that some found within the two years, to be worthless or non-existto the lands ent, to the satisfaction of the defendant himself, who then onsequence waived any release from John Dewitt, and the pretended l, but in lieu equity in Patterson, having in fact no existence, or cited that if having long before disappeared, that the plaintiff did complete a within the two years show a good and perfect paper title, sthereafter, consisting of the patent from the Crown, and the confendant, he, veyance to him from the patentee in 1817. The legal further sum title was perfect, and there was no equity outstanding, "that if the and Mr. Freeman approved of and was satisfied with it, of the bond as found by the jury in the action at law, and as appears title to the from his endorsement on the bond. If it was not intended sfaction of that I should take as evidence in this case the facts as id did conreported in the case at law (which report was used y rfectly and both parties on the argument) then I would give leave to ." It seems examine Mr. Freeman, who, I think, could not have come ful because to any other conclusion than the one stated. It was such utstanding a title as this court would have compelled the purchaser to take, within the language of his contract. And whatsome supe father of ever technical strictness may have stood in the plaintiff's way at law in suing upon the bond, no such embarrassiod of two supposed ment exists here, in decreeing specific execution of the produced only remaining term of a contract, which the plaintiff has substantially, if not literally, performed. The decree they both must be for payment of the £100 and interest, accordupon the ing to the terms of the bond, with the usual legal rate nt that he interest from the time the last instalment was payable. plaintiff's equity in ust there-MILLER V. START. ie. There

Mortgagee-Evidence-Costs.

In a suit by a prior against a mesne encumbrancer on the argument of the cause, by consent, an affidavit was read which stated an agreement on the part of the prior encumbrancer to be postponed to the latter; when the court gave liberty to the plaintiff to cross-examine the deponent upon the statements contained in his affidavit, which permission not being acted upon by plaintiff, his bill was dismissed with costs.

Mr. Gray, for the plaintiff.

upon the

ined with

ase it, but e imagine

on of the

ning it as an equity

I think

ving been

Mr. Proudfoot and Mr. Wilkinson for the defendants, other than Start, against whom the bill was taken pro confesso.