to remove him, doing no more than was necessary for that purpose, which is the alleged first assault by the plaintiff.

70th. That the defendant was not entitled to the said way over Denial of right the plaintiff's land, as the defendant has alleged.

71st. That the alleged trespass was not a use by the defendant of Alleged trespass not a use of the said way.

72d. That the defendant was not within the age of twenty-one Denial of lufancy years, as alleged.

73d. That the alleged deed was not delivered as an escrow, as Not delivered

74th. That the defendant was not, and is not now, the wife of one Denial of W. T, as alleged.

75th. That the defendant did not make the alleged deed by Dental of duress duress, as alleged.

76th. That the alleged deed was not procured by the fraud of the Denial of fraud plaintiff.

77th That the defendant did not commit the alleged assault in Denial of selfhis own defence.

New Assignment.

(If the plaintiff replies and new assigns, the new assignment may be as follows):

78th. The plaintiff, as to the ——— and ——— pleas, says, that Form of new he sucs not for the trespasses therein admitted, but for trespasses assignment committed by the defendant in excess of the alleged rights, and also in other parts of the said land and on other occasions, and for other purposes than those referred to in the said pleas.

79th. And the plaintiff, as to the _____ and ____ pleas, further same. says, that he sues not only for the trespasses in these pleas admitted, but also for, etc.

(If the plaintiff replies and new assigns to some of the pleas, and new assigns only to the others, the form may be as follows):

80th. And the plaintiff, as to the — and — pleas, further same says that he sues not for the trespasses in the _____ pleas (the pleas not replied to), admitted, but for the trespasses in the pleas (the pleas replied to), admitted, and also for, etc.

Pleas in Abatement.

81st. That the plaintiff, at the time of issuing the summons in 22 Mi 492, 32 Md 482, 33 Md 186, 33 Md 189 458, 35 Md 169 this case, was and still is the wife of one R. B.

82d That the plaintiff is within twenty-one years of age; and Infancy has declared by attorney, when he should have declared by next friend or guardian.

83d. That the said contract in the declaration mentioned, was Non-joinder made by the defendant jointly with one W. P., who is still living, Md 174, 192, 33 and is residing in the county (or in the city) aforesaid; and was 215, 38 Md 138, 38 not made by the defendant alone, and therefore, the said W. P. 39 Md 314 should have been sued also.