plaintiff really desires to be furnished with these minuter details he will have no difficulty in explaining his purpose by a special interrogatory. *Alsager* v. *Johnson*, 4 *Ves.* 217; *Norway* v. *Rowe*, 1 *Meriv.* 347; *Beaumont* v. *Beaumont*, 5 *Mad.* 51.

Hence it clearly appears, that a defendant, in making answer to a bill, cannot be permitted, in any manner, to stray beyond the confines of the case therein set forth; or to bring within those limits any thing which can afford no degree of that information asked for by the bill; or which can have no influence upon the case; or which cannot be, in any way, needful to him as a defence against the claims and pretensions of the plaintiff. Upon these principles, in the case now under consideration, I cannot pronounce the various allegations of this answer, designated by the plaintiff as additional matter, to be entirely impertinent and foreign from the subject in dispute.

It is admitted, that the defendants have fully and sufficiently responded to all that has been asked of them by the bill. But the defendants having a right to set forth the matters on which they mean to rely as a defence against the plaintiff's claim have done so; and it is against those positions of the answer, that all the plaintiff's objections have been directed. These defendants, in the suit at law, have relied upon the plea of *plene administravit;* and in their answer to this bill they do, in effect, shew how they mean to sustain that plea. They here state, as the substance and foundation of their defence, that they had reasonable ground to presume, that the claim of the plaintiff had been satisfied, or abandoned, arising from the length of time during which the dispute had loitered or slumbered in the Court of law; from no demand having been made upon them, after they had given notice by publication according to law, which notice had been repeatedly delivered into the house of the plaintiff's testator, who had for many years resided near these defendants and their testator; and before * a distribution of the surplus had been made among his next of kin. *Boydell* v. *Drummond*, 11 *East*, 144. *note;* **405** *Leeson* v. *Holt*, 2 *Com. Law Rep.* 349; *Wright* v. *Pulham*, 18 *Com. Law Rep.* 271. It is true, that these matters might, without danger of inaccuracy, have been sufficiently set forth in a more condensed manner and with fewer words; but I cannot consider them as irrelevant, or say that they have been so very diffusively set forth as to amount to impertinences which should be expunged.

But these defendants have exhibited, as a part of their answer, a copy from the records of the Orphans' Court of their second administration account, and of the distribution of the surplus of their intestate's estate. This I hold to have been wholly useless and unnecessary; because their administration accounts, or the mode in which they had administered the estate of their intestate, was in no way questioned, or called for by the bill; nor were any