in chief and cross examined and dismissed, and because the question and answer are irrelevant to the issue; and to being recalled on page 97 of the testimony, and to interrogatory 1 and answer thereto, and to interrogatory two and three and answers, because the witness was exhausted, and the questions and answers are irrelevant to the issue.

On the 10th July 1883, the following opinion was filed, and order passed, in words following, to wit:

James L. Goodwin, and wife vs Alphonso A. White, and Wife	Circuit Court of Anne Arundel County No. 650, Equity

By deed of the 19th of July, 1876, Mary Maria Disney for the consideration of $50. conveyed to her aunt Julia Ann Disney, (who subsequently, in January, 1877, married Mr. White,) certain real estate, which had been devised to her by Louisa Ann Disney, another aunt, who died in March, 1874 leaving a will containing this devise, dated the 17th of March, 1876. In November, 1876, the grantor married Mr. James L. Goodwin, and on the 26th of January 1878, she and her husband filed the bill in this case, against the grantee and her husband, seeking to have this deed vacated and annulled. During the progress of the case, and after she had been examined as a witness, Mrs. Goodwin died, leaving an infant son of tender years, by whom, as well as by her surviving husband, the suit has been prosecuted to a hearing.

It is proved and conceded, that the real value of the property thus conveyed, is between $800 and $900, and it was all the property the grantor ever possessed.

It is also admitted, that the father of the infant is a laboring man, owning no property in his own right. It would seem therefore, to be a very hard case, for the grantee to retain this property under this deed, against the wishes of her niece, the grantor, and to the prejudice of this infant child. But the mere hardship of the case, furnishes no ground for setting aside the deed. Neither Courts of law, nor of equity, have ever undertaken to enforce a mere code of honor, or of generosity, or the rule of perfect morality, as declared by divine authority, and which acknowledges as its one principle, the duty of doing to others, as we would that others should do to us. The law permits a person of full age, of sound mind, and free from debt, to do what he pleases with his property. He may give it away by a voluntary conveyance, or sell it for less than its value, or otherwise dispose of it, as his inclination or caprice may dictate, and such a conveyance once made, must stand, if the grantee chooses to hold on to it. It is incumbent, therefore, upon the complainants to allege and prove, apart from the mere hardships of the case, some ground which Courts of Equity recognise as sufficient to justify a decree annulling this deed. After a careful examination of the testimony, I am constrained to say that no such case has been satisfactorily made out.

1st. The averments of the bill that she did not know when she executed the instrument, that it was an absolute conveyance of her property, but that she supposed it to be a mere assignment or paper authorizing her aunt to rent the property in her own name, or that she was induced to execute it by means of false or fraudulent representations on the part of the grantee, are not, in my