

No, 9811, Equity,

.....

mary M, Forrest one of these respondents, did not join in the Execution of the last mentioned deed, but they deny all and singular, the Other allegations Contained, in the Fourth paragraph, of said Bill of Complaint,

Fifth; that they specifically deny the allegations" That the title of the said Winnie Forrest, to said real Estate to said real estate, was acquired through said or either of them, and they further Specifically deny that the said Harry M, Forrest ever intended or desired to revoke the deed dated March 21st, 1916,

Sixth; That they Neither admit nor deny the allegations contained in Fifth paragraph, of said Bill of Complaint, but demand proff as to the truthfulness, of the same,

Seventh; they Neither admit nor deny the allegations contained in the sixth paragraph, of said Bill of Complaint, (which allegations these respondents, cannot admit, in the absence of authenticating Proof,) yet they deny that said persons are "Judgment creditors, of the parties Having an Interest," in the real estate involved in this suit,

Eighth;- That while it may be true S.W, George, & Co., V, Kaplan Co., Charles A, Carlisle, and R,b, Wenner, are Creditors of Winnie B., Forrest, as alleged in the Seventh, paragraph of said Bill of Complaint, (Which allegation these respondents cannot admit, in the absence of authenticating proof) yet they deny that said persons are "Judgment Creditors, of the parties having an interest" in the real estate involved in this suit,

Ninth; That the Respondents further say, they are advised that, the deed of March 21st, 1916, although executed by Harry M, Forrest when he was not Sui Juris (which averment they do not admit,) is not void, but Voidable only, subject to the right of the said Harry M., Forrest, to disaffirm the same upon attaining his majority

Tenth; that these respondents furth say, that this essential act of disaffirmance or repudiation has nver taken place, but on the contrary the said deed dated March 21, 1916, having never been avoided, vacated or revoked, the same is valid and effective, the said Deed having been ratified and confirmed, vesting in the said Harry M, Forrest, the title to said real estate therein mentioned as tenants in Common, and any subsequent conveyance such as that attempted to be made on January 16th, 1916, as evidenced by "Exhibit B, is a Nullity, inoperative, unenforceable an Void,

Eleventh, that your Honorable Court, is without Jurisdiction in the premises and the Plaintiffs have no right, title, or interest in the Sub-ject Matter of this suit,

Wherefore these respondents fully answered, pray to be hence dismissed with Costs,;

And as in duty, Etc.,

Lee, Weinberg,
Solicitor for the defendants,

.....

Answer of George W, Forrest, Widower,

Charles A, Carlisle, et al.,	0	No, 9811, Equity,
	o	
Vs,	o	in Equity
George W, Forrest, Et al.,	o	

To The Honorable The Judges of Said Court;-

The answer of George W, Forrest, Widower, to the Bill of Complaint, of Charles A, Carlisle, et al., in your Honorable Court, against this Defendant and Others Exhibit This respondent says;

1- That he admits the first and second Paragraphs, of said Bill of Complaint,

2- That he admits the allegations Contained in the third paragraph, of said Bill of Complaint,

3- That he neither admits nor denies the allegations of the fourth paragraph, of said Bill Of Complaint,

4; That he neither admits nor denies the allegations contained in the fifth Sixth and seventh paragraph, of said Bill of Complaint,

Wherefore this respondent having fully answered said Bill of Complaint, prays to be hence dismissed, with costs,

And as in duty bound, etc.,

René S. Hupp.

Solicitor for Respondent,