the said Jeremiah Townley Chase were made parties as defendants, and all the defendants answered the said bill, taking different views of the will aforesaid, not one of whom made any suggestions as to the incompetency of the testator, but all of them, to use the language of Chancellor Bland, claim under and in affirmance of its provisions, taking the said will, and its several codicils, together; and the Court of Appeals, in the same case, speaking of the will, says that it affords pregnant evidence that all the testator's children were equally the objects of his bounty and affection.

And these respondents, further answering, say that claiming as the complainants do, under those who were parties to the proceedings in the case aforesaid, they are estopped by the decision therein rendered, which, so far as they are concerned, is to be regarded as establishing the validity of the will now in question, or any of the codicils thereto.

And these defendants, further answering, say that immediately after the death of the said Jeremiah Townley Chase, in the year eighteen hundred and twenty-eight, the said Hester Ann Chase entered into possession of the said tract of land, as absolute owner thereof, subject to the leasehold interest of the said Rachel Dorsey, under and by virtue of the said sixth codicil to the said Chase's will, and that thereafter she continued uninterruptedly to hold, use and enjoy the same as and for her own absolute property, and to deal with it as such, with claim of title thereto, as aforesaid, until her death, in the year eighteen hundred and seventy five.

That the leasehold estate of the said Rachel Dorsey terminated on May seventh, eighteen hundred and thirty eight.

That the indenture of lease from the said Hester Ann Chase to the said Thomas Winans, (being "Exhibit -,"

filed with the bill of complaint,) was dated May seventh, eighteen hundred and fifty-nine, and recorded - G.H.S. No. 170. folio 193. That the deed from the said Hester Ann Chase to the said Thomas Winans and others, (being "Exhibit -," filed with the bill of complaint,) was dated January fifth, eighteen hundred and sixty nine, and recorded in Liber G.R. No. 405. fol. 204. and that the said bill of complaint in the case was filed on March twenty-sixth, eighteen hundred and eighty, and that the lapse of said long interval of time ought to preclude forever, and be a sufficient bar in this Honorable Court to any suit, or claim whatsoever, against these defendants by reason of the premises.

And for a further and special plea in this behalf, these defendants and each of them, not waiving, but relying upon all the matters of defense herein set up, say that if the complainants, or those under whom they claim, ever had any cause of action or suit against these defendants, or any of them, for or concerning any of the matters in the said bill mentioned, which these defendants in no sort admit, and expressly deny, such cause of action or suit did accrue or arise about twenty years before the filing of the said bill, or before serving or suing out process against these defendants.

And these respondents further say, that with the judicial decision before them of Chase vs. Lockerman, not even the most prudent and careful man would have suspected that the party executing the said will and codicils was known or believed to be of unsound mind, or incapable of executing a valid deed or contract. That the said decision was made in the year eighteen hundred and forty, within twelve years after the decease of the testator;