Bond.

This indenture witnesses that we Harry Cordua, as principle. and Wm. Roop. L. L. Sheline. J. M. Andrews surety, both of b the county of Adams and state of Ind., are held and firmly bond unto the George A. Bohrer Brewing Company of LaFayette, Indiana, in the penal sum of One Thousand (\$1000.00) Dollars for the payment of which well and truly to be made we hind ourselves, our heirs and administrators jointly and severally, firmly by these presents without releif from valuation or appraisemnt laws and with attorneys fees. The condition of the above obligation are such that whereas the said Harry Cordua desires to purchase from the George A. Bohrer Brewing Company goods in its line and pay for the same at such prices as may be agreed upon. Now therefor if the said Harry Cordua, shall well and truly pay for all goods he may purchase from the said George A. Bohrer Brewing Company and properly account for all cooperage, bottles and cases that he may receive from time to time, then this obligation to be null and void, otherwise to remain in full force and effect.

In witness whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names and affixed our seals, this 17" day of May, 1906.

Harry Cordua Wm. Roop,

(SEAL)

L. L. Sheline.

J. N. Andrews.

State of Indiana, Adams County.

Before me, the undersigned, a notary public in and for said county, this 17" day of May, 1906, personaly appeared Harry Cordua, Wm. Roop, L. L. Sheline, and acknowledged the foregoing bond execution for the uses and purposes therein mentioned,

Witness my hand and notarial seal.

P. K. Kenney,

My Commission expires April 22", 1907. Notary Public,

State of Indiana, S:S:

Before me, the undersigned, a notary public in and for said county this 26" day of June, 1906, personally appeared J. M. Andrews and acknowledged the foregoing bond execution for the uses and purposes therein mentioned.

Witness my hand and Notarial seal.

P. K. Kenney,

Notary Public.

Com. ex. Apr. 22, 1907.

State of Indiana, SS:

On the 19th day of January, A. D. 1907, before the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for said County and State, personally came Edward F. Bohrer, who being duly sworn, on his oath says that the account to which this is annexed, in favor of the George A. Bohrer Brewing Company, against Harry Cordue, is correct; that no payments have been made thereon, except the credits thereon given; that there are no set-offs against the same to his knowledge, and furthermore, that no part of this account is for usurious interest; and that the amount shown in said account, to-wit, \$472.59 , is now justly due and owing, and wholly unpaid; all of which he verily believes.

Edward F. Sohrer.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, on the date first above written.

A. C. Thompson Notary Public.

My commission as Notary Public will expire on the 22" day of March, 1910.

La Fayelle Ind. Jany 19/07 M Harry Cordner, Decatur, Inda To The Geo. A. Bohrer Brewing Co. Dr. Account No. STATEMENT OF BOTTLES AND CASES SHIPPED AND RETURNED Balance Due on Bottles BOTTLE BEER SHIPPED Cases and Bottles Returned and Amount Cases and Bottles Shipped Cases for Bottles Balance Cases Amount Date and Amount on Cases Credits Pts. Cases for Beer Cases 1906 Beer Pts. Ots. July 20 145 240 4860 183 75 3600 17000 3600 17000 100 17500 17000 100 17500 558 75 303 46 \$255 29 Jan 2 445 240 15660\$ 75450 41220713694\$67110 \$8340 \$355.39 Balance due on Bottle Beer Cases.

State of Indiana. § In the Adams Circuit Court, § S.S. April Term, 1907.

The George A. Bohrer Brewing Company,
A corporation.

VS.

Harry Cordua,

William Roop,

Ludlow L. Sheline,

Jonathan M. Andrews.

Comes now the George A. Bohrer Brewing Company, a corporation, by D. D. Heller & son, its attorneys, and moves the court for a new trial in the above entitled cause for the reasons following, towit:-

First:- The decision of the court is contrary to law.

Second: - The verdict of the jury is contrary to law.

Third:- The verdict of the jury is not sustained by sufficient evidence.

Fourth: - The judgment of the court is contrary to law.

Fifth:- The judgment of the court is not sustained by sufficient evidence.

Sixth:- The court erred in giving and reading to the jury instruction number two, tendered by the defendants William Roop and Ludlow L. Sheline.

Seventh:-The court erred in giving and reading to the jury instruction number three, tendered by the defendants William Roop and Ludlow L. Sheline.

pighth:- The court erred in giving and reading to the jury instruction number four, tendered by the defendants William Roop and Ludlow L. Sheline.

Ninth:- The court erred in giving and reading to the jury instruction number seven tendered by the defendants William Roop and Ludlow L. Sheline.

Tenth:- The court erred in giving and reading to the jury instruction number eight tendered by the defendant William Roop and Ludlow L. Sheline.

Elementh: The court erred in giving and reading to the Jury instruction number ten tendered by the defendants William Roop and Ludlow L. Sheline.

Twelfth:-The court erred in giving and reading to the jury on its own motion instruction number one.

Thirteenth: - The court erred in giving and reading to the jury on its own motion instruction number two.

Fourteenth: - The court erred in giving and reading to the jury on its own motion instruction number three.

Fifteenth: - The court erred in giving and reading to the jury on its own mation instruction number four.

Sixteenth:- The court erred in giving and reading to the own to work mation jury instruction number five.

The George H. Bohrer Bruing Coo, a Corporation, by Statteller + Low Ito attorneys

State of Indiana

Adams County

The George A. Bohrer Brewing Company.a Corporation

VS

Harry Cordua, William Roop, Ludlow L. Sheline, Jonathan Andrews.

In the Adams Circuit Court, February

Term, 1907.

#

Separate demurrer by all the defendants

#

#

The defendants Harry Cordua, William Roop, Ludlow L.

Sheline and Jonathan M. Andrews, demurs separately and severally each for himself, to the plaintiff's complaint on the following grounds:

That said complaint does not state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action.

Attorney fo defendants leaded

and Sheline.

State of Indiana In the Adams Court Court

Adams County 3 Jebruary Jerun 1907

George A Boher 3

Brewnief Company 3

Sudlows & Sheline

Et at Sudlow & Sheline who bring Dworn on his Oach Dweaves and Doys that he is One of the defendants in the above entitled course and hat he believes he cannot have a fair and Importal 12 brial of the above louse before the Hon Richard 18 K & rwin Judge of the Adams Cercuit Court of 14 Adews Cowely Indiana before whome soul 16 Course is now pending on account of the bras 18 ulerest and projudice of soil Judge in Sail 17 Course and he now moves the Court that the 18 Venue of Doid Course br Changed, 10 Indloss of Shehire Dubscribed and Aworn to before me this 23 of duy of Morch 1907 Lewis @ De Voes Hotory Public COMMISSION AS NOTARY PUBLIC

State of Indiana, # In the Adams Circuit Court February County of Adams. # term, 1907.

The George A.Boher # Separate demur by defendant Wm. Roop .

Brewering Company a

Corporation. #

VS

Harry Cordua
William Roop #

Ludlow L.Sheline

Jonathan M. Andrews

The defendant here William Roop for his separate demur to plaintiffs complaint says that said complaint does not contain facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against this defendant.

Atty con plain tiff

Offy for Degundant

State of Indiana Adams County 88. In the Adams einent Court figby Lerm 190%. The George A. Bohrer Brown Company a Confrontine. Harry Cordua Aal Comes now the planitiff by Ditende D. Heller dem do attorneys and dernus to the seprende and amonded answer of the defendant William Roofe filed in this lours and in this case on the II day of march 1907 and for Course of Dennier says that sand paragraph does not state facts sufficient to Constitule à cause of défense AT Heller Ason Allys for pliff.

The State of Indiana Adams county SS; In the Adams enouit Court Fiely Lorm 1907. The Seo & Bohren Browing Company a Cirporation. Harry Cordua Et al Cornes now the plaintiff by A Weller voin cto attorney and for nepty to the seperate Judlow I Sheline - nephies and denies Each and Every allegation therein contamiel DA Heller Kron Allys for play,