

8717

No. _____

Supreme Court of Illinois

Daniel Myers

vs.

John Malcom, Admr.

1.

State of Illinois }
 Marion County } Pleas & proceeding had
 in the Circuit Court within & for the County
 of Marion & State of Illinois in a certain cause
 heretofore pending in said Court wherein
 John Malcom administrator of the estate
 of Joseph Malcom deceased was plaintiff
 and Simon Albert was defendant.

Be it remembered that the said defendant
 heretofore to wit: on the 3rd day of July 1857
 filed in the office of the Clerk of the Circuit
 Court of said County a transcript of a judgment
 obtained against him in the County Court
 of said County and in favor of him
 the said plaintiff, which transcript
 is in the words & figures following, to wit;

At a County Court held within and for Marion
 County at the Court House thereof on Monday
 June the 13th 1857. Present Harsham Tracy Esq.
 County Judge, James S. Martin Clk. and
 Wm. Eastland Sheriff officers holding Court
 John Malcom admr of the }
 Est. of Joseph Malcom decd } Debt on
 vs } promising note
 Simon Albert }

And now at this
 day comes the said Complainant by S. L. Bryan
 his atty and the said deft. by Willard & Rogers
 his attys and acknowledged themselves

[8717-2]

2

ready for trial whereupon the said defendant
 move the Court to dismiss the Cause for want of
 declaration, which motion is overruled by
 the Court, whereupon the said defendant files
 a set off amounting to the sum of \$401.¹⁰
 and the Court after hearing the proofs and
 allegations as well upon the part of said
 defendant as Complainant and being fully
 and sufficiently advised of the premises
 Orders.

That judgement be rendered against
 the said defendant for the sum of \$61.⁴⁸
 Amt. of note and interest after deducting offset
 allowed of \$60.⁰⁰ and that Execution issue
 for same, and that the said Complainant
 do recover the amount of cost and charges in
 this behalf expended to wit:

Sheriff's fees	Witnesses fees		
\$3. ⁷⁰	James Malcom \$1. ⁰⁰	} Clerks } fees \$2. ⁵⁵	
	H. Malcom 1. ⁰⁰		
	E. Wickens 1. ⁰⁰		

State of Illinois } SS
 Marion County } St James S. Martin clerk of
 the County Court of said County do certify the
 foregoing to be a true and correct copy of the
 records now on file in my office



Given under my hand and seal of office
 at Salem this 1st day of July A.D. 1857
 James S. Martin clk.

3
And upon the filing of said Transcript and
appeal bond, as required by law - a
Summons issued in the words & figures following

To wit:

State of Illinois } ss

Marion County } The people of the
State of the Illinois: To the Sheriff of
said County - Greeting.

We command you to summon John Madem
administrator of Est. of Joseph Madem deceased
if to be found in your County to appear before
the Circuit Court of said County on the first
day of the next term thereof, to be holden
at the Court House in Saline, on the second
Monday in the month of August next to answer
Simon Albert in his appeal from a judgement
obtained against him in the Probate Court
in & for said County and hereof make due
return to our said Court as the law directs

Witness H. W. Cazan clerk
of our said Court, and the
Judicial Seal thereof this 3rd
day of July A D 1857
H. W. Cazan clk.



And at the time of filing the aforesaid trans-
cript there was also filed a notice of set
off against the promissory note herein which
is in the words & figures following, to wit.

