52 Ark.]	MAY TERM, 1889.	101
1	Bogan v. Cleveland.	
	BOGAN V. CLEVELAND.	
The homestead or to sale u	nveyance of not fraudulent. of a debtor not being subject to the lien inder execution, his conveyance of it, al motive, deprives his creditors of no righ idulent.	though executed
	om Washington Circuit Court in Cha	ncery.
J. M. Pittm		•
•	ance which this suit seeks to ave The Constitution of 1874, Article	
provides that	a homestead "shall not be subject	to the lien of
any judgment, tion * * *	or decree of any court, or to sale * * except such as may be ren	
	ey, or for specific liens, laborers'	
liens for impro	oving the same, * * * * or a	against execu-
	ators, guardians, receivers, attorney hem and other trustees of an exp	-
-	om them in their fiduciary capacity."	
	on, for appellant.	
The sale wa	s made in good faith, and from a	good motive,

SUPREME COURT OF ARKANSAS, [52 Ark.

Bogan v. Cleveland.

and was not in fraud of creditors. The land was his homestead, and not subject to execution or sale for his debts. Act March, 1887, p. 90.

C. R. Buckner, Sam H. West and B. R. Davidson, for appellees.

The judgment of appellees had become a lien on the land before Mrs. Bogan made a payment on it, if she ever did make one. *Const., Art.* 9, *sec.* 9; 30 *Ark.*, 111.

She was not an innocent purchaser; she had notice; and the proof shows the conveyance made for the express purpose of defrauding creditors. 23 Ark., 258; 45 id., 520; 32 id., 251.

The act of March, 1887, has no application; it applies only to execution sales. If the homestead right is not asserted in the manner prescribed by law, the right is waived. 33 Ark., 454; 28 id., 485.

PER CURIAM. The appellees, judgment creditors of one Bryant, brought this suit, seeking to cancel for fraud a con-

Homestead: Conveyance of. veyance of land from him to the appellant. The land constituted the homestead of the debtor when

ance of. the conveyance was made. It was not subject to the lien of a judgment, or to sale under execution. Creditors could not be injured by the conveyance. The debtor may have executed the conveyance with a bad motive, but it deprived his creditors of no right, and was therefore not fraudulent. *Bump's Fraud Con.*, *p.* 245; *Wait Fraud Con., sec.* 71; *Cammack v. Lovett*, 44 *Ark.*, 180.

The judgment is reversed and cause remanded with instructions to dismiss the bill.

102