

13th of December, 1830, the executors King and Hebb, filed objections to an allowance of any of the claims now filed, or which might hereafter be filed, &c. Some time after which, the matters in controversy were finally adjusted by an agreement among the parties, and the case so closed.

409

* JONES v. STOCKETT.

LEGACY TO ONE FOR LIFE WITH REMAINDER OVER.—INVESTMENTS.—INTEREST ON ANNUITY.—RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF TRUSTEES.—PARENT AND CHILD.—REMOVAL OF TRUSTEES.

A legacy to a woman directed to be put out on good security, and the annual interest to be paid to her during her life, remainder to her children should not be placed in the hands of her husband on any terms, or be lent on mere personal security. (a)

The legatee for life, of such a legacy, should be heard as to the mode of putting out the legacy; the Court, considering itself as *ex officio* guardian of the interest of those in remainder, the legacy was, on the suggestion of the legatee for life, invested in bank stock; and the loss of interest, which might have been made, from the time the money was brought into Court until it was invested, was directed to be borne by the legatee for life. (b)

An annuity, like a pecuniary legacy, in general, carries interest only from one year after the death of the testator; the exceptions to this rule.

Under the head of just allowances a trustee may be allowed a fee paid to a solicitor for advice in relation to his trust. (c)

A complaint, that a trustee holds the trust fund in his hands idle and unprofitable, necessarily implies that it should be brought into Court and invested.

There are few cases in which trustees may not decline to act without direction of the Court. (d)

Although a trustee may have no pecuniary interest in the subject, yet he has duties to perform, in regard to which he should keep the Court correctly informed.

In what cases, and how far the Court will interfere with the relations of parent and child.

In what cases the Court will remove or discharge a trustee, after he has accepted the trust.

THIS bill was filed on the 16th of October, 1823, by Samuel Jones of Joshua, and Ann his wife, against Richard G. Stockett and Henry Wayman. The bill states that Larkin Shipley, on the 19th of Feb-

(a) See *Evans v. Iglehart*, 6 G. & J. 172, note (c).

(b) See *Gray v. Lynch*, 8 Gill, 403, note (b); *Murray v. Feinour*, 2 Md. Ch. 418.

(c) Approved in *Laroque v. Candole*, 4 Md. Ch. 348. See also *Hagthorp v. Hook*, 1 G. & J. 305.

(d) See *Abell v. Brown*, 55 Md. 217.