

his application for the benefit of the insolvent laws, had not been made a party, the Chancellor by an order dated the 5th of November, 1846, directed the case to stand over, with leave, by a supplemental bill or otherwise to make the said trustee a party. Such a bill was accordingly filed, alleging that upon the said application of Dent, the defendant, George T. Richards, had been appointed his trustee and duly qualified as such, and praying subpœna against the said Dent, Richards and his wife, requiring them to answer such supplemental matter.

The defendants, Richards and wife, admit in their answer to this supplemental bill, the application of Dent for the benefit of the insolvent laws as charged, and that the defendant, Richards, was appointed his trustee, and ask that the complainants may be required to file a copy of the proceedings upon his petition, that their character may be better understood.

The answer then proceeds to state, that at the time of the execution and delivery of the conveyances impeached as fraudulent by the original bill, they, the defendants, and each of them, were uninformed and ignorant of any intention or design on the part of the said Dent, to hinder, delay, or defraud his creditors, or any of them, or to injure, wrong, or prejudice, any person or persons whatever. And the said defendant, Priscilla, answering for herself, says, that the conveyances were *bona fide* executed and received, so far as she is concerned, and for a full and valuable consideration paid therefor to the said Dent. The defendant, George T. Richards, speaking as trustee, says he has no title as such to the property in dispute, and interposes no claim thereto. The defendant, Dent, did not answer the supplemental bill, but this omission was afterwards supplied by an agreement. The complainants excepted to the answer of Richards and wife to the supplemental bill, upon the ground that it responds to matters contained in the original bill to which they had previously answered, the complainants insisting that the defendants should simply have responded to the new matter alleged in the supplemental bill.

Exceptions were also filed by the defendants, Richards and wife, to the averments of the bill, 1st. Because it was not therein