

Surname	Given names	vs	Surname	Given names	Publication Date	
Bodey	Maud A	vs	Bodey	A E	27 Jan 1905 p8	14 Feb 1905 p5
					<p>But if Cupid has been asleep the green-eyed dragon of connubial infidelity has been sowing discord, and divorces are claimed on various statutory grounds as follows: Marie M. Nelson from Peter A. Nelson. Mary Lazy Boy from Old Lazy Boy. Grace B. Spencer from Elbrey D. Spencer. Eva M. Miley from Oliver J. Miley. Maud A. Bodey from A. E. Bodey, and the mills still grind.</p>	<p>A decree of divorce has been granted Maud A. Bodey from A. E. Bodey, and the plaintiff resumes her maiden name of Maud A. McConville.</p>
Brewster	Mollie	vs	Brewster	William	30 Jun 1905 p5	
					<p>Mollie Brewster makes application for a divorce from William Brewster on the grounds of cruelty. McKeown & Conrow are the plaintiff's attorneys.</p>	
Brown	Maud	vs	Brown	Herbert	2 Jun 1905 p8	
					<p>Suit for divorce has been instituted by Mrs. Maud Brown against Herbert Brown. Desertion and non-support are the alleged grounds.</p>	
Chance	Ollie or Nettie	vs	Chance	Ike	Nov 21 1905 p5	22 Dec 1905 p8
					<p>Suit for divorce on the plea of desertion was filed this week by Ollie Chance against Ike Chance, and by Annie Chitty against James D. Chitty. McKeown & Conrow are attorneys for plaintiffs in both cases.</p>	<p>A divorce was granted Nettie Chance on Wednesday from Ike Chance.</p>
Chitty	Annie	vs	Chitty	James D or V		29 Dec 1905 p8
						<p>A divorce was this week granted Annie Chitty from James V. Chitty who deserted her several years ago.</p>
Curry	Carolyn	vs	Curry	J F	17 Mar 1905 p3	12 May 1905 p5
					<p>Carolyn Curry has filed application for divorce from J. F. Curry, now in Spokane. The divorce is asked for on the grounds of extreme cruelty.</p>	<p>Among other divorces granted in the district court this week was that of Caroline Curry from J. F. Curry.</p>
Dixon	John	vs	Dixon	Lucy E	11 Jul 1905 p4	
					<p>Alias Summons. In the District Court of the Eleventh Judicial District of the State of Montana, in and for the County of Flathead. John Dixon, Plaintiff, vs. Lucy E. Dixon, Defendant. The State of Montana sends greetings to the above named defendants and to each of them: You are hereby summoned to answer the Complaint in his action, which is filed in the office of the Clerk of this Court, a copy of which is herewith served upon one of you in each County wherein any of you reside, and to file your answer and serve a copy thereof upon the Plaintiff's attorney within twenty days after the service of this summons, exclusive of the day of service; and in case of your failure to appear or answer, judgment will be taken against you, by default, for the relief demanded in the Complaint. This action is brought to obtain a decree of divorce dissolving the bonds of matrimony which have heretofore and do now exist between Plaintiff and Defendant, upon the ground of desertion of the Plaintiff by the Defendant, since the year 1897. Witness my hand and the Seal of said Court this 8th day of July, 1905. (Seal) —James K. Laag, Clerk of said Court. J. H. Stevens, attorney for plaintiff, Kallispell, Montana.</p>	
Erbs	Esther	vs	Erbs	John H	27 Jan 1905 p5	
					<p>Divorced at Great Falls. A sensational divorce case attracted the attention of readers of the Great Falls Tribune of Wednesday. Esther Erbs who married John H. Erbs, in this city some two years ago, sued for a divorce which was granted on grounds of cruelty and non-support. Erbs was one of the firm of Erbs Bros. who were engaged in business here for several months, acting as agents for Sherman Bros. and who were successful in running up a lot of bills they never paid. Mrs. Erbs was a former resident of Kallispell.</p>	

