here into Court: Whereupon the said William Griggs by his Attorney aſd prayed that the said Daniel Charles Heath to his Writ of Scirefacias aſd might answer: Thereupon it was ruled by the Court at the prayer of the said William Griggs that the aſd Daniel C. Heath should shew cause &c, and answer thereto by the second Tuesday in September then next, & that for default thereof should be rendered against him: The same day was given to the said William Griggs there, &c. —

At which day, towit, the second Tuesday of September Seventeen hundred and ninety two, here came again the parties aforesaid by their Attornies aſd: And the aforesaid Daniel Charles Heath by William Pilgriman his Attorney comes & says, that the aforesaid William Griggs his Execution against him the said Daniel of the Debt and damages aforesaid to have ought not because he says that he after the recovery of the Judgment aforesaid in the Writ of Scirefacias aforesaid above mentioned & before the imperation of the said Writ of Scirefacias, towit, on the first day of October in the year of our Lord seventeen hundred and eighty eight paid to the said William the aforesaid sum of Two hundred and seventy two pounds & eight pence one farthing current money & five hundred and ninety three pounds & one fifth of a pound of Tobacco in exonration & satisfaction of the Judgment aforesaid, towit, at Cecil County aforesaid which said sum of money & Tobacco the said William then there received & accepted in full satisfaction & discharge of the Judgment aforesaid, & this he is ready to verify: Wherefore he prays Judgment of the said William his Execution against him of the Debt & damages aforesaid to have ought, &c. — And also prayed the liberty of imparling here to the Action aforesaid, until the second Tuesday in April then next following, and it was granted unto him: The same day was given to the said William Griggs there, &c. —

And now here at this day, towit, the second Tuesday of April, Seventeen hundred and ninety three, come again the parties aforesaid by their Attornies aforesaid; And the said Daniel Charles Heath by

his Attorney aforesaid relinquishes his Avrment by him in pleading above pretended, & says that he cannot ~~deny~~ gainsay the Action aforesaid of the said William Griggs, nor can he deny but that he owelh unto the said William Griggs the aſd sum of Two hundred and seventy two pounds current and the quantity of Five hundred and ninety three pounds and one fifth of a pound of Tobacco in manner and form as the said William Griggs above against him hath complained: Therefore it is Considered by the Court here that the said William Griggs do recover against the said Daniel Charles Heath the Debt aſd in form aſd acknowledged: And also the quantity of Six hundred and eighty four pounds of Tobacco which were adjudged as well for his damages which he hath sustained by occasion of the detention of that Debt as for his Costs and Charges by him about his suit in this behalf expended, unto the same William Griggs by the Court here with his Assent adjudged, &c. And the said Daniel Charles Heath in mercy, &c. —

Judgment was rendered in this Action on the tenth day of April Anno Domini, Seventeen hundred for the sum mentioned in the Scirefacias — payments if any to be allowed. —

James Earle Jun. Clk

George Moore Executor of John Moore against State of Maryland	Be it remembered that on the sixteenth day of August Seventeen hundred and ninety, John Moore by William Pilgriman his Attorney filed in Court here the following Issues, towit. In Chancery June 2nd 1790. —

Whereas John Moore of Kent County hath preferred a petition to the Chancellor setting forth, that James Chalmers late of the said County was indebted unto him in the sum of three hundred and fifty pounds current money on a Bond bearing date the 2nd day of April 1773 with Interest from that day; that he never received any part of the said sum; that he commenced Suit on the said Bond in the General Court & obtained Judgment thereon; that the said Chalmers having been convicted of Treason against the State, and his property thereupon forfeited & seized: the Petitioner produced his claim to the Auditor General who refused to pay the same; and whereas the said Petitioner hath produced his claim to the Chancellor, and it appe-