

Peter Peterson per  
Daniel Norris doct }  
Hoc sur case Declaracion

Hoc est Daniel Norris of Kent County Good Landlord  
attached to answor unto Peter Peterson for payment  
of a piece of his pass upon the case &c.

And whereupon the said Peter Peterson by Griffith Jones  
his Attorney complaineth and saith that the said Norris  
within the Jurisdiction of this Court Goodlyly indebted  
unto him the said Peterson the full and just summe of five  
hundred forty and seven pds of Tobacco as by a certaine  
and bearing date in October Anno 91 to Anno 1695 the  
said Court produced may more at large appears which  
said summe of five hundred forty and seven pds of Tobacco  
although often demanded to pay yett the said Norris lieth  
regarding but restlyly intending to derriue him the  
said Peterson of the aforesaid summe he hath not paid  
will doth refuse and denie to the damage of the said  
Peterson One thousand and eighty pounds of Tobacco  
and thereupon he bringeth this suit  
Jone Jps Quo Vobis  
Re Roe } plody

Norris  
Peterson }  
Hoc And whereupon the sd defendt by William  
Hanslow his Attorney saith that for the Manifest  
imperfections insufficiency and inconstancies in the plea de-  
claracion and the Matter therein contained he cannot nor  
by the Law of this Land is he bound wherford for want  
of a sufficient declaracion and for want of sufficient  
matter in the same to be retained the said Defendt prayeth  
Judgmt<sup>th</sup> Hic. Hanslow p defendt.

And the said declaracion is by this Court judged to be insuffi-  
cient Judgmt<sup>th</sup> is the fore Awarded for a Non suit  
Wherford it is considered by this Court that the defendt  
Daniel Norris doo recover as w<sup>th</sup> the summe of five hundred  
and seventy pounds of Tobacco rest of suit

Simon Willmore etc