

FILED

1 FEB 26 1923

R. J. [Signature]
CLERK

STATE OF WISCONSIN: MILWAUKEE COUNTY: CIRCUIT COURT

At a regular term of said Court, begun and held at the Court House in the city of Milwaukee, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin, on the first Monday of January, 1923, and on the 24th day of January, 1923, in said term.

Present Hon. Lawrence W. Halsey, Judge presiding.

Helen Gardien,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Rene Gardien,

Defendant.

The above entitled action having been duly placed upon the January, 1923, term calendar of said Court, and the same having come on in its regular order to be heard before the Court;

And it appearing that this is an action for divorce, and the summons and complaint in this action having been duly and personally served upon the defendant, as appears by the affidavit of service endorsed on said summons on file herein;

And it further appearing that on the 12th day of January, 1922, and within ten days after service on the defendant, a copy of said summons and of said complaint were duly served on the Hon. Winfred C. Zabel, the District Attorney and Divorce Counsel for said Milwaukee County, as appears

-4-

by the admission of such service endorsed upon the original summons and complaint on file herein;

And it further appearing that twenty days have elapsed since the date of the service of the summons and complaint upon said defendant, and that said defendant has failed to answer or demur to said complaint; that said defendant has not in any manner appeared in said action, except that Thomas E. Leahy, Esq., attorney, appeared for said defendant on an order to show cause in said action;

And the plaintiff appearing in person and by Hugo J. Trost, Esq. her attorney, and the defendant, Rene Gardien, appearing in person and by Thomas E. Leahy, his attorney; and the State of Wisconsin appearing by Walter G. Wallschlaeger, assistant District Attorney for said Milwaukee County, who is the divorce counsel, in and for said Milwaukee County; and after hearing the testimony and proofs submitted by the plaintiff, and the said Walter G. Wallschlaeger, Divorce Counsel having appeared in open court, and on behalf of the public made a fair and impartial presentation to the Court and fully advised the Court as to the merits of the case, and the rights and interests of the parties, and of the public, and being fully advised in the premises, and the Judge in open Court having informed the parties hereto appearing in Court that the judgment so far as it affects the status of the parties will not become effective until one year from the date of the entry of judgment, I, Lawrence W. Halsey, the Judgebefore whom this action was tried, do make these findings of fact and conclusions of law, as follows, to-wit;

FINDINGS OF FACT.

1.

That on or about the 8th day of July, 1920, at the city of Milwaukee, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin, plaintiff and defendant duly intermarried and ever since have been and now are wife and husband.

2.

That the plaintiff and defendant have been bona fide residents of the State of Wisconsin for more than two years immediately preceding the time of the commencement of this action.

3.

That the plaintiff is 26 years of age, and the defendant 39 years of age.

4.

That there is no issue of said marriage.

5.

That a previous action for divorce has been commenced but that the same was dismissed and that there is no other action now pending in any other Court or before any Judge thereof in this State or elsewhere.

6.

That ever since the marriage of the parties hereto, the treatment of the plaintiff by the defendant has been cruel and inhuman, practiced by personal violence and other means.

7.

That on or about the latter part of October, 1921, the defendant, without cause or provocation violently grabbed the plaintiff, severely hurting her.

8.

That defendant was drunk on an average of two or three times a week for long periods of time.

9.

That on or about the latter part of September, or the first part of October, 1921, the defendant threatened to do the plaintiff bodily harm by taking a fork which she was using while frying some meat, and threatened her with it.

10.

That on or about the month of December, 1920, the defendant, without cause or provocation, put his hands around plaintiff's neck and threatened to choke her.

11.

That the defendant has not been true to the plaintiff but has been associating with other women.

12

That said defendant has repeatedly called the plaintiff vile and indecent names, too vile and indecent to be spread upon the records of this Court.

13.

That the treatment of the plaintiff by the defendant has so affected the plaintiff's health that it is entirely unsafe and improper for plaintiff longer to cohabit with said defendant.

14.

That several of the acts of cruel and inhuman treatment herein mentioned were committed when no witness other than the plaintiff competent to testify to the same was present.

And I find as

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

1. That the plaintiff is entitled to judgment wholly dissolving the bonds of matrimony heretofore subsisting between the plaintiff and defendant, and forever freeing the plaintiff and defendant from the obligations thereof; providing, however, that said judgment so far as it determines the status of the parties shall not be effective except for the purpose of an appeal to review the same, until the expiration of one year from the date of the entry of same.

2. That neither of the parties to this action shall marry again until one year after the entry of said judgment, and the marriage of either of the parties to this action solemnized before the expiration of one year from the date of the entry of judgment herein shall be null and void.

