

- Case of Fanchon, free mulattress vs Francisco Demaziller  
2-5
- Proceedings instituted in consequence of the death of  
Dona Francisca Radegonda Mayeux, inventory & appraisal  
of the properties of the deceased 2-7
- Case of Margarita Meilleur, vs Claudio La Coste, her  
husband 2-10
- Proceedings instituted by Alexandro Chonet, in order  
to recover the estate left by the deceased Juan Luis  
Lacroix, his nephew 2-13
- Don Pedro de Aragon y Villegas, vs Don Cladio Lacoste 2-14
- Case of Lorenzo Wiltz, vs Claudio Lacoste 2-15
- Case of Don Santiago Phelipe Guinault, vs Claudio Lacoste  
2-15
- Case of Narciso de Alba, vs Claudio Lacoste 2-19
- Case of Francisco Verret, vs Claudio La Coste 2-20
- Public Auction of the damaged effects from a Brigantine  
owned by Henry Voix 2-20
- This document is made of 5 certified copies of powers-  
of-attorney, in the matter of estate of Robert Laurent  
Beltremieux, former merchant of La Rochelle, who left 6  
children 6-19, 1778
- Case of Luis Lamate, vs Cretien 2-22
- Case of Antonio Dejean vs Claudio Lacoste 2-26
- Official criminal proceedings instituted against 2 run-  
away negro slaves for the murder of an agent government  
in attempting to free a group of runaway slaves in cus-  
tody 3-1
- Case of Nicolas Pertui, vs George Enot 3-3
- Testamentary execution of Francisco Bijon 3-3

Case of Miguel Fortier, vs Pedro Bouche St.Martin 3-3

Proceedings instituted by Fernando Rodrigues, regarding the resignation of Leonardo Masange, made in his favor of the position as secretary of the government, of the City Council & of the public 3-4

Case of Francisco Mayrrone, vs Pablo Segon. The plaintiff brought this action for the purpose of compelling the defendant to vacate a house of his ownership. 3-6

Proceedings instituted by Carlos Poree, & Carlos Jose Fraissinet, for the purpose of obtaining a permit to sell the Brigantine named " San Juan" of the ownership of Pedro Rousseau & Thomas Poree 3-10

Proceedings instituted by Pedro Favrot, as testamentary executor of the deceased Henrique Gerard and Augustina Allain, in regard to certain transaction with Claudio Trenaunay 3-13

Proceedings instituted by Jose Maria de La Barba, for the purpose of selling certain pieces of dry goods 3-14

Proceedings instituted by Pedro Bertoniere, regarding the resignation of Fernando Rodriguez, of the position of official attorney of this City made in his favor 4-15

Official criminal proceedings instituted against Manuel De Los Santos for the murder of Tomas Guzman 4-18

Succession of Doña Antonia Del Castillo 4-29

Case of Pedro Jose de Pedesclaux, vs Juan Vincent. n.d

Proceedings instituted by Bartolome Tardiveau & Co., in regard to a theft of certain merchandise, the theft was committed by Santiago Corbert, a pirate of English nationality 6-2

Jaime Urgel & Co., vs Jose Sanchez 6-12

File #3328 )  
Jan. 12, 1783. )  
Judge: Estevan )  
Miro. )  
Court Clerk: )  
Fernando Rodri- )  
guez. )  
PP. 1 to 6. )  
French and )  
Spanish. )

PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED BY  
JUAN CADUE VERSUS FRANCIS-  
CO AUDIBER IN REGARD TO  
THE COLLECTION OF A CER-  
TAIN SUM OF PESOS.

Plaintiff petitions the  
Court, alleging that as evi-  
denced by the promissory  
note presented the Defendant  
owes petitioner the sum of  
ninety-eight pesos and three

reales; that on several occasions petitioner  
has demanded the Defendant to pay, but Defend-  
ant has refused; therefore petitioner begs the  
Court, to compel the Defendant to appear in  
Court and declare under oath whether he owes  
the sum claimed.

On Jan. 12, 1783, the Court  
granted the Plaintiff's petition.

On the same day, the Defend-  
ant, declared that he owes said sum of ninety-  
eight pesos to the Plaintiff; but that the De-  
fendant had paid to the Plaintiff the sum of  
twenty-four pesos and four reales on account of  
the sum in question.

Plaintiff, again petitions  
the Court, alleging that Defendant has no docu-  
ment to prove that he had paid the sum of twenty-  
four pesos and four reales on account; there-  
fore petitioner begs the Court to issue a writ  
of execution against the person and properties  
of the Defendant to satisfy the full sum of  
ninety-eight pesos, plus interest and costs of  
these proceedings.

On Jan. 21, 1783, the Court  
granted the Plaintiff's petition.

(cont'd)

Doc. #775  
(cont'd)

On Jan. 24, 1783, Don Nicolas Fromantin, Chief Constable went to the house of the Defendant and requested him to pay to the Plaintiff the sum claimed of ninety-eight pesos plus interest and costs of these proceedings, but the Defendant refused, and not finding any properties to seize, he arrested the Defendant.

The record is incomplete and the outcome of the case is not known.

File #28.  
Jan. 13, 1783.  
Judge: Don Este-  
van Miro.  
Court Clerk: Don  
Rafael Perdomo.  
Pages 1-6.  
All in Spanish.

Case of  
Don Joseph Foucher, Treasur-  
er of the City of New Orleans  
versus  
Don Fernando Rodriguez, Nota-  
ry Public and Clerk of the  
Government and Council of the  
City of New Orleans.

Joseph Foucher, as Treasurer of the City of New Orleans, petitioned the Court, alleging that as evidenced by the document duly presented the Defendant owes the Treasury of the City the sum of one thousand twenty-four pesos for the value of the office of Public Attorney of which Don Rafael Perdomo was formerly in possession and which the Defendant bought; petitioner further alleges that although on several occasions petitioner has requested the Defendant to pay said sum the Defendant has refused; therefore, petitioner begs the Court to issue a writ of execution against all the properties of the Defendant until the total payment of said sum plus the costs of these proceedings.

The Court granted the Plaintiff's prayer.

Then the Plaintiff petitioned the Court, alleging that the writ of execution was levied on the shoe buckles of the Defendant as there was no other properties to be seized; therefore, the petitioner begs the Court to seize the office of Public Attorney from the Defendant in order to satisfy the claim of one thousand twenty-four pesos owed to the City Treasury.

The Court granted the Plaintiff's prayer.

The record is incomplete and the outcome of the case is not known.

File #57 )  
 Jan. 13, 1783.)  
 Judge: Estevan )  
 Miro. )  
 Court Clerk: )  
 Rafael Perdomo )  
 PP. 1 to 4. )  
 French and )  
Spanish. )

PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED BY  
 ALBERTO GRIMA VERSUS CON-  
 STAN FARDI IN REGARD TO  
 THE COLLECTION OF A SUM  
 OF PESOS.

Plaintiff, petitions the Court, alleging that, as evidenced by two promissory notes, which he duly presents, the Defendant, a resident of the City of Pensacola, owes petitioner the sum of three thousand three hundred pesos for certain merchandise which petitioner sold to the Defendant; that on several occasions petitioner has demanded payment of said Defendant which Defendant has refused; that since, petitioner had been informed that said Defendant is in jail in the City of Pensacola; therefore petitioner begs the Court to issue a warrant and forward it to the Governor of said City of Pensacola in order to compel said Defendant to pay petitioner the sum in question and to seize Defendant's properties if he refuses to satisfy said debt.

On Jan. 13, 1783, the Court granted the Plaintiff's petition.

The record is incomplete and the outcome of the case is not known.

File #66	)	PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED BY
Jan. 13, 1783	)	DON JUAN DIDEZIC MOLEN-
Judge: Martin	)	HAUSSER, MASTER OF THE BRI-
Navarro.	)	GANTINE NAMED "JUAN HAMBUR-
Court Clerk:	)	GOS," FOR THE PURPOSE OF
Rafael Perdomo.)	)	JUSTIFYING HIMSELF OF THE
PP. 1 to 41.	)	DAMAGES SUFFERED BY SAID
<u>All in Spanish.)</u>	)	BRIGHTINE UNDER HIS COM-
		MAND.

Don Juan Didezic Molenhauser, master of the Brigantine named "Juan de Hamburgos", petitions the Court, alleging that as evidenced by the attested protest presented, said Brigantine suffered huge damages, resulting, when said Brigantine went aground, and also from misfortunes encountered on the high seas in his voyage from Burdeos, France to this Port of New Orleans; that said damages were caused not through his negligence; that in order to exonerate petitioner from paying said damages; therefore petitioner begs the Court that he be allowed to submit information, and that the witnesses that petitioner will present declare under oath in accordance with said attested protest, and that a copy of their testimonies be delivered to petitioner in order to promote whatever may be convenient.

On Jan. 13, 1783, the Court granted the Petitioner's prayer.

Petitioner presented before the Court several witnesses and they declared in accordance with the attested protest presented.

The Court after hearing the witnesses exonerated petitioner from all blame of the damages caused to said brigantine named "Juan de Hamburgos."

The cost of these proceedings amounted to 357 reales.

File #80.	)	Case of
Jan. 13, 1783.	)	Don Juan Bta. Pomet
P. From 1 to 8.	)	versus
All in Spanish.	)	one named Armant.
Judge: Don Estevan	)	
Miro.	)	Plaintiff, petitioned the
Court Clerk: Rafael	)	Court, alleging that the
Perdomo.	)	Defendant owes him the
	)	sum of 1792 pesos 6 1/2

reales as ~~it is~~ evidenced by the three promissory notes presented. Therefore petitioner begs the Court, to order the Defendant to satisfy said sum, or to give petitioner a security, and to order the defendant not to leave this City, until he has settled this matter.

On January 13th, 1783, Governor Miro, Colonel of Infantry, ordered the Defendant, to appear in Court to acknowledge his signature at the foot of said three promissory notes and to ~~declare~~ if he owes the sum claimed by petitioner.

On the same day in compliance with the preceding decree the Court Clerk, went to the house of the Defendant and after the Defendant was duly sworn according to law he declared that the signature at the foot of said three promissory notes are his, and that he owes the sum of 1792 pesos 6 1/2 reales to the Plaintiff.

Then the Plaintiff, petitioned the Court, alleging that as it is evidenced by the Defendant's declaration in which he admitted owing said sum, therefore petitioner then begs the Court to issue a writ of execution against the personal properties of the Defendant, in order to satisfy said claim.

On January 15th, 1783, Don Estevan Miro, granted the Plaintiff's petition. The record is incomplete and the outcome of the case is not known.

File #90 )  
Jan. 13, 1783. )  
P. from 1 to 81. )  
Spanish & French )  
Judge: Gov. Es- )  
tevan Miro. )  
Court Clerk: )  
Fernando Rodri- )  
guez. )

PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED BY THE  
BOARD OF CREDITORS OF THE DE-  
CEASED MANUEL PONCE PASQUIN  
VERSUS THE ESTATE OF DON MANU-  
EL PONCE PASQUIN.

The record shows that each  
creditor presented their  
claims, duly signed by the de-  
ceased Manuel Ponce Pasquin,  
showing the nature and amount  
of the claim, and petitioning the Court that  
their claims be satisfied out of the proceeds  
of the sale of the property left by said de-  
ceased.

On Feb. 6, 1783, Don Francisco  
Broutin, as tutor, ad lites of the minor heirs  
to the estate of the deceased Manuel Ponce Pas-  
quin petitioned the Court, alleging that since  
the inventory of the properties left by the said  
deceased has been approved, therefore, petitioner  
begs the Court to order the sale of said proper-  
ties on terms of six months payment.

On Feb. 21st, Governor Estevan  
Miro, ruled that by virtue of the majority of the  
creditors having opposed the proposal made by Don  
Francisco Broutin, tutor of the minor heirs, it  
was finally decided that the estate should be  
disposed of for cash, and that the sale should  
take place January 25th, 1784.

The record shows that the  
creditors, that had not filed their claims, af-  
ter becoming aware of the above decree, filed  
their claims, and the estate was disposed of,  
for cash and some of the creditors were satis-  
fied out of the proceeds others were not.

File #22.  
Jan. 14, 1783.  
P. From 1 to 7.  
All in Spanish.  
Judge: Don Este-  
van Miro.  
Court Clerk:  
Rafael Perdomo.

Case of  
Don Pedro Duranton  
versus  
Manuel Subi.

Plaintiff petitioned the Court, alleging that the Defendant owes him the sum of 71 pesos, as evidenced by the promissory note presented, and that the Defendant has refused to pay on demand. Therefore petitioner begs the Court to order the Defendant to appear in Court to acknowledge his signature affixed at the foot of said promissory note and to declare if he owes the sum claimed.

On January 14th, 1783, Don Estevan Miro, ordered the Defendant to appear in Court as petitioned.

On March 29th, 1783, in compliance with the preceding decree, the Defendant appeared before the office of the Court Clerk, to give his declaration, and after Defendant was duly sworn according to law, he declared that the signature affixed at the foot of said promissory note is his and that he owes the sum claimed by petitioner.

Then the Plaintiff, petitioned the Court to order the Defendant to appear in Court and declare if he owes the sum claimed. The Defendant answered the Plaintiff's petition alleging that the accounts presented by the Plaintiff are incorrect, and that he only owes 21 pesos and 5 reales.

The record is not complete and the outcome of the case is not known.

File #85 )  
 Jan. 14, 1783. )  
 P. from 1 to )  
 16. )  
 Judge: Don )  
 Juan Ventura )  
 Morales. )  
 Court Clerk: )  
 Don Rafael )  
Perdomo. )

PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED BY  
 BERNARDA ARCINY, NEGRESS  
 SLAVE OF DON FRANCISCO  
 DANIEL DUPAIN FOR THE PUR-  
 POSE OF OBTAINING HER LET-  
 TER OF FREEDOM.

Bernarda Arciny, negress slave  
 of Don Francisco Daniel Dupain,  
 petitioned the Court, alleging  
 that she desires to obtain her  
 freedom for her appraised value.

Therefore, petitioner begs the Court to order her master to appoint an appraiser on his part and to appoint on her part an appraiser, to estimate her value and in case of disagreement to appoint a third appraiser.

On Jan. 15th, 1783, Don Juan Ventura Morales, Justice of the Peace, granted the petitioner's prayer and ordered the Court Clerk, to notify Don Francisco Daniel Dupain, master of petitioner, to comply as petitioned.

Then Don Francisco Daniel Dupain, petitioned the Court, alleging that in compliance with the preceding decree, wherein he was ordered to appoint an appraiser to estimate his negress slave, he appointed on Don Carlos Onorato Olivier; therefore petitioner begs the Court to order the Court Clerk to notify Don Onorato Olivier of said appointment.

The Court granted Don Francisco Daniel Dupain's petition and, on the same day the Court Clerk, notified Don Carlos Onorato Olivier and Don Gaspar de Aranda of the appointment as appraisers, which appointment they accepted.

On Jan. 17th, 1783, Don Juan Ventura Morales, Justice of the Peace ordered the Court Clerk to set the 18th day of the cur-

Doc. #782  
(cont'd)

rent month for the appraisement of said negress slave.

On Jan. 18th, 1783, the appointed appraisers, appeared before the office of Don Juan Ventura Morales, Justice of the Peace, for the purpose to proceed to the estimation of said slave which they estimated for 800 pesos.

On Jan. 22nd, Bernarda Arciny, negress slave of Don Francisco Daniel Dupain, appeared before the Court Clerk, and paid the sum of 800 pesos, which is her appraised value.

On Jan. 23rd, Don Juan Ventura Morales, Justice of the Peace, ordered Don Daniel Dupain to issue the letter of freedom to his negress slave as petitioned.

On March 7, 1784, Don Nicolas Frenantia, Chief Constable, in compliance with the decree of the Court, went to the house of the Defendant and ordered said Defendant to pay the City Treasury the sum of one thousand nine hundred and fifty pesos interest and the costs of these proceedings but the Defendant refused to pay, therefore he seized the house of the Defendant.

Plaintiff again petitions the Court, alleging that Don Nicolas Frenantia, Chief Constable, in compliance with a decree issued by the Court, seized the house of the Defendant; therefore petitioner begs the Court to sell the house in question.

On March 24, 1784, the Court granted the Plaintiff's second petition.

(cont'd)

File No. 3318.	)	Doc. No. 783.
Jan. 14, 1783.	)	Box 41.
Judge: Juan Ventura	)	
Morales.	)	PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED
Court Clerk: Leonardo	)	BY DON FRANCISCO BLACHE
Mazange.	)	VERSUS DON GEORGE HENO
PP. 1 to 55.	)	IN REGARD TO THE COLLEC-
<u>French and Spanish.</u>	)	TION OF A SUM OF PESOS.

