his brother was taken very ill did not frequent or visit him.

Your respondent further represents that the said William Lecompte attempted three several times in a secret and clandestine manner to prevail on his brother the said Charles Lecompte to convey to him the whole of the said land and not confining his designs to the land on which it is said the said Charles Lecompte resided as set apart by the division said to have been executed between the said Thomas Mackeel and Charles Powell.

Your respondent denies that the said Charles Lecompte sent for the said William Lecompte to procure two deeds to be drawn to enable him to docke the entail aforesaid for the purposes mentioned in the bill of Complaint but your respondent agrees that the said William Lecompte did procure two deeds to be drawn and brought them to the said Charles, your respondent doth admit he had informed some of the neighbouring Magistrates that the said William wished to obtain a title to the land your Respondent had purchased of the aforesaid Thomas Mackeels heir that impressed with the opinion they ought not to lend their aid to perfect an act so unjust they refused to attend for the purpose. your respondent further admits when two magistrates did meet with the approbation of the said Charles Lecompte, your respondent did interline the said deed so as to confine its operation to the land then in the possession of the said Charles Lecompte, but your Respondent denies it was done with an expectation the said Charles Lecompte might die before new deeds were prepared. neither doth your Respondent believe it was necessary in point of law or that the interlineations made by him would have rendered the deed invalid

Your respondent further admits that the three deeds referred to in the Complainants bill as distinguished by No 3. 4 and 5 were on the days mentioned executed two of them by the said Charles Lecompte and the other by the Complainant William Lecompte, but your respondent denies that the deed from Charles Lecompte to him was not read but on the Contrary your Respondent avers and is ready to prove that the said deed previous and at the time of its execution was read by the said Charles Lecompte and was by him particularly examined that its effect and operation was well known and clearly understood by the said Charles Lecompte as your respondent believes and that he did not design as your respondent apprehends and believes simply to convey that part of Sprocotts on which the said Thomas Mackeel and those claiming under him resided but designed and intended to vest in your respondent a clear title to the whole tract that the said Charles

Lecompte

Lecompte was fully apprised that the deed from Charles Powell to Thomas Mackeel conveyed the whole land and that a reference to that Conveyance would as fully transfer the same to your respondent as if the same Courses were again repeated but your respondent believes the said Charles Lecompte to avoid the repeated solicitations of his brother (and wife) was induced to execute the deed No 3 to the said William Lecompte although he well knew as your respondent believes no title would be transferred thereby that he was apprehensive as your respondent has reason to believe if the entail was docked the said William Lecompte by some stratagem or device would contrive to derive a title to the land. Your Respondent further expressly states that at the time the above deeds were executed the said Charles Lecompte had in his possession his last will and testament in his own hand writing whereby he devised the whole of his real estate to the wife of your respondent and so far from an intention to give his property to his brother he was not named in the said will and on the execution of the above deeds least from some defect in the deed from him to your respondent, the whole interest in Sprocott should not be transferred to your respondent before the magistrates departed who had taken the said acknowledgements from his house the said Charles Lecompte caused the will above mentioned to be produced and informed one of the magistrates his brother William wished some alterations to be made that at the request of the said Charles Lecompte a new will was then drawn and executed in the presence of three Witnesses who at the request of the testator signed their names. Your respondent expressly avers that by this will the said Charles Lecompte devised the estate in the said tract of land called Sprocott to the wife of your respondent in fee that so far from having the least suspicion of the integrity and uprightness of your Respondent he wished to intrust the said will with him that your respondent refused to take charge of said will and it was immediately directed to be sealed up and left in the care and possession of the said Sarah Lecompte one of the Complainants and your respondent states that the said William Lecompte was privy to the contents of said will. Your respondent further states that for want of wafers or sealing Wax the said Will could not be then sealed up but was folded up in a cover and delivered to the said Sarah in order that it might be sealed up and preserved as the last will and testament of the said Charles Lecompte, but your Respondent is informed and believes that the said William got possession of the said will and took it to an attorney at law in order to connect him on the legal operations of the deeds made therein and being advised that the said Charles Lecompte had by the said will devised the aforesaid land to the wife of your respondent in fee he the said William as your respondent is informed and believes without the

direction