Amos Lord by Augustus W. Bradford and Reverdy Johnson his attorneys; and thereupon on motion of the said Amos Lord by his attorneys aforesaid it is ruled by the Court here, that the said Richard Roe Lessee as aforesaid assign the errors in the record of proceedings aforesaid or in the giving the judgment aforesaid so as aforesaid brought before the Court of Appeals here, for correcting the errors supposed to be therein or judgment by the Court of Appeals here, will be entered against him in default thereof. And the said Richard Roe Lessee as aforesaid by his attorney aforesaid says that in the record of proceedings aforesaid and also in the giving of judgment aforesaid there is manifest error in this to wit, that by the record aforesaid it appears that the judgment aforesaid in the plea aforesaid given was given for the said Amos Lord against the said Richard Roe Lessee as aforesaid when by the law of the land that judgment ought to have been given for the said Richard Roe Lessee as aforesaid against the said Amos Lord therefore in that there is manifest error, and he prays that the judgment aforesaid for that error and others being in the record of proceedings aforesaid may be reversed annulled and held entirely as void and that he the said Richard Roe Lessee as aforesaid may be restored to all things which he hath lost by occasion of the said judgment, and that the said Amos Lord may rejoin to the errors aforesaid and so forth: And thereupon it is ruled by the Court of Appeals here that the said Amos Lord join in the errors by the said Richard Roe Lessee as aforesaid above assigned in the record of proceedings aforesaid or judgment by the Court of Appeals here, will be rendered against him in default thereof. And the said Amos Lord, by his attorney aforesaid prays that a day may be given to him to join in the error by the said Richard Roe Lessee as aforesaid above assigned in the record of proceedings aforesaid until the first Monday in December next; and to him it is granted; the same day is also given to the said Richard Roe Lessee as aforesaid. At which said first Monday in December being the seventh day of the said month, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty which said day was given to the said Amos Lord to join in the errors by the said Richard Roe Lessee as aforesaid above assigned come again into the Court of Appeals here, the parties aforesaid by their attorneys aforesaid; and the said Amos Lord by his attorneys aforesaid says there is no error in the record of proceedings aforesaid, nor in the giving of the judgment aforesaid and he prays that the Court of Appeals here will proceed to the examination as well of the record of proceedings aforesaid as of the matters aforesaid by the said Richard Roe Lessee as aforesaid above for error assigned and that the said judgment may be in all things affirmed and so forth: thereupon further process of and upon the premises 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. At which said second Monday in June being the fourteenth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty one come again into the Court of Appeals here the parties aforesaid by their attorneys aforesaid: But because 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 attorneys aforesaid to come before the Court of Appeals here, on the first Monday in December next to hear the judgment of the Court of Appeals here, of and upon the premises for that the Court now here, as yet are not &c. And now at this day to wit, the said first Monday in December being the sixth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty one come again into the Court of Appeals here the parties aforesaid by their attorneys aforesaid; Whereupon as well the record and proceedings aforesaid, and the judgment given in form aforesaid as the matters aforesaid by the said Richard Roe Lessee as aforesaid 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 no error in the record of proceedings aforesaid nor in the giving of the judgment aforesaid: Therefore it is considered by the Court of Appeals here, that the judgment aforesaid given in form aforesaid be in all things affirmed and stand in full force and effect, the said causes for error above assigned and alleged in anywise notwithstanding. And it is further considered by the Court of Appeals here, that the said Amos Lord have execution against the said Richard Roe Lessee as aforesaid as well for the costs and charges aforesaid adjudged unto him in the said County Court of Harford County as also the sum of eighty dollars and forty seven cents adjudged unto the said Amos Lord by the Court of Appeals here on his assent for his costs and charges which he had sustained by occasion of the delay of the execution of the judgment aforesaid by pretext of the prosecution of the said appeal by the said Richard Roe, Lessee as aforesaid for the correcting of errors of and upon the premises as aforesaid prosecuted &c.

Ex.d. Test, Richard W. Gill, Clerk.

Isaac Nesbit George Keifer William H. Grimes and wife Terre Tenants of James and Elie Prather.
vs.
Alexander Manro use of George F. Warfield.

Be it remembered that now here on the first Monday in December being the fourth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty seven the chief Judge and associate Judges of the fifth 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 Washington County between Alexander Manro plaintiff and Isaac Nesbit George Kiefer William H. Grimes and wife Terre Tenants of James and Elie Prather defendants, and wherein the said County Court gave judgment for the said Alexander Manro against the said Isaac Nesbit George Kiefer William H. Grimes and wife Terre Tenants as aforesaid and from which said judgment the said Isaac Nesbit George Keifer William H. Grimes and wife Terre Tenants as aforesaid appealed to the Court of Appeals here, the tenor of which said record of proceedings is in form following to wit:—

State of Maryland Washington County, to wit:

At a County Court of the fifth Judicial District of the State of Maryland begun and held at Hagers Town in and for the County aforesaid on the third Monday of November being the twentieth day of the same month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred