

A109

B17338

In the Circuit Court  
of Cook County

Jessie Nickerson Whitlock

vs

Harry O. Whitlock

NK60  
NW374

Bill Jones

Bill for divorce

H. K. Lone  
atly for Plaintiff

R2461/2

STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
                          ) SS.  
COUNTY OF COOK     )

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY.

JESSIE NICKERSON WHITLOCK )  
                                  ) vs. )  
HARRY O. WHITLOCK.         )

(1)

BILL FOR DIVORCE.

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGES OF THE  
CIRCUIT COURT IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS  
IN CHANCERY SITTING:

Your oratrix, Jessie Nickerson Whitlock, respectfully represents unto your honors that she is an actual resident of the said County of Cook and is now and has been for more than fifteen (15) years last past a resident of the State of Illinois. That on, to-wit, the 1st day of March, 1908, she was lawfully married to the defendant, Harry O. Whitlock, hereinafter named, and from the time of said marriage until on or about the 19th day of December, 1911, she lived and cohabited with the said Harry O. Whitlock as his wife and always conducted herself towards him as a true, kind and indulgent wife and at all times performed her marital duties as such wife. Your oratrix further represents that the said Harry O. Whitlock, wholly regardless of his marriage covenants and duty afterwards and on, to-wit, the 19th day of December, 1911, wilfully deserted and absented himself from your oratrix without any reasonable cause for the space of two (2) years and upwards and has persisted in such

desertion and yet continues to absent himself from your oratrix.

Your oratrix further shows that there were born as the fruit of said marriage two children, namely Norma, aged 5 years and Albert, aged 4 years, and your oratrix shows that ever since the said defendant so deserted your oratrix on the 19th day of December, 1911, your oratrix has had the care and custody of said children and has cared for said children faithfully and properly, and your oratrix therefore shows that she should be given the absolute custody of said children free from any restraint or interference on the part of the said defendant.

2

Forasmuch, therefore, as your oratrix is without remedy in the premises except in a court of equity and to the end that the said Harry O. Whitlock who is made a party defendant to this bill may be required to make full and direct answer to the same and that the said marriage between your oratrix and the said Harry O. Whitlock may be dissolved and declared null and void by the decree of this court according to the statute in such case made and provided, and that your oratrix may have such other and further relief in the premises as equity may require and to your honors may seem meet.

And your oratrix further prays that an order be entered in this cause giving to your oratrix the care, custody, control and education of the said children without any interference on the part of the said defendant.

May it please your honors to grant unto your oratrix the writ of summons in chancery directed to the above named defendant to appear before this court at the next term thereof to be held at the court house in the City of Chicago, County and State aforesaid, then and there to answer this Bill, etc.

M. K. Lowe

2246114

Gen. No. B 17338

CIRCUIT COURT  
COOK CO.

WHITLOCK

v

WHITLOCK

EVIDENCE HEARD.

FILED

JAN 15 1916

*John W. Ramsey*  
CLERK

B.K. TONE, Esq.,  
Solicitor for Complainant.

R24/61/5

(No. 9)

AK60  
ANSW

B-17338.

CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY.

JESSIE HICKERSON WHITLOCK

v.

HARRY O. WHITLOCK.

*Oct 3 1912*

ANSWER TO BILL OF COMPLAINT.

State of Illinois, )  
County of Cook. ) ss.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY.

JESSIE NICKERSON WHITLOCK )  
v. ) No. B:17338.  
HARRY O. WHITLOCK )

ANSWER OF HARRY O. WHITLOCK TO THE BILL OF COMPLAINT OF JESSIE NICKERSON WHITLOCK, Complainant.

This defendant, by protestation not admitting nor acknowledging any or all of the uncertainties or imperfections of the said bill of complaint, for answer thereto, or as much thereto as he is advised that he should answer, says:

He admits that the complainant was and is an actual resident of Cook county more than fifteen years last past and that she and this defendant were lawfully married to one another on the 1st day of March, 1908 but denies that they lived and cohabited together until the 19th day of December, 1911 but says that they did not live and cohabit together as husband and wife on the 28th day of October, 1911.

Said defendant further answering says, that he denies that the complainant has always conducted herself to him as a true, kind and indulgent wife and that she has at all times performed her marital duties as such wife, and denies that on the 19th day of December, 1911, or at any other time, he willfully deserted and absented himself from the complainant without any reasonable cause for the space of two years and afterwards or for any other period of time.

This defendant further answering says that he admits that there were born as the fruit of said marriage two children but says that the names of said children are Norma Whitlock and → Harry O. Whitlock, Jr. and this defendant denies that the complainant should be given the care and custody of said children.

Further answering this defendant denies that the plaintiff is entitled to any of the relief prayed in said bill of complaint, or any part thereof, and prays to be hence dismissed with reasonable costs, etc.

Harry O. Whitlock

By Durk Hatter of Rossberg

His Solicitors.

209

B17338

In the Circuit Court  
of Cook County

Jessie Nickerson Whitlock

v.

Henry D. Whitlock

Decree

Judge Kersten

JAN 15 1918

Att. Gen.  
NW374

5061

\* 22461/9

STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
                          )SS.  
COUNTY OF COOK   )

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY.

HARRY G. WHITLOCK  
vs.  
HARRY G. WHITLOCK

B17338

DECREE.

This cause having come on to be heard upon the bill of complaint herein, the answer of the defendant to such bill, the replication of complainant to such answer and the testimony of witnesses this day heard in open court, the court finds that the defendant has been duly served with process of summons in this cause more than ten (10) days prior to the first day of the present term of this court. Now the court finds that the material facts alleged in complainant's bill are true, that complainant and defendant were married on, to-wit, the 1st day of March, 1908, that there were born as the issue of said marriage two children, namely, Norma, aged 5 years, and Albert, aged 4 years. That the parties continued to live and cohabit as husband and wife until on or about the 19th day of December, 1911. That on, to-wit, the 19th day of December, 1911 the defendant wilfully deserted and absented himself from complainant without any reasonable cause for the space of more than two (2) years, and has been guilty of wilfully deserting and absenting himself from complainant for more than two (2) years prior to the filing of this



DOROTHY BROWN  
CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS  
RICHARD J. DALEY CENTER  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60602  
ARCHIVES - 1113

R2461/11

S

#291465

THE HONORABLE DOROTHY BROWN  
CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT  
COOK COUNTY, IL

DATE: 5/20/2005 TIME: 8:47AM  
IN: 0002-0001 RN: 00000332  
DIST: 01 DIV: Archives  
ARC1-117 CASHIER: BERHANEI CR#: 036

ATTORNEY NO: 99500

REF CASE NO: 11S-291465  
REF OTHER: 05-2807

CASE TOTAL: \$3.50	
Copy Fee	\$3.50
CHECK NO: 4050	
CHECK AMOUNT:	\$3.50
CHANGE	\$0.00

RECEIPT 0001 OF 0001	
TRANSACTION TOTAL:	\$3.50

THANK YOU

JAMES EDWA  
948 N. AUSTIN  
OAK PARK, IL

6030241733



S

# 291465

Docket No. 9807—Agenda 31—October, 1914.

Harry O. Whitlock, Defendant in Error,  
v. Jessie Nickerson Whitlock, Plaintiff in Error.

Mr. JUSTICE CRAIG delivered the opinion of the court:

Defendant in error (hereafter referred to as complainant) filed his bill in the superior court of Cook county on December 22, 1911, against plaintiff in error (hereafter referred to as defendant) for divorce. The bill charged defendant with having committed adultery with Dr. O'Byrne, the family physician of the parties to the suit, on September 21, 1911, and at divers other times. Defendant answered the bill denying the charge of adultery and filed a cross-bill for divorce charging her husband with extreme and repeated cruelty. The husband filed an answer denying the charge in the cross-bill. Replications were filed and the cause was heard by the court without a jury, resulting in a decree finding the defendant in the original bill guilty of adultery as charged and awarding the complainant in the original bill a divorce upon that ground. The cross-bill was dismissed for want of equity. On appeal to the Appellate Court for the First District the decree was affirmed, and the case is brought to this court upon a writ of *certiorari*.

It is assigned for error that the Appellate Court erred in affirming the decree of the superior court finding that subsequent to her marriage the defendant committed adultery and decreeing a divorce on that ground and dismissing the cross-bill for want of equity, and that such decree is contrary to the evidence. As the decision of the case depends entirely upon the evidence and the question is altogether one of fact we have examined the record closely, the honor and good name of both parties to the suit and that of their children being involved.

The parties were married March 1, 1908. Their first child was born on November 24, 1909, and the second on March 24, 1911. Dr. O'Byrne attended defendant at the birth of the first child and continued as the family physician from that time until subsequent to the date of the alleged adultery. After the marriage the parties lived on South Forty-fifth avenue, in Chicago, until about May 1, 1910, for the next year on Washtenaw avenue, and from about May 1, 1911, until after their separation, in a flat-building on West Adams street which was owned by the

mother of complainant and who lived in the upper flat of the building, complainant and defendant and their children occupying the lower flat. The material witnesses on behalf of the complainant were himself, his brother, William, and his mother. The complainant testified that at the time of the birth of their first child, and about an hour after the child was born, he stepped into the bed-room, where Dr. O'Byrne was alone with the defendant, and found him patting her cheek and calling her endearing names. On June 20, 1910, he came home and entered the house quickly and found the defendant with her face flushed, her hair mussed up and holding her hands behind her back, and that she confessed afterwards that she was hiding the doctor's gloves behind her back, and that he had left by the back door through the basement as complainant came in at the front. In June, 1911, the complainant came home sick, affected by the heat, as he says, and saw the doctor getting up from a couch where his wife was lying, in the bed-room. On that occasion the doctor ministered to the complainant, putting him to bed and placing cracked ice on his head. On September 24, 1911, the complainant discharged Dr. O'Byrne for the reason that his treatment of the baby was not satisfactory and another physician was called. On October 28, 1911, after a conversation with his mother, he claims that the defendant confessed to having had improper relations with Dr. O'Byrne at different times, and subsequently, on the same evening, admitted the same thing in the presence of her father and mother, who lived in the neighborhood and who had been sent for to bring over an anonymous letter the defendant's mother had received. The brother of the complainant, William Whitlock, also testified that she repeated this confession in the presence of the complainant and himself on November 18, 1911. These admissions and alleged confessions were denied *in toto* by the defendant and by her father and mother, who were present on October 28 when it was claimed they were first made, and their testimony puts the matters that were there discussed in an entirely different light. There is evidence of some of the neighbors that Dr. O'Byrne was a frequent caller at the Whitlock house and at other houses in the neighborhood where he had patients. The mother of the complainant testified that in the latter part of June, 1911, she was in the parlor of the flat occupied by complainant and defendant, when Dr. O'Byrne drove up in his automobile. The defendant let him in at the front door.

Opposite the door was a picture hanging on the wall with a black background, in which the witness claimed she could see the reflection of the defendant and the doctor. She testifies: "I saw him raise his hand as though he was about to embrace her, and I heard her say, 'Harry's mother is here.'" On another occasion she came in the flat unexpectedly with a neighbor and saw Dr. O'Byrne kissing defendant in the hall. The neighbor who accompanied her (Mrs. Morris) was also a witness and corroborated this story to the extent of coming into the flat with the complainant's mother and meeting the doctor, who was there on a visit to the sick baby, but saw nothing of the kissing.

The only direct evidence to sustain the charge of adultery in the bill was that of the mother of complainant, who testified that on September 21, 1911, between eleven and twelve o'clock in the forenoon, while she was in her flat above the one occupied by the defendant, she heard the doctor and the defendant come out on the back porch of the flat, which was screened in and where the baby was asleep, and then go back in and lock the door. Shortly after she heard the door-bell ring and went down to the entrance, which was used for both flats. A woman was there inquiring where someone lived and asked if anyone was sick. The witness saw no one in the defendant's flat excepting the older child. She went back up-stairs to her flat and went down the back way. There was a man just leaving the porch, who inquired if she wanted the baby's picture taken. She thought the man had been in the hall and left the door open. She went down the back stairs on to the screened porch in the rear of defendant's flat, saw the younger baby asleep in the hammock, tried the door leading into the northeast room of the defendant's flat and found it was locked. The flat-building faces to the south and the porch is on the north side of the flat. There are two rooms in the north end of the flat, next to the porch. The east room is the larger of the two and is connected with the porch by a door, and east of the door opening onto the porch are two windows close together. The west room has no windows opening onto the porch. There is a door between the two rooms. To look into the west room from the porch windows it is necessary to look through the door connecting the two rooms. There was a cot in the southwest corner of the west room. The witness first testified that she looked through both of these windows in

