# 1938 Supplement

## To

# Mason's Minnesota Statutes 1927

## (1927 to 1938)

### (Superseding Mason's 1931, 1934, and 1936 Supplements)

Containing the text of the acts of the 1929, 1931, 1933, 1935, and 1937 General Sessions, and the 1933-34, 1935-36, 1936, and 1937 Special Sessions of the Legislature, both new and amendatory, and notes showing repeals, together with annotations from the various courts. state and federal, and the opinions of the Attorney General, construing the constitution, statutes, charters and court rules of Minnesota together with digest of all common law decisions.



#### Edited by

WILLIAM H. MASON, Editor-in-Chief W. H. MASON, JR. R. O. MASON J. S. O'BRIEN H. STANLEY HANSON R. O. MASON, JR.

> MASON PUBLISHING CO. SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA 1938

Clerk of court may issue a second marriage license when any female decides to marry a different man, though first man refuses to surrender the first license. Op. Atty. Gen., Nov. 27, 1933.

8569. Marriage licenses.-Application for a marriage license shall be made at least five days before a license shall be issued. The clerk shall examine upon oath the party applying for license relative to the legality of such contemplated marriage, and if, at the expiration of said five-day period, satisfied that there is no legal impediment thereto, he shall issue such license, with his official seal attached, and make a record thereof, provided, that in case of emergency, or extraordinary circumstances, the judge of the probate court or any judge of the district court of the county in which the application is made may authorize the license to be issued at any time before the expiration of said five days. If any person intending to marry shall be under age, and shall not have had a former husband or wife, such license shall not be issued unless the consent of the parents or guardians shall be personally given before the clerk, or certified under the hand of such parents or guardians, attested by two witnesses, one of whom shall appear before such clerk and make oath that he saw said parents or guardians subscribe, or heard them acknowledge, the same. The clerk shall be entitled to a fee of two dollars for administering the oath, and issuing, recording, and filing all papers required. Any clerk who shall knowingly issue or sign a marriage license in any other manner than in this section provided shall forfeit and pay for the use of the parties aggrieved not to exceed one thousand dollars. (R. L. '05, §3559; G. S. '13, §7095; Apr. 25, 1931, c. 401, §1.)

G. 5. 15, §1095; Apr. 25, 1931, C. 401, §1.) Marriage may be annulled where it took place within six months after divorce of defendant, through false rep-resentation. 171M340, 214NW650. A male person over 18 but under 21 years of age and a female over 16 but under 18 years of age cannot pro-cure a marriage license without the consent of parents or guardians. Op. Atty. Gen., Feb. 13, 1930. In computing the five-day period, the day on which the application is made is to be excluded and the day the license is issued is to be included. Op. Atty. Gen., Apr. 29, 1931.

Fractions of days may not be considered in determin-ing five days after which a marriage license may be is-sued. Op. Atty. Gen., May 9, 1931. Consent of parents may be given any time during the five-day period. Op. Atty. Gen., June 2, 1931. A party applying for a license must appear personally before the clerk. Op. Atty. Gen., June 2, 1931. After the five-day period has expired, it is proper to mail the license to the applicant. Op. Atty. Gen., June 19, 1931.

Mall the license to the appendent children born of a biga-mous marriage may receive a county allowance to en-able her to care for these children in her home. Op. Atty. Gen., Sept. 26, 1931. Marriage is forbidden between a woman and her mother's first cousin. Op. Atty. Gen. (300j), Feb. 26, 1925.

1935. A court commissioner has power to waive five-day waiting period for marriage license, and express desire of judge of district court that court commissioners do not exercise such power is of no force and effect. Op. Atty. Gen. (128b). June 21, 1935. Neither Laws 1937, c. 79. nor Laws 1937, c. 435, affect §8569, or any other provisions of marriage law of state, and consent to marriage is required from guardian or parent where female is of full age of 15 years and under 18. Op. Atty. Gen. (300a), May 13, 1937.

