Saturday on Saturday 21 Inst provided a copy of the within Subpoena upon the parties or their Counsel four days before the said 21 day of December 1861.

John H. Price

And afterwards to wit on the 17 day of December in the year last aforesaid Pleasant Hunter Esquire to whom the said Commission to assign guardian had been issued made return thereof to the Court together with his proceedings thereunder and by virtue thereof in form following to wit

To the Honorable John H. Price Judge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore County In Equity.

The subscriber being the Commissioner named in the annexed Commission, hereby certifies that in Execution of the powers thereby vested in me, I did on the 20 day of November in the year 1861 proceed to where William Little John Little John Anderson, George Anderson, Mary E. Anderson, Calder Little Ann M. Little Clara H. Little Georgetta Little, Julia Lane, the infants named in said Commission then were, and caused the said infants to be brought before me and then and there in the presence of the said infants, assigned and appointed George Little of Baltimore County guardian to said Infants and took the answer of said infants by their said guardian and under the Oath of said guardian by me administered to the Bill of Complaint in said Commission mentioned which said answer with said Commission is herewith returned closed under my hand and seal this 20 day of November in the year 1861.

Pleasant Hunter Com.

The answer of William Little John Little John Anderson George Anderson Mary E. Anderson Calder Little Ann M. Little Clara H. Little Georgetta Little and Julia Lane Infants under the age of twenty one years by George Little their guardian to the Bill of Complaint of James Turner and others against them in the Circuit Court for Baltimore County in Equity Exhibited,

These defendants cannot admit any of the matters and things alleged in the said Bill and being Infants of tender years submit their rights to the protection of this Court

George Little Guardian.

On this 20 day of November in the year 1861 the above named George Little appeared before me Commissioner, and made oath that the matters and things stated in the foregoing answer are true to the best of his knowledge and belief

Pleasant Hunter Com.

And afterwards to wit on the 30 day of January in the year 1862 the said George Little, Rebecca Lane James Anderson, and Ann his wife by George W. Brown and Frederick H. Brune Esquires their Solicitors filed in Court here the following answer to the said Bill of Complaint to wit

To the Honorable John H. Price Judge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore sitting in Equity.

The joint and separate answer of George Little Rebecca Lane James Anderson and Ann his wife the said George Rebecca and Ann being Children of Mary Little daughter of James Calder late of Baltimore County deceased to the Bill of Complaint of James Turner and others in this Honorable Court against them and others exhibited respectfully shews.

That they admit that James Calder formerly of Baltimore



County died, leaving a Will duly executed to pass Real Estate as aforesaid as alleged in said Bill and that Exhibit A is a true copy of said Will that Margaret the Widow of said testator renounced all claim to any devise under said Will, and elected to take in lieu thereof her dower in his Real Estate that has since departed this life that George Calder the son of said testator departed this life in the year 1849 unmarried and without leaving any child or descendant of a child, and that Mary Little one of the daughters of said testator subsequently in the year 1852 also departed this life, having issue living at her death. That during her life time the said Mary and her three sisters mentioned in the Will of the said James Calder entered into agreement for a partition of the Real Estate of the said testator which is particularly referred to in the Act of Assembly of 1854 ch 302 and the proceedings for a partition in the case in your Honorable Court of Park and others vs Christian Ehrman and Michael Withers mentioned in said Bill and to which the respondents also for greater certainty refer.

Your respondents further admit that Margaret Park another of the daughters of the said testator James Calder, departed this life on or about the first of July 1860 leaving no children or descendants, and that the children and grand children of the said Mary Little deceased, and of Sarah Turner and Charlotte Withers, the other two daughters of said James Calder, still living are correctly stated in said Bill.

Your respondents now show that under the proceedings for a partition above referred to and by virtue of the decree therein passed by this Honorable Court on the 4th day of December 1855 a certain portion of the Real Estate of the said James Calder particularly mentioned in said proceedings and said decree were allotted to the said Margaret Park to be held in severalty by her for life and after her death in severalty by their children in remainder under the Will of the said James Calder, as upon reference to said decree and the act of assembly authorising it as aforesaid will better appear.

And your Respondents deny that by a proper construction of the said Will of the said James Calder the land thus allotted to the said Margaret for the life passed upon her death as aforesaid to her surviving sisters Sarah Turner and Charlotte Withers in undivided moieties for their several lives and after their deaths then to their children or descendants living at the time of their several deaths in fee, as alleged in said Bill and your respondents allege that these respondents and the other descendants of said Mary Little for shares are also entitled to a share of said Estate allotted to said Margaret as aforesaid, and your respondents allege that by force of the ultimate limitation in remainder to John Guyon upon the the death of all the testators children without issue, it will be contended that the life Estate preceding given to each of his children including those originally given to his son George and daughter Margaret became enlarged to estates tail which by rules of the act of descents were converted into estates in fee, but whether this be so or not respondents contend that the limitation over to said Guyon being after indefinite failure of issue of all said children is too remote and therefore void.

Your respondents further allege that the Estates thus originally given under said Calder's Will to his said children whether in fee or for life are only affected by two classes of limitation in remainder, which being