Said Indenture was Duely and Legally Acknowledged by the Said Pryor Smallwood and Elizabeth his wife and Inrolled Amongst the Records of Charles County as by the Sa Indenture relation be thereunto had may more fully appear And the Said Daniel Protesting that the Said Pryor hath not performed fullfilled and keept any thing in the Said Indenture above Contained on the Part and behalf of the Said Prior to be performed fullfilled and keept According to the form and Effect of the Said Indenture the Said Bryon in fact Saith that at the Time of the Sealing and Delivery of the Said Indenture he the Said Pryor did not Stand firmly Seized in his Demesne of a fee Simple in the afd Land and premisses by the Said recited Indenture Granted and that the Said Prior Smallwood at the Time of Sealing and Delivery of the Said Recited Indenture had not full and absolute Power to Sell and Assure the Same According to the form and Effect of his afd Covenant in the Said Recited Indenture above Contained. And the Said Daniel further in fact Saith That he the Said Dan' was by vertue of the Said recited Indenture Seized of the Said Lands and premisses called St Bridgetts and that a Certain W<sup>m</sup> Hoskins having Long before the Makeing and Execution of the Said Indenture by the Said Prior as afa a Lawfull right and Title of an Estate in fee to Sixty Seven Acres Parcell of the afd Tract of Land and Premisses called St Bridgetts did after making of the Said Indenture as afd and before the Impetration and Exhibition of this writt in Charles County afd Enter upon the possession of the Said Daniel unto the Said Sixty Seven Acres Part of the Said afa Tract of Land called Saint Bridgetts and mentioned in the Sa above recited Indenture to be granted to the Said Daniel as afd Whereupon the Said Daniel in order to recover the Possession and Seizin of the Said Sixty Seven Acres Parcell of the Sa Tract called St Bridgetts was Oblidged to Commence and Did Actually Commence an Action of Trespass and Ejectment at the proper Costs and Charges of him the Said Dan' Agt the Said William which Said Action being at issue did at the Assizes held for Charles County on the Twenty first Day of September in the year One Thousand Seven hundred and Twenty Come to a tryall at which Said Tryall the Jury Elected and Sworn to try the Cause afd did Say that the Said William was not guilty of the Trespass and Ejectment as the Said Daniel Agt him had Complained as by the Record of the Said proceedings in the Provi Court remaining may appear by force and vertue of which Said Verdict the Said William keep the Said Daniel out of the S<sup>d</sup> possession and Seizin of the S<sup>d</sup> Sixty Seven Acres part of the Said Tract of Land by the Sa recited Indenture Granted to the Sa Daniel by the S<sup>d</sup> Pryor as af<sup>d</sup> Contrary to the form and Effect of the S<sup>d</sup> Indenture and Warranty therein Contained with this that the Said Daniel Will Averr That the Title right and Interest of the Said William of and into the Said Sixty Seven Acres [735] Part of the aforesaid Tract of Land is more Antient than the Title Right and Interest of the Sa Daniel unto the Same and thus the Said Pryor his Covenants afd hath not the often requested keept but