

Issued the 26th day of June A.D. 1935

Eli G. Haugh

Clerk

To the Sheriff of Frederick County.

E. Austin James
Solicitor

The Defendant is required to file his answer or other defense in the Clerk's office within fifteen days after the return day mentioned above, but the personal attendance of the defendant at Court on the return day is not required.

Sum. and copy left with him. Roy M. Hiltner, Sheriff.

(Filed June 27, 1935)

EQUITY SUBPOENA

State of Maryland, Frederick County, to wit:

THE STATE OF MARYLAND.

To Arthur D. Lambert (near Feagaville, Frederick County, Maryland) of Frederick County,
Greeting:

YOU ARE HEREBY COMMANDED. That all excuses set apart, you personally appear before the Judges of the Circuit Court for Frederick County, sitting as a Court of Equity, to be held at the Court House in Frederick, in and for Frederick County, on the FIRST Monday of September 1935 to answer the Amended Bill and Complaint of Katherine V. Lambert For appointment of Trustee, etc. against you in said Court exhibited, and so forth.

Hereof fail you not, as you will answer the contrary at your peril.

Witness the Honorable Hammond Urner, Chief Judge
of said Court the 1st day of July

A. D., 1935

Issued the 20th day of August A.D. 1935

Eli G. Haugh

Clerk

To the Sheriff of Frederick County:

E. Austin James
Solicitor

The defendant is required to file his answer or other defense in the Clerk's office within fifteen days after the return day mentioned above, but the personal attendance of the defendant at Court on the return day is not required.

Sum. and copy left with him. Roy M. Hiltner, Sheriff.

(Filed August 22, 1935)

ANSWER TO BILL OF COMPLAINT

Katherine V. Lambert	"	No. 13,118 Equity
Vs.	"	In the Circuit Court
Arthur D. Lambert	"	for Frederick County.

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF SAID COURT:

The answer of Arthur D. Lambert to the Bill of Complaint filed against him in this cause, says:

FIRST: Answering the first and second paragraphs your respondent admits the matters and things therein contained.

SECOND: Answering the third paragraph your respondent admits that the real estate is incapable of partition or division without loss and injury but avers that whilst it may be to the best interest and advantage of his former wife to have said real estate sold, and the proceeds divided and he hereby consents to the sale yet it would be a considerable hardship on him as it is now used and has been used for a long period of time as a home for himself and