Plaintiff, City Treasurer, petitions the Court, alleging that, as evidenced by the account duly presented, the Defendant former lessee of the public provisions supply of this City, owes the City Treasury the sum of one thousand nine hundred ninety-nine pesos; that several occasions Plaintiff has demanded said sum from the Defendant but Defendant has refused to pay; therefore Petitioner begs the Court to issue a writ of execution against the person and properties of the Defendant to satisfy the sum in question plus interest and the costs of these proceedings.

On March 6, 1783, the Court by official decree granted the Plaintiff's petition.

On March 7, 1783, Don Nicolas Fromantin, Chief Constable, in compliance with the preceding decree went to the house of the Defendant and ordered said Defendant to pay the City Treasury the sum of one thousand nine hundred ninety pesos plus interest and the costs of these proceedings but the Defendant refused to pay, therefore he seized the house of the Defendant.

Plaintiff again petitions the Court, alleging that Don Nicolas Fromantin, Chief Constable, in compliance with a decree issued by the Court seized the house of the Defendant; therefore Petitioner begs the Court to sell the house in question.

On March 24, 1784 the Court granted the Plaintiff's second petition.

(cont'd)

On May 6, 1783, the house of the Defendant was sold at Public auction to Don Manuel Lara for the sum of three thousand pesos which sum will be paid half in cash and the other half on time.

On August 5, 1783, the Court by judicial decree ordered the Defendant to pay the Plaintiff the sum of one thousand five hundred pesos which sum is the cash payment made on the house of the Defendant, deducting from said sum the costs of these proceedings.

The costs of these proceedings amounted to 56 pesos and 5 reales.

Then Maria Fariuete Moke, legitimate wife of Arnaldo Segura, petitioned the Court alleging that she had given her consent to her husband to sell all of the community property. Therefore she begs His Lordship to accept her consent and to order as her husband has petitioned.

On January 16th, 1783, Don Juan Ventura Morales, ordered the Court Clerk, to sell at public auction said property.

On January 15th, 18th, and 25th, 1783, the Court Clerk, in compliance with the preceding decree, ordered the public orator to advertise the properties of the petitioner, and there being several persons present no bidder appeared.

On January 25th, 1783, Don Juan Ventura Morales, went to the house of the Petitioner, to witness the public auction of the properties of the petitioner, His Lordship ordered the Court

(cont'd)

File #3353. )  
 Jan. 14, 1783. )  
 P. From 1 to 6. )  
 All in Spanish. )  
 Judge: Don Juan )  
 Ventura Morales. )  
 Court Clerk: )  
Leonardo Mazange. )

Doc. #784.  
 Box 41.

SALE OF THE PROPERTIES OF ARN-  
 OLDO MAGNON AND OF ENRIQUETA  
 ROCHE HIS WIFE.

Don Arnoldo Magnon a merchant of this City petitioned the Court, to grant him the necessary license to sell at public auction all his properties. Therefore the Petitioner begs His Lordship to grant him said license, and to order the Court Clerk, to sell his properties at public auction.

On January 14th, 1783, Don Juan Ventura Morales ordered the Petitioner to present before the Court his wife's consent for the sale of the community property.

Then Madam Enriqueta Roche, legitimate wife of Arnoldo Magnon, petitioned the Court alleging that she has given her consent to her husband to sell all of the community property. Therefore she begs His Lordship to accept her consent and to order as her husband has petitioned.

On January 16th, 1783, Don Juan Ventura Morales, ordered the Court Clerk, to sell at public auction said property.

On January 16th, 21st, and 25th, 1783, the Court Clerk, in compliance with the preceding decree, ordered the public crier to advertise the properties of the petitioner, and there being several persons present no bidder appeared.

On January 28th, 1783, Don Juan Ventura Morales, went to the house of the Petitioner, to witness the public auction of the properties of the petitioner, His Lordship ordered the Court  
 (cont'd)

Clerk, that by the voice of the public crier to advertise said properties, and after they were advertised for several times no bidder appeared, and being 12 o'clock His Lordship ordered said public auction stopped, and to continued same whenever it is convenient to the interested parties.

The record is incomplete and the outcome of the case is not known.

The court accepted said protest and ordered the proposed indemnifications to be received from the witnesses presented by the petitioner.

The witnesses appeared before the court and rendered their information which entirely substantiated the allegations made by the petitioner in the aforementioned protest.

The petitioner then requested the court that in consideration of the information rendered by the witnesses, which prove that the loss of said vessel and its cargo did not occur through petitioner's incompetency or negligence, said loss be officially declared unavoidable and therefore petitioner be absolved of all responsibility.

(cont'd)

File #10	)	PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED BY DON
Jan. 21, 1783.)	)	ZENON TORRES, A RESIDENT OF
Judge: Don	)	NEW ORLEANS AND CAPTAIN OF THE
Martin Navar-	)	BILANDER NAMED "NUESTRA SENORA
ro.	)	DEL ROSARIO", FOR THE PURPOSE
Court Clerk:	)	OF PROVING THE MANNER IN WHICH
Don Rafael	)	SAID BILANDER AND ITS ENTIRE
Perdomo.	)	CARGO WERE LOST AT SEA.
Pages 1 to 33.)	)	
All in Span-	)	Don Zenon Torres, a resident of
ish.	)	New Orleans and Captain of the
	)	bilander named "Nuestra Señora

del Rosario" petitioned the Court, alleging that the manner in which said bilander and its entire cargo were lost, was through no fault of petitioner, as reasonable measures to save said vessel and its cargo were taken, wherefore, petitioner presents before the Court a copy of a protest petitioner made before the Notary Public Don Rafael Perdomo, wherein petitioner explains in detail the manner in which said vessel and its cargo were lost, and begs the Court to receive informations of several witnesses, members of the crew, so that petitioner may be exonerated of all responsibility.

The Court accepted said protest and ordered the proposed informations to be received from the witnesses presented by the petitioner.

The witnesses appeared before the Court and rendered their informations which entirely substantiated the declarations made by the petitioner in the aforementioned protest.

The petitioner then requested the Court that in consideration of the informations rendered by the witnesses, which prove that the loss of said vessel and its cargo did not occur through petitioner's incompetency or negligence, said loss be officially declared unavoidable and therefore petitioner be exonerated of all responsibility.

(cont'd)

Doc. #785  
(cont'd)

The Court in view of the evidence presented, granted the petitioner's prayer and officially declared the accident unavoidable.

The cost of these proceedings amounted to 57 pesos and 4 reales.

File #47 )  
 Jan. 21, 1783. )  
 P. 1 to 14. )  
 All in Spanish. )  
 Judge: Estevan )  
 Miro. )  
 Court Clerk: )  
Rafael Perdomo.)

PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED BY DON  
 GASPAR DE ARANDA, FOR THE PUR-  
 POSE OF PROVING THAT A CERTAIN  
 LOT OF HANDKERCHIEFS WHICH HE  
 HAS FOR SALE IN HIS STORE, ARE  
 OF GOOD QUALITY.

Don Gaspar de Aranda, merchant  
 of this City petitions the  
 Court, alleging that a shipment of silk handker-  
 chiefs which he has recently received had been  
 estimated of inferior quality by several merchants  
 of this City, in regard to the said merchandise.

On the 21st of January, 1783,  
 Governor Estevan Miro, ordered the petitioner to  
 appear and present the evidence he offered.

On the 22nd of January, 1783,  
 in the Governor's Court, appeared the petitioner  
 and his witnesses, Don Antonio Cavalier, Captain  
 of the rural militia, Don Salomon Mallines, Don  
 Pablo Legond and Don Charles Norwood, all mer-  
 chants of this City, whom testified under oath  
 that they had carefully examined the merchandise  
 in question and found it to be of good quality.

On the 28th of January, 1793,  
 Governor Estevan Miro, judicially decreed that  
 the silk handkerchiefs that Don Gaspar de Aranda  
 has in his store, can be sold to the public as  
 merchandise of good quality.

The cost of these proceedings  
 amounted to 22 pesos 5 reales.

File #23 )  
Jan. 23, 1783. )  
P. from 1 to 8 )  
All in Spanish. )  
Judge: Gov. )  
Estevan Miro. )  
Clerk: Rafael )  
Perdomo. )

Case of

Don Pedro Aragon y Villegas  
vs  
Don Carlos Lechen, a resi-  
dent of the coast of Alle-  
mands.

Plaintiff petitioned the Court, alleging that the Defendant sold him a certain negro slave from Martinique, for the sum of 400 pesos, as an able bodied and in good health, but as a matter of truth and fact, said slave has been suffering with chronic hernia trouble prior to the date of sale, which took place on August 20th, 1783. Therefore, petitioner begs the Court to order the Defendant to refund the sum paid and to receive said slave.

On Jan. 23, 1783, Don Estevan Miro, ordered the Court Clerk to inform the Defendant of Plaintiff' petition.

The Plaintiff in proof of his allegations presented a Medical Certificate issued by Doctor Robert Don, Principal surgeon of the Royal Hospital, certifying that the slave in question is suffering with chronic hernia and that the patient acknowledges to have had since his youth.

This record is not completed and the outcome of the case is not known

File #40 )  
 Jan. 23, 1783. )  
 P. from 1 to )  
 28. )  
 French and )  
 Spanish. )  
 Judge: Don )  
 Juan Ventura )  
 Morales. )  
 Court Clerk: )  
Rafael Perdomo.)

Case of

Don Estevan Bauré

vs

Don Alejandro Bauré

In regard to the restitution  
 of a negro slave.

Plaintiff petitioned the Court, alleging that on the 21st of January, while attending the Public Sale of Arnauld Magnon, for the purpose of selling two of his negro slaves, for which petitioner was offered by Don Leonardo Mazange the sum of 700 pesos, which petitioner refused, and that petitioner sold one of them named Frontin, 12 years old, to the Defendant for 350 pesos, and that Defendant took the negro with him as a finished sale, that evening Defendant met petitioner in the office of the Notary of Mr. Mazange, to have the bill of sale signed by petitioner and the Defendant, to which the Defendant refused on the grounds that the negro was suffering from dropsy.

On the 23rd of January, Don Juan Ventura Morales, Justice of the Peace, ordered the Defendant to appear in Court, as petitioned.

On the 28th of January, the Defendant appeared and presented testimony to show cause why he should not be made to pay for the slave in question.

On Feb. 4th, 1783, Don Juan Ventura Morales, Justice of the Peace, ordered Doctors Robert Don and Joseph Montegut to examine the slave and make a report of the examination. The report submitted by the doctors appointed, certified that the slave in question did not

Doc. #788  
(cont'd)

have dropsy and furthermore never did suffer from said sickness.

On February 28th, 1789, the Judge ordered the Defendant, Don Alexandro Bauré to pay the cost of court and to pay for the slave he purchased.

File #45	)	PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED BY
Jan. 29, 1783.	)	DON ANTONIO CAVALIER VER-
Judge: Juan	)	SUS THE FREE NEGRESS SLAVE
Ventura Morales.	)	NAMED MANON, IN REGARD TO
Court Clerk:	)	THE OWNERSHIP OF SEVERAL
Rafael Perdomo.	)	FEET OF LAND.
PP. 1 to 54.	)	
<u>All in Spanish.</u>	)	

Plaintiff petitioned the Court, alleging that in the claim for a certain plot of land in dispute with Defendant, that a copy of the final decree issued against the Defendant on July 22, 1779, had been delivered to petitioner and that said decree was issued by the Court, in consequence of the proceedings instituted by one Andres Roche, former owner of Plaintiff's property versus said free negress slave; that taking into consideration that said final decree, orders to inform the Defendant not to disturb her neighbor Andres Roche regarding the ownership of his house located on Royal Street, or anybody else owning said house in the future; that said disturbances are made by the Defendant for the purpose of obtaining several feet of land besides those which were sold to Defendant by said Andres Roche; that it is evident by the act of sale that the Defendant purchased a small house with its corresponding land which at the present is occupied by the Defendant, that the Notary who issued said act of sale, made a mistake as also the seller of said property, since he sold to the Defendant only the land where the house is built and not a piece of the Plaintiff's property which is located at the side of the Defendant's property; and that ~~the petitioner~~ desiring to construct a new house in the front of his plot of land and to avoid any future trouble with the Defendant; therefore petitioner prays the Court to order Don Gilberto Guillermard, City surveyor, to measure the property occupied by the Defendant so that said measures may be used as property titles for the Plaintiff and Defendant.

(cont'd)

On Jan. 29th, 1783, Don Juan Ventura Morales ordered the Court Clerk to give a copy of the Plaintiff's petition to the Defendant.

On March 20th, 1783, the Plaintiff and one Don Pedro Richaux, appeared jointly, to save Court cost and time, the latter having bought the house and land in question from the negress Magnon Durand, they mutually agreed to be satisfied with the following partition of land, Richoux to have 13 ft. 7 in. of frontage by 70 ft. depth, which amounts to 16 ft. 2 in. of land part of the property in dispute, this joint agreement was signed by both parties and approved on the same day by the Judge, Don Juan Ventura Morales, who ordered the negress Magnon to pay the cost of the proceedings on pages 23 to 27, wherein appears the original act of sale made by Don Andres Roche, to the free negress Magnon, which erroneously called for 20 ft. frontage by 120 depth, and a house composed of a parlor and two rooms, built of brick and lumber.

On pages 44 to 47, appears the statement of appraisal and measurements made by the Royal and public surveyor Don Carlos Laveau Trudeau, appointed by the Court to perform this act, and in the presence of all concerned except the Defendant who declined to be present, executed the agreement between Don Antonio Cavelier and Don Antonio Mermillion, who became adjacent neighbors.

On page 48 appears a plan of the land in dispute surveyed by the abovementioned surveyor.

On page 50, Don Andres Almonaster was ordered to make a declaration, certifying whether he was present at the verbal sentence

Doc. #789  
(cont'd)

made by Don Luis de Unzaga against Enrique Roche in regard to the number of feet of land that were unaccounted for according in the deeds of the property, his statement shows that he was present and attested thereto.

On May 18th, 1768, the Defendant Magnon was sentenced by Judge Don Josef de Crue to pay the cost of Court or be sentenced to a term in the public jail of this City.

File #3347 )  
Jan. 30, 1783. )  
Judge: Estevan )  
Miro. )  
Court Clerk: )  
Leonardo Ma- )  
zange. )  
PP. 1 to 3. )  
French and )  
Spanish. )

PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED BY  
DON FRANCISCO JOSEPH LE-  
BRETON VERSUS DON PEDRO  
HENRIQUE DERNEVILLE IN RE-  
GARD TO THE COLLECTION OF  
A SUM OF PESOS.

Plaintiff, Senior Justice of the Peace of this City, petitions the Court, alleging that as evidenced by the promissory note duly presented, signed by the Defendant and endorsed to the order of Don Luis Cesario de Lebreton, father of the Plaintiff, said Defendant owes the Plaintiff and the absent heirs of said deceased, the sum of three hundred twenty-four pesos; therefore petitioner begs the Court to compel the Defendant to declare under oath whether he owes said sum, and once this is done, to compel the Defendant to pay the amount in question.

On Jan. 30, 1783, the Court granted the Plaintiff's petition.

On the same day the Defendant declared in the presence of the Court Clerk, that he owes said sum of three hundred twenty-four pesos to the Plaintiff.

On April 1, 1783, the Defendant paid to the Plaintiff said sum of three hundred and twenty-four pesos.

The record is incomplete and does not show the costs of these proceedings.

File #3338 )  
Doc. #792 )  
Sheets 1 to 11 )  
Feb. 5th, 1783)

Case of  
Fanchon, free mulattress  
vs  
Don Francisco Demaziller.

Plaintiff, a free mulattress thru P. Gauvain, instituted proceedings for the purpose of proving with her respective documents, her freedom.

Plaintiff alleges that, her master, the defendant had sold her to Don M. Foucher for the amount of 4000 livres (800 pesos) after she was granted her freedom.

Plaintiff obtains judgment; and defendant is ordered to return purchase price to the aforesaid Foucher.

In proof of her allegation the plaintiff presented following witness:

Clemente Frese, who declares, that during the year 1774, Don Asilliere entrusted him with the sale of her person, who instead hired her himself; and on September 4th, 1782, she was turned to Mr. Harris, who possessed power of attorney for the defendant.

Mr. Harris, declared that as legal agent of the defendant he actually sold said mulattress to Mr. Foucher.

