

November Court 1710 45 B

The matter in the same contained is not sufficient in Law to preclude the Court here from having cognizance of the plea of the afo^rd^e Giles and that he the same biles to the plea of the afo^rd^e James in manner and form afo^rd^e Pleaded he hath no need nor by the Law of the Land is in any sort held to Answer and this he is ready to Verifie wherefore for want of a sufficient Plea by the afo^rd^e James in this part the same biles pray Judgment and that the Court here of the plea afo^rd^e will take further cognizance and that the afo^rd^e James to the writ afo^rd^e may further Answer & stand for causes of Demurrer to the plea afo^rd^e the same biles According the form of the statute in the like case lately and provided shew to the Court here that the said James should have concluded his plea his plea with a Hoc paratus et Verificare that the afo^rd^e James (his plea being a foreign plea) he ought to have made affidavit or have shewn some probable cause of the truth of the plea before the filing thereof that the afo^rd^e plea is altogether uncertain insufficient and wants form.

Whereupon the said James Peterkin and Elizabeth pray Leave hereof to Impale here until next Court to be held at Dividing Creek the third Tuesday of August then next following and they have it and the same day is given to the aforesaid Giles hereafter.

At which day here came againe as well the aforesaid James Peterkin and Elizabeth his wife as the aforesaid Giles Bashaw in their proper persons and wherupon the said James says that the plea afo^rd^e of him the said James and

the matter therein contained are sufficient in Law to preclude the Court here from cognizance of the plea afo^rd^e of the said Giles which matter the said Giles hath not gainsayed or the same in any sort answered but the verification of the same James to admit altogether hath refused and this he is ready to verify Wherefore as before the said James intends not that the Court here of the plea afo^rd^e cognizance further to take will.

Whereupon all and singular being seen and by the Court here fully understood as well to his writt afo^rd^e as the aforesaid plea of the aforesaid defendant in quashing of the writt aforesaid above pleaded it seemeth to the Court here that the same plea is not sufficient in Law to the aforesaid Writ of the aforesaid plaintife to quash, and that the same writt be adjudged good notwithstanding the said plea of the aforesaid defendant in quashing the same writt in form afo^rd^e pleaded. Therefore it is considered that the aforesaid plaintife to the action aforesaid further answer And the said Giles Bashaw complained against the afo^rd^e James Peterkin & Eliz^a his wife in the plen afo^rd^e in form following — Somerset vs James Peterkin late of Somerset County planter and Elizabeth his wife were attached to Answer unto Giles Bashaw of a plea of trespass upon the case &c.

And Whereupon the same biles by William Arbuttle his Attorney complains that whereas on the day of seventeen hundred and thirty at Somerset County afo^rd^e a certain discourse was had and moved between the said Elizabeth when she was sole and the said biles of and concerning the sale of a Negroe called Sampson to the same biles by the said Elizabeth upon which discourse then and there had the said Elizabeth for and consideration of twelve pounds current money of Maryland by the same biles to the said Elizabeth then and there agreed to be paid did Bargain and sell to the same biles and to his proper use the afo^rd^e Negroe and then and there by Bargain warranted and affirmed the Negroe afo^rd^e to be but eight years of age and also that he was sound and free from any distemper and the same biles in fact saith that at the time of the sale warranting and affirmation afo^rd^e the said Negroe was a Lymatich and troubled Epileptic fits and also above the age of eight years And so the same biles putting confidence in the Warranty and affirmation of the said Elizabeth against the form of the Warranty and affirmation