

McHenry

John E. Dow in pres

Saml. Rattle

10

11825

Prepared

1851

United States of America

State of Illinois }
McHenry County }
} sp.

Shew before the Honorable Hugh
Wenderson Judge of the Eleventh
Judicial Circuit of the State of Illinois and Presiding
Judge of the McHenry County Circuit Court, ^{State's Court} organ
and held at the Court house in Woodstock in said
County on the fourteenth day of April in the year of
our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty
one and of the Independence of the United States the twenty fifth

Present the Hon Hugh Wenderson
Judge

Attest
A. H. Johnson
Clerk

P. W. Platt, State Attorney
John Brink
Sheriff

Be it remembered that heretofore to wit, on the
third day of January in the year of our Lord one
thousand eight hundred and fifty one, a certain
writ of summons was issued out of the office of the
Clerk of the Circuit Court of said County in the State
of Illinois, in the words and figures following to wit:

State of Illinois }
McHenry County }
} sp. The People of the State of
Illinois to the Sheriff of said
County greeting.

We command
You that you summon John E. Cook & William Cook
if they shall be found in your County personally to
be and appear before the Circuit Court of said County
on the first day of the next term thereof to be holden

at the Court house in Woodstock in said County on
the second Monday of April next to answer unto
Samuel Rattle in a plea of Assumpsit to the damage
of the said plaintiff as he says in the sum of four
hundred dollars. And have you then and there this writ
with an Endorsement thereon in what manner you ^{shall have} ~~shall~~
at the same. Witness Joel N. Johnson Clerk of our said Court
and the seal thereof at Woodstock aforesaid
this 3^d day of January 1851.



J. N. Johnson
Clerk of the Circuit Court

Which said writ of Summons has enclosed theron,

Personally served by reading the within to the within named
John E. Dow, William Dow not found in the County
Jan 21st 1851.

John Brink
Sheriff

Filed Jan 9th 1851

J. N. Johnson Clk

And thereafter to wit on the 21st day of March in the
year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty
one the said plaintiff filed in the Clerks office of the
Circuit Court of said County his certain declaration in
writing in the words and figures following to wit:

State of Illinois } of. Circuit Court of McHenry County,
McHenry County } of the April Term in the year of our
Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty one
Samuel Rattle

Plaintiff in this suit by Anson Spring his attorney
Complain's of John E. Dow and William Dow defendants

in this suit in custody &c. of a plea of trespass on the
case on promises. For that whereas the said defendants on
the third day of April in the year of our Lord one
thousand Eight hundred and fifty at Chicago in the
County of Cook, to wit, in said County of McHenry
made their certain promissory note in writing bearing
date the same day and year aforesaid and thereby then
and there promised to pay by the name style and
description of John E. Dow & son (the defendants meaning) to
Rose & Rattle or bearer five hundred and fourteen dollars
& Eighty four cents for value received. And the said Rose
& Rattle to whom or to whose order the payment of the said
promissory note and before the payment of the said sum
of money therein specified, to wit, on the day aforesaid
assigned the said promissory note to the plaintiff, by
which said assignment the said Rose & Rattle ordered
& appointed the said sum of money in the said prom-
issory note specified to be paid to the plaintiff & delivered
said promissory note so assigned to the plaintiff
by reason whereof and by force of the statute in such case
made and provided the said Defendants became liable to
pay the said plaintiff the said sum of money mentioned
and being payable ^{and being payable} ~~and being payable~~ ^{in the said note} according to the tenor and effect thereof
the said Defendants afterwards to wit on the same day
and year aforesaid at the place to wit McHenry County
aforesaid, undertook and then and there faithfully prom-
ised the said plaintiff to pay him the said sum of
money mentioned in the said note according to the
tenor and effect thereof.
And whereas also the said Defendants afterwards to wit
on the 7th day of March in the year of our Lord one
thousand ^{Eight hundred} ~~and~~ ^{and} eight hundred and fifty in ~~at~~ ^{at} the place
McHenry County aforesaid were indebted to the said

