

Virginia

John M. Pherson

Pt.

vs. Turner ad. of John Day decd.

Deft. } Upon Scinfor.

This day came the parties by their attorneys, and on the motion of the defendant by his attorney he withdrew his former plea of payment by consent of the Deft. by his attorney leave is given the Pt. to amend his Tere facias in this case

Joseph B. Whitehead ap. of Benjamin Whitehead

Pt.

against

Elizabeth Wick

Deft.

} In debt

This day came the parties by their attorneys and thereupon a Jury (to wit) Richard Darsen, Matthias Williams, John Harrod, James M. Parker, David Vallance, Abraham Nelson, James Millikin, Lewis Williams, Jordan Edwards, Ichabod Johnson, Mcmon Cold and Benjamin Williams who being sworn the Clerk so spoke upon the issue, brought here into Court a verdict in the words following (to wit) "we the Jury find for the Pt. the debt in the declaration mentioned with interest from the first of Sept. 1814 till paid subject to a credit of five dollars paid 12th Nov. 1814 and of his damages to one Cent."

Therefore it is considered by the Court that the Pt. recover of the defendant the sum Seventy Six dollars with legal interest thereon from the 1st day of Sept. 1814 till paid. the debt aforesaid together with his damages aforesaid in form aforesaid specified and his costs by him about suit in this behalf expended, and the said defendant in money. But this judgment is to be credited for the sum of five dollars paid the 12th Nov. 1814

James Millikin Esqr. Mary Williams decd.

Pt.

vs.

Arthur A. Love

Deft.

} In Case

On the motion of the defendant by his attorney it is ordered that this suit be continued until the next Court

Thomas Johnson

Pt.

} In debt

vs. Robert

Deft.

By Consent of parties by their attorneys It is ordered that this suit be continued until the next Court

James Schell

Pt.

} In Case

vs. Pelly Jones decd. and several with

Deft.

On the motion of the defendant by their attorney they are adjourned to the next Court and the said parties are to appear at that time and show cause why they should not be granted a new trial. The Court is of opinion that the said parties are not entitled to a new trial and the said parties are to appear at that time and show cause why they should not be granted a new trial. The Court is of opinion that the said parties are not entitled to a new trial and the said parties are to appear at that time and show cause why they should not be granted a new trial.