3. That the defendant pay to the Clerk of this Court, the sum of Ten Dollars (\$10) per week for the support of the plaintiff, the first payment to be made as and of the 24th day of January, 1923.

4. That the defendant pay to the Clerk of this Court forthwith, for the use of Hugo J. Trost, plaintiff's attorneys, the sum of Twenty Dollars (\$20) balance due on attorney fees heretofore ordered by this Court.

5. That the defendant pay to the plaintiff forthwith, the sum of Fifty Dollars (\$50) alimony in arrears, and in the event of the non-payment thereof, defendant be adjudged in contempt of this Court.

6. That the defendant pay to Hugo J. Trost, attorney for the plaintiff, forthwith, the sum of Twenty-five Dollars (\$25) additional attorney fees, and the sum of Six and 20/100 Dollars (\$6.20), being clerk's fees for entering judgment in this action.

Let judgment be entered accordingly.

Dated Milwaukee, Wis. ~~January~~ ^{February} 26th 1923.

By the Court;

Lawrence C. Halsey

Circuit Judge.

Findings approved ___ day of _____ 1923.

Attorney for defendant

Findings approved 9 day of February 1923.

Walter G. Miller

Assistant District Attorney

Original

STATE OF WISCONSIN
MILWAUKEE COUNTY
CIRCUIT COURT

Helen Gardien,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Rene Gardien,

Defendant.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

FILED

1 FEB 26 1923

R. Maas
CLERK

HUGO J. TROST,
LAWYER,
1302 FIRST NAT. BANK BLDG.
MILWAUKEE, WIS.

STATE OF WISCONSIN: MILWAUKEE COUNTY: CIRCUIT COURT

Helen Gardien,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Rene Gardien,

Defendant.

This action having been brought on for trial on the 24th day of January, 1923, at the regular January 1923 Term of this Court, before the Hon. Lawrence W. Halsey, Judge of said Court, and the Court having filed its findings of fact and conclusions of law from which it satisfactorily appears and wherein the Court finds that the plaintiff herein is entitled to a judgment of divorce;

NOW ON MOTION OF Hugo J. Trost, plaintiff's attorney;

IT IS ADJUDGED AND DECREED, That the bonds of matrimony heretofore subsisting between the plaintiff, Helen Gardien, and the defendant, Rene Gardien, be and the same are hereby wholly dissolved, and they are forever freed from the obligations thereof, provided that this judgment so far as it determines the status of the parties shall not be effective except for the purpose of an appeal to review the same until the expiration of one year from the date of the entry of the same.

IT IS FURTHER ADJUDGED AND DECREED, That neither of the parties to this action shall marry again until the expiration of one year after this judgment is entered, and the marriage of either of the parties to this action solemnized before the expiration of one year from the date of the entry of the same shall be null and void.

IT IS FURTHER ADJUDGED AND DECREED, That the defendant be and he is hereby required to pay to the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Milwaukee County, the sum of Ten Dollars (\$10) per week for the support of the plaintiff, the first payment to be made as and of the 24th day of January, 1923.

IT IS FURTHER ADJUDGED AND DECREED, That the defendant be and he is hereby required to pay to the Clerk of this Court for the use of Hugo J. Trost, plaintiff's attorney, the sum of Twenty Dollars (\$20), balance due on attorney fees heretofore ordered by this Court.

IT IS FURTHER ADJUDGED AND DECREED, That the defendant be and he is hereby required to pay to the plaintiff forthwith, the sum of Fifty Dollars (\$50) alimony in arrears, and in the event of the non-payment thereof, defendant be adjudged in contempt of this Court.

IT IS FURTHER ADJUDGED AND DECREED, That the defendant be and he is hereby required to pay to Hugo J. Trost, attorney for the plaintiff, forthwith, the sum of Twenty-five Dollars (\$25) additional attorney fees, and the sum of Six and 20/100 Dollars (\$6.20) cost of entering this judgment.

Dated Milwaukee, Wis. February 27 1923.

Judgment approved
_____ 1923.

C. C. MAAS, Clerk

By Chas. Scherer Deputy

~~Defendant's Attorney~~

Judgment approved February 9 1923.

Walter M. Klagen
Assistant District Attorney and Divorce Counsel

63374
Original

STATE OF WISCONSIN
MILWAUKEE COUNTY
CIRCUIT COURT

Helen Gardien,
Plaintiff,
vs.
Rene Gardien,
Defendant.

JUDGMENT OF DIVORCE

J. L. [unclear]

FILED

FEB 27 1923

[Handwritten signature]

HUGO J. TROST,
LAWYER,
1902 FIRST NAT. BANK BLDG.
MILWAUKEE, WIS.