is entitled to

John H. Price

Whereupon commission issued accordingly.

And afterwards to wit, on the 28th day of May 1864. the following amended order of court was filed to wit.

Francis B. Groff, Executor & others	In Circuit Court of Baltimore County.
vs	
Edwin Palmer.	Amended order of Court directing Commission to issue to take testimony to Robert L. Rogers & Wm. S. Kiefer Esqrs.

Ordered this 28th day of May A.D. 1864. on the application of the complainants by Richard Grason, Special Judge of the Circuit Court of Baltimore County sitting as a Court of Equity, that the commission to take testimony heretofore ordered by the Court & directed to the standing commissioners of this County, be & the same is hereby ordered & directed to be issued to Robert L. Rogers & Wm. S. Kiefer Esqrs.

Richard Grason Special Judge

And commission issued accordingly:

And afterwards, to wit, on the 23rd day of May in the year 1866 the following answer was filed, to wit.

To the Honorable W. H. D. C. Emory, Judge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore County.

The answer of Edwin A. Palmer, of the City of Baltimore and State of Maryland to the bill of complaint of Francis B. Groff, Executor &c. William S. Groff and Mary A. Todd in this Honorable Court exhibited

This respondent reserving to himself every right of exception to complainants said bill for its manifold errors and inaccuracies for answer thereto or so much thereof as he is advised it is material for him to answer, answering says. That he is advised and believes, it to be true that the marriage between the testator and his mother Susan Groff took place in Lancaster County in the State of Pennsylvania. that he was a widower with the children named in said bill as of the issue of his first marriage, and she a widow also having children of the first marriage viz David A. Palmer her deceased husband That it is true they quitted Lancaster County, and took up their residence in Baltimore County, where they resided at the time of the executing of the deeds referred to in said bill, and the Wills also filed as Exhibits thereto do a part thereof That it is true the said Susan Groff had issue whose name is Edward Palmer and that he resided during the year eighteen hundred and fifty eight and nine with his mother, and her said husband but he avers and charges that it was for their mutual qualification and benefit and at their special and particular instance and

request, and arrangement to the disadvantage of respondent inasmuch as he gave his business engagements in Baltimore for that purpose. And he further avers and charges, that it is not true as alleged, that he was a non resident of the State of Maryland, but insists that he is now and has ever been a citizen and resident of the said state. It is true however that he did leave the State aforesaid for the purpose of residing awhile in the state of Georgia anterior to hostilities between the North and South and was prevented from returning to his place of residence as aforesaid by reason of the disruption between the sections that ensued. that at the time of his leaving, the union was unbroken, and he had no anticipations of the struggle and disruption that followed. That until the cessation of hostilities he had no means of returning as he would have done, had it been practicable, as is attested by his having done so as soon as communications were restored, and upon his return as aforesaid he learned for the first time of the decease of the said Groff the testator, and of the proceedings in this cause. And this respondent further answering admits that the said testator was seized in fee simple of the tract of land or real estate containing one hundred acres more or less, situated in Baltimore County and partially described in complainants said bill. And he also admits that at or about the period designated the said Groff and wife made a conveyance of a portion, about a moity thereof to Amos Richards and that said Richards & wife again executed a conveyance of said portion or moity, of about fifty acres to the mother of your respondent and the consideration for said conveyances is stated in said deeds to have been the sum of one thousand dollars

And your respondent avers and charges, that the statement of said consideration arose from the fact as he knows that said Groff had obtained from respondents mother, his wife, at least the sum of one thousand dollars, monies belonging to your respondent and his brother, deceased before the execution of said deeds, belonging to them as a part of the estate of their brother, which she held in her possession and which testator claimed from his said wife

And your respondent admitting the execution of the Will of his said mother, in which after bequeathing a life estate to her said husband, she devises over the reversion in fee to respondent, charges that said Will, as will appear by reference thereto was made with the uniform approbation and concurrence subjoined thereto by the said Abraham Groff,

Further answering, he says that altho the said testator was advanced in years at the time of the transactions hereinbefore referred to and stated, yet he was notwithstanding a man of unusual vigor, both mentally and physically and was at all times capable of intelligently and aptly attending to his business transactions, having no one to aid him by his counsel in their performance.

And your respondent denies that he was easily influenced in his actions