passing along the porch and saw the defendant in the act of committing adultery on the cot in the west room with Dr. O'Byrne. Her testimony was as follows: "When I first looked into the window I looked south over the sash curtain of the east window and then I looked over the sash curtain of the west window, where the glass was broken out. I could see this couch from both places just as I have described it. \* \* \* I looked into the east window first. From the east window I could see the doctor below the hips, and also the head. When I went to the west window I could see about as much of the doctor but not quite. As I told you, there is a six-inch difference in the space. It would make about that much difference. I was not in the center of that west window but, to the east side of it. I did not have to go to the west window. I just had to move a few inches. I went to the west window and looked in there where the glass was broken. There was only six inches difference in what I could see from that window." Later on she corrected her testimony and claimed that she saw this episode through the east window and did not try to look through the west window. Still later she testified that she did see the head and shoulders of the doctor and the defendant through the west window. A plat of these rooms and porch, with measurements showing the dimensions, is in the record, together with lines of sight from the two windows into the west room, in which the alleged adultery took place. From the plat, the sight lines and the testimony of the architect who made the plat it appears that from the east side of the east window a person standing on the porch could see a portion of the cot but that it was impossible to see more than a corner of the cot through the door between the rooms from the west window. It further appears that after the witness testified as to what she saw through the west window, and before she went on the witness stand and corrected her former testimony, a reporter had called at the house and examined the premises, and he and others had attempted to verify her testimony but were unable to see from the west window the space formerly occupied by the cot and had called her attention to that fact. It further appears that the witness had a key to the flat occupied by the defendant and her husband and had access to it at all times.

The story told by the above witness is at least an improbable one. To sustain this decree we must believe that the parties went into the room in question and without

even taking the precaution to close the door or pull down the window shades committed a gross act of adultery in broad daylight, in premises that were accessible to two families and where they could be seen by anyone around the premises. There is other testimony in the record which tends to cast a grave doubt upon the motives of the complainant in bringing this suit and the part taken therein by his principal witnesses,—his mother and brother. About the time of the occurrences above set out certain anonymous letters were written,—one of them to the mother of the defendant,—and it was this letter that caused the father and mother of the defendant to be called to the flat of the complainant and defendant on October 28. We infer from the record that this letter was printed, but from certain figures in the letter similar to the same figures made by Mrs. Whitlock, Sr., and the mis-spelling of certain words peculiar to her as shown by the evidence, and the further evidence in the record that she called attention to these anonymous letters and denied having written them before she was accused of so doing, there is a strong suspicion that she was the author of these letters despite her denial of being the author. Another circumstance that is shown by the record is that complainant, some time in the latter part of October, or in November, 1911, through his brother, William, procured the services of an attorney and took steps to bring an action against Dr. O'Byrne for damages for alienation of the defendant's affections, and conferences were held between him and the attorney of Dr. O'Byrne, who denied having been guilty of any impropriety and refused to pay. William Whitlock at first testified that the first he knew of the trouble between the parties was when he called at their flat on November 18, and yet it seems he had been active in procuring the services of an attorney for the complainant at least two weeks prior to that time, and, incidentally, as early as November 4 had procured the report of a commercial agency on the financial standing of Dr. O'Byrne. There is also the evidence of a witness who lived across the street from the Whitlocks, and who was entirely disinterested, that Mrs. Whitlock, Sr., had offered her money to testify against the defendant.

Aside from the evidence which we have detailed there is nothing whatever in the record which is against defendant in any way. She was unquestionably a young woman of education and refinement and of a good family. Her parents, while not wealthy, are respectable and honest peo-

ple and have properly stood by the defendant in her trouble. The defendant, at the time of her marriage, was in the employ of the United States civil service commission at a salary of \$1000 a year,—a position that is not generally held by wantons or women of loose character. She had a high school education and is a graduate of the Art Institute, had saved money, and spent a large part of it in furnishing her home when she married the complainant. She denies absolutely any impropriety with Dr. O'Byrne or having admitted to the complainant or anyone else any improper conduct with him, and her testimony as it appears in the record, as well as that of her parents and Dr. O'Byrne, is convincing. The defendant and her parents directly contradict the complainant and his brother as to the alleged admissions of infidelity, and their account of what occurred is a reasonable one. The language and profanity imputed to the defendant in these alleged admissions is entirely at variance with her conduct and demeanor as shown by disinterested witnesses. There are no property interests involved in this litigation. The defendant has little, if anything, to gain in a financial way in the outcome of the suit. It is not often that a party to litigation of this character, unless honest and actuated by the best of motives, will go to the extent the defendant has gone in this case to protect and preserve her good name. Dr. O'Byrne was a physician residing in that neighborhood. He was called to attend the defendant in two cases of confinement and to attend the children afterwards. The younger child was sick much of the time after its birth, and it is very evident from the record that the attendance of the doctor was necessary. The young wife and mother was having a hard time and should have had the sympathy and support of her husband's relations instead of their unconcealed hostility and aversion. The doctor attended the defendant and her children the same as any other physician would attend them, made his charges for such services and rendered his bills to the complainant, who paid them. It is true the defendant and Dr. O'Byrne were at times alone together in the defendant's home, but his attendance as a physician being necessary, there is nothing in that circumstance, alone, from which guilty intimacy could be implied. To hold otherwise would be to put a perverted and wholly unwarranted construction upon many of the necessary and proper ministrations of the medical profession. The testimony of the complainant contains many innuendoes and reflections

(6)

on the character of the defendant, but there was nothing within his actual knowledge on which to base such testimony, and it is clear that from anything he actually saw or knew he had no suspicion of any improper relations between his wife and Dr. O'Byrne until long after the doctor was discharged and his mother had told the preposterous story she subsequently testified to. Then everything he had ever noticed was seen by him in a different light. As an instance of this, at the time of the first act of impropriety of which complainant testified, (the occasion when their first child was born,) the defendant, as complainant further testified, was under the influence of anæsthetics. As said in *Carter v. Carter*, 62 Ill. 439, on page 449: "When the evidence may as well establish innocence as guilt the jury should always adopt the former rather than the latter hypothesis; and the same is manifestly true where a violation of the marital rights is charged by the commission of an act that degrades the parties and inflicts great wrong upon society. When such a charge is made it involves the character of both parties to the offense, and the character of the woman, to whom it is of priceless value. She should not be found guilty on evidence which may as well import innocence as guilt." In *Chestnut v. Chestnut*, 88 Ill. 548, the same rule is laid down.

