

is an infirm man, and has been for some time, past of a weakly constitution; that at the term to which he recognises to appear he was labouring under much debility of body and totally unable to attend to his business of any kind. he therefore prays to be released from the said forfeiture, and also that his said security be released therefrom. And the Court having stated their belief of the truth of the facts alleged by the petitioner, and recommended a compliance with his prayer. we do, hereby, remit the said forfeiture.

Jos. Kent
Jos. Gabby
Wm Stewart
Dan Martin
Arvid E Jones.

By the petition of Jordin Skinner of Charles County, accompanied by a transcript from the records of the County Court of said County, it appears that he, together with a certain David Thompson entered into a recognizance, jointly and severally in the sum of £20, for the said Skinner's appearance before the said Court at the Term 1823 to answer a presentment pending against him in the said Court; which said recognizance was afterwards forfeited. The petition states that he was presented for a charge of having committed an assault and battery on Joseph Dial, that he attended the Court at the said Term 1823 with his witnesses to show his entire innocence, and proper, through his Counsel, Nicholas Stonestreet Esquire, to have his trial, but in consequence of the absence of the witnesses upon the part of the State, he could not have his trial, and he left Court under the impression that the case was continued, when he afterwards, was informed that his recognizance, entered into at a previous Court, had been forfeited and he therefore prays a remission of the said forfeiture. And the aforesaid representation of the petitioner being supported by a certificate of Nicholas Stonestreet Esquire, and the Court having recommended that the prayer of the petitioner be granted. we do, hereby, remit the said forfeiture.

Jos. Kent
Jos. Gabby
Wm Stewart
Dan Martin
Arvid E Jones.

By the petition of Ezra Watson of Charles County, it appears that at the last Term of Charles County Court 1827, he was fined by the said Court in two several cases the sum of sixteen dollars in each case for retailing spirituous liquors by less measure than a pint without ordinary License. The Petitioner states that he removed to Benedict in Charles County, about the 12th of June last, when he now resides; that on the 15th of June he obtained a License to retail spirituous liquors at Benedict, & supposed that his License authorized him to sell a less quantity than a pint; that he had been in the habit of dealing with retailers in Seaport Towns when he purchased in small quantities and thought he was authorized to sell in the same way; that he soon discovered the error into which he had fallen, and did not hesitate to acknowledge and immediately correct it and that he has not, since he discovered his error, sold a smaller quantity than a pint. Under those circumstances he humbly prays that the said fine may be remitted. And the Court having recommended a remission of the said fine we do, hereby, remit the same.