intent and meaning thereof. acknowledged before Geo Salmon. James Calhoun
Received to be recorded the 7th day of May 1796 same day recorded and
examined pr Wm Gibson clk.
I do certify that the aforegoing is a true copy from the land records of Baltimore
County Liber WG No VV folio 365 & so forth. Wm Gibson clk of Baltimore County.

And thereupon the parties aforesaid by their attornies aforesaid filed in
Court here the following agreement to wit:

Daniel Lammot &c
vs
Henry Thompson &c

In Equity. It is agreed between the parties by their
counsel that in this case where the same papers or
instrument is referred to in the bill and answer
it shall only be once inserted in the record for the Court of appeals. that
the record of the Ejectment between Daniel Bowly and Daniel Lammot
referred to in the answer be wholly omitted (with the understanding
that the same record in the Court of appeals may be read as part of this
record) and that the book of accounts making a part of the deposition
of William Gibson and the plat and illustrations referred to in the answer
be specifically attached to the record and considered a part thereof.

N Williams for Complainants
I Meredith for Defts.

And thereupon the parties aforesaid by their attornies aforesaid filed in
Court here the following agreement to wit:

Lammot & al
vs
Thompson & al.

In Chancery. It is agreed in this case that a commission
shall issue to take testimony to Louis Eichelberger. El Finly
and Edwd Hinkley Esquires or any two of them

N Williams Sol for Compts I Meredith Sol for Defs.

Whereupon accordingly issued a commission directed to the said Louis Eichelberger
Ebenezer L Finley and Edward Hinkley in manner and form following to wit:
Maryland Ss. The State of Maryland To Louis Eichelberger Ebenezer L
Finley and Edward Hinkley Esquires commissioners named on the part of the
Complainants and Defendants. Know ye that you are appointed commissioners
to examine evidences in a cause depending in Baltimore County Court
between Daniel Lammot and Elizabeth Lammot heirs and devisees of
Daniel Lammot decd complainants and Henry Thompson and Ann
L Thompson his wife and others defendants: Therefore you or any two of
you are requested after having taken the oath hereunto annexed and also
administered the annexed oath to the person whom you shall appoint
as clerk to attend the execution of this commission that at such time
and place as to you or any two of you shall seem convenient you cause
to come before you or any two of you all such evidences as shall
be named or produced to you or any two of you by either the plaintiff

or Defendant and that you or any two of you examine them upon their corporal oaths
to be by you or any two of you administered on the Holy Evangels of almighty God
touching their knowledge or remembrance of any thing that may relate to the cause
aforesaid and having reduced the depositions of the witnesses so taken by you or any
two of you into writing and send the same with this commission closed under your or
any two of your hands and seals to the Judges of the said County Court with all
convenient speed. Witness Walter Dorsey Esquire chief Judge of our said Court the
19th day of October in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred & eighteen
Issued the 19th day of October 1818 Wm Gibson clerk.

The following interrogatories were attached to and sent with the said Commission to wit:

Lammott & others
vs
Henry Thompson & others

Baltimore County Court In Chancery
Interrogatories on the part of Defendants to be answered by
Richard Ridgely Esquire. 1st Were you or were you not
acquainted with the late William Lux George Lux Daniel Bowly and William
Rupell all late of Baltimore County deceased? State how and in what
manner you were so acquainted with them. 2d Had you or had you not the
means of knowing and being acquainted with the affairs and business of the
persons mentioned in the preceding interrogatory with each other? 3d were or
were not the said William Lux George Lux and William Rupell or some of
them. and which of them indebted to said Daniel Bowly and when were
they so indebted and how? state what you know on this subject fully.
4th Had you or had you not much opportunity to know in what manner
and how Daniel Bowly considered his right under the will of said William
Lux and how did it consider them: and when did he become acquainted
and understand his rights to the lands and property now in controversy as
alledged and claimed by him in the latter part of his life and as claimed
by the present Defendants: state your knowledge on this subject fully and
particularly. 5th Was or was not the said Daniel Bowly acquainted with
the second sale of land being two acres mentioned in the bill by William Rupell
to Harry Dorsey Gough at the time the same made: and when did he
become acquainted with it: state your knowledge fully and particularly.
6th When did Lammot make his first improvements upon the lands which he
bought from Harry D Gough as stated in said Bill and were they or were
they not exclusively on the first parcel of land of fourteen and one quarter
acres bought by Gough as aforesaid from said William Rupell: state fully
and minutely all your knowledge on this subject. 7th When did Lammot or
those claiming under him first improve or take possession of the second purchase
of two acres made from said Rupell by Gough as stated in said bill? state
fully and particularly

Wm H Winder. I Meredith for Defendants.