Baltimore City, This Respondent in answer to the said Bill saith that he did on or about the 21st day of October 1856 recover a judgment against Thomas A Cunningham for the sum of $1922.33 with interest and costs, That this defendant regarding the deeds of the said Cunningham to Abigail Cunningham his mother as utterly fraudulent and void was about, upon his execution upon his said judgment to cause the said property to be sold as if such deeds had not been executed and but for the injunction issued against him at the instance of the Complainant would have so proceeded, This defendant does not admit but on the contrary denies the right of the Complainant to stop his said proceedings by injunction and prays to be hence dismissed with his reasonable costs in this part wrongfully sustained &c.

Robert A Ridgeway Solr for Defendant
Sexton

State of Maryland City of Baltimore to wit

On this 24 day of November 1858 before me the subscriber a justice of the peace of the State of Maryland in and for Baltimore City personally appeared J B Sexton and makes oath on the Holy Evangelist of Almighty God that the facts matters and circumstances in the above answer set forth and contained are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

Sam Reford J Ridgely

And on the same 30 day of November the said Edward Mitchell and Joseph Edmondson by their Solicitor aforesaid filed in said cause their answer to the said Bill of Complaint in form following to wit.

The joint answer of Edward Mitchell and Joseph Edmondson defendants to the Bill of Complaint of John Dwyer in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City exhibited. These defendants in answer to the said Bill so far as they are required to answer the same, say they admit that on the 25 day of March 1856 they did recover in the Court of Common Pleas of Baltimore City two judgments against Thomas A Cunningham the one for $261.46 and the other for $264.03 with interest and costs and that no part of the said judgments have been paid to these defendants and believing as they did and still do that the deeds of the said Thomas A Cunningham to his Mother Abigail Cunningham office copies of which are exhibited by the Complainant were fraudulent and void as against the creditors of the said Thomas A Cunningham and defendants did intend to proceed against the property so conveyed they were advised they could as if no deed in consequence of the same had been made regardless thereof and these defendants would have caused the said property to be sold under the said execution had they not been arrested by the Injunction issued against them at the instance of the Complainant. They are advised and do insist that the facts and circumstances alleged in the said Bill are not sufficient to warrant the extraordinary remedy of said injunction and they pray that the said Injunction so issued against them may be dissolved and they hence dismissed with their reasonable costs most wrongfully sustained.

Robt A Ridgely Solr for Defendants

State of Maryland Baltimore City to wit

On this 24 day of November 1858 before me the subscriber a justice of the peace of the State of Maryland in and for the City of Baltimore personally appeared Joseph Edmondson and makes oath on the Holy Evangelist of Almighty God that the facts matters and circumstances in the above answer set forth and contained

are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

Sworn Before J Ridgely

And thereupon the said Defendants by their Solicitor filed in said cause the following Motion to dissolve Injunction to Injunction

Dwyer
vs
Cunningham

Mr Turner Enter Motion to dissolve the Injunction as to James Hall, Mitchell and Edmondson and J B Sexton.

R. A. Ridgway Solr for defendants

And afterwards to wit on the first day of December in the year aforesaid the Court passed the following Order to wit

John Dwyer
vs
Thomas A Cunningham
and others.

In the Circuit Court for Baltimore City.
December 1st 1858.

Ordered, upon motion of the Solicitor of James Hall Mitchell and Edmondson and J B Sexton that the Motion of dissolve the Injunction heretofore issued in the above cause be set down for hearing on the 8th day of Decr 1858 provided a copy of this Order be served on the opposite party or his Solicitor on or before the 7th day of Decr inst

Wm. G. Weeks.

On the Back whereof is thus endorsed to wit. Service of copy admitted.

J J Waters Solr for Pltff 1 Decr 1858

And afterwards to wit on the 3rd day of December in the year aforesaid the said Robert Carroll by his Solicitor aforesaid filed in said cause his Answer to the said Bill of Complaint in form following to wit

To the Honorable William Geo Weeks Judge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City. The Answer of Robert Carroll of said City to the Bill of Complaint of John Dwyer against this Respondent and others in your Honorable Court exhibited. This Respondent saving to himself all benefit of exception to said Bill of Complaint whether for form or substance for answer thereto says. That he admits the facts allegations contained in said Bill to be true and especially this your Respondent insist that the said Deeds from said Thomas A Cunningham to said Abigail Cunningham as mentioned in said Bill were fraudulently and made by said Thomas for the purpose of hindering, delaying and defrauding her Creditors of whom was your Respondent, And further answering your Respondent discloses and claims that he was a creditor of the said Thomas A Cunningham upon the same claim for which he afterwards recovered the judgment alleged in said Bill which he executed the said deeds to said Abigail that about that time or afterwards to wit on the 10th day of January 1856 he brought suit against Thomas in the Superior Court of said City on said claim and on the 10th of September 1856 recovered a Judgment by default against said Thomas for $2000 damages in Nov which judgment on the 31st of May last the Court extended for $1184 40/100 with interest from 31st May 1858 and costs And your Respondent insists that if the said Deed to said Abigail be set aside as claimed they should be then your Respondents Judgment is the second one in point of priority and after the judgment of Mitchell and Edmondson is the next lien upon the Real Estate mentioned in said Deeds And your Respondent submits to such Decree as this Court may pass in the premises praying that