of all these claims were filed in that case and claims of the Complainant Banks to the amount of $7500 and directions declared and given upon them and this in the lifetime of Mrs Chase when she had in her power to accede to them if she had regarded them as unjust or improper claims against her but no evidence has been offered to show that she did so object to them nor is it alleged that she did in any manner resist or object to the payment of them when so filed. The fact of these claims having been filed and having received directions under the decree to Mr Farrow has been introduced into the case by the defendants for the purpose of showing that these claimants are estopped from impeaching the deed to the Williams Trustees for the reasons heretofore given. It cannot thus accomplish this object. It is consider that it has the effect very much to relieve these claims from the odium that the defendants seek to cast upon them: It further appears by Complainants Exhibit Mrs that Mrs Chase in her and handwriting attested by two of her daughters who say they saw her write it date 30 Decr 1847 less than 6 months before her death expressly acknowledges a large part of her indebtedness to the Complainant Banks enumerates certain Notes held by him "which she says were given by her to her grandson William Chase Burney, declares that Mr Banks is her largest and most preferred creditor, that he has acted kind and generously to her, and she is anxious to show him as little trouble as possible in getting his claims in her Estate settled. As it appears that the personal Estate left by Mrs Chase is insufficient to pay her debts or the reasons appearing in the foregoing opinion I shall therefore pass a decree setting aside the deed to the Messrs Williams with the trust of the Will of Mrs Chase and creditors referred to in the deed as fraudulent and void as against these creditors. I find ample from many authorities that such settlements and voluntary deed may be void as against creditors yet binding upon the grantor and those claiming under him and therefore it would be improper to disturb the trust of this deed

more than may be necessary for the satisfaction of those who have such claims against Mrs Chase at the time of her death. In Story's Equity Jur. sec 371 the law upon this subject as stated in numerous cases is laid down in the following language of the Author "Although Voluntary Conveyances are in many be good as to existing creditors they are perfect and effectual as between the parties and cannot be released by the grantor they are not only valid as to the grantor but also as to his Heirs. A conveyance of this sort tho' it has been seen with great force and truth is void only as against creditors and then only to the extent in which may be necessary to deal with the conveyed Estate for their satisfaction. To this extent and to this only it is treated as if it had not been made, to every other purpose it is good. Satisfy the creditors and the conveyance stands" Curtis vs Price 12 Ves 102, so in Stewart vs Teybland 7 Pick and Johnson 136 the Court of Appeals of this State has decided, that a deed made to defraud creditors is void under the Statute of Elizabeth as against creditors but as against the grantor is good and valid under the decree therefore that I should pass for the sale of this Estate to pay creditors the parties interested in these trust may make suggestions in regard to the property to be sold having a view to the interference with these trust as little as may be consistent with the interest of creditors.

Wm Geo Krebs.

Daniel B Banks and others vs. Nathaniel Williams Executor &c	In Circuit Court for Baltimore City.

This case having been set down for hearing and having been argued by the Solicitors of the respective parties, and all the pleadings allegations and proofs in the cause having been read and duly considered by the Court, It is thereupon this second day of December in the year 1854 by me William George Krebs