

Mary E Orendoff demanded through her said solicitor, that said trustees should offer said parcels at sale, and ascertain whether or not the same would sell for the said sum of \$4000 before they should sell any other portion of said land and that they should forbear to sell any more of said land in case said parcels should realize the said sum of \$4000; and they state that said trustees refused to comply with said notice and demand, and refused to offer said parcels, and proceeded to sell said land in bulk or in one body in defiance of said notice and demand, and they state that the sum of \$4000, is more than enough to pay said claims, costs and expenses. And further that a good and sufficient purchaser is now, and will be ready & willing to bid and pay said sum of \$4000 for said parcels of said land on which the buildings are erected as aforesaid, and they state that in refusing to offer the same as demanded the said trustees transcended and violated their duty.

2nd. That after selling for \$4500, the lands reported as sold to said Francis H Orendoff which sum is greatly more than sufficient to pay all claims in said cause, and supposed the said Trustees proceeded without any cause or reason, to sell the other parcel of land reported by them to have been sold to Ephraim Bentley, and that in so doing the said Trustees transcended their duty.

3rd. That said Trustees had no rightful power under said decree to sell any more of said lands than were necessary to be sold to pay and satisfy the claims of the complainants in the bill in said cause mentioned, and all costs & expenses, and that that they did sell more than necessary as aforesaid.

4th. That said Trustees did not make any effort or inquiry to ascertain whether or not said land could be advantageously divided and any part thereof sold according to their duty under said decree.

5th. That the said proceedings of said Trustees in making said sales was arbitrary and oppressive, and in violation of the rights of the Defendants.

Whereupon the Defendants James A Orendoff and Mary E Orendoff pray that said sales reported by said Trustees and each thereof may be set aside, and not ratified by the Court.

Filed August 22, 1883.

Wm P Maulsby  
Attorney  
Sole for Objectors

Affidavit  
Support

Eliza Conner et al  
vs  
James A Orendoff et al } No 4411 Equity  
In the Circuit Court for  
Forsyth County

The answer of Fred J Nelson & C. D. S Levy, Trustees, to the objections to ratification of sale filed by James A & Mary E Orendoff

Answer of Trustees  
to  
Objectors to ratifi-  
cation of Sales

These respondents for answer to said objections say: That they have in all things conformed their action in the premises to the decree of your Hon. Court passed herein, as affirmed by the Court of Appeals; and that they have in no particular transcended or violated their duty, or in any manner acted arbitrarily, oppressively or in violation of the rights of the objectors, and that no sufficient cause is assigned by objectors for setting aside said sale.

Filed September 5, 1883

Fred J Nelson  
C. D. S Levy  
Trustees

Court's Order Ordered by the Court this 8th day of September 1883 that the objections to the ratification of the sales reported by the Trustees in this cause, filed by James A and Mary E Orendoff