

for selling liquors without licence which also appears by transcripts from the said Court, he represents that he was ignorant of the breaking up of the Court so soon, and did apply to the Court following but could not obtain a licence; he also sets forth that he is advanced in years, has a wife and several small Children, and that he is unable to pay the fines, and the Chief Justice and three other Justices of the said Court together with several respectable inhabitants of Baltimore having recommended a Remission of his fines, the Board do order and direct that the same be remitted upon paying all the Costs arising thereon.

James Brice
H. Ridgely
John Davidson

In Council April 4. 1792

Whereas it appears by the representation of the Chief Justice and the two Associates of Cæcil County, that Henry Clelland Baker of said County at October term seventeen hundred and eighty nine did apply to the said Court for a licence to keep Tavern at a place called long Creek, which was granted to him, and that he paid the sum of Six pounds five shillings being the sum prescribed for one year's keeping of a Tavern, and that Whereas the Laws of this State at [p. 53] that time required that persons should apply at the June Courts for such licence or if they should apply at any other term their licence should continue not longer than the June Court following when the same should determine and might be removed, and that the said Henry Clelland Baker alleges that he thought his licence would continue to the October term 1790, and omitted to renew the same at the June Court following the October that he obtained it, and in consequence of this neglect the said Henry Clelland Baker was presented at October Court 1790, and was fined the Sum of Six pounds, And the said Court having in consequence of the indigent Circumstances of the said Henry Clelland Baker recommended the remission of the said fine. We do therefore order and direct that the said fine be remitted upon the said Baker's paying the Costs thereon accruing.

James Brice
H. Ridgely
John Davidson

In Council April 4, 1792

Whereas it appears by the representation of the Chief Justice of the 2d District, and the two Associates of Kent County that William Pope of the Said County was fined by the said Court at March term last, the quantity of two thousand pounds of Tobacco for keeping Ordinary without licence, that the said William Pope had kept an Ordinary for several years previous to the usual [p. 54] time of holding Court in June 1790, and that he took out a licence at the said Term, which was in force until the usual time of holding June term 1791, that he went to Chester town for the purpose of obtaining a licence at an adjourned Court, being ignorant of the abolition of June Court until after the adjournment of a March Court in course, that when he went to Chester town for the purpose aforesaid the adjourned March Court was further adjourned, at which last adjournment he did not apply by reason of his mistaking the day of adjournment, That licence was granted to him at October term last for which he paid the Sum of three pounds, the said licence to continue in force until March term last, by which omission the State has lost forty shillings, that he had no intention to violate the Laws. And the said Justices having recommended a remission of the said fine. The Board