The plaintiff then presented a CERTIFICATE OF FREEDOM: That states that Don Francisco Demazelliere, owner of her person and in consideration to her good services, granted her freedom, and obligating himself to make this public deed prevail for her safety so no one can have any legal claim on her person.

Mr. Foucher then petitioned the court to nullify the aforesaid sale, and the refunding of his monies from the mentioned defendant.

THE COURT, on Feb. 11, 1783, decided that considering the deed granted by the defendant in favor of the Plaintiff; and the petition of M. Foucher and the Power of Attorney of Mr. Harris, ordered the defendant to reimburse the aforesaid sum of 800 pesos to Mr. Foucher, within the term of six days, or else a writ of execution will be issued to seize his properties.

The decision of the court was signed by Gov. Estevan Miro and attested by Leonardo Mazange, Court Clerk.

File #3359 ) TESTAMENTARY EXECUTION  
Doc. #793 )  
Sheets from) Proceedings instituted in con-  
1 to 109 ) sequence of the death of Doña  
Feb. 7, ) Francisca Radegonda Mayeux.  
Year, 1783.) Inventory and appraisal of the  
properties of the deceased.

Judge  
Joseph LeBretton

Court Clerk  
Leonardo Mazange

In New Orleans on February twenty-seventh of the year one thousand seven hundred and eighty-three the Honorable Judge Don Joseph LeBretton was informed of the death of Doña Radegonda Mayeux, and in view of which he instituted proceedings and commissioned the present Court Clerk to take possession of the keys and to attest the death of the deceased party, for the corresponding steps. Then Don Leonardo Mazange certifies that in obedience to the preceding decree, he went to the deceased's house and found the corpse lying on a bed and her survivors, making all the necessary arrangements for her burial, and that he received two keys, left by the deceased, to which he attests.

On February 28, 1784, the court ordered that a copy of the last will and testament of the deceased be brought for further proceedings.

She states in her last will that an amount of 2000 pesos belongs to her <sup>husband</sup> spouse and it is not included in their marriage contract. She leaves three minor children as her absolute heirs. She wills to her <sup>husband</sup> ~~spouse~~ Don Juan Bautista Mercier the fifth part of her properties, after having deducted all the expenses; and she appoints her <sup>husband</sup> ~~spouse~~ as the ex-

(cont'd)

ecutor of her properties.

Juan Bautista Mercier, executive of the properties of the deceased, petitions, that there is a need of someone to represent his three minor children in the proceeding in the Court and therefore recommends as guardian of his children, Don Francisco Broutin, which appointment was agreed by Judge Le Bretton.

Broutin, accepted the appointment as guardian of the three minor children, and the Court gave him authority as such.

Don Francisco Broutin, as guardian of the Mercier minors petitioned the Court to order an appraisal and inventories of the properties left by the deceased. On March 5th, 1783, Judge Joseph Le Bretton ordered to proceed as petitioned.

Don Juan Bautista Mercier also petitioned the Court to appoint as appraiser Don Salomon Prevoste to represent him. On March 11th, 1783, Judge Le Bretton appointed said Salomon Prevoste, as petitioned.

On the same day, Don Salomon Prevoste accepted the appointment as appraiser for Juan Bautista Mercier.

Upon the request of Francisco Broutin, His Lordships set the sixth day of May for the appraisal and inventory of the properties of said deceased. Then on the mentioned day at the farm-house of the deceased 9 miles below the City, the Honorable Judge, the Court Clerk, Don Francisco Broutin, attorney and guardian of the minor children Don Salomon Prevost and Adrian de la Plaze appointed appraisers proceeded to take the requested inventory and appraisal of the properties; which procedure took several days. On June 14th, the properties

(cont'd)

were valued at 11,041 pesos.

The costs of the appraisal amounted to 755 1/2 reales, said sum was collected from Juan B. Mercier and paid by the judicial treasurer, to the parties who made the appraisement and inventory.

Then, the aforesaid Mercier presents an act of sale, wherein is stated that in said property were included 18 negroe slaves that were sold to him by Don Pedro Mayoux, his brother-in-law for the sum of 10300 pesos, and petitioned the court to order the interested parties to appear in order to render accounts of said estate. On March 13, 1789, the court ordered as petitioned.

The court found that said appraisal and inventory was correct. Don F. Boutin resigned <sup>HIS APPOINTMENT</sup> as guardian of the three Mercier minors, and the Court appointed in his place Don Antonio Mendez, who accepted the appointment, and the Court authorized him to act as such.

Don Antonio Mendez, approved the appraisal and inventory that was made by the appraisers, as correct.

The record shows that the minors Juana Luisa Mercier, age 7 years, died <sup>on</sup> March 5, 1789 and Maria Grace Athenia, age 5 years died on December 13, 1783.

Then Don Juan Bautiste Mercier, thru the Attorney General, Don Felipe Guinault, petitioned the Court that in view of the death of his two minor daughters, he be made absolute heir of their estate. The Court on April 20, 1789, granted his petition, with the consent of Antonio Mendez, guardian of the other Mercier minor.

(Cont'd)

Don Juan Bautiste Mercier, petitioned the court to close the proceeding of the case as there was no further matters to be decided. Judge Ortega, on July 7th, 1789, ordered the judicial accountant to proceed as petitioned.

On December 16, 1789, the Mercier minor, through his guardian Antony Mendez, acknowledged as absolute heir his father Juan B. Mercier, of the estate left by the other 2 deceased Mercier minors.

The court on December 17, 1789, declared as legitimate heir Juan B. Mercier of the properties left by the 2 deceased Mercier minors, and the rest of the estate left by the deceased Francisca Radegonda Mayeux, as decided in the proceedings et supra. The Court costs that amounted to 34 pesos 3 reales to be paid by Juan Bautista Mercier.

FILE #18 )  
Feb. 10, 1783. )  
Judge Intendant )  
General Don )  
Martino Navarro )  
Court Clerk, )  
Don Rafael Perdomo )  
Spanish and French. )  
Sheets from 1 to 45.)

Doc. 794  
Box. 41

Proceedings instituted  
by Don Felipe Alexandro  
Rigoult, Captain of the  
Brigantine named Egeluk  
de Ostende; for the pur-  
pose of proving the dam-  
ages suffered by the car-  
go brought on his ship

to this Port.

Don Felipe Alexandro Ri-  
goult, Captain of the Brigantine named "Egeluk de  
Ostende", declared before His Lordship the Gover-  
nor of this Province, that as evidenced by the  
documents which he duly presented his ship and ~~the~~  
cargo were damaged due to bad weather encountered  
on the high seas on his voyage to this Port, and  
to exonerate himself of any responsibility of the  
damaged cargo he petitions His Lordship to have  
the Court Clerk, Don Rafael Perdomo, Don Francis-  
co Braquier, Don Narciso de Alva Vermos and the  
commander of this city to estimate the damages su-  
ffered by said cargo and that he be delivered with  
a list of the damaged cargo in order to promote  
whatever be convenient.

The petition made by the  
declarer was granted by the Court on Feb. 8, 1783  
and Don Juan Josef Duforest was appointed to tran-  
slate the documents presented by said declarer.

Don Juan Josef Duforest,  
interpreter appointed by decree of Don Martin Na-  
varro, Intendant General of this Province of Loui-  
siana appeared before Don Rafael Perdomo, Court  
Clerk, for the purpose of translating several do-  
cuments presented by said Captain Don Felipe Alex-  
andro Rigoult in order to prove that his ship and  
cargo were damaged on his voyage to this Port.

(cont'd)

A translation made by Don Josef Duforest, of one of the documents presented by said Captain Don Felipe Alexandro Rigoult stated that upon his petition, the officials Don Juan Bautista Estel, Lieutenant general of Admirality of the French Cape, accompanied by the Attorney of His Majesty and of the Court Clerk went on board the damaged vessel at six o'clock in the morning on December the fifth, 1782 to inspect the repairs performed by the experts Pebien and Senof, ship captains, and Lucas Mar and Luis Fugery, ship carpenters, who were appointed to recondition said vessel.

The Officials approved the work done by the experts and ordered the freight that had been displaced for safe keeping to be stored in its proper place and informed the Captain that he may proceed in his voyage to the Province of Louisiana which is his destination.

Two translations also made by Don Josef Duforest of two documents presented by said Captain Don Felipe Alexandro Rigoult stated due to the bad weather encountered on the high seas his ship and ~~the~~ cargo suffered serious damages.

The Captain then declared that he has received the list of the damaged cargo and petitioned his Lordship to have Don Juan Bettaler and Francisco Groud ship captains accompanied by Santiago Seguin and Jean Canto Carpenters and Don Rafael Perdomo Court Clerk to go on board the ship to estimate the damages suffered by said ship.

The declarer's petition was granted

doc 794

by the Court on Feb. 12, 1783.

The record ends with the judge rendering the following decision: In consideration of the documents presented by said Captain Don Felipe Alexandro Rigoult and the estimation made by the experts and having found to be true that the damages were caused by bad weather suffered by the cargo and Brigantine under Captain Rigoult His Lordship declared him free from any responsibility for the above mentioned damages.

FILE #50  
Document #795  
Feb. 10, 1783.

The case of  
Margarita Meilleur  
versus  
Claudio La Coste,  
(her husband)

Plaintiff instituted action demanding from the defendant her dowry and her share of the community property.

Plaintiff petitioned His Lordship, to have Don Leonardo Masange, Notary Public, make a written testimony of the sale that the defendant, her husband made to Don Bernardo Otero, Accountant of the Army and of the Royal Treasury, of a negress named Mariana, with her daughter named Goton; another sale made to the free mulatress named Francisca of a negress named Rosa, another sale made to the one named Brizet of a certain house; and another sale made to Don Pedro Bertonier of a certain house.

The Plaintiff's petition was granted by the Governor on February 10, 1783.

The Plaintiff later petitioned His Lordship alleging, that she has been informed that the defendant her husband, has sold the house where he resides to Don Jaime Jordan, who has not yet paid the sum of four thousand pesos, which is the value of the house, wherefore she petitions His Lordship to seize said sum in the possession of Don Jaime Jordan until the conclusion of this proceedings.

The Governor granted the Plaintiff's petition on February 20, 1783.

The Plaintiff then petitions His Lordship to have Don Leonardo Mazange, Notary Public, make a written testimony of the sale made by

(cont'd)

the Defendant to Don Jaime Jordá of said house.

The Plaintiff's petition was granted by the Governor on February 21, 1783.

The plaintiff later petitioned His Lordship not to grant the required sailing permit to the defendant who is planning to sail for the Kingdom of France.

The Governor granted the Plaintiff's petition on March 8, 1783.

The Defendant declares that in order to avoid further scandals originated from these proceedings he is willing to reconcile with his wife.

The Plaintiff alleges that she is mistreated by the Defendant and for this reason she is not willing to be reconciled.

The Defendant then petitions His Lordship to make an inventory of all his properties, and his petition was granted by the Governor on May 21, 1783.

The Governor then ordered the plaintiff and defendant to be notified to appear before him.

The record ends with the governor's decision ordering the defendant to pay the sum of seventeen pesos a month to his spouse for her support.

File #78 )  
Feb. 13, 1783 )  
In French and )  
Spanish. )  
Judge: Don )  
Juan Ventura )  
Morales. )  
Court Clerk: )  
Dn. Rafael )  
Perdomo. )  
Sheets from 1 )  
to 9. )

Doc. #796  
Box 41

Proceedings instituted by Alexandro Chonet, in order to recover the estate left by the deceased Juan Luis Lacroix, his nephew.

Don Alexandro Chonet, petitioned his Lordship to order the Court Clerk to translate certain letters that were written in French into Spanish, alleging that these letters as it is evident by their content shows that his brother Hervieux Chonet was indebted to him the sum of 120 pesos and that his deceased nephew Juan Luis Lacroix, was at the Post of Illinois when his brother Hervieux Chonet died and that he illegally inherited his brother's estate. The petitioner further alleged that his said deceased nephew Lacroix, later came to this City where he died, willing his properties to one Dn. Solomon Maline, a merchant of this City.

Alexandro Chonet further petitioned His Lordship to order Solomon Maline to appear in Court, and to declare under oath what properties and money he inherited from his deceased nephew Juan Luis Lacroix.

On February 14, 1783, the Court granted Alexandro Chonet's petition, and on the same day Solomon Maline appeared in Court and declared that he inherited nothing from the deceased Lacroix, but that he was indebted to the deceased for a draft of 500 pesos and that he paid this sum to one Chavel, whom the said deceased had verbally appointed his universal heir.

On February 15, 1783 the Court appointed Dn. Luis Liotan, to translate the said two letters, that are in French into Spanish, which appointment he accepted.

(cont'd)

FIRST LETTER: From Luis Lacroix addressed to his uncle Alexandro Chonet, dated September 1st, 1776 from St. Louis, Illinois, wherein said Lacroix acknowledged the receipt of two letters from his uncle Chonet. Lacroix also regrets sorrowfully the death of his uncle Hervieux Chonet, who died intestate. Lacroix also informs his uncle in this letter that his deceased uncle Hervieux had died intestate and that his properties were in possession of one Monsieur Duralde. Lacroix also informs his uncle Alexandro Chonet that he has intentions of coming to this City in the near future.

SECOND LETTER: From Hervieux Chonet addressed to his brother Alexandro Chonet dated May 15th, 1776, from St. Louis Illinois, wherein Hervieux ~~is~~ regrets very much not being able to comply with the payment of a past due debt of 120 pesos which payment he involuntarily neglected for a long time. Hervieux in this letter promises his brother, Alexandro, that he will pay him this debt upon his next arrival to this City.

This record appears to be incomplete and ends with the translation of the two above letters.

File #42	)	The Case of
Feb. 14, 1783	)	Don Pedro de Aragon y Villegas
Judge Governor	)	versus
Estevan Miro.	)	Don Claudio Lacoste.
Court Clerk	)	
Rafael Perdomo.	)	
No. of sheets	)	Plaintiff instituted action
1 to 9.	)	for the purpose of compelling
<u>All Spanish.</u>	)	the Defendant to pay a past
		due debt.

Plaintiff alleged that the Defendant purchased from him a lot of hats amounting to two thousand pesos; on which sum the Defendant has only paid the sum of one thousand five hundred pesos.

The Plaintiff also alleged that the Defendant has sold his house to Don Jaime Jordan for the sum of four thousand five hundred pesos; this sum has not yet been paid by said Don Jaime Jordan, and that four thousand pesos of this sum has been seized by the Court at the petition of the Defendant's spouse; wherefore the Plaintiff petitioned His Lordship to have said Don Jaime Jordan pay him the sum of five hundred pesos as this sum is not included in the seizure.

By decree of the Judge the Defendant was ordered to declare under oath whether he owes said sum.

The Defendant under oath declared that he owes the sum in question.

Later the plaintiff again petitioned His Lordship to have Don Jaime Jordan pay him said sum of five hundred pesos.

The petition was granted on February 17, 1783 and the record ends with the  
(cont'd)

Judge's decision ordering Don Jaime Jordan to pay said sum of five hundred pesos to the Plaintiff, and to pay the court expenses from the funds he is withholding from the Defendant, which amounts to 7 pesos and 2 reales.

File #38 )  
Feb. 15, 1783 )  
All in Spanish )  
PP. 1 to 9. )  
Judge: Governor )  
Estevan Miro. )  
Court Clerk: )  
Rafael Perdomo )

Doc. 798  
Box 41

Case of  
Don Lorenzo Wiltz  
vs  
Claudio Lacoste

Plaintiff instituted proceedings to compel the Defendant to pay a past due promissory note for 900 pesos. The Plaintiff petitioned the court to order the Defendant to appear and to acknowledge under oath if the signature at the foot of said promissory note of 900 pesos is his and if he owes said sum, alleging that he has demanded the Defendant to pay said past due note and that the Defendant has refused to comply with the payment.

On Feb. 15, 1783, the Court granted the Plaintiff's petition, and ordered the Defendant to appear.

On Feb. 17, 1783, the Defendant appeared before the Court Clerk in compliance with the preceding decree and after being sworn according to law he acknowledged his signature and owing to the Plaintiff said promissory note for 900 pesos.

The Plaintiff then petitioned the court to seize the sum of 900 pesos to satisfy his claim from the money that Don Jaime Jordan owes to the Defendant in a judgment in favor of the Defendant against said Don Jaime Jordan.

On Feb. 17, 1783, Gov. Miro, the presiding Judge, ordered that the 900 pesos that Jaime Jordan is withholding which belong to the Defendant to be seized and to give said money to the Plaintiff to satisfy his claim. On the same day the Court Clerk went to the home

(cont'd)

of Jaime Jordan and informed him of the preceding decree. Jordan stated that he will comply according to the decree of the Court.

