John Adams

A

General Abridgment

OF

LAW and EQUITY

Alphabetically digeſted under proper TITLES

WITH

NOTES and REFERENCES

to the WHOLE.

By CHARLES VINER, *Eſq;*

Favente Deo.

ALDERSHOT *in* Hampſhire *near* Farnham *in* Surry.

PRINTED for the Author, by Agreement with the *Law Patentees*, and are to be Sold by *George Strahan* in *Cornhill*, and by *John* and *Paul Knapton* in *Ludgate-ſtreet*; Or may be had of the Author at his Houſe at *Alderſhot* as above, or at his Chambers N°. 3. in the *King's Bench Walks*, *Inner-Temple*; Or, in his Abſence, of *Thomas York* in *Flower-de-Luce-Court* in *Fleet-Street*, *London*. 1742.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

PHILIP Lord HARDWICKE

Baron of HARDWICKE in the County of Glouceſter,
Lord High-Chancellor of Great Britain.

My LORD,

I *Moſt humbly ask Pardon for this Preſumption in dedicating to Your Lordſhip this Book; But as the ſame is Part of a General Abridgment of Law and Equity, it cannot be ſo properly Addreſs'd to any Perſon as to Your Lordſhip, whoſe Knowledge in both muſt be, and is allowed by all to be the moſt Excellent, and has ſo Eminently diſtinguiſhed itſelf in thoſe Reſpective Great Poſts, ſucceſſively filled by Your Lordſhip with ſo much Reputation to Yourſelf, and Advantage to the Publick, of Lord Chief Juſtice of England, and Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain.*

Your Lordſhip has on all Occaſions with the greateſt Judgment, Perſpicuity, and Impartiality qualified and moderated with Equity the Rigour of the Common

Common Law without hazarding the Fundamentals of it; Nor can Your Lordſhip be denied the moſt Valuable Character of an unbyaſſed Diſtributer of Legal and Equitable Juſtice.

I ſhould think myſelf wanting, My Lord, in Duty to my Country, (for which I have as ſtrong Affections as any Man living,) ſhould I not moſt ſincerely wiſh, that Your Lordſhip may long preſide in that High Court of Chancery, of which Your Lordſhip is ſo great an Ornament, and am with the greateſt Veneration and Reſpect

My LORD

Your Lordſhip's

Moſt Obedient and

Humble Servant,

Charles Viner.

THE

PREFACE.

THE *Commencement of this Work* was with the preſent Century, at which Time I was admitted a Member of the Honourable Society of the Middle-Temple, and attended, as a Student, the Courts of Weſtminſter. After the coming out of the firſt Volume of Mr. *Danvers's Abridgment*, (that moſt curious and exact Work) I began to ſlacken in proceeding with my Own, and being under ſome Apprehenſions of having injured my Health by a very cloſe Application, I retired into the Country, and for ſome Years wholly laid aſide proſecuting my Undertaking without intermedling with Buſineſs of Law, unleſs in preventing and compromiſing Differences among Neighbours, and others applying to me, at ſome Expence to my ſelf but none to them. At length I reſolved to reviſe what I had before gone thro' with, and Mr. Danvers's ſecond Volume being then come Abroad, laid it down as a Rule to examine, whatever came in my Way, with Mr. Danvers, ſo far as he had gone, and to enter Nothing in my own which I found in him, intending my own only as a Supplement to his, or his only as a Supplement to my own Collections; and in that View, before I entered upon the having my own Collections tranſcribed, I ſtruck out many I had before made, and for that Reaſon only, that I found the ſame under the like Titles in him. The like Method I took afterwards with Mr. *Nelſon* on the coming out of his Abridgment, thinking it then ſufficient for my private Satisfaction, if I might have a ready reſort to any Place, for what I might deſire to find; having never entertained any Thoughts of making Publick my own Collections, till after the coming out of Mr. Nelſon's and the Title (Error) of Mr. Danvers's. By this Method I obſerved many Caſes in Mr. *Nelſon* not taken out with that Care and Exactneſs which Mr. *Danvers* had done, and therefore either abridged the ſame, or added in the Margin ſome Mark or Memorandum by way of Caution, that it was not to be depended upon, or interlined what I thought was omitted, and made ſome other Marks for what he had added of his own, and which was not to be found in the Original Book cited by him as his Authority. As for Mr. *Shephard's* Abridgment I have ſcarcely ever looked into it, but having occaſionally examined Mr *Hughes's* find him in a Manner wholly tranſcribed by Mr. Nelſon, ſometimes with little or no Variation, and if any it is by way of diſguiſe only, ſometimes exchanging one Error for another, ſupplying very few Imperfections, correcting as few Miſtakes found in his Original, and ſometimes, by miſtaking Mr. Hughes, making ſome Errors where none were before; ſo that a literal Tranſcribing had perhaps been better. Had Mr. Nelſon duly conſidered this before his Publication of his *Lutwich*, he would have been more decent in his Remarks on the Work of that great and *valuable Perſon* ſo much his Superior, *and* who had been dignified with the Honour of being a *Judge*.

My *Lord Roll*, whoſe Abridgment is my Text, has ſupplied the greateſt Part thereof out of the *Year Books*, thoſe *rich Mines of the Law*, and out of which thoſe other Great Men *Lord Fitzherbert* and *Brooke* drew ſo much valuable Ore, which afterwards *Lord Coke*, in his *Inſtitutes*, melted into Ingots, and which, with ſome little refining and purifying, have ſince become the current and precious Coin

of

of the Common Law. While thoſe Books were the only Magazines, or Repoſitories of the Law, the Profeſſion was in great Eſteem; There was then no Ebb or Poverty of legal Knowledge, but the Tides of Law rolled High. The induſtrious Students reſorted thither for their Burthen, which both inriched themſelves, and would, no doubt, have done the like by their Poſterity, had not they, like prodigal and thoughtleſs Heirs, neglected or ſquandered away, what their Predeceſſors or Anceſtors had amaſſed for them. The Name of *Plowden* ought to be reverenced by every Profeſſor of the Law, and after him Lord Coke merits their great Thanks. But ſo unfortunate were *theſe Great Men* in the extraordinary Pains they took to ſerve the Profeſſion, that their Labours may perhaps, by an unnatural Conſequence and Accident, have, in too many Inſtances, occaſioned Ignorance inſtead of Improvement. In this Reſpect *Sciences* may be *compared to Bodies natural*, as that, which by a right Uſe and Application would not nouriſh only, but ſtrengthen, may, by an Abuſe, be converted into Poiſon, and deſtroy that which it was intended to preſerve. And thus *Abridgments*, according to their different Uſe, *will neceſſarily have very different* and contrary *Effects* and Operations, either *of doing much Good or* much *Harm*. The Study of the Law is a very long Journey, and the Roads not the plaineſt, in which they *may ſerve as* Poſts and *Mercuries to direct the Students in their Way*, but ought not by any Means to be conſidered as their Journey's End, or Place of their laſt Reſort and Reſidence.

In a Work of ſo great Extent as that, of which this is a Part, it cannot be expected, but that many *Miſtakes* may be found, notwithſtanding the utmoſt Care; and a great Part thereof having been ſeveral times *tranſcribed by other Hands*, the Tranſcribers may well be ſuppoſed to have varied ſometimes from the Original, and ſo to have made Errors where they found none; whereas, on the other Hand, it is not to be imagined, that any Original Errors, eſpecially in the References to Books, out of which any Caſe or Point is cited to be taken, ſhould be thereby corrected.

The Reader is deſired to take Notice, that the *Placita*, cited out *of Lord Brooke's Abridgment*, are Number'd as found *in the largeſt Edition in Folio*, there being ſometimes Variances between the Numbring or Figuring the Pleas in that and the other Editions, whereas thoſe other Editions vary but in few Inſtances from each other.

The Reader is alſo deſired to take Notice, that *where any Book is cited containing* ſuch and ſuch *References*, *or* where it it ſaid, *that the Book cites ſo and ſo*, this Author is not anſwerable for the Truth of ſuch Citations or References, he not being in ſuch Caſes any otherwiſe concerned than to mention them, as the Book does.

The remaining Part of the Work will be printed off by three Volumes in a Year till the whole be publiſh'd.

The Reader is deſired to correct the following ERRATA.

FOLIO 2. Pl. 4. line 5. *dele* the Comma after Smith, and put it in before Smith.—Faits (C) pl. 2. in the Note, r. received.——f. 18. in the Title, r. Faits.—Ditto pl. 2. in the Note, l. 5 r. Time.—— Faits (H) pl. 1. r. cannot —— f. 30. laſt l. *dele* Grant (R. 7) —— f. 54. laſt l. *dele* Habendum, *dele* (X) ——f. 56. laſt l. *dele* (X)—f. 103. pl. 1. l. 1. r. Leaſe. —f. 106. l. 2. *dele* full point, and make it a Comma ——f. 122. pl. 11. l. 1. r Tail.——f. 147. pl. 8. l. 5. r. executes.——f. 154 (G) pl. 3. r. and Plaintiff had Judgment.——Fences (B) at the End *dele* Improvement (E. 2)——f. 237. (M) pl. 2. Marg. * ſhould be ‡, and the ſecond * following ſhould be ‡.——f. 292. pl. 23. l. 9. r. fictitious.——f. 340. (l. b) Marg. l. 1. r. D. 254.——f. 356. (N. b) laſt l. but 2. after is *dele* not.—f. 375, 376. in the Title, r. Firſt Fruits and Tenths—f. 383. (F) pl. 1. l. 1. r. Entry. — f. 396. (U) pl. 3. l. 2. r. was not ſaid. — f. 404. pl. 6. Marg. r. Word.——f. 411. (D) Marg. laſt l. but 1. *dele* for.—f. 423. pl. 6. l. 1. r. Foreſt.—— f. 450. pl. 4. laſt l. of the Note, r Order ought to be of every one.——f. 456. (W) in the Diviſion, *pro* or r. but.—f. 458. pl. 4 l. 2. r. Chancery.——f. 486. at the end of the firſt Note, for 276. r. 976.——Fractions (A) pl. 2. laſt l. r. Yarworth.—f. 500. in the firſt long l. of the Note, at Years *dele* the s. and in the 2d. l. *pro* at r. as.—f. 510. (C) pl. 3. l. 1. r. three. —f. 543. pl. 9. l. 8. in the Note, r. Agreement.—f. 544. pl. 3. laſt l. but 2. r. of.——f. 557 in the Diviſion, *dele* the Apoſtrophe at Creditor's.——f. 563. laſt l. but 1. r. 342.

A

TABLE

OF THE

Several TITLES, with their Diviſions and Subdiviſions.

Neceſſary

A TABLE of the ſeveral TITLES,

Paſſes.

With their Diviſions and Subdiviſions.

Entry

First Fruits and Tenths.

Forcible Entry and Detainer.

Juſtifiable

A TABLE of the ſeveral TITLES,

A CATALOGUE OF AUTHORS made Uſe of, WITH Their Several CONTRACTIONS and EDITIONS.

A

AND. 2 And.	ANderſon's Reports 1ſt. and 2d. Parts 1664
All.	Allen's Reports 1681
B	
Bendl.	Bendloe's Reports 1689
Brownl. 2 Brownl.	Brownlow's Reports 1ſt. and 2d. Part 1675
Bridgm.	Bridgman's Reports 1659
Br.	Brooke's Abridgments 1573
Buls. 2, 3 Buls.	Bulſtrode's Reports 1ſt. 2d. and 3d. Parts 1657
C	
Cart.	Carter's Reports 1688
Carth.	Carthew's Reports 1728
Ch. or Chan. Caſes	Caſes in Chancery 1ſt. Part 1701
2 Ch. or Chan Caſes	Caſes in Chancery 2d. Part 1707
3 Ch. or Chan. Caſes	Select Caſes in Chancery 1715
Ch. or Chan. Prec.	Precedents in Chancery 1733
Ch. Rep. or Chan. R.	Reports in Chancery 1ſt. Part 1615
2 Ch. Rep. or Chan. R.	Reports in Chancery 2d. Part 1615
3 Ch. Rep. or Chan. R	Reports in Chancery 1716
1 Rep. or 2 Rep. &c.	Ld. Coke's Reports in 11 Parts 1697
12 Rep. 13 Rep.	Lord Coke's 12th. and 13th. Reports 1677
Comb. or Cumb.	Comberbach's Reports 1724
Cro. E.	Croke's Reports in Q. Elizabeth's Time 1683
Cro. J.	Croke's Reports in King James's Time 1683
Cro. C.	Croke's Reports in King Charles the 1ſt Time 1683
D	
Dal.	Daliſon's Reports 1689
Dav.	Davis's Reports 1674
D.	Dyer's Reports 1688
F	
Farr.	Farreſley's Reports 1716
Fin.	Finch's Law
Fin. R.	Reports of Caſes in Chancery, in Ld. Nottingham's Time 1725
Fitzh.	Fitzherbert's Abridgment 1565
F. N. B.	Fitzherbert's Natura Brevium 1687—1730
G	
Gibb.	Fitz-Gibbons's Reports 1732
G. Equ. R.	Gilbert's Reports of Caſes in Equity 1734
Godb.	Godbolt's Reports 1652
Godolp. Rep.	Godolphin's Repertory 1680
God. Orph.	Godolphin's Orphans Legacy 1685
Gold.	Goldsborough's Reports 1653

H

Hard.	Hardreſs's Reports 1693
Hawk. Pl. C.	Hawkins's Pleas of the Crown 1724
Hawk. Pl. C. Abr.	Hawkins's Pleas of the Crown Abridg'd 1728
Het.	Hetly's Reports 1657
Hob.	Hobart's Reports 1724
Holt's Rep.	Holt's Reports 1738
Hutt.	Hutton's Reports 1656

I

Jenk.	Jenkins's Centuries 1661, 1734
Co. Litt.	Coke on Littleton 1703
2 Inſt	2d. Part of Lord Coke's Inſtitutes 1671
3 Inſt.	3d. Part of Lord Coke's Inſtitutes 1648
4 Inſt.	4th. Part of Lord Coke's Inſtitutes 1648
Jo.	Sir William Jones's Reports 1675
2 Jo.	Sir Thomas Jones's Reports 1695

K

Keb. 2, 3 Keb.	Keble's Reports 1ſt. 2d. and 3d. 1685
Kelw. or Keilw	Keilway's Reports 1688
Kel.	Kelyng's Reports 1708

L

Lane	Lane's Reports 1657
Lat.	Latch's Reports 1661
Le. 2, 3, 4 Le.	Leonard's Reports in 4 Parts 1687
Lev. 2, 3 Lev.	Levinz's Reports 1702
Ley	Ley's Reports 1659
L. P. R.	Lilly's Practical Regiſter 1719
Lit. R. or Rep.	Littleton's Reports 1683
Lutw. 2 Lutw.	Lutwich's Reports 1ſt. and 2d. Part

M

Mar.	Marſh's Reports 1675
Mod.	1ſt. Part of Modern Reports 1700
2 Mod.	2d. Part of Modern Reports 1698
3 Mod.	3d. Part of Modern Reports 1700
4 Mod.	4th. Part of Modern Reports 1722
5 Mod.	5th. Part of Modern Reports 1720
6 Mod.	Modern Caſes argued &c. in B. R. 1713
7 Mod.	Farreſley's Reports 1716
8 and 9 Mod.	Modern Caſes in Law and Equity 1730
10 Mod.	Caſes in Law and Equity chiefly in Lord Macclesfield's Time 1736
11 Mod.	Reports of Caſes in B. R. in Q. Ann's Time 1737
12 Mod.	Caſes in B. R from the 2d. Year of W. 3. to the end of his Reign 1738
Mo.	Moor's Reports 1663

N

Noy	Noy's Reports 1656

O

Ow. or Owen	Owen's Reports 1656

P

Palm.	Palmer's Reports 1688
Parl. Caſes	Shower's Parliament Caſes 1698
Perk.	Perkins 1642
Pig. of Recov.	Pigot of Recoveries 1739
Pl. C.	Plowden's Commentaries 1588
Poll. or Pollexf.	Pollexfen's Reports 1702
Poph.	Popham's Reports 1656

R

Raym.	Raymond's Reports 1696
Roll. R. 2 Roll. R.	Roll's Reports 1ſt. and 2d. Parts 1675, 1676
Roll. Abr. 2 Roll. Abr.	Roll's Abridgments in 2 Parts 1668
R. S. L.	Readings upon the Statute Law 1723

S

1, 2 Salk.	Salkeld's Reports 1ſt. and 2d. Part 1721
Sav.	Savill's Reports 1688
Saund. 2 Saund.	Saunders's Reports 1ſt. & 2d. Part 1722
Sel. Ch. Ca. in Ld. King's Time	Select Caſes in Chancery in Lord King's Time 1740
Show.	Shower's Reports 1ſt. Part 1708
2 Show.	Shower's Reports 2d. Part 1720
Sid.	1ſt. Part of Siderfin's Reports 1783
2 Sid.	2d. Part of Siderfin's Reports 1714
Skin.	Skinner's Reports 1728
Sti. or Sty.	Stile's Reports 1658
Swinb.	Swinburne of Teſtaments 1728

T

Treat. of Ten.	Treatiſe of Tenures 1728

V

Vaugh.	Vaughan's Reports 1677
Vent. 2 Vent.	Ventris's Reports 1ſt. and 2d. Part 1726
Vern.	Vernon's Reports firſt Part 1726
2 Vern.	Vernon's Reports ſecond Part 1728

W

Went. Off. Ex.	Wentworth's Office of Executors 1728
Weſt's Symb.	Weſt's Symboleographia 1641
Wms's Rep. 2 Wms's Rep.	William's Reports 1ſt. and 2d. Part 1740
Winch. or Win.	Winch's Reports 1657

Y

Yelv.	Yelverton's Reports 1674

YEAR BOOKS.

MAynard's Edward 2d.	1679
Firſt Part of Edward 3d.	1679
Second Part of Edward 3d.	1679
Third Part of Edward 3d.	1600, 1679
Book of Aſſiſes	1580, 1606, 1679
Henry 4th. and 5th.	1575, 1601, 1679
Firſt Part of Henry 6th.	1609, 1679
Second Part of Henry 6th.	1567, 1679
Edward 4th.	1556, 1578, 1680
Long Quinto	1638, 1680
Edward 5th, Richard 3d, Henry 7th, and Henry 8th.	1555, 1679

FACTOR.

(A) Who may be a Factor, and how conſidered.

* See Bankrupt.

1. A Factor *is* a Servant created by a Merchant's Letters, and taketh a Kind of Proviſion called Factorage; ſuch Perſons are bound to anſwer the Loſs which happens by over-paſſing or exceeding their Commiſſion; but a ſimple Servant or an Apprentice can only incur his Maſter's Diſpleaſure. The Gain of the Factorage is certain, however the Succeſs of the Voyage proves. Molloy 462. Sect. 1. Mal. Lex Merc. 81. And his Duty is as a Servant to merchandize the beſt he can, and differs from a Ferryman, Inn-keeper or Carrier, who take Hire, and muſt anſwer for Things ſtole. 4 Rep. 84. in Southcote's Caſe.

2. 9 & 10 *W.* 3. 26. *No Governor, or Deputy* Governor of any of the Plantations in America, *or the Judges there, or any other for their Uſe, ſhall be a Factor or Agent for the* African *Company or others, for the Sale or Diſpoſal of Negroes; and any Perſon offending therein ſhall* forfeit 500 l. *to be recovered in any of the Courts of Record at* Weſtminſter. Expired.

3. By 20 H. 6. 5. *No Cuſtomer, &c. their Servants, &c. ſhall be Factor to any Merchant.*

(A 2.) What is his Power.

1. A Factor that *has only a bare Authority to ſell* cannot *Truſt*, but ought to take and receive the Money preſently on the Sale. 1 Bulſt. 104. Barton v. Sadock. —— Molloy 463. Sect. 3.

2. When the Merchant *delivers Goods to the Factor to ſell*, he has made the Factor *Negotiator Geſtorum*, and therefore he may ſell without ready Money, and 'tis good Reaſon, for by Chance they are *Bona peritura*; but if he ſells them *to one whom he knows will prove Bankrupt*, 'tis not good. Per Hobart Ch. Juſt. Winch 53. —— Factor that has a general Commiſſion may *ſell on Truſt*, but not take *Bond in his own Name.* 2 Chan. Caſ. 57. Daſhwood v. Elwell. —— Pleading ſuch Bond is not good by Way of Account, but 'tis a good Plea before the *Auditors* by Way of Diſcharge. Bulſt. 103. per Williams Juſt. cites D. 29. pl. 193. 1 Roll. Abr. 124. pl. 12. cites D. 29. pl. 193. But ſuch Truſt muſt be *for a reaſonable Time only*, according to the uſual Time allow'd for ſuch Goods ſo diſpoſed of, tho' his Power was general, of doing with them as if they were his own; but he cannot truſt for an unreaſonable Time, as for ten Years. Bulſt. 103. Burton v. Sadock. —— Molloy 463. Sect. 3.

3. A Merchant delivers Goods to his Factor *ad Merchandizandum*; he cannot *ſell them upon Credit*, but for ready Money, unleſs he has a If Factor ſells Goods to one that is worth nothing, or that cannot give Security for them, it ſhall be to *his own Loſs*, and not his Maſter's. Yelv. 202. Sadock v. Burton.

particular Commiſſion from the Maſter ſo to do; for if he can *find no Buyers* he is not anſwerable, and if they are *Bona peritura*, and cannot be ſold for Money on the Delivery, the Merchant muſt give him Authority to ſell upon Truſt. 2 Mod. 100. Anonymus.

4. In Trover and Converſion of divers Quarters of Malt; the Caſe upon the Evidence was, That the Defendant having a great Quantity in a Veſſel impowered one *Smith*, a Broker, to ſell it, and afterwards the *Defendant himſelf ſold it* to a Stranger, and the *ſame Day, and before Notice of the Sale by the Defendant* Smith, *ſold it to the Plaintiff*, who demanded it of the Defendant, who denied to deliver it; and the Caſe was doubtful to Rolle Ch. Juſt. For *if the Defendant's Sale ſhould ſtand againſt the Sale of* Smith, before Notice of the firſt Sale, then ſhould he be chargeable for his Bargain which he could not perform without any Default in him; and on the other Side it were hard that the Sale of the Owner, who hath the abſolute Property in the Goods, ſhould be defeated by a ſubſequent Sale of him that had but a bare Authority. But in Concluſion he declared his Opinion, that the Sale of the Defendant ſhould ſtand good, and the *Broker ought in ſuch Caſe to make his Sale conditionally*, if the Maſter hath not ſold it before; but he ſaid that neither the Broker nor his Vendor ſhould be liable to any Action for detaining the Goods tho' demanded, without Notice given of the Sale by the Maſter. Et partes concordaverunt. Aleyn 93. Alwin v. Taylor.

5. He cannot *barter* any Commodities for other Commodities, but he muſt have expreſs Commiſſion and Order for it from the Merchant; neither can he *transfer or ſet over any Bills obligatory*. For albeit this Manner of Commiſſion given to Factors is very large, yet it containeth certain Reſtrictions and Limitations in every Merchant's Underſtanding. Mal. Lex Merc. 83.

6. A Factor is not barely intruſted with the Cuſtody of the Company's Goods, and as ſuch has a Power *to inveſt* their *Money and Goods in whatever he thinks moſt for the Advantage of* the Company, and is not to account for the Goods themſelves but the neat Produce of them, ſo that he *may convert* the Company's *Stock to his own Uſe*, provided he anſwers it to them out of his own Eſtate. 10 Mod. 144. Shepherd and Maidſtone, *B. R.* (Alias The Eaſt-India Company's Caſe.)

Unleſs he can *prove* that he was *ignorant* of the Party's weak Eſtate and Credit, *or that he ſold the Goods on his own Account alſo*; which argueth plain Dealing, or that he *had Commiſſion* of the other Man to deal for him as if it were for his own proper Goods. Mal. Lex Merc. 83.

7. Every Factor of common Right is to *ſell for ready Money*; *but if* he be a Factor in a Sort of Dealing or Trade, where the *Uſage is* for Factors *to ſell on Truſt*, there, if he ſells to a Perſon of *good Credit at that Time*, and he after becomes inſolvent, the Factor is diſcharged; but otherwiſe if it be to a *Man notoriouſly diſcredited at the Time of the Sale*. But if there be no ſuch Uſage, and he, upon the general Authority to ſell, ſells upon Truſt, let the Vendee be ever ſo able, the Factor is only chargeable; for in that Caſe, the Factor having gone *beyond his Authority*, there is no Contract created between the Vendee and the Factor's Principal; and ſuch Sale is a Converſion in the Factor; and if it be not in Market overt, no Property is thereby alter'd, but Trover will alſo lie againſt Vendee. So likewiſe if it be in a Market overt, and Vendee *knows the Factor to ſell as Factor*. Per Holt Ch. Juſt. at Guild-hall. 12 Mod. 514, 515. Anonymus.

Mal. Lex Merc. 81.

8. In Commiſſions they now generally inſert theſe words: *Diſpoſe, do, and deal therein, as if it were your own*, by which the Actions of the Factor are to be excuſed, tho' it turns to his *Principal's Loſs*, becauſe it ſhall be preſumed he did it for the beſt, and according to his Diſcretion. Molloy 463. Sect. 2.

(B) Tranſactions and Accounts between him and his Employer.

1. IF a *Conſul* beyond Sea hath Power, and doth *levy Goods upon a private Merchant*, the Company muſt bear it, if the Factor could not prevent the Act of the Conſul. Hill. 1630. Toth. 169. Leate v. Turkey Company of Merchants.

2. An *Eaſt-India* Factor was not allowed to place any Thing to *Account* under the Head of *General Expences*, &c. Fin. *R.* 117. Eaſt-India Company v. Blake.

3. If a Factor by *Error of Account* do wrong to a Merchant, he is to amend and make good the ſame, not only for the Principal Money, but alſo with the Intereſt thereof for the Time; and on the contrary, if a Factor in his own Wrong hath forgot to charge the Merchant's Account with ſome Payment made by him, or Money made over by Exchange; the Merchant is to anſwer it, with Intereſt for the Time. Mal. Lex Merc. 83.

4. Between Merchant and Factor, if the *Factor has paid more than the Merchant could have demanded* of him, the Merchant ſhall have no Account from the Factor till he has made even. Sic dicitur. 2 Chan. Caſes 38. as a Note on the Caſe of * Faſhion v. Atwood.

* Vide (C) pl. 2.

5. Factor's *Account reſted upon fourteen Years*, and his Books and *Papers loſt by no Fault of his*, but by a Seiſure in Spain where he factored, he ſhall not be charged beyond his own Oath. Chan. Caſes 30. Borr v. Vandall. —— N. Chan. R. 140. S. C.

6. Factor ſhall have the Benefit of *Cuſtoms ſaved* and not the Merchant that imployed him. Chan. Caſes 25. Smith v. Oxenden. —— This was where the Cuſtoms were ſtolen from *a foreign King*; but of Cuſtoms ſtolen from our own King, Factor ſhall not have the Benefit. Chan. Caſes 30. Borr v. Vandall —— N. Ch. R. 87. S. C. but reports it decreed againſt the Factor on the general Foot of Fraud.

Chan. Caſes 76. Knipe v. Jeffon, S. P.

Action on the Caſe lies for the Owner againſt the Factor for running Goods, by which Means they are *forfeited* and ſeized. Cro. J. 265. Lewion v. Kirk.

Where a Factor ſmuggles *Foreign Cuſtoms*, and yet ſets them down to his Maſter as paid upon Account; the Chancery would not relieve, for that the Factor ventured his Life; and ſo it was ruled by Hide, Lord Chancellor, in the Caſe of Vanderbaldy and Barry; but North (Lord Keeper) ſaid he was not ſatisfied of it, for that he ventured his Maſter's Goods as well as his own Life. Skin. 149. Anonymus in Canc.

7. Factor *deceives the Merchant* in ſending him from beyond Sea one Sort of Silk for another; Merchant ſells them again to *J. S.* for the ſame Sort of Silk for which the Factor ſent it, and was ignorant of the Deceit. Per Holt, The Merchant is anſwerable for the Deceit of the Factor *civiliter*, tho' not *criminaliter*, and Judgment for *J. S.* 1 Salk. 289. Hern v. Nichols.

8. As to Accounts between the Agents and Factors of the *African Company* and the Company, vide 2 Chan. Caſ. 11 to 14. Melliſh v. African Company and Edlin.

[See Account ( ) pl. 8.]

(B 2.) Tranſactions between Factor and Employer. *Frauds by Factor.*

Mal. Lex Merc. 82.

1. IF Factors ſhall give Time to a Man for Payment of Monies contracted on Sale of their Principal's Goods, and after the Time is elapſed, they ſhall *ſell Goods of their own* to ſuch Perſons *for ready Caſh* (*leaving their Principal's unreceived*) and then ſuch Man break and become *inſolvent*, the Factor in Equity and Honeſty ought to make good the Loſſes, for they ought not to diſpenſe with the Non-payment of their Principals Monies after they become due, and procure Payment of their own to another Man's Loſs; but by the Laws of *England* they cannot be compelled. Molloy 463. Sect. 5.

2. If any Factor ſell unto a Man certain Goods of another Perſon's Account, either by themſelves or among other Things, and *gives not Advice to his Principal of the Sale* of the ſaid Goods, but afterwards having more Dealings with the ſame Man he becomes *inſolvent*; the Debt for the Goods ſo ſold the Factor ſhall be anſwerable for, becauſe he gave no Advice to the Owner of the Sale of the ſaid Goods in convenient Time; and it is as if he had diſpoſed of thoſe Goods to a Man contrary to the Commiſſion given unto him; for the Salary of Factorage bindeth him thereto. Law of Trade, *&c.* 2d Part 403.

3. *Alſo* if a Factor *by Commiſſion* of a Merchant *buy a Commodity* for his Account, with the ſaid Merchant's Money, or by his Credit, and the Factor *giveth no Advice* of it to his Principal, *but ſells the ſame* Goods *again for his own Benefit*; the Merchant ſhall recover this Benefit of the Factor, according to the Cuſtom of Merchants, and his Factor ſhall likewiſe be amerced for the Fraud. Law of Trade, *&c.* 2d Part 403.

4. If a Factor ſhall *by falſe Entry* in the Cuſtom-houſe, either *unawares or of Purpoſe* conceal Part of the Cuſtom *without Conſent* or Privity of the Merchant, whereby the *Goods become forfeit* to the Prince, the ſaid Factor ſhall bear the Loſs of them and anſwer the Value thereof unto the Merchant as they did coſt, if it be for Goods to be tranſported, or as they might have been ſold, if it be for Goods to be imported. Mal. Lex Merc. 83.

5. If a Factor, by a Letter of Advice or *by an Invoice* of Commodities which the Merchant ſendeth, *doth make a ſhort Entry* in the Cuſtom-houſe, the Goods not entred ſhall be loſt, but the Factor cannot be charged with the ſame. Mal. Lex Merc. 83.

[See (B) pl. 6. —— (F 2.) pl. 2.]

(C) Diſputes between Factor or Employer, and *Creditors* of the other; and where the Factor or Employer dies or fails.

1. A Merchant *remits Goods* to his Factor, and about a Month after *draws a Bill* on him, the Factor *having Effects* in his Hands *accepts the Bill*, then the *Principal breaks*, againſt whom a Commiſſion of Bankrupt is awarded, and the Goods in the Factor's Hands are ſeized; it has been conceived the Factor muſt anſwer the Bill notwithſtanding.

withſtanding, and come in as a Creditor for ſo much as he was enforced by reaſon of his Acceptance to pay. Molloy 465. Sect. 8.

2. Factor having over-paid his Merchant, but having Goods unſold of the Merchant's in his Hands, the Merchant by *Parol agrees that Factor ſhall pay himſelf out of the Monies ariſing from the Sale of the Goods remaining* in his Hands; Factor being indebted to others by Parol likewiſe aſſigns to his Creditors the Debts which were due for Sale of the Goods of the Merchant. The Merchant dies, and owes Debts by Bond.—The Factor dies indebted by Bond likewiſe. Per Lord Chancellor, the Factor had a good Title in Equity to the Debts which in Equity are become his, and are no longer the Merchant's, and decreed for the Creditors of the Factor. 2 Chan. Caſ. 36. Faſhion v. Atwood.

3. *A.* as Factor to *B.* ſells Goods *on Credit, and dies indebted* by Specialty more than his Aſſets would pay. The Money ſhall be paid to *B.* and not to *A.*'s Adminiſtrator, as Part of *A.*'s Aſſets, but the *Commiſſion Money* muſt be deducted for the Adminiſtrator of *A.* And per Cowper C. Tho' the Factor has a Right at Law, yet he *is only a Truſtee in Equity.* 2 Vern. R. 638. Burdet v. Willet & al.

4. A *Blackwell-Hall* Factor having Cloth in his Hands *advanced Monies to the Clothier*; the Clothier dies, Adminiſtrator ſues the Factor at Law for the Cloth, the Factor ſues in Equity to be allowed what he advanced, but denied *per* Lords Commiſſioners; for if there are Debts of a higher Nature, 'twill be a *Devaſtavit* in the Adminiſtrator to pay or diſcount the Plaintiff's Debt. 2 Vern. 117. Chapman v. Derby.

Whether he may retain in Caſe the Clothier becomes *Bankrupt.* 2 Vern. 254. Woodford v. Swaine.

5. If one employs a Factor, and intruſts him with the Diſpoſal of Merchandize, and the Factor *receives the Money*, and *dies indebted to Debts of an higher Nature*, and it appears by Evidence that *this Money was inveſted in other Goods*, and remains unpaid: Thoſe Goods ſhall be taken as Part of the Merchant's Eſtate, and not the Factor's.—But if he *have the Money*, it ſhall be looked upon as the *Factor's Eſtate*, and muſt firſt anſwer the Debts of a ſuperior Nature. 1 Salk. 160. In Canc. Whitcomb v. Jacob.

(D) Of *Joint* Factors; or where one Factor is imploy'd by ſeveral Principals.

1. ONE and the ſame Factor may act for ſeveral Merchants, who muſt *run* the *joint Riſque of his Actions*, tho' they are *meer Strangers to one another*; as if five Merchants remit to one Factor five diſtinct Bales of Goods, and the Factor makes one joint Sale of them to one Man, who is to pay one Moiety down, and the other at ſix Months End; if the Vendee breaks before the ſecond Payment, each Man muſt bear an equal Share of the Loſs, and be contented to accept of their Dividend of the Money advanced. Molloy 463. Sect. 4. Mal. Lex Merc. 82.

2. *But* if ſuch a *Factor draws a Bill* of Exchange *upon all thoſe five Merchants*, and *one* of them *accepts* the ſame, the others ſhall not be obliged to make good the Payment. Tamen quære de hoc. Molloy 463. Sect. 4.

3. If two Men are *Partners of Merchandizes* in one Ship, and one of them appoints and makes a Factor of all the Merchandizes, it was ſaid, and not denied, that both of them may have *ſeveral Writs* of

Account againſt him, or may join in one Writ of Account if they pleaſe. Quære of that. Godb. 90. M. 28, 29 Eliz. B. R.

4. *Surviving* Factor ſhall *account* for what was made by himſelf or Co-Factor, and yet Account lies againſt the *Executrix* of the dead Factor. Chan. Caſ. 127. Holtſcomb. v. Rivers.—N. Ch. R. 139. S. C.

(E) In what Caſes his *Contracts* bind the Principal.

Mal. Lex Merc. 85.

1. IF a Factor *enters into a Charter-party* with a Maſter *for Freightment*, the Contract obliges him; *but* if he *lades aboard generally* the Goods, the Principals and the Lading are made liable, and not the Factor, for the Freightment. Molloy 466. Sect. 9.

Mal. Lex Merc. 86.

2. The *Principal orders* his Factor that as ſoon as he hath loaded (he having Monies in his Hand) *to make an Aſſurance on the Ship and Goods*; if the Ship happens to miſcarry, by the Cuſtom of Merchants he ſhall anſwer the ſame, if he hath neglected his Commiſſion; ſo it is if he having made an Aſſurance, and Loſs hath occurred, he ought not to make a Compoſition without Orders from his Principal. Molloy 466. Sect. 9.

2 Law of Trade 403, 404.

3. If a Factor by Order or Commiſſion of his Principal *buys* any Goods *above the Price limited* to him, *or* they be *not of that Sort, Goodneſs or Kind*, as by the Authority they ought to be; this Factor is to keep the ſame for his Account proper, and the Merchant may diſclaim the buying of them. Mal. Lex. Merc. 82.

2 Law of Trade, &c. 404.

4. *The like* he may do, if the Factor having *bought* a Commodity *according to his Commiſſion* ſhall *ſhip the ſame for any other Place* than he hath Commiſſion to do. Mal. Lex Merc. 82.

2 Law of Trade 404.

5. *But* in ſuch Caſe if the *Price* of the Goods *riſeth*, and the Factor thereupon fraudulently ladeth them for ſome other Port, to take the Advantage thereof, the principal Merchant may recover Damages of the ſaid Factor upon Proof made of it. Mal. Lex Merc. 82.

6. If one be a Factor for a Merchant *to buy one Kind of Stuff, as Tin*, or other ſuch like, and the ſaid Factor hath not uſed to buy any other Kind of Wares, but this Kind only for his Maſter; if now the ſaid Factor *buys Saies, or other Commodities* for his Maſter, and aſſumes to pay Money for that, now the Maſter ſhall be charged in an *Aſſumpſit* for the Money, and for that let the Maſter take heed what Factor he makes. Per Cur. Goldsb. * 138. pl. 46. Petties v. Soame.

* The Book is miſpaged (139).

7. A Motion for a new Trial in *Indebitatus* againſt a Factor on Sale of Rape-Seed, becauſe tho' the Goods were *ſold to* S. yet it was *for the Uſe of* D. and ſo were the Receipts; ſed non Allocatur. For per Cur. if a Factor or Servant *buy Goods generally*, and do not upon the Contract declare that he buyeth only as Factor or Servant, he is chargeable in his own Right, and Judgment for Plaintiff; but if he would have ſtood only on Payment, new Trial might be. 2 Keb. 812. Degelder v. Savory.

(E 2.) Liable to *anſwer Damages* in what Caſes in general.

1. IF a Factor, having received other Mens Goods or Monies into his Cuſtody, *be* * *robbed* of the ſaid Goods and Monies, he is to bear the Loſs, and to make good the ſame unto the Merchant; but *not* in Caſe where the unmerciful Elements of *Fire and Water* ſhall deſtroy the ſaid Goods or Monies, or where a *Town is ſacked* or *pilled*, which is always to be born by the Owner or Proprietary of the ſame. Mal. Lex Merc. 83.

* In Account it is a good *Plea before Auditors*, that he was robbed. For tho' he has Wages, yet if he uſes all his Induſtry, he ſhall be diſcharged. 4 Rep. 64. in Southcote's Caſe. — S. P. and ſo if they are burned without his own Default. 2 Mod. 100. Anonymus.

2. If a Factor buy a Commodity which *afterwards becomes damnified by ſome Accident* or Caſualty, whereby the Merchant (for whoſe Account he bought the ſame) becomes a Loſer, the Factor is not to be charged with any Part of the Loſs. *But* if the Commodities were *damnified before*, then he is to bear ſome Part of the Loſs, altho' it happened to be known afterwards. Mal. Lex Merc. 84.

3. If a Factor receives *Money* for other Mens Accounts, which are *afterwards decried*, or ſome Loſs doth happen by exchanging the ſame, be it upon Copper Monies, or light Gold taken for Merchandizes ſold, every Man is to bear that Loſs proportionably according to his Sum, and the Factor is to ſuſtain no Damage thereby, unleſs it were for *falſe Coin* by him received, which he is bound to know. Mal. Lex Merc. 84.

(F) Factor liable to anſwer Damages, in what Caſes. *Not obſerving Orders*, or *acting without Orders.*

1. A Factor *ſelling* Merchandize *under the Price limited* unto him by his Principal, he is to make good the Loſs or Difference of the Price, unleſs he can give a ſufficient Reaſon for his ſo doing. Mal. Lex Merc. 82. 2 Law of Trade, &c. 404.

2. A Factor is accountable for all lawful Goods which come ſafe to his Hands, and ſhall ſuffer for not obſerving of Orders. If he has *Orders not to ſell any Commodities particularly ſpecified*, and yet ſells them, he is anſwerable for any Damage that ſhall be received; in Caſe Goods are bought or exchanged without Orders, it is at the Merchant's Curteſy whether he will receive them, or turn them on his Factor's Hands. Law of Trade, &c. 2d Part 409.

3. If a Factor do *pay Money* for a Merchant (*without Commiſſion*) to another Man, it is at his Peril to anſwer for it: And if he *deliver* another Man's *Money at Intereſt, and take more than the Toleration of the Statute*, whereby the Statute againſt *Uſury* taketh hold of him, and the Money is loſt, the ſaid Factor is to be charged therewith, and to make good the Money unto the Merchant. Mal. Lex Merc. 83.

4. If a Factor be required *to make Aſſurance* for a Merchant *upon a Ship or Goods laden* for a certain Voyage, *and have Monies in his Hands* to pay for the Premium or the Price of Aſſurance; and this Factor doth neglect the ſame, and giveth *no Notice* of it to the Merchant, who might have made Aſſurance in another Place, and the

ſaid

ſaid Ship or Goods do periſh at the Seas; this Factor is to anſwer the Damage, unleſs he can give ſome ſufficient Reaſon for the Non-Performance of the ſaid Order or Commiſſion. Mal. Lex Merc. 86.

5. If a Factor having made Aſſurance upon Goods laden, which afterwards are taken by the Enemy, makes any *Compoſition with the Aſſurers* for the ſame, *without Order* or Commiſſion for it, he is to anſwer the whole Aſſurance to the Merchant. Mal. Lex. Merc. 86.

(F 2.) Liable to anſwer Profit or Damage. *Not giving Notice* of Tranſactions.

1. IF a Factor do *ſell* unto a Man certain Goods of another Man's Account, either by it ſelf or among other Parcels, and this Factor giveth not Advice unto the Owner or Proprietary, of the Sale of the ſaid Goods, but afterwards (having had more Dealings with that Man in ſelling of Goods and receiving of Monies) this Man *becometh Inſolvent*, the Factor is to make good that Debt for the ſaid Goods ſo ſold, becauſe he gave no Advice to the Owner of the Sale of them at convenient Time, even as if he had ſold thoſe Goods unto a Man contrary to the Commiſſion given unto him; for the Salary of Factorage bindeth him hereunto. Mal. Lex Merc. 82.

2. If a Factor, by the Advice of a Merchant, do buy a Commodity for that Merchant's Account, with the ſaid Merchant's Money, or by his Credit, and the Factor giveth no Advice of it to the ſaid Merchant, but doth *ſell the ſame again for his own Benefit* and Gain, the Merchant ſhall recover this Benefit of the ſaid Factor, by the Office of Prior and Conſuls, according to the Cuſtom of Merchants, and ſhall be moreover amerced for his Fraud. Mal. Lex Merc. 83.

[See (B 2.) pl. 2.]

(F 3.) Liable, how. In Caſe of *prohibited Goods* or *Seiſures.*

1. IF a Factor *make Return* unto a Merchant for the Provenue of his Commodities ſold, *in prohibited Goods* which may not be tranſported, *and have no Commiſſion* from the Merchant to do the ſame; he ſhall bear the Loſs of thoſe Goods, if they be ſeiſed upon for the King, or taken as forfeited. *But if it be upon Commodities to be imported*, the Factor is in no Fault. Howbeit he ought to give *Advice* to the Merchant what Commodities are forbidden to be imported or exported, according to the Pleaſure of the Princes, which are abſolute Governors in their Havens, Harbours, Ports or Creeks. Mal. Lex Merc. 83.

2. If a Factor *commit an unlawful Act by Direction* of the Merchant, be it for the *Tranſportation of Gold or Silver* into the Parts beyond the Seas, or otherwiſe; and if it happen thereupon that the ſame be taken, the Merchant beareth the Loſs: And yet the Factor is ſubject to pay treble Damages by the Law, if it be followed within the Year; or *may be fined* for the ſame in the Star-Chamber, altho' it be *many Years after.* Mal. Lex Merc. 83.

(F 4.) *Offences* by Factor. Puniſhment.

IF a Factor or Merchant do *Colour the Goods of Merchant Strangers, in paying but Engliſh Cuſtoms* (altho' he did bear the Adventures of the Seas for the ſaid Goods) he runneth into a *Præmunire*, and forfeiteth all his Goods unto the King, and his Body to *perpetual Impriſonment*. Mal. Lex Merc. 83.

[See (F 3.) pl. 2.]

(G) Actions, Pleadings and Evidence.

1. IT is a good Diſcharge *before Auditors* for a Factor to ſay that in a *Tempeſt*, becauſe the Ship was ſurcharged, the *Goods were caſt* over-board *into the Sea*. Dubitatur 41 E. 3. 4. Roll. a. 124. (O) pl. 1. — So, that he was * *robbed*, or that the Goods were *burned* without his own Default. 2 Mod. 100. Anonymus.

Br. Account pl. 56. cites 41 E. 3. 3 & 9.
* 4 Rep. 84. in Southcote's Caſe.

2. Action on the *Caſe* lies for the Owner againſt the Factor *for Running Goods*, by which Means they are forfeited and ſeiſed. Cro. Jac. 265. Lewſon v. Kirke.

Lane 65. S. C. by Name of Leviſon v. Kirke.

3. If Factor that has a general Commiſſion *takes a Bond in his own Name*, he cannot plead ſuch Bond *by way of Account*, but it is a good Plea *before Auditors* by way of Diſcharge. Per Williams Juſt. Bulſt. 103. cites D. 29.

D. 29. pl. 193. 1 Roll. Abr. 124. pl. 12. cites S. C.

4. If the Factor makes a *Contract for his Maſter*, the Maſter ſhall have the Action on the Contract. Per Coke Ch. Juſt. Roll. R. 337.

5. If, where the Uſage is for Factors to ſell upon Truſt, he ſells to a Perſon *of good Credit at that Time*, and he after becomes Inſolvent, the Factor is diſcharged; but otherwiſe if it be to a *Man notoriouſly Diſcredited at the Time of the Sale*, *unleſs* he can *prove* that he was *ignorant* of the Party's weak Eſtate and Credit. Mal. Lex Merc. 83.

6. The proper Remedy againſt a Factor, acting as ſuch, is *Account*; but if he converts, *Trover* will lie againſt him. Per Holt Ch. Juſt. 12 Mod. 602. Anonymus.

7. Where a Factor at the Canaries deſerves Money for Factorage, he cannot bring an *Action for his Factorage*, unleſs the *Principal refuſe to come to an Account*; and if it appears that the Factor has Money in his Hands, he may *detain*, and cannot bring an Action for his Factorage; but if he were directed to veſt all the Produce of his Adventure in Wines, then he may bring an Action for his Factorage and Pains, becauſe he cannot detain, and hath no other Remedy. Per Holt. Comb. 349. Hereford v. Powell.

8. Where a Factor or Agent of the African Company had *delivered up his Accounts* to his Succeſſor, according to the Rules of the Eſtabliſhment, which were afterwards *burnt* by a late Agent of the Company, the Lord Chancellor ordered the Plaintiff to *ſwear that he left them with the Succeſſor*, which ſhould conclude the Company. Mich. 31 Car. 2. 2 Chan. Caſ. 11, 14. Melliſh v. African Company and Edlin.

9. A Factor *took a Bond in his own Name*, and died, and the Obligor having failed, a Bill was brought againſt his Son for an Account. The Lord Chancellor put the Son to *prove that* his Father the Teſtator *gave particular Notice* to the Plaintiff that he ſold on Truſt, and to whom. Trin. 33 Car. 2. 2 Chan. Caſ. 56, 58. Daſhwood v. Elwall.

[See Maſter and Servant (B).]

(A) Faculties.

4 Inſt. 337. Godolp. Rep. 106. Sect. 8.

1. THE *Court of Faculties is* a Court, altho' it holdeth no Plea of Controverſy. It belongeth to the Archbiſhop, and his Officer is called *Magiſter ad Facultates*. And *his Power is* to grant Diſpenſations, as to marry, to eat Fleſh on Days prohibited, (and ſo may every Dioceſan) the Son to ſucceed his Father in his Benefice, one to have two or more Benefices incompatible, &c. It is called Faculties in the Statute of 28 *H.* 8. which in one Senſe ſignifieth a Diſpenſation. So as *Facultates* (in this Senſe) *Diſpenſationes & indulta, are Synonyma*. This Authority was raiſed and given to the Archbiſhop of Canterbury by the Statute of 25 H. 8. 21. 4 Inſt. 337.

An Exception was taken, that a Faculty granted by the Archbiſhop of Canterbury was *not ſubſcribed by the Archbiſhop's Clerk of the Faculties, but by his Under-Clerk*, when 'tis expreſly required by the Stat. 25 H. 8. that it ſhould be

2. 25 H. 8. 21. *enacts, that the* Archbiſhop of Canterbury *and his Succeſſors ſhall have Power and Authority to ordain, make and conſtitute a Clerk, which ſhall Write and Regiſter every Licence, Diſpenſation, Faculty, Writing or other Inſtrument to be granted by the ſaid Archbiſhop, and ſhall find Parchment, Wax and ſilken Laces convenient for the ſame, and ſhall take for his Pains ſuch ſums of Money as ſhall be hereafter in this preſent Act to him limited in that Behalf for the ſame. And that likewiſe the King, his Heirs and Succeſſors, ſhall by his Letters Patent under his Great Seal ordain, depute and conſtitute one ſufficient Clerk, being learned in the Court of Chancery, which always ſhall be Attendant upon the Lord Chancellor, or the Lord Keeper of the Great Seal for the Time being, and ſhall make, write and inrol the Confirmations of all ſuch Licences, Diſpenſations, Inſtruments or other Writings, as be thither brought under the Archbiſhop's Seal, there to be confirmed and inrolled; and ſhall alſo intitle in*

ſigned by the Clerk himſelf, which is very true; but *the Act is but Directory*, and 'tis not ſaid that it ſhall be ſigned by the Chief Clerk himſelf; ſo that this being ſigned by his Under-Clerk, and it being *cuſtomary* in this Office for the Under-Clerk to ſign Faculties, this Exception is of no Weight. 8 Mod. 364. King v. Biſhop of Cheſter.

Another Exception was taken in the Caſe above, that it was *not ſubſcribed and inrolled by the King's Clerk of the Faculties in Canc.* as it ought, becauſe *he is impowered* by the Statute *to tender an Oath to the Perſon* who hath obtained it; which Statute was made to reſtrain the extravagant Grants of the Pope in thoſe Days, and therefore ſhould be fully and ſtrictly performed by the Clerks themſelves, and not by their *Deputy Clerks*; and this muſt be intended by the Legiſlators, for otherwiſe this Act would have been penned as the Statute of Wills, or as the Statute of Promiſſory Notes, by which 'tis enacted, That the Signing ſhall be by the Parties themſelves, or by any other Perſon authorized by them; therefore this muſt be done by the principal Clerks themſelves, and not by their Under-Clerks, for 'tis not aſſignable to them;

and

in his Book, and inrol of Record, ſuch other Writings as ſhall thither be brought under the Archbiſhop's Seal, not to be confirmed, taking for his Pains ſuch reaſonable Sums of Money as hereafter by this Act ſhall be limited for the ſame; and that as well the ſaid Clerk appointed by the ſaid Archbiſhop, as the ſaid Clerk to be appointed by the King, his Heirs or Succeſſors, ſhall ſubſcribe their Names to every ſuch Licence, Diſpenſation, Faculty or other Writing that ſhall come to their Hands to be written, made, granted, ſealed, confirmed, regiſtred and inrolled by Authority of this Act, in Form as is before rehearſed.

and therefore this Faculty is void, eſpecially ſince there is a *Proviſo* in the Faculty it ſelf, *that it ſhall not be good till ſubſcribed and regiſtred by the Clerk of the Faculties in Chancery*, which is in the Nature of a Condition precedent, and not to be ſigned or ſubſcribed by his Order. It was held, that where a Man doth any Thing by the *expreſs Order of another*, as it was done in this Caſe, 'tis as good as if done by himſelf; as where one expreſly orders another to ſign a Deed, which the Perſon thus ordered did afterwards ſign, this is good as one determinate Act; but where the Deputy doth any Thing by Virtue of general Deputation, it muſt be where a Deputy may be made by Law. The Judgment was affirmed. 8 Mod. 364, 365. King v. Biſhop of Cheſter.

3. The *King* by his Prerogative, *without the Archbiſhop*, may grant to a Biſhop to hold a Church in Commendam, notwithſtanding the Statute of 25 H. 8. 21. Cro. Eliz. 601. Armiger v. Holland.

[See Commendam. —— Pluralities (G).]

Faits or Deeds.

Fol. 21.

(A) What Perſons may make a Deed.

1. If an Infant deliver a Deed, it is not void but voidable. 8 H. 6. 22. 9 H. 6. 6. The *Difference* taken that the Deed of an Infant (as *Letter of Attorney*) whereby he gives an Authority, is *void*, but where he paſſes any Intereſt (as *Bond, &c.*) is *only voidable*, is not agreeable to Reaſon; for by that Means the Infant would be more prejudiced in paſſing his Eſtate than he would in giving a bare Authority, which cannot be maintained. Per Holt Ch. Juſt. Comb. 468. in Caſe of Thompſon v. Leach.

Where 'tis held that the *Deeds of* Infants are not *void* but *voidable*, the Meaning is, that *Non eſt factum* cannot be pleaded, becauſe they have the Form tho' not the Operations of Deeds, and therefore are not void upon that Account, without ſhewing ſome Special Matter to make them of no Efficacy. 3 Mod. 310. Thomſon v. Leach. —— But he may ſay *Non conceſſit, &c.* Per Wray Ch. Juſt. 2 Le. 218. in Hemfreſton's Caſe.

2. *Dum fuit infra Ætatem* was brought by an Infant of Land and Rent, ſo that you may ſee that *Grant of Rent by Inrolment* by Deed is not void but voidable, as it ſeems. Br. Faits, pl. 83. 46 E. 3. 33.

3. 5 Eliz. 4. Sect. 42. *Becauſe there hath been ſome Queſtion, whether any Perſon being within the Age of one and twenty Years, and bounden to ſerve as an* Apprentice *in any other Place than in the City of* London, *ſhould be bounden, accepted and taken as an Apprentice,*

4. Sect.

4. Sect. 43. *Be it enacted, That all and every ſuch Perſon and Perſons that at any Time or Times from henceforth ſhall be* bounden by Indenture *to ſerve as an Apprentice in any Art, Science, Occupation or Labour, according to the Tenor of this Statute, albeit the ſame Apprentice, or any of them, ſhall be within the Age of one and twenty Years at the Time of the making of their ſeveral Indentures, ſhall be bounden to ſerve for the Years in their ſeveral Indentures contained, as amply and largely to every Intent, as if the ſame Apprentice were of full Age at the Time of making ſuch Indentures; any Law, Uſage or Cuſtom to the contrary notwithſtanding.*

Noy 130. cites 21 H. 6. 31. —— Roll. R. 242. Palm. 237.

5. If an Infant makes a Deed of *Feoffment, and a Letter of Attorney* to a Stranger *to make Livery* of Seiſin, and he makes Livery of Seiſin by Force thereof, he ſhall be taken for a Diſſeiſor. Perk. 6, 7. cites 18 E. 4. 2. —— See pl. 1.

Br. Feoffment pl. 48. cites 18 E. 4. 27. *But a Letter of Attorney* by Infant *to receive Livery* and Seiſin for him is good, becauſe it is for his Advantage. Per Aſcue Juſt. But econtra per Paſton Juſt. Br. Faits, pl. 31. cites 21 H. 6. 31. But he ſays the Law ſeems to be with Aſcue.

Br. Age, pl. 80. cites 4 Ma. 1. —— pl. 45. cites 21 E. 4. 13, 14.

6. In Little Brook, fol. The Caſe is, a *Parſon or Prebend* being within Age *made a Leaſe* for Years *of his Benefice*, and would, but could not, after avoid it for his Nonage; for ſeeing the Church had made him of full Age to diſcharge the Spiritual Office, our Common Law thought it fit to enable him to diſpoſe of his Temporalties. Callis of Sewers 202. —— Watſ. Comp. Inc. 456.