Farrow	Sadie	vs	Farrow	Robert	14 Jul 1905 p8	11 Aug 1905 p8
					<p>Mrs. Sadie Farrow has filed her application for a divorce from Robert Farrow on the ground of wilful neglect to provide. She asks an absolute divorce and the custody of the two minor children, Edward and Albert, five and two years old, respectively. McKeown & Conrow are attorneys for the plaintiff.</p>	<p>Sadie Farrow was granted a divorce from Robert Farrow, without contest, an agreement as to the custody of the children being effected.</p>
Fisher	Irving V	vs	Fisher		17 Feb 1905 p8	
					<p>Wife Deserted Him. Divorce has been applied for in the district court by Irving V. Fisher, who alleges in complaint that his wife deserted him 1902. They were married at Mazeppa, Minn., in 1893, and there are two children, boys, of 10 and 7 years of age, of which the plaintiff desires custody. Mr. Fisher is in the life insurance business and of two months residence in Kallapell. Sidney M. Logan is his attorney.</p>	
Fox	A A	vs	Fox	Mrs	29 Sep 1905 p3	
					<p>Proceedings for a divorce have been begun by A. A. Fox of Browning to relieve him of a wife. Mrs. Fox proposes to contest the proceedings and will probably have her attorneys file a counter suit. Both parties to the disagreement were in Kallapell Wednesday, seeking legal advice.</p>	
Johnson	Lina	vs	Johnson	Lars	20 Jun 1905 p8	
					<p>Lina Johnson, who has been for some time living in a state of siege with her husband, Lars Johnson, on a claim near Swan lake, has filed a petition for divorce and a division of property and children. Among other cruelties she alleges that Lars has called her such pet names as "beast," "worthless hog," and she has finally concluded that he is no longer a congenial mate for her. Jesse H. Stevens is the attorney for Mrs. Johnson.</p>	
Harrison	Minnie	vs	Harrison	Geo W	7 Mar 1905 p5	
					<p>Minnie Harrison has filed an application for divorce against Geo. W. Harrison on statutory grounds.</p>	
Harshman	Dan D	vs	Harshman	Temperance	18 Apr 1905 p1	
					<p>Wife's Desertion. Suit for divorce was filed today by Dan. D. Harshman against Temperance Harshman whom he accuses of desertion. F. H. Nash is Danny's attorney.</p>	
Hart	Alma	vs	Hart	Chas B	12 May 1905 p5	
					<p>Alma Hart was given a decree of divorce, Wednesday, from Chas. B. Hart, on the grounds of non-support. The custody of the child remains with the father.</p>	
Higin	Sevreaan	vs	Higin	Sallie	8 Aug 1905 p7	11 Aug 1905 p8
					<p>Alias Summons. In the District Court of the Eleventh Judicial District of the State of Montana, in and for the County of Flathead. SEVREAN HIGIN, Plaintiff, vs. SALLIE HIGIN, Defendant. The State of Montana sends greetings to the above named Defendant: You are hereby summoned to answer the complaint in this action, which is filed in the office of the Clerk of this Court, a copy of which is herewith served upon you, in the county wherein you reside, and to file your answer and serve a copy thereof upon the Plaintiff's attorney within twenty days after the service of this summons, exclusive of the day of service; and in case of your failure to appear or answer, judgment will be taken against you, by default, for the relief demanded in the complaint. Said action is brought to obtain a decree for a divorce upon the grounds of desertion. Witness my hand and the Seal of said Court this 5th day of August, 1905. (SREAL) —James K. Lang, Clerk of said Court.</p>	<p>Sevreaan Higin has applied for divorce from Sallie Higin, Major Baldwin being attorney for the plaintiff.</p>

Holten Rgnhild vs Holten John 17 Oct 1905 p8

Rgnhild Holten has applied for a divorce from John Holten on the grounds of desertion. They were married in Trondheim, Norway, in 1884, came to Flathead three years ago. She asks for division of community property, costs and attorney's fees.

