replication of the said Nicholas Blacklock in the plea aforesaid, and thereupon the said Nicholas Blacklock by his Attorney aforesaid, prays that the said John Harris Gibbs to his replication aforesaid may answer; Whereupon it is ruled by the Court here, on motion of the said Nicholas Blacklock that the said John Harris Gibbs answer to the replication aforesaid of the said Nicholas Blacklock by twelve o'clock on the eighth day of June next. And it is said to the said John Harris Gibbs that if he does not answer to the replication aforesaid by the time aforesaid, Judgment will be entered against him by default, the same time is given to the said Nicholas Blacklock then and soforth. And now here at this day, towit, at twelve o'clock on the eighth day of June comes the said Nicholas Blacklock by his Attorney aforesaid, and the said John Harris Gibbs though solemnly called comes not nor says any thing in bar or preclusion of the action aforesaid of him the said Nicholas Blacklock but therein doth make default whereby the Nicholas Blacklock remains against the said John Harris Gibbs undefended; But because it is unknown to the Court here what damages the said Nicholas Blacklock hath sustained by occasion thereof; Therefore on motion of the said Nicholas Blacklock the writ of the State of Maryland of enquiry of damages issues forth out of the General Court here, returnable to October Term Seventeen Hundred and ninety.

Test John Grinn Clk

Nicholas Blacklock against Zachariah Owen	The same proceedings mutatis mutandis as in the Case of Nicholas Blacklock against John Harris Gibbs. folio two hundred and forty two. Test John Grinn Clk
Same vs Hezekiah Young	The same proceedings mutatis mutandis as in the case above mentioned. Test John Grinn Clk
Same vs George Page	The same proceedings mutatis mutandis in the cases above mentioned. Test John Grinn Clk

Bingham and Gilmor against James Somerville	Be it remembered, that heretofore Court on the fourth day of April Anno Domini seventeen hundred and eighty nine the plaintiffs by Robert Smith their Attorney sued out of the General Court here the State of Maryland's writ of

capias ad respondendum directed to the Sheriff of Montgomery County in the words and figures following towit.

The State of Maryland ss. To the Sheriff of Prince Georges County Greeting. We command you that you take James Somerville late of Prince Georges County otherwise called James Somerville of Prince Georges County if he shall be found in your bailiwick and him safe keep so that you have his body before the Judges of our General Court to be held at the City of Annapolis on the second tuesday of May to answer unto William Bingham and Robert Gilmor of a plea that he render unto them the sum of six hundred and eight pounds fifteen shillings current money of Maryland which he owes to and unjustly detains from them and soforth hereof fail not at your peril and have you then and there this writ. Witness Robert Hanson Harrison Esquire Chief Judge of our said Court the 18th day of November Anno Domini 1788. Issued the fourth day of April 1789. R Smith, Jno Grinn Clk

And the said William Bingham and Robert Gilmor by Robert Smith their Attorney declared against the said James Somerville in the plea aforesaid as follows towit. Western Shore of Maryland, Prince Georges County, towit, James Somerville late of Prince Georges County otherwise called James Somerville of Prince Georges County was summoned to answer unto William Bingham and Robert Gilmor of a plea that he render unto them the sum of six hundred and eight pounds fifteen shillings current money of Maryland which he owes to and unjustly detains from them and soforth. And whereupon the same Bingham and Gilmor by Robert Smith their Attorney complain that the aforesaid James Somerville on the the twenty third day of May in the year seventeen hundred and eighty seven at the County aforesaid by his writing obligatory which the aforesaid Bingham and Gilmor with the Seal of the said James Somerville sealed here into Court do bring the date whereof is on the day and year aforesaid, acknowledged himself to be held and firmly bound unto the aforesaid Bingham and Gilmor in the aforesaid sum of six hundred and eight pounds fifteen shillings to be paid to the said Bingham and Gilmor when thereto afterwards he should be required. Nevertheless the aforesaid James Somerville (although often thereunto required) the aforesaid sum of money or any part thereof to the said Bingham and Gilmor hath,