Br. Age, pl. 64. cites 20 E. 4. 8.

7. In 21 H. 7. 12 & 13. the Caſe is put by Bridges, and confirm'd by Juſtice Sylliard, and was not denied by any, That an *Obligation* made *by a Mayor and Commonalty*, Dean and Chapter, Abbot and Covent, *ſhall not be avoided for the Nonage of the Mayor*, Dean or Abbot. Callis of Sewers 202.

8. If a *Blind Man* has Underſtanding, he may deliver a Deed ſealed by him. Jenk. 222. pl. 75.

Fin. Law 8vo. 103.

9. If a Man be *born Dumb*, but can well hear, ſuch a Man at full Age, by Delivery of his Hands by Signs, and without Delivery *by Signs*, may make a Gift. Perk. 11. Sect. 25.

Vide Martha Elliot's Caſe, Cart. 53.

10. *And* a Man that is *born Dumb and Deaf* may make a Gift, *if he have Underſtanding.* But it is hard that ſuch a Perſon ſhould have Underſtanding. For a Man ought to have his perfect Underſtanding by his Hearing, yet divers Perſons have Underſtanding by their Sight, *&c.* And a Man *born Dumb and Blind* may have Underſtanding. *But* a Man that is *born Blind, Deaf and Dumb*, can have no Underſtanding, ſo that he cannot make a Gift or a Grant. Perk. 11. Sect. 25.

11. The Grants of *all dead Perſons in Law*, as *Monks, Friars* and *Canons profeſſed*, and ſuch like others, are void, if they be *not* made by the *Sovereigns of ſuch Houſes*, or by Matter of Concluſion, or otherwiſe that it be in Special Caſes; and therefore if a Monk, Friar or Canon profeſſed, who is not Sovereign of the Houſe, grant unto me an Annuity by *Deed Poll*, the Grant is void notwithſtanding that he be *dereigned afterwards, or made Sovereign* of the ſaid Houſe, or of another Houſe, or created a Biſhop, *&c.* Perk. 2. Sect. 3. cites H. 14 H. 8. 16. Mich. 2 H. 3. 5. H. 32 H. 6. 31.

12. If a *Feme Covert* grants an Annuity by Deed, the Grant is void. Perk. 3. Sect. 6. cites M. 1 H. 5. 12.

13. *And* if a *Man be ſeiſed of Lands in the Right of his Wife*, and his *Wife grant a Rent iſſuing out of the ſame Lands*, without the Knowledge of the Husband, the Grant is void; and ſo 'tis notwithſtanding that the Husband had Conuſance of it, if it be made and delivered *without his Aſſent, or with* his Aſſent, if it be made in the Name of the Wife, and *not in the Name of the Husband.* Perk. 3. Sect. 6. cites M. 9 E. 3. 28.

14. *And* notwithſtanding the *Husband was abroad out of the Country at the Time* of ſuch Grant made and deliver'd, ſo that it is not known whether he be alive or dead; yet ſuch Grant is void if the Husband be living, in as much as if the Grantee, by Force of ſuch Grant, enter into the Land and diſtrain, the Husband, at his Return, ſhall have for his Entry and Diſtreſs an Action of Treſpaſs. Perk. 3, 4. S. 6. cites H. 4 H. 4. 13. H. 2 H. 7. 15.

15. 34 & 35 *H.* 8. 22. *Enacts, That Recoveries and Deeds inrolled, &c.* by Femes covert in corporate Towns *ſhall be of the ſame Force as they were before* 32 *H.* 8.

See { Deaf, Dumb and Blind (A). / Enfant ( ) / Feoffment (E). } { Grant ( ) / Lunatick (B). / Non Compos (B). }

(B) By what Names they may make a Deed. [*Miſnoſmer*].

1. If a Man makes a Deed by Name of J. S. the Elder, where he is J. S. the Younger; yet he ſhall not avoid the Deed, becauſe he is the Perſon who made it. 13 H. 4. 4. b.

2. So if J. Boſom makes a Deed by Name of J. Bozom, he ſhall not avoid it. 14 H. 4. 3. b. Br. Faits, pl. 22. cites 14 H. 4. 30. [So it is in the Original and in the Year-Book.]

3. If J. S. binds himſelf in an Obligation by the Name of W. S. he ſhall not avoid it; but if it be falſe in the Name of Baptiſm only, it is otherwiſe. 3 H. 6. 25. b. 26.

It ſeems that one cannot plead Miſnoſmer of the Name of Baptiſm, neither need he do it, for he is not the ſame Perſon. Nota, Br. Miſnoſmer, pl. 4. cites 3 H. 6. 25. ——

If J. S. grants an Annuity by his contrary Name of Baptiſm, viz. by the Name of W. S. ſome think this Grant is not good, becauſe that the Deed of W. cannot be the Deed of J. for a Man cannot have (*a*) two Names of Baptiſm, and ſo they conceive the Grantor may deny the Deed. Perk. 17. S. 38. cites 3 H. 6. 26. —— (*a*) Cro. J. 558. Watkins v. Oliver.

And ſome hold contrary, for when they are at Iſſue upon the Deed, the *Plaintiff may give in Evidence the Day, Year and Place*, where the Plaintiff delivered the ſame as his Deed, &c. then the *Grantor hath not any Thing* to help him, *but to ſay that his Name is J. and not W.* and ſo not his Deed; now they ſay, That the Plaintiff may demur upon this Evidence, foraſmuch as he hath not gainſaid the Delivery of the Deed as his Deed, they ſay, that he ſhall be *concluded* to ſay, that his Name is other, but as the Deed doth ſuppoſe, Ideo Quære. Perk. S. 39. cites M. 9 E. 4. 43.

But if *J. S. reciting* by his Deed, *that his Name is J. S.* and by the ſame Deed *grants* an Annuity *by the Name of W. S.* this is a good Grant, for the Writ ſhall be brought upon the whole Deed. Perk. S. 40. cites 3 E. 3. Itin. Not. Eſto. 132.

4. If a Man binds himſelf by a falſe Surname, as by the Name of J. S. where his Name is J. D. he ſhall not avoid it, but it ſhall eſtop him, becauſe he (*b*) may have divers Surnames. 3 H. 6. 25. b. Br. Miſnoſmer, pl. 4. cites S. C.

(*b*) Br. Miſnoſmer, pl. 2. S. P. cites 2 H. 6. 5. *Burges* made a Releaſe by the Name of *Burgeles*, and the Defendant pleading that Burges, by the Name of Burgeles, releaſed, &c. the ſame was held good. Br. Faits, pl. 34. cites 22 H. 6. 48.

5. Debt, and counts *Quod cum prædictus Jacobus, per nomen Johannis Winlow*, ſuch a Day and Year, *per quoddam ſcriptum ſuum Obligatorium conceſſit, &c.* The Defendant demanded Oyer of the Bond, whereby it appeared, that the Defendant, by the Name of John Winlow, *fecit ſcriptum, &c.* and the *Condition was, If James Winlow* paid, &c. whereupon the Defendant demurred. And all the Court held, that the Action lay not: For John cannot be James. Cro. E. 897. Field v. John alias James Winlow.

6. *A. binds himſelf by the Name of B.* and he is accordingly ſued by the Name of B. he may *plead Miſnoſmer*, and the other may *reply*, that he made the Bond by the Name of B. and *eſtop* him by demanding Judgment, if againſt his own Demand he ſhall be admitted to ſay *his Name is A.* and then he may *rejoin*, and ſay he made no ſuch Demand; and this he muſt do without Oyer; for if he *pray Oyer*, he admits his Name to be B. Per Cur. 1 Salk. 7. Lineh v. Hook. —— 6 Mod. 225. Fox v. Tilly —— Litt. R. 184. per Richardſon Ch. Juſt.

See Eſtoppel (O). Grants (B). Miſnoſmer (A). Noſmes (B).

(C) *To what Perſons* may be made.

Per Catesby, If one *enfeoffs* a Feme Covert, and after the *Baron diſagrees*, the Feoffment is void, to which Brian agreed. For the Feoffment was never good without the Agreement of the Baron; quære of this Opinion, for it ſeems that 'tis *good till the Baron diſagrees*. Br. Feoffment de terre, pl. 36. cites 1 H. 7. 16.

1. A Deed may be made to a Feme Covert. 3 H. 6. 23. b.

Perk. 19. S. 43. ſays, that the Grant is good till the Husband diſagrees, and therefore if a *Rent-charge* be granted unto a Feme Covert, and the *Deed is delivered unto her*, her Husband not knowing thereof, and the *Husband die* before any Diſagreement made by him, and before any Day of Payment; now the Grant is good, and ſhall not be avoided, by ſaying that the Husband did not agree, &c. But the *Diſagreement* of the Husband *ought to be ſhewed*. Perk. 19. S. 43. cites 15 E. 4. 2.

If an Eſtate be made to a Man's *Wife de novo*, 'tis not neceſſary to *aver the Husband's Aſſent*, for it (*c*) veſts till he diſſent; but Aſſent is neceſſary where the Wife had an Eſtate before, which cannot be *deveſted* by his Aſſent to the latter Eſtate. Hob. 204. (*d*) Swain v. Holman & Ux'. —— Hutt. 7. —— (*c*) Show. 298. arguendo cites C. L. 3. 356. of a Feoffment by Livery to a Feme Covert. (*d*) S. C. cited arguendo, Show. 300.

If he *agrees ſeven Years after*, 'tis good. So 'tis of a *Diſſeiſin to an Uſe*, and ſo 'tis of an *Aſſumpſit to the Wife*. Arg'. Goldsb. 13. cites 27 H. 8. in Jordan's Caſe, and 1 H. 7. in Dove's Caſe.

If an Engliſhman *goes into France, and there becomes a Monk*, yet he is capable of any Grant in *England*, becauſe ſuch *Profeſſion* is not triable, and alſo becauſe all Profeſſion is taken away by the Statute, and by our Religion now revived, ſuch Vows and Profeſſion is held void; I have heard that this was reſolved accordingly by all the Juſtices at Serjeants Inn in 44 Eliz. in one Ley's Caſe. 2 Roll. 43. Grant (C). pl. 1.

2. But if a Deed be made to a Monk it is void. 3 H. 6. 23. b.

If a *Leaſe for Life* be made to a Monk, the Remainder over, both the Eſtates are void. Per Coke Ch. Juſt. 2 Bulſ. 292. cites 9 H. 6. 24. and Perk. 109. pl. 568. and Pl. C. 35. in Colethirſt's Caſe.

3. So if made to a Channon profeſt, it is void. 3 H. 6. 23.

4. *But* if a Monk or Friar profeſs'd, &c. be *Sovereign of the Houſe*, he may be a Grantee. Vide Perk. 24. S. 51. cites 5 H. 7. 25. M. 19 H. 6. 25.

5. A Man *non ſane Memoriæ* may be a Grantee. Perk. 24. S. 51.

6. A Man *attainted of Felony, Murder or Treaſon*, may be Grantee, and a *Clerk convict* and a Man *impriſoned*. So may the King's Villein and an *Alien*. And a Man *outlawed in a perſonal Action*, and a *Baſtard*, may be a Grantee or a Purchaſor, but a Baſtard cannot be Heir, nor have Heir, without Iſſue of his Body begotten. Perk. 22. S. 48.

7. An *Abbot* may be Grantee, and ſo may *Dean and Chapter*, *Mayor and Commonalty*. Perk. 23, 24. S. 51. cites 5 H. 7. 25. M. 19 H. 6. 25.

[See Grants (C).]

(D) What *Things* are *neceſſary* to the making of a Deed. [*And what Words.*]

1. THere ought to be theſe Things to the Making of a Deed, that is to ſay, Writing, Sealing and Delivery. 4 H. 6. 4. 8 H. 6. 6. b. 30 E. 3. 32. Perk. S. 118. ſays, that ſome *Kings* and Princes have uſed to make *blank Patents and Charters ſealed* to be delivered to divers Men, to write what Matter ſoever they would in them. And that ſuch Patent has been ſufficient warrant to the Patentees, &c. Yet if a *common Perſon* ſeal an Obligation, or any other Deed, without any Writing in it, and deliver the ſame unto a Stranger, Man or Woman, it is nothing worth.

2. If a Deed be wrote upon Wood, Leather, Cloth, or the like, it is not good, but ought to be wrote upon Parchment or Paper, otherwiſe it is not good, becauſe the Writing upon them may be leſs vitiated or corrupted. Co. Lit. 35. b. 2 Inſt. 672. cites 5 Rep. 20. b. Stiles's Caſe.

3. The Deed takes effect from the Delivery, and not from the Date. 29 E. 3. 23. adjudg'd. As to Dates Vide (P). 2 Rep. 5. Goddard's Caſe.

4. A Deed ſhall be good enough tho' it has not any Date. 13 H. 7. Kelloway 34. b. For the Time of the Making may be alledg'd in Pleading. 2 Rep 5. Goddard's Caſe. Perk. S. 120.

5. If an Abbot and Covent make a Deed, and in the End the Words are In cujus rei teſtimonium ſigillum noſtrum appoſuimus, tho' it be not Sigillum noſtrum Commune, yet it is good enough to bind the Succeſſor. 22 H. 6. 4. As to Sealing. Vide (H). Perk. S. 133. cites S. C. and 11 E. 4. 4. and 37 H. 6. 3. Br. Faits, pl. 30. cites S. C. and 21 H. 6. 3.

6. If an Obligation be, Ad quam quidem ſolutionem bene & fideliter faciendam obligo me, hæredes, Executores & Adminiſtratores meos firmiter per præſentes datas, &c. tho' the Words (Sigillo meo ſigillat') are omitted, yet it is a good Deed. M. 10 Jac. B. R. adjudg'd between *Meyhen* and *Dune*.

7. This Word (meum) in a Deed is not neceſſary, for In cujus rei * teſtimonium ſigillum appoſui is ſufficient without the Word Meum; for if he ſeals it with the Seal of another Man, it is ſufficient. 21 E. 4. 81. * Folio 22.

8. Theſe words (In cujus rei teſtimonium ſigillum meum appoſui) are not neceſſary to be in a Deed. Bro. Obligation 8. in abridging 40 E. 3. 17. Kelloway 41. b. Contra 40 E. 3. 2. Br. Faits, pl. 103. cites 7 H. 7. 14.

9. Theſe words (ſigillum meum appoſui) are not neceſſary. 8 H. 6. 35.

10. There muſt be *Grantor and Grantee*; yet where a Deed tripartite of Bargain and Sale inroll'd *had not the Grantor's Name before the words* (*Hath Granted*) ſo that it was not ſaid, who hath granted, and (Hath) was in the ſingular Number tho' the Deed was tripartite, yet becauſe a Grantor may *with Certainty enough be collected from the whole Deed*, the Deed was held good. 10 Mod. 45, &c. Lord Say and Seal's Caſe. 2 Vent. 142. Treheway v. Elleſden.

11. If a Deed of Feoffment be *without Premiſſes*, *habendum*, *tenendum*, *reddendum*, Clauſe of *Warranty*, or * of *In cujus Rei teſtimonium*, the *Date* and the Clauſe of *his teſtibus*, yet 'tis good. Co. Lit. S. 1, 7. a. * D. 19. pl. 13. Dal. 1. pl. 4. 96.

pl. 24. — Le. 25. Bedoe's Caſe — Ow. 33. — 3 Bulſ. 301. — Kelw. 70. b. — 2 Rep. 5. Goddard's Caſe. — Het. 75. Peters v. Field.

12. The

12. The *Year of the King* is not eſſential to a Deed. 2 Salk. 462. Cromwell v. Grunſden.

13. Tho' a Deed be ſufficiently written, *viz.* without Raſure, Interlining, or new Writing upon the old Writing, or without any other like Fault, and alſo be ſufficiently ſealed and delivered as the Deed of the Party, yet if the *Words* in the Deed in themſelves are *not ſufficient in Law to bind the Party*, the Deed will avail little or nothing againſt him. Perk. S. 155.

14. In the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, Deeds were often *without Witneſſes*, and a Counterpart of an old Leaſe without Witneſſes made about that Time, was allow'd as good Evidence; and Windham Juſt. ſaid, that he had ſeen ſeveral Deeds made in her Time without Witneſſes. Lev. 25. Garret v. Liſter.

15. If *A. makes a Deed to B. and delivers it to J. S. to deliver it to B.* this is not a Deed without *B.'s Agreement* to it; for J. S. the Bailee, as here, is Servant to A. who makes the Deed, and not to B. to whom the Deed is made. Br. Faits, pl. 80. 8 H. 7. 13.

See Aſſent (B. 4.)

(D 2.) What ſhall be ſaid to be, or ſhall *amount to* a Deed.

1. A *Preſentation by Writing* to a Church is not a Deed, but only in Nature of a Letter to the Biſhop. C. L. 120. a.

2. Debt upon Bond of 200 l. to indemnify againſt a Bill ſealed (for the Payment of 42 l. in which the Plaintiff was bound) when he ſhould be required; the Defendant pleaded Non eſt factum, upon which they were at iſſue; and it appeared upon the Evidence, that the *Bill was written in a Book*, and that the Defendant *put his Hand and Seal to the* ſame *Leaf on which it* was written, after a Verdict adjudged, this was a good Deed, tho' there was *no Evidence of the Delivery.* Cro. E. 613. Fox v. Wright.

3. *Grant of next Preſentation* or Avoidance of a Living cannot be good without Deed, and a *Letter wrote by the Patron* to the Father of the Plaintiff, in which the Patron *ſaid he had given him the next Avoidance*, is not ſufficient. Cro. E. 164. Criſp's Caſe.

[Vide N. a.]

(D 3.) What ſhall be ſaid the Deed, or *only the Agreement* of Perſons ſigning it.

WHEN an *Incumbent grants a Rent* by the Conſent of the *Patron and Ordinary*, and they *put their Seals* to it; this is not their Deed, but only their Agreement to it. Cro. E. 57. Eaſt, Skidmore, &c. v. Vaudſtevan.

(E) What Things are neceſſary to make a *Deed indented.*

1. IT cannot be a Deed indented, unleſs it be actually indented. For if the Words of the Deed are, Hæc Indentura, &c. yet if it be not indented in fact, it cannot be an Indenture. Co. Litt. 143. b. 5 Rep. *Stiles's* Caſe 20. b. adjudged, tho' there were two Parts of it. Cro. El. 474. Frampton v. Stiles.—— 2 Inſt. 672.

2. If the Deed be indented, tho' the Words of the Deed are not Hæc Indentura, yet it is an Indenture. Co. Litt. 143. b. 2 Inſt. 672. cites 5 Rep. 20 b. Stiles's Caſe.

(F) [*Charter-Parties*] Who ſhall be ſaid Parties to the Indenture to be charg'd, or to take Advantage by it. [*Or rather, who ſhall take Advantage or be bound by a Deed, not being Party or Sealing.*]

1. IF an Indenture of the Charter-party be made between one A. and others, Owners of the Ship called E. whereof B. is Maſter, of the one Part, and C. of the other Part. In which Indenture (a) A. covenants with B. and C. and C. covenants with A. and B. and binds them to C. and B. for Performance of Covenants in 600 l. and the Concluſion of the Indenture is, In Witneſs whereof, the Parties aboveſaid, have put their Hands and Seals, and the ſaid B. to the ſaid Indenture, put his Hand and Seal, and delivered it. In this Caſe B. is not any Party to this Indenture, ſo that B. cannot releaſe the Action, brought upon this Indenture by A. becauſe it is an Indenture reciprocal, between Parties of one Part, and Parties of the other Part, in which Caſe no Obligation, Covenant or Grant can be made with any who is not Party to the Deed; but where the Deed indented is not reciprocal, but is without the Words, between, &c. as Omnibus Chriſti fidelibus, &c. there the Obligation, Covenant, or Grant may be made to divers ſeveral Perſons. Co. Magna Charta 673. where is cited Trin. 29 El. B. R. adjudg'd. See (C. a).—Molloy de Jure Maritimo 261. cites S. C. and is thus, (viz.) A. covenanted with C. and B. and bound themſelves to the Plaintiff, and B. in 600 l.—Where a *Deed* runs *in the firſt Perſon* ſigning and ſealing makes B. a Party, *tho' not named* therein.

1 Salk. 214. Nurſe v. Frampton.——— (a) In the Indenture were divers Covenants to be performed by A. and by B. to C. and e converſo; and there was a Clauſe, that A. and B. bound themſelves to C. to perform the Covenants. Cro. El. 56. Eaſt, Skidmore and Foame v. Vaudſtevan,——The Words in 2 Inſt. 673. are, that A. covenanted with C. and B. and alſo C. covenanted with A. and B. and bound themſelves to A. and B. for Performance of Covenants in 600 l. &c. 2 Inſt. 673. Scudamore v. Vandeſtene

2. If an Indenture of Charty-party be made between A. and B. Owners of a Ship, of the one Part, and C. and D. Merchants, of the other Part, and there are ſeveral Covenants of the one Part and the other, and A. only ſeals the Indenture of one Part, and C. and D. of the other Part; But in * all the Indenture is Mention, that A. and B. covenant with C. and D. and C. and D. covenant with A. and B. In this Caſe A. and B. may join in Action againſt C. and D. upon this Indenture, for Breach of a Covenant in the Deed, tho' B. never ſealed the Deed; for he is a Party to the Deed, and C. and D. had ſealed the other Part to B. as well as to A. upon which the Action is brought. Hill. 18 Car. B. R. adjudged per Cur' upon a Demurrer without Argument, for the Clearneſs of it, between Clement and Henly. See (D. a) * Molloy 262. S. C. but leaves out the Word (All).—Debt on a Charter-party, *Quod per Indenturam teſtatum exiſtit, that A. covenanted to pay 100 l. to B.* between whom, as Owner, and C. Merchant

the Indenture was, *and 100 l. to D. the Plaintiff*, as Maſter The Defendant pleaded, that the Plaintiff was no Party to the Indenture. The Plaintiff demurred; and per Curiam, any one mentioned therein, is Party enough to ſue this Indenture, being not between Parties, but only *Hæc Indentura teſtatur*, which is all one with a Deed in the firſt Perſon; as if it was, I give ſo much to J. N and ſo much to J. S. 3 Keb. 115. Hill. 24 Car. 2. B. R. Coke v. Child.

See Indorſement.

(G) In what Line or Place the Writing being, ſhall be *Parcel* of the Deed.

A Bond was condition'd to *ſave Lands harmleſs* from all Incumbrances

1. IF Part of the Deed be written upon the Back of the Deed for Default of Parchment, yet it is a good Deed. 41 E. 3. 10 b.

made by the Obligor, and a Memorandum was alſo indorſed, that the Condition *ſhould not extend to an Extent of a Statute* acknowledged by him to J. S. and it was held to be Parcel of the Condition conjoined to it as an Exception; for it is an Explanation in Writing of the Intention of the Parties, written before the Sealing of the Bond. Mo. 679. Broke v. Smith.

But it ought to be *written before the Sealing and Delivery*, or elſe it is not good.

2. So an Obligation, with a Condition upon the Back of it, is a good Condition. 41 E. 3. 10. b.

Per Harvey Juſt. Het. 137. Taylor's Caſe.

Indorſement *after* Sealing and *Delivery*, and at another Time, makes a new Deed. 6 Mod. 237. Cook v. Remington.

3. If an Obligation be made, and one Word is put above and another below, and another in another Place, yet the Deed is good. 14 H. 4. 18.

* Folio 23. Mo. 679. Brook v. Smith. A *Condition under a Recognizance* is no Part of the Recognizance, not being in the Recognizance, but under. *So* if it was *on the Back* of it.

4. * If a Man be bound in an Obligation upon Condition, That if he pay a certain Sum to his firſt Child which ſhall be born afterwards, then the Obligation ſhall be void, and before the Sealing of it a Memorandum is made under the Condition, that it is the Intent of the Parties, that the Sum mentioned in the Condition ſhall not be paid till the Firſt Child, which ſhall afterwards be born, can aſk his Father's Bleſſing; this is Part of the Condition as ſtrongly as if it had been put in the Reſidue of the Condition, it being done before Sealing; for it is not repugnant to the Condition before, but only an Explanation of the Condition and of the Intent of the Parties. Dubitatur Paſchae 16 Jac. between *Chibborn* and *Horwood*, upon a Demurrer.

——See Trial (C g.) pl. 25. cites 36 H. 6. 2. adjudged.

5. But the Obligee did not much rely upon the Law, but ſued in the Court of Requeſts.

6. And in this Caſe, if the Memorandum had been, that the Matter aforeſaid ſhould be Parcel of the Condition aforeſaid; this would make it Parcel of the Condition. Per Mountague, in the ſaid Caſe of Chibburn and Horwood.

7. And in the Caſe aforeſaid, if after the Memorandum, and the Matter aforeſaid done and alleged, there had been theſe Words, then the Condition ſhall be void, it had been Parcel of the Condition. In the ſaid Caſe agreed per Houghton.

Bendl. 12. contra. Het. 88 arguendo. S. P.

8. If a Clauſe comes in a Deed after theſe Words, In cujus rei teſtimonium, &c. ſigillum appoſui, &c. it is not any Part of the Deed, tho' it was written before the Sealing and Delivery. 1 Ma. Brook, Faits, 72. agreed by the Juſtices. And ibid. 76.

If a *Proviſo* be put in *after the In cujus rei teſtimonium*, and ſubſcribed to the Deed before the Sealing, it is then Part of the Deed. And tho' it be after the Sealing, yet it may be as a Condition annexed to the Deed. Per Doderidge Juſt. 3 Bulſt. 302. Thompſon v. Butcher.

That which is *written* in a Deed *after the In cujus rei Teſtimonium* ſhall be Parcel of the Deed as well as that which is wrote before. Per omnes J. Mo. 3. pl. 12. Anon.——Per Coke Ch. Juſt. 'Tis no Part of the Bill, but may be a Condition, and muſt be pleaded. So in Covenant brought on Words of Covenant in a Deed, after the In cujus, &c. and above the Seal, it was held good. Brownl. 59. Hamond v. Jethrell.——2 Brownl. 99. S. C.

Before the Sealing twenty Things may be *indorſed* or *ſubſcribed*, as Condition of the Obligation, and all ſhall ſtand. Mo. 679. Brook v. Smith.

9. Before

9. Before the Sealing a Leaſe of Houſes in which a Rent was reſerved, it was *indorſed* for the *Payment of twelve Bottles of Canary Wine every Year to the Leſſor.*———'Twas argued for the Defendant, that the Wine ariſes in Covenant, that 'tis a Reſervation and not properly a Rent; but for the Plaintiff it was ſaid not to be material, whether a Reſervation or not; For that 'tis a Duty, and ariſes by Reaſon of the Thing demiſed, and goes along with it. 4 Mo. 74. in the Caſe of Pitcher v. Tovey.

10. In Debt to perform Covenants in an Indenture; one Covenant was, That the Defendant would ſafely give up to the Plaintiff the *Goods, a Particular whereof was writ on the Back of the Indenture,* It was held per Cur. that the *Indorſement, if made at the Time of the Enſealing and Delivery of the Deed,* was Part of it, and therefore giving Oyer of the Deed without Oyer of the Indorſement, was an in compleat Oyer of the Deed relating to the Indorſement, and not perfect without it. 6 Mod. 237. Cook v. Remington.

(H) Sealing.

1. **That cannon be the Deed of any, who does not ſeal it.** 6 H. 4. 5. See (N. a. 4) pl. 1.—Perk. S. 130.

Tho' *Words obligatory*, or &c. *are written* in Parchment or Paper, and Obligor, or, &c. *delivers the ſame as his Deed*, and it is *not ſealed* at the Time of the Delivery, it is but *an Eſcrowl* notwithſtanding that the Name of the Obligor be ſubſcribed. Perk. S. 129.

A. by Indenture *leaſes to B. and C.* rendering Rent and with divers Covenants, and *B. and C. bind themſelves for Performance of the Covenants in* 40*l.* and *B. ſeals the Indenture, but C. does not*, but *both enter.* This is no Obligation as to the 40*l.* but only againſt B. who ſealed it, as it ſeems there. Br. Obligation, pl. 13. and 27, cites 38 E. 3. 8. and 45 E. 3. 3. 11.———Br. Dette pl. 80. cites S. C. becauſe it is a Collateral Thing, tho' he ſhall be bound by his Agreement to the Leaſe as to the Payment of the Rent, yet not as to the 40*l.* unleſs he had ſealed, per Finch.———Br. Dette, pl. 38. cites 45 E. 3. 4. But Brooke ſays, Quære Legem. For that it ſeems not Law in the Point of the words Obligatory, and cites 45 E. 3. 11. that of all Reſervations and Things neceſſary to the Leaſe, C ſhall be bound by his Agreement, tho' C. had been a Feme Covert at the Time, but that of a Thing which binds the Perſon as a Thing Obligatory ſealing and delivery is neceſſary.——Br. Dett. pl. 80. S. P. cites 38 E. 3. 8. and there Brooke ſays, that a Penalty for Non-payment of the Rent annually is a Reſervation.

2. If four make a Deed, two may make one Seal, and the other Two another Seal; **and this may be averred, and ſhall be a good Deed of all Four.** 6 H. 4. 5. 29 E. 3. 32.

3. If Twenty **make a Deed and** all ſeal it at the ſame Time with one and the ſame Seal, **yet it is good, and the Deed of all.** * 8 H. 4. 8. ‡ 22 H. 6. 4. b. per Port. Jo 268. S. P. Lord Lovelace's Caſe.—Br. Faits, pl. ‡ S. C. 17. pl. *S. C. 30.

One Piece of Wax may ſerve *for all the Grantors* which are named within the Deed, if every one of them put his Seal upon the ſame Piece of Wax, or if another do ſo for them, &c. if the Words in the Deed imply ſo much, viz. if it be ſaid in the Deed *In cujus rei Teſtimonium ſigilla noſtra appoſuimus*, or Words to the ſame Effect. Perk. S. 134. cites 8 H. 6. 8. 27 H. 6. Feoffm. 105.

Per Clark Juſt. *Twenty Men may ſeal with one Seal on one Piece of Wax only*, if all lay their Hands on the Seal together. Per 2 J. contra. 2 Le. 21 in the Caſe of Lightfoot v. Butler.———Per Noy, Attorney General, that it is good. Jo. 268. in Itinere Windſor.———Cro. El. 247 Bretton v. Bolton.——Br. Obligation, pl. 73. cites 21 H. 6. 3. and 27 H. 6. 4. S. P. which Brooke ſays, ſeems to be intended where all Seal with one Print.

4. If an Abbot and Covent ſeal a Deed with a Seal, **it is good enough to charge the Succeſſor.** 22 E. 3. Abbe 21.

5. If a Man ſeal a Deed with the Seal of another Man, **it is good enough.** 21 E. 4. 81. Jo. 331. Lort v. Biſhop of St. Davids.—

Br. Faits, pl. 75.———For the Print of the other's Seal is his Seal. Br. Obligation, pl. 69. cites 21 E. 4. 81.

6. If

Tho' the Words are In cujus rei Teſtimonium appenſum eſt *noſtrum ſigillum commune*; for this Seal ſhall be ſaid the Covent or Common Seal for the Time, for with their common Aſſent they *may change their common Seal* at what Time they will. Perk. S. 132———Br. Obligation, pl. 73. cites 21 H. 6. 3. and 22 H. 6 4.

6. If an Abbot and Covent make a Deed, and ſeal it with my Seal, it is good enough. 22 H. 6. 4. b. Per Pole. Perkins 132.

So if it had been *ſigilla noſtra appoſuimus*, inſtead of ſaying the Common Seal, and yet held good, and it ſhall be intended their Common Seal. Br. Faits, pl. 70 cites 11 E. 4. 4.

7. The Sealing of Charters and Deeds is much more *ancient* than ſome, out of Error, have imagined; for the Charter of the *King Edwyn*, Brother of King Edgar, bearing Date Anno Dom. 956. made of the Land called Jecklea in the Iſle of Ely, was not only ſealed with his own Seal (which appears by theſe Words, Ego Edwinus Gratia Dei totius Britanniæ telluris Rex meum donum proprio ſigillo confirmavi) but alſo the Biſhop of Wincheſter put to his Seal, Ego Elfwinus Winton Eccleſiæ divinus ſpeculator proprium ſigillum impreſſi. And the Charter of *King Offa*, whereby he gave the *Peter-pence*, doth yet remain under Seal. But no King of England before or ſince the Conqueſt ſealed with any Seal of Arms, before King *Richard* 1. but the Seal was, the King ſitting in a Chair on the one Side of the Seal, and on Horſe-back on the other Side, in divers Forms. Co. Litt. 7. a.

Br. Obligation, pl. 73. cites 21 H. 6. 3. and 22 H. 6. 4.

8. If *Dean and Chapter* or *Mayor and Commonalty* cauſe a Writing to be made, in which it is ſaid *ſigillum noſtrum appoſuimus*, and *not* ſigillum noſtrum *commune*, yet the Writing is ſufficient, and ſhall bind them. But if *Dean and Mayor ſeal* a Writing made in their Names, and in the Name of the Chapter and Commonalty, *without the Aſſent of the Chapter and Commonalty*, and it is ſaid in the Deed ſigillum noſtrum Commune appoſuimus, and the ſame is *delivered by the Dean and Mayor without the Aſſent* or Agreement *of the Chapter and Commonalty*; this is only the Deed of the Dean and Mayor and not of the Chapter and Commonalty; cauſa patet. Perk. Sect. 133. cites 11 Ed. 4. 4. 22 H. 6. 4. 37 H. 6. 3.

S. P. per Keble, and not denied per Read of the other Side.

9. If in a Deed *no Mention is made of Sealing*, it is not a good Deed *tho' ſealed in Fact*, if theſe Words, ſigillum appoſui, are wanting. Br. Faits, pl. 76. cites 21 E. 4. 81.

Br. Faits, pl. 103. cites 7 H. 7. 14. and 8 H. 6. 35. S. P. but not adjudged there.———and cites alſo 40 E. 3. 1.———Br. Obligation, pl. 8. cites 40 E. 3. 1. where Debt was brought on an *Obligation* which *was in the third Perſon*, and no mention made that the Parties had put to their Seals and awarded that the Plaintiff take nothing by his Writ; but he makes a Quære if the Want of thoſe words (Sigillum appoſuit) be material.

Jum

10. *Declaration of Uſes of a Fine* may be good by Writing only, without a Seal, even ſince the Statute of Frauds. Per Holt Ch. Juſt. Farr. 76. in Caſe of Shortridge v. Lamplugh.

[See (F) pl. 2. (I) pl. 9. (Y. 2) pl. 4. Corporation.]

(H. 2) What Things are eſſential to make a good Deed. [*Signing.*]

A. MAKES a *Bond to B.* but does not *ſubſcribe it*, yet the Bond is good without it; for ſubſcribing is no eſſential Part of the Deed, and Sealing is ſufficient. 2 Salk. 462. Cromwell v. Grunſden.

2. *Signing*

2. *Signing* is not neceſſary to a Deed. For in former Times they were only ſealed but not ſigned. But now *ſince the Statute of Frauds*, an *Aſſignment* by Writing, if 'tis no Deed, yet it muſt be ſigned. Per Holt Ch. Juſt. 3 Salk. 171. Queen v. Goddard. Per Holt Ch. J. the Name in the Bond is only material. Comb. 477. S. C.

3. All *Solemnities* in Conveyancing are appointed *to hinder the Parties from Surprize.* G. Equ. R. 170.

(I) What Things are neceſſary to make a good Deed. [*Delivery, and what is a good Delivery.*]

1. THere ought to be a Delivery, otherwiſe it cannot be a Deed. 9 H. 6. 37. b. *Action on a joint Bond* was brought *againſt one*, and a Verdict was for the Plaintiff. On Motion in Arreſt of Judgment, that tho' this might have been pleaded in Abatement, yet ſince it appears on the Face of the Record that the Plaintiff had no Right againſt one alone, he cannot have Judgment, the Court was of Opinion, that it did not *appear of Record that the other* ſigned, ſealed or delivered this Bond; but admitting that it did appear that he *ſigned and ſealed it*, yet if it appeared *not that he delivered it*, it is the Bond of the Defendant alone, tho' another is named in it with him, for it is not his Deed without the Delivery. 8 Mod 242. Cloud v. Nicholſon.

2. There ought to be a Livery in Law or in Deed to make a good Deed. 9 H. 6. 37. b. Curia.

3. If I make a Deed to B. and ſeal it, and after B. takes the Deed without any Delivery of me, without my Will, or otherwiſe, it is not a good Deed, becauſe it wants a Livery. 9 H. 6. 37. b. Curia. 10 H. 6. 25. Contra 14 H. 6. 1. b. Notwithſtanding that a Deed be ſufficiently written in my Name, and ſealed by me, if it is not delivered by me, or by another, by my Aſſent, or by my Agreement or Commandment, the ſame ſhall not bind me; for all this while it is but an Eſcrowl. And if I make ſuch Eſcrowl, and let it lie by me, and a Stranger gets it, it ſhall not bind me, for it is not yet my Deed. Perk. Sect. 137.

4. The Deed of a Corporation needs not any Delivery, but the Appoſition of the Common Seal gives Perfection to it without any Delivery. Da. Rep. 44. b. Dean and Chapter of Fernes. 2 Le. 97. S. P. Willes v. Jermin.

5. As if Dean and Chapter put their Chapter Seal to a Deed, this is a perfect Deed by it without any Delivery. Da. Rep. 44. b. H. 32 El. B. R. agreed between Germin and Willis. Cro. E. 167. S. C.

6. * But if a Dean and Chapter have a Right to the Land, but they cannot make a good Leaſe before an Entry made by them into the Land, as [if] a Stranger has a voidable Leaſe, they may make a Leaſe in Writing, and affix their Seal to it, and make a Letter of Attorney to J. S. to deliver it as their Deed upon the Land, who delivers it accordingly. This is a good Leaſe, for the Affixing of the Seal to the Leaſe doth not make it a Deed, they being out of Poſſeſſion till the Attorney has delivered it as their Deed upon the Land, becauſe otherwiſe it ſhall be void. Mich. 13 Car. B. R. between * *Fludd* and *Gregory*. Per Cur. reſolv'd upon a Trial at Bar, which concerned the Dean and Chapter of Peterburgh, and Juſtice Jones cited a Reſolution accordingly. * Fol. 24. It is a good Leaſe; for tho' the putting the Seal of the Corporation Aggregate to the Deed carries with it a Delivery, yet *the Letter of Attorney to deliver it on the Land ſhall ſuſpend the Operation of it till then.* Vent 257. Anon. upon Evidence in Ejectment. * Per two Juſtices accord', and per two contra. Jo. 170.

7. If I make an Obligation to two, and deliver it to one of them only, and say nothing of the other upon the Livery, the Deed is void as to him. 3 H. 6. 19.

8. If a Man seals a Writing Obligatory, in which he is bound to J. S. but this is made for the Behoof and Use of A. S. whom the Obligor intends to marry, and on the Day of the Solemnization of the Marriage he delivers it to A. S. saying these Words, *scilicet*, This will serve; and immediately the Feme delivers it over to the Obligee, this is a good Delivery. D. 3 El. 192. 26. adjudg'd, Tenant's Case.

9. If a Deed not sealed be produced in Court, if the other acknowledges it, it is of force. 41 E. 3. 10. b.

10. A *Statute* is good tho' there was no Delivery, per Fenner Just. And per Popham, Debt lies upon it as upon a Record, tho' it never was delivered; for 'tis upon Record that it was delivered, and the Party is *estopped* to say the contrary. Cro. E. 494. in Case of Ascue v. Hollingworth.

Vide (K) pl. 5. 11. A. makes an Obligation to B. and *seals it and flings it on the Table*, and B. takes it, it is not good. Ow. 95. Stanton v. Chamberlin. —— Cro. E. 122. S. C. —— D. 192. b. pl. 26. Marg.

Jenk. 221. pl. 75. S. P. 12. A. makes an Obligation *to B. to the Use of C.* and A. *delivers it to C. in the Presence of B.* and says to him, *this will serve*. This is a good Delivery to B. Jenk. 195. pl. 2.

13. If a *Patron draws a Presentment* in Writing, and *puts his Seal to it*, and *lets it lie in his Study*, and the Party named in it to be presented gets it without the Privity of the Patron, and carries it to the Bishop, and is instituted and inducted thereupon, 'tis merely void, and no Presentation at all. Yelv. 7. in the Case of Grendit v. Baker.

[See Corporation ( )]

(K) Delivery of a Deed, how it may be.

1. THE Deed of a Corporation does not need Delivery, but the Appositon of the Seal gives Perfection to it. Da. Rep. Dean and Chapter of Ferns, 44. b.

2. Co. 9. Thoroughgood, 136. b. Resolv'd that actual Delivery of a Writing seal'd to the Party without any Words is a good Delivery.

Dal. 104. pl. 46. 3. Co. Litt. 36. Co. 9. Thoroughgood, 137. b. Resolv'd if a Man deliver a Writing seal'd to the Party with these Words, I deliver this Writing to you, it is clearly sufficient, tho' he doth not say, as his Deed, or as his Act.

4. Co. 9. Thoroughgood, 137. If a Writing be seal'd, and it lies in a Window, or upon a Table, and the Obligor saith to the Obligee, Do you see the Writing there? Take it as my Deed, and he takes it accordingly, this is a good Delivery in Law. Co. Lit. 36.

D. 192. b. pl. 26. Parker v. Tenant. — 5. So if he saith, Go and take the said Writing, it is sufficient for you, or it will serve the Turn. Co. Lit. 36.

Jenk. 221. pl. 75. S. C. *Casting* a Writing signed and sealed *on a Table*, and saying nothing, is no Delivery. But if he says, *This will serve*, 'tis good. Le. 140. Chamberlain v. Stanton. —— The Jury found that the Defendant caused the Obligation to be written, and signed and sealed it, and then laid it upon a Table, and the Plaintiff came and took it; the Question was, if this was the Defendant's Deed; and the Opinion of all the Justices was that it was not, without other Circumstances found by the Jury. Cro. E. 122. S. C.

Delivery is sufficient without speaking any Words. Per Anderson Ch. Just. Cro. E. 356. in Case of Hollingworth v. Ascue. —— Co. Lit. 49. b. —— Otherwise a Man that is *mute* cannot deliver a Deed, which he may do. See (A) pl. 9.

6. If a Man ſeals a Deed, and delivers it to a Stranger to keep to the Uſe of the Maker, this is not any Deed without other Delivery. 4 H. 4. 3. b. Dubitatur.

7. If a Man makes an Obligation to J. and delivers it to B. if J. gets the Obligation he ſhall have Action upon it, for it ſhall be intended that B. took the Deed for him as his Servant. 3 H. 6. 27.

After Refuſal to receive it upon B.'s Offer to deliver it to him as the Deed of A.

he got the Obligation, and recovered upon it. 2 Le. 111. pl. 145. Alford v. Lea. cites 1 Eliz. D. 167. Taw's Caſe. —

8. If a Man writes a Deed of Feoffment to J. with Letter of Attorney to B. to make Livery, but does not deliver it, and after alters his Intent, and razes out the Name of J. and puts in the Name of S. in his place, and delivers it to S. but doth not ſay any thing upon the Delivery, yet this is a good Deed, for his Intent appears. Dubitatur 35 Aſſ. 6.

9. But if this will not be ſufficient, [yet] if the Attorney makes Livery to S. and the Feoffor agrees to it, it ſhall be ſufficient, for this will explain his general Delivery before. Dubitatur 35 Aſſ. 6.

10. A *Parchment* (not a Deed indented) *ſealed and delivered by one firſt, and then by the other*, is the Deed of one as well as of the other. Per tot. Cur. 2 And. 36. Croſs v. Powell 41. S. P. adjudged accordingly.

A Deed Poll of Covenants between A. and B. in which A. covenants to convey Lands to B. and B. covenants to pay A. 100 l. B. delivers to A. and then A. delivers the ſame Deed to B. this *Re-delivery* does not make the Deed void. 2 And. 41. Croſs v. Powell. — Cro. E. 483. S. C and that 'tis a good Deed to both. —

11. Bond to ſubmit a Matter to Arbitration, *Ita quod deliberetur utrique partium* —If there are two, or four, &c. it muſt be delivered to every one. 5 Rep. 103. a. b. Hungate's Caſe.

12. A. *delivers a Deed made to J. S. to J. D.* tho' he does *not ſay to the Uſe of J. S.* yet 'tis a good Delivery of the Deed to J. S. if he accepts it. Clayt. 31. Anonymus.

13. *An Indorſement after Sealing and Delivery* is a new Deed. 6 Mod. 237.

[See Corporation ( )]

(L) * How the Delivery of a Deed may be, and what ſhall be ſaid a Delivery.

* Fol. 25.

1. IF a Man, being out of Poſſeſſion, makes a Deed of Leaſe of the Land to try the Title, and annexes a Letter of Attorney to enter and deliver the Leaſe upon the Land, and annexes the Letter of Attorney to the Leaſe, and makes a Label of both, and puts his Seal upon the Label, and after puts another Seal upon the Letter of Attorney only, and then delivers the Letter of Attorney only as his Deed, and not the Leaſe, this is not any Delivery in Law of the Leaſe alſo, tho' it be annexed to the Letter of Attorney, and ſo he delivers it in Fact; for he may well divide his Delivery to give Effect to that which he intends to deliver only. Mich. 15 Ja. B. R. between *Davies* and *Bridges*, in Ejectione firmæ upon Leaſe made by the *Biſhop of Oxford* againſt

gainſt *Fawkner*. Reſolv'd and adjudg'd per Cur. upon Evidence at the Bar.

Popham willed the Jury to find it Specially, but they found it generally to be *Factum ſuum*, for they ſaid it was an uſual Courſe in London; and being afterwards moved in Court, Clench and Popham agreed that it was a good Deed, but Fenner doubted. Yet now by the Verdict it is put out of Queſtion. Cro. E. 613. S. C.

2. If a Man writes an Obligation in a Book, and there at the ſame Folio puts his Seal to it, and then delivers the Book to the Obligee as his Deed, this is a good Obligation, for he has deliver'd that which makes the Obligation, and more, as his Deed; and tho' the Delivery be void for the Surplus, it is good for the Reſidue. Tr. 40 El. B. R. between Fox and Wright.

3. Leſſee for Years grants his Term by Deed, and *ſealeth it in the Preſence of divers, and of the Grantee* himſelf; and the Deed at the ſame Time *was read*, but not delivered, nor the Grantee did not take it, but *they left it behind them* in the ſame Place. Yet the Opinion of all the Juſtices was, that it was a good Grant; for the Parties came for that Purpoſe, and performed all that was requiſite for perfecting it, except an actual Delivery; but it being left behind them, and not countermanded, it ſhall be ſaid a Delivery in Law. Cro. E. 7. Shelton's Caſe.

(M) Delivery to deliver over.

Pl. 5. Perk. S. 142.

1. If I make a Writing to A. and deliver it to another as an Eſcrow, and after A. gets the Deed, yet this is not my Deed, for the Bailee has not any Authority to deliver it as his Deed. 10 H. 6. 25. 9 H. 6. 37. b. So it ſeems, by this Reaſon, it ſhould be tho' the Bailee had delivered it over as his Deed; for this is out of his Authority, it not being appointed.

It is not his Deed *ſimpliciter*. Perk. S. 138. — Verdict was that *A. delivered a Deed to B. to the Uſe of C. and D. ſo as C. would agree.* A. directed B. to carry it to C. and pray him to take the ſame, but if C. would not, that then he would not that D. ſhould be made acquainted with it, but that all ſhould be void. B. went to C.'s Houſe, but did not ſpeak with C. and C. after died, not having any Notice of the Deed. Adjudged that this was a Condition precedent, and ſo not his Deed. Mo. 300. Degoſe v. Rowe. —— Le. 152. S. C. and two Juſtices againſt one that it was his Deed. But adjornatur.

2. If a Man ſeals a Writing, and delivers it to a Stranger (as his Deed, it ſeems, it is to be intended) to deliver to the Party to whom it is made, after certain Conditions perform'd; if the Stranger delivers it to him before the Conditions perform'd, yet it is his Deed, and he is put to his Remedy againſt the Bailee. 9 H. 6. 37. b. Contra 8 H. 6. 26.

Perk. S. 144. S. P. and ſtates it as in pl. 2. ſupra of the Delivering to a Stranger (*as his Deed*).

3. So it ſhall be if he to whom the Deed is made gets the Deed without any Delivery of the Bailee, it is a good Deed. 9 H. 6. 37. b.

As until certain Indentures between me and the ſaid A. containing certain Conditions, are ſealed and delivered; this Obligation ſo taken away ſhall not bind me. Perk. S. 142. cites 9 H. 6. 27.

4. If I make a Writing to A. and ſeal it, and command another to keep it till certain Conditions perform'd; if A. takes the Deed out of his Poſſeſſion before the Conditions perform'd, yet this is not a Deed, becauſe here is not any Condition either in Deed or Law; and here is not any Word that the Deed ſhall be delivered to A. at any Time. 9 H. 8. 37. b. Curia.

5. If I make a Writing to A. and deliver it to another to deliver to A. after certain Conditions performed, if A. takes the Deed out of the Poſſeſſion of the Bailee before the Condition performed; this is not his Deed, becauſe he does not deliver it as his Deed, but as an Eſcrow. 19 H. 6. 58. 10 H. 6. 25. Dubitatur. Pl. 1. 6 Mod. 217. S. P. Buſhell v. Paſmore.

6. So if Bailee delivers the Deed before the Conditions perform'd, it is not his Deed. 19 H. 6. 58. Contra 14 H. 6. 1. b.

7. If I deliver an Obligation or other Writing unto a Man as my Deed, to deliver unto him to whom it is made *when he ſhall come to York*, it is my Deed preſently; and if he deliver it to him before he comes to York, yet I ſhall not avoid it; and if I die before he comes to York, and afterwards he cometh to York, and he delivereth the Deed unto him, it is clearly good, and my Deed, and that it cannot be, if it were not my Deed before my Death. Perk. S. 143.

8. A Difference was taken between a Delivery of a Deed *to a Stranger*, or *to the Party himſelf*. It cannot be an Eſcrow, if delivered to the Party himſelf. Mo. 642. Williams v. Green. —— 6 Mod. 218. Buſhell v. Paſmore. —— Noy 6. Whiddon's Caſe —— Hob. 246. Holford v. Parker —— 9 Rep. 137. Thoroughgood's Caſe. Co. Lit. 49. b. —— Contra, by the greater Part of the Juſtices. Mo. 697. Wilcock v. Howſon.

9. A. delivers a Deed to B. as an *Eſcrow*, to deliver it to C. who *refuſes*, upon which B. leaves the Deed, and afterwards C. brings Action upon it, and held good. And. 4. Taw v. Bury. —— S. C. cited 2 Le. 101. —— D. 167. pl. 14. S. C.

(N) At what Time the Delivery ſhall be good. Second Delivery.

1. If a Deed be ſealed and delivered, yet if the Sealing and Delivery are * all utterly void, ſo that it cannot take Effect as a Deed; there a ſecond Delivery, without new Sealing, will make it a good Deed. 8 H. 6. 7. * Folio 26. When a Perſon at the firſt Delivery *has no Power or Ability in Law to make the Leaſe, &c. but before the ſecond Delivery he becomes able*, there the Leaſe, &c. is void. But when he *has Ability at the firſt Delivery* to contract, *but cannot perfect it* till an Impediment is removed, there, if the *Impediment is removed before the ſecond Delivery*, the Contract is good. 3 Rep. 35. b. cites the Caſe of Jennings v. Bragg.

2. As if a Feme Covert ſeals and delivers a Deed, a ſecond Delivery when ſhe is ſole will make it good; for the firſt Delivery was merely void. Perk. S. 154. As if an *Infant or Feme Covert* deliver a Deed as an *Eſcrow*, and 'tis delivered after full Age, or *when ſhe is ſole*, 'tis void. For it *has Relation* to the firſt Delivery; ſo è converſo, where a *Feme ſole delivers a Deed as an Eſcrow*, &c. becauſe it was delivered by Authority before, when ſhe was ſole. Cro. El. 447. in Caſe of Jennings v. Bragg.
S. C. cited 3 Rep. 35. b. in Butler and Baker's Caſe, Goldsb. 167. S. P. cites Paſ 5 H. 7. 27.

3. If a Man ſeal and deliver a Deed, and after the Seal is taken from the Deed, if he ſeals and delivers it again, tho' the ſame Writing continues, yet it is a good Deed. (For the firſt Deed was utterly defeated by the taking away the Seal). 11 H. 6. 27. Curia. For there other Matter is pleaded.

4. But if the firſt Delivery be not void, but it continues a Deed only voidable, but not void, there a ſecond Delivery will not make it good. 8 H. 6. 7. Where it *once takes Effect*, a ſecond Delivery will not make it good. Br. Faits, pl. 28. cites 8 H. 6. 6. pl. 64. cites 1 H. 7. 14. per Vaviſor. —— Perk. S. 154.

Br Faits, pl. 28. Perk. S. 154.

5. As if an Infant makes and delivers a Deed, and after at full Age delivers it again, this ſecond Delivery is void; becauſe the Deed was but voidable by Plea, and not void. 8 H. 6. 7.

Br. Faits, pl. 28. Perk. S. 154.

6. So if a Man makes a Deed by Dureſs, and delivers it again at large, this ſecond Delivery is void; becauſe it was voidable by Plea, not void. 8 H. 6. 7.

7. If A. be bound in an Obligation to B. and after B. delivers it to A. in lieu of an Acquittance of Money, and A. after, before any Cancelling of the Obligation, delivers the ſame Obligation to B. for another Duty; this is void, becauſe it continues his Deed by Force of the firſt Delivery at the Time of this ſecond Delivery, and ſo the ſecond Delivery void. 1 H. 7. 14. b.

8. If a Writing by the firſt Delivery takes Effect as a Deed, tho' it be void in Operation, yet a ſecond Delivery, at a Time when it may operate in Law, ſhall be void, and ſhall not make it good.

Br. Faits, pl. 28. cites 8 H. 6. 6. that it is good by the ſecond Delivery, becauſe it took no Effect by the firſt Delivery.

9. As if a Parſon grants an Annuity, and the Patron ſeals and delivers a Deed of Confirmation before the Grant, and after the Grant delivers it again, this ſecond Delivery is void; becauſe tho' by the firſt Delivery it does not take Effect as a Confirmation, but is void in Operation; yet it was his Deed, for he could not plead Non eſt factum. Ergo. Contra 8 H. 6. 6. b. 39 H. 6. 37. b.

As where one *grants a Rent-charge out of the Manor of C. and has nothing in it at the Time*, &c. and after he *purchaſes* the ſame Manor, and then retakes the Deed and redelivers it to the Grantee, this is good.

Br. Faits, pl. 28. cites 8 H. 6. 6. pl. 64. cites 1 H. 7. 14. per Vaviſor.

10. So if I releaſe to you all my Right in the Manor of D. where you have nothing in the Manor at the Time, and you after purchaſe the Manor, and after I deliver the Releaſe again, the ſecond Delivery is void, becauſe it was my Deed before, tho' it was void in Operation. Contra 1 H. 6. 4. b. 1 H. 7. 14. b. Dubitatur 8 H. 6. 22.

Br. Faits, pl. 96. Fitzh. Bar. 13. So where the Label was taken out, and a new Label and Seal put to it. Bro. Faits, pl. 98. cites 11 H. 6. 27.

11. Debt upon *Bond* by A. againſt B. who ſaid, that the Writing was ſealed and delivered as his Deed, and after A. *by Negligence broke the Seal, and prayed B. to ſeal it again*, who did ſo, and delivered it to A. This is a good Deed. Br. Obligation, pl. 81. cites 11 H. 6. 27. —— The Reaſon ſeems to be, that tho' a Deed cannot have two Deliveries, yet when the Seal is broke it is not a Deed but a Writing, and a Writing by Sealing and Delivery may be made a Deed. Quod nota. Br. Faits, pl. 78. ut ſupra.