King Mrs T E vs King T E 14 Jul 1905 p8

TROUBLES OF THE KINGS
Unqualified Denial of the Charges Made by Mrs. T. E. King.
SHE ALLEGES CRUEL TREATMENT
And That Her Side of the Difficulty Has Been Unfairly Stated—Says There Was a Conspiracy to Get Her Money and Her Husband Was Unfaithful.
Mrs. T. E. King claims that she was more sinned against than sinning. She denied in the preliminary examination at Whitefish she was charged with throwing acid upon King, that she did anything of the kind, but that he adopted this heroic measure as a part of a conspiracy to enable him to get good grounds for a divorce. On account of the gravity of the charge the justice held Mrs. King to the district court and she promptly furnished the required \$1000 bail, Nelson Willoughby and J. L. McIntire signing the bail bond as sureties.
Concerning the divorce proceedings Mrs. King states that for more than a year past King has been urging her to convert all her real property into cash and start him in business and that he has never treated her as a husband should.
She says further that before the case is settled she will appear as the prosecutor instead of the prosecuted one.

28 Jul 1905 p4

Charging Mrs. T. E. King With Felonious Assault.
On Wednesday, among other informations filed by County Attorney McKown, was one against Mrs. T. E. King, of Whitefish, charging her with assault upon T. E. King with a caustic acid. Mrs. King had already given bonds and will be tried at the next term of the district court.

Knight Dell vs Knight Carrie D 7 Feb 1905 p4

Alias Summons.
In the District Court of the Eleventh Judicial District of the State of Montana, in and for the County of Flathead.
Dell Knight, Plaintiff, vs. Carrie D. Knight, Defendant.
The State of Montana sends greetings to the above named defendant:
You are hereby summoned to answer the complaint in this action, which is filed in the office of the Clerk of this Court, a copy of which is herewith served upon you in the County wherein you reside, and to file your answer and serve a copy thereof upon the plaintiff's attorney within twenty days after the service of this summons exclusive of the day of service; and in case of your failure to appear or answer, judgment will be taken against you, by default, for the relief demanded in the complaint.
This action is brought upon the ground of adultery to obtain a decree dissolving the bond of matrimony heretofore and now existing between plaintiff and defendant.
Witness my hand and the seal of said court this 6th day of February, 1905.
(SEAL) —James K. Lang,
Clerk of said Court.
J. H. Stevens, attorney for plaintiff, Kalispell, Montana.

Lacey Katie A vs Lacey William 18 Apr 1905 p1

The divorce mill was working over time and issued quittances to Geo. Wron, a Flathead Indian, from his wife, Susan Wron; Grace B. Spencer cuts loose from Elbrey D. Spencer; the maiden name of Addie Jewell (Warner) is restored and William Jewell is wifeless; Katie A. Lacey drew a \$500 prize as alimony and bids William C. Lacey a long farewell.

Lazy Boy Mary vs Lazy Boy Old 27 Jan 1905 p8

But if Cupid has been asleep the green-eyed dragon of connubial infelicity has been sowing discord, and divorces are claimed on various statutory grounds as follows:
Marie M. Nelson from Peter A. Nelson.
Mary Lazy Boy from Old Lazy Boy.
Grace B. Spencer from Elbrey D. Spencer.
Eva M. Miley from Oliver J. Miley.
Maud A. Bodey from A. E. Bodey, and the mills still grind.

17 Feb 1905 p8

Mr. and Mrs. Lazy Boy will no longer quarrel under the same tepee. A divorce was applied for by Mary Lazy Boy from his job lots, and extreme cruelty was alleged and proven by numerous witnesses in the court this morning.

Lloyd Lulu vs Lloyd Chester D

8 Dec 1905 p4

Alias Summons.

In the District Court of the Eleventh Judicial District of the State of Montana, in and for the County of Flathead.

Lulu M. Lloyd, Plaintiff, vs. Chester D. Lloyd, Defendant.

The State of Montana sends greeting to the above named Defendant.

You are hereby summoned to answer the complaint in this action, which is filed in the office of the Clerk of this Court, a copy of which is herewith served upon you in the County wherein you reside, and to file your answer and serve a copy thereof upon the Plaintiff's attorneys within twenty days after the service of this Summons, exclusive of the day of service; and in case of your failure to appear or answer, judgment will be taken against you, by default, for the relief demanded in the complaint.

That this action is brought for the purpose of obtaining a decree of said Court dissolving the bonds of matrimony now existing between said Plaintiff and said Defendant, on the statutory grounds of desertion and non-support, and for the care and custody of two minor children, the issue of said Plaintiff and said Defendant.

Witness my hand and the seal of said Court this 7th day of December, 1905.

(SEAL) —James K. Lang,
Clerk of said Court.

McKeown & Conroy, attorneys for Plaintiff, Kallispell, Montana.
First publication Dec. 8, 1905.

Marceau Frank vs Marceau Mabel

7 Mar 1905 p5

Alias Summons.

In the District Court of the Eleventh Judicial District of the State of Montana, in and for the County of Flathead.

Frank Marceau, Plaintiff, vs. Mabel Marceau, Defendant.

The State of Montana sends greeting to the above named defendants and to each of them:

You are hereby summoned to answer the complaint in this action, which is filed in the office of the Clerk of this Court, a copy of which is herewith served upon one of you in each county wherein any of you reside, and to file your answer and serve a copy thereof upon the plaintiff's attorney within twenty days after the service of this summons, exclusive of the day of service; and in case of your failure to appear or answer, judgment will be taken against you, by default, for the relief demanded in the complaint.

This action is brought for the purpose of obtaining a decree of divorce dissolving the marriage relations between the plaintiff and defendant, upon the ground of desertion for more than one year prior to the filing of the complaint herein.

Witness my hand and the seal of said court this 4th day of March, 1905.

(SEAL) —James K. Lang,
Clerk of said Court.

M. D. Baldwin, attorney for plaintiff, Kallispell, Montana.

Jun 20 1905 p8

Frank Marceau, who is of the half-caste variety, lost his wife Mabel, who made good her getaway to Canada and there remains. Frank, through his attorney, Major Baldwin, made formal process to this desertion of his bed and board, and the court has granted him permanent deliverance.

McCabe Mary vs McCabe Thomas

7 Feb 1905 p1

Mar. McCabe vs. Thomas McCabe, extreme cruelty and abuse alleged as cause of action.

Miley Elva M vs Miley Oliver J

27 Jan 1905 p8

But if Cupid has been asleep the green-eyed dragon of connubial infelicity has been sowing discord, and divorces are claimed on various statutory grounds as follows:

Marie M. Nelson from Peter A. Nelson.

Mary Lazy Boy from Old Lazy Boy.

Grace B. Spencer from Elbrey D. Spencer.

Eva M. Miley from Oliver J. Miley.

Maud A. Bodey from A. E. Bodey, and the mills still grind.

Miller Clara J vs Miller Martin J

18 Jul 1905 p8

Clara J. Miller has commenced suit for a divorce from Martin J. Miller on the grounds of extreme cruelty.

Nelson Marie M vs Nelson Peter A

27 Jan 1905 p8

But if Cupid has been asleep the green-eyed dragon of connubial infelicity has been sowing discord, and divorces are claimed on various statutory grounds as follows:

Marie M. Nelson from Peter A. Nelson.

Mary Lazy Boy from Old Lazy Boy.

Grace B. Spencer from Elbrey D. Spencer.

Eva M. Miley from Oliver J. Miley.

Maud A. Bodey from A. E. Bodey, and the mills still grind.

7 Apr 1905 p1

In the district court this week divorces were granted to Mary K. Nelson from Peter A. Nelson; Josephine A. Pederson from John M. Pederson; Minnie Harrison from George W. Harrison; Mary A. Smith from Wm. W. Smith.

Newell Emma F vs Newell Herman F

20 Jun 1905 p7

9 Jun 1905 p1

Alias Summons.

In the District Court of the Eleventh Judicial District of the State of Montana, in and for the County of Flathead.

Emma F. Newell, Plaintiff, vs. Herman F. Newell, Defendant.

The State of Montana sends greetings to the above named defendant:

You are hereby summoned to answer the complaint in this action, which is filed in the office of the Clerk of this Court, a copy of which is herewith served upon you in the county wherein you reside, and to file your answer and serve a copy thereof upon the plaintiff's attorneys within twenty days after the service of this summons, exclusive of the day of service; and in case of your failure to appear or answer, judgment will be taken against you, by default, for the relief demanded in the complaint; that said action is brought by said plaintiff to obtain a decree of this court, dissolving the bonds of matrimony now existing between said plaintiff and said defendant, on the grounds of habitual intemperance of said defendant, for more than one year now last past, as more fully appears from said complaint, on file in said Court, in said action.

Witness my hand and the seal of said Court this 20th day of June, 1905.

(SEAL) —James K. Lang,
Clerk of said Court.

Emma F. Newell has filed complaint against Herman Newell, a non-resident, alleging habitual drunkenness as her cause for action.

28 Jul 1905 p8

Emma L. Newell was granted a divorce yesterday from Herman F. Newell, on the grounds of habitual drunkenness. The custody of the minor sons was given Mrs. Newell.

Pederson Josephine A vs Pederson John M

7 Feb 1905 p1

Josephine A. Pederson vs. John M. Pederson, desertion.

Pulian Mary vs Pulian Mary

9 Jun 1905 p1

Mary Pulian, an Italian whose troubles with her husband would fill a large volume, loves Peter no longer and would have the family divided up, taking the oldest and youngest child, the old man is handed three to take care of. This couple have a ranch and have made a good living together but have agreed to split up their blankets.

Robinson Lillian Grace vs Robinson Frank

14 Apr 1905 p8

Divorce suit has been filed by Lillian Grace Robinson vs. Frank Robinson on the grounds of desertion.

Selvage Rose vs Selvage Charles H

11 Jul 1905 p3

Alias Summons.

In the District Court of the Eleventh Judicial District of the State of Montana, in and for the County of Flathead.

Rose Selvage, Plaintiff, vs. Charles H. Selvage, Defendant.

The State of Montana sends greetings to the above named Defendants and to each of them:

You are hereby summoned to answer the Complaint in this action, which is filed in the office of the Clerk of this Court, a copy of which is herewith served upon one of you in each county wherein any of you reside, and to file your answer and serve copy thereof upon the Plaintiff's attorney within twenty days after the service of this summons, exclusive of the day of service; and in case of your failure to appear or answer, judgment will be taken against you, by default, for the relief demanded in the complaint, a copy of which is herewith served upon you and to which you are hereby referred for further particulars.

Said action is brought to secure a decree of divorce and a dissolution of the bonds of matrimony heretofore and now existing between Plaintiff and Defendant, and for the custody of the minor children of said marriage, and for the award to Plaintiff of the real property of defendant described in the complaint herein as lots 4 and 5, block 5, Columbia Falls, Montana, and said action is brought and relief sought upon the ground of willful desertion and abandonment of Plaintiff by Defendant for the period of more than two years immediately prior to the commencement of this action; and that said desertion continues and has not been caused by any act of Plaintiff.

Witness my hand and the Seal of said Court this 7th day of July, 1905.

(SEAL) —James K. Lang,
Clerk of said Court.

D. F. Smith, Attorney for Plaintiff, Kalispell Montana.

Spencer Grace B vs Spencer Elbrey D 24 Jan 1905 p5 27 Jan 1905 p8

Alias Summons.
 In the District Court of the Eleventh Judicial District of the State of Montana, in and for the County of Flathead.
 Grace B. Spencer, Plaintiff, vs. Elbrey D. Spencer, Defendant.
 The State of Montana sends greeting to the above named defendant and to each of them:
 You are hereby summoned to answer the complaint in this action, which is filed in the office of the clerk of this court, a copy of which is herewith served upon one of you in each county wherein any of you reside, and to file your answer and serve a copy thereof upon the plaintiff's attorney within twenty days after the service of this summons, exclusive of the day of service; and in case of your failure to appear or answer, judgment will be taken against you, by default, for the relief demanded in the complaint.
 This suit is brought to dissolve the bonds of matrimony now existing between the plaintiff and defendant on the grounds of desertion. Plaintiff alleges that the defendant deserted and abandoned her on or about the 1st day of August, A. D. 1902. Witness my hand and the seal of said court this 19th day of January, 1905.
 SEAL) —James K. Lang,
 Clerk of said Court.
 P. H. Greenman, Attorney for Plaintiff, Kalispell, Montana.

But if Cupid has been asleep the green-eyed dragon of connubial infelicity has been sowing discord, and divorces are claimed on various statutory grounds as follows:
 Marie M. Nelson from Peter A. Nelson.
 Mary Lazy Boy from Old Lazy Boy.
 Grace B. Spencer from Elbrey D. Spencer.
 Eva M. Miley from Oliver J. Miley.
 Maud A. Bodey from A. E. Bodey, and the mills still grind.

