No. 6131. Equity.

William H. Wagner
vs.
Horatio Eiler and Susan M. Eiler his wife, and George T. Buckey.

No. 6131 Equity.
In the Circuit Court for Frederick County, in Equity.

The Answer of George T. Buckey, one of the defendants in the above cause to the Bill filed

This defendant admits the allegations of said Bill necessary for him to answer, and consents to the passage of a decree for the sale of said real Estate, providing the purchase money be applied after the payment of Costs and Expenses, to the payment of the amount due on said Mortgages which is as follows on the Mortgage for $1120.00 there is due of the principle $923.33 and interest thereon from may the second 1892. on the Mortgage for $1400.00 the entire principal with interest from April 4th 1893.

Filed June 5th 1893.

Geo. T. Buckey

Answer.

Answer of Horatio Eiler and wife

William H. Wagner
vs.
Horatio Eiler and Susan M. Eiler his wife et al

No. 6131 Equity
In the Circuit Court for Frederick County in Equity.

To the Honorable the Judges of said Court.

The joint and several answers of Horatio Eiler and Susan M. Eiler his wife to the Bill of Complaint of William H. Wagner filed them and George T. Buckey in this Court filed.

1. In response to the first paragraph of the Bill of Complaint, these respondents and each of them deny that the said Horatio Eiler was ever indebted to said William H. Wagner as is alleged in said paragraph and say that he is not indebted as alleged.

2. In response to the second paragraph of said Bill of Complaint these Respondents and each of them admit the Execution of the deed Exhibited as Exhibit No. 4. to the Bill but deny that the said sum of five dollars was never paid by said Susan M. Eiler and deny that the same was never intended to be paid by her.

3. In response to the third paragraph of the Bill of Complaint these respondents and each of them deny that the deed from Horatio Eiler to his wife Susan M. Eiler was made for the purpose of hindering, delaying and defrauding the Creditors of said Horatio Eiler out of their just claims and they deny that the same was made for the purpose of hindering, delaying and defrauding the plaintiff and they deny that the same was without Consideration.

4. In response to the fourth paragraph of the Bill these Respondents admit the Execution of the Bill of sale Exhibited as Exhibit No 5 to the Bill but they and each