

Opinion of the Court.

HICKS v. KNOST.

CERTIFICATE FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
SIXTH CIRCUIT.

No. 512. Submitted May 14, 1900. — Decided May 28, 1900.

A District Court of the United States has jurisdiction, by the proposed defendant's consent, but not otherwise, to entertain a bill in equity by a trustee in bankruptcy to recover property conveyed to the defendant by the bankrupt in fraud of the Bankrupt Act and of his creditors.

Bardes v. Hawarden Bank, ante, 524, followed.

THE case is stated in the opinion of the court.

Mr. Charles M. Peck for appellant.

Mr. Frederick Hertenstein for appellee.

MR. JUSTICE GRAY delivered the opinion of the court.

This was a bill in equity in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio by a trustee in bankruptcy, appointed by that court, against a creditor of the bankrupts, to recover money to the amount of \$2780, paid by the bankrupts to the defendant, with intent to prefer the defendant and to defraud the creditors of the bankrupts, within four months before the institution of the proceedings in bankruptcy. Both parties were citizens of Ohio and residents of that district. The District Court dismissed the bill, for want of jurisdiction. 94 Fed. Rep. 625. The plaintiff appealed to the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, which certified to this court the following question:

"Has a District Court of the United States jurisdiction to entertain a bill in equity filed by a trustee in bankruptcy, appointed by it, against a fraudulent grantee or transferee of the bankrupt resident in its district, to recover the property belong-

Statement of the Case.

ing to the estate of the bankrupt, and by him fraudulently conveyed to defendant?"

For the reasons stated in *Bardes v. Hawarden Bank*, just decided, the answer to this question must be that the District Court has such jurisdiction by the consent of the proposed defendant, but not otherwise.

Ordered accordingly.

WHITE v. SCHLOERB.CERTIFICATE FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
SEVENTH CIRCUIT.

No. 530. Submitted April 26, 1900. — Decided May 28, 1900.

After an adjudication in bankruptcy, an action of replevin in a state court cannot be commenced and maintained against the bankrupt to recover property in the possession of and claimed by the bankrupt at the time of that adjudication, and in the possession of a referee in bankruptcy at the time when the action of replevin is begun; and the District Court of the United States, sitting in bankruptcy, has jurisdiction by summary proceedings to compel the return of the property seized.

THIS was a petition in equity to the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, under the jurisdiction conferred upon that court by the second clause of section 24 of the Bankrupt Act of July 1, 1898, c. 541, to superintend and revise in matter of law the proceedings in bankruptcy of the District Courts of the United States in that circuit. 30 Stat. 553. The Circuit Court of Appeals certified to this court the following statement of the case and the questions of law:

"On September 13, 1899, August T. Schloerb and Eugene B. Schickedantz, who were respectively residents and inhabitants of the Eastern District of Wisconsin, and who were co-partners in trade in the said district, filed their voluntary petition in bankruptcy in the District Court of the United States for that district. On the same day they were duly adjudged