fraudulently concealed and disposed of property which ought to have been applied in satisfaction of the debt with which the

---

supersedeas, will, on application after that day be dissolved. Provided a copy of this order be served on the complainant Williams, or his counsel, or either of the superseders on the judgment so confessed, before the 7th day of March next.

In compliance with this order the plaintiffs filed another bond, in the condition of which the judgment confessed as a supersedeas was expressly recited in the usual form, which bond they submitted for approbation.

10th March, 1810.—KILTY, *Chancellor*.—The within bond is received for the present. If any objection should be made thereto, and ruled good, a further time will be fixed for the execution of another bond.

On the 7th of July, 1810, the defendant, David Stewart, put in his separate answer, by which he explained away or denied most of the principal facts and circumstances stated in the bill. And on the 6th of August, 1810, David C. Stewart filed his answer, in which he refers to, adopts, and relies upon the answer of his partner and co-defendant, David Stewart.

12th September, 1810.—KILTY, *Chancellor*.—The motion to dissolve the injunction in this case came on to be heard according to notice at the present term, and was fully argued by the counsel on each side.

In this case, as in others of a similar nature, whatever might be the result on the final hearing, it would be proper to continue the injunction if the answer was evasive and not full; if the answer did not deny the facts on which the equity of the complainants rested; and also if the books and papers, exhibited in compliance with the prayer of the bill, shewed, that the facts were different from what the defendant conceived and represented them to be. But the answer of the defendant Hall certainly contains a full and complete denial of the equity stated in the bill; and the documents called for by the complainants, go more to corroborate than to weaken that denial; and Hall's answer is also sustained by those of Stewart & Son, filed since the notice of the motion to dissolve.

Among the points, deducible from the charges made in the bill, the most important is, that the complainants Hillen and Williams were not interested with Stewart & Son in the Holstein. It would make an end of the case, and was therefore most strenuously urged by the complainant's counsel. But it is a remarkable circumstance, that, although the bill may be said to be argumentative with a view of inducing the court to believe this to be the fact, it is not in any part thereof expressly stated to be so. And the Chancellor is more particularly induced to notice this circumstance, from his recollection of having pointed it out as one of the objections to the bill that was first filed.

Upon the whole it is ordered, that the injunction heretofore issued in this case, be and the same is hereby dissolved.

The plaintiffs, by their petition, filed on the 9th of February, 1811, without oath or affidavit of any one, stated, that they believe, that further answers and documents which David Stewart could make and produce, relative to the matters and things contained in the bill of complaint, would materially promote the developement of the facts alleged in it, and particularly the following books, papers and documents, viz.: The ledger of the said David Stewart & Son, from the beginning of the year 1799, till the dissolution of their partnership; their journal, day book, &c. &c. And therefore pray, that David Stewart & Son may be ordered to