third monday in December next to hear their Judgment of and upon the premises for that the Court now here as yet are not thereof advised and soforth.

At which said third monday in December being the nineteenth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eight Come again into the Court of Appeals here the parties aforesaid by their attorneys aforesaid. But because the Court now here are not yet advised what Judgment to give of and upon the premises a day is therefore further given to the parties aforesaid with the Consent of the said parties by their attorneys aforesaid before the Court here until the third monday in June next to hear their Judgment of and upon the premises for that the Court now here as yet are not thereof advised and soforth.

At which said third monday in June being the nineteenth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and nine Come again into the Court of Appeals here the parties aforesaid by their attorneys aforesaid. But because the Court now here are not yet advised what Judgment to give of and upon the premises a day is therefore further given to the parties aforesaid with the Consent of the said parties by their attorneys aforesaid before the Court here until the third monday in December next to hear their Judgment of and upon the premises for that the Court now here as yet are not thereof advised and soforth.

At which said third monday in December being the eighteenth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and nine Come again into the Court of Appeals here the parties aforesaid by their attorneys aforesaid. But because the Court now here are not yet advised what Judgment to give of and upon the premises a day is therefore further given to the parties aforesaid with the Consent of the said parties by their attorneys aforesaid before the Court here until the third monday in June next to hear their Judgment of and upon the premises for that the Court now here as yet are not thereof advised and soforth.

At which said third monday in June being the eighteenth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ten Come again into the Court of appeals here the parties aforesaid by their attorneys aforesaid. But because the Court here are not yet advised what Judgment to give of and upon the premises aforesaid a day is therefore further given to the parties aforesaid with the Consent of the said parties by their attorneys aforesaid before the Court here until the third monday in December next to hear their Judgment of and upon the premises for that the Court now here as yet are not thereof advised H.

And now at this day towit the said third monday in December being the seventeenth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ten Come again into the Court of Appeals here the parties aforesaid by their attorneys aforesaid. Whereupon as well the record of proceedings aforesaid and the Judgment given in form aforesaid as the matters aforesaid by the said Fabricio Wood above for error assigned being seen and fully understood by the Court here and mature deliberation thereupon had for that it appears to the Court here that there is no error either in the record of proceedings aforesaid or in the giving the Judgment aforesaid. Therefore it is considered by the Court here that the Judgment aforesaid in form aforesaid given be in all things affirmed and stand in full force and effect the several matters above

for

for error assigned in any wise notwithstanding and it is further considered by the Court here that the said Jorge Rapold have execution against the said Fabricio Wood as well for his damages costs and charges aforesaid so as aforesaid adjudged unto him in the said County Court as also the sum of two hundred and eighty six dollars and sixty five cents Current Money adjudged unto him by the Court here for his additional damages and also the sum of twenty nine dollars and eighty three cents also adjudged unto him by the Court here on his appeal for his costs and charges which he hath sustained and expended by reason of the delay of execution of the Judgment aforesaid by pretext of the prosecution of the said appeal by the said Fabricio Wood of and upon the premises and soforth.

Memorandum Judgment was affirmed by the Court in this cause on the tenth day of January 1811 for $2419.20 Current Money Damages thirteen hundred and fifty two pounds of Tobacco costs in the County Court and $586.65 Current Money additional damages accrued in this Court and $29.85 Costs of this Court.

At the Argument and decision of this case in the Court of Appeals the Honourable Joseph H Nicholson Esquire Judge withdrew from the Bench.

Test W. Harris Junr. Clk.

Archibald Stewart
vs
Lewis Pascault.

Be it remembered that now here on the third monday in June being the fifteenth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seven the chief Judge and associate Judges of the sixth Judicial district in pursuance of the act of Assembly in such Case made and provided transmit to the Court of Appeals here the record of proceedings of a plea which was lately depending before them in Baltimore County Court between Lewis Pascault Plaintiff and Archibald Stewart Defendant and wherein the said County Court gave Judgment for the said Lewis Pascault against the said Archibald Stewart and from which said Judgment the said Archibald Stewart prayed an appeal unto the Court of Appeals here the tenor of which said record of proceedings is in form following towit -

State of Maryland — Baltimore County towit

At a County Court of the sixth Judicial district of the State of Maryland begun and held at the Court house in the City of Baltimore in and for the County aforesaid on the fourth monday in March in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seven.

Present.

Joseph Hopper Nicholson Esquire chief Judge
Nebulon Hollingsworth and Thomas Jones } Esquires associate Judges -
John Hunter Esqr. Sheriff William Gibson Clk.

Among other were the following proceedings towit.

Lewis Pascault against Archibald Stewart } Be it remembered that heretofore towit on the third day of April in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and four the said Lewis Pascault by Samuel Chase Junior prosecuted and sued forth out of the

General