

Publication Number: M-162

Publication Title: The Revolutionary War Prize Cases: Records of the Court of Appeals in Cases of capture, 1776-1787

Date Published: 1954

THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR PRIZE CASES:
RECORDS OF THE COURT OF APPEALS IN CASES OF CAPTURE, 1776-1787

Introduction

On the 15 rolls of this microfilm publication are reproduced the records of prize cases heard on appeal from Colonial and state courts by committees of the Continental Congress (1776-80) and by the Court of Appeals in Cases of Capture (1780-86).

These records, frequently referred to as the Revolutionary War Prize cases, are in the custody of the Supreme Court of the United States, where they were deposited by an act of congress approved May 8, 1792. This act provided, among other things:

That all the records and proceedings of the court of appeals heretofore appointed, previous to the adoption of the present constitution, shall be deposited in the office of the clerk of the supreme court of the united sates, who is hereby authorized and directed to give copies of all such records and proceedings, to any person requiring and paying for the same, in like manner as copies of the records and other proceedings of the said court by law directed to be given: which copies shall have like faith and credit as all other proceedings of the said court.

In the summer of 1946 the Supreme Court requested and obtained the advice of the National Archives as to steps that should be taken to prevent the deterioration of these records. As the cost of complete restoration was prohibitive, it was decided to repair the papers sufficiently to permit microfilming and to make microfilm publication program of the National Archives.

Shortly after the revolution entered its military phase, armed vessels serving under the individual colonies began to prey upon British Commerce. In addition, the Continental Congress caused ships to outfitted to intercept vessels bringing provisions to the besieged British garrison in Boston. There was need for speedy and regular condemnation of the prizes taken by all these ships. Failure to provide for such action might well lead to conflict among colonies. The vice-admiralty courts that had existed under the British had for the most part disappeared, and it was necessary to create new courts or broaden the jurisdictions of existing ones.

The lack of courts for the condemnation of prizes taken by the continental vessels was a source of annoyance to General Washington. In a letter to the President of the Continental Congress dated November 8, 1775, he reported that he had ordered two captured vessels to Cambridge, that another had been carried into Portsmouth and that two others were in Plymouth. These actions, he said, pointed to "the necessity of establishing proper courts without loss of time for the decision of Property and the legality of Seizures; otherwise I may be involved in inextricable difficulties." On the same day Washington wrote the Richard Henry Lee, saying, "I should be very glad if the Congress would without delay, appoint some mode by which an examination into the captures made by our armed vessels may be had, as we are rather groping in the dark till this

happens.” On November 11, 1775, he again wrote the President of the Congress, enclosing a copy of the Massachusetts statute of November 1, 1775, establishing the first colonial prize court. In his letter Washington observed:

...As the Armed vessels fitted at the Continental expense, do not come under this Law, I would have it submitted to the consideration of Congress, to point out a more summary way of proceeding, to determine the property and mode of condemnation of such prizes as have been or hereafter may be made, than is specified in this Act. Should not a Court be established by Authority of Congress, to take cognizance of the Prizes made by the Continental Vessels? Whatever the mode is which they are pleased to adopt, there is an absolute necessity of its being speedily determined on, for I cannot spare time from Military Affairs, to give proper attention to these matters...

On November 17, 1775, Washington's letter was read in the Continental Congress. A resolution was adopted to appoint a committee of seven "to take into consideration so much of the said letter as relates to the disposal of such vessels and cargoes belonging to the enemy, as shall fall into the hands of, or be taken by, the inhabitants of the United Colonies." A committee then was chosen consisting of George Wythe of Virginia, Edward Rutledge of South Carolina, John Adams of Massachusetts, William Livingston of New Jersey, Benjamin Franklin and James Wilson of Pennsylvania, and Thomas Johnson of Maryland.

Unaware of this action of the Congress and still at a loss as to the procedures to be followed in disposing of captured vessels and their cargoes, Washington again wrote the President of the Congress on December 4, 1775:

It is some time since I recommended to the Congress, that they would institute a Court for the Trial of Prizes made by the Continental Armed Vessel, which I hope they have ere now taken into their consideration, otherwise I should again take the Liberty of urging it in the most pressing manner.

In the meantime the committee had reported its recommendations to the Congress on November 23, 1775. Although these recommendations were comprehensive in a number of respects, no proposal was made for the establishment of a court under the Congress. The committee did propose, however, that the capture of prizes be authorized and that those already made be legalized, and it suggested rules for the distribution of prize money. It further recommended that the Colonial legislatures empower existing courts, or create new ones, to deal with prize cases; that all prosecutions take place in Colonial courts, and that appeals to the Congress from the decisions of these courts be allowed. Eight resolutions based on the committees recommendations were adopted by the Congress on November 25, 1775. The sixth resolution, respecting appeals, reads as follows:

That in all cases an appeal shall be allowed to the Congress, or such person or persons as they shall appoint for the trial of appeals, provided the appeal be demanded within five days after definitive sentence, and such appeal be lodged with the secretary of Congress within forty days afterwards, and provided the party appealing shall give security to prosecute the said appeal to effect, and in case of the death of the secretary during the recess of Congress, then the said appeal to be lodged in Congress within 20 days after the meeting thereof.

The Colonies followed the suggestions of Congress and either created special prize courts or empowered their existing courts to handle prize cases.¹

The intent of the Congress to exercise only appellate jurisdiction was misunderstood for a time. On January 31 and February 27, 1776, petitions were received requesting the Congress to assume original jurisdiction in prize cases. The Congress refused and referred the petitioners to the Colonial courts. But on April 4, 1777, it took original jurisdiction in the case of the sloop *Sally*, of which James McKnight was the prize master, directing that the vessel be sold and the proceeds distributed. This action was rescinded by the Congress on May 22, 1777, as it was alleged that the prize master had not handled the sale in the mode prescribed or acted with the authority of the Congress.

The Congress, on August 5, 1776, received the first appeal, the case of the schooner *Thistle*. At first it attempted to hear the case as a body, but after several delays in the proceedings it referred the matter to a special committee on September 9, 1776. Thereafter appeals in prize cases were referred by the Congress to various special committees until the appointment of a Standing Committee on Appeals on January 30, 1777.

On January 15, 1780, the Congress, after numerous delays, provided for the establishment of a Court of Appeals consisting of three judges with authority to appoint their own Register. (During the entire existence of the Court five men served as judges: William Paca, Titus Hosmer, Cyrus Griffin, George Bead, and John Lowell).

No provision was made at the time of the creation of the Court for the transfer to it of cases then pending before the Congress. A resolution approved on May 24, 1780, however, provided for this transfer and for the transfer to the Register of the Court of all papers concerning appeals then lodged with the Secretary of the Congress. Although no mention was made in this resolution of the transfer to the court of records of the Standing Committee on Appeals, which apparently were maintained separate from those of the Secretary of the Congress by the Register of the Standing Committee, it seems likely that these records were transferred at the same time.

By the end of December 1784 the court had acted on all cases submitted to it. The Congress, by a resolution of July 1, 1785, suspended the payment of salaries to the judges of the court. On June 27, 1786, however, the court was summoned by the Congress to reconvene in November, as a number of appeals were then pending. During this and a few additional sessions of the court the judges were paid per diem when actually holding court or while traveling. The last session of the court was held on May 16, 1787, in Philadelphia.

The first Register of the Court of Appeals, Andrew Robeson, took his oath on June 14, 1780; before this he had been Register of the Standing Committee on appeals as well as register of the court of Admiralty of Pennsylvania. John Potts, Robeson's successor, took the oath on July 30, 1781, and was still in office as late as January 20, 1785. John D. Coxe was appointed in August 1786 and resigned on November 7, 1786. The last Register of the Court, Benjamin Bankson, was appointed on November 18, 1786. As late as August 1789, more than 2 years after the last session of the Court, he was still acting as Register.

¹ For summaries and discussions of this legislation, see Hampton L. Carson, *The History of the Supreme Court of the United States*, 1:44-47 (Philadelphia, 1901); J.C. Bancroft Davis, "Federal Courts Prior to the Adoption of the Constitution," in 131 U.S., app. xx-xxii; and J. Franklin Jemson, "The Predecessor of the Supreme Court," in J. Franklin Jameson (ed.), *Essays in the Constitutional History of the United States in the Formative Period, 1775-1789*, 9-12 (Boston and New York, 1889).

When J.C Bancroft Davis used these records more than 60 years ago in preparing his article, "Federal courts prior to the adoption of the Constitution," he gathered together in one or more bundles the papers relating to each case and assigned a number to each of the cases not reported in 2 Dallas 1-42. These cases he numbered consecutively from 1 through 109 in the order in which they were presented or referred to the committees of the Congress or to the Court of Appeals. The cases reported in 2 Dallas 1-42 were arranged in the order in which they were reported by Dallas. Miscellaneous papers were filed at the end of the cases. The basic pattern of arrangement developed by Davis has been maintained in this microcopy. In the absence of complete docket books to serve as a guide the papers relating to each case have been arranged in the order in which the committees of the Congress or the Court of Appeals received or created them. Any endorsements, numbers, or other data appearing on the back of a document have been filmed before the text of the document.

