sealed under the guise of a general bill with a general title: That in further pursuance of said agreement the said parties fo'd applied to the Court of Appeals to revise their former decision which they refusing to do the cause was entered reversed by Court and in the County Court was entered agreed. That while the application to the Legislature was pending the said Hester conveyed the said property to Roger B. Taney and Ellie Beatty in trust which deed was delivered as an escrow to be returned in case the Legislature should refuse to pass the said law that the said Upton Lawrence died in March 1824 and that Christian Hager and others claiming the said property as devisees of Rosanna Hester have filed their bill in this Court against the complainant the heirs of Upton Lawrence and the devisees of Daniel Hester and those claiming under them to which bill she has answered.

The bill then prays that the complainant may be put in possession of her said inheritance thus wrongfully and unjustly detained from her and that the defendants may account with her for the rents and profits of the same since the death of Upton Lawrence and prays general relief. The bill further states that all the defendants above enumerated in the title of this suit reside out of the State of Maryland.

It is thereupon ordered that the complainant by causing a copy of this order to be published in some convenient newspaper three successive weeks before the 25th day of February next give notice to the said absent defendants of the application and of the substance and object of the bill that they be warned to appear in this Court in person or by a solicitor on or before the 25th day of June next to show cause if any they have why a decree should not pass as prayed.

True Copy Test, Ramsay Waters, Reg. Cur. Law.

I hereby certify that the annexed order was published three successive weeks in the Torch Light commencing on the 2d day of February 1832.

March 23d 1832. W. D. Bell.

And afterwards at the same Term a commission to appoint a Guardian to appear to the said Cross Bill and defend the said suit on behalf of the infant defendants Jonathan Hager Lawrence Upton Hager Lawrence Pattey West Lawrence Matilda Lawrence Elizabeth Lawrence and Barbara Orendorff Lawrence was issued in the usual form to Robert M. Tidball. And afterwards at the same Term like commission on behalf of the infant defendants Peregrine John and Benjamin Fitzhugh was issued to Daniel Weisel. And at the same time there were filed in said cause the answers of some of said defendants to the said Bill and also of some of said defendants to the said Cross Bill severally in the words following.

The Joint and Several answer of John D. Hester William Heyser Jacob Stake Hugh Kennedy David Stallsman John A. Donaldson John Motter John Weis Henry Keefer John Briley John Long William Bender Joshua Murray John Figely Daniel Bovey Christian Fechtig William Moffett John Ringer Abraham Kelley David Dasher Dennis McKilmy Samuel Newman Thayer McMullen William McGonigal John Toland Job Ringer Thomas Ringer Jacob Ringer Henry Cole Benjamin Reigle Daniel Heister and John Kennedy Gabriel Hester and William Hester defendants to the bill of complaint of Robert Hicks and Magdalina his wife

and others complainants.

These defendants now and at all times hereafter saving and reserving to themselves all and all manner of benefit and advantage of exception to the manifold errors uncertainties imperfections and insufficiencies in the said complainants said bill of complaint contained for answer thereunto or unto so much and such parts thereof as these defendants are advised is material for them to make answer unto they answering say they believe it to be true that the said Jonathan Hager of Frederick County died intestate in the year 1775 leaving two children Jonathan his only son and heir at law then about nineteen years of age and Rosanna then the wife of Daniel Hester and that he was at the time of his death seized of a large and valuable real Estate lying in said County which descended to his said son; That the said Jonathan Hager the younger with a view to make an adequate and liberal provision for his sister and to fulfil the known intention of his father who had died suddenly without providing for her as he had declared his intention to do did soon after the death of his father agree to convey to his said sister and her husband and the said five lots of ground in Elizabeth Town and executed two written agreements one in the year 1775 and the other in 1776 by which he covenanted and agreed to convey the said property to them in fee simple as soon as he should attain the legal age of twenty one years That soon afterwards and before he was twenty one he enlisted in the Revolutionary Army and was taken prisoner by the British and in a short time enlisted into the British Service: That the said Daniel Hester by the permission of the American Government paid a visit to him then in Halifax in the province of Nova Scotia where the said Jonathan being then upwards of twenty one years of age on the twelfth day of December 1777 executed a deed to him for the said fourteen hundred acres of land and five lots of ground a true copy whereof and of the endorsements thereon is herewith exhibited marked exhibit A which these defendants pray may with all other exhibits made by them and accompanying this answer be taken and received as part thereof; That the said deed was not acknowledged in the manner prescribed by the laws of Maryland and was therefore inoperative and void that the said Daniel Heister thereupon applied to the General Assembly of Maryland in the year 1781 on behalf of himself and his wife for a bill confirming their title to the said property and that upon his said application the said law was passed at November Session 1781 entitled an act for vesting an Estate for life in Daniel Hester the younger and an Estate in fee simple in Rosanna his wife in fourteen hundred acres of land lying in Washington County and in five lots of land lying in Elizabeth Town in the said County of which the complainants Exhibit A. 1. is admitted to be a true exemplification: These defendants deny that there was any attempt on the part of the said Daniel Hester by his said petition to the Legislature or otherwise to obtain the passage of a law limiting the said Estate to himself alone or to himself and his wife in any manner different from the limitation in the said act of Assembly contained or that there was any call or necessity for the General Assembly on that occasion to exert any functions of conservative Justice as parens patriæ to protect the interest of the said Rosanna against the cupidity and selfish aims of her husband as set forth in the said Bill of complaint: These defendants