Naomi Van Bokkelen, &c., vs. Mary C. Carter, &c.	In the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, in Equity.

To the Honorable, the Judges of the Circuit Court for Baltimore County:

The joint and several answer of Mary C. Carter and Sarah R. Carter to the bill of complaint against them, by Naomi Van Bokkelen, in her own right, and as executrix, in this Court exhibited.

1. These defendants admit all the allegations of the said bill to be true, and they also admit that all that is material in the several instruments therein referred to is correctly set forth in the said bill.

2. Further answering, they say they are advised by their counsel, that the deed to Thomas J. Wilson, and the one from him to Libertus Van Bokkelen, which are mentioned in the bill of complaint, wherein effect but a gift from Amelia D'Arcy Van Bokkelen to said Libertus, and that a question has been raised whether this gift was such a disposition as under the terms of the deed of trust therein referred to, the said Amelia was authorized to make.

3. They are also advised that a question has been raised whether or not the said "Anthony M. Johnson, trustee," can give a valid release of the mortgage mentioned in the deed, although the mortgage debt is now overdue, unless by proper proceedings in a Court of Equity it is ascertained that the said Johnson is author-

ized to receive payment of the balance due on the note secured by the said mortgage, and to discharge the said mortgage.

4. They are also advised, that a question has been made as to whether under the power contained in the codicil to the will of the said Libertus Van Bokkelen, the said Naomi Van Bokkelen is authorized to make the sale to your defendants, unless the same is ratified by a Court of Equity in a proceeding to which the other persons who, under the said will, have an interest in the said land, are parties.

5. These defendants further show unto your Honors, that by their agreement of purchase, they were to get a clear and unincumbered title in fee simple to the land so sold to them, and they are advised that by reason of the questions above mentioned, the title which the plaintiff proposes to convey to them would be open to objection, and unmarketable.

6. That they are ready and willing to take the said land and pay the agreed price for the same, provided they thereby acquire a good and marketable title in fee simple, and they therefore submit to the passage of such decree in the premises as may be proper.

And as in duty bound, &c.

Barton & Helmer,
Sols. for Defendants.

And on the same day the following submission for decree was filed:

Submission for Decree.
(Filed Sept. 9th, 1890.)