We are mindful of the rule that a court of review will not disturb the findings of fact of a chancellor unless such findings are clearly and palpably against the evidence, particularly where the chancellor has seen the witnesses and heard them testify and is in a better position to judge of their credibility than the upper court. Still, where the only specific evidence that tends to prove the charge in the bill is that of a witness who could not possibly have seen what she claims she saw and her testimony is contradicted by credible witnesses, the evidence is not sufficient to justify the decree and it is our duty to reverse such decree.

We are cognizant of the authorities cited by complainant in support of the above proposition that the holding of the lower court should not be disturbed unless contrary to the evidence, and without reviewing them here it is sufficient to say that there has been no case decided by this court of which we are aware or that has been cited, in which a charge of adultery has been sustained on contradicted evidence of such character as is contained in the record in this case. In the case of *Jenkins v. Jenkins*, 86 Ill. 340, this court reversed a decree for divorce granted for

adultery of the defendant where the only evidence of the adultery was that of the complainant, and her testimony was improbable in its details and the defendant and the co-respondent denied the charge. In the case of *Berckmans v. Berckmans*, 16 N. J. Eq. 122, the facts were very similar to those in the case at bar. The husband sued his wife for divorce on the ground of adultery alleged to have been committed with her family physician. The mother-in-law testified to seeing the act through a window. After sight lines had been projected demonstrating that she could not have seen what she swore to from the point where she stood, she changed her testimony. The court, in rejecting her evidence for this among other reasons, said, on page 129: "It shows that what she originally swore she saw was a physical impossibility, and that after that fact had been ascertained her evidence was so modified to meet the emergency as to render it of little or no significance."

As to the cross-bill filed by the defendant charging the complainant in the original bill with extreme and repeated cruelty, the defendant testified to two acts of cruelty and physical violence by the complainant. To justify a divorce on the ground of extreme and repeated cruelty the cruel treatment proved must be actual violence and it must be repeated. What would amount to extreme and repeated cruelty depends largely upon the facts and circumstances of each particular case. (*Ward v. Ward*, 103 Ill. 477.) There is some corroboration as to one of the alleged acts, but the evidence, for the most part, is entirely that of the defendant, and the complainant denied her charges. There should be evidence of such acts as would constitute sufficient cause for divorce under the circumstances besides the evidence of the party to the suit who makes such charges, where such acts are denied. This evidence is lacking, and we do not feel justified in reversing the finding of the chancellor or the judgment of the Appellate Court on the decree, on the cross-bill.

For the reasons given, the judgment of the Appellate Court and the decree of the superior court will be reversed and the cause will be remanded to the superior court.

*Reversed and remanded.*

DUNN, COOKE and WATSON, JJ., dissenting.

---

8

# Con-Con Voting Tables

Following are the results of the con-con primary election, with the four candidates in each district with the biggest number of votes qualifying for the final election on Nov. 18.

<b>1ST DISTRICT</b>	
[192 of 197 precincts]	
Samuel W. Witwer	10,883
Frank Cicero Jr.	11,494
Marion E. Burks	7,898
Joseph W. Smith	3,894
Steven J. Schada	3,700
Robert A. Simon	3,313
Robert J. Salberg	875
<b>2D DISTRICT</b>	
[186 of 187 precincts]	
Lucy Reum	8,440
Thomas J. McCracken	8,068
John J. Walsh Jr.	6,419
Arthur J. Moore	5,618
Thomas J. Campbell	3,806
Jack C. Rossetter	3,685
Dwight Follet	3,598
Michael W. Meila	1,628
Reginald A. Barnett	1,444
Melvin R. Kurr	407
<b>3D DISTRICT</b>	
[257 of 274 precincts]	
John G. Woods	8,727
Virginia Macdonald	8,524
William Engelhardt	5,535
Madeline Schroeder	5,412
Mary Carlson	3,524
Eugene L. Griffin	2,191
Thomas S. Johnson	1,921
Samuel A. Lasusa	1,160
Wilfred L. Robbins	1,005
Douglas R. Cannon	995
LeMoine D. Stitt	903
Lester A. Bonaguro	833
Robert A. Bush	700
Donald F. Colby	697
Winn C. Davidson	594
Annis F. Bush	421
<b>4TH DISTRICT</b>	
[221 of 226 precincts]	
Marshall S. Howard	3,681
Clyde Parker	3,082
Anne H. Evans	2,778
Theodore A. Shapero	4,674
Michael H. Lavin	4,620
Jerome Goldstick	1,793
William C. Nigut	1,699
Samuel T. Cohen	1,573
Franklin Lee	747
James I. Gottreich	650
<b>5TH DISTRICT</b>	
[197 of 204 precincts]	
John F. Dvorak	6,393
Robert N. Price	5,006
Samuel A. DeCaro	4,856
Anne Willer	4,435
Vernon R. Forgue	4,420
Mary O'Callaghan	3,576
Raymond G. Cox	3,102
Thomas V. Kane	2,560
Gorden H. Ryan	1,884
Luella M. Seida	1,335
Kirby Johnston	561
<b>6TH DISTRICT</b>	
[195 of 199 precincts]	
Martin Ozinga Jr.	8,385
Porter Orr	4,649
James E. Gierach	4,240
Herbert V. Huskey	2,065
Bill P. Perry	2,340
Jean A. Keeney	2,290
Lester F. Catlin	1,933
Richard O. Bennett	1,850
Frank McCune	1,800
Robert G. Johannsen	1,400
Ralph J. Berg	1,170
Lester D. McCurrie	660
Sandra J. Stegenga	625
Joan A. Plahm	547
Z. Erol Smith	516
Roy C. Johnson	299
James E. Jones	278
Jordan Morris	237