18 Apr 1905 p1

The divorce mill was working overtime and issued quittances to Geo. Wren, a Flathead Indian, from his wife, Susan Wren; Grace B. Spencer cuts loose from Elbrey D. Spencer; the maiden name of Addie Jewell (Warner) is restored and William Jewell is wifeless; Katie A. Lacey drew a \$500 prize as alimony and bid's William C. Lacey a long farewell.

Stevens Rose M vs Stevens Harry A 8 Aug 1905 p5

THREATS TO KILL WIFE.
 Prominent Missoula Man Is Shown in His Home Colors.
 Missoula, Aug. 5.—One of the most sensational divorce suits which has been brought in Missoula for many years was filed here this afternoon by Rose M. Stevens, through her attorneys, Joyce & Mainway, against her husband, Harry A. Stevens. The complaint alleges that the parties were married in Missoula, July 8, 1891, and from the union there are two children, Lucile, aged 12 years, and Billie, aged 9 years.
 The complaint alleges cruel and inhuman treatment of a startling nature, claiming defendant had upon various occasions threatened the plaintiff's life, and at one time in the presence of her children he pointed a revolver at her, threatening to shoot her. It is alleged that defendant has carried on improper relations with a certain woman of the city and otherwise acted in a manner unbecoming a husband and a father.
 It is stated in the complaint that the defendant now owns property, real and personal, valued at about \$10,000, and that he is capable of earning and is earning at the present time as much as \$150 per month.
 The plaintiff says that she is in destitute circumstances, with no means of supporting herself and children, and asks that \$75 per month be paid her during the pendency of this action, and also that she be allowed \$250 as a reasonable attorney's fee.
 As judgment the plaintiff asks that the bonds of matrimony be dissolved; that she be awarded the custody of the children, and that a fair apportionment of the above mentioned property and the income of the defendant be granted her.

Stock Mary I vs Stock Samuel 11 Aug 1905 p8

Decree of divorce granted Mary I. Stock from Samuel Stock; Susanna Stryker from D. W. Stryker.

Stone Katie vs Stone 9 Jun 1905 p1 30 Jun 1905 p8

Katie Stone vs. Fred C. Stone. The wife complains of cruel and inhuman treatment, insult and calumny for an unendurable period at the hands and tongue of her husband. He is an operator at Essex and they are possessed of considerable property. Mrs. Stone would like to have the home and furniture and her maiden name restored, Katie Ball Halter.

A decree of divorce for Mrs. Katie Stone, of Essex, was handed down by the court yesterday and filed by McKown & Conrow.

Stryker vs Stryker 30 Jun 1905 p8 11 Aug 1905 p8

The divorce case of Stryker vs. Stryker, filed this week, will be contested, and there are some lurid counter charges in the answer filed by Mr. Stryker's attorneys.

Decree of divorce granted Mary I. Stock from Samuel Stock; Susanna Stryker from D. W. Stryker.

Has Persecuted Her for Years and Driven Her Away.
PUT IN AN INSANE ASYLUM

And While She Was Thus Deprived of Her Liberty and Unable to Defend Her Name He Filed a Petition for Divorce—She Will Contest the Case.

Laura Sweet, wife of Irwin L. Sweet, has filed an answer to the complaint of Mr. Sweet asking for a divorce. In this answer she alleges that she did not desert her husband but that he deserted her after having put her in an insane asylum, and that she was not insane at the time she was taken to the asylum. She asks for the custody of the children, alimony, temporary suit money and a divorce. She alleges cruelty and non-support.

The case of Sweet vs Sweet occupied the greater of the stage in the district court seven days during the two weeks past, and the commodious audience room was arranged with interested listeners to an early and late hour.

The case was an action for divorce on the grounds of desertion, filed by Irwin L. Sweet, of Flathead county, Montana, Feb. 23, 1905, against Laura Sweet, of Chicago.

Laura Sweet, by her attorneys filed an answer and cross-complaint, asking for custody of the bonds of matrimony, alimony, and the custody of their four minor children, alleging desertion, failure to provide the necessities of life, and cruelty on the part of the plaintiff.

