

Appeal from the Judgment aforesaid, so as aforesaid rendered to the Court of Appeals, to be holden in the Eastern Shore of this State and its counties her. It is therefore Ordered by the said Court that the record and proceedings aforesaid in the plea aforesaid with all things thereunto relating be transmitted to the said Court of Appeals to be holden for the Eastern Shore of the said State and the same are transmitted to the said Court accordingly. Test John Brown Clerk of the said Court of Appeals, June 1st 1777.

In testimony whereof to this Declaration I have subscribed my name and affix the Seal of the said Court this 1st day of June in the year 1777 and thousand eight hundred & fifteen - J. M. Murphy Clerk of the said Court.

And now comes into the said Court of Appeals as well the said Richard Term paper of the said Rebecca Holding by Thomas S. Bullock & Henry Harrison Esquires her Attorney as the said Rebecca Holding by William Amichand Esquire her Attorney; and the said Rebecca Holding by her said Attorney saith that in the record and proceedings aforesaid, and also in the giving of Judgment aforesaid there is manifest error in this Court, that by the record aforesaid it appears that the Judgment aforesaid in the plea aforesaid given was given for the said Richard Term paper as aforesaid, against the said Rebecca Holding, when by the law of the land that Judgment ought to have been given for the said Rebecca Holding against the said Richard Term paper as aforesaid therefore in that there is manifest error and he prays that the Judgment aforesaid for that error and others being in the record & proceedings aforesaid may be reversed annulled and held entirely as void, and that the said Rebecca Holding may be restored to all that she has lost by occasion of the said Judgment - and that the said Richard Term paper as aforesaid, may regain to the errors aforesaid.

And the said Richard Term paper as aforesaid, by his attorney aforesaid says there is no error in the record and proceedings aforesaid or in the rendition of the Judgment aforesaid & he prays likewise that the Court here may proceed to the examination, as well of the record and proceedings aforesaid as of the matters aforesaid by the said Rebecca Holding above for errors assigned, and that the said Judgment may be in all things affirmed - Whereupon it is ruled by the Court here that the matters in controversy between the parties aforesaid be argued and fully discussed as well on the part of the said Rebecca Holding as on the part of the said Richard Term paper as aforesaid before the Judges of the said Court here & thereupon further process of and upon the premises aforesaid between the parties aforesaid by consent of the said parties and their attorneys aforesaid and by order of the Court here thereon is continued until the last Monday of November next. At which day Court, the last Monday in November eighteen hundred and sixteen, come again into the Court of Appeals here the parties aforesaid by their Attornies aforesaid: thereupon further process of and upon the premises aforesaid between the parties aforesaid by consent of the said parties and their Attornies aforesaid and by order of the Court here thereon is further continued until the last Monday of May next. And now here at this day Court, the first of Monday of June eighteen hundred and sixteen, come again into the Court of Appeals here by virtue of an act of the General Assembly in such case made and provided was changed, continued and adjourned, come again into the Court of Appeals the parties aforesaid by their Attornies aforesaid whereupon as well the record and proceedings aforesaid and the Judgment given in form aforesaid as the matters aforesaid by the said Rebecca Holding above for errors assigned being seen and by the Court here was fully understood, and matured deliberation thereupon had, for that it appears to the Court here that there is manifest error in the record and proceedings aforesaid and also in the rendition of the Judgment aforesaid therefore it is considered by the Court here that the Judgment aforesaid for those errors and others in the record and proceedings aforesaid be reversed annulled & held entirely as void and that the said Rebecca Holding be restored to all things which by reason of the Judgment

and then to John Weeks
of law firm current
and bequeath into
of my Estate - whom
I have named as his
executor as his

Charles Sanders, the
decedent being duly solemnly
sworn that they saw the
testimony & declared it to
be true he was to the best
of his knowledge that they did subscribe
in the presence of the said
said paper on the 17th day
of February 1777 and
in election to stand and
be holden by the said
entered into the laws devised
with the declaration mentioned
in the said will
that Mary Steuart +
her daughter obtained the full
benefit by getting Sarah
Wright and Holding and
her husband & by her will
Charles Holding entered
the said will for
under John Hargis
to be returned for
of appeal -
by the Court
at her own head and
tail that it appears to the
Court to recover upon this
paper - Thereupon
in the said recover
and undivided of
said Scott's but range
balance and that he has
and it is also considered
said recover against
of eight cents and one
penny for his costs &
expenses and the said
paper aforesaid prays an

June Term 1815.