Plaintiff in the sum of four hundred dollars for divers goods
wares and Merchandize by the said Plaintiff before that
time sold and delivered to the said defendants and at their
instance and request. And also in the further sum
of four hundred dollars for money by the said Plaintiff
before that time lent and advanced to the said defendants
and at their like instance and request, and for other
money by the said Plaintiff before that time paid laid
out and expended for the said defendants and at their
like instance and request, and for other money by the
said defendants before that time had and received to
and for the use of the said Plaintiff, And being so indebted
and in consideration thereof the said defendants afterwards
to wit on the same day and year last aforesaid at the place
aforesaid undertook and faithfully promised the said
Plaintiff to pay him the said several sums of money
above mentioned when they should be thereto afterwards
requested. Yet the said defendants have not paid to the said
Plaintiff the whole or any part of the said several sums of
money above mentioned although often requested so but to pay
the same or any part thereof to the said Plaintiff the said
defendants have hitherto wholly neglected or refused and
still do neglect and refuse to the damage of the said
Plaintiff of four hundred dollars and therefore he brings
Suit &c

Anson Spruy

Attorney for Plaintiff

Copy of Note and Accounts declared upon
P 214. 211. Due Messrs Rose & Rattle or bearer Two
hundred and fourteen & 3/4 dollars for value
received Chicago April 3rd 1852 John C. Dow & Son
"Pay Samuel Rattle, Rose & Rattle."

And says that by reason of any thing in the first count of plaintiff's declaration set forth in manner & form as therein set forth, ought not to have and maintain his aforesaid action thereof against them and that they are not bound by law to answer the same wherefore they pray judgment &c

C. McClure disto atty

And for plea to the remainder of the said declaration the defendants say that they did not promise and undertake as the said plaintiff hath thereof abledged against them & of this they put themselves upon the country &c

Which demurrer has endorsed thereon.
Filed Apr 17th 1857.

C. McClure for disto

J. H. Johnson

Att

And thereafter to wit on the 18th day of April in the year last aforesaid the said Court being then in session as aforesaid the following proceedings were had to wit

Samuel Rattle

John E. Dow with

William Dow impleaded

Assumpsit.

And now come the

defendant John E. Dow by M^c

Clure his attorney and files his demurrer herein to the first count of the said plaintiff's declaration in which the said plaintiff by Sperry his attorney joins and the Court having heard the parties therein and being fully advised in the premises overrules the same to the opinion of the Court in overruling said demurrer the said defendant by his said attorney excepts. It is therefore

ordered and considered by the Court that the said plaintiff
have and recover of the said defendant John E. Dow his
costs and charges in and about ~~the~~ said ~~affidavit~~ his
joinder in demurrer ~~affidavit~~ and that he have Execution
therefor.

And the said defendant stands by his demurrer and saying
nothing further in bar to the said plaintiff's action.
It is therefore ordered by the Court that the said plaintiff
have judgment for his damages but because these
are uncertain and unknown to the court this suit being
brought upon an instrument of writing for the payment
of money only it is ordered that the clerk assess the same.
And he having assessed and reported to the Court the
sum of two hundred and twenty eight dollars and
thirty nine cents which is ordered to stand confirmed
and approved by the Court. It is therefore ordered and con-
sidered by the Court that the said plaintiff have and recover
of the defendant John E. Dow the sum of two hundred and
twenty eight dollars and thirty nine cents his damages
so assessed, as also his costs and charges herein ~~expended~~
and that he have Execution therefor, to the rendering of
which judgment by the Court the said defendant by
his Counsel excepts. And thereupon on motion of plaintiff
attorney it is ordered that a writ of *scire facias* issue herein
returnable to the next term of this Court to Wm. Dow.

State of Illinois
McHenry County

I the undersigned Clerk of the
Circuit Court in and for the said
County and State aforesaid do certify
that the foregoing is a true and complete and correct
copy of the record and papers on file in the above
entitled Cause, now on file and on record in
the office of Notary Joel H. Johnson Clerk of
our said Court and the said thing
at Woodstock in said County this
28th day of May A.D. 1857.

Joel H. Johnson
Clerk

1851

Edw. Henry
Supreme Ct
June Term AD 1851

Row
vs
Hattel } No
Error

Filed June 19. 1851.
L. Heland Clk.

Was
Cut
2 60
25
A 2 85
Paid

[Faint, illegible handwritten notes in the lower left quadrant of the page.]

