

Palmyra Feb. 26th 1836.

Dear Brother. You may have sold your right to real and personal as well as father ours as there is no doubt but the bargain was the same but none of us have released for any thing but the real estate according to the release themselves and for the sum of \$197 if I remember right not having them at present in my possession having left them with my attorney - the balance then of the \$300 which each rec'd. was for the personal which is quite a different division from that of Robert in this same case. You acknowledge and it is perfectly clear to me now that when you and father settled that you did not know what you were doing otherwise there could have been no settlement on such terms. For father to sell what he had already in his hands is ridiculous - no man of sense would believe such a thing - then what did he sell. Why if any thing our share of those notes and Bonds taken by Grandfather of some of his children which Sawyers always contended could be collected and I believe father thought so too or he would hardly have lifted Boals note. but in this they as well as yourself were mistaken. Grandfather in his will charged those that had got money from him either by receipt note or Book account and allowed them to receive an equal share counting what they had received and said nothing about paying back if any had got too much & notwithstanding the will was set aside it appears it still makes a difference from that when there is no will at all. ^{Mr. G.} Fadden it is true brought his action against father as Executor but at the same time claimed as much as would make his share equal with all the rest out of the notes and the balance in father's hand \$1311.11 and succeeded in the Circuit Court of Lebanon county but on father's appeal to the Supreme Court that decision was set aside and he got but a proportionate sum out of the \$1311.11 to what he and others had rec'd. amounting to nearly the half after the widow's third was taken off. In opposition to his claim of a share of those Notes father's attorney read the will in evidence before the Supreme Court that it was not Grandfather's intention that they should be collected and it was admitted pretty much on an established precedent that so soon as money has passed from father to son or daughter it becomes theirs if it should be the half of his estate and cannot be collected.

unless expressly mentioned so to be in the instrument itself and that in his life time. After a Will is set aside the person who was executing it is reduced to an administrator properly having no other powers and as father in his inventory as executor had given an account of the whole personal estate there was no necessity for an administrator in the case not knowing it however he took out letters of administration which only confused matters but could not make them worse on any other ground which were considered all when father's account as executor was contested in both the orphan and Supreme Courts - even Doak's payment of that note was before the final action of the Courts on that account and yet it was not taken in and the balance struck at \$111.11 out of which Mr Fadden recovered: but nothing else. What do Attorneys know about a Case - nothing, you must tell them and then they often do not comprehend you and then you lose. I wrote several letters to my attorney considering that the best plan of stating and enforcing my views and knowledge of the matter because if one endeavors to talk them into one view they take offence as if one were dictating to those who knew better and we consequently agreed though not without some dispute about what was best to be done. He then drew up a declaration setting forth the facts only, stating the time Grandfather ^{deceased} and what had been done since &c, and that he had left an real estate of 250 acres which the complainant has ever since held and that the estate so far as father was concerned as executor or administrator was according to the decisions of the Supreme Court on his executor acct. and the case of Mr Fadden ~~is~~ completely settled and I asked to be discharged from any further liability in it: which the Court ordered, with this proviso unless exceptions should be filed before the next Court of which my attorney was to notify me but has not as yet and I am in great hopes that ^{them} will be none filed which will leave the thing better than it ever was. And if he does I feel confident that I can sustain my declaration which will be better as that would settle it in toto. No one of the heirs not even Joseph has received by receipt, note and Doak account as much from Grandfather as would have amounted to their shares of the whole estate real and personal if it had been lawfully settled & the land sold and equally distributed.

That agreement with the heirs is a very faulty thing making the
signers only liable to the amount of \$600 and it written the promise
to pay making it joint obligation only. but still I have none
to fear but Hoals and from them there is a letter acknowledging
their liability to pay a greater amount. You say father neglected
to sue Clokey, Allen and Sarah McDonald for their shares of
those costs but you are mistaken for the Supreme Court had not
finally acted on fathers account unto after they had allowed
their share to Sawyer and father could not know that he
would have to pay those costs himself and afterwards look
to those who had articulated with him and again he might
have thought that they would draw equal shares out of the
ballance in his hands in which he was also mistaken for it
was divided as I have already mentioned leaving all ^{but} ^{had} \$150 to
us and Mr Fadden. Father signed that writing and as we tribute
the amount at stake of any of the others we thought to pay im-
position which would swallow up all our shares of what was
in his hands. Since I have examined the affair I feel perfectly
easy about it: confident that he cannot collect a cent, he is
not a little tickled at your idea of compromising between
- you the most passionate the least able to bear a difference of
opinion of the three full brothers of us to act as mediator and
that when justice is wholly on one side of the question another
mine!!! When the thing came out that he could not make a
title it surprised the whole country and he let out who was
the cause and threatened vengeance which I was told. Let
the person know that I disregarded him. but still if he
would pay for it I would endeavor to exonerate him. But
you know he was and will always be a fool and yet you
talk of mediating - tut tut. If he will come to me and say settle
this matter and give me the means I will. But on "Compulsion"
I will prove a ^{ry} Hatstaff in his hands. No Administrator has
any control over real estate unless there is not sufficient in his
hands to pay the debts until the heirs petition Court to dispo-
se of it when the order the sheriff and twelve men to appraise it
when ^{the} eldest are notified to take it at the appraisement

and then the next and if none are willing to do so then the
court orders the administrator to sell and distribute otherwise
he cannot even collect the rents: such is the law here. I threaten Sawyer
if he put me to any further trouble I would call him to account for
his mothers estate on which he administered and filed an Inventory
of \$5 or \$10 but never settled an account which his oath required
him to do within a year. I believe he will have to acc^t. for the third
of the rents to the acct of Grandmother with interest. I was married
to Jane McBay of Palmyra on the 23rd inst. I will not leave home till
the first of May. All well. Aunt Man is ugly but otherwise well enough.
John Geddes
William Geddes

Palmyra Pa
Febry 25th
1836

Mr John Geddes
Postoffice
Michigan

25

