1849.

Crooks.

Mr. Burns and Mr. Mowat on behalf of the petitioner.

Mr. Vankoughnet for the respondent R. J. Turner.

Mr. Galt for respondent H. J. Boulton.

Amongst the cases cited were Wood v. Wood, (a) Wickens v. Townshend, (b) Floyd v. Nangle, (c) Skip v. Harwood, (d) Curre v. Bowyer, (e) Simes v. Gibbs, (f) Moore v. Macnamara, (g) Gaskell v. Durdin. (h)

Dec. 14th.—The court this day gave judgment.

THE CHANCELLOR.—The petition filed in these suits has been framed under the 163rd order of this court, and asks the relief sought upon the facts disclosed in the accompanying affidavits. In regard to those facts (so far, at least, as they are material to the order which I think ought to be pronounced in this matter) they have been either admitted in argument, or so clearly established upon affidavit, as hardly to afford room for controversy. Those points treated at the bar as questionable, I leave out of the case as immaterial, in the view which I take of this application.

Judgment.

It appears that Leslie, Street, Burnham, and Crooks, four of the defendants in the first mentioned suit, having obtained four several judgments, and sued out executions thereon, the plaintiff, who is the son and heir-at-law of one William Crooks, deceased, filed his bill in the month of June, 1840, praying that those judgment creditors should be restrained from proceeding further upon their executions; that an account should be taken of the personal estate of William Crooks, deceased; that it should be applied in payment of the judgment debts; and in case of deficiency a sale of the reality, or of so much as might be required. Mary Crooks and James Crooks, the personal representatives of William Crooks, deceased, were made parties defendant. A special injunction, as prayed by the bill, was issued shortly after the institution of this suit; and in the month of September, 1842, a decree was pronounced by which that injunction was made perpetual; an account of the personalty was directed; and in case of deficiency a sale of the realty, as

In t
by the
of Wi
having
suit, ha
The pr
save th

the M

estate (
for and
nounced
consolid
in payn
to priori

I have much pa as in sev wanting have been some par learned continuous decision of the second second

In both Boulton, plaintiff, instituted agent of I the solicit Crooks, the of Mary tatives of second suit

It would the person the excepti has as yet l

<sup>(</sup>a) 4 Russ, 558.

<sup>(</sup>b) 1 Ru. & M. 361; Exp. Scallan, 1 Mol. 63.

<sup>(</sup>c) 3 Atk. 568.

<sup>(</sup>d) 3 Atk. 564.

<sup>(</sup>e) 3 Mad. 456. (g) 2 B. & B. 186.

<sup>(</sup>f) 2 Jurist, 418. (h) 2 B. & B. 170.