again into the County Court here the parties aforesaid, by their attorneys aforesaid. And thereupon on motion of the said John Doe, lessee as aforesaid, by his attorneys aforesaid, it is ordered by the Court here, that the writ of the State of Maryland of warrant of resurvey issued in this cause, and the same accordingly issues, directed to the sheriff and surveyor of Baltimore County aforesaid, and returnable on the second day of May next, the same day is given to the parties aforesaid then, &c. At which said second day of May to wit, in the year last aforesaid, come again into the County Court here the parties aforesaid, by their attornies aforesaid. And the sheriff and surveyor of the County aforesaid make no return to the Court here of the warrant of resurvey aforesaid.—

Thereupon further process of and upon the premises aforesaid, between the parties aforesaid, by consent of the said parties and their attorneys aforesaid, and by order of the Court thereon, is continued (with leave to complete the survey under the warrant heretofore issued in this cause) until the first day in September next. At which said first day of September, to wit, in the year last aforesaid, come again into the County Court here the parties aforesaid, by their attorneys aforesaid. And the sheriff and surveyor of the County aforesaid, to whom the warrant of resurvey aforesaid was in form aforesaid directed in pursuance thereof, make return to the Court here of three plats and explanations.—

Thereupon further process of and upon the premises aforesaid, between the parties aforesaid, by consent of the said parties and their attornies aforesaid, and by order of the Court here thereon, is continued until the second day of January next. And now here at this day, the said second day of January, to wit, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty three, come again into the County Court here, the parties aforesaid, by their attorneys aforesaid; and thereupon the defendants aforesaid, by their attorneys aforesaid, file in the Court here the following defence, to wit:

Casey's Lessee vs. Inloes and others — Ejectment — The defendants take defence in this action for all the land lying between the west side of Caroline Street and the east side of Spring Street, and the south side of Alice Anna Street and the north side of Duncaster Street.—

R. Johnson,
Wm. F. Giles, Defendants Attorneys.—

Whereupon for trying the issue between the parties aforesaid above joined, it is ordered by the Court here, that twenty persons from the panel of jurors returned to the Court here, by the sheriff of Baltimore County aforesaid, be drawn by ballot according to the act of Assembly in such case made and provided; and thereupon, the twenty persons being so drawn by ballot and written upon two lists, one of which said lists is delivered to the counsel for the respective parties, and the counsel for each of the said parties having stricken out four persons from the said lists, thereupon the remaining twelve persons being called come, that is to say, Nathaniel Lightner, George H. McDowell, Robert Bines, Edward A. Murdoc, Andrew Harker, Isaac Evans, Timothy B. Scully, John Pearson, John Connolly, John D. Quincy, Andrew P. Winchester, Thomas McElderry, who being empannelled and sworn to say the truth in the premises, upon their oaths do say, that the said William Inloes, Joshua Inloes, James Hooper, Jonathan Chapman and William Tyson, the defendants aforesaid, are not guilty of the trespass and ejectment aforesaid, as the said defendants above by pleading have alleged.

Therefore it is considered by the Court here, that the said John Doe, lessee as aforesaid, take nothing by his declaration aforesaid, but that he being in mercy, &c. and that the said defendants go thereof without day, &c. It is also considered by the Court here, that the said William Inloes, Joshua Inloes, James Hooper, Jonathan Chapman and William Tyson recover against the said Elizabeth Casey, the lessor of the said John Doe, the sum of _____ by the Court here into the said William Inloes, Joshua Inloes, James Hooper, Jonathan Chapman and William Tyson, on their assent adjudged for their costs and charges by them about their defence in this behalf expended, and that they have thereof their execution against the said Elizabeth Casey, &c.

Memorandum. Before the jurors aforesaid withdrew from the bar of the Court here, the parties aforesaid, by their attorneys aforesaid filed in Court here in said cause the following bills of exceptions, to wit:

Casey's Lessee vs. Inloes and others — Baltimore County Court — Ejectment — At the trial of this cause the plaintiff to support the issue on her side offered in evidence the following papers, to wit, a patent granted by the State of Maryland to Alexander Mountenay for Mountenay's Neck dated 30th June 1663; a deed from Robert Blunt to James Todd, 4th October, 1695; a deed from James Todd to John Hurst of the 3rd March 1701; a deed from said Todd to Charles Carroll of the 16th June, 1701, and the deed of mortgage from John Hurst to Richard Colegate of the 13th October, 1702; deed from said Hurst to Thomas Sheridine, Thomas Sligh of the 19th March, 1749; the will of Richard Colegate, 8th of August, 1721, devising Mountenay's Neck to his two sons John and Thomas Colegate; a deed from said John and Thomas Colegate to Thomas Sheridine and Thomas Sligh of the 15th November 1750; a deed from Thomas Sheridine to Thomas Sligh of the 26th June 1756; a deed from Charles Carroll to Thomas Sligh of the 1st May 1759; a deed from Thomas Sligh to Thomas Hammond.—

Grant of Alexander Mountenay for 200 acres in Patapsco River, Mountenay's Neck.—

Cecelius, absolute Lord and Proprietary of the Provinces of Maryland, and Avalon, Lord Baron of Baltimore, &c.

To all persons to whom these presents shall come, greeting, in our Lord God Everlasting: Know ye that we, for and in consideration that Alexander Mountenay, of this Province, planter, hath due unto him two hundred acres of land by assignment from Lawrence Porter, of this Province, planter, as appears upon record and upon such conditions and terms as are expressed in our conditions of our Province of Maryland, under our greater seal at arms, bearing date at London, the second day of July, in the year of our Lord God 1649, and remaining upon record in our said Province of Maryland, without such alteration as in them is made by our declaration, bearing date the 22d day of September anno 1658, likewise remaining upon record in our said Province of Maryland, do hereby grant unto him the said Alexander Mountenay, a parcel of land called "Mountenay's Neck", lying in Chesapeake Bay, and on the north side of a river called Patapsco, and on the north side of the north west branch of the said river: Beginning at a marked red oak by a little branch, and running up along the north west branch, for breadth, west north west one hundred perches over a cove unto a marked white oak, by a line drawn north north east running into the woods, for length, three hundred and twenty perches by a line