

THE IRVINE

IRVINE COLLECTION
Arizona Historical Foundation
CASE,

JUL 10 1897

①

Complaint and Answer Filed in the District Court,

Early last week the Irvine case of which our people have heard considerable in the past few months was made public property by the filing, in the office of the District Court clerk, suit for divorce by Mr. E. Irvine against Mary A. Irvine his first wife.

The petition sets forth that plaintiff and defendant were married in January, 1867, at the town of Fairville, New Brunswick, and that since September, 1874, his wife, has deserted him and refused to live with him. This petition ~~also~~ further says that there is no community property and asks that a divorce be granted.

Saturday the answer was filed. It is a voluminous document and denies most of the assertions in the petition. It admits the marriage but says that the plaintiff deserted the defendant about October, 1868 at St. John, New Brunswick, leaving her absolutely destitute and taking with him all the money and even selling the last family cow owned by them. That the defendant at that time had the care of their infant daughter one year old and she was at the time enceinte.

The answer sets forth that there is a considerable community property; and gives in detail a list of the property held to be community property. This property the answer sets forth was conveyed in January of this year [1897] to Izora E. Irvine, formerly Izora E. Jackson, and states that about that time it was mortgaged by the plaintiff
1000 1- \$3,000, which amount was used by the plaintiff

[Irvine began case]
in travelling to Fargo, North Dakota, for the purpose
of securing a divorce, but on his arrival he met who knew
him and the fact that he had two wives and changing
his mind he returned to Phoenix without attempting to secure
the divorce.

The defendant asks that plaintiff be required to pay
her a sufficient amount of money for her support and
maintenance and asks that the suit for divorce be dis-
missed.

[May 15, 1897]

10100
10102

SACKS COLLECTION
Arizona Historical Foundation

E. Irvine, who has resided in Phoenix for over
over twenty years, and who has accumulated con-
siderable property there has just been indicted for
adultery. When Mr. Irvine left the east he left a
wife and child there and he married in Arizona
without going through the formality of procuring
a divorce.

[Dec. 6, 1898]

2
thy
30
on
copy
me
ed
p
ar-
n-
br
nce

Violators of the Edmunds Law Indicted, Among
Them Being E. Irvine -- Other Cases.

The United States grand jury, after being in session four days, made a final report to Judge Street Thursday and was relieved from further duty. The report states that during their session they examined twenty-two witnesses, who testified in the ten cases submitted to the jury. Three of the cases were selling liquor to Indians, one for passing counterfeit money, and six for adultery

From the report of the grand jury it is surmised that the Edmunds law is anything but a dead letter in Arizona. Among the indictments brought in under this head by the grand jury was one against Edward Irvine, a well known and wealthy resident of this city. Mr. Irvine will be arraigned at 9:30 o'clock this morning, and in the meantime is at liberty on \$1,000 bail.

Mr. Irvine's matrimonial experience furnished the people of Phoenix, about eighteen months ago, with a detailed resume of the facts that were brought so prominently to the attention of the public at that time. Briefly stated, it was charged that Mr. Irvine has two wives living -- one whom he left years ago in Canada and the other whom he has since married in Phoenix, and has been living with happily and contentedly ever since. The sensation was precipitated when Mrs. Irvine No. 1 came from Canada and took up her residence in Phoenix.

[Irvine Bigamy Case]

Immediately on the heels of the revelation Mr. Irvine disappeared, but after being absent a few months returned home and has been living ever since with his young family. Grand juries have met repeatedly in district court but he has never been disturbed. The grand jury recently sitting in United States court has seen fit to make an investigation of Mr. Irvine's marital relations, and has brought in a charge of adultery against him.

Mr. Irvine has employed Baker & Bennett to defend him, and will undoubtedly institute a vigorous defense. There is a probability, as well, that the case will not be tried at this term of court but continued to a future date.

[Dec. 1, 1898]