In answer to this part of the petition, Ann Maria Pfeltz says, "she denies positively that she ever told the petitioner that the proceedings in the said suit were stopped or stayed, or otherwise led him into error in regard to the proceedings;" and no proof is produced to show that she did mislead him upon the subject.

It seems to me, adopting the language of the Court of Appeals, "that if upon the application of this party, thus guilty of disregarding the process of the court, its decrees are to be revised and changed, a lax principle of practice will be established, which will be productive of the most serious consequences in the administration of equitable jurisprudence."

There is another insuperable objection to entertaining this petition, supposing it may assume the character of a bill of review, and that is, that it was filed more than nine months from the date of the decree; it having been settled by the Court of Appeals, that the limitation of time as to appeals from the decrees of the court applies to the right of filing bills of review. *Berrett* vs. *Oliver*, 7 *G. & J.*, 207.

The children of Julius Peter Pfeltz were not parties to the bill upon which the decree passed, and are of course not bound by it. Their rights are, therefore, supposed to be unaffected; but the father, the petitioner, was, and his petition, for the reasons stated, must be dismissed.

HANDEL M. HAYDEN
vs.
DAVID STEWART, JR. } JULY TERM, 1849.

[JUDGMENT—LIEN OF.]

A JUDGMENT rendered in any one of the county courts in this state is not a lien upon lands lying in another county, until the plaintiff, in the mode pointed out by the acts of 1794, ch. 54, and 1795, ch. 24, has transferred his judgment to such other county.

Judgments, when liens at all, are general liens upon all the lands of the defendant, continuing for twelve years, and fasten as well upon those lands which the defendant held at the time of their rendition, as upon those subsequently acquired.