

were forfeited; that he was committed to the Jail of said County in October 1825; that one of the indictments was returned "not a true Bill"; that he submitted in the other case and was fined \$5. He therefore prays a remission of the aforesaid forfeited Recognizance; and the said Court having stated their belief in the truth of the aforesaid representations, and recommended compliance with the petitioner's prayer - the said forfeitures are hereby remitted.

Jos. Gabby
Wm Stewart
Robt H. Archer
Jas Martin

By the Petition of Hinson Barnes, accompanied by a transcript from the Docket of William A. Schaffer Esquire a Justice of the Peace for the City of Baltimore, it appears, that on the 22^d day of June 1825, he was fined by the said William A. Schaffer Justice of the Peace as aforesaid, the sum of six dollars ninety three cents, for swearing away Oaths before a constable in the execution of his duty; that being unable to pay the said fines he was committed to the Jail of Baltimore County, where he yet continues being unable to pay the said fines and costs. The Petitioner acknowledges the justice of his punishment, but submits that, he has lain six months in jail, and prays that this may be considered a sufficient punishment, and that the said fines may be remitted; and the said Justice of the Peace having recommended the said Petitioner to the Executives - the said fines are hereby remitted.

Joseph Gabby
Wm Stewart
Robt H. Archer
Jas Martin

By the Petition of James Deany of Talbot County, accompanied by a transcript from the proceedings of the County Court of said County, it appears, that at the November Term of the said County Court in the year 1825, he was convicted of an affray with a certain Richard Darden, and fined the sum of thirty dollars. The Petitioner states, that at the time of his trial the said Richard Darden was extremely hostile to him, otherwise he would have confessed what he well knew, to wit - that he alone was the cause of what had happened between the petitioner of himself, and that he (the Petitioner) acted only in self defence, when he made the resistance which has been adjudged to constitute an affray; that believing that Darden, if put on his oath, would confess that your petitioner had acted only in self defence, and fearing if both were tried together the Jury would be embarrassed and confounded by the testimony that would be brought forward, he applied to the Court for a separate trial, urging that he could not shew that he acted in self defence otherwise than by proving that Darden made the first attack, and that Darden having pleaded not guilty, would necessarily endeavour to prove that your petitioner made the first attack, thus the defendants would be made to accuse each other but the Court refused the application, and the consequence was, that the Jury were perplexed and confounded by the conflicting testimony, and found