

Yest Noorthie left the 20 Augt 1750 next and Champlain
 affordid little regarding but looking and intodring them
 and Sarah & Daniel and John traffick to doone the 20 June
 of £5000 of tobaccoe or the value therof as affordid no batty
^{paid} not all the oft as done and but the same to pay no batty &
 done and refusd and still doth deny and refuse to pay same
 as of them the to Sarah Daniel and John his suuid of
 £15 per pound of tobaccoe bese of the matter
 in hand and thereupon they bring this suit
 Homfley et al: plody &c: vs: Doc Recd

Henry Marsh
 Sarah Dan^{et al} and John Depondt by Michael Laroche, 24th of
 John Stacs — } and to defendt by Michael Laroche, 24th of
 for plea saith that the dole of the said Sarah Daniel and John Stacs
 and the Matter therin contained is not sufficient in Law for them
 to sue Dolt to have and maintain their action w^t him the same
 and that the sd Dolt has no Battyness nor by the Law of the Land
 is he bound to answer all which he is ready to prove therfor forth
 want of a sufficient dole in this Behalfe and sufficient matter
 therin to be contained in the sd Dolt's prouerby & Judgment together
 with his costs to be adjudged unto him by this Court according to the
 Laws of this domⁿ

1st reas: That it is in their dole both alidys of Dolt stand huffly in-
 doled to them in the full and just sum of £5000 then paid & bound of
 of tobaccoe or the value therof in Indian corn and Wheat &c sue
 doth not declare how the sd Dolt stand in doled to them the 20 June
 the 20 June of tobaccoe &c: w^t witness Bill Bond att^d: or otherwise
 so that the sd Dolt knoweth not how to put in a certain Answer
 2^d reas: If the sd Dolt dole upon an account then his said account &
 should have soon filed with their Dole that the sd Dolt might &
 know how to Answered but if upon an obliigation then his to
 Dolt should haue mentioned their obligation that then the Dolt
 might haue known by the same and know how to haue answere
 the same

Third