If the Jury find the facts stated in the petitioners antecedent prayer, and also find that whilst said petitioner was in the District of Columbia under said permission and agreement, that her said owner gave a power of Attorney to her agents, to seize her in said District and sell her there or any where else as a slave for life, that then any importation of said Petr. unto this State by her said owner or her agents for sale entitles the Petitioner to her freedom, and if they find such an importation, that then the Petr. is entitled to her freedom".

Which said prayer after being duly considered by the said Court, were by the said Court here, endorsed

"Rejected"

And thereafter the said Hope H Slatter by his counsel aforesaid offers to the Court, the following prayer to wit.

"The defdt. prays the Court to instruct the Jury.

That if they believe the contract or agreement spoken of by the witness Mrs Ellen Scott a witness on the part of the petitioner was made, it is wholly void and does not give the petitioner any right to her freedom.

He also prays the Court to instruct the Jury,

That if the jury shall find from the evidence, that the petitioner was sent from this State into the District of Columbia, to be hired to service, for a limitted time, by Mrs Martha Scott, and that at the time of such removal the said Martha was the owner in fee of the person of the said petitioner, then the bringing back into this State of the said petitioner by the said Martha Scott, does not entitle the said petitioner to her freedom. Although the Jury may believe from the evidence, that after the said petitioner was sent into the District aforesaid, there was an agreement between the said petitioner & Martha Scott that on payment of a sum of money by the petitioner to the said Martha Scott, the said petitioner should be free.

The defendant prays the Court to instruct the Jury that if they believe from the evidence that Martha Scott gave the petitioner a written permission to go to the City of Washington & hire herself & receive her own wages, &c. afterwards in November 1845 caused the said petitioner to be brought again into Maryland, and then sold her for life, that said petitioner is not therefore entitled to her freedom".

Which said prayer being duly considered by the Court here, was by the Court here endorsed

"Granted"

And thereafter, to wit, on the fourth day of July in the year last aforesaid, the said Jurors impannelled as aforesaid and sworn to say the truth in the premises, do say that the said Petitioner Lucy Crawford is free as by her said petition she hath alleged.

Whereupon the said Hope H Slatter by his counsel aforesaid says, that the said Court ought not to proceed to render judgment against him aforesaid upon the said verdict by the jurors aforesaid in form aforesaid found, and prays that the same verdict may be stricken, and that the issue aforesaid may be tried anew by other jurors, to be a fresh impannelled, & upon the fifth day of July in the year aforesaid, filed in Court the following reasons, that is to say.

"Lucy Crawford } Petition for freedom.
" }
Hope H Slatter } The respondent moves the Court for a new trial in this case & assigns for reasons
1st. That the verdict of the jury is against evidence.
2d. That the verdict was against the instructions of the Court,
3. That the verdict is against law.

C. J. Pitts for ptf
J. Y. Mason for ptf."

Which said motion was on the twenty fifth day of July in the year aforesaid, overruled by the Court here.

And thereupon it is considered by the Court here, that the said Negro Lucy Crawford, the petitioner aforesaid, recover her freedom of and against the said Hope H Slatter, and that she be free & discharged of and from the service of the said Hope H Slatter, and that she the said Lucy Crawford go thereof free and discharged without day &c.

And it is also considered by the Court here, that the said Lucy Crawford recover against the said Hope H Slatter the sum of fourteen dollars and thirty four cents by the Court