Elmer Gertz	6,508
Raymond Schumacher	6,053
Sherwin H. Bender	3,138
Thomas C. Brophy	1,303
Mary Ann Fogarty	1,197
John J. Hogan	852
Harry P. Kuhr	382
<b>14TH DISTRICT</b>	
[169 of 170 precincts]	
John F. Leon	10,070
William J. Laurino	9,802
Vincent J. Pokacki	4,054
Roger Charlier	3,973
Leon S. Conlon	2,566
Steven J. Telow	1,758
Fred H. Justin	1,216
<b>15TH DISTRICT</b>	
[All 197 precincts reporting]	
Thomas G. Lyons	19,257
David E. Stahl	18,176
Zeamore A. Ader	4,663
Edward R. Burr	2,976
Ken Denzel	2,945
Joseph M. Moran	2,328
Melbourne A. Noel	2,002
<b>16TH DISTRICT</b>	
[All 195 precincts reporting]	
William F. Lennon	12,767
James E. Strunck	12,432
Catherine M. Richards	6,325
Donald E. Eslick	4,958
Joseph S. Zukowski	4,056
Robert J. Kennedy	2,976
Frank Haluska	1,963
Samuel J. Deitch	1,665
Monica Garslka	1,190
Timothy J. Sullivan	1,064
Joseph L. Rispoli	892
Robert E. Romano	795
Kenneth P. Gill	759
Warren M. Mose	532
<b>17TH DISTRICT</b>	
[152 of 155 precincts]	
Harold M. Nudelman	18,212
Frank Orlando	15,395
Harry Axelrod	3,515
Thomas E. Kramer	2,999
Henry L. Klinger	2,010
Leo R. Granger	1,353
<b>18TH DISTRICT</b>	
[164 of 166 precincts]	
Edward J. Rosewell	11,065
Leonard N. Foster	9,606
Edward L. Stepnowski	2,637
Howard A. Heldt	2,221
Alfred L. Portis	2,137
LeRoy Cross	1,713
<b>19TH DISTRICT</b>	
[No contest]	
William A. Jaskula	
Joseph C. Sharpe Sr.	
Douglas Huff Jr.	
<b>20TH DISTRICT</b>	
[No contest]	
Victor A. Arrigo	
Marison L. Brown	
<b>21ST DISTRICT</b>	
[No contest]	
Frank D. Stemberk	
Gloria S. Pughlsley	
Joseph G. Policky	
<b>22D DISTRICT</b>	
[No contest]	
Samuel A. Patch	
James Kemp	
Yolande M. Johnson	
<b>23D DISTRICT</b>	
[All 166 precincts reporting]	
Richard M. Daley	24,502
Leonard F. Miska	20,690
John P. Tully	4,657
Robert A. Urbanek	3,313
George E. Esch	1,460
Howard L. Doyle	1,327
Stephen J. Winbush	390
<b>24TH DISTRICT</b>	
[All 149 precincts reporting]	
Odas Nicholson	9,183
Albert A. Raby	8,997

Norman C. Geary	3,795
Robert G. Cronson	2,314
Lawrence L. Lee	1,415
Joseph B. Coleman	1,306
William J. Hughes	1,152
Elmer E. Koske	509
<b>33D DISTRICT</b>	
[All 174 precincts reporting]	
Stanley C. Johnson	6,664
Jeff Strack	5,986
Maxine Wymore	4,611
Wilbur M. Hoffman	3,533
Earle B. Johnson	3,530
Richard E. Harmison	1,653
<b>34TH DISTRICT</b>	
[All precincts reporting]	
Robert R. Canfield	4,868
Mrs. Thomas Keegan	4,584
John P. Graves Jr.	4,329
Avery O. Gage	4,243
[Only top four candidates listed.]	
<b>35TH DISTRICT</b>	
[All precincts reporting]	
Harlan Rigney	8,764
Wayne W. Whalen	6,787
W. C. Linker	5,944
Virginia Matthews	4,080
[Only top four candidates listed.]	
<b>36TH DISTRICT</b>	
[All precincts reporting]	
Louis J. Perona	6,123
Arthur E. Quaise	4,727
Edwin F. Peterson	4,019
James Lannon	3,498
[Only top four candidates listed.]	
<b>37TH DISTRICT</b>	
[All precincts reporting]	
Richard G. Browne	5,395
Paul E. Mathia-	4,961
David David	4,242
Henry J. Spitzer	3,149
[Only top four candidates listed.]	
<b>38TH DISTRICT</b>	
[All 192 precincts reporting]	
Betty Howard	8,934
Albert N. Whitlock	4,910
Lawrence N. Hansen	4,827
James S. Brannen	3,938
Sydney L. Perkins	3,074
Richard N. Young	2,919
W. L. McCullough	2,208
J. Robert Murphy	2,112
Terry Sternberg	1,405
William Mosley	337
<b>39TH DISTRICT</b>	
[All 224 precincts reporting]	
Thomas C. Kelleghan	5,477
William Sommerschild	4,897
Margaret Larson	4,737
Stanley A. Kula	4,629
William J. Adelman	4,522
Robert Schmiede	3,544
William G. Doan	1,759
Donald J. Mock	1,732
Norman Koltvitz	1,198
<b>40TH DISTRICT</b>	
[All 185 precincts reporting]	
Helen C. Kinney	7,625
Anthony M. Peccarelli	7,140
James H. Clark	3,659
J. Glenn Schneider	3,564
Jane Elkins	3,447
Helen Harshbarger	3,373
James W. Smith	3,312
Robert W. Shoemaker	3,094
William T. Grant	1,929
<b>41ST DISTRICT</b>	
[91 of 153 precincts]	
George E. Sangmeister	3,766
Louis F. Bottino	3,738
Arthur T. Lennon	2,790
Daniel L. Kennedy	1,817
Arthur J. O'Donnell	1,074
James J. O'Connell	854
Eugene L. House	807
Vernon L. Young	740