On Feb. 18, 1783 the Plaintiff appeared before the Court Clerk and declared that in compliance with the decree of the Court that Jaime Jordan had given him the sum of 900 pesos that he was withholding, which belonged to the Defendant.

On Feb. 19, 1783 Gov. Miro, in view of the fact that the Plaintiff's claim had been satisfied he ordered that a statement of the expenses of these proceedings be made by Don Luis Liotau and to pay said expenses from the balance of the money that Jaime Jordan is withholding, which belongs to the Defendant.

The record ends with an itemized statement of the costs of these proceedings which amounted to 7 pesos 2 reals, submitted by Don Luis Liotau on Feb. 24, 1783.

FILE #3343  
Doc. #799  
Feb. 15, 1783.

Doc. 799

The case of  
Don Santiago Felipe Guina-  
ult.  
versus  
Claudio Lacoste.

Plaintiff instituted action for the purpose of compelling the defendant to pay a past due debt.

Plaintiff alleged that the defendant owes him the sum of one thousand one hundred fifty pesos, as final payment for a certain house sold to him by his mother, and later the Defendant sold said house to Don Jaime Jordan who is withholding the payment of the house by decree of the Governor; therefore the Plaintiff petitioned His Lordship, to have Don Jaime Jordan pay said sum from the funds he is retaining.

The plaintiff's petition was granted by the Governor on Feb. 15, 1783.

The record ends with the Plaintiff declaring that he has been paid said sum by Don Jaime Jordan.

File #86 )  
Feb. 19, 1783. )  
All in Spanish )  
PP. 1 to 10 )  
Judge: Governor )  
Estevan Miro. )  
Court Clerk: )  
Rafael Perdomo.)

Doc. 800  
Box 41  
  
Case of  
Don Narciso de Alba  
vs  
Claudio Lacoste

Plaintiff instituted proceedings to compel the Defendant to pay a past due promissory note for 690 pesos.

The plaintiff presented as evidence a promissory note, wherein the Defendant on March 10, 1782, bought from him a certain quantity of gold and silver that amounted to 690 pesos, which sum he promised to pay at the end of said year (1782). The Plaintiff petitioned the court to order the Defendant to appear in court to acknowledge his signature at the foot of said promissory note and to declare if he owes said sum of 690 pesos, alleging that he has demanded the Defendant to pay said sum and that the Defendant has refused to comply with the payment of said past due note.

On Feb. 19, 1783, the Court granted the Plaintiff's petition and ordered the Defendant to appear. The following day the Defendant, in compliance with the preceding decree, appeared before the Court Clerk and declared that the signature at the foot of said promissory note is his and that he acknowledges owing to the Plaintiff said past due note for 690 pesos.

The Plaintiff then petitioned the Court to seize the sum of 690 pesos to satisfy his claim from the money that Don Jaime Jordan is withholding for the Defendant in a judgment in favor of the Defendant against said Don Jaime Jordan.

(cont'd)

Doc. 800  
(cont'd)

On Feb. 24, 1783, Governor Miro, the presiding Judge, ordered that from the 2600 pesos that Jaime Jordan is withholding, which belongs to the Defendant to seize 690 pesos and to give said money to the Plaintiff to satisfy his claim. On the same day the Court Clerk went to the house of Jaime Jordan and informed him of the preceding decree. Jordan stated that he will comply according to the decree of the Court.

On Feb. 25, 1783, the Plaintiff appeared before the Court Clerk and declared that in compliance with the decree of the Court that Jaime Jordan had given him the sum of 690 pesos that he was withholding, which belonged to the Defendant.

On Feb. 26, 1783, Gov. Miro, in view of the fact that the Plaintiff's claim had been satisfied he ordered that a statement of the expenses of these proceedings be made by Don Luis Liotau and to have the Defendant pay said expenses from the balance of the money that Jaime Jordan is withholding, which belongs to said Defendant.

The record ends with an itemized statement of the costs of these proceedings which amounted to 7 pesos 2 reales, submitted by Don Luis Liotau on Feb. 24, 1783.

File #6 )  
Feb. 20th, 1783 )  
Judge: Governor )  
General Don )  
Estevan Miro. )  
Court Clerk )  
Don Rafael Perdomo )  
All in Spanish, )  
except promissory )  
note which is in )  
French. Sheets )  
from 1 to 10 )

Doc. #801  
Box 41

CASE OF  
Don Francisco Verret  
vs  
Claudio La Coste.

Plaintiff petitions the Court to compel the Defendant to acknowledge owing said promissory note for 400 pesos as well as his signature.

On February 20th, 1783, the Court ordered the defendant to appear as petitioned.

On February 21st, 1783, the defendant appeared in Court and acknowledged owing said debt.

Plaintiff informs the Court that Don Jaime Jorda is holding 400 pesos which belong to the Defendant and petitions that said sum be seized to satisfy his debt.

On February 22nd, 1783, the Court ordered Don Jaime Jorda to release said amount of 400 pesos, as petitioned.

Then on February 24th, 1783, Don Jaime Jorda, in obedience to the preceding decree, releases the 400 pesos to the Plaintiff, who acknowledged receipt of said sum.

The Judge Don Estevan Miro, on February 22nd, 1783, ordered that in view of the fact that said Jordan paid the plaintiff the sum of 400 pesos, that Luis Liotau, appraise the costs of this proceedings, which said Liotau submitted on February 24th, 1783, appraising

(cont'd)

the expenses at 7 pesos 4 reales.

The proceedings terminate with a power of Attorney, granted by Don Francisco Verret to Don Luis Liotau to represent him in all legal matters. The record ends with the following note: The Court Clerk certifies that Don Luis Liotau has collected from Don Jaime Jorda and paid to the Plaintiff the sum of 400 pesos, complying with the decree, of February 22nd, 1783 from Governor Miro.

Doc. #802  
Box 41.

File #42 )  
Feb. 20, 1783.)  
Judge: Don )  
Juan Bentura )  
Morales. )  
Court Clerk: )  
Don Rafael )  
Perdomo. )  
Sheets 1 to 32)  
All in Spanish)

Public Auction of the  
Damaged Effects of  
Don Henry Voix.

Don Henry Voix petitions the  
court for a permit to auction  
his damaged dry-goods from the  
cargo of his Brigantine.

Judge Juan Bentura Morales on  
Feb. 20, 1783, grants permit,  
as petitioned.

Then on February 22nd, 1783,  
the Judge commissioned the Court Clerk to sell  
to the highest bidders said dry-goods. The  
auction took three days. The buyers of said  
dry-goods were Mr. Beltran, Father Salvador,  
Francisco Soler, Mr. Fullusa, Mr. Cadet, Mr.  
Cafini, Alberto Grima, Mr. El Sastre, Toma  
Dusen, Mr. Portal, Madam Agustina, Mr. Esclavon  
and Mr. Corona. The auction of said dry-goods  
yielded 1795 pesos 3 reales.

Don Henry Voix, then petitioned  
His Lordship to legalize the sale of goods. On  
February 26, 1783, the sale was legalized by the  
proper authorities.

Then Don Henry Voix, petitioned  
the Court that the Public Appraiser Don Luis  
Liotau forward to him the accounts of the costs  
and expenses of the court. On February 28, 1783,  
said public appraiser, presented the accounts  
caused by the action of said goods as petitioned,  
which amounted to 20 pesos, 7 1/2 reales, that  
was paid by Don Enrique Voix.

File 3349 )  
Feb. 22, 1783 )  
All Spanish )  
except the pro- )  
missory note )  
which is in )  
rench. )  
Judge Don )  
Juan Morales. )  
Court Clerk )  
Dn. L. Mazange )  
Sheet from 1 )  
to 7. )

Doc. #804  
Box 41

Case of  
Luis Lamate  
vs  
One named Cretien.

Plaintiff, thru his attorney instituted proceedings to compel the Defendant to pay a past due promissory note for 55 pesos, alleging that the Defendant has refused to pay said sum for the past nine years:- Therefore the Plaintiff petitioned his Lordship, to order the Defendant to appear in Court and acknowledge owing said debt.

On February 22nd, 1783, the Court ordered the Defendant to appear as petitioned. On same day the Defendant appeared in Court and declared that he owes said promissory note.

On February 24, 1783, the plaintiff petitions the court to issue a writ of execution in order to seize the properties of the Defendant to satisfy said debt, alleging that the defendant has acknowledged owing said debt and has refused to pay.

On February 25, 1783, the Court ordered a writ of execution to be issued in favor of the Plaintiff, and against the properties of the Defendant for the value of 55 pesos. Then on February 28th, 1783, the Plaintiff informed the Court of having been paid by the Defendant the aforesaid sum of 55 pesos, therefore requests the court, to release said Defendant from jail, and to have the present Court Clerk to return him his promissory note.

On same day the Court decreed, as petitioned by the Plaintiff.

(cont'd)

This case ends with a notification to Dn. Francisco Muñoz, Judge of this Royal Jail, to release said Defendant from jail.

All in Spanish  
vs  
Judge, etc.  
Court Clerk  
[Signature]

vs  
Claudio Lacosta

The Plaintiff instituted proceedings to compel the Defendant to pay a past due promissory note for 500 pesos, dated Dec. 4th, 1782.

The Plaintiff alleges in his petition that as it is evident by the promissory note presented the Defendant is indebted to him the sum of 500 pesos, and that he has demanded the Defendant to pay said sum and the Defendant has refused, giving as a reason that his money has been seized by a decree of his Lordship, and petitions the Court to order the person who is in custody of the Defendant's money to satisfy his claim for 500 pesos, which he holds against the Defendant. Plaintiff further alleges that as the Defendant has acknowledged owing said debt, the official proceedings of having the Defendant acknowledge owing said debt can be dispensed with.

On Feb. 25, 1783, the Court ordered the Defendant to appear for the purpose of acknowledging said debt. The following day the Defendant in compliance with the preceding decree appeared before the Court Clerk and declared that the signature at the foot of said promissory note is his and that he acknowledges owing to the Plaintiff said past due note for 500 pesos.

The Plaintiff then petitioned the Court to seize the sum of 500 pesos to satisfy his claim from the money that Don Jaime Jordan is withholding for the Defendant in a (cont'd)

File #55	)	Case of
Feb. 26, 1783	)	Antonio Dejean
All in Spanish	)	vs
PP. 1 to 5	)	Claudio Lacoste
Judge: Gov.	)	
Estevan Miro.	)	The Plaintiff instituted pro-
Court Clerk:	)	ceedings to compel the Defen-
<u>Rafael Perdomo.</u>	)	dant to pay a past due prom-
		issory note for 500 pesos,
		dated Dec. 4th, 1782.

The Plaintiff alleges in his petition that as it is evident by the promissory note presented the Defendant is indebted to him the sum of 500 pesos, and that he has demanded the Defendant to pay said sum and the Defendant has refused, giving as a reason that his money has been seized by a decree of his Lordship, and petitions the Court to order the person who is in custody of the Defendant's money to satisfy his claim for 500 pesos, which he holds against the Defendant. Plaintiff further alleges that as the Defendant has acknowledged owing said debt, the official proceedings of having the Defendant acknowledge owing said debt can be dispensed with.

On Feb. 26, 1783, the Court ordered the Defendant to appear for the purpose of acknowledging said debt. The following day the Defendant in compliance with the preceding decree appeared before the Court Clerk and declared that the signature at the foot of said promissory note is his and that he acknowledges owing to the Plaintiff said past due note for 500 pesos.

The Plaintiff then petitioned the Court to seize the sum of 500 pesos to satisfy his claim from the money that Don Jaime Jordan is withholding for the Defendant in a  
(cont'd)

judgment in favor of the Defendant against said Don Jaime Jordan.

On March 15, 1783, Gov. Miro, the presiding Judge, ordered that from the money that Don Jaime Jordan is withholding which belongs to the Defendant to seize 500 pesos to give said money to the Plaintiff to satisfy his claim. On the same day the Court Clerk went to the home of Jaime Jordan and informed him of the preceding decree.

On March 18, 1783, the Plaintiff appeared before the Court Clerk and declared that in compliance with the decree of the Court that Jaime Jordan had given him the sum of 500 pesos that he was withholding, which belonged to the Defendant.

The record ends with the Plaintiff's declaration that his debt had been satisfied and is apparently incomplete.

FILE NO. 3330 )  
March 1, 1783 )  
Sheets from 1 )  
to 202. All )  
in Spanish. )  
Judge Governor )  
Don Estevan )  
Miro )  
Court Clerk, )  
Leonardo Mazange.)

Doc. #806  
Box 41

OFFICIAL CRIMINAL PROCEED-  
INGS INSTITUTED AGAINST  
TWO RUNAWAY NEGRO SLAVES  
FOR THE MURDER OF AN AGENT  
OF THE GOVERNMENT IN AT-  
TEMPTING TO FREE A GROUP OF  
RUNAWAY SLAVES IN CUSTODY.

The record begins with a declaration of Governor Estevan Miro, stating that he has just been informed by Don Guido Duffossat, Sub-Lieutenant of the permanent Regiment of this City, who was commander of an expedition for the purpose of capturing several runaway slaves, that in the attempt to capture said slaves one of the members of the expedition was murdered by four runaway slaves one of which is dead another escaped and the remaining two were captured and held for the murder. The Governor ordered that Don Patricio Macnamara, Don Francisco Delery and several other members of said expedition to appear in Court to testify as witness of said crime.

Don Patricio Macnamara, in compliance with the Governor's order, appeared in Court and stated: That while bringing in a small boat with several runaway slaves that were captured, an attempt was made by four other runaway slaves named Esteban, Carlos, Jasmin and St. Malo to free the slaves in custody and that in the struggle one of the members of the expedition was murdered by the assailants, and among the attacking said slaves Esteban was drowned; St. Malo escaped, and Carlos and Jasmin were captured.

(cont'd)

806  
Don Francisco Delery and several other members of the expedition appeared in court and their declarations of the murder was similar to the declaration made by Patricio Macnamara.

The Governor went to the Royal Public Jail of this City to question the runaway slaves in custody and their declarations conformed the declaration made by Don Patruio Macnamara.

The Negro Carlos appointed Don Francisco Broutin as his Attorney to defend him, and appeared with his Attorney before His Lordship and declared: That the negro Jasmin was the one who started the attempt to free the other slaves in custody from said Don Patricio Macnamara and his men.

Then the negro Jasmin appeared and declared that the negroes St. Malo and the deceased Estevan did all the shooting that started the fight with said Macnamara and his men which resulted in the death of one of the members of the expedition.

The record ends with the governor's judicial decree imposing on the two slaves found guilty of the murder of one of the members of the expedition to suffer for said murder three hundred lashes and to be exiled from this Province.

Doc. 807  
Box 41

File No. 87 )  
March 23 )  
1783. )  
all in Span- )  
ish. )  
PP. 1 to 8 )  
Judge: Juan )

Case of

Nicolas Pertui  
vs  
George Enot.

Ventura Mo- ) Plaintiff instituted this action to  
rales. ) compel the Defendant to pay a past  
Court Clerk: ) due promissory note for 60 Pesos  
Rafael Per- ) 7 1/2 Reales, alleging in his peti-  
domo. ) tion that when the Defendant was in  
partnership with one Joseph Colet  
he supplied the Defendant with bread  
that amounted to said sum of 60 pesos 7 1/2 real-  
es, and that the partnership between the Defen-  
dant and said Joseph Calet have desolved, and  
that he has demanded the Defendant the payment of  
said debt, and that the Defendant has refused,  
therefore he petitioned His Lordship to order the  
Defendant to pay said debt, without delay.

On March 13, 1783, Juan Ventura  
Morales, Justice of the Peace, ordered that the  
Defendant acknowledge owing said promissory note,  
and after this has been done to deliver to the  
Plaintiff said notes, for his convenience. The  
record shows that on the same day the Court Clerk  
in compliance with the preceding decree went to  
the Defendant's residence, where he was informed  
that the Defendant was out of town. The follow-  
ing day, March 14, 1783, the Court Clerk went  
again to the residence of the Defendant, who  
after being duly sworn according to law, declared  
that the signature at the foot of said promissory  
notes are his and that he acknowledges owing  
said notes that amount to 60 pesos 7 1/2 reales  
to the Plaintiff.

Then the Plaintiff setting forth in  
his petition that the Defendant has acknowledged

(cont'd)

Doc. 807  
(cont'd)

owing said debt of 60 pesos 7 1/2 reales, and petitioned His Lordship to order that a writ of execution be issued in order to seize the properties of the Defendant, to satisfy said debt, plus interests and costs.

