

Dickinson College Archives & Special Collections

<http://archives.dickinson.edu/>

Documents Online

Title: Letter from John Reed to John Brock

Date: May 11, 1846

Location: I-SpahrB-1940-1

Contact:

Archives & Special Collections
Waidner-Spahr Library
Dickinson College
P.O. Box 1773
Carlisle, PA 17013

717-245-1399

archives@dickinson.edu

Carlisle. May 11. 1846.

Dear Sir.

I rec^d your letter on Saturday, upon my return from Juniata Court. I find the questions you propose are of a vexed sort and not readily settled. I look in the 2 vol of Keely Com: 3^d Edⁿ page 236 & see the notes - & have referred to - also also the 4th Edⁿ of ^{on} Chubb's Contracts: 153 etc & the notes - can refer to.

at Com. law. a feme covert, could not make a deed. She can only do so by virtue of our act of ass^{embly} 10th Dec. 177. She must be of "full age" & it must be so certified. I doubted at first if the deed be good & was not Void - not voidable. But I think our Supreme Court decided, perhaps in Cook & Laflin D. S. & R. that when the acknowledged of a married woman in deputation, she may confirm it afterwards. It would in that case be voidable. I suspect that I have not fully investigated - that though a right of redemption was reserved, yet a fee simple was vested in Jane, and if she suffered a long time to elapse after the death of her husband, no provision to be made

Made

or look any positive benefit under the tale
that it would be considered a confirmation
as to the right of her heirs. I don't think
the mere omission to affirm or disaffirm the
Deed after the known of age or discovery -
could defeat the right of any one of her children,
it could require some act equivalent
to a confirmation, or something that
would settle her - her heirs in equity
from denying the validity of the Deed.

The right of the children after her death,
I have no doubt would be preserved,
and each one could act for him self and
could not prejudice the claim of the
other. Unless some very decisive evidence
exists - of rendering it inevitable that
for any one of her children to claim
his right, I would think upon tender-
ing the Deed. then from him, he could never
see his undivided interest. "No one

Can see with great certainty what
might be the result without a trial
as I should think it worth a contest.

I am very busy preparing for the paper
and what will meet in a few days. I
trust you had a warm apology for the
unpleasant manner in which I
have expressed the inquiry.

My R & Mrs M. please
them respects. I please another
an offering of my high respect.

John

ELLSIE
MAY
12
1854

Wm Brock Esq
Atty at Law
Philadelphia



Carlisle May 11, 1846

Dear Sir

I recd your letter on Saturday, upon my return from Juniata court. I find the questions you propose are of a vexed sort and not readily settled. Look in the 2 vol of Keats Com: 3d Edn page 236 etc and the notes - & cases referred to -- also also [?], Edn & [?] [?] Contracts 153, etc etc and the notes & cases referred to.

At com. Law a femme [?] could not make a Deed. She can only do so by Virtue of an act of assembly. [?????] She must be of "full age" & it must be so certified. I doubted in fact if the Deed referred to was not Void - not voidable. But I think Am Supreme Court decided, perhaps in Cook vs Cosill & C. vs. R. that when the acknowledgement of a married woman is deputed, she may confirm it afterwards. It would in [?????] be voidable I expect. Tho' I have not fully investigated it. That maybe a night of [?????], yet a few simple [?????] in Love, and if she suffered a long time to elapse, after the death of her husband, improvements to be made or look any [?] benefit under the sale that it would be considered a confirmation and bar the right of her heirs. I dont think the mere omission to affirm or disaffirm the Deed after she becomes of age or Discouvert could defeat the right of any one of her children, it would require [?????] equivalent to a confirmation - or something that would stop her & her heirs in equity from denying the validity of the Deed. The right of the children after her death, I have no doubt would be personal and each one could act for himself and could not prejudice the claims of the others. Unless some very [??] exists - rendering it inequitable now for any one of her children to raise his right, I would think upon tendering the amt. due from him, he could [?] his undivided interest. No one can act with exact certainty what might be a result without a trial and I should [?????]

Letter from John Reed to John T. Brock. (Page 2)

I am very busy preparing for the Superior Court which will meet in a few days. I must on that account apologize for the unsatisfactory manner in which I have answered the inquiry.

Mrs. R. & Mrs M [?]; their respects & please accept an apology & my high respect.

John Reed.

(On verso) John P. Brock Esq

Atty at Law

Philadelphia

Postmarked Carlisle May 12 Pena.