

Sedent } <sup>mr Secret</sup> And vpon the oath of the plf that at the Liber P. R.  
 } <sup>mr Ja: Neale.</sup> entry of this action on the 11. nov: last  
 Angud baker ought him 300<sup>l</sup> tob & that he had received since  
 no more toward it then 200<sup>l</sup> tob: the Court found that he  
 should recover 100<sup>l</sup> tob of the said Jo: mottram.

Tho: Carey prayed to be admitted to make further prooffe  
 ags<sup>t</sup> humphrey Chaplin, & produced the returne of the Com-  
 mission for the swearing of Anne Thomson :

And vpon the reading of the evidence the Court found for  
 the said Thomas Carey, that he should recover the service of  
 humphrey Chaplin till the 14<sup>th</sup> of March next, and (with consent  
 of the def<sup>ts</sup> attorney Edw. packer) two months after the said 14<sup>th</sup>  
 of march, (cont 58 daies) in recompence of damage for his  
 absence since the last of Aprill.

Giles Brent Esq p attornat Edw. packer demandeth of Tho:  
 wetherley 4. bushells of English meale, for w<sup>ch</sup> he received as  
 price thereof in hand, 2. hh. tob. cont 500<sup>l</sup> tob at the least ;  
 warr<sup>t</sup> to the defend<sup>t</sup> to shew cause at Court forthwith.

the said Tho: Wetherly came & saith that the tob was not  
 merchantable, & the pl<sup>t</sup> not being able to depose of the  
 goodnes of the tob nor that the defend<sup>t</sup> tooke it for good or  
 bad, the defend<sup>t</sup> was admitted to his oath, vpon whose oath  
 that william Nauphone the seller of the tobacco did say to him  
 of one of the hogsheads that it was as good below as at the  
 top, w<sup>ch</sup> the dep<sup>t</sup> saw, & that it would make vp it selfe, & the  
 rest that was good of the other hogshead; & that there was  
 no more of it vsible then about 200 w<sup>t</sup>

whereas nathan: Pope hath petitiond the Court that he may  
 have the bodies of 3. maidserv<sup>s</sup> of S<sup>r</sup> Edmond Ploydon delivered  
 to his custody to carry downe to S<sup>t</sup> Edmond in virginea the  
 Court can find it no way iust to allow his said petition in  
 regard the pet<sup>r</sup> can shew no authorisem<sup>t</sup> from S<sup>r</sup> Edmond to  
 demand or receive them; besides that by a letter of attorney to  
 m<sup>r</sup> Giles Brent Esq dated 26. march last it appeares to the  
 Court that the said Giles Brent is authorised by the said S<sup>r</sup>  
 Edmond to demand & take into his custody the said servants  
 But by reason of m<sup>r</sup> brents absence in Kent no demand yet  
 either by the said Giles Brent or any other on the said S<sup>r</sup>  
 Edmonds behalfe hath beene made to this govern<sup>t</sup> for the said  
 servants; and whensoever they shalbe lawfully demanded, the  
 Court wilbe ready to doe for S<sup>r</sup> Edmond, all that to right &  
 iustice shall apperteine.