#### 8579. Illegitimate children.

8579. Illegitimate children. This statute does not refer to the children of one mar-rying while still having a spouse by a prior voidable marriage. 175M547, 221NW911. The presumption of the legitimacy of a child conceived during wedlock, while strong, is not conclusive. State v. Soyka, 181M533, 233NW300. See Dun. Dig. 3432. Marriage of parents legitimized child and purged be-getting of all meretricious aspect, as affecting necessity of consent to adoption. Anderson, 189M85, 248NW657. See Dun. Dig. 844(19). In bastardy proceedings wherein there was no excep-tion or objection to charge, court did not err in submit-ting case to jury in absence of proof that child was born alive or was still living, and no proof that defend-ant was not husband of complaining witness, since it is not conceivable that defendant would not attempt to deceive state by setting forth his rights under §§8579, 9814(1). State v. Van Guilder, 199M214, 271NW473. See Dun. Dig. 840. Dun. Dig. 840.

Dun. Dig. 340.
Issue of bigamous marriage is legitimate. Op. Atty.
Gen., July 25, 1933.
Where following birth of illegitimate father signed atfidavit of admission of paternity and thereafter married mother and two years later a divorce was obtained, child was legitimate and father could be prosecuted for desertion. Op. Atty. Gen. (494b-27), Sept. 17, 1935.

### CHAPTER 71 Divorce

See §§208-1 to 208-9.

8580. What marriages void.—All marriages which are prohibited by law on account of consanguinity, or on account of either or both parties being under the age of 15 years, or on account of either party having a former husband or wife then living, if solemnized within this state, shall be absolutely void, without any decree of divorce or other legal proceedings; Provided, that if any person whose husband or wife has been absent for five successive years, without being known to such person to be living during that time, marries during the lifetime of such absent husband or wife, the marriage shall be void only from the time that its nullity is duly adjudged. (As

from the time that its nullity is duly adjudged. (As amended Apr. 24, 1937, c. 407, §2.) One who married during the existence of a voidable marriage was guilty of bigamy. 175M498, 221NW867. Evidence held not to show common-law marriage. 175 M547, 221NW911. A widow of a member of fire department relief as-sociation, recipient of a pension under its constitution and by-laws, terminated her right to such pension by a marriage and is not entitled to reinstatement as a pen-sioner upon such marriage being annulled by a judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction. Northrup v. S., 193 M623, 259NW185. See Dun. Dig. 6605a. Marriage between first cousins solemnized outside of the state would probably be valid in Minnesota. Op. Atty. Gen. (133b-46), Sept. 7, 1935.

#### 8581. What voidable.

8581. What volume. 175M498, 221NW867; note under \$8580. Marriage may be annulled where it took place within six months after divorce of defendant, through false rep-resentation. 171M340, 214NW650. Determined for annulment of

resentation. 171M340, 214NW650. Denial of intercourse is not ground for annulment of marriage unless at the time of the marriage the offend-

ing spouse entertained an intention not to fulfill her marital obligations. Osbon v. O., 185M300, 240NW894.

marital obligations. Osbon v. O., 185M300, 240NW834. See Dun. Dig. 5797. A widow of a member of fire department relief asso-ciation, recipient of a pension under its constitution and by-laws, terminated her right to such pension by a mar-riage and is not entitled to reinstatement as a pensioner upon such marriage being annulled by a judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction. Northrup v. S., 193M 623, 259NW185. See Dun. Dig. 6605a.

8582. Action to annul.

Jurisdiction to annul a marriage—Conflict of laws. 16 MinnLawRev398.

8583. When not annulled. Application of clean hands doctrine to annulment of void marriages. 16MinnLawRev215.

8585. Grounds for divorce.---A divorce from the bonds of matrimony may be adjudged by the district court for any of the following causes:

- Adultery. 1.
- 2. Impotency.
- Cruel and inhuman treatment. 3.
- Sentence to imprisonment in any state or Unit-4. ed States prison or any state or United States reformatory subsequent to the marriage; and in such a case a pardon shall not restore the conjugal rights.
- Wilful desertion for one year next preceding the commencement of the action. 5.
- Habitual drunkenness for one year immediately 6. preceding the commencement of the action.
- 7. Incurable insanity, provided that no divorce shall be granted upon this ground unless the insane party shall have been under regular

treatment for insanity, and because thereof, confined in an institution for a period of at least five years immediately preceding the commencement of the action. In granting a divorce upon this ground, notice of the pendency of the action shall be served in such manner as the court may direct, upon the nearest blood relative and guardian of such insane person, and the superintendent of the institution in which he is confined. Such relative or guardian and superintendent of the institution shall be entitled to appear and be heard upon any and all issues. The status of the parties as to the support and maintenance of the insane person shall not be altered in any way by the granting of the divorce.