12. If a Man be diſſeiſed and make a Writing of a *Leaſe for Years, and deliver the Deed, and after deliver it upon the Ground*, the ſecond Delivery is void, for the firſt Delivery made it a Deed, and for that the Leaſe for Years muſt take Effect by the Delivery of the Deed, therefore the Deed delivered when he was out of Poſſeſſion, was void. But ſo it is not of a Charter of Feoffment, for that takes Effect by the Livery and Seiſin. But if the Leſſor had *delivered it as an Eſcrow* to be delivered as his Deed upon the Ground, this had been good. Co. Lit. 48. b. (d)

13. A *Corporation* ſeiſed of the Lands in Queſtion in the ſeveral *Poſſeſſions of A. and B.* made a Deed of *Leaſe to J. S. and a Letter of Attorney to W. R. to deliver the Deed and the Poſſeſſion.* W. R. entered on the Poſſeſſion of A. and there delivered the Deed, and then into the Poſſeſſion of *B.* and there delivered the Deed; and this was found by Verdict; the Queſtion was, if this were good for the Land, for which the ſecond Delivery was, becauſe one Deed cannot have two Deliveries. The firſt was not doubted; 'twas held, that as the Verdict is found, this Matter does not come in Queſtion; for 'tis found that the Corporation

was ſeiſed, and being ſo ſeiſed made the Deed, and then there is no Impediment, but that the Delivery ſhall be good for all; for it ſhall not be intended, but A. and B. had Poſſeſſion only as *Tenants at Will to the Corporation*, and then the *Delivery in one Place is good for all*; and it ſhall not be intended, that they had a Leaſe for Years or Life, except it be ſo ſhewn. Cro. El. 181. Williams v. Aſhet Aſh.

14. A *Diſſeiſee made a Leaſe for Years*, and delivered it to a Stranger as an *Eſcrow*, commanding him to enter into the Land, and then to deliver it as his Deed, who did it accordingly. This was adjudged a good Leaſe, for the Leſſor was able to make a Contract as well in regard of his Perſon as of his Right and Intereſt in the Land, but was only hindred by the Diſſeiſin, which *Impediment being removed before the ſecond Delivery*, the Leaſe is good. 3 Rep. 35. b. cites it as adjudged in the Caſe of Jennings v. Bragg. ——— Cro. El. 446. S. C. adjornatur. But it was there ſaid per Anderſon, that 'twas not his Deed till the ſecond Delivery, at which Time he had a good Right and Power to ler it. ——— And the ſecond Reſolution, 3 Rep. 35. b. 36. was accordingly, and that to ſome Intent the ſecond Delivery ſhall have *Relation*, as where it is for Neceſſity, and *Ut Res magis valeat quam pereat*, but to other Intent it ſhall have *No Relation*, but according to the Truth ſhall become a Deed from the Time of the ſecond Delivery, and not from the firſt, when the Leſſor was out of Poſſeſſion, and the Leaſe therefore void; and *Fictio legis inique operatur alicui damnum vel Injuriam.* ——— 'Twas reſolved 3dly, That as to *collateral Acts* done between the firſt and ſecond Delivery, there ſhall be no Relation. As if Obligee releaſe before the ſecond Delivery, ſuch Releaſe is void. 3 Rep. 36. Jennings v. Bragg.

But if he delivered the Deed *as a Deed, and after delivered it on the Land*, the ſecond Delivery is void, for the firſt Delivery made it a Deed; and becauſe the Leaſe for Years muſt take Effect by the Delivery of the Deed, therefore the Deed delivered when he was out of Poſſeſſion was void. Co. Lit. 48. b. (d) *Secus* of a *Feoffment*, for that takes Effect by Livery and Seiſin. Co. Lit. 48. b.

So a *Leaſe by a Corporation* perfected in their Chapter-houſe, by ſetting to it their Seal, and afterwards by Letter of *Attorney* delivered on the Land to eject the Tenant in Poſſeſſion, was held good for Neceſſity, there being no other Way for a Corporation to make a Leaſe but this. Cro. El. 167. Willis v. Jermin.

A. The Leſſor of the Plaintiff in Ejectment being in another County, and out of Poſſeſſion of the Lands, *delivered a Leaſe to B. as his Deed, to the Plaintiff's Uſe*, and afterwards made a *Letter of Attorney to B. to deliver it upon the Land*, which he did; the Leaſe is void, for it was delivered in another County when A. had nothing in the Land; and tho' the firſt Delivery is void to *paſs a Thing, yet 'tis his Deed by the firſt Delivery*, ſo as it takes thence its Eſſence, and ſo the ſecond Delivery is void. Cro. El. 483. Stephens v. Elliot.

15. In Caſe of a Leaſe delivered as an *Eſcrow*, if at the Time of the *firſt Delivery* the Leſſor be a *Feme ſole*, and *before the ſecond Delivery* ſhe *takes Baron or dies*, in ſuch Caſe for Neceſſity, Ut Res magis valeat to this Intent, by Fiction of Law, this ſhall be a Deed ab initio. 3 Rep. 35. b. in the Caſe of Butler v. Baker.

(N 2.) Second Delivery neceſſary, in what Caſes.

A. Made Indenture of Covenant to ſtand ſeiſed to Uſes, according to Perpetuities, and delivers this to a Stranger to the Uſe of the Covenantee, who hearing of it, utterly diſagreed to it, by which *A.* in every Part of the Deed raſed the *Name of the Covenantee, and writ the Name of J. S.* Lord Keeper *Egerton* agreed, that the Deed is void as to all the Benefit which the Covenantor might have; but 'tis not therefore void for the Uſe and Eſtates to the other Perſons; and that a *New Delivery* is neceſſary, otherwiſe there is not any Covenant for Want of a Covenantee. Mo. 300. Waferer v. Row.

(O) Delivery of a Writing as an *Eſcrow* to be his Deed, upon a Condition performed.

Mo. 642. Le. 152. Degory v. Roe. 6 Mod. 218. in the Caſe of Buſhel v. Paſmore.

1. IF a Writing be delivered ſeal'd to the Party as an Eſcrow to take Effect as his Deed, upon Condition perform'd, it is his Deed now; for the Law reſpects the Delivery to the Party himſelf, and rejects the Words which ſhall make the expreſs Delivery to the Party upon the Matter no Delivery. 9 Rep. 137. Thoroughgood's Caſe, and are cited 12 H. 8. Rot. 751. Upon Demurrer adjudged, and 13 H. 8. Rot. 405. Upon Demurrer alſo adjudged accordingly. Mich. 3 Jac. B. R. between Wade and Blundell adjudg'd. Hobart's Reports 307. between Hackford and Parker adjudg'd, 8 H. 6. 26. b. Trin. 3 Jac. per Cur'. Co. Lit. 36.

Cro. El. 835. Hawkſland v. Gatchell.

* Folio 27.

5 Rep. 84. b. (d). Perryman's Caſe. 9 Rep. 137. S. P. Thoroughgood's Caſe.

A Deed cannot be delivered as an Eſcrow to *the Party* himſelf. Cro. El. 520. Whiddon's Caſe.

2. 19 H. 8. 8. Delivery of an Obligation to the Party upon Conditions to be performed, or otherwiſe but as an Eſcrow, and there adjudg'd, that it is his Deed preſently. (Nota) That he delivered it as an Obligation, which implies it to be his Deed; and then it is clear, that he cannot make it * as Eſcrow by Non-performance of a Condition. But note, That the Delivery to the Party explains it, for there it is agreed, that otherwiſe it would be to a Stranger. Paſ. 44 El. B. cites Trin. 43 El. B. R. to be adjudg'd. Mich. 9 Car. B. R. between Baker and Shepherd, adjudged upon a Demurrer. Intratur Hill. 8 Car. Rot. 419. Contra 29 H. 8. D. 34, 35. per two Juſtices. 27 H. 8. 12. admitted. For Iſſue is taken upon the Performance of the Condition. Trin. 43 El. B. R. by the Opinion of the Court adjudg'd, Hanckton and Gatchell.

Cro. El. 835. diſtinguiſhes between delivering it as an Eſcrow, upon Condition to be his Deed, to the Party himſelf, and delivering it as his Deed upon Condition, &c. and that in the laſt Caſe the Deed is abſolute, but not in the firſt. Hawkland v. Gatchell. —— But Cro. El. 884. Contra, and adjudged, that it cannot be delivered to the Party himſelf as an Eſcrow, becauſe then a bare Averment without any Writing would make void every Deed. Williams v. Green.

3. A. delivers a Deed as an Eſcrow to J. S. to deliver it to the Tertenant on certain Conditions to be performed, and before the Day A. *becomes Non compos*, and then the *Conditions are performed*, and J. S. delivers the Deed. This is good, becauſe it has Relation to the firſt Commandment. Br. Lect. Stat. Limit. 150.

4. If I make a Deed and deliver the ſame *unto J. S. a Stranger* as an Eſcrowl, *to keep until ſuch a Day*, &c. upon Condition, that *if before that Day* B. (he to whom the Eſcrowl is made) ſhall *pay to me* 10 *l.* or ſhall give me a Horſe, or infeoff me of the Manor of Dale, or ſhall perform any other Condition, *then J. S. ſhall deliver the Eſcrowl unto B. as my Deed*, in this Caſe, if J. S. deliver the ſame unto B. as my Deed, *before the Conditions* or Condition *performed*, it is not my Deed *ſimpliciter*; but if the Conditions or Condition be performed, and the Eſcrowl be delivered by J. S. *after the Conditions performed*, as my Deed, then it is my Deed and ſhall bind me, and at the Time of this Delivery then begins it to be my Deed, and ſhall not have Relation to the firſt Delivery. But Quære, if it ſhall have Relation to the Time of the Condition or Conditions performed. But it ſeemeth not. Perk. S. 138. cites 9 H. 6. 37. 10 H. 6. 25. 41 E. 3. 29.

5. J. S. delivered a Deed to A. to the Uſe of B. and C. *if B. would agree to the ſame*, &c. B. dies before Agreement.—— So the Deed is void, becauſe 'twas a Condition precedent. Mo. 300. Degoze v. Row.

—— Le. 152. S. C. but no Judgment; but Anderſon Ch. Juſt. and Periam J. held, that it is the Deed of J. S. tho' B. never agreed. But Walmſley contra. ——

6. If *A. delivers an Obligation* to B. *as an Eſcrow* (in which he is bound to C.) *to be deliver'd as his Deed* to C. *after certain Conditions performed*, and after C. releaſes to A. *before the ſecond Delivery*, this is void, becauſe tho' after the ſecond Delivery it ſhall relate to the firſt Delivery, where there is a Neceſſity, Ut res magis valeat quam pereat; yet as to *collateral Acts* it ſhall not relate at all. 2 Roll. 410. Releaſe (B a.) pl. 3. cites 3 Rep. 36. Butler v. Baker.

S. P. Goldsb. 167 and 168. in the Caſe of Hoo v. Marſhall, cites 5 H. 7. 27. notwithſtanding that 27 H. 6. 7. is contrary.

(O 2.) Pleadings as to Deeds delivered on Conditions, and to be delivered over.

1. ALtho' the *Obligor cannot avoid* his own Deed, by alledging, that he delivered it to the Obligee upon Condition; *yet a Stranger* to the Obligation, to whom the Obligor delivered it, to be delivered to the Obligee upon the Performance of a certain Condition; *if Detinue be ſued againſt him* for this Deed by the Obligee, he (the Stranger) *may plead this Bailment and Condition*, and *pray Garniſhment* againſt the Obligor, *to acknowledge whether the Condition be performed*, or not; for he is Party to the Bailment, but not to the Deed; and upon the Garniſhment, the Trial of Performance, or not, ſhall be between the Obligor and Obligee. Jenk. 166. pl. 20. —— cites 8 H. 6. 28. — 43 Ed. 3. 27. —— 4 Ed. 2. — Fitz. Debt, 167.

2. A. delivers a Deed to B. to deliver as his Deed to C. *C. refuſes to accept it*; B. leaves it, C. however ſues upon it and has Judgment. And. 4. Taw v. Bury —— Dy. 167. pl. 14. S. C. —— 5 Rep. 119. b. ſays, by the Refuſal, the Delivery has loſt its Force, and Non eſt factum may be pleaded. —— 1 Salk. 307. S. C. cited.

2 Le. 101. S. C.

3. In *Debt on Bond*, Defendant pleads, that he deliver'd it as an *Eſcrow*, & hoc *paratus eſt* verificare. 'Tis not good, for he ought to ſhew to whom he delivered it, and alſo to conclude his Plea, and *Iſſint nient ſon fait*. Vent. 9. Anonymus. — Vent. 210. Ward v. Ford. S. C. the Party himſelf, he cannot plead Non eſt factum, for 'tis his Deed ab origine. Mo. 642. —— Jenk. 327. pl. 50. cites M. 14 Jac. Aſhfield v. Wrensford —— D. 34. b. pl. 25. —— Cro. El. 835. Gatchell contra. —— He ought to *conclude to the Country*. 1 Salk. 274. Watts v. Roſwell. Whiddon's Caſe. —— Noy 6. S. C. —— ibid. 50. S. P.

Cro. El. 884. Williams v. Green —— Mo. 642. S. C. If the Delivery was to Hawkſland v. Cro. El. 520.

(O 3.) Eſcrow. Relation thereof to what Time.

1. IF I make a Deed and deliver the ſame *unto J. S. a Stranger* as an Eſcrowl, *to keep until ſuch a Day*, &c. upon Condition, that *if before that Day* B. he to whom the Eſcrowl is made, ſhall *pay to me* 10 *l.* or ſhall give me a Horſe, or infeoff me of the Manor of Dale, or ſhall perform any other Condition, *then J. S. ſhall deliver this Eſcrowl unto B. as my Deed*; in this Caſe, if J. S. deliver the ſame unto B. as my Deed, *before the Conditions* or Condition *performed*, it is not my Deed *ſimpliciter*. But if the Conditions or Condition be performed, and the Eſcrowl be delivered by J. S. *after the Condition performed* as my

Deed, then it is my Deed, and ſhall bind me, and at the Time of this Delivery then begins it to be my Deed, and ſhall not have Relation unto the firſt Delivery. But Quære, if it ſhall have Relation unto the Time of the Condition or Conditions performed. But it ſeemeth not. Perk. S. 138. cites 9 H. 6. 37. 10 H. 6. 25. 41 Ed. 3. 29.

(P) Date. [*Neceſſary or not, and what is ſufficient.*]

A *Date is not eſſential* to a Deed. Per Tirrel Juſt. Cart. 153. cites Perk. fo. 25. b. 2 Rep. 5. * Goddard's Caſe. —— Pl. C. 231. b. —— A Deed is good without any Date, by the Delivery of the ſame. Per Doderidge Juſt. 3 Bulſ. 312. and agreed. —— But upon the Statute of *Inrolments*, the Inrolment muſt be within ſix Months after the Date. Per Jones Juſt. Ibid. 313. * S. C. cited arg. 5 Mod. 284.

1. If a Deed has not any Date of Day or Place, yet it is good. 20 E. 4. 1. Perkins S. 120. 20 H. 6. 44. b.

For the Pleadings vide (P 3.)

2. And in ſuch Caſe a Day and Place may be averr'd of the Delivery. Perkins S. 120.

Hob. 148. Per Hobart. The Day of the *Delivery* is the Day of the Date, tho' no Day is ſet forth. 1 Salk. 76. pl. 18. Armit v. Breame.

3. A Deed is good tho' it has *no Date*. Kelw. 34. b. —— Noy 21. —— 2 Roll. R. 274. arg'. ——— Pl. C. 231. b. in Caſe of Williams v. Barkley, ſays 'tis the ſame in Caſe of *Letters Patent*.

4. *Bond* was given *March* 25. and *Releaſe* of all Demands, *dated* 27*th*, *but altered to the* 24*th*, before Execution, to avoid releaſing the Bond, and the Day indorſed was the 24th; yet this upon *Primo deliberatum pleaded* was adjudged a Releaſe of the Bond. N. B. The Releaſe ſhould have been *till the Day of the Date*. D. 307. pl. 67.

5. The Date of the Deed many Times *Antiquity* omitted, and the Reaſon was, for that the Limitation of Preſcription, or Time of Memory, did often in Proceſs of Time change, and the Law was then holden, that a *Deed bearing Date before the limited Time of Preſcription was not pleadable*, and therefore they made their Deeds without Date, to the End they might alledge them within the Time of Preſcription. And the Date of the Deed was commonly added in the Reign of E. 2. and E. 3. and ſo ever ſince. Co. Lit. 6. a.

A Date *impoſſible* as to the *Year of the King*, but the Year of the Lord, and the Day of the Month being well, is ſufficient. Cro. J. 261. Dobſon v. Keyes. —— So where the *Year of the Lord* was impoſſible, and the Year of the King was right. 8 Mod. 45. Ford v. Lord Grey.

6. A Deed was dated *Anno Domini* 11671. and yet held good. 6 Mod. 45. in Caſe of Ford v. Lord Gray. ——— An *impoſſible Date* is no Date, and the Plaintiff muſt declare of the Time of making. 2 Salk. 463. Cromwell v. Grunſden.

In Wills the *Eccleſiaſtical Law* takes Notice only of the Anno Domini, but the *Common Law* of Anno Regis. Per Doderidge J. Lat. 11.

A Deed dated 8 *Sept. Anno* 78. without ſaying more, as 1478. or 1578. was held a void Date, becauſe the Years were not well alledg'd. Br. Faits, pl. 74. cites 21 E. 4. 38.

7. The Date of a Deed was 1701. (without Anno Domini) and *Willielmi tertii nunc Regis Angliæ, &c. Domini tertio* (without Anno Regni) and yet held good, for it is implicitly in the Deed. 2 Salk. 658. Holman v. Borough.

[See Grant (R 7.)]

(P 2.) Dates. Conſtruction thereof.

1. IF a next Avoidance of a Church be *granted* unto B. *by Deed bearing Date the firſt Day of May* in the 5 H. 7. and the ſame Deed is *firſt delivered* as a Deed to *B. the fourth* Day of May the ſame Year; and *by another Deed dated the ſecond* of May in the ſame Year, the *next Avoidance* of the ſame Church *is granted by the ſame Grantor to C.* and the ſame Deed is delivered as the Deed of the Grantor *the third* Day of May in the ſame Year; in this Caſe the laſt Grantee ſhall have the next Avoidance of the ſame Church, and not the firſt Grantee; and yet his Deed did bear Date before the Deed of the ſecond Grantee: But it is, becauſe a *Deed firſt takes Effect by its Delivery, &c.* Perk. S. 145.

2. *A datu* includes the Day, but *a die datus* excludes the Day. 2 Salk. 413. Hath v. Aſh. —— 3 Lev. 439. S. C. —— Roll. R. 387. (*a*) Bacon v. Waller. Per Croke and Haughton, that a datu, and a die datus, is all one, and Judgment accordingly. —— This Difference is good where it is *in a Caſe, where an Intereſt is to be convey'd* from one to another, as in Caſe of a (*b*) Leaſe for Years, &c. But *in Matters of Account only*, where no Intereſt is to be paſs'd, as if A. is to be accountable to B. and the Deed expreſſes it to be done a die datus, or a datu, 'tis all one. Per tot' Cur. Bulſ. 177. Anonymus. — There is no Difference between the Date of a Deed and the making of it; for the making is the Delivery, notwithſtanding 1 Inſt. 46. b. Per Holt Ch. Juſt. and Sir Barth. Shower ſaid, that 'twas held by all the Court of Common Pleas, (*c*) *to hold from the Date*, or from *the making*, is all one. Cumb. 399. Hicks v. Harvey.

(*a*) 3 Bulſ. 264. S. C.

(*b*) Cro. J. 647. Scavage v. Porter. Held good in an Ejectment Leaſe. Cro. J. 135. Oſborn v. Rider. —— Habend' *from henceforth* includes the Day, and an Ejectment may be alledged the ſame Day. Cro. J. 258. Luellin v. Williams. *Policy of Inſurance* was, that the Defendant undertook to pay the Plaintiff 100 l. if Sir Robert Howard did *live a Twelvemonth from the Day of the Date* of the Policy, being the third of December 1697. and he died the third of December 1698. and Holt directed the Jury to find for the Plaintiff. And he ſaid, if a Man born on the third of December, die the ſecond of December twenty Years after, making a Will on that Day, it would be a good Will. 12 Mod. 256. Fanſhaw v. Harris.

(*c*) Cro. J. 647. Scavage v. Porter.

3. The Day of the *Delivery* of a Deed is the Day of the Date, tho' there is no Date ſet forth; if a Deed bear Date at one Day, and be deliver'd at another, it was really dated when deliver'd, tho' the Clauſe of *Gerens dat'* be otherwiſe. 1 Salk. 76. * Armitt v. Bream. — Brownl. 30, 31. S. P. —— But every *Grant by Record* has Relation to the Day of the Date ſpecified in the Record, and not to the Time of the Delivery. Pl. C. 491. b. Ludford v. Gretton.

Per Doderidge Juſt. 3 Bulſ. 312. D. 307. pl. 68. 5 Rep. 1. Cleyton's Caſe. * 6 Mod. 244. S. C. 2 Salk. 463.

Gerens dat' muſt be underſtood of an expreſs Date, but *Cujus dat'* may be the Delivery. Cromwell v. Grunſden.

(P 3.) Pleading of Dates.

1. IF A. be *bound in a Recognizance to B.* and *B. grants* unto A. by his Deed indented, bearing Date before the Recognizance, *That if A. perform certain Conditions* contained in the ſame Indentures, that *then the Recognizance ſhall be of no force*, in this Caſe it behoveth A. to take Advantage of this Deed, by *averring the Delivery of the* ſame *Deed after the Recognizance* entred into. Perk. S. 147. cites 29 Aſſ. p. 47.

2. If

2. If the *Defeazance of a Recognizance* be *dated before*, if in this Caſe any Uſe be to be made of it, it muſt be *averr'd to be delivered* at or *after the* Time of the *Recognizance* entred into. Heath's Max. 37. cites Perk. S. 147.

3. A Bond bears Date *at S. in the County of S.* and *Action is brought in Com. W.* the Plaintiff ought to *ſurmiſe, that the firſt Delivery was made at B. in the County of W.* where the Writ is brought. Ut dictum fuit. Quære. Br. Faits, pl. 35. cites 22 H. 6. 57.

4. In Aſſiſe the Defendant pleaded a *Releaſe, bearing Date at A.* the *Plaintiff ſays, that tempore Confectionis he was impriſon'd at B.* and the *Defendant ſays, that after the Impriſonment the Plaintiff delivered to him this Releaſe at C. when he was at large*; and becauſe he had departed from the Place where the Releaſe bears Date, the Aſſiſe was awarded. Quod Nota. Br. Faits, pl. 46. cites 1 H. 6. 3.

Vide Perk. S. 148.
Vid. Br. Faits, pl. 48. cites 1 H. 6. 8.
Where a Confirmation delivered after a Grant bore Date before it. ——
So of a *Defeazance of a Recognizance.*
Br. Faits, pl. 60.
29 Aſſ. 47.
* Br. Faits, pl. 101.
5 H. 7. 27. — pl. 102.
18 H. 6. 8.

5. Note, per Coteſmore, if I *deliver an Acquittance to J. N. the ſixth of May*, dated the ſame Day, and *afterwards J. N. delivers me a Bond, bearing Date the firſt of May*, and in Debt upon the Bond J. N. pleads the Acquittance, it is a good Replication, that after the Delivery of this Acquittance this Obligation was delivered to me. 1 H. 6. 4. But 18 H. 6. 8 H. 6. 5 H. 7. are contrary, and * that the Plaintiff ſhall count upon a *primo Deliberatum in his Count*, and not come in with it in his Replication, for then there is a Departure, *viz.* he ſhall count that the Bond bearing Date a Week before the Delivery, *was delivered to him the 8th of May after*, quod Nota, ſcilicet, quod idem Def. per ſcriptum ſuum obligatorium gerens dat' primo die Maii, &c. et primo deliberat' to the Plaintiff octavo die Maii, &c. conceſſiſſet ſe teneri, &c. and then the Acquittance bearing Date the ſixth Day of May ſhall be no Bar to the Obligation bearing Date the firſt of May, which was not delivered till the 8th of May. Nota. Br. Obligation, pl. 40. —— Vide Br. Faits, pl. 47. cites 1 H. 6. 4.

6. *Treſpaſs* was laid the *firſt of June*, the Defendant *pleads a Releaſe until the 30th of May*, (which was the Day of the Date) *abſque hoc quod cauſa actionis accrevit poſt Confectionem ſcripti:* This is naught, becauſe the dies datus excludes the Day of the Date. And the *Traverſe* ought to be *abſque hoc, that he was guilty after the 29th of May*, which is the Day next before the Day of the Date. Paſch. 5 W. & M. B. R. L. P. R. 393.

7. If a Deed bear Date *before Time of Memory*, it is not pleadable, if it be not upon Record, but the Party may well give ſuch Deed in Evidence. Perk. S. 120.

8. In an Action brought by a Feme Sole upon an Obligation, if the Releaſe of one who was her Husband be pleaded, &c. the Woman may ſay, that at the Time of the Delivery of the Releaſe he was not her Husband, &c. and the *Jury* ſhall be charged to *enquire of the Time of the Delivery, and not of the Date*, notwithſtanding that the Woman in her Plea doth not make Proteſtation of the Date, &c. And 'tis to be known, that he who pleads a Deed, and he againſt whom a Deed is pleaded, may *vary from the Date of the Deed* in the Time of the Delivery. Perk. S. 146.

9. Debt was brought on *Bond* conditioned *to perform Covenants in an Indenture bearing even Date* with the Bond, (but *neither Bond or Indenture had any Date*). Per Cur. they ought to have *averr'd a Date* of the Bond, and alſo that the Indentures bore Date the ſame with the Obligation. Noy 21. Anonymus.

10. A Deed Poll was pleaded thus: (Et quoad diem & menſem ſine datu) ſed geren' datum in eodem Anno 1638. The Deed was to all Chriſtian People, &c. and concluded thus: In Witneſs whereof the Parties to theſe preſent Indentures *their Hands and Seals interchangeably*

have ſet the Day and Year firſt above written, 1638. But *there was no Day or Year named throughout the whole Deed.* But no Objection was made to it. Vide Carth. 340. Ward v. Everard.

11. Plea of Payment of a Bond ſuch a Day *Poſt datum Conditionis*, is well enough, and ſhall be intended Poſt datum *Obligationis*; for the Bond and Condition are but one Deed, and the Date of the one is the Date of the other. Cro. E. 732. Forth v. Harriſon.

12. When a Man *declares* that he *leas'd* by Indenture of ſuch a Date, it ſhall always be *intended* to be deliver'd at the ſame Time whereon it bore Date, if it be not ſhewn with a *Primo deliberat'* at another Day; and he that pleads a Deed of ſuch a Date, cannot by *Replication*, or other Pleading, maintain it to be delivered at another Time, for it would be a Departure. Cro. E. 773. Hall v. Denbeigh & al. —— cites 5 H. 7. 26. D. 167, 221. —— Cro. E. 890. S. P. —— But when 'tis ſaid, he demis'd May 1ſt, by Indenture dated March 25th, 'tis neceſſary to be intended, that 'twas not deliver'd the ſame Day it bore Date, but upon the Day of the Demiſe, as 'tis alledg'd. Cro. E. 890. Houſe v. Laxton.

2 Rep. 4. b. *But if the Date is miſtaken*, the Party may declare, or in his firſt Plea plead, that *by Deed bearing Date ſuch a Day, but primo deliberat' other* Day the Party granted, or become bound, &c. and ſo are D. 307. a. 315. a. Cro. E. 773, 890. 5 H. 7. 27. a. to be taken upon this Difference. 3 Lev. 348, 349. Stone v. Bale.

13. *Averment* of *Primo deliberatum* ought not to be received againſt a *Deed inrolled*; for by the ſame Reaſon that that might be averr'd, Nunquam deliberatum may; and ſo upon the Matter, Non eſt factum. 3 Le. 176. Holland v. Bonis alias Baines. —— Savil 91. Holland v. Downes, S. C. contra. And the Court were of Opinion, that a *Stranger ſhall not be eſtopp'd* by the Inrolment, but the Parties ſhall be bound by it. For tho' the Inrolment is reputed to be of the Record, yet 'tis not a Record created by any judicial Act. For 'tis not like to a *Recognizance*, and in all Recognizances Nul tiel Record is a Plea. The Sealing and Delivery is the Force of ſuch Deeds, as Deeds of Bargain and Sale, &c. and not the Inrolment. But in Caſes of Recognizances, there they take their Force and Effect by Inrolment, and the Conuſance only, and not by the Delivery; and therefore the Time of Delivery may well enough be denied, which is but Matter of Fact; but the Conuſance before the Judge is Matter of Record, and by that the Debt is created. But Bonds, Indentures and Deeds of Feoffment take their Force by the Delivery; ſo there is a perfect Act before the Conuſance is taken, and before any Inrolment; and Judgment was given accordingly. ——

14. Tho' a Man may plead that a Deed was delivered after the Day of the Date, yet he *cannot plead that it was delivered before the Day of the Date.* Vide Br. Faits, pl. 28. cites 8 H. 6. 6.—pl. 94. 12 H. 6. 8.— Vide tamen Br. Faits, pl. 99. cites 11 H. 6. 48. to the contrary. Fitzh. Releaſe, 7. Perk. S. 146, 149. For every Deed, which hath a Date, ſhall be intended to be written the Day of the Date, but it is no Deed before the Delivery, and a Deed cannot be delivered to take Effect as a Deed, before it be written.

After the Delivery of a Bond, *and before the Date, the Obligee died* Inteſtate, yet Judgment was given for the Adminiſtrator. 3 Lev. 100. Denton v. Goddard.

15. If A. declares on a Bond as bearing Date the ſixth of May, he cannot on Non eſt factum give *in Evidence a Bond bearing Date at another Day*, but he may give in Evidence a Bond that bears Date the 6th of May, tho' 'twas delivered at another Day. 2 Salk. 463. in Caſe of Cromwell v. Grunſden; and Holt Ch. Juſt. denied the Caſe in 2 Cro. 136. Debt on Bond dated the 15 *Novemb.* 25 *Eliz.* upon *Non eſt factum* pleaded, the Jury found a Bond dated 15 Novemb. 23 (25) Eliz. but *not ſealed till* 18 *Novemb.* 26 *Eliz.* Reſolved that the Verdict was found for the Plaintiff; for the Iſſue Non eſt factum being *generally pleaded*, it appears to be his Deed; but 'twas ſaid, that peradventure by *Special Pleadings* the Defendant might have helped himſelf. Cro. J. 136. Lane v. Pleadall.

16. *Declaration*, That the Defendant the eighth of *September* 1689. per ſcriptum ſuum obligatorium *conceſſit ſe teneri*, &c. to the Plaintiff, and upon Oyer the Bond bore Date the eighth of *September* 1699. and for the Variance a Demurrer. And it was urged, that ſince the Plaintiff varied the Lien from the Date of the Bond, he ought to ſhew when it was firſt delivered; and the right way had been to *declare upon the Bond with the Date it bore, and* then to *ſay Primo deliberat'* at ſuch a Time, and at this Rate one might declare upon a Bond after the Action brought. *But* per Cur. ſince it is ſaid, that *ſuch a Day conceſſit ſe teneri*, it is well, for that could not be without it were then delivered, Jud. pro Quer'. 12 Mod. 651. Lane v. Green.

17. There is a *Difference* between *Declaring on* a Deed, and Declaring *of a Deed*; as ſuppoſe in Treſpaſs for cancelling a Deed by the Defendant, made by the Defendant to the Plaintiff; in the firſt Caſe the Date muſt be *ſet forth*, but in the other it need not, for here it is only a Deſcription of the Deed. Holt's Rep. 455, 456. Norris v. Ware.

Pl. 2. In a Declaration on a Bond it was *Dat' primo die Julii, Anno Regni Regis Caroli Secundi*, 1674. whereas there is no ſuch Date, and it is a void Date, and the Plaintiff may alledge the Deed made when he will; and tho' by the *Profert hic in Cur.* * he has confin'd himſelf, yet the Cujus datus ſhall be *underſtood of the Delivery*, and not the Date. *Cujus datus* ſhall be *the giving of which was, &c.* If it had been *Geren' dat'*, it might have been otherwiſe, but here it is good enough; and Judgment accordingly. 12 Mod. 193. Cromwell v. Grunſdale. —— 5 Mod. 285. S. C. but adjornatur. —— Comb. 478. S. C. adjudg'd. —— 2 Salk. 463. S. C. * 12 Mod. 205. Pullen v. Benſon.

18. If a Deed has *no* Date, or an *impoſſible* Date, you *may declare, that* the Defendant by his Deed on ſuch a Day and Year did ſo and ſo, and upon Oyer there will be no Variance; but if you ſay, that by his Deed of ſuch a Date, or bearing Date ſo and ſo, and upon Oyer the Deed has no Date, or an impoſſible one, it will be a *Variance*. Per Holt. Farr. 38. Anonymus.

(Q) Day.

1. If a Deed bears Date at a Day, where it appears there is no ſuch Day, yet the Deed is good. 20 E. 4. 1.

For the Pleadings vide (P 3.) Br. Faits, pl. 28. cites 8 H. 6. 6. 3 Lev. 348. Stone v. Bale.

2. And he may count of Primo deliberatum at another Day. 21 E. 4. 1.

3. If a Deed be dated 8 December, without Mention of the Year of the King, or of God, it is a void Date, and the Plaintiff may count of a Delivery of it at any other Day. 21 E. 4. 38. b.

4. So if a Deed be dated 8th Day of December, 78. and doth not ſay, if it be the Year of God, or of the King, it is a void Date, and the Plaintiff may count of the Delivery of it at any other Day. 21 E. 4. 38. b.

(R) Place. [*And Pleadings.*]

1. If a Deed bears Date at a Place, and there is no such Place in England, yet the Deed is good and suable, and shall be taken according to where the Plaintiff counts. 20 E. 4. 1. Contra Perkins, S. 120. Because he cannot vary from the Date.

If a Man bring *Debt in C. B.* upon an Obligation bearing Date at *Berwick*, the Plaintiff shall take nothing by his Writ, because he cannot vary from the Place dated in the Obligation, and the Common Pleas *hath not Jurisdiction there*. But when a Deed is pleaded bearing Date at such a Place where the Court hath not Jurisdiction, if the Deed be not answerable, the Plea is good enough. Perk. S. 121. cites 2 E. 3. Oblig.

2. If a Deed bears Date at C. in L. and there is not any such Vill as L. yet the Obligation is good. 3 H. 4. 4. b.

3. If a Deed bears Date out of the Realm, it is good. 20 E. 4. 1. Contra Dock. & Stud. 62. 11 H. 7. 16. Perkins, S. 121. Contra 41 E. 3. 29. b. 20 H. 6. 28. b.

4. It seems if an Action be brought upon such Deed, if he avers, that the Place mention'd in the Deed is in any Place in England, the Action will lie, for it is not traversable; but if it be not alledg'd, but appears that it is dated beyond Sea, it is otherwise, and so the Books may be reconciled; for then it cannot be tried.

5. 48 E. 3. A Deed was dated in H. which in Truth was in Normandy; but in Debt upon it, it was supposed in Kent, and the other travers'd, that there was not any H. in Kent, and the other imparl'd. 48 E. 3. 3. b.

6. If an Obligation be dated at C. in London, and there is not any such Place in London, but in another County, in an Action upon it, one may alledge C. to be in London. 3 H. 4. 5.

7. If a Deed be dated apud Mansionem meam, it is good. 48 E. 3. 3. b.

8. So if it be dated at H. in such County, and if H. be not Vill nor Hamlet, nor in any of them. 48 E. 3. 3. b. Dubitatur.

Perk. S. 120. says, that it is said, that this is a void Deed for the Party, who useth the Deed from the Place dated within the same Deed.

9. If a Deed be made out of the Realm, yet if it has not any Date, * Action may be brought here, supposing it to be made in any Place in England, which is not traversable. 20 H. 6. 44. b.

* Folio 28.

10. A Man may *plead* a Deed to be delivered at another Day than it bears Date upon, but *not to be delivered at another Place* than is comprised in the Deed. Br. Faits, pl. 28. cites 8 H. 6. 6.

Br. Faits, pl. 33. 22 H. 6. 12. Perk. S. 150.

11. He *who pleads a* Deed *shall not vary* from the Place where it bears Date; *but he against whom a Deed is pleaded may* say, that it was made by *Duress of Imprisonment at another Place*, and in another County than it beareth Date. Perk. S. 151.

12. *And therefore*, If in *Quare ejecit* infra terminum, or terminum qui præteriit, or in Formedon, &c. the *Tenant pleadeth* the *Release* of the Demandant *bearing Date at Dale*, &c. and the Demandant says, that he was taken by the Tenant at Dale *in another County, and there was imprisoned* by him, *until he made the Deed* unto him; this is a good Plea, and the Matter shall be tried where the Imprisonment was alledged, *&c.* and so a Man may vary from the Place which is comprised in the Deed; because when a Man maketh a Deed by Imprisonment, he to whom the Deed is made, may put in the Deed what Date he will. Perk. S. 152. cites 8 E. 3. 3. 22 E. 3. 16. Visne 7.

13. An

13. An Obligation or other Deed may be made *by Abbot and Covent out of their Monaſtery*, for all the Monks may be in another Place, ſo that if the Deed ſay, *Datum apud London*, without ſpeaking *de domo capitulari*, ſuch a Deed is good enough, although that their Monaſtery were at Kingſton, &c. *But* if their Deed ſay *Datum in domo Capitulari*, this cannot be but where the Chapter is, &c. Perk. S. 153. cites 9 E. 4. 40.

(R 2.) Avoided, how, or where it remains good.

1. IF a Deed be *delivered* to the Party himſelf *to be cancelled*, yet if it be not cancelled, and the other *gets it again*, it remains a good Deed. Cro. El. 483. in the Caſe of Croſs v. Powell.

(S) What Act or Thing at the making of a Deed will make the Deed void. [*Falſe Reading*].

And an *Indictment* lies for ſuch falſe Reading.

1. IF I am a Man not letter'd, and I deliver a Writing, which is read to me contrary to that which is acknowledged in the Deed, it is not a good Deed. 9 H. 6. 59. b. 10 H. 6. 10. Sid. 312. K. v. Skerret, &c.

But if *I can read*, ſuch falſe Reading will not be reliev'd, for it is my own Folly. Skin. 159. Anonymus, pl. 6.

If a Deed be *read otherwiſe than it is*, and thereupon the Party executes it, 'tis not a good Deed, if the Perſon be *illiterate*. 2 Rep. 9. Thoroughgood v. Cole —— And. 129. S. C. —— Mo. 148. S. C. —— Whether the Party is *literate or illiterate is all one*. Kelw. 70. b. pl. 6. Mic. 21 H. 7.

11 Rep. 27. b. in Pigot's Caſe. Hob. 226. in the Caſe of Needler v. Biſhop of Wincheſter.

So where a *literate Perſon became blind*, and a Deed was read falſly to him, he was not bound by it. 12 Rep. 89. Shulter's Caſe.

But if a Perſon illiterate ſeal and deliver a *Deed* and *does not ask to have it read* to him, he ſhall never plead Illiterature after; but if it be read to him in other Form, he ſhall plead it after. Per Anderſon Ch. J. Mo. 184. pl. 326.

11 Rep. 28. in Pigot's Caſe.

2. If Agreement be to releaſe 20 l. and the other makes a General Releaſe, and he being not letter'd delivers it by Agreement as a Releaſe for 20 l. only, this Deed is void. 47 E. 3. 3. b. 17.

3. If Agreement be to releaſe all Treſpaſſes, and in the Deed is put Releaſe of Land, and this is delivered by a Man not letter'd, as a Releaſe only of Treſpaſs, this Deed is void. 44 E. 3. 23. 44 Aſſ. 30.

A *Bond* given by an illiterate Perſon *by the Perſuaſion of another*, who impoſed on him, telling him it was a Thing of another Nature, and that it would not damnify him, was ſet aſide, and ſo was the Judgment obtained upon it, and the Execution-money ordered to be repaid, and a *perpetual Injunction*. Fin. Rep. 161. Jones v. Crawley and Wolſton.

4. So where there is not any Agreement to make any Releaſe, but a Man comes to another not letter'd, and prays him to ſeal a Deed, ſaying, that it ſhall be no Prejudice to him, and he ſeals it without hearing it; the Deed is a good Deed, becauſe he did not pray to hear it. 44 Aſſ. 30. 44 E. 3. 23. Dubitatur.

5. If a Man for great Age cannot ſee to read, and ſeals an Obligation upon falſe Reading, he ſhall avoid it. 3 H. 6. 52. b. Mich. 9 Jac. in the Star-Chamber, Shuter's Caſe cited 11 Rep. 28.

28. resolv'd, tho' he was letter'd, for now he has all his Intelligence by Hearing.

6. If a Deed be read to a Man illiterate, to be upon Condition, where it is without Condition, it is not his Deed. 9 H. 6. 59. Br. Faits, pl. 37. 14 H. 8. 25. per Brooke.

7. If a Deed be read to a Man illiterate, as a Gift in Tail, with a Letter of Attorney, where it is a Feoffment in Fee, it is void in all, as well in the Estate as in the Letter of Attorney; for all is but one Deed, and by the Livery secundum formam Chartae, nothing passes, the Deed being void. 30 E. 3. 31. b. Curia. 11 Rep. 27. b.

8. If an Obligation be read to a Man illiterate, that he binds himself by it in 5 l. where it is 100 l. it is void in all. 30 E. 3. 31. b. 11 Rep. 27. b.

9. If a Man not letter'd will make a Feoffment, and upon one Parchment, &c. two Feoffments are contain'd, and only one is read to him, yet the Deed, for this Feoffment which is read to him, is good. 30 E. 3. 32. 11 Rep. 27. b.

10. If three distinct Obligations are written upon one Piece of Parchment, and one of them only is read to the Obligee, and he being a Man not letter'd seals and delivers the Deed, This is good for that which was read, and void for the others. 11 Rep. 27. b. Piggot's Case. Br. Faits, pl. 37. cites 14 H. 8. 25

(T) What Act or Thing will avoid a Deed. Rasure, [*and Pleadings*].

1. Rasure will avoid a Deed. 14 H. 4. 18. Mo. 80. Arden v. Mitchel.

If a Deed-Poll be rased *in a Place not material*, the Deed is not suspicious for such Matter. Perk. S. 124.

As if a Deed of *Feoffment* be rased in the *Addition of the* Name of the *Feoffee*, *or* if the Deed *comprehend Dedi & conceſſi*, and *conceſſi is rased*, the Deed is not suspicious for such Matter. Perk. S. 124.

But otherwise is it, if *Dedi* be rased, for the Word Dedi comprehends the Effect and Force of the Word conceſſi, and more; for Dedi *in a Deed of* Feoffment *comprehends* in it *a Warranty* against the Feoffor, and so doth not the Word conceſſi. Perk. S. 124.

And altho' a Deed-Poll be rased in a material Place, as in the *Name of Baptiſm* of the Grantor or Grantee, if it appear that there was *no Writing there before*, it is not very suspicious. Perk. S. 124.

2. Rasure of the Condition upon the Back of an Obligation will make the Obligation suspicious. 41 E. 3. 10. b. It will not make it void. Br. Faits, pl. 7. S. C.

If there be a Rasure of a Bond indorsed for *Performance of Covenants*, the Indenture proving the Bond makes it good. Mo. 10. pl. 37. Anonymus per Hale J.

3. The Rasure of the Date of a Deed will avoid the Deed, because peradventure it was dated out of the Realm. 41 E. 3. 29. b. 44 E. 3. 42. b. adjudged. Br. Faits, pl. 11. If the Date *of a Releaſe* be rased in the Place, it is very suspicious, because it may be it was dated out of the Realm. Perk S. 123. cites 44 E. 3. 42.

Plaintiff *altered the Date of a Bond* for Performance of Covenants from 84 to 85; per Cur', the Rasure is in a *Place not material*, and also tends to the *Advantage of the Defendant* himself who pleads it; and if the Indenture had been void by it, the Obligation had been single. Le. 282. Lord Darry v. Sharp.

Br. Faits, pl. 9.

4. But **in this Case if the Plaintiff** avers, That it was dated in London, and shews a Defeazance thereof, which bears Date there, **it is good enough; for now the Date is not material.** 41 E. 3. 29. b. **Perkins S.** 126.

5. If the *Name* of the Grantor or Grantee be rased or interlined, the Deed is very suspicious. Perk. S. 123.

6. If there be a Rasure of the *Thing granted*, it makes the Deed very suspicious. Perk. S. 123.

7. So it is, if the Rasure is in the *Limitation of the Estate*, &c. Perk. S. 123.

8. If a Man *grants* unto me a *Rent-charge* by Deed, which he hath issuing out of the Land of another Man, and the Tenant attorns, and the *Grantee* by his Deed *reciting the same* Grant, *regrants the same to his Grantor*, yet it is not very suspicious, because it doth *rely upon another Deed*, in which Relier, (viz. Recital) it is not rased; *Quære*, if such Deed be rased in the *Date of the Place*, &c. Perk. S. 125.

9. *And* if in Debt brought upon an Obligation, the *Date of the Obligation* be rased, and the Plaintiff shews forth an *Indenture of Defeazance proving the Obligation*, the Obligation is good enough. Perk. S. 126.

10. *So* it is of *Indentures bipartite*, *tripartite*, or *quadripartite*, if *one of them or all* of them be interlined or *rased in a material Place*, they are sufficient notwithstanding the same, if so be they do *not vary in the Words*. Perk. S. 126.

But if one Indenture be rased *in a Place material*, and the other Indentures or Indenture are not rased, and the Indenture which is rased doth *not agree in Words*, in that Place which is rased, with them or that which is not rased, the Indenture rased is very suspicious. Perk. S. 127.

11. Rasing of *one Indenture* after Sealing, does not make it void, if it *agrees* in Words *with the other Indenture*. Per Cur. Mo. 10. Anonymus.

12. *Several Persons* enter into *several Covenants*. If the Deed be rased in any Clause which concerns them all, or in the *Date*, the Deed is avoided as to all; but otherwise the Deed is intended several to every of them, so that the pulling off the Seal of one is no Discharge against the other. Cro. El. 546. Matthewson v. Lydial.

13. In case of Rasures and Interlineations in *antient Times*, the *Judges adjudged* on their View the Deed to be *void*, as appears 7 E. 3. 57. 25 E. 3 41. 41 E. 3. 10. but of late Times the Judges have left this to be *try'd by Jurors*, whether the Rasing or Interlining was before the Delivery. 10 Rep. 92. b. in Dr. Leyfield's Case.

D. 261. b. pl. 28, 29. Anonymus. — Mo. 835. pl. 1125. S.P. Anonymus.

14. Rasing a Deed *by the Party himself* avoids the Deed, tho' it be in a Place not material, but Rasure *by a Stranger* does not, unless it be in a Place material. Per omnes J. Angliæ. Jenk 232. cites 11 Rep. 27. Pigot's Case.

If the Indentures are of *Bargain and Sale of Land and Tenements*, and the Indenture which remaineth with the Vendee is rased, and the Word which is rased is *Manor*, and in the other Indenture the Word which is rased is *House*; and the Vendor hath a Manor and also a House in the same Town where the Lands sold lie; the Indenture which the Vendee hath is greatly suspicious, and so it is of Interlining and other like Things. Perk. S. 128.

15. *Lessor rases one of the Parcels out of the Lease*; this made all the Deed void. Per omnes — But per Dyer, Lessee may plead this as a Lease Parol. Mo. 36. pl. 116. Anonymus.

And if the Words which testify, That the Grantor, Obligor or Feoffor, &c. *have put their Seal* to the Deed, are rased, the Deed is insufficient notwithstanding it be sealed. Perk. S. 128. cites 40 E. 3. 1.

If it be in the Sum to be paid, it vitiates the Bond. 2 Bulst. 248. in the Case of Piggot v. Winchcomb.

16. A. is bound to B. in 20 l. B. rases out 10 l. and makes the Bond only for 10 l. all the Bond is void, and yet this Act is to the *Advantage of the Obligor*. Arguendo Kelw. 161. b.

17. A. made an Indenture of Covenants to ſtand ſeiſed to Uſes according to Perpetuities, and delivers this to a Stranger, to the Uſe of the Covenantee, who hearing of it utterly diſagreed to it, upon which A. in every Part of the Deed raſed the *Name of the Covenantee, and writ the Name of J. S.* Lord Keeper Egerton decreed, that the Deed was void as to all the Benefit which the Covenantor might have; but 'tis not therefore void for the Uſes and Eſtates to the other Perſons; and that a *new Delivery* is neceſſary, otherwiſe there is not any Covenant for want of a Covenantee. Mo. 300. Waferer v. Row.

18. *Drawing a Line underneath* any Words is no Defacing or Drawing them out. Cro. Jac. 542. Draycot v. Heaton.

19. A Policy *altered by Conſent* after 'twas underwritten, was held well. 2 Salk. 444. Bates v. Grabham.

[See (U) pl. 6.]

(U) * Interlining ſhall avoid a Deed. 14 H. 4. 18. [*And Altering.*]

* Folio 29.

1. If a Deed be altered in a Point material by the Plaintiff himſelf, or by a Stranger, without the Privity of the Obligee, be it by Interlineation, Addition, Raſure, or by drawing of a Pen thro' the Midſt of any Word, the Deed by this becomes void. 11 Rep. 27. Pigot's Caſe, per Cur' reſolved, for it is not now the ſame Deed. Roll.Rep. 39. S. C. 2 Bulſt. 246. S. C.

2. As if an Obligation be made to a Sheriff to appear, &c. and in the Obligation the Name of the Sheriff is omitted, and after the Delivery of it his Name is interlined, either by the Obligee or by a Stranger, without his Privity, yet the Deed is void by it. 11 Rep. 27. Pigot's Caſe, reſolv'd per Cur'. If the Interlineation be in a Place not material, it does not avoid the Bond, &c. as where a

Bond was made to a Sheriff without the Name of Office, and in an Action upon it *Vicecomiti Com. O.* was found interlined after Delivery, but not found by whom; it was adjudged for the Plaintiff, becauſe not in a Place material. Mo. 835. pl. 1125.

3. But if the Deed be interlined in a Thing not material, by a Stranger, without the Aſſent of the Obligee, this ſhall not make the Obligation void. Reſolved 11 Rep. 27. Pigot's Caſe. Mo. 835. pl. 1125. Anonymus. A. and B. ſeal

and deliver a Bond to D. then by *Conſent of all the Parties*, the Name, &c. of C. was interlined, and C. ſealed and delivered it. Reſolved it is good, and the Obligation of all Three. 2 Lev. 35. Zouch v. Clay.

Blanks were filled up with *Conſent of Obligors* after the Execution of the Bond, and held good. Mo. 547. Markham v. Gomaſton. —— Cro. El. 627. S. C. held contra.

Vent. 185. Zouch v. Clay, takes no Notice of the Conſent of the Parties, but that upon the Delivery by A. and B. a *Space was left in which the Name of C. was put in, who alſo ſealed and delivered it*; and held, that the Bond remained the ſame as to A. and B. and they could not take Advantage of it; and 'tis the uſual Practice for Sheriffs to make their Bonds for Appearance in this Manner.

4. But otherwiſe it is, if the Interlining of the Deed be by the Obligee himſelf, tho' it be in a Thing not material. Per Curiam, 11 Rep. 27. Pigot's Caſe.

5. A Man leaſed for Years by Indenture, reſerving Rent, and in the Counterpart of the Leſſor 27 l. was reſerv'd, and in the Counterpart of the Leſſee but 26 l. and after a Controverſy grew between the Leſſor and Leſſee, which Rent ſhould be paid, and the Leſſor would have 27 l. and the Leſſee would pay but 26 l. Cro. El. 627. cites it as Fecknam's (the Dean of Paul's) Caſe.

But

But after the Leſſee was content to pay 27 l. and ſo agreed with the Leſſor, and for this the Leſſee made a Stroke in his Indenture, and made it 27 l. This makes his Leaſe void. *Facman's* Caſe adjudg'd, cites Mic. 40 & 41 El. B. R. 76.

6. If A. leaſe Land to B. by Indenture dated 10 Feb. 27 H. 8. and after dies, and C. the Heir of A. by Indenture recites the Leaſe, but miſrecites it, that is to ſay, reciting it to be dated 10 Feb. 28 H. 8. and then leaſes it by Indenture to B. for Years, to commence after the Expiration of the ſaid recited Leaſe, and after the Sealing and Delivery of this laſt Leaſe, this Miſrecital is raſed and reform'd, and made 10 Feb. 27 H. 8. according to the true Leaſe, but it is not known by whom it is done, nor when (a); This ſhall not avoid the Intereſt of the Eſtate for Years, tho' it ſhall avoid the Deed, becauſe the Deed is not of the Eſſence to paſs the Eſtate; but the Eſtate being well paſſed, and it not being neceſſary to ſhew the Deed for Maintenance of the Eſtate, the Eſtate ſhall not be deſtroy'd by it. Hill. 10 Car. B. R. between (b) *Miller* and *Manwaring* per Jones and Barkley contra Croke. Intratur Trin. 10 Car. Rot. 321. In this Caſe Juſtice Jones cites *Allen Swanwick's* Caſe in the Court of Wards to be reſolv'd, That the Raſure of a Deed of Feoffment doth not deſtroy the Eſtate.

(a) Cro. Car. 399. S. C.

(b) Jo. 355. S. C. — Cro. Car. 397. S. C.

(a) It was ſo held per Jones and Harvey J.

But Croke J. held contra, that as it is a Leaſe by the Deed, it is a Contract by the Deed; and the Party intereſted raſing the Deed, he determines the Deed and his Intereſt by his voluntary Act, as if he had ſurrendered; and the Contract being by Deed, he may not determine the Deed and the Covenants; but *Quoad himſelf* he doth deſtroy it, but perhaps *Quoad the Leſſor* it may have Eſſence, if the Leſſor will; but this is at his Election, and not at the Election of the Leſſee. Cro. Car. 399. cites 11 Rep. 27. D. 261. 10 Rep. 97. in Dr. Leyfield's Caſe, 7 E. 3. 57. 14 H. 8. 27. per Brook 44 E. 3. 42.

Adjudged good, being filled up by Conſent. Mo. 547. S. C. ſays, it was afterwards ſo adjudged in a new Action in B. R. upon Demurrer. the Plaintiff having pleaded the Aſſent of A. and B.

7. If A. at the Requeſt of B. be bound in a Statute with B. to C. as his Surety, and upon this B. cauſes D. his Servant to make a Counterbond, in which he and E. will be obliged to A. to ſave him harmleſs from the ſaid Statute, and commands him alſo to leave out of the Condition of it the Chriſtian Name of C. the Place of his Habitation, the County and his Addition, who does it accordingly, and after E. ſeals and delivers the Counterbond as his Deed, to the Uſe of A. and after the ſaid D. by the Command of B. and by the Aſſent of E. inſerts in the Spaces the Chriſtian Name of C. the Place of his Habitation and County, and his Addition, and after B. ſeals and delivers the Obligation; This is * a void Obligation againſt E. by the ſaid Addition in the Spaces, tho' it was done by the Aſſent of E. Adjudg'd Mich. 40 & 41 El. B. R. between Markham and Goneſtone.

* Folio 30.

Cro. El. 627. S. C. but that is an Action on the Caſe brought by C. againſt D. in Nature of a Deceit for deſtroying the Effect of the Bond; and there Popham held, that if it had been *appointed* by the Obligor *before the Sealing* and Delivery thereof, *that it ſhould be afterwards filled up*, it might perhaps be good and not have avoided the Deed.

A *Bond is made ſingle* for Payment of a Sum of Money, and afterwards the Obligee *indorſes a Condition*, that if the Obligor infeoffed the Obligee by ſuch a Day, the Bond to be void. Adjudged per Three Juſtices againſt One, that the Obligation was good; but Three of the Juſtices of B. R. were of Opinion, that the Judgment ought to be reverſed, tho' it was not; and about twenty Years afterwards, three other Juſtices of the C. B. in another Caſe before them, were of Opinion, that tho' B. R. did not proceed to Reverſal, yet that if it came in Argument now, it would be reverſed without great Doubt; and per Fitzherbert, he might plead *Non eſt factum*, for when the Condition is written after the Delivery, it is not the ſame Deed that was delivered. Kelw. 162, 164. Mic. 3 H. 8.

