

Died 1765 in Ålebyn, Norra Råda fs, Värmlands län. [1] 1/4 out of 1/6 in star
 fjärdingshmt Åleby, Råda sn, which Per Nilsson ibd redeemed by his
 sister Ingeborg Nilsson for 25 Rd ct equally Ingeborgs and her
 husband Håkan Larssons in Västra Hedetorp given deed dated 11.2
 1723, offered for Per Nilsson in Åleby 1gggn [93] Håkan Larsson in
 Västra Hedetorp came with accusations against his brother-in-law Per
 Nilsson's in Åleby taken legal action on Håkan's wife Ingeborg
 Nilsson's fixed inheritance 1/4 out of 1/6 in fjärdingshmt Åleby,
 because Håkan denies having given Per up there letter of purchase.
 However, Håkan Larsson admits that he is guilty of Per Nilsson 27 Rd
 ct after his bond issued on 13 February 1719, which is why he pledged
 his wife's accrued inheritance land to the unpaid wife and did not give
 his consent. Due to the fact that Per Nilsson, on the 13th of October
 1724, had his sister Ingeborg Nilsson's inheritance in Åleby sold, but
 Ingeborg's parents are still alive and that she thus has no inheritance.
 So it was reasonably tried that this legal speed had to rest in the
 condition it may have already come and Håkan Larsson in Västra
 Hedetorp was ordered (?) To pay his acknowledged debt 27 Rd ct to
 Per Nilsson in Åleby without delay. [94] 202. By Nils Persson in Åleby,
 Per Persson claimed at the same time to be allowed to return his
 grandfather Per Nilsson's sister through a purchase to her nephew Nils
 Persson in Åleby leased part in Åleby on her behalf. fasting letters why
 and as a part of the same home is so completely through commotion
 and fasting prayers (?) under Nils Persson that all fatalities for Per
 Persson to its returning past were. For this reason, Nils Persson, in the
 capacity of the 1720 ordinance (?) (?), Will be released from Per
 Persson's debt burden, which for unjustified trial Nils Persson should
 be satisfied with 1 rd ct. Against the previous verdict, Per Persson
 appealed with 3 dlr smt intra fatalia during the good law of the Court of
 Appeal, which is why he was considered to take a lawsuit so early that
 he may send the same party 6 weeks before the next court session.
 [95] 163. With the assertion that legal proceedings may stop for Per
 Nilsson in Åleby on the 2/3 in the 1/4 homestead Åleby which the still
 alive Nils Persson there on 5.7 1736 bequeathed to his son Per
 Nilsson with the admission that thereby get legal danger, now sued on
 behalf of his wives Britta Nilssons in Kvarnäs and Ingeborg
 Nilssons in Västra Hedetorp on behalf of Elof Börjesson and Håkan
 Larsson over which after obtaining an explanation from the defendant

2a

through studiosus Jonas Piscator was dismissed, the court reasonably tries that the law may have won the same will legal force stay for Per Nilsson on the aforementioned property in support of § 3 Chapter 18 ÄB who leaves the nearest heirs after the testator's death and received knowledge of the will night and year open to blame such which fatalities would be these plaintiffs cut off against the same law- - - [96] 226. In an appeal in this case against Brit Nil Nils in Kvarnäs and Ingeborg Nilsson in Västra Hedetorp against Per Nilsson in Åleb. y regarding the fact that he had to keep a legal record of their mother Gunilla Bernhardsdotter's estate left behind and regarding inventory preparation of their father Nils Persson's surviving estate as well as regarding alleged payment for any work and any cost he incurred only the plaintiff and Commissioner Daniel Cruse, their counsel, but the defendant did not appear, yet it now suffered towards the end of the thing; for which reason he was nevertheless proved by Sergeant Algot Dejenberg and Jon Olofsson's testimony in Lakene to be legally agreed: talk about this in the following ruling: For with regard to the alleged inventory of Gunilla Bernhardsdotter's surviving estate, the plaintiff must admit that she was dead more than 20 years ago, without the parties now present being able to prove that they (?) to guard and enforce over (?) her right of inheritance after her, for preferably since her husband lived for many years after her in another marriage, the defendant, who has not received her estate, can now (?) be sentenced over her property against 5 § 15 chap ÄB to occupy some other inventory, than that which her husband established after her, that he nevertheless under oath should them u as being with him equally interested in the documents of the mortuary and interested in the record of the father's property, so since the defendant was shown to live with his surviving widow, Botilla Jonsdotter, he has no less than she, to refrain from honestly proving it after the father's death over his estate left established inventory correctness according to Chapter 9 of the same code, otherwise regarding the disputed receivables and cost so because no ready invoice or anything

volume_up

content_copy

26