Minutes, dockets, or registers of some type were no doubt maintained by the court. In case 40, *Griffin v. The Sloop George*, there is evidence of this. An undated note signed by J.D. Coxe, register of the Court of Appeals, reports the results of a search he has made for the record "in ye case of ye Sloop *George* Smith Master—I have looked over ye books and do no find in either of them any such name as ye Sloop *George* & Cargo Richard Downing Jennings Claim & appt." A search of the records of the Supreme Court and of the Continental Congress papers now in the National Archives as well as among the records of the Department of State (where the Continental Congress papers once were) failed to reveal any trace of the two books referred to by Coxe. The fact that no bound volumes are among the records although some were filed as exhibits indicates that at some time in the past all bound volumes were segregated from the loose papers and filed with some undetermined body of records.

The number and type of documents in the cases vary greatly. No papers have survived for a few of the cases listed by Davis and hence listed in the microcopy; for some there is only an attested copy of the proceedings in the lower court along with jottings on the wrapper, while others are documented by a wealth of material. Among the case papers are petitions and memorials to the Congress; copies of resolves of the Congress relating to prize cases; attested copies of proceedings in the lower courts; libels; exhibits; notices of hearings; monitions; depositions; interrogatories; affidavits; briefs; bonds; notices of appeal; petitions for rehearings; statements of court costs and Registers fees; decrees; sentences; opinions; copies of State, Colonial, and Royal statutes and proclamations; and various types of documents found on board prize vessels such as certificates of registry or enrollment, licenses, crew-lists, shipping articles, clearance papers, charter parties, repair bills, bills of lading, invoices, manifests, log books, account books, journals, instruments of agreement, consort agreements, letters of marque and reprisal, correspondence belonging to ship's officers, crews, and passengers, and packets of private mail in transit.

The cases constitute a valuable source of documentary materials for the maritime and commereial history of the Revolutionary War and for the development of admiralty law. They are also useful for a study of prize procedure in particular States or Colonies, or for a comparative study of procedures in different ones. From the copies of the records of proceedings as-well as from the numerous papers forwarded on appeal that had been filed with or created by these lower courts it is possible to determine the procedures used by most of them. These records should be of interest to economists, biographers, and naval, social, and legal historians. In them, for example, are evidences of the exploits of some of the early American naval heroes such as John Barry (cases 4 and 78), John Manley (cases 2, 93, and 973, Daniel Bucklin (cases 15 and

20), and Stephen Decatur (case 61); letters or documents signed by John Jay (case 2 Dall. 34 and 2 Dall. 41), Benedict Arnold (case 39), Alexander Hamilton (cases 91, 103, and 2 Dall. 41), and other important Revolutionary figures; significant source material on the British occupation and evacuation of Boston (case 2); copies of letters (March 10-31, 1781) from Capt. John Barry, commanding the *Alliance*, to Benjamin Franklin, John Laurens, and others (case 78); and a packet of private letters addressed by residents of British-occupied New York to friends and relatives in Halifax, Nova Scotia (cases 91-92).

Among the papers of the Continental Congress now in the National Archives are a few documents closely related to those reproduced in this microcopy. Two volume record of accounts of the registers office, 1781 to 1783. The journals of the Congress, indispensable for any study of Congress publication *Journals of the Continental Congress* (Washington, 1904-37. 34 vols.).

A number of articles concerning the work of the court of Appeals have been published. One of these is J.C. Bancroft Davis, "Federal Courts Prior to the adoption of the Constitution," in 131 U.S., app., xix-xlix. The annotated list of cases 1 through 109 that follows reproduces with some modifications the list of cases prepared by Davis. Other useful studies of the origins and work of the court are contained in J. Franklin Jameson, "The Predecessor of the Supreme Court," in J. Franklin Jameson (ed.), *Essays in the Constitutional History of the United States in the Formative period, 1775-1789*, 1-45 (Boston and New York, 1889); Hampton L. Carson, *The History of The Supreme Court of the United States*, 1: 1-8 (Oxford, 1923). The eight opinions filed by the Court of Appeals and reported in 2 Dallas 1-42 are reprinted in Scott 3: 2099-2138.

LIST OF CASES BY NAME OF STATE OR COLONY
FROM WHICH THE APPEAL WAS MADE*

Connecticut:	3 (28), 5 (46), 6 (49,50), 8(71),9 (76, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83), 10 (84, 89), 13 (101, 103, 109)
Delaware:	4 (31, 32), 5 (41), 6 (52), 9 (77)
Georgia:	(12**), (27**)
Maryland:	2 (15), 6 (48), 8 (63), 10 (85)
Massachusetts:	1 (3,9), 2 (14, 21), 5 (47), 6 (54, 56, 57), 7 (58, 59, 60), 8 (66, 67), 9 (75, 78), 10 (86, 88), 12 (93, 94, 96, 98), 13 (99, 104, 107, 108), 14 (2 Dall. 34)
New Hampshire:	1 (2), 3 (30), 12 (97)
New Jersey:	3 (29), 34 (35, 36, 38), 5 (40, 45)
North Carolina:	2 (16, 17, 20), 5 (42, 43), 8 (65, 69, 70), 9 (73), 10 (87), 13 (105, 106)
Pennsylvania:	1 (1 4 7), 2 (10, 13, 23), 4 (33, 39), 5(44), 8 (62, 72), 14 (2 Dall.1, 2 Dall.19, 2 Dall.36)
Rhode Island:	1 (6,8), 2 (11, 18, 19), 4(34, 3), 8 (68), 10 (90***), 13 (100), 15 (2 Dall.40)

South Carolina: 2 (24), 3 (25), 15 (2 Dall.41)

Virginia: 1 (50), 13 (102)

Unknown: (22**), (26**)

*The case number, in parentheses, is preceded by the number of the roll on which the records for that case have been filmed. For those cases reported by Dallas that do not have case numbers the citation of the case appears in parentheses.

**No documents on file.

***Reported in 2 Dall. 40.

MEMBERS OF THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS WHO SERVED ON
SPECIAL COMMITTEES TO HEAR APPEALS, THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
APPEALS, AND THE COURT OF APPEALS IN CASES OF CAPTURE

Special Committees To Hear Appeals

The first of these committees was appointed on September 9, 1776, and the last on January 11, 1777.

1. Roberts, claimant and appellant, v. The Thistle and McArory. September 9, 1776.

Richard Stockton of New Jersey
Samuel Huntington of Connecticut
Robert Treat Paine of Massachusetts
James Wilson of Pennsylvania
Thomas Stone of Maryland

2. The Elizabeth and Cargo, Wentworth, appellant. September 30, 1776.

Robert Treat Paine of Massachusetts
Samuel Huntington of Connecticut
Thomas Stone of Maryland
George Wythe of Virginia
James Smith of Pennsylvania

3. The Peggy and Cargo. October 17, 1776.

Samuel Huntington of Connecticut
Robert Treat Paine of Massachusetts
George Wythe of Virginia
James Smith of Pennsylvania
James Wilson of Pennsylvania

4. Barry v. The Sloop Betsey. November 7, 1776.

George Wythe of Virginia
Robert Treat Paine of Massachusetts
James Wilson of Pennsylvania
William Hooper of North Carolina

Edward Rutledge of South Carolina

5. *Joyne v. The Sloop Vulcan*. November 27, 1776.
George Wythe of Virginia
Robert Treat Paine of Massachusetts
James Wilson of Pennsylvania
William Hooper of North Carolina
Samuel Chase of Maryland
6. *Hopkins v. Derby and The Kingston Packet*. December 31, 1776.
No members named
7. *Craig v. The Brig Richmond*. January 4, 1777.
James Wilson of Pennsylvania
William Hooper of North Carolina
Samuel Chase of Maryland
William Ellery of Rhode Island
8. *Pierce v. The Brig Phoenix and Cargo*. January 11, 1777.
James Wilson of Pennsylvania
William Hooper of North Carolina
Samuel Chase of Maryland
Jonathan Dickinson Sergeant of New Jersey
William Ellery of Rhode Island

The Standing Committee On Appeals

On January 30, 1777, the Congress resolved “That a standing committee, to consist of five members, be appointed to hear and determine upon appeals brought against sentences passed on libels in the courts of Admiralty in the respective states...” The first Committee was chosen by the Congress on January 30, 1777. The last appointment to the Standing Committee was made on January 5, 1780. Appointments were made as follows:

January 30, 1777.

James Wilson of Pennsylvania
Jonathan Dickinson Sergeant of New Jersey
William Ellery of Rhode Island
Samuel Chase of Maryland
Rodger Sherman of Connecticut

March 12, 1777. The following were added:

John Adams of Massachusetts
George Read of Delaware
Thomas Burke of North Carolina

May 8, 1777. The old Committee was discharged as too numerous and the following five members were appointed, “they or any three of them to hear and determine upon appeals brought to Congress”:

James Wilson of Pennsylvania
James Duane of New York

John Adams of Massachusetts
Jonathan Dickinson Sergeant of New Jersey
Thomas Burke of North Carolina

October 13, 1777. Because of absences a new Committee of five was appointed. The entire body or any three were empowered to act.

