May Term 1795.

Thomas Contee vs Edward Boteler	Debt. Judgment for penalty & costs: to be released on payment of Principal, Interest & costs.

Sir, The action that Mr. Thomas Contee hath brought against me in the General Court to the present term, I have agreed to give him Judgment for on the following terms – one third to be paid in twelve months, with the preceding Interest and cost suit; one third to be paid in two years with the preceding Interest and the Balance in three years: the time to commence from the time the Judgment is entered, and I request you will be pleased to enter the Judgment this way.

Sam. W. Abbot Serv.
Edward Boteler
May 16. 1795

William Cooke Esquire

Robert Bowie (Pgo) proves one days attendance this Term as a Witness for Archibald Campbell against Maguder & Compton and allowed two days Stinerant charges. order given for two hundred and forty pounds of tobacco.

Frederick Grammer (aa) proves one days attendance this Term as a Witness for William Wilcox against William King. order given for Eighty pounds tobacco.

Walter Brooke Cox (Pgo) proves one days attendance this Term as a Witness for the State of Maryland for the use of Matthias Williamson & Wife against Benjamin Levy. order given for Eighty pounds of Tobacco.

Charles Beatty (Mont) proves four days this Term as a Witness for Joseph Chapline against David Harvey. order gevin for Three hundred & twenty pounds Tob.

Robert Moore (Cal) proves two days this term as a Witness for Joseph and Richard Yates against Charles Williamson; and allowed three days Stinerant charges. order given for four hundred pounds of tobacco.

Peter Walstrum (a Subject of the King of Sweden) appears in open Court and prays to be admitted to become a Citizen of the United States; and it appearing to the satisfaction of the Court, that he had resided within the limits, and under the Jurisdiction of the United States, previous to the passage of the Act of the Congress of the United States of America passed at a second Session of third Congress begun and held at the City of Philadelphia in the State of Pennsylvania on Monday the third of November seventeen hundred and Ninety four, entitled, "An act to establish an uniform rule of Naturalization: and to repeal the Act heretofore passed on that subject"; Thereupon the said Peter Walstrum is Naturalized a Citizen of the United States of America by taking the Oath prescribed by the said Act, to wit, "That he has resided two Years at least within and under the Jurisdiction of the United States of America, and one year at least, within the State of Maryland; that he will support the Constitution of the United States; and that he doth absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all Allegiance and fidelity to any foreign Prince, potentate, State or Sovereignty whatever, and particularly to the (King)

May Term 1795.

King of Sweden, whereof he was before a subject." and it also appearing to the satisfaction of the Court, that during the said term of two years, he had behaved as a Man of good Moral character, attached to the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same: Whereupon the said Peter Walstrum is admitted by the Court here to become a Citizen of the said United States and is hereafter to be deemed, adjudged and taken for a natural born Citizen of the United States of America, according to the provisions contained in the said Act.

Rahamah Chapline vs Joseph Chapline	A Judgment and Execution in Dower returnable to May Term 1795. in the General Court at Annapolis. It is agreed by the parties that this Execution shall stand uncalled by consent. That the Defendant shall pay to the plaintiffs attorney one thousand Dollars in hand, that the Execution shall be then endorsed, to be released

on payment of one hundred and ten pounds current money, with Interest from the first day of May 1795 till paid, and all costs of suit. The Plaintiff agrees to release to the said Defendant all the Lands by her recovered in Dower of him as above; and moreover to release to him all her claim of Dower of in and to any Lands or other property which he the Defendant holds or is entitled to as Devisee of Joseph Chapline her late Husband. The Plaintiff agrees to sign any Deed for that purpose and to that effect which shall be reasonably advised or devised by the said Joseph Chapline or his Counsel; provided the same be first presented to John T. Mason her Attorney for his examination; the same to be done at the expence of the said Joseph Chapline. Joseph Chapline agrees that the Judgment of the General Court in the above case shall by consent be affirmed in the Court of Appeals where the same has been removed by the said Joseph Chapline by Appeal from the Judgment of the General Court with a release of errors. Joseph Chapline agrees that the Writ of Error by him heretofore obtained in the above case shall be entered upon the record of the Court of Appeals and dismissed at the next term at his costs. It is to be understood that this agreement is not to have any relation to the costs due to the Sheriff for serving the above execution which Joseph Chapline is himself to settle with the said Sheriff.

John T. Mason for Pltff.
Philip B. Key for Defr.

21st May 1795.

Rahamah Chapline vs Jeremiah Chapline	In two Judgments the one in Dower, the other in Ejectment, upon which executions have issued. In these cases it is agreed by the parties, that Jeremiah Chapline shall enter into an Indenture of Lease with Rahamah Chapline whereby he

shall have the property recovered in the above cases and shall pay her during her life an annual Rent for the same. The Rent is to commence from the first of March 1795. it is to be for all the property recovered by her both in the Ejectment and Action of Dower as delivered and assigned to her upon the Executions returned to the General Court by the Sheriff of Washington County. The Value of this property that is the annual Rent is to be fixed and ascertained by William Good and John Ritchie mutually chosen by the parties with power to choose a third person in case of disagreement between the said William Good and John Ritchie, the Opinion of (any)