1853 Octo 15	6 Bags Guano 909 lbs	4 6/10	18 75	
	Int & drayage		1 56	
	Commission 2½ p c		50	20.81
21	2 lbs Plaster	125	2 50	
	6 bags Guano 949 lbs	4 6	19 57	
	Freight & drayage		2 72	
	Comm 2½ p c		63	25.42
1854 Apl 20	2 Cords Wood	1 50	1 00	3.00
Augt 3	1 Bbl Flour		9 25	
	4 Hams	52 lbs 13½	7 02	
	Int & drayage		1.00	17.27
Augt 1	1 Balance due Wm Sellers		600.00	
	Int 6 Augt 1st		21.00	621.00
	Amt due Bill John Collins			200.00
	Interest on same			2.00
Augt 1	My Note at 3 yrs Int agency			925.98
	Sum Octo 2d 1854,			1818.48
Augt 1	1 By purchase of Farm		1800.00	
	Sales of Potatoes		18.48	1818.48
	1 Balance of a/c		£ 925.98	
	Less Int on Wm Sellers Say		6.00	
	6 Octo 2d		922.98	

1 Baltimore Octo 2d 1854

£922 98/100 Three years after date I promise to pay to the Order of Mr Samuel Mark Nine hundred and twenty two 98/100 dollars Value rec bearing Interest at the rate of six per cent.

J. M. Rhodes

I became the Counsel of Cresson Stuart and Peterson of Philadelphia in the Spring of 1857 and have since continued to be and am their Counsel in the City of Baltimore.

In the Month of May 1858 some difficulty arose between Cresson Stuart and Peterson and J M Rhodes whereupon Rhodes refused longer to defend the suit of Jackey & Sons Chancery against him in the Equity Court for Howard County,

E J Kilbourne Esq having been Rhodes Solicitor in the Jackey case up to that time declined to continue in the cause unless authorised to do so by Cresson Stuart and Peterson as Rhodes interest in the property had terminated some 12 Months previously Sorting to the fact that Mr Kilbourne had filed an answer in the cause and was familiar with the facts &c I addressed Cresson & Co in May 1858 to induce them to continue to defend it. He had continued at their suggestion and he and myself prepared the Arguments and subsequently concluded the cause to its final termination by the Court

A H Hobbs.

I agree that this paper shall be read in Evidence at the hearing in the same manner as if Mr Hobbs had been examined before the Commissioner

Subject to all other legal objections.

March 12th 1860. Wm H G Dorsey Solr for Complt.

Samuel Mark vs Cresson et al } In the Circuit Court for Howard County sitting in Equity.

It is admitted in this cause that J M Rhodes one of the defendants was Trustee at the time when Complainants Bill was filed in this cause,

A H Hobbs Defts Solr
W H G Dorsey Solr for Complt

At the execution of the annexed Commission issued out of the Circuit Court for Howard County and to me directed and Empowering me to examine Witnesses in the cause depending in the said Court sitting as a Court of Equity between Samuel Mark as Complainant and Wm P Cresson Dean Stuart and Richard Peterson are defendants I William N Brod Commissioner therein named having met on the 24 day of January 1860 at the office of Wm H G Dorsey Esq in the City of Baltimore and having taken the oath annexed to the said Commission did in the presence of Wm H G Dorsey Esq Solicitor for Complainant and for the Commission there being no Witnesses to examine until the first day of February 1860 at 10 o'clock

The Commissioner met pursuant to adjournment at the office of Wm H G Dorsey Esq the City of Baltimore on the first day of February 1860 and adjourned in the presence of A H Hobbs Esq Solicitor for the defendants the Solicitor for the Complainant not being present.

The Commissioner met on the 10th day of February 1860 at the office of Wm H G Dorsey Esq in the City of Baltimore and the proceedings thereon in the presence of Wm H G Dorsey Esq Solicitor for Complainant and of A H Hobbs the Solicitor for the defendant to take the following depositions to wit I Dean Smith a Witness of lawful age produced on the part of the Complainant being duly sworn and examined deposes and says. I have no personal knowledge of the parties to this suit except Mr J M Rhodes I was in the Spring of Winter of 1856 or 1857 I cannot recollect which, I was called upon to examine Rhodes title to the property for my Clients Jackey and Sons and the title deeds with certain receipts from Sellers to Marks for money paid on account of purchase Money I think twelve hundred dollars and I objected to Rhodes title because of the Equitable lien created by the payment of said purchase money by Marks to Sellers. Mr Kilbourne was the Counsel for Mr Rhodes. And an interview with me on account of this objection which I stated gave my belief to the validity of this equitable lien and referred him to the Maryland authorities upon which I relied, my Objection to the Bill was that Marks had paid twelve hundred dollars to Sellers, and thus he was equitably entitled to a lien upon the property because of such payment I communicated these facts to Mr Kilbourne and I think about early in the Spring of 1857 some few days after the deed of the said in Howard County was made by Rhodes to Cresson and Peterson I found it on record and found that

Subject to all other legal objections.