At which day to wit, the second Tuesday of April in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and Ninety eight, Came into the General Court here, the said Alexander Stewart Junr. by his Attorney aforesaid, and the Sheriff of Somerset County aforesaid, to whom the said Writ was directed, now here makes return of the writ aforesaid, thus endorsed, the writ, made known by Jn. Doe & Rich. Roe, no answer Ge Handy Sheriff, and thereupon the said Alexander Stewart Junr. by his Attorney aforesaid, prays that the said William Pollitt may answer to the Scire facias of him the said Alexander Stewart Junr. in the plea aforesaid — if the said William Pollitt doth not answer to the Scire facias in the plea aforesaid Judgment will be rendered against him by default, and the said William Pollitt by John Holbrook Esquire his Attorney defends the force and injury when &c. And prays leave of the Court to imparle until the next Term, to answer to the Scire facias of the said Alexander Stewart Junr. in the plea aforesaid, and he said, the same day was given to the said Alexander Stewart Junr. then &c. at which said second Tuesday of September Seventeen Hundred and ninety eight, being the day the said William Pollitt has leave to imparle, and there to answer to the Scire facias of the said Alexander Stewart Junr. in the plea aforesaid, Came as well the said Alexander Stewart Junr. as the said William Pollitt by their Attorney aforesaid, and the said William Pollitt by his Attorney as before, defends the force and Injury when &c. And saith that the said Alexander Stewart Junr. ought not to have his Execution against him the said William Pollitt, because he says, that he the said William after the recovery of the Judgment and before the suing forth the writ of Scire facias, to wit, in Somerset County on the — day of — Seventeen hundred and ninety — paid to the said Alexander the Debt and Damages in form aforesaid Recovered, and this he is ready to Verify. Wherefore he prays Judgment, whether the said Alexander ought to have his said Execution against him &c. And the said Alexander Stewart Junr. by his Attorney aforesaid, saith that he the said William did not after the recovery of the Judgment and before the suing forth the writ of Scire facias aforesaid or at any other time pay to him the said Alexander the Debt and Damages aforesaid or any part thereof, and this he prays may be inquired of by the Country &c. And the said William Pollitt likewise &c. Wherefore to try the issue aforesaid above joined, between the parties let a Jury thereon appear before the Court, on the second Tuesday of April next, by whom &c. and who neither &c. to recognize &c. because as well the same day is given to the parties aforesaid there and then &c. And now at this day to wit the second Tuesday of April in the year of our Lord one thousand seven Hundred and ninety nine Came again into the General Court here, the parties aforesaid, by their Attorney aforesaid, and the said William Pollitt by his attorney aforesaid relinquishes the Imparlance aforesaid, alias by him pretended and says that he cannot show cause why the said Alexander Stewart Junior should not have his Execution against him for the Debt, Damages, Costs, and Charges aforesaid, according to the form and effect of the recovery aforesaid, Therefore it is Considered by the Court here that the said Alexander Stewart have Execution against the said William Pollitt, for as well the Debt, Damages, Costs and Charges aforesaid in the Writ of Scire facias aforesaid mentioned, according to the form and effect of the recovery aforesaid as the quantity of Six Thousand and Twenty three pounds of Tobacco, to the

said Alexander Stewart Junr. on his account by the Court here adjudged, for his Costs and Charges, which he hath sustained by reason of the delay of the Execution of the Judgment aforesaid, and the said William Pollitt in mercy &c.

Test. James Earle Junr. Clk

Memorandum That 16th April 1799 payment if any to be allowed —

Archabald Moncriff & William Goldsborough

Be it remembered that heretofore, to wit, on the twenty third day of August in the year of our Lord one thousand Seven hundred and Ninety three, Archabald Moncriff by Luther Martin Esquire sues forth out of the General Court here, the writ of the State of Maryland of Capias ad respondendum against a certain William Goldsborough in the words and figures following to wit, The State of Maryland &c. to the Sheriff of Dorchester County Greeting, we command you that you take William Goldsborough late of Dorchester County Gentleman, 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 Easton, in Talbot County, the Second Tuesday of September next, to answer unto Charles Cooke Hanks and Archibald Moncriff of a plea of Trespass upon the Case, Whereof fail not at your peril, and have you then and there this writ, Witness the Honorable Samuel Chase Esquire Chief Judge of our said Court, the ninth day of April Anno Domini 1793 — Issued 23 day of August 1793 L.S. James Earle junr Clk

At which mentioned Second Tuesday of September Seventeen hundred and ninety three being the day of the return of the foregoing Writ Came into the General Court the said Archibald Moncriff and Charles Cookehanks by their Attorney aforesaid and the Sheriff of Dorchester County to whom the said writ was by form aforesaid directed made return thereof to the Court thus endorsed to wit Cepi Charles Hodson Sheriff. And thereupon William Goldsborough by Nicholas Hammond and Philip B. Key his Attorneys, and defendes the force and Injury when and wherefore, and prayed Leave of the Court to imparle until the next Term, and he had it, the same day was given to the said Charles Cookehanks & Archibald Moncriff at which said next Term to wit, the second Tuesday of April one thousand Seven hundred and ninety four Came again into Court the parties aforesaid by their Attorneys aforesaid and thereupon at the prayer of the said William Goldsborough by his Attorneys aforesaid it was ruled by the Court that the said Charles Cookehanks and Archibald Moncriff declare against him in the plea aforesaid by the Second Tuesday of September