the said General Court might proceed to the examination as well of the record of proceedings aforesaid as of the matters aforesaid by the said John and Margaret Hay above for error assigned and that the said Judgment might be in all things affirmed and so forth. But because the said General Court were not advised to give their Judgment of and upon the premises day therefore was given to the parties aforesaid before the said General Court until the second Tuesday of May then next to hear their Judgment of and upon the premises because the said Court thereof were not advised &c.

At which said second Tuesday of May being the tenth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and three came again into the said General Court the parties aforesaid by their attorneys aforesaid. But because the said General Court were not then advised to give their Judgment of and upon the premises day therefore was further given to the parties aforesaid (by consent of the said parties and their attorneys aforesaid) before the said General Court until the second Tuesday of October then next to hear their Judgment of and upon the premises because the said Court thereof were not then advised &c.

At which said second Tuesday of October being the eleventh day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and three came again into the said General Court the parties aforesaid by their attorneys aforesaid. But because the said General Court were not then advised to give their Judgment of and upon the premises day therefore was further given to the parties aforesaid (by consent of the said parties and their attorneys aforesaid) before the said General Court until the second Tuesday of May then next to hear their Judgment of and upon the premises because the said Court thereof were not then advised &c.

At which said second Tuesday of May being the eighth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and four came again into the said General Court the parties aforesaid by their attorneys aforesaid. But because the said General Court were not then advised to give their Judgment of and upon the premises day therefore was further given to the parties aforesaid (by consent of the said parties and their attorneys aforesaid) before the said General Court until the second Tuesday of October then next to hear their Judgment of and upon the premises because the said Court thereof were not then advised &c.

At which said second Tuesday of October being the ninth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and four came again into the said General Court as well the said John and Margaret Hay by Nicholas Brice and Thomas Kell their attorneys as the said Walter Conner by his attorneys aforesaid.

But

But because the said General Court were not then advised to give their Judgment of and upon the premises day therefore was further given to the parties aforesaid (by consent of the said parties and their attorneys aforesaid) before the said General Court until the second Tuesday of May then next to hear their Judgment of and upon the premises because the said General Court thereof were not then advised &c.

At which said second Tuesday of May being the fourteenth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and five came again into the said General Court the parties aforesaid by their attorneys aforesaid. But because the said General Court were not then advised to give their Judgment of and upon the premises day therefore was further given to the parties aforesaid (by consent of the said parties and their attorneys aforesaid) before the said General Court until the second Tuesday of October then next to hear their Judgment of and upon the premises because the said Court thereof were not then advised &c.

At which said second Tuesday of October being the eighth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and five came again into the said General Court the parties aforesaid by their attorneys aforesaid. But because the said General Court were not then advised to give their Judgment of and upon the premises day therefore was further given to the parties aforesaid (by consent of the said parties and their attorneys aforesaid) before the said General Court until the second Tuesday of May then next to hear their Judgment of and upon the premises aforesaid, because the said Court thereof were not then advised &c.

And at this day to wit the third Monday in June being the seventeenth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and six, until which day the proceedings aforesaid which had remained without day by the operation and effect of an act of the General Assembly of this state passed at a session of Assembly begun and held at the City of Annapolis on Monday the fourth of November in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and five, entitled "An act to confirm an act entitled An act to provide for the trial of facts in the several Counties of this state and to alter change and abolish all such parts of the Constitution and Form of Government as relate to the General Court and Court of Appeals," were in virtue of an act passed at the same session of Assembly entitled "An act to provide for the organization and regulation of the Courts of Common Law in this state and for the administration of Justice therein" revived and continued until the next Court of Appeals to be holden for the Western Shore at the City of Annapolis Come here into the Court of Appeals as well the said John and Margaret Hay

by