State of Illinois
Supreme Court

Set,

June Term in the year
of our Lord one thousand
Eight Hundred and Fifty one.

John E. Rows

vs
William " Rows

In Error.

vs
Samuel Rattel

Afterwards to wit on the
day June at this same term of the court before
the Justice thereof Comes the said John E. Rows
and ~~William Rows~~ by C. McClure and J. O. Murphy
his ~~their~~ attorneys and say that in the record and
proceedings aforesaid and also in the rendition of
the Judgment aforesaid there is manifest Error, in this
to wit that the Declaration aforesaid and the matters
therein contained are not sufficient in law for the
said Samuel Rattel to have or maintain his aforesaid
action thereof against ~~them~~ the said John E.
Rows and ~~William Rows~~. There is also Error in this
to wit that by the record aforesaid it appears
that Judgment aforesaid in form aforesaid
given, was given for the said Samuel Rattel
against the said John E. Rows and ~~William
Rows~~. Whereas by the laws of the land the said
Judgment, ought to have been given for the said
John E. Rows and ~~William Rows~~, against the said
Samuel Rattel, because ~~they~~ ^{he} say that the court
Erred

1st In overuling the Demurrer to the first count
of the plaintiffs Declaration

2^d The Court Erred in overuling rendering final
Judgment, on said Demurrer against
John E. Rows

when the said Decree, had been filed by
John E. Pous and William Pous, Jointly,
S^o. That the Court

Ordered. In rendering final Judgment
on said Decree, against John E. Pous
while the plea of General issue to said
Declaration/Except to the first count thereof/was
undisposed of.

And The said John E. Pous and William
Pous, pray that the said Judgment aforesaid
for the Errors aforesaid and for other Errors apparent
in the record, and proceeding aforesaid may be
reversed annulled and altogether held for
nothing, and that ~~they~~^{he} may be restored to all things
which ~~they~~^{he} hath lost, by occasion of the said
Judgment, &c.

W. McClure and J. C. Murphy
atty for plaintiff in Error,

Supreme Court
June Term 1801

Now and Now
to { In Error
Samuel Rattel

Assignment of Error

8
A promissit against two; one only assued with
procep. The dependants demurred to the first count,
and pleaded non-assumpsit to the second. The
court overruled the demurrer, and, without noticing
the plea, ~~and~~ rendered judgment against the
dependant named with procep. That judgment must
be reversed on two grounds. It was error to enter final
judgment for the plaintiff, before disposing of the issue
tendered by the plea. It was also error to enter judgment
against one of the dependants, without disposing of the
case as to the other. Both were before the court, and the
case had to be tried as to both, before any final
judgment could be properly entered.

The judgment is reversed, and the case remanded.

Dow et al. v. Nettle.

Opinion.

Heat.

Prepared
E.

State of Illinois, set.

WRIT OF ERROR—FREE TRADER PRINT.

The People of the State of Illinois,
To the Clerk of the Circuit Court for the County of *McHenry* - GREETING :

BECAUSE in the record and proceedings, as also in the rendition of the judgment of a plea which was in the Circuit Court of *McHenry* county, before the Judge thereof, between _____

Samuel Kettle — plaintiff — and *John E. Dow impleaded*
with William Dow _____

defendant, it is said manifest error hath intervened, to the injury of the aforesaid *defendant*.

as we are informed by *his* complaint, and we being willing that error, if any there be, should be corrected in due form and manner, and that justice be done to the parties aforesaid, command you that if judgment thereof be given, you distinctly and openly, without delay, send to our Justices of the Supreme Court the record and proceedings of the plaint aforesaid, with all things touching the same, under your seal, so that we may have the same before our justices aforesaid at Ottawa, in the county of La Salle, on the *2^d Monday in June* — next, that the record and proceedings, being inspected, we may cause to be done therein, to correct the error, what of right ought to be done according to law.

WITNESS, the Hon. SAMUEL H. TREAT, Chief Justice of our said Court, and the seal thereof, at Ottawa, this *19th* day of *June* — in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty *one*.

A. Heland Clerk of the Supreme Court.

McHenry
John E. Dowse
by
David Kettle
writ of error

Filed June 19, 1854.
H. Keland Clerk.