John Adams of Massachusetts
Joseph Jones of Virginia
Richard Law of Connecticut
Henry Marchant of Rhode Island
Henry Laurens of South Carolina

November 17, 1777. The following changes were made:

John Harvie of Virginia, Francis Dana of Massachusetts, and William Ellery of Rhode Island in place of Henry Laurence, John Adams, and Henry Marchant.

December 10, 1777. A new member was added:

Benjamin Rumsey of Maryland

February 17, 1778. Four members were added:

Thomas McKean of Delaware
Samuel Huntington of Connecticut
John Henry of Maryland
James Smith of Pennsylvania

July 27, 1778. The Congress was informed that only two member, (names not mentioned) of the Committee were present and that sundry cases were ready for trial. Three members were added (any three of the Committee were empowered to act):

Joseph Reed of Pennsylvania
William Henry Drayton of South Carolina
Elias Boudinot of New Jersey

September 23, 1778. The following members were added:

John Mathews of South Carolina
Henry Marchant of Rhode Island

October 26, 1778. a new member added:

Oliver Ellsworth of Connecticut

March 9, 1779. The membership of the Committee now consisted of only three members: William Henry Drayton of South Carolina, William Ellery of Rhode Island, and John Henry of Maryland. The Congress added two new members.

Jesse Root of Connecticut
William Paca of Maryland

July 29, 1779. The following replacements were made:

Henry Marchant of Rhode and Edmund Randolph of Virginia in place of William Ellery and William Paca.

August 27, 1779. The following replacement was made:

William Paca of Maryland in place of Edmund Randolph.

October 14, 1779. Replacements as follows:

James Mercer or Virginia and Cyrus Griffin of Virginia in place of Drayton (deceased) and Paca (absent).

December 7, 1779. Replacements as follows:

Ezra L'Hommedieu of New York and William Ellery of Rhode Island in place of Henry Marchant and Jesse Root.

January 5, 1780. A replacement as follows:

Oliver Ellsworth of Connecticut in place of William Paca (absent).

The Court of Appeals in Cases of Capture

On January 15, 1780, the Congress established "a court for the trial of all appeals from the Courts of admiralty in these United States, consisting of three judges appointed and commissioned by Congress, either two of whom, in the absence of the other to hold court...trials therein [to] be according to the usage of nations and not by jury." The first judges of the court were elected by the Congress on January 22, 1780; the date of the last appointment was December 5, 1782. On January 24, 1780, the Congress resolved that the court be named "Court of appeals in cases of Capture."

January 22, 1780. The following were elected:

George Wythe of Virginia (declined)

William Paca of Maryland (accepted on February 9, 1780)

Titus Hosmer of Connecticut (accepted on May 4, 1780)

March 31, 1780. A letter from George Wythe, dated February 21, 1780, declining the office of judge of the court, was read. Thereupon the Congress elected:

Cyrus Griffin of Virginia (accepted on May 4, 1780)

December 5, 1782. The following replacements were made:

George Read of Delaware and John Lowell of Massachusetts in place of Paca (resigned) and Hosmer (deceased).

December 13, 1782. The Congress, by drawing lots, gave George Read precedence over Lowell and Griffin.

INDEX TO CASES

The title of each case is followed by (1) the roll number of this microcopy in which the papers of the case are reproduced, and (2) by the number of the case (given in parentheses) as reported in 131 U.S., or, when the case was reported in Dallas, by the citation. Where no roll number appears no documents for that case are on file.

Active (The Sloop), Houston v. 4 (39)

Adventure (The Schooner), Young, claimant, Boitar v. 13 (106)

Allen v. The Good Fortune 10 (87)

Alsop. *See* Mary Alsop and others v. Rutenburgh 2 (11)
Anna Maria (The Ship), Daniel Bucklin, claimant and appellant, White v. 2 (21)
Anthony and McClure v. The Schooner Hepzabeth 8 (70). *See* also Deshon v. The Brig Kitty 8 (69)
Anthony and McClure v. The Schooner John 8 (70). *See* also Deshon v. The Brig Kitty 8 (69)
Arthur, Weyman v. 2 (24)
Babcock v. The Brigantine Brunette 9 (75)
Babcock v. The Ship Nancy 5 (47)
Babcock, The Countess of Eglington, Jones, claimant, v. 1 (9)
Bailey (The Ship), and Russell, appellee, Manly v. 12 (93)
Bain et al., appellants, v. The Schooner Speedwell et al., appellees 15 (2 Dall. 40)
Baldwin, The Leghorn, Polk claimant, v. 2 (13)
Barbary (The Schooner), Decatur v. 8 (61)
Barlow. *See* Sampson v. The Schooner Fanny, and Barlow 13 (99)
Barlow v. The Sloop Fanny, Coffin, claimant 13 (104)
Barrell v. The Sloop Good Intent, Seymour, appellee 13 (102)
Barrett v. The Schooner Packet 6 (52)
Barry v. The Brig Mars 9 (78)
Barry v. The Sloop Betsey 1 (4)
Bermudas (The). *See* Cook, appellant, v. Conklin, in the cases of The Eagle and The Bermudas 6 (50)
Betsey (The Schooner), and Ridgway, appellant, Earle, appellee, v. 9 (77)
Betsey (The Sloop), Barry v. 1 (4)
Betsy (The Sloop), Bradley, claimant, Old v. 8 (71)
Boitar v. The Schooner Adventure, Young, claimant 13 (106)
Bradford v. The Viper 6 (54)
Bradley. *See* Old v. The Sloop Betsy, Bradley, claimant 8 (71)
Bradley, claimant, Lockwood v. 9 (83)
Bragg v. The Sloop Dove 8 (65)
British Goods. *See* Sundry British Goods.
Brooks and Griffith, The Schooner Hope and Cargo, Lopez, claimant, v. 3 (28)
Brunette (The Brigantline), Babcock v. 9 (75)
Bucklin, Daniel. *See* The Montgomery v. The Hinervs 2 (15), and White v. The Ship Anna Maria, Daniel Bucklin, claimant and appellant 2 (21)
Cabot v. The Nuestra Senora de Merced 6 (57)
Caldwell v. Newman and The Polly 2 (23)
Captor (The) of The Brig Cumberland, Cruger v. 13 (109)
Cathcart. *See* Garrett, claimant, v. The Brig Nonsuch and Cathcart 12 (94)
Champlin. *See* The Two Brothers, Joseph Stanton and Samuel Champlin, claimants 2 (18)
Charming Peggy (The). *See* The Peggy and Cargo 1 (3)
Chester (The Owners of The Sloop) v. The Owners of The Brig Experiment 15 (2 Dall. 41)
Cleaveland v. The Ship Valenciano 7 (58)
Coakley v. The Brigantine Hope and John Martin 10 (85)
Coffin. *See* Barlow v. The Sloop Fanny, Coffin, claimant 13 (104) and The Industry, Coffin, Master 2 (14)
Conklin, Cook, appellant, v. in the cases of The Eagle and The Bermudas 6 (50)
Conquerant (The Sloop), Pillas, claimant, Gibbs v. 5 (42)
Cook, appellant, v. Conklin, in the cases of The Eagle and The Bermudas 6 (50)
Coor. *See* James Coor et al. v. The Hanover 2 (16)
Countess of Eglington (The), Jones, claimant, v. Babcock 1 (9)

