

DOCKET NO. 172

NUMBER	TERM	YEAR
<u>18</u>	<u>November</u>	<u>1960</u>

John Daniel Duttry

VERSUS

Ruth Regina Duttry

No. 18 Nov. T. Term, 1960

Testimony in show #1

No. _____ Term, 19____

No. _____ Term, 19____

No. _____ Term, 19____

Clearfield County, ss:

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to L. R. BROCKBANK, ESQ.,

Greeting:

Know you, that in confidence of your prudence and fidelity we have appointed you, and by these presents do give unto you full power and authority, in pursuance of an order made in our County Court of Common Pleas, for the County of Clearfield, in a certain cause there depending, wherein

JOHN DANIEL DUTTRY Plaintiff ,

and

RUTH REGINA DUTTRY Defendant ,

to call before you at a certain day and place by you for that purpose to be appointed, all and every person who may be named to you on the part of the parties

as witnesses in the said cause, and then and there to examine each of the said witnesses upon their oath or solemn affirmation touching the premises and reduce their testimony to writing and report the same with form of Decree

and when you shall have done so, you are to send the name before our Judge at Clearfield, at our said Court, together with the interrogatories and this writ, and under your hand and seal.

In Testimony Whereof, we have caused the seal of our said Court to be hereunto affixed.

WITNESS, the Hon. John J. Pentz, President of our said Court, at Clearfield, the 31st day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty one

Am. T. Hagerty Prothonotary

To the Honorable, the Judge, &c.:

The execution of this commission appears in a certain schedule hereto annexed.

L. R. Brockbank
May 23-1963
COMMISSIONER.

No. 18 November Term. 19 60

John Daniel Duttry

VERSUS

Ruth Regina Duttry

COMMISSION

Eugene D. Vallely
Attorney.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF CLEARFIELD COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

JOHN DANIEL DUTTRY

vs.

RUTH REGINA DUTTRY

: No. 18 November Term, 1960

:

:

:

:

:

IN DIVORCE

DOCKET ENTRIES

NOVEMBER 9, 1960, COMPLAINT IN DIVORCE filed: One copy certified to Attorney.

NOVEMBER 17, 1960, On praecipe filed by Anthony S. Guido, Attorney, Rule is entered on the Plaintiff to file a Bill of Particulars within twenty (20) days after service of the Rule, or non pros. sec. leg.

NOVEMBER 28, 1960, Service of within Rule accepted, and receipt of copy thereof acknowledged. Eugene D. Vallely, Attorney for Plaintiff.

NOVEMBER 23, 1960, Petition for Alimony Pendente Lite, Counsel fees and Expenses, filed by Gleason, Cherry & Cherry, Attorneys.

ORDER: AND NOW, this 21st day of November, 1960, upon consideration of the foregoing Petition and on motion of Anthony S. Guido, Esquire, Attorney for the Defendant, a rule is granted on the Plaintiff to show cause why he should not pay the Defendant alimony pendente lite and counsel fees and costs. Returnable sec. leg. By the Court, John J. Pentz, President Judge.

Service of within petition and rule accepted and receipt of copy hereby acknowledged. Eugene D. Vallely, Attorney for Plaintiff.

DECEMBER 28, 1960, Plaintiff's Answer filed by Bell, Silberblatt & Eugene D. Vallely, Attorneys for Plaintiff.

DECEMBER 29, 1960, Service accepted. Anthony S. Guido, Attorney for Defendant.

FEBRUARY 9, 1961, On praecipe filed by Gleason, Cherry & Cherry, Attorneys, the above case is placed on the Argument List for March, 1961.

MARCH 8, 1961, Bill of Particulars filed by Eugene D. Vallely, Attorney.

MARCH 7, 1961, Service of the within Bill of Particulars hereby accepted and receipt of copy thereof acknowledged; and time of filing waived. Gleason, Cherry & Cherry, by Anthony S. Guido.

