

pounds of Tob. according to the tenure of my Bill unto M^r Symon Ouerzee as wittnes my hand, Aprill 8, 1658

Liber
P. C. R.

Dauid Thomas

Wittnes

Nicolas Gwyther.

Uppon the demand of Symon Ouerzee pff agst Dauid Thomas dēft. in an accōn of Debt. The dēft acknowledging a Judgm^t under his hand in writing, for fowre hund^d & odde pownds according to the tenure of his Bill. And the Bill being fowre hund^d fifty & fwe pownds Tob, in cask. Ordered th^t a Judgm^t be entred according to the Bill for fowre hund^d fifty, fwe pownds Tob, in Cask, & according to dēfts acknowledgm^t to be satisfyed & payd unto the pff uppon demand.

Uppon the Petⁿ of James Mullekin pff agst Henry Coursey dēft; The Dēfts Attorney John Coursey, not hauing notice or knowledge concerning this Cause, desyres a Respite till next Court w^{ch} was Graunted.

Mullekin v.
Coursey

Uppon the demand of Cap^t Tho: Cornewalleys pff agst Samuel Parker dēft, in an accon of debt. Nicolas Gwyther Sheriffe, desyres a Respite till next Court on the behalfe of the dēft, w^{ch} was allso granted him.

Corne-
walleys v.
Parker

Know all men by these p^{nts} th^t I John Thomkinson of the prouince of Maryland, doe acknowledge a Judgm^t unto Thomas Cornewalleys Esq^r for a Bill due unto the s^d Cornewalleys, as wittnes my hand

p. 34
Corne-
walleys v.
Thomkinson

Aprill 9th 1658

John † Thomkinson

Wittnes

Nicolas Gwyther

Will^m Hatton.

Uppon the demand of Cap^t Thomas Cornewalleyes pff agst John Thompkinson dēft in an accōn of debt. The dēft acknowledgeth (under hand writing) Judgm^t for a Bill. But noe mention made of the summe. Whereuppon the pff produced the Bill, w^{ch} is fowre hund^d & forty pounds of Tob. & cask. Ordered th^t Judgm^t be entred according to the s^d Bill.

Uppon the demand of Cap^t Thomas Cornewalleys pff. against George Gooderick, (Adm̄istrato^e of the Estate of Leiu^t William Lewis deceased) dēft; for fueteene pownds of Beauer, the Remainder of a greater summe. The pff producing the Bill, & the Adm̄istrato^e, not able to alleage anything agst the same. It is therefore

Corne-
walleys v.
Gooderick