Defendants and one of the Devisees in the will of William Lock the Elder, and first above mentioned is heir at Law to the said first named William Lock Physician, that is to say Eldest son to the only Sister of the said William Lock, that William Chew Lessor of the plaintiff is the son of Sarah Lock in the will aforesaid mentioned who was the Illegitimate Daughter of the said William Lock Physician, that the aforesaid David Weems always claimed the Lands in the declaration above mentioned as Lands that would belong to himself, and his brother James Weems under the will of William Lock the Elder upon the death of William the Son without issue - Also the Jurors aforesaid upon their oaths aforesaid further say that Sarah Lock the devisee in the will of the said William Lock the Elder mentioned after the death of the said Testator entered into part of the Tract of Land aforesaid called Padgett as aforesaid devised to her the said Sarah and was and now is seized and possessed of the said part of the said Tract of Land under and by virtue of the said will, which said part hath been heretofore laid out by a line drawn by consent agreeable to said Will between the said Sarah and the Defendants or some of them, and hath been occupyed worked and possessed by her the said Sarah for upwards of twenty years before the bringing the present Ejectment severally, and the residue of the said Tract hath always been held by the Defendants or some of them in severalty. And the Jurors aforesaid upon their oath aforesaid say that they find the Leases Entry and Ouster mentioned and charged in the Declaration aforesaid; But whether upon the whole Facts so found the Defendants are Guilty of the Trespass and Ejectment aforesaid in the said Tracts of Land in the Declaration aforesaid called Padgett and Lochedew they are ignorant and pray the advice of the Court and if the Court shall be of opinion that upon the whole facts so found they are Guilty, they find them Guilty, and if the Court shall be of opinion that they are not Guilty they find them not Guilty

Sam[l] Briscoe, Foreman
Wm Paca pro Plaintiff
I Hall & Defendants

Whereupon for that the Court here as yet are not advised of the rendering their Judgment of and upon the Verdict and premisses aforesaid day therefore is given as well to the said Chrispin Keeltap Lessee of the said William Chew, as to the said James Weems, John Weems, and David Weems until next Court to hear thereof their Judgment, for that the said Justices as yet, are not &c

At which said next Court to wit, the second Tuesday of September Anno Domini seventeen hundred and seventy one, come again the said parties Plaintiff and Defendants by their Attorneys aforesaid, But for that the Court as yet are not advised of the rendering of their Judgment of and upon the Verdict and premisses aforesaid, day therefore is further given to the said parties until next Court, to hear thereof their Judgment, for that the said Court as yet, are not &c

At which said next Court to wit the second Tuesday of April Anno Domini

seventeen hundred and seventy two, come again the said parties plaintiff and Defendants by their Attorneys aforesaid, But for that the Court are not advised of the rendering their Judgment of and upon the Verdict and premisses aforesaid day therefore is further given to the said parties until next Court, to hear their Judgment, for that the said Court as yet are not &c

At which said next Court to wit, the second Tuesday of September Anno Domini seventeen hundred and seventy two, comes again as well the said Chrispin Keeltap Lessee of the said William Chew by his Attorney aforesaid, as the said James Weems, John Weems and David Weems by their Attorney aforesaid; Whereupon all and singular the premisses being by the Court here seen heard and fully understood and mature deliberation thereupon being had for that it seems to the Court here that the Law in the premisses upon the verdict aforesaid is with the Plaintiff.

Therefore it is considered by the Justices here that the said Chrispin Keeltap Lessee of the said William Chew recover against the said James Weems son of James John Weems son of David, and David Weems his Writ yet to come and unexpired of it and unto all that Tract or parcel of plantable Land called Padgett lying and being in the County aforesaid with the appurtenances containing four hundred and thirty acres, and also of all that Tract or parcel of plantable Land called Lochedew lying and being in the County aforesaid with the appurtenances containing four hundred and sixty four acres, and that he have thereof his possession against the said James Weems son of James, John Weems son of David, and David Weems &c

And it is also considered that the said William Chew Lessee of the said Chrispin Keeltap recover against the said James Weems son of James, John Weems son of David and David Weems the sum of

pounds of Tobacco by the Court here ajudged for his costs and charges by him about his suit in this behalf laid out and expended. It is also considered that the said Chrispin Keeltap Lessee of the said William Chew be in mercy for his false plaint against the said James Weems son of James, John Weems son of David, and David Weems as to the Trespass and Ejectment in the Declaration aforesaid in this cause mentioned in the Tract of Land therein mentioned called Fords Folly whereof the said James Weems son of James, John Weems son of David, and David Weems are above in form aforesaid acquitted, and the same James Weems son of James, John Weems son of David, and David Weems do go thereof without day &c

Thereupon the said James Weems son of James, John Weems son of David, and David Weems by their Attorney aforesaid pray an appeal from the Judgment aforesaid so as aforesaid rendered to his Lordships High Court of Appeals, and the same is granted upon giving security according to act of assembly Whereupon the said James Weems son of James, John Weems son of David, and David Weems by their Attorney aforesaid filed in Court here the following appeal Bond to wit.

Maryland ss Know all men by these presents that we John Weems son