Received of Mrs Hannah Benson the sum of four shillings and ten pence three farthings sterling for his Lordships use being the alienation fine on the within mentioned two hundred and forty four acres of Land by virtue of a Commission from Benj^a Tasker Esqr his said Lordships agent and receiver general Recorded May 5th 1740. Ff Richard Dorsey.

In Testimony that the aforegoing is a true Copy from Liber RD No 3 folio 253 one of Ann^e County Land record Books I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the Seal of my office this 30th day of May anno Domini 1790.

(Seal)

Nich Harwood Cl Act Coty.

Whereupon all and singular the premises between the parties aforesaid by the Court here being seen, heard and fully understood and mature deliberation thereupon had, for that it appears to the Court here that the said Negro Nanny the Petitioner aforesaid is entitled to her freedom as she by her petition to the Court here hath alleged: Therefore it is considered by the Court here that the said Negro Nanny the Petitioner aforesaid be free and discharged of and from the service of the said Orman Hammond, and that & she the said Negro Nanny the Petitioner aforesaid go thereof without day &c. It is further considered by the Court here that the said Negro Nanny recover against the said & Orman Hammond the quantity of seven hundred and forty six pounds of Tobacco by the Court here unto her on her absent adjudged for her costs and charges by her about the prosecution of her Petition aforesaid laid out and expended, and that she have thereof her execution &c.

Test, John Gwinn Clerk.

Negro Lydia vs John Raitt

Same proceedings and Judgment mutatis mutandis as Negro Nanny against Orman Hammond & entered in this Book page Two hundred and fifty three. It is admitted and agreed in this case that the Petitioner is the daughter of Nanny who petitioned and obtained her freedom against Orman Hammond.

Test, John Gwinn Clerk.

Negro Peter vs Philip Hammond

Same proceedings and Judgment mutatis mutandis as Negro Nanny against Orman Hammond entered in this Book page two hundred and fifty three. It is admitted and agreed in this case that the Petitioner is the son of Nanny who petitioned and obtained her freedom against Orman Hammond.

Test, John Gwinn Clerk

John Hartley and Thomas Hartley vs Jonathan Simmons

Be it remembered that heretofore, to wit, on the twenty sixth day of August in the year of our Lord One thousand seven hundred and eighty eight the said John Hartley and Thomas Hartley by William Cooke their attorney prosecuted and sued forth out of the General Court here the writ of the State of Maryland of Capias ad respondendum, directed to the Sheriff of Washington County, in the words following, to wit;

The State of Maryland Ss. To the Sheriff of Washington County Greeting, We command you that you take Jonathan Simmons late of Washington County Farmer otherwise called Jonathan Simmons son of Elizabeth of Frederick County in the province of Maryland 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 October next, to answer unto John and Thomas Hartley of a plea that he render unto them the sum of One hundred and sixty six pounds twelve shillings and six pence Current Money which to them he owes and from them unjustly detains & and so forth. 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 12th day of June anno Domini 1788. Issued the 26th day of August 1788.

(Cooke) Jno Gwinn Clk.

And the said John Hartley and Thomas Hartley by their attorney aforesaid, on the day of prosecuting and suing forth the said writ, declared in the Court here against the said Jonathan Simmons in the plea aforesaid, as follows, to wit;

Western Shore State of Maryland Washington County, to wit, Jonathan Simmons late of Washington County Farmer otherwise called Jonathan Simmons son of Elizabeth of Frederick County in the Province of Maryland was summoned to answer unto John and Thomas Hartley,