Perk. S. 124. 8. If a Deed be ras'd or interlined in the *Date*, *in the Name of Parties*, *in the Limitation of Eſtate*, *in the Name of the Thing granted*, *or the Rent reſerved*, 'tis ſuſpicious to enfeeble the Deed, becauſe in a Thing of

Subſtance. But if it be in *Recital* or *Addition*, or in other *Word of Explanation* in Deeds, or *Words of Courſe* and Form, This ſhall not impeach the Credit of the Deed, becauſe they are only Matters of Circumſtance. Per Manwood Ch. B. Mo. 230. in Fanſhaw's Caſe.

9. There is no Book in the Law, which avoids Leaſes or Grants of Corporations for Variance in any of theſe four Circumſtances, viz. *Addition*, *Interpoſition*, *Omiſſion*, *Commutation*; if they retain the four firſt Principles of Subſtance, viz. *Name* of *Perſons*, of *Houſe*, *Foundations or Dedication*, *and Place known before* the Foundation in which the Houſe is ſituate. Per Manwood Ch. B. Mo. 235. in Fanſhaw's Caſe.

There muſt be no Omiſſion of any material Part. And. 23. Dean and Chapter of Eaton's Caſe.

10. Where Words of *Power reſerved* (as to grant, ſell and demiſe, &c.) which give a larger Power than before, are interlined, but there is *no Proof when* theſe Words were interlined, *or that it was by the Direction of the Grantor*, they muſt be looked upon as if they had been originally incorporated in the Body of the Deed. Per Reynolds Ch. B. Gibb. 214. Fitz-Gerald v. Lord Falconbridge.

11. An Interlineation (if nothing appears againſt it) will be *preſumed to be at* the Time of *Making the Deed*, and not after. Keb. 22. Trowell v. Caſtle.

12. A Deed of Revocation, and a new Settlement made by that Deed, tho' after the Sealing and Execution thereof *Blanks* were *filled up*, and *not read again* to the Party, *nor reſealed* and executed, was yet held a good Deed. 2 Chan. Rep. 410. Paget v. Paget.

(U 2.) Actions and Pleadings, as to Raſures, Interlineations, Falſe Readings, &c.

1. IN a Bond the *Day was omitted*, and a Space left, and after Delivery the *Plaintiff inſerts* the Day; per Dyer, the better Pleading had been to plead the ſpecial Matter, per quod ſcriptum prædictum perdidit effectum. Mo. 28. pl. 89. Anonymus.

2. It ought to be *ſpecially pleaded*, and not given in Evidence. Mo. 66. pl. 179. Anonymus.

3. Action on the *Caſe lies* againſt a *Stranger* interlining a Bond by Order of the Obligor, and ſo avoiding it; and a Writ ſhall be awarded to inquire of Damages. Cro. El. 626. Markham v. Gomaſton.

(X) Breaking off the Seal.

1. IF the Seal be taken away from the Deed, it is not any Deed. 11 H. 6. 27. Where the Seal is broken off, *Non eſt factum* is a good *Plea*; but if there is any ſpecial Matter, the *Jury* may find it. 5 Rep. 119. b. —— D. 112. pl. 50. Peres v. Biſhop.

Br. Faits, pl. 22. cites S. C. Perk. S. 135.

2. If there be no Manner of Print remaining, by which it may appear that it ever was ſealed, it ſhall avoid the Deed. 14 H. 4. 30. b. Demurrer.

S. P. *But* if there appear *any Print* of the Seal upon it, and the Seal remains annexed to the Deed, it is ſufficient: *But if* the Seal be *ſevered* from the Deed, notwithſtanding the Print remains, the Deed is inſufficient. Perk. S. 135. cites 7 H. 6. 18.

Br. Faits, pl. 27. Perk. S. 136.

3. If the Seal be once ſevered from the Deed, and after ſewed together, and glewed to it again, yet the Deed is void by it. 7 H. 6. 18. Curia. Perkins, S. 135.

4. If the Seal of a Deed be a little bruiſed, whether it be an antient or new Writing, if *Part of the Seal remains, upon which there is any Print*, the Deed is good enough; but if the Part which remains to the Deed has not any Print, then the Deed is inſufficient. Perk. S. 136.

Debt on Bond againſt A. and B. Jury found, that *after Iſſue joined, and before Niſi prius* the Seal of B. was taken from the Bond, adjudged the Bond was good. Owen 8. Michael's Caſe. —— For it was Defendant's Deed at the Time when Iſſue was joined, and the Trial ſhall relate to that. Cro. El. 120. S. C. —— Goldsb. 83. S. C.

5. Debt was brought upon a Bond, and *after Plea pleaded* the Seal was broken; the Jury were directed to find the ſpecial Matter. D. 59. pl. 12. Nichols v. Haywood.—— This Accident ſhall not be aſſigned for Error. D. 59. pl. 12. Marg. cites 41 Eliz. Worſley v. Charnock. —— ibid. cites Michel v. Stockworth and Andrews. —— Ow. 8. Michael's Caſe, had it been *before Iſſue joined*, it would have avoided the Deed—— cited 2 Show. 29.

6. Debt upon Bond againſt Two, the *Seal of one* is broken; this avoids all the Deed, tho' the *Bond is joint and ſeveral*; for this implies jointly, and it is not material who broke the Seal. D. 59. pl. 12. marg. cites Paſ. 3 Jac. B. R. —— 2 Show. 28. Seaton v. Henſon.

7. A. and B. *covenant with Six, who ſeparatim covenant with A. and B.* one of the *Seals of one of the Six* is broken off; this does not avoid the Deed. But if the *Seal of A. or B.* who covenanted jointly had been broken, the Deed had been defeated. 5 Rep. 23. —— Cro. El. 408. Mathewſon v. Lydiate, S. C. —— 470. 546. S. C.— 2 Bulſt. 248. —— cited Poph. 161.

8. A Deed was left with Baron Snigg, and *by Caſualty* of Fire the Seal was *melted off*. The Defendant being a meer Stranger, and Owner of the Land (the Plaintiff by the Deed claiming a Watercourſe thro' it) pleaded a ſpecial *Non eſt factum*; Plaintiff moved, that he might plead the General Iſſue, and then the Jury might well find all the Special Matter for the Court to judge upon: Per Coke Ch. Juſt. we cannot aid in this (tho' Snigg made an Affidavit); for if his Right depends on a Deed, if he loſe his Deed, by this he loſes his Right, and no Remedy here for him; agreed per Curiam (abſente Doderidge); afterwards the Book of 43 Eliz. c. 3. was remembred, that if one has a Deed, and the Party, from whom he had it, takes it from him and pulls off the Seal, he may plead this Deed without ſhewing it, but ſhall plead that his Adverſary has done this. It was urged, that *Ne grant pas* a *Stranger* may plead, but not *Non eſt factum*; but an *Executor* may plead Non eſt factum. 3 Bulſt. 79. Moor v. Salter.

Palm. 403. S. C. Argol v. Cheyny.

9. Seals were broken off from a Deed to *lead the Uſes of a Recovery*. Yet upon Examination it was admitted to guide the Uſes, it being proved to have been done by a little Boy, and that the Seals were once annexed, and being compar'd together, the Raſures of the Parts agreed. Lat. 226. Anonymus.

(X 2.) *Cancelled* Deeds. The Effect thereof at Law.

1. CAncelled Deeds were allowed to be *given in Evidence*, Proof being firſt made of the Truth of their being cancelled. Het. 138. Beckrow's Caſe.

2. Commiſſioners of Bankrupts had *aſſign'd a Bankrupt's Goods to A. B. C. and D.* But his Deed of Aſſignment was afterwards cancell'd, and a *new Deed made to A. B. and C. only*, who without D. brought an Action for the Goods; and per Rainsford and Wild Juſt. (Hale Ch. Juſt. being ſick) tho' the Cancelling of the prior Aſſignment does *not alter the Property*, but that it *remains in A. B. C. and D.* and tho' D. is not Party to the Action, yet the others upon Not guilty pleaded ſhall recover Damages in Trover for two Parts of the Goods, and ſhall not be nonſuited; but the Defendant might have pleaded this in Abatement of the Writ for ſo much. But having pleaded Not guilty, they, tho' Jointenants with one another, ſhall recover Damages for their Parts; to which Sir Will. Jones, of counſel for the Plaintiff, hæſitanter ſubmitted. 2 Lev. 113. Nelthorp and Farrington v. Dorrington.

3. The Court declared, that tho' the Deed appeared cancelled, yet it was a good Deed, and that the Cancelling thereof did not deveſt the *Eſtate of the Truſtees therein named*, and that the Truſt thereby created ought to be performed. 2 Chan. Rep. 100. Leech v. Leech.

4. *Grant of an Office to A. and B.* for their two Lives and the Life of the longeſt Liver of them, *B.* keeps the Deed without being produced; which in Trial of an Action brought by *A.* appeared to be cancelled; it was inſiſted, that the Eſtate in the Office was thereby deſtroyed; but per Cur', not as to A. unleſs it appeared that A. had a Hand in the Cancelling it. Vent. 297. Woodward v. Aſton.

5. A *Rent* or other *Grant* is *not loſt* by the Deſtruction of the Deed, as a Bond or *Choſe en Action* is. Per Cur. Vent. 297. Woodward v. Aſton. —— The Property remains the ſame. 2 Lev. 113. Nelthorpe and Farrington v. Dorrington. —— 2 Vern. 476. Lady Hudſon's Caſe cited there.

Quære per the Reporter, If the Party himſelf cancels it. Vent. 297.

6. A Father having taken Diſpleaſure at his Son, made an additional Jointure on his Wife by a *voluntary Conveyance*, which he kept in his own Power, and being afterwards reconciled to his Son, the Father cancelled the additional Jointure, and died. The Wife after his Deceaſe found the cancelled Deed, and recover'd by Virtue of it. Cited per Lord Wright, 2 Vern. 476. as Lady Hudſon's Caſe —— cited per Lord Wright Ch. Prec. 235.

(X 3.) Cancelled Deeds relieved in Equity.

1. A *Bond* was taken away fraudulently and cancell'd. Decreed, that the *Widow* ought to have Satisfaction out of her Husband's Eſtate by whom the Bond was cancelled, and as much Benefit, as if it had been uncancelled. Fin. Rep. 184. Brown v. Savage.

2. A *Bond torn* may be relieved in Equity. Per Finch C. Obiter. Vern. 78. in the Caſe of Wilcox v. Stuart.

3. A. deviſed his Lands to ſeveral Relations, at the Funeral a younger Brother of the Heir at Law ſnatches the *Will* out of the Executor's

cutor's Hands, and tore it in many ſmall Pieces, the Pieces (eſpecially of that Part in which the Land was deviſed) were picked up and *ſtitched together*. A Bill was brought to eſtabliſh the Will; and decreed the Deviſees to enjoy againſt the Heir, and he to convey to them, tho' no direct Proof was made, that what was done was by his Direction. 2 Vern. 441. Haines v. Haines.

4. A. by Anſwer confeſſed he had in a Paſſion *burnt his Marriage Articles*, but it being proved, that he had produced them at a Commiſſion after the Time he pretended he burnt them, he was *committed to the Fleet*, and tho' he made Oath he had them not, and could not produce them, yet the Court would not diſcharge him, till he *conſented to admit, they were to the Effect in the Bill.* 2 Vern. 561. Sanſon v. Rumſey.

(X 4.) Remedy againſt Perſons Cancelling and Deſtroying Deeds.

1. A. delivered a Deed of B. to J. S. who *tore it in Sport without Malice, by Misfortune and Chance.* Both A. who delivered the Deed, and J. S. who tore it, were *impriſoned*, and the Deed was *inrolled* immediately. Br. Faits, pl. 88. cites 3 E. 3.

2. If a Man *finds a Bond*, and cancels it, *Treſpaſs Vi & armis* lies, for he deſtroys the Thing found. Cro. E. 723. Watſon v. Smith.

3. *Action on the Caſe* lies for tearing off the Seal of a Deed, by which J. S. granted to the Plaintiff *unum annualem Redditum ſive Annuitatem* of 10 l. for his Life, tho' the Plaintiff ſhewed not, whether it was an Annuity or a Rent, or that it was the Seal of the Grantor, or the Seal of the ſame Deed, but only Sigillum eidem annexat'; or that he loſt the Annuity; yet it was adjudged for the Plaintiff. Cro. J. 255. Aſh v. Brudnell.

4. *A. on the Marriage of his Son ſettled ſeveral Lands* in this Manner, viz. *as to Part, to* the Uſe of *himſelf for Life*, and after to the Uſe of *his Son for Life*, then to his *firſt and other Sons in Tail*, and for want of ſuch Iſſue, to the Uſe of *the Plaintiff, who was his Brother, and his Heirs*; and *as to other Part* of the Lands, to the Uſe of the *Son for Life*, and after to the Uſe of the *Wife for her Jointure*, then to the *firſt and other Sons in Tail*, and for want of ſuch Iſſue, to the *Plaintiff and his Heirs*; the *Son and Wife died without Iſſue* in the Life-time of A. and after their Deaths *A. got the Settlement and cut it in pieces*; but the Counterpart was intire, and in the Hands of A. and the *Bill* was brought to *diſcover* it, and have it preſerved; and the *Counterpart* being confeſſed in the Anſwer, the Plaintiff obtained an Order at the Rolls to have it brought into Court, and a Motion was made to have that Order diſcharged, for that the Remainder to the Plaintiff was meerly voluntary, and therefore he ought not to have any Aid from a Court of Equity; but the Court would not Diſcharge the Order, but made the *Deed* be *brought into Court, there to remain, and thereby hinder A. from ſelling the Eſtate* from the Plaintiff. Trin. 1691. Abr. Equ. 168. Brookbank v. Brookbank.

5. 2 *Geo.* 2. *C.* 25. *S.* 3. *If any Perſon ſhall ſteal, or take by Robbery, any Exchequer Bills, Bank-Notes,* South-Sea *Bonds,* Eaſt-India *Bonds, Dividend Warrants of the Bank,* South-Sea *Company,* Eaſt-India *Company, or any other Company, Society or Corporation,* Bills of Exchange, *Navy Bills or Debentures,* Goldſmiths Notes *for Payment of Money, or other* Bonds *or Warrants, Bills,* or Promiſſory Notes *for the Payment*

of any Money, being the Property of any other Perſon, or of any Corporation, notwithſtanding any of the ſaid Particulars are termed in Law a Choſe in Action, *it ſhall be deemed and conſtrued to be Felony of the ſame Nature and in the ſame Degree, and with or without the Benefit of Clergy, in the ſame Manner as it would have been if the Offender had ſtolen or taken by Robbery any other Goods of like Value with the Money due on ſuch Orders, Tallies, Bills, Bonds, Warrants, Debentures or Notes, or ſecured thereby, and remaining unſatisfied; and the Offender ſhall ſuffer ſuch Puniſhment as he ſhould or might have done, if he had ſtolen other Goods of the like Value with the Money due on ſuch Orders, Tallies, &c.*

(Y) What Act or Thing will avoid a Deed. [*In part or in all.*]

1. If divers ſeveral Perſons make ſeveral Covenants in one Deed with one another, and no joint Covenant, and the Seal of one of the Covenantees is broken off, yet this ſhall not avoid the Deed as to the others. Tr. 2 Ja. B. adjudged between *Alabaſter* and *Hickman*. 5 Rep. 22. b. 23. adjudged. *Matthewſon's* Caſe. Pl. 4.

2. If an Under-Sheriff covenants with his High-Sheriff to ſave him harmleſs of all Fines and Amerciaments for any Eſcape, and covenants alſo, that he will not execute any Writ of Execution above the Sum of 20 l. tho' this laſt Covenant be againſt the Law, and void; (becauſe by the Statute 27 El. cap. 12. the Under-Sheriff takes his Oath to execute all Proceſs) yet this doth not make the other Covenants void. M. 11 Ja. B. between Sir *Daniel Norton* and *Symms*, adjudged. Tr. 12 Ja. B. ſame Caſe adjudged. 11 Rep. 27. in Pigot's Caſe. Godb. 212. Hob. 12. S.C.

3. In the ſaid Caſe, if the Under-Sheriff obliges himſelf in an Obligation, with Condition for the Performance of Covenants in the ſaid Indenture, tho' ſome of the Covenants are againſt the Law, and void, yet the Obligation is not void by it, but he is bound to perform the good Covenants in the Indenture. Tr. 12 Ja. B. adjudg'd, the Covenants being ſeveral, between Sir Daniel Norton and Symms. Godb. 212. S. C. And *Difference* was taken between a *Bond made void by Statute*, and *by Common Law*, for upon the Statute of 23 *H.* 6. if a Sheriff will take a Bond for a Matter againſt that Law, and alſo for a Debt due, the whole Bond is void; for the Letter of the Statute is ſo, for a *Statute is a ſtrict Law*, but the Common Law doth divide according to common Reaſon, and having made that void that is againſt Law, lets the reſt ſtand; as is 14 H. 8. fo. 15. Hob. 14. in Caſe of Norton v. Simms.

4. If divers covenant jointly by a Deed to do a Thing, and after the Seal of one of the Covenantors is broken off from the Deed, this ſhall make the Deed void as to all the other Covenantors. 5 Rep. 23. Matthewſon's Caſe. Pl. 1.

5. If two are bound in an Obligation, and after the Seal of one is diſſolv'd and taken from the Obligation, this makes the Obligation void as to the other, the ſeal of whom remains to the Obligation not hurt; in as much as the one is diſcharged by the Taking off his Seal, and by Conſequence the other alſo. 3 H. 7. 5. 11 Rep. 28. b. Pigot's Caſe.

6. If a Deed contains divers diſtinct and abſolute Covenants, if any of the Covenants be alter'd by Addition, Interlineation or Raſure,

ſure, this Miſreaſance Ex poſt facto ſhall avoid all the Deed. 11 Rep. 28. b. Pigot's Caſe. 14 H. 8. 25, 26.

[See (E a) (F a) (S) per tot. (U) 7.]

(Z) Who ſhall have them.

1. IF Feoffee with Warranty bail the Charters concerning the Land to another, and after enfeoffs the Bailee of the Land with Warranty, the Bailee ſhall not have the Charters to him bailed, becauſe the Bailor ought to have them to vouch over when he ſhall be vouch'd. 39 E. 3. 17.

Folio 31.

2. If a Man makes a Feoffment in Fee, no Deeds or Evidences paſs to the Feoffee, but only the Deed of Feoffment it ſelf. 18 H. 7. Kell. 3.

Unleſs the Feoffor *gives them to the Feoffee.* Per Huſſey. Br. Charters de terre, &c. pl. 54. 6 H. 7. 3. —— *But againſt a Stranger* the Feoffee ſhall have an Action of Detinue for thoſe Charters which concern the Lands, if he cannot make Title by the Feoffor, or thoſe who claim Title by the Feoffor. F. N. B. 138. (G).

3 Keb. 711. S. P. adjudg'd Warwick v. Braddon. Carth. 316. Reynell v. Long, S. P.

3. If a Man makes Feoffment in Fee to J. S. to the Uſe of J. N. in Fee, the Deeds belong to the Feoffee, and not to the Ceſty que Uſe, tho' he has not any Eſtate continuing in him, for he was only the Conveyance now ſince the Statute of 27 H. 8. For before the Feoffee ought to have it, and the Statute hath not expreſly given the Deeds to the Ceſty que Uſe. D. 10 El. 277. 58. Curia, 37 El. B. Reſolv'd between (a) *Sacheverell* and *Bagnall.* H. 6 Ja. B. R. per Cur. præter Walmſley, between the Counteſs of (b) Huntington and Sir Anthony Mildmay.

(a) Cro. El. 356. S. C.
(b) Cro. J. 217.

Walmſley Juſt. ſaid, that in one Ekin's Caſe, wherein he was of Counſel, it was held, that the Deed appertained to the Feoffee, and not to Ceſty que Truſt. Cro. E. 357.

They belong to the Feoffor to have his *Warranty Paramount,* and the Feoffee

4. If a Man makes Feoffment in Fee of Land, without any Warranty, the Feoffee ſhall have all the Charters, Deeds and Evidences concerning the Land, as incident to the Land, to the Intent that by them he may defend the Land. Co. Lit. 6.

ſhall not have them, unleſs there be a Covenant between them to that Purpoſe. Br. Charters de terre, pl. 15. 44 E. 3. 1. per Thorpe. —— Ibid. pl. 38. 39 E. 3. 17. per Knivet, quod non negatur. ——For the Evidences are as it were the Sinews of the Land, and the Feoffor being not bound to Warranty, has no Uſe of them. But Evidences which *concern the Poſſeſſion, and not the Title of the Land,* the Feoffee ſhall have. Co. Lit. 6.

5. The ſame Law is when a Feoffment is made with a Warranty only againſt the Feoffor and Heirs, for the Feoffee cannot recover in Value upon this Warranty. Co. Lit. 6.

Unleſs there be an expreſs Grant of the Deeds. Reſolved 1 Rep. 1. b. Lord Buckhurſt's Caſe.

6. If Feoffment be made of Land with Warranty, upon which the Feoffor is bound to Warranty, and to render in Value, there the Feoffor, becauſe he is bound to defend the Title, ſhall have all Deeds which comprehend Warranty, of which he may take Advantage. Co. Lit. 6.

As if *A. infeoff B. with Warranty, to him and his Heirs and Aſſigns,* and *B. by Deed infeoffs C. without Warranty,* and *C. infeoffs D. with Warranty,* yet C. ſhall have the firſt Deed and the ſecond alſo. 1 Rep. 1. b. Lord Buckhurſt's Caſe.

7. So in this Caſe the Feoffor ſhall have ſuch Deeds, which may ſerve to dereign the Warranty paramount. Co. Lit. 6.

8. So **in this Caſe the Feoffor ſhall have all Deeds and Evidences, which are** material for the Maintenance of the Title **of the Land. Co. Lit.** 6. 1 Rep. 1. b. Lord Buckhurſt's Caſe. For as the Feoffor is bound to render in Value, there is great Reaſon that he ſhould have all the Evidences material or requiſite to defend the Title, and the Feoffee has truſted to his Warranty, by which he ſhall vouch the Feoffor. 1 Rep. 1. b. Lord Buckhurſt's Caſe.

9. But **when a Feoffment is made** with Warranty, **the Feoffee ſhall have the Evidences** which concern the Poſſeſſion, and not the Title **of the Land. Co. Lit.** 6. *As Court-Rolls, &c.* for they are concomitant and incident to the Poſſeſſion. 1 Rep. 1. b. Lord Buckhurſt's Caſe.

10. **If a** Leaſe for Life **be made,** the Remainder over in Fee, **this Deed appertains to the Lord during his Life.** 12 H. 4. 20. b. 2 Ch. Caſ. 42. Br. Charters de terre, pl. 34. 33 H. 6. 22.

11. **And** not to him in Remainder. 7 H. 6. 1. 10 Rep. 93. b. **D. Leyfield's Caſe.** *But* where the Deed is *delivered to the Remainder Man,* he may detain it. Br. Charters de terre, pl. 16. 47 E. 3. 18.

12. **If** Leaſe for Life **be,** the Remainder in Tail, **and** Donor releaſes to the Leſſee, who dies, **this Deed doth not appertain to him in Remainder. (It ſeems it is intended that this enlarges the Eſtate of the Leſſee.)** 9 H. 6. 54. If a Man makes a Leaſe for Years, and afterwards *confirms his Eſtate in Fee,* the Heir of the Feoffee ſhall have the *Deed of the Leſſor for Years,* as well as the Deed *of Confirmation,* becauſe the Deed doth make the Confirmation good. And ſo of every Deed which makes his Title, or a Releaſe, or the like, without which his Title ſhall not be ſure, and he ſhall have an Action of Detinue for them. F. N. B. 138. (K) cites 9 E. 4. 53.

13. If Gift in *Tail be to A.* Remainder *to B. in Tail,* and then *A. dies without Iſſue,* B. ſhall have the Deed, which Nota for clear Law. Br. Charters de terre, &c. pl. 52. 3 H. 7. 15.

14. The Deed of Intail, *upon Diſcontinuance of the intail'd Eſtate,* belongs to the Diſcontinuee, and not to the Heir, for he has no Poſſeſſion of the Land. Per Rede, and Keble and Tremaile accordingly. But per Fairfax and Huſſey, the Deed belongs to the Heir, for it is no Chattel, nor paſſes by Gift de omnibus Bonis & Catallis; and Replevin lies not of a Deed, for it is an Inheritance as the Land is, and of the Nature of the Land, and ſhall go to the Heir. And if Tenant in Tail *cancels or burns the Deed,* the Heir is without Remedy for the Deed, but not for the Land, for he ſhall have Formedon tho' it was of Rent, and this without Monſtrance of it, for it is in the Right. But in Avowry he ſhall ſhew the Deed, for it is in the Poſſeſſion. Br. Charters de terre, &c. pl. 53. 4 H. 7. 10. The Heir in Tail ſhall have a Writ of *Detinue againſt the Diſcontinuee* for the Deed of Intail, by which the Land was given. F. N. B. 138. (H). cites 18 E. 4. 15. 44 E. 3. 1. 10 E. 4. 9.

15. If Land be given *to A. for Life, Remainder over* [*to ſeveral*] by Deed, *any of them who firſt gets the Deed* ſhall retain it. And therefore whoever has any Land contained in the Deed, where others have the Reſidue of the Land, yet he that has this Parcel, may on Account thereof retain the Deed. Per Fairfax and Huſſey. Bro. Charters de terre, &c. pl. 53. 4 H. 7. 10.

16. *Deed of Intail, after the Tail determined,* belongs to the Donor, and in Caſe of his Death to his Heir, and he may have Detinue for it; and the Original and Counterpart are but one Deed in Law, and both belong to the Donor or his Heir. Br. Faits, pl. 51. 38 H. 6. 25. —— Br. Charters de terre, &c. pl. 47. 38 H. 6. 24. F. N. B. 138. (F). 38 H. 6. 24. b. 25. pl. 1.

17. *Tenant*

Cro. E. 496. in Caſe of Kellack v. Nicholſon.

17. *Tenant in Fee-ſimple may give* the Deed or Charter of his Land to whom he will, but * *otherwiſe of a Tenant in Tail*; for in the laſt Caſe the Heir ſhall have it, but not ſo of the Fee-ſimple. Br. Faits, pl. 86. 9 H. 6. 60.

* The Iſſue ſhall have all the Deeds notwithſtanding that his Father gave them away, for *it may be that the Donor was in by Diſſeiſin, and after the Diſſeiſee releas'd to him*, the Iſſue ſhall have this Releaſe. Br. Charters de terre, pl. 36. 9 E. 4. 52.

Ibid. pl. 36. 9 E. 4. 52.

18. *Leaſe to A. for Life*, Remainder *to B. in Fee*, after the Death of A. the Deed belongs to B. But if a *Releaſe be to A. only*, this does not belong to B. after A.'s Death. Bro. Charters de terre, pl. 6. 9 H. 6. 54.

19. If *A. infeoffs B. on Condition*, and *B. breaks the Condition*, the Deed belongs to the Feoffor again; for it ſhall not remain as an Evidence againſt him or his Heirs afterwards. Br. Charters te terre, &c. pl. 5. 39 H. 6. 36.

20. If I am *infeoff'd* with Warranty *to me and my Heirs*, and after *I infeoff A. in Fee, and bind my Heirs to Warrant*, and die, if any one gets the Deed by which I was infeoff'd, my Heir ſhall have thereof *Detinue by Special Count*, and Non ratione terræ. Br. Charters de terre, pl. 58.

Nota, if *A. infeoffs B. with Warranty*, and *B. infeoffs C. by Dedi*, that B. during his Life ſhall have

21. If A. infeoff B. with Warranty *to him, his Heirs and Aſſigns, and B. infeoff C. with Warranty*, tho' C. may vouch A. as Aſſignee, yet he ſhall not have the firſt Deed; for B. has made Warranty to C. and B. may be vouched, and therefore B. ſhall have the firſt Deed to have his Voucher over. 1 Rep. 1. b. the fourth Reſolution in Lord Buckhurſt's Caſe.

the Charters, which comprehend Warranty, and which ſerve for the neceſſary Defence of the Title. But his *Heir* ſhall not have them, but the Feoffee. Per Coke, 1 Rep. 2. b.

22. One *Parcener* may have the Charters *which concern her Purparty only*, and ſhall have Detinue thereof againſt her Siſter on a Special Count. F. N. B. 138. (G) the Notes there.

23. The Heir ſhall have a Detinue of Charters, *altho' he hath not the Land*; *as* if I be *infeoffed with Warranty, and I infeoff another with* a *Warranty in Fee*, my Heir ſhall have a Detinue of that Deed by which I am infeoffed, becauſe he may have Advantage of the Warranty. F. N. B. 138. (L) cites 9 E. 4. 53.

24. *And* if my *Father* be *diſſeiſed, and dieth*, I ſhall have a Detinue for the Charters, altho' I have not the Land, and the Executors ſhall not have the Action for them. F. N. B. 138. (L).

25. After a Leaſe is determined, the *Counterpart of the Leaſe* belongs to the Leſſor. Jenk. 254. pl. 46.

26. *Counterpart* of a Deed, *by which a Rent is reſerved* on a Feoffment, does not paſs to the Vendee by Bargain and Sale of the Rent, as incident, for it is not the Original Deed by which the Rent was at firſt reſerved. Per Omnes, except the Ch. Juſt. who ſays, that this Counterpart waits upon the Intereſt, and is good Evidence for it. Yelv. 224.

27. When the Common or Statute *Law gives Lands*, it gives the Means to keep them, as the Evidences. Arg. God. 323.

Mo. S. C. 488. to 503.

28. If A. be ſeiſed of a Seigniory, Rent, Advowſon, or any *Thing which lies in Grant*, and grants it over to B. with Warranty, and B. grants it to C. with Warranty, C. ſhall have the firſt Deed, becauſe it is neceſſary to the making his Title, and without it he cannot make any Defence againſt A. or any claiming by him; and when B. grants to C. the Rent or Advowſon, C. ought to have the Effect of his Grant, and B. cannot in Derogation of his Grant detain any Thing

which is of Neceſſity, and of the Eſſence of his Grant. 1 Rep. 1. b. fifth Reſolution in Lord Buckhurſt's Caſe.

29. If A. makes a Feoffment with *Warranty*, and dies, *the Heir of the Feoffor* ſhall have all Charters, which the Feoffor himſelf might detain (tho' the Heir has nothing by Deſcent) by reaſon of the Poſſibility of the Deſcent after. 1 Rep. 1. b. ſixth Reſolution in Lord Buckhurſt's Caſe.

30. The *Lord by Eſcheat* ſhall have all the Charters, which concern the ſame Land, becauſe (as Popham gives the Reaſon) he is in *in le Poſt, and cannot vouch*; and therefore the Feoffor ſhall not detain the Evidences, for he can be at no Prejudice. 1 Rep. 2. ut ſupra, cites 10 E. 4. 14. b. per Moyle. Br. Charters de terre, pl. 59. cites 20 E. 4. 14.

31. A. by Deed *infeoff'd B. and C. and to the Heirs of B.* and the Deed of Feoffment, and other Evidences are delivered to B. and afterwards *B. dies, C. ſhall have the Deed by which he was enfeoff'd*, becauſe it makes his Eſtate; *but not the antient Deeds*, for they were delivered to B. the other Jointenant, for the aſſuring his Inheritance. 1 Rep. 2. cites 34 H. 6. 1. a. Br. Charters de terre, pl. 11.

32. *And if A.* after ſuch Feoffment *releaſe to B. and C.* and *delivers the Deed to B*, C. ſhall not have it, for *C.'s Eſtate was perfect without this Deed.* 1 Rep. 2. cites 34 H. 6. 1. a. Br. Charters de terre, pl. 11.

33. *But* per the Reporter of the Year-Book, if a *Releaſe be made to two, who have joint Eſtate by defeaſible Title*, and the Deed is delivered to one of them, who dies, in this Caſe the other who ſurvives ſhall have it, becauſe *it perfects his Eſtate.* 1 Rep. 2. b. cites 34 H. 6. 1. a. 6 H. 7. 3. b. 21 H. 7. 33. a. according to the Reaſon of this Caſe. Br. Charters de terre, pl. 11.

34. It was ſaid, that if A. *infeoff B. and C. to them and their Heirs*, and *gives the antient Deeds to B.* and *B. dies*, C. ſhall have all the Deeds, and not the Heir of B. for he can have no Loſs by not having them, or Benefit by having them, as C. may; and C. ſhall have them as Things which go with the Land. 1 Rep. 2. b. in Lord Buckhurſt's Caſe.

[See (H a) Sutcliff v. Conſtable (S a)]

(A a) Who may juſtify the Detaining them.

1. ONE Coparcener may juſtify the Detaining of the Charters of the Land in Coparcenary againſt the other in Detinue, for they belong to her as well as to the other. 3 H. 6. 19. b.

2. After Partition, the one Coparcener cannot juſtify the Detaining againſt the other the Charters of the Land, which ſhe alone has allotted to her. 3 H. 6. 19. b.

3. If Tenant in Fee-ſimple gives the Charters concerning the Land to another, the Donee, tho' he has nothing in the Land, yet he may juſtify the Detaining them againſt the Heir who has the Land. 10 H. 6. 20. b. 2 Roll. 45. (F) pl. 9. contra.

4. A *Leaſe for Life* is made *to A. Remainder to B. in Fee*, if the *Deed is delivered to B.* he may retain the Deed. Br. Charters de terre, pl. 16. 47 E. 3. 18.

Mo. 222. S. C.

5. *Grantee of Deeds by Tenant in Tail* cannot detain the Deed of Intail againſt the Iſſue after the Death of the Grantor: But 'tis otherwiſe of ſuch Grant by *Tenant in Fee-ſimple.* Cro. E. 496. in Caſe of Kelſack v. Nicholſon.

6. Several Writings left with Counſel for his Opinion, in order for Sale of the Land, were *delivered to a Scrivener by Conſent of the Parties, who finding a Deed concerning the Intereſt of a third Perſon, delivers it to him*; upon Complaint to the Court, he was commanded to produce the Deed to be delivered again to the Parties, they conceiving it to be *an Abuſe in his Practice*, which was under the Regulation of this Court. Vent. 46. Parry's Caſe.

[See Attorney.]

(B a) Kept private by, or in Cuſtody of the Maker.

1. THE Condition of a *Bond* was *to convey Lands to his Son* to enjoy after the Obligor's Death. In Debt the Defendant pleaded, that he made a Feoffment to a Stranger to the Uſe of himſelf for Life, and after to the Uſe of his Son in Tail. This upon Demurrer was held to be *no Performance* as it was pleaded, for the Infant was not made Party to the Conveyance, nor had he any Deed or Aſſurance to prove his Eſtate, ſo as he is not ſure thereof, nor can have any Knowledge perhaps of ſuch an Eſtate, nor Means to prove the Uſes limited, which was not the Intent of the Condition. Cro. E. 625. Stutfield v. Somerſet.

2. A. is *bound to make a Releaſe to B.* 'tis not ſufficient to make it, and *deliver it to a Stranger* to the Uſe of the Plaintiff. Cro. E. 826. cites 20 E. 3. Aud. Quer.

But where a *voluntary Settlement* was *made to Truſtees* and their Heirs, in Truſt to receive the Rents, &c. and put them out from Time to Time *for the Benefit of one of his Daughters*, and entred into a Bond to the ſame Truſtees for Payment of 1000 l. for the Uſe of the ſame Daughter at a Day certain, but kept both Deed and Bond, and received the Profits of the Eſtate till his Death, on a Bill by the Daughter for a Satisfaction out of the Profits from the Time of the Settlement made, and of the 1000 l. from the Time it was made payable, Lord Wright ſaid, they were the Father's Deeds, and he could not derogate from them, and decreed the Intereſt of the Bond from the Time: But as to the Profits of the Eſtate, Plaintiff and Defendants agreed to ſet the Profits of the Lands againſt the Daughter's Maintenance. But tho' the Father had by his Will given her a *Legacy in Satisfaction* of the Bond, yet the Court would not tie her up to that, but left her to her Election. Ch. Prec. 210. Barlow v. Heneage.

3. A *Bond to a Daughter*, found after the Father's Death ſeveral Years, was ſet aſide; and Lord Wright ſaid, it appeared to be the Father's Intention, that no Uſe ſhould be made of it, but only *to protect him from Taxes*, as ſhe had owned ſhe took the Intent to be; and it was without Condition, and payable immediately; and he always kept it by him, and therefore if ſhe had got it from him, and put it in Suit againſt him, he thought Equity would have *relieved* him againſt it, it being voluntary, and only for a ſpecial Purpoſe. Ch. Prec. 183. Ward v. Lant.

4. A *Bond* for 1500 l. was made at the Time of a Will, and ſhewn to the Obligee with his Will, and afterwards found with his Will, and it being for a like Sum which he had promiſed ſome Years before to give to the Obligee, on his marrying the Obligor's Daughter in Law, and whoſe Fortune was in the Obligor's Hands, but not adjuſted; Lord Harcourt looked upon it to be only *in Nature of a Legacy, and voluntary as againſt Creditors.* Ch. Prec. 370. Loeffes v. Lewen.

5. A. *conveys* his Eſtate to the *Uſe of himſelf for Life, with Power to Mortgage ſuch Part as he ſhall think fit*, Remainder to the Truſtees to ſell and pay all his Debts, but *continues in Poſſeſſion*, and *keeps the Deed.* He becomes indebted afterwards by Judgments, Bonds and ſimple Contracts. The Deed of Truſt is fraudulent, as againſt Creditors by Bond and Judgment, who having *no Notice of the Settlement*, ſhall not come in in Average only with the other Creditors. 2 Vern. 510. Tarback v. Marbury.

(B a 2.) Take by a Deed. Who ſhall not, tho' named in the Premiſſes.

LEaſe was made *to A. and B. his Wife, & primogenito proli*, Habendum to them, and the longer liver of them ſucceſſively during their Lives; and then the Husband and Wife had Iſſue a *Daughter born afterwards.* Per three Juſtices the Daughter had no Eſtate, becauſe ſhe was not in eſſe at the Time of the Grant. Ow. 152. Stephens's Caſe.

(B a 3.) Loſt Deeds, &c. In what Caſes Actions lie at Law, tho' the Deeds are loſt.

1. A *Ction* lies not for a Deed *determined*, or for the *Counterpart* of an Indenture, *in which a Warranty is contained*, without a *ſpecial Grant.* Brownl. 222. Sutcliff v. Conſtable.

2. Where a *Demiſe* is made of Lands, rendring Rent, tho' the Leaſe be loſt or miſlaid, the Landlord *may ſue for the Rent, and declare on a Demiſe in general*, without ſaying, it was a Leaſe in Writing; and ſo you may in all Caſes, where it is not a Thing that lies in Grant, &c. Per Cur. 2 Vern. 98, 99.

[See Trial (B f. 6.) Loſt Deeds.]

(B a 4.) Where in Caſes of Deeds loſt Actions ſhall be brought on the Counterpart.

A. Covenants with B. to make an Aſſurance of Land before Mich. by Indenture, A. dies, the Covenant unperformed, and the original Deed comes *into the Hands of the Executors of A.* B. brought a Writ of *Covenant on the Counterpart*; and per Cur. it does not lie without the Deed itſelf. Per Walmeſley, he may have an Action of Detinue to recover the Deed. Noy 53. Yelverton v. Cornwallis. —— In Caſe of a *Mortgage loſt* it was decreed, that the Counterpart ſhould be allowed as an Original, and admitted as ſuch at any Trial, &c. Fin. R. 239. Briſcoe v. Earl of Denbeigh & al'.

(C a) Who ſhall take or be bound by the Deed. One not named in the Premiſſes as a Party.

1. A. *diſſeiſed B.* and then *A. infeoff'd J. S.* by Deed, thus, viz. *Know all Men*, &c. *Quod ego* A. *per aſſenſum & conſenſum B. Dedi* & conceſſi, & hac preſenti, &c. *unto J. S.* and that be done before any Entry made by B. theſe Words, (*per aſſenſum & conſenſum* of A.) ſhall not bind him, but that he may enter, notwithſtanding that it be true, that the Feoffment was made with his Aſſent and Conſent; for when he is diſſeiſed, he hath but a Right, which ſhall not depart from him, if not by Extinguiſhment; and it ought to be at leaſt by Deed, and made unto him, who at the leaſt hath the Poſſeſſion of the Freehold in the ſame Land at the Time, &c. And in this Caſe the Feoffee had not any Poſſeſſion at the Time of the Feoffment, and the Diſſeiſor cannot enter in the Name of the Diſſeiſee, and reveſt the Poſſeſſion in the Perſon of the Diſſeiſee, for the Diſſeiſor himſelf is in Poſſeſſion, and he cannot enter upon himſelf, &c. So it cannot be, that the Diſſeiſor doth make this Feoffment, *as Servant* to the Diſſeiſee, for it is made in the Name of the Diſſeiſor, &c. Perk. S. 156.

2. *And* if a *Stranger had entred in the Name of the* Diſſeiſee, and by his Commandment had made a Feoffment in the Name of the Diſſeiſee, *& per aſſenſum & conſenſum* of the Diſſeiſee *by a Deed*, containing in it a Warrant of Attorney to make Livery of Seiſin, by ſuch Feoffment the Diſſeiſee ſhall be bound. Perk. S. 157.

3. *If J. S. be infeoffed* to have and to *hold to J. S. and T. K.* and *Livery* of Seiſin is made *unto J. S.* according unto the Deed, it is void unto T. K. Perk. S. 164. cites 12 E. 3. 77. 5 H. 4. 2.

4. *But if Livery* of Seiſin had been made *unto T. K.* according unto the Deed, then he takes by the Livery of Seiſin, and not by the Deed. Perk. S. 164.

5. If I *leaſe* Land *to J. S.* Habendum to him for twenty Years, *Remainder to J. K. in Fee*, he ſhall take the Fee-ſimple, and yet he is not named in the Premiſſes. Arg. Pl. C. 158. in Caſe of Throgmorton v. Tracy—160. S. P. arg'.

6. One granted to a Baron and Feme, being Tenants for Years in Poſſeſſion, that they ſhould have the Lands for their Lives, and granted further by the ſame Deed, that *after their Deaths their Children ſhould have the Land for* 40 *Years*. Per three Juſtices, the Children ſhall take *by way of Remainder*, tho' there be no Word of Remainder in the Deed; and as a Remainder they may take it, tho' they are not Parties to the Deed. Cro. E. 10. Anonymus. ——— One may take an *Executory Eſtate*, or by way of Remainder, that is not Party to a Deed. Cro. J. 563. Greenwood v. Tyler.

S. C. cited per Brown J. Cart. 60.

7. *Leſſor deviſed to his Leſſee for Years* his Land for the ſame Term he had before, *paying the ſame Rent* at the ſame Days, and *under the ſame Covenants* which were in the former Leaſe. Adjudg'd it was not a Condition, but only a *Covenant*, or rather a Truſt. 2 Show. 40. cites the Caſe of Martindale v. Martin. Cro. E. 288. ——— Godb. 99. pl. 114. —— And. 197. Maunchel v. Dodington alias Michel v. Dunton. Adjudged that they were vain Words. ——— Ow. 54. S. C. they are not either Condition or Covenant, cited per Popham. Poph. 8. as Michel's Caſe. ——

8. In *Copyhold* Grants a Perſon may take by being named in the Habendum only. Cro. E. 323. Downs v. Hopkins.

9. A Demiſe was thus, ſc. This Indenture made, &c. between A. of the one Part, and *B. his Wife, and their Children lawfully begotten at the Aſſignment of the ſaid B. of the other Part.* B. and his Wife had a Child born at the Time, and after had ſeveral other Children. But per tot. Cur. The Child then born, or thoſe born afterwards, took nothing. And per Ayliff Juſt. The Child then born ſhould have taken, had it not been for the Words (at the Aſſignment) but by reaſon of thoſe Words the ſaid Child is excluded. 4 Le. 64. Trecarram v. Friendſhip.

10. A. made a *Leaſe to B.* by Deed Poll, *Habend' to B. and his Wife and Daughter ſucceſſive, Sicut ſcribuntur & nominantur in ordine.* B. and his Wife died; per Cur. the Daughter has a good Eſtate *in Remainder*, and theſe Words make the Grant certain enough. 4 Le. 246. Grubham's Caſe. Cro. J. 563. S. C. Greenwood v. Tyler. (a)

But where it was *& eorum diutius Viventi Succeſſive*, it gave no Remainder. Hob. 313.

Windſmore v. Hulbert. —— Godb. 51. S. C. argued. — S. C. cited Cro. Jac. 564.

(a) But there it is reported thus: The Deed was made between A. of the one Part, and B. of the other, by which A. *demiſed the Land to B. and his Wife and Daughter, Habend' to them, ut ſupradictum eſt, & eorum diutius Viventi Succeſſive, for Term of their Lives*; ſo that the firſt Part ſhews that all ſhall take, and not the Habendum only; and this is much inforced by the Words (Ut ſupradictum eſt) and the (Succeſſive) is before the Limitation for all their Lives, and it was adjudged accordingly; but upon Error in the Exchequer Chamber, the Juſtices doubting, they moved the Parties to compound, who did ſo.

11. Where A. and B. are named only in the Premiſſes of the Indenture as Parties of the one Part, and C. of the other Part, tho' J. S. is *afterwards named* in the Deed, 'tis a void Deed as to him, and no *Covenant* made to him, or by him, is good; for he is a Stranger to it, and his Sealing and Delivery is not material. Per Coke arg. and he agreed the Caſe put on the other Side. 4 E. 2. Where a Bond was made by J. S. and *ad majorem rei ſecuritatem inveni J. D. fidejuſſorem*, and J. D. put his Seal to it, this was held his Deed, for 'tis not mentioned whoſe Deed it is, and ſo it is the Deed of both which are named and put their Seals, &c. Cro. E. 56. Eaſt Skidmore, &c. v. Vaud Stephens.— And Wray ſaid, they conceived the Matter in Law accordingly in the Principal Caſe, which was of an Indenture between Parties, and a Releaſe made by one not Party, but who was covenanted with, and who covenanted in the Deed, and executed the Deed, was held not good.

Poph. 182. cites 2 E. 4. 20. Br. Faits, pl. 42. 39 E 3. 9.— Perk. S. 158. ſays it has been ſo held, yet adds a Quære.

12. A. bargains and ſells Land by Indenture inrolled to B. and there was a Proviſo, viz. *Proviſo ſemper*, and it is covenanted, granted, &c. *that J. S.* (who was *a Stranger*) *ſhall dig in the Land for Mines.* Adjudged, that this Proviſo doth not make a Condition or Covenant, but a Grant. Mo. 174. Lord Huntington v. Lord Mountjoy.

13. *Articles* were made *between A. of the one Part, and B.* (not ſaying of the other Part) by which *A. lets B. a Houſe at 10 l. a Year, payable quarterly; and whereas the ſaid B. hath agreed and taken the Houſe aforeſaid, paying the Rent quarterly, &c. and leaving it in good Repair, and that the ſaid Rent may be ſatisfied as aforeſaid, be it known unto all Men, that I J. K. do covenant for my ſelf, &c. on the Behalf of the ſaid B. that the ſaid B. ſhall pay the Rent, and perform the other Covenants*, &c. and this Deed was ſealed by B. and J. K. In an Action of Covenant brought on this Deed by A. againſt J. K. the Defendant upon Oyer demurred generally; but after Argument the Court was clear in Opinion, that the Action lay upon this Deed againſt the Defendant. Carth. 76. Salter v. Kidgley.

14. He, that is no Party to the Deed, can neither *give or take* any Thing by it, &c. except it be by way of *Remainder*. Arg. Carth. 77. in Caſe of Salter v. Kidgley. —— cites 3 Cro. 56. 2 Inſt. 673. 2 Roll. 220. 2 Cro. 359. 1 Inſt. 352. —— See 2 Lev. 74.

Co. Lit. 231. A Leaſe was made by A. *to B. Habend' to B. and M. his Wife for their Lives*, et eorum diutius Viventi *Succeſſive* uni poſt alterum *ſicut ſcribuntur & nominantur in ordine.* Adjudged a good Remainder in M. Cro. J 372. Wheadon v. Sugg.

2 Inſt. 673. S. P. but if it be *without a (between) &c.* as Omnibus Chriſti fidelibus, &c. tho' it be by Deed indented, a Bond, Covenant or Grant may be made to divers ſeveral Perſons not Parties. Trin. 29 Eliz. B. R. Scudamore v. Vandenſtene.

15. One, that is not Party to a Deed *made between Parties*, cannot *take* by the Deed, unleſs by way of Remainder. Per Levins Juſt. 3 Lev. 139. in Caſe of Gilby v. Copley. —— Hutt. 88. Windſmore v. Hobert. —— Hob. 313, 314. Greenwood's Caſe.

If *A. gives Land, To have, &c. to B. and his Heirs*, this is good, tho' the Feoffee is not named in the Premiſſes; but this is only by Conſtruction of Law, Ut res magis valeat, &c. Co. Lit. 7. S. 1.

16. A Man cannot *take immediately*, where he is not Party; but where do you find that a Man cannot *give* without being a Party? In a Deed of Feoffment a Warrant of Attorney to A. not a Party, is good now, tho' formerly held to be otherwiſe. Per Holt. Ch. J. Show. 59. in Caſe of Salter v. Kidley. —— Carth. 76. S. C.

A. made a Leaſe to B. and B. covenanted to do ſeveral Things; and it was contained in the Deed, that the *ſaid B. found W. as his Surety for Performance of thoſe Covenants*; and then is added, *for performing which Covenants we bind our ſelves*, & utrunque noſtrum per ſe, &c. this is a good Deed againſt W. and Covenant was brought againſt him in the Life of B. and well lies. Br. Faits, pl. 6. cites 40 E. 3. 5.

17. Why cannot a Man *oblige himſelf* by a Deed, if there be expreſs Words for it, and he ſeals it? Suppoſe at the End of an Indenture it be, *And be it known unto all Men, that A. B. for himſelf covenants, &c.* and he ſeals it, why ſhould not this oblige him? Per Holt Ch. Juſt. Show. 59. in Caſe of Salter v. Kidley. —— Carth. 76. S. C.

18. One that is *Party* to a Deed *cannot covenant with another that is no Party*, but a meer Stranger to it; *but* one that is *no Party* to a Deed *may* covenant *with another that is a Party*, and thereby oblige himſelf by ſealing the Deed. Per Holt Ch. Juſt. and Judgment accordingly. Carth. 76. Salter v. Kidgly.

Covenant may be brought on a Deed Poll, but then the Party muſt be named *in the Deed.* 1 Salk. 197. Green v. Horn. — An Indenture of *Charterparty* not being between Parties, by which one covenants *with a Stranger* to the Indenture *to pay Money to another Stranger*, both of whom are named in the Indenture, is good; and an Action of *Debt* being brought thereupon by the Stranger, and the Count being by *Teſtatum exiſtit*, was held good, tho' in Debt and not in Covenant, and tho' brought by him alone, to whom the Money was covenanted to be paid. 2 Lev. 74. Cooker v. Child. — S. C. cited Lutw. 305. and reſolv'd accordingly in the Caſe of Lucke v. Lucke.

19. In a *Deed Poll* there may be a *Covenant* in Behalf of a third Perſon, but not in an Indenture; therefore where there is a Covenant between A. and B. that ſuch a Sum of *Money ſhall be paid to C.* it is not good. Arg. 8 Mod. 116. in the Caſe of Lowther v. Kelly. — cites Inſt. 47. a.

20. Where a Deed *runs in the firſt Perſon*, Signing and Sealing makes a Man a Party, tho' not named therein. 1 Salk. 214. Nurſe v. Frampton. ——— 3 Lev. 140. in Caſe of Gilby v. Copley.

Cro. J. 653. 21. A *Servant* ſold his Maſter's Beaſts, and *took a Bond in his own Name* for the Money, *but to the Uſe of his Maſter*; adjudged, that the Maſter cannot bring the Action, becauſe he was no Party, and he could not releaſe it. Arg. 8 Mod. 116. in Caſe of Lowther v. Kelly. —— cites Lev. 235. Offly v. Ward. —— 2 Lev. 74. Cooker v. Child. —— 3 Lev. 138. Gilby v. Copley.

[See (F) pl. 1.—Habendum. — Condition (X) ( ) — Eſtate ( )]

(C a 2.) Bound who, and by what. Perſons not named in a Deed.

THere were two Obligors, the *Name of one* was omitted *in the Bond*, but *both ſigned and executed.* He whoſe Name was omitted, knowing nothing of the Omiſſion, was applied to to give freſh Security, which he agreed to; but after, upon Diſcovery of the Omiſſion, he refuſed, the other being run away; this is a proper Matter to be relieved in Equity. 3 Ch. R. 99. Crosby v. Middleton. — Per Cowper, Ch. his Hand and Seal is ſufficient Evidence, and the Omiſſion is a ſufficient Accident for Equity to relieve againſt. 101. —— But where a Blank was left for the *Chriſtian Name* in the Bond, and the Surname was inſerted, and after the Obligor ſubſcribed both Chriſtian and Surname, 'twas adjudged ſufficient. Cro. J. 261. Dobſon v. Keyes.

(C a 3.) Advantaged or bound. One not named in the Premiſſes.

1. IF *A. gives Lands to have* and to hold *to B. and his Heirs*, this is good, tho' the Feoffee is not named in the Premiſſes. And yet no well adviſed Man will truſt to ſuch Deeds, which the Law by Conſtruction makes good, Ut res magis valeat; but when Form and Subſtance concur, then is the Deed fair, and abſolutely good. Co. Lit. 7. a.

2. The Plaintiff deſired to be relieved for a Leaſe made by the Defendant to him for Years, which the Defendant endeavour'd to impeach, becauſe *in the Premiſſes of the Leaſe there is no Leſſee named*, but only in the Habendum; and the Cauſe being referred to the two Lord Chief Juſtices and the Lord Chief Baron, they certified their Opinion in Law, that the Leaſe was good in Law, notwithſtanding the Leſſee was not named in the Premiſſes of the Leaſe, but in the Habendum only; and therefore it was decreed accordingly, that the Plaintiff ſhould hold the ſaid Leaſe. Cary's Rep. 122, 123. cites 21 & 22 Eliz. Butler v. Dodton.

If a Man grants Land by Deed, *naming no Perſon in the Premiſſes, Habendum to B.* it is not a good Grant, becauſe he was not named in the Premiſſes, the

which is to deſign the Perſon and the Thing, and the Habendum to limit the Eſtate. 2 Roll. 67. Grant (K a) pl. 13. cites M. 37 Eliz. B. R. per two Juſtices. Contra Co. Lit. 7.

[See (C a) per tot.]

(D a) Who may take or be bound by it. One not ſigning it.

1. IN the Queen's *Patent* there was a Clauſe for *repairing* and leaving in Repair. Reſolv'd, that tho' the Leſſee only takes by the Patent, and it is not made by him, yet this is as a *Covenant* on the Leſſee's Part to bind him and his Aſſigns; for when he takes by the Patent, he conſents to all therein, and the Words in that Clauſe are as ſpoken by him, and 'tis a Covenant that runs with the Land.

S. C. cited, and S. P. reſolved. Cro. J. 522. in Caſe of Brett v. Cumberland.

Cro.

Cro. J. 240. Lord Ewre v. Strickland. —— Arg. S. C. cited, Lane 78. in Caſe of Sawyer v. Eaſt.

Arg. 3 Bulſ. 163. 2. If there be *two Leſſees*, and *one only ſeals the Counterpart*, yet the other ſhall be bound by the *Covenants* contained in it. Arg. 2 Brownl. 71. in Caſe of Portington v. Rogers. —— So of *Feoffees*, where he that did not ſeal entred and agreed to the Eſtate conveyed. Arg. 2 Roll. R. 63. cites 38 E. 3. 8. a. —— S. C. cited, D. 13. b. —— Jo. 309. S. C. cited, per Barkley Juſt. —— Arg. Lane 78. cites 38 E. 3. 8. that a Man, that takes Benefit by a Leaſe which he never ſigned, ſhall be bound by a Nomine pœnæ contained in it.

3. If *Leſſor ſeals, and not the Leſſee*, it is as good againſt him, as if both had ſealed, in the Caſe of an Indenture, for an Indenture is the mutual Deed of both. Fin. Law 8vo, 109.