MARCH 9, 1961, Supplemental Bill of Particulars filed by Bell, Silberblatt & Swoope, Attys.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF CLEARFIELD COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

JOHN DANIEL DUTTRY	:	No. 18 November Term, 1960
	:	
vs.	:	
	:	IN DIVORCE
RUTH REGINA DUTTRY	:	
	:	

DOCKET ENTRIES

NOVEMBER 9, 1960, COMPLAINT IN DIVORCE filed: One copy certified to Attorney.

NOVEMBER 17, 1960, On praecipe filed by Anthony S. Guido, Attorney, Rule is entered on the Plaintiff to file a Bill of Particulars within twenty (20) days after service of the Rule, or non pros. sec. leg.

NOVEMBER 28, 1960, Service of within Rule accepted, and receipt of copy thereof acknowledged. Eugene D. Vallely, Attorney for Plaintiff.

NOVEMBER 23, 1960, Petition for Alimony Pendente Lite, Counsel fees and Expenses, filed by Gleason, Cherry & Cherry, Attorneys.

ORDER: AND NOW, this 21st day of November, 1960, upon consideration of the foregoing Petition and on motion of Anthony S. Guido, Esquire, Attorney for the Defendant, a rule is granted on the Plaintiff to show cause why he should not pay the Defendant alimony pendente lite and counsel fees and costs. Returnable sec. leg. By the Court, John J. Pentz, President Judge.

Service of within petition and rule accepted and receipt of copy hereby acknowledged. Eugene D. Vallely, Attorney for Plaintiff.

DECEMBER 28, 1960, Plaintiff's Answer filed by Bell, Silberblatt & Eugene D. Vallely, Attorneys for Plaintiff.

DECEMBER 29, 1960, Service accepted. Anthony S. Guido, Attorney for Defendant.

FEBRUARY 9, 1961, On praecipe filed by Gleason, Cherry & Cherry, Attorneys, the above case is placed on the Argument List for March, 1961.

MARCH 8, 1961, Bill of Particulars filed by Eugene D. Vallely, Attorney.

MARCH 7, 1961, Service of the within Bill of Particulars hereby accepted and receipt of copy thereof acknowledged; and time of filing waived. Gleason, Cherry & Cherry, by Anthony S. Guido.

MARCH 9, 1961, Supplemental Bill of Particulars filed by Bell, Silberblatt & Swoope, Attys.

MARCH 9, 1961, Service accepted, Gleason, Cherry & Cherry, Attys. by.
Anthony S. Guido.

MARCH 11, 1961, Order for counsel fees filed by Eugene D. Vallely, Atty.

ORDER: AND NOW, March 6, 1961, after agreement reached by counsel for the parties in the above entitled action, the rule to show cause, heretofore granted in this case, is made absolute, and the Plaintiff, John Daniel Duttry, is directed to pay the defendant, or to Gleason, Cherry & Cherry, her attorneys, the sum of One Hundred Fifty (\$150.00) Dollars as counsel fees and costs. By the Court, John J. Pentz, President Judge.

NOW, March 22, 1961, By motion on the watch-book, Leo R. Brockbank, Esq., is appointed Master to take the testimony and report the same with form of Decree.

Certified from the record this 31st day of March, A. D., 1961

Wm T. Hagerty
Prothonotary

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF CLEARFIELD COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

JOHN DANIEL DUTTRY)

-vs-)

RUTH REGINA DUTTRY)


NO. 18 NOVEMBER TERM, 1960

IN DIVORCE


TO: RUTH REGINA DUTTRY, late of R.D.1, DuBois, Clearfield County, Pennsylvania.

You are hereby notified that I have been appointed Master in the Divorce Action of JOHN DANIEL DUTTRY, your husband, against you in the Court of Common Pleas of Clearfield County, Pennsylvania, at No. 18 November Term, 1960, and that I will hold a meeting for the purpose of taking testimony in said case at my office, Suite 240-242-244 DuBois Deposit National Bank Building, at the corner of East Long Avenue and South Brady Street, in the City of DuBois, Clearfield County, Pennsylvania on Friday, April 21, 1961 at 10:00 o'clock a.m., Eastern Standard Time, when and where you may attend with witnesses, if you so desire.


