

Oath was, and though upon much argument the Court permitted the same to be read —  
 yet w<sup>t</sup> the direction to the Jury, not to take the same as Evidence but as a History —  
 that the same was read and in the same was proved the said Master coming with his  
 ship from P<sup>r</sup>. Aug<sup>r</sup>. to S<sup>c</sup>. Mary<sup>s</sup>, and then returning to sale goods & Merchandise  
 in the Information mentioned at Viderwood's Bond and putting the same into  
 Viderwood's tobacco house and cellar by Mr. Viderwood & Co: and many other  
 substantial proofs, and other evident circumstances touching the proceeding  
 of the said Master & Merchant in breach of the said Act of Parliament in the  
 Information mentioned do by the said affidavit make appear y<sup>e</sup> t<sup>t</sup> the said  
 Jury would take no notice of the same, but found for the Defendant. Though —  
 many of the Jury thought Carr did declare that if that oath might have been  
 admitted as Evidence they must have found for the defendant all which is —  
 erroneous, and the Verdict against proof and law.

4: The Plaintiff produced another of the said Provincial Court made the 5<sup>th</sup> of March  
 whereby they had left matter upon the said Information to be determined at  
 a Speciall Court to be held the 4<sup>th</sup> of April next March wherein at the request of the  
 said Lynch for himself and others interested in the said goods, w<sup>t</sup> were many  
 of them Liquors and other perishable Commodities it was Ordained the same  
 should be appraised and delivered to Mr. Lynch the giving Security and general  
 to that order they were appraised and amounted to Sav. only £18: Eight Shillings, and  
 their price as by the same produced appeared and the bond given by Mr. Lynch —  
 being also produced whereby it plainly appeared the said goods were brought  
 goods imported into this Province by land or by water and were owned by the  
 said Lynch and other the Merchants of the said ship providers of Trade and  
 payable to them and condemned y<sup>e</sup> t<sup>t</sup> the Jury took no notice of the same which  
 they ought to have done:

5: The said Lynch by his Counsel offered for law before the Jury that the said goods were  
 not quantitatively or conveniently without the said ship were forfeited condemned —  
 for the transportation making the same like the rest of principale & accessory, and  
 that the Master and ship not being Laid by the principals the accessory is  
 clear w<sup>t</sup> is not admitted for law or reason Nor could this case facilitate w<sup>t</sup> that of  
 principale & accessory, for if goods be brought in by land to be seized if not returned  
 according to law they are by express words of the Act 15<sup>o</sup> Car: 2: in the Information  
 mentioned forfeited, and if they come by water and be seized, and the vessel shall  
 bring them in go<sup>r</sup> away that she cannot be seized, for it doth not at all respect  
 the goods, y<sup>e</sup> t<sup>t</sup> admitt the same were disputable in law the Jury had not to do therewith  
 but only with matter of fact, and the Jury ought to have not withholding that  
 suggestion to have brought in for the plaintiff or at least a Speciall Verdict upon  
 the whole matter, for their Duty is to find the truth of the whole fact and to refer  
 the distinction of the law to the Justice then arising upon argument & Evidence Special  
 matter of law, And the Reverend Coke sayd. If the Jury will not find the special  
 Verdict matter and have it to the Judgment of the law they ought at their p: r: to find  
 according to law, and if the Jury find contrary to law yet have inseparably the law  
 Judgment shall be given contrary to the Verdict. And the Jury has have found contrary  
 to Evidence plain and for the same ought to be quashed. (6)