211

Know all men by these presents, that I, the Sheriff of Queen Anne's County, Maryland, do hereby command you, George Walls, late of Queen Anne's County, to appear before the County Court now sitting at Centerville, in said County, to answer the petition of Henry Stensley and her children, preferred against him for freedom. And if you fail to appear, you shall be held to answer the said petition as if you had appeared, and you shall be liable to the costs of the said petition. Witness the honorable Richard Fitzhugh Carter, Esquire, Chief Judge of the County Court in the said Judicial District of Maryland, the first day of May in the year eighteen hundred and fifteen. Given the 13th day of May 1815. John Brown Clk.

And whereas the Sheriff of Queen Anne's County, Richard Moffett, Gentleman, to whom the said aforesaid writ of subpoena was in form aforesaid directed, makes return thereof to the said Court here, that he has served the said writ on the said George Walls, as shown within Commanded, R. Moffett, Esquire, Attorney for the said Henry Stensley and her children, his attorney appears in Court here. Whereupon it is ordered by the Court here that the said George Walls enter into recognizance in the sum of two thousand Dollars current money, with security, that he the said George Walls do not remove the aforesaid Henry Stensley and her children out of this State nor obstruct them from attending this Court from time to time in support of their petition for freedom preferred against him the said George Walls, and in the mean time to feed cloath & use the said petitioners well. Whereupon the said George Walls present here in Court acknowledges himself to owe and stand justly indebted unto the State of Maryland, in the sum of Two thousand Dollars current money and a certain Samuel Chaplain of Queen Anne's County also present here in Court in like manner acknowledges himself to owe and stand justly indebted to the said State of Maryland in the sum of two thousand Dollars, which he and each of them acknowledge shall be made and paid of their respective bodies goods and chattels lands and tenements to and for the use of the said State and it is Conditioned that the said George Walls do not remove Henry Stensley, Susan Stensley, Juliana Stensley & Priscilla out of this State nor obstruct them attending this Court from time to time in support of their petition for freedom, exhibited in the said Court against the said George Walls, and in the mean time to feed cloath and use them well & pay whatever satisfaction the Court shall adjudge for the services of the said Henry Stensley, Susan Stensley, Juliana Stensley, and Priscilla Stensley from this time to the time of the Judgment with Costs - and the said George Walls by his attorney aforesaid defends the Complaint aforesaid when and where the Court will take the same into consideration & prays leave of the Court here to impale until the third Monday of October next, and to him it is granted the same day is given to the said Henry Stensley and her children also.

At which said third Monday of October being the sixteenth day of the same month in the year Eighteen hundred and fifteen, came again into Court here, as well the said Henry Stensley and her children by their attorney aforesaid as the said George Walls by his attorney aforesaid; and the said George Walls by his attorney aforesaid as before defends the Complaint aforesaid, when and where the Court will take the same into consideration and prays leave of the Court here to impale until the first Monday of May next, and to him it is granted the same day is given to the said Henry Stensley and her children also. And now here at this day, the first Monday of May being the sixth day of the same month in the year eighteen hundred and fifteen, came again into Court here as well the said Henry Stensley and her children by their attorney aforesaid as the said George Walls by his attorney aforesaid, and the said George Walls by this said attorney as before defends the Complaint when and so forth and saith that the said Henry Stensley and her children are not entitled to their freedom from being descended with the female line from a free woman named Susan in manner and form as stated within said petition.

... that Justice the
... case made and
... to the
... and
... had taken place or any
... that the said Rebecca
... and the sum of Twenty two
... into the said Rebecca
... and whereas a true her
... have thereof
... is Parrott & Co.

... last Monday of May
... of Justice and associate
... in person of the
... as provided, transmit
... which was lately depending
... children, petitioners
... judgment for the
... and from which
... Court of appeals here
... Court.
... of the said Judicial
... in and for Queen
... day of the same month
... the Independence of

... following Court.
... of May being the first
... and fifteen
... Henry Stensley
... to the Court here
... following Court.
... the petition of Henry
... Priscilla Stensley
... to their freedom being
... and that they are now
... in Queen Anne's County but
... against the said George
... such further notice
... for petitioners
... State of Maryland
... against the said George Walls
... which accordingly

June Term 1818.