<b>44TH DISTRICT</b>	
[All precincts reporting]	
Charles R. Young	7,834
Joe T. Co' ively	4,877
Edward H. Jenison	4,501
James R. Livesay	3,395
[Only top four candidates listed.]	
<b>45TH DISTRICT</b>	
[No contest]	
John C. Parkhurst	
David E. Connor	
Victor J. Kasel	
Joan R. Howells	
<b>46TH DISTRICT</b>	
[All precincts reporting]	
Samuel L. Martin	6,480
Donald D. Zeglis	6,241
Jack R. Beaupre	3,909
Betty Lou Elliott	3,441
[Only top four candidates listed.]	
<b>47TH DISTRICT</b>	
[All precincts reporting]	
Charles W. Shuman	5,738
Joan Severns	4,613
Wayne W. Whalen	6,787
Henry I. Green	3,624
John H. Finfrock	3,250
[Only top four candidates listed.]	
<b>48TH DISTRICT</b>	
[All precincts reporting]	
Clarence E. Yordy	6,234
Earl Madigan	4,795
John R. Lauer	3,319
William D. Fogal	2,863
[Only top four candidates listed.]	
<b>49TH DISTRICT</b>	
[All precincts reporting]	
Maurice W. Scott	14,298
William L. Fay	10,370
Thomas F. Londrigan	10,057
Walter Oblinger	4,917
[Only top four candidates listed.]	
<b>50TH DISTRICT</b>	
[All precincts reporting]	
Elbert S. Smith	6,092
Franklin E. Dove	5,235
W. A. Sappington	3,101
Marshall A. Susler	2,250
[Only top four candidates listed.]	
<b>51ST DISTRICT</b>	
[All precincts reporting]	
Dwight P. Friedrich	9,366
James S. Parker	6,941
Walter Shipp	4,813
C. F. Marley	4,351
[Only top four candidates listed.]	
<b>52D DISTRICT</b>	
[All precincts reporting]	
John Alexander	4,253
Udell W. Wehling	3,837
Casmir F. Gierut	3,186
Joseph J. Carrillo	2,493
[Only top four candidates listed.]	
<b>53D DISTRICT</b>	
[All precincts reporting]	
Wendell Durr	3,699
Doreen D. Young	3,011
Ray Johnsen	2,919
Lucien B. Ringering	2,129
[Only top four candidates listed.]	
<b>54TH DISTRICT</b>	
[All precincts reporting]	
William F. Fennoy Jr.	4,526
John M. Karns Jr.	2,427
Charles Oelrich	2,290
Carolyn Chapman	1,614
[Only top four candidates listed.]	
<b>55TH DISTRICT</b>	
[All precincts reporting]	
J. L. Buford	7,650
Henry C. Hendren	5,332
Parker Graves	4,204

Other 3 - No Title

Chicago Tribune (1963-Current file); Sep 22, 1969; ProQuest Historical Newspapers Chicago Tribune (1890 - 1973)  
pg. 3

# Here Are Con-Con Indorsements

Tribune recommendations in the con-con primary races, excluding downstate districts, are:

**1ST DISTRICT**  
Samuel W. Witwer

**2D DISTRICT**  
John J. Walsh Jr. Thomas J. McCracken  
Mrs. Lucy Reum Arthur J. Moore Jr.

**3D DISTRICT**  
Mrs. Virginia B. MacDonald William R. Engelhardt  
Mrs. Madeline Schroeder Thomas J. Johnson

**4TH DISTRICT**  
Marshall S. Howard Michael Lavin  
Clyde Parker Mrs. Anne Evans

**5TH DISTRICT**  
Dr. Robert Price Samuel DeCaro  
Vernon R. Forgue Mrs. Mary O'Callahan

**6TH DISTRICT**  
Martin Ozinga Jr. Bill P. Perry  
Porter Orr Ralph J. Berg

**7TH DISTRICT**  
Joseph A. Tecson State Rep. Gerald Shea  
Roy C. Pechous Frederick C. Smith

**8TH DISTRICT**  
Samuel La Porte Jr., Thomas H. Miller  
Ray H. Garrison Gerald W. Getty

**9TH DISTRICT**  
State Sen. Terrel E. Clarke Joseph Meek  
William E. Cairnes Ollie E. Stone

**10TH DISTRICT**  
Peter Tomei Mrs. Peggy Norton  
State Rep. Paul Elward State Sen. Esther Saperstein

**11TH DISTRICT**  
Bennett B. Harvey Jr. Martin Tuchow  
Neal Ball

**12TH DISTRICT**  
Albert W. Hachmeister

**13TH DISTRICT**  
Ronald C. Smith Raymond Schumacher

**14TH DISTRICT**  
Roger H. Charlier John Leon  
Vincent Poklacki

**15TH DISTRICT**  
Thomas G. Lyons Zeamore Ader  
David E. Stahl

**16TH DISTRICT**  
Mrs. Catherine Richards James E. Strunck  
Samuel J. Deitch

**17TH DISTRICT**  
Harry Axelrod Frank Orlando  
Harold M. Nudelman

## The Story of Con-Con

A full report on tomorrow's delegate primary and the forthcoming Illinois constitutional convention appears on pages 8 and 9 of this section.

Read "The Importance of Voting Tomorrow" on the editorial page.

**18TH DISTRICT**  
Edward L. Stepnowski Edward J. Rosewell  
Le Roy Cross Howard A. Heldt

**19TH DISTRICT**  
No contest

**20TH DISTRICT**  
No contest

**21ST DISTRICT**  
No contest

**22D DISTRICT**  
No contest

**23D DISTRICT**  
John P. Tully Richard M. Daley

**24TH DISTRICT**  
Noble W. Lee Mrs. Odas Nicholson

**25TH DISTRICT**  
Daniel Kwiat John J. Fempok

**26TH DISTRICT**  
No contest

**27TH DISTRICT**  
No contest

**28TH DISTRICT**  
Lendol D. Snow Philip Carey  
Ted A. Borek Peter D. Oosterbaan

**29TH DISTRICT**  
No contest

**30TH DISTRICT**  
Mrs. Dorothy Stevenson Henry Soltysinski  
David Linn

**31ST DISTRICT**  
John D. Wenum Glenn H. Reinler

**32D DISTRICT**  
Robert S. Cushman Samuel T. Lawton  
Jeffrey R. Ladd

**38TH DISTRICT**  
James Brannen Mrs. Betty Howard  
Lawrence Hansen Albert N. Whitlock

**39TH DISTRICT**  
William Sommerschild Stanley Kula  
Thomas Kellegan

**40TH DISTRICT**  
Helen C. Kinney Anthony Peccarelli  
James H. Clark Mrs. Helen Harshbarger

**41ST DISTRICT**  
Louis Bottino Daniel Kennedy  
Arthur Lennon George Sangmeister

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

# Tribune Makes Indorsements for Delegates to State Con-Con

TRIBUNE recommendations for delegates to the constitutional convention in today's election are:

