

Case No. 2358 *Inf Heirs of Hugh Finch*
PROBATE COURT OF MADISON COUNTY, ALA.
 ESTATE OF Margaret Finch & Etals Vs James Finch & Etals
Inf Heirs of Hugh Finch (Deceased Minor N. C. M.)
 (Administrator Executor Guardian)
 Date of Letters _____ Address _____
 Represented by Attorneys: _____
CASE INDEX TO RECORD

DATE			DESCRIPTION	WHERE RECORDED		
DAY	MO.	YEAR		KIND OF BOOK	BOOK NO.	PAGE NO.
5	6	60	<i>Pet for sale of slaves</i>	PR	25	515
5	6	60	<i>Pet to sell four (4) slaves</i>	M	8	75
	7	60	<i>Decree for the sale of slaves</i>	"	"	250
	11	60	<i>" " " " " "</i>	"	"	559
T	5	54	<i>Adms committed to Sheriff</i>	M	3	52
"	"	"	<i>Order to appraise property</i>	"	"	"
2	7	60	<i>Letters Adms, granted</i>	"	4	139
"	"	"	<i>Ord, apper propri prop</i>	"	"	"

This 1860 probate court record index seems to show Margaret Finch as an “infant heir” of Hugh Finch, but the Margaret L. Finch who was aunt to William H. Timmons was born in the 1795- 1815 period, so she herself was definitely not an “infant” under 21 in 1860. Likewise, the others named in the index record were certainly over the age of 21 (not “infants”, legally), so whoever made the notation on the index record should have written “heirs”, rather than “infants”. Careful examination of the index shows that the probate court case was actually dealing with a lawsuit between Margaret L. Finch **and others** versus James Finch **and others**. Subsequent scrutiny of the actual papers used in the probate court proceedings provided the details of the lawsuit, involving a dispute over the ownership and sale of “a Negro woman slave known as Silva” and her children. The information in the papers supports the conclusion that Margaret and James (and others named in the papers) were in fact all direct descendants and heirs of an older (deceased) Finch – most likely Hugh. Information contained in Probate Minute Book 3 per the index reference shows that Hugh Finch resided in