

*Pleasant Grove.*" This is a designation of one entire tract of land of such a name; it is not as seems to have been supposed, a sale of an uncertain part of a tract of land called "*Pleasant Grove*;" and therefore the description of this parcel also is sufficiently certain. *Thirdly*, of "one tract of land called *Duvall's Pleasure* or part of *Duvall's Pleasure.*" This is a designation of one whole tract having the one or the other of two names, and is, therefore, a sufficient description. *Fourthly*, of "one tract of land called *Teukesbury* and a part of *Teukesbury* and *Walker's Delight.*" This description also clearly refers to and designates one parcel of land as a whole and not as a part of a tract. And *lastly*, of "a tract of land called *Friendship.*" This description is confessedly sufficient.

Hence it clearly follows, that as this return is sufficiently descriptive in its several parts, it must be so considered as a whole, and when taken altogether. Consequently this plaintiff, who has been thus returned as the purchaser, has thereby obtained such a valid right to the lands held by the defendant *Nathan Waters*, as entitles him to have the fraudulent deeds complained of set aside so far as they at all interfere with his claim.

Whereupon it is decreed, that the said deed bearing date on the 17th day of February, 1824, and also the deed bearing date on the 29th day of August, 1825, and the records thereof be and the same are hereby set aside and declared and directed to be held, deemed and taken to be utterly null and void to all intents and purposes whatever, so far as the same may interfere with or in any manner affect the right and claim of the said plaintiff *Charles Duvall*, unto the several parcels of land specified in the said return to the said writ of *feri facias*, by which it appears he became the purchaser thereof as in the proceedings mentioned.

defendants may obtain a rule for further proceedings, &c. This will either oblige the complainant soon to take out a commission, or will soon put him out of court. And if a commission be taken out, a little diligence and vigilance on the part of the defendants will obtain an early return of the commission; or put it in their power to shew, that delay is sought by the complainant.

Now in cases of injunction, obtained on filing the bill, the Chancellor has always thought it his duty to discourage, as much as he could, consistently with a fair administration of justice, all studied or needless delay on the part of the complainant.

It is ordered, that the injunction in this cause heretofore issued, shall continue until final hearing or further order.

After which, on the 17th of December, 1803, by direction of the plaintiff, the injunction was dissolved, and the bill dismissed with costs obtain an early termination of this cause, the Chancellor must aver, that little delay

has proceeded from this court. He will go further, as he conceives he may do with propriety, and suggest what is proper to be done for expediting the cause. The