Each art in order to shew that he was an agent for William Chase Barney by which Witness they hope to prove he the Barney paid no consideration for a certain note to the said Chase They now require Evidence to prove all claims (set forth in the Evidence) to be produced before Wm. T. Talbott requiring to be paid dividends under a certain deed of Trust made to said Talbott and as in duty bound &c.

Robt J. Brent

Sworn to in open Court
Edwd Dorsey Clk.

Superior Court. In Equity November 24th 1852
Ordered that the subject matter of the within petition be heard by the Court in Tuesday the 30th Inst provided a Copy of the petition and this order be served upon the Solicitor of the opposite party on or before Saturday the 27th Inst.

Wm Frick

Service of Copy admitted this 27th November 1852
J. Malcolm
Complts Solr

(Filed 24th November 1852)

Banks and Stewart
vs
Williams and others } In the Superior Court of Baltimore City in Equity.

To the Honorable William Frick Judge of the Superior Court of Baltimore City sitting in Equity. The Complainants in this case ask leave that the paper in this case be removed to the Circuit Court for Baltimore City for further proceedings and trial.

J. Malcolm
St Geo W. Teackle
Solrs for Complts

Ordered this 17th day of November 1853 that the papers in this case be transmitted to the Circuit Court of Baltimore City as prayed.

Wm Frick

(Filed 17th November 1853)

And now here at this day to wit, the first day of December in the year Eighteen hundred and fifty three came into the Circuit Court for Baltimore City here as well the said Daniel B. Banks John Stewart, Thomas Beck, William P. Milligan, Robert Renwick, by St George W. Teackle and James Malcolm Esquires their Solicitors as the said Mary Barney, William Chase Barney, Samuel C. Barney, William P. Steele and Francis H. his wife Franklin Steele and Ann his wife, William H. Rogers and Mary his wife, Geo. Harrington and Caroline his wife, Maria M. Postell, Clayonie Barney and Catharine C. Olofield, Nathaniel Williams, Joseph B. Williams and William Hopkins Postell by Nathaniel Williams, Robert J. Brent and Henry May Esquires their Solicitors. Thereupon further process of and upon the premises aforesaid between the parties aforesaid by consent of the said parties by their Solicitors aforesaid and by order of the Court here therein is continued until the second Monday in January next, at which said second Monday of January last in the year Eighteen hundred and fifty four came again into Court here

the parties aforesaid by their Solicitors aforesaid; and afterwards to wit on the thirtieth day of January last in the year last aforesaid on motion of the Complainants by their Solicitors aforesaid the Court passed the following rule for hearing, to wit;

Banks et al
vs
Williams et al } In the Circuit Court of Baltimore City

Upon application of the Solicitors for the Complainants; It is ordered this 30th day of January 1854. That this cause be set down for hearing on the 8th day of February next provided a copy of this order be served on the defendants Solicitors on or before the 6th day of February next.

Wm Geo Krebs

"On the back whereof is thus indorsed to wit; Service of Copy admitted R. J. Brent Defendants Solicitor" And afterwards to wit on the eighth day of February in the year last aforesaid the Complainants by their Solicitors aforesaid file in Court here in said cause the following letter to wit.

Wm Malcolm, Baltimore

Dear Sir; Mr May cannot be here on Thursday owing to the Gardiner case and I do not want him to lose his fee. He is very certain that he could come Thursday week and I take for granted you will agree to this Extension to gratify him with the assurance that I will not be backward in bringing it on after this indulgence.

Yours Respectfully
R. J. Brent

Febyy 6th 1854.

Whereupon the Court passed and filed in said cause the following order enlarging the rule for hearing to wit;

Ordered this 8th day of February 1854 with the assent of the Complainants that the rule for the hearing of above cause be extended to 16th Inst.

Wm Geo Krebs

Whereupon for that the Court is not advised to give its Judgment of and upon the premises aforesaid, day therefore is given to the said parties to hear their rights Judgment until the second Monday in March then next &c At which said second Monday of March last in the year aforesaid came again into Court here the parties aforesaid by their Solicitors aforesaid and thereupon afterwards, to wit, sixteenth day of March in the year last aforesaid by leave of the Court here first had and obtained the following Copy of account and agreement, and release and agreement were filed in said cause to wit;

In the Case of
John Patterson
vs
William A. Talbott } In Baltimore County Court
In Equity

The Auditor reports to the Court that he has again re-examined the proceedings, claims and proofs filed in this cause and that in obedience to the Court's order of the 24th January last he has stated the within account rejecting all claims not proven and distributing the funds amongst those creditors whose claims are proven, all of which is respectfully submitted.

Baltimore 6 March 1848.

T. Parkin Scott
Auditor