

of the said Eleanor it was Surmised in the High Court of Chancery of this Province that the said Tract of Land lay w<sup>th</sup>in Panguayah Mann<sup>r</sup> reserved for his Lordship the Lord Proprietarie's Own Use Whereupon a Scire facias was issued out of the said Court in the name of the Right hon<sup>ble</sup> Charles late Lord Prop<sup>ry</sup> of noble memory Successor of the said Lord Caecilius Returnable the tenth Day of February Sixteen Hund<sup>d</sup> Seventy three against the widdow and Heiress of the said Walter to Appear in the Said Court of Chancery to Shew Cause why the said Grant should not be Cancelled and vacated. To which the Widdow of the said Walter is Said to have Appeared by one Mathew Hill her Son in Law a person who by any thing that appears was not Learned in the Law or in any wise Capable or obliged to make any Defence for the Said Infant and who was So far from making any that he Delivered and Surrendred the Said Grant to be vacated Which was Accordingly Done, That the said Widdow imagining that the Proceedings in Vacating the Said Grant were regular and Justifiable and the suggestion whereon the Said Vacation Was founded was true, Either through her Ignorance in business and Legal Proceedings or instigated by those that Expected or had Procured the Said Land from the Said late Lord Proprietor [783] To make the said Determination Seem plausible During the Infancy of the Said Orphan Petitioned the said late Lord Charles to Grant four Hund<sup>d</sup> Acres in Lieu of the said Seven hund<sup>d</sup> and fifty Acres W<sup>ch</sup> was Accordingly Done by a Grant or Patent bearing Date In the Year Sixteen Hundred Seventy Six But never Accepted of by the Said Elianor or any other Person Claiming Under her.

And Whereas it hath been made Evidently Apparent to this Present General Assembly that there was no Reserve of Panguaya Mann<sup>r</sup> till a Considerable Time after the Survey and Grant to the Said Walter Beane the Conditions whereof appear also to have been by him Complied With So that it is Apparent that the Decree of the High Court of Chancery for vacating the said Patent was irregular Unjust and without the least foundation And Whereas the said John Beale who intermarried with the said Eleanor and had issue the said Richard in the Year Seventeen Hundred and five and the Said Eleanor brought their Ejectment in the Provincial Court of this Province and had a Special Verdict against one Edw<sup>d</sup> Diggs Gen<sup>t</sup> who Claimed the said Land finding all the facts herein before mentioned

Whereupon the said Edward to prevent a Judgment being given thereon Procured an injunction out of the then High Court of Chancery to Stay Proceedings at Law untill a Reversall should be of the former Decree Given for the vacating the Grant of Durham w<sup>ch</sup> the said Chancellor in Stead of Doing on a hearing and Rehearsing of the Cause gave a further Decree against the said John Beale and his wife for the affirmation of the former Decree without the Least Colour Reason or justice and Discouraged the Said Jn<sup>o</sup> Beale from prosecuting a review by giving out that he would not