sum of $5463. 54/8. made payable to the said John Rose by his former account according to the principles of this Order.

Wm Alexander.

And afterwards, on the same day and year last aforesaid, the following Prayer of Appeal was filed in said cause to wit;

In the case of
George Meyer et al
vs
John Eisler.
Trustee et al

In the Circuit Court of Baltimore City
30th September 1865.

And the said Complainants, George Meyer and others, and the defendants Clorinda and Francis Godfrey Meyer, a Lunatic, and Elizabeth Meyer his Committee, here come into Court and pray an appeal from the Order of the Honorable William Alexander, Judge passed this day overruling the Exceptions of the said Complainants and others to the Claim of the said John Rose, as stated and filed in the Auditor's account filed in this case and they here with file the Affidavit of ——— that the said appeal is not taken for the purpose of delay.

Wm Parkin Scott, Solr.

Which Appeal being by the Court here also granted, It is thereupon Ordered by the Court here that a Transcript of the Record and Proceedings in the cause aforesaid, with all things thereunto relating be transmitted to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and the same is hereby transmitted accordingly.

Test; Samuel W. Evans Clerk.

In Testimony Whereof that the aforegoing is a full and true Transcript taken from the Record of Proceedings of the Circuit Court of Baltimore City

I hereunto Subscribe my name as Clerk and affix the seal of the Court aforesaid this twenty third day of October in the year of our Lord one thousand Eight hundred and sixty five.

(Seal) (5¢ U.S. Stamp)

Samuel W. Evans,
Clerk of the Circuit Court
of Baltimore City

And now come into the Court of Appeals here, as well the said George Meyer and others by Wm Parkin Scott Esq their

Attorney, as the said John Eisler Trustee & John Rose by G. S. Alexander & Mason Campbell & Dm, Thomas Eggs, their Attorneys, and thereupon, on motion of the said John Eisler et al by their Attorneys aforesaid, it is ruled by the Court here, that the said George Meyer et al assign the errors in the Record of Proceedings aforesaid, or in the giving the Decree aforesaid, so as aforesaid brought before the Court of Appeals here, for correcting the errors supposed to be therein, or Decree by the Court of Appeals here, will be entered against them in default thereof; and the said George Meyer et al by their Attorney aforesaid, say, that in the Record of Proceedings aforesaid, and also in the giving of Decree aforesaid, there is manifest error in this, to wit, that, by the Record aforesaid it appears that the Decree aforesaid, in the plea aforesaid given, was given for the said John Eisler et al against the said George Meyer et al when, by the law of the land, that Decree ought to have been given for the said George Meyer et al against the said John Eisler et al. therefore in that there is manifest error. and they pray that the Decree aforesaid, for that error and others, being in the Record of Proceedings aforesaid, may be reversed, annulled, and held entirely as void, and that they the said George Meyer et al may be restored to all things which they have lost by occasion of the said Decree and that the said John Eisler et al may rejoin to the errors aforesaid, and soforth. And thereupon it is ruled by the Court of Appeals here, that the said John Eisler et al join in the errors by the said George Meyer et al above assigned in the Record of Proceedings aforesaid, or Decree by the Court of Appeals here, will be rendered against them in default thereof; and the said John Eisler et al by their Attorneys aforesaid, say there is no error in the Record of Proceedings aforesaid, nor in the giving of the Decree aforesaid, and they pray that the Court of Appeals here will proceed to the examination as well of the Record of Proceedings aforesaid, as of the matters aforesaid, by the said George Meyer et al above for error assigned, and that the said Decree may be in all things affirmed, and soforth; thereupon further process of and upon the premises between the parties aforesaid, is, by virtue of an Act of Assembly in such cases made and provided, continued before the Court of Appeals here, until the first Monday in April next; the same day is given to the said parties there, then to hear the Decree of the Court of Appeals here, of and upon the said premises, and soforth;

At which said first Monday in April being the second day of the said month, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty six come again into the Court of Appeals here, the parties aforesaid by their Attorneys aforesaid: But —