The word "maturity" construed to be equivalent to the words "lawful age" as used in this section. Carpenter v. Boulden, 48 Md. 129. As to releases to executors, see art. 79, sec. 1.

An. Code, 1924, sec. 148. 1912, sec. 143. 1904, sec. 142. 1888, sec. 143. 1798, ch. 101, sub-ch. 14, sec. 12. 1896, ch. 255.

151. Any administrator or executor shall be entitled to appoint a meeting of persons entitled to distributive shares or legacies, or a residue of a decedent's estate, on some day by the orphans' court named and appointed, on petition, and distribution or payment may be then and there made under the court's direction and control, subject, however, to such adjournments from time to time as the court shall deem proper to order; and where the parties in interest are known and reside in the State of Maryland they may be notified under order of court by summons issued to any county in the State; and when they are non-residents of the State and are known, they may be notified under order of court by published notice, as hereinafter provided, of the day of meeting as aforesaid, and the object of it; and when the places of residence of the persons in interest are unknown, or when the parties in interest are unknown, or when it is not known whether the persons in interest be actually living or dead, they may be proceeded against as non-residents, and in all cases when the parties are non-residents, or may be proceeded against as non-residents, as aforesaid, the court may order notice to be given by publication in one or more newspapers, stating the time and purpose of the meeting, and warning such person or persons, if known, and all persons interested as distributees, legatees or otherwise in the residue of the decedent's estate to be and appear in person, by guardian, solicitor or agent, on or before the day named in such order for distribution or payment, and such notice shall be published as the court shall direct, not less than once a week for four successive weeks, thirty days before the day named in such notice for distribution and payment to be made; and distribution and payment as aforesaid made under the direction and control of the court shall protect and indemnify the administrator or executor acting in obedience to it.

This section referred to in deciding that under a District of Columbia statute the settlement of an administrator's account, which stated the manner of distribution of the residue of the estate, was not res judicata of distributee's rights. Claudy v. Duvall, 5 F. (2nd), (Ct. Apps., D. C.), 384.

At hearing under this section, where court decided in favor of one group of claimants

on the ground of greater intrinsic weight of testimony, held that trial court is in better position to judge and findings of fact will be sustained unless they are not supported by clear weight of evidence. Hampson et al. v. Brundige, 168 Md. 59.

Cited but not construed in Oxenham v. Mitchell, 160 Md. 273; Watkins v. State, 162 Md. 616; Marriott v. Marriott, 175 Md. 571.

The duty of ascertaining who the legatees are rests upon administrator or executor and next were ascert in but at a truth and provides simple method of protesters. State at Brown.

and not upon court; but statute provides simple method of protection. State v. Brown, 170 Md. 97.

Ordinarily it is safer for an administrator to follow the course pointed out by this section, but he is not compelled to do so. Payment may be made either before or after the passage of account. Biays v. Roberts, 68 Md. 513; Donaldson v. Raborg, 28 Md. 56; Am. Agri. Chem. Co. v. Scrimger, 130 Md. 392.

In most cases an administrator is safe in acting under this section. The requirements of this section must, however, be complied with. Shriver v. State, 65 Md. 282; Clarke v. Sandrock, 113 Md. 423; Scott v. Fox, 14 Md. 396; Conner v. Ogle, 4 Md. Ch. 450. Cf. Wilson v. McCarty, 55 Md. 283.

The petition, order of court and publication, held to have been in compliance with this section. This section is valid—distribution held to have been made thereunder. Garrett v. Kerney, 107 Md. 503. Cf. Scott v. Fox, 14 Md. 397; Conner v. Ogle, 4 Md. Ch. 450.

Ordinarily an administrator can safely proceed under this section, but in a dispute as to who are entitled to decedent's estate as next of kin, where certain of claimants are non-residents, resort may be had to a court of equity although a day has been set