from theirs and also that other and different issues should be raised at the trial of the cause than those taken in said answer: and that as the answers are not required to be upon oath he prays that to raise the same he may be permitted to file a separate and amended answer and as in duty &c.

Geo. H. Williams
Solicitor for Schaferman

Which being read and heard the Court here passed the following order to wit: Ordered this 3rd day of May A.D. 1860 that the Complainant shew cause if any he have on or before the 10th instant why the prayer of the foregoing petition should be granted, Provided a copy of this petition and order be served on Complainants Solicitor on or before the 7th inst.

Wm Geo. Krebs

Which said Petition and order is thus endorsed to wit: "Service of Copy admitted L. M. Reynolds for Complt." And afterwards to wit on the same Third day of May on Motion of the said Complainants by their Solicitor aforesaid the Court here passed the following order to wit:

O'Brien vs Schaferman et al	In the Circuit Court for Baltimore City 1st May 1860

Ordered upon the motion of the Complainants Solicitor that the above cause be set down for hearing on the 12th day of May 1860 Provided a copy of this order be served on the opposite party or its Solicitor, on or before the 3rd inst Wm Geo. Krebs

On the back whereof is thus endorsed to wit: "Service admitted 3d May 1860 G. H. Williams Sol. for H. Schaferman." And afterwards to wit on the Fifth day of May in the year last aforesaid the following Agreement was filed in said cause to wit:

In the Circuit Court for Baltimore City. O'Brien vs Leiman, Schaferman et al – It is agreed that the day for the Complainant to shew cause why the deft – Schaferman shall not be permitted to file a separate & amended answer shall be changed & made the 5th day of May 1860 instead of the 7th day of May inst. as mentioned in the order of May 3rd 1860

L. M. Reynolds
for Complts

And afterwards to wit on the Twelfth day of May in the year last aforesaid the Court here passed and filed in said cause the following order on the foregoing Petition of the said Harman Schaferman to wit:

In the Circuit Court for Baltimore City. O'Brien vs – Leiman et al. A copy of the foregoing petition and order having been served on the Complainants Solicitor as directed, and no cause having been shown as required, and the Complainants Solicitor being in Court, and offering no objection though called upon, it is this 12th day of May – A.D. 1860 ordered that said Harman Schaferman be and he is hereby permitted to file a separate amended answer as prayed for in said petition

Wm Geo Krebs

And the said cause so standing was continued until the second Monday of May instant. At which said second Monday of May to wit in the year last aforesaid come again into Court here the parties aforesaid by their Solicitors aforesaid. – And thereupon the said Harman Schaferman by his Solicitor aforesaid filed in said cause the following Answer to the aforegoing Petition of the said Samuel Harman to wit:

The answer of Harman Schaferman to the petition of Samuel Harman filed in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City in a cause therein in which William O'Brien is Complainant and this Respondent and Conrad Leiman are defendants.

This Defendant answering denies that Leiman his Co-defendant was ever indebted to said Petitioner, and he puts said Harman to full proof upon the Statute of limitations as a bar against any such claim as may be shown to exist; and this Defendant also pleads and relies upon the Statute of limitations as a bar to the pretended claim of the said Complainant O'Brien and that neither of said parties have therefore any legal standing in Court sufficient to entitle them to any relief whatever much less to the appointment of a receiver.

That pending these proceedings the property in question has been bona fide sold by this Respondent to George Royce and William Henry Weaver to whom possession thereof has been given, and also an ample title by deed, and who ought to be made parties to this controversy if the same is continued further.

That the said Grantees are in the receipt of the rents thereof properly, and that the conveyance of said property by Leiman to this Respondent was fair, and bona fide, and not made to hinder, delay or defraud any one whatsoever and that subsequent to such conveyance no rent was ever collected therefrom by said Leiman save and except as the agent of this Respondent, and this Respondent submits that said petition should be dismissed with costs