On March 26, 1783, Morales, Justice of the Peace, granted the Plaintiff's prayers and ordered a writ of execution to be issued against the properties of the Defendant, as petitioned.

The record shows that sometime later the Plaintiff filed a petition in the Court of Francisco Maria Regio, Justice of the Peace, setting forth that he was granted a writ of execution to seize the properties of the Defendant, by Morales, Justice of the Peace, but as other creditors of the Defendant had instituted action against the Defendant, a certain farm house of the Defendant was seized, and that said writ of execution was suspended by Morales, who promised him that as soon as the Defendant's seized farm house was sold, his claim will be satisfied, but as a matter of fact the Defendant's farm house was sold and nine months have passed since the sale of said farm house, without having his claim of 60 pesos 7 1/2 reales satisfied, wherefore he petitioned His Lordship to enforce said writ of execution, that was suspended by Morales.

The record ends with the Plaintiff's petition, and the outcome of this case is not known.

File #89 )  
March 3rd, 1783 )  
Judge: Governor )  
Miro. )  
Court Clerk: Don )  
Rafael Perdomo. )  
All in Spanish. )  
Sheets from 1 )  
to 19. )

Doc. 808  
Box 41

Testamentary Execution  
of Don Francisco Bijon.

Governor Estevan Miro, on March 1st, 1783 was informed of the death of Francisco Bijon, and ordered the Court Clerk to go to the residence of the deceased to attest the death of said Bijon and to secure any personal papers or documents left by the deceased. On the same day the Court Clerk in compliance with the decree of the Governor, went to the residence of the deceased and found the body of said Bijon lying in bed and the ~~exe-~~ ~~tors~~ of the deceased Don Renato Brion and Doña Maria Brion his wife, making the necessary arrangements for the burial of the body. The personal papers and documents left by the deceased were surrendered to the Court Clerk.

Among the papers left by the deceased his last will and testament was found, dated January 21st, 1783, in which testament said Bijon sets forth that Don Renato Brion and Doña Maria Brion his wife, are his executors and only absolute heirs of all his properties.

On March 3rd, 1783, said executors petitioned his Lordship to legalize and to put into operation the last will and testament of the deceased Brion by ordering the Court Clerk to surrender the personal papers and documents of the deceased and to place them in possession of the properties of the deceased.

On February 5th, Governor Miro ordered the Court Clerk to surrender said papers and documents left by the deceased to the petitioners and by a judicial decree recognized said petitioners as executors and absolute heirs of the properties of said deceased authorizing them to take full possession of said properties.

(cont'd)

Doc. 1305  
Governor Miro on the same day ordered the judicial appraiser Don Luis Liotau to submit a statement of the expenses of the foregoing proceedings and charged said expenses to the executors of the estate of the deceased Bijon.

On March 6th, 1783, Don Luis Liotau, in compliance with the Governor's orders, submitted a statement of the expenses of the foregoing proceedings which amounted to 9 pesos 6 1/2 reales, and charged said expenses to the executors of the estate of the deceased Bijon.

These expenses, which amounted to 7096 pesos and were to be divided among the heirs and the defendant their one-third of said amount. The defendant gave forth that Bouche St. Martin purchased Luis Gallo's to give him his share in the same. Upon said agreement said St. Martin had already given 150 pesos on account and agreed to pay the balance as follows: 300 pesos in 1785, and 150 pesos which is the balance in the month of December, 1783.

The Plaintiff as agent of Don Juan Gallo, instituted proceedings on behalf of the principal to compel the Defendant to comply with the payment of 800 pesos which include interest and expenses of the balance due as it is agreed by the contract presented, entered into between principal and Defendant. The Plaintiff petitions the Court to issue a writ of execution in its favor in order to seize the properties of the Defendant to comply with said past due debt. On March 15th, 1783 the Court ordered the bailiff to seize the properties of the Defendant to the amount of 800 pesos.

On March 19th, 1783, the Plaintiff informed the Court that the Defendant had complied with said payment and to direct these proceedings and to release the Defendant of all liability.

File #3340 )  
March 3rd, 1783 )  
Judge: Governor )  
Miro. )  
Court Clerk: )  
Leonardo Mazange. )  
All in Spanish. )  
Sheets from 1 to )  
11. )

Doc. #809  
Box 41

CASE OF  
Don Miguel Fortier  
vs  
Don Pedro Bouche St.  
Martin.

The record begins with a contract between Don Luis Gallot and Don Pedro Bouche St. Martin, in which the properties left by the deceased Doña Theresa Drillan, and Don Lazarre Nogues, which amounted to 7095 pesos were going to be divided among the heirs given each correspondent heir one-third of said sum. The contract sets forth that Bouche St. Martin promised Luis Gallot to give him his share in cash. Upon said agreement said St. Martin had already given 450 pesos on account and agreed to pay the balance as follows; 300 pesos in 1782, and 507 pesos which is the balance in the month of December, 1783.

The Plaintiff as agent of Don Luis Gallot, instituted proceedings on behalf of his principal to compel the Defendant to comply with the payment of 600 pesos which include interest and expenses of the balance due as it is evident by the contract presented, entered into between principal and Defendant. The Plaintiff petitions the Court to issue a writ of execution in his favor in order to seize the properties of the Defendant to comply with said past due debt. On March 13th, 1783 the Court ordered the bailiff to seize the properties of the Defendant to the extent of 600 pesos.

On March 17th, 1783, the Plaintiff informed the Court that the Defendant had complied with said payment and to close these proceedings and to release the Defendant of all liability.

(cont'd)

Continuation of  
Doc. #809  
Box 41.

On the same day the Governor ordered proceedings to be closed approving the payment made to the Plaintiff by the Defendant, not charging for his judicial decree.

The record ends with a notice of the Court Clerk stating that he had notified the Plaintiff and Defendant of the judicial decree.

File #75 )  
March 4, )  
1783. )  
Judge: )  
Estevan )  
Miro. )  
Court )  
Clerk: )  
Rafael )  
Perdomo. )  
PP. 1 to )  
11. )  
All in )  
Spanish.)

PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED BY DON FERNANDO RODRIGUES, REGARDING THE RESIGNATION OF DON LEONARDO MASANGE, MADE IN HIS FAVOR, OF THE POSITIONS AS SECRETARY OF THE GOVERNMENT, OF THE CITY COUNCIL AND OF THE PUBLIC.

The record begins with a certified copy dated March 4, 1783, of the resignation of Don Leonardo Masange, to the positions as Secretary of the Government, of the City Council and of the Public, in favor of Don Fernando Rodrigues, and signed by Don Leonardo Masange in the presence of the witnesses Don Manuel Ramon, Don Pedro Villamil and Don Manuel Monrroy, and attested by Don Rafael Perdomo, Court Clerk.

This copy of the resignation of Don Leonardo Masange, was presented as evidence by Don Fernando Rodrigues, who instituted the following proceedings:

Don Fernando Rodriguez, Official Attorney, petitioned his Excellency Governor Estevan Miro, alleging that as it is evidenced by the certified copy of the resignation which he duly presents, Don Leonardo Masange has resigned in his favor the positions as Secretary of the Government, of the City Council and of the Public, and in order to take charge of said offices he therefore begs His Lordship that after complying with the necessary requirements to be placed in charge of said offices.

On March 26, 1783, Estevan Miro, Acting Governor, ordered the Court Clerk that after the resignation has been presented, and after he certifies that the twenty days have elapsed since Don Leonard Masange made his re-

(cont'd)

Doc. #810  
(cont'd)

signation as prescribed by law, to inform the Accountant of the Royal Treasury of these proceedings so that he may promote whatever it may be convenient to him.

On the same day the Court Clerk, in compliance with the preceding decree, went to the residence of Don Leonardo Masange, who was in his office performing his duties, and having questioned him on several matter, he answered to all his question.

The record shows that the Accountant of the Royal Treasury, acting as fiscal of same, in view of the fact that he has been informed of the proceedings instituted by Don Fernando Rodrigues stated: That as the Court Clerk has certified that the twenty days as prescribed by law have elapsed since Don Leonardo Masange, made the resignation of his positions, he therefore does not have any objection to procede in the estimation of the offices resigned by said Don Leonardo Masange by experts who will be appointed by His Lordship, so that the corresponding fees belonging to His Majesty will be deposited in the Royal Treasury.

On April 2, 1783, Gov. Miro, ordered the Court Clerk to appoint Don Andres Almonaster y Roxas and Don Luis Liotaud to appraise the offices resigned by Don Leonardo Masange, and also to inform the Accountant of the Army to witness said appraisal, and after this has been done to bring before him a written report of said appraisal so that he may decree whatever it may be convenient.

On the same day the Court Clerk personally informed Don Andres Almonaster y Roxas and Don Luis Liotaud of the preceding decree and they accepted their appointments to appraise the offices resigned by Don Leonardo Masange, and they were then sworn in according

(cont'd)

to law. On April 3, 1783, in the presence of Don Martin Navarro, Intendant General of this Province, and Don Bernardo Otero, Accountant of the Army and acting as fiscal of the Royal Treasury, said appraisers stated that they appraised the offices resigned by Don Leonard Masange at three thousand one hundred pesos.

Later Don Fernando Rodriguez, petitioned Gov. Miro, alleging that he has paid the corresponding Royal Fees to the City Treasury as evidenced by the receipts issued by the City Treasury and which he duly presented; therefore he begs His Lordship to order that he be given the corresponding title so that he may present it to the City Council in order to take charge of the offices resigned by Leonardo Masange.

On April 4, 1783, Don Estevan Miro, Intendant General of this Province ordered the Court Clerk to bring before him the records of these proceedings and after examining said records, ordered that in view of what was manifested by Don Fernando Rodriguez; the Military Counsellor, who will be in charge of these proceedings will proceed with the examination of said Rodriguez and after said applicant has proven himself capable to perform the charges of the offices resigned by Leonardo Mazange, he will then certify his approval and add his certification to these records, after this has been complied, said applicant will be presented with the corresponding title, as he has paid to the Royal Treasury the fees corresponding to His Majesty, and he will present himself with said title before the City Council, so that he be sworn in according to law, and after this has been done, the Court Clerk will give him an official certified copy of this proceedings so that within 5 years, counting from the day said title is given to him, he will present

Doc. #810  
(cont'd)

it to be approved by His Majesty, and if this period has elapsed, he will lose all rights and privileges to said title, and it will then be lost in favor of the Royal Treasury, as decreed by His Majesty.

In compliance with the preceding decree, on April 9, 1783, before Don Juan Doroteo del Postigo, General Assessor and Military Counsellor of this City, appeared Don Fernando Rodriguez, and in the presence of the Court Clerk, he examined said Don Fernando Rodriguez by asking him several questions concerning the functions that he will perform to which he answered satisfactorily for which reason he declared Don Fernando Rodriguez to be capable of taking charge of the offices resigned by Leonardo Masange.

The record ends with two receipts from Joseph Foucher, Principal Treasurer of the Army and Navy of the Province of Louisiana, showing that Don Fernando Rodriguez has paid the necessary fees to His Majesty. The first receipt dated April 6, 1783, for 975 reales, 15 maravedies, and the second dated April 6, 1783 for 8266 reales, 22 maravedies.

File #8 )  
March 6, )  
1783. )  
Judge: Juan )  
Ventura Mo- )  
rales. )  
Court Clerk: )  
Rafael Per- )  
domo. )  
PP. 1 to 15. )  
All in Span- )  
ish. )

CASE OF

DON FRANCISCO MAYRRONE  
VS  
DON PABLO SEGON.

THE PLAINTIFF BROUGHT THIS AC-  
TION FOR THE PURPOSE OF COMPELL-  
ING THE DEFENDANT TO VACATE A  
HOUSE OF HIS OWNERSHIP.

The Plaintiff brought this suit before Juan Ventura Morales, Justice of the Peace of this City, alleging that the Defendant is a tenant in possession of his house without a lease, renting it by the month on oral agreements, and desiring to occupy said house himself, he has notified the Defendant to obtain another house and to vacate his, and that the Defendant has refused to vacate said house, stating that he does not wish to move; therefore, he petitioned His Lordship to order the Defendant to move from said house within the time prescribed by the law.

On March 6, 1783, Morales, Justice of the Peace, ordered the Court Clerk to forward a copy of the above petition to the Assessor and a second copy to the Auditor of War, in order that they may advise him on the point of law in this case, and also to forward a third copy of said petition to the Defendant.

Later the Plaintiff petitioned His Lordship to order the Defendant to answer his first petition, alleging that the Defendant has received a copy of said petition, and has failed to answer it within the time prescribed by law.

(cont'd)

The record shows that on March 17, 1783, Morales, Justice of the Peace, in view that the Defendant has not yet answered the Plaintiff's petition within the time prescribed by the law, ordered the Court Clerk to urge the Defendant to file his answer to said petition.

The Defendant through his Attorney appeared before His Lordship and stated, that in the action instituted by the Plaintiff to eject him from the house he is now occupying, alleged that he does not recognize the Plaintiff as the true owner of said house as he has not rented it from him; therefore, he petitioned His Lordship to order the Plaintiff not to disturb him with suits of this nature.

On March 17, 1783, Morales, Justice of the Peace, ordered the Court Clerk to bring before him the records of this proceedings to be examined, and on March 18, 1783, after examining said records, His Lordship ordered the Plaintiff to present his title to the house occupied by the Defendant.

Then the Plaintiff in compliance with the preceding decree, presented his title to the house in question, and petitioned His Lordship to order whatever is of justice in this case.

On March 20, 1783, Morales, Justice of the Peace, ordered the Court Clerk to bring before him the Plaintiff's title to the house in question.

On March 22, 1783, Morales, Justice of the Peace, ordered that in view of the fact that the Plaintiff has proven himself owner of the house now occupied by the Defendant without a lease, and taking into considera-

Doc. #811  
(cont'd)

tion that the Defendant has been notified by the Plaintiff to vacate said house on the last of the current month, His Lordship ordered to inform the Defendant to vacate said house within fifteen days, the time prescribed by law, warning him that if he does not comply with this order he will be ejected by the law.

The record shows that the Court Clerk, Don Rafael Perdomo, in view that the case between Don Francisco Mayrrome vs. Don Pablo Segon, has terminated, petitioned His Lordship to declare what party is to pay the costs of these proceedings.

On March 26, 1783, His Lordship ordered the Judicial Appraiser to estimate the costs of these proceedings and to charge said costs to the Defendant.

The record ends with an itemized statement dated April 1, 1783, submitted by Don Luis Liotau, the Judicial Appraiser, of the costs of these proceedings which amounted to fourteen pesos and one half real.

File #70 )  
March 10, )  
1783. )  
PP. from )  
1 to 8. )  
All in )  
Spanish. )  
Judge: Don )  
Martin )  
Navarro. )  
Notary )  
Clerk: Don )  
Rafael Per- )  
domo. )

Proceedings instituted by Don Carlos Poree and Don Carlos Jose Fraissinet, for the purpose of obtaining a permit to sell the Brigantine named "San Juan" of the ownership of Don Pedro Rousseau and Don Thomas Poree.

The record shows that Carlos Poree, and Carlos Joseph Fraissinet, as agents of Don Pedro Rousseau and Don Thomas Poree, brought this action before the Intendant General of this Province Don Martin Navarro, alleging that in view of a letter of authorization presented, dated January 29, 1783, from their principals, authorizing them to sell the Brigantine "San Juan" of the ownership of said principals, and that as they have a good offer to sell said brigantine, and as they have forgotten their power of attorney they had, they petitioned Your Lordship to accept said letter presented as their power of attorney to sell said brigantine and to order the Registration Clerk, to record said letter in order that he could make the corresponding deed.

On March 10, 1783, Don Martin Navarro, in view of the letter of authorization presented ordered the Court Clerk to inform the petitioners that after they give the necessary security, the permit to sell said brigantine will be issued.

Then Carlos Poree, and Carlos Joseph Fraissinet, in compliance with the preceding decree, informed Your Lordship, that they have given the necessary security before the Registration Clerk, given as guarantor Don Martin

(cont'd)

Doc. #812  
(cont'd)

Braquier, and that said security having been accepted by Pedro Ecmiere, the prospective buyer, they petitioned His Lordship to order the Registration Clerk, to draw the deed of sale of said brigantine.

On March 12, 1783, Navarro, ordered the Court Clerk to bring before him the records and after having examined said records, on March 13, 1783, ordered the Registration Clerk to draw the act of sale of said brigantine, according to the terms of the security given. Navarro also ordered the Court Clerk to inform Don Luis Liotau, Judicial appraiser to make an itemized statement of the cost of these proceedings.