4. A *Feme Covert* is bound by the *Covenant* by the *Acceptance* of the Eſtate. Per Barkley J. Jo. 309. cites 3 H. 6. 4. 26. b. 43 & 45 E. 3.

5. An Eſtate for Life was made by Indenture, with *Remainder over upon Condition.* The Tenant for Life ſeals, and dies. The Remainder Man enters by force of the Remainder, he is bound to perform the Conditions, becauſe he takes by the Deed. Arg. 3 Bulſ. 163. cites 59 E. 3. 22.

6. A *Promiſſory Note to pay* 100 *l. for ſo much South-Sea Stock* obliges the Perſon to transfer the Stock, by his *accepting the Note.* Gibb. 2. Anonymus.

[See (F) pl. 2. (H 2.)]

(D a 2.) Not Party or Privy, &c. In what Caſes an Agreement to a Remainder, Leaſe, &c. ſhall make the Perſon ſo agreeing liable to all Conditions annexed to ſuch Eſtate, tho' not Party or Privy to ſuch Leaſe, &c.

1. A *Leaſe* is made by Indenture to *A. and B.* and *A. ſeals*; *B. does not, but enters* and occupies. B. is liable to the *Rent*, per Thorpe. And Finch ſaid, that this is a good Leaſe; for his Agreement charges him. But he ſhall not be charged by a *Condition in Groſs* in the Deed, which is no Parcel of the Leaſe, but a Thing by it ſelf, and *Collateral*, unleſs he ſeals the Leaſe. Br. Dette, pl. 80. 38 E. 3. 8.

Br. Faits, pl. 25. S. C. 2. But the principal Caſe was, an Action of *Debt* was brought upon an Indenture of Leaſe to A. and B. with a *Penalty of* 20 *l. for not performing Conditions*; and A. ſeal'd, but B. did not, but agreed and entred as above, and was ſtill living, and yet the Writ being brought againſt A. only, was abated. Br. Dette, pl. 80. cites 38 E. 3. 8. but ſays, Quod mirum, for he thinks this is not like a Penalty for Non-payment of Rent annually, for *it is a Reſervation.* Ibid.

[See Condition (X)]

(D. a. 3) Bound or advantaged Who; By the Words of one Party only.

See (G. a)

1. IF a Man makes a *Leaſe* of Land *by Indenture reſerving Rent*, and in the Deed are no Words of the Leſſee, but the *Leſſee ſeals the Deed* and enters and pays the Rent, and after refuſes, yet he is compellable; for being by Indenture it is the Deed of both Parties. Br. Eſtoppel, pl. 147. cites 45 Aſſ. 14.

2 One ſhall be bound *by putting his Seal* to a Deed indented *and Delivery* of the ſame, tho' the Words in the Deed are ſpoken only by another Man; and therefore if a Man makes a *Leaſe to me of my own Land by Deed indented, for Years*, without ſaying any more, by this Deed I ſhall be concluded, and yet there are no Words of mine in the Deed. Perk. S. 159. cites 14 H. 6. 22.

3. *And if* there be Father and Son, and the *Father is ſeiſed* of Land in Fee, and a *Stranger leaſes the ſame to the Father by Deed indented for Years*, and the *Father dies*, the Leſſee by this Deed ſhall conclude the Heir of the Leſſor to ſay that his Father died ſeiſed in his Demeſne as of Fee, and yet there are no Words of the Father in the Deed, &c. Perk. S. 159. cites 43 E. 3. 17.

The Year Book does not ſeem to accord with this; For that is of a Leaſe made *by the Father to a Stranger for Life of the Stranger*, by which the Father *bound himſelf and his Heirs to Warranty*; but it ſeems not clearly reported, nor does this Point of Perkins appear clear in Fitzh. Abr. Eſtoppel, pl. 6. And in the Year Book it is not ſettled whether the Father at the Time of the Leaſe was ſeiſed in Fee, or had any Thing in the Land, or whether the Grandfather was not then Tenant in Tail and ſurvived the Father.

4 An *Indenture* was between Lord and Tenant, *reciting*, that the *Tenant held* of the Lord *by Homage, Fealty, and* 10s. *Rent, the Lord confirms* his Eſtate, *ſalvo antiquo Dominico & ſervitio*; and it was held, that tho' it was indented, and both ſealed, yet becauſe it is a Recital, and all are the Words of the Lord only, therefore it ſhall not *eſtop* the Tenant to plead Hors de ſon fee. Br. Faits, pl. 4. cites 35 H. 6. 34.

(E. a) Where one Part being void ſhall avoid the Whole

See (S)(U) pl. 7. (Y)

1. IN Debt upon an *Obligation of* 20l. the Defendant *pleaded Not lettered, and that it was read to him as* 20s. *which he had paid*, and ſhewed an Acquittance thereof, *and as to the Reſidue Not his Deed*, and the Plea was held good. Br. Non eſt factum, pl. 8. cites 9 H. 5. 15.

S. C. cited 11 Rep. 27. b. by the Reporter in his Obſervations upon Pigot's Caſe and ſays that this Caſe being of one intire Sum, proves without Queſtion, that if there are *two abſolute and Diſtinct Clauſes* in one Deed, and the one is read to the Party, and the other Not, that the Deed is good for the Clauſe which was read, and void Ab Initio for the Reſidue; and that tho' the Deed conſiſting of *one Intire Sum was void for the Whole*, as is agreed in 14 H. 8. and 30 E. 3. 31. b. yet it was wiſely done by the Defendant's Counſel in 9 H. 5. 15. a. to plead the Truth of the Caſe, and not to leave the Matter upon any Queſtion in Law, when the Truth of the Matter will ouſt all Queſtions.

2. *Some of a Convent ſealed* a Deed *by Dureſs*, this made the whole Deed void, for the Deed is intire; and if it be void in Part, it is void in all, tho' the *greater Number did agree*. Br. Faits, pl. 52. 38 H. 6. 27.

3. If *three Obligations* are *Written in one Parchment, and one is read to him and no more*, it is his Deed as to this Part and not for the reſt. Br. Non eſt factum, pl. 11. cites 14 H. 8. 25. per Pollard to which Brudnel agreed.

S. C. cited per Coke 11 Rep. 27. b. in Pigot's Caſe.

4. *So* where an *Obligation* is *in two ſeveral* 10l.'s and it is *read for one* 10l. *only*, it is his Deed for the one 10*l.* and not for the other 10*l.* and a Deed raſed in Part where more is Writ to it, or is interlined after the making, this ſhall avoid the Deed, per Pollard to which Brudnell agreed. Br. Non eſt factum, pl. 11. cites 14 H. 8. 25.

5. If *two join or are joined* in a Deed, *whereof one has no Capacity*, (as a Monk or Feme Covert) yet it is good either to charge or benefit the Perſon able, tho' void as to the other. Br. Faits, pl. 37. cites 14 H. 8. 25. per Brudenell Ch. J.

6. A *Recognizance* was made *to Sir Nich. Bacon Kt. Lord Keeper* of the Great Seal, *and to 2 others*, and this *was taken* and acknowledged *before the ſaid Sir Nich. Bacon Kt. Keeper of the Great Seal*; upon demanding the Opinion of the Juſtices if this was good or not, they thought that as to Sir Nicholas Bacon is was void, but as to the other 2 it was good enough. D. 220. b. pl. 14. Paſch. 5 Eliz. Sir Nicholas Bacon's Caſe.

7. A Deed may be good in Part, and void in Part; *as* if a Deed be *read to a Man unlearned*, and *Part* is *interlined*, it is good for ſo much as was read, and void for the Reſt, per Hutton J. Ley 79. in Caſe of the Biſhop of Chicheſter v. Freeland.——But *Raſure* avoids the whole Deed. Mo. 35. pl 116. Trin. 4 Eliz. Anon.

It is good in Part and void for the Reſt. Br. Faits, pl. 37. cites 14 H. 8. 25. per Fitzherbert.

8. A. is *bound* to inſeoff J. S. of one Manor, and *to diſſeiſe J. N.* of another Manor. It was ſaid Arguendo, that the Bond is void in the Whole, and cited 14 H. 8. 25. Godb. 213. in the Caſe of Norton v. Symms.

Hob. 14.

9. Where there are *legal Covenants* and Covenants *againſt Law* in the ſame Deed, the laſt are void, and the firſt ſtand good. 11 Rep. 27. b. per Coke in Pigot's Caſe.——Cites 14 H. 8. 25, 26, &c.

10. As to a Deed's being good in Part, and void in Part, Coke thought there was a Difference when a Deed *is void ab initio*, and when it becomes void *by Miſfeazance ex poſt facto*. 11 Rep. 27. in Pigot's Caſe.

11. *Alſo* there is a Difference *when the Deed, which is void in Part ab initio, conſiſts upon the Whole, and when upon diverſe ſeveral Clauſes.* Per Coke, ut ſupra.

12. *Alſo* there is a Diverſity when the *ſeveral Clauſes are abſolute and diſtinct*, and *when tho' ſeveral, yet one has Dependency on the other.* ut ſupra.

The ſame Difference was taken and reſolv'd. Hob. 14. Trin. 12 Jac. C. B. in Caſe of Norton v. Simmes.

13. *A Bond void in Part by a Statute Law* is void in toto; but at *Common Law* it is good as to the legal Part, and void as to the Illegal. Arguendo 2 Jo. 90, 91. cites 3 Rep. 82, 83. Twine's Caſe.

———*As* upon the Statute of 23 H. 6. if a *Sheriff takes a Bond* for a Point againſt that Law, and for a due Debt alſo, the whole Bond is void. For the Letter of the Statute is ſo, and a Statute is a ſtrict Law; but the Common Law doth divide according to Common Reaſon, and having made that void which is againſt Law, lets the reſt ſtand.

Yelv. 18. Mich. 44 & 45 Eliz. B. R. Soprani v. Skurro. S. P.

14. Where the *Grant* is void, the *Covenants in it* are alſo void, and ſo is a *Bond of Performance* of Covenants. Lev. 45. Mich. 13. Car. 2. B. R. (ſays he heard it was ſo reſolved) ‡ Caponhurſt v. Caponhurſt.

———Owen 136. held, that the Covenant ſhall bind, tho' the Deed is void. Paſch. 10. Jac. Waller v. Dean and Chapter of Norwich.——* 1 Salk. 199. cites the Caſe of Caponhuſt v. Caponhurſt, and diſtinguiſhes between *dependent* and *independent Covenants*, that the firſt are void, but not the other. Mich. 10 W. 3. B. R. Northcott v. Underhill.———* S. C. & P. 2 Brownl. 161, 164, 165. Paſch. 10 Jac. C. B. in Caſe of Waters v. the Biſhop of Norwich.———‡ Raym. 27. S. C. adjudged.

(E. a. 2) Deeds voidable, by whom and when,

1. THE Grants of ſome Perſons are voidable *by themſelves and their Heirs, and* by *thoſe who ſhall have their Eſtates for ever.* And the Grants of ſome Perſons are voidable *by the Grantors only during certain Time*, and ſome are voidable *after the Death of the Grantor by the Heirs of the Grantors*, and not by the Grantors, or by any other Perſon during the Life of the Grantors, &c. Perk. 2. S. 2. cites Bract. l. 2. 5.

See Enfant (B)(C)(D) —Void and voidable.

(F. a) Void or voidable only, what Deeds are.

1. A *Bond, Releaſe or Feoffment*, and the like, *made by Dureſs*, is not void, and therefore the Party cannot ſay *Non eſt factum*, nor ſhall have Aſſiſe, but may enter and avoid them by Plea; For ſuch Deeds are not void, but voidable. Br. Faits, pl. 68. cites 2 E. 4. 20.

See (F. a. 2) pl. 1.—So if the Feoffor makes a *Letter of Attorney to deliver Seiſin*, and all is done by Dureſs of Impriſoment, and Livery of Seiſin is made by Force thereof; this is a Diſſeiſin to the Donor, but that does not prove that the Deed of Feoffment and the Letter of Attorney are void, for then the Donor might *traverſe* them, which he cannot do, &c. And Impriſonment ought to be made for the making of a Deed, &c. Perk. 8, 9. S. 17. cites p. 41 E. 3. 9.

2. *So* of a Deed *by an Infant*, tho' *otherwiſe of a* * *Feme Covert*. See (N) pl. 2, 5, 6.

* For a Bond made by Feme Covert if he poſſeſſes

is merely void, even tho' ſhe has a ſeparate Eſtate, but yet her Executors or her Husband, himſelf, after her Death, of any of her Effects, are liable to pay the Money borrowed; her ſeparate Eſtate being all a Truſt Eſtate for Payment of Debts. Per the Maſter of the Rolls. Trin. 1723. 2 Wms's Rep. 144. Norton v. Turvil.

3. 'Tis a common known Rule, That *all* ſuch Gifts, Grants or *Deeds* made *by an Infant*, which do not *take Effect by Delivery of his Hand*, are void, but ſuch Gifts, Grants or Deeds made by an Infant, by Matter in Deed or in Writing, which take Effect by Delivery of his own Hand, are voidable by himſelf and his Heirs, and by thoſe which ſhall have his Eſtate. Perk. 6. S. 12.

4. An *uſurious Bond* is not void, but voidable by Plea. Per Warburton J. 2 Brownl. 163. in the Caſe of Walters alias Waller v. The Dean and Chapter of Norwich.

See Acceptance —Confirmation.—Eſtate.—Voluntary Conveyances.

(F. a. 2) Voidable Deeds made Good by ſome after Act.

1. IN Debt, the Prior of D. avoided an *Obligation be Dureſs*, made by the Prior his Predeceſſor to the Convent; and the Plaintiff eſtopped him by *Defeaſance made after* he was at large upon the ſame Obligation; and the beſt Opinion was, that it is a good Eſtoppel. And ſo it appears, that a Deed made by Dureſs is not void, but voidable, Br. Faits, pl. 87. cites 35 H. 6. 17.

5. If an *Infant infeoffs* or makes a Leaſe to B. and delivers it with his own Hand, this is not void but voidable only; and if, *when of Age, he ſays, God give you Joy* of it, this is an Affirmance. Per Mead J. 4 Le. 4. pl. 15. Anon.

3. *Feoffment by Husband and Wife of the Wife's Land*, rendring Rent; the Husband dies, the *Wife accepts the Rent*, this ſhall bind her. Arg. 2 Brownl. 141. in Caſe of Portington v. Rogers———So that her Deed is not void. Cro. El. 769. Trin 42 Eliz. B. R. Shipwith v. Steed.

Kelw. 18. b. per Wood J. 4 Le. 15. per Gawdy J.

(G. a.) Deed-

(G. a) Deed-Poll, and what is conſidered as ſuch; the Effect thereof, and Difference between it and an Indenture.

1. A Deed-Poll is that which *is* plain without any indenting; ſo called, becauſe it is cut even or polled: Every Deed that is pleaded ſhall be *intended* to be a *Deed-Poll*, *unleſs* it be *alledged to be indented*. Co Lit. 229.

2. A Deed-Poll *is* that which is *only* the Deed *of the Grantor*.——— An *Indenture is* that which is the *mutual* Deed of both. Fin Law, 8°. 109.

3. Heretofore a Deed indented was called *Charta Chirographata*, or Charta Communis, becauſe each Party had a Part. And a Deed-Poll was called *Charta de una parte*. Co. Lit. 143. b.

4. Tho' a Deed of *Defeaſance of a Statute* be *indented*, yet it is but in the Nature of a Deed-Poll, and the Words of the Defeaſance are the Act and Words of the Conuſee only; and if the Conuſor and Conuſee deliver a ſeveral Deed to one another, and there be a Variance in any Point material, it ſhall be taken according to the Deed delivered by the Conuſee. 2 And. 58. Hollingworth v. Wheeler.

S. C. cited Lutw. 305. and reſolved accordingly. Trin. 1 Jac. 2. Lucke v. Lucke.— —S. C. cited 3 Lev. 139. in the Caſe of Gilby v. Copley.———An Indenture by the Words *Hæc Indentura teſtatur*, is all one with a Deed in the firſt Perſon. 3 Keb. 115, Coker v. Child.

5. An *Indenture not being between Parties* is in Nature of a Deed-Poll, ſo as one may covenant with a Stranger to the Indenture. 2 Lev. 74. Hill. 24 and 25 Car. 2. B. R. Cooker v. Child.

6. A Deed of Covenants, being only a Deed-Poll, is, for that Reaſon, the *Deed of the Defendant only*, and therefore the Covenants *cannot be mutual*. 8 Mod. 41. Paſch 7 Geo. 1722. Lock v. Wright.

7. A Contract by Deed-Poll cannot make that to *paſs*, which another then enjoys, but is void. Arg. Pl. C. 433. b. in the Caſe of Smith v. Scapleton.

S. P. 2 And. 41. Trin. 38 Eliz. Anon. ——Cro. E. 483. Trin. 38 Eliz. S. C.

8. *A. by Deed-Poll covenants with B.* to ſell Land to B. for 200*l*. *and B. by the ſame Deed covenants with A.* to pay the 200*l*.———B. firſt delivered the Deed to A. as his Deed, and then A. ſealed and delivered it to B. as his Deed; adjudged, that this was the Deed both of A. and B. and that he, that has Poſſeſſion of it, may have Action of Covenant againſt the other, notwithſtanding the firſt or ſecond Delivery of it; for it is ſufficient to bind both. 2 And. 30. Mich. 37 and 38 Eliz. Croſs v. Powell.

Perk. S. 162. ſays, that tho' it is ſaid by ſome, that if in a Deed indented between two, both ſpeak by Words within the Deed, but the Words of one are in the firſt Perſon, and the Words of the other in the third Perſon, that all the Words in the Deed ſhall be ſaid to be ſpoken by him who ſpoke in the firſt Perſon, yet ſuch Saying is nothing to the Purpoſe.

9. Upon a Recordare, the Defendant avowed for Damage-feaſant, and the Plaintiff made Title at Common Law, and the Defendant ſhewed a Deed indented, running thus, *Noverint me J. Abbatem de E. dediſſe to the Plaintiff* tale Tenementum, &c. *pro quo idem the Plaintiff renunciavit totam Communiam ſuam* quam habuit in B. &c. and it was held there, that notwithſtanding *Part of the Words are in the firſt Perſon, and Part in the third Perſon*, and tho' the Words renunciavit, &c. are all the Words of the Abbot, and not the Words of the Plaintiff who releaſed; yet becauſe it is by Deed indented, and both have ſealed and delivered it, it is therefore good; but it was held, that becauſe it is *renunciavit, and does not ſay to whom*, &c. (for it ought to be, renunciavit præfato Abbati), &c. that therefore the Deed is not good Per Babbington, & per Cur. Br. Faits, pl. 1. cites 9 H. 6. 35.

* Le. 246. Trin. 32 Eliz. B. R.

10. Tho' * the Words of an Indenture are the *Words of both Parties*, yet is otherwiſe in a Deed-Poll; For there the Leſſee is *not*

Thomas v. Ward.—Roll. Rep. 69 arguendo cites D. 152.—Arg. Roll. Rep 80.—Ow. 152. cites Whitchcot v. Fox.———Cro. J. 398. Paſch. 14. Jac. B. R. Whitchcot v. Fox ——Co Lit. 47. b.—Carth 248. Hilman v. Hore. See Eſtoppel (N).

10. Mod

eſtopped to plead, that the Leſſor nihil habuit in Tenementis, &c. Arg. 8 Mod. 312. in the Caſe of Shipwith v. Green. —— Gawdy Serjeant agreed, that in Deeds-Poll the Words ſhould be *taken ſtrong againſt the Grantor*, but otherwiſe in Indentures; for there the Words ſhall be taken according to the Intent of the Parties, being the Words of both. Le. 318. in the Caſe of Scovel or Scobell v. Clavel or Cavel.—— But this muſt be intended of *material* Words, and not of every minute and *deſcriptive Word* and Circumſtance. Per Cur. 8 Mod. 313. Skipwith v. Green.

10 Mod. 47, 48. Lord Say and Seal's Caſe. The Words of an Indenture put *in the Generality*, ſhall bind both Parties, and be taken to be the Agreement of each. Per Gawdy, Cro. El. 567. in the Caſe of Ruſſel v. Gulwell.

11. If there be a *Variance between the Indenture* to the Conuſor of a Statute and that to the Conuſee, tho' that of the Conuſee to the Conuſor is but in Nature of a Deed-Poll, &c. yet, ſo far as the Variance is, it is utterly void. 2 And. 58. Hollingworth v. Wheeler.

(H a) *Counterparts* of Deeds, and where they vary from the Originals.

1. IF there happens to be any Variance *between the Indenture and Counterpart*, it ſhall be taken as the Deed of the Grantor is; and the other ſhall be intended only the Miſpriſion of the Writer. Fin. Law, 8°. 169.

2. *So* of a *Defeaſance of a Statute by Deed-Poll*, if there is one delivered by the Cognizee to the Cognizor, and another by the Cognizor to the Cognizee, if they differ in a Point material, it ſhall be taken according to the Deed of the Cognizee delivered to the Cognizor; and tho' theſe Deeds were indented, yet as to this Purpoſe of a Defeaſance 'tis but in Nature of a Deed-Poll, and ſo far as the Variance is, it is utterly void. 2 And. 58. Hollingworth v. Wheeler.

3. A. infeoffed B. of a Manor, rendring for certain Cloſes, Parcel of the Manor, 60 *l. Rent* per Ann. A. *aſſigns the Rent to C.* by Bargain and Sale inrolled; the Counterpart ſealed by B. was delivered to C. who loſt it, and A. found it and *tore it*. Upon an Action brought by C. againſt A. for tearing the Counterpart, it was held by all but the Chief Juſt. that this being only a Counterpart, and *not being particularly granted*, it does not paſs to the Plaintiff as incident; but the Ch. Juſt. held, that this Counterpart waits upon the Intereſt, and is good *Evidence* for it. Yelv. 223. Sutcliff v. Conſtable.

4. Tho' a *Condition may be pleaded* by Indenture ſealed with the Seal of the other Part; yet a *Conveyance cannot* be pleaded by Deed, unleſs ſealed with the Seal of the Party agent, ſcil. the Feoffor, Grantor, Leſſor, &c. 3 Le. 95. Gurney v. Saer.

5. A Counterpart of a Settlement in Tail was admitted as ſufficient *Evidence*, that there was ſuch a Settlement, and a Conveyance was decreed accordingly. Ch. Prec. 116. Eyton v. Eyton. 2 Vern. 380. S. C.

(I a) Duplicates.

1. *TWO Patentees of the ſame Office* for their Lives; one has the real Patent, the other only a Duplicate. The Principal Patent was wrote per Warrantiam de Privato ſigillo Auctoritate Parliamenti, and a little under the Seal of the other was wrote the word (Duplicate); he, that had the Principal Patent, ſurrendered it in the Abſence of the other Patentee beyond-ſea, and took a new Patent to himſelf and another, and the firſt Patent was cancell'd; it was the Opinion of ſeveral, that when the *Principal Patent was cancelled*, the Force of the Duplicate was gone in Law; becauſe no Title can be made by this Patent, becauſe it was granted and ſealed by the Chancellor at his Pleaſure, and without any Warrant from the King to do it. D. 179. b. Kemp v. Hales.

2. If a Fine is levied by Husband or Wife of Lands which he has in Right of his Wife, and there is a Deed made at the ſame Time to declare the Uſes thereof, and afterwards this *Deed is loſt*, and then *another* is *made to the ſame Effect and dated as the firſt*, that Deed is ſufficient to declare the Uſes of the Fine. Per Holt Ch. Juſt. Holt's Rep. 735. in the Caſe of Buſhell v. Burland.

3. Where a Perſon has a large Eſtate, and *ſells the biggeſt Part*, and is conſtrained to *deliver all the Deeds* to the Purchaſor, by which he has none left to make out the Title to the Reſidue by; upon the Vendor's moving the Court, that the Parties to the Conveyance to him might be *ordered to execute a Duplicate of the Conveyance* to be kept by him, Lord Keeper Wright, ſaid he look'd upon it to be *within the Covenant for further Aſſurance*, and ordered that a Duplicate ſhould be executed, but that it ſhould be *indorſed* upon it, that this was only a Duplicate. Abr. Equ. Caſ. 166. Mich. 1700. Napper v. Allington. —— But the Matter being moved again by the other Side, the Order was diſcharged; for that the Decree being once executed, the Court had no more to do in it. Ibid.

(K a) In what Caſes they ſhall be brought into or remain in Court.

1. UPon *Non eſt factum* found againſt the Deed, it may be kept in Court; but otherwiſe on a *collateral Iſſue*. 1 Salk. 215. Fitch v. Wells.

(a) S. P. and per Hanke, if the Party *wants it to plead it in another Action*, he ought to ſhew it, and he may have a *Writ to the Juſtices* to remove the Deed to ſhew it. Br. Faits, pl. 20. cites F. N. B.

2. Per Cur. If you had (a) *denied* the Deed, according to Weymark's Caſe, it is to remain in Court *till the Cauſe be tried*; *ſecus*, it ſhall only remain *for the Term in which* it is brought in; but the moſt it goes is, that *upon Imparlance* granted, it ſhall remain in Court *till* the *Defendant pleads*; as in an Action upon a Bond, if it be by *Bill*, the Defendant *after Imparlance* may crave Oyer, and therefore there it muſt remain in Court, *till* the *Party is put to plead*, that he may in that Caſe have Oyer of it. 6 Mod. 233. in the Caſe of Selby v. Green.—— 12 H. 4. 8. —— A Certiorari was granted. Br. Faits, pl. 85.

3. Where Deeds and Muniments do *concern as well* the Defence of the *Tenant for Life*'s Title, who alſo poſſeſſeth the Deeds, *as the* Right of another in *Reverſion or Remainder*, it is uſual to have them brought into this Court for the avoiding all Perils, and the indifferent Cuſtody of them. Cary's Rep. 26, 27. cites 40 Eliz. Dixies v. Hillary.

Mo. 807. S. P. in the Caſe of Cole v. Moor. —— *But*, at Law, if the Tenant for Life has a Deed whereby the Reverſion and Inheritance is in another, he may detain it againſt the Reverſioner. Per Finch C. Hill. 32 & 33 Car. 2. 2 Chan. Caſes 42. Earl of Banbury v. Briſcoe.

4. It was ordered that a Settlement which *concerned very much the Eſtates of two Perſons* ſhould be brought into Court for its ſafeſt Cuſtody, and both Parties have the Uſe of it as they have Occaſion; and both may if they pleaſe have Copies atteſted. Hill. 32 & 33 Car. 2. 2 Chan. Caſes 42. Earl of Banbury v. Briſcoe.

Fin. R. 161. Nurſe v. Yarworth — 391. Maſon v. Goodburn. Two *Coheirs*, one claimed the Whole under a Will, the other inſiſted on an *Intail* not dock'd, and on a Bill brought by him it was ordered, that the Deeds be brought into Court for the Plaintiff to have the Liberty of Inſpecting, tho' the Will is not ſet aſide. 9 Mod. 99. Foire v. Sidenham. ——

5. If a *Deed belongs to Two*, and *he, who has the Deed, dies*, the other ſhall have a Subpœna to deliver the Deed to him for Maintenance of his Title, per Pigot. Quod non negatur. Bro. Conſcience, pl. 3. cites 9 E. 4. 41.

6. A. on the Marriage of his Son conveys Lands to the Uſe of *himſelf for Life*, then to *his Son for Life*, then to the *Iſſue of his Son in Tail*, and for Default of ſuch Iſſue, then *to his Brother and his Heirs*; the Son and Wife died without Iſſue, living A. who got the Settlement, and cut it in pieces; but on a Bill of Diſcovery brought by the Brother, the Court inforced the bringing the Counterpart into Court by A. tho' it was objected, that the Remainder to the Brother was meerly voluntary; and ſo A. was prevented from ſelling the Eſtate. Trin. 1691. Abr. Equ Caſes 168. Brookbank v. Brookbank.

Every *Remainder-man* has a Right to come into this Court for Aid, to compel Perſons to bring in the Deeds and Evidences relating to the Eſtate. Per Cur. Hill. 11 Geo. 9 Mod. 132. per Cur. in Canc. in the Caſe of Reeves v. Reeves.

7. A *Subpœna ducens Tecum* was awarded againſt the Defendant to bring in certain Deeds, and ſhew Cauſe why they ſhould not be delivered to the Plaintiff; the Defendant ſhew'd, that the *Mortgage was upon Condition for Payment of* 40 *l.* at a Day, and *before the Day the Mortgagor ſold the ſame to the Plaintiff*, and delivered the Eſtate *by Livery and Seiſin*, whereby the Condition was extinct, and yet the *Defendant offered to give* 100 *l.* It was ordered, that the Deeds ſhould be delivered to the Uſher of the Court, but not to the Plaintiff without ſpecial Order. Cary's Rep. 74, 75. cites 18 & 19 Eliz. Witford v. Denny.

8. *Adminiſtrator durante minori ætate* of one *Co-heir* who was Executor was decreed at the Suit of the other Coheir, to bring the Writings of the Real Eſtate into Court, that the Plaintiff may have Copies of them, and try her Title at Law. Mich. 26 Car. 2. Fin. R. 136. Maplet v. Pocock.

9. A *forged* Bond or Warrant of Attorney ſhould be *lodged in Court*. Cumb. 339. The King v. Lewis — It cannot be torn or defaced by Law, but muſt be kept, that the King may proceed upon it againſt the Criminal. Vern. 66. Frankland v. Hampden.

(L a) *Detinue* of Deeds. Action. Who ſhall have it.

IN Detinue of a Bag of *Charters*, Plaintiff counts of a *Bailment by his Father, to rebail him or his Heirs*, and counts ſpecially of a Charter by which A. infeoffed one B. and tho' he *makes no Title to the Land* in the Charter, yet he ſhall have a Delivery, and the Count was awarded good. Br. Chartres de terre, pl. 31. cites 19 H. 6. 41.

(L a 2.) Pleadings in Detinue of Deeds.

Br. Chartres de terre, pl. 7. cites 9 H. 6. 60.

1. IN Detinue of *Charters* the *Count* ought to *mention the Land* which the Charters concern, and the *Value* of the Land; for the Plaintiff in this Action recovers the Charters, and if they are *deſtroyed*, the Value of the Land in Damages. Jenk. 21. pl. 39.

But in *Treſpaſs* for taking and detaining, it is good; without mentioning the Land, eſpecially after a Verdict, for in Treſpaſs, Damages only are recoverable; and not the Charters. Jenk. 20. pl. 39. —— For the Taking contra pacem, Br. Chartres de terre, pl. 26. cites 21 E. 3. 28.

Otherwiſe, if not ſealed, he muſt count of a ſpecial Charter.

2. Where the Count is of a *Box of Charters ſealed*, there is no need to mention the Matter contained in the Charters. Per Brown Clerk. Quod non negatur. Br. Chartres de terre, pl. 4. cites 9 H. 6. 18.

Ibid. pl. 37. cites 39 E. 3. 7, 8.

3. If A. has *Deeds to which he has no Title, and loſes them*, and B. finds them, A. ſhall not have Detinue without *Requeſt*; but otherwiſe of him who *bails* Goods or Deeds. Br. Chartres de terre, pl. 9. cites 33 H. 6. 26.

4. Where the *Heir brings Detinue* of Charters, he ought to count upon a *Requeſt poſt mortem anteceſſoris*. Br. Charters of Land, pl. 10. cites 33 H. 6. 29, 30. per Priſot.

5. Where Plaintiff counts of a Cheſt, Bag or *Box ſealed*, he *ſhall not ſhew what Charters*; for if they are open, he may *demand the Charters only, and not the Box*, for the Box belongs to the Executors, and this will not go to the Count for the Box only, but all the Count ſhall abate, per Thorpe. And Finch ſaid, That he might have counted of a Box incloſed, and that it is *not traverſable, if incloſed or not*. Nota, Br. Chartres de terre, pl. 13. cites 41 E. 3. 2.

6. In Detinue of a *Cheſt of Charters*, it is no Plea to *ſay, that it was a Hamper*, for it is not *traverſable*; but only if he detains the Charters, or not. Br. Chartres de terre, pl. 15. cites 44 E. 3. 1. per Thorpe.

7. Detinue of *Charters, by which A. infeoff'd his Anceſtor* of Blackacre, &c. and *counts of his own Bailment*, and found for the Plaintiff to the Damage of 40 s. And if the Deed cannot be found, 40 *s. for the Detinue, and* 100 *l. for the Deed.* It was moved in Arreſt of Judgment, becauſe he *made no Privity to the Anceſtor as Heir*; yet becauſe he counted of his own Bailment, it was awarded, that he ſhall recover the Deed, if it can be found, and 40 *s.* Damages; and if the Deed cannot be found, then 100 l. for the Deed, and 40 s. Damages. Br. Chartres de terre, pl. 28. cites 7 H. 6. 31.

8. Where one demands Charters *as Heir to the Land*, he ſhall *ſhew the Certainty of the Land, and where it lies*; but otherwiſe where he demands

mands *by Privity of Bailment of his Father to rebail to him or his Heirs*, and the Father dies, and he demands by this Bailment, there he may count generally of Land in A. and *alibi* in the County of M. but otherwise where he demands as Heir. Br. Chartres de terre, pl. 30. cites 19 H. 6. 10

9. In Detinue, Plaintiff counts of a *Charter, by which J. S. infeoffed him of Black-acre*, and the Charter came to the Defendant by Trover, and the *Defendant intitles himself to the Land, absque hoc, that the Defendant infeoffed the Plaintiff*; and per Townsend and Brian J. this is a good Plea. Br. Chartres de terre, &c. pl. 51. cites 2 H. 7. 1.

10. *But* if he had counted, that he detained a Charter *containing that J. S. infeoffed him*; now the Feoffment is not traversable. Per Townsend and Brian J. Br. Chartres de terre, &c. pl. 51. cites 2 H. 7. 1.

11 Detinue of Charters lies well by Reason of the Possession *without shewing how the Defendant came by them.* Per Cur. Br. Chartres de terre, pl. 65. cites 9 H. 5. 14.

12. In *Detinue* of Charters *by Two*, if the *Defendant delivers them to one* of them, tho' out of Court, he shall be excused against the other, and so in Dower against Two, who plead Detinue of Charters. F. N. B. 138 (G) the Notes there.

13. Tho' Plaintiff counts upon Bailment by Indenture, yet Non Detinet is a good Plea, notwithstanding the Indenture. Br. Barre. pl. 110. cites 10 H. 7. 24.

(L a 3) Bar; What is a good Plea in Bar in Detinue of Charters.

1. DEtinue of Charters as Heir, *Bastardy* is a good Plea. Br. Chartres de terre, pl. 64.

2. A. brought Detinue of a Box of *Charters* against J. S. and *Counts, that B. and C. were possessed of them as of their proper Goods, and bailed them to the Defendant to deliver to the Plaintiff*, J. S. pleads, that he is *seised of twenty Acres in D. which the Charters concern, and* that he *was possessed of the Charters till B. and C. took them from him, and that after they delivered them to him prout in the Count*, and therefore he detains them, prout ei bene licuit; the Plaintiff *replies*, that *before J. S. had any Thing, W. R. was seised* of the twenty Acres, *and possessed of the Charters, and gave the Box and Charters to B. and C.* by which they were possessed, *and then W. R. died seised and J. S. intruded, and B. and C. bailed the Box and Charters to J. S to deliver to the Plaintiff*, and prays Delivery, and *J. S. rejoins and maintains his Bar, absque hoc, that J. S. intruded, &c.* and per Cur. It is no Plea, but he shall answer to *the Title of W. R.* for that *is the Substance, and not the Intrusion*, quod Nota. Br. Chartres de terre, &c. pl. 55. cites 5 E. 4. 85.

3. Detinue *of a Chest of Charters, and of one special Charter*, by which Land was given to his Father in Fee by J. N. of which Land the Father died seised, and he entered, &c. the Defendant to the special Charter *protestando*, that the Plaintiff is not seised, &c. pro placito *said, that J. N. gave to the Father of the Plaintiff, and to W. S. who survived the Father, and* that *W. S. gave* the Charter *to the Defendant*, and *to the rest waged his Law*; and all held good. Br. Chartres de terre, pl. 73. cites 10 H. 6. 20.

4. In Detinue of Charters, the Defendant *said, that the Plaintiff delivered them upon Condition*, that *if the Feme of the Defendant survived the Plaintiff*, that he should retain them; and *said that his Feme is yet living*, and a good Plea *without Title*. Br. Chartres de terre, pl. 68.

See Traverse (K a)—Bailment (G)—Detinue ( )

(L a 4) Damages in Detinue of Charters, what; and the Difference between Damages in Detinue and Treſpaſs.

S. P. ibid. pl. 119. cites 20 Aſſ. 2. S P. Br Count. pl. 86. cites S. C and 20 Aſſ 3.

1. IN *Treſpaſs for carrying away of Charters*, the Defendant pleaded Not Guilty, and was *found Guilty to the Damage of* 100*l.* and the Defendant brought Error upon the Judgment given thereupon, becauſe the *Plaintiff did not ſhew the Quantity of Land in his Count*, ſo that the Jury could not know the Damages, and yet the firſt Judgment was Affirmed, inaſmuch as the Plaintiff *in Treſpaſs of Charters, ſhall not recover Damages according to the Quantity of the Tenements Compriſed*; For he did not demand the Charters, as *in Writ of Detinue of Charters*; therefore, in the one Caſe he ſhall recover Damages only for the taking, and in the other *he ſhall recover the Charters; and in Caſe they are burnt or deſtroyed, then Damages to the Value of the Tenements*; but here he ſhall recover Damages only for the taking contra Pacem. Note the Diverſity. Br. Error pl. 61. cites 21 E. 3 28.

2. Detinue *of a Box of Evidences*, the *Defendant prayed Garniſhment againſt Two*, who *came and made Title* to the Evidences, and the *Plaintiff other Title*, and the Box was opened, and the Evidence of every One delivered to him to whom it belonged, and the Plaintiff recovered Damages againſt the Garniſhee. Br. Damages pl. 41. cites 7 H. 4. 7.

3. *And*, if the *Garniſhees have had Aſſize againſt the Plaintiff, and recovered in Default of thoſe Charters*, yet the *Plaintiff ſhall not recover* Damages in this Action of Detinue *to the Value of the Land loſt*, per tot. Cur. Br. ibid.

(M a) Pleadings, where there muſt be *Profert* or *Monſtrans* of the Deed. In what Caſes in general and the Reaſon thereof.

And it is not enough for the Party to ſay, that the *Rent*, &c. *which could not paſs without Deed* was

1. THE *Reaſon why* Deeds are ſhewn to the Court is, becauſe it belongs to the Court *to Judge of the Sufficiency* or Inſufficiency of them. 6 Rep. 38. Bellamy's Caſe, alias Walker v. Bellamy.——And whether they were *duly executed*, and if they are *Abſolute or Conditional* and revocable. 10 Rep. 93. b. Dr Leyfield's Caſe.

granted to him, but the Court muſt ſee and adjudge of it, or elſe the Right appears not, and the adverſe Party may cauſe the Deed to be Inrolled, which makes it a Part of the Plea, whereupon the Court ſhall Judge whether it maintains the Plea or not, per Hobert Ch. J. Hob. 233.—And that the Court may ſee that there is no Razure, Interlining or other Defect to avoid it. Arg. 1. Le. 310. in Caſe of Maidewell v. Andrews.——And whether it Binds the Party. per Glyn Ch. J. Sty. 459. in Caſe of Dod v. Herbert.

If the *Defendant is privy to the Deed*, he ſhall have Over and View of it,

2. Where the Plaintiff uſes a Deed, as a Deed of *Grant of the Anceſtor of the Defendant*, he ſhall have Oyer and View of the Deeds, and econtra, if he *claims by a Stranger*, Note a Diverſity. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 85. cites 8 Aſſ. 7.

but *not where the Plaintiff dees claim by a Stranger*. Br. Oyer de Faits, &c. pl. 21. cites S. C.

3. In Aſſiſe, if the *Plaintiff makes Title to the Reverſion* by Grant of the Defendant, he ought to ſhew Deed, for otherwiſe, it is not good, ſo it ſeems, if he makes ſuch Title by a Stranger. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 86. cites 8 Aſſ. 11.

4. In

4. In *Mortdancestor of a Rent charge*, the Assise was taken without shewing Specialty. Br. Monstrans. pl. 88. cites 11 Ass. 29. Br. Monstrans. pl. 141; cites S. C.

5. Formedon in Remainder does not lie without shewing Specialty, and yet when it is shewn the Party Tenant shall not have Answer to it. Br. Formedon. pl. 33. cites 21 E. 3. 49.

6. *Quod ei deforceat* lies well without shewing any Record. Br. Monstrans. pl. 16. cites 41 E. 3. 30.

7. In Trespass, a *Gift of Trees* may be Pleaded without shewing Deed thereof. Br. Monstrans. pl. 147. cites 42 E. 3. 23.

8. In *Scire Facias, upon a Recovery of an Annuity*, the Plaintiff need not shew Deed; For the Record sufficeth per Opinionem. Br. Scire Facias. pl. 209 cites 3 H. 6. 40.

9. It was agreed, that where a Man *declare upon Specialty*, and does not shew it, *or pleads Release*, or the like, *or Record* and does not shew it, and they *Demurr in Law for the not shewing*, that this is *Peremptory*, quod nota. Br. Peremptory. pl. 13. cites 7 H. 6. 19.

10. *Annuity*, the Defendant demanded Judgment of Count, because it was Granted, *upon Condition contained in the Deed*, and the *Plaintiff had not made mention of the Condition in the Count*, but *the Roll was otherwise*, and there it appears that the *Plaintiff ought to make mention of the Condition in his Count, if* it be *contained in the Deed, and be to be performed of the Part of the Plaintiff*. Br. Count. pl. 9. cites 9 H. 6. 15. 16.

11. *Contra if* the Condition be *indorsed upon* the Deed, *and not contained in the Deed*; For this shall come in of the Part of the Defendant, Note a Diversity. Ibid.

12. In *Debt upon an Obligation and* in Debt *by Executors*, upon Testament; the *Obligation* and *the Testament* shall be shewn in the Declaration. *Contra of Deed in remainder*, and where the Deed shall be shewn in the * Count, there Variance is material, and it shall abate the Writ. Br. Variance pl. 56. cites 14 H. 6. 1. * *Orig.* Covenant.

13. In every Case where the *King is Party*, a Man shall shew the Deed, whether it belongs to him or not. Br. Monstrans. pl. 11. cites 35 H. 6. 8. per Danby.

14. A Man may Plead a Deed, *by way of Defence*, without shewing it. Per Littleton Choke and Brian. Br. Monstrans. pl. 60. cites 15 E. 4. 16.

15. *So* where a Man may plead a Deed *without Privity*, he shall have the Plea without shewing the Deed. Br. Monstrans. pl. 61. cites 14 H. 8. 4. per Fitzherbert.

16. A *Difference* was taken *between Letters Patents, and other Matters of Record, which of their own Nature are of Record*, and *Matters in Fact*, that the First might be pleaded in the same Court of Record, where they are Inrolled without shewing them, tho' they were not pleaded before. But tho' a Deed be Inrolled in a Court, yet it cannot be pleaded in the same Court without shewing it, 5 Rep. 74. b. in Wymark's Case in a Note by the Reporter, cites 21 E. 4. 49. a. The Abbot of Waltham's Case.

17. Where a Man does *not claim the Thing granted, as Incumbent, who* pleads that J. S. granted the next Presentation to W. N. who presented him, he shall not shew the Deed, for he *does not claim the Patronage, but only the Incumbency*, per Brian. Br. Monstrans. pl. 125. cites 21 E. 4. 50.

18. Note, that the Deed of Tail belongs to the Heir in Tail, and if the Father breaks it, yet the Heir shall have *Formedon*, tho' it be * *of Rent*, without shewing of the Deed; For Formedon is in the Right; *contra* of *Avowry* or *Assise*, for *this is in the Possession*. Br. Formedon, pl. 44. cites 4 H. 7. 10. * S. P. ibid. pl. 52. cites 12. H. 7. 11. But Brook makes a Quere of it.

19. *Conditions to defeat Chattles*, may be pleaded without a Deed, but not Conditions to defeat Freeholds; as of a Lease for Years, or Grant of a Ward, the Condition may be pleaded without Deed. But where it is pleaded to defeat a Franktenement, *be it in Personal Action or Real*, it must be pleaded by Deed. 11 H. 7. 22. b. pl. 12. per Vavisor. Quod fuit Concessum. per tot. Cur.

20. The

20. The *Grantee of a Common* may plead a *Releaſe* made *to the Tenant of the Land in diſcharge* of his Beaſts without ſhewing it; becauſe he juſtifies in his own Right, and there is no Privity between the Party who made the Releaſe and him. Per Brudnel J. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 61. cites 14 H. 8. 4.

21. *He who hath not the entire Fee*, need not ſhew the Deed. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 72. Marg.

22 *In any Title or Bar*, or other Matter, *where Land*, or other Thing *ſhall be gained or loſt*, the Party ſhall not be enforced to ſhew *more than what makes for him.* Pl. C. 410. a. in Caſe of Newys and Scholaſtica. v. Larke.

23. *As* in Aſſiſe, a Man may plead in Bar a *Feoffment*, which is upon Condition *without mentioning the Condition in it.* Pl. C. 410. a. b.

24. *So* of *Obligation on Condition.* Ibid. 410. b.

25. And *ſo* of an *Act of Parliament*, in which are divers Branches. But per Harper J. if in the Act there be a Proviſo or Exception, or other Matter which goes to every Branch, there the Party ought to *plead* ſuch *Proviſo*, &c. becauſe ſuch Proviſo, &c. is parcel of every Branch ſo that the Branch is not perfect Law without it. Ibid.

26. *But* of *Matters of Record* where the Record in *Parcel makes for the Party*, as Fine or Recovery of One Acre, where there are in the Record 20 Acres, there all the Record muſt be ſhewn; becauſe the Original is intire, and ſo is the Record grounded upon it. Pl. C. 410. b. in Caſe of Newys and Scholaſtica v. Larke.

27. A Deed that is requiſite *ex Juſtitutione legis*, muſt be ſhewn in Court, tho' it concerns a Thing collateral and conveys, or transfers Nothing. As in Caſe of Attornment by Corporation which muſt be by Deed, there the Deed muſt be ſhewn; Secus where 'tis *ex Proviſione Hominis*; as where the Condition of a Leaſe, is that the Leſſee ſhall not Aſſign but by Deed and not by Parol. There he might plead the Aſſignment without ſhewing the Deed; an Aſſignment by Parol being then ſufficient, had it not been provided againſt by the Condition. 6 Rep. 38. Paſch 3. Jac. C. B. Bellamy's Caſe.——Alias Walker v. Bellamy.

28. Where the Deed is but an *Inducement to the Action*, it need not be mentioned in the Declaration. 2 Buls. 228. * Babington v. Matthews. ——Style 193. Meers v. French, S. P.—Cro. E. 217. Vantry v. Alpen. S. P.——Cro. J. 43. Dent v. Oliver.——Cro. J. 70. Dagg and Kent v. Penkevon.——Jo. 377. Stockman v. Hampton.——Cro. Car. 442. S. C.—Sty. 264. King v. Weeden.

* Roll. Rep. 13. S. C.—Pl. C. 232. Roll. Rep. 328. Curtis. v. Dowtie.

29 *But* where it is *in Bar*, it is otherwiſe. Jenk. 305. pl. 80. 316. pl. 4.

30. In all Caſes where a *Thing cannot be demanded but by Deed*, the Deed muſt be produced. But where it may be demanded either by Deed, or without Deed, it is otherwiſe. Per Glyn Ch J. Sty. 459. in Caſe of Dod v. Herbert.

31. A Profert hic in Curia, is not neceſſary in a *Suggeſtion.* 2 Show. 303. Trin. 35. Car. 2. B. R. Sands v. Exton

32. Where A. has *bound himſelf to make a Deed, and is ſued for not doing it*, 'tis not enough to ſay that he made the Deed, viz. Leaſe, Bond, &c. but he muſt ſet it forth that the Court may judge of its Sufficiency; For it ought to be a good Deed; but if it be *to deliver*, or *ſhew*, or *produce a Deed* (that is) a Deed *already made*, there 'tis enough to ſay that he delivered, or ſhewed, or produced it. Per Holt Ch. J. 2 Salk. 498. Armit v. Bream. Mich. 3. Annæ. B. R.——6 Mod. 244. S. C.

See Bar ( ) Que Eſtate (C)

(M a 2) Where the Deed or Record muſt be ſhewn preſently.

1. NOte for Law, that if a Man *pleads a Record as Dilatory*, viz. in Abatement of a Writ, &c. he *muſt ſhew it preſently*. per Babbington. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 4. cites 3. H. 6. 15. S. P. ibid. pl. 6. cites 21. H. 9. per Frowick Ch. J.

2. *Econtra where he pleads it in Barr*; For there the other may ſay that Nul tiel Record, and the other may have Day to bring it in, per Babbington. quod non negatur. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 4. cites 3. H. 6. 15. S. P. ibid. pl. 6. cites 21. H. 9. per Frowick Ch. J.

(M a 3) Where it ſhall be ſhewn in the Declaration, or not till demanded.

1. IN *Waſt by him in Remainder*, if the *Deed and the Writ vary*, yet it is no Matter; For he is not bound to ſhew the Deed unleſs the Defendant demands it, and if he demands it, the *Action does not lie by him in Remainder without ſhewing Deed*; For *this Action is not properly founded upon the Deed*. Br. Variance. pl. 108. cites 10. H. 6. 8.

2. *In Debt upon an Obligation, or as Executor* upon Teſtament, the Obligation or Teſtament ſhall be *ſhewn in the Declaration*, and there Variance between the Writ and * Obligation, or Teſtament, is material to the Writ. Br. Monſtrans. pl 74. cites 14. H. 6. 5. * S. P. And *ſo in Quare impedit* which varies from the Specialty. Br. Variance. pl. 108. cites 10. H. 6. 8.

3. *Contra* upon * *Formedon in Remainder*, and there Deed ſhall *not* be ſhewn *till it is demanded*, and there Variance is not material. Br Monſtrans. pl. 74. cites 14. H. 6. 5. Br. Monſtrans pl. 80. S. P. For the Formedon is not founded upon the Deed. cites 36. H. 6. 16. ——— * S. P. And ſo in Waſte by him in Remainder. Br. Variance. pl. 14. cites 41. E. 3. 23.

4. Debt by an Adminiſtrator, the Plaintiff ſhewed the *Letters of Adminiſtration upon* the Declaration, but *not in the Declaration*, in which it appeared that the Adminiſtration was committed to B. and the *Defendant imparled*, and at the Day the Defendant *ſaid that there is Variance* to the Writ, becauſe the Letters which were ſhewn bore *Date at C. and not at B.* and by the Opinion of the Court, the Plaintiff ſhall not be compell'd to ſhew the Letters again, becauſe they were ſhewn at firſt as they ought; for Letters of Adminiſtration ſhall be ſhewn upon the Declaration; and an *Obligation ſhall be ſhewn in the Declaration*, and ſhall remain always in Court; but econtra of Letters of Adminiſtration, for it may be that the Plaintiff hath another Suit upon it in another Court, and therefore ſhall not be ſhewn but once, and *the ſame Law of Teſtament*; but if it had been in one and the ſame Term, or if the Letters had been *entered Verbatim*, then may the Defendant plead ſuch Variance after Imparlance. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 82. cites 36. H. 6. 31.

5. *Formedon in Remainder*; the Tenant demanded the Deed, the Demandant would not ſhew the Deed, the Tenant ſhall go ſine Die; and yet if the Tenant had anſwered without demanding the Deed it had been good, quod nota in Scire Facias. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 83. cites 38. H. 6. 19.

(M a 4) What ſhall be ſaid a ſufficient Shewing.

1. IN Aſſiſe of Eſtovers, a Deed of Grant was ſet forth, by which H. the Defendant had granted to the Plaintiff and his Heirs 20 *Load of Wood, of which the Plaintiff had* 16 *of the Gift of Richard his Father*, and ſhewed only the Deed of the Defendant, and not of his Father who granted the 16 Load, and yet good; for it is a good Grant of 20 Load by the Defendant, tho' his Father never granted 16. quod nota. Br. Grants pl. 69. cites 20. Aſſ. 8.

2. *Aſſiſe againſt* 2. the *one pleaded a Deed in Barr*, and would not that his Companion ſhould be aided thereby; and the *other pleaded the ſame Deed* in Barr for his Part; and the *Plaintiff demurr'd becauſe he did not ſhew it*; Per Mombray it ſuffices by the ſhewing of the other, by which the Plaintiff made Title. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 142. cites 40. Aſſ. 34.

3. If a Man ought to ſhew a Deed, and does not ſhew it, but a *Confirmation* of it, 'tis not good. quod nota bene. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 134. cites 12. H. 4. 23.

4. A *Deed inrolled* muſt be ſhewn, and *not the Inrolment*; and therefore if the Deed be loſt all is loſt. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 137. cites 19. H. 6. 6.

5. *Error* to reverſe a Judgment in C. B. *in Debt*, where the Plaintiff declar'd, *That* the *Defendant* decimo octavo Maii quarto Caroli, *conceſſit ſe Teneri* to the ſaid Sir Richard Greenvill *in* 280*l. ſolvend. upon Requeſt, et profert* hic in Curia *ſcriptum Prædictum*, quod debitum Prædictum in forma Prædicta teſtatur, cujus dat. eſt eiſdem die & Ann.: The Defendant demands Oyer Conditionis ſcripti Obligatorii prædicti; which being read, he pleads Payment; and Iſſue thereupon, and Judgment given for the Plaintiff; and the *Error aſſigned*, *becauſe he does not declare*, according to the uſual Courſe, *quod per ſcriptum Obligatorium conceſſit, nor any Writing mention'd in the former Part of the Declaration: So* it doth *not appear* to the Court, *that there was any Writing* obligatory, and that being faulty in Subſtance, no Plea or Verdict may make it good. But all the Court were of Opinion, becauſe he ſhew'd the Writing, whereby he demands the Debt, and the Defendant by his Plea ſhews that it is an Obligation with a Condition, and Iſſue is taken thereupon, and found for the Plaintiff, that the Declaration is good enough; at leaſt it appears to the Court that the Plaintiff has a juſt Debt, and good Cauſe to recover; wherefore the Judgment is good, and was affirmed. Hill. 6. Car. B. R. Cro. C. 209. Sir Wm Courtney v. Sir Rich. Greenvill———cites Co. Rep. 45.——7. Rep. 25. a.——8. Rep. 133. b.—8. H. 7. 71.—18. E. 4.

(M a 5) Second Time, &c. where Deed ſhall be ſhewn after a former Shewing.

1. IN *Execution*, W. of C. *brought Debt againſt B. and recovered* 100*l.* and 80*l.* Damages, and now he ſued *Scire facias againſt the Tertenants*, and they demanded the ſhewing of the *Teſtament*, and were ouſted by Award, becauſe it was *ſhewn in the firſt Suit*, and is enter'd in the End of the Declaration, quod proferunt hic in Curia literas Teſtament. &c. quod nota Br. Monſtrans. pl. 66. cites 24. E. 3. 30.

2. *Scire facias*, the *Defendant pleaded a Releaſe*, the *Plaintiff denied it*, and upon this they are at Iſſue, the *Plaintiff is Nonſuited*, and *brings another Action* upon it, and there the Defendant pleads the ſame Deed

again

again *remaining in the Cuſtody of the Court* as a Deed denied, Judgment, ſi Actio; and a good Plea, and this without ſhewing the Deed of Releaſe; For it remains with the Court, quod nota. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 67. cites 24. E. 3. 73.

3. A Man was *indicted of Murder*, and pleaded a Charter of the King which was allowed, and after *in Appeal* of the ſame Murder, the *Defendant was arraigned again*, and the Plaintiff was nonſuited, and the Defendant was arraigned upon the Declaration, and pleaded how he pleaded a Charter before, et non Allocatur, without ſhewing it; but he may plead all the firſt Record of Diſcharge, and have Day to ſhew it. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 36. cites 11. H. 4. 41.

4. *Debt by an Executor and ſhews the Teſtament*, as he ought, and the Defendant makes Defence and *imparles* to the next Term, he cannot plead Variance; For the Plaintiff *is not obliged to ſhew the Teſtament again*, and then the *Variance of the Name of the Executor* in the Writ and in the Teſtament cannot be tryed; For it may be that the Executor muſt ſhew the Teſtament in another Court in another Action the ſame Day. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 53. cites * 19. H. 6. 7.

