

decree, it must have been the intention of the court to reserve all the rights and equities of the parties for its consideration and adjustment after the sale had been made.

10th April, 1826.—BLAND, Chancellor.—This case has been very elaborately argued, and is now presented to the court for the purpose of being finally closed. It appears to have been warmly contested in every stage. It has been partly decided, but there yet remains much to be judicially considered and determined.

There is no principle, in relation to the administration of justice, which it is more important to preserve, or more necessary to adhere to, than that there must somewhere be an end to litigation. A matter which has been once solemnly decided, ought not, nor cannot be reheard and readjudicated; controversy must have an end, or society could have no peace. Errors of an inferior tribunal may be corrected by a superior; and even the same court, under certain circumstances, will correct its own mistakes by motion, petition, or bill of review. But no court of justice can allow itself to be engaged in the endless task of weaving and unweaving; of progressing to an adjudication, and then going back to readjudicate. Hence, whatever has been heretofore determined in this cause must now be considered as finally settled, and in every respect unalterable, except by bill of review, appeal, or in the regular course of law. (a) This does not seem to have been directly controverted in the argument; but the counsel differ widely as to the nature of the decree of May, 1822, and as to how far it extends over the matter of this suit; and some arguments have been urged which, if yielded to, might lead the court unwarily to trench upon the confines of that decree.

The first inquiry, therefore, is, how much of this case yet remains to be judicially passed upon. This case was originated on the equity side of *Baltimore* County Court, and has been removed into this court according to the act of assembly authorizing such removals. It stands here now as it would have stood had it continued there, or as if it had been begun and instituted here, and these proceedings are to be so considered. They have not been affected by any mere circumstance of place or tribunal, but are here as if they had all passed under, and been sanctioned by the judicial authority of the present Chancellor, and will be treated accordingly.

The complainants came into court as the creditors of *Henderson & Rogers*, of both and each of them. The plaintiffs complain,

---

(a) Attorney General v. Bowyer, 3 Ves. 725.