

May, 1822, in which he admits, that he is one of the tenants in **559** *possession of a part of the premises mentioned in the bill of complaint; and says, that his testator purchased of a certain Samuel Young and Francis Young, on the 10th of September, 1804, for a valuable consideration, and without notice of any claim of the said complainant or the heirs of the said Anthony Hook.

On the 19th of July, 1822, the defendant King put in his answer, in which he says, that he, on the 29th of March, 1819, took a lease from John Cator for a lot of ground fronting on Goodman street thirty feet; and that he is ignorant of, and entirely unacquainted with any of the matters or things set forth in the bill of complaint.

The defendant Chittenden put in his answer, on the 26th of November, 1822, which, it was agreed by the plaintiff, should be received without oath, in which he says, that he held the possession of a lot of ground on Alice Anna street, which John Hook, as administrator of Anthony Hook, had sold and conveyed to Patrick Bennett, from whom it was passed by several mesne conveyances to this defendant, all of which conveyances he is ready to produce and prove as this Court shall direct; that this defendant, and those under whom he claims are *bona fide* purchasers for a valuable consideration, without notice of any claim of the plaintiff or the heirs and representatives of the said Anthony Hook.

The defendant Weaver, on the 16th of January, 1823, put in his answer, which was also, with the consent of the plaintiff, received without oath, in which he says, that in the year 1819, he obtained a lease of a part of the ten acre lot from the defendant McMechen; and that he is a *bona fide* purchaser for a valuable consideration, and without notice of any claim of the plaintiff or of the heirs and representatives of Anthony Hook, deceased.

On the 7th of February, 1823, on the petition of the plaintiff, leave was granted so to amend the bill as to make James Hook a defendant, who on the same day put in his answer, which he styles his separate answer "to the amended bill of complaint of James Neale," &c.; and says that he is the only child and heir-at-law of John Hook; but as to all the other matters set forth in the bill he is ignorant, and therefore leaves the plaintiff to prove the same.

After which, on the 28th of July, 1824, the plaintiff, with the leave of the Court, filed a supplemental bill; the only material difference between which and the original bill is, that the supplemental bill, as it is called, says, "that the said Anthony Hook left, at his death, four children; the said John Hook, who administered upon *his estate, and into whose hands and possession the same passed, by virtue of the said administration, **560** since deceased, leaving one child, James Hook, one of the defendants to this bill; and three daughters, Margaret Knight, Catherine