Courter v. The Brigantine Pitt 8 (63)
Craig v. The Brig Richmond 1 (7)
Cruger v. The Captor of The Brig Cumberland 13 (109)
Cumberland (The Brig). *See* Cruger v. The Captor of The Brig Cumberland 13 (109)
Darby v. The Brig Erstern 14 (2 Dall. 34)
Davis v. The Schooner Polly, Gibbons, claimant 5 (43)
Debade, Pere, appellant, v. The San Antonio, Hayden et al., libellants 12 (95)
Decatur v. The Schooner Barbary 8 (61)
Derby v. The Ship Minerva, Kohler, appellant 12 (96)
Derby and The Kingston Packet, Hopkins v. 1 (6)
Deshon v. The Brig Kitty 8 (69). *See also* Anthony and McClure v. The Schooner Hepzabeth 8 (70) and Anthony and McClure v. The Schooner John 8 (70)
DeValmais. *See* Tucker v. The LeVern and Cargo, DeValmais, claimant 6 (56)
Diamond (The). *See* Jackson v. The Diamond, Forman, claimant 11 (91-92)
Doane et al., appellants, v. Treadwell and Penhallow, libellants, and The Brig Susannah 3 (30)
Dolphin (The), Forman, claimant, Jackson v. 11 (91-92)
Doo, Vicenti. *See* Randall et al. v. The Schooner Nostra Seigniora da Solidade e St. Miguel e Almas and Cargo, Vicenti Doo, claimant 10 (88)
Dove (The Sloop), Bragg v. 8 (65)
Eagle (The). *See* Cook, appellant, v. Conklin, in the cases of The Eagle and The Bermudas 6 (50)
Earle, appellee, v. The Schooner Betsey, and Ridgway, appellant 9 (77)
Edwards, Elderkin v. 5 (46)
Eglington. *See* The Countess of Eglington, Jones, claimant, v. Babcock 1 (9)
Elderkin v. Edwards 5 (46)
Elizabeth (The) and Cargo, Wentworth, appellant 1 (2)
Elkins v. The Sloop Good Intent 13 (108)
Ellis v. The Sloop Hannah 9 (74)
Erstern (The Brig), Darby v. 14 (2 Dall. 34)
Experiment (The Owners of The Brig), The Owners of Th Sloop Chester v. 15 (2Dall. 41)
Fame (The Schooner), Johnston, claimant Taylor v. 5 (45)
Fancy (The Sloop), Jencks v. 4 (34)
Fanny (The). *See* Jencks v. The Sloop Fancy 4 (34)
Fanny (The Schooner), and Barlow, Sampson v. 13 (99)
Fanny (The Sloop), Coffin, claimant, Barlow v. 13 (104)
Forcan, appellant, v. The Brig Maria Theresa, and Manly, appellee 12 (97)
Forman. *See* Jackson v. The Dolphin, Forman, claimant and Jackson v. The Diamond, Forman, claimant 11 (91-92)
Fossett v. The Sloop Jane 6 (48)
Foster et al., Hart v. 9 (82)
Four Sisters (The Schooner) and Rogers, appellee, Robinson v. 9 (76)
Fowkes v. The Roseanna, Hussey, claimant 2 (20)
Gardiner. *See* Johnson, appellee v. Sundry British Goods, Gardiner et al., claimants and appellants 9 (81)
Gardner v. The Brig Sea-Horse and Cargo, John Lynch, claimant 8 (64)
Garrett, claimant, v. The Brit Nonsuch and Cathcart 12 (94)
George (The Sloop), Griffin v. 5 (40)
Gibbons. *See* Davis v. The Schooner Polly, Gibbons, claimant 5 (43)
Gibbs v. The Sloop Conquerant, Pillas, claimant 5 (42)
Gleason v. The Mermaid 6 (53)
Gloucester (The Brig), Keane v. 14 (2 Dall. 36)

Godwin v. The Schooner Fortune 4 (31)
Good Fortune (The), Allen v. 10 (87)
Good Fortune (The), Howell et al. v. 10 (87)
Good Intent (The Schooner), Tam Ploy, claimant, Gurney v. 5 (44)
Good Intent (The Sloop), Elkins v. 13 (108)
Good Intent (The Sloop), Seymour, appellee, Barrell v. 13 (102)
Gray, claimant, Scudder v. 6 (49)
Green. *See* Pierce v. The Brig Phoenix and Cargo 1 (8)
Green, J. *See* White v. The Sloop Polly and Cargo 2 (12)
Greenwich (The) 2 (19)
Griffin v. The Sloop George 5 (40)
Griffith. *See* The Schooner Hope and Cargo, Lopez, claimant, v. Brooks and Griffith 3 (28)
Gurney v. The Schooner Good Intent, Tam Ploy, claimant 5 (44)
Hannah (The Sloop), Ellis v. 9 (74)
Hanover (The), James Coor et al. v. 2 (16)
Harper, etc. v. The Schooner Liberty 13 (105)
Harridan v. The Sloop of War Hope 8 (62)
Hart v. Foster et al. 9 (82)
Hart, John. *See* The Peggy (26)
Hathaway, claimant of The Sloop Polly, v. Ingersol 13 (107)
Havens, claimant, v. The Trumbull, etc. 9 (80)
Hawk (The:Schooner), Tredwell v. 4 (37)
Hawke (The Sloop), Murphy v. 4 (32)
Hayden. *See* Pere Debade, appellant, v. The San Antonio, Hayden et al, libellants 12 (95)
Hezabeth (The Schooner), Anthony and McClure v. 8 (70). *See also* Deshon v. The Brig Kitty 9 (69)
Hinchinbroke (The) (27)
Hope (The Brigantine) 13 (103)
Hope (The Brigantine) and John Martin, Coakley v. 10 (85)
Hope (The Schooner) and Cargo, Lopez, claimant, v. Brooks and Griffith 3 (28)
Hope (The Sloop of War), Harridan v. 8 (62)
Hopkins v. Derby and The Kingston Packet 1 (6)
Houston v. The Sloop Active 4 (39)
Howell et al. v. The Good Fortune 10 (87)
Hulbert. *See* Hope (The Brigantine) 13 (103)
Hussey. *See* Fowkes v. The Roseanna, Hussey, claimant 2 (20)
Hussey, Palmer v. 2 (17)
Industry (The), Coffin, Master 2 (14)
Industry (The Sloop), Jencks v. 8 (68)
Ingersol, Hathaway, claimant of The Sloop Polly, v. 13 (107)
Ingersol v. The Brig Recovery 6 (55)
Ingersol v. The Schooner Lovely Nancy 4 (38)
Jackson v. The Diamond, Forman, claimant 11 (91-92)
Jackson v. The Dolphin, Forman, claimant 11 (91-92)
James Coor et al. v. The Hanover 2 (16)
Jane (The Sloop), Fossett v. 6 (48)
Jencks v. The Sloop Fancy 4 (34)
Jencks v. The Sloop Industry 8 (68)
John (The Schooner), Anthony and McClure v. g (70). *See also* Deshon v. The Brig Kitty 8 (69)
John and Sally (The Schooner), Stevens v. 4 (35)

Johnson, appellee, v. Sundry British Goods, Gardiner et al., claimants and appellants 9 (81)
Johnston. *See* Taylor v. The Schooner Fame, Johnston, claimant 5 (45)
Jones. *See* The Countess of Eglinton, Jones, claimant, v. Babcock 1 (9)
Jones. *See* Joyne v. The Sloop Vulcan 1 (5)
Jones, Isaac. *See* The Private Sloop of War Retaliation (22)
Joyne v. The Sloop Vulcan 1 (5)
Judson. *See* Wells, appellant, v. Sundry British Goods, Judson, appellee 9 (79)
Keane v. The Brig Gloucester 14 (2 Dall. 36)
Kingston Packet (The). *See* Hopkins v. Derby and The Kingston Packet 1 (6)
Kitty (The Brig), Deshon v. 8 (69). *See also* Anthony and McClure v. The Schooner Hepzabeth
8 (70) and Anthony and McClure v. The Schooner John 8 (70)
Knight, Peter. *See* White v. The Sloop Polly and Cargo 2 (12)
Kohler. *See* Derby v. The Ship Minerva, Kohler, appellant 12 (96)
Lake, etc., v. Hulbert et al. *See* Hope (The Brigantine) 13 (103)
Lark (The Sloop), Preble v. 10 (86)
Lark (The Sloop), Taylor v. 4 (36)
Leghorn (The), Polk, claimant, v. Baldwin 2 (13)
LeVern (The) and Cargo, DeValmais, claimant, Tucker v. 6 (56)
Liberty (The Schooner), Harper, etc. v. 13 (105)
Lockwood v. Bradley, claimant 9 (83)
Lopez. *See* The Schooner Hope and Cargo, Lopez, claimant, v. Brooks and Griffith 3 (28)
Lovely Nancy (The Schooner), Ingersol v. 4 (38)
Luke v. Hulbert. *See* Hope (The Brigantine) 13 (103)
Lynch, John. *See* Gardner v. The Brig Sea-Horse and Cargo, John Lynch, claimant 8 (64)
McAroy. *See* Roberts, claimant and appellant, v. The Thistle and McAroy 1 (1)
McClure. *See* Anthony and McClure v. The Schooner John and Anthony and McClure v. The
Schooner Hepzabeth 8 (70) and Deshon v. The Brig Kitty 8 (69)
McClure v. Sundry British Goods 13 (101)
Manly. *See* Forcan, appellant, v. The Brig Maria Theresa, and Manly, appellee 12 (97)
Manly v. The Ship Bailey, and Russell, appellee 12 (93)
Maria Theresa (The Brig), and Manly, appellee, Forcan appellant, v. 12 (97)
Mars (The Brig), Barry v. 9 (78)
Martin, John. *See* Coakley v. The Brigantine Hope and John Martin 10 (85)
Mary Alsop and others v. Ruttenburgh 2 (11)
Mary (The Ship), Rathburn v. 8 (67)
Mary (The Sloop) and Cargo, Smith v. 9 (73)
Massachusetts (The Board of War for) v. The Ship Victoria 7 (59)
Mermaid (The), Gleason v. 6 (53)
Miller v. The Ship Revolution 14 (2 Dall. 1; 2 Dall. 19)
Minerva (The), The Montgomery v. 2 (15)
Minerva (The Ship), Kohler, appellant, Derby v. 12 (96)
Montgomery (The) v. The Minerva 2 (15)
Murphy v. The Sloop Hawke 4 (32)
Nancy (The Ship), Babcock v. 5 (47)
Newman v. The Sherburne and Cargo 2 (10)
Newman and The Polly, Caldwell v. 2 (23)
Nicholson v. The Sandwich Packet 8 (66)
Nonsuch (The Brig) and Cathcart, Garrett, claimant, v. 12 (94)
Norris v. The Schooner Polly and Nancy 3 (25)
Norton v. Perceval and The Schooner Sally 12 (98)

