

REX *versus* WILLIAMS, in Escheat.

IN February Court, a rule *nisi* was made to attach *Parkinson*, (*vide* p. 34.). In August last, that rule was enlarged; and now, after long argument, the Court, coupling *Parkinson's* words with his conduct, in obstructing the execution of the escheat, made the

*Rule absolute.*

*Note.*—The next term, February 1778, *Parkinson* appeared the first day; but the Court refused to take notice of him till *returned in custody*; after which he was brought in on 6th March, and being sharply reprimanded, was fined L. 50. *ip n. n*

## February Grand Court, 1778.

MITCHELL *versus* FLEMINGS et al.

IN an action of trespass on the case for damages, sustained by the plaintiff <sup>for</sup> on a violent *assault and battery*, a doubt arose, it appearing, that the declaration was *jointly* against three, and that *one* of them, (*Saunders*), after conviction, had obtained a release from the plaintiff; but this was cured by the *pleas* being *several*, and therefore verdict was given for L. 100 against Fleming, and against the other for L. 10.

BAXTER *versus* HILL.

A Rule *nisi* having been made on the Provost Marshal, for paying to *Baxter* a surplus of money, arising from a levy on a writ, *Fernandes versus Hill*, it was now moved to make that rule *absolute*.

Here the contention lay between *Baxter* and *Harris*. *Baxter's* writ was *prior*, but then it was *versus Hill* and *Hall*, and *Harris's* writ was against *Hill* only.

Mr