



[Minnesota.](#)
[District Court \(Carver County\).](#)
[Civil and Criminal Case Files and Index.](#)

Copyright Notice:

This material may be protected by copyright law (U.S. Code, Title 17). Researchers are liable for any infringement. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/copyright.

No. 830

DISTRICT COURT,
CARVER COUNTY, MINN.

Enoch Holmes
Plaintiff.

vs.

Monroe L. Pierce
Defendant.

Sevance & Dickinson
Plaintiff's Attorney.

Defendant's Attorney.

Date of Entry May 5th, 1874

Register of Actions "A" Page 204

Term Tried 1

Judgment for Plaintiff

Amount of Judgment \$ 878.35

Date of Judgment July 31st 1874

Maine to Record "A"
Judgment Book "A" Page 376

Default Judgment Book Page

Date of Docketing July 31st 1874

Judgment Book "A" page - 122 -

State of Minnesota }
 County of St. Louis }
 I did on the 12th day of May 1874 Attach the South
 West Quarter (1/4) of Section Thirteen (13) the South East
 Quarter (1/4) of Section Twenty Three (23) and the South
 West Quarter (1/4) of Section Twenty four (24) all
 in Township one Hundred & one (101) Range
 Twenty four (24) in the County of St. Louis
 and State of Minnesota the property of the
 within Deft M. L. Pierce & R. Davis
 Dated May the 12/74 Fees/Service 1.00 Sheriff's Office
 50
 50
 1.00

26.05
 25.70
 51.75

District Court,

County of Cass

Enoch Holmes

vs
 Maurice L. Pierce

WRIT OF ATTACHMENT.

Issued May 12th 1874

W. H. Graymire clerk.

Returned December 31st 1874

W. H. Graymire clerk.

W. H. A

Lawrence E. Dickinson
 Plaintiff's Attorney.

For Sale at the Office of the St. Paul Pioneer.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
County of *Carnes*

DISTRICT COURT,
English Judicial District.

Enoch Holmes
as
Monroe L. Pierce

Writ of Attachment.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
County of *Carnes*

The State of Minnesota,

To the Sheriff of the County of *Saint Paul*, Greeting:

Whereas, in the above entitled action, which is for the recovery of money, an application has been made by *Enoch Holmes* the Plaintiff, for a Writ of Attachment against the property of *Monroe L. Pierce*

defendant therein, and to that end an affidavit has been made and filed, showing that a cause of action exists against such defendant, specifying the amount of the claim and the ground thereof; and that the defendant is not a resident of the State of Minnesota, but now is a foreigner, and has been a resident of San Francisco State of California and the bond in such case required by law, has been duly filed, and such Writ has been duly allowed.

Therefore, You are hereby commanded and required to attach and safely keep all the property of said *Monroe L. Pierce* within your County, and not exempt from execution, or so much thereof as may be sufficient to satisfy the said plaintiff demand, (which amounts to the sum of *Eight Hundred & fifty two dollars & twenty five cents*, as appears by the Complaint in said action,) together with costs and expenses, and that you proceed hereon in the manner required of you by law.

Witness the Honorable *A. B. Chatfield* Judge
of the District Court aforesaid, at *Carnes*
this *fifth* day of *May* in the
year *1874*

J. W. H. H. H. Clerk.

SUMMONS.

District Court,
Eighth Judicial District.
County of Barnes

Emile Hubner

AGAINST

Monroe Price

May 15th 1894

Subscribed and sworn to before me at St. Paul, Minn. this 15th day of May 1894.

Lawrence E. Dickerson

Plaintiff's Att'y.

For -

State of Minnesota ss.
County of Barnes

I hereby certify and return that I have made diligent search to find the said Monroe L. Price, the defendant herein for the purpose of serving upon him the within summons, that said defendant is not a resident of said County of Barnes, and can not be found therein.

May 15th 1894

J. E. Du Toit
Shurtz & Co Minn

STATE OF MINNESOTA,

County of *Cann*

DISTRICT COURT,

6th Judicial District.

Enoch Holmes

vs
Marius L. Price

SUMMONS.

The State of Minnesota, to the above named Defendant :

You are hereby summoned and required to answer the complaint of the plaintiff in the above entitled action *which is filed with the Clerk of said Court in said County* and to serve a copy of your answer to the said complaint upon the subscribers at *their* office in *the City of Mankato* in the County of *Blue Earth* in the State aforesaid, within twenty days after the service of this summons on you, exclusive of the day of service; and if you fail to answer the said complaint within the time aforesaid, the plaintiff will *take judgment against you for the sum of Seven Hundred & fifty two dollars and twenty five cents - with interest on the sum of four hundred dollars for one year from the first day of July 1869*

May 22

A. D. 1874

Erasmus E. Dickinson
Plaintiff's Attorney &

"State of Minnesota
County of Carver

District Court
Eighth District

Enoch Holmes

vs

Monroe & Pierce

The plaintiff in the above
entitled action complaining against the defendant
therein shews to the Court:

That on the first
day of July 1869, at Carver in this State
the plaintiff lent to the defendant, at his
request the sum of Fourteen Hundred dol-
lars, no part of which has ever been paid
save the sum of Five Hundred dollar
paid on the 26th day of September 1873, and
the sum of One Hundred and fifty dol-
lars paid on the first day of October 1873,
in all Six Hundred and Fifty dollars

The plaintiff further complaining, alleges
that on the first day of October 1873, and at
said Carver, the plaintiff at the instance and
request of the defendant, paid out and expen-
ded money in the sum of Two dollars and Twenty
five cents, in and about the business of the
defendant, and for his use, no part of which has
ever been paid, although the defendant promised
to pay the same.

Wherefore the plaintiff demands judgement
against the defendant for the sum of Seven
Hundred and fifty two dollars and twenty
five cents, with interest on said sum of
Fourteen Hundred dollars for one year from
the first day of July 1869, besides costs and
disbursements of this action

Severance & Dickinson
Plffs Attys.

"State of Minnesota } ss
County of Carver }

Enoch Holmes, being duly
sworn deposes and says, that he is the plaintiff
in the above entitled action, and that the
complaint therein is true of his own knowledge,
except as to matters therein stated on infor-
mation and belief, and as to those matters he
believes it to be true.

E. Holmes

Subscribed and sworn to }
before me this 1st day of

1874
G. Strayenholtz
Notary Public
Minneapolis

State of Minnesota
County of Carver

District Court
Eighth Judicial District

Enoch Holmes
vs
Monroe & Pierce

Complaint

copy

Filed May 15th 1894
G. H. Hagenbuhl
Clerk
- Post -

Severance & Dickinson
Attys
Mankato Minn

State of Minnesota District Court
County of Carver Eighth District

Enoch Holmes

vs

Monroe L. Pierce

State of Minnesota
County of Carver ss

Enoch Holmes

being duly sworn says that he is
the plaintiff in the above en-
titled action - that the summons
was issued therein on the 2d day
of May 1874 & that said entitled action
is now pending in said County
of Carver and in said Court -
that this affiant now does &
for more than two years last
past, has resided at Carver
in said County of Carver - in the
State of Minnesota - that he
believes that Monroe L. Pierce the
above named defendant is not
a resident of the State of Minnesota -
that he cannot be found therein -
that said defendant has for more
than two years ^{last past} and now does re-
side in the City of San Francisco

in the State of California - that on
the fifteenth day of May 1874 he
deposited a true copy of the Sum-
mons in the action in the Post office
in said town and County of Cam-
bridge in an envelope, and
postage prepaid & addressed &
directed to Monroe S Pierce said
defendant at said City of San Fran-
cisco, State of California, - that said
defendant has property in the State
of Minnesota - to wit - two hundred
acres of land and more in the
County of Hancock in said State -
that the said action arises on
Contract - & the said cause has
jurisdiction thereof.

Attest

Subscribed and sworn to
before me the 15th day of
May 1874

G. H. Graymire
Judge of said County
of Hancock

State of Minnesota
County of Cambridge
said Court
subscribed

Attest
Monroe S. Pierce

Received for sub-
scription of Summons.

Filed May 15th 1874
G. H. Graymire
Judge

Post

State of Minnesota
District Court
County of Carver.

Enoch Holmes
vs

Monroe L. Pierce,

Affidavit of publication.

Filed, July 31st A.D. 1874
G. H. Rayburn
Clerk

State of Minnesota

County of Carver

SUMMONS.

State of Minnesota, }
County of Carver, }

District Court, Eighth Judicial District.

Enoch Holmes, vs. Monroe L. Pierce.

