

to take further testimony, in relation to the claims, and questions indicated in the foregoing opinion,
Filed June 24, 1878.

John A. Lynch
W. Veins Bowie
Judges of the Circuit Court

Lyle Griffiths Louisa Griffiths
his wife (vs) Hollie K. Griffiths
John C. Hardt, & Hiram Keefer
trading & as Hardt, & Keefer

No. 4183. Equity
In the Circuit Court, for
Frederick County.

Claim of
Statute of
Limitations

The Defendants Lyle Griffiths Louisa Griffiths, his wife, and Hollie K. Griffiths as to the claims of the Creditors against the Estate of the said Thomas Hammond d.c. filed in this cause subsequently to the filing of the Bill of Complaint herein say that the same are barred by the Statute of Limitations and that they rely upon the bar of said Statute against them
Filed July 17, 1878.

Milton G. Womer
Fred J. Nelson
Sols for Defs

Hardt, & Keefer
(vs)
Lyle Griffiths

No. 4183 Equity.
In the Circuit Court, for Frederick
County, sitting in Equity.

Answer
Against
Supplemental
Answer

The Complainants by W. H. Ross & Wm P. Maulsby, Jr. their attorneys by way of answer why the Petition filed by Lyle Griffiths and others for leave to file a Supplemental answer say: - 1st - That the Original answer expressed fully & clearly that the Respondents admit that the personal property of which Col. Hammond was possessed at the time of his death, was insufficient for the payment of his debts but deny that said personal property so left, by Col. Hammond added to the real estate, described by said alleged will to be sold for the payment of debts was insufficient to pay the just debts of Col. Hammond and insist that said personal property left by Col. Hammond and the land devised to be sold was sufficient to pay debts and the complainants insist that this is the meaning which Petitioners in their Petition allege is the correct one -
2nd Because there is no ambiguity whatever in regard to the language used in the Original answer.
3rd Because the Court and Counsel for Complainants as also the Counsel for Defendants who prepared the Original answer all understood the language in the way alleged by said Petitioners to be the true one -
4th Because said Petition does not show fairly & finally what is proposed to be put in by way of supplemental answer in this the Original answer admits that the personal property left by Col. Hammond