Br. Oyer de faits, &c. pl. 16. cites 33. H. 6. 2. * Br. Eſtoppel. pl. 80. cites S. C.—Br. Variance, pl. 44. cites S. C.

5. *So, of Formedon in Remainder*, he ſhall ſhew the Deed preſently, and ſhall not be compell'd to ſhew it again *in another Term*; and therefore the Defendant was ruled [to anſwer] over. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 53. cites * 19. H. 6. 7.

Br. Monſtrans. pl. 80. cites 36. H. 6. 16. S. P. * Br. Eſtoppel pl. 80. cites S. C.——Br. Variance pl. 44. cites S. C.

6. *Contra of an Obligation*; for it remains always in Court. Br. Monſtrans pl. 53. cites * 19. H. 6. 7.

S. P. And then it is always apparent. Br. Variance. pl. 44. cites S. C. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 80. cites 36. H. 6. 16. S. P. * Br. Eſtoppel. pl. 80. cites S. C.

7. Where a Man *ſued Execution* by Capias *in Chancery, upon a Statute Merchant, returnable in C. B.* 15. Hill. there per tot. Cur. he ſhall not have Execution if he does not ſhew the Obligation again, tho' he ſhewed it in Chancery before. Br. Monſtrans pl. 73. cites 37. H. 6. 6.

8. *Econtra* in Execution *upon Statute Staple*; For there the Capias is returnable in Canc. and Liberate ſhall Iſſue there, therefore once ſhewing ſuffices for all; For *'tis all in one Court*; *contra* where 'tis *in another Court*. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 73. cites 37. H. 6. 6.

(M a 6) Excuſed by Fraud or Force.

1. WAST *by Baron and Feme againſt Tenant for Life*, the Tenant *pleaded that the Baron had releaſed to him in Fee*, and *by Indenture, which he ſhewed* to the Court, *'twas agreed* between them, that *if the Baron acquitted the Tenant of a Statute Merchant to N. that the Releaſe ſhould be void*, and ſaid, that he hath not acquitted him, Judgment, &c, and *ſhall ſhew the Indenture, but not the Releaſe*, Thorpe asked where is the Releaſe? Kirton ſaid it was bail'd into an indifferent Hand, and the Defendant has a Writ of Detinue pending upon it in this Court now; and becauſe he did not deny the Indenture, Judgment, &c. Per Belke he muſt ſhew the Releaſe; For where Debt is brought upon an Obligation of 100l. and he ſhews the Indenture of Defeaſance proving it, and not the Obligation, the Action does not lie. Per Finche. Demurr if you will, and then diſpute after. Per Belke. the Indenture is not our Deed——and the other econtra. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 38. cites 42. E. 3. 18.

This Caſe in 5 Rep. 75 a. in Wymark's Caſe is ſtated by the Reporter thus, Scilicet, *Feme ſole leaſed for Life, Leſſee did waſt*, the *Baron releas'd and deliver'd the Deed into an indifferent Hand to deliver to Defendant on certain Conditions to be perform'd*; the *Defendant perform'd* the Conditions; the *Baron got the Releaſe and detain'd it* from the Leſſee; *and he and his Feme brought Action of Waſte*; the Leſſee, upon this ſpecial Matter ſhall plead the Releaſe without ſhewing it. Coke ſays it is a good Caſe, and cites 42 E. 3. 18 a.

2. Where

2. Where the *Conuſee takes the Deſeaſance from the Conuſor with Force, and ſues Execution upon the Statute*, the Conuſor ſhall plead it without ſhewing the Indenture, per Juſtitiarios; For tho' he may have Treſpaſs of the taking, yet the Conuſee may deny, and then the Action of Treſpaſs is gone, and yet his Executor may ſue Execution. Br. Monſtrans pl. 26. cites 47. E. 3. 25. 26.

3. *So*, where an *Obligation is deliver'd into an indifferent Hand*, upon certain Condition performed to deliver it to the Obligee, and he retakes it with Force before the Condition performed, and brings Debt upon it. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 26. cites 47. E. 3. 25. 26.

4. *Or*, where the *Obligee makes an Acquittance, and after retakes it by Force, and brings Debt*, the Defendant ſhall be aided by Plea without ſhewing the Specialty. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 26. cites 47. E. 3. 25. 26.——quære hoc. for contra 1 H. 7. 14. ibid.

5. In Aſſiſe the Tenant *pleads a Feoffment of the Anceſtor of the Plaintiff unto him*; the *Plaintiff ſaid*, that it was *upon Condition*, &c. and that the Condition was *broken, and he reenter'd, and that the Tenant enter'd and took away the Cheſt in which the Deed was, and yet detains the ſame.* The Plaintiff ſhall not in this Caſe be forc'd to ſhew the Deed. Co. Litt. 226. a.

6. In Caſe upon a *Policy of Inſurance*, Plaintiff declar'd upon a Writing, without ſaying, Hic in Curia prolat. It was moved for the Defendant, that as his Caſe is, he cannot plead Non aſſumpſit, but a ſpecial Plea grounded upon the Writing of which he *has no Counterpart, neither is it* **enter'd in the Office* of Aſſurance; and therefore, that ſince the Plaintiff declared upon it, he ſhould be ruled to make a Profert in Curia, that the Defendant might ſee it. And for the Plaintiff it was inſiſted that he need not count on any Writing, but on an Agreement generally by Policy of Aſſurance; and that no Oyer can be demanded, nor hic in Curia prolat. Keble reports, that for theſe Reaſons, Twiſden J. held that the Defendant ſhould not have a Copy; but that per Cur. præter Twiſden, wherever the Plaintiff declares upon a Writing, the Court on Affidavit, that he has no Part of it, will let him have a Copy. But where the *Declaration is on an Agreement generally, and the Writing but Evidence*, they will not grant it. But at laſt the *Parties agreed to take and give a Copy* to try it the ſame Term. Siderfin reports that the Ch. J. and Windham J. held that in Action on the Caſe, where the Plaintiff *declares upon a Writing*, it is in the Diſcretion of the Court to grant Oyer or not; but Twiſden econtra; but that all agreed, that if the *Plaintiff would ſtrike out* of his Declaration, the Words *(per Scriptum)* then *the perpetual Imparlance* ſhould be diſcharged; and at laſt the Plaintiff agreed that Defendant ſhould have Oyer. Vide Sid. 386. and Keb. 430. Mich. 20. Car. 2. B. R. Suiſter alias Suſter v. Cowell alias Coel.

* Twiſden J. ſaid that it is not uſual to regiſter Policies of Aſſurance when an Action on the Caſe is brought upon them; but only when they are put in ſuit before the Commiſſioners; which is the more dilatory way. 2. Keb. 430. S. C.

7. In *Quare Impedit*, the Plaintiff declares on a Grant of the Advowſon to his Anceſtor, and ſays Hic in Cur. prolat', but had not the Deed to ſhew; there was an *Affidavit* in Court *that Defendant had got the Deed* into his Hands; ſo 'twas prayed that Plaintiff might take Advantage of *a Copy*, which appeared in an Inquiſition found Tempore Ed. 6. Per Cur. When *Debt on Bond to perform Covenants* in a Deed is brought, and the Defendant cannot plead Covenants performed without the Deed, becauſe the Plaintiff has the original Deed, (and perhaps Defendant took not a Counterpart of it) we uſe to grant *Imparlances* till the Plaintiff brings in the Deed; and upon Evidence, if it be proved, that the other Party has the Deed, we admit Copies to be given in Evidence. But here the Law requires the Deed to be produced. You have your Remedy for the Deed at Law; we cannot alter the Law, nor ought to grant an Imparlance. Mod. 266. pl. 17. Trin. 29. Car 2. C. B. Anon.

If the Party, who would plead the Deed, has it not, he ought to move the Court, and the *Court will order* that he ſhall have the Deed, or a Copy of it. Sic dictum fuit. Sid. 50. pl. 13. Mich. 13 Car. 2. B. R. The Court ſometimes will compel the *Plaintiff to give a Copy* of an Indenture to Defendant, if he *ſwears that he never had a Part*, or that he hath *loſt it*; but this is ex Gratia Curiæ, and not ex

ex debito Juſtitiæ. 1. Sand. 9 Mich. 18. Car. 2. Jevens v. Harridge.——6. Mod. 237. Mich 3. Annæ B. R. Cook v. Remington.——264. Mich 3. Annæ. B. R. Ward v. Apprice.——S. P and if it be loſt, the Court will on Affidavit compel the Party to *ſhew his Counterpart and he to pleád thereto*, otherwiſe they *will* grant an *Imparlance*, Cro. J. 429. Trin. 15. Jac. B. R. pl. 5. Anon.

See Policy of Inſurance. (B)

(M. a. 7) Excuſed, by Accident.

1. IF there be *Iſſue in Tail of a Gift of Rent* in Tail, &c. (which cannot paſs but by Deed) *and the Gift be executed*, the Heir in Tail ſhall have *Formedon* without ſhewing Deed; For he is *aided by the Statute of W.* 2. *cap.* 1. if the Deed be burnt or loſt. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 60. cites 15. E. 4. 16.

2. *So* where it is *by Way of Defence*. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 60. cites 15. E. 4. 16.

3. *But* otherwiſe 'tis of *a Stranger to the Tail*, he *ſhall not have an Action nor make Defence*, unleſs he ſhews the Deed. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 60. cites 15. E. 4. 16.

4. If Tenant in *Tail of Rent* granted by Deed breaks the Deed, and dies, the Heir in Tail ſhall have *Formedon* without ſhewing the Deed; For this Action is in the Right. But he ſhall not have *Avowry* nor *Aſſiſe*, if he makes Title by Gift of Rent, if he does not ſhew the Deed; for it is in the Poſſeſſion. Per Huſſey and Fairfax. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 108. cites 4. H. 7.

S. P. ibid. pl. 112. cites 9. H. 7. 23. per Vaviſour. Br. Formedon pl. 44. cites 4. H. 7. 10.

(M. a. 8) By Detainer by another, who has Right to it.

1. A *Siſe* by an Infant *againſt* 2. the *one pleaded in Barr a Deed of Feoffment with Warranty of the Anceſtor of the Plaintiff*, in which Deed all the Tenements were compriſed, *and would not ſuffer his Companion to have the Deed*; and the other ſaid that the Anceſtor by the ſame Deed, &c. ut in alia Barra. Per Mombray, becauſe the Deed is in the Hands of the other, who hath Right thereto, and he cannot deraign it out of his Poſſeſſion; therefore he ſhall have Advantage of it without ſhewing the Deed; by which the Plaintiff made Title; quod nota. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 56. cites 40. Aſſ. 34.

(M. a. 9) By Detainer in another Court, &c. in another Suit, &c.

1. IN Aſſiſe the Tenant pleaded a *Releaſe*, *which was before denied by the ſame Plaintiff in an Oyer and Terminer*, and there remained to be tried, and did not ſhew the Deed; and upon good Advice it was adjourned into Bank; and there, *becauſe the Oyer and Terminer was diſcontinued*, the Defendant ſued to have the Releaſe; but 'twas ſaid to the Defendant that he ſhould have his Releaſe before them ſuch a Day at his Peril. Quod nota. Quære what ſhould be done if the Oyer and Terminer had not been diſcontinued, ſo that it might have been tryed? Br. Monſtrans. pl. 100. cites 38. Aſſ. 10.

If a Deed be denied in one Court by which it remains there, it may be pleaded in another Court without ſhewing it. 5 Rep. 74 b. per the Reporter in Wymark's Caſe. cites 12 H. 4. 8. a. b. and 43 E. 3. 27. a acc. For *Lex non cogit ad impoſſibilia.*

2. In Treſpaſs, the Caſe was that *Tenant in Tail leaſed for Years* and died, *the Iſſue confirmed* the Eſtate of the Termor by Deed, and after enter'd, and the Tenant re-enter'd, and he brought Aſſiſe, and the Tenant pleaded the Confirmation; the Plaintiff denied the Deed, by which the *Deed remained in Court as a Deed denied*, and the Plaintiff brought Treſpaſs alſo againſt the ſame Tenant, and he pleaded the Leaſe, and the other pleaded the Tail, and that he is Heir, and the Defendant pleaded the ſame Confirmation, and *vouched it in the Hands of the Juſtices of Aſſiſe as a Writing denied*; and per Hanke, he ſhall not plead this without ſhewing it, clearly; but he may have a Writ to the Juſtices of Aſſiſe to have it to ſhew, and the Plaintiff paſſed over, and denyed the Deed. Br. Monſtrans pl. 38. cites * 42. H. 4. 8.

* It ſeems it ſhould be 12. H. 4. 8.

(M. a. 10) Where they, or the Eſtates, &c. which they relate to, are executed.

1. IN *quare impedit*, the Plaintiff made Title becauſe *B* was *ſeized of the Manor of P. and the Advowſon Appendant*, and *preſented*, &c. *and* B. *died ſeized*, and the *Premiſſes deſcended to three Daughters, who aſſigned* the Manor and Advowſon *to A. their Mother in Dower*, and the Church being void A. preſented, &c. and the *eldeſt Daughter granted her third Part* of the Manor with her third Part of the Advowſon *to J. S. in Fee*, and A. attorn'd, and *J. S. granted it to the Father of the Plaintiff in Fee*, and *A. attorn'd and after died*, by which *the Father* of the Plaintiff *enter'd into the third Part of the Manor, and died ſeized, and the Plaintiff as Heir entered*, and ſo the Plaintiff has the Eſtate of the eldeſt Daughter, and ſo it belongs to him to preſent; and the Defendant demanded Judgment for not ſhewing of the Deeds of the Grant of the Reverſion; Per Thorpe, where a *Reverſion is granted*, and the *Tenant Attorns*, the Tenant for Life *dies*, and the *Grantee enters*, it ſhall be good Title in Aſſiſe without ſhewing the Deed of Grant of the Reverſion; becauſe the *Poſſeſſion was executed*; and per Cur. becauſe the Plaintiff is in Poſſeſſion *by Deſcent*, therefore he need not ſhew Specialty; and if the Grant was of the Land without the Advowſon, it is ſaved to the Defendant by way of Anſwer. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 65. cites 24. E. 3. 52.

2. In *falſe Impriſonment*, where the Defendant *juſtifies by a Warrant* to him ſent; *by all the Juſtices*, this Plea is good, without ſhewing any Thing of the Warrant; for it may be that it is *returned* before the Juſtices. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 96 cites 27. Aſſ. 36. per Sharde.

3. In *Treſpaſs*, the Plaintiff counted, that he had *bona Waviata by Grant of the King*, and ſeized ſuch Waif, and the Defendant came and carried it away: And there 'twas held, per Finche, that where a Man *has been in Poſſeſſion of the Thing*, and brings a Writ of Treſpaſs, as here, he need not ſhew the Charter of the King; and *econtra*, *where he demands* by the Charter *a Thing, of which he had not Poſſeſſion before*. Quære. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 13. cites 40. E. 3. 10.

4. In Ejectment by J. N. againſt C. the Defendant pleaded that *A. gave* a Manor *to B. and M. his Wife in Tail*; B. and M. had Iſſue C. and that after *B. and M. gave* the Manor to *J. S. upon Condition that he ſhould leaſe the* Manor to J. N. for a Term of Years, the Remainder to B. and M. that afterwards J. S. leaſed the Manor *to J. N.* the Plaintiff, *the Reverſion to himſelf*, that *B. died, and M. entered and died* ſeized, and *C. entered as Iſſue in Tail*, &c. Judgment, ſi Actio. Cheld objected that C. the Defendant maintain'd his Entry for a Condition broken, which lies in Specialty, and yet he did not ſhew it, &c. But Belknap ſaid that the Thing was executed, for which Reaſon no Deed need be ſhewn, and if this Matter was found by Verdict of Aſſiſe, it was good, &c. Fitzh. Monſtrans. pl. 141. cites T. 44. E. 3. 22.

Co Litt. 226. a. S. C. and adds a Nota, that the Defendant being Iſſue in Tail was remitted to the Eſtate Tail.

5. The

5. The Plaintiff need not ſhew a *Fine*, nor any Deed when 'tis executed; contra if it be executory; Per Hill. and Hanke. Br. Formedon. pl. 23. cites 11 H. 4. 39. Br. Nugation pl. 4. cites S. C.—Ibid. pl. 10. cites S. C.

6. *When a Remainder is veſted* or executed, *Deed* of Remainder *ſhall not be ſhewn after*; per Threſam, and Huddey ad idem. *In Aſſiſe* the Plaintiff intitled himſelf by Remainder, he need not ſhew the Deed; becauſe by his Seiſin it was veſted and executed: And *the ſame Law in Formedon* if the Remainder be once veſted. Br Monſtrans. pl. 75. cites 14 H. 6. 26.

7. If *Iſſue in Tail be of a Gift of Rent* in Tail, &c. which cannot paſs but by Deed, yet *if the Deed be executed*, the Heir in Tail ſhall have *Formedon* without ſhewing the Deed; for he is *aided by the Stat. of W. 2. Cap.* 1. if the Deed be burnt or loſt. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 60. cites 15. E. 4. 16.

8. He, who juſtifies to make *Replevin by Warrant of the Sheriff, muſt ſay that he hath returned his Warrant* to the Sheriff; for otherwiſe he ſhall ſhew it to the Court. Quod nota, per Cur. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 126. cites 21. E. 4. 66. Br. Pleadings. pl. 131. cites S. C.

9. *Commiſſioners*, who ſit by Commiſſion, and *after return their Commiſſion* into Bank, may juſtify by it, without ſhewing the Commiſſion. Per Fineux Ch. J. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 172. cites 13 H. 7. 14. and 20. H. 7. 6.

10. Where *Land is given for Life, or in Tail*, the *Remainder over in Tail*, &c. and the Tenant for Life, or the Tenant in *Tail, dies without Iſſue*, and he in Remainder enters; there, *if Diſcontinuance*, Diſſeiſin, &c. *is made, ſo that the Heir in Tail* in Remainder, *or* he in *Remainder in Tail is to make Title* by this Remainder, he need not ſhew Deed of the Remainder as in Formedon in Remainder; becauſe the Remainder was executed before. Quod nota. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 1. cites 18. H. 8. 4.——— And ſo is T. 34. E. 3. quod nota in a Writ of Entry ſur Diſſeiſin. Br. ibid.

11. If three Tenants in Common of an *Advowſon* make *Compoſition to preſent by Turn*, and every one of them has preſented by his Turn once by Vertue of the Compoſition; in a *quare impedit* brought after between them, the Plaintiff need not ſhew the Compoſition; becauſe it was executed: But otherwiſe, if it was not executed; and between Coparceners Compoſition may be made without Writing, becauſe by the Common Law they are Privies, and as one Heir, and compellable to make Partition; and ſo Diverſity. Held per Shelly and Fitzherbert J. and many of the Serjeants. D. 29. pl. 194. Hill. 28. H. 8. Anon.

12. A *Licence* that is executed and has no Continuance need not be ſhewn. 6. Rep. 38. Paſch. 3. Jac. C. B. Bellamy's Caſe. A Licence in its Nature cannot be without Writing, and there did not any Intereſt paſs thereby, but a Reſtraint only ſet upon a Liberty; and 'tis a Thing *executed*; and his Aſſignee to whom he had alien'd Part by Vertue of the Licenſe, perhaps has it for the Fortifying his Eſtate. Cro J. 102. Walker v. Bellamy.

* 13. A *Warrant executed* by a Bailiff is returned to the Sheriff, and therefore need not be produced in Juſtification of a Treſpaſs of Aſſault, &c. in Arreſting a Perſon by Vertue thereof. But 'tis otherwiſe in a Juſtification for a Rent-Charge, or ſuch Things as have *Continuance*. Cro. J. 372. Trin. 13. Jac. B. R. Bateman v. Woodcock. * Roll. R. 221. per Coke; and by him and Doderidge 'tis the ſame of a *Grant of next Avoidance* after Grantee has preſented. S. C.——S. P. 3. Lev. 205. Mich. 36. Car. 2. C. B. in Caſe of Aylesbury v. Harvey.

14. *So* of a Deed or * *Leaſe determined*. Arg. Pl. C. 149. in Caſe of Throgmorton v. Tracy. * S. P. 3. Lev. 205. ut Sup.

15. In Replevin the Defendant juſtify'd by a *Condemnation before the Juſtices of Peace* upon the Statute of Exciſe for the Non Entry of ſtrong Waters, and a *Warrant made thereupon* to levy 20s. ſet for a Fine; Exception was taken, becauſe there was no Profert hic in Curia of the Warrant. But per Cur. the Statute does not require that the Warrant be under Hand and Seal, but only in Writing, and no Writing is to be ſo pleaded unleſs it be a Deed; and that, of Things executed, a Deed need not be ſhewn; and cited 7. Rep. in the End of Bellamy's Caſe, and ſo Judgment

Judgment was given for the Defendant. 3. Lev. 204. 205. Mich. 36. Car. 2. C. B. Aylesbury v. Harvey.

16. In *Treſpaſs* of Aſſault, Battery, Wounding and *Impriſonment* the Defendant juſtify'd by *Warrant of the Council of State in Barbadoes, &c. for Commitment of the Plaintiff*; Exception was taken, becauſe the *Warrant* was not ſhewn; but it was anſwered that it lay not in their Power, becauſe it was *delivered to the Provoſt Marſhall*, as his Authority for the Capture and Detention, and therefore did belong to him to keep; and Judgment was given accordingly for that and other Reaſons, and ſo a former Judgment reverſed. Show. Parl. Caſes, 24. Dutton v. Howell and al.

[See (M. a. 11.) pl. 1. Reverſion (S)]

(M. a. 11) In what Caſes, in Reſpect of the Thing Sued for being grantable without Deed, or not.

1. IF a *Man purchaſes Rent-Service, and gets Seiſin*, he ſhall have Aſſiſe without ſhewing Deed thereof, and yet it cannot be purchaſed but by Deed; and this, *by reaſon that 'tis of common Right*, therefore need not ſhew Specialty after Seiſin. *Contra of a Rent-Charge and Rent-Seek*; and the Reaſon is, becauſe the Rent *may be claimed by Que Eſtate* without ſhewing Deed, where 'tis claimed as Parcel or Appendant to the Manor where the Land is.; becauſe the *Manor or Land may paſs by Livery without Deed, and then the Rent goes with it.* Br. Monſtrans pl. 91. cites 22 Aſſ. 53.

2. In Aſſiſe of *Rent*, he, who *preſcribes in himſelf and his Anceſtors, and in thoſe whoſe Eſtate he has*, ought to ſhew Deed of the Rent; For Que Eſtate cannot be of Rent without Deed; by which the Plaintiff *ſhewed Deed of the Grant* of the Rent to his Anceſtor, *but* did *not* ſhew Deed *of Commencement of the Rent*, and therefore ill, by the beſt Opinion; For a Man may preſcribe in himſelf and his Anceſtors, &c. without ſhewing Deed, but not in a Que Eſtate of a Thing which cannot be granted without Deed, without ſhewing Deed thereof: *Contra of Acquittall* in him and thoſe whoſe Eſtate the Lord has in the Seigniory, or Common Appendant, or Eſtovers Appendant, &c. there he may preſcribe by Que Eſtate without ſhewing Deed. Br. Preſcription pl. 29. cites 24. E. 3. 23. 39.

3. A *Corporation* cannot make a *Leaſe*, *Releaſe*, nor *give Command*, or *Licence* but by Deed, which ſhall be ſhewn. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 127. cites 21 E. 4 19. 75.

4. He, who is a *mere Stranger* to a Deed of Releaſe, and has no means to come by it, and the * Deed goes *in diſcharge* of him, may plead it without ſhewing the Deed; Per Brudnel and Pollard Juſtices. Contra by Brook and Fitzherbert J. *But* they all agreed, that he who was *privy in Eſtate*, as Leſſee for Years, Feoffee, &c. *and all who claim Intereſt in the Land*, cannot plead the Deed without ſhewing it. Quod Nota bene. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 161. cites 14 H. 8. 4.

* *Orig.* Suiſt.

5. If a Man pleads a Conveyance of a *Rent*, or the like, which cannot paſs without Deed, and does not produce the Deed in Plea, it *is not holpen by the Stat. 27 Eliz. 5. of Demurrer.* Per Hobert Ch. J. Hob. 233. in pl. 295.

Cited 3 Mod. 52.

6. *Leſſee for Years claims a Way* to his Houſe *by a Que Eſtate* without ſhewing the Deed, and held good by 3 Juſtices againſt one; becauſe the Leſſee has not the Deed, and it is but a *Conveyance* to the Action, which is grounded on the Diſturbance done to him in Poſſeſſion. Cro. J 673. Slackman v. Weſt.——Palm. 385. S. C.

But

7. *But* if he claimed a *Rent* or * *Common in groſs*, which cannot paſs without Deed, it had been otherwiſe; For there he could not ſhew *que Eſtate* without ſhewing the Deed, how he came by the Eſtate. Cro. J. 673. Mich. 21 Jac. B. R. Slackman v. Weſt. * Yelv. 201. Hill. 8. Jac. B. R. Farmer v. Hunt. S. P. ——and Brownl. 220.

S. C.—And Cro. J. 271. S. C.——See 2 Mod. 277. Birch v. Wilſon.

8. An *Arbitrament* under Seal is no Deed, and the Arbitrament may be made without Deed, and therefore is not neceſſary to be produced in Court; For it is but a Writing under Hand and Seal. Per Glyn Ch. J. Sty. 459. Trin. 1655. Dod v. Herbert. The Deed of a Thing, which cannot paſs without Deed, ought to be ſhewn

to the Court, Arg. Comb. 93. cites Dy. 275. 1 H. 7. 12. Cro. Car. 143. 10 Rep. 94. Yelv. 201. Hob. 233.——*But tho'* a Thing will paſs *without Deed*, yet if the *Party pleads a Deed and makes a Title thereby*, he muſt come with a Profert. Arg. 2 Mod. 64. cites 1 Le. 309. Roll. Rep. 20.——And yet in ſome Caſes where a Thing cannot paſs without Deed, as a Remainder, or Reverſion, a Deed need not be ſhewn; but contra after Execution. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 55. cites 21 H. 6. 23. per Fulthorp, to which Yelverton agreed.

[See Que Eſtate (C)]

(M. a. 12) The Difference between Oyer and Monſtrans of Deeds and Records.

1. NOTE a *Diverſity* between *Monſtrans of Deeds or Records*, *and* the *Oyer of them*; For he who pleads the Deed or Record, or that declares upon the Deed or Record, to him it belongs to ſhew the Deed or Record but the other againſt whom the Record or Deed is pleaded or declared, ſhall demand the Oyer of the Record or Deed, which his Adverſary brought againſt him. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 165. Oyer of a Deed or Record *is always to be had by him, who is to be charged by it* and *not by him who pleads it*; For he who pleads it, or declares upon it ſhall ſhew it. Br. Oyer de faits, &c. pl. 15. (bis)

2. When Oyer of a Deed is prayed, it is intended that the Deed is in Court, and the *(ei legitur)* or reading of it is the Act of the Court. Sid. 308. Mich. 18 Car. 2. in Caſe of Jevons v. Harridge.

3. When a Deed is pleaded with a Profert hic in Curia, the very *Deed it ſelf is by* * *intendment of Law immediately in the Poſſeſſion of the Court*; and therefore when Oyer is craved, it is of the Court, and not of the Party. And *after Oyer* is craved the *Deed becomes parcel of the Record*, and the Court muſt judge upon the Whole; and the *Demand* of Oyer *is a kind of Plea*, and may be counterpleaded. 3 Salk. 119. pl. 2. 3. 4. * Sid. 308. Mich. 18. Car. 2. B. R. in Caſe of Jevons v. Harridge.

(M. a. 13) Monſtrans, in what Caſes there muſt be a Monſtrans or Profert, though the Deeds cannot be traverſed when pleaded or ſhewn.

1. IN *Formedon in Remainder* the Defendant ought to ſhew the Deed, and yet the Deed is not traverſable. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 48. cites 21 E. 3. 49. Br. Traverſe per Sans, &c. pl. 128. ibid. pl. 324. cites 14 H. 6. 1. Br. Traverſe per ſans, &c. pl. 58. cites S. C.—Deed of Formedon in Remainder is not traverſable; For he ſhall *not ſay Ne dona pas by the Deed* but *Ne dona pas* only. Br. Traverſe, pl. 145. cites 14 H. 6. 1. nota. Br. Forger de faits pl. 20. cites 10 E. 4. 1.

He muſt ſhew the Deed; For the *Statute is if he hath Quarrel*, which is *intended by Action of Covenant.*

2. *Forger* of Deeds lies, where *Termor prayes to be reſceived, and ſhews a forged Deed of Leaſe*; For per Moile, he cannot be reſceived without ſhewing Deed; and this Deed ſhall not be traverſed upon the Reſceipt, Per Danby and Chocke. Br. Forger de Faits, pl. 15. cites 9 E. 4. 37.

Ibid. and Br. Reſceit pl. 75. cites 9 E. 4. 30. Br. Traverſe per ſans, &c. pl 128. cites 9 E. 4. 37.

3. Executors ſhall not have Action before *Probat of the Teſtament*, but if it be written on the Back, quod Probatum eſt, &c. this ſhall not be traverſable, but only whether he was Executor or not, and not whether he proved the Teſtament. Br. Travers. pl. 129. cites 9 E. 4. 47.

(M. a. 14) Monſtrans of Deeds. Act of Law. Where Perſons come in by Act of Law.

Debt on a *Bond Aſſigned by Commiſſioners of Bankrupts*, and becauſe he comes in by Act in Law, and hath no means to ſhew the Obligation; it was adjudged upon demurrer to be good enough without ſhewing it in Court; as *Tenant by Statute Merchant or* Tenant *in Dower* ſhall have advantage of a *Rent-charge* without ſhewing the Deed. Hill. 6. Car. B. R. Cro. C. 209. Gray v. Fielder. 10 Rep. 94. in Leyfield's Caſe.——Jenk. 305. pl. 80. Co. Litt. 225. b.

1. A *Tenant by Statute Staple* or *Elegit*, that has extended an *Abbot's Leaſe*, or a Leaſe made out of an Abbot's Leaſe, is not bound to ſhew it, becauſe he comes in by Act of Law; but any other that comes in under the Leaſe, muſt ſhew it. Per tot. Cur. Brownl. 38. Mich 10. Jac. Anon.——5 Rep. 75. a. in Wymark's Caſe.

2. If a *Guardian* in Chivalry in Right of the Heir had *entered for Condition broken*, he might have *pleaded the Eſtate* to have been *upon Condition* without ſhewing any Deed; becauſe his Intereſt was created by the Law. Co. Litt. 225. b.

3. *So* of *Tenant in Dower*. Co. Litt. 225. b.

4. *But* the *Lord by Eſcheat*, tho' his Eſtate be created by the Law, ſhall not plead a Condition to defeat a Freehold without ſhewing it; becauſe *the Deed belongs to him*. Co. Litt. 226. a.

5. *So* a *Tenant by the Curteſy* ſhall not plead a *Condition made by his Wife and a Re-entry* for Condition broken without ſhewing the Deed, For tho' his Eſtate be created by Law, yet the *Law preſumes that he had the Poſſeſſion of the Deeds* and Evidences belonging to his Wife. Co. Litt. 226. a.

(M. a. 15) Monſtrans, &c. By what Perſons. Aſſignees.

1. WHERE a *Covenant* is annexed to a Thing, *which* of it's Nature *cannot paſs without Deed* at firſt, in ſuch Caſe the *Aſſignee* ought to be in by Deed, otherwiſe he ſhall not have Advantage of the Covenant; *but* where the Covenant is not ſo, but *runs with the Eſtate*, the Aſſignee ſhall have Covenant without ſhewing any Deed of Aſſignment. Cro. E. 373. 436. Hill. 37 Eliz. B. R. Noke v. Awder.

2. A *Licence to Leaſe Land* need not be ſhewn by Aſſignee; For he does not claim by it any Eſtate in the Land, but 'tis merely *collateral to*

the

the Intereſt of the Land, and only pleaded to excuſe the Forfeiture of the Leaſe: and not like a *Releaſe* or *Confirmation*; For they give or transfer a Right. 6 Rep. 38. Paſch. 3. Jac. C. B. Bellamy's Caſe.—Alias Walker v. Bellamy.

3. Where the *Condition of a Leaſe* is, *that* the *Leſſee ſhall not Aſſign but by Deed* and not by Parol, there he may plead the Aſſignment without ſhewing the Deed, an Aſſignment by Parol being ſufficient, if it be not provided againſt by the Condition. Ibid.

3. In *Debt* upon a Leaſe for Years by the Aſſignee *of the Reverſion*, it was aſſigned for Error, that he claimed by Grant of the Reverſion, and did not ſhew that it was by Deed; and without a Deed or Fine a Reverſion cannot paſs; and for this and another Error principally the Judgment was reverſed. Cro. C. 143. Mich. 4. Car. B. R. Long v. Nethercote.

(M. a. 16) By Baily or Servant.

1. IN Treſpaſs the Defendant juſtified as Servant *of a Collector to diſtrain for* 10*s. Tax*, and prayed Aid of his Maſter, and the Plaintiff prayed that the Defendant ſhew the Letters Patents by which his Maſter was made Collector; and was not compelled to ſhew them; For *the Power of the Maſter is the Act of Parliament*, which granted the Tax, and not the Letters Patents. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 58. cites 22 H. 6. 42.

2. *But* where a Man *juſtifies as Servant of another*, or *makes Conuſance in Replevin* by reaſon of a Rent-charge, he ſhall ſhew the Deed of Grant which was agreed; For there the Deed is the Effect of the title. Contra ſupra. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 58. cites 22 H. 6. 42.

But if a Man diſtrains for Rent due to a Corporation, or other Perſon, as Bailiff and is not their Bailiff, and has no Deed for the doing it, yet it is good if the Party, &c. agrees to it; For it is not traverſable whether Bailiff or not, if he to whoſe Uſe &c. agrees to it. Br. Travers. per &c. pl. 3. cites 26 H. 8. 8.

3. A Baily, or Servant, who *juſtifies for a Rent granted to himſelf*, ought to ſhew the Deed of Grant. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 125. cites 21 E. 4. 50. per Brian.

4. Baily *of a Dean and Chapter may juſtify to cut Trees to repair* or make the Palès of the Dean and Chapter's Park, *without ſhewing Specialty how he was made Baily*; for he is but an Officer or Servant to them, and for their Uſe. *But* econtra of them who *claim Intereſt from* the Dean and Chapter, as a Leaſe or Licence to take Trees, &c. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 113. cites 12 H. 7. 25. 26.

S. P. For it belongs to his Office likewiſe to cut Trees, &c. but to be Attorney to *make Livery and Seiſin*, &c. it muſt be by Deed. Br. Corporations pl. 51. cites S. C.

He who *juſtifies as Servant of a Corporation and by their Commandment* muſt ſhew Deed; but *Baily* ſhall not. Br. Corporations, pl. 54. cites 7 E. 4. 14. and Trin. 10 E. 4. acc.—But ſee ibid. pl. 56. cites 12 E. 4. 9. 10. Contra per Littleton.—If a Man *pleads the Frankeſtenement of a Dean and Chapter, and that he entered by their Command*, he muſt ſhew a Writing of their Command; by the beſt Opinion. Br. Corporations, pl. 59. cites 18 E. 4. 8.—So of Servant of *Mayor and Commonalty*. Ibid.

5. If a Man *appears* as Bailiff *in Aſſiſe* for the Defendant, the Plaintiff ſhall not have Traverſe, that he is not his Bailiff. Br. Bailie. pl. 9. cites 15 H. 7. 17. per Townſend.

6. If there are 2 *Coparceners* and one diſtrains, ſhe may avow for herſelf, and *juſtify* as Bailiff to her Companion, and it is not traverſable if ſhe be Bailiff or not. Br. Baillie. pl. 9. cites 15 H. 7. 17. per Collowe.

7. A Servant, &c. who *pleads a Releaſe*, ought to ſhew it. Per Fitzherbert and Brooke. Br. Monſtrans pl. 61. cites 14 H. 8. 4.

8. It

8. It is a Maxim, that where a Man is a *Stranger* to the Deed, and *doth not claim the Thing* compriſed in the Grant, *or any thing out of it, nor* doth claim any thing *in Right of the Grantee, as Bailiff or Servant*, there he ſhall plead the Patent, or Deed, without ſhewing it. 10 Rep. 94. Hill. 8 Jac. Dr. Leyfield's Caſe.

9. In Treſpaſs of carrying away Trees; Defendant ſaith, that long before the Plaintiff had any thing in the Place where, &c. one *P. was ſeiſed in Fee, and by Indenture demiſed to J. S. the ſaid Cloſe, &c. excepting the Wood and Underwood thereupon growing*; Habend for the Life of one A. *and further Covenanted, that it ſhould be lawful for the ſaid J. S. and his Aſſigns to take neceſſary Fireboot and Houſeboot, &c.* and Defendant ſaith, that J. S. aſſigned over his Eſtate to the ſaid A. and that he as Servant took the ſaid Trees for neceſſary Fireboot, &c. to be expended upon the Premiſſes, and avers the life of A. and it was thereupon demurred, becauſe he *juſtifies by force of a Covenant in an Indenture*, and does not ſhew the Indenture, it being a Thing which cannot be granted without Deed; and the Plea was held to be ill and adjudged for the Plaintiff. Cro. J. 291. 292. Mich. 9. Jac. B. R. Purſry v. Gryme.

10. In Aſſault and Battery, the Defendant *juſtified* as Servant to J. S. for that the *Plaintiff came to fiſh in the ſeveral Piſchary of his Maſter*; and Judgment being given for the Defendant, a Writ of Error was brought and 2 Exceptions taken, 1. That whereas the Defendant had *intitled his Maſter in his Plea of Juſtification to the ſeveral Piſchary by the King's Letters Patents*, he had not ſhewn, that the King was ſeiſed of this ſeveral Piſchary Jure Coronæ, and ſo it might be that the King had no Power to grant it: 2. That he did not ſhew *the Letters Patents*, which he ought to do, becauſe he derives a Title by them: And a Rule was given to ſhew Cauſe why the Judgment ſhould not be reverſed. Sty. 15. Paſch. 23. Car. B. R. Jones v. Young.

(M. a. 17) By Bailiff, or other Officer of the King.

1. A Man *may* be Bailiff of the King *without Patent*. *Contra* of a *Forreſter*. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 153. cites 33 H. 6. 3.

S. P. Br. Baillie. pl. 2. But he cannot be *Sheriff* or *Eſcheator* without Patent. cites 33 H. 6. 2. by the beſt Opinion.—S. P. Br. Baillie. pl. 45. cites 7 H. 7. 10.

2. In Treſpaſs the Defendant may juſtify *by Command of the King, tho' he be not the King's Bailiff*, nor other Officer, quod nota by Award; and therefore it ſeems that he may do it without ſhewing a Deed or Writing thereof. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 79. cites 39 H. 6. 17.

He may be Baily of the King without Patent, tho' he cannot be Grantee but by Patent. Br. Travers. per ſans, &c. pl. 118. cites S. C per Vaviſor.

3. Where a Man makes *Cognizance to diſtrain*, as Bailiff of the King's Manor, *for Rent or Services* arrear, *and prays aid of the King*, he ſhall have it without ſhewing the Patent how he is made Bailiff; becauſe he claims to the Uſe of the King. *But if he claims* of the King *to his own Uſe*, there he ſhall ſhew the Patent. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 64. cites 15. H. 7. 17.—Br. Baillie. pl. 9. cites S. C.—Br. Aid del Roy pl. 51. cites S. C. per Vaviſor.—A Diſtreſs taken by one as Baily who *is not Bailiff* is good, if the King agrees to it. Br. Travers per &c. pl. 3. cites 26 H. 8. 8. Br. Baillie. pl. 1. S. P. For whether Bailiff or not is not traverſable, cites 26 H. 8. 8.

(M. a. 18) By Ceſty que Uſe, Truſt, Covenantor, &c.

1. THE Tenant of the Land cannot plead a Releaſe made by Ceſty que Uſe to the Feoffee without ſhewing the Releaſe. Br. Monitrans. pl. 61. cites 14 H. 8. 4.

2. A. *gives Land to J. S. and J. N. and their Heirs, to the Uſe of* himſelf and the Heirs of his Body, and *for Default* of ſuch Iſſue *to the Uſe of* B. and his Heirs; A. dies without Iſſue, B. brings a Formedon; but the Opinion of the Court was Prima facie, that he need not produce the Deed, becauſe it *belongs to the Feoffees*, and not to him. D. 277. a. Trin. 10 Eliz. Eſtoft v. Vaughan.——Cro. Car. 441. Stockman v. Hampton. S. P.

But upon Covenant with a Stranger *to the Uſe of the Stranger* he muſt ſhew the Deed.

D. 277. Marg. pl. 58. ſays it was ſo Reſolved 4 Eliz. B. R.——In pleading the *Grant of an Advowſon* after the Statute of 27 H. 3. *to One to the Uſe of another in Taile*, it was held per tot. Cur. that Ceſty que Uſe need not ſhew the Deed, becauſe it belonged to the Grantee and not to Ceſty que Uſe; But that he ought to *ſhew that it was granted by Deed*; but Walmſley Contra, that he ought to ſhew the Deed, becauſe the Grant is not good without Deed, and ſo differs from D. 277. Eſtoff's Caſe, Cro. J. 217. Hill. 6 Jac. B. R. Huntington (Earl) v. Mildmay.

In a Caſe upon the ſame Point, the ſame Objection was made as by Walmſley; but Reſolved Contra for the Reaſon above in D. 277. and alſo becauſe Ceſty que Truſt has *no remedy in Law to get Poſſeſſion* of the Deed; and alſo, becauſe he *is in merely by Operation of Law and not in the Per.* Carth. 316. Trin. 6 W. M. B. R. Reynell v. Long.

3. *And* the Court was likewiſe of the ſame Opinion, becauſe the Remainder *might commence without Deed.* D. 277. b. pl. 58. Trin. 10 Eliz. pl. 58. S. C.

S. P. and alſo becauſe the *Eſtate is executed by the Statute of Uſes*, and ſo the Party is *in by the Law*; as Tenant in Dower, Tenant by Statute Staple or Merchant, who have a Rent-charge extended to them. Cro. C. 441. 442. Hill. 11 Car. B. R. Stockman v. Hampton.

4. In a *Quare Impedit*, Plaintiff intitled himſelf to a Manor to which an Advowſon was appendant, that his Father was ſeiſed and Covenanted (without ſaying per Indenturam hic in Cur. prolat.) for natural Affection to ſtand ſeiſed to himſelf for Life, Remainder to the Plaintiff, and that his Father died; the Defendant demurred. Per Cur. 'tis good; For the Plaintiff is *not Party or Privy to the Deed*, nor has a Remedy to come to it, and he has the Eſtate by the 27 H. 8. of Uſes, and now the *Deed properly belongs to the Covenantee*, and ſo was the better Opinion in D. 277. and that differs from the 14 H. 8. 7. 8. and Judgment was given accordingly. Noy. 145. Welby's Caſe.

Cro. J. 217. Huntington v. Mildmay. ——Jo. 377. Stockman v. Hampton.—— Carth. 315. Reynell v. Long. S. P.

5. In *Debt againſt Executrix* for 10 l. the Plaintiff declared *upon an Obligation Conditioned to pay 5 l. to A. to the Uſe of M. his Daughter at a Time limited in a certain Indenture*, the Defendant *pleads that the Indenture was made between her Teſtator and one J. S. by which the Plaintiff enfeoffed J. S. to the Uſe of the Teſtator and his Heirs, and that the Teſtator Covenanted to pay 5 l. to the Plaintiff within Two Months after the Death of W. R. which W. R. is yet alive.* The Plaintiff demurred, becauſe the Defendant did not produce the Indenture, but the Court held that the Plea was good without it, becauſe the Defendant was a *Stranger* to the Deed, and it does not belong to him, but *belongs to the Feoffees*, and ſhe has no means to enforce them to produce it, and the Court will not impoſe an Impoſſibility, eſpecially ſhe being an Executrix; but the Plaintiff had leave to diſcontinue. Lutw. 481. Trin. 3. Jac. 2 C. B. Croteh v. Crotch.

[See Ceſty que Truſt (F)]

(M. a. 19) By Corporations and their Grantees, &c.

1. IF a particular Man claims an *Exemption by a Charter made to a Corporation*, he muſt ſhew it, per Haughton J. ſays it has been adjudged. Roll. Rep. 296. in the Caſe of Buckham v. Dundridge.

S. P. Ow. 16. Trin. 36 Eliz. C. B. Thurſton's. Caſe.

2. Plaintiff in Ejectment declared of a *Leaſe made to him by a College by Indenture*, without ſaying Hic in Curia prolat. it is not good. 1 Buls. 119. Paſch. 9. Jac. St John's Coll. Oxon v. Ld Norris. alias Clerk v. Hannes.

3. *But* if a *Leaſe for Years* had been made *to a Corporation*, who cannot take without Deed, *and they granted it over*, the Grantee might have intitled himſelf without ſhewing the Deed; becauſe the Leaſe of the Thing in its Nature might have paſſed without Deed, altho' the Perſons who took it could not take it without Deed. Cro. J. 110. cites it as ſo ſaid in Caſe of Predyman v. Wodry.

[See (M a 11)—Corporations ( )]

(M. a. 20) By Perſons that are in by Deſcent.

1. HE, who is in Poſſeſſion by Deſcent, need not ſhew Specialty. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 65. cites 24 E. 3. 52. per Cur.

(M. a. 21) By Deviſee.

Ibid. pl. 160. cites S. C.— S. P. ibid. 49. cites 7 H. 6. 1. per Strange, quod non negatur.

1. IN Mortdanceſtor, the Tenant intitled himſelf by Deviſe, by *Teſtament* of the Anceſtor, of whoſe Seiſin the Defendant demanded, and this by Cuſtom of Deviſe, and Belk. challenged, becauſe he does not ſhew any thing of the Deviſe, & non allocatur; becauſe the Teſtament *does not belong to the Tenant, but to the Executors*, quod nota bene. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 102. cites 40 Aſſ. 2.

(M. a. 22) By Diſſeiſee.

1. D*iſſeiſee* cannot plead a *Releaſe* made *to the Diſſeiſor* without ſhewing it; nor econtra. per Fitzherbert. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 61 cites 14 H. 8. 4.

(M. a. 23) By Grantee, Leſſee, &c.

1 IN *Debt upon Leaſe for Years by Indenture*, the Plaintiff may Count without the Indenture; For the Leaſe is the Effect and not the Indenture; For variance between the Writ and the Indenture for this Cauſe was agreed not to be material. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 20. cites 44 E. 3. 42.——Ibid. cites 4 H. 6. 7. contra per Babbington. But Brooke ſays, it ſeems the Law is contra to Babbington.

2. In

2. In *Waſt*, 'twas admitted that if a Man *Leaſes for Life*, and after by * Aſſent of the *Leſſee makes Livery to another in Fee*, and the *Leſſee does waſt*, the *Feoffee ſhall have waſt as Aſſignee*, without ſhewing the Deed of Grant of the Reverſion. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 24. cites 46 E. 3. 25. * *Orig.* Aſſignment.

3. 'Tis ſaid for Law that where an Ejectment is brought againſt *Alienee of him in Reverſion*, he *may plead a Condition* without ſhewing Deed. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 31. cites 7 H. 4. 16.

4. *So* upon a *Leaſe for Years rendering Rent* with Condition of Non-payment; the Reaſon ſeems to be becauſe 'tis of a *Chattle*. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 31. cites 7 H. 4. 16.

5. If *Tenant for Years* in whom there is Privity *pleads a Releaſe*, he ſhall ſhew the Deed. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 61. cites 14 H. 8. 4.

6 A Leaſe was made *by A. to J. S. and* afterwards *A. made another Leaſe to W. R. to begin after the Determination of the Leaſe made to J. S.* In ſecond Deliverance brought Exception was taken, that the Plaintiff had conveyed to himſelf an Intereſt of a Leaſe made by A. to W. R. which is made by Name of the Reverſion, and to commence after the firſt Leaſe made to J. S. ended, which is *alledged to be made by Deed indented*, and that therefore the Plaintiff ought to ſhew the Indenture, and the rather for that the Validity of the 2d Leaſe depends upon the Validity of the firſt Leaſe, ſo that to make the ſecond Leaſe good, the Plaintiff muſt ſhew the Firſt to be good, and in order to that muſt ſhew ſuch Deed, notwithſtanding it was made to J. S. and not to him. But the Exception was diſallowed. Pl. C. 147. &c. 3 Ma. Throckmorton v. Tracy.

7. *Ejectment* was brought *by Leſſee* for Years, *Defendant pleaded a Bargain and Sale* made to him in Fee by Indenture inrolled within 6 Months, *by which he was ſeiſed till Leſſor diſſeiſed him, who leaſed* after to the Plaintiff. The Plaintiff *replyed that* the Bargain and Sale *was upon Condition, which was broken*, abſque hoc that the Leſſor diſſeiſed, &c. Defendant demurred and for Cauſe ſhewed, according to the Statute, that the Plaintiff in his Replication did not ſet forth the ſaid *Indenture comprehending the Condition*, and after good Debate and Conſideration of the Matter in Law, it was adjudged for the Plaintiff. Mich. 35 and 36 Eliz. B. R. 5 Rep. 74. Wymark's Caſe.——Alias Dun v. Low.

8. A Man claims from a *Grantee of a Patentee* of a Hundred, in which was a Leet; he muſt ſhew the Deed, if he avows for an *Amerciament* in the *Leet*. Cro. El. 245. Porter v. Gray.

9. Plaintiff declared of a *Leaſe by Baron and Feme*, and ſhewed it not to be by Deed, yet 'twas held well enough; For it may be intended by Deed, tho' no Declaration thereupon; and tho' it be without Deed yet 'tis well enough, at leaſt during the Life of the Baron; and 'tis a Leaſe from them both during that Time. Mich. 27 and 38 Eliz. B. R. Cro. E. 438. Bateman v. Allen.

10. In Trepaſs, Defendant, who was *under Leſſee* of the Patentee of part of the Term, juſtifies under the Leaſe *by Patent from the King*. Per tot. Cur. he ought to have pleaded Hic in Curia prolat. and for this Omiſſion the Juſtification is not good, and Judgment pro Quer. 1 Buls. 154. Trin. 9 Jac. *Layfield v. Hellicar.—So † of the *Leſſee of Patentee*, per Periam J. but Rhodes Contra, Godb. 112. pl. 133. Mich. 28 and 29 Eliz. Anon.—Sty. 15. P. 23 Car B. R. Jones v. Young, S. P.—But where the *King comes to the Land‡ en le Poſt*, his Grantee need not ſhew it; For by Intendment the King had it not. Cro. J. 109. Hill. 3 Jac. B R. Predyman v. Wodry. Cro. J. 317. S. C. but there it is *Servant of Patentee*. Cro. E. 716. S. P. Brownlow's Caſe. * Cro. J. 317. S. C. adjudged in the Exchequer upon Error aſſigned, that he being *but a Servant*, his Plea was good. But it was held, that he *deriving his Title* from the Patentee, *not by Act in Law but by his Command*, he muſt make Profert as well as one that claims as Aſſignee.——Cro. J. 360 Rolls v. Boulton, S. P.

† Jenk. 305. pl. 80.—316. pl. 4.

Pl. C. 57. b. per 2 Juſtices contra, unleſs the King's Grantee *grants over all his Intereſt*, by which the Patent belongs to the Grantee; otherwiſe in Grant of Parcel only. D. 29. b. pl. 200. Hill. 28 H. 8.—‡ Every Purchaſor of the King of Abbey Lands comes in en le Poſt, and he that *comes in en le Poſt*, ſhall not be inforced to ſhew the Deed or Writing, by which he, after whom he comes in, was *diſcharged of Tithes*. Arg. 2 Roll. Rep. 253.

11. One

11. One Poſſeſſed of a Grand Leaſe makes an under Leaſe, *under Leſſee* makes a Leaſe, and his Tenant Covenants to repair; in an Action of *Covenant* on the Breach, he need not ſet out the *original Leaſe* or *mean Aſſignments*. Cart. 31. Gold v. Barnſly.

[See Prerog. (Y. c. 2) Que Eſtate (D)]

(M. a. 24) By Grantee of a Chattel.

Br. Preſcription pl. 105. cites S. C.

1. WHERE the Lord of B. and his Anceſtors, &c. time out of mind, have had *Foldage of Sheep* for their Tenants in B. and he Grants it to W. N. *for 4 Years*, it is good, and W. N. may juſtify without ſhewing Writing of the Grant; For he need not [becauſe it is] but a Chattel. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 166. cites 1 H. 7. 24.

2. A. who was the true and rightful *Patron granted the next Avoidance to B.* and after *B. made C. and D. his Executors* and died. The *Executors granted it to J. S.* and all their Intereſt in it: The Church voids and J. S. brings Qua. Imp. & avers this to be the next Avoidance, but does not ſhew the *Literas Teſtamentarias of B.* and it ſeems he need not; For tho' the Executors never proved the Teſtament, yet the Grant of the Avoidance is good, and is an Adminiſtration in Law. D. 135. pl. 13. Mich. 3 and 4 P. and M. Smithley v. Chomeley.

(M. a. 25) By Lord by Eſcheat, &c.

1. LORD by Eſcheat ſhall not plead a *Releaſe* made to the Diſſeiſor by the Diſſeiſee without ſhewing it. 10 Rep. 93. in Dr. Leyfield's Caſe.

2. *Grantee of a next Preſentation was Outlaw'd*, and the Church became Vacant. The Lord of the Manor, to whom the Goods, Chattels, &c. of Outlaw'd, &c. Perſons were granted by Letters Patents, brought Qua. Imp. and it was Reſolved, that the Plaintiff being *en le Poſt*, and not privy to the Grant in any wiſe need not ſhew the Deed of Grant to the Perſon Outlaw'd. Hob. 302. Mich. 17 Jac. Holland v. Shelley.

[See (M. a.)]

(M. a. 26) By Lord, Meſne and Tenant.

1 WHERE there is Lord, Meſne and Tenant, the *Tenant may plead a Releaſe*, made *by the Lord to the Meſne* without ſhewing it; for this amounts to Hors de ſon Fee. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 61. cites 14 H. 8. 4.

2. *So* where the Lord or Meſne has *Granted his Seigniory or Meſualty over*, &c. to which he attorns, and does not ſhew the Deed; for this *goes in his Diſcharge*, and it does not belong to him, and he has no means to come by it. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 61. cites 14 H. 8. 4.

(M. a. 27) By Officers.

1. HE, who *justifies the Entry into a House as under Echeator*, shall shew the Commission, by which the Echeator commanded him to do so. Br. Monstrans. pl. 92. cites 22. Ass. 57.

2. A *Sheriff* * *or Bailiff sworn and known*, who makes an *Arrest*, need not *shew the Warrant*. Contra of a Servant of the Sheriff, &c. who is not sworn nor known. Br. Monstrans. pl. 117. cites 8. E. 4. 16. and 21. H. 7. 23. 37.

* S.P. ibid. pl. 77. cites 21. H. 7. 23. Per Rede Ch. J. And therefore he may do it by Command of the Sheriff, without a Precept in Writing, and the Party ought to obey. Ibid pl. 63. S. P. cites 14. H. 7. 8.

3. An Under-Collector need not shew Records, per Choke. Br. Monstrans. pl. 125. cites 21. E. 4. 50.

4. *Trespass of Imprisonment*; the Defendant *justified as Servant of a Justice of Peace*, to arrest the Plaintiff, who was making a *Riot* in Presence of the Justice, and good, without shewing Præcept in Writing; for, *in presentia Justiciar.* contra in *absentia* Justiciar. Br. Monstrans. pl. 63. cites 14. H. 7. 8.

5. *And* a *Sheriff*, who has a Capias, need not *shew the Capias* to the Party when he arrests him. Br Monstrans. pl. 63. cites 14. H. 7. 8.

6. For he is an Officer known. Nota. Br. Monstrans. pl. 77. cites 21 H. 7. 32.

(M. a. 28) By Privies.