Nostra Seigniora da Solidade e St. Miguel e Almas (The Schooner) and Cargo, Vicenti Doo, claimant, Randall et al. v. 10 (88)

Old v. The Sloop Betsy, Bradley, claimant 8 (71)

Packet (The Schooner), Barrett v. 6 (52)

Palmer v. Hussey 2 (17)

Peggy (The) (26)

Peggy (The) and Cargo 1 (3)

Penhallow. *See* Doane et al., appellants, v. Treadwell and Penhallow, libellants, and The Brig Susannah 3 (30)

Perceval and The Schooner Sally, Norton v. 12 (98)

Peters. *See* Spencer, appellant, v. The Sloop Sally, and Peters, appellee 10 (84)

Phoenix (The Brig) and Cargo, Pierce v. 1 (8)

Pierce v. The Brig Phoenix and Cargo 1 (8)

Pillas. *See* Gibbs v. The Sloop Conquerant, Pillas, claimant 5 (42)

Pitt (The Brigantine), Courter v. 8 (63)

Ploy, Tam. *See* Gurney v. The Schooner Good Intent, Tam Ploy, claimant 5 (44)

Polk. *See* The Leghorn, Polk, claimant, v. Baldwin 2 (13)

Polly (The). *See* Caldwell v. Newman and The Polly 2 (23)

Polly (The Schooner), Gibbons, claimant, Davis v. 5 (43)

Polly (The Sloop). *See* Hathaway, claimant of The Sloop Polly, v. Igersol 13 (107)

Polly (The Sloop) and Cargo, White v. (12)

Polly (The Sloop), and Wickham, appellee, Smith v. 13 (100)

Polly and Nancy (The Schooner), Norris v. 3 (25)

Pope v. The Sloop Sally 5 (41)

Poy, Tam. *See* Gurney v. The Schooner Good Intent, Tam Poy, claimant 5 (44)

Preble v. The Sloop Lark 10 (86)

Price v. The Success 6 (51)

Randall et al. v. The Schooner Nostra Seigniora de Solidade e St. Miguel e Almas and Cargo, Vicenti Doo, claimant 10 (88)

Rathburn v. The Ship Mary 8 (67)

Read, appellee, and The Squirrel, Stoddard v. 10 (90)

Recovery (The Brig), Ingersol v. 6 (55)

Resolution (The Ship), Miller v. 14 (2 Dall. 1; 2 Dall. 19)

Retaliation (The Private Sloop of War) (22)

Richmond (The brig), Craig v. 1 (7)

Ridgway. *See* Earle, appellee, v. The Schooner Betsey, and Ridgway, appellant 9 (77)

Roberts, claimant and appellant, v. The Thistle and McArroy 1 (1)

Robinson v. The Schooner Four Sisters and Rogers, appellee 9 (76)

Rogers. *See* Robinson v. The Schooner Four Sisters and Rogers, appellee 9 (76)

Roseanna (The), Hussey, claimant, Fowkes v. 2 (20)

Russell. *See* Manly v. The Ship Bailey, and Russell, appellee 12 (93)

Ruttenburgh, Mary Alsop and others v. 2 (11)

Sally (The Schooner). *See* Norton v. Perceval and The Schooner Sally 12 (98)

Sally (The Sloop), Pope v. 5 (41)

Sally (The Sloop), and Peters, appellee, Spencer, appellant v. 10 (84)

Sampson v. The Schooner Fanny, and Barlow 13 (99)

San Antonio (The), Hayden et al., libellants, Pere Debadé appellant, v. 12 (95)

Sandwich Packet (The), Nicholson v. 8 (66)

Santos y Martyros (The), Tracy v. 7 (60)

Scudder v. Gray, claimant 6 (49)

Sea-Horse (The Brig) and Cargo, John Lynch, claimant, Gardner v. 8 (64)
 Seymour. *See* Barrell v. The Sloop Good Intent, Seymour, appellee 13 (102)
 Sheafe, Jacob. *See* The Elizabeth and Cargo, Wentworth, appellant 1 (2)
 Shaler v. The Speedwell 3 (29)
 Sherburne (The) and Cargo, Newman v. 2 (10)
 Smith v. Sundry British Goods 10 (89)
 Smith v. The Sloop Mary and Cargo 9 (73)
 Smith v. The Sloop Polly, and Wickham, appellee 13 (100)
 Speedwell (The), Shaler v. 3 (29)
 Speedwell (The Schooner) et al., appellees, Bain et al., appellants, v. 15 (2 Dall. 40)
 Spencer, appellant, v. The Sloop Sally, and Peters, appellee 10 (84)
 Squirrel (The). *See* Stoddard v. Read, appellee, and The Squirrel 10 (90)
 Stanton. *See* The Two Brothers, Joseph Stanton and Samuel Champlin, claimants 2 (18)
 Stephen. *See* Stevens v. The Schooner John and Sally 4 (35)
 Stevens v. The Schooner John and Sally 4 (35)
 Stoddard v. Read, appellee, and The Squirrel 10 (90)
 Success (The), Price v. 6 (51)
 Sundry British Goods, McClure v. 13 (101)
 Sundry British Goods, Smith v. 10 (89)
 Sundry British Goods, Gardiner et al., claimants and appellants, Johnson, appellee, v. 9 (81)
 Sundry British Goods, Judson, appellee, Wells, appellant, v. 9 (79)
 Susannah (The Brig). *See* Doane et al., appellants, v. Treadwell and Penhallow, libellants, and
 The Brig Susannah 3 (30)
 Taylor v. The Schooner Fame, Johnston, claimant 5 (45)
 Taylor v. The Sloop Lark 4 (36)
 Taylor v. The Sloop Polly 4 (33)
 Thistle (The and McAroy, Roberts, claimant and appellant, v. 1 (1)
 Tracy v. The Santos y Martyros 7 (60)
 Treadwell and Penhallow, libellants, and The Brig Susannah, Doane et al., appellants, v. 3 (30)
 Treadwell v. The Schooner Hawk 4 (37)
 Trumbull (The), etc., Havens, claimant, v. 9 (80)
 Tucker v. The LeVern and Cargo, DeValmais, claimant 6 (56)
 Two Brothers, (The), Joseph Stanton and Samuel Champlin, claimants 2 (18)
 Two Friends (The Sloop), Young v. 8 (72)
 Valenciano (The Ship), Cleaveland v. 7 (58)
 Victoria (The Ship), The Board of War for Massachusetts v. 7 (59)
 Viper (The), Bradford v. 6 (54)
 Vulcan (The Sloop), Joyne v. 1 (5)
 Wells, appellant, v. Sundry British Goods, Judson, appellee 9 (79)
 Wentworth. *See* The Elizabeth and Cargo, Wentworth, appellant 1 (2)
 Weyman v. Arthur 2 (24)
 White v. The Ship Anna Maria, Daniel Bucklin, claimant and appellant 2 (21)
 Wickham. *See* Smith v. The Sloop Polly, and Wickham, appellee 13 (100)
 Young v. The Sloop Two Friends 8 (72)
 Young. *See* Boitar v. The Schooner Adventure, Young, claimant 13 (106)

CONTENTS

Roll Case number; Description

1; Roberts, Claimant and Appellant, v. The Thistle and McAroy.

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for the port of Philadelphia, condemning the vessel. September 9, 1776, referred to a committee. September 16, 1776, reversed.

2; The Elizabeth and Cargo, Wentworth, Appellant.

Appeal from a decree in the Court Maritime of New Hampshire, discharging the vessel and cargo. September 12, 1776, libellant's appeal present to the Congress. September 30, 1776, the owners of the goods petitioned the Congress to hear the appeal, whereupon it was referred to a committee. October 5, 1776, the petition of Jacob Sheafe respecting it was referred to the same committee, styled Commissioners. October 14, 1776, the committee reported, and on their report the degree was reversed by the Congress.

3; The Peggy and Cargo

Appeal from the Maritime Court in the Middle District of Massachusetts Bay. October 17, 1776, read and referred to a special committee. Transferred to the committee on Appeals and then to the Court of Appeals; dismissed by the latter, May 24, 1784, "neither party appearing." In the Journal of Congress this vessel is called "The Charming Peggy"; but in the papers on file it is called "The Peggy."

4; Barry v. The Sloop Betsey

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for the port of Philadelphia, in Pennsylvania, condemning the vessel. November 7, 1776, referred to a special committee, with power. November 26, 1776, decree below affirmed by the committee.

5; Joyne v. The Sloop Vulcan

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for Virginia. November 27, 1776, referred to a special committee. January 24, 1777, decree below reversed by the committee, in the printed Journal "Joyne" is given as "Jones."