The said juror did he left York Town. That about two weeks before he left York Town he had been at the spot, where he had seen people such the mother of Henry one of the petitioners, selling cakes & beer without a license, and that he saw her repeatedly afterwards selling cakes & beer at the shore of the River at York Town, until the day before Captain Sweet sailed when the said such was brought on board Captain Sweet's vessel by five or six men, at about 9 o'clock at night & purchased for the said Sweet, that another black woman was brought on board Captain Sweet's vessel by the same persons who was retained and set on board in consequence of her cries and screams; that the said Sweet had informed the said Negro that she would make her his wife and that the said such had said during her passage to Maryland that she was sorry she had come away, as she was free in Virginia and had a white husband there - On his cross examination the said Griffin was asked if he had heard the story of the kidnapping mentioned at any period since he came to Maryland, or whether at any time since he has mentioned it - which he answered he did not recollect to have mentioned it but had heard it talked of, - said Griffin also proved that one Bartus Sweet returned to Maryland with Captain Sweet & himself; that both Bartus Sweet & Captain Sweet are dead. The petitioners then proved by John Conroy that he had heretofore resided within the immediate neighborhood of William Sweet, who is now dead, the brother of Captain Sweet and with whom negro such then lived, that he heard a conversation between the said such, and the mother of the witness in which the said such stated herself to have been free in Virginia and to have been taken from thence by Captain Sweet - The Counsel for the petitioners then asked the said Conroy, if it was the reputation of the neighborhood that the said such was a free woman to which the defendant by his Counsel objected but the Court did permit the witness to answer the question and to testify that such was the reputation of the neighborhood - To which the defendant by his Counsel excepted & that he might have the benefit of his exception, prays the Court to sign and seal this his Bill of Exception which is accordingly done this 11th day of May 1818.

Henry Hemmley & others vs. Wm. Sweet & others

Prayer of
George Walls In addition to the several matters and things stated in the above Bill of Exception the petitioners proved by the above named Griffin and Conroy, the Declaration of Captain Sweet as to the freedom of the above named Negro such, & the Defendants proved that Captain Sweet had sold her to John Gibson an assid - they then proposed to prove by the declarations of the said John Gibson, that the said such was a slave, but the petitioners by their Counsel objected to the testimony & the Court would not permit it to be given, to which opinion of the Court the defendant excepted, & prays the Court to sign and seal this Bill of Exception which is accordingly done this 11th day of May 1818.

And thereafter the said George Walls by his Attorney aforesaid prays an appeal from the Judgment aforesaid so as aforesaid rendered to the Court of Appeals to be holden for the Eastern Shore of this State and did grant him: It is therefore ordered by the said Court that the record and proceedings aforesaid in the plea aforesaid with all things thereunto relating be transmitted to the said Court of Appeals to be holden for the Eastern Shore of the said State and the same are transmitted to the said Court accordingly.

Maryland Queen Anne's County Court. I hereby certify that the within & foregoing is truly taken from the record & proceedings of Queen Anne's County Court.

In testimony whereof to this Recomplication I have unto subscribe my name & give the seal of Queen Anne's County Court this 10th day of June in the year of our said One thousand eight hundred and sixteenth.

Wm. Murphy, Clerk of Queen Anne's County Court. And now comes into the Court of Appeals the said George Walls by Gabriel Chambers & Henry Garrison, Esquires his Attorneys as the said Henry Hemmley, Susan

Henry Hemmley and her
and appear before the Court
has become as well as
Thomas Richardson
James, John Price, Thomas
Dabney, William A. Earle
Thomas B. Turpin and
Ninian Benton, Thomas
Charles Deane, John Price
and sworn upon that
of a bench challenged on the
Nathan Weston John
William Wright the other
and sworn on their oaths do
and present Henry Hemmley
and of free condition as
found against the said George
his said Attorney saith that
the said verdict & prayer
the Jurors aforesaid in
verdict is contrary to the
against the weight of testimony
of the Petitioners to prove
man in Virginia
had been heard & fully
as to the Court had that
take at said -
Susan Hemmley
prayer then prays of
aged of and from the service
Susan Hemmley Juliana
and others -
Susan Hemmley,
a third George Walls
third of the Court by the
Susan Hemmley, & others
by them about the prosecution
of the said their execution
Murphy, Clerk
the Court had the following
and sealed the book and
the Court proved by
before the surrender of
and gone to James River,
transferred to the Baltimore
Court on board Captain
has on the 11th after

Decisions.

