Mr John Hanson bought a negro wench named May, appraised I believe to £70 which he made over to Miss Sally Doncastle, he also supply'd the children with a Hhd of Rum and by what I understood they was to pay him for it if ever able if not, he was to take it out in Tavern expence, but as Mr Hanson is at present in Annapolis he can most properly declare his intentions.

Mr Daniel Senifer gave and made over to Miss Sally, the child of the above Wench May as Mr Hanson had made over the mother — He also gave Miss Sally £50 in a negro man named Sam appraised to £70. the balance of which being £20 I since paid him on account of the said children, he also gave and made over to Miss Betsey a mulatto girl named Sal. Mr George Frazier Hawkins I believe bought a negro man named Toney, and left him in the possession of the children of Mrs Doncastle, on what terms I cannot say.

Captn Randolph Hawkins in trust for Miss Sally and Betsy Doncastle took the house and furniture of Mr Senifer at £70 pannum, which I was a witness to, I have reason to believe they have the promise of more subscriptions, tho not yet received

it understood as from Mr Senifer Junr.

Tho Hon Ridgale

Port Tob. 9th of Decr. 1766.

N.B. I am mistaken as to the rent of the house and furniture it was £50. for the rent of the house and fifteen prCt on the value of the furniture, which we imagined would be about £20 pannum: so that the total rent would be £70.

I hereby certify that the aforegoing is

is a true copy from the original except that the above blank being left for a few words, which were so much defaced as not to be read.

Nichl Brewer Regbarban

Sarah Doncastle
against
Elizabeth Ridgale
admx of Thomas Ridgale

In Chancery
February Term
1810

In this suit the present defendant has appeared in consequence of a Bill of Revivor filed against her as administratrix of Thomas Ridgale against whom and his Trustees since decease the original Bill was filed.

When it is seen that this suit was commenced under the Proprietary Government the Chancellor thinks it proper to declare that it came before him for hearing for the first time at the present Term — when it was argued for the Complainant no Counsel appearing in Court for the Defendant.

From the nature of the transaction and the length of time that has elapsed it is presumed that testimony more full might have been produced at an earlier period, but the Chancellor is of opinion that there is in the proceedings sufficient to justify a Decree for the Complainant.

The only testimony on which the present decree is grounded is that of Joseph Wilson (excepting that taken as to the particular property) the testimony of Mrs Doncastle under the

Commission