W. L. Bryan Esq. ⁴

You will take notice that I will offer the following account as set off to the plaintiffs action and that the said plaintiff was at the time of the commencement of this suit and now is indebted as follows, to wit:

Joseph Malcomb

To Simon Albert We

1854

Sept To Money expended for ^{sd} Malcomb
On trip to Missouri 200, 00

1855

May To money paid expense of two
teams from Marion County
to Chester for furniture for ^{sd} Malcomb 5, 00
To use of two teams seven days
each hauling ^{sd} furniture \$2,50
per day 35, 00

Board washing &c from April 1st
1855 to Sept 1st 6 mo. at \$16 pr "
for self & wife 96, 00

and for board washing &c for Malcomb & wife
from Oct 1st 1855 to Feb. 1st 1856 4 months
at \$16 per mo. 64, 00

110 Boards at 1,00 per hundred 1, 10

\$ 401, 10

And afterwards to wit; at the August term
A D 1857 the following orders were made
by the Court, to wit;

5
John Malcom Admr. &c
of Joseph Malcom
vs
Simon Albert
Monday August 10th 1857
Appeal

And now at this day
came the said plaintiff by Bryan his Atty.
and suggested the death of said defendant
Whereupon Daniel Myers Administrator of
the estate of Simon Albert enters his appear-
ance herein.

Wednesday August 19th 1857
John Malcom Admr. &c
of Joseph Malcom dec'd
vs
Daniel Myers Admr. &c
of Simon Albert dec'd
Appeal

And now at this day
came the said defendants by Haynie & Willard
his Atty. & file their exception to the
deposition of said plaintiff filed in this
Cause, which exception is allowed to all
except the 1st, 4th, & 5th and on motion Eli Albert
is discharged as security in the appeal bond
herein for the purpose of making him a witness
and Logan Shelton accepted as security in his stead
who accordingly executed bond.

6.
Friday August 31st - A D 1857

John Malcom Adms &c

vs

Appeal

Daniel Myers Adms &c

And now at this day
Came the said plaintiff by Bryan his Atty. and
the said deft. by Haynie & Willard his Atlys. and
issue being joined let a jury come. Whereupon
a jury was called to wit: Rutherford Sumner,
Robert Smith, Miles Sanders, John Carter, George
Davidson, Wm Branson, Thomas H Pigg, Wm
Wilkins, John R Casley, John J Holt, J R
Oster, & Robert Clark, twelve good and lawful
men who being elected, tried & sworn well &
truly to try the issue joined after having heard
the evidence and arguments of Counsel retired
to consider of their verdict and afterwards
returned into Court the following verdict.

"We the jury find for the plaintiff \$108.57"
Whereupon the said defendant enters his mo-
tion for a new trial which is denied by
the Court. And the Court being ^{fully &} sufficiently
advised of & concerning the premises, orders
and adjudges that the said plaintiff recover
of & from the said defendant the said sum of
\$108.57 together with his costs in this behalf
expended & may have execution therefor &c
Ordered further that said deft be allowed until the 5th of
Sept. next to file his bill of exceptions here in

7
And afterwards, to wit: on the ~~day of~~
~~1785~~ the came the defendaut and
filed his bill of exceptions in the
words & figures following to wit:

9
Do it Remembered that at the
August Term of the Marion Circuit Court
A. D. 1857 a certain Cause wherein one
John Malcom Administrator of the Estate of
Joseph Malcom Deceased, was Plaintiff,
and Daniel Myers Administrator of the
Estate of Simon Albert (Deceased) was Defend-
ant) Came on for trial and said Plaintiff to
maintain his Cause introduced as evidence the
promissory note of Albert to wit. one day after
date & promise to pay Joseph Malcom the
sum of one hundred Dollars and Seven
Dollars and 75 Cents for value received of
him this April the 12th 1855 Witness my
hand and seal
Simon Albert Seal

And Defendant to prove set
off introduced witness as follows to wit.
Lavi Albert said the note referred to was
given by Simon Albert to Joseph Malcom for
money loaned by him & some of the money was
expended on trip to Missouri as I understand
from the both parties. That Albert & Malcom
traveled together he knew nothing but that
they left Illinois in September 1854. Came
back to Chester in this State last of March
1855. The note as he understood from both
parties Malcom & Albert was given for
money loaned during the trip knew nothing
of a settlement between the parties that

8.

