

1 S. P. HENDON
2 Stockton Savings & Loan Bldg.
3 Stockton, California
4 Telephone: -1764
5 Attorney for Plaintiff

DEC 6 1950
W. G. GIBHAM
Edward Ludwig

6
7
8 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
9 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN.

10
11 DOROTHY E. TELLER,)
12 Plaintiff)
13 vs.)
14 GEORGE W. TELLER,)
15 Defendant)

COMPLAINT No. 47919
Dept. 1

16
17 Comes now the plaintiff and for cause of action alleges:

18 I.

19
20 That plaintiff now is and continuously for more than one
21 year last past has been, prior to the commencement of this action,
22 a resident of the State of California, and now is and for more
23 than three months last past preceding the commencement of this
24 action has been a resident of the County of San Joaquin.

25 II.

26 That for the statistical purposes required by Section 426-a
27 of the Code of Civil Procedure of the State of California, plain-
28 tiff alleges:

29 (1) That the parties hereto were married in the City of
30 Reno, State of Nevada; that the date of said marriage was on the
31 9th day of July, 1950; that the date of separation was on or about
32 the 30th day of November, 1950, and that the time elapsing from

1 the date of marriage to the date of said separation is four months
2 and twenty-one days.

3 III.

4 That there are no children the issue of said marriage.

5 IV.

6 That there is no community property.

7 V.

8 That ever since the date of said marriage, defendant has
9 been guilty of extreme cruelty toward plaintiff, DOROTHY E.
10 TELLER, and has treated plaintiff in a cruel and inhuman manner
11 and has wrongfully inflicted upon her great and grievous mental
12 suffering and anguish, and grievous bodily injury.

13 VI.

14 That defendant forcibly took from plaintiff, off of her
15 finger, the diamond and wedding ring set, which was hers and is her
16 property. That plaintiff is afraid of defendant because of the
17 physical and cruel treatment had by plaintiff from defendant and
18 she fears that unless defendant is restrained from coming to the
19 residence of plaintiff at 427 East Sonora Street, Stockton,
20 California, great and irreparable harm will be done.

21 WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows, to-wit:

- 22 1. That the bonds of matrimony now and heretofore
23 existing between plaintiff and defendant be dissolved;
24 2. That defendant be required to deliver to plaintiff
25 the diamond and wedding ring set taken forcibly from her person.
26 3. That defendant be restrained from molesting or
27 annoying plaintiff in any way, or from coming on the premises
28 located at 427 East Sonora Street, Stockton, California, where
29 plaintiff resides;
30 4. For such further and other relief as to this Court
31 may seem just and proper in the premises.

32
W. P. Rendon
Attorney for Plaintiff.

Receipt of Copy is hereby
acknowledged this 17 day of
January, 1951

C. P. Rendon
Attorney for Plaintiff and Cross-
Complainant.

JAN 17 1951
R. E. GRAHAM
B. Scantlebury
CLERK
DEPUTY

1 WILLENS & BOSCH
2 1016 Bank of America Bldg.
3 Stockton, California
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

11 DOROTHY B. TELLER,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 GEORGE V. TELLER,

15 Defendant.

No. 49919 Dept. No. 1

ANSWER AND CROSS-COMPLAIN

17 Comes now the Defendant, GEORGE V. TELLER, and answering
18 the Complaint of plaintiff on file herein, admits, denies and alleges as
19 follows, to-wit:

20 I.

21 Admits the allegations contained in Paragraphs I, II and
22 III of plaintiff's complaint.

23 II.

24 Denies each and every, all and singular, the allegations
25 contained in Paragraphs IV, V and VI of plaintiff's complaint.

26 CROSS-COMPLAIN

27 As and for a cross-complaint against plaintiff and cross-
28 defendant, defendant and cross-complainant complains and alleges:

29 I.

30 That for the statistical purposes required by Section
31 25-a of the Code of Civil Procedure of the State of California defendant
32 and cross-complainant alleges:

1 between defendant and cross-complainant and plaintiff and cross-defendant
2 be dissolved.

3 2. That the community property of the parties
4 be equitably divided.

5 3. For such further and other relief as to this
6 Court may seem just and proper in the premises.

7
8 WILLES & BOSCOE

9
10 BY Marion M. Killen
11 Attorneys for Defendant & Cross-Complainant

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

GEORGE G. SPANOS
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF
520 AMERICAN TRUST BLDG.
STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA
PHONE: 44525

Filed MAY 14 1951
R. E. GRAHAM CLERK
Edward Ludwig DEPUTY

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN

DOROTHY E. TELLER,

PLAINTIFF

VS

GEORGE W. TELLER,

DEPNDANT

No. 49919 Dept. 1

STIPULATION FOR DISMISSAL
OF ACTION

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED between DOROTHY E. TELLER, the
plaintiff and cross-defendant in this action, and GEORGE W. TELLER,
the defendant and cross-complainant in the above-entitled action,
that the complaint and cross-complaint filed in the above-entitled
action be dismissed without prejudice.

Dorothy E. Teller
Dorothy E. Teller

George W. Teller
George W. Teller

George G. Spanos
Attorney for Plaintiff

sl

FILED
JAN 1 1965
R. E. GRAHAM, Clerk

1 GEORGE G. WILKES
428 American Trust Building
2 25 W. San Joaquin Street
Stockton, California
3 Telephone: 5-2043
4 Attorney for Plaintiff

Handwritten: J. E. GRAHAM
Handwritten: [Signature]

8 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN

11 DOROTHY TILLER,
12 Plaintiff,
13 vs.
14 GEORGE TILLER,
15 Defendant.

No. 51861 Dept. 2

FINAL DECREE OF DIVORCE

17 In this cause an Interlocutory Judgment was entered on the 13th day of
18 September, 1961, adjudging that plaintiff was entitled to a divorce from defen-
19 dant; that more than one year has elapsed and no appeal has been taken from said
20 judgment; that no motion for a new trial has been made, and the action has not
21 been dismissed; that plaintiff has filed a verified affidavit for a final
22 decree of divorce in which plaintiff states that a conditional reconciliation
23 was attempted by the plaintiff with the defendant; that said attempted reconcili-
24 ation lasted for a period of only two weeks, in which time the defendant
25 failed to perform the conditions of the reconciliation; that plaintiff filed a
26 Notice of Motion for a final decree and a copy thereof was mailed to the defen-
27 dant; that said motion was heard on the 21st day of January, 1965, in Department
28 4 of the Superior Court, County of San Joaquin, State of California, the defen-
29 dant not being present;

30 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ADJUDGED that plaintiff be and is granted a Final
31 Judgment of Divorce from defendant and that the bonds of matrimony between the
32

1 plaintiff and the defendant be, and the same are, dissolved.

2 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND DECREED that wherein said Interlocutory De-
3 crees relates to the property of the parties hereto, said property be and the
4 same is hereby assigned in accordance with the terms thereof to the party there-
5 in declared to be entitled thereto.

6 DONE BY THE COURT this Eleth day of January, 1913.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

M. H. Townsend
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT