK OF COURT

CLERK OF COURT

CLERK OF COURT

CLERK OF COURT

CLERK OF COURT

CLERK OF COURT

CLERK OF COURT

CLERK OF COURT

CLERK OF COURT

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

H. H. MAUST,

vs.

Plaintiff,

MORLEY MARY MAUST,

Defendant.

No. D-153,928

ORDER TO ENTER DEFAULT

TO THE CLERK OF SAID COURT:

The defendant

having been regularly served with process, and having failed to appear and answer the
plaintiff's complaint on file herein, and the time allowed by law for
answering having expired, application is hereby made that you enter the default of said
defendant, herein according to law.

W. J. Mathews

Attorney for Plaintiff.

No. D 153,928

Default Divorce Card

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, IN AND
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

H. H. FAUST,

vs.

DOROTHY FREED FAUST,

CLERK'S MEMORANDUM

The said case was on the APR 2 1937 day
of APR 9 1937 193, set for trial
for the day of 193.
at 9:30 o'clock M., in Dept. 19

1. Has there been a former divorce case between the parties?
If so, state the court and number of case.

Ans.

2. What is the estimated time necessary for the trial thereof?

Ans. 30 minutes

3. State names of attorneys of record.

Ans. LEE W. MATTHEWS

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT

4. Has the time allowed by law for answering expired and has defendant failed to answer?

Ans. Yes.

Lee W. Matthews

(ATTORNEY MAKING MOTION MUST SIGN HERE)

516 W. Broadway

STREET ADDRESS OF YOUR OFFICE

Dated March 30th, 1937

NOTICE

Cases will not be set for trial unless the foregoing questions are answered, and address of attorney shown.

The Clerk is authorized to set default divorce actions for trial in certain Civil Departments only, in rotation, and for such dates as will not congest the calendars therein. If an earlier date than that fixed by the Clerk is desired, application must be made to the Judge of the Calendar Dept.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

No. D. 224
1937

EX-100
EX-101
EX-102
EX-103
EX-104
EX-105
EX-106
EX-107
EX-108
EX-109
EX-110
EX-111
EX-112
EX-113
EX-114
EX-115
EX-116
EX-117
EX-118
EX-119
EX-120
EX-121
EX-122
EX-123
EX-124
EX-125
EX-126
EX-127
EX-128
EX-129
EX-130
EX-131
EX-132
EX-133
EX-134
EX-135
EX-136
EX-137
EX-138
EX-139
EX-140
EX-141
EX-142
EX-143
EX-144
EX-145
EX-146
EX-147
EX-148
EX-149
EX-150
EX-151
EX-152
EX-153
EX-154
EX-155
EX-156
EX-157
EX-158
EX-159
EX-160
EX-161
EX-162
EX-163
EX-164
EX-165
EX-166
EX-167
EX-168
EX-169
EX-170
EX-171
EX-172
EX-173
EX-174
EX-175
EX-176
EX-177
EX-178
EX-179
EX-180
EX-181
EX-182
EX-183
EX-184
EX-185
EX-186
EX-187
EX-188
EX-189
EX-190
EX-191
EX-192
EX-193
EX-194
EX-195
EX-196
EX-197
EX-198
EX-199
EX-200

DECREE OF DIVORCE
(Default)

DANIEL FRED PAUL

Plaintiff

FILED

APR 9 1937

L. E. LAMPTON, County Clerk

Defendant

LEE A. HARRIS,
Attorney for Plaintiff.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

E. H. FAUST,
Plaintiff,
vs.
MARGARET ELLEN FAUST,
Defendant.

No. D. 153,938
INTERLOCUTORY JUDGMENT
OF DIVORCE
(Default)

This cause came on to be heard the 25th day of April, 1937, in
Department 12, 12th Street appearing as attorney for plaintiff,
and it appearing that defendant was duly served with process and has not appeared or answered
the complaint, and that the default of defendant has been entered:

IT IS ADJUDGED that plaintiff is entitled to a divorce from defendant: that when one year
shall have expired after the entry of this interlocutory judgment a final judgment dissolving the
marriage between plaintiff and defendant be entered, and at that time the Court shall grant such
other and further relief as may be necessary to complete disposition of this action.

Done in open Court this 25th day of April, 1937

Harvey Lincoln
Judge.

NOTICE—CAUTION

This is not a judgment of divorce. The parties are still husband and wife, and will be such
until a final judgment of divorce is entered after one year from the entry of this interlocutory
judgment. The final judgment will not be entered unless requested by one of the parties.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

No. D 153,938

H. E. FAUST,

Plaintiff,

FINAL JUDGMENT
OF DIVORCE

DOROTHY PHEBS FAUST,

Defendant.

Filed at request of:

Address 610 S. Broadway

Attorney for:

Plaintiff

~~Defendant~~

(Strike out one and sign in ink.)

ENTERED

APR 15 1938

DOCKETED

BOOK 1002

PAGE 21

BY

I. R. [Signature]

DEPUTY

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

H. E. FAUST,
vs. Plaintiff,
DOROTHY FREES FAUST,
Defendant.

No. D. 153,928

FINAL JUDGMENT
OF DIVORCE

In this cause an interlocutory judgment was entered on the 12th day of
APRIL, 1937, adjudging that plaintiff was entitled to
a divorce from defendant, and more than one year having elapsed, and no appeal having been taken
from said judgment, and no motion for a new trial having been made, and the action not having
been dismissed;

Now, upon the Court's own motion, it is adjudged that plaintiff be and is granted a final judg-
ment of divorce from defendant and that the bonds of matrimony between plaintiff and defendant
be, and the same are, dissolved.

It is further ordered and decreed that wherein said interlocutory decree makes any provision
for alimony or the custody and support of children, said provision be and the same is hereby made
binding on the parties affected thereby the same as if herein set forth in full, and that wherein said
interlocutory decree relates to the property of the parties hereto, said property be and the same is
hereby assigned in accordance with the terms thereof to the parties therein declared to be entitled
thereto.

Done in open Court this 18 day of APRIL, 1938.

Lester E. Steele
Judge.

THIS DECREE IS NOT EFFECTIVE UNTIL ENTERED IN
JUDGMENT BOOK BY CLERK