6; Hopkins v. Derby and the Kingston Packet

Appeal from a judgment in the Court of Justice for the Trial of Prize Causes for Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. December 31, 1776, referred to the Committee on Appeals. September 8, 1777, reversed by the Committee on Appeals.

7; Craig v. the Brig Richmond

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for the port of Philadelphia, in Pennsylvania, condemning the vessel. January 4, 1777, referred to a special committee. January 17, 1777, affirmed by the committee.

8; Pierce v. the Brig Phoenix and Cargo

Appeal from a decree in the Maritime Court for Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, condemning the vessel and cargo. January 11, 1777 referred to a special committee. January 31, 1777, in Congress, the affirmance set aside because it has been heard and determined by a different committee from that appointed to hear it," and it was "referred to the Standing Committee on Appeals.

June 7, 1777, the petition of Green and others for a new hearing referred to the Committee on Appeals. September 3, 1777, decree below reversed by the Committee.

9; The Countess of Eglington, Jones, Claimant, v. Babcock

Appeal from a judgment in the Superior Court of Judicature, Court of Assize, and General Jail Delivery in Plymouth County, Massachusetts. The proceedings were begun on January 14, 1777, and the judgment was reversed September 14, 1783.

2

10; Newman v. The Sherburne and Cargo

Appeal from a verdict and judgment of condemnation in the Court of Admiralty for the port of Philadelphia, in Pennsylvania. January 30, 1777, referred to the Standing Committee for hearing and determination. April 12, 1777, the Committee reported that they were divided in opinion, whereupon it was referred to a special committee. May 10, 1777, decree below affirmed. In May 1777, the Marine Committee, to whom it appears to have been then referred, reported that the case had already received a judicial determination by the Committee on Appeals, and that it was improper for the Congress to come to any resolution relative thereto.

11: Mary Alsop and Others v. Rутtenburgh

Appeal from a judgment in the Court of Justice for the Trial of Prize Causes for Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. March 6, 1777, lodged with the Secretary; and, on April 24, 1777, referred to the Committee on Appeals. May 20, 1777, reversed by the Committee.

12; White v. the Sloop Polly and Cargo

Appeal from a judgment in the Court of Admiralty for Georgia condemning the vessel. March 12, 1777, referred to the Committee on Appeals. August 6, 1777, J. Green and Peter Knight asked leave to file a further appeal and the application was referred to the Committee on Appeals, who, on the 15th of August, reported that the appeal had been taken too late. Congress then voted to authorize the Committee to receive it, and, on August 18, 1777, the decree below was affirmed by the Committee. No papers are on file for this case.

13; The Leghorn, Polk, Claimant, v. Baldwin

Appeal from a judgment in the Court of Admiralty for the port of Philadelphia, in Pennsylvania. April 1, 1777, referred to the Committee on Appeals. May 24, 1777, affirmed by the Committee.

14; The Industry, Coffin, Master

Appeal from a judgment in a Maritime Court for the Southern District of Massachusetts Bay held at Plymouth, in Massachusetts, condemning the vessel. April 16, 1777, referred to the Committee on Appeals. September 8, 1777, decree below affirmed by the Committee.

15; The Montgomery v. the Minerva

Appeal from a judgment in the Court of Admiralty of Maryland. April 24, 1777, referred to the Committee on Appeals. June 2, 1777, decree below affirmed by the

Committee. June 24, 1777, a petition of Daniel Bucklin, commander of the Montgomery, referred to the same Committee.

16; James Coor et al. V. the Hanover

Appeal from a decree of a Court of Admiralty for North Carolina, held at New Bern. May 1, 1777, referred to the Committee on Appeals. August 7, 1778, reversed by the Committee.

17; Palmer v. Hussey

An appeal from the same judgment by other interested parties. It was dismissed May 22, 1777.

18; The Two Brothers, Joseph Stanton and Samuel Champlin, Claimants

Appeal from a judgment in the Court of Justice for the Trial of Prize Causes for Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, ordering a sale of the vessel for the benefit of the claimants. May 13, 1777, referred to the Committee on Appeals. August 30, 1779, decree below reversed by the Committee and sale ordered for the benefit of Stanton and others. The judgment was set aside, and, on a rehearing in the Court of Appeals, the decree below was affirmed May 28, 1783.

19; The Greenwich

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. June 7, 1777, referred to the Committee on Appeals, and on their report denied.

20; Fowkes v. the Roseanna, Hussey, Claimant

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for North Carolina. Date of reference to the Committee on Appeals not known. June 9, 1777, affirmed. Reopened, and on October 25, 1777, reversed by the Committee.

21; White v. the Ship Anna Maria, Daniel Bucklin, Claimant and Appellant

Appeal from a decree in the Maritime Court for the Middle District of Massachusetts Bay, held at Salem, in Massachusetts. June 24, 1777, referred to the Committee on Appeals, August 18, 1780, decree below affirmed by the Court of Appeals.

22; The Private Sloop of War Retaliation

Court below not known. August 2, 1777, memorial of Isaac Jones, on behalf of himself and other owners, referred to the Committee on Appeals. No papers are on file for this case.

23; Caldwell v. Newman and the Polly

Appeal from a judgment in the Court of Admiralty for the port of Philadelphia, in Pennsylvania. September 8, 1777, referred to the Committee on Appeals. September 12, 1778, reversed by the Committee.

24; Weyman v. Arthur

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for South Carolina. September 12, 1777, referred to the Committee on Appeals. August 7, 1778, reversed by the Committee.

3

25; Norris v. the Schooner Polly and Nancy

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for South Carolina. April 20, 1778, referred to the Committee on Appeals. August 14, 1778, affirmed by the Committee.

26; The Peggy

Court below not known. August 14, 1778, petition of John Hart respecting it referred to the Committee on Appeals. No papers are on file for this case.

27; The Hinchinbroke

Appeal from a decree in a Court of Admiralty in Georgia, condemning the vessel. August 20, 1778, referred to the Committee on Appeals. No papers are on file for this case.

28; The Schooner Hope and Cargo, Lopez, claimant, v. Brooks and Griffith

Appeal from a decree in the County Court for the County of Hartford, in Connecticut. September 7, 1778, referred to the Committee on Appeals. April 10, 1779, decree below reversed by the Committee. Motion for a new trial denied February 19, 1780.

29; Shaler v. the Speedwell

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for New Jersey. September 21, 1778, referred to the Committee on Appeals. November 10, 1778, reversed by the Committee.

30; Doane et al., Appellants, v. Treadwell and Penhallow, Libellants, and the Brig Susannah

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for New Hampshire. October 9, 1778, referred to the Committee on Appeals. September 1783, the Court of Appeals reversed the decree as to the appellants. For further proceedings in this case, *see* Penhallow v. Doane, 3 Dall. 54. *See also* Doane v. Penhallow, 1 Dall. 218.

4

31; Godwin v. the Schooner Fortune

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for Delaware. October 12, 1778, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. September 5, 1779, decided by the Committee, but in what way does not appear.

32; Murphy v. the Sloop Hawke

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for Delaware. October 13, 1778, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. September 8, 1779, affirmed by the Committee.

33; Taylor v. the Sloop Polly

Appeal from a judgment in the Court of Admiralty for the port of Philadelphia, in Pennsylvania. October 20, 1778, referred to the Committee on Appeals. November 22, 1779, affirmed by the Committee.

34; Jencks v. the Sloop Fancy

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. October 20, 1778, referred to the Committee on Appeals. December 3, 1778, reversed by the Committee. In the printed Journal of Congress this vessel is called “The Fanny.”

35; Stevens v. the Schooner John and Sally

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for New Jersey. October 23, 1778, referred to the Committee on Appeals. March 11, 1779, affirmed by the committee. The plaintiff’s name is “Stephen” in the printed Journal.

36; Taylor v. the Sloop Lark

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for New Jersey. October 26, 1778, referred to the Committee on Appeals. January 28, 1780, affirmed by the Committee.

37; Tredwell v. the Schooner Hawk

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. October 26, 1778, referred to the Committee on Appeals. Affirmed March 29, 1779.

38; Ingersol v. the Schooner Lovely Nancy

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for New Jersey. October 26, 1778, referred to the Committee on Appeals. August 22, 1780, affirmed by the Court of Appeals.

39; Houston v. the Sloop Active

Appeal from a judgment in the Court of Admiralty for the port of Philadelphia, in Pennsylvania. November 28, 1778, referred to the Committee on Appeals. December 15, 1778, reversed. For further proceedings in this case, see 131 U. S. xxix-xxxiv.

5

40; Griffin v. the Sloop George

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for New Jersey. December 7, 1778, referred to the Committee on Appeals. December 23, 1780, reversed by the Court of Appeals. *See Jennings v. Carson*, 4 Cr. 2.

41; Pope v. the Sloop Sally

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for Delaware. January 1, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. Decided by the Committee in 1779. No further particulars.

