

as between husband and wife. How husband might settle money upon his wife. *Bayne v. State*, use of Edelen, 62 Md. 104. See also *Farmers' Bank v. Jenkins*, 65 Md. 248; *Hinkle v. Wilson*, 53 Md. 292; *Sabel v. Slingluff*, 52 Md. 132; *Oswald v. Hoover*, 43 Md. 368.

A transfer from the husband to wife held to be a fraud as against creditors, and that the wife was not *bona fide* engaged in business, so as to be protected by sec. 7 of Code of 1888. *Manning v. Carruthers*, 83 Md. 7.

Quære, as to whether a transfer of certain notes to the wife was not void under this section. Case remanded that this question might be determined. *Luckemeyer v. Seltz*, 61 Md. 325.

No acquisition of property passing to the wife from the husband after coverture is valid if the same has been made in prejudice of the rights of the latter's subsisting creditors, and a deed by the husband to the wife for a simulated consideration will be treated as a fraud upon his creditors. Conveyance held void. *Reismeyer v. Norwood*, 117 Md. 333.

Voluntary conveyances from a husband to his wife are void as against existing creditors. Necessary parties. *Sudler v. Sudler*, 121 Md. 59.

Wife's property protected from husband's debts.

Where property held by husband and wife as tenants by the entireties is mortgaged by the husband, the purchaser of husband's interests is not entitled to possession as against wife. Such property cannot be subjected to the husband's debts. *McCubbin v. Stanford*, 85 Md. 390.

A claim for damages for personal injuries is not "property." The words "in any other manner," construed. *Samarzevosky v. Baltimore, etc., Ry. Co.*, 88 Md. 480. (See sec. 5.)

Where a suit is against a husband and wife jointly for the wife's tort, art. 45, sec. 1, of Code of 1860 (relative to the wife's property not being liable for the husband's debts), did not prevent the wife's separate estate from being levied on. *Brown v. Kemper*, 27 Md. 673.

For a case involving a merger as affected by spirit and intent of act of 1853, ch. 245, secs. 1 and 2 (protecting the wife's property from husband's debts), see *Clark v. Tennon*, 33 Md. 90.

For cases involving effect of acts of 1841, ch. 161, 1842, ch. 293, and 1853, ch. 245, in connection with the constitutional provision to effect that the legislature should pass laws protecting wife's property from husband's debts, see *Clark v. Wootton*, 63 Md. 116; *Schindel v. Schindel*, 12 Md. 313.

For cases involving act of 1842, ch. 293, sec. 1 (enabling married women to become seized of property), see also *Mutual Ins. Co. v. Deale*, 18 Md. 47; *Bridges v. McKenna*, 14 Md. 266; *Logan v. McGill*, 8 Md. 469.

The wife's real estate acquired before 1853, is exempted during her life from execution for husband's debts. The same rule holds when the real estate is converted, save affected by the husband's curtesy. Art. 45, sec. 1, of Code of 1860, was intended mainly as a revision or embodiment of pre-existing statutes. *Rice v. Hoffman*, 35 Md. 350. And see *Smith v. McAtee*, 27 Md. 436; *Taggart v. Boldin*, 10 Md. 116; *Logan v. McGill*, 8 Md. 469.

Act of 1853, ch. 245, did not impair or alter the marital rights of husband in his wife's property, but placed it beyond reach of his creditors. *Masterman v. Masterman*, 129 Md. 171.

At common law, wife's personal property acquired during coverture, including *choses in action*, vested in husband and was liable for his debts. If notes and bonds were not reduced into possession by the husband during coverture, they passed to wife's administrator under act of 1798, ch. 101. *Crane v. Gough*, 4 Md. 328; *Peacock v. Pembroke*, 4 Md. 282. See also *Hubbard v. Barcus*, 38 Md. 180; *State v. Krebs*, 6 H. & J. 31; *Wylie v. Basil*, 4 Md. Ch. 329.

For cases arising under art. 45, secs. 1 and 2, of Code of 1860, relative to the protection of wife's separate property from husband's debts, see *Clark v. Wootton*, 63 Md. 117; *Armstrong v. Kerns*, 61 Md. 366; *Willis v. Jones*, 57 Md. 366; *Frostburg Bldg. Assn. v. Hamill*, 55 Md. 315; *Frazier v. White*, 49 Md. 7; *Keller v. Keller*, 45 Md. 276; *Willis v. Jones*, 42 Md. 423; *Hill v. Hill*, 38 Md. 184; *Hubbard v. Barcus*, 38 Md. 180; *Schull v. Murray*, 32 Md. 16; *Krone v. Linville*, 31 Md. 145; *Buchanan v. Turner*, 26 Md. 6; *Weems v. Weems*, 19 Md. 344; *Unger v. Price*, 9 Md. 557.

Limitations.

This section applied to bar suit brought nine years after last conveyance to husband and wife. *Davis v. Harris*, 170 Md. 610.

The rules previously pertaining to coparceners now apply to entireties, except that neither can by separate action defeat the survivorship. *Schilbach v. Schilbach*, 171 Md. 405.

Act of 1892, ch. 267 (prescribing a period of limitations), cannot be construed retroactively, as in that case it would be unconstitutional. Where a creditor sues within three years from the adoption of said act, he is not barred as to conveyances executed prior to act. *Manning v. Carruthers*, 83 Md. 7.