

meeting House, during the time of service, when not making a noise through the instrumentality of his companions, he was taken to the Watch House, and from thence next morning committed to prison: he not being able to pay the fine imposed on him, as his little earnings are barely sufficient to maintain his wife and two helpless children, who must inevitably suffer many privations while he is thus confined, and unable to extricate himself. He states that it is the first fault of the kind that he ever committed, and he, therefore, prays for remission of the said fine. And several respectable citizens having certified to the truth of the petitioning statement. We do, hereby, remit the said fine.

Jos. Kent

Jos. Gabby

Wm. Stewart

David Martin

The Petition of Peter White of Worcester County, represents that he has been reported to the County Court of Worcester for retailing Spirituous liquors contrary to Law, and fined agreeably to the Act of Assembly in that case made and provided. He states that he is almost blind, that he has a family to support, that he is totally incapable of doing any kind of Manual Labour from his loss of sight, that he was entirely ignorant of the Law in this respect. He also further states that he had once paid for Licence to retail Spirituous liquors, which had just expired, and that in fact unless he had resorted to this mode of procuring a livelihood and maintenance, both himself and family must have become chargeable to the County. Wherefore he prays that the said fine may be remitted. And the Court having remitted a remission thereof, he prays, hereby, remit the same.

Jos. Kent

Jos. Gabby

Wm. Stewart

David Martin

By the Petition of William F. Remo of Charley County, accompanied by a transcript from the Records of Charley County Court, it appears that he entered into a recognizance in the sum of £50, with James Posy and Benjamin Burgess his securities in the sum of £25 each, for the appearance of negroes Lewis, Isaac and Abraham, before the said County Court, at March Term 1826, and for their good behaviour to Richard Brooke, and that the said recognizance was entered forfeited.

The Petitioner states that being a neighbour of Mr Brooke, knew that it was not his intention to appear against him, and being ignorant of the Law in such case, supposed that he had complied with the terms and conditions of the recognizance, and therefore did not answer when the recognizance was called, in consequence of which it was forfeited.

He states that it was very far from his intention willfully to have incurred the penalty above mentioned, and as neither the State nor the party has sustained any injury, and the party has never since appeared against him, and the circumstances giving rise to the oath of the peace having ceased to exist - and the feelings at that time engendered have been truly subdued, he prays, a remission of the said forfeiture. The Statement of the Petitioner