of May in the year our Lord one thousand seven hundred and ninety five.

Samuel Harvey Howard, Reg, bar, lan,

In Pursuance whereof, and according to the form and effect of the Act of Assembly in such cases made and provided a Transcript of the Judgment aforesaid so as aforesaid rendered with all things thereunto relating is hereby transmitted to the said State of Marylands High Court of Appeals accordingly.

Test, John Gwinn Clk.

In Testimony that the aforegoing Transcript is truly taken from the Record and proceedings of the General Court for the Western Shore of the State aforesaid I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the Public Seal of the said General Court this Sixteenth day of May in the year of our Lord One thousand seven hundred and ninety five, And in the Nineteenth Year of the Independence of the said State.

John Gwinn, Clerk, General Court, Western Shore State of Maryland.

At which said second Tuesday of June being the Ninth day of the same Month seventeen hundred and ninety five come into our High Court of Appeals as well the aforesaid Charles Burgess by Edward Nicholls his Attorney as the aforesaid Joseph Yates and Richard Yates surviving partners aforesaid by William Cooke their Attorney but because the Court are not advised to give their Judgment of and upon the premises day therefore is given to the parties aforesaid before the Judges of our high Court of Appeals here until the second Tuesday of November next to hear their Judgment of and upon the premises because the Court now here thereof not yet &c. At which said second Tuesday of November being the tenth day of the same Month seventeen hundred and ninety five comes again here into our high Court of Appeals the said parties Appellant & Appellees by their Attornies aforesaid and the said Charles Burgess by his Attorney saith that in the Record and process aforesaid likewise in the rendering of Judgment aforesaid there is Manifest Error in this to wit that by the Record and process aforesaid it does appear that the Judgment aforesaid rendered was given for the aforesaid Joseph & Richard Yates surviving partners aforesaid against the aforesaid Charles Burgess whereas by the Law of the Land that Judgment ought to have been given for the said Charles Burgess against the said Joseph & Richard Yates surviving partners aforesaid therefore in that it is manifestly erred. And the said Appellees aforesaid says that there is no error in the Record and proceedings aforesaid, or in the rendition of the Judgment aforesaid, and prays likewise that the Court here may proceed to examination as well of the record and proceedings aforesaid as of the matter aforesaid by the said Appellant above for error assigned. day therefore is given to the parties aforesaid until the second Tuesday

of June next, to hear their Judgment of and upon the premises because the Court now here thereof are not yet &c. And now here at this day to wit the second Tuesday of June being the fourteenth day of the same Month seventeen hundred and ninety six comes again here into our high Court of Appeals the said parties Appellant and Appellees by their Attorneys aforesaid Whereupon as well the record and proceedings aforesaid and the Judgment given in form aforesaid as the matters aforesaid by the said Charles Burgess above for errors assigned being seen heard and fully understood. Thereupon it is fully considered by the Court that the Judgment aforesaid be in all things in its whole force and effect the said Causes and matters above for error assigned in any wise notwithstanding and further it is considered by the Court here that the said Joseph Yates and Richard Yates surviving partners aforesaid do recover against the said Charles Burgess the quantity of Eleven hundred and twenty eight pounds of Tobacco for their costs and damages which they have sustained by reason of the delay of the execution of the Judgment aforesaid by pretence of prosecution of the State of Maylands Writ of Error and that the said Joseph Yates and Richard Yates surviving partners aforesaid have thereof execution &c.

Test, Burton Wheteroft, Clk. to the Court of Appeals.

William Holland Reynolds agt. Joseph Wilkinson & Thomas Gray

Be it remembered that heretofore to wit on the Seventeenth day of June Anno Domini Seventeen hundred and ninety five the aforesaid William H. Reynolds sued out of the State of Maylands high Court of Chancery the Writ of the State of Maryland of Error directed to the Honorable the Judges of the General Court in the words and figures following to wit:

Maryland sc. The State of Maryland, to the Honorable the Judges of the General Court Greeting because in the record and process and also in the rendering of Judgment on a certain Action of Debt, on the case brought by Joseph Wilkinson & Thomas Gray against William Holland Reynolds for the sum of four hundred and twenty seven pounds seventeen shillings & six pence current money and Costs to be released on payment of £213. 5. 9 Current money with Interest from the 11th of July 1793. until paid Costs at a General Court held before you our said Judges at the City of Annapolis May Term last Manifest Error as it is said has happened to the great Damage of the said William Holland Reynolds as of his Complaint we have received and we being willing that the Errors if any there be should be duly corrected and full and speedy justice done to the said Reynolds in this behalf Command you that if Judgment be thereof rendered that then the record & process aforesaid with all things thereunto relating under your Seals distinctly and openly you send & this Writ so that the same may be had before the Judges of our high Court of Appeals at Annapolis the second Tuesday in November next that the record & process aforesaid being inspected into we may further do therein for the Correcting of that Error which of right and according to the Laws & Customs of this State may be done. Witness the Honorable Alexander Contee Hanson Esquire Chancellor this 17th days of June Anno Domini 1795.

Great Seal in Wax appendant.

Samuel Harvey Howard Reg, bar, lan