The record ends with the itemized statement of the cost of these proceedings, which amounted to 6 pesos, submitted by Don Luis Liotau, on March 13, 1783.

File #58 )  
 MARCH ~~April~~ 10, )  
 1783. )  
 Judge: )  
 Martin Na- )  
 varro. )  
 Court Clerk: )  
 Rafael Per- )  
 domo. )  
 PP. 1 to 20. )  
 All in Span- )  
 ish. )

ACTION INSTITUTED BY DON  
 LUIS SULSER FOR THE PUR-  
 POSE OF PROVING THAT THE  
 MERCHANDISE SOLD TO HIM  
 IN THE CITY OF OSTENDE  
 WAS OF BAD QUALITY.

Don Luis Sulser, brought this  
 action, in the Court of Don Mar-  
 tin Navarro, Intendant General  
 of this Province, alleging in  
 his petition that as evidenced  
 by the written testimony of pro-  
 test which he duly presented,

Ese de Mendez, a resident and merchant of the  
 City of Ostende, sold him a box containing  
 several pieces of dry goods supposing to be  
 of good quality and in good condition, and  
 that said pieces of dry goods were examined by  
 petitioner before being packed in the box, and  
 confident in the good faith which mutually ex-  
 isted between the merchants and the customers,  
 the petitioner left said merchandise in said  
 Mendez's possession so that he would pack it  
 with the aid of his servants, in a box, which  
 was then nailed, and marked as specified in  
 the written testimony of protest, and then de-  
 livered to petitioner; and that said box ar-  
 rived in this Port and was then opened by pe-  
 titioner who found that the merchandise was  
 not of the same kind and quality that he pur-  
 chased from said Mendez and that part of said  
 merchandise was damaged without said box or  
 container suffering any exterior damage, that  
 may have injured said merchandise, and in or-  
 der to prove the foregone allegations, so that  
 petitioner may claim from said Mendez, said  
 merchandise or its value, he therefore peti-  
 tioned His Lordship to please order the present  
 Court Clerk with the assistance of Don Francisco

Riano and Don Christobal de Armas Alcila, merchants of this City, to inspect and examine said merchandise and to estimate its legitimate value and to deliver to petitioner a copy of the appraisal in order to promote whatever may be convenient to petitioner.

On April 10, 1783, Navarro, the Intendant General, ordered the Court Clerk that after the written testimony of protest has been presented to appoint the appraisers mentioned in the petition and to notify them of their appointment so that they will be sworn in according to law, and after this has been done to proceed with the inspection and appraisal of said damaged merchandise, as petitioned.

On the same day Don Rafael Perdomo, Court Clerk, notified Don Francisco Riano and Don Christobal de Armas Alcila of the preceding decree and they accepted their appointments of appraisers and they were sworn in, according to law by said Court Clerk.

On April 11, 1783, Don Rafael Perdomo, Court Clerk, assisted by Don Francisco Riano and Christobal de Armas Alcila, merchants of this City, went to the store of Don Luis Sulser to inspect and appraise the merchandise in question and after examining the box they did not find any exterior damage to said box, through which the injury of said merchandise could be produced and also they noticed that the merchandise contained in said box was not the same as the one specified in the invoice presented by said Don Luis Sulser.

Later Don Luis Sulser, petitioned His Lordship, alleging that the inspection and appraisal of said damaged merchandise have taken place as he requested in his last peti-

tion and that said inspection have proven the fraud committed by said Ese de Mendez, and therefore petitioned His Lordship to confirm said inspection by a judicial decree so that he may claim from said Ese de Mendez, whatever may be convenient.

On April 12, 1783, Navarro, the Intendant General ordered the Court Clerk to bring before him the records of these proceedings to be examined and on April 14, 1783, His Lordship declared that in view of the facts presented by Don Luis Sulser, and by his protest and by the inspection and appraisal done by the Court Clerk and the other appraisers, that the sale of said merchandise by Ese Mendez to Luis Sulser was a fraud, and in order that he may claim damages caused by the fraud committed by said Mendez in the sale of said merchandise, he declared it as such by a judicial decree.

Don Luis Sulser, then petitioned His Lordship, alleging that as the necessary litigation had terminated by the preceding decree of April 14, 1783, he therefore petitioned His Lordship to order the appraisal of the costs of these proceedings and to order the Court Clerk to give him whatever written testimony of these proceedings he may request and that said testimonies must be certified so they may be legal.

On April 16, Navarro, Intendant General, ordered the Court Clerk to appoint Don Luis Liotaud, the Judicial Appraiser, to appraise the cost of these proceedings, and to deliver to Don Luis Sulser whatever testimonies he may request in these proceedings.

The record ends with an itemized statement of the costs of these proceedings which amounted to twenty two pesos and one real, submitted by Don Luis Liotaud on June 17, 1783.

File #25 )  
March 13, )  
1783. )  
P. from 1 )  
to 10. )  
All in )  
Spanish. )  
Judge: Don )  
Estevan Miro. )  
Court Clerk: )  
Don Rafael )  
Perdomo. )

PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED BY  
DON PEDRO FABROT, AS TES-  
TAMENTARY EXECUTOR OF THE  
DECEASED HENRIQUE GERARD  
AND AUGUSTINA ALLAIN, IN  
REGARD TO A CERTAIN TRANS-  
ACTION WITH DON CLAUDIO  
TRENAUNAY.

The record begins with a petition made by Don Pedro Favrot, as curator of the minor Doña Francisca Gerard, legitimate daughter of Henrique Gerard and Agustina Allain; and Francisco Broutin, as attorney representing Don Claudio Trenaunay, a resident of Point Coupe, alleging that in the auction of the properties of said minor, at the price of the appraisal of said properties to said Trenaunay, I Favrot have noticed a mistake or error in said transaction, that may prejudice the said minor, and to avoid any future trouble that may prejudice both parties, and desiring to maintain harmony in the family, we have agreed to settle this matter for the sum of 500 pesos, who said Trenaunay promised to pay in cash, for the mistake or error committed in the auction of said minor's corresponding legal paternal and maternal share, for which I, Favrot promise to withdraw and cease any legitimate claim or demand against said Trenaunay, on behalf of said minor Francisca Gerard, and therefore petition His Excellency Governor Miro, to order the Court Clerk to execute this transaction with its discharge in full.

Governor Miro, on March 13th, 1783, ordered the Court Clerk to notify Francisco Broutin, Attorney, for Claudio Trenaunay, to present his power of attorney, in order to proceed.

(cont'd)

Doc. #814  
(cont'd)

The record then shows a power of attorney granted by Claudio Trenaunay to Francisco Broutin, dated July 6, 1782, presented by said Broutin in evidence of his authority.

Then Francisco Broutin, petitioned His Lordship, alleging, that in compliance with the preceding decree, he presented his power of attorney granted by Claudio Trenaunay, and therefore to order the Court Clerk to execute the transaction as petitioned before.

On March 14, 1783, the Governor ordered the records of this case to be brought before him to be examined, and after having examined said records on March 15, 1783, in view of the power of attorney presented by Broutin, ordered the Court Clerk to execute the deed of the transaction with its discharge in full of all the legal rights and privileges that the minor Francisca Gerard may have against Trenaunay, and in order to terminate this matter, His Lordship approved said transaction by this judicial decree.

Later Claudio Trenaunay petitioned His Lordship, alleging that as the necessary litigation had terminated by the preceding decree, to therefore order the Court Clerk to give him a copy of the records of these proceedings and to order a statement of the costs of these proceedings to be made as he is ready to pay for said costs.

Governor Miro, on March 17, 1783, granted the petitioner's prayer and order a statement of these proceedings to be made.

(cont'd)

Doc. #814  
(cont'd)

The record ends with an itemized statement of the costs of these proceedings which amounted to 6 pesos, 4 reales, submitted by Luis Liotau, the judicial appraiser on March 17, 1783.

Don Juan Maria de la Harbo,  
Deputado Governador hizo lo  
que sigue a petitiu to auction  
certain pieces of dry goods of  
his warehouse in front of the  
Real Audiencia of San Pedro de  
Macoris, the Court Clerk  
is witness the auction of said  
goods.

On March 16th, 1783, the Gov-  
ernor ordered the petitioner's papers.

The record shows that on March  
16th, 1783, the Court Clerk, Don  
Juan Pineda, in complying with the Govern-  
or's order, appeared before his public office  
and ordered to sell to the highest  
bidder the complete lot of merchandise of  
Don Juan Maria de la Harbo, but no bidder ap-  
peared.

On March 20th, 1783, Governor  
in view of the fact that the Court Clerk  
did not sell the public the said dry  
goods, and no bidder appeared, set the  
day of March, at 9:00 a.m. for the public  
auction of said dry goods.

The record shows that the Court  
Clerk in complying with the Governor's  
order, on March 20th, 1783, sold at  
public auction the merchandise of Don Juan  
Maria de la Harbo, who then petitioned the  
Governor, alleging that as the clerk of

(cont'd)

Doc. #815  
Box 41

File #329	)	PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED
March 14,	)	BY DON JOSE MARIA DE LA
1783.	)	BARBA, FOR THE PURPOSE
Judge: Gov-	)	OF SELLING CERTAIN PIECES
ernor Don	)	OF DRY GOODS.
Estevan Miro	)	
Court Clerk:	)	
Rafael Per-	)	Don Jose Maria de la Barba,
domo.	)	petitioned Governor Miro to
P. from 1 to	)	grant him a permit to auction
20.	)	certain pieces of dry goods of
All in Span-	)	his ownership in front of the
ish.	)	Capitular Houses of this City,
	)	and to order the Court Clerk
	)	to witness the auction of said
	)	goods.

On March 14th, 1783, the Governor granted the petitioner's prayer.

The record shows that on March 14th, 18th, and 22nd, the Court Clerk, Don Rafael Perdomo, in complying with the preceding decree, appeared before his public office and announced and offered to sell to the highest bidder the complete lot of merchandise of Don Jose Maria de la Barba, but no bidder appeared.

On March 24th, 1783, Governor Miro, in view of the fact that the Court Clerk announced to the public the sale of said dry goods, and no bidder appeared, set the 26th day of March, at 9:00 a.m., for the public auction of said dry goods.

The record shows that the Court Clerk, in complying with the Governor's preceding decree, on March 26th, 1783, sold at public auction the merchandise of Don Jose Maria de la Barba, who then petitioned the Governor, alleging that as the auction of

(cont'd)

Doc. #815  
(cont'd)

said merchandise had terminated, to approve said sale.

Governor Estevan Miro, after having examined the documents on March (no date on record) 1783, approved by judicial decree the public auction of said merchandise.

Jose Maria de la Barba, then petitioned the Governor to order to estimate the cost of these proceedings, alleging that he is ready to pay for said costs.

Governor Miro, ordered Don Luis Liotau, the judicial appraiser to submit a statement of the expenses of these proceedings.

The record ends with an itemized statement of the cost of these proceedings, which amounted to 18 pesos, 5 reales.

26

Doc. #817  
Box 41

File #3317 )  
April 12, )  
1783. )  
P. from 1 )  
to 4. )  
All in )  
Spanish. )  
Judge: Gov- )  
ernor Este- )  
van Miro. )  
Court Clerk: )  
Fernando )  
Rodriguez. )

SALE OF THE BRIGANTINE  
NAMED "LA AMABLE HEN-  
RIETA" OF THE POSSES-  
SION OF DON LUIS TOU-  
TAN BEAUREGARD.

Don Luis Toutan Beauregard, pe-  
titioned His Lordship, for a  
permit to sell at public auc-  
tion a certain brigantine named  
"La Amable Henrieta" with the  
consent of his partner.

On April 15th, 1783, Governor  
Miro, in view that the petitioner is authorized  
by his partner, granted the petitioner's re-  
quest.

On April 27th, 1783, after said  
auction was announced by the public crier for  
three consecutive times, at which auction said  
brigantine was sold to the highest bidder Don  
Francisco Riaño, who offered the sum of 2,500  
pesos.

\*\*\*ooOoo\*\*\*

On April 8, 1783, Governor Miro,  
ordered the Court Clerk, to forward a copy of  
the above petition to the Auditor of the  
Real of the Province.

On the same day the Court Clerk, in  
compliance with the preceding orders, notified  
the Auditor of the Royal Treasury.

[Signature]

File #24 )  
 P. from 1 )  
 to 12. )  
 April 15, )  
 1783. )  
 All in )  
 Spanish. )  
 Judge: )  
 Estevan )  
 Miro. )  
 Notary )  
 Clerk: )  
 Leonardo )  
Mazange. )

PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED BY DON PEDRO BERTONIERE, REGARDING THE RESIGNATION OF DON FERNANDO RODRIGUEZ, OF THE POSITION OF OFFICIAL ATTORNEY OF THIS CITY MADE IN HIS FAVOR.

The record begins with a certified copy dated March 17, 1783, of the resignation of Don Fernando Rodriguez, to the position of Official Attorney of this City, in favor of Don Pedro Bertoniere, and signed by Fernando Rodriguez, before the witnesses Don Luis Liotau, Don Phelipe Guinault and Don Salomon Mallines and attested by Leonardo Mazange, Court Clerk.

This copy of the resignation of Don Fernando Rodriguez, was presented as evidence by Don Pedro Bertoniere, who instituted the following proceedings.

Pedro Bertoniere, petitioned His Excellency, Governor Estevan Miro, alleging that as it is evident by the resignation of Don Fernando Rodriguez, in his favor, which he duly present, he is entitled to the position of Official Attorney of this City, and as the 20 days has passed as prescribed by the law, he therefore begs His Lordship to place him in charge of said office.

On April 5, 1783, Governor Miro, ordered the Court Clerk, to forward a copy of the above petition to the Auditor of the Army and of the Province.

On the same day the Court Clerk, in compliance with the preceding decree, notified the Auditor of the Royal Treasury.

Doc. #816  
(cont'd)

Then on April 17, 1783, Don Fernando de Otero, Auditor of the Royal Treasury, declared: That he has received a copy of Don Pedro Bertoniere's petition wherein he is applying for the Office of Official Attorney of this City, and that as soon as the appraisal of this office has been made and the petitioner has paid the necessary fees to the Royal Treasury, he finds no objection in accepting the petitioner to take charge of said office.

On April 7, 1783, Governor Miro, ordered the Court Clerk to appoint Francisco Broutin, and Don Luis Liotau, to appraise the Office of Official Attorney of this City, after they had complied with the oath of Acceptance as prescribed by law.

On the same day, in compliance with the Governor's decree, the Court Clerk notified Francisco Broutin and Luis Liotau of the preceding decree, and which appointment they accepted.

On April 8, 1783, Francisco Broutin and Luis Liotau appeared before His Lordship, Don Martin Navarro, Intendant General of this Province and Don Bernardo de Otero, Auditor General of this Province and stated: That they have appraised the Office of Official Attorney of this City, for the amount of 600 pesos.

On the same day Governor Miro, in view that the estimation of the office of Official Attorney was made to have Bertoniere pay the sum of said appraisal to the Royal Treasury, and then to be examined by Don Juan Doroteo del Postigo, Counsellor and Assessor General.

Don Joseph Foucher, principal Treasurer, of the Army and Navy of this Province, certified that on May 26th, 1784, he has re-

(cont'd)

ceived from Pedro Bertoniere, the sum of 1600 reales one third of the asset value of the Office of Official Attorney of this City, the position renounced by Fernando Rodriguez, in favor of said Bertoniere.

On May 27, 1783, Don Joseph Furcher, certified that he received from Pedro Bertoniere, the applicant to the office of Official Attorney of this City, the sum of 188 reales and 27 maravedies and one 1/5, said sum include the 2 1/2% of the 4800 reales, the amount of the appraisal of said office of Official Attorney of this City, which is the fees that His Majesty is entitled to plus 18 reales for the expense of the transportation of said fees to Spain.

On April 9, 1783, Juan Doroteo del Postigo, Counsellor and Assessor General of the Army, certified that he has examined Pedro Bertoniere, applicant to the office of Official Attorney of this City, and after having questioned him as to the theory and practice of the profession and having conferred with him in regard to civil and criminal jurisprudence, he found him competent to fulfill said office of Official Attorney of this City.

Don Pedro Bertoniere then petitioned the Governor, alleging that as it is evident by the document presented, he has complied with the payment of the necessary fees to His Majesty, plus the expense of transporting these fees to Spain, and therefore he begs His Lordship, to grant him the corresponding title of Official Attorney, so that he may present said title to the Most Illustrious Council of this City, for the purpose of taking charge of said office of Official Attorney of this City.

On June 9th, 1784, Governor Miro, requested the Court Clerk to bring before him the

DOC. #816  
(cont'd)

record of this case to be examined and after having examined said record on Juen 12, 1784, Governor Miro, in view of the fact that Bertoniere has complied with the conditions imposed in his decree of April 8, 1783, he ordered the Court Clerk, that the title petitioned for as Official Attorney be issued and given to Bertoniere, so that he may present said title to the Most Illustrious Council of this City, and to notify Bertoniere, that he has a period of five years in which he may present said credential, and after the lapse of this period, he will lose all rights and privileges to said office of Official Attorney, and that the title of said office granted to him, will pass in favor of the Royal Treasury.

File #69 )  
Apr. 18, 1783 )  
Sheets from 1 )  
to 56. )  
All in Spanish. )  
Judges: Juan Ven- )  
tura Morales and )  
Francisco Maria )  
Regio. )  
Court Clerk: )  
Rafael Perdomo. )

OFFICIAL CRIMINAL PROCEED-  
INGS INSTITUTED AGAINST MAN-  
UEL DE LOS SANTOS FOR THE  
MURDER OF TOMAS GUZMAN.

The testimonies of the wit-  
nesses even though they all  
differ in minor facts, do  
prove that on April 18, 1783  
Manuel de los Santos and To-  
mas Guzman went to the Bay-  
ou with the intention of buying a small boat  
and on their return they went to a saloon be-  
longing to "Tia Lorenza", where they met Mar-  
iano Fernandez and Juan Canoso. Here they en-  
gaged in drinking wine. Their conversation de-  
veloped into an argument in which Tomas Guzman  
struck Manuel de los Santos with his fist caus-  
ing him to fall, the struggle was stopped by  
the other two members in the party. About 10:30  
P. M. according to the testimony of Guzman they  
walked out of the saloon in the direction of  
the levee where De los Santos and Guzman con-  
tinued their argument which was interferred  
twice by the witness Canoso, who disarmed Guz-  
man in the two attempts he made against De los  
Santos. After the witnesses Canoso and Fernan-  
dez separated from De los Santos and Guzman &  
finding themselves alone De los Santos struck  
Guzman with a knife inflicting a small wound  
in the right side of the body.

The testimony of Guzman  
stated that after being wounded by De los San-  
tos he reported the crime to the authorities,  
who took him to the Royal Hospital of this City.

By order of Governor Miro  
on April 18, Juan Ventura Morales, Justice of  
the Peace was appointed to investigate the  
crime committed by De los Santos.

Morales immediately proceed-

ed his investigations of the crime and the record showed the testimonies of the witnesses Fernandez and Canoso and of the defendant De los Santos and of the victim Guzman. The four testimonies appeared to be different as to the facts leading to the crime, but all of the testimonies asserted that De los Santos committed the crime.

The record also shows the written testimony of Dr. Josef Montegut chief surgeon of the Royal Hospital of this City wherein he declares that on Apr. 18, 1783 Guzman was admitted in his institution to be treated for a small wound on the left side of his body. Upon examination it was found that Guzman had been suffering for some time from the liver and the bladder and that on June 18, 1783 Guzman died his death being caused by his ailments from which he had been suffering for some time and not by the wound inflicted by De los Santos; but that the wound did weaken the body of the deceased to the extent that the other ailments developed and caused his death.

The record shows that on June the 21st 1783 the Defendant appointed for his legal advisor Pedro Bertoniere and the State appointed Francisco Broutin to prosecute the defendant.

After eleven months of litigation in which the defense tried to prove that the deceased did not die from the wound inflicted by the defendant as it is evident by the medical certificate presented, the facts presented by the prosecuting attorney proved beyond any doubt that the defendant having unlawfully and deliberately struck the deceased with a knife inflicting a wound which caused indirectly the death of the deceased, therefore the defendant was guilty of murder, even though the intent of the defendant was not to kill the deceased,

his mere violent and unlawful act which indirectly caused the death of the deceased, the defendant is liable for murder.

The court found the defendant guilty of murder and the sentence was imposed by Francisco Maria Regio, justice of the peace of this City, on June 4th, 1784 sentencing the defendant to six years in prison, and to pay the expenses of this proceedings.

FILE #2 )  
April 23rd 1783 )  
P. From 1 to 2 )  
All in Spanish )  
Judge: Ventura )  
Morales. )  
Court Clerk: )  
Rafael Perdomo. )

Doc. #819  
Box 41

Case of  
Pedro Ponne  
versus  
Claudio Lacoste.

Plaintiff, instituted auction for the purpose of compelling the Defendant, to pay a past due debt.

Plaintiff, alleged that the Defendant owes him the sum of 86 pesos as it is evidenced by the documents presented: Therefore he petitioned his Lordship, to have the Defendant appear in Court, and declare under oath, whether the signature affixed at the foot of the promissory note is his own and declare whether he owes said amount.

The record ends with a decree of Governor Morales, of April 23rd, 1783, wherein he granted the Plaintiff's petition.

File #30 )  
April 28, )  
1783. )  
Judge: )  
Governor )  
Miro. )  
Court ) Don Joseph Conand, petitioned the  
Clerk: ) Governor for a permit to sell at  
Rafael ) public auction certain barrels of  
Perdomo. ) flour.  
P. from 1 )  
to 2. ) Governor Miro, by decree of July  
28th, 1783, ordered Mr. Pertui and  
Mr. Monlon to inspect said flour  
and if found in a good condition, he will  
grant the requested permit.

Said gentlemen, on the same day  
were interviewed by the Court Clerk, and after  
they were notified of the preceding decree,  
they accepted their appointment.

Then Don Santiago Monlon and Don  
Nicolas Pertui on August 2nd, 1783, appeared  
before the Court Clerk and declared that as  
decreed, they went to the warehouse of Don  
Francisco Bouligne to examine said flour, and  
they found that said flour was in an excellent  
condition.

The record is incomplete and the  
outcome of the case is not known.

Doc. #821  
Box 41

File 88 )  
April 29, )  
1783. )  
Judge: )  
Juan del )  
Postigo y )  
Balderrama. )  
Court Clerk: )  
Rafael Per- )  
domo. )  
All in Span- )  
ish. )

SUCCESSION OF DÑA ANTONIA  
DEL CASTILLO.

In the City of New Orleans, on  
April 29, 1783, Doña Antonia  
de Castillo, wife of Francisco  
Godoy, Lieutenant of Infantry,  
died intestate.

In the absence of her widowed  
husband, the Assessor General of  
the King appointed Don Jose Diaz  
as tutor and curator of the minors,  
who obtains from the Court, permission to make an  
inventory and appraise the estate in question,  
which was later sold at public auction.

In compliance with a decree, Don  
Jose Diaz, renders an account of the liquidation  
of said estate, showing that its sale amounted  
to 975 pesos, 7 reales, and that he paid for  
doctor, medicines and funeral expenses 223 pe-  
sos, leaving a net balance of 752 pesos, 7  
reales.

File #44 )  
April 30, 1783 )  
Judge: Governor )  
Miro. )  
Court Clerk: )  
Rafael Perdomo. )  
All in Spanish )  
Sheets from )  
1 to 7. )

Doc. #822  
Box 41

Case of  
Don Enrique Desprez  
vs  
Juan Bautista Seran.

Record begins with a deed, drawn before the Notary Public, on Sept. 22, 1781, wherein is stated that Defendant obligated himself to surrender his properties, if he does not return the sum of 800 pesos in two payments of 400 pesos each, to the Plaintiff within the period of 18 months, according to the stipulations of said deed.

Plaintiff, in view that said defendant had failed to keep his promise as stated in the preceding deed, petitioned the Court to issue a writ of execution to seize the properties of said Defendant for the aforesaid sum, plus the costs of the court.

The Court, after having examined the said deed, on April 30th, 1783, decreed as plaintiff petitioned.

Plaintiff in view that said Defendant appeared to pay his first payment of 400 pesos, before the writ of execution had any effect, petitioned the court to withhold the said writ of execution and to close this case since he is willing to pay the expenses caused by the court.

Then the Court on May 7th, 1783, decreed as plaintiff petitioned.

File #41 )  
May 14th, 1783. )  
Judge; Juan )  
Ventura Morales, )  
Court Clerk: )  
Rafael Perdomo. )  
All in Spanish. )  
P. From 1 to 60. )

DOC. #823  
Box 41

PUBLIC AUCTION OF THE  
EFFECTS BROUGHT TO THIS  
PORT BY ENRIQUE BUA.

Enrique Bua petitioned His Lordship for a permit to sell certain damaged merchandise that he brought to this Port on board, his Brigantine. He also petitioned His Lordship to order the Court Clerk to witness the Public Auction of said merchandise.

On May the 14th 1783 Juan Ventura Morales, Justice of the Peace of this City, granted the petitioner's prayer and ordered the Court Clerk to announce to the public that said merchandise was for sale and if any person desired to buy all of the merchandise as a lot as prescribed by law.

In compliance with the preceding decree the Court Clerk, on May the 14th, 19th, and the 23rd, 1783 publicly announced the sale of said merchandise as prescribed by law. The Court Clerk after the last announcement was made, reported that no bidder appeared to buy all of the merchandise as a lot.

Then Enrique Bau petitioned His Lordship alleging that as the Court Clerk had publicly announced the sale of said damaged merchandise as prescribed by law, and no bidder having appeared, to set a day for the public auction of said merchandise.

On May the 24th, 1783, Juan Ventura Morales, Justice of the Peace, granted the Plaintiff's petition and set the 25th, day

of May, 1783, as the day for the public auction of said merchandise.

The record shows that the public auction of said merchandise began on May 25th, 1783 and ended on the 30th of May 1783.

After the termination of said public auction, Enrrique Bau petitioned His Lordship alleging that said merchandise was sold at Public auction and that he therefore petitioned His Lordship to approve by Judicial authority the sale of said merchandise.

On June the 2nd, 1783, Juan Ventura Morales, Justice of the Peace, granted the petitioner's prayer and approved the sale of said merchandise. The following day Enrrique Bau petitioned His Lordship to order an itemized statement of the costs of this proceeding and forward said statement to him. On June the 3rd, 1783 Juan Ventura Morales, Justice of Peace, ordered that the statement of the expense of these proceedings be made as petitioned.

The record ends with the Court Clerk notifying Luis Liotau, Judicial Appraiser, of the preceding decree.

The record being incomplete, does not show the expenses of these proceedings.

EXHIBIT 824  
BOX 41

File #76  
Judge:  
Intendant  
General  
Bvarrio.  
Court Clerk:  
Rafael Per-  
domo.  
EP. 1 to 31  
Spanish and  
French.

CASE OF

DON PEDRO JOSE DE PEDESCLAUX  
VS  
DON JUAN VINCENT.

DOCUMENT NO. 824.  
BOX 41

The Plaintiff, Don Pedro Jose de Pedesclaux, as agent of the firm of "Pedesclaux Father and Son", brought this action to recover the proceeds of the sale of certain goods belonging to Don Juan

DOCUMENT 824 was found to belong to May 20.  
1789 changed to Document No. 2148(A). Box 54.

The Plaintiff, in his petition alleged: That in the year 1778, his deceased brother Juan Bautista Pedesclaux instructed the Defendant, Pilot of the Frigate "Nuestra Señora del Carmen" of the company of said firm, "Pedesclaux Father and Son" with certain merchandise to be sold in this Province of Louisiana and that the Defendant sailed from Bordeaux, France and came to this Province where he disposed of said merchandise, and that said deceased in the same year sailed from France to French Santo Domingo, where he died in the year 1781, and that the firm of Pedesclaux Father and Son are entitled to the proceeds of said merchandise, and that he had requested the Defendant to surrender said funds, and that he has refused, giving as a reason that before surrendering said funds he must be presented with a death certificate of the deceased, but as this has not been furnished, and that he has been informed of the death of said deceased by several persons in this City, and furthermore there are several other persons who have also deceased in Santo Domingo and will require of his death, and as the Defendant doubts the legations he suspects that said funds are safe in the hands of the Defendant and he

#20  
#10

(cont'd)

DOCUMENT #825  
BOX 41

File #76	)	CASE OF
Judge:	)	
Intendant	)	DON PEDRO JOSE DE PEDESCLAUX
General	)	VS
Navarro.	)	DON JUAN VINCENT.
Court Clerk:	)	
Rafael Per-	)	The Plaintiff, Don Pedro Jose de
domo.	)	Pedesclaux, as agent of the firm
PP. 1 to 23	)	of "Pedesclaux Father and Son",
Spanish and	)	brought this action to recover the
<u>French.</u>	)	proceeds of the sale of certain
	)	merchandise consigned to Don Juan
	)	Vicent, the Defendant.

The Plaintiff, in his petition alleged: That in the year 1778, his deceased brother Juan Bautista Pedesclaux intrusted the Defendant, Pilot of the Frigate "Nuestra Señora del Carmen" of the ownership of said firm, "Pedesclaux Father and Son" with certain merchandise to be sold in this Province of Louisiana and that the Defendant sailed from Bordeaux, France and came to this Province where he disposed of said merchandise, and that said deceased in the same year sailed from France to French Santo Domingo, where he died in the year 1781, and that the firm of Pedesclaux Father and Son are entitled to the proceeds of said merchandise, and that he had requested the Defendant to surrender said funds, and that he has refused, giving as a reason that before surrendering said funds he must be presented with a death certificate of the deceased, but as this reason is not justifiable as the Defendant has been informed of the death of said deceased by several persons in this City, and furthermore there are several other persons who knew the deceased in Santo Domingo and will certify to his death, and as the Defendant denied these allegations he suspects that said funds are not safe in the hands of the Defendant and therefore

(cont'd)

Doc. #825  
(cont'd)

he petitioned His Lordship that as Agent of the firm of "Pedesclaux Father and Son" to order the Defendant to surrender to him said fund with the necessary documents of the sale of said merchandise, or to deposit said funds and documents in the hands of a reputable merchant of his approval for safe keeping.

The Intendant General Navarro, the presiding judge, on May 2, 1783, ordered the petitioner to prove his allegations in his petition in regard to the death of his brother.

The Plaintiff then petitioned His Lordship alleging that he is ready to prove the death of his brother and therefore to accept several persons who will testify in his behalf.

On May 23, 1783, the Governor ordered the Court Clerk to take the testimony of the persons presented by the Plaintiff to testify to the death of his brother, and further ordered the Plaintiff to present his credentials authorizing him to bring this action.

The following day in compliance with the preceding decree, Don Juan Alexandro Cadonir, Don Juan Pounon and Don Francisco Mayronne appeared before the Court Clerk and after being duly sworn according to law declared: That during their visit to the French Santo Domingo they were informed by several persons of the death of said Juan Bautista Pedesclaux.

Then the Plaintiff in compliance with the decree of May 23, 1783, presented his credentials authorizing him to bring this action and therefore he petitioned His Lordship

(cont'd)

to order the Defendant to surrender said funds and documents to him or to a reputable merchant of his approval.

On May 28, 1783, the Governor ordered the Court Clerk to deliver to the Defendant a copy of the Plaintiff's petition.

The record shows that on the same day the Plaintiff appointed Francisco Mayronne as his Attorney in these proceedings.

The Defendant answered the Plaintiff's petition denying his allegations, and alleging that about a month ago the Plaintiff instituted proceedings in the Court of Francisco Joseph Lebreton, Justice of the Peace for the purpose of having certain funds in possession of Don Felix Matteredne a merchant in this City to be surrendered to him, as agent of the firm Pedesclaux Father and Son, but upon investigation, it was found by said Court that the Plaintiff was not authorized to collect said funds and was proceeding with malice, and the Court decided to forward said funds to a certain merchant named Bruno Hermanos of Burdeaux, France, who were entitled to said funds. The Defendant further alleged, that the Plaintiff in the suit against him, is evidently proceeding with malice ~~st~~forethought as in his previous intent to collect funds as agent of the firm Pedesclaux Father and Son, and as he has already left town, wherefore he petitions His Lordship, to dismiss the plaintiff's action, and to order the Plaintiff to pay the costs of this suit.

On June 4, 1783, Navarro, ordered the Court Clerk to deliver a copy of the Defendant's petition to Plaintiff's attorney.

Doc. #825  
(cont'd)

Don Francisco Mayronne, Attorney for the Plaintiff answered the Defendant's petition, alleging that he has received a copy of the Defendant's petition, and that he is not in a position to answer said petition as the Plaintiff is out of town and has left without giving any instructions, and therefore he petitions His Lordship to postpone this suit until the return of the Plaintiff to this City.