The State of Minnesota, to the above named Defendant

You are hereby summoned and required to answer the complaint of the plaintiff in the above entitled action which is filed with the Clerk of said Court in said County, and to serve a copy of your answer to the said complaint upon the subscriber at office in the City of Mankato in the County of Blue Earth in the State aforesaid, within twenty days after the service of this summons on you, exclusive of the day of service; and if you fail to answer the said complaint within the time aforesaid, the plaintiff will take judgment against you for the sum of seven hundred and eighty-two dollars and twenty-five cents, with interest on the sum of fourteen hundred dollars for one year from the first day of July 1869.

May 2d A. D. 1874.

SEAVANCE & DICKERSON,
Plaintiffs Attorney.

A. L. Dwyer being
duly sworn on oath
deposes that he is one
of the publishers of the
"Valley Herald" a
weekly newspaper printed
and published at Chaska
in the County of
Carver and State of
Minnesota. That
the ~~publication~~ of which the

annexed is a printer by name
printer and publisher in
said news paper once in each
week for six successive weeks.
That the first publication thereof
was on the 28th day May A.
D. 1874 and the last publication
was on the 8th day of July of that year
Subscribed and sworn

in before me this 30th day of July A. L. Dwyer
A. D. 1874

Dec 8 85

L. L. Bayler
Notary Public
Carver Co Minn

No 5

DISTRICT COURT.

of *Carned*

Rich Holmes

Plaintiff

vs.

ie L. Rience

Defendant

Undertaking in Attachment.

I approve the within undertaking and the
sureties thereto.

Dated *May 5th*

J. A. Sargent

County Commissioner

Lincoln & Lukens

Plaintiff's Attorney. S

Mark Kuts

- 204 -

Minn.

Ramaley & Cunningham, Publishers, St. Paul.

Filed May 5th A.D. 1894.
J. A. Sargent
clerk

DISTRICT COURT,
County of Carr

Enoch Holmes

Plaintiff

Mamie L. Price

Defendant

WHEREAS

Enoch Holmes

Plaintiff, has commenced an action

by summons for the recovery of money against

Mamie L. Price

Defendant

and has made application for a Writ of Attachment against the property of said Defendant in pursuance of the Statute:

NOW THEREFORE, we Enoch Holmes prop and
Wm. A. Griffin att do Undertake, Promise and agree

to and with the said Defendant that the said Plaintiff shall and will pay all costs that may be awarded to said Defendant, and all damages he may sustain by reason of the said attachment not exceeding Two Hundred & fifty Dollars.

Dated this 8th day of May 1874

Enoch Holmes
Wm. A. Griffin

State of Minnesota,

County of Carr ss.

Enoch Holmes and Wm. A. Griffin

being duly sworn, each for himself says that he is a resident and freeholder of the State of Minnesota and is worth the sum of One Thousand Dollars, over and above his just debts and liabilities and exclusive of property exempt from execution.

Subscribed and sworn to before me,
this 8th day of May 1874

Wm. A. Griffin
Wm. A. Griffin
Wm. A. Griffin

Enoch Holmes
Wm. A. Griffin

No 4

Shuttl Court.

County of Carroll

Enoch Holmes

against

Marion L. Lince

Affidavit for Attachment.

To the Clerk of Said Court:

On filing the within affidavit and a bond approved
by me in the within entitled cause, let a Writ of
Attachment issue as within prayed.

Dated May 5 1874

J. A. Sargent

Judge of said Court.

Robert Cunningham

Filed May 5 A. D. 1874

G. H. Weyenbuhl

Clerk of said Court.

Samuel & L. L. Kline

Plaintiff & Attorney.

Ramaley & Cunningham, Printers and Stationers.

Rost

DT2

State of Minnesota,
County of Cann

} ss.

District

Court.

Engels Judicial District

Enoch Holmes

against

Affidavit for Attachment.

Thomas L. Reice

State of Minnesota,
County of Cann

} ss.

Enoch Holmes came

before me personally, and being first duly sworn, doth say, that he is the

said Plaintiff in the above entitled action, which is brought for the recovery of money, and a summons has been issued therein.

That a cause of action exists against the Defendant, and in favor of said Plaintiff therein, and the amount of said Plaintiff's claim therein is Eight hundred & fifty

two dollars & twenty five cents Dollars, and the ground thereof

is as follows, that is to say - The plff lent the deft \$14 on the
first day of July 1869 - on which only \$6.50 has been
paid - The plff also paid to deft use & at his
request \$2.25 on the first day of October 1873 & plffs
claims the balance of the aggregate of said sums
lent and paid - after deducting said payments,
as set out in sum \$14.00 less one sum

Deponent further says that the said Defendant

is not a resident of
the State of Minnesota but is and has
more than one year been
resident of San Francisco in the State
of California -

Therefore deponent asks that a Writ of Attachment may be allowed and issued against the property of said Defendant, according to the statute in such case provided.

Holmes

Subscribed and sworn to before me this
7th day of May 1874

Wm. H. Hays
Notary Public
in and for the State of Minnesota

State of Minnesota, }
County of Carver } ss.

Know all Men by these Presents, That we Enoch Holmes

as principal, and

and Morrice L. Pierce as surety are held and firmly bound unto

in the sum of Two Thousand and

Dollars, lawful money of the United States, to be paid to the said Morrice L.

Pierce his heirs, executors, administrators or assigns, for the payment whereof, well and truly to be made, we jointly and severally bind ourselves, our heirs, executors and administrators, firmly by these presents.

Sealed with our seals and dated this Twenty seventh day of July

A. D. 1874.

The condition of this obligation is such that, WHEREAS, an action has been commenced in the District Court in and for the said County of Carver wherein said Enoch Holmes is plaintiff and said Morrice L. Pierce is defendant. The summons in which action has been served by publication as provided by law; and whereas the said plaintiff is about to apply to said court for judgment therein, the said defendant having suffered default in such action.

Now therefore if the above plaintiff, Enoch Holmes, shall abide the order of said court touching the restitution of any money or property collected or recovered under or by virtue of the judgment in such action, in case the said defendant or his representatives shall apply thereafter and be admitted to defend such action, and shall succeed in the defence of

then this obligation shall be void, otherwise of force.

In testimony whereof, we have hereunto set our hands and seals on this Twenty seventh day of July A. D. 1874

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED IN PRESENCE OF

John D. [unclear]

E. Holmes [SEAL]
Wm. A. Griffin [SEAL]

[SEAL]

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
County of Carver

} District Court Eighth Judicial District

Enoch Holmes

against

Murroe L. Pierce

Affidavit of No Answer.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
County of Blue Earth

ss.

Martin J. Severance

being first duly sworn, doth depose and say, that he is one of the Attorneys for the Plaintiff in the above entitled action; that the summons in said action was ~~personally~~ served upon the defendant ^{by publication} and by ~~affidavit~~ on file in the Office of the Clerk of said Court therein as appears by the return thereon; that more than twenty days have elapsed since the service of said Summons, ^{and since the completion of the publication thereof} and that no answer or demurrer, or copy of either, has been received by the Plaintiff's Attorneys in this cause, ^{nor has defendant in any manner appeared therein.} and prays judgment according to law.

Subscribed and Sworn to before me,

On this 24th day of July A. D. 1874

Martin J. Severance

D. A. Dickinson
Notary Public, Minn.

District Court
Carver County.

- Enoch Holmes

AGAINST

Murroe L. Pierce

Affidavit of No Answer, &c.

- Filed, July 28th 1874
J. H. Waymouth
Clerk

Severance & Dickinson
Attorneys for Plaintiff.

Ramaley & Cunningham, Printers and Stationers.

State of Minnesota,
County of Carver

District COURT.
Eighth Judicial District

Emoch Holmes

Against

Monroe L. Pierce

Affidavit of Disbursements.

Plaintiff's Costs and Disbursements.

Statute Costs,	\$ 5.00	✓
Affidavits, and oaths.	2.00	✓
Sheriff's Fees, in serving process.	1.20	✓
Clerk's Fees to be added,	6.20	✓
Publication of summons	8.85	✓
Court commissions for	2.00	✓
stamps for upon attachment	2.75	✓
Total Costs	\$ 28.10	

Amount claimed in Summons.

Principal, and interest	850.25
Interest,	\$ 848.35

State of Minnesota.
County of Blue Earth

ss.

Martin J. Severance.

being first duly sworn, doth depose and say, that he is one of the Attorney of said Plaintiff in the above entitled cause; that the above bill and items of Costs and Disbursements therein are just and correct, and have been or will be necessarily incurred therein.

Subscribed and Sworn to before me,
On this 24th day of July A. D. 1879

Martin J. Severance

S. A. Dickinson
Notary Public, Minn.

State of Minnesota
County of Carver

District Court
Eighth Judicial District

Enoch Holmes

as

Monroe L. Pierce

The complaint of the plaintiff in this action having been duly filed and the summons therein having been delivered to the sheriff of the County of Carver for service upon the defendant, and the defendant not being found within the state of Minnesota, and the said sheriff having ^{made return} ~~returned~~ to this court that the said defendant could not be found within said county, and an affidavit having been filed by the attorney for the plaintiff showing the said defendant to be not a resident of said state and that he could not be found therein and that he had deposited a copy of the summons in the post office directed to the defendant at his place of residence, and showing also jurisdiction of this court over the subject of the action and that the said defendant had property in this state; and the summons in said action having been published as required by law; and more

three twenty days, having elapsed since
the completion of the service of such
summons, and no answer or de-
fenses having been entered in
this action or any appearance made
by the defendant therein; and the
plaintiff having filed the security re-
quired by law.

Now therefore on motion of Joseph Sec-
erance & Dickinson, attorneys for the
plaintiff, it is adjudged that the
plaintiff, Enoch Holmes, do receive
of the defendant, Monroe L. Pierce the
sum of Eight hundred fifty dollars & twenty five cents
~~and~~ with Twenty eight dollars & ten cents -
~~and~~ costs and disbursements,
amounting in the whole \$ 878.35¹
Eight hundred seventy eight dollars and thirty five
cents.

Dated July 31st A.D. 1874 By the Court:

Esther Turnbull
Clerk

State of Minnesota
District Court
County of Carver,

Wm. H. Holmes
^{vs}
Monroe L. Pierce,

Judgment Roll.

Judgment \$ 851.25
Costs " 28.10

Total \$ 879.35

Filed July 20th 1894
G. H. Kuylenbuhl
Clerk.

204.

Given and h. Dickinson Aug 9 for
Haining, 471 and late. Minn.

No. 831

DISTRICT COURT,
CARVER COUNTY, MINN.

Frederick K. Kiklin
Plaintiff.

vs.

Peter Sallgren & J. L. Olsen
Defendant.

Baxter & Child
Plaintiff's Attorney.

Defendant's Attorney.

Date of Entry May 16th, 1874

Register of Actions "A" Page 153

Term Tried 1

Judgment for Plaintiff

Amount of Judgment \$ 127.05

Date of Judgment March 4th, 1875

Minute Record "A"
Judgment Book Page 1120

Default Judgment Book Page

Date of Docketing March 4th, 1875

Judgment Book'd page - 208 -

State of Minnesota I hereby certify and return that I did
 County of Leaver at the Township of Watertown in
 said County of Leaver on the 24th day of June
 AD 1874, serve the within summons upon Peter Dahlgren
 the within named defendant by handing & leaving
 with him personally a true & correct copy thereof. I
 also further certify that I could not find
 J. F. Valen in said County - after due & diligent
 search.

Legal Service 2.00
 Travel 45 miles 4.50
 Copy 30
 6.80.

J. E. DeTait
 Sheriff County
 Minn.

DISTRICT COURT,
 8th Judicial District.
 County of Leaver

J. E. DeTait
 vs
 Peter Dahlgren &
 J. F. Valen

S U M M O N S .

Filed, returned 4/5/74
 Attorney at Law
 J. E. DeTait

Rayter & Peck
 Plaintiff's Attorney.

State of Minnesota

DISTRICT COURT.

8th Judicial District.
County of Carver

Fredrick Hecklin
 Against
 Peter Dahlgren and
 J. S. Valen

SUMMONS.

The State of Minnesota, TO THE ABOVE NAMED DEFENDANT:

You and each of you are hereby summoned and required to answer the Complaint in this action which has been filed in the office of the Clerk of said Court at Chaska in said Carver County and to serve a copy of your Answer to the said Complaint on the subscribers, at their office in Chaska in said Carver County within twenty days after the service of this Summons upon you, exclusive of the day of such service, and if you fail to answer the said Complaint within the time aforesaid, the Plaintiff in this action will take judgment against you for the sum of Ninety and 00/100 with interest at seven per cent per annum from Feb. 8th, 1878, and 12 per cent from said 8th day of October 1878 besides the costs of this action.

Dated May 16th

A. D. 1878

Barter & Beck
Plaintiff Attorney, Chaska Minn.

Witnes

C A Dahlgren. That said sum
daily transfers were delivered to
the said plaintiff by said defendant
and that said plaintiff is now
the lawful owner and holder of
said note no part of which has
been paid. Wherefore the plaintiff de-
mands judgment against said defendant
for the sum of Ninety and 5/100 dollars
with interest thereon at the rate of seven
per cent per annum from July 8th 1873 to
Oct 8th 1873 and at the rate of 12 per
cent from and since the said 8th day
of October 1873. Resolved the court of this action
Baptist & Co
Repps & Co

District Court
Carmen County

L. K. Kellin

vs

Peter Dahlgren & Co
Complainants

Filed, May 16th 1874

W. H. H. H. H.

Valued

163.

Baptist & Co
Repps & Co

State of Minnesota
District Court Eighth Judicial District
County of Carver

Frederick Hecklin
 August
 Peter Dahlgren Esq
 of ~~St~~ Valen
 H

The plaintiff in the above entitled action for complaint therein respectfully states and shews to the court that the above named defendants for value received on the 3^d day of February A.D. 1843 made and executed in writing and delivered to one John M. Carlson their certain promissory note in the words and figures following ~~for the~~ the sum of \$90.⁵⁵/₁₀₀ Dollars To wit \$90.⁵⁵/₁₀₀

Watertown Feby 3 1843

On or before the Third day of October
for value received I the Subscriber of
Watertown Sec 19 County of Curran State
of Minnesota Promise to pay to the
order of John M Carlson at the
Office of - in Watertown with interest
at 7 per cent from date - and 12
per cent after due until paid without
benefit of the stay of Execution or Homestead
Law. This note to become due and collectable
on the removal of its maker Peter Dahlgren
Pastor in Watertown J. A. Fisher

Jesse Court
Cannon County.

J. Hicklin

²
Peter Dahlgren et al

Affidavit of no
assess.

Julius March 4th 1875
Guthrie & Co
Chick

State of Minnesota
Last Court & Circuit
Lower County.
Hermann Hickins

- vs -
Peter Dahlgren and
J. J. Valen
County of Scott.

} Affidavit of No answer

H. J. Peck being duly sworn says
that he is one of the Attys for plaintiffs in
the above entitled action, that there
has been no appearance therein
on the part of said defendant either
by answer answer or otherwise
Subscribed & sworn to
this 13th day of February } H. J. Peck.

1895:

J. M. Brown
Notary Public
Scott. Co. Minn.



District Court
Larimer County

Fred Kuehlin

vs
Oahlgren &
Valeri

Filed March 4th 1895
G. H. Graymiller
Clerk

Barter & Child
Attorneys for
Krebs

State of Minnesota
District Court Eighth
Judicial District
County of Olmsted,

Frederick Hecellin

against

Peter Dahlgreen and
J. S. Allen.

Copy of Judgment.

The Complaint in the
above entitled Action having been duly filed with
the Clerk of said Court and the Summons personally
served upon the Defendant Peter Dahlgreen,
and it appearing by the Affidavit of the Attorney
for Plaintiff that there has been no appearance
therein on the part of said Defendant either
by answer, demurrer or otherwise.

Now therefore Upon Motion of
Baxter & Child Attorneys for Plaintiff, It is hereby
adjudged and determined and the judgment of
this Court is that said Plaintiff recover of said
Defendant Peter Dahlgreen, the sum of ninety dollars
and fifty five cents principal, and twenty dollars
seventy cents interest, as claimed by said Summons
and complaint, together with the sum of fifteen
dollars and eighty cents costs and disbursements
incurred in said action, the whole amounting

To the sum of One Hundred twenty Seven dollars
and five Cents, And that Said Plaintiff have his
lawful receipt therefor.

Judgment, principal \$ 90.55
Interest at 12% " 21.40

\$ 111.95

Costs. Statute Costs \$ 5.00
Sheriff's fees " 6.80
2 affidavits " 1.50
Clerk's fees " 3.50 " 15.80

Total \$ 127.15

Dated March 4th AD 1875.

By the Court:

— J. H. Haysenbuck
Clerk

State of Minnesota
District Court
County of Carver,

Fredrick Hestlin
Against
Peter Dahlgreen
and J. S. Vallen,

Judgment Roll.

Judgment	\$ 90.55
Interest	" 20.70
Costs	" 15.80

Total \$ 127.05

Given March 4th A.D. 1895.
Godfrey Embuhl
Clerk

Wester & Child Attys for Puff
Charles, Minn.

No. 832

DISTRICT COURT,
CARVER COUNTY, MINN.

James F. Dickey
Plaintiff.

vs.

August Voll
Defendant.

Baxter & Pick
Plaintiff's Attorney.

Defendant's Attorney.

