John Prutzman &
Elizabeth his wife and
Henry Prutzman
vs
Henry Pitefell.

Be it Remembered that now here on the third monday in june being the fifteenth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seven the Chancellor of the State of Maryland in pursuance of the act of assembly in such cases made and provided transmits to the Court of Appeals here the record of proceedings in a cause which was lately depending before him in the Court of Chancery between Henry Pitefell complainant and John Prutzman and Elizabeth his wife and Henry Prutzman Defendants and wherein the said Court of Chancery passed a decree in favor of the said Henry Pitefell against the said John Prutzman and Elizabeth his wife and Henry Prutzman and from which said decree the said John Prutzman and Elizabeth his wife and Henry Prutzman prayed an appeal unto the Court of Appeals here the tenor of which said record of proceedings is in forme following to wit [Here copy the record of proceedings as bound up in Book marked I. H No. 1] And now come into the Court of Appeals here as well the said John Prutzman and Elizabeth his wife and Henry Prutzman by Arthur Shaaff and Roger Nelson their attorneys as the said Henry Pitefell by Richard Ridgely his attorney and thereupon on motion of the said Henry Pitefell by his attorney aforesaid it is ruled by the Court here that the said appellants assign the Errors in the record of proceedings of the decree aforesaid brought before the Court here for correcting Errors supposed to be therein or judgment by the Court here will be entered against them in default thereof and the said appellants by their attornies aforesaid say that in the record of proceedings aforesaid as also in rendering the decree aforesaid it is manifestly erred in this that is to say that by the record of proceedings aforesaid it appears that the decree aforesaid in

form aforesaid given was given to the said Henry Pitefell against them the said appellants when by the Law of the Land and in Equity and good conscience ought to have been given for them the said appellants against the said Henry Pitefell therefore in that it is manifestly erred and they pray that the decree aforesaid for this and other Errors in the record of proceedings aforesaid being may be revoked annulled and held for naught and that they the said appellants to all which they by occasion of the decree aforesaid have lost may be restored &c. And they pray that the said Henry Pitefell may rejoin to the Errors aforesaid and so forth. And thereupon it is ruled by the Court here that the said Henry Pitefell the Errors by the said appellants above assigned in the record of proceedings of the decree aforesaid or judgment by the Court here will be rendered against him in default thereof and the said Henry Pitefell by his attorney aforesaid prays that a day may be given him to join in the Errors by the said appellants above assigned in the record of proceedings aforesaid until the third Monday in december next and to him it is granted the same day is also given to the said appellants At which said third Monday in december being the Twenty first day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seven which said day was given to the said Henry Pitefell to join in the Errors aforesaid by the said appellants above assigned come again into the Court of Appeals here the parties aforesaid by their attornies aforesaid and the said Henry Pitefell by his attorney aforesaid says that neither in the record of proceedings aforesaid nor in rendering the decree aforesaid it is in any wise Erred and he prays that the Court of Appeals here may proceed to examine as well the record of proceedings aforesaid as the matters aforesaid above for Error and that the decree aforesaid in form aforesaid given may be in all things affirmed and so forth But Because the