The Sweets were married in Chickadee county, Iowa, in 1888, where they lived until 1893, when Sweet, with his children and relatives came to Flathead county, Montana, leaving the wife an inmate of the insane asylum, Iowa, hospital for the insane, and without means of support.

The evidence in the case shows both parties to the action as people of exemplary character and morals, and lives in the manner, unable to dictate to the wife, resolved to make life as much of a burden to her as possible, and the consensus of opinion is that they succeeded.

Mr. Sweet discovered from defendant's language toward his relatives, that she was insane. They repaired services together, and the next morning on the plea that he wanted her as a witness in a suit against his father, Sweet deceived his wife to New Hampton, and on the certificate of a physician, that night Laura Sweet was an inmate of the insane hospital, without having been brought before the commissioners of insanity, provided for in that state.

A peculiar circumstance in the case is that the parents of Mrs. Sweet, living only nine miles away, the brothers and sisters, in the same neighborhood, one only twenty miles away, with railway, telegraph and telephone connections, were not notified of the insanity of defendant or her incarceration until some days after it was all over.

Dr. Hill, superintendent of the asylum at Independence, in his deposition states that defendant was in very poor health, and that it would require an expert to detect it. The doctor also states that the only symptom of mania he observed in the patient was that in his conversation with her she stated that "Mr. Sweet's relatives had persecuted her."

But now comes the defendant with the same story of persecution and wrong, and proves to the satisfaction of twelve competent jurors that the former "delusion of the mind" was true, and that the conduct of the plaintiff and his relatives was such "as to cause her mental suffering and anguish, and to impair her health and mind."

A mass of testimony was introduced along the whole line of the Sweet family, as usual in divorce cases, all of which is of little interest to the general public.

The jury, in their verdict, sustain the allegations of defendant as to desertion, and the effect of the further findings if adopted will be to give plaintiff custody of the children and would not entitle defendant, or any of plaintiff's property, and they seem to have met the approval of the vast majority who have followed the evidence to the case.

The case was closely contested. F. H. Greenman and Judge D. F. Smith, appearing for the plaintiff and Messrs. Peake, Penney and R. J. McElroy for the defendant. The arguments closed Wednesday night, the jury retiring on Wednesday afternoon, their findings being as follows:

In the District Court of the Eleventh Judicial District of the State of Montana, in and for the County of Flathead.

Irwin L. Sweet, Plaintiff
 vs.
 Laura Sweet, Defendant.

Findings of Fact.

1.—Were the plaintiff and defendant lawfully married at Chickadee township, county of Chickasaw, Iowa, December 23rd, 1887?

Answer: "Yes."—W. Penney, Foreman.

2.—Has the plaintiff resided in the

SWEET VS SWEET CASE WAS LONG DRAWN OUT

Troubles of the Family Discussed and Jury Returns Answers to a Long List of Propositions.

3.—Did the defendant refuse to conform or come to any suitable place and mode of living provided by plaintiff, and has such refusal continued for more than one year prior to the commencement of this action?

Answer: "No."—W. Penney, Foreman.

4.—Did the defendant refuse to come to Montana and refuse to live with plaintiff and refuse to accept of or live in any reasonable place provided by plaintiff?

Answer: "No."—W. Penney, Foreman.

5.—If defendant has refused to come to Montana and has refused to conform or come to any reasonable place or mode of living provided by plaintiff, for how long a time has defendant so refused?

Not answered.

6.—Is the plaintiff a fit and proper person to have the care, custody and control of the minor children of plaintiff and defendant?

Answer: "Yes."—W. Penney, Foreman.

7.—Has the plaintiff ever been guilty of extreme cruelty to defendant at any time since their marriage, as charged in defendant's cross-complaint?

Answer: "No."—W. Penney, Foreman.

8.—How much is plaintiff worth?

Answer: \$3,000.—W. Penney, Foreman.

9.—Has the plaintiff always been ready and willing to receive the defendant and take her home and support her to the best of plaintiff's ability?

Answer: "No."—W. Penney, Foreman.