Date of Entry May 25th, 1874

Register of Actions "A" Page 157

Term Tried 1

Judgment for

Amount of Judgment \$

Date of Judgment 1

Judgment Book Page

Final Judgment Book Page

Date of Docketing 1

State of Minnesota
District Court 8th Dist
Cannon County.

James H. Bailey

- 23 -

Seymour Hall.

The Plaintiff for complaint in the above entitled action, states and shews to the Court, that herebefore to wit. on the 12th day of February 1874 and long prior thereto the said Defendant was the owner of and had in his possession in the town of Wacornia in said County of Cannon Minnesota one certain Cow which said Cow was vicious and unruly and accustomed to and would whenever opportunity was given break and gore horses, all of which was during all of said time well known to this Defendant.

That on said 12th day of February 1874 in said town of Wacornia the said Defendant did carelessly and negligently and in violation of laws allowed and suffer said Cow to run at large and be upon the public highway in said town. That while so at large as aforesaid and upon said public

highway on the day aforesaid the
said cow did break said gate a certain
horse the property of this Plaintiff to the
great injury of said horse and to the
damage of said Plaintiff as hereafter
stated.

That by reason of and on account of
said carelessness and negligence and
unlawful acts of said Defendant as
aforesaid, and the injuries received by
said horse from said cow, ^{and not otherwise} the said
horse became and was lame and sick
and crippled and disabled for the space
of fifty six days, whereby and on account
of which the said Plaintiff for the space
of fifty six days was unable to use
or drive and work said horse in any
manner whatever to the damage of this
Plaintiff in the sum of fifty six dollars.

That the Plaintiff further avers, that in
and about his endeavor to cure and
heal said horse of his lameness and
of the injuries so received as aforesaid
he necessarily paid said out and expen-
-diture in medical service and medicines
and in care and attention and in feeding
said horse. the sum of nineteen dollars
and eighty five cents.

District Court
Leam County

James H. Seely

- vs -

August Hall

Complainant

Baxter & Peto
Attys for Plaintiff

Filed May 25th 1874
J. H. Maynard
Clerk

page 157
Reg A

Wherefore Plaintiff demands judgment
against said Defendant for the sum
of Seventy five Dollars and Eighty five
cents. Together with his costs and
disbursements of suit.

Barton & Peck

Attys for Plaintiff

No.

833

DISTRICT COURT,
CARVER COUNTY, MINN.

John Flegg Wm. B. Griswold
Partners as Flegg & Griswold
Plaintiff.

vs.

Lucius Hunt & Son
Defendant.

Baxter & Peck
Plaintiff's Attorney.

J. A. Sargent
Defendant's Attorney.

Date of Entry *May 26th* 1874

Register of Actions *"A"* Page *158*

Term Tried *October General* 1874

Judgment for

Amount of Judgment \$

Date of Judgment 1

Judgment Book Page

Default Judgment Book Page

Date of Docketing 1

Cody

DISTRICT COURT.

County of Lincoln

Guy & Ames

Plaintiff

L. H. & L.

Defendant

Undertaking in Claim and Delivery.

I approve the within undertaking and the
sureties thereto.

Dated May 26 1874

L. H. & L.
L. H. & L.
L. H. & L.

Plaintiff's Attorney.

W. H. & K.

Attest Minn.

DISTRICT COURT,

County of Linn,

John W. Guy & William A. Gruesen
Co-partners as Guy & Gruesen

Plaintiff

Lucas Hume & Andrew S. Hume
Partners doing business as
G. Hume & Son

Defendant

WHEREAS, the above named Guy & Gruesen kindly
 allege that Lucas Hume & Andrew S. Hume do not have in
actual possession and wrongfully detain certain personal property belonging to the said
Guy & Gruesen of the estimated value of
one hundred & twenty five Dollars, and the said
Guy & Gruesen is about to commence an action to
 recover the possession of said property and claims the immediate delivery of the said property to
them by the Sheriff of the County of Linn

NOW THEREFORE, we L. W. Stoller & Philip Kuehn
 of the County of Linn of persons
 do hereby undertake and bind ourselves in the sum of \$ 250.00
 Dollars, for the prosecution of the said action and for a return of the said property to the said
defendants if a return thereof shall be adjudged,
 and for the payment to the said Lucas Hume & Andrew S. Hume
 of any such sum as may for any cause be recovered in said action against said
Guy & Gruesen

Dated the 25 day of May 1874

L. W. Stoller
Philip Kuehn

STATE OF MINNESOTA,

County of Linn

ss.

L. W. Stoller

and

Philip Kuehn

the sureties to the above undertaking,

being first duly sworn, each for himself says that he is a resident and freeholder of the County of
Linn in the State of Minnesota, and that he is worth the sum of
\$ 250.00 Dollars, over and above his just debts and liabilities
 and exclusive of property exempt from execution.

Subscribed and Sworn to before me,
 this 25 day of May A. D. 1874

G. H. H. H. H.
Chas. H. H. H.
Am. A. H. H.

L. W. Stoller
Philip Kuehn

DISTRICT COURT.

8

Judicial District.

County of

Lucas

Gregg & Grimes

- vs -

L. H. Hume & Son

Cosby,

SUMMONS.

Served 25 May

Baxter & Rich

Plaintiff Attorney

(44.)

STATE OF MINNESOTA,

DISTRICT COURT,

County of *Levee*

Judicial District.

*John W. Grogan & William A. Grogan
partners doing business as Grogan & Grogan*

SUMMONS.

*Lucius Howe & Son & L. Howe & Son
partners doing business as L. Howe & Son*

THE STATE OF MINNESOTA to the above named Defendant:

You *L. Howe & Son* are hereby summoned and required to answer the complaint in this action which has been filed with the Clerk of said Court in his office in *Chaska* in the County of *Levee* and State of *Minnesota* and to serve a copy of your answer to the said complaint on the subscribers, at *their* office in

the Village of Chaska in the County aforesaid.
within twenty days after the service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of such service, and if you fail

to answer the said complaint within the time aforesaid, the Plaintiff in this action will *apply to*
the Court for the relief demanded in the
said Complaint.

Dated *May 25*

1874.

Bothe & Peterson
Plaintiff & Attorney, *Chaska* Minn.

State of Minnesota
County of Hennepin
Leisi Court 8th Dist
John W. Gray & Wm. B. Griswold
Opertures doing business as
Gray & Griswold

-vs-

Lucas Home & Ermon L. Home
Opertures doing business as
L. Home & Son.

The Plaintiffs for Complaint in the
above entitled action state and shew
to the Court, that for more than
one year last past said Plaintiffs
have been and still are Opertures
doing business as Gray & Griswold

II That the said Defendants have
for two years last past been
and still are Opertures doing
business as L. Home & Son.

III The Plaintiffs further say that
for one year last past they have
been and still are the owners of
and entitled to the immediate possession
of the following personal property
to wit One Hack wagon of the
value of twenty five dollars and
one Revere brick machine of the

value of One hundred dollars
 that these plaintiffs did before the
 Commencement of this action delivered by
 said defendants that they deliver up
 said personal property to these plaintiffs
 that said defendants ^{are completely in the possession} refused to
 deliver up the possession thereof to
 these plaintiffs but wrongfully and
 unlawfully retained the possession
 thereof from these plaintiffs. That by reason
 of said wrongful retention of said property these plaintiffs have been damaged in
 the sum of \$25.00. That these plaintiffs demand judgment
 against said defendants for the
 recovery of the possession of said
 personal property and in case the
 possession thereof can not be had
 that these plaintiffs recover of said
 defendants the value thereof together
 with the sum of \$25.00 damages for
 said wrongful detention. with costs
 of suit.

Arthur R. Rich

Attys for Plffs.

Wm. C. Cress

Leah Cress

George & Frederick

— do —

L. Horner & Sons

Official Assignee Comptroller

Seems to be dict - court

Papm

State of Minnesota } In High Court
County of Hamlin } 8th Feb High

John W Gregg & Mrs B Griswold }
Cofpartners doing business as }
Gregg & Griswold }
against }
Lucius Howe & Emmons & Howe }
Cofpartners doing business as }
& Howe & Son }

The answer of the above named
defendants to the Complaint of the above
named plaintiffs shows and states to
the Court-

I. They admit that said plain-
tiffs are the owners and entitled to the
possession of the personal property described
in said Complaint-

II. And these
defendants further answering allege
that they have, at all times, during the
year last past been willing, desirous and
solicited the said Plaintiffs to remove
from the premises of these defendants and
and take possession of said personal property
described in said Complaint-

III These

defendants further answering, deny that said personal property described in said complaint has been wrongfully detained by these defendants, from the possession of said plaintiffs, and deny that they ever refused to deliver the same to said plaintiffs.

IV. These defendants further answering, deny that said Plaintiffs have been damaged in any sum whatever by the wrongful detention of said personal property by these defendants.

