

114
STATE OF WISCONSIN

UPPER BRANCH
COUNTY COURT

LINCOLN COUNTY

EDITH M. BRICCO,
Plaintiff

-vs-

CHARLES J. BRICCO,
Defendant

FINDINGS OF FACT
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
JUDGMENT

At a Term of the County Court,
Upper Branch, of Lincoln County,
held at the Court House in the
City of Merrill on January 5, 1949.

Hon. Max Van Hecke, County Judge,
present and presiding.

This action coming on for trial before the Court
this 5th day of January, 1949, the plaintiff appearing in
person and by Carlyle B. Wurster, of Wurster & Curtis, her
attorneys; and Ralph H. Nienow, divorce counsel of Lincoln
County appearing as such, and the defendant not appearing;
and after hearing the proofs and allegations, and being
advised in the premises, the Court makes and files the following

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. Plaintiff is a housewife and domestic worker
and resides at 1201 1/2 East Main Street in the City of Merrill
Lincoln County, Wisconsin.

2. Defendant is a restaurant operator and resides
at Fort Klamath, Oregon.

3. The plaintiff Edith M. Bricco is and has been
for more than two years prior to the commencement of this
action continuously a resident of Lincoln County, Wisconsin,
and is still such resident.

4. On April 19, 1904, plaintiff and defendant
were married at Bear Creek, Wisconsin and ever since have been
and still are wife and husband.

5. No other action for obtaining a divorce by either
of the parties to this action has at any time been commenced
or is now pending in any court or before any Judge thereof
in this state or elsewhere.

6. Three children were born of this marriage, namely,
Lyle, Lucile, and Kenneth, and each of said children is over
the age of twenty-one years.

7. Although the plaintiff has always conducted her-
self towards the said defendant as a faithful and obedient
wife, the defendant disregarding his duties as a husband in
the fall of 1928, wilfully deserted the plaintiff, and has
ever since said time and for more than one year immediately
preceding the commencement of this action uninterruptedly
continued said desertion without cause on the part of this
plaintiff.

8. Ever since he deserted the plaintiff in the fall
of 1928, and for more than ten years prior to the commence-
ment of this action, the said defendant Charles J. Bricco
though of sufficient ability, has wholly refused and neglected
to provide for and support the plaintiff.

9. The plaintiff has no property of her own, but is informed
and believes that the defendant owns, or has an equity in a
restaurant in Fort Klamath, Oregon, the value of which is un-
known to your plaintiff.

10. The Summons and Complaint in this action were
duly and personally served upon the defendant Charles J. Bricco
on November 20th, 1948, at Fort Klamath, Oregon, in the manner
provided by law, and the defendant is wholly in default in
this action. And I find as

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The plaintiff is entitled to divorce from the
bonds of matrimony, as prayed in the complaint.