

The indigent was given, say (the said was in the day following) that  
Hollis had returned & showed out of the estate of Mr. Baker, and further  
John Hawk asked that he had heard John Hollis had returned  
in Court affirming they had heard speak concerning the said wife: to have  
in Court, and John Hawk asked that he had heard John Hollis had returned  
Cowan, wherefore the Court ordered, that the sd. John Hollis should have a writ  
of writ in returning against the estate of Mr. Baker, & that he should  
bring in a return a new he might have been awarded to draw the  
the Court respited it until the first of December next John Hollis for  
that the said attorney might have notice of it.

In the return of said writ the Court says he is not bound to  
the Court being a specialty by any law of the Province  
no just law appearing in the proceedings, that he found out was  
in the case of Hawks: awarding of Rich: Cop: 10. Defendant doth  
not acknowledge any such thing in judgment was there and was  
Hollis there employed in another of Dept a year John Hollis in 20  
of Dec: I went to see it: was: to see Mr. Hawk:

Cushbert Thomt employed against Anthe: Kaskairy about: of his  
for in an action of debt of 400 £ 3000 or thereabouts  
In demand of said debt: Margaret went beside the said  
250 £ worth to be paid  
an account for the same

The said party should receive one hundred ninety seven yoms of the said  
and for want of speciality for the payment of two hundred pounds of toll, as  
by account, the Court being by ed to follow the Law of England  
in return by the defendant's estate, without speciality, as appears by the  
and issued to out say for what accounts that for account:

As in the account of John Clarke and James Nathaniel Lane, the said Nathaniel Lane  
was employed to receive in the Sheriff's hands, which he should put in security to the value of  
the thousand pounds of tobacco and to answer the same, the first of  
the Court being credibly informed of the little likelihood of getting  
the value of the said account, and that the said Lane had examined the said  
with him in the month of March. The Court ordered that the said Nathaniel Lane should be  
liberty for the said Lane, and absolved, as withal for his estate in case the said Lane  
should not be able to pay the same by the first of December:

John Hollis attorney for Mr. Baker demanded a cow, due to the said speaker, by  
an special order of Leonard Calvert Esq. baron, out of his Co. stock:

The said suit of Rich: against John Rolier the被告 did answer  
he owed him nothing  
No evidence appearing the Court dismissed the cause without the  
Court adjourned till Monday morning:

Nathaniel Lane employed against William Dimes for a wife  
the said Dimes returned that  
was to be paid: