

NOTICE is hereby given, that the Partnership heretofore subsisting between us the undersigned, carrying on business as Pawn-Brokers, at Burnley, in the County of Lancaster, was dissolved the 1st day of November 1827; and the concern will be hereafter carried on by the said Thomas Slater, and debts received or paid by him.—Dated this 29th day of February 1828.

Thomas Slater.
John Röström.

NOTICE is hereby given, that the Partnership some time ago subsisting between William Martin and John Turner, in the business of a Brass-Founder, carried on at Birmingham, in the County of Warwick, under the firm of Martin and Turner, was dissolved on the 1st day of January 1826. Dated this 4th day of March 1828.

William Martin.
John Turner.

NOTICE is hereby given, that the Partnership heretofore carried on by us the undersigned, John Walker, John Salthouse, and Joseph Butler, as Joiners and Builders, at Preston, in the County of Lancaster, was this day dissolved by mutual consent, so far only as relates to the said John Salthouse: As witness our hands this 29th day of February 1828.

John Walker.
John Salthouse.
Joseph Butler.

NOTICE.

WHEREAS the Partnership of Rogers, Cole, and Rogers, formerly Bankers, at Newport, Isle of Wight, was dissolved on the 14th day of September 1813, by the death of Robert Cole, one of the Partners, and the surviving Partners thereupon paid and satisfied all the claims which were made upon them; but in as much as it is possible that there may be outstanding unsatisfied demands on the said firm, the surviving Partners and Executors of the deceased Partner do hereby give notice, that all notes of the said late firm of Rogers, Cole, and Rogers, which shall be presented to Messrs. J. H. and E. H. Rogers, at their residence, in Sea-Street, in Newport aforesaid, on or before the 31st day of March instant, and all claims on the said firm which shall be made and substantiated before that day, will be immediately paid; but as it is absolutely necessary that the concerns of the said Partnership should now be finally closed, all claims not then made, must be disallowed.—Dated this 1st day of March 1828.

J. H. ROGERS.
EDWD. H. ROGERS.
ELIZABETH COLE, ROBT. BLOXAM, Executor
and Executor of the will of the late Robt. Cole.

TO be sold, pursuant to an Order of the High Court of Chancery, made in a cause Saunders v. Norman, with the approbation of John Edmund Dowdeswell, Esq. one of the Masters of the said Court, at the Public Sale-Room of the said Court, situate in Southampton-Buildings, Chancery-Lane, London, on Monday the 14th day of April next, at Two of the Clock in the Afternoon, in several distinct lots;

Certain freehold estates, situate in the Parish of Mitcham, in the County of Surrey, and also an allotment of freehold land, in the Parish of New Windsor, in the County of Berks, consisting of a freehold farm, in the occupation of Messrs. Dalgleish and Taylor, under lease, containing 92A. 0R. 39P.; freehold lands, in hand, containing 48A. 1R. 30P.; and an allotment of freehold land, in the occupation of Mr. William Perryman; tenant at will, containing 1A. 2R. 23P. more or less.

Particulars whereof may be had (gratis) at the said Master's Office; in Southampton-Buildings aforesaid; of Messrs. Heming and Baxter, Solicitors, Gray's-Inn; of Messrs. Tennant, Harrison, and Tennant, Solicitors, Gray's-Inn; of Messrs. Chapman, Son, and Webb, Land-Agents and Surveyors, Middle-Temple-Hall, London; and at the Buck's-Head, Mitehau.

TO be peremptorily resold, pursuant to an Order of the High Court of Chancery, made in a cause of Davies against Orcroft, and three other causes, with the approbation of Sir Giffin Wilson, Knight, one of the Masters of the said Court, by a person to be appointed by him for that purpose, at the Bear Inn, at Crickhowell, in the County of Brecknock, on Saturday the 12th day of April 1828;

Two several freehold estates, situate in the Parish of Aberystwith, in the County of Monmouth, late the property of

Walter Watkins, of Dan-y-Craig, in the County of Brecon, Esq. deceased, and included in Lots No. 1 and No. 2 of the particular of sale.

