

April Court --- 1729 — (94)

At which Said next Court to witt the Twentieth day of November Anno Domini One Thousand Seven
hundred and twenty two Comes againe the Said Parties by their attorneys aforesaid and the Said defft by
her Said attorney Gray, for the leave to Imparte heremt to witt the Next Court and the same is
and the same day is given to the Elst. also —

At which Said next Court to witt the Nineteenth day of March Anno Domini One Thousand
Seventeen hundred and twenty two Comes againe the Said Parties by their attorneys aforesaid and therupon
the Court adjourns until the last Tuesday of April againe being the Thirteenth day of the same month
Anno Domini One Thousand Seven hundred and twenty three, on which day and year last mentioned
the Court Satt againe, and then and there come the Said Parties Elst. and defft by their attorneys
aforesaid and the Said Esther Skivin by her attorney aforesaid before the said the fore and injury whereof
and pray Judgment of the declaration aforesaid because she saith that the debt aforesaid and the matter in the
same contained are Insufficient in Law the action of them the aforesaid Ebbeinger and Cricilla against
her the aforesaid Esther to have and maintain to which debt the Said Esther needs not nor by the Law of
the Land is she Obliged in any manner to answer and this she is ready to verifie wherefore for want
of a sufficient declaration in that Part the Said Esther pray Judgment and that the aforesaid Ebbeinger
and Cricilla from having their action aforesaid against her may be barred and for causes of Damuror.

The Said Esther according to the forme of Statute sheweth to Court here the reasons following 1st —
for that it doth not appear by the Said declaration that the Bill of Exchange was tendered to and demanded
of Thomas Hanmer to whom it was directed —

2^{dly}. No assumption is laid to be made by William Skivin in his life time or by the aforesaid after his death
Lastly the declaration is erroneous in matter of Substance and wants forme Allen off Doffe —

And the aforesaid Ebbeinger and Cricilla for that they have above in deferring alledged sufficient
matter in Law to maintain their action aforesaid against the aforesaid Esther which they are ready to verifie
which certaine Matter the aforesaid Esther doth not gavay nor leare to in any wise answer Answer
but that verification to admitt altogether refutes Gray Judgment and Non damages by occasion
of the Exemptees to them to be adjudged &c. Wm. Clapwode —

Whereupon all and Singular the Exemptions by the Court have been heard and fully understood and
Matheu deliboration therupon had for that it seems to the Court here that the declaration aforesaid and the
matter therin contained are sufficient in the Law for then the Said Ebbeinger Hanry and Cricilla
Burton Esqrs. aforesaid their action aforesaid against the Said Esther Skivin Esq. aforesaid to have and maintain
therefore it is considered by the Justices here the Twentieth day of April Anno Domini One Thousand
Seven hundred and twenty three aforesaid that the Said Ebbeinger Hanry and Cricilla Burton Esqrs. of the
same Samuel Hanry Esq. Broker against the Said Esther Skivin Esq. of the same William
Skivin Esq. as well the sum of ten pounds, Sterl. Non damages aforesaid, as Ninety Shillings Sterl. damages
allowed by act of assembly by occasion of the Exemptions aforesaid, which Said damages ~~amounted~~ in the
whole,