Wherefore said defendants demand that said action may be dismissed with their costs.

J. H. Sargent
Meigs City
Chaska Minn

Exhibit
vs
L. H. Sargent

Page 1

State of Minnesota
Leise Count & Leise
Leise County

John W. Gregg & William B. Gussow
Partners doing business as
Gregg & Gussow

- vs -

Lucas, Guss & Gordon, L. Howe
Partners doing business as
L. Howe & Son.

The Plaintiffs for Complaint against
the defendants allege.

I That for one year last past the
said Plaintiffs have been and still
are copartners doing business as
~~Gregg~~ Gussow.

II That during all of said time the
said defendants have been and still
are copartners doing business as
L. Howe & Son.

III The Plaintiffs further say that for
one year the Plaintiffs have been
and still are ~~the~~ the owners of and
entitled to the immediate possession
of the following personal property to wit.
One Truck Wagon of the value of
twenty five dollars. And one Revere
Rack Machine of the value of one hundred dollars.

- That said Defendants are wrongfully and unlawfully in the possession of said property, that before the Commencement of this action the Plaintiffs did demand of ^{that they demand of said Defendants} said Defendants, that they refused so to do, that they are now wrongfully and unlawfully in the possession thereof and do withhold the possession of said property from the Plaintiffs. That by reason of said wrongful and unlawful detention of said property by said Defendants, the Plaintiffs have been deprived of the use thereof to their damage in the sum of fifty dollars, wherefore Plaintiffs demand judgment against said Defendants -
- I For the return and delivery of the possession of said personal property to the Plaintiffs
- II For the sum of fifty dollars damages for said wrongful detention.
- III For the sum of fifty dollars with costs of suit.

Robert P. Pick

Attorney at Law.

Dir- Leant
Cann Coaliz

1797 1798

L. H. Ma & Co

Compliment

Box 10 & 11
Ally 10 Dr 11 12

Yield, May 16th 1874
G. H. Mayentahl
Deluck

State of Minnesota }
County of Le Sueur } On this 10th day of
8th Mo.

John W. Gregg & Wm B. Griswold
Complainants doing business as
Gregg & Griswold
against
Lucius Howe & Sons & Howe
Complainants doing business as
L. Howe & Son

The answer of the above named
defendants to the complaint of the above
named plaintiffs shows and states to
the Court.

I. They admit that said
plaintiffs are the owners and entitled
to the possession of the personal property
described in said complaint.

II. These defend-
ants further answering allege, that they
have at all times, during the year last
past, been willing, desired and solicited
the said plaintiffs to remove from the
premises of these defendants, and take
possession of said personal property described
in said complaint.

III. These defend-

ants further answering, deny that said personal property, described in said complaint has been wrongfully detained from the possession of said plaintiffs, by these defendants - and deny that they ever refused to deliver the same to said plaintiffs -

IV. These defendants further answering - deny that said plaintiffs have been damaged in any sum whatever by reason of the wrongful detention of said personal property by these defendants -

Wherefore said defendants demand that said action may be dismissed with their costs -

J. A. Sargent -

Plt's Atty

John W. Munn

State of Minn. - Can
Co. Dist Court 8th
Dist -

Longg + Brosold
agts
L. Horn & Son

Answer -
Original

Service admitted
This 13th day of
June 1874

Robert M. W.
att'y (G. 138)

Filed June 30th A.D. 1874.
G. H. Bryant
Clerk.
-158-

State of Minnesota,

DISTRICT COURT,

County of

Carn

ss.

Eight

District.

John M. Gugg and
William Guggenwey Co-
Partners as Gugg and Guggenwey
AGAINST

Lucius Hand and Sons L.
Home Hardware Store, as
Home & Son.

Affidavit in Claim and Delivery of
Personal Property.

State of Minnesota,

County of

Carn

ss.

John M. Gugg

came

before me personally, and being first duly sworn doth say, that he is one of
the firm of Gugg & Guggenwey
said Plaintiffs in the above entitled cause; that the said Plaintiffs are the owner, and lawfully
entitled to the immediate possession of that certain personal property to recover possession of which
this suit is brought, and which is described as follows, that is to say:

One Truck Wagon, and one Reel
Rich Machine

that the same is wrongfully detained from said Plaintiffs by said Defendant at Shulls
in the County of Carn and State aforesaid; that the same has not been taken for
a tax, assessment or fine, pursuant to a Statute, or seized under an execution or attachment against
the property of said Plaintiffs or either of them

and that the actual value of the aforesaid property is of one hundred
and twenty five Dollars,

and further saith not.

Subscribed and Sworn to before me,

On this

25th

day of

May

1874

}

J. W. Gregg

J. W. Gregg

Notary Public
Carn

State of Minnesota,
County of Carver } ss.

I hereby certify and
return that by virtue of the within and
endorsement herein I did on the 26th
day of May 1874 take from the possession of the
within named defendants the property herein described
to wit, one Revere brick machine and one truck
wheeler in Chaska in said County and after returning
the same as provided by law deliver the same to
the within named Sheriff, with a copy of this
affidavit endorsement and bond in due
action. Dated May 30th 1874. J. G. Dnt. Dist.
Sheriff of Carver County
Shuff. by
A. Schoenborn
Deputy

I have this 26th day of May 1874
return of the overhauled 1 Revere brick machine
+ 1 truck wheeler.

DISTRICT COURT,

County of Carver

J. G. Dnt. Dist.

against

L. Home and Son

Affidavit and Order in Claim and Delivery of Personal Property.

To the Sheriff of the County of
Carver State of Minnesota,

Sir:

You are hereby required to take
the property described in the within affidavit from
the Defendant in the within entitled cause, and
deliver the same to the Plaintiff therein according
to law.

Dated May 26th A. D. 187

Yours, &c.,

Baxter and Peck

Plaintiff's Attorney

BARRETT, CHASE & CO., St. Paul.

187.
Alvin,
John, Walter & Son,
Chaska, Minn.

DISTRICT COURT.

County of Leam

Gregg & Green Plaintiff

vs.

L. Home & Son.

Defendant

Undertaking in Claim and Delivery.

I approve the within undertaking and the
sureties thereto.

Dated May 26 1878

F. G. Du Pont Shipy Can Co

By C. J. H. H. H. H. H.

Secretary

Boyle & Rice

Plaintiff's Attorney.

Chas. A.

188

Minn.

Ramaley & Cunningham, Publishers, St. Paul.

Filed, October 28 1874.
Attest, Clerk.

DISTRICT COURT,

County of Cass

John W. Gregg and William
D. Greenwood ^{as Gregg & Greenwood} Plaintiff
 against
Lucius How & Simon L. Howe
partners doing business as L. Howe & Co. Defendant

WHEREAS, the above named Gregg and Greenwood plaintiffs
 allege that Lucius How & Simon L. Howe defendants are in
 the actual possession and wrongfully detain certain personal property belonging to the said
Gregg and Greenwood of the estimated value of
One hundred and twenty five Dollars, and the said
Gregg & Greenwood is about to commence an action to
 recover the possession of said property and claims the immediate delivery of the said property to

them by the Sheriff of the County of Cass
 NOW THEREFORE, we L. W. Noble and Philip Kirchner
 of the County of Cass aforesaid

do hereby undertake and bind ourselves in the sum of Two hundred & fifty
 Dollars, for the prosecution of the said action and for a return of the said property to the said
Defendant if a return thereof shall be adjudged,
 and for the payment to the said Lucius How & Simon L. Howe partners
 of any such sum as may for any cause be recovered in said action against said
Gregg & Greenwood plaintiffs

Dated the 25th day of May 1874

L. W. Noble
Philip Kirchner

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
 County of Cass } ss.
Philip Kirchner

L. W. Noble and

the sureties to the above undertaking,
 being first duly sworn, each for himself says that he is a resident and freeholder of the County of
Cass in the State of Minnesota, and that he is worth the sum of
Two hundred & fifty dollars Dollars, over and above his just debts and liabilities
 and exclusive of property exempt from execution.

Subscribed and Sworn to before me,
 this 25th day of May A. D. 1874

L. W. Noble
Philip Kirchner

Wm. H. H. H. H.
Notary Public
Warren, Minn.

STATE OF MINNESOTA, }

County of *Le Sueur* }

District Court,

8

Judicial District.

Greg G. Gundersen

AGAINST

L. Gundersen

NOTICE OF TRIAL.

Due service of the within notice is hereby ad-

mitted this *26* day of

Sept

A. D. 187*4*

J. H. Gundersen

Attorney for

Le Sueur

Attorney for

Filed this

Sept
Oct 1st

day of

A. D. 187*4*

B. & T. & V. Gundersen
Attorneys at Law

Printed and for sale at the St. Paul Pioneer office.

