Attorneys of A. J. Willis contestant of the auditors report, filed in this cause on the 27th day of February 1862. and to J. H. Bryant and P. W. Downes Attorneys for the support of said auditors report, that the auditor would sit on this day for the purpose of hearing the allegations and proofs of claims against the estate of the said Richard H. Wright insolvent petitioner, in behalf of the said A. J. Willis, and the auditor having issued summons to the Sheriff of Caroline County, directing him to summon Wm A. Tully, Richard H. Wright ~~and~~ Alcaid Dawson to attend as witness in behalf of the said A. J. Willis on that day — and no witnesses being that day in attendance, the auditor gave notice as aforesaid that he would sit as aforesaid again on the 11th day July 1862.

Denton July 11th 1862 — in accordance with the previous adjournment of the hearing of the proffs and allegations in this cause, the Auditor having summoned in behalf of A. J. Willis the contestant, as his witnesses. John H. Simpson, Alcaid Dawson, Wm H. Tully and Richard H. Wright a witness of lawful age produced on the part of A. J. Willis, the contestant, whereupon the said Wright being affirmed, the Counsel for the support of the said Auditors' report, to wit. Messrs. Bryant & Downes, objected to the testimony of the said Wright on the grounds 1st that the said Wright is a party to the record 2nd that the said Wright has interest in the questions pending — and 3d that the said Wright is the insolvent petitioner in this cause — Whereupon it was admitted without proof (by J. H. Bryant and P. W. Downes counsel for the support of the Auditors report) that Richard H. Wright was discharged as an insolvent petitioner at a past term of Caroline County Circuit Court. It was further admitted (by the Counsel for the report without proof that the "single bills" filed in Caroline County Circuit Court in the causes No 177 and 167, on which single bills judgments have been obtained against the said Richard H. Wright by A. J. Willis, and of which the copies marked Exhibits No 1 A and No 2 A and herewith filed, were made by the said Richard H. Wright for the purpose and with the intent expressed in said single bills — It is also admitted (by the Counsel for the support of the report that the land and mill referred to in said single bills, is the same land and mill which were returned by the said Richard H. Wright, insolvent petitioner, and sold by J. H. Bryant as his Trustee in insolvency to A. J. Willis for $720.00 — that the money distributed by the said Auditors report, is the money for which said land and mill was sold and that the said J. H. Bryant as trustee sold the said land and mill under the order of the Court in insolvency. It is also admitted by the Counsel for the report that the transfers and signatures endorsed upon the single bills of which the exhibits No 1 A and No 2 A and copies as aforesaid are the act of Wm A. Tully, and are his transfers.

The question was then asked of Richard H. Wright the witness by the Counsel for A. J. Willis "Was there a deed given to you by William A. Tully conveying to you the land and mill

sold as aforesaid by J. H. Bryant your trustee? To which the witness replied there was no deed given to him not to any one for him.

The witness was then asked. "Was it or not agreed on the part of you Richard H. Wright and on the part of William A. Tully that after the payment by you of $600.00 of the purchase money, the said Tully was to give you a deed. and not before? Witness answered that it was so agreed. The witness was then asked "Have you or not ever paid to William A. Tully or to A. J. Willis any part of the purchase money? and if yes, what amount, and to which of them? Witness answered that he paid Wm A. Tully $45.00 and that that is all he has paid to either A. J. Willis or Wm A. Tully. It is admitted by the counsel of Willis, that William A. Tully only received one deed for the property, and that was a deed from Watkins and wife to him the said Tully — Whereupon the Counsel for the report offered in evidence the Auditors notice marked Exhibit A which notice the Counsel for A. J. Willis admitted was published as certified by John G. Standing for A. G. Gullett as Editor of the Denton Journal. Whereupon the Counsel for the report desired the auditor to file and mark as exhibits certain letters of A. J. Willis — which letters were accordingly filed and marked by the Auditor, letter No 1 Exhibit B letter No 2 Exhibit C. J. R. Tarr a witness of lawful age produced by the Counsel for the report being duly sworn was asked. Are you acquainted with the handwriting of A. J. Willis? Witness answered he is. The witness was then desired to look upon letter No 1 Exhibit B and upon letter No 2 Exhibit C and say whether or not they are the handwriting of A. J. Willis? Witness answered "they both are"

A. G. Gullett, a witness of lawful age produced by the Counsel for the Auditor's report being duly sworn, was asked "are you acquainted with the handwriting of A. J. Willis?

Witness answered "he knows the handwriting of A. J. Willis

The witness was then desired to look at letter No 1 Exhibit B, and letter No 2 Exhibit C. and say whether he thought the signatures thereto are the signatures of A. J. Willis? Witness answered they are" The witness was then desired to look at the auditors notice marked exhibit A, and say whether he published the said notice in the Denton Journal for three weeks antecedent to the 29th day of January 1862. and whether he ever published any other auditor's notice in the said cause? Witness answered "that he did publish the said notice marked exhibit A. in accordance with the certificate thereto annexed, and has published no other auditors notice in said cause"

The Counsel for A. J. Willis objected to the filing of letter No 1 Exhibit B, and letter No 2. Exhibit C and to the competency of the testimony in relation thereto, for the reason that it impeaches the petitioner A. J. Willis in a manner illegal under the law of the land. The counsel for A. J. Willis object generally to the filing of the letters No 1 & 2 Exhibits B & C, and to the competency of the testimony in reference thereto.

And the Counsel for A. J. Willis objects to the introduction of the