- 8. Continuous separation under decree of limited divorce for more than five years next preceding the commencement of the action.
- That Laws 1933, Chapter 262 be and the same hereby is repealed. (R. L. '05, \$3574; '09, c. 443, \$1; '27, c. 304; Apr. 15, 1933, c. 262, \$1; Apr. 20, 1933, c. 324; Jan. 9, 1934, Ex. Ses., c. 78; Apr. 25, 1935, c. 295.) 9.

Ses., c. 78; Apr. 25, 1935, c. 295.) A husband sued for a limited divorce, held not es-topped by the decision against him in a subsequent suit for absolute divorce from his wife. 178M1, 226NW412. Divorce jurisdiction is purely statutory, and court has no power in premises except as delegated to it by statute. Sivertsen v. S., 198M207, 269NW413. See Dun. Dig. 2784b. Amendments covered or attempted to be covered by Laws 1933, c. 262, were not repealed by Laws 1933, c. 324, approved five days later. Op. Atty. Gen., Nov. 18, 1933.

Amendments covered or attempted to be covered by Laws 1933, c. 262, were not repealed by Laws 1933, c. 324 approved five days later. Op. Atty. Gen., Nov. 18, 1933.

1933. Amendments provided for in Laws 1933, c. 262, were not repealed nor superseded by Laws 1933, c. 324. Op. Atty. Gen., Jan. 2, 1934. **3. Cruel and inhuman treatment.** Conduct and associations of a spouse with one of the opposite sex. carried on against the protest of the one wronged and of a character justifying the belief that the object is criminal may constitute cruel and inhu-man treatment within the meaning of the divorce stat-ute. 170M255, 212NW193. Acts of cruel and inhuman treatment which result from a diseased mind are no cause for divorce. 171M 258, 213NW906. Husband granted divorce for cruelty of the wife. 172

acts of cruel and inhuman treatment which result from a diseased mind are no cause for divorce. 171M 258, 213NW906.
Husband granted divorce for cruelty of the wife. 172 M250, 215NW181.
Finding of cruel and inhuman treatment sustained. 177M53, 224NW461.
Cruel treatment held not established. Taylor v. T., 177M453, 225NW287.
Evidence held insufficient to show desertion, but to show cruel and inhuman treatment. 179M266, 229NW128.
Finding that wife was guilty of cruel and inhuman treatment, though she used no physical force or violence held sustained by evidence. Eller v. E., 183M133, 233NW 823.
See Dun. Dig. 2778.
Divorce for cruel and inhuman treatment will be denied where parties were equally to blame. Thorem v. T., 188M153, 246NW674. See Dun. Dig. 2778.
Evidence that wife nagged, scolded and upbraided husband and called him names at all times, even when he was convalescing from a major operation, held to warrant divorce for cruel and inhuman treatment. Gordon v. G., 193M97, 259NW529. See Dun. Dig. 2778(87).
Cruel and inhuman treatment may consist in actual or threatment consisting of continued scolding and fault-finding, using unkind language, and petty acts of a malicious nature. Bickle v. B., 194M375, 260NW361. See Dun. Dig. 2778.
Evidence held sufficient to sustain divorce to husband on ground of cruel and inhuman treatment. Monson v. M., 195M257, 262NW641. See Dun. Dig. 2778.
Evidence held sufficient to sustain divorce to husband on ground of cruel and inhuman treatment. Monson v. M., 195M257, 262NW641. See Dun. Dig. 2778.

Desertion.

5. Desertion. Nonsupport. 172M250, 215NW181. Complaint failed to establish desertion arising out of wife's qualified refusal to live with plaintiff while de-pending upon the benevolence of his father. Taylor v. T., 177M453, 225NW287.
Evidence held sufficient to establish willful desertion. Graml v. G., 184M324, 238NW683. See Dun. Dig. 2776. Complaint held to sufficiently state cause of action for desertion. Hoogesteger v. W., 186M419, 243NW716. See Dun. Dig. 2791.
Evidence held to support finding of desertion.

Evidence held to support finding of desertion. Hooge eger v. W., 186M419, 243NW716. See Dun. Dig. 2776.

8. Continuous separation under decree. Chapter 324, Laws 1933, approved five days after ap-proval of c. 262, Laws 1933, did not repeal latter. Gerdts v. G., 196M599, 265NW811. Laws 1933, c. 262, adding a ground for absolute divorce, is retrospective as well as prospective. Id. Right to absolute divorce after continuous separation under a decree of limited divorce is to either spouse re-gardless of ground upon which decree of limited divorce was granted. Id.

