

Deere

1. a 12226 to Mary Ann Willhite, are adults, all living in the State of Maryland. ~ The defendants are Sarah Ida, G. W. Martha E Willhite, living in the State of Maryland, Lucy Jane Koil, Charles Koil, Myrtle Koil, living out of the State of Maryland. All the defendants are infants under twenty one years of age. The complainants are all adults. ~

To the 2nd Sub: I did know Daniel Willhite, who was the son of Conrad. He died in the month of February, in the year 1870. He left children and grand children as mentioned in my answer to the 1st Interrogatory. Jane E. Mary E and Daniel Willhite, died during the lifetime of the said Daniel their father. Jane E, died leaving two children, Sarah Ida, George W Willhite, Mary E. married to James Koil, died leaving children, Lucy Jane Koil, Charles Koil and Myrtle Koil, Daniel died leaving one child, Martha E Willhite, all of whom are infants under twenty one years of age. The children of the said Daniel, son of Conrad Willhite are among the complainants in this cause, and have the names, are of the age, and reside as mentioned in my answer to the 1st Interrogatory. ~


Jane E. Willhite, married to David E Willhite, Mary E. married to James Koil, Witness does not recollect whom Daniel married. The rest are married as mentioned in my answer to the 1st Interrogatory. ~

To the 3rd Sub ~ I know the land upon which Daniel Willhite lived at the time of his death, I look at Exhibit No. 2. Said Exhibit does describe said land, It is part of the same land devised by Conrad Willhite to his sons Daniel and William by his last Will and Testament Marked Exhibit No. 1. Daniel Willhite was in possession of said land at the time of his death.

To the 4th Sub. ~ I think it would be better for the land mentioned in these proceedings to be sold. There are so many heirs that the division of it would be in very small portions. But one part of it lies against the public road, and it would cost a great deal to get an inlet if it was divided. I think it would be to the interest of all parties interested to have the land sold, and proceeds divided among the parties entitled. ~

To the last Sub: I know nothing else. ~

There being no other witnesses to be examined, and neither party desiring further time for the production of his evidence the Commissioner closed the said Commission and herewith returns the same under his hand and seal, together with Exhibits Nos. 1 & 2 filed by the complainants as evidence in this cause, this third day of September, in the year Eighteen Hundred and Seventy.

Francis Brungle 
Commissioner

Costs of this Commission
 Commissioner's fees \$16.00
 William H. Croen Witness .75
 William Beane " .75
 John Rouzer " .75
 Sheriff's fees 1.20
 \$19.45

Francis Brungle 
Commissioner

Endorsed

"The execution of this Commission will appear by certain Schedules thereunto annexed."

Filed Sept. 3rd 1870 ~

Francis Brungle  Court