Hamilton vs Kunze &c. At which said second Monday in June being the fourteenth day of the said month, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty which said day was given to the said Samuel A Jones to join in the errors by the said Samuel Hamilton above assigned, come again into the Court of Appeals here, the parties aforesaid, by their attornies aforesaid; and the said Samuel A Jones by his attorney aforesaid says there is no error in the record of proceedings aforesaid, nor in the giving of the decree aforesaid, and he prays that the Court of Appeals here will proceed to the examination as well of the record of proceedings aforesaid, as of the matters aforesaid, by the said Samuel Hamilton above for error assigned, and that the said judgment 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 first Monday in December 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 first Monday in December being the sixth day of the said month, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty come again into the Court of Appeals here the parties aforesaid, by their attornies aforesaid: 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 parties aforesaid, with the consent of the said parties, by their attornies aforesaid, to come before the Court of Appeals here, on the second Monday in June next, to hear the judgment of the Court of Appeals here, of and upon the premises, for that the Court now here as yet are not, and so forth.

And now, at this day to wit: the said second Monday in June being the thirteenth day of the said month, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty one, come again into the Court of Appeals here the parties aforesaid, by their attornies aforesaid. Whereupon as well the record and proceedings aforesaid, and the decree given in form aforesaid, as the matters aforesaid, by the said Samuel Hamilton above for error assigned being seen, and by the Court of Appeals here fully understood, and mature deliberation thereupon had: for that it appears to the Court of Appeals here, that there is no error in the record of proceedings aforesaid, nor in the giving of the decree aforesaid: Therefore it is considered by the Court of Appeals here that the decree aforesaid, given in form aforesaid, be in all things affirmed and stand in full force and effect, the said causes for error above assigned and alleged in any wise notwithstanding: And it is further considered by the Court of Appeals here, that the said Samuel A Jones have execution against the said Samuel Hamilton as well for the

costs and charges aforesaid adjudged unto him in the said County Court of Prince Georges, sitting as a Court of Equity, as also the sum of twenty three dollars and sixty five cents adjudged unto the said Samuel A Jones by the Court of Appeals here, on 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 Samuel Hamilton for the correcting of errors of and upon the premises as aforesaid prosecuted and so forth.

Test. John Johnson Clk.

William Wells of Geo. and Semina his wife vs. Otho B Beall administrator of Richard B Brashears.

Be it remembered, That now here, on the 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 the Chancellor 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 of a certain cause which was lately depending before him in the Court of Chancery between William Wells of George and Semina his wife complainants and Otho B Beall administrator of Richard B Brashears defendant, and wherein the said Court of Chancery passed a decree for the said Otho B Beall administrator as aforesaid against the said William Wells and Semina his wife, and from which said decree the said William Wells of George and Semina his wife appealed to the Court of Appeals here, the tenor of which said record of proceedings is as from following to wit:

(See record bound up in Book No. A.R.)

And now come into the Court of Appeals here, as well the said William Wells of George and Semina his wife by Bereadg Johnson and Francis Key their attornies, as the said Otho B Beall administrator as aforesaid by Alexander C Magruder and Alexander Mundell his attornies; and thereupon, on motion of the said Otho B Beall administrator as aforesaid, by his attornies aforesaid, it is ruled by the Court here, that the said William Wells of George and Semina his wife, assign the errors in the record of proceedings aforesaid, or in the giving the decree aforesaid so as aforesaid brought before the Court of Appeals here, for correcting the errors supposed to be therein, or judgment by the Court of Appeals here will be entered against them in default thereof: And the said William Wells of George and Semina his wife by their attornies aforesaid, say that in the record of proceedings aforesaid, and also in the giving of decree aforesaid, there is manifest error in this, to wit, that by the record aforesaid it appears that the decree aforesaid in the plea aforesaid given, was given for the said Otho B Beall administrator as aforesaid against the said William Wells of George and Semina his wife when by the law