DuBois, Pa.
April 4, 1961.


L. R. Brockbank

Service of the above Notice accepted April 4, 1961, by copy.


Of Counsel for Plaintiff.

Service of the above Notice accepted April 4, 1961, by copy.


Of Counsel for Defendant

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF CLEARFIELD COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

JOHN DANIEL DUTTRY)
)
 -vs-)
)
 RUTH REGINA DUTTRY)

NO. 18 NOVEMBER TERM, 1960
IN DIVORCE

The Master's Hearing in the above case has been postponed at the request of the Defendant until Friday, June 2, 1961 at 10:00 o'clock a.m., Eastern Daylight Saving Time, at my office, Suite 240-242-244 DuBois Deposit National Bank Building, at the corner of East Long Avenue and South Brady Street, in the City of DuBois, Clearfield County, Pennsylvania, as per this written agreement of Counsel for Plaintiff and Counsel for Defendant.

DuBois, Pa.
April 20, 1961.

Eugene H. Valley
Of Counsel for Plaintiff

Anthony J. Guido
Of Counsel for Defendant

A. Rockbank
Master

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF CLEARFIELD COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

JOHN DANIEL DUTTRY

-vs-

RUTH REGINA DUTTRY

:
:
:
:
:
:
:

NO. 18 November Term, 1960

IN DIVORCE

MASTER'S REPORT

TO THE HONORABLE JOHN J. PENTZ, PRESIDENT JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

L. R. Brockbank, Esq., the Master appointed by your Honorable Court in the above proceedings of Divorce to take the testimony of the witnesses in the case and return the same with a Report thereof, respectfully reports as follows:

I. SCHEDULE

November 9, 1960

Complaint filed.

November 15, 1960

Complaint in Divorce served personally on Ruth Regina Duttry by Robert N. Colley, Constable.

November 17, 1960

On Praeceptum filed by Anthony S. Guido, Attorney for Defendant, Rule is entered on the Plaintiff to file a Bill of Particulars within twenty (20) days after service of the Rule, or non pros. sec. leg.

November 23, 1960

Petition for Alimony Pendente Lite, Counsel fees and expenses filed by Gleason, Cherry and Cherry, Attorneys for Defendant.
ORDER: AND NOW, this 21st day of November, 1960, upon consideration of the foregoing Petition and on motion of Anthony S. Guido, Esquire, Attorney for the Defendant, a Rule is granted on the Plaintiff to show

	cause why he should not pay the Defendant alimony pendente lite and counsel fees and costs. Returnable sec. leg. By the Court, John J. Pentz, President Judge. Service of the within Petition and Rule accepted and receipt of copy hereby acknowledged. Eugene D. Vallely, Attorney for Plaintiff.
November 28, 1960	Service of the within Rule accepted and receipt of copy thereof acknowledged. Eugene D. Vallely, Attorney for Plaintiff.
December 28, 1960	Plaintiff's Answer filed by Bell, Silberblatt and Swoope and Eugene D. Vallely, Attorneys for Plaintiff.
December 29, 1960	Service accepted. Anthony S. Guido, Attorney for Defendant.
February 9, 1961	On Praecipe filed by Gleason, Cherry and Cherry, Attorneys for Defendant, the above case is placed on the Argument List for March, 1961.
March 8, 1961	Bill of Particulars filed by Eugene D. Vallely, Attorney for Plaintiff. Service of the within Bill of Particulars hereby accepted and receipt of copy thereby acknowledged; and time of filing waived. Gleason, Cherry and Cherry by Anthony S. Guido.
March 9, 1961	Supplemental Bill of Particulars filed by Bell, Silberblatt and Swoope, Attorneys for Plaintiff. Service accepted this 9th day of March, 1961. Gleason, Cherry and Cherry by Anthony S. Guido.
March 11, 1961	Order for Counsel Fees filed by Eugene D. Vallely, Attorney for Plaintiff. ORDER:

AND NOW, March 6, 1961 after agreement reached by Counsel for the parties in the above entitled action, the Rule to Show Cause, heretofore granted in this case, is made absolute, and the Plaintiff, John Daniel Duttry, is directed to pay to the Defendant, or to Gleason, Cherry and Cherry, her attorneys, the sum of One Hundred Fifty (\$150.00) Dollars as Counsel fees and costs. By the Court, John J. Pentz, P.J.

March 31, 1961

By Motion on the Watch Book, L. R. Brockbank, Esq., is appointed Master to take the testimony and report the same with form of Decree.

April 4, 1961

Service of Master's Notice of date set for Hearing served on Eugene D. Vallely, of Counsel for Plaintiff, and Anthony S. Guido, of Counsel for Defendant.

April 20, 1961

Divorce Hearing postponed until Friday, June 2, 1961 by agreement of Counsels for Plaintiff and Defendant and Master.

May 15, 1961

First Hearing in Divorce Case taken by agreement of Counsels for Plaintiff and Defendant in the office of the Master Grant Snyder, Witness, Hon. F. Cortez Bell and Eugene D. Valley, Esq., and Anthony S. Guido, Esq.

May 26, 1961

Divorce Hearing postponed until June 12, 1961 by agreement of Counsels for Plaintiff, Defendant, and Master.

June 12, 1961

Second Hearing in Divorce. Appearances: Eugene D. Vallely, Esq., Hon. F. Cortez Bell, for Plaintiff; and Edward Cherry, Esq. and Anthony S. Guido, Esq., for Defendant. The

Plaintiff and Defendant also appeared and fourteen (14) witnesses as enumerated in the testimony.

July 28, 1961

Third Hearing in Divorce - Appearances: Eugene D. Vallely, Esq. and Hon. F. Cortez Bell for Plaintiff; and Edward Cherry, Esq. and Anthony S. Guido, Esq. for the Defendant. The Plaintiff and Defendant also appeared and also seven (7) additional witnesses.

August 7, 1961

Petition for additional Counsel fees filed. ORDER: - AND NOW this 7th day of August, 1961, the Court having read and considered the foregoing Petition and on Motion of Gleason, Cherry and Cherry, Attorneys for the Petitioner, grants a Rule on the Plaintiff to show cause why an additional adequate allowance for Petitioner's Counsel fees and expenses should not be made. Returnable sec. leg. By the Court, John J. Pentz, President Judge. Now August 7, 1961, service accepted by copy. Bell, Silberblatt and Swoope - F. Cortez Bell.

August 14, 1961

Answer of John Daniel Duttry to Petition for additional Counsel fees filed. Service accepted this 14th day of August, 1961. Gleason, Cherry and Cherry, by Anthony S. Guido.

January 22, 1962

All testimony in this case returned to the Master and Briefs by Attorneys for the Plaintiff and Attorneys for the Defendant filed by this date with the Master.

February 5, 1962 Petition for Additional Master's Fees and Order of Court filed.

February 14, 1962 Order of Court filed directing certain arrearages to be paid, etc. and directing that the Divorce Action shall not proceed further until the arrearages and other fees are paid.

May 20, 1963 Order of Court filed directing certain payments to be made, which have been done. Also, directing the Master to proceed with the Divorce Hearing.

II. SERVICE OF PROCESS

The original Complaint in Divorce was filed on November 9, 1960, and one copy was certified to the Attorney for the Plaintiff. The Certified Copy of the Complaint in Divorce was served on the Defendant, Ruth Regina Duttry, personally, by Robert N. Colley, Constable on November 15, 1960. Notice of the Master's Hearing was served on Eugene D. Vallely, of Counsel for Plaintiff and Anthony S. Guido, of Counsel for the Defendant. All of the provisions of the Rules of Court of Clearfield County, Pennsylvania, have been complied with in full.

