

No. 4411 Equity.

Lorouse, E. L. R. Rowe
and others
vs
James A. Crudorff and
Mary E. Crudorff

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

Mary E. Crudorff, defendant, excepts to the competency and admissibility in this cause, of the following testimony of Complainants, to wit:

Mary E. Crudorff
Exceptions to Testi-
mony.

1st. To the competency and admissibility of each and every of the following interrogatories of Complainants to James A. Crudorff, and of each and every answer of said Crudorff to said interrogatories, and each thereof, to wit:

68th, 69th, 70th, 71st, 72d, 73d, 74th, 75th, 79th, 81st, 82d, 83d, 84th, 85th, 86th, 87th, 88th, 89th, 90th, 94th, 95th, 96th, 97th, 98th, 99th, 100th, 101st, 102d, 103d, 104th, 105th, 106th, 107th, 108th, 109th, 100th, 111th, 112th, 113th, 114th, 115th, 116th, 117th, 118th, 119th, 120th, 121st, 122d, 123d, 124th, 145th, 146th, 147th, 148th, 149th, 150th, 151st, 152d, 153d, 154th, 155th, 156th, 157th, 160th, 163d, 164th, 165th, 173d, 174th, 175th, 176th, 177th, 178th and 188th in chief, because the said answers to said interrogatories, and each and every thereof, are not admissible evidence against said defendant, Mary E. Crudorff, and cannot affect her rights in this cause, and she excepts severally to said interrogatories, and to the answers thereto.

2nd. To the competency and admissibility of each and every of the following interrogatories of Complainants to J. Hiram Taylor, and of each and every answer of said Taylor to said interrogatories, and each of them, to wit: 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th and 14th in chief, because said answers to said interrogatories, and each and every thereof, are not admissible evidence against her, the said Mary E. Crudorff, and cannot affect her rights in this cause.

Competent
Exceptions
In As.

3rd. To the competency and admissibility of the 3rd, 4th and 6th interrogatories of Complainants to James A. Elder, and of the answers thereto, and each thereof, because the same, and each thereof, are not admissible evidence to affect the rights in this cause of her, said Mary E.

4th. To the competency and admissibility of the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th interrogatories of Complainants to John R. Stoner, and to the answers thereto, and each thereof, are not admissible evidence against her, said Mary E. in this cause.

5th. To the competency and admissibility of the 1st and 2nd interrogatories of Complainants to Eugene L. Rowe, and of the answers thereto, and each thereof, because the same, and each thereof, are not admissible evidence against this defendant, Mary E., in this cause.

6th. To the competency and admissibility of the 3rd and 4th interrogatories of Complainants to J. W. Herring, and of the answers thereto, because the same, and each thereof, are not competent evidence against her.

7th. To the competency and admissibility of the 3rd interrogatory of Complainants to Josephus A. Crudorff, and of his answer thereto.

8th. To the competency and admissibility of the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th interrogatories of Complainants to Aloysius A. Crudorff, and of the answers thereto and each thereof, because the same, and each and every thereof, are not competent evidence against her.