### 8586. Residence of complainant.

**8586.** Kesidence of complainant. Where both parties in divorce action in another state voluntarily appear and submit to jurisdiction of court, they are bound by judgment as to all matters liftgated therein and cannot avoid it in a collateral proceeding in this state by proof that when action was brought and judgment rendered neither of them was a resident in that state. and that both were residents in this state, follow-ing In re Ellis' Estate. 55M401, 56NW1056, 23LRA287, 43AmStRep514. Norris v. N., 273NW708. See Dun, Dig. 2789.

### 8587. Denial, though adultery proved.

Condonation of adultery held sufficiently shown. 171 M65, 212NW738. Knowledge or belief as a prerequisite to condonation.

21MinnLawRev408.

8588. Action--how and where brought-venue.-An action for divorce or separate maintenance may be brought by a wife in her own name, and all actions for divorce shall be commenced by summons and complaint in the county where the plaintiff resides, as hereinafter provided, subject to the power of the court to change the place of trial by consent of parties, or when it shall appear that an impartial trial cannot be had in the county where the action is pending, or that the convenience of witnesses and ends of justice would be promoted by the change. (R. L. '05,

Sastra would be promoted by the change. (R. L. '05, \$3577; G. S. '13, \$7114; Apr. 20, 1931, c. 226, \$1.) In view of \$9311, plaintiff was entitled to have the facts found and the conclusions of law separately stated in writing, and judgment entered accordingly. 172M72, 214NW783.

214NW783. Whether the place of trial should be changed is large-ly discretionary with trial court. State v. District Court, 186M513, 243NW692. See Dun. Dig. 2788. Denial of a motion to change place of trial of an ac-tion for divorce, brought in proper county, upon ground that convenience of witnesses and ends of justice will be promoted, may be reviewed on mandamus. State v. District Court, 186M513, 243NW692. See Dun. Dig. 2788. In matters of divorce and alimony, district court has no jurisdiction not delegated to it by statute. Ostrander v. O. 190M547, 252NW449. See Dun. Dig. 2784b. Attack on decrees of divorce. 34MichLawRev749.

### 8593. Alimony pending suit.

**3693.** Alimony pending suit. Defendant in divorce in contempt of court in failing to obey order for payment of temporary alimony, is not for that reason deprived of the right of defense. 173M 165, 216NW940. Postnuptial agreements properly made between hus-band and wife after a separation, are not contrary to public policy, but the parties cannot, by a postnuptial agreement, oust the court of jurisdiction to award ali-mony or to punish for contempt a failure to comply with the judgment, though it followed the agreement. 178M 75, 226NW211. Show cause order served with summers in similar

the judgment, though it followed in a divorce ac-75, 226NW211. Show cause order served with summons in divorce ac-tion, held to give court jurisdiction to mere motion for temporary alimony. 179M106, 228NW351. Service of an attorney for wife in divorce case ami-cably withdrawn was not a necessity for which hus-band was liable. Melin v. R., 189M638, 249NW194. See Dun. Dig. 2804. Where wife sued for divorce and her prayer was denied but husband was given a divorce on cross-bill, wife was

where whe such for divorce and her prayer was denied but husband was given a divorce on cross-bill, wife, was not entitled to receive additional allowance on account of attorney's fees on her appeal which was entirely with-out merit. Monson v. M., 195M257, 262NW641. See Dun. Dig. 2804.

Final determination of a suit for divorce supersedes any power on part of court to grant further temporary alimony and an order granting temporary alimony termi-nates then even if order provides that it is to be paid until further order of court. Bickle v. B., 196M392, 265 NW276. See Dun. Dig. 2802.

Appellate court and lower court from which an appeal is taken in an action for divorce have concurrent juris-diction to award temporary alimony pending appeal. Id.

Temporary alimony, paid pending appeal, may be applied as pro tanto payment on a permanent alimony award. Id. See Dun. Dig. 2803.

#### 8595. Custody of children, etc.

Husband could not attack a judgment granting ali-mony entered on stipulation because it provided for sup-port of a child living with the parties, but not their own. Cary v. C., 177M194, 225NW11.

Evidence held insufficient to show that mother was unfit person to have custody of infant child. 179M184, 228NW759. Jurisdiction to award custody of minor child. 18Minn LawRev591.

