June Term 1828.

aforesaid, by the said Daniel Renner above for error assigned, and that the said decree may be in all things affirmed, and so forth.

Thereupon further process of and upon the premises, between the parties aforesaid, is by virtue of an act of assembly, in such case made and provided, further continued, before the Court of Appeals here, until the second Monday, in June next: the same day, is given to the said parties, there then to hear the Judgment of the Court of Appeals here, of and upon the said premises and so forth.

At which said second Monday, in June being the eleventh day of the said month, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty, seven come again into the Court of Appeals here as well the said Daniel Renner by Benjamin S Jones his attorney, as the said Henry Dellinger by Alexander Colhagruder and John Brook his attornies: But because the Court of Appeals here are not yet advised what judgment to give of and upon the premises, a day therefore is further given to the said parties, with the consent of the said parties, by their attornies aforesaid, to come before the Court of Appeals here, on the first Monday in December next to hear the Judgment of the Court here, of and upon the premises, for that the Court over here as yet are not, and so forth.

At which said first Monday, in December being the ninth day of the said month, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty seven come again into the Court of appeals here the parties aforesaid, by their attornies aforesaid: Thereupon further process of and upon the premises aforesaid, between the parties aforesaid, is by virtue of an act of assembly in such case made and provided, further continued before the Court of Appeals here, until the second Monday in June next, the same day is given to the said parties, there then to hear the Judgment of the Court of Appeals here, of and upon the said premises, and so forth.

And now at this day, to wit, the said second Monday in June being the ninth day of the said month, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty eight come again into the Court of appeals here, the parties aforesaid, by their attornies aforesaid: and the said Henry Dellinger by his attornies aforesaid, offers himself against the said Daniel Renner of and upon the premises, and prays that the Court of Appeals here will proceed to the examination as well of the record of proceedings aforesaid, as of the matters above for error assigned, and that the said decree may be in all things affirmed, and so forth: and for as much as the said Daniel Renner doth not allege to the Court of Appeals here, any matter or thing for the reversal of the decree aforesaid, nor insist upon the matters aforesaid, by him above for error assigned: Therefore, it is considered by the Court of Appeals here, that the decree aforesaid, in form aforesaid given, be in all things affirmed, and stand in full force and effect, the said causes above for error assigned, in any wise notwithstanding; and it is further considered by the Court of Appeals here, that the said Henry Dellinger have execution against the said Daniel Renner as well for the decree aforesaid, so as aforesaid passed in the said county Court of Montgomery, as also for the sum of thirty six dollars and two cents adjudged unto him by the Court of Appeals here, in his assent for his costs and charges, which he hath sustained by occasion of the delay of the execution of the decree aforesaid, by pretext of the prosecution of the said appeal by the said Daniel Renner for the correcting of errors of and upon the premises as aforesaid prosecuted and so forth.

Test. H. Harris Clk.

June Term 1828.

Gustavus R Brown & Eliza his wife vs. William Hebb & Peter D. Hatton

Be it remembered that now here on the second Monday in June being the eleventh day of the said month, in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and twenty seven the chief Judge and associate Judges of the first Judicial District of Maryland, in pursuance of the directions of the act of assembly in such case made and provided, transmit to the Court of appeals here the record of proceedings in a cause which was lately depending before them in the County Court of Prince Georges County between Gustavus R Brown and Eliza his wife plaintiffs; and William Hebb and Peter D Hatton defendants and wherein the said County Court passed a decree for the said William Hebb and Peter D Hatton against the said Gustavus R Brown and Eliza his wife and from which said decree the said Gustavus R Brown and Eliza his wife appealed to the Court of Appeals here, the tenor of which said record of proceedings is in form following, to wit:

Maryland Prince Georges County Set.

At a County Court of the first Judicial District of the said State begun and held at Upper Marlborough Town in and for the County aforesaid (as a Court of Equity) on the first monday in April being the third day of the same month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty six and of the Independance of the United States the fiftieth.

Present

The Honourable	John Stephen	chief Judge
	Edmund Key & John R Plater.	Associate Judges

George Semmes Esquire sheriff. Aquila Beall clk.

In the record and proceedings of the same Court among others are the following to wit.

A. M.	Gustavus R. Brown	
H. A.	& Eliza his wife	
	vs.	
N. S.	William Hebb &	
Key & P. M.	Peter D. Hatton	

Be it remembered that heretofore to wit: on the nineteenth day of December Eighteen hundred and twenty one Gustavus R Brown and Eliza his wife by Alexander Mundell Esquire their attorney preferred to the Judges of said County Court acting as a Court of Equity their bill of complaint against the said William Hebb & Peter D Hatton in the words and of the tenor following to wit

To the Honourable the Judges of Prince Georges County Court sitting as a Court of Equity — The Bill of complaint of Gustavus R Brown and Eliza his wife both of Prince Georges County humbly sheweth that some time in the month of November in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty a certain William Hebb of the County aforesaid (whom your Complainant prays may be made a defendant to this bill of Complaint) (being indebted to one of your Complainants) the aforesaid Gustavus, executed at his request a Bond for the said sum to a certain Peter D Hatton (whom your Complainants pray may be likewise be made a Defendant to this bill) payable your Complainants their Ex in Eighteen months from the date, your Complainants some time before this, having intermarried and the said Gustavus having acquired considerable personal property by the said Eliza was desirous to secure to her some portion of it, and thought this the most advantageous mode of doing it placing great confidence at that time in the said Peter D Hatton his object in requesting the said William Hebb to give the aforesaid bond to Hatton was that Hatton should hold it and receive the money in trust for the said Eliza that the said Peter D Hatton and William