1. TRespass of Goods taken, &c. the *Defendant justified*, because *he was Mayor* of M. *and the Vill has Goods of Outlaws* by Grant of the King and he took them as Goods of the Outlaw, as Mayor; and after was *removed, and another made Mayor*, Judgment; and the Plaintiff demurred, because he did not shew the Patent; and per Danby and Moyle, he need not as here, for now this *Interest is determined, and the Patent belongs to the new Mayor. But where the Interest is determined, and the Patent belongs to himself*; there he shall shew it. And per Danby, he shall shew the Deed in the Principal Case: Therefore quære, for *Adjornat.* Br. Monstrans. pl. 11. cites 35. H. 6. 8. S. P. cited in Pl. C. 81. b. in the Case of Partridge v. Strange and Crocker. —S. C. cited ibid. 148. in the Case of Throgmorton v. Tracy.

2. A Man has a *Rent for* Term *of another's Life, and Cestuy que Vie dies*, he shall shew Patent; *contra, where the Remainder of the same Rent is over in Fee*; For this belongs to him in Remainder. Br. Monstrans. pl. 11. cites 35. H. 6. 8.

3. *So* of a *Parson*, who *has a Rent in Fee, and Permutes or Resigns*; For the *Deed belongs to the new Parson*. Br. Monstrans. pl. 11. cites 35. H. 6. 8.

4. He who is Privy as *Lessee for Years, Feoffee*, &c. can't plead a Deed without shewing it. Br. Monstrans. pl. 61. cites 14. H. 8. 4.

5. A *Remainder Man* shall not plead a *Release made to the Tenant for Life*, without shewing it; and yet it *does not belong to him*; nor has he Means to come at it. 10. Rep. 93. b. in Dr Leyfield's Case. Co. Litt. 265. b. because they are Privies in Estate. ——So of a *Confirmation* to Tenant for Life, *Remainder to another in Fee*. Litt. S. 573. Because he is Privy in Estate. Co. Litt. 315. b.

[See Reversion. *(S)*]

(M. a. 29) By Strangers.

1. A. *Gave Land to B. in Fee rendering Rent, and to re-enter for Non Payment*; afterwards *B. leaſed to C.* for a Term of Years *rendering Rent*; The *Rent payable to A. was arrear, by which he entered and ouſted C.* Now C. ſhall be diſcharged of his Rent againſt B. and ſhall *ſay that his Eſtate is defeated by the Condition* as above, and that by Reaſon of the Rent arrear he is ouſted, and ſo his Eſtate defeated, &c. without ſhewing the Deed of the Condition. 45 E. 3. 8. b. pl. 10.

2. He who is a *Stranger to the Releaſe can't plead it without ſhewing it*, as it ſeems. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 41. cites Littleton tit. ſtates accordingly.

3. *As* in *Debt* againſt N. who ſaid, that the Obligation was made by him, and by a Feme who took E. to Baron, and the Plaintiff by the Deed which he ſhewed had releaſed to E. all Actions, &c. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 41. cites 11. H. 4. 30.

4. *Formedon*, the Tenant ſaid that *A. was ſeized and leaſed to him for Life*, and after granted the *Reverſion to ſeven*, and *four of them releaſed to the other three*, and after, one of the three releaſed to the other two, and ſhewed all the Deeds; and ſo it ſeems that he ought to ſhew a Deed to which he is a Stranger, if he pleads it. Br. Monſtrans pl. 42. cites 14. H. 4. 32.

5. In *Præcipe quod Reddat* the *Tenant made Default* after Default, A. came and ſaid that T. was ſeized in Fee, and leaſed to the Tenant for Life, the *Remainder* to him *in Fee*, and *prayed to be received*, and did not ſhew the Deed of Remainder. And the Opinion of the Court, except Priſot, was, that he ſhould be received without ſhewing the Deed; For *he is to affirm the Poſſeſſion of the Tenant*, and this *by Defence*. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 12. cites 35. H. 6. 31. 32.

6. *But* quære *in Formedon*, in Remainder *or Waſt*, where he *is to recover the Land*; there he ſhall ſhew the Deed of Remainder. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 12. cites 35. H. 6. 31. 32.

7. *And* the Tenant ſhall have *Aid of him in Remainder*, without ſhewing the Deed and a Fortiori here; for the Deed appertains to the Tenant for Life during his Life, and not to him in Remainder. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 12. cites 22. H. 6. 1.

8. *And* it ſeems, that he may *make Title in Aſſiſe* by ſuch Remainder without ſhewing the Deed; but there the *Remainder was executed*. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 12. cites 22 H. 6. 1.

9. In Debt upon an *Obligation, that A. ſhall ſerve the Plaintiff for ſeven Years*, the Defendant ſaid that A. ſerved from the Day, &c. till ſuch a Day in the ſeventh Year, when the Plaintiff diſcharged him out of his Service: and a good Plea without ſhewing the *Deeed of Diſcharge*; becauſe the Condition is put in the Deed, and alſo the *Defendant is a Stranger* to the Service, and was not Servant, but A. was the Servant. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 119. cites 10. E. 4. 15.

Cro. C. 209. in the Caſe of Gray v. Fielder.

10. A Feme ſhall have *Dower of a Rent-Charge* without ſhewing the Deed, becauſe the Deed does *not belong* to her. Arg. Pl. C. 46. in the Caſe of Wimbiſh v. Talboys.——55. S. P. Per Montague Ch. J.——Arg. 81. b. S. P. in the Caſe of Partridge v. Strange.

Tenant in Dower may plead a *Releaſe to her Baron* without ſhewing it.

11. Where a Deed is *pleaded in Diſcharge*, and the Party does *not make Title under it*, there is no need of Prolat. hic in Curia. Mo. 870. Brown v. Goldſmith.

Cro. E. 863. in the Caſe of Brome v. Carr.——10. Rep 93. in Leyfield's Caſe.——For this is an Eſtate gained *by Act in Law*. 94. b. ibid——The *Tenant by Curteſy* muſt ſhew the Releaſe made to his Wife; for, tho' his Eſtate be created by the Law, yet the Deed belongs to him, and he had it in his Power; For being made to his Wife, he may detain it during his Life. 10. Rep. 94. in Dr. Leyfield's Caſe.——Co Litt. 226. a.

12. It

12. It is a Maxim, that where a Man is a *Stranger* to the Deed, and *doth not claim the Thing* comprized in the Grant, *or any Thing out of it*; *nor* doth claim any Thing *in Right of the Grantee, as Bailiff or Servant*; there he ſhall plead the Patent or Deed without ſhewing it. 10. Rep. 94. Dr Leyfield's Caſe.

Br. Monſtrans. pl. 61. cites 14 H 8. 4 Per Pollard J. that where a Stranger, who has no Privity, is to take Advantage of a Deed, and *has no Means to come by it*; he ſhall plead it without ſhewing it.—

13. *But* when he *claims the Thing*, or any Right or Intereſt out of it, or juſtifies in Right of the Grantee, he muſt ſhew the firſt Grant. Ibid.

14. *As ſecond Grantee of a Rent-Charge* muſt ſhew the firſt Grant, and and ſo muſt his Baily. Ibid.

15. *And* the Grantee of the Rent-Charge ſhall not plead the *Releaſe of the Diſſeiſee to the Diſſeiſor* without ſhewing it; for tho' he claims not the Land of which the Releaſe is made; yet he, that hath Rent out of the Land, *hath Right in the Land*, which by Releaſe of all his Right ſhall be extinct, and therefore muſt ſhew the Deed. Ibid.

He that is *Party or Privy* in Eſtate or Intereſt, or he that *juſtifies in the Right of him* that is Party or Privy, ſhall plead a Deed. Tho' he, that is Privy, *claims only Part of the original Eſtate*; yet he ſhall ſhew the original Deed to the Court. 10. Rep. 92. Dr. Leyfield's Caſe.——94. ibid.——By juſtifying under the Right or Intereſt of his Maſter, it ſeems he *meddles with the Title*, and therefore muſt ſhew the Deed, without which he cannot juſtify, and it was his Folly to juſtify under one, who could not or would not ſhew the Deed. 9. Jac. B. R. Cro. J. 291. Purfrey v. Grimes———2. Mod. 64. S. C. cited in the Caſe of Stubbings v. Bird.

16 If Land be *mortgag'd* upon Condition, and the *Mortgagee* (in Poſſeſſion ſuppoſe) *leaſes the Land for Years, reſerving a Rent*, and afterwards the *Condition is perform'd*, and the *Mortgagor re-enters*; the Leſſee, in an Action of *Debt for the Rent*, ſhall plead the Condition, and re-entry without ſhewing the Deed Co. Litt. 226.

17. One need not produce a Deed of *Releaſe* in Pleading, where it *was to a * Third Perſon*, and he † *claims not under him, nor has any Means to come by it.* Per Levinz. J. 2. Show. 418. in the the Caſe of Howard v. Denham.

* Pl. C. 148. b. 149. a. b. Throgmorton v. Tracy. † Pl. C. 231. b. D. 1-4. 18. 3. Le. 83. Carver v. Pinkney.

18. *But*, where a * Servant juſtifies by *Leaſe of Tythes made to his Maſter*, he ought to make Profert. Cro. J. 360. Rolls v. Bolton.

* Br. Monſtrans pl. 11. cites 35. H. 6. 8. Per Moyle and Danby.

(M. a 30.) By Tortfeiſor.

1. A Tortfeiſor, who *can't make Title*, may plead a Deed without ſhewing it, per Fitzherbert and Brook. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 61. cites 14. H. 8. 4.

(M. a. 31) Monſtrans. To whom.

1. IN *Præcipe* quod reddat againſt S. he *pleaded that R.* was ſeized, and *infeoff'd him in Mortgage, upon Condition of Payment* of certain Money at a Day; *and that R. paid the Money at the Day, and enter'd*, Judgment of the Writ. Exception was taken, becauſe he ſhew'd no Deed of the Condition. But Ruled that he need not ſhew the Deed for two Reaſons. 1. That he ought not to ſhew any Deed to the *Demandant*, becauſe he *is a Stranger*. 2. It might be when R. paid the Money, and the Condition perform'd, that the Deed was *Re-bail'd to R.* and ſo the Plea was adjudg'd good, and the Writ abated. Co. Litt. 226. a.

(M. a. 32). Profert or Monſtrans, Aided or Cured by what.

Defendant in Debt on Bond *confeſſed the Action*, and ſo Plaintiff had Judgment; yet upon Error brought for Want of a Profert the Judgment was reverſed. Trin. 2. Jac. B. R Cro J. 32. Dawbeny v. Baniſter.

1. THE Want of Profert may be made good by the *Plea of the other Party*. Pl. C. 230. b. 4 Eliz. in the Caſe of Williams v. Barkley.—— *As* in the Grant of an Advowſon, where the *Iſſue* was taken *on a collateral Matter*. Hutt. 54. Lightfoot v. Brightman.

2. In *Replevin*, the Defendant juſtified as Servant to J. S. as in his Freehold, and the *Plaintiff convey'd as Patentee for Years* from the Queen, without making Profert, *and traverſed the Freehold of J. S.* It was held by all the Juſtices except Walmſley upon a *General Demurrer* for the not making Profert, that it was but Matter of Form, and not much material. For it was an *Inducement only to the Traverſe*, and not traverſable, and may be amended: And they ſaid, that *if the Defendant makes no Defence, and there wants an Averment*, the Words (Hic in Curia prolat.) may be *amended and inſerted*; For the Truth of the Matter appears, and in this Caſe the *Letters Patent are not Iſſuable*. But, Periam ſaid, that if ſuch Plea had been in an Avowry when it was *Iſſuable*, it ſhould be otherwiſe, and it was adjudged accordingly for the Plaintiff. Cro. E. 217. Hill. 33. Eliz. B. R. Vautry v. Aplen.

S. C. cited per Hobert Ch. J. Hob. 301.—— Sid. 308. Mich. 18. Car. 2. B. R. Jevons v. Harridge.

3. In Replevin, the Defendant *avowed for Rent* granted 12. E. 2. but did not ſhew the Deed. The Plaintiff *Demurr'd generally*, and the Court held, that the Want of Hic in Curia Profert is Matter of Subſtance, and *not aided by the Statute* 27. *Eliz.* 3. 5. *upon a General Demurrer*. Mo. 885. Trin. 13. Jac. Heard v. Baskervill.

4. In Treſpaſs of breaking his Cloſe, the Defendant juſtified, becauſe it was the Freehold of J. S. and that he enter'd by his Command. The Plaintiff ſaid that the Place where is Cuſtomary Lands, Parcel of the Manor of D. &c. and demiſable by Copy at Will in Fee; that W. R. was ſeized in Fee according to the Cuſtom, and died ſeized; and that the *Land deſcended to A. and B. two Daughters as Heirs* of the ſaid W. R. *and that*, at ſuch a Court, *Dominus conceſſit eis*, &c. Habend', &c. to them *and their Heirs*, whereby they are ſeized in Fee, and demiſed to the Plaintiff. *Iſſue was join'd upon a collateral Matter*, and Verdict for the Plaintiff. It was mov'd in Arreſt of Judgment, becauſe the Plaintiff *did not ſhew the Grant*, and that he ſhewing that A. and B. were ſeized in Fee, without ſhewing the Grant, was not good: And of that Opinion was all the Court, that the Pleading was not good; but Hide, Jones, and Whitlock J. conceiv'd, that it was *but a Default in the Form*; *and* the *Iſſue being* taken *upon a collateral Matter*, it *was help'd by the Statute of Jeofails*; whereupon it was adjudg'd for the Plaintiff. Cro. C. 190. Paſch. 6. Car. B. R. Shepherd's Caſe.

5. 16. *and* 17. *Car.* 2. 8. After Verdict, *Judgment ſhall not be ſtaid or reverſed for Default of Alleging the bringing into Court any Bond, Bill or other Deed mention'd in the Pleadings, or of any Letters Teſtamentary, or of Adminiſtration.*

6. The Plaintiff *declared of Taking, Chaſing, and Detaining a Cow* for the Space of 8 Hours, the Defendant *pleaded that I. S. was Patentee of all the Eſtrays within the Manor of H. by which he was poſſeſs'd of all Eſtrays, &c. and ſo being poſſeſs'd, the Heifer* [Juvenca] *aforeſaid, being*

an-

an Eſtray, came into the Manor, by which, he, as *Servant* of the ſaid I. S. took and chaſed the Heifer [Juvencam] aforeſaid; which is the ſame taking, &c. and detain'd her till replevied by the Plaintiff. Exception was taken to the Bar, for not producing the Patent, ſed non Allocatur; becauſe no Advantage can be taken of it but upon *ſpecial Demurrer*. But the Plaintiff had Judgment for the Variance between the Declaration, which was [Vaccam] and the Plea which was (Juvencam), Lutw. 1353. Hill. 2. and 3. Jac. 2. C. B. Mellor v. Bocking.

7. In *Debt on Bond* in the Grand Seſſions of Wales, the Plaintiff in his Declaration omitted the making of a Profert, &c. and Judgment was for the Plaintiff. This was aſſigned in Error; but the Court held it only Matter of Form, of which no Advantage could be taken * *after Verdict, or on a* ‡ *General Demurrer*, and therefore affirmed the Judgment. 2. Salk. 497. Mich 4. and 5. W. & M. B. R. Salisbury v. Williams. Nels. abr. 1263. Pleas (R) pl. 14. Marg. ſaies that in the MS. of this Caſe it is [after Judgment by Default] * S. P. Cro. E. 153. Trin. 31. Eliz 3. Lee v. Curveton.——‡ S. P. Sid. 249. Paſch. 17. Car. 2. Whiteman v. Miles.

8. *Adminiſtrator brought Debt* upon a Bond made to the Inteſtate ſetting forth that he was Adminiſtrator to J. S. and that the Defendant did not pay to the Teſtator in his Life, or to him [the Adminiſtrator,] ſince J. S's. Death. [The Defendant pleaded] *Non eſt Factum*, and Verdict for the Plaintiff; [Exception was taken] that it *did not appear that Adminiſtration was committed to the Plaintiff*. And per Cur. that would be a fatal Exception upon Demurrer; but is help'd *by your Pleading over, whereby you admit him capable* to ſue. 6. Mod. 135. Paſch. 3. Annæ B. R. in the Caſe of Adams v. the Tertenants of Savage.

9. 4 *and* 5 *Annæ*. 16. *Helps ſuch Omiſſions*, unleſs ſpecially demurr'd to: *And that all Statutes of Jeofails ſhall extend to Judgments by Confeſſion, &c.*

See more Matter of Monſtrans or Profert of Deeds, *under the Hand of Pleadings at the ſeveral Titles* throughout the Work.

(N. a) Pleading *Non eſt Factum*. By what Perſons.

1. A *Stranger* ſhall not ſay Non eſt Factum; but a *Privy* may. Br. Non eſt Factum. pl. 18. cites 28. H. 6. 6. Br. Compriſe. pl. 3. cites S. C.

2. A *Stranger* to a Deed may plead *Ne Releſſa pas*; but a Party to the Deed muſt plead Non eſt Factum, if he has Nothing to plead to avoid his Deed; but where he has Matter ſufficient to avoid his Deed, he may plead Ne Releſſa pas ſpecially. 2. Buls. 55. Mich. 10. Jac. B. R. Richardſon v. Piſtell. *So*, a Stranger may ſay *Rien Paſſa* by the Deed. Br. Eſtranger al Fait. pl. 1. cites 3 H. 6. 18. 26.——Ibid pl. 6.——But Contra per Strange. pl. 22. cites 10. H. 6. 7. A Stranger ſhall not ſay *Nient Compriſe*, but *Ne enfeoffa pas* by the Deed. Br. Eſtranger al Fait. pl. 2. cites 28 H. 6. 6.——So he may ſay * *Ne Granta pas*, or † *Ne Charga pas* by the Deed, and ſuch like. Ibid pl. 4. cites 43 E. 3. 1.——So *Ne Dona pas*. Ibid pl. 6. cites 2 H. 4. 20. 21.——So *Ne Leſſa pas* in Caſe of a Leaſe for Life to Defendant, Remainder in Tail to the Plaintiff. But in the ſame Caſe *Rien Paſſa* by the Deed was held no good Plea as that Caſe was. Ibid pl. 7. cites 2 H. 4. 22.——S. P. For tho' the Leaſe was without Deed, yet it was good. Ibid pl. 9. cites 9 H. 4. 3.

* Ibid pl. 13. cites 24 E. 3. 37. per Thorpe.——† Ibid pl. 14. cites 37. Aſſ. 16.

3. None but the *Party himſelf*, *his Heirs*, *Executors*, or Adminiſtrators may plead Non eſt Factum. per the Ch. J. and Powell J. Lutw. 662. Trin, 11. W. 3. C. B. Robinſon v. Corbet. Br. Eſtr. al Faits pl. 4 cites 43. E. 3. 1.——pl. 17. cites 22. E. 4. 1.

4. A *Feme Covert* may plead Non eſt Factum to a *Bail Bond* given *by her* to the Sheriff who arreſted her, and it ſhall not eſtop her. 1. Salk. 7. Mich. 3. Annæ B. R. Linch v. Hooke. 6. Mod. 311. S. C.

[See Stranger. (F)]

(N. a. 2) Pleading non eſt Factum. In what Caſes.

1. R *Aviſhment of Ward* brought *by Executors* inaſmuch as the Anceſtor of the Infant held of the Teſtator in Chivalry, &c. the *Defendant ſaid, that the Teſtator by Deed infeoffed the Anceſtor of the Infant in Fee, To hold of the Chief Lord*; and no Plea per Cur. without giving *Colour* to the Plaintiff; and ſo he did after; and then they were at Iſſue upon Not the Deed of the Teſtator; quod nota, Iſſue upon a Deed, which touches Frank-tenement, taken *in Action Perſonal, which demands only a Chattle.* Br. Raviſhment de Gard. pl. 8. cites 2 H. 4. 23.

2. *Debt* was brought *againſt an Abbot upon an Obligation of his Predeceſſor*; where it was *doubtful if he was Abbot or not, becauſe he* was *elected by* 10 *Monks and put in by the Viſitor*, and *another was elected by* 14 *Monks*, and the Abby paſſed by Election; and the Perſon that was elected by 10 made the Obligation; and it is not there agreed if he ſhall plead *the ſpecial Matter* and conclude Judgment ſi Actio, or if he ſhall ſay Not the Deed of the Abbot and Covent generally, and give the Matter in Evidence, or plead the Matter and conclude, and ſo Not his Deed; For no Judgment. Br. Non eſt Factum, pl. 3. cites 9 H. 6. 32.

3. *But* it was held there, that where an *Abbot or Parſon* is *inducted erroneouſly*, and makes a Grant or Obligation, and after is *deprived or reſigned for Pre-contract*, or ſuch like, it ſhall bind; becauſe *he was an Abbot* or Parſon *in Poſſeſſion*; but an *Uſurper* who Uſurps before Inſtallation, or Inſtitution, or Preſentation, where another Abbot or Parſon is rightfully in Poſſeſſion; or if one enters and Occupies in the time of Vacation *without any Election*; the Deeds of ſuch are void. Br. Non eſt Factum, pl. 3. cites 9 H. 6. 32.

4. A. is *bound to J. S.* where there *are Two J. S's* and *the* contrary *J. S. gets the Bond* and ſues it; the Defendant may *ſay that he* Sealed and *delivered the Deed to the other J. S.* and not to the Plaintiff; Judgment if Action; and ſhall not be compelled to ſay, Non eſt Factum. Br. Noſme. pl. 65. cites 12 H. 6. 7.

5. In Debt upon Obligation under the Covent Seal, *Not the Deed of the Abbot* is a good Plea; and *ſo* of *Not the Deed of the Covent*; but *Not the Deed of the Abbot and Covent* is double. Br. Negativa, &c. pl. 31. cites 14 H. 6. 16. 17.

6. In Treſpaſs, the Defendant *pleaded a Releaſe bearing Date after the Treſpaſs, and* pleaded *the primo Deliberatum ſuch a Day after, Abſque hoc that he is Guilty after the ſaid Day*; and a good Plea; and the *Plaintiff may well ſay, Non eſt Factum, if all be in one and the ſame County.* Br. Treſpaſs, pl. 33. cites 34 H. 6. 5.

7. In Recordare, the *Defendant pleaded* againſt the Plaintiff, *Not the Deed of S. after time of Memory*; and 'twas held Negative pregnant. Br. Negativa, &c. pl. 35. cites 39 H. 6. 7. 8.

8. *In all Caſes where* the Defendant *confeſſes once the Deed, and after would avoid it by a Matter, which makes the Deed defeaſible and not void*, he ſhall never ſay, Not his Deed. Mo. 43. pl. 132.

In Debt on Bond, Defendant pleaded that *Factum predict. was made and delivered without Date, and that afterwards Plaintiff put a Date, and ſo Not his Deed*; but held ill on Demurrer; For firſt he confeſſes the Deed, by ſaying *Factum predict.* and afterwards denies it: Whereas he might have ſaid, Non eſt Factum, generally. Adjudged for the Plaintiff. Cro. E. 800. Mich 42 and 43 Eliz. C. B. Copſy v. Turner.

9. *As* in Debt upon an *Obligation*, the *Defendant cannot plead that he has paid the Sum, and that the Obligation was delivered to him in lieu of an Acquittance*, and that the Plaintiff re-took it with force from the Defendant, and *ſo not his Deed*; For he has *confeſſed it* before to be his Deed. Br. Non eſt Factum, pl. 9. cites 1 H. 7. 14. and 22 H. 6. 52.

So where 2 *were bound jointly in a ſingle Bill*, and one died, and *Debt was brought againſt the Survivor*, who pleaded that he ought not to be charged, becauſe as to part the Obligor had paid it to the Plaintiff at ſuch a Ward in L. and the Reſidue he had himſelf paid at the ſame Place, at another

other time, and which the Plaintiff accepted in full ſatisfaction, and delivered the Bill obligatory in the Name of an Acquittance of that Debt to the Defendant, *Protestu cujus, the ſaid Bill had wholly loſt its force and effect*, and that after the Plaintiff took it from him by Force, &c. *and ſo the Defendant ſays that that Bill, Non eſt Factum ſuum.* & de hoc ponit ſe, &c. upon this the Plaintiff demurred. It was argued by 2 Serjeants, Stanford and Bromley, that it was no Plea; becauſe, when a Man pleads Payment in the ſame County, he ought to rely upon the Debet. &c. and alſo, becauſe no Acquittance was ſhewn of the Payment, it being a Maxim, that a ſingle Obligation cannot be avoided by naked Matter, but by ſomething as High in its Nature as the Obligation is, viz. by Matter in writing; and alſo, from the Inconvenience of putting Matters in writing and Matters in fact upon a Level. And further, that this Bill cannot be an Acquittance, becauſe not made in the Name of the Obligee, nor any words of Account. D. 51. pl. 12. &c. Mich. 38 H. 8. Cockerell's Caſe.——Hughes's Abr. 598. pl. 5. cites S. C. by the Name of Cotterel's Caſe, and ſays, it was held that the Re-delivery of the Deed to the Defendant could not be an Acquittance; becauſe it wanted words of Acquittance to that Purpoſe.——And Nels. Abr. Bonds (H) pl. 3. fo. 388. cites S. C. by the Name of Cotterel's Caſe and ſays, the Plea was adjudged an ill Plea.——But Quære, if any thing is ſaid by the Court in the whole Caſe.

So in *Covenant againſt an Apprentice upon Indenture*, Diſcharge by Parol is no Plea; and it is a good Concluſion to ſay Judgment Si Actio; but not, So Not his Deed. Br. Bar. pl. 68. cites 1 H. 7. 14. per Vavaſor and Keble.——*So* if one *pleads Acquittance againſt an Obligation.* Per Keble. Ibid.——*So* if in Debt upon an Obligation, the Defendant pleads that at the time of the making he was *within Age*, he ſhall not ſay, Not his Deed; For the Deed is voidable for this Matter. Mo. 43. pl. 132.

And *ſo* where *any matter* is *to come after the Delivery.* Mo. 43. pl. 132.

10. In Caſe of *Dureſs* the Party muſt demand Judgment Si Actio, and cannot plead Non eſt Factum; becauſe the Delivery of the Deed was not void. Per Montague Ch. J. Pl. C. 66. b. in Caſe of Dive v. Maningham. Br. Barre. pl. 68. S. P. cites 1 H. 7. 14.

11. *So* in Caſe *of *Infancy.* Ibid.—5 Rep. 119. S. P. in Whelpdale's Caſe.——A Bond by Infant, or *Non Compos* is void; becauſe the Law has appointed no Act to be done to avoid it; and the only Reaſon, why the Party cannot plead Non eſt Factum, is, becauſe the Cauſe of Nullity is extrinſick and appears not on the Face of the Record. 2 Salk. 675. Hill. 9 W. 3. B. R. Thompſon v. Leach. * Br. Barre. pl. 68. S. P. cites 1 H. 7. 14.

12. In Debt upon an *Obligation* the Defendant ſaid, that there was a *Schedule annexed* to the Obligation concerning certain Covenants, the which Schedule is now diſannexed from the ſaid Obligation, and ſo Not his Deed. And it was held by all the Juſtices, that this Concluſion was not good; but he ought to ſay *Judgment ſi Actio.* Mo. 43. pl. 132.

13. *Where the Deed never was his Deed*, as where 'tis *falſely read*, and ſuch like, *he ſhall conclude Not his Deed.* Br. Non eſt Factum, pl. 11. cites 14 H. 8. 25. per Pollard.

14. *But* where a Deed is *made in a defeaſible Manner*, *or* where it is *avoidable by an Act ex poſt Facto*, he ſhall conclude *Judgment ſi actio*; As in Caſe upon a Bond made *by Dureſs*, or by an *Infant*, or is *raſed* after, there he ſhall ſhew the Matter and ſhall conclude, Judgment ſi Actio; and the ſame upon *Interlining* after, per Pollard. Br. Ibid.

15. Sir Edward Aſhfield was bound in an *Obligation* by the Name of Sir *Edmund*, and ſubſcribed it with the Name of *Edward*; and in Debt brought upon it, he pleads it is Not his Deed; and all the Juſtices inclined, that he might well plead it; For it appears to them, that he is not named Edmund; and the *Original* againſt him *was*, *Command Edward*, *otherwiſe Edmund*, and this was not good; For a Man cannot have two Chriſtian Names; and if Judgment were given againſt him by the Name of Edmund, and the Sheriff ſhould Arreſt him by a Capias, Falſe Impriſoment would lie againſt him. 2 Brownl. 48. Hill. 8. Jac. C. B. Sir Edward Aſhfield's Caſe.

16. *In all Caſes*, where a Bond *was* once *his Deed*, *but before Action brought becomes no Deed*, either by * *Raſure*, or † *Addition*, or other *Alteration* of the Deed, or by ‡ *breaking the Seal*, the Defendant may ſafely plead, Non eſt Factum; For at the time of the Plea, which is in the preſent time, it was not his Deed. 5 Rep. 119. b. the laſt Reſolution in Whelpdale's Caſe. Br. Barre. pl. 68. cites 1 H. 7. 14. * 11 Rep. 27. Trin. 12. Jac. Pigot's Caſe. —Savil 71. Manwood v. Harris, Contra adjudged.—† Cro. E. 627. Mich. 40 and 41 Eliz. Markham v. Gonaſton——Dal. 53. 21. Contra, 3 Eliz. Anon.——‡ Dal 103 pl. 50. S. P. per Southcote and Wray, 15 Eliz. Anon.

17. *Obligation*

Br Obligation, pl. 42. cites 3 H. 7. 5. that it was Argued, that he whoſe Seal was torn off might plead Non eſt Factum; and that Brian agreed that he might; but ſays nothing of its being held, whether he whoſe Seal remained might plead that Plea, but only that it was argued, whether he might or not.——But in the Year Book the Argument was only, whether he, whoſe Seal remained, might plead Non eſt Factum; and Brian held, that he might plead it well enough, and that for the Reaſon mentioned of 2 being obliged before, and now only one; ſo that the Year Book is according to Br. Non eſt Factum, pl. 21. ——* It ſhould be 3 H. 7. 5.

17. *Obligation* was made *by Two*, and after the *Seal of the one was torn* off the Deed; there, per Brian, in an Action brought againſt the other he may ſay Non eſt Factum, as if it had been raſed, or interlined; For a Diſcharge to the one ſhall ſerve both; and alſo, when it was his Deed 2 were obliged, and now only one is, and therefore not his Deed. Quære. Br. Non eſt Factum, pl. 21. cites 3 H. 7. 15.

D. 59. pl. 12. Paſch. 36 and 37 H. 8. C. B. Nichols v. Haiwood.—So where after the Iſſue join'd the *Seal was pull'd off*, the Plaintiff had Judgment; For the Trial ſhall relate to the time of the Iſſue joined. Cro. E. 120. Mich. 30 and 31 Eliz. B. R. Michael v. Stockwith.

18. In Debt upon Bond, Defendant pleaded Non eſt Factum, and *before the Day of Appearance of the Inqueſt*, *Rats eat the Label*, by which the Seal was fixed, through the Negligence of the Clerk in whoſe Cuſtody it was. The Judges directed, that, if the Jury find it was the Defendant's Deed at the time of the Plea pleaded, they give a *ſpecial Verdict*; and ſo they did. 5 Rep. 119. b. in Whelpdale's Caſe, cites D. 59.

19. If a Deed *was once the Party's Deed, and after the Duty is extinct*, then he ought to demand Judgment *ſi Actio*; as if a *Releaſe* of the Duty be pleaded, he ought to demand Judgment ſi Actio; For it was once his Deed, and therefore he cannot ſay Non eſt Factum. Per Montague Ch. J. Pl. C. 66. b. in Caſe of Dive v. Maningham.

20. *W. S.* was bound in an *Obligation to A. in which he was named J. S.* and J. S, perceiving the Miſnomer ſealed and delivered the Obligation as his Deed. Afterwards, *Debt was brought* upon this Obligation againſt him *by the Name of W. S. otherwiſe called J. S.* and he pleaded Non eſt Factum, and this ſpecial Matter was found by Verdict; and by the Opinion of the Juſtices of C. B. the Plaintiff ſhall not recover upon this Verdict. But the better way had been to have brought the Action by the Name of J. S. as named in the Obligation; and then, if he appeared and pleaded Non eſt Factum, he ſhould be concluded by the Obligation. Mich. 10 and 11 Eliz. C. B. D. 279. b. pl. 9. Shotbolt's Caſe.

5 Rep. 26. b. it is ſaid by the Reporter, that peradventure the Obligor cannot plead Non eſt Factum, becauſe it was *once his Deed*.——Holt Ch. J. cited 5 Rep. 119. b. and ſaid the Subſequent Refuſal made the Deed *void ab initio*. 1 Salk. 30*.

21. A Bond was *delivered to A. to the Uſe of B.* the Obligee; *B. refuſes* to take it; now the Delivery has loſt its force; and the Obligor, if ſued upon it, may plead, Non eſt Factum; Contrary to the Opinion in * D. 167. 5 Rep. 119. b. in Whelpdale's Caſe.

* D. 167. pl. 14. Trin. 1 Eliz. Taw's Caſe.——And. 4. pl. 8. S. C.——Bendl. 75. S. C.

22. A *Statute Staple* being *ſued as a Bond*, the Defendant may plead, Non eſt Factum, and give in Evidence, that there was no Delivery. But, if by his Bar he admits a Delivery, Judgment will be againſt him. per Popham. Cro. E. 495. in Caſe of Aſcue v. Hollingworth.

S. P. adjudged accordingly; but Defendant might have pleaded *in Abatement* of the Writ, but could not plead Non eſt Factum. 5 Rep. 119. firſt Reſolution in Whelpdale's Caſe.—Upon Non eſt Factum, he ſhall not have the Advantage; becauſe it is his Deed, and a ſeveral Deed: But becauſe the *Lien is joint*; therefore if it be pleaded in Abatement, that another ſealed the Deed, who is *not named and is yet living*, Judgment ſhall be againſt the Plaintiff. Per Holt Ch. J. Skin. 280. Hill. 2. W. and M. in Caſe of Boulſton alias Boſon v. Sandford.

23. Upon Non eſt Factum, by ſpecial Verdict the Bill was found in hæc Verba, whereby it appeared, that the *Defendant and another* ſealed and delivered that Bond, and *were jointly bound*, and that the other is yet alive; and if, &c. It was adjudged without Argument for the Plaintiff. Cro. J. 152 Hill. 4. Jac. B. R. Stead v. Moon.

24. A

24. A *Feoffment inrolled without Livery* is of no force to make the Land paſs, but the Inrollment may *Eſtop* the Feoffor to ſay, Not his Deed. Agreed per Omnes. Poph. 8. Gibbons v. Maltyard and Martin. Per Manwood B. Obiter.

A *Bond inrolled* eſtops the Party to plead Non eſt Factum. Per Ho't Ch J. Comb. 248. Paſch. 6. W. and M. B. R. in Caſe of Smart v. Williams ——2 Le. 65. in Sir William Pelham's Caſe.

[See Eſtoppel (F). Inrollment (B)]

(N. a. 2) Pleadings. Non eſt Factum, Specially or Generally, and at what Time.

1. DEBT upon an *Obligation*, the *Defendant ſaid, that he delivered it to J. S. as an Eſcrow upon certain Conditions* to be performed, *to deliver to the Plaintiff as his Deed*; and ſaid *that the Conditions are not performed, and ſo Not his Deed*; this is no Plea, becauſe he does not confeſs any delivery to the Plaintiff, by which *he ſhall ſay, that the ſaid J. S. delivered the Obligation to the Plaintiff, the Conditions not performed, and ſo* Non eſt Factum; and then well, becauſe otherwiſe nothing ſhall be entered but Non eſt Factum generally. Br. Non eſt Factum, pl. 16. cites 18 E. 3. 29.

2. The Defendant ſaid that he was lay, and *not lettered*; and that the Obligation was *read to him by Name of 8 Marks, where it is 8 l.* and ſo not his Deed, &c. and 3 H. 6. 37. is to the ſame Intent, and the Plaintiff ſaid, that His Deed; Priſt, &c. ad patriam. Br. Non eſt Factum, pl. 2. cites 3 H. 6. 52.

3. If a Man *Seals a Deed, and delivers it to a third Perſon to keep till a certain Condition be performed*, and then to deliver it to the Obligee, &c. there if he *delivers it contrary to the Condition*, and an Action is brought; the Defendant may plead this Matter and conclude, and ſo Not his Deed, becauſe it was never delivered as a Deed, &c. Br. Non eſt Factum, pl. 4. cites 9 H. 6. 37. Br. Relation, pl. 1 cites 21 H. 6. 7.

4. *But* contrary where it is *delivered as a Deed to the third Perſon, to keep till* the Condition be performed, &c. there he ſhall not conclude, Non eſt Factum; and in this Caſe a Deed was delivered as a Deed, and the Defendant pleaded the Truth of the Matter, how he delivered it to the third Perſon as a Deed, and he delivered over the Condition not being performed, and ſo Not his Deed; and the other econtra, and found by Verdict not his Deed, yet the Plaintiff ſhall recover; becauſe *in pleading he has confeſſed a Delivery*; and therefore it is his Deed, and therefore when a *Verdict is found contrary to an Acknowledgment by Matter of Record*; there the Judgment ſhall be given upon the Acknowledgment, and not upon the Verdict; per Cur. And there it is ſaid, that where the Matter precendent as above, is *doubtful to the lay Gents*, there the *Conſuſion does not wave the precedent Matter*, and the Jury ſhall not be charged with it if it be not entered in the Roll. Br. Non eſt Factum, pl. 4. cites 9 H. 6. 37.

5. When the Defendant *comes in by Garniſhment*, he cannot plead Non eſt Factum, generally, but ſpecially. Hill. 9 H. 6. b. per Cott.

6. A Man is *bound in* 40 *l. to J. S.* where there *are Two J. S's* and the *contrary J. S. gets the Bond and ſues it*, the *Defendant may ſay, that he ſealed and delivered* the Deed *to the other J. S. and not to the Plaintiff*, and a good Plea. Br. Miſnomer. pl. 82. cites 11 H. 6. 12, 13.

7. If a Man makes an *Obligation in my Name*, I may ſay Non eſt Factum. Contra, upon Matter of Record. Br. Diſceit. pl. 17. cites 19 H. 6. 44.

8. If a Man *delivers an Obligation to J. S. upon* certain *Conditions* to be *performed, to deliver to the Obligee as a Deed*, and if *not to keep it as an Eſcrow.* If the *Obligee gets it contrary to the Condition, and brings Debt*, the other cannot ſhew this Matter and conclude Judgment ſi Actio, but ſhall conclude, and ſo Non eſt Factum; For it was an Eſcrow, and *never a Deed*, by reaſon that it was delivered to the Obligee, the Condition not performed. Br. Non eſt Factum, pl. 19. cites 19 H. 6. 1. 38. and 10 H. 6. 25. 26.

9. *Confirmation* was *pleaded* of the Demandant, *after the laſt Continuance* in precipe quod reddat, the *Demandant ſhall not ſay Not his Deed after the laſt Continuance*, for 'tis *Negativa pregnans*, nor ſhall he ſay that he made it before, &c. and not after; For then he confeſſes the Deed, and ſhall be barred; but he *may ſay that he made it ſuch a Day by Dureſs before the laſt Continuance*, *Abſque hoc*, that he made it after, &c. and *the other ſhall ſay that he delivered it after the laſt Continuance*, and ſo the *Time is only in Iſſue.* Br. Non eſt Factum, pl. 20. cites 21 H. 6. 9.

Where a Man pleads Not his Deed, *the Entry is* that *Scriptum pradictum Non eſt Factum Suum.* Br. Eſtoppel, pl. 6. cites 9 H. 6. 59.

10. Debt upon an Obligation, the Defendant *ſaid, that he delivered the ſame Obligation* to W. N. *as an Eſcrow*, upon certain Act to be done, to deliver it as his Deed, and he did deliver it the Act not being done, and ſo Not his Deed. Per Paſton, by *this word (Obligation)* you have *acknowledged that is was a Deed*, by which Newton ſaid, that he ſaid to W. N. that, if the Plaintiff did ſuch an Act, that then, he in his Name ſhould make an Obligation and deliver it to the Plaintiff, &c. and he has delivered it, the Condition not performed, &c. and ſo Not his Deed, and others econtra Nevertheleſs if he had ſaid that he had delivered *the Writing* as an Eſcrow then it had been good. Br. Non eſt Factum, pl. 12. cites 24 H. 6. 1.

11. *Where the Deed is void*, and *not voidable only*; *Defendant ſhall ſay, and ſo Not his Deed.*

12. *As Feme Covert* ſhall conclude, and ſo Not her Deed. Br. Barre. pl. 68. cites 1 H. 7. 14. per Keble.

Br. Barr. pl. 78. cites 1 H. 7. 14.

13. *So* where the *Obligor* is *not lettered*, and the Obligation being with Condition, is *read otherwiſe than it is written*, he ſhall plead Non eſt Factum and give the Matter in Evidence. And he pleaded accordingly. Br. Non eſt Factum, pl. 10. cites 15 E. 4. 17. per Brian and another.

S. C. cited per Coke. 11 Rep. 27. b. in his Notes on Pigot's Caſe.

14. *As* in Debt upon an *Obligation of* 20*l.* the Defendant ſaid that he is Lay, and not letter'd, and that it was *read* to him *as an Obligation of* 20*s. which he had paid*, and ſhewed an Acquittance thereof, *and as to the Reſidue Not his Deed*; and held a good Plea. Br. Non eſt Factum, pl. 8. cites 9 H. 5. 15.

S. C. cited per Coke, 11 Rep. 27. b. in his Obſervations on Pigot's Caſe.

15. Debt upon an *Obligation*, the Defendant ſaid that it is indorſed upon Condition, that if he *perform* all the *Covenants compriſed in the Indenture* made, &c. that the Obligation ſhall be void, and ſhewed the Indenture which contained 4 Covenants, and that he was a Layman, and *not lettered and that the Indenture was read to him upon the firſt 2 Covenants only, and alledged the Performance of them*, & hoc, &c. Judgment ſi Actio, &c. and per Fitzherbert and Brudnell Juſtices the Deed is *good in part, and in part not*, ſcilicet the Indenture; and therefore the concluſion, Judgment ſi Actio, is well; contra per Brook Juſtice, and that the Indenture is *void in all*, and therefore ſhould conclude, and ſo Not his Deed; and per Pollard Juſtice, becauſe the Indenture is void, therefore the Obligation is ſingle, and therefore he ſhould have concluded and ſo Not his Deed. Br. Non eſt Factum, pl. 11. cites 14 H. 8. 25.

16. In *Debt* upon an Obligation the Defendant ſaid, that the Deed was for payment of 20 l. at a certain Day, but at the time of the Delivery the Day was not Writ in the Deed, but a Space was left for inſerting it; and after the Delivery the Plaintiff *inſerted the Day*, and ſo Not his Deed. Per Dyer, the better pleading had been to ſet forth the ſpecial Matter, per quod Scriptum predict. *perdidit* effectum. Judgment ſi Actio. Quod nota; Mo. 28. pl. 89.

17. *Where*

17. *Where a Man confeſſes* a Deed *to have been once his Deed, and after ſhews Matter, by which 'tis become void*, he ſhall plead the ſpecial Matter and conclude to the Action. Mo. 30. pl. 98. Anon. Trin. 3 Eliz. Dal. 33. pl. 21 S. P. per Plowden 5 E. 6. Anon. Mo 43 pl. 132. Anon. —66. pl. 179. Anon.

18. *But where it appears that it was not his Deed at the beginning*, he ſhall plead generally Non eſt Factum, per Plowden. Ibid.

19. A Bond was made by A. to *two Obligees, B. and C.—B. died*, C. brought Action and *declared of a Bond made by A. to C.* It was adjudged the Deed of A. For tho' it had been better pleading to have ſhewn that the Bond was made to the ſaid C. and B. now deceaſed, yet upon this general Iſſue of Non eſt Factum, it ſhall be reputed the Deed of A. tho' it was made to B. and C. Sav. 92. Mich. 30 and 31 Eliz. Paunce v. Read.

20. *In all Caſes where the Deed is voidable, and ſo remains at the time of Pleading*; the Obligor cannot plead Non eſt Factum; For it is his Deed at the time of the Action brought, and ought to be avoided by ſpecial Pleading with concluſion of *Judgment ſi Actio*. 5 Rep. 119. Trin. 2 Jac. C. B. the ſecond Reſolution in Whelpdale's Caſe.

21. *As* if *Infant* ſeals and delivers a Deed, or a Man of full age by *Dureſs*. Ibid. cites 1 H. 7. 15. a. b.

22. When an Obligation or other Writing, is *by Act of Parliament, enacted to be void*, the Party who is bound cannot plead Non eſt Factum, but in Conſtruction of Law, the Deed is to be voided by the Party who is bound by it by ſpecial Pleading of the Matter, taking Advantage of the Act of Parliament; For tho' the Act makes the Obligation, &c. void, yet to this the *Law requires Order and Manner, which the Perſon Obliged muſt purſue*. 5 Rep. 119. Trin. 2 Jac. C. B. the third Reſolution in Whelpdale's Caſe. Upon the *Statute of uſury* [13 *Eliz.* 8.] Defendant cannot plead Non eſt Factum; nor upon the Statute of 23 *H.* 6. of *Sheriff's Bonds*, being according to the Form preſcribed; For they are Deeds, ſuch as they are. Jenk. 295. pl. 45.———But where the Bond is not according to the Statute, the Defendant ſhall plead this Matter, and *conclude, and ſo the Obligation is void, Judgment ſi Actio*, and ſhall not conclude Non eſt Factum. And the ſame Concluſion ſhall be made upon the Statute of Uſury. Br. Non eſt Factum pl. 14 cites 7 E. 4. 5. and Trin. 7 E. 6.———S. P. and ſame Caſes cited and held againſt the Opinion of Mountague in Pl. C. in Manningham's Caſe. 5 Rep. 119. b. in Whelpdale's Caſe.

* 7 Mod. 151. in Caſe of the Queen v. King.

23. In *Debt* upon an Obligation for *letting one go at large upon Mainprize*, if it is *not ſaid, the Plaintiff is Sheriff*, the Defendant may plead Specially, and ſo conclude his Plea by way of Non eſt Factum; but he cannot plead Non eſt Factum generally, becauſe that is Contrariant. Brown's Analyſis. 17.

24. In Debt on *Bond for* 300 *l.* Defendant, after a general imparlance Demands Oyer of the Bond and pleads Specially, that it was *but for* 30 *l.* but it was not allowed *after a general Imparlance*; and Defendant pleaded that it was not his Deed, which was the proper Plea in that Caſe. Brownl. 70. Hill. 9 Jac. Anon.

25. All ſpecial Pleas of Non eſt Factum in Caſe of an *Eſcrow* or *Raſure*, &c. are impertinent; For thereby the Defendant brings all the Proof upon himſelf; whereas if he had pleaded Non eſt Factum generally, he would turn the Proof of whatſoever is neceſſary to make it his Deed, upon the Plaintiff. Per Holt. Ch. J. 6 Mod. 217. Trin. 3. Annæ. Bulhel v. Paſmore.

[See (N. a. 2)]

(N. a. 4) Pleadings in General.

But where the Count was that A. per Scriptum ſuum conceſſit, &c. without ſaying Sub ſigillo, &c. and this was aſſigned in Error to reverſe the Judgment; it was diſallowed, becauſe it cannot be Scriptum Abſque ſigillo. Palm 173. Paſch. 19. Jac. B. R. Vulgar v. Higgins

1. A Bare Writing is not a Deed without ſealing it; and therefore the Pleading ought to be *per Scriptum ſuum ſigillat.* or *Per Factum ſuum*; For Factum ſuum implies the Sealing and Delivery. Arg. 1. Le. 310. Paſch. 33 Eliz. Maidwell v. Andrews.

2. A Deed of Leaſe for 99 Years by him in Reverſion expectant on an Eſtate for Life, was made in the Words *Demiſe ſet, and to Farm let*, and was pleaded in the ſame Words; yet upon the whole Pleading, it was adjudg'd to be a *Bargain and Sail.* 8 Rep. 93 b. 94. a. Hill. 7. Jac. Fox's Caſe.——But ſee the next Caſes in the Reports of which this Caſe was cited.

S. P. per Holt Ch. J. For he ſaid that Pleading in the Words of the Deed would be uncertain and barbarous Pleading. Skin 375. in Caſe of Baker v. Lane.——12 Mod. 401. Paſch. 12 W. 3. per Holt Ch. J. Steer v. Shalecroft.

3. *So*, if Tenant for Life by the Word *Dedi* grants his Eſtate to him in Reverſion, this ought to be pleaded as a *Surrender*, as it is by Operation of Law, and not in the Words of the Deed. Per Holt Ch. J. Skin. 570. Mich. 6. W. and M. B. R. in the Caſe of Netherton v. Jeſſop.

4. In Error to reverſe a Judgment in Replevin, it was aſſigned that the Count was *that A. per quandam Indenturam granted to the Defendant*, and does *not ſhew between what Parties* the Indenture was made. But it was over-ruled; For the Defendant muſt neceſſarily be a Party, or otherwiſe he cannot take by it. Palm. 173. Paſch. 19. Jac. B. R. Vulgar v. Higgins.

4 Mod. 149. S. C. Barker v. Lade.—— 2 Vent. 267. S. C. —— Skin 315. S. C. by Name of Baker v. Lane.——3. Lev. 291. S. C.——Per Holt Ch. J. 12 Mod. 538.

5. Every Deed muſt be pleaded *expreſsly according to its Operation*, and not according to the Words at large. Carth. 254. Tr. 3 W. and M. B. R. Baker v. Lade.

* Adjudged contra in C. B. by 3. I. againſt Pollexfen Ch. J. 2 Vent. 266. S. C.——3 Lev. 291.

6. *As* where the Words *Give and Grant* operate as a Covenant to ſtand ſeized, and will not take Effect otherwiſe; there it *muſt be pleaded as a Covenant to ſtand ſeized*, and ſo Judgment in C. B. was reverſed. Carth. 254 * Baker v. Lade.——308. S. P. Oſmer v. Sheaf.

(O. a) Pleadings. What Deeds are pleadable.

Br. Faits pl. 21. cites S. C.

1. A Deed made *before Time of Memory* is not pleadable; Contra of Record. Br. Avowry. pl. 45. cites 12. H. 4. 23.

Br. Faits pl. 21. cites S. C.

2. *Therefore* in *Avowry*, where the *Tenant had a Deed* bearing Date before Time of Memory, *to hold by leſs Services*, he cannot plead it; but *is put to a Ne injuſte Vexes*, or other like Remedy; notwithſtanding that he has *Confirmation of a King*, which is Matter of Record, *reciting the firſt Grant.* Br. Avowry. pl. 45. cites 12. H. 4. 23.

(O. a. 2) Pleadings. Where Deeds refer one to another.

1. I. S. was bound in an *Obligation* of 20*l.* *to J. Bazam*, with a (Z) to pay 10*l.* at two ſeveral Days; and after, upon Payment of one of the Sums, the Obligee *made an Acquittance in the Name of J Boſam*, with an (S). In Debt brought upon this Bond, the Defendant was compell'd to *ſay that J. Bozam, by the Name of J. Boſam acquitted him, &c.* Br. Pleadings pl. 21. cites 14. H. 4. 31. Br. Faits. pl. 22. cites 14. H. 4. 30.

2. In debt upon Obligation the Defendant *pleaded Defeaſance, that if the Plaintiff may peaceably enjoy the Office* of Parker of B. *taking 3d. per Day, according to the Deed of Grant of the Defendant, that then, &c. and ſaid, that he had enjoy'd it according to the ſaid Grant.* And per Cur. this is no Plea without *ſhewing what was the Effect of the Grant in certain.* Quod nota. Br. Pleadings. pl. 105. (bis.) cites 16. E. 4. 9.

3. Debt. The *Condition of a Bond* was *to pay* 1400*l. with Intereſt* on ſuch a Day, *according to the Intent of a certain Proviſo or Covenant mentioned in an Indenture bearing even Date, &c. and made between the ſame Parties.* The *Defendant recites a Deed* of the ſame Date made between the Plaintiff and Defendant, *whereby, in Conſideration of* 1400*l. ſecur'd to be paid by an Obligation of the ſame Date, and in Conſideration of five Shillings paid to the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff aſſign'd to the Defendant a 20th Share of Lead Works, &c. and* ſaith *that he paid the Money ſecundum Formam Proviſion. in Indentura præd. mentionat.* The Plaintiff *reply'd*, that the *Defendant did not pay* the Money, &c. Verdict for the Plaintiff.—— It was mov'd in arreſt of Judgment, that *Defendant had miſtaken the Deed*; *For* there is *no ſuch Covenant in the Deed ſet forth*, and therefore it is a *void Iſſue, and ought to be a Repleader*; and to that Opinion the Court inclin'd. Holt ſaid, that the Defendant is *eſtopped to ſay, that there is no ſuch Deed*; therefore he *ſhould ſet forth ſuch a Deed*, or elſe he is gone, and muſt pay the Money; and that he might have pleaded *Payment, ſecundum Formam Conditionis*, and well; For the *Indenture is but a further Deſcription of the Agreement.* The Counſel for the Defendant ask'd, what if they ſhould ſet out the whole Indenture, and there is no ſuch Covenant? to which Holt anſwer'd, that it was your Fault to ſay ſo in the Condition; and Judgment for the Plaintiff. (Cæteris tacentibus.) Comb. 377. 378. Trin. 8. W. 3. B. R. Evans v. Powell.

4. If a *Bond* be to *perform Articles in one Deed, and that Deed refers* the Party *to another* Deed: In order to diſcharge himſelf, he muſt *ſhew the Matter in the ſecond Deed that is referr'd to from the firſt.* Mich 3. Annæ B. R. 6. Mod. 237. in Caſe of Lady Cook v. Remington.

(O. a. 3) Indenture. What muſt be by Indenture and not by Deed-Poll, &c.

1. *By* 27. *H.* 8. 16. BArgains and Sales *to an Uſe of Inheritance of Freehold ſhall be by Deed indented and inrolled within ſix Months.*

2. *By* 32. *H.* 8. 28. *All* Leaſes *made* by Husband and Wife *of Lands, &c. of the Wife ſhall be by Indenture.*

3. *By* 7. *Eliz. c.* 13. Sale of Bankrupt's Eſtate *by Commiſſioners of the Bankruptcy, muſt be by Deed indented and inrolled.*

4. *By* 43. *Eliz. c.* 11. *Contracts relating to draining Waſts, &c. where the*

Queen, her Heirs and Succeſſors, hath an Intereſt in ſuch Waſtes, &c. ſuch Contracts or Bargains ſhall not bind them, unleſs they be written in Parchment, indented and certified in Chancery, and the Royal Aſſent thereunto firſt obtained and ſignified under the Privy or Great Seal, when the Waſtes or Soils are of the Poſſeſſions of the Crown, but under the Seal of the Dutchy of Lancaſter, and inrolled in that Court when they are of that Kind.

5. *Leaſes by Eccleſiaſtical Perſons* muſt be by Deed indented; For tho' the Statutes of 1 and 13 Eliz. do not appoint the Leaſe to be made by Writing, yet it muſt therein and in the other following Properties and Qualities required by Stat. 32. *H.* 8. follow the Pattern thereof (*Concurrent Leaſes* only excepted). Watſ. Comp. Inc. fol. 429. cites Co. Lit. 44.

(P. a) *Conſtruction* of Deeds in Equity.

1. IF it be lawful for a Court of Equity in ſome Caſes, and upon ſome *ſpecial Circumſtances*, to expound a Deed *otherwiſe than the Letter* ſeems to import; yet this ought never to be done, ſo as to make a Deed, but only *to avoid ſome Extremity*. Hill. 25. Car. 2. Fin. R. 101. Cheek v. Lord Liſle and Harvey.

[See Grants.]

(Q. a) *Averments* as to Deeds in Equity.

1. AVerment by A. againſt a *General Warranty* in a Deed, and ſome Proof being that it was declared on the Sealing, that the Plaintiff ſhould undertake for his own Act only; he was relieved. Mich. 14. Car. 2. Chan. Caſes. 15. Caldcot v. Hill.

See Vendor and Vendee (E).