On the 11th day of January, 1851, the Court met at 10 o'clock, and the following cases were called for:

1. *William G. Smith vs. John D. Smith*, by William G. Smith, Esq., and John D. Smith, Esq., attorneys for the parties.

The Court heard the evidence and the arguments of the parties, and after a short deliberation, the Court rendered its decision in favor of the plaintiff, William G. Smith, and awarded him the sum of \$1000, with costs.

2. *John D. Smith vs. William G. Smith*, by John D. Smith, Esq., and William G. Smith, Esq., attorneys for the parties.

The Court heard the evidence and the arguments of the parties, and after a short deliberation, the Court rendered its decision in favor of the plaintiff, John D. Smith, and awarded him the sum of \$1000, with costs.

3. *John D. Smith vs. John D. Smith*, by John D. Smith, Esq., and John D. Smith, Esq., attorneys for the parties.

The Court heard the evidence and the arguments of the parties, and after a short deliberation, the Court rendered its decision in favor of the plaintiff, John D. Smith, and awarded him the sum of \$1000, with costs.

4. *John D. Smith vs. John D. Smith*, by John D. Smith, Esq., and John D. Smith, Esq., attorneys for the parties.

The Court heard the evidence and the arguments of the parties, and after a short deliberation, the Court rendered its decision in favor of the plaintiff, John D. Smith, and awarded him the sum of \$1000, with costs.

5. *John D. Smith vs. John D. Smith*, by John D. Smith, Esq., and John D. Smith, Esq., attorneys for the parties.

The Court heard the evidence and the arguments of the parties, and after a short deliberation, the Court rendered its decision in favor of the plaintiff, John D. Smith, and awarded him the sum of \$1000, with costs.

6. *John D. Smith vs. John D. Smith*, by John D. Smith, Esq., and John D. Smith, Esq., attorneys for the parties.

The Court heard the evidence and the arguments of the parties, and after a short deliberation, the Court rendered its decision in favor of the plaintiff, John D. Smith, and awarded him the sum of \$1000, with costs.

7. *John D. Smith vs. John D. Smith*, by John D. Smith, Esq., and John D. Smith, Esq., attorneys for the parties.

The Court heard the evidence and the arguments of the parties, and after a short deliberation, the Court rendered its decision in favor of the plaintiff, John D. Smith, and awarded him the sum of \$1000, with costs.

8. *John D. Smith vs. John D. Smith*, by John D. Smith, Esq., and John D. Smith, Esq., attorneys for the parties.

The Court heard the evidence and the arguments of the parties, and after a short deliberation, the Court rendered its decision in favor of the plaintiff, John D. Smith, and awarded him the sum of \$1000, with costs.

9. *John D. Smith vs. John D. Smith*, by John D. Smith, Esq., and John D. Smith, Esq., attorneys for the parties.

The Court heard the evidence and the arguments of the parties, and after a short deliberation, the Court rendered its decision in favor of the plaintiff, John D. Smith, and awarded him the sum of \$1000, with costs.

10. *John D. Smith vs. John D. Smith*, by John D. Smith, Esq., and John D. Smith, Esq., attorneys for the parties.

The Court heard the evidence and the arguments of the parties, and after a short deliberation, the Court rendered its decision in favor of the plaintiff, John D. Smith, and awarded him the sum of \$1000, with costs.

(Faint handwritten notes on the left margin, including names like "John D. Smith" and "William G. Smith")

SUMMER TERM 1818.

Patrick McNeal, use of ³ Court remembered that on the first Monday of
 James Armstrong for ³ Some eighteen hundred and eighteen the Chief Justice and
 William Jordan ³ associate Justices of Balbot County Court, in pursuance of the
 Act of assembly in such case made and provided, transmitted
 to the Court of appeals here the Record and proceedings of a plea which was lately depending
 before them in the said County Court between Patrick McNeal plaintiff and William Jordan,
 defendant in the said County Court gave judgment for the said Patrick McNeal against
 the said William Jordan, and from which said judgment the said William Jordan prayed an
 appeal to the Court of appeals here the tenor of which said Record and proceedings is informed following vizt
 The State of Maryland, At a County Court begun and held at Easton in and for the County of
 Balbot County, to wit the State aforesaid on the fourth Monday of May being the twenty seventh day of
 the said month in the year of our Lord eighteen hundred and eighteen, before the Honorable the Judges
 of the said County Court & other Officers duly commissioned & qualified to hold the same Court, of whom
 were present. The Honorable Richard Sigmund Earl Esquire Chief Judge,
 Lemuel Powell Esquire associate Judge,
 James Clayland Esquire Sheriff.