Malcom made a contract with Albert to have the spring wagon & team was to bear the expenses of the team and did so during the trip that the note was given after they returned from Missouri that Albert had very little money when they started in 1834 that Malcom used the team of Albert but two days hauling from Chester to Nashville & then hired a team to haul his things to Richview and there shipped them on the Rail Road. That I went with Malcom & Albert to Missouri and returned with them to Chester in this State Albert paid all expenses to Missouri & back.

Thomas Sanders testified that he lived neighbor to Albert knows that Albert went to Chester after goods for Malcom & himself was gone five or six days. One of the teams belonged to Albert the other to Eli Albert, Malcom drove one of the teams went with two teams.

Says Malcom & wife stayed with Albert his son in Law at one time from sometime the first of May 1835 until last of August or first of September 1835 at an other time from some time in March until September 1836 at one time four months or there about at an other time six months board was worth two Dollars or two and one half per week each.

9. Malcom & wife were very old and feeble. did not do any work of any consequence were a great deal of trouble while there.

Cropey

Does not know that Malcom contributed anything for the support of the family might have done so, but thinks not was there frequently never saw him or the old Lady doing any work but that the old lady required a good deal of waiting upon owing to her feeble health.

U. S. G. testified that he lived neighbor to Albert and Malcom was at the ^{house} frequently knew that Malcom & wife lived at Alberts were very old and feeble does not know the exact time they were at Alberts but thinks at both times not less than eight or nine months that they were unable to do much work if any thinks they did nothing never saw them do anything it was worth two Dollars and fifty cents each to board them. saw the two teams start to Chester after the goods Albert drove one and Malcom the other were gone about one week teams were worth about two twenty five or two Dollars & fifty cents per day thinks one of the teams was Alberts the other belonged to Eli Albert Simons Brother

Cropey examined

Do not know that Malcom furnished

any provision for the family never heard
either party say anything about it.

Edo Albert testified that Simon went to Chester
after Malcoms things took two teams one
Team belonged to him and the other to Simon
that he objected to his team going on account of
the feed that teams fed on grass in prairie
but his team did go and he charged Simon two
Dollars & fifty cents per day for it was gone a
week Simon had some things there himself
to bring up.

Robert Malcom testified that he moved old
man Malcom to Simon Alberts some time in
December 1836 a short time before Christmas
that he died some time in Feb. 1837 the old
man wanted him to move him & wife to Simon,
& Simon got him to do it.

Annis Malcom testified that she knows
that Joseph Malcom & wife lived at Simon
Alberts went there some time in December
1836 and left some time in Feb. 1837 does
not know what it was worth were there
that time about two months.

Mary Moore testified she heard Malcom
say he intended to give the note referred to
to Albert heard nothing more said about it.

12

Whereupon the Plaintiff asked the Court to instruct the Jury as follows all of which instructions were objected to by the Defendant

- 1st A Promissory Note is prima facie Evidence of Settlement and is Conclusive, unless the party making the Note show that matters of account back of the Note were not taken into the settlement (or that the note was given for an independent transaction)
- 2nd That if the Jury believe from the evidence that Joseph Malcom & his wife were received into the family of Simon Albert as members thereof without any intention of charging for their board and so understood by the parties at the time he cannot recover for the board for a party is not permitted to Confer a benefit and then charge for it
- 3rd That if the Jury believe from the evidence Joseph Malcom & wife went into the family of Albert to live and furnish his proportion of the provisions for the Common family then Albert cannot recover for the board of Malcom
- 4th That in no case is positive evidence required to establish a fact. and the

Jury are at liberty to take into consideration all the circumstances of the case to determine whether there was or was not an intention on the part of Albert to charge for the team & wagon or the board of Joseph Malcom & wife.

5th That a promise to give the promissory note to Albert does not become operative till the delivery of the note unless the promise to give up the note is upon a valid consideration & must be proved to the satisfaction of the Jury.