## 1ST DISTRICT

Samuel W. Witwer  
Marion E. Burks

## 2D DISTRICT

John J. Walsh Jr.  
Thomas J. McCracken  
Mrs. Lucy Reum

## 3D DISTRICT

Mrs. Virginia B. McDonald  
John G. Woods

## 4TH DISTRICT

Marshall S. Howard  
Clyde Parker

## 5TH DISTRICT

Dr. Robert Price  
Samuel DeCaro

## 6TH DISTRICT

Martin Ozinga Jr.  
Porter Orr

## 7TH DISTRICT

Joseph A. Tecson  
Roy C. Pechous  
Gerald W. Shea

## 8TH DISTRICT

Ray H. Garrison  
Thomas H. Miller

## 9TH DISTRICT

State Sen. Terrel E. Clarke  
Mrs. Joan C. Anderson  
Joseph Meek

## 10TH DISTRICT

Peter<sup>1</sup>A. Tomel  
State Rep. Paul F. Elward

## 11TH DISTRICT

Martin Tuchow  
Bennet B. Harvey Jr.

## 12TH DISTRICT

Albert W. Hachmeister  
Mrs. Dawn Clark Netsch

## 13TH DISTRICT

Ronald C. Smith

## 14TH DISTRICT

Roger H. Charlier  
Vincent J. Poklacki

## 15TH DISTRICT

Thomas G. Lyons  
David E. Stahl

## 16TH DISTRICT

Mrs. Catherine Richards  
James E. Srunek

## 17TH DISTRICT

Harold M. Nudelman  
Frank Orlando

## 18TH DISTRICT

Edward L. Stopnowski  
Edward J. Rosewell

## 19TH DISTRICT

Joseph C. Sharpe  
William A. Jaskula

## 20TH DISTRICT

No Contest

## 21ST DISTRICT

No Recommendation

## 22D DISTRICT

Mrs. Yolande M. Johnson

## 23D DISTRICT

Richard M. Daley  
John P. Tully

## 24TH DISTRICT

Mrs. Odas Nicholson  
Mrs. Attyo Belle McGee

## 25TH DISTRICT

No Recommendation

## 26TH DISTRICT

Norman R. Robinson

## 27TH DISTRICT

Joseph K. Prince  
Joseph V. Ruchunas

## 28TH DISTRICT

Lendol D. Snow  
Ted A. Borek

## 29TH DISTRICT

Charles A. Coleman  
Mabry T. Roby Jr.

## 30TH DISTRICT

David Linn  
Henry Soltysinski

## 31ST DISTRICT

John D. Wenum  
Mrs. Mary A. Pappas  
Glenn H. Reinler

## 32D DISTRICT

Joffrey R. Ladd  
Samuel T. Lawton

## 33D DISTRICT

Stanley C. Johnson  
Mrs. Maxine Wymore

## 34TH DISTRICT

Robert R. Canfield  
Avery O. Gage  
John P. Graves Jr.

## 35TH DISTRICT

Harlan Rigney  
W. C. [Bill] Linker

## 36TH DISTRICT

Louis James Perona  
Arthur E. Quaffe

## 37TH DISTRICT

Richard G. Browne  
David Davis  
Paul E. Mathias

## 38TH DISTRICT

Mrs. Betty Howard  
Albert N. Whitlock

## 39TH DISTRICT

William Sommerschild  
Thomas Kelleghan

## 40TH DISTRICT

Anthony Peccarelli  
Mrs. Helen C. Kinney

## 41ST DISTRICT

Louis Bottino  
Arthur Lennon

## 42D DISTRICT

John L. Knuppel  
James S. Thompson

## 43D DISTRICT

Lewis D. Wilson  
Seymour P. Golden

## 44TH DISTRICT

Charles R. Young  
Joe T. Connelly

## 45TH DISTRICT

David E. Connor  
John C. Parkhurst

## 46TH DISTRICT

Samuel L. Martin  
Donald D. Zeglis

## 47TH DISTRICT

Charles W. Shuman  
John H. Finfrock

## 48TH DISTRICT

Clarence E. Yordy  
Earl Madigan

## 49TH DISTRICT

Maurice W. Scott  
William L. Fay

## 50TH DISTRICT

Elbert S. Smith  
Franklin E. Dove

## 51ST DISTRICT

Dwight P. Friedrich  
James S. Parker

## 52D DISTRICT

Stanley L. Klaus  
John Alexander

## 53D DISTRICT

Ray Johnsen  
Mrs. Doreen D. Young

## 54TH DISTRICT

Charles Oelrich  
Mrs. Carolyn Chapman

## 55TH DISTRICT

J. L. Buford  
Parker Graves

## 56TH DISTRICT

Ralph Dunn  
David Kenney

## 57TH DISTRICT

Clifford L. Downen  
Robert L. Butler

## 58TH DISTRICT

Matthew A. Hutmacher  
Mrs. Evelyn Sacadat

**1994 Phone and Address Directory**

Viewing record 1 of 1 match for:

**Albert N. Whitlock in Illinois during 2000**

« [Global Search Results](#)

Name	Address	City	State	Phone Number
<b>ALBERT N WHITLOCK</b>	1720 SOUTHLAWN PL	AURORA	IL	(708) 897-1836

[View printer-friendly](#)

2000

(630) 897-1836  
↑

**Refine your search of the 1994 Phone and Address Directory**

Best Matches (Ranked) **NEW**    Exact Matches Only    [Search Tips](#)

Your search will only show records that match **all** of these fields:

<input type="text" value="Albert N."/>	<input type="text" value="Whitlock"/>	<input type="text" value="Exact"/>
First Name	Last Name	Spelling
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Any State"/>	<input type="button" value="Search"/>
City	State	

**What is the Phone and Address Directory?**



This database is a phone directory from 1994 in the United States of America. Entries include name, address, city, state and phone number. Telephone directories are the descendants of city directories with the criterion for inclusion simply being subscription to a particular phone service. Telephone directories are useful as locators of a person in a specific time and place and are very useful for twentieth-century family research. This type of directory can be great for locating living distant relatives.

