

1765.

[612.] [Reference to the Board of Trade of a memorial of the Ohio Company addressed to his Majesty, and a memorial of Colonel George Mercer, on behalf of the Company, that the instruction of 16 March, 1749, in their favour (*see pp.* 55-8) be renewed, or that some provision be recommended to Parliament for reimbursing their expences, or that they receive compensation by way of a grant of land in some other part of his Majesty's American dominions.] [p. 244.]

21 June.
Ohio
Company.

[The Committee order a copy of the Board of Trade report on Mercer's petition] to be sent to the Earl of Shelburne in order to write to the Governor thereupon. [V. p. 425.]

(1767.)
24 Aug.

[613.] [Reference to the Committee of the petition of Thomas Wilson, William Huggins and Anne, his wife, John Wilson, William Wilson, and Isaac Hobday and Elizabeth, his wife, for a day for hearing their appeal from a decree of the Virginia Chancery, 11 April, 1763, upon a bill filed against them and Lewis Almond and Jane, his wife, to account for all the personal estate of Sampson Darrell, the elder, and pay the same with interest, and deliver the real estate to Sampson Darrell, George Turner and Elizabeth, his wife, William Sansom and Ann, his wife, John Noble and Elizabeth, his wife, and William Slaughter.] [*pp.* 261, 280.]

10 July.
Virginia.

[Appearance for the respondents entered by Mr. Walton of Girdlers Hall, Basinghall Street.] [VI. p. 468.]

(1769.)
8 Mar.

[614.] [Reference to the Committee of the petition of Elisha Whittlesey for leave to appeal from a resolution of the General Assembly of Connecticut in May, 1763, whereby certain agreements between him and Jacob Pierpoint for the purchase of each other's lands were declared null and void and prohibited from being given in evidence in any court in the colony.] [p. 262.]

10 July.
Connecticut.

[615.] [Reference to the Committee of the petition of Waddell Cunningham for leave to appeal from a judgment of the Supreme Court of New York in October term, 1764, on an action of trespass, assault and battery brought against

10 July.
New York.

1773-4. § 279 *cont.*]

William Beckford Ellis not administered by his widow, Susanna, and also administrator of Susanna, who had married him on Ellis's death, and of Ellis's infant son and heir, William Beckford Ellis, by Borton, his guardian, for a day for hearing their appeal from a decree of the Chancellor of Jamaica, 21 Feb. 1772, in favour of Angus Campbell.] [p. 351.]

(1775.) [On the Committee report of 12 Jan., the decree is varied in
23 Jan. part and otherwise affirmed without costs. Names occurring in the report are Susanna Addenbrook, already a widow when she married Ellis, John Venn, James Pfevost, Thomas Fuller, Joseph Lee, Robert Cooper Lee, Edmund Goldegay, and James Powell.] [XI. pp. 337-49, 373.]

31 Dec. [280.] [On the Committee report of 17 Dec., the appeal
Virginia. *Wilson v. Darrell*, referred on 10 July, 1765 (*cf.* Vol. IV. p. 727), is dismissed.] [pp. 371, 389.]

1774. [281.] [A Bahama act of Dec. 1770,—for regulating the
2 Feb. proceedings on attachments issuing out of courts of judicature
Bahamas. within these islands—is disallowed, in accordance with a Committee report of 25 Jan., agreeing with a Board of Trade representation of 1 July, referred to them on 28 July. Mr. Jackson, K.C., objected that the act gave an attachment against the goods of absentees, whatever the cause of absence, and although they had never been within the colony: that this was contrary to the principles of the English laws and highly dangerous to commerce: and that such proceedings should be confined to persons absenting themselves purposely to avoid the process of the court.] [pp. 254, 417, 430.]

2 Feb. [282.] [Reference to the Committee of the petition of
Jamaica. Sir Simon Clarke, Bart., for a day for hearing his appeal from an order of the Jamaica Chancery, 19 Feb. 1773, in an action of account brought by John Reid and Mary, his wife.] [pp. 435, 456.]

(1775.) [On the Committee report of 2 Feb., the order is reversed,
6 Feb. solicitor for the respondents consenting thereto.]

[XI. pp. 391, 398.]