

Francis Denor

Puff

against

Jacob Denor and Simon Marfet

B.P.

A copy of the decree of the Court of Appeals in this cause, was received by the Clerk of this Court on the
evening thereof the 2^d day of April 1849 and is in these words-

Verdict: At a Special Court of Appeals held at the State Courthouse in the City of Richmond on
Thursday March 8 1849.

Francis Denor

Appellate

against

Jacob Denor and Simon Marfet

Upon an appeal from the
Court Superior Court of Law and Chancery held for Southampton County, on the 10th day of
April 1843, in a suit in which the appellant was Plaintiff and the appellees were defendants -

1845.
3530
40.25
Defect.

This day came the parties by their counsel, and the Court having maturely considered the transcript of the
record of the decree aforesaid and the arguments of counsel, is of opinion, that the contract stated in the bill, is
sound in a legal and sufficient consideration, and that the appellee Marfet is responsible for the con-
sequences of all impediments to an exact fulfillment of it, occasioned by his own acts, and the appellant is respon-
sible for all such as were occasioned by his acts, whether they proceeded from inadvertence, carelessness or
design - That the said appellee Marfet disabled himself from a full performance on his part, by allowing
the execution to be levied on the property of the appellant, and thereby making it necessary for him to give the
forthcoming bond - On the other hand the appellee offered to perform his contract and give the app-
pellant the full benefit of it, as soon as he was apprised by the bill of his unintentional breach of it - He
was prevented from doing so, by his having in the first instance improperly enjoined him from
proceeding against the defendant Joseph Denor, by his persisting in the Court below, and by his
appeal to the Court of Appeals in the injunction which wholly prevented the appellee Marfet
from fulfilling his contract - How far these acts may prevent the appellee from making the
money out of the other blegors cannot be known now. Justice will be attained by turning the
appellant out of a Court of equity, to sue his remedy at law, for such damages as have been
occurred by the act of the appellee Marfet. This remedy would be unavoidable, if he is allowed
to plead the Statute of Limitations - As both parties have contributed to the delay, the appellee
should be enjoined from pleading or in any manner relying on the Statute of Limitations, to
any action where the appellant may bring on the contract in the bill mentioned - Therefore it is
decreed and ordered, that the said decree be reversed and annulled, and that the appellant do pay
onto the appellee, as the parties judicially proceeding, three cents by them about their deficit
in this behalf expended - And this court proceeding to pronounced such decree as the said
Court Superior Court ought to have pronounced; it is further decreed and ordered, that the no-
junction awarded the plaintiff in this case, on the Twenty ninth day of February 1848, be dissolved,
and her bill dismissed, and that each party pay their own costs in the said Circuit Superior
Court. But this decree is to be without prej[ud]ice due to any action at law which the appellant may
be advised to bring on the contract in the bill mentioned, and that the appellee be restrained
from pleading or in any manner relying on the Statute of Limitations as a defense to such action -
Whereas it is desired to be certified to the said Circuit Superior Court -

Appellee's costs in the

Court of Appeals \$ 38.80

A Copy.

Taste. Waller C.W.