In the Record of proceedings of the said County Court, among other things were the following to wit
 Patrick McNeal, use of ³ As it remembered that heretofore, to wit on the first day of April, in
 the year eighteen hundred and fifteen, the Plaintiff in this cause by
 Thomas James Bullitt Esquire his Attorney, prosecuted and sued for the
 said William Jordan - ³ out of the County Court here the writ of the State of Maryland of
 Capias ad personam, directed to the Sheriff of Balbot County, in and for the County of
 Balbot County, to wit the State of Maryland. To the Sheriff of Balbot County, greeting. We Command
 you that you take William Jordan, late of Balbot County prisoner if he shall be found in your
 jurisdiction and him safe keep, so that you have him before the Judges of our County Court
 to be held at Easton, in the said County, on the fourth Monday of May next, to answer unto Patrick
 McNeal in a plea that he sues unto him the sum of twenty five pounds eight shillings & four
 pence current money of Maryland which saith he owes and from him unjustly detains &
 saith he does not at your peril and have you then and there this writ. Witness the Honorable
 Richard Sigmund Earl Esquire Chief Judge of our said Court the 11th day of November Anno
 Domini 1815. Splice the 1st day of April 1815. W. D. Lombard Clerk -
 At which said fourth Monday of May next to wit in the year eighteen hundred and fifteen being the
 return day of the foregoing writ, comes into Court here the said Patrick McNeal by his Attorney aforesaid
 and the Sheriff of the County aforesaid to whom the said writ was inform aforesaid makes return thereof
 to Court here the return under to wit. Copy Thomas Steucus, Sheriff.
 And the said William Jordan being called comes into Court here by William Hayward junior
 Esquire his Attorney, thereupon on motion of the said McNeal, by his said Attorney it is ruled by
 the Court here that the said William Jordan give special bail in the plea aforesaid whereupon a certain
 Thomas Robinson of said County, comes into Court here in propria persona and with the consent
 of the said McNeal by his Attorney aforesaid becomes pledge and bail for the said Jordan, in the usual
 form of this Court; whereupon the said McNeal by his said Attorney, prays leave of the Court here
 to depart, until the second Monday of November next, and he hath it the same day is given
 to the said Jordan the same. At which said second Monday of November next, to wit in
 the year eighteen hundred and fifteen, comes again into Court here the parties aforesaid by their
 Attorneys aforesaid, and the said McNeal by his said Attorney, declares against the said Jordan
 in the plea aforesaid as follows to wit. Balbot County, to wit, William Jordan late of Balbot County
 of whom, was summoned to answer unto Patrick McNeal as a plea that he sues unto him
 the sum of twenty five pounds eight shillings & four pence current money of Maryland which
 saith he does not at your peril & unjustly detains & And whereupon the said Patrick McNeal by Thomas
 James Bullitt his Attorney says that the said William Jordan on the twenty second day of

James Bullitt, Esquire their attorney
 that in the record and proceedings aforesaid
 and in this Court, that by
 the plea aforesaid given was
 the said County Court by the
 the said County Court against the
 is manifest and he prays
 the record and proceedings aforesaid
 that he the said County Court may
 judgment, and that the said County
 the year
 the record and proceedings aforesaid say there is no
 of the judgment aforesaid. The prays
 as well of the record and proceedings
 as above for more aforesaid and
 when prays it ruled by the
 aforesaid be argued & fully discussed
 the said County Court & the
 further prays of the parties aforesaid
 that the said County Court be held
 the last Monday of November next.
 two hundred and sixteen, come
 by their Attorneys aforesaid. There
 between the parties aforesaid
 and the order of the Court here
 of next.
 of and Act of the General
 and contained and explained, come
 by their Attorneys aforesaid
 to the judgment given inform
 aforesaid for more aforesaid, being
 aforesaid had thereupon,
 proceedings of the said County Court
 of the said County Court as stated
 as stated in the said first plea of
 that the said County Court be
 aforesaid be held at Easton, and
 in the record and proceedings
 of the said County Court
 the said County Court
 aforesaid inform aforesaid given
 the said County Court, be in all things aforesaid
 aforesaid & aforesaid in
 pursuant to the direction of
 aforesaid a permission of
 said County Court of Queen Anne's
 said County Court directing them
 in the said County Court as if no trial
 that James Parrott (b)