Jury the original certificates returned to the Land office under the warrant aforesaid issued to said Thomas Bladen and which were afterwards granted to said David Ross as stated in the defendants statement and which certificates are as follows to wit

Number of acres,	name of the land,	dates of the Survey	when examined.
264	Turkey Flight	8th Augt 1746	8th May 1761
210	Birch Lodge	13th June 1746	16th May 1761
160	The Lawrence	8th Novr 1746	16th May 1761
915	Wills Town	1st June 1745	16th May 1761
240	The Big Bottom	12 Novr 1746	18th May 1761
235	The Prized	8th Augt 1746	18th May 1761
230	Sugar Bottom	13th June 1746	18th May 1761

The Defendant offered Evidence to the Court and Jury to prove that the land mentioned in the aforesaid Patent to William Mason Thompson Mason and John Mason and the Land Located upon the plots in this cause returned by the name of Pleasant vally are one and the same land and not different and also offered in Evidence as aforesaid that before the year 1766 that it was not the practice in the proprietary land office of the then province of Maryland to indorse on certificates of survey the time when they were returned into the said office or to make any entry thereof and that before that time it was the practice of the Lord proprietarys Surveyors when they made surveys for individuals upon warrants issuing from the said office to return to the said office the certificates of survey so made for that office and for the Clerk of the Land office to send that certificate

of survey to the Examiner General to be examined and for the said Examiner to return the same after he had Examined it to the said Land office to be there acted upon and that all certificates of survey returned to the said Land office must remain in the said office six months by the rules of the said office before patent could issue thereon The plaintiff offered in evidence that there were Instances under the proprietary Government where the parties themselves who claimed under the certificates before the certificates were examined returned them to the Land office and officers of that office sent them to the Examiner General for Examination The Plaintiff also offered in Evidence that before the year 1760 it was customary where certificates were returned to the Land office to note the same in a memorandum book for that purpose kept which memorandum Book has since been lost - The Plaintiff also offered in Evidence to the Court and Jury that altho' it was customary for the Surveyor who made out a certificate before the year 1766 to return the same to the Land office from whence it was sent to the Examiner yet there was no regulation which prevented the party himself from bringing down his own certificate and carrying it himself to the Examiner General previous to its coming into the Land office and that before the year 1766 as well as ever Since it was the business of the owner of a certificate that had been Examined and passed to carry the same to the person authorized to receive the composition money that he might ascertain the sums to be paid them and to pay the said composition money to the person so authorised to receive the same and further offered in Evidence to the jury that all the Evidence so offered to the jury as establishing the usage of the said Land office and the return of certificates to the said office was derived from John Callahan now dead but for many years Register of the Land office of this State