pointment.[11] But as the wardship of a female infant under an appointment of guardian by the Orphans Court terminates at her age of eighteen years or marriage, the jurisdiction of Chancery to appoint a guardian for a female infant above eighteen and under twenty-one would seem still to exist, see Davis v. Jacquin, 5 H. & J. 109; Fridge v. the State *supra;* and it was expressly affirmed in Waring v. Waring, 2 Bl. 673. The general authority of Chancery in the appointment of guardians is very fully gone into in Corrie's case, 2 Bl. 488, where the Chancellor held that the Court of Chancery, in all cases where the jurisdiction of the ordinary tribunals falls short, and there was a wide range of such cases (though since his time in some respects contracted), might, upon petition without suit, appoint a guardian for an infant and provide for his education and maintenance and the management of his estate.[12] There the father, the natural guardian, filed a petition, stating that his brother had died in the island of Trinidad, leaving a considerable real and personal estate, which he had devised to the children of his brothers and sisters,—that the children of the petitioner had become entitled under the will,—and that, by the laws of Trinidad, the estate so given them could only be recovered by their guardian; wherefore he prayed that he might be appointed such guardian, and he was appointed accordingly, and required to give bond with security in the Chancery Court. But, ordinarily, the father, if living, is the natural guardian of a female infant after her age of eighteen years, see Smith v. Williamson, 1 H. & J. 147. See as to foreign guardians, Kraft v. Wickey, 4 G. & J. 332; *in Re* Dawson, Dawson v. Jay, 2 Sm. & G. 199.

Testamentary guardians.—In general, the testamentary guardianship is preferred to all others, and the power of the father to appoint a guardian extends, under the Statute, to all his legitimate children under twenty-one years of age and unmarried at his decease, and so he may appoint a guardian to all his children born or to be born, and the guardianship extends to children by a then existing or any future marriage, *Ex parte* Earl of Ilchester, 7 Ves. Jun. 348.

---

[11] **Notice to parents.**—Such notice must be by summons if the parent is within reach of process of the court, or by publication, if beyond it. Verbal notice is insufficient. Where the appointment of such guardian is made without due notice to the parent, the latter is not restricted to an appeal directly from the order of appointment, but may impeach is validity and regularity by petition or other proceeding in the Orphans Court filed within thirty days after actual knowledge of the appointing order. Redman v. Chance, 32 Md. 42. Cf. Stanley v. Safe Dep. Co., 88 Md. 407.

[12] Conferring jurisdiction on the Orphans Courts to appoint guardians did not divest the established jurisdiction of chancery. Norris v. Baumgardner, 97 Md. 534. It seems, indeed, that the latter jurisdiction is especially reserved under Code 1911, Art. 16, sec. 96.

A guardian appointed by an equity court has precedence over one appointed by an Orphans Court and can compel the latter to deliver up money received for the ward; as per decision of the lower court by McSherry, C. J., & Motter, J., in Norris v. Baumgardner, 97 Md. 534.