

402.

Isham Newsum Jr. v.
Wm. Parmenter - def

Non adsumpt by Deft. Replication & issue

Matthew Williamson Jr. v. In base

Lazarus Cook - d. Non adsumpt by Deft. Replication & issue

Edmund Tyler Jr. v. In base

Arthur Deleg. - d. Non adsumpt by Deft. Replication & issue

William Browne } In Debt
agst. Jeremiah Tyler and Michael Bolke

This day came the plaintiff by Daniel Fisher his attorney
and the defendants being solemnly called and not appearing on the motion
of the said plaintiff it is ordered that the conditional judgment obtained
at the last court be confirmed for one thousand pounds paper currency the
174th June 1813 debt in the declaration mentioned. Therefore it is considered by the Court that
the plaintiff recover against them the said one thousand pounds paper currency
by him about his suit in their behalf expended &c on may be paid
this judgment is to be discharged by the payment of three hundred
& eighty pounds eighteen shillings and six pence directed thereon after the
rate of 5% per cent of annum from the 22nd September 1781 till paid, which
by a rule of this Court is to be settled by a scale of depreciation to be calculated
according to the act of assembly at 80 for 1 from feby 1781

Lazarus Cook

agst. Arthur Turner adm't. &c of Littleton Turner } In Debt.

The defendant by his attorney avouches
defend the force & wrong when he avouches that his intestate was under the age of
twenty one years when he contracted the debt in the declaration mentioned. He further
pleas the act of assembly intituled an act to prevent excessive & deceitful
gaming to which the plaintiff replies & of this he puts himself on the record
& the defendant likewise doth the same

Wm. Lofton apie of Ch. Taylor

agst. Arthur Turner adm't. Littleton Turner } In Debt
com. & issue

Silas Rulley

agst. David Asheal } In Debt

Same plea & replication as Cook v. Turner

The defendant by his attorney pleads that he had
paid the debt in the declaration mentioned the plaintiff replies the cause is