tuesday of October in the year of our Lord One thousand seven hundred and ninety eight, come again into the General Court here as well the said State of Maryland by William Roche, John Thomson Mason and Roger Nelson its attornies, as the said Thomas Gantt by Arthur Shaaff, John Mackall Gantt and Luther Martin his attornies and the Jurors of the Jury whereof mention is above made, not being called do not come; Therefore as before let a Jury thereon come before the Court here on the second tuesday of May next, by whom and so forth, and who neither and so forth, to recognize and so forth, because as well and so forth, the same day is given to the parties aforesaid then and there and so forth. – And thereupon further process of and upon the premises aforesaid, between the parties aforesaid, by consent of the said parties by their attornies aforesaid, and by order of the Court here thereon is continued until the said Second tuesday of May next. — At which said Second tuesday of May in the year of our Lord One thousand seven hundred and ninety seven, come again into the General Court here, as well the said State of Maryland by its attornies aforesaid, as the said Thomas Gantt by his attornies aforesaid: whereupon the parties aforesaids by their attornies aforesaids file in Court here the Interrogatories and Depositions (in the following) to wit. – State vs Gantt. – same vs Ellenburn. – Same vs Wood. – Same vs Oden. – Interrogatories on the part of the Defendants. First. What was the manner in which the Council & Agent proceeded under the Law of 1792. C. 81. in the approving or rejecting Bonds. were the Bonds after being rec.d delivered to the agent. 2.nd were the Bonds to the State herewith shewn you. one purporting to be Signed, Tho.s Gantt, James Ellenburn & Peter Wood. dated 14.th day of Sept. 1793. marked No. 1. the other signed Samuel Maynard, Benjamin Oden, and dated 14.th September 1793. marked No. 2. were received & rejected by the Council, or were they ever delivered to the Agent, and by him to the Treasurer, was you agent on the 14. Sept. 1793.? Did you ever before see either of the said Bonds? 3.d Did Joseph Sim & William Campbell ever give a Bond to the State, at what time was the said Bond taken, and on what account, and for what Debt. – 4.th Do you know any other thing which will benefit the Defendants. – On the part of the Plaintiff — Do you know any thing that will benifit the Plaintiff or any thing further respecting this Suit. Declare your knowledge. – Randolph B. Latimer answers to the first Interrogatory that all Bonds offered for Installing Debts due to the State of Maryland, were to be approved by the Governor and the Council, or rejected, and if approved, were afterwards delivered to the agent for the State and by him delivered over to the Treasurer of the Western Shore. He answers to the second Interrogatory, that he does not recollect, during the time he acted as agent for the State that any of the Bonds mentioned in the said Interrogatory were offered to him as agent by any person whatever; He answers he was agent on the 14.th day of September 1793. but does not recollect to have ever seen the Bonds above referred to. He answers to the third Interrogatory, that Col.o Joseph Sim did give a Bond to the State, with William Campbell security, dated the 18.th October 1793. as an Installment for a Bond on which there was a balance due the State from John Harrison

with Joseph Sim and Thomas Gantt securities, this Bond was taken from Col.o Joseph Sim agreeably to a Resolution of the Governor and the Council of the 18.th October 1793. – To the fourth Interrogatory. This Deponent says he knows nothing more than can benefit the Defendants. To the Interrogatory on the part of the Plaintiff. This Deponent answers as he has done to the 4.th Interrog. on the part of the Defendant. – Anne Arundel County, May 31.st 1799. Came R. B. Latimer before the subscriber a Justice of the peace for the County aforesaid and made oath on the Holy Evangels of Almighty God that the foregoing to the best of his knowledge, are true answers to the several Interrogatories referred to. Sworn Before. Allen Duvall. —

The answers of John Hilly to the Interrogatories in the Cases of State vs Gantt. same vs Ellenburn. same vs Wood. same vs Oden. To the First Interrogatory made on behalf of the Defendant, this Deponent answers that his recollection of the manner in which business relative to the Installment of Debts due on Bond to the State was transacted under the Law referred to is slight and imperfect. The Deponent believes that it was usual for persons who desired to install such Debts to apply in the first instance to the Agent Mr. Latimer who if he approved of the new securities came with the parties to the Council for the purpose of obtaining it's approbation. – In some Cases (as when the Agent was absent from Annapolis) the Deponent believes that new Bonds were taken without the previous concurrence of the Board, but that this was obtained in all cases before the old Bonds were given up. He believes that no Entries were in General made in the Council Records of the approbation or rejection of the Bonds which were offered. He believes that those which were approved did not go immediately from the Council to the Treasury but were delivered to the agent so far as they had been actually produced to the Board; But he believes that in some instances the Bonds themselves were not seen by the Council, the business being arranged by the Agent's merely stating the names of the new obligors and troubling the Board no further after it had approved of them. To the 2.nd Interrogatory the Deponent answers that he cannot with any degree of certainty or safety say that the Bonds referred to were or were not rejected by the Council. He is firmly of opinion however that they were not accepted by that Board, and he believes of course that they were not delivered to the agent and by him to the Treasurer. To the question whether he has ever seen either of these Bonds, he answers that so far as he may trust a very faint impression, he is inclined to believe that he has before seen the Bond marked No. 1. But that of the Bond marked No. 2. he has no recollection. — To the 3.d Interrogatory the Deponent answers that whether and at what time Joseph Sim & Mr. Campbell gave a Bond to the State he cannot positively declare; but that he has no doubt of the authenticity and correctness of that part of the Records of the Council which exhibits an order or resolution in October 1793. that a Bond from those persons should be accepted in discharge of the balance due on the Bond then laying in the Treasury from John Harrison, Joseph