June Term 1829

provided, further continued before the Court of Appeals here, until the second Monday in June next; the same day is given to the said parties there then to hear the judgment of the Court of Appeals here of and upon the said premises and so forth.

At which said second Monday in June being the ninth day of the said month, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty eight come again into the Court of Appeals here, the parties aforesaid, by their attornies aforesaid; But the cause the Court of Appeals here are not yet advised what judgment to give of and upon the premises, a day therefore is further given to the parties aforesaid, with the consent of the said parties, by their attornies aforesaid, before the Court of Appeals here, until the first Monday in December next, to hear the judgment of the Court of Appeals here, of and upon the said premises, for that the Court now here, as yet are not, and so forth

At which said first Monday in December being the first day of the said month, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty eight come again into the Court of Appeals here the parties aforesaid, by their attornies aforesaid; Thereupon further process of and upon the premises aforesaid, between the parties aforesaid, is by virtue of an act of assembly in such case made and provided, further continued before the Court of Appeals here, until the second Monday in June next; the same day is given to the said parties, there then to hear the judgment of the Court of Appeals here, of and upon the said premises and so forth.

And now at this day to wit, the said second Monday in June being the eighth day of the said month, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty nine come again into the Court of Appeals here the parties aforesaid, by their attornies aforesaid. Whereupon as well the Record and Proceedings aforesaid, and the Judgment given in form aforesaid, as the matters aforesaid, by the said Thomas A Hays above for error assigned, being seen, and by the Court of Appeals here fully understood, and mature deliberation thereupon had; for that it appears to the Court of Appeals here that there is manifest error in the record of proceedings aforesaid, and also in the giving of the Judgment aforesaid: Therefore it is considered by the Court of Appeals here, that the judgment aforesaid for those errors, and others being in the record and proceedings aforesaid, be reversed, annulled and held entirely as void, and that the said Thomas A Hays be restored to all things which by reason of the judgment aforesaid, he hath lost. It is further considered by the Court here that the said Thomas A Hays have execution against the said William Richardson for the sum of sixty two dollars and six cents adjudged unto the said Thomas A Hays by the Court of Appeals here, on his assent for his costs and charges by him sustained about the prosecution of his said appeal of and upon the premises as aforesaid prosecuted, and so forth

Test. John Johnson Clk.

June Term 1829

John James Giraud's Lessee
vs.
George A. Hughes, Samuel Moore & Peggy his wife, Christopher Hughes, Louisa Armstead, Horatio Gates Armstrong & Mary Armstrong, his wife & Charles M Thruston & Julian — his wife.

Be it remembered, that now here on the first Monday in December being the first day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty five the chief Judge and associate Judges of the sixth Judicial District of Maryland, in pursuance of the directions of the act of assembly in such case made and provided, transmit to the Court of Appeals here the record of proceedings of a plea which was lately depending before them in the County Court of Baltimore between John Doe Lessee of John James Giraud plaintiff, and George A Hughes, Samuel Moore and Peggy his wife, Christopher Hughes, Louisa Armstead, Horatio Gates Armstrong and Mary his wife and Charles M Thruston and Julian — his wife defendants, and wherein the said County Court gave judgment for the said George A Hughes, Samuel Moore and Peggy his wife, Christopher Hughes, Louisa Armstead, Horatio Gates Armstrong, and Mary his wife and Charles M Thruston and Julian — his wife against the said John Doe Lessee as aforesaid and from which said judgment the said John Doe Lessee as aforesaid appealed to the Court of Appeals here, the tenor of which said record of proceedings is in form following to wit:

The State of Maryland. Baltimore County to wit.

At a County Court of the sixth Judicial District of the State of Maryland, begun and held at the Court House, in the City of Baltimore, in and for the County aforesaid, on the third Monday in September, in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and twenty five.

Present.

The Honorable. Stevenson Archer, Chief Judge. Charles M Hanson, William H Ward, Associate Judges.

Standish Barry, Esquire Sheriff. William Gibson, Clerk.

Among others, were the following proceedings, to wit.

John James Giraud's Lessee
vs.
George A Hughes, Samuel Moore and Peggy Moore, his wife, Christopher Hughes, Louisa Armstead, Horatio Gates Armstrong and Mary his wife, and Charles M Thruston and Julian his wife.

Be it remembered, that at the above term, to wit, on the eighteenth day of October, in the year of our Lord, one thousand, eight hundred and twenty five, John Doe Lessee of the said John James Giraud by Joseph D Learned, and Benjamin C Howard his attornies, and the said George A Hughes, Samuel Moore, and Peggy Moore, his wife, Christopher Hughes, Louisa Armstead, Horatio Gates Armstrong, and Mary his wife, and Charles M Thruston, and Julian his wife, by Thomas Kell and Charles Mitchell, their attornies, come into the County Court here, and filed in the said Court, the following agreement to wit:

Giraud vs. Hughes' heirs. 3 Cases of Ejectment in Harford County Court.