Particulars may be had (gratis) at the said Master's Chambers, in Southampton-Buildings, London; of Mr. Pugh, Solicitor, No. 11, King's-Road, Bedford-Row; of Messrs. Ward and Aldersey, Solicitors, Bedford-Square; of Mr. Pryer, Solicitor, Gray's-Inn; and of Mr. Charles Gabell, Attorney at Law, at Crickhowell, where a plan of the estates may be seen; at the Bear Inn, in Crickhowell; and the principal Inns, in South Wales.

VICE-CHANCELLOR.—Friday the 22d day of February, in the ninth year of the reign of His Majesty King George the Fourth, 1828, between Richard Strelley, plaintiff, Isaac North and Thomas Thorp, defendants.

FORASMUCH as this Court was this present day informed by Mr. Rogers, of Counsel for the plaintiff, that the plaintiff on the 17th day of December last, exhibited his bill in this Court against the defendants, as by the Six Clerks' certificate appears, and took out process of subpoena requiring them to appear to and answer the same, but that it appears by the affidavit of William Blunt Fensbrooke, the Attorney for the above named plaintiff, now produced and read, that on or about the 15th day of November last, judgment was signed in an action then lately depending in the Court of Common Pleas, for £179 8s. damages and costs between the before named plaintiff Richard Strelley, and the before named defendant Isaac North; and the said deponent has been informed, and believes, that on or about Thursday the 22d day of the same month of November, the said Isaac North caused all his household goods and furniture to be removed by some of his the said defendant's children from his dwelling-house, situate in Loughborough, to the dwelling-houses of his sons James North and Thomas North, to avoid the same being taken in execution at the suit of the aforesaid plaintiff as the said deponent verily believes; and that on the said 22d day of the same month, the said defendant Isaac North, left his aforesaid dwelling-house and has not since returned to the same, and the aforesaid dwelling-house has been since let by the said Isaac North's children, some of one them, to one Thomas Richardson, and that on or about Saturday the 1st day of December last, William North, one of the sons of the said defendant Isaac North, called at the said deponent's office, situate in Loughborough aforesaid, and requested to know the amount of the damages and costs in the aforesaid action, and the said deponent informed the said William North by his the said deponent's clerk, that the amount was £179 8s. and that on Monday the 3d day of the said month, the aforesaid William North and John Pilkington, of Loughborough aforesaid, Auctioneer, a very intimate friend of the said William North's, called at the deponent's office, and the said John Pilkington said that they, meaning the said William North and the said John Pilkington, had called for the purpose of compromising the aforesaid sum of £179 8s. as the said William North and his brother, meaning the said James North, who is the eldest son of the said Isaac North, had been talking over the matter together; and that they, the said William North, thought it a very hard case for the said defendant Isaac North to be kept away for so small a sum; that the said James North constantly managed the affairs of the said Isaac North, and the said defendant Isaac North generally attended to and acted upon the advice of his aforesaid son the said James North; and the said deponent informed the said William North and John Pilkington, that he the said deponent would not take any thing less than the aforesaid amount, and the said deponent hath since enquired of the said John Pilkington to inform him where the said Isaac North was gone to reside, but the said John Pilkington refused to give the said deponent any information whatsoever, to enable him the deponent to serve the defendant, Isaac North, with process of this Court; nevertheless, at the same time alleging that he could give every information necessary; and what was required by the said deponent, but also alleging that the reason he could not do so was, that the said James North and William North, sons of the said Isaac North, would never employ him, the said John Pilkington, any more; and that they were good customers of his; and that the said John Pilkington informed the said deponent that he, the said John Pilkington, knew where the said defendant Isaac North was at this present time then residing; and the said deponent has been informed