T. B. G.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,

DISTRICT COURT,

County of Cannon } ss.

Judicial District.

John W. Grey & Wm B. Mansueti
Petitioners as Grey & Mansueti

AGAINST

L. Horn & Erwin & Son
Petitioners as L. Horn & Son

Notice for Trial.

Sir: You will Please take Notice, That the issue of fact
the above entitled action, will be brought on for trial
at the next term Term of this Court, to be held
at the Court House, in the city
of St. Paul in said County, on the 1st day of
December A. D. 1874 at the opening of said Court on that day, or as soon
thereafter as Counsel can be heard.

Dated, _____ 187

Yours Respectfully,

Baxter & Peto
Attorneys for Shrinkley

To J. A. Sargent
Attorney for L. Horn & Son

No. 834

DISTRICT COURT,
CARVER COUNTY, MINN.

Julius Ackerman
Plaintiff.

vs.

Albert Lister
Defendant.

Baxter & Beck
Plaintiff's Attorney.

Frank Warner
Defendant's Attorney.

Date of Entry June 4th 1874

Register of Actions A Page 205

Term Tried 1

Judgment for Defendant

Amount of Judgment \$ 35.47

Date of Judgment 1

Judgment Book Oct 7th Page 1876

Default Judgment Book Page 143

Date of Docketing 1

242

State of Minnesota J.S.S. J. E. Du Tail - Sheriff
 County of Carver J.S.S. State of Minnesota
 in and for the County of Carver, State of Minnesota
 do hereby certify & return that at the Hall
 of Henry Label in the village of Young America
 Minn. on the 11th day of June A.D. 1874,
 serve the within Summons on the within named
 defendant by handing to & leaving with him
 a true copy of the same.
 True Summons \$1.00
 Copy 1.25

J. E. Du Tail
 Sheriff Carver Co. Minn.

DISTRICT COURT.

9.47th Judicial District,
 County of Carver

John Hermann & Son

against

Edmund Lervick

SUMMONS.

John Hermann & Son
 Plaintiff
 vs
 Edmund Lervick
 Defendant

Do

Ray & Decker
 Plaintiff's Attorney

(44.)

STATE OF MINNESOTA,

DISTRICT COURT,

County of

Carver

Eighth

Judicial District.

Julius Ackermann Plaintiff
 Ackermann and Chas Ackermann ex
 partem doing business under the firm
 name and style of Ackermann Brothers

SUMMONS.

THE STATE OF MINNESOTA to the above named Defendant:

You are hereby summoned and required to answer the complaint in this action
 which has been filed with the Clerk of said Court
 in his office in Chaska in said Carver County
 and to serve a copy of your answer to the said complaint on the subscriber, at the office in
 Chaska Carver County Minnesota
 within twenty days after the service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of such service, and if you fail
 to answer the said complaint within the time aforesaid, the Plaintiff, in this action will have the
 amount they are entitled to recover ascertained by
 the Court or under its direction and shall receive
 judgment for the amount so ascertained under
 the terms of this action.

Dated

from 4th

1874

Baptist Beck

Plaintiff's Attorney,

Chaska Minn.

State of Minnesota
District Court Eighth Judicial District
County of Carver

Julius Ackermann William
Ackermann and Christ Ackermann
copartners doing business under the
firm name and style of
Ackermann Brothers

vs
Albert Laisner

The plaintiffs in the above
captioned action for complaint therein res-
pectfully state and show to the court
that they are copartners doing business at
Young America in the County of Carver
in the State of Minnesota under the firm
name and style of Ackermann Brothers
That the said plaintiffs are the owner and
possessor of and in possession of the following
described land real estate situated lying
and being in said County of Carver
to-wit Lots (9 & 10) nine and ten in Block

in the town site of Young America
according to the plat thereof on record
in the Office of the Register of Deeds of
said County of Carver, and also of
the Steam Flour and Saw Mill situated
thereon, That the said Steam Flour and Saw
Mill is located and standing on the lands

And shore of a certain lake lying and being
in Sections, (14, 15, 22 & 23) fourteen, fifteen, twenty two
and twenty three, in Township (115) one hundred
and fifteen of Range (24) twenty six
in said County of Carson, and that said lake
has been measured and metes and
boundaries established thereon by the government
of the United States in the survey of the
Public lands, And the said Plaintiff
further says that the said Flour and Saw
Mill is run and operated by steam, and
that the water used for that purpose is ob-
tained and drawn from said lake, and
water sufficient to run and operate said
mill cannot be otherwise obtained
That on the 30th day of May A.D. 1844
the said defendant well knowing the
premises and wrongfully and unjustly
by intending to injure the said plaintiffs
and to deprive them of the use benefit
profit and enjoyment of the said
Steam flour and Saw mill, and to annoy
and incommode them in the possession of
the said lands above described did wrong-
fully, willfully and injuriously excavate
and dig a ditch and cause to be dug
and excavated a ditch at the outlet
of said lake on the south side thereof
That through said by means of said ditch

District Court
Carmen County

Ackermann Brothers

vs

Edward Leischner
Complainant

Subscribed and sworn to
J. W. Wrayenbuhl
Clerk

205

Raymond Pick
Plaintiff's Attorney

State of Minnesota
County of Carmen ss

Christ Ackermann being duly sworn
on oath says that he is one of the Plaintiffs in
the above entitled action, that the fore-
going complaint is true of his own knowledge
except as to matters which are stated to be
his information and belief and as to those
matters that he believes it to be true
Subscribed and sworn to
before me this 4th day of June 1884
Christ Ackermann

J. W. Wrayenbuhl, Clerk Dist Court
Carmen County

as aforesaid day and execution and
caused to be day and execution by the said
defendant as aforesaid in the said
defendant did willfully wrongfully
and for the purpose then and then of in-
juring the said plaintiffs in the use and
possession of said above discrete mem-
is and to deprive them of the use
benefit profits and enjoyment of
the said steam saw and flour mill
drain the said lake, ~~and~~ by means
of such draining and through and by the
said acts of the said defendant the
said plaintiffs are unable to remove
water in sufficient quantity to run
and operate the said mill and are
thoroughly deprived of the use then and
of the profits and benefits arising
therefrom, and that by means
of the said wrongful acts of the said
defendant the plaintiffs have been
damaged in the sum of three thousand
dollars - Wherefore the plaintiffs de-
mand judgment against the said
defendant for the sum of three thou-
sand dollars with interest since the
said 30th day of May 1884 and
the costs of this action

Respectfully

Plaintiffs Attorneys

fol 11

State of Minnesota
District Court
8th Judicial District
County of Carver

Julius Ackermann
William Ackermann
Christ Ackermann
Partners doing
business under the
firm and style of
Ackermann & Brothers
cyp
Albert Liestke

The defendant above
named for Answer to
the Complaint of the Plaintiff
in the above Entitled
action denies each and
every allegation in the
Complaint of the Plaintiff
not herein after expressly
admitted, stated, or
qualified. And the defendant
further Answering the
Complaint of the Plaintiff

admits that the plaintiffs
are the owners of the
several lots of land
mentioned in the Complaint
and of the Steam Flour
" 2 and Saw Mill situated
thereon and that the
same is situated upon
a certain Lake in sections
fourteen fifteen twenty
two and twenty three
in Township one hundred
and fifteen (115) of Range
twenty six (26) in the
County of Carver

Wherefore the defendant
demands judgment that
this action be dismissed
with costs

Dated Carver
June 11th 1874 } Frank Warner
atty for def
Carver
Min

State of Minnesota
County of Carver }
Albert Liston

Dist Court
8th Dist
in "

Ackermann & Bros
vs

Albert Lintco
vs "

Answer

New German of the within
Answer is hereby admitted
Let at the June 11th 1894.

B. & L. & V. & Co

attys for def

Given, June 11th a.m. 1894
by the court, clerk

Frank Warner
attys for def
= 205, = Curran
Minn

being first duly sworn
deponent and says, that
he is the defendant in
the foregoing entitled action
that the facts set forth
in the foregoing answer
are true of his own know-
ledge except as to the matters
therein stated upon in-
formation or belief and
as to those matters he
believes it to be true

Sworn to and
Subscribed before { Albert Leistikow
me this 11th day
of June A.D. 1874 }

Frank Warner
Justice of the Peace

District Court.

County of Carm

Ackermann Bros

against

Albert Seustien

Affidavit for Attachment.

To the Clerk of Said Court:

On filing the within affidavit and a bond approved
by me in the within entitled cause, let a Writ of
Attachment issue as within prayed.

Dated June 4th 1874

J. C. Simpson

Clerk of Court
Carm County, N. M.

Filed June 4th A. D. 1874

205

Boyle & Pelt

Plaintiff's Attorneys

Ramaley & Cunningham, Printers and Stationers

Filed June 4th A. D. 1874.
Wraymuhl

State of Minnesota,

County of

Carm

ss.

District

Court.

Eighth District

Lulus Ackermann William Ackermann
and Christ Ackermann, co partners
against
Eugene Ackermann and the firm name and
style of Ackermann Brothers

against

Affidavit for Attachment.

Albert Leistica

State of Minnesota,

County of

Carm

ss.

Christ Ackermann came

before me personally, and being first duly sworn, doth say, that he is one of
the said Plaintiff in the above entitled action, which
is brought for the recovery of money, and a summons has been issued therein.

That a cause of action exists against the Defendant, and in favor of said Plaintiff therein,
and the amount of said Plaintiff's claim therein is three

thousand Dollars, and the ground thereof
is as follows, that is to say The said action is brought to
recover damages for injury to the property of
Plaintiffs caused by the burning of a building
dependent upon which plaintiffs have lands in
the town of Irving Ancker Carm County Minnesota

Deponent further says that the said Defendant is about to assign the
estate and dispose of his property with the intent
to delay and defraud his creditors

Therefore deponent asks that a Writ of Attachment may be allowed and issued against the
property of said Defendant, according to the statute in such case provided.

Christ Ackermann.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this

4th day of June 1874

J. H. Sargent

Justice Peace

DISTRICT COURT.

County of Cass

Hermann Bros

Plaintiff

Albert Leichten

Defendant

undertaking in Attachment.

prove the within undertaking and the
s thereto.

dated June 3 1874

W A Sargent,
County Commissioner

205

Baptist Peak

Plaintiff's Attorney.

Chaska

Minn.

Ramaley & Cunningham, Publishers, St. Paul.

Filed, June 14 1874
Wrayenbuhl Clerk

DISTRICT COURT,

County of Cass

Julius Ackermann William Ackermann
and also Ackermann copartners doing
business under the firm name and style
of Ackermann Brothers
vs
Albert Leistler
Defendant

WHEREAS Ackermann Brothers the above
named — — — — — Plaintiffs, have commenced an action
 by summons for the recovery of money against Albert Leistler
the above named — — — — — Defendant
 and have made application for a Writ of Attachment against the property of said Defendant in
 pursuance of the Statute:

NOW THEREFORE, we Fr Green and
Jacob Ehrenkrantz do Undertake, Promise and agree
 to and with the said Defendant that the said Plaintiffs shall and will pay all costs that may be
 awarded to said Defendant, and all damages he may sustain by reason of the said attachment
 not exceeding two hundred and fifty Dollars.

Dated this 4 day of June

1874

Fr. Greiner

Jacob Ehrenkrantz

State of Minnesota,

County of Cass

ss.

Fr. Green and
Jacob Ehrenkrantz

being duly sworn, each for himself says that he is a resident and freeholder of the State of
 Minnesota and is worth the sum of two hundred and fifty Dollars, over
 and above his just debts and liabilities and exclusive of property exempt from execution.)

Subscribed and sworn to before me,
 this 4th day of June 1874

Fr. Greiner

Jacob Ehrenkrantz

L L Dwyer

Natary Public
Cass Co Minn

State of Minnesota
 County of Curmuss - I Frederick E Du Toit
 Sheriff in and for said County do hereby certify
 and return that on the 4th day of June
 AD 1874 I attached as the property of
 the within named defendant, by virtue
 of the within writ of Attachment the
 following described land and real estate
 situated lying and being in the County of Curmuss
 and State of Minnesota ^{to wit} ~~two~~ ^{Lat} ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~one~~ ^{and} ~~section~~ ^{and}
 in Section (12) ~~thirteen~~ ^{thirteen} also ~~section~~ ^{section} ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~one~~ ^{and} ~~section~~ ^{and}
~~and~~ ^{and} ~~one~~ ^{and} ~~section~~ ^{and} ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~one~~ ^{and} ~~section~~ ^{and}
 section. Out Lat, ~~thirteen~~ ^{thirteen} and ~~fourteen~~ ^{fourteen} all in ~~township~~ ^{township}
 ship one hundred and fifteen Range & twenty six
 Dated June 4th 1874.

F. E. Du Toit

Sheriff Curmuss County Minn

Fees - Service Writ \$1.00.
 Two Copies 60.
 Frank & Mils (40)
 2.00

District Court,

County of Curmuss

William W. Brooks

vs
 Albert Leitch.

WRIT OF ATTACHMENT.

Issued

June 4th

1874

clerk.

Anthony J. Burkell

Returned

June 10th

1874

clerk.

Anthony J. Burkell

Bayless Pickel

plaintiff Attorney.

Printed and for sale at the office of the St. Paul Pioneer.

State of Minnesota,

County of

Carver

DISTRICT COURT,

Ninth

Judicial District.

Julius Gellermann William Gellermann
and Christ Gellermann Co Partners
doing business under the firm name and style of
Gellermann Brothers

Writ of Attachment.

vs
Albert Leistico

STATE OF MINNESOTA,

County of

Carver

The State of Minnesota,

To the Sheriff of the County of

Carver

, GREETING:

Whereas, in the above entitled action, which is for the recovery of money, an application has been made by Gellermann Brothers the Plaintiffs for a Writ of Attachment against the property of Albert Leistico

defendant therein, and to that end an affidavit has been made and filed, showing that a cause of action exists against such defendant, specifying the amount of the claim and the ground thereof; and that the defendant is about to assign, convey and dispose of his property with the intent to delay and defraud his creditors and the bond in such case required by law, has been duly filed, and such Writ has been duly allowed.

Therefore, You are hereby commanded and required to attach and safely keep all the property of said Albert Leistico within your County, and not exempt from execution, or so much thereof as may be sufficient to satisfy the said plaintiff demand, (which amounts to the sum of Three Thousand Dollars as appears by the Complaint in said action,) together with costs and expenses, and that you proceed hereon in the manner required of you by law.

Witness the Honorable

Amos G. Chatfield

Judge

of the District Court aforesaid, at

Chaska

this Ninth day of

June

in the

year 1874.

J. Grayenbuck

Clerk.

State of Minnesota
County of Carver
District Court
8th Judicial District

Lulus Ackermann
William Ackermann
Christ. Ackermann
Partners doing
business under the
firm name and
style of
Ackermann Brothers
by
Albert Liestke

Please take notice, that
on the affidavits ~~books~~
~~annexed~~ of Albert Liestke
and Frank Warner copies
of which are hereto annexed
and marked respectively
"A" and "B", and upon the
pleadings in said action
and all papers in said
action on file in the
office of the Clerk of the
District Court for said

County - The undersigned
will move, the Court
at a special Term thereof
to be held at Shakopee
in the County of Scott
State of Minnesota at the
Court house at Shakopee
aforesaid on the 18th day
of July A.D. 1876 at 10 o'
clock in the forenoon
or as soon thereafter
as Counsel can be
heard, to discharge the
Attachment in this action
and vacate the same
upon the following
grounds among others

1st. That said Attachment
was improperly issued
in said action.

2^d. That the statements in
the affidavit for the
writ are false and
untrue and insufficiently
made

Notia affirmativa.

Filed, July 2nd 1896
G. W. C. C. C. C. C.
del. C. C. C. C. C.

3^d That lapse of time
and the understanding
and agreement of
the parties have rendered
said Attachment a
nullity

And the under-
signed will read said
affidavits in support
of said motion and will
apply for such further
relief as may be just
herein and for Costs
of this motion.