(Judge a promise to make a gift is not binding unless upon a valid consideration)

6th That if the Jury believe from the evidence that Albert did not intend to charge for the horses & wagon or wagons when he let them go to Malcom he cannot afterward make a charge for it (and of this you are to judge from the circumstances)

And thereupon the Defendant asked the following instructions to wit which were given 1st If the Jury believe from the evidence that Simon Albert received into his family as boarders Old Man Malcom & his wife to be charged therefor

After the note in this case was given by him & so understood by the parties then the amount then the amount of the board proven is proper to be set off against the note and if the account proved over balances the note judgment must go for ^{the} Defendant for the balance given

D^d The Law implies that every person is entitled to pay for his labor & services and unless the P^{ty} shows that Simon Albert did not intend to charge for the board of Old Man Malcom & his wife the Jury must allow the amount of Board proven. (It is a matter of understanding and intention to be judged of by the circumstances of the case)

And thereupon the Jury retired and afterwards returned into open Court the following verdict.
 And the Jury find for the Plaintiff and assess his damage at \$108 ⁵⁷/₁₀₀

And then & thereupon Defendant moved the Court for a new trial. Because the verdict was against the Law and evidence and because the Court gave improper instructions. But the Court overruled the motion of Defendant for new trial and entered judgment upon the verdict aforesaid, to the doing of all of which the Defendant then and there by his Counsel excepted and now prays his Bill to be signed and sealed

Sidney Brersted

~~7~~

Dear

David Mayes
A. D. W. D.

by
John Malcom
A. D. W. D. Joseph
Malcom sen

Filed Dec. 2, 1857.
N. Johnston Clerk
Paid by Mayes \$5.00

founder in Enn

John L. Bryan A. D. W. D.

STATE OF ILLINOIS, } ss. *1st Grand Division*
SUPREME COURT. }

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,

To the Sheriff of *Marion* County,

Because in the record and proceedings, and also in the rendition of the judgment, of a plea which was in the Circuit Court of *Marion*

County, before the judge thereof, between *John Malcom Adm^r of*

Joseph Malcom Deceased - Plaintiff -

and Daniel Myers - Adm^r of Simon

Albert Deceased -

defendant, it is said that manifest error hath intervened to the injury of said *Daniel Myers -*

Adm^r of -

as we are informed by *his* complaint, the record and proceedings of which said judgment, we have caused to

be brought into our Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, at Mt. Vernon, before the Justices thereof, to correct

the errors in the same, in due form and manner, according to law; therefore we command you, that by good and

lawful men of your county, you give notice to the said *John Malcom - Adm^r of*

of Joseph Malcom Deceased -

that *he* be and appear before the Justices of our said Supreme Court, on the first day of the next term of

said Court, to be holden at Mount Vernon, in said State, on the *first Tuesday after the* Second Monday in November next, to hear the

records and proceedings aforesaid, and the errors assigned, if *he* shall think fit; and further

to do and receive what the said Court shall order in this behalf; and have you then there the names of those by

whom you shall give the said *John Malcom - Adm^r of*

notice, together with this writ.

John D. Caton

Witness, the Hon. ~~Samuel H. Treat~~, Chief Justice of our said

Court, and the seal thereof, at Mount Vernon, this *21st*

day of *October* in the year of our Lord,

one thousand eight hundred and fifty-*seven*.

Noah Johnston

Clerk of Supreme Court.

~~37~~ 7

Daniel Myers - Adm of
Simon Abit Sec D -

us } Sci fu

John Malcolm - Adm of
Joseph Malcolm Sec D
Malcolm

Not sent out - but
retained here by order
of Judge Haynie
A. Johnston Clk



ABSTRACT.

Page. DANIEL MYERS, *Adm'r &c.* } Supreme Court, November '57.
vs. }
 JOHN MALCOM, *Adm'r. &c.* } Error to Marion County.

