The Gardiner Will Case—A Decision in Equity.

A domestic feud, in which the widow of a former President of the United States and her only brother were the principal actors, has occupied a full share of public attention for a few days past by its thorough exploitation in a Staten Island Court.

Yesterday the case was concluded in favor of the plaintiff, and we do not hesitate to say against the weight of the evidence—the jury yielding to the equity of the point at issue. Our readers will understand that we refer to the action between Mrs. TYLER and her brother, Mr. GARDINER, touching the validity of the will of their mother. Mrs. JULIANA GARDINER, who died in October, 1864, leaving the bulk of her property, amounting to $180,000, to Mrs. TYLER during her natural life, or until the United States should reimburse her for the losses, consequent upon the war, to the property left her in Virginia by her husband, Ex-President TYLER.

As the contingency upon which the reversion of any portion of this estate to Mr. GARDINER during the lifetime of Mrs. TYLER was altogether out of reason, the terms of the testatrix were equivalent to an absolute disinheritance of her son. When the will was presented for probate, it was thrown out at the instance of Mr. GARDINER, on the ground that undue influence had been exerted upon his mother by Mrs. TYLER. The latter then appealed the matter to the Supreme Court, in General Term, which overruled the decision of the Surrogate. It was now Mr. GARDINER'S turn to carry up the case, and on the argument before the Court of Appeals the original ruling of the Surrogate was sustained, the will being pronounced invalid. The suit just concluded was then instituted by Mr. GARDINER for partition of the property under the statute, as if no will existed; and Mrs. TYLER, setting up the will as a defence, made the question of its validity an issue for the determination of a jury, who have rendered their decision adversely to her expectations.

Such was the case in its legal aspects—offering no novelties but affording another of the innumerable illustrations of the law's uncertainties and vexations. When we look, however, at the circumstances out of which these family infelicities arose, we discover their origin to have been in the political antagonisms of the rebellion, which divided many a household besides that of Mrs. GARDINER.

As an illustration of the bitter asperities and active hostility which sectional feeling excites, and of the tendency of such animosities to make us forgetful of the simplest social amenities, unmindful of the promptings of natural affection, and selfishly regardless of equitable considerations, we present a brief outline of the salient points of the case as they were developed on the trial.

Mrs. TYLER, by the eventualities of the war, was reduced, soon after her husband's death, from the affluent position of an owner of sixty slaves and eleven hundred broad acres, to a condition of poverty as abject as it was unaccustomed and distasteful. Her slaves freed, her lands despoiled, herself widowed, and her family of seven children beggared, she sought refuge at the home of her mother, whose maternal affection was fully aroused by her distress, and by whom she was cordially welcomed.

Up to this period Mr. GARDINER was fully in the confidence of his mother, having managed her estate for many years, and still living beneath her roof. On his part there would seem to have been an antipathy to the settlement of his sister and her family at the mother's house, as he refused to set out for Virginia to escort the widow and her children to New-York, giving as a reason that the life of a Northern man would not be safe if he had anything to do with rebels.

Here, then, was the key-note to the unhappiness of the family. Mrs. TYLER, smarting under her misfortunes, and an avowed sympathizer with the Southern cause, took umbrage at the cool reception with which her brother greeted her, and from that time began the series of petty annoyances which she had the bad taste to permit on the part of the children toward their uncle, the plaintiff. It is very well to say that it is unmanly to resent the meaningless epithets and insulting language of underbred urchins, but the mildest-mannered man could scarcely brook for months the treatment which Mr. GARDINER appears to have received from his nephews and nieces, without occasionally losing his patience. At last Mr. GARDINER was compelled to take his family from his mother's dwelling, which he never again entered. Eight months before her decease she wrote a very curt and formal note to her son, requiring him to yield the agency of her estate, and he obeyed the mandate. He never held communication with his mother again. Meanwhile Mrs. TYLER remained with the invalid, and four hours before her decease the will was signed which virtually made the daughter mistress of the property.

In these facts there would seem to be strong presumptive evidence of undue influence; but, from the testimony of a number of respectable witnesses, it was shown that none was exerted, and that Mrs. GARDINER made her will in the full consciousness of what jealousy and heart-burnings would probably arise from her action. The sympathies of the people in this case were, however, reflected by the jury, who, in such instances as this, are apt to lose sight of the law and decide the case upon its equity.

The New York Times
Published: May 1, 1867
Copyright © The New York Times