On August 1, 1783, Navarro ordered the Court Clerk to deliver to the Defendant a copy of the Plaintiff's petition.

Two years later on April 25, 1785, Morales, Justice of the Peace, by order of Navarro, Intendant General of this Province, ordered that in view of the information submitted by the Court Clerk Pedro Pedesclaux, that the Defendant Juan Vincent, had died, he ordered to close the proceedings in this case and to charge the costs of said proceeding to the Plaintiff Don Pedro Joseph Pedesclaux.

The record ends with an itemized statement of the costs of these proceedings which amount to 17 pesos 1/2 real.

File No. 77. )  
June 2, 1783. )  
Judge: Hon. )  
Intendant Gen- )  
eral. Court Clerk: )  
Rafael Perdomo. )  
Spanish and French.)

PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED  
BY BARTOLOME TARDIVEAU  
AND COMPANY IN REGARD  
TO A THEFT OF CERTAIN  
MERCHANDISE, WHICH THEFT  
WAS COMMITTED BY SANTIAGO  
CORBERT, A PIRATE OF  
ENGLISH NATIONALITY.

Record begins with a copy of a protest made on May 30, 1783, by Don Bartolome and Don Pedro Tardiveau, brothers, and Don Miguel Lacasagne, natives of France and residents of Philadelphia, U. S. A., before Notary Public Rafael Perdomo and two witnesses, stating that while coming to this City from Philadelphia on board the vessel named "El Cobro" loaded with the merchandise described in the statement they duly presented, at a distance of about a league from where the Mississippi and San Francisco rivers meet, they were assaulted by a band of pirates headed by a man named Corbert, of English nationality, who after having wounded one of their rowers, seized from them all the merchandise they were carrying except a small quantity of provisions which they were allowed to keep, just enough to keep them alive until they could get some help. Therefore, in accordance with law, they made a formal protest for such a crime and the delays, damages and losses they suffered so that they may claim indemnification from whom the law may designate as responsible.

The said Bartolome Tardiveau and company later petitioned the Court that the seizure of the aforesaid merchandise be declared illegal and that they be given a certified copy of these proceedings for the purposes that may be convenient for them.

On June 5, 1783, the Court granted said petition.

Doc. #827  
Box 41

File #183 )  
June 4, )  
1783. )  
Sheets from )  
1 to 5. )  
All in Span- )  
ish. )  
Judge: Don )  
Estevan Miro. )  
Notary Clerk: )  
Dn. Rafael )  
Perdomo. )

Case of

Dn. Enrique Bua  
vs  
Mr. De Shemine.

PLAINTIFF INSTITUTED PROCEED-  
INGS FOR THE PURPOSE OF COM-  
PELLING THE DEFENDANT TO PAY  
A PAST DUE DEBT.

Plaintiff, a resident of this City, brought action against the Defendant alleging that the Defendant, a resident of the Post of Allemanes, owes him the sum of 460 pesos value of a certain negro slave that he sold to the Defendant on credit, but Defendant failed to comply with the payment as agreed. Plaintiff, further alleged that he is just about to leave this City, for which reason he requested his Lordship to issue a writ of execution to the Commandant of the Post of Allemanes, to seize the properties of the Defendant, as Defendant refused to pay said sum.

On June 4, 1783, Governor Miro granted the Plaintiff's petition.

The record is incomplete and the outcome of the case is not known.

File #35 )  
June 12, 1783 )  
Sheets from )  
1 to 12, )  
All in Spanish. )  
Judge: Don )  
Estevan Miro. )  
Notary Clerk: )  
Dn. Rafael )  
Perdomo. )

CASE OF

Jaime Urgel & Co.  
vs  
Jose Sanchez.

Plaintiffs instituted proceedings to compel the Defendant to pay two past due promissory notes that amounted to 54 pesos 6 reales.

The Plaintiffs set forth in their petition, that as it is evident by the two past due promissory notes presented, the Defendant is indebted to them the sum of 54 pesos, 6 reales, and that said debt arises from the balance due on certain merchandise that the Defendant bought. The Plaintiffs further alleged that they have demanded the Defendant to pay said notes and that he has refused, wherefore they petitioned His Lordship to order the Defendant to acknowledge his signature affixed at the foot of said two promissory notes and declare if he owes said notes that amount to 54 pesos, 6 reales.

On June 12, 1783, Governor Miro, the presiding judge, ordered the Defendant to appear in Court, to acknowledge said debt, as petitioned.

On June 14, 1783, the Defendant appeared before the Court Clerk, in compliance with the preceding decree, and after being duly sworn according to law, did depose and declare that the signatures at the foot of said two promissory notes presented by the Plaintiffs are his, and he acknowledged that he owes to the

(cont'd)

Doc. #828  
(cont'd)

Plaintiffs said promissory notes that amount to 54 pesos 6 reales.

Then the Plaintiffs, petitioned his Lordship, setting forth that as it is evident by the declaration made by the Defendant wherein the Defendant acknowledge owing said past due promissory notes that amount to 54 pesos 6 reales, that said declaration having resulted in his favor, wherefore they petitioned His Lordship to issue a writ of execution in order to seize the properties of the Defendant until he has complied with the payment of said sum of 54 pesos 6 reales, plus interest and costs.

On June 21, 1783 Governor Miro, in view of the fact that the Defendant has verbally stated in this Tribunal that he was willing to comply with the payment of said debt, but only had 14 barrels of salt meat in his possession be ordered to issue a writ of execution in order to seize said 14 barrels of salt meat and to sell them in public auction in order to satisfy the Defendant's debt, setting the 23 days of June for the sale of said barrels.

On June 23, 1783, the Court Clerk, in compliance with the preceding decree, proceeded to auction to the highest bidder the 14 barrels of sale meat, that were seized from the Defendant. The highest bidder was one Francisco Chico to whom the said 14 barrels were sold for 67 pesos.

On June 25, 1783, the Governor, in view of the fact that the said 14 barrels of salt meat that were seized from the Defendant, were sold at public auction for 67 pesos, ordered the Court Clerk to satisfy the Plaintiff's claim for 54 pesos 6 reales; and to notify Dn.

(cont'd)

(Doc. #828)

(cont'd)

Luis Liotaud, the Judicial Appraiser to make an itemized statement of the costs of this proceedings and to pay said costs from the balance of the 67 pesos, and after this has been done to give the Defendant the balance.

On the same day, the Court Clerk notified Dn. Luis Liotaud of the preceding decree.

On the same day, in compliance with the preceding decree, the Plaintiff came and appeared before the Court Clerk and declared that he has received from said Court Clerk the sum of 54 ps. 6 reales in payment of his claim.

The record ends with the Defendant's declaration made on June 26, 1783, in compliance with the preceding decree, wherein he acknowledged the receipt of 9 pesos 2 1/2 reales as the balance left from the sale of the 14 barrels of salt meat that were sold for 67 pesos, from which was deducted 54 pesos 6 reales given to the Plaintiff to satisfy his claim and 12 pesos 7 1/2 reales for the expense of these proceedings.

DOCUMENT NO. 829  
BOX 41

Doc. #830  
Box 41

File 51  
June 20, 1783  
Judge: Don Estevan  
Giró.  
Court Clerk: Rafael  
Pardame.  
Spanish and English.

PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED BY  
DOÑA MARIA MAGDALENA BARR-  
INGER DUSEWIL ROLLAND,  
WIDOW OF DON JUAN SANTIAGO  
ELAS BARRADIE, AGAINST THE

DOCUMENT 829 was found to belong to Dec. 11, 1783,  
changed to Document No. 901 A. Box 41.

The Plaintiff, through her legal agent Don  
Luis Licuete, appeared before the Court and  
stated: That Don Nicolas Forstall and Don Juan  
Josep Dufrenet, Trustees appointed to take  
charge of the business affairs of the late Don  
Isaac Monsanto, drew in her favor on Nov. 30,  
1771, a bill of exchange for the sum of four  
thousand six hundred seventy-two pounds, eleven  
suelдон and six dineros, against Don Juan de  
Aragon, a merchant of the city of San Sebastian,  
Spain, by order of Don Luis Enxage and Arce,  
Governor of the Province of Leizboa, as sanc-  
tioned by said bill of exchange which provided  
that the payment of said sum was not to be made  
such as Don Juan de Aragon did not have in  
possession any funds belonging to said Don  
Monsanto, or derived by the same in any way  
connected to the same. The Plaintiff  
therefore, petitioned the Court to order  
the said bill of exchange to be paid in  
full in the hands of the Trustees of said  
Monsanto for the satisfaction of said sum,  
to be paid the aforementioned sum of four  
thousand six hundred seventy-two pounds,  
eleven and six dineros, in preference of the  
creditors of the deceased.

#20  
#10

On June 20, 1783, the Court ordered

Trustee Don Santiago Mather be appointed

File 51  
June 20, 1783  
Judge: Don Estevan  
Miró.  
Court Clerk: Rafael  
Perdomo.  
Spanish and English.

Doc. #830  
Box 41

PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED BY  
DOÑA MARIA MAGDALENA HARR-  
ENGER IUSMENIL ROLLAND,  
WIDOW OF DON JUAN SANTIAGO  
BLAS DABBADIE, AGAINST THE  
SUCCESSION OF ISAAC MONSAN-  
TO, FOR THE COLLECTION OF  
A SUM OF PESOS.

The Plaintiff, through her legal agent Don Luis Lioutau, appeared before the Court and stated: That Don Nicolas Forstall and Don Juan Josefp Duforest, Trustees appointed to take charge of the business affairs of the late Don Isaac Monsanto, drew in her favor on Nov. 30, 1771, a bill of exchange for the sum of four thousand six hundred seventy-two pounds, eleven sueldos and six dineros, against Don Juan de Aragon, a merchant of the city of San Sebastian, Spain, by order of Don Luis Unzaga and Amezaga, Governor of the Province of Louisiana, as evidenced by said bill of exchange duly presented; that the payment of said sum was not made inasmuch as Don Juan de Aragon did not have in his possession any funds belonging to said Don Isaac Monsanto, as proved by the three letters that are also presented to the Court. The Plaintiff, therefore, petitioned the Court to order that for the funds belonging to said Monsanto and which were in the possession of Don Santiago Mather, Trustee for the creditors of said Monsanto, she be paid the aforementioned sum of four thousand six hundred seventy-two pounds, eleven sueldos and six dineros, in preference of the other creditors of the deceased.

On June 20, 1783, the Court ordered that Trustee Don Santiago Mather be notified of the

(Doc. 830)

(cont'd)

above petition, which was done

This record is incomplete and the outcome of the case is not known.

all in open-  
188.  
Judge  
Joseph Le-  
Sutton.  
Court Clerk  
Sweeney  
Kearney

June 1885.

plaintiff, petitioned for  
for the purpose of compelling  
the defendant to pay a just  
and promissory note for the  
sum of 100 pounds.

plaintiff, petitioned his Lord-  
ship alleging that as it is evi-  
dent by the just and promissory  
note presented, the defendant owes him the sum  
of 100 pounds, which he has refused to pay, there-  
fore he begs His Lordship to order the defendant  
to appear in court to acknowledge under oath his  
signature of the fact of said promissory note,  
and whether he owes said sum.

On June 18th, 1885, Dr. Joseph  
Sutton, Justice of the Peace, granted the  
plaintiff's prayer and ordered the defendant  
to appear in court, as petitioned.

On the same day, the defendant  
appeared before the Court Clerk, in accordance  
with the preceding order, and after having read  
oath according to law, declared that he  
signed at the time and place of the note  
presented by the plaintiff the sum of 100 pounds  
and that he owes the same to the plaintiff.

File #3324 )  
June 25, )  
1783. )  
P. 1 to 5. )  
All in Span- )  
ish. )  
Judge: Dn. )  
Joseph Le- )  
breton. )  
Court Clerk: )  
Fernando )  
Rodriguez. )

Case of

Juan Bissier  
vs  
Juan Caduc.

Plaintiff, instituted action for the purpose of compelling the Defendant to pay a past due promissory note for the sum of 149 pesos.

Plaintiff, petitioned his Lordship alleging that as it is evident by the past due promissory note presented, the Defendant owes him the sum of 149 pesos, which he has refused to pay, wherefore he begs His Lordship to order the Defendant to appear in Court to acknowledge under oath his signature at the foot of said promissory note, and whether he owes said sum.

On June 21st, 1783, Dn. Joseph Lebreton, Justice of the Peace, granted the Plaintiff's prayer and ordered the Defendant to appear in Court, as petitioned.

On the same day, the Defendant appeared before the Court Clerk, in compliance with the preceding decree, and after being duly sworn according to law, declared that the signature at the foot of said promissory note presented by the Plaintiff is his, and he acknowledged that he owes to the Plaintiff said promissory note of 149 pesos.

Then the Plaintiff, petitioned his Lordship, setting forth that as it is evident by the declaration made by the Defendant wherein said Defendant acknowledged owing said past due promissory note of 149 pesos, that said declaration having resulted in his favor,

(cont'd)

wherefore he petitioned His Lordship to issue a writ of execution in order to seize the properties of the Defendant until he has complied with the payment of said sum of 149 pesos, plus interest and cost.

On June the 5th, 1783, Dn. Joseph Lebreton, Justice of the Peace, ordered the Court Clerk to bring the documents to Court, in order to be examined.

On June 26th, 1783, Don Joseph Lebreton the presiding Judge, after having examined the documents, issued a writ of execution in favor of the Plaintiff in order to seize the properties of the Defendant, to satisfy the Plaintiff's claim of 149 pesos. And therefore the Defendant be requested to pay said past due debt, and if he refuses to comply with the payment of said debt, to seize the properties of the Defendant in order to satisfy the Plaintiff's claim of 149 pesos plus interest and cost.

The record shows that on the same day Don Nicolas Tromentin, Constable of this City, appeared before the Court Clerk and stated: That in compliance with the preceding decree, he demanded the Defendant to pay said sum of 149 pesos, and that the Defendant promised to comply with said payment immediately.

The record appears to be incomplete, thus the outcome of the case is not known.

On July 4th, 1783, Governor [unclear], after having examined the document, granted to Juan Pallas, the permit to fly the Spanish flag on said vessel.

Doc. #832  
Box 41

File #65	)	PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED BY
June 30,	)	DON JUAN PALLET, IN ORDER
1783.	)	TO HAVE THE FLAG ON HIS
Pages from	)	PACKET BOAT CHANGED FROM
1 to 7.	)	FRENCH TO SPANISH.
All in Span-	)	
ish.	)	
Judge: Don	)	Juan Pallet, a merchant of
Martin Na-	)	this City petitioned His
varro.	)	Lordship, alleging that he
Notary Clerk:	)	bought a certain Packet boat
Rafael Per-	)	in Martinica Island, and that
domo.	)	at present said boat is an-

chored in this Port, flying the French Flag. Therefore he begs His Lordship to grant him permission to fly the Spanish flag on said vessel of his ownership named "Los Quatro Hermanos."

On July 3rd, 1783, the Intendant General of this Province Don Martin Navarro, ordered the petitioner to bring his document in regard to this matter, in order to be examined.

Don Pallet, in compliance with the preceding decree petitioned His Lordship, alleging that as it is evidenced by the documents presented, he bought the Packet-boat in question in the Martinica Island, from Don Carlos Dubar, and Juan Lami. Wherefore he begs His Lordship to grant him the permit to fly the Spanish flag on said vessel.

On July 4th, 1783, Governor Miro, after having examined the document, granted to Juan Pallet, the permit he petitioned for.

Doc. #833  
Box 41

File #72  
June 30,  
1783.

Judge:

Martin

Navarro.

Court

Clerk:

Rafael

Perdomo.

PP. 1 to

7.

Spanish

and French.

) PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED BY DON  
) CARLOS POREE IN ORDER TO OB-  
) TAIN A PERMIT TO SELL A VESSEL  
) NAMED "MARQUEZ DORVESAN."

) Don Carlos Poree presented a let-  
) ter in which D'Etincourt, the  
) owner of the vessel named "Marquez  
) Dorvesan" authorizes him to execute  
) the sale of said vessel.

) Martin Navarro, Intendant general  
) of this Province decreed: That  
) the authorization letter presented  
) by Don Carlos Poree is not suffi-  
) cient to grant said permit, there-

fore he ordered the Court Clerk to inform said  
Don Carlos Poree that he has to render a secu-  
rity bond covering the value of the sale so that  
he may grant said permit.- The security bond  
was rendered and the permit was granted.