which from the nature of the transaction ought to be apparent on the warrant itself.

A plat returned on a survey by a private person, appointed by one of the parties, without the consent of the other, is not admitted as evidence, and the depositions taken on such a survey are also to be rejected.

A paper purporting to be the field notes of the surveyor, without a table of courses, and not properly authenticated by such surveyor, has been rejected when offered as proof of the original running of land.

The expressions in a grant, it has been held, may be controuled by proof.

Absolute verity, it has also been held, does not reside either in a warrant issued from the land office, or in the record of it made by the register. If the date, description &c. contained in a warrant are alledged to have been altered, the chancellor receives evidence to establish the fact, after which it will be adjudged void, or amended, as the circumstances may require.

Where no positive proof is produced of the issuing of a patent, or the payment of composition money, the chancellor will not *presume*, from long possession, or other circumstances, (which might exist) without such a patent, or payment, that a patent did issue, and that the composition was paid. It is otherwise where the judge is satisfied by proof that a patent had issued, and had been recorded in a book which was afterwards lost.

Plats, when arbitrarily made, and not corresponding with the grant, are not to be regarded.

The proof of a deputy surveyor to a *beginning* has been allowed to be refuted, or discredited, by other testimony.

Where the former surveyor who laid down all the lands involved in a dispute, for illustration, has certified and sworn to his whole work, and produced strong circumstances to prove that the runnings were as formerly laid down, it has been deemed sufficient evidence to the chancellor.

On an appeal from the decision of the judge of the Eastern shore land office it has been stated that plats ought to accompany the transcript, but new evidence is not to be received in the hearing on such an appeal.

Evidence (not on appeal) omitted by mistake may be produced on granting a re-hearing.

On a caveat against a certificate returned under an escheat warrant, it is stated by chancellor Hanson to be the settled rule and practice that the caveator must shew a title in himself or in some other person; and, the shewing of a deed from a person, reciting that he is the heir of another therein named,