III. CAUSE OF DIVORCE

Indignities to the Person.

IV. FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Plaintiff and the Defendant were married in the Village of Salem, Brady Township, Clearfield County, Pennsylvania, on July 20, 1957.

2. Residence. At the time of their marriage, the Plaintiff was a resident of Sandy Township, Clearfield County, Pennsylvania, and the Defendant was a resident of Brady Township, Clearfield County,

Pennsylvania. At the time this suit was instituted, the Post Office address of the Plaintiff was R.D. #2, DuBois, Pennsylvania; and the Post Office address of the Defendant was R.D. #1, DuBois, Pennsylvania. The Plaintiff has resided in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for at least twenty-four (24) years at the time of the bringing of the Action in Divorce.

3. The Plaintiff and the Defendant are both citizens of the United States.

4. Both the Plaintiff and Defendant are adults over twenty-one (21) years of age, and the Plaintiff was engaged in the Automobile Racing business and the Defendant is a housewife. The Plaintiff also worked as a car man for the B. & O. Railroad, DuBois, Pa.

5. Two children were born to this union, Sherry Lynn Duttry born April, 1958 and a second child born after the Divorce Action was started, said second child being born on May 20, 1961, and the name of this second child is not given. The Plaintiff, John Daniel Duttry was married previously and divorced and two children were born as the result of the first marriage, Harold Duttry, age 7 and John Duttry, age 5. One of these children is with the first wife and the second child lives with the Plaintiff, and the Plaintiff resides with his parents on R.D. #2, DuBois, Pa., in Sandy Township.

6. Military Service - Armed Forces. The testimony in this case shows that neither the Plaintiff nor the Defendant were ever in military service, and they appeared at the various hearings before the Master. Based upon the testimony and other matters connected with this case before the Master, the Master makes a specific Finding of Fact that the Defendant is not now a member of any branch of the Armed Services of the United States.

7. The Complaint in this case charges: "The Defendant has offered such indignities to the person of the Plaintiff as to render

his condition intolerable and life burdensome." According to the testimony, the parties were married on July 20, 1957, and they separated about September, 1959, and the Defendant filed for Divorce, after which they went back living together again and then separated permanently about September 6, 1960. In the Supplemental Bill of Particulars, it was stated that the Defendant had said both before Judge Pentz and on the streets of DuBois that her husband had a venereal disease and that he gave it to her. From the testimony of Dr. Joseph L. Chick, it appears that the husband did not have a venereal disease, and there was no evidence, as far as the doctor was concerned, that the Plaintiff ever had such a disease. The Plaintiff testified that his wife accused him of having a venereal disease and that he had given it to her, and he went to Dr. Grill, of DuBois, Pa., and that he was kidded down at the works about it. The Plaintiff also testified concerning the disease that the men at the shops where he worked kept asking him if he brought his syringe with him and whether he was taking 20 ccs. etc. He was in the Maple Avenue Hospital, the DuBois Hospital, the Ridgway Hospital and a Cleveland Hospital, all for nervous breakdowns. Thelma Bush testified that she had talked to Mrs. Duttry, the Defendant and Mrs. Duttry had told her the same story, and that all the girls were talking about it at the Goodrich Plant in DuBois. This testimony was also corroborated by Eugene D. Vallely, Esquire, as to what Mrs. Duttry, the Defendant, said before the Court. The Master is again reminded that Dr. Chick said that the Plaintiff did not have and probably never did have the disease.