Dated at Carson
July 10th 1876

Frank Warner
att'y for
Def't

Lothrop Baxter Esq. Peck
att'y for
Plaintiffs

Carson
Nev

fol (1)
State of Minnesota
County of Carver
District Court
8th Judicial District

Julius Ackermann
William Ackermann
Christ Ackermann
Copartners doing business
under the firm name
and style of
Ackermann Brothers
vs
Albert Leistico

Carver County } \$8
Albert Leistico being
first duly sworn deponent
swears, that he is
the defendant in the
foregoing entitled action
that the summons
in said action was served
on this deponent the
defendant therein on
the 14th day of June A.D.
1874 and thereafter on the
same day the said plaintiffs

11 2
Caused a writ of Attachment
to issue against the
Real Estate of this defendant
and that the day
aforesaid said defendant's
property was attached
which is described as
follows To wit: Lot
six (6) in Section Twelve 54,
also Lot five (5) in said
section and Lots 4 and
7 and 8 in said section
out lots 13 and 14 all
in Township 115 of Range
26 in the County of
Crawford (Missouri)

And the defendant
further says, that said
action was claimed
to have been commenced
to recover the sum
of three thousand dollars
damages from said
3 defendant - by reason
of draining a certain
lake in said County
upon which said

plaintiffs have and now
have a Mill, - And
the defendant further
says that soon after
the service of the summons
in said action ~~and~~
served upon him, he
died on the 11th day
of June A.D. 1874. Curren
an answer to the
Complaint of the Plaintiffs
to be served upon
them through their said
attorneys Messrs Baxter and
Peck which said answer
therein denied each
and every allegation
in said Complaint. And
which said answer
the said defendant the
defendant does then
and has ever since
been ready to prove
to be true in all
respects - And the
defendant further says
that said plaintiffs on
or about the 4th day

7 June A.D. 1874 Commenced
and carried on against
this defendant a Criminal
prosecution for the draining
of the Lake aforesaid
but that upon the
hearing of the Evidence
the Grand Jury of said
County of Carson refused
to take any action
therein and thereupon
said Criminal proceeding
were dismissed and
came to an end which
was at the Fall Term
of said Court A.D. 1874
And the defendant
further states and
shows that thereafter
no further action was
ever had or taken to
bring to trial the action
against this defendant
for damages aforesaid
and it was then and
there understood that
said Cause was to

be discontinued and
dismissed, and no
further attention was
given to it. by the said
defendant, no notice
of trial ever having
been served, and
the defendant further
states and shows, that
the affidavit upon
which said writ of
Attachment ^{was issued} signed by
Christ. Ackerman one of
said plaintiffs stated
as the following as the
ground for said Attachment

"The defendant is about
to abscond and remove
and dispose of his property
with the intent to delay
and defraud his Creditors"

That said statement
was at the time the
same was made and
is now wholly false
and untrue and
without any foundation
in fact - that each

this defendant known or
doubted this said action
had not been dismissed
he would have caused
a notice of trial to
be served on said
plaintiffs long previous
to this date

And the defendant
further states and shows
that he now desires
to exchange his said
farm attached as above
and described with a
neighboring farmer and
has found it to his
advantage so to do
and that by reason
of said exchange he would
obtain more land
than he now owns
and more suitable
for his business - that
upon making arrangements
with his said neighbor
for said exchange of
farms, he prepared

be dismissed and vacated
and be declared in
operation

James D. French
Subscribed before
me this 3^d day of
July A.D. 1876
James D. French
Notary Public

Albert L. Lister

711 words

Dist. Court
of the District

Achman A. B.

As
Albert Lister

att-

Applicant of Defendant

John J. Lister
Attorney at Law
Shelton

to execute a Warrant
Due to said Neighbor
& said premises and
has now ascertained
to his surprise that
said writ & Attachment
aforeaid has not been
discharged and now
remains as a lien
or incumbrance upon
his said land.

" 8 That thereafter upon being
said plaintiffs and
requesting them to dis-
miss said writ & At-
-achment they refuse to
do so unless this defendant
shall convey to them
one acre of said land
which would greatly
injure the premises of
this defendant and
render the same unsal-
-able.

The defendant therefore
by reason of the matter
hereto stated asks that
said writ & Attachment

fol 111

State of Minnesota
County of Carver
District Court
Said Judicial Dist

Lulus Ackermann
William Ackermann and
Christ Ackermann
Co-partners doing
business under
the firm name and
style of }
Ackermann Brothers "B"

vs
Albert Lintico }

Carver County } ss
Frank Warner being first
duly sworn deposes and
says that he is attorney
for the defendant in
the above Entitled action
and has been acting as
such attorney since
the service of the answer
therein - that in the fall
of the year A.D. 1874 after
the fall term of the district

11 2 Court for Juice County
he had a conversation
with Chris. Ackerman
one of the plaintiffs in
the above entitled action
and thereby he this
deponent was given to
understand that no
further proceedings
would be had in
said action and the
same would be dismissed
and discontinued and
suffered the same case
dismissed, until recently
informed by the defendant
the same does not dis-
-missed - that otherwise
notice of the trial of said
action would have
been served on the
plaintiffs in this action
and deponent further
saith that.

Wm. D. Miller
Subscribed before } Frank Warner
me this 12th day
of July A.D. 1876 }
Jol (3) W. H. Miller
Notary of the Peace

Dial Court
8th Dial

Ackerman Bros

vs

Albert Lister
— — —

Notice of Motion
— — —

Affidavits and
Order —

On service hereby
admitted & of copies
of the within notice
of motion affidavits
and order this
day of July 1876

Frank Warner
att'y for Deft

Julius W. H. H. H.
G. H. H. H. H.
H. H. H.

St. Chambers Stokely

July 13th 1878

It is hereby ordered that the ~~Def.~~
in the foregoing entitled when
shall come before the Court at the
time and place designated in the
foregoing notice of motion. Why
said writ of Attachment should
now be vacated and set aside
Let the Plaintiffs have notice of
this ~~order~~ by service of a copy
upon their attorneys two days at
least prior to the day fixed
for the hearing.

L. M. Brown
Judge &c

State of Minnesota
County of Carver
District Court
8th Judicial Dist.

Julius Ackermann
William Ackermann
Chas. Ackermann
Co partners doing
business under
the firm name
and style of

Ackermann Brothers
vs
Albert Leister

This cause having
come up for hearing
upon an order to
show cause why the
Attachment in said
action should not
be vacated and
dismissed, and the
plaintiffs having failed
to show sufficient
cause in the premises

State of Minnesota }
County of Carver }
District Court }
Superficial Dist. }

Ackermann Bros }
vs }
Albert Lister }

Carver County } S.S.
David Parks being
first duly sworn depose
and says, that he was
duly subpoenaed as a
witness for the defendant
in the above entitled
action and that in
pursuance thereof he
attended the General Term
of the District Court of the County of Carver
on the 4th day of October
as a witness on the part
of the defendant at Chadron
in said County.

And the deponent
further says that he
necessarily attended

in attending upon said
 Term of Court in
 going & return
 from said Term of
 Court at Chaska in
 said County the distance
 of thirty two miles and
 attended said Term
 of Court for the Term
 of one day

Looked to said
 Subscribers before
 me this 4th Tuesday
 of October A.D. 1874

James Parks

Georgewick
 Albert Christ
 Almon Co.

State of Minnesota
 County of Carver

William A. A. A.

Albert Christ

Affidavit of
 Jurors David Parks

Given, Subscribed & sworn to
 Georgewick
 Albert

State of Minnesota
County of Carver
District Court
8th Judicial Dist.

Julius Ackermann
William Ackermann
Lehrich Ackermann
Partners doing business
under the firm name
and style of

Ackermann Brothers
against
Albert Luntz

Statement of Costs

Costs per order of Court
July 18th 1876 upon dismissal
of Attachment — \$10.00

Statute Costs upon
dismissal of action } 5.00

Sheriff's fees
Witness fees
Dwain Parks
1 day
32 miles
\$7.65-
1.00
1.92
\$ 20.57

Clerk's fees To be } 29.54
 Taken } 11.90
 James Chubbuck }
 Oct 5th 1876 }
 Grant Learning for attack 2.00
 Total 35.44

It is hereby stipulated
 and agreed that the
 Clerk of the District
 Court shall enter
 judgment for the costs
 above named the
 Clerk's fees to be taken
 and may be done
 without further notice
 Given this Oct 5th 1876

Dated P. M.
 R. H. Atty
 Frank Warner
 atty for def.

Dist Court
 8th Dec
 Asherman Esq
 No
 Grant Learning
 stipulation to
 & costs

Given October 5th 1876
 G. H. Learning
 Clerk

Just

Frank Warner
 atty for def.

State of Minnesota
District Court Eighth Judicial District
County of Carver.

Julius Ackermann, William Ackermann
And Christ Ackermann Copartners
doing business under the firm style of
Ackermann Brothers
against
Albert Reistico.

This cause came on for Trial in its
regular order upon the Calendar at a General Term
of this Court held on the 2nd day of October AD 1876,
and ^{the} Motion of Attorneys for the Plaintiff said action
was dismissed without prejudice to any right that
defendant may have on the attachment Bond in
said action.

Now therefore, an Motion of Frank
Warner Attorney for Defendant and by Stipulation
of the respective attorneys for the plaintiff and defendant,
It is hereby ordered and adjudged that said defendant
recover from said Plaintiff the Costs in said action
Sustained and taxed at the Sum of Thirty five dollars
and forty seven cents and that said defendant have his
lawful process therefor.

Dated October 7th AD 1876.

By the Court:
G. F. Rayenbuhl
Clerk

State of Minnesota
District Court
County of Carver,

Julius Ackermann,
William Ackermann ^{and}
Christ Ackermann
copartners as
Ackermann Brothers
vs
Albert Leistico,

Judgment Roll

Judgment for costs \$38.44

Filed, October 14th 1896
J. H. Venzendahl
Clerk

205 A

Frank Warner
att'y for defendant,