#### 8596. Custody of children.

8596. Custody of children. Custody of girl of 15 years and a boy of 12 years, held properly awarded to mother. 172M89, 214NW793. Habeas corpus lies to determine right to possession of child but court will give effect to divorce judgment. 173 M177, 216NW937. Provision for custody of child in judgment is binding until changed but may be changed upon application in action where conditions warrant it. 173M177, 216NW937. In a judgment decreeing a divorce the court may com-mit the custody of minor children to mother and may require father to pay specified sum monthly, and may make the same a lien upon specified real estate. 176M 393, 223NW609. Court abused its discretion in giving divided custod

make the same a lien upon specified real estate. 176M 393, 223NW609. Court abused its discretion in giving divided custody of a child six years of age, where it required frequent moving of the child between homes in different states. 176M490, 223NW789. Where, at time of entry of divorce decree, the ques-tion of custody of the child cannot be determined, a de-termination of such matter should be made as soon as possible. 181M176, 231NW795. Only court of state in which minor is domiciled can fix or change custody. State v. Larson, 190M489, 252NW 329. See Dun, Dig. 4433b. Though unemancipated minor generally has his

Though unemancipated minor generally has his father's domicile, where mother and father are divorced, minor's domicile follows that of parent to whose custody it has been legally given. Id. See Dun. Dig. 2813.

2813. A wife may after divorce acquire a separate domicile. Id. See Dun. Dig. 2814. Where mother is able to and does properly keep, care for, and control child in her own suitable home, its custody should not be divided so as to permit divorced father to transport child to another home in a different town and surroundings for a week's visit each month, where it is not shown that such other home is suitable. McDermott v. M., 192M32, 255NW247. See Dun. Dig. 2800. 2800.

2800. Evidence abundantly supported trial court's conclusion that welfare and best interests of children required that they remain in custody of their mother. Brown v. B., 193M211, 258NW150. See Dun. Dig. 2800. Court properly struck from original judgment provision for support and maintenance of children after reaching majority. Sivertsen v. S., 198M207, 269NW413. See Dun. Dig. 2800.

for support and managements of the support of the support of the super-majority. Sivertsen v. S., 198M207, 269NW413. See Dum. Dig. 2800. Plaintiff's financial situation held so changed as to justify substantial modification of original judgment. Id. See Dun. Dig. 2805.

#### 8597. Order may be revised.

176M393, 223NW609; note under \$8596. Provision for custody of child in judgment is binding until changed but may be changed upon application in action where conditions warrant it. 173M177, 216NW937. If child was awarded to third party who has never had nor sought possession of him, on controversy be-tween parents, court will make such provision for his custody as it deems for the best interest of the child. 173M177, 216NW937.

Application to amend decree by changing custody of children, held properly denied; and letters by one of the children to his mother were properly excluded. 179M 520, 229NW868.

Custody of minor child, held properly changed to aunt, Sister of mother who had remarried. 180M182, 230NW479. Provision for alimony and support of children may be changed and amended though incorporated in the decree by stipulation. 181M18, 231NW413. Where divorce decree of Iowa awarded custody of minor child to each parent alternately for six months of each year and mother subsequently established her comiclie in Minnesota, Minnesota court has jurisdiction to determine minor's custody during mother's six months and is not bound by full faith and credit clause of fed-eral constitution. State v. Larson, 190M489, 252NW329. See Dun. Dig. 2800. Evidence held to show a change of circumstances suf-

Evidence held to show a change of circumstances suf-ficient to warrant awarding custody of a minor child to the mother in contravention of an earlier divorce de-cree of the Iowa court. Id.

#### 8598. Possession of wife's real estate, etc.

**8598.** Possession of wife's real estate, etc. This section does not prevent determination of the rights of husband and wife in real estate so far as such issues are tendered by the pleadings or litigated by con-sent in the divorce action, and judgment vesting abso-lute title to certain iand in the husband, is not open to collateral attack by the wife. 177M189, 222NW922. Where a divorce is granted to the wife, on the ground of cruel and inhuman treatment, the court is not au-thorized to grant husband any alimony or allowance out of the property of the wife. 177M189, 224NW852. Court properly divided property in the name of plain-tiff, but coming from the defendant by giving a half to each. 179M266, 229NW128. When the husband dies after the judgment of divorce in his favor, and pending the appeal in this court, and

property rights are involved, his personal representative will be substituted and the case reviewed, notwithstand-ing the general rule as to the abatement of divorce actions by the death of either party. Swanson v. S., 182 M492, 234NW675. See Dun, Dig. 15. wi. ing ti ntions 2

#### 8601. Trustee of alimony.

Trust agreement made in contemplation of divorce, held to derive its force from court's approval, and pay-ments thereunder were alimony. Douglas v. Willcuts, 296US1, 56SCR59, aff'g 73F(2d)130.

