are not ffe At which said next Court to wit the 10th day of April Anno Domini 1759 Come again the said Parties Plaintiff and Defendant by their Attorneys afs. but for that the said Court hear as yet are not advised of their Judgment of and upon the Premises day thereof is further given to the said Parties to hear thereof their Judgment until next Court for that the said Court are not ffe. At which said next Court to wit the 11th day of September Anno Domini 1759 Come again the said Parties Plaintiff and Defendant by their Attorneys afs. but for that the said Court hear as yet are not advised of their Judgment of and upon the Premises day thereof is further given to the said Parties to hear thereof their Judgment until next Court for that the said Court are not ffe. At which said next Court to wit the 8th day of April Anno Domini 1760 Come again the said Parties Plaintiff and Defendant by their Attorneys aforesaid but for that the said Court hear as yet are not advised of their Judgment of and upon the Premises day thereof is further given to the said Parties to hear thereof their Judgment until next Court for that the said Court are not ffe. At which said next Court to wit the 9th day of September Anno Domini 1760 Come again the said Parties Plaintiff and Defendant by their Attorneys aforesaid but for that the said Court hear as yet are not advised of their Judgment of and upon the Premises day thereof is further given to the said Parties to hear thereof their Judgment until next Court for that the said Court are not ffe. At which said next Court to wit the 14th day of April Anno Domini 1761 Come again the said Parties Plaintiff and Defendant by their Attorneys aforesaid but for that the said Court hear as yet are not advised of their Judgment of and upon the Premises day thereof is further given to the said Parties to hear thereof their Judgment until next Court for that the said Court are not ffe. At which said next Court to wit the 8th day of September Anno Domini 1761 Comes again as well the said Mary Porter Administratrix as aforesaid by her Attorney aforesaid as the said Doctr. Hugh Mathews by his Attorneys aforesaid Whereupon for that it Seems to the Court here that in the record and Process aforesaid and also in the rendering of Judgment thereupon It is nothing Erred It is therefore Considered by the Justices here the day and year last mentioned that the Judgment afs. be in all things Affirmed and Stand in its full force and Effect And further It is Considered that the afs. Doctor Hugh Mathews recover against the said Mary Porter Administratrix of James Porter the Sum of

pounds of Tobacco to the same Doctr.

Hugh Mathews by the Court here Adjudged According to the form of the Statute thereof lately published and provided for his Costs and Charges and his Damages which he has Sustained by Occasion of the delay of the Execution afs. by pretext of the Prosecution of his said Lordships Writ of Error and that the said Doctr. Hugh Mathews have thereof his Execution

Ff. Peter Goodright Lessee of Philip Greenwalt
against
Jack Noright Michael Spoon Tenant } Frederick County Sc. Jack

Noright late of Frederick County plaintiff was attached to answer unto Peter Goodright in a plea wherefore with force and Arms and soforth into all that tract or parcel of plantable Land called Poplar Spring lying and being in the County aforesaid with the Appurtenances containing Ninety two Acres of Land which Philip Greenwalt to him the said Peter demised for a Term not yet past he the said Jack did enter and him the said Peter from his farm afs. did eject and other harms to him the said Peter did to the great Damage of him the said Peter and against the peace of the Right Honourable the Lord Proprietary that now is and soforth

And Whereupon the said Peter by Thomas Johnson Junior his Attorney complains that whereas the afs. Philip Greenwalt on the Ninth day of April in the year of our Lord Seventeen hundred and Sixty one at Frederick County afs. had demised unto him the afs. Peter the said Premises with the Appurtenances thereunto belonging To have and Occupy the same Premises with the Appurtenances to him the said Peter and his Assigns from the Eighth day of the same April unto the full end and Term of Seven years then next following fully to be compleat and ended by virtue of which Demise the aforesaid Peter into the Premises with the Appurtenances did enter and was thereof Possessed and the said Peter so being thereof possessed the afs. Jack afterwards to wit on the same Ninth day of April in the year afs. at the County afs. with Force and Arms and soforth into the Premises with the Appurtenances afs. which the said Philip to him the said Peter in form afs. had demised for the term aforesaid which is not yet past entered and him the said Peter from his farm afs. did eject and other Harms to him the said Peter then and there did to the great Damage of him the said Peter and against the peace of the Right Honourable the Lord Proprietary that now is and soforth whereby the said Peter Saith he is the worse and hath Damage to the Value of One hundred Pounds Current Money and therefore he brings suit and soforth

Pledges and soforth { John Doe
Rich. Roe

To which aforegoing Declaration was annexed the following rule I am informed that you are in Possession of or Claim title to the Premises in this Declaration of Ejectment mentioned or to some part and I being sued in this Action as Casual Ejector and having no Claim or Title to the same do advise you to appear to this Declaration at the next Provincial Court to be held at Annapolis the Second Tuesday of September next by some Attorney of that Court and then and there by Rule of the same Court to cause yourself to be made Defendant in my stead and to

(confess)