**Source Information:**

Ancestry.com. *Phone and Address Directory* [database online]. Provo, UT: MyFamily.com, Inc., 2003. Original 1994 *White Pages*. Little Rock, AR: Acxiom Corporation, 19--.

no physician or midwife (when in attendance), or the parent or householder should immediately send this certificate accurately filled out to the County Clerk of the County in which the birth takes place. Penalty for not making report within 30 days, fine of \$10 to \$100, or imprisonment in jail for 30 days, or both.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,  
Cook County.

REPORT OF BIRTH.\*

1915

VITAL STATISTICS DEPARTMENT—COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE.

Full Name of Child Walter Whitlock  
 Sex Male Race or Color (if not of the white race) White  
 Number of Child of this Mother 2 How many now living (in all) 2  
 Date of this Birth Mar 24 - 11  
 Place of Birth, No. 1844 Street W. Harrison St City Hebron  
 Residence of Mother, No. 50 Street N. Wackeran St Village Hebron Town Hebron  
 Place of Birth TOWN STATE OR COUNTRY AGE OF  
 a. Father Hebron N.Y.  
 b. Mother Chicago Ill.  
 Full Name of Mother Mrs Jessie Whitlock  
 Maiden Name of Mother Miss Jessie Nickerson  
 Full Name of Father Mr Harry Oliver Whitlock  
 Occupation of Father Post Office Clerk  
 Name and Address of Nurse or Attendant (if any) Miss Sandra Wilder  
 Reported by D. Bryan  
 Date 1915 Residence Telephone

Two names: 1) at birth: Harry Oliver Whitlock Jr.  
 2) at divorce: Albert Nickerson Whitlock

GENEALOGY  
PURPOSES  
ONLY

GENEALOGY  
PURPOSES  
ONLY

Son of Harry Oliver Whitlock - brother of William Amos  
 Whitlock  
 B: Hebron, N.Y. (1878)  
 B: Morris, Ill. (1876)



J E S S I E N . W H I T L O C K

the complainant, called on her own behalf, being duly sworn,  
testified on oath, as follows:

BY COUNSEL,  
Mr. Tone:

Q What is your name, please? A Jessie N. Whitlock.

Q Where do you live? A 4109 Congress Street, Chicago.

Q When were you married to the defendant? A March 1, 1908

Q Here in Chicago? A Yes.

Q Have you lived in Chicago ever since that time?

A Always

Q How many children were born as the result of this

marriage? A Two.

Q What are their names and ages? A Norma, six years old  
and Albert, four years old.

Q Did you live with your husband until he deserted you?

A I did.

Q On or about the 19th of December, 1911, did he leave?

A Yes.

Q Has he ever been back since? A No.

Q Did you give him any ground for leaving you? A No.

Q Since that time, have you had the care, custody and  
education of the children? A Yes, sir.

Q How have you supported them? A I have had some  
money by order of court, and outside of that, I have taken

Q You have not had any money recently? A Not since last July.

Q You have supported them since that time? A Yes.

Q Are you living with your mother and father? A Yes.

Q Are you able to take care of the children? A Yes.

Q And are you willing to do it? A Yes, glad to do it.

Q You want their care and custody? A Yes.

THE COURT: When did the separation take place?

A In the Fall of 1911.

Q Do you remember the exact date? A I think it was some time in December.

Q And you have resided here how long? A All my life.

Q Continuously? A Yes.

Q You are satisfied with the order as to the care and custody of the children? A Yes.

Q You are not asking for alimony at all? A No.

(Cross Examination Waived)

C H A R L O T T E N I C K E R S O N

called as a witness on behalf of the complainant, being duly sworn, testified on oath, as follows:

BY COUNSEL,  
Mr. Tone:

Q What is your name? A Charlotte Nickerson.

Q Where do you reside? A 4109 Congress Street, Chicago.

Q You are the mother of the complainant? A Yes.

Q Do you recall that after the 19th of December, 1911, the defendant deserted the complainant and has remained away ever since? A Yes.

Q Were you there when the separation took place?

A Yes, when the trouble arose I was there.

Q You were at the house several times a week? A Yes.

Q And you know that from the 19th of December, 1911, to the present time, the defendant has not lived with your daughter, the complainant? A He has not.

Q The children have been in the care and custody of your daughter? A Yes.

Q She has taken good care of them? A Yes.

Q They go to school? A Yes, sir.

Q She is able and willing to do so in the future? A Yes.

(Cross Examination Waived).

N E L L I E H U G E

called as a witness on behalf of the complainant, being duly sworn, testified on oath, as follows:

BY COUNSEL,  
by Mr. Tone:

Q What is your name? A Nellie Huge

Q Where do you reside? A 2745 Michigan Avenue, Chicago.

Q Do you know the complainant? A Yes.

Q Do you know that after the month of December of 1911, her husband didn't live with her? A I do.

Q The complainant is taking care of the children? A Yes.

Q She is able to look after the children? A Yes.

Q And is a fit person to have them? A Yes, sir.

(WHICH WAS ALL THE EVIDENCE HEARD)

STATE OF ILLINOIS, )  
( SS.  
COUNTY OF COOK. )

*MARION RUTH VERHOEFF* being  
duly sworn, says that she is the court  
reporter who took down in shorthand  
the evidence at the trial of the above case  
and the above is a true and correct  
transcript of the same.

*Marion Ruth Verhoeff*

SUBSCRIBED and sworn to  
before me this 12th day of  
January, A.D. 1916.

*John W. Rainey*  
NOTARY PUBLIC.

STATE OF ILLINOIS, )  
( SS.  
COUNTY OF COOK. )

*D.K. TONE*, being duly  
sworn, says that he is the solicitor for  
the complainant in the above case, and, to  
the best of his belief, the above is a  
true and correct transcript of the evidence  
heard.

*David H. Tone*

SUBSCRIBED and sworn to  
before me this 12th day of  
January, A.D. 1916.

*Fauna Rowland*  
NOTARY PUBLIC.

FORASMUCH, THEREFORE, as the matters and things herein-  
above set forth do not fully appear of record, the com-  
plainant tenders this, her certificate of evidence, which she  
prays may be signed and sealed by the Judge before whom said  
cause was heard, which is accordingly done the day and date  
of the entry of the decree herein.

*G. J. ...*  
JAN 15 1916

----- (SEAL)  
JUDGE.