42; Gibbs v. the Sloop Conquerant, Pillas, Claimant

Appeals from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for North Carolina. February 6, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. March 18, 1779, affirmed by the Committee.

43; Davis v. the Schooner Polly, Gibbons, Claimant

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for North Carolina. February 6, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. March 23, 1779, reversed by the Committee.

44; Gurney v. the Schooner Good Intent, Tam Ploy, Claimant

Appeal from a judgment in the Court of Admiralty for the port of Philadelphia in Pennsylvania. February 8, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals and affirmed by them November 13, 1779.

45; Taylor v. the Schooner Fame, Johnston, Claimant

Appeal from a decree in the Maritime Court for New Jersey. February 16, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. December 23, 1780, affirmed by the Court of Appeals.

46; Elderkin v. Edwards

Appeal from a judgment in the Court of Admiralty in Connecticut. April 29, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. January 5, 1780, reversed by the Committee.

47; Babcock v. the Ship Nancy

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for the Southern District of Massachusetts Bay. May 12, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. August 9, 1779, affirmed by the Committee.

6

48; Fossett v. the Sloop Jane

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for Maryland. May 31, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. January 18, 1780, reversed by the Committee.

49; Scudder v. Gray, Claimant

Appeal from a judgment in the County Court of Fairfield County, Connecticut. May 31, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. December 23, 1780, reversed by the Court of Appeals.

50; Cook, Appellant, v. Conklin, in the Cases of The Eagle and The Bermudas

Appeals from judgments in the Maritime Court for New London County, Connecticut. June 7, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. December 23, 1780, reversed by the Court of Appeals.

51; Price v. the Success

Appeal from a decree in the Admiralty Court for New Jersey. July 2, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. July 20, 1779, dismissed on appellee's motion, appellant not objecting.

52; Barrett v. the Schooner Packet

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for Delaware. July 21, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. February 28, 1780, settled by the parties.

53; Gleason v. the Mermaid

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for New Jersey. July 21, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. In January 1780, the decree was reversed by the Court of Appeals.

54; Bradford v. the Viper

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for the Middle District of Massachusetts Bay. July 24, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals . November 8, 1779, affirmed by the Committee.

55; Ingersol v. the Brig Recovery

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for New Jersey. August 17, 1779, dismissed with costs, not having been lodged within the forty days.

56; Tucker v. the LeVern and Cargo, DeValmas, Claimant

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for the Middle District of Massachusetts Bay. Referred to the Committee on Appeals. Date of reference not known. The decree below was made September 17, 1779. In 1780, the decree below was reversed by the Court of Appeals. Date of reversal not known.

57; Cabot v. the Nuestra Senora de Merced

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for the Middle District of Massachusetts Bay. October 9, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. November 6, 1779, reversed by the Committee.

7

58; Cleaveland v. the Ship Valenciano

Appeal from a judgment in the Superior Court of Judicature, Court of Assize, and General Jail Delivery at Boston, in the Middle District of Massachusetts Bay. October 9, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. November 1, 1779, reversed by the Committee.

59; Board of War for Massachusetts v. the Ship Victoria

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for the Middle District of Massachusetts Bay. October 9, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. November 6, 1779, affirmed by the Committee.

60; Tracy v. the Santos y Martyros

Appeal from a judgment on a verdict in the Superior Court of Judicature, Court of Assize, and General Jail Delivery at Boston, in the Middle District of Massachusetts Bay. October 9, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. November 6, 1779, affirmed by the Committee.

8

61; Decatur v. the Schooner Barbary

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for the State of New Jersey. November 12, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. Decided in 1779 by the Committee. Date and character of decision not given.

62; Harridan v. the Sloop of War Hope

Appeal from a judgment in the Court of Admiralty for the port of Philadelphia, in Pennsylvania. 3 Hopkins Works 14; Bee, 385, where it is reported that “the verdict [in the court below] was contrary to the opinion of the judge.” November 30, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. Settled by the parties.

63; Courter v. the Brigantine Pitt

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for the State of Maryland. December 30, 1779, lodged with the Committee on Appeals. January 30, 1780, reversed by the Committee.

64; Gardner v. the Brig Sea-Horse and Cargo, John Lynch, Claimant

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for New Jersey. March 14, 1780, claimants letter lodged with the Committee on Appeals. Decided in 1780. Date and judgment not given.

65; Bragg v. the Sloop Dove

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for North Carolina. May 9, 1780, lodged with the Court of Appeals. December 23, 1780, reversed by the Court.

66; Nicholson v. the Sandwich Packet

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for the Middle District of Massachusetts Bay. June 2, 1780, lodged in the office of the Register of the Court of Appeals. August 14, 1780, affirmed.

67; Rathburn v. the Ship Mary

Appeal from a judgment of the Maritime Court for the Southern District of Massachusetts Bay. Date of lodgment in the office of the Register of the Court of Appeals not given. June 23, 1780, affirmed.

68; Jencks v. the Sloop Industry

Appeal from a judgment of the Maritime Court for the Trial of Prize Causes in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. September 14, 1780, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. November 24, 1780, reversed.

69; Deshon v. the Brig Kitty

Appeal from a decree of the Court of Admiralty at Beautort for North Carolina. October 28, 1780, lodged in the Court of Appeals. April 5, 1781, (probably) affirmed. *See also* case 70.

70; Anthony and McClure v. the Schooner John Anthony and McClure v. the Schooner Hepzabeth

Appeals from decrees in the Court of Admiralty for North Carolina. October 28, 1780, lodged in the Court of Appeals. April 5, 1781, affirmed.

71; Old v. the Sloop Betsy, Bradley, Claimant

Appeal from a judgment in the County Court of the County of New Haven, Connecticut. November 20, 1780, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. September 21, 1783, reversed.

72; Young v. the Sloop Two Friends

Appeal from a judgment in the Admiralty Court for the port of Philadelphia, in Pennsylvania. 3 Hopkins' Works 50-54. December 14, 1780, lodged in the office of the Register of the Court of Appeals. December 23, 1780, affirmed.

73; Smith v. the Sloop Mary and Cargo

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for North Carolina. July 31, 1781, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. May 6, 1784, dismissed.

74; Ellis v. the Sloop Hannah

Appeal from a decree in the Admiralty Court for New Jersey. June 1781, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. August 4, 1781, reversed. A petition for a rehearing was presented on March 7, 1785, and referred to a committee which reported in favor of a rehearing on March 28, 1785. The rehearing was presented and read on November 11, 1786, and rejected by the Court on November 14, 1786.

75; Babcock v. the Brigantine Brunette

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for the Middle District of Massachusetts Bay. February 6, 1781, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. August 4, 1781, reversed.

76; Robinson v. the Schooner Four Sisters and Rogers, Appellee

Appeal from a judgment in the Court of Admiralty for the County of New Haven, Connecticut. September 24, 1781, lodged in the office of the Register of the Court of Appeals. September 21, 1783, affirmed.

77; Earle, Appellee, v. the Schooner Betsey, and Ridgway, Appellant

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for Delaware. October 4, 1781, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. June 14, 1783, reversed.

78; Barry v. the Brig Mars

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for the Middle District of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. October 12, 1781, lodged in the office of the Register of the Court of Appeals. Decided in 1781. Date and decree not given.

79; Wells, Appellant, v. Sundry British Goods, Judson, Appellee

Appeal from a judgment in the County Court for Hartford County, Connecticut. January 21, 1782, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of appeals. September 21, 1783, reversed.

80; Havens, Claimant, v. the Trumbull, etc.

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for the County of New London, Connecticut. January 21, 1782, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. Decided 1782. Date and decree wanting.

81; Johnson, Appellee, v. Sundry British Goods, Gardiner et al., Claimants and Appellants

Appeal from a judgment in the County Court for Hartford County, Connecticut. January 21, 1782, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of appeals. September 21, 1783, reversed.

82; Hart v. Foster et al.

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for New London County, Connecticut. March 13, 1782, lodged in the register's office of the Court of Appeals. September 21, 1783, reversed.

83; Lockwood v. Bradley, Claimant

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for Fairfield County, Connecticut. April 4, 1782, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. Dismissed in 1782, neither party appearing.

10

84; Spencer, Appellant, v. the Sloop Sally, and Peters, Appellee

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for New London County, Connecticut. May 16, 1782, lodged in the office of the Register of the Court of Appeals. June 12, 1783, reversed.

85; Coakley v. the Brigantine Hope and John Martin

Appeal from a decree in the Admiralty Court for Maryland. June 10, 1782, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of appeals. May 6, 1784, reversed.

86; Preble v. the Sloop Lark

Appeal from a judgment in the Supreme Judicial Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. June 14, 1782, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. Ordered to be struck off the docket. Date of order not known

87; Allen v. the Good Fortune, Howell et al. V. the Good Fortune

Appeals from a decree of the Court of Admiralty for North Carolina. August 26, 1782, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. June 14, 1783, decree affirmed in Allen's appeal. May 17, 1787, Howell's appeal dismissed.

