December Term 1859.

day of the said month in the year of our Lord 1858 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 June 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 ge. At which said first Monday in June being the sixth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight Hundred and fifty nine, 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 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 premises. For that the Court now here as yet are not ge,

And now at this day to Wit, the said first Monday in December being the fifth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand Eight Hundred and fifty nine 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 Mary Ann Simpers Lessee above for error assigned, being seen and by the Court of Appeals here fully understood, and matters deliberate thereupon had, for that it appears to the Court of Appeals here that there is 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 given in form aforesaid be reversed annulled and held entirely as void. And it is further considered by the Court of Appeals here, that the said Mary Ann Simpers Lessee have execution against the said Henry D Simpers as well for the premises described in the declaration as the sum of thirty six dollars and one cents costs in the Circuit Court as also the sum of adjudged unto the said Mary Ann Simpers Lessee by the Court of Appeals here on his account for his costs and charges which he sustained by the prosecution of the said appeal by the said Mary Ann Simpers Lessee for the correcting of errors of and upon the premises as aforesaid prosecuted go

Test. William A Spencer Clerk.

June Term 1860.

Edward Cockey
vs
George Milns Lessee

Be it remembered that on here on the first Monday in December being the sixth day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand Eight Hundred and fifty eight the Judge of the Superior Court of Baltimore City being in the Fifth Judicial Circuit of Maryland in pursuance of the directions of the act of Assembly in such case made and provided, transmit to the Court of of Appeals here the Record of proceedings of a plea which was lately depending before him in the Superior Court of Baltimore City between George Milns Lessee plaintiff and Edward Cockey defendant, and wherein the said Superior Court gave judgment for the said George Milns Lessee against the said Edward Cockey and from which said judgment the said Edward Cockey appealed to the Court of Appeals here, the tenor of which said record of proceedings is in form following to Wit,

State of Maryland
City of Baltimore to Wit.

At a Session of the Superior Court of Baltimore City in the Fifth Judicial Circuit of the State of Maryland begun and held at the Court House in and for the City aforesaid on the second Monday in September being the 13 day of the said month in the year of our Lord one thousand eight Hundred and fifty Eight

Present
The Honorable F Collins Sen Judge,
Thomas Creamer Esquire Sheriff.
Ge. E Langston Clerk.

Among other inter the following proceedings to Wit.

George Milns
Lessee
vs
Richard Roe Casual
Ejector, Edward Cockey
Tenant in possession,

Ejectment go

Be it remembered that heretofore to Wit on the twenty sixth day of November in the year of our Lord one thousand eight Hundred and fifty five John Doe Lessee of George Milns by Messrs Dobbin & Talbott his attorneys declared in the Superior Court of Baltimore City here against Richard Roe in a plea of Trespass and Ejectment with a notice to his declaration annexed in form following to Wit State of Maryland Baltimore City to Wit. Richard Roe was attached to answer John Doe of a plea. Wherefore the said Richard Roe with force and arms go entered into all that piece or parcel of ground situate in the City of Baltimore and contained within the following description, Beginning for the same at the Corner formed by the intersection of the West side of Fulton Street and the South east side of Tyson Street and running thence South westerly bounding on Tyson Street One hundred and fifty Eight feet to the Lot heretofore conveyed by John Sinclair and Wife to Matthias Bangenger and John Eshbrook then South Easterly bounding on that ground seventy five feet to a ten feet alley, said continuing the same direction across said alley ten feet to the South East side thereof then further westerly along the South side of said ten feet alley fifty feet to Tyson alley then South Easterly along the South East side of Tysons alley one hundred and twenty five feet to the ground recently conveyed by the said Sinclair and Wife to John Eshbrook then South Easterly along that ground to Fulton Street, and then Northward bounding on Fulton Street to the beginning with the appurtenances situate and being in Baltimore City aforesaid which George Milns had demised to the said John Doe