April Term 1788.

prayd that the said Stephen Smart the Tenant in possession of the premises aforesaid or those under whom he claims to this Declaration aforesaid might afs-
-pear and Answer. And the said Stephen Smart by Gustavus Scott his Attorney came here into Court and Defended the force and injury when &c., and prayed the liberty of imparling thereof untill the second Tuesday in September then next following and it was granted unto him the same Day was given to the said John Justice &c.

At which said second Tuesday of September Anno Domini one thousand seven hundred and eighty six came again as well the said John Justice Lessee of the aforesaid James Tilghman by his Attorney aforesaid as the said Stephen Smart the Tenant in Possession by his Attorney aforesaid — — — — — —

And the aforesaid Stephen Smart the Tenant in Possession by Gustavus Scott his Attorney came and also Francis Baker the Landlord, who claiming right to the Premises in Question prayd leave of the Court here to be made a Defendant with the Tenant in Possession and it was granted unto him, who thereupon together with Stephen Smart aforesaid by Gustavus Scott aforesaid their Attorney defended the force and injury when and so forth and to the defence according to their pretentions as they shall appear to be laid down on the Return of Warrant of Resurvey to be found in this Cause and entered into the Common rule and pray leave to imparle hereunto until the second Tuesday in April then next following and they had it, the same day is given to the said John Justice Lessee of the said James Tilghman also.

At which said second Tuesday in April Anno Domini one thousand seven hundred and eighty seven came again the Parties aforesaid by their Attorneys aforesaid and thereupon further Process of and upon the premises aforesaid between the Parties aforesaid by the consent of the said Parties and their Attorneys aforesaid and by order of the Court hereupon was continued untill the second tuesday in September then next following. — At which said second Tuesday in September came again the Parties aforesaid by their Attorneys aforesaid and thereupon further process of and upon the premises aforesaid between the parties aforesaid by order of the Court here was continued under a notice of Trial until the second tuesday in April then next following — And now here at this day, to wit, The second Tuesday in April Anno Domini seventeen hundred and eighty eight, comes as well the said John Justice Lessee of the said James Tilghman by his Attorney aforesaid as the said Stephen Smart Tenant and Francis Baker Landlord by their Attorney aforesaid and the said —

April Term 1788.

Stephen Smart Tenant and Francis Baker Landlord by their Attorney aforesaid relinquishes their averment, by them in Pleading above pretended, and say, that they cannot deny the said Action of the said John Justice Lessee of the aforesaid James Tilghman, nor but that they are guilty of the trespass and ejectment aforesaid in manner and form as the said John Justice Lessee of the said James Tilghman hath above thereof complained against them. Therefore it is considered that the said John Justice Lessee of the said James Tilghman recover against the said Stephen Smart Tenant and Francis Baker Landlord his Term aforesaid yet to come of and in the Tenements aforesaid with the appurtenances, and also the quantity of one thousand and fifty seven and an half pounds of Tobacco for his Costs and Charges by him about his suit in this behalf laid out and expended, adjudged to the said John by the Court here with his assent, and that the said Stephen Smart Tenant and Francis Baker Landlord in mercy &c. —

James Earle Clk.

Judgment was confessed in this Action on the sixteenth day of April Anno Domini one thousand seven hundred and eighty eight for Possession & Costs. —

William Goodwin Thomas Russell and Hugh McBryde.
against
William Steven Hill.

Be it Remembered that on the twentieth day of December in the year one thousand seven hundred and eighty six: Command was given to the Sheriff of Worcester County that he should take William Steven Hill late of Worcester County and State of Maryland Planter otherwise called William Steven Hill of Worcester County and State of Maryland if he should be found in his Bailiwick and him safe keep so that he might have his Body before the Judges of the next General Court to be held for the Eastern Shore of this State at Talbot County Court House the second Tuesday of April next to answer unto William Goodwin, Thomas Rusel and Hugh McBryde of a Plea that he render unto them the sum of eight hundred and twenty seven Pounds fourteen shillings and three pence current money of Maryland which to them he owes and from them he unjustly detains and so forth — And that thereof he should not fail and that he should have there and there that Writ &c. — And the said William Goodwin Thomas Russell and Hugh McBryde by Robert Goldsborough their Attorney declared against the said William Steven Hill in manner & form following to wit: Worcester County, to wit; William Steven Hill late of Worcester County and State of Maryland Planter otherwise called William Steven Hill of Worcester County and State of Maryland was summoned to answer unto William Goodwin Thomas Russel and Hugh McBryde of a plea that he render unto them the sum of eight hundred and twenty seven pounds fourteen shillings and three pence current money of Maryland which to them he owes and from them unjustly detains &c.