

The separate answer of John Sharp to the Bill of Complaint filed by John Brabson and others against Wm. Henserson & others in the Chancery Court at Sevierville.

This Respondent saving and reserving to himself all manner of benefit from the many errors mistakes in said Bill contained, for answer thereto or to so much thereof as he is advised is material, answering says: accord- to his best recollection, some time previous to or about the year 1817 he was informed by Major James P.H. Porter that he, Respondent, had been appoint- a Trustee of Nancy Academy in Sevier County. Respondent told Major Porter that owing to his feeble health it would not be practicable for Respondent to attend the meetings of the Trustees at Sevierville or perform the duties incumbent on him as a Trustee- Major Porter insisted that Respondent should go up to Sevierville & attend some of the meetings of the Board of Trustees, accordingly Respondent did go up and was present at one meeting perhaps about January 1817 as well as Respondent can now recollect. Respondent believes this was the only meeting of the Trustees of said Academy which he ever attended and at this one there was no business done as well as Respondent now recollects- Respondent informed the then Trustees that owing to his infirm health and the distance he lived from Sevierville that it would be impossible for him to continue a Trustee or discharge the duties of one and from that time to the filing of Complainants Bill Respondent has had no participation directly or indirectly with the sd Trustees in the management of the funds or in any thing else touching said Academy- Respondent knows nothing in relation to the two acres of ground charged to have been donated by Thomas & McMahan to the Trustees for the use of the Academy, nor does he know any thing whatever about the said Lots being adversely held. Respondent does not know any thing in relation to the purchase from M.C. Rogers of the Brick House & Lots spoken of in Complainants Bill, nor whether the price was reasonable or extravagant- Respondent supposes the Trustees thought a House necessary and that the price asked was a reasonable one or they would not have made the purchase. In relation to the funds of the Academy, this Respondent has no knowledge whatever- He has never known of their receiving any thing until he saw the fact stated in complainants Bill- If there were funds belonging to the Academy (and Respondent supposes there were) he had no hand or agency in their control or management and cannot therefore state the amount of either principal or interest- Respondent has never seen the Book or Record kept by the Trustees, but he supposes it would exhibit a correct statement of the funds and their management. Respondent is equally ignorant of the disbursements made by the Trustees of said Academy nor can he state the objects or amounts of the same. In conclusion it may be proper for Respondent to observe that he does not know certainly that he ever was a Trustee of sd Academy- No record of the fact can be found & Respondent knows nothing on the subject except what he was informed by Major Porter as hereinbefore stated. One thing however is certain and that is, that this Respondent has had no agency in the control and management of the said Acade- my or its funds and he protests against being held responsible for the con- duct of others. Respondent regrets he is not able to answer more fully and specifically the various allegations in Complainants Bill, but owing to his age and infirmity he has been unable even to see or visit those of whom he could get the necessary information.

Alexander & Lyon, solicitors

John Sharp

Ack., before Edmund Hodges, J.P., 9th April 1842