88; Randall et al. V. the Schooner Nostra Seigniora da Solidade e St. Miguel e Aimas and Cargo, Vicente Doo, Claimant

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for the Middle District of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. September 14, 1782, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. May 29, 1783, affirmed in part and reversed in part.

89; Smith v. Sundry British Goods

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for Fairfield County, Connecticut. September 14, 1782, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. May 20, 1787, dismissed, neither party appearing.

90; Stoddard v. Read, Appellee, and the Squirrel

Appeal from a judgment in the Court of Admiralty for Rhode Island. November 15, 1782, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. For interlocutory proceedings in this case, *see* 2 Dall. 40. October 1, 1783, decree below affirmed.

11

91-92; Jackson v. the Dolphin, Forman, Claimant, Jackson v. the Diamond, Forman, Claimant

The cases were appealed from decrees of the Court of Admiralty for New Jersey. March 16, 1783, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. Affirmed on May 21, 1784.

12

93; Manly v. the Ship Bailey, and Russell, Appellee

Appeal from a judgment of the Maritime Court for the Middle District of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Certified copy of the record below, dated April 25, 1783, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals, but the date of lodgment not known. May 13, 1783, affirmed.

94; Garrett, Claimant, v. the Brig Nonsuch and Cathcart

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for the Middle District of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. May 2, 1783, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. May 13, 1783, affirmed.

95; Pere Debade, Appellant, v. the San Antonio, Hayden et al., libellants

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for the Middle District of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. May 5, 1783, lodged in the office of the Register of the Court of Appeals. May 28, 1783, reversed.

96; Derby v. the Ship Minerva, Kohler, Appellant

Appeal from a judgment of the Maritime Court for the Middle District of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. May 5, 1783, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. May 27, 1783, decree below affirmed, but with costs to the appellant, which were fixed by agreement of the parties.

97; Forcan, Appellant, v. the Brig Maria Theresa, and Manly, Appellee

Appeal from a judgment of the Court Maritime for the State of New Hampshire. Date of lodgment unknown. June 12, 1783, reversed.

98; Norton v. Perceval and the Schooner Sally

Appeal from a judgment in the Supreme Judicial Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. June 28, 1783, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. Settled by the parties.

13

99; Sampson v. the Schooner Fanny, and Barlow

Appeal from a judgment in the Supreme Judicial Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. June 28, 1783, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. May 28, 1784, affirmed.

100; Smith v. the Sloop Polly, and Wickham, Appellee

Appeal from a judgment in the Court of Admiralty for Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. August 9, 1783, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. May 26, 1784, reversed for want of jurisdiction.

101; McClure v. Sundry British Goods

Appeal from a judgment in the Maritime Court for New London County, in Connecticut. No date of lodgment. September 21, 1783, reversed.

102; Barrell v. the Sloop Good Intent, Seymour, Appellee

Appeal from a decree of the Court of Admiralty for Virginia. Date of lodgment not known. September 30, 1783, reversed.

103; The Brigantine Hope

[Reported-2 Dall. 41]

Appeal from a judgment of the Maritime Court for New London County, Connecticut. This appeal being dismissed because not filed in time, a petition was filed praying the court to take jurisdiction. Citations were ordered, and the petition was dismissed by the court, May 3, 1787.

104; Barlow v. the Sloop Fanny, Coffin, Claimant

Appeal from a judgment of the Supreme Judicial Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. February 19, 1784, lodged in the Register's office of the Court of Appeals. May 6, 1784, settled by the parties.

105; Harper, etc. v. the Schooner Liberty

Court of Admiralty for North Carolina. Petition for appeal forwarded to the Delegates from Virginia, and presented by them to Congress, August 10, 1779, and referred on that day to the Committee on Appeals. May 6, 1784, dismissed, neither party appearing.

106; Boitar v. the Schooner Adventure, Young, Claimant

Appeal from a decree in the Court of Admiralty for North Carolina. Date of lodgment not known. May 21, 1784, reversed.

107; Hathaway, Claimant of the Sloop Polly, v. Ingersol

Appeal from a judgment in the Supreme Judicial Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Libel not on file. May 21, 1784, affirmed.

108; Elkins v. the Sloop Good Intent

Appeal from a judgment in the Supreme Judicial Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Date of lodgment not known. May 23, 1784, affirmed.

109; Cruger v. the captor of the Brig Cumberland

Original petition to the Court of Appeals, praying an appeal against a judgment in a Court of Admiralty in Connecticut. May 3, 1787, dismissed, neither party appearing.

14

2 Dall. 1 and 2 Dall. 19; Miller v. the Ship Resolution

Appeal from the Admiralty Court of Pennsylvania, where the ship had been acquitted and the cargo condemned. Date of lodgment not known. Decree of the Court of Appeals dated August 15, 1781. A rehearing was granted and it was argued on December 26, 1781. On January 24, 1782, a revisionary decree was delivered.

2 Dall. 34; Darby v. the Brig Erstern

Appeal from a judgment of the Admiralty Court of the State of Massachusetts Bay, where the brig and her cargo had been acquitted. The case was argued on January 28-30, 1782. Decided February 5, 1782. The advocate on the part of the owners of the Erstern twice attempted to get the court to rehear the case. On May 24, 1782, and May 11, 1787, the court refused a rehearing.

2 Dall. 36; Keane v. the Brig Gloucester

Appeal from a decree of the Court of Admiralty for Pennsylvania. After argument, Paca and Griffin, the presiding Commissioners delivered the sentence on February 5, 1782.

15

2 Dall. 40; Bain et al., Appellants, v. the Schooner Speedwell et al., Appellees
Appeal from a judgment of the Court of Admiralty for Rhode Island and the Providence Plantations. June 17, 1783, filed in the office of the Register of the Court of Appeals. May 24, 1784, reversed by the Court of Appeals.

2 Dall. 41; The Owners of the Sloop Chester v. the Owners of the Brig Experiment

Appeal from a judgment of the Court of Admiralty for South Carolina. Petition dismissed May 3, 1787.

Miscellaneous Case Papers:

1. Accounts relating to the schooner Kitty's cargo, August 1772
2. Receipt for military stores for the Needham dated at the customhouse, London, October 5, 1776
3. Papers relating to the capture of the brig Joseph by the schooner Eagle, Brazilla Smith, commander, comprising:
 - a. A letter from Cornelius Harnett, President of the Convention of the state of North Carolina, dated at Halifax, North Carolina, December 23, 1776, to John Hancock, President of the Continental Congress, enclosing a memorial of the same date from the Convention of the state of North Carolina to the delegates of the United States of America in Congress assembled.
 - b. A deposition of Emperor Mosely dated December 23, 1776, enclosing a copy of the invoice of the cargo on board the Joseph.
 - c. An undated report of a committee of congress, prepared sometime during the year 1777, referring the dispute to the State of Massachusetts Bay.
4. Papers in the case of Powers et al. V. the Sally and Mifflin, October 9, 1779-June 6, 1782.
5. Papers in the case of Brown Brothers v. the Perseverance, October 4, 1781-September 27, 1782.
6. A copy of the commission of the British ship Regulator, February 22, 1782.
7. Papers relating to the seizure of the British privateer Bachelor's Delight, April 10-July 22, 1784.

Miscellaneous Court Records

1. Extracts from minutes of the Continental Congress relating to the appointment of members of the Committee on Appeals, November 17, 1777-January 5, 1780.
2. Causes pending in the Committee on Appeals, February-May, 1778.
3. Copy of an Act of June 30, 1779, of the General Court of Massachusetts Bay authorizing appeals in certain admiralty cases to the "Court of appeals."
4. Copies of resolutions of the Continental Congress of May 24, 1780, relating to the Court of Appeals.
5. Causes pending in the Court of appeals, June 1780-March 1781.
6. A report of a committee of the Continental Congress on a motion for extending the time for entering appeals from judgments of maritime courts, June 6, 1783.
7. Oaths of office and resignation papers of Registers of the Court of Appeals, 1780-86.
8. Minutes of the Court of Appeals, September 10-11, 1783.
9. A copy of a Resolution of the Continental Congress of September 29, 1783, instructing the Ministers for negotiating peace on behalf of the United States with Great Britain to negotiate an explanation of a declaration acceded to on January 20, 1783, relative to captures.
10. A letter of Elias Boudinot dated at Princeton, October 2, 1783, to the judges of the Court of Appeals, transmitting a resolution of the Continental Congress regarding the time of cessation of hostilities.
11. Papers relating to the compensation of judges of the Court of Appeals, December 23, 1784-April 1, 1785.
12. A letter of January 20, 1785, addressed to the Continental Congress by Cyrus Griffin, member of the Court of Appeals, recommending payment for the register of the Court of Appeals and recognition of the Court's work.
13. A letter from Jos. Hugg, dated at Gloucester, October 28, 1785, to Richard Henry Lee, President of the Continental Congress.
14. Correspondence between Rufus G. Amory of Boston and Benjamin Bankson, Register of the Court of Appeals, relating to papers in a case purportedly involving Amos Potter, commander of the armed sloop Revenge and the brigantine Jane, August 1789.
15. A table of fees charged by the Register, n.d.