#### 8602. Property of husband-Permanent alimony.

8602. Property of husband—Permanent alimony.
\$5,000 as permanent alimony and \$500 as attorney's fees was not excessive where husband was worth \$15,000 and had monthly income of \$300. 171M65, 212NW738. Where husband had annual income of \$6,000 and property worth \$7,000 to \$8,000, court properly awarded plaintiff \$2,500, and also permanent alimony in the sum of \$50 per month, and an allowance of \$50 per month for support of two children. 172M89, 214NW793. Where husband worth \$12,000 was granted divorce for wife's cruelty, court properly fixed alimony at one-third of that amount. 172M250, 215NW181. Where the only resource for the payment of alimony is the income of a professional man the statutory limitation refers to the net income. 173M464, 217NW488. Upon hearing of motion for reduction, the only issue is whether there has been such a change in the status of the parties since the last time. that court should reduce or cancel same. 173M464, 217NW488. In a judgment decreeing a divorce, the court may commit the custody of minor children to mother and may require father to pay specified sum monthly, and may require father to pay specified real estate. 176M393, 223NW609. Alimony judgment creditor. 177M178, 225NW 104. Court, held to have properly vacated amended judg-

Court, held to have properly vacated amended judg-ment entered on stipulation for undue influence and over-reaching. 179M488, 229NW791. Allowance supported by evidence, held not reviewable on appeal. 180M180, 230NW638.

Allowance supported by ordered by reacting the support of the superior of the support of the sup

Accorntick v. H., 180A330, 243NW392. See Dun. Dig. 1813a. A discharge in bankruptcy does not discharge an as-signed matured claim for alimony. Cederberg v. G., 193 M421, 258NW574. See Dun. Dig. 749. A past-due sum or installment of alimony payable to a divorced wife is assignable. Id. See Dun. Dig. 569. A separation agreement between husband and wife which in terms obligated each to join with other in ex-ecution of future conveyances or incumbrances of real property belonging to either, was illegal. Simmer v. S., 195M1, 261NW481. See Dun. Dig. 4282. Where contract between parties, entered into many years after they were divorced, recites a valuable con-sideration, and facts show a valuable consideration, past-due installments of alimony constitute a legal indebted-ness and may be recovered in an independent action. Koch v. K., 196M312, 265NW276. See Dun. Dig. 2803. Temporary alimony, paid pending appeal may be ap-plied as pro tanto payment on a permanent alimony award. Id.

Where plaintiff's right to alimony was litigated in a divorce action brought against her in another state, she cannot thereafter maintain an action therefor in this state. Norris v. N., 273NW708. See Dun. Dig. 2807(81). Availability of equitable relief in enforcing foreign alimony decrees. 18MinnLawRev589. Separation agreements and effect of adultery. 19Minn LawRev218.

### 8603. Order for alimony, etc., revised.

Court has power to cancel accrued installments of ali-mony, but must use its discretion in doing so, there be-ing no "vested rights." Plankers v. P., 178M15, 225NW 913.

913. Alimony allowance, held properly modified on account of husband's changed financial condition, and evidence of wife's misconduct may be considered. 180M33. 230NW 117.

Provision for alimony and support of children may be changed by the court though incorporated in the decree by stipulation. 181M18, 231NW413. Agreement between parties as to amount of alimony did not oust court of power to amend its judgment as to alimony. 181M421, 232NW793. See Dun. Dig. 2805.

Fact that income from a trust estate had not been paid over to defendant by trustees at time of hearing did not prevent court from taking such income into consid-eration in awarding additional alimony. 181M421, 232 NW793. See Dun. Dig. 2805.

Fact that income from trust cannot be reached or at-tached by creditors while in hands of trustees did not prevent its consideration by court in determining ali-mony. 181M421, 232NW793. See Dun. Dig. 2803. Court may modify alimony allowance where there has been a substantial change in the situation of the parties. Holida v. H., 183M396, 237NW2. See Dun. Dig. 2805.