"The committee, in all the views in which they have been able to consider this subject, find themselves compelled to adopt the conclusion, that the prayer of the petitioner ought not to be granted. They therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the petitioner have leave to withdraw his petition."

"Mr. Claude moved to strike out the report, and the question was put and determined in the negative. The question was then put, Will the Senate concur in the report and assent to the resolution? Determined in the affirmative." (r)

2d May, 1825.—Bland, Chancellor.—In this case the defendant, Hugh Thompson, by his counsel, on the 11th of April last, moved the court to grant an appeal from its order of the 12th of February last, and thereupon filed and offered an appeal bond for the approbation of the Chancellor. The motion was permitted to lay over until the plaintiffs could be heard; after which their counsel appeared, and asked to be allowed further time to reply, in writing, to the defendant's motion, which was granted; and on the 28th of the last month, a written argument, on the part of the plaintiffs, in opposition to the motion, was accordingly submitted to the Chancellor. The parties having been thus heard, the motion has been deliberately and maturely considered.

The Chancellor took some pains, after a very careful research into all the authorities within his reach, to explain the reasons and grounds on which he founded the order of the 12th of February The greater part of the debatable ground, occupied in the discussion of the motion for that order, was as to its foundation,as to the kind of admissions, or state of things which would warrant its being made. The court was, therefore, explicit upon that subject. But, whether such an order was interlocutory or finala "decretal order" or not, was neither mentioned in argument, nor considered by the court. The investigation of the nature of the basis of such an order being a matter of much importance, was however, made with great care; because, upon its being ascertained, whether that basis was solid and uniform, or loose and shifting, depended the very interesting question presented in that argument-whether such orders were likely to be attended with good or ill consequences; or whether they were, or were not capa-

<sup>(</sup>r) The Chancellor's case, post 595.