interest of Albert Segaloff is invalid but aver that the Receivers, if they did ever have possession of said real estate, that same was abandoned many years ago.

Further answering said paragraph your respondents deny that any money paid for the interest of Albert Segaloff in said real estate is an asset of the Receivership nor have they ever given bond for any interest the said Albert Segaloff may have had in said real estate.

Further answering said paragraph your respondents say that they are not in contempt of your Honorable Court, nor have they done anything that could be considered technically in contempt as it was their understanding that they had been dealing with the owners of said property since the 5th day of April, 1941, at which time they entered into a three-year lease and have been in possession of said property since said date.

After having fully answered your respondents respectfully ask that said Petition be dismissed.

William M. Storm
SOLICITOR FOR RESPONDENTS
HARRY KESSLER AND STELLA KESSLER

STATE OF MARYLAND, FREDERICK COUNTY, TO-WIT:

I hereby certify that on this 12th day of March, 1946, before me, the subscriber, a Notary Public for the State of Maryland, in and for Frederick County, personally appeared Harry Kessler and Stella Kessler, Respondents, and did each make oath in due form of law that the matters and things stated in the aforegoing Answer are true as therein set forth to the best of their knowledge, information and belief.

Notarial

Hettye A. Hahn
Notary Public

Filed March 13, 1946.

ANSWER OF ALBERT SEGALOFF TO PETITION OF RECEIVERS

BUTLER BROS., INC., A body corporate,	"	No. 14,296 EQUITY
	"	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT
vs.	"	FOR FREDERICK COUNTY
ALBERT SEGALOFF AND CHARLES A. SEGALOFF & SON	-----"-----	IN EQUITY

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR FREDERICK COUNTY, IN EQUITY:

The Answer of Albert Segaloff to the Petition of Leslie N. Coblentz and Benjamin B. Rosenstock, Receivers.

Answering said Petition, Albert Segaloff answers and says:

FIRST: That he admits passage of an order bearing date on the seventeenth day of February, in the year Nineteen Hundred and Forty-one, as set out in the said Petition .

SECOND: Answering the Second paragraph of said Petition Albert Segaloff says that the receivers appointed by the said order of the seventeenth day of February, Nineteen Hundred and Forty-one, gave bond in the penalty of Three Thousand Dollars, with corporate surety, as set out in the Petition, and your Respondent further sayd that the receivers have not paid the annual premium upon the said bond since the year Nineeteen Hundred and Forty-one, and have not treated the bond as continuing.

THIRD: Answering the Third Paragraph of the said Petition your Respondent admits that by virtue of the said order of the seventeenth day of February, Nineteen Hundred and Forty-one, the receivers took into their possession the stock and goods of your Respondent, individually, and trading as Charles F. Segaloff & Sons, and had said stock of goods appraised under orders of your Honorable Court, advertised for bids and the sale in bulk of the said stock and pending the acceptance of bids continued the operation of the store at Nos. 9 and 11 South Market Street, for a period of thirty days from February twenty-second, Nineteen Hundred and Forty-one, and employed clerks and assistants in order to keep the said store open