

Lucretia Danner, his wife,	"	For Frederick County,
	"	In Equity.
vs.	"	No. 14,201 Equity.
Frank Garber, et al.	-----	

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF SAID COURT:

Thomas Danner and Catherine I. Danner, now married to Lawrence V. Riggles, by their Attorney, Sherman P. Bowers, for answer to the Bill of Complaint, respectfully shows:

1. That the both and each admit the allegations contained in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th paragraphs of the Bill of Complaint, except that in paragraph 2 (G), these respondents in reply thereto, say that the are two of the children of Thomas Matey Danner and Mae Elizabeth Danner, his wife, the said Thomas Matey Danner being a son of the said George T. (Tobias) Danner, and having died in 1912, and the said Mae Elizabeth Danner being now a resident of Frederick City, Frederick County, Maryland, and unmarried.

These respondents further say that the consent, so far as they can do so, to the passage if a decree and the appointment of a Trustee or Trustees as prayed.

WHEREFORE, having fully answered the said Bill of Complaint, these respondents pray to be hence dismissed with their proper costs, etc.

And as in duty bound, etc.

Sherman P. Bowers  
Attorney for Respondents,  
Thomas Danner and Catherine I,  
Danner.

Filed September 9, 1940

ANSWER OF HARRY W. DANNER, MABEL BARGER, CHARLES DANNER DAISY GIBBONS AND EDNA DANNER

John H. Danner and Lucretia Danner, his wife,	"	In the Circuit Court
	"	For Frederick County,
vs.	"	In Equity.
Frank Garber, et. al.	-----	Number 14,201 Equity

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF SAID COURT:

Harry W. Danner, Mabel Barger, Charles Danner, Daisy Gibbons and Edna Danner, by their Attorney, Stewart H. Brown, for answer to the Bill of Complaint, respectfully shows:

FIRST: That they and each of them admit the allegations contained in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th paragraphs of the Bill of Complaint.

SECOND: These respondents further say that they consent, so far as they can do so, to the passage of a decree and the appointment of a Trustee or Trustees as prayed.

WHEREFORE, having fully answered the said Bill of Complaint, these respondents pray to be hence dismissed with their proper costs, etc.

And as in duty bound, etc.

Stewart H. Brown  
STEWART H. BROWN, SOLICITOR

Filed September 13, 1940.

ANSWER OF IDA SHAFER, DEFENDANT

John H. Danner and Lucretia Danner, his wife.	"	In the Circuit Court
	"	for Frederick County, Maryland.
vs.	"	
Frank Garber et al.	-----	No. 14201 Equity.

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF SAID COURT:

The Answer of Ida Shafer, one of the defendants in the above-entitled case, to the Bill of Complaint heretofore filed in said case respectfully shows:

That she admits the matters and things stated in said Bill of Complaint and consents to the sale of the real estate described in said Bill of Complaint.

And as in duty bound, etc.

Walter E. Sinn  
Solicitor for Ida Shafer,  
defendant

Filed Sept. 16, 1940.