

January 2009

## A.S. Priddy Grounds of Defense

Follow this and additional works at: <https://readingroom.law.gsu.edu/buckvbell>

---

### Institutional Repository Citation

"A.S. Priddy Grounds of Defense" (2009). *Buck v Bell Documents*. 16.  
<https://readingroom.law.gsu.edu/buckvbell/16>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Publications at Reading Room. It has been accepted for inclusion in Buck v Bell Documents by an authorized administrator of Reading Room. For more information, please contact [mbutler@gsu.edu](mailto:mbutler@gsu.edu).

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE CITY OF RICHMOND,

WILLIE T. MALLORY,

v)

Grounds of Defence.

A.S. PRIDDY,

In compliance with the order of the Court, requiring the defendant to file a statement of the grounds of his defence, the said defendant says:

1st: This defendant denies that he directed or that he had any connection with the arrest or removal of the plaintiff from the City of Richmond, or that he individually ever at any time deprived her of her liberty or kept or detained her in custody.

Defendant is superintendent and physician in charge of the Virginia Colony for the Feeble Minded, and it is the duty of the defendant, as such superintendent, to receive into such institution all persons committed thereto by the Courts of the state. The plaintiff was duly and regularly committed to such institution by the Courts, and legally constituted commissions of this state, and received into the said institution accordingly, and the defendant has never had any control over or connection with the plaintiff, except as superintendent of the said institution.

2nd: The defendant denies that the said plaintiff was, at any time, illegally detained or deprived of her liberty. The said Willie T. Mallory was before the Juvenile Court of

the City of Richmond on some charge; when the said Court directed that a commission should be held to examine and determine whether the plaintiff was feeble-minded. Such commission was held, determined that the said plaintiff was feeble-minded, and should be committed to the institution aforesaid, which finding was approved by the said Court; and the defendant notified thereof, and the plaintiff was delivered to the institution aforesaid under and in pursuance of the said commitment, and held subject to the order of said Court, during the probation or observation period, provided by the statute.

The said plaintiff was an inmate of the institution aforesaid during the observation period aforesaid, with the result that she was regarded as feeble-minded within the meaning of the statute in such case made and provided. She was subsequently released on bond, but the terms of the bond were violated.

3rd: The defendant denies that at any time, he, by force and violence placed the plaintiff under an anesthetic and performed an operation upon her against her will. The plaintiff whilst in the institution aforesaid was in a very bad physical condition; the defendant made a careful examination of her condition, and caused a like examination to be made by his assistants, with the result that it was determined that an operation was not only desirable, but absolutely necessary. The condition was explained to the plaintiff, who expressed not only a willingness, but a desire to have the operation performed. The attention of the Board of Directors of the Institution was called to the situation, and they directed

that the operation should be performed, and it was performed. The result of the said operation was entirely satisfactory, the plaintiff being restored to good health and capacitated to make a living, which defendant is informed she is now doing, and which she never could have done, but for such operation, and she expressed her gratitude and gratification at the result. But for the said operation the plaintiff would most probably have died; certainly never could have been well or fairly comfortable any more.

The defendant further denies that the result of the said operation was to sterilize or unsex the plaintiff or destroy her power to bear children, that condition having been produced and resulting from the diseased condition of the plaintiff before and at the time the said operation was performed.

4th: The defendant denies that he ever placed or caused the plaintiff to be placed in any dungeon or small room in the dark; or that she ever was so placed whilst in the aforesaid institution.

Defendant has been informed and avers that whilst the plaintiff was an inmate of the institution aforesaid, she was guilty of a violation of the rules of the institution, and one of the officials of the institution, without the knowledge of the defendant, required the plaintiff to remain in a room from ten o'clock a.m. to four o'clock p.m., a period of six hours. The said room was at the time used as a bed room, with three beds, and is now used as a sitting room; it was well ventilated and lighted, and entirely comfortable. The punishment consisted in simply depriving the plaintiff of association with the other inmates during the period mentioned.

5th: The defendant avers that the plaintiff has for a long time been well-known to the police of the City of Richmond, and the social and charity workers of the State of Virginia, as a deficient, and as a most troublesome and undesirable citizen, frequently before the Courts, and incapable of leading a clean and proper life.

Respectfully submitted,

A. S. Fridley  
by Leaskie Leaskie Ally-