then to hear the Judgment of the Court of Appeals had of and upon the said premises and so forth.

And now at this day to wit, the said second Monday in June being the tenth day of the said month in the year aforesaid one thousand eight hundred and thirty three came again into the Court of Appeals here the parties aforesaid by their attornies aforesaid: and the said Hugh W Evans and Joseph Todhunter by their attorney aforesaid offer themselves against the said John Hart 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 John Hart 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 Hugh W Evans and Joseph Todhunter have execution against the said John Hart as well for the damages costs and charges, so as aforesaid adjudged unto them in the said Court of Chancery, as also for the sum of thirty two dollars and thirty one cents adjudged unto them by the Court of Appeals here on their assent for their costs and charges which they have 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 John Hart for the correcting of errors and upon the premises aforesaid prosecuted and so forth.

Test John Johnson Clk.

Margaret Ann Steiger adm.x of Mary Steiger vs Thomas Hillen

Be it remembered, that now here on the first Monday in December being the first 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, transmits 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 Mary Ann Steiger administratrix of Mary Steiger complainant and Thomas Hillen Defendant and wherein the said Court of Chancery passed a decree for the said Thomas Hillen against the said Margaret Ann Steiger administratrix as aforesaid, and from which said decree the said Margaret Ann Steiger administratrix as aforesaid appealed to the Court of Appeals here, the tenor of which

said record of proceedings is in form following to wit

(See record bound up in book J.J. No. 4 W.)

And now come into the Court of Appeals here, as well the said Margaret Ann Steiger administratrix of Mary Steiger by Charles F. Mayer her attorney, as the said Thomas Hillen by John Scott his attorney: and thereupon on motion of the said Thomas Hillen by his attorney aforesaid it is ordered by the Court here that the said Margaret Ann Steiger administratrix as aforesaid 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 her in default thereof: And the said Margaret Ann Steiger administratrix as aforesaid by her attorney aforesaid says 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 cause aforesaid given, was given for the said Thomas Hillen against the said Margaret Ann Steiger administratrix as aforesaid when by the Law of the Land that decree ought to have been given for the said Margaret Ann Steiger administratrix as aforesaid against the said Thomas Hillen. Therefore in that there is manifest error, and she prays that the decree aforesaid for that error and others, being in the record of proceedings aforesaid, may be reversed, annulled and held entirely for nought and that she the said Margaret Ann Steiger administratrix as aforesaid may be restored to all things which she hath lost by occasion of the said decree, and that the said Thomas Hillen may rejoin to the errors aforesaid, and so forth. And thereupon it is ordered by the Court of Appeals here, that the said Thomas Hillen join in the errors by the said Margaret Ann Steiger administratrix as aforesaid above assigned in the record of proceedings aforesaid, or judgment by the Court of Appeals here will be rendered against him in default thereof. And the said Thomas Hillen by his attorney aforesaid prays that a day may be given to him to join in the errors by the said Margaret Ann Steiger administratrix as aforesaid above assigned in the record of proceedings aforesaid, until the second Monday in June next: and to him it is granted: the same day is also given to the said Margaret Ann Steiger administratrix as aforesaid.

At which said second Monday in June being the eighth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty nine which said day was given to the said Thomas Hillen to join in the errors by the said Margaret Ann Steiger administratrix as aforesaid above assigned, come again into the Court of Appeals here, the parties aforesaid, by their attornies aforesaid: And the said Thomas Hillen 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