1 John Malcom Adm'r of Joseph Malcom, Dec'd, sued Simon Albert on a note
 2 given by him to Joseph Malcom. Suit before Probate Court and judgment for
 3 Plaintiff below for \$61,48. Defendant appealed to Circuit Court and died.—
 4 Daniel Myers, Adm'r of Simon Albert made a party, and cause heard before Hon.
 5 Sidney Breese and a jury, at August Term, 1857—verdict for Plaintiff below for
 6 \$108,57—motion for new trial denied—judgment for Plaintiff.

7 Note sued on "One day after date I promise to pay Joseph Malcom, the sum of
 8 one hundred dollars and seven dollars and fifty cents, for value received of him
 9 this April the 13th, 1855. Witness my hand and seal, SIMEON ALBERT,

L. S.

DEFENDANT SETT OFF—ITEMIZED.

MALCOM to ALBERT,	Dr.
To money paid going to Missouri,	\$ 200 00.
To money paid for teams going to Chester,	5 00.
To use 2 teams 7 days, at \$2 50 each	35 00.
To boarding & washing from 1st of April '55 to Sept.	
55. six months at 16 per month	96 00.
To same from Oct. 1st '55 to Feb. '56, 4 m. at \$16,	64 00.
To 110 boards	1 10.
	\$ 401 00.

8 Levi Albert testified—He went with Malcom and Albert to Missouri and back,
 9 Albert paid *all the expenses there and back.*

8 Tom Saunders—Knows Albert went to Chester after goods for Malcom and
 himself—gone 5 or 6 days—went with two teams—one Simon Albert's and Levi
 Albert's—*Malcom and wife* staid with Albert from first of May 1855, until last
 of August or 1st of Sept. '55—at another time—from March to September '56—
 at one time 4 months at another six months—board was worth \$2, to \$2,50 each
 9 per week—Malcom and wife were very old and feeble did nothing were a great
 deal of trouble &c.

CROSS EXAMINED BY PLAINTIFF.

Dont think they contributed anything to support of family—old lady required a
 good deal of waiting on.

Hiram Torrey—Testified to same fact, that Saunders, last witness does, and
 says farther, their board worth \$2 50 each, pr week, saw two teams start to Chester,
 gone a week—teams worth \$2 25 or 50 per day—one team Simon's, other Eli
 Albert's.

10 Eli Albert—Testified that Simon Albert went to Chester for old man Mal-
 com's things—with two teams—one was Simons, the other *witnesses*—witness
 charged Simon for his team, \$2 50 per day—gone a week.

Robt. Malcom—Said he moved old man Malcom to Smon's, (deft.) in Dec. '56,
 that old man died February '57—the old man wanted to go to Simon's and Simon
 took him.

Anise Malcom—Knows that old man Malcom and wife boarded at Simon Al-
 bert's two months, from Dec. '56 until in February '57—don't know what it was
 worth,

Mary Moore—Old man Malcom said he intended to give the note to Simon.

INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN.

12 n. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6, objected to by Defendant.

ERRORS ASSIGNED.

15 1st. The Court erred giving the instructions to No. 1, to 6 to Plaintiff below.
 2nd. The Court erred in overruling defendants motion for new trial and entry
 of judgment for Plaintiff below or answer.

1st. Because the verdict is against law.

2nd. The verdict is against the evidence.

3d. The verdict is against the law and evidence.

WILLARD & HAYNIE, Pl'ff in Error.

ABSTRACT.

Nov. Term, Sup. Court, 1857.

Daniel Myers, Ad. &c.

Vs.

John Malcom, Administrator &c

Error to Marion County.

WILLARD & HAYNIE, Plt'f in Error.

54. The verdict is against the law and evidence.
55. The verdict is against the evidence.
56. Because the verdict is against the law.
57. Judgment for Plaintiff in law and evidence.

