

Saturday 3<sup>o</sup> March 1659 as afore.

All p<sup>e</sup>nt as yesterday.

Liber  
P. C. R.  
March 3

Whereas Nicholas Gwyther Sheriffe of S<sup>t</sup> Maries County hath peti[ti]oned this Board, Shewing how th<sup>t</sup> One Richard Galey (who came w<sup>th</sup> the Ship S<sup>t</sup> George into this Prouince) was by Order of the Gouverno<sup>r</sup> & Councell banished & Ordered not to returne into the prouince againe w<sup>th</sup> out speciall lycence, as by th<sup>t</sup> Order of Court may appeare. And whereas the s<sup>d</sup> Galey returning againe into the prouince w<sup>th</sup> in his limitted time of banishm<sup>t</sup> w<sup>th</sup> out lycence, & committing some misdemeano<sup>rs</sup> was therefore committed to the Sheriffs Custody, where hee remayned Prisoner about three months, & then dyed. The s<sup>d</sup> Sheriffe finding him dyett, lodging & other necessaries att his owne Charge all the time of his imprisonm<sup>t</sup>: And then att his Death decent & Christian like Buriall, ffor all w<sup>ch</sup> hee receiued noe ffee, or other satisfaction, the s<sup>d</sup> Galey being not resident here, nor hauing any Estate or ffortunes in this Prouince.

Re Galey

Vide 3 Md.  
Arch. Coun.  
361

It is Ordered That it be referred to the Assembly, And the howse to make Order for such matters, in this & the like Cases.

These p<sup>e</sup>nts wittnes That I Nathaniel Vtye Merch<sup>t</sup> doe assigne & make ouer unto Joseph Wicks of the Ile of Kent Two men Seruants named ffrancis Brooke & Thomas Brooke for the time & tearme of fflower yeares, As wittnes my hand this 3<sup>d</sup> of March 1656.

Wicks v.  
Utye

Wittnes Henry Meese Thomas Ward.

Nath Vtye

Vppon the motion of Cap<sup>t</sup> Joseph Wicks Pff, Concerning Two seruants bought of Co<sup>th</sup> Nath: Vtye dēft, The s<sup>d</sup> dēft uoluntarily ioyned issue w<sup>th</sup> him.

And thereuppon the pff produceth his Assigm<sup>t</sup> or noate of the s<sup>d</sup> Two seruants from the dēft to him, & Craueth the Judgm<sup>t</sup> of the Board touching the same.

The Judgm<sup>t</sup> of the whole Board is That those Two seruants assigned ouer to the pff by the dēft, according to th<sup>t</sup> noate for fflower yeares; The Board understandeth fflower yeares apeice.

And for that one of the s<sup>d</sup> Seruants is allready ffree, & the other likewise hath petitioned att this p<sup>e</sup>nt Court for his ffreedome allso, Soe th<sup>t</sup> one whole yeare is remaying of th<sup>t</sup> Seruants labo<sup>r</sup> due to the pff w<sup>ch</sup> is allready ffree. In Consideraōn of w<sup>ch</sup> yeares Service It is Ordered th<sup>t</sup> the dēft pay unto the pff One Thowsand pounds of Tob, att the next Crop.

Vid. fol. 348  
p. 370

Thomas Gerard Esq<sup>r</sup> Sheweth That hee was summoned to appeare att a Court held in Caluert County (1658) 5<sup>th</sup> of Octob<sup>r</sup>, by John Lord, And the s<sup>d</sup> Lord not appearing att th<sup>t</sup> Court; The s<sup>d</sup> Thomas Gerard obteyned a Nonsuite agst him w<sup>th</sup> Charges of attendance.

Gerard v.  
Lord  
Vid. fol. 25  
&  
Vid. fol. 99