in Chancery. 2d Because the Court has no power to Decree that Deeds of Manumission be recorded after the expiration of the time within which the Law directs them to be recorded. 3d Because the said Deed was never perfected by delivering either to the petitioners or to any other person for their use and Richard Darnall was not bound in Law to execute the same.

H Magruder for Vicks & Darnall.

And the said Cause thus standing and being continued from term to term until February Term Eighteen hundred and seventeen then Come the parties as aforesaid here again into Court and the Complainants by their Solicitor as aforesaid file proof of the due publication of the Order of publication aforesaid which said proof is as follows. To Wit.

Aramanta & Letty Chew & others by John Davis their next friend.

against

The heirs and Devisees of Richard Darnall.

In Chancery September 11th 1816.

The object of the petition is to obtain a Decree for recording a Deed of Manumission executed by Richard Darnall on the tenth day of May 1805. for manumitting and setting free the Complainants. It is therefore upon Adjudged and Ordered that the Complainants by causing a Copy of this Order to be inserted three successive Weeks in The Maryland Republican before the 1st day of October next give notice of this application and the substance and object thereof that any person who may be interested may appear in this Court in person or by Solicitor of this Court before the 1st day of February next to shew cause if any they have wherefore a Decree should not be passed as prayed.

True Copy. Test. Thos H Bowie. Reg. Cur. Can.

Annapolis February 13th 1817. I certify that the above Order has been published in The Maryland Republican three successive Weeks. For John Chandler. Thos I Leakin.

And afterwards George Medkiff and Dorothy his Wife come here into Court and file their answer as follows. To Wit. The Answer of George Medkiff and Dorothy his wife to the petition of Aramanta Chew and others heretofore filed in this Honorable Court. These Respondents now and at all times hereafter saving and reserving to themselves the benefit of exceptions to the manifold uncertainties and untruths in thes said petition contained for answer thereunto or to so much thereof as they are advised that it is material for them to answer unto answereth and saith. That one of these Respondents Dorothy is one of the heirs of Richard Darnall mentioned in the Complainants petition and who has since intermarried with your other respondent George Medkiff. They admit that Richard Darnall did in his life time execute and acknowledge the Deed of Manumission mentioned in the petitioners petition but which Deed of Manumission they allege was not recorded agreeably to the Laws of this State but remained unrecorded until