1st. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry
2d. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry
3d. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry

4th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry
5th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry

6th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry
7th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry

8th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry
9th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry

10th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry
11th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry

12th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry
13th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry

14th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry
15th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry

16th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry
17th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry

18th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry
19th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry
20th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry

21st. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry
22nd. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry
23rd. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry
24th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry
25th. The Court were in error in their judgment for new trial and entry

HAYNIE & WILLARD, Plt'f in Error.

Filed Dec. 12, 1857
A. Johnston

JOHN MALCOM, Adm'r. }
DANIEL MYERS, Adm'r. }
vs. }
HAYNIE & WILLARD, Plt'f in Error.

ABSTRACT.

State of Illinois }
Jeff. County } 1st Grand Division Sup Ct,

Daniel Myers administrator to
Pluff. in Error.

vs

John Malcom administrator to
Aft in Error.

A. Hunter Clerk.

In Plene issue writ of
Error directed to the clerk of the circuit Court of Monroe
County Ill. requiring him to send up a duly certified record
of the proceedings had before the Circuit Court of said
County in a certain case tried and determined in said
Court at its August term 1857 wherein, John Malcom
administrator of Joseph Malcom Dec^d, was pluff, and
Daniel Myers administrator of Seneca Albert Dec^d, was
Aft in which 2^d Cause said pluff below received
Judgment against said Aft. Also issue a scire
facias directed to the staff of said County requiring
him to summon said Malcom administrator to be
at the Sup Court for 1st Grand Division on
the first day ~~of~~ of the next term thereof to be
held at Mt Vernon Ill 1857. then to
hear Error to

Oct 21st 57.

J. H. Kays
W. H. Miller
for Pluff in Error

~~34~~
7

Daniel Myers Adm^{ty}
Sina Albert Deed
Pliff in error

as } Prucep

John Malcolm Adm^{ty}
Joseph Mallen Deed
Deft in error.

Jilou Octobr 21. 1857
A. Johnston Ck

X

[Faint, illegible handwriting in the background, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

ABSTRACT.

Page. DANIEL MYERS, *Adm'r &c.* } Supreme Court, November '57.
vs. }
 JOHN MALCOM, *Adm'r. &c.* } Error to Marion County.

1 John Malcom Adm'r of Joseph Malcom, Dec'd, sued Simon Albert on a note
 2 given by him to Joseph Malcom. Suit before Probate Court and judgment for
 3 Plaintiff below for \$61,48. Defendant appealed to Circuit Court and died.—
 4 Daniel Myers, Adm'r of Simon Albert made a party, and cause heard before Hon.
 5 Sidney Breese and a jury, at August Term, 1857—verdict for Plaintiff below for
 6 \$108,57—motion for new trial denied—judgment for Plaintiff.

9 Note sued on "One day after date I promise to pay Joseph Malcom, the sum of
 one hundred dollars and seven dollars and fifty cents, for value received of him
 this April the 13th, 1855. Witness my hand and seal, SIMEON ALBERT,

L. S.

DEFENDANT SETT OFF—ITEMIZED.

MALCOM to ALBERT,

	Dr.
To money paid going to Missouri,	\$ 200 00.
To money paid for teams going to Chester,	5 00.
To use 2 teams 7 days, at \$2 50 each	35 00.
To boarding & washing from 1st of April '55 to Sept.	
55. six months at 16 per month	96 00.
To same from Oct. 1st '55 to Feb. '56, 4 m. at \$16,	64 00.
To 110 boards	1 10.
	\$ 401 00.

8 Levi Albert testified—He went with Malcom and Albert to Missouri and back,
 Albert paid *all the expenses there and back.*
 8 Tom Saunders—Knows Albert went to Chester after goods for Malcom and
 himself—gone 5 or 6 days—went with two teams—one Simon Albert's and Levi
 Albert's—*Malcom and wife* staid with Albert from first of May 1855, until last
 of August or 1st of Sept. '55—at another time—from March to September '56—
 9 at one time 4 months at another six months—board was worth \$2, to \$2,50 each
 per week—Malcom and wife were very old and feeble did nothing were a great
 deal of trouble &c.

CROSS EXAMINED BY PLAINTIFF.

Dont think they contributed anything to support of family—old lady required a
 good deal of waiting on.
 Hiram Torrey—Testified to same fact, that Saunders, last witness does, and
 says farther, their board worth \$2 50 each, pr week, saw two teams start to Chester,
 gone a week—teams worth \$2 25 or 50 per day—one team Simon's, other Eli
 Albert's.
 10 Eli Albert—Testified that Simon Albert went to Chester for old man Mal-
 com's things—with two teams—one was Simons, the other *witnesses*—witness
 charged Simon for his team, \$2 50 per day—gone a week.
 Robt. Malcom—Said he moved old man Malcom to Smon's, (deft.) in Dec. '56,
 that old man died February '57—the old man wanted to go to Simon's and Simon
 took him.
 Anise Malcom—Knows that old man Malcom and wife boarded at Simon Al-
 bert's two months, from Dec. '56 until in February '57—don't know what it was
 worth,
 Mary Moore—Old man Malcom said he intended to give the note to Simon.

INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN.

12 n. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6, objected to by Defendant.

ERRORS ASSIGNED.

15 1st. The Court erred giving the instructions to No. 1, to 6 to Plaintiff below.
 2nd. The Court erred in overruling defendants motion for new trial and entry
 of judgment for Plaintiff below or answer.
 1st. Because the verdict is against law.
 2nd. The verdict is against the evidence.
 3d. The verdict is against the law and evidence.

WILLARD & HAYNIE, Plt'ff in Error.

ABSTRACT.

Nov. Term, Sup. Court, 1857.

Daniel Myers, Ad. &c.

Vs.

John Malcom, Administrator &c

Error to Marion County.

Page

DANIEL MYERS, Adm'r, &c.

JOHN MALCOM, Adm'r, &c.

Error to Marion County.

Superior Court, November 27.

ABSTRACT.

8717

Official

HAYNIE & WILLARD, Plt'ff in Error.

Filed Dec. 10. 1857
A. J. [Signature]

WILLARD & HAYNIE Plt'ff in Error.

34 The verdict against the law and evidence.
35 The verdict is against the evidence.
36 Decrees the verdict is against the
37 judgment for plaintiff below or answer.
38 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
39 of judgment for plaintiff below.
40 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
41 of judgment for plaintiff below.
42 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
43 of judgment for plaintiff below.
44 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
45 of judgment for plaintiff below.

46 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
47 of judgment for plaintiff below.
48 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
49 of judgment for plaintiff below.
50 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
51 of judgment for plaintiff below.

52 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
53 of judgment for plaintiff below.
54 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
55 of judgment for plaintiff below.
56 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
57 of judgment for plaintiff below.
58 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
59 of judgment for plaintiff below.
60 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
61 of judgment for plaintiff below.

62 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
63 of judgment for plaintiff below.
64 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
65 of judgment for plaintiff below.
66 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
67 of judgment for plaintiff below.
68 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
69 of judgment for plaintiff below.
70 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
71 of judgment for plaintiff below.

72 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
73 of judgment for plaintiff below.
74 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
75 of judgment for plaintiff below.
76 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
77 of judgment for plaintiff below.
78 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
79 of judgment for plaintiff below.
80 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
81 of judgment for plaintiff below.

82 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
83 of judgment for plaintiff below.
84 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
85 of judgment for plaintiff below.
86 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
87 of judgment for plaintiff below.
88 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
89 of judgment for plaintiff below.
90 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
91 of judgment for plaintiff below.
92 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
93 of judgment for plaintiff below.
94 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
95 of judgment for plaintiff below.
96 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
97 of judgment for plaintiff below.
98 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
99 of judgment for plaintiff below.
100 The Court erred in overruling defendant's motion for new trial and entry
101 of judgment for plaintiff below.

No
Malco

Error to Marion

8717

Affirmed