10.—Has plaintiff always provided for and supported defendant while she lived with plaintiff, and has plaintiff failed to contribute to the support of defendant since plaintiff came to Montana because of defendant's failure and refusal to live with plaintiff?

Answer: "Yes."—W. Penney, Foreman.

11.—Is the plaintiff now willing and ready to receive the defendant and take her home and suitably provide for her according to the best of plaintiff's ability?

Answer: "No."—W. Penney, Foreman.

12.—Was the defendant duly and regularly adjudged insane in the State of Iowa, July 12th, 1897?

Answer: "Yes."—W. Penney, Foreman.

13.—Has the defendant sufficient money and means and earning capacity to support herself?

Answer: "Yes."—W. Penney, Foreman.

14.—Did the plaintiff wilfully and without cause desert and abandon the defendant on the 13th day of July, 1897, and has he ever since continued to so wilfully and without cause desert and abandon the defendant and to live separate and apart from her?

Answer: "Yes."—W. Penney, Foreman.

15.—Has the plaintiff at all times since the 13th day of July, 1897, wilfully neglected to provide the defendant with the common necessities of life, having the ability so to do?

Answer: "No."—W. Penney, Foreman.

16.—Has the plaintiff at any time conspired the defendant to become a public charge and a common pauper?

Answer: "No."—W. Penney, Foreman.

(Continued on Page Four.)

THE PICKLING PLANT

Will Resume Operations With a Full Crew in February.

W. T. Henry, superintendent of the pickling plant at Somers, stopped over in Kalispell last night on his way to Columbia Falls. The pickling plant which has been closed down since early in the summer, will be again in operation about February 1. Between 65 and 70 men are necessary to the proper handling of the tin and when the work starts up it will probably continue in operation all the year round. Since the completion of the cut off the treated tin from the Somers plant have been used only for restoring the track, but it is probable that some of the new construction will draw tin from this plant.

Whisman Myron S vs Whisman Grace E

4 Jul 1905 p2

30 Jul 1905 p5

Alta Summons.
 In the District Court of the Eleventh Judicial District of the State of Montana, in and for the County of Flathead.
 Myron S. Whisman, Plaintiff, vs
 Grace E. Whisman, Defendant.
 The State of Montana sends greeting to the above named Defendant. You are hereby summoned to answer the complaint in this action, which is filed in the office of the Clerk of this Court, a copy of which is herewith served upon you in the county wherein you reside, and to file your answer and serve a copy thereof upon the Plaintiff, Attorneys within twenty days after the service of this summons, exclusive of the day of service; and in case of your failure to appear or answer, judgment will be taken against you by default, for the relief demanded in the Complaint; that said action is brought by said Plaintiff to obtain a decree of this Court, dissolving the bonds of matrimony now existing between said Plaintiff and said Defendant, on the grounds of desertion for a period of more than one year last past, as more fully appears from said complaint, on file in said Court, in said action.

Witness my hand and the Seal of said Court this 28th day of June, 1905.
 (LEGAL.)
 -James R. Ladd,
 Clerk of said Court.
 McGowan & Conner, Attorneys for Plaintiff, Flathead, Montana.

Myron S. Whisman is desirous of eliminating Grace E. Whisman from his family connection and has filed suit for divorce, on the grounds of desertion. They were married in Denver, Col., in 1900.

White Swan Minnie vs White Swan Charley

20 Jun 1905 p8

The Indians are adopting, among other vices of the whites, their indelicate divorce proceedings. Miss Minnie White Swan, one of the amiable pot pie makers of the Blackfoot reservation, some time ago complained that her spouse, Charley White Swan was allowing his affections to stray and had won out a maiden on a nearby claim with whom he had taken up a residence in the good old-fashioned way of the aborigine. Her complaint being well grounded, the petition was granted and her separation from faithless Charley becomes a matter of record.

Wren George vs Wren Susan

18 Apr 1905 p1

The divorce mill was working over time and issued quittances to Geo. Wren, a Flathead Indian, from his wife, Susan Wren; Grace D. Spencer cuts loose from Elbrey D. Spencer; the maiden name of Addie Jewell (Warner) is restored and William Jewell is wifeless; Katie A. Lacey drew a \$500 prize as alimony and bids William C. Lacey a long farewell.