the said sum of six hundred and thirty seven pounds thirteen shillings current money and quantity of five hundred and eighty seven pounds of tobacco in full satisfaction and discharge of the Judgment aforesaid in the said writ of scire facias above mentioned as the said Joseph Renshaw by his said plea hath alledged; for plea, nevertheless by way of replication the said Margaret Hudson administratrix as aforesaid says that after the recovery of the Judgment aforesaid and before the issuing of the said writ of scire facias to wit on the said first day of January he the said Joseph Renshaw did not pay and satisfy to her the said Margaret Hudson administratrix as aforesaid the said sum of six hundred and thirty seven pounds thirteen shillings current money and quantity of five hundred and eighty seven pounds of tobacco in full satisfaction and discharge of the Judgment aforesaid in manner and form as the said Joseph Renshaw by his said second plea hath alledged; and this the said Margaret Hudson administratrix as aforesaid prays may be enquired of by the Country &c. and the said Joseph Renshaw in like manner &c.

And because the Court here are not yet ready to inspect and examine the Record aforesaid and to give their Judgment of and upon the premises the premises aforesaid whereof the parties aforesaid have put themselves on the Judgment of the Court, a day is therefore given to the parties ---- aforesaid until the second Tuesday of May next to hear thereof their Judgment of that issue for that the Court here are not yet &c. and as to the trial of the issue aforesaid between the parties aforesaid above joined to be tried by the Country, let a Jury thereon appear before the Court here on the same day by whom &c. and who neither &c. to recognize &c. because as well &c. the same day is given to the said parties there and there and so forth.

And now at this day to wit the said second Tuesday of May being the tenth day of the same month in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and ninety one come again into the General Court here the parties aforesaid by their respective attornies aforesaid and the said Joseph Renshaw by his attorney aforesaid relinquishing the averments aforesaid above by him pretended and alledged says that he cannot deny but there is such a Record of the said Judgment and recovery against him the said Joseph Renshaw of the debt damages costs and charges aforesaid in the writ of Scire facias aforesaid above mentioned nor but that the said Margaret Hudson administratrix as aforesaid ought to have her execution against him the said Joseph Renshaw for the debt damages costs and charges aforesaid in the said writ of scire facias above specified. Therefore it is considered by the Court here that the said Margaret Hudson administratrix as aforesaid have execution against the said Joseph Renshaw for as well the debt damages costs and charges aforesaid in the

writ of scire facias aforesaid mentioned according to the force form and effect of the recovery aforesaid as the quantity of five hundred and eighty three pounds of tobacco to the said Margaret Hudson administratrix as aforesaid on her assent adjudged by the Court here for her costs and charges which she hath sustained by reason of the delay of the execution of the Judgment aforesaid and the said Joseph Renshaw in mercy and so forth.

Memorandum: Fiat for execution rendered in this cause on the seventh day of May in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and ninety one for the sum of six hundred and thirty seven pounds thirteen shillings ... current money debt and the quantity of five hundred and eighty seven pounds of tobacco costs & costs. Stay execution until the first day of August next

Test John Gwinn cl.

Henry Ridgely use of Richard Ridgely against John Poole

Be it remembered that heretofore to wit on the fifth day of January in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and ninety the said Henry Ridgely by William Cooke his attorney prosecuted and sued forth out of the General Court the writ of the State of Maryland of capias ad respondendum directed to the Sheriff of Montgomery County in the words and of the tenor following to wit, The State of Maryland Se To the Sheriff of Montgomery County greeting We command you that you take John Poole late of Montgomery County planter otherwise called John Pool of Montgomery County in the State 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 May next to answer Henry Ridgely of a plea that he render the said Henry the sum of five hundred and sixty seven pounds current money which he owes him and unjustly detains from him &c. 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 7th day of November anno Domini 1789 Issued the 5th day of January 1790 (M.C.) Jno. Gwinn Clk.

and the said Henry Ridgely by his attorney aforesaid on the day of prosecuting and suing forth the said writ declared in the said Court against the said John Poole in the plea aforesaid as follows to wit, Western Shore State of Maryland Montgomery County to wit, John Poole late of Montgomery County planter otherwise called John Poole of Montgomery county in the State of Maryland was summoned to answer Henry Ridgely of a plea that he render the said Henry the sum of five hundred and sixty seven pounds current money which he owes him and unjustly detains from him &c. And ---- whereupon the said Henry by William Cooke his attorney says that whereas the said John on the twenty second day of May in the year of our Lord

one