There is considerable testimony by or concerning June Zortman, Jolene Dinger, Carol Wesiliski, Lucy Ingram, Patricia Murray, Grant Snyder, Mr. and Mrs. Fairman, Beverly Duttry, Sally Cairns, Ed Williams, John Duttry's first wife, Raymond Young, Mrs. Young, and others, most of which is flatly contradicted by the other side, regardless of who did the testifying, and a large part of the testimony

during the three Hearings and covering over two hundred (200) pages is completely irrelevant and has nothing to do with whether Ruth Regina Duttry offered such Indignities to the person of the Plaintiff, John Daniel Duttry as to render his condition intolerable and life burdensome. In a good many of the instances in which the Plaintiff is accused of improper relations with various girls in automobiles, there were persons present in the cars or at the Hot Dog Stands, or at the ball games, and some of these witnesses then admitted on cross-examination that they did not mean, necessarily, that Jack Duttry was having improper relations with these particular girls. There is also testimony that Jack was drinking and his testimony is that he does not drink at all. There is also testimony concerning a disturbance which took place at a ball game - Jack's first wife took Jack's child (by his first wife) over to the Bleachers where his second wife was sitting while Jack was playing in the game, and the two wives got into an argument, and she told Jack's second wife that the child belonged to Jack and twelve others, and Jack's first wife then hit Jack's second wife and pulled her hair. The testimony also shows that Jack had his first wife arrested for hitting his second wife. There is also the Parker Dam incident when Jack and his wife had Mr. and Mrs. Fairman with them as passengers in Jack's car and some conversation came up with reference to lip stick on cigarette butts, and Mrs. Duttry attacked her husband while he was driving the car, scratched his face, and grabbed the wheel and tried to wreck the car. There is also the incident concerning the gun - one night, when he came home from the races in July, 1960, his wife met him at the door with a gun and said that she would shoot him.

As to the improper relations with Luch Ingram and Patricia Murray, it was brought out on cross-examination that the witness did not believe it as both of the girls named did not like Jack Duttry.

This continued course of conduct, as above mentioned, plus the various other actions mentioned in the testimony, leads the Mast

during the three Hearings and covering over two hundred (200) pages is completely irrelevant and has nothing to do with whether Ruth Regina Duttry offered such Indignities to the person of the Plaintiff, John Daniel Duttry as to render his condition intolerable and life burdensome. In a good many of the instances in which the Plaintiff is accused of improper relations with various girls in automobiles, there were persons present in the cars or at the Hot Dog Stands, or at the ball games, and some of these witnesses then admitted on cross-examination that they did not mean, necessarily, that Jack Duttry was having improper relations with these particular girls. There is also testimony that Jack was drinking and his testimony is that he does not drink at all. There is also testimony concerning a disturbance which took place at a ball game - Jack's first wife took Jack's child (by his first wife) over to the Bleachers where his second wife was sitting while Jack was playing in the game, and the two wives got into an argument, and she told Jack's second wife that the child belonged to Jack and twelve others, and Jack's first wife then hit Jack's second wife and pulled her hair. The testimony also shows that Jack had his first wife arrested for hitting his second wife. There is also the Parker Dam incident when Jack and his wife had Mr. and Mrs. Fairman with them as passengers in Jack's car and some conversation came up with reference to lip stick on cigarette butts, and Mrs. Duttry attacked her husband while he was driving the car, scratched his face, and grabbed the wheel and tried to wreck the car. There is also the incident concerning the gun - one night, when he came home from the races in July, 1960, his wife met him at the door with a gun and said that she would shoot him.

As to the improper relations with Luch Ingram and Patricia Murray, it was brought out on cross-examination that the witness did not believe it as both of the girls named did not like Jack Duttry.

This continued course of conduct, as above mentioned, plus the various other actions mentioned in the testimony, leads the Mast

to believe that the wife would get all worked up and create considerable disturbance with her husband, and when coupled with the false charges of venereal disease, was more than he could endure and caused his trips to the hospitals. After his wife was calmed down, she was sorry for what she had done and testified she would take him back if he would behave himself. And when asked why she was fighting the divorce, Mrs. Duttry testified that she did not know.

As to the Indignities to the Person, there is ample evidence covering this charge. It is impossible to lay down a general rule for the determination of what indignities render the condition of the injured spouse intolerable. It has been held by many courts that they may consist of vulgarity, unmerited reproach, habitual contumely, studied neglect, intentional incivility, manifest disdain, abusive language, malignant ridicule, and every other plain manifestation of settled hate and estrangement. The Master believes a number of the above qualifications are in this case and are sufficient to support the Divorce on the grounds of Indignities to the Person.

V. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. That the proceedings are in accordance with the requirements of the Divorce Code and the Rules of Court of Clearfield County, Pennsylvania.

2. That the Court has jurisdiction of the parties and the subject matter of this Action.

3. That the facts establish Indignities to the Person within the meaning of the Act of Assembly.

4. The legal domicile of the Plaintiff is R.D., DuBois, Clearfield County, Pennsylvania; the legal domicile of the Defendant is R.D., DuBois, Clearfield County, Pennsylvania.

5. The Complaint in Divorce was served personally on the Defendant by Robert N. Colley, Constable; the Notice of the Master's


Hearing was served personally on the Attorneys for the Plaintiff and the Attorneys for the Defendant.

6. There has been no collusion, connivance, or levity between the parties.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS


The Master, therefore, finds that the averments of the Complaint have been sustained and recommends that the Prayer of the Complaint be granted, and that a Decree be entered by your Honorable Court divorcing JOHN DANIEL DUTTRY, the Plaintiff and RUTH REGINA DUTTRY, the Defendant, from the bonds of matrimony now existing between them, and a suggested form of Decree is attached hereto.

All of which is respectfully submitted.


L. R. Brockbank - Master

DuBois, Pa.
May 23, 1963.

In the Court of Common Pleas of Clearfield County, Pennsylvania



<u>JOHN DANIEL DUTTRY</u>	}	Of <u>NOVEMBER</u> Term, 19 <u>60</u>
<u>Plaintiff</u>		No. <u>18</u>
<u>VERSUS</u>		
<u>RUTH REGINA DUTTRY</u>		
<u>Defendant</u>		DIVORCE

And Now, the 27th day of May 1963, the report of the Master is acknowledged. We approve his findings and recommendations; except as to _____

We, therefore, DECREE that JOHN DANIEL DUTTRY be divorced and forever separated from the nuptial ties and bonds of matrimony heretofore contracted between ~~herself~~ himself and RUTH REGINA DUTTRY. Thereupon all the rights, duties or claims accruing to either of said parties in pursuance of said marriage, shall cease and determine, and each of them shall be at liberty to marry again as though they had never been heretofore married, except that _____

The Prothonotary is directed to pay the Court costs, including Master's fees, as noted herein, out of the deposits received and then remit the balance to the libellant. No Decree to issue until the costs be fully paid. We do further award to the said John Daniel Duttry ~~her~~ his costs expended in this action.

ATTEST
Carl E. Walker.
Prothonotary

BY THE COURT
John P. [Signature]
President Judge

In The Court of Common Pleas
Of Clearfield County, Penna.

No. 18 -NOVEMBER Term 1960

JOHN DANIEL DUTTRY
Libellant

VERSUS

RUTH REGINA DUTTRY
Respondent

DECREE

Attorney

Service accepted and notice waived
5-27-63

Clauson, Cherry & Cherry
By Emmitt Danner
Blld. Alkubhatt - 1 wife
J. Danner

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
OF CLEARFIELD COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA.
No. 18 November Term 1960

IN DIVORCE

BE:

JOHN DANIEL DUTTRY,
Plaintiff,

-VS-

RUTH REGINA DUTTRY
Defendant.

MASTER'S REPORT

"CONTESTED"

Leo R. Brockbank,
Master-----\$ 100.00

FILED

MAY 27 1963

CARL E. WALKER
PROTHONOTARY

LEO R. BROCKBANK

ATTORNEY AT LAW

SUITE 240, 242, 244 DU BOIS DEPOSIT
NATIONAL BANK BUILDING
DU BOIS, PENNSYLVANIA