2. Averments are not to be admitted in *Chancery contrary to the Purport* of the Deed. Tr. 32. Car. 2. 2 Vent. 345. in Sir William Beverſham's Caſe. cites 1. Roll. 379.

3. In Caſe of a *Surrender made by a Steward of a Copyhold*, if there be any *Miſtake*, that is only Matter of Fact, and the Courts at Law will in that Caſe admit an Averment, that there was a Miſtake, &c. *either as to Land or Uſes*. P. 1689. per Com'rs 2. Vern. 98. in Caſe of Towers v. Moor.

4. The *Father purchaſed Land in Name of a younger Son*, and another, who after the Father's Death diſclaim'd; and in the Conveyance the whole Purchaſe Money was mention'd to be paid by the Father. It was Ruled by the Lord Chancellor, that Parol Evidence ſhould be admitted *to ſhew the Intention of the Father*, that this Conveyance was for the Benefit and Advancement of the younger Son; becauſe it *concurr'd with the Conveyance, and was only to rebut a pretended reſulting Truſt:* And tho' the Father took the Profits till his Death, at which Time the Son was eight Years old, it can be no Evidence of a Truſt for him; For it muſt be intended to have been done by him as Guardian to the Son. Wms's Rep 111. to 113. Mich. 1709. Lamplugh v. Lamplugh.

5. A. a Baronet convey'd *to the Uſe of himſelf in Tail*, Remainder *to B.* his ſecond Couſin the Defendant (who was *preſumptive Heir to the Honour in caſe of Failure of Iſſue Male of A.) for Life*, Remainder *to the firſt, &c. Son of B. in Tail Male*, Remainder over, *with Power of Revocation* to A. who ſometime after *revoked the old Uſes, and limited new ones* upon D. his youngeſt Siſter for Life, Remainder to her firſt, &c. Son in Tail Mail, they taking the Name of A. &c. A. died, and D. brought a Bill

to

to eſtabliſh the Revocation; and *B.* brought his Bill to ſet aſide this later Deed, and to recover ſome Legacies given him and his Children by *A*'s Will; *B.* died, and upon a Reviver of the Suit by the two Infant Sons of *B.* the Deed of Revocation &c. was fully proved; and on the other Side was only circumſtantial Proof; as that *A.* had expreſſed his Intentions, that his Eſtate ſhould go with his Honour, &c. But Ld Parker ſaid, that Words can have no Weight againſt a Deed ſo ſolemnly executed, and it muſt therefore ſtand. Wms's Rep. 481. Mich 1718. Shales v. Sir John Barrington.

[See Averment.]

(R. a) Suppreſſed Deeds. Relief in Equity.

1. A. Was *attainted*, and it was ſuppoſed that he was *ſeized of an Eſtate Tail.* A Bill was exhibited in Chancery, becauſe the Deeds, by which the Eſtate was to come to *A.* were not extant, but were ſtrongly ſuſpected to be ſuppreſs'd by ſome, under whom the Defendants claimed. And it was decreed by Ld Chancellor, Ld Coke, and Hobert, and Maſter of the Rolls, that the King and his Heirs, and his Farmer of the ſaid Lands ſhould hold and enjoy the Lands, till the Defendants ſhould produce the Deeds, and the Court thereupon take further Conſideration, and Order: Hob. 109. Trin. 14. Jac. The King and Ld Hunſdon v. Counteſs of Arundell and Ld William Howard.

Wms's Rep. 332. Mich. 1721. S. C. cited by Jekyl Ma. of the Rolls; and ſaid that upon Search he found it under the Name of Hobert, Attor. General v. L. . . . ——— 2. Wms's Rep. 680. Mich. 1734. S. C. cited in the Caſe of Cowper v. E. Cowper. Per Jekyl Ma. of the Rolls, who ſaid that the Decree was drawn up thus. "That the King his Heirs, "and his Farmer ſhould hold and enjoy, till the Defendants produc'd the Deeds, therein particularly "mentioned, and *proved once to have been extant, and duely executed.*" And makes this Remark, (viz) that here we ſee, that the *Exiſtence of the Deeds was fundamental to the Decree, and the Proof of them fully and expreſsly aſſerted by the Court in framing* the Decree.——and Pag. 682. he ſays, that he does not remember or believe, that any Caſe had been cited, where there was not ſome Proof made of the Exiſtence of the Deed or Writing ſuppoſed to be ſuppreſſed or deſtroyed.

2, The Defendant entered into a *Bond to leave his Fellowſhip*, and after took away his Bond, and the Court decreed him to leave it. Toth. 128. 129. cites P. 15. Car. Holme v. Wild.

3. *Termor for Years* dies *inteſtate*; Adminiſtration is granted to *B.* who dies and makes J. S. Executor. *C. is Adminiſtrator de Bonis non*, and brings a Bill againſt J. S. for the original Leaſe; and it was decreed accordingly. Hill. 25. Car 2. Fin. R. 59. Preſtidge v. Preſtidge.

4. Upon a Bill for Diſcovery and Delivery of old Deeds, Defendant inſiſted, that the Plaintiff's Claim was under One *executed for Felony*, whereby his Lands were forfeited to the King, and that Defendant was in Poſſeſſion ſeveral Years under that *Forfeiture.* But it appearing that the Anceſtors of Defendant had the Deeds concerning theſe Lands, the Court ordered the Bill to be retained to enable the Plaintiff and his Heirs to make uſe of the Depoſitions therein at any Trial at Law, and Defendant to do the ſame, and the Plaintiff to have *Recourſe to the Records, Rolls, and Evidences of the Manor*, in which the Lands lie, to view, *peruſe and take Copies*, (paying for the ſame) and ordered that Defendant and his Heirs, Lords of the Manor, ſhould *produce at any Trial* at Law ſo many thereof as the Plaintiff or his Heirs ſhall at any Time require, but at the Charge of the Plaintiff, his Heirs or Aſſigns. P. 28. Car. 2. Fin. R. 249. Draper and Zouch.

5. Lands were *decreed*, where a Marriage Deed of Settlement was got back by the Father by a Trick ſet forth in the Bill and proved, and by him burnt or cancelled; and the Decree confirmed on a Re-hearing; and where Deeds are ſuppreſs'd Omnia præſumentur. *And* the Chancellor *would not allow a Tryal at Law*, whether the Father ſurrendered his Eſtate for

Where the Evidence is ſuppreſs'd by either Party, a Court of Equity will al-

ways *presume a Title* against Persons suppressing it, untill the *Evidence* be produc'd.

for Life to enable a Recovery produc'd for making good the Settlement by Barring a prior Entail. See 2. Ch. Cases 292. 293. Mich. 28. Car. 2. Gartlide v. Ratcliffe. Mich. 32. Car. 2. Fin. R. 471. Lewis v. Lewis.

6. A. gave B. a Statute for 5000l. and B. gave A. a *Defeasance of the Statute*, which was to perform a *Trust* of a Term; B. died. The Heir of B. by Bill, claimed the Term, as being declared by the Defeasance to be in trust to attend the Inheritance; but A. suppress'd or conceal'd he Defeasance; Finch C. decreed the Trust for the Plaintiff. P. 30. Car. 2. Fin. R. 357. Goodwin v. Cutler.

7. Where a *Conveyance* by Fine was *Voluntary*, and without Consideration, no Money being paid, and the Defendant, who was Heir to her Mother, and whose Estate it was, insisted, that the Fine was gain'd unduely, and deny'd the having the Deed, by which the Complainant claim'd, and of which he pray'd Discovery, the Court would give no Relief, but left the Plaintiff wholly at Law to help himself there as he could. Hill. 34. and 35. Car. 2. 2. Chan. Cases 133. 134. Anon.

See Account (L. a.) S. C. more full.

8. *Detinue of Charters* (during the Detainer) is a good Plea at Law in Bar of an Account; and so it is in Equity. Hill. 1688. per Cur. 2 Vern. 33. in the Case of Lady Plymouth v. Bladen.

9. The Plaintiff was a *Remainder Man in Tail* in a voluntary Settlement, and the Bill was for the Discovery of the Deed; but it appearing to the Court that the Entail was *discontinued*, the Court would not Relieve the Plaintiff. Hill. 1688. 2 Vern. 35. Kelley v. Berry.——50. Pasch. 1688. Bunce v. Philips. S. P.

10. A. presented a Parson to a Living, and took *a Bond to resign on Request* at any Time with seven Years; A's House-keeper being the Parson's Sister, *got away the Bond*, and deliver'd it over to the Parson. A. brought Bill to discover, and to be reliev'd. The Defendants demurr'd, and the Demurrer allow'd. 2. Vern. 242. in the Case of Bainham v. Manning, cited by Commissioner Hutchins. Mich. 1691. as the Case of Mr Fortescue.

11. The Defendant suppressed a Marriage Settlement, whereby a *Remainder in Tail* was limited to the Plaintiff's Father, and all the prior Estates were spent; on Proof that the *Settlement* came to Defendant's Hands, and that he confess'd it in an Answer to a former Bill, the Master of the Rolls decreed the Plaintiff to hold and enjoy. Affirmed by Ld Keeper Wright. Trin. 1700. 2 Vern. 380. Eyton v. Eyton.

12. A. *Tenant for Life* without Impeachment of Waste, *with Power to make a Jointure* on any Wife, *not exceeding* 100l. a Year for each 1000l. brought by her, and so ratably for any less Sum, *Remainder to Trustees to preserve contingent Remainders*, Remainder *to the first, &c. Son in Tail Male*; *Remainder over*. Afterwards *A. married M. but whether she had any or no Fortune does not appear.* They *part by Consent, and a Deed is drawn between A. and M. and the Remainder Man and Trustees* with Covenant *to settle 30l. a Year for the Provision of M. during the Separation, in Consideration of which she is to claim no Thirds or any Thing out of the Husband's Estate under the Statute of Distributions. A. executes this Deed, and sends it to the Remainder Man in the Country to be executed by him, who did so, and return'd it to A. who kept it*, and did not deliver it to the Trustees; M. apply'd for it, but could not get it; however, *Money was paid her in Pursuance of the Deed.* Afterwards *A. cancels the Deed in Presence of the Remainder Man* A. dies, M. brings a Bill against he Remainder Man to have the Benefit of this Covenant from the Death of A. and so decreed by the Master of the Rolls, and on Appeal affirmed by the Ld Chancellor. Sel. Ch. Cases in Ld King's Time. 75. Trin. 2 Geo. 2. Sepalino v. Twitty.

13. Defendant

13. Defendant had *articled to give a Portion* in Marriage with his Daughter to S. and had the Deed in his Cuſtody. S. ſu'd for the Portion, and ſet forth the Purport of the Articles by his Bill. The *Defendant*, in his Anſwer, *pretended that the Articles varied from what the Bill ſet forth, and afterwards burnt* the Articles. All which being made to appear, he was committed and continued *confin'd, till he admitted the Articles* to be as the Bill had ſet them forth. Mich. 1731. 1 Wms's Rep. 733. where Jekyl, Maſter of the Rolls, cites it as the Caſe of Sanſon v. Rumſey; and ſays that the Commitment was only by an Interlocutory Order, and the Cauſe never heard. 2 Vern. 561. S. C. as to Commitment. See (X. 3) pl. 4

14. A. by Deed *ſettled a Term, ſo as that after his and M. his Wife's (the Defendant's) Death without Iſſue*, the ſame was to come *to the Plaintiff for the Reſidue of the Term.* A. died without Iſſue, and M. had burnt the Deed; and by her Anſwer did but faintly deny it. viz. That ſhe did not remember ſhe ever burnt or deſtroy'd the Deed. Two Witneſſes ſwore to the Limitations of the Settlement; Both agreed that it was in Truſt to A. for Life, Remainder to M. for Life; but differed as to the Words of the Remainder; One ſaying that it was to the *Heirs of their Bodies*, and the other that it was to the *Iſſue of their Bodies, and for Want of Iſſue by A. and M. Remainder to the Plaintiff.* It was inſiſted for the Defendant, that the Remainder over upon either of thoſe Limitations of the Truſt of a Term was void in Law; and therefore the admitting the Deed to be ſuppreſs'd could not advantage the Plaintiff. But the Maſter of the Rolls ſaid, that tho' ſuch Limitations as before mention'd were void, yet a Limitation in Truſt for A. and M. for their Lives, and afterwards for their Children, or for their Iſſue, *and for Want of ſuch Children or Iſſue living at the Death of the ſaid A. and M.* then to go over to the Plaintiff, is good; and that ſince a Term might be limited in ſuch Manner, he would *intend it ſo limited in the preſent Caſe*; For every Thing ſhall be preſum'd *in Odium Spoliatoris.* But he ſaid there could be no Decree for the Poſſeſſion, nor any preſent Conveyance to the Plaintiff, it being only a Remainder of a Term after the Defendant's Death; but directed that the *Defendant aſſign over the Term* to Truſtees, *in Truſt for her ſelf for Life, and after for the Plaintiff, and bring the Deeds* relating to the Title *into Court, and pay Coſts.* 1 Wms's Rep. 731. to 734. Mich. 1731. Dalſton v. Coatſworth.

15. What a Court of Equity will look upon as *Evidence to preſume a Suppreſſion* of Deeds, See 2. Wms's Rep. 678. &c. Mich. 1734. Cowper v. Earl Cowper.

[See (B. a) (X. 3)—Diſcovery (M.)—Fraud. Hunt v. Matthews.]

(S. a) Deeds directed by Chancery to be delivered up, or Cancelled.

1. IN Debt upon an *Obligation*, the Defendant ſaid he had *made* it to the Plaintiff *for certain Debts which he had bought of the Plaintiff*, which were *due to him by diverſe Perſons*; and becauſe it is only a *Choſe in Action*, of which no Property is alter'd to the Defendant, nor can he ſue for them, but the Plaintiff may ſue for them, or releaſe them, and ſo he *has not quid pro quo*, by which he ſued by *Subpœna* againſt the Plaintiff upon this Matter in Chancery *to have the Obligation diſcharged*; to which the Plaintiff there came and anſwered; and the Chancellor for Doubt adjourned them into the Exchequer-Chamber; and there it was debated by him and all the Juſtices of both Benches; and Held that the Plaintiff in Conſcience ought to diſcharge the Obligation, in as much as the Defendant has not, nor cannot, have any Thing by this Obli-

gation; by which the Chancellor awarded in the Chancery, that the Plaintiff bring in the Obligation to be cancelled, or make an Acquittance or releaſe it. And becauſe the now Plaintiff refuſed to do it, he was awarded to the Fleet, there to remain until &c. and there he yet remains, which is the ſame Obligation, Judgment, &c. and Held that the Obligation remains in Force, and therefore no Bar. Br. Barre pl. 45. cites 37 H. 6. 13.

2. *Ancient Bonds* being put in Suit were ordered to be cancelled. Toth. 88. cites Mich. 16 Jac. Garford v. Humble.

3. Bonds entered into by *Menaces*, Threats and Impriſonments, were ordered to be cancell'd. Toth 88. cites 4 Car. Watts v. Lock.

4. Bonds concerning Wares were cancelled becauſe of *Coſinage*. Toth. 88. cites 5 Car. Otby v. Daniel.

5. Bonds entered into *for Fees and Lord's Favours* were cancelled. Toth. 89. Lever v. Arſents.

6. *Marriage Brocage Bonds* were order'd to be cancelled. Toth. 89. cites Feb. 17 Jac. Arleſton v. Kent.

7. A *Voluntary Bond* of 1000 *l.* entered into for no Conſideration was cancelled in the Preſence of the Judges. Toth. 89. cites 7 Car. Wright v. Moor.

8. Bond entered into in 22 Eliz. (being a very *long Time ſince*) was decreed to be delivered up, it being conceived that the Money was all paid, becauſe it was *not Inventoried, nor any Money proved to have been paid to the Teſtator*. Toth. 90. cites Lord Cavendiſh v. Forth.

9. A. made a *Feoffment* to the Mayor and Burgeſſes of Glouceſter *to the Uſe of a Free School* and other Purpoſes; and a Bill being exhibited againſt them, and the Plaintiff not proving his Title, it was decreed for the Defendants and their Succeſſors, and that the Plaintiff ſhould by Chriſtmas then next deliver them all the Evidences concerning the ſame. Toth. 120. cites Meſſenger v. the Mayor and Burgeſſes of Glouceſter.

10. A. as Principal, and B. as Surety, were bound in a Bond to C. The *Obligee's Name was uſed only in Truſt for A. one of the Obligors*, and if any Money was paid, 'twas A's Money; but it did *not appear if any Money was lent*. B. being ſued brought his Bill, and the Court decreed the Bond to be delivered up and cancelled, and Satisfaction acknowledged with Coſts to the Plaintiff. See Mich. 26 Car. 2. Fin. R. 127. Launce v. Marden and al.

11. If a *Deed with Power of Revocation is revoked*, he, to whom the Inheritance belongs, may, by a Bill in Chancery, compel a Delivery thereof to him in Order to be cancelled; Becauſe the Deed of Revocation may be loſt, and then 'tis unreaſonable, that the other ſhould be ſtanding out. Paſch. 4 Annæ. G Eq. R. 1. ſays it was ſo held in Chancery.

12. A. *lent Money on a bad Security*, which his Lawyer adviſed him was a good one; he having *Notice of the other Title*, how it ſtood, (tho' not knowing the Goodneſs of it,) or at leaſt knowing, that another claimed Title to it, he muſt deliver up all the Writings, except the Mortgage Deed; But that he may keep, becauſe of the Covenant therein for Payment of the Money. At the Rolls. Mich. 1720. Ch. Prec. 548. Opie v. Godolphin.

(T. a) *Defects* in Deeds ſupplied in Equity.

1. A Leaſe was made to two during their Lives, and after *to the Uſe of ſuch of the Children begotten by P. R.* without any expreſs Concluſion, what Child or Children. In this Caſe the Conſtruction touching the Uſes muſt be made, as near as may be to the *Meaning of the Parties, who conveyed* the ſame to Uſes. Toth. 191. cites 16. June 36. Eliz. Rumney v. Garnon.

2. The Word *(Heir)* was left out *in a Clauſe of Reſervation*, but ſupplied in Equity. Toth. 229. cites July 1606. Baildon v. Church.

It was made a Queſtion whether Chancery might help a *Purchaſor* of Lands for a valuable Conſideration, the Word (Heirs) being omitted in the Purchaſe Deed; but the Point was not reſolved. 4 Le. 8. 184. M. 30. Eliz. C. B. in. Halton's Caſe.

3. A. was poſſeſs'd of a defective *Leaſe from the King*, which the Defendant would have avoided by a Compoſition made by him with the Commiſſioners for defective Titles; but he was relieved here. Toth. 192. cites Hill. 5. Jac. Gage v. Scory.——and ſays, that any other Eſtate whatſoever would be relieved in like Caſes.

4. A *Bond for 500 l. by a Miſtake of the Writer*, was not good; but the Court ordered the Obligor to give a new Bond of like Penalty. Toth. 237. cites 10 Jac. Haddon's Caſe.

5. A *Conveyance* was defective, yet becauſe there was a full *Intention to make better Aſſurance*, it was decreed. Toth. 106. cites 2 Car. Cooke v. Cleere.

6. A Bill being brought to be relieved, as to a *Covenant ill penn'd*, was demurr'd to; but in Regard of ſome *precedent Agreement*, the Demurrer was over-rul'd. Toth. 110. cites Mich. 3 Car. Vanlore v. Bartlett.

7. Chancery will help a Defect in a *Surrender*. 12 Car. 1. 1 Chan. Rep. 108. Smith v. Smith.

8. The Aſſignment of a Term for Years had *not Words ſufficient to convey all*, which was conveyed by the Grant of the Inheritance; but the Defect was made good. Paſch. 30 Car. 2. Fin. R. 347. E. of Pembroke v. E. of Middleſex and Hawles, and al.

9. A *Bill* was brought to ſupply a *Defect in a Settlement* of Lands on the Plaintiff, the better to enable him to pay his Debts; but the Cauſe coming on upon Bill and Anſwer, the Court would make *no Order without a Replication and Proofs*. Hill. 13 Car. 2. Fin. R. 415. Sir John Tufton v. Hawtry.

10. A Defect in a voluntary Conveyance, made as a *Proviſion for Children* and for their Maintenance, ſhall be ſupplied in Equity. Paſch. 1682. Vern. 40. Thompſon v. Atfield.

11. The *not Delivery of a Deed*, tho' it was ſigned and ſealed, is not relievable in Equity; by Wright Keeper. Hill. 1704. 2 Vern. 475. in Caſe of Clavering v. Clavering.

12. A Bond being *interlin'd after Execution*, and ſo void at Law, was endeavoured to be made good or relieved in Equity for ſo much Money, as it was really given to ſecure; and that it might be conſidered there as a Bond. But Lord Chancellor was of Opinion, that at moſt, it can be a Charge by ſimple Contract only; it being deſtroyed as ſuch by themſelves, and ſo is, as if it had never been, and conſequently can be no Bar to the Payment of a Debt of a ſuperior Nature. Sel. Ch. Caſes in Lord K's Time. 24. Trin. 11. Geo. 1. Anon.

13. A. made a *voluntary Conveyance to B. his half Brother*, which proved defective. A. died without Iſſue. B. brought a Bill to compel the Heir

to

to make good the Conveyance. And Lord K. Wright was of Opinion that as the Conſideration of Blood, would at Common Law raiſe an Uſe, and as before the Stat. 27 H. 8. ſuch Ceſty que Uſe ſhould have compell'd an Execution of the Uſe in a Court of Equity; ſo would this imperfect Conveyance *raiſe an Uſe in Reſpect of the Conſideration of Blood, and* conſequently *ought to be made good in Equity*. Wms's Rep. 60. Mich. 1702. Watts v. Bullas.

[See Copyhold.—Powers.]

(U. a) Aided, or relieved at Law, or in Equity.

1. IF a Man *pleads by Force of an Indenture*, which is loſt, on *Affidavit* made thereof, the Party ſhall be compell'd by the Court to *ſhew his Counterpart*, and he to plead thereto; or otherwiſe the Court may grant an *Imparlance*. So 'tis, if he will depoſe that he never had any Counterpart. Trin. 15 Jac. B. R. Cro. J. 429. Anon.

2 A *Fine* ſhewn in Evidence, there being *Proof of the Purchaſe Money paid*, was held *to be good Evidence*, that the Eſtate was paſſed accordingly tho' the *Deed of Uſes* is loſt. Clayt. 121. Grice v. Beaumont.

3. The Plantiff having only a Copy of a Deed of Feoffment, under which ſhe claimed the Land, (the Original being loſt) and the Defendant having a Counterpart, the Plantiff pray'd by her Bill, that the *Copy* might be *compared to the Counterpart*, and if it agreed, that the ſame might be *allowed in pleading as a good Deed ſealed and delivered*; which was granted, and it was referr'd to a Maſter to ſettle the ſame. Paſch. 13. Car. 2. N. Ch. R. 82. Griffin v. Boynton.——So of a *Probate* of a Will, whereof the original Will was loſt. ibid. cited as decreed 13 Car. 2. in the Caſe of Gorges v. Foſter.

Poph 205, 206 --Contra Noy. 82. Vincent v. Beverly. Contra.

4. It was ſaid, that if a Grantee in a *voluntary Deed*, or an Obligee in a voluntary Bond, loſe the Deed or Bond, they ſhould have *Remedy* againſt the Grantor or Obligor *in Equity*. Mich. 18 Car. 2. 1 Chan. Caſes 78. Underwood v. Stany.

5. A *Docket* or Inrollment *of a Decree* was loſt, and ordered to be new-inroll'd. 19 Car. 2. 3 Ch. R. 20. Deta & al. v. Dickenſon.

6. Proof being made of the conſtant Payment of a *Rent* till 12 Years paſt, the Deeds being loſt, the Rent and Arrears were *decreed* to be paid, becauſe it did *not appear what kind of Rent* it was, and ſo no Remedy at Law. Hill. 20 and 21 Car. 2. 1 Chan. Caſes 120. Collet v. Jacques.

7. A *Statute* being loſt, it was moved *to have it certified*, and two Preſidents were ſhewn. But per Finch K. they are Preſidents not to be followed, and I will never do it; exhibit your Bill againſt all that are concerned in the Land, and Juſtice ſhall be done you. Mich. 27 Car. 2. 1 Chan. Caſes 270. Anon.

8. A *Debtor convey'd his Eſtate to Truſtees for Payment of Debts*, but the *title Deeds were burnt* caſually, and the Perſon, from whom the Eſtate was originally purchas'd, knowing this refuſed to *execute a Releaſe* for the Satisfaction of a Purchaſor; but he was decreed to join. Trin. 28 Car. 2. Fin. R. 262. Bennet v. Ingoldsby and Hampton.

9. An *Annuity* was granted, but afterwards the Deed *came into the Hands of the Heir of the Grantor*; yet 'twas decreed it ſhould be paid with Intereſt. Paſch. 29 Car. 2. Fin. R. 293. Stokes v. Verrier.

10. A *Bill of Exchange* being loſt *after Acceptance*, the Drawee was decreed to pay the Money to the Plantiff, on giving Security to indemnify the Defendant as the Maſter ſhall think reaſonable, againſt any Perſon that may hereafter demand the ſame. Paſch. 29 Car. 2. Fin. R. 301. Terceſe v. Geray.

11. A

11. A Mortgagor, having confeſs'd that he had *burnt the original Mortgage Deed*, was ordered to deliver to the Plaintiff's Clerk in Court the Copy of it upon Oath, with the Names of the Witneſſes. Paſch. 30 Car. 2 Fin. R. 352. Corſellis v. Corſellis.

12. Where Equity relieves in Caſe of Deeds charg'd to be ſuppreſſed, or burnt, or cancell'd, it is *neceſſary to prove that there were ſuch Deeds.* Per the Maſter of the Rolls. 2 Wms's Rep. 681. cites it as ſo done in Caſe of the **King v. the Counteſs of Arundel.** Hob. 109.——and 1 Ch. Caſes 292. in Caſe of Gartſide v. Ratcliffe——and 1 Vern. 408. Hunt v. Matthews.

[See Account.]

(W. a) Loſt Deeds ſupplied by after-Deeds.

1. THE Defendant acknowledged a *Recognizance*, which was taken away privately; the Court order'd that either the Plantiff ſhould be paid his Money, or that the Recognizance ſhould be inroll'd. Toth. 267. cites 22 Eliz. Charnock v. Charnock.

2. Obligee in a *Bond loſt*, hath remedy againſt a Surety in Equity. Mich. 18 Car. 2. 1 Ch. Caſes 77. Underwood v. Staney —— Arg. Hill 31 and 32. Car. 2. 2 Ch. Caſes 23. S. P.

3. If an *Annuity* is *granted* by one *to his Houſekeeper with a Bond for Payment* of it, and the *Bond is loſt* Equity will decree Payment of the Annuity; For *Service is a good Conſideration*, and *no Turpis contractus* ſhall be *preſumed*, unleſs proved. Abr. Equ. Caſes 24 pl. 7. Hill. 1700. Lightbone v. Weedon.

Tho' it appeared that no Wages was due to her. Abr. Equ. Caſes 93. S. C.

4. If a *Fine* is levied by Husband and Wife of Lands, which he has in right of the Wife, and there is a *Deed* made at the ſame Time *to declare the Uſes* thereof, and afterwards this Deed *is loſt*, and then *another is* made to the ſame Effect, and *dated as the firſt*; that Deed is ſufficient to declare the Uſes of the Fine. Per Holt Ch. J. Mich. 7. Annæ. Holt's Rep 735. in Caſe of Fulhell v. Burland.

(X. a) Of inſpecting Deeds by Order of Court, and at what Time.

1. AN *Earl* having a Notion that his next eldeſt Brother was extravagant, and having no Iſſue of his own, *cut off the Entail of his Eſtate* by a Recovery, *and by Deed and Will ſettled it on his younger Brother* for Life, Remainder to his firſt Son (then in Being) for Life, with Remainder to Truſtees to preſerve contingent Remainders; Remainder to the firſt Son of that Son in Tail Male; &c. *charging the Eſtate with* 100 l. *a Year only to his next Brother the preſent Earl*, and died without Iſſue. Lord C. Macclesfield taking Notice of the Ingratitude to the Crown, to give away the Eſtate from the Honour, and that here being *no Purchaſer*, there was no Occaſion to bring the Cauſe to a Hearing; his Lordſhip, on Bill and Anſwer, ordered all the Deeds and Writings to be brought by the Defendant, the Deviſee, before the Maſter; and that the Plantiff, the preſent Earl might, either by himſelf or Agents, have the Inſpection of them; ſo that if any Thing has ſlipped the Conveyance, or if the Entail be not well dock'd, the Plantiff may have the Benefit thereof. 2 Wms's Rep. 177. Trin. 1723. Earl of Suffolk v. Howard.

Lord Macclesfield ſaid that more ought to be done in this Caſe, than in a common Caſe, Ibid. 1-8.——Yet afterwards in a Caſe where Peerage was not concerned, where the Plaintiff claimed by Virtue of a Remainder in Tail expectant on an Eſtate Tail,

and was *Heir Male of the Family*, and the *Defendants were Heirs General*, and Siſters of the Tenant in Tail,

Tail, and by their Anſwer ſhewed, that their Brother the Tenant in Tail had ſuffered a Recovery, and declared the Uſe to himſelf in Fee, referring to the Deed in their Cuſtody. Lord C. Talbot before the Hearing, ordered the Defendants to leave with their Clerk in Court, the *Deeds making the Tenant to the Præcipe, and declaring the Uſes of the Recovery.* 2 Wms's. Rep. 1-8 in an Addition at the End of the Page, cites about Hill. 1735. Sir Edward Bettiſon v. Farrington and al.

2. In the Proofs of a Cauſe, *Plaintiff prov'd a Deed*, and the *Defendant, on Petition* to the Maſter of the Rolls, *got an Order of Leave to inſpect; becauſe the Depoſition* of the Witneſs *referring to the Deed, made the ſame to be Part of the Depoſition.* But to diſcharge the Order, it was moved that Defendant can have no Right to ſee the Strength of Plaintiff's Cauſe, or the Evidence of his Title before the Hearing; and that if this were to be granted, ſuch Motions would be made every Day; ſince it would be every one's Curioſity to try to pick holes in the Deed or Settlement, by which he is diſinherited; and no ſuch Order was ever made in the like Caſe; and Lord Chancellor diſcharged the Order. 2 Wms's. Rep. 410. Paſch. 1727. Davers v. Davers.

False Judgment.

(A.) Who ſhall hold Plea of False Judgment.

Before the making of *this Statute*, if a falſe Judgment had been given in a Court Baron, this ſhould have been *redreſſed in the Court Baron of the Lord next above him*, and ſo upwards of the Lords Paramount; which both was an Occaſion of long Delays, and the King had alſo many Times Prejudice thereby; for that thoſe baſe Courts could aſſeſs no Fine or Amerciament to the King; which is to be underſtood, that if the next immediate Meſne had no Court Baron, the Falſe Judgment could not be redreſſed in the Court of the Lord next above, for Default of Privity; but then the Falſe Judgment was to be redreſſed in the Court of Common Pleas, or before the Juſtices in Eyre; and now the Juſtices in Eyre being worn out, the *original Writ* of Falſe Judgment is *returnable coram Juſtitiariis* noſtris apud Weſtm. which are the Juſtices of the Court of Common Pleas. 2. Inſt. 138, 139.

1. 52 *H.* 3. 20. *Stat. Marlb.* ENACTS that *none from henceforth (except our Lord the King,) ſhall hold in his Court, any Plea of Falſe Judgment given in the Court of his Tenants; For ſuch Plea ſpecially belongeth to the Crown and Dignity of our Lord the King.*

(B.) Lies

(B.) Lies in what Cases; and where False Judgment, and where a Writ of Error, or other Action; and the Difference.

1. WRIT of False Judgment lies * *not before Execution sued*, and till the Demandant has entred. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 6. cites M. 18 E. 3. and F. N. B.——And in False Judgment it was held a good Plea, that the Plaintiff himself is yet seised of the Franktenement, and was so the Day of the Writ purchased. But *Writ of Error* lies against him who was Party to the Judgment, whether he was Tenant of the Franktenement or not. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 8. cites 38 E. 3. 34.

* *But* it was admitted by Catesby and Jenney, that it lies † without any Execution *in Plea of Land*. Br. Faux Judgment pl. 19. cites 8 E. 4. 19.——But ibid. cites ‡ F. N. B. contra. Brook makes a Quære *in Plea Personal*, but says, it seems all one; otherwise 'tis *in Attaint*, by Reason that the Petit Jurors may die, but it seems that the Suitors may live. Quære.—— ‡ F. N. B. 19 (A) cites M. 38 E. 3. 15. and 8 E. 4. 19. accordingly. That where the Tenant loses his Land by False Judgment in a Writ of Right in a Court Baron, he shall *not* have a Writ of False Judgment *before* the *Demandant has entred* upon him, &c ——— † Orig. is (Sur) but in the other Editions of Brook, it is (Sans) which is according to the Year Book, per Jenney.

2. *Land* is *recovered* in Court Baron *by Plaint*, where 'tis *Franktenement*, and ought to have been by Writ. False Judgment lies, but not *Assise*, *nor Trespass*; For 'tis not void, nor Coram non judice, but Error. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 11. cites 22 Ass. 64.

So Defendant might bring *Error*. Br. Trespass. pl. 238. S. C.

3. A *Sheriff* in the County *quash'd the Essoin without the Consent of the Suitors*, and the Party brought *a Bill against him in the Exchequer*, and it well lies. For *False Judgment does not lie; because 'twas not the Act of the Suitors*, who are Judges there; and the Essoin was cast in Writ of taking of Beasts: and so Note that Suitors are in the County. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 18. cites 26 Ass. 45.

S. P. Br. Action Sur le Case. pl. 9. cites S. C.

4. Note, that of a *Judgment* given *in Ancient Demesne of Lands at Common Law* a Writ of False Judgment does not lie, because it is Coram non judice. F. N. B. 19 (D) in the Notes there (C) cites 7 H. 4. 28. b.

For *Error or erroneous Process in Ancient Demesne*, the Parol shall not be removed; For the Party may have Writ of False Judgment. Br. Cause a Remover, &c. pl. 4. cites 9 H. 6. 34.

5. 'Tis said that *in False Judgment the Parties have Day in Court*, and *in a Writ of Error not*. And in Debt before the Sheriff in the County the Plaintiff recovered his Debt and his Damages, and the Defendant brought a Writ of False Judgment, by which the Record was removed by Recordare out of the County into Bank; and in the same Court the Plaintiff in the first Action may pray Execution, if the *Defendant will not assign his Errors*; and after the Plaintiff in the Writ of False Judgment, was *nonsuited*. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 15. cites 20 H. 6. 18.

6. Of *Error in Court of Piepowders* Writ of Error lies, and not Writ of False Judgment; which proves that it is a Court of Record; and this per Littleton, quod non negatur. Br. Error. pl. 162. cites 6 E. 4. 3. and 7 E. 4. 23.

7. False Judgment lies upon a *Justicies*, and *Admeasurement of Pasture*, and *all other Vicontiel Writs*. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 14. cites 7 E. 4. 23.

8. A Writ of False Judgment does not lie *of Error in Assise of Fresh-force*, but a Writ of Error; For Assise of Fresh-force is always in Court of Record. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 22. cites the Register.

F. N. B. 19 (I).

9. If False Judgment be given in a *Writ of Right Close*, the Party Tenant or Demandant may sue a Writ of False Judgment thereupon. F. N. B. 12. (A)

10. But

Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 7. cites 14 H. 4. 39.—For if a Copyholder should have such Writ,

10. But *Copyholders* of Land in Ancient Demesne at the Will of the Lord must sue by Bill in the Lord's Court; and shall make Protestation to sue there in the Nature of what Writ he will. But tho' False Judgment be given, he *shall not have* Writ *of False Judgment at Common Law.* F. N. B. 12. (B). Ibid. 18 (H).

he should be restored to a Freehold which he never lost, but always continued in the Lord. But it seems the Recovery is void, and may be avoided by Plea. F. N. B. 12. (B) in the Notes there (b).

11. Upon False Judgment given in *Courts, holding Plea by Præscription* in every Sum in Debt by Bills before them, False Judgment will not lie, but a Writ of Error thereupon. F. N. B. 18 (H).

But it is said there in Marg. that it is contrary if the Justicies be *removed* into B. R. *by a Pone.*

12. Where False Judgment is given upon a Writ of *Justicies* directed unto the Sheriff, the Party grieved shall have False Judgment, and not a Writ of Error; altho' the Judgment be of Debt, or Trespass over the Sum of 20 s. F. N. B. 18 (H).

——Br. Error. pl. 20. S. P, cites 34 H. 6. 48. and 63.

But County Court, Hundred Court and Court Baron, &c. are no Courts of Record;

13. A Writ of *Error properly lies*, where False Judgment is given in any Court, which is a Court of Record; as in the Common Pleas, or in London, or other City, or Place where they have Power to hold Plea by the King's Charter, or by Præscription, in any Sum in Debt or Trespass over the Sum of 40 s. F. N. B. 20. (D).

and so a Writ of Error lies not, but a Writ of False Judgment. Co. Litt. 117. b.——and tho' the Plea is held with or without Writ, it is all one. 6 Rep. 11. b. Jentleman's Case.

See Court Baron [ ] Jentleman's Case.

14. If the *Steward is named* in the Judgment, it makes it a False Judgment. Noy. 74. in Case of Vaughan v. Paramore cites 1 E. 5. 36. and the reason is because he is not Judge there. Ibid. cites 6 Rep. 11. Jentleman's Case.

[See (D.) pl. 1.]

(C.) False Judgment tried by whom, and how; and of the returning the Writ, and removing the Record.

* Upon Error assign'd in a Writ of False Judgment given in the County of York, in an Indebit. assumpsit, & a Quantum meruit, the Defendant in the False Judgment, after pleading to the other Errors, founds a further Plea upon this Statute thus, (viz.) *Et quod in Præmiss. ill. Manifeste est Variatio inter Loquelam prædict. superius retornat. & loquel. in Cur' Com' præd' super quo* Judicium Predict' realiter reddit' fuit *absque hoc* quod defect. præd' superius pro Erroribus assign' fuerunt vel eorum aliquis fuit content' in Loquela præd. super quo Judicium præd' in Cur' Com' prædict' reddit. fuit, prout in Cur' hic pretextu Brevis de falso Judicio præd' superius retorn' recordatur, Et hoc paratus est verificare unde petit Judicium, si Curia hic ad Examinationem defect' prædict' procedere velit seu debeat, &c. Lutw. 957, 958. Hill. 13. W. 3. Butterfield v. Sarton.——And refers to a like President in Hearne (495) 399.

1. 1 *E.* 3, 4. *Stat.* 1. ENACTS that *when a Record cometh into the King's Court by Writ of False Judgment, in Case where the Party alledgeth, that the Record is * otherwise than the Court doth record the same, the † Averment shall be received of the good Country, and of them which were present in the Court when the Record was made, if they do ‡ come with others of the Country by the Sheriff's Return. And if they come not, the Inquest shall be taken by the good Country.*

* In a Writ of False Judgment on a Judgment in Ancient Demesne it was said to be *in Curia Regis* where it should be *Reginæ*; now by this there is no Record made or removed but only an *Error*, and is as if the Suitors had brought in the Record *without a Writ to warrant it.* F. N. B. 18. (G) in the Notes there (d). *But in Writ of Error* which removes a Record if it be *abated*, a *Special Writ* may be awarded upon the Record *quod residet in Curia*, &c. For this was a Record before the Removal, and the Justices of C. B. may carry it into B. R. in their Hands; tho' otherwise of a Roll of a Base Court which is

is not a Record.—Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 1. cites 4 H. 6. Fitzh. Faux Judgment. pl. 1.—Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 1. cites 3 H. 6. 26.

† That is, it ſhall be tried by thoſe who were then preſent. For the Word Averment, in this Place, *ſignifies an Act or Trial*; and not an Offer to juſtify the Thing. N. Lutw. 303. in his Additions to the Report of Butterfield v. Sarton.

‡ If they come, and by other of the Country, &c. Cay's Abr. Stat. tit. False Judgment.

2. If the *Sheriff returns that the Suitors will not record le Parol* (or Plea), a *Sicut alias Diſtringas* ſhall iſſue againſt all the Suitors. And if at the Day *ſome* of the Suitors do *appear, and others do not*, the Court here ſhall accept the Record by the Hands of thoſe that appear; For perhaps, at the Diſtringas ſicut alias, the others will diſavow the Record; but their Iſſues ſhall be ſaved, and the Diſtringas ſicut alias ſhall iſſue as well againſt thoſe that appear, as againſt the others. And by Hill, if on the firſt Writ the Record had been delivered to 4 Suitors, and 2 of them had appeared, and the other 2 made Default, the Record had been (well) accepted. See 1 E. 3. 9. 26. E. 3. 61. * 12 H. 4. 23. And an *idem Dies* ſhall be given to thoſe that appear, according to 29 E. 3. 26. For it may be that at the other Day, thoſe who now appear may make Default. But if the Sheriff returns the Names of thoſe who refuſe, the Diſtringas ſhall iſſue only againſt them: and if any of them make Default, the Record ſhall not be receiv'd by the Hands of thoſe that appear, but their Iſſues ſhall be ſaved, and a new Diſtringas ſhall go both againſt them and thoſe who made Default. F. N. B. 18. (E) in the Notes there (b) cites 9 Eliz. D. 262.

All that are returned by the Sheriff to be Suitors at the Court Baron, and *preſent* when the Judgment was given, *ought to return the Writ*, and not all thoſe that ought to make Suit at Court by that means the Party ſhall never have it certified, as it may happen. Noy. 74. Vaughan v. Paramore.—cites F. N. B. 18 (D) and D. 262.—* Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 5. cites S. C.—See (E) pl. 1.

3. Note, that Records of a Court-Baron ſhall be certified *by all the Suitors* upon a Writ of Falſe Judgment, and not by ſome of them; quære, how this ſhall be taken. Brook ſays it ſeems, by all thoſe *who ſhall be in Court upon the ſame Plea*, and not by thoſe Suitors who never were preſent in this Suit. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 16. cites 12 H. 4. 22. and 31 E. 3. Fitz. Faux Judgment 8.

4. Writs of Falſe Judgment *iſſue out of Chancery*, and are directed to County and Hundred Courts, &c. and are *returnable only in C. B.* L. P. R. 529.

(C. 2) The Effect thereof, and how it muſt be obeyed.

1. IF a Writ of Falſe Judgment be directed to the Court of a Lord, they *cannot proceed after*; and if the *Lord will not hold Court to allow it, Diſtringas ſhall iſſue* to diſtrain him to hold his Court; For the Writ muſt be ſerved at a Court. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 12. cites 6 H. 7. 15.

(D) In what Court, and at what Time, and to whom Directed.

1. FALSE Judgment ſhall iſſue *to the Suitors in a Baſe Court*, and *not to the Bailiffs*; For where Bailiffs have Conuſance of Pleas, or Authority to *hold Plea by Præſcription*, 'tis a Court of Record, and therefore a Writ of Error lies there, and not of Falſe Judgment; quod Nota Diverſit. & Dubitat. there what Writ ſhall lie of Falſe Judgment in a Court of *Piepowders*. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 3. cites 45 E. 3. 1.

Writ of False Judgment *lies not but againſt the Suitors*, per Litt. J. and *Diſtringas Sectatores ad habendum record'* lies againſt the Suitors. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 14. cites E. 4 4 23.

2. If a Writ of False Judgment be brought against the Steward and the Suitors, the Writ shall abate because the Steward is named. Per Vavisor Arg. it seems, 'tis intended, where the Writ is directed *to the Steward and Suitors*. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 20. cites 1 E. 5. 3.

3. A Man shall not have a Writ of False Judgment, but in the Court *where there are Suitors*; For if there be no Suitors, the Record can't be certified by them. F. N. B. 18. (H).

[See (B.)]

(E) Pleading, and Errors in False Judgment.

1. IN False Judgment 'twas assigned for Error, because in *the Precept of Summons*, &c. these Words, *coram tali*, &c. *were wanting*; and because it appeared by the Record that he had *appeared before Judgment*, therefore he has affirmed the Summons; and where a Man is *essoigned*, he shall not say after, that he was not summoned, per Wyche; and after the Judgment was affirm'd. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 4. cites 46 E. 3. 30.

2. Error *upon False Judgment* given *in D upon a Writ of Right*; 'tis said that the *Heir shall be warned as well as the Tertenant*; and 'tis said there, that the *Plea of the Tenant shall be taken*, and not of the Heir: But this seems to be in False Judgment, and not in Error. Br. Error. pl. 42. cites 8 H. 4. 18.

Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 9. S. C.

3. False Judgment *upon a Justicies directed to the Sheriff* of D. viz. J. B and the *Under-Sheriff*, viz. N. T. *held the County, and gave the Judgment* of the Sum of 1000 *l.* contained in the Justicies; and the Defendant brought Writ of False Judgment, and assigned it for Error; and that they *made the Record that the Plea was held before J. B.* named in the Justicies, *where in Fact he was absent*; quod Nota. but the Plaintiff was nonsuited, and so no Determination; but it seems to be Error: For by the Writ of False Judgment the Sheriff is Commissioner; and Commissioner, nor Judge can't make a Deputy; and see here, that he shall falsify the Roll; but it seems, that he shall not say so, if 'twas in a Court of Record. Br. Error. pl. 78. cites 21 H. 6. 43.

4. False Judgment upon a Recovery in a Writ of Right in a Court-Baron, the False Judgment was assign'd, for that the Roll was, *Placita coram Seneschallo & Sectatoribus*, &c. where the Steward is no Judge, but the Suitors; and therefore Error, per Chock and Littleton. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 13. cites 6 E. 4. 3.

* Orig. (Accord.) but in the other Editions it is (Record).

5. Note by Fitzh. for clear Law, that in a Writ of False Judgment, *in nullo est Erratum*, is no Plea; For they shall join Issue upon some *Matter in Fact certainly alledged by the Party*, and shall be tried per Pais; For 'tis not a * Record, contra in Error. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 17. cites M. 23 H. 8.

Dal. 73. pl. 56. S. C. with the after Additions, viz. * quatuor. † quatuor.

6. In False Judgment, if the Plaintiff assign the Errors, he shall not say *in hoc Erratum est*, but he shall say, *unde queritur diversimodo sibi falsum judicium factum fuisse, judicium viz. in hoc*, &c. Note the Diversity between Error and False Judgment in this Point. And note, that upon the Writ of False Judgment, the Sheriff returned, *quod acceptis secum* 4. *Legalibus militibus de Com' suo accessit*, &c. *& recordum illud habeo coram*, &c. *sub Sigillo meo & Sigillis Prædictorum* * *militum*, and held the Return not good; and that the Record was not removed by it. For the Return should be *sub Sigillis* † *ex his qui Recordo illo interfuerunt*, and not of 4 Knights. And for this Cause the Court could not proceed. Trin. 6 Eliz. Mo. 73. pl. 198.

7. A Writ of False Judgment was brought in the Common Pleas of a False Judgment given in the Court of Ancient Demesne, in a Writ of Right

Right-Close prosecuted there in the Nature of a Writ of *Aiel*; one of the Plaintiffs, who had before appeared, was nonsuit and severed, and the other Suitors would not send the Record to the Sheriff; whereupon a Distringas issued against them; upon which they brought the Record into Court, and there assigned many Errors in the Record of the Judgment. 1. Because in the Stile of the Court no mention is made *before what Judges*. 2. There is *no Officer named in the Award or Return of the Summons*. 3. *No Day prefixed* to the Tenant in the Summons, *but ad proxim. Curiam*. 4. Tenant *made Attorney within Age*. 5. *No Warrant* of Attorney *entred for the Plaintiff*. 6. *No Names of the Summoners returned*. 7. Tenant within Age, and in by Discent *ousted of Age*. 8. *Refusal to receive Demurrer*. And upon non sum inform' the Court proceeded to the Examination of Errors, and reversed the Judgment; and awarded that he should be restored to all which he had lost by Reason of the Judgment aforesaid; but no Costs or Damages; and the Suitors were amerced to 7 *l.* Trin. 9 Eliz. D. 262. b. pl. 32, 33. Anon.

8. The Writ was defective as it seems, because it was Recordari facias loquel. *quæ est in eadem Curia*; whereas it should be *fuit*. Mich. 9 and 10 Eliz. D. 268. pl. 17. Herford v. Winde.

9. *Exceptions* were taken *to a Writ* of False Judgment in a Court of Ancient Demesne, because the Writ was *assumptis tecum quatuor Militibus de Comitatu tuo, &c.* and in the End, *per* 4. *legales Homines ejusdem Curiæ*. But disallowed, for it is the Form of the Register. Mich. 22. & 23 Eliz. D. 373. pl. 13.

A Writ was *sub Sigillo tuo & Sigillis* 4. *legalium hominum ejusdem Curiæ*; where it should be *sub Sigillo tuo, & per* 4 *legales homines ejusdem Curiæ*, &c. and also in the End of the Writ, before the Teste, it wanted the Words * *& aliud Breve*; and the Defendant refusing to consent to the amending the Writ, the Court doubted what to do. Trin. 4 and 5. P. and M. D. 164. pl. 58. and cites 4 H. 6. 4. that where the Writ wants Substance, the Plaintiff may have another Writ out of Chancery, to the Justices of C. B. reciting the Matter and commanding them to proceed to discuss the Errors contained in the Record, *quod Penes eos residet*. Nota Bene.

* D. 268. in Case of Herford v. Winde.

10. If a Judgment in an inferior Court is erroneous, *no Advantage shall be taken* of it upon Pleading, *but by Writ of False Judgment*; and the Judgment shall be intended good, till it be avoided. Hill. 24 and 25 Car. 2. B. R. 2 Lev. 81, 82. Doe v. Parmiter.

11. An Action was brought in the Court of Leicester, for an inartificial cutting of the Plantiff's Sow. The Defendant demurred. Plaintiff joined. And *upon the Demurrer* Day was given *ad Proximam Curiam* without mention of any Day certain; and this was held to be incurable. But then it was moved that it *appears to be a Court of Record*, and then a Writ of *Error lies*, and not a Writ of False Judgment, if there had been a *Compleat Judgment* which there was not, there being only a Writ of Inquiry of Damages awarded, and so nothing further was done. Mich. 3. Jac. 2. C. B. Lutw. 951. to 954. Buffard v. Bull.

12 An *Infant* brought Trespass in an inferior Court for taking of a Cow, and after a Verdict and Judgment for the Plaintiff, it was assigned for Error. 1. That *in the Venire facias* the Word *fcire* &c. was inserted *instead of sciri*, &c. 2. That the Plaintiff in the inferior Court, did *not declare by his Prochein Amy*. 3. Because it is said in the Record, that the *Jury elect. Triat. & Jurat. fuerunt per Cur'* where the Jury is to be tried by Triors, and for these Reasons Judgment was reversed. Lutw. 954. to 957. 3 & 4 Jac. 2. Wilson v. Leathat.

[See (B).—Error. [(J. c)—K. c) &c.] ——See more in Townsend's Tables 153. and Cornwall's Tables 173, 175.]

(F) How the Judgment ſhall be.

1. IN a Writ of Falſe Judgment, if the Judgment be reverſed, the Suitors are amerced; and the Court ſhall *give* the former *Judgment which the Suitors ought to have given* F. N. B. 18. (A.) a Note there.

F. N. B. 19. (D.) Marg. laſt Edition ſays, that it was held accordingly, in Caſe of Phillipsv. Bury. In Hill. 6 W. 3. B. R. by Holt, and the Opinion of Dyer 373. denied, becauſe not warranted by 34 Aſſ. 40.

2. In a Writ of *Right-Cloſe*, if the *Writ of* the *Demandant* be *abated*, whereupon he brings Falſe Judgment *in C. B.* and there the Judgment is *reverſed*, and the Writ awarded good; then he ſhall hold Plea in C. B. and a *Judicial Writ ſhall iſſue from* the *Common Pleas*, in Nature of *Proteſtation* made in the firſt Writ; and if the Proteſtation were in Nature of Aſſiſe of *Mortdanceſtor*, the Juſtices ſhall direct a *Writ unto the Sheriff to ſummon the Jurors* to come *out of Ancient Demeſne thither*, and all the Matter ſhall be tried and determined in C. B. And altho' the Judgment be given of the Land in C. B. yet the Land ſhall be Ancient Demeſne. Quod vide M. 3. E. 3. in tit. Faux Judgment. F. N. B. 19. (D.) cites 4 Inſt. 270.

3. *Tenant in Tail levied a Fine of* Land, which was *Ancient Demeſne*, with Proclamations; a *Formedon* was brought of the Land within the Court of Ancient Demeſne, and the Defendant pleaded the Fine in Bar of the Eſtate Tail by the Cuſtom, and Judgment was given there accordingly. Whereupon a Writ of Falſe Judgment was brought in the Common Pleas, and it was a Queſtion in that Caſe, if the averring of the Cuſtom for barring of the Eſtate Tail there was good againſt the Statute *de Donis Conditionalibus*, which was made within Time of Memory. Ld. Dyer makes a Nota, that if the Judgment ſhould be reverſed for that Error; yet the Judgment given here can be no other, but that the Party ſhall not have Judgment to recover Seiſin of the Land which is Ancient Demeſne, but *only that he ſhall be* * *reſtored to his Action*, &c. which will be adjudged there according to their Cuſtom. Mich. 22 and 23 Eliz. D. 373. a. b. pl. 13.——cites 37. Aſſ. 4.

* See (E.) pl. 1.

(G) Execution awarded where, and how. And of Scire Facias.

1. IT was ſhewn to Thirning, that a Man had *recovered Land in Ancient Demeſne*, and before that Execution ſued he, who loſt, brought a Writ of Falſe Judgment, ſo that the *Record is in C. B.*. and the *Plaintiff does not purſue it*, and the *Demandant cannot now have Execution in Ancient Demeſne.* And Thirning ſaid, he *may ſue Execution as well by Scire Facias* as upon a Writ of Error in B. R. For when the Record is there, they will award Execution. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 6. cites 12 H. 4. 23.

2. 'Twas agreed that *if the Plaintiff upon Scire Facias ad Aſſignand.* [*Audiend'*] *Errores appears*, the *Court ſhall proceed to the Examination of Errors*; but *if he makes Default*, the *Defendant ſhall have Execution*; For the *Court is not bound to examine the Errors, tho'* they are *apparent*, unleſs at the Aſſignment of the Party; and that a Man cannot be nonſuited in a Writ of Error; For he has not *Day in Court*; contrary in a Writ of Falſe Judgment; but in the Sci. Fa. upon Writ of Error, he may be nonſuited; quod non negatur. Nevertheleſs 'tis not expreſly ruled. Br. Error. pl. 11. cites 20. H. 6. 18.

3. The *Original is determined by the Nonſuit* of the Plaintiff in Falſe Judgment, per Aſcough; and therefore, per Paſton, Execution ſhall be awarded in Bank preſently; and ſo ſee that the Record ſhall not be remanded

manded into the Country, but Execution ſhall be made in Bank. B. Faux Judgment. pl. 15. cites 20 H. 6 18.

4. In Falſe Judgment J. T. recovered againſt R. S. in a Juſticies directed to the Sheriff of D. 1000 *l.* which *Recovery was removed into C. B.* at the Suit of the Defendant, by Writ of Falſe Judgment returnable 15 Hill. 21 H. 6. at which Day *J. T. appeared, and R. S. was nonſuited*; by which *J. T. brought Scire facias to have Execution*, returnable 15 Paſch. and the *Parties appeared*, and the Plaintiff [in the Court below] prayed Execution. Yelverton objected to it, and ſaid he could not have Execution; *and ſhewed a Writ of Falſe Judgment, quod coram vobis reſid.t* returnable 15 Johis. *and prayed Proceſs* againſt J. T. and tendered ſurety to ſue with Effect, *and aſſigned Error.* that the Juſticies was directed to the High Sheriff, and the Under Sheriff held the County and the Plea between the Parties, and the Record was entered as before the High Sheriff, where in Fact it was before the Under Sheriff, and ſo the Judgment Coram non Judice; and becauſe both Parties appeared 'twas held in vain to award any Proceſs againſt the ſaid J. T. upon which *J. T. ſaid that the ſaid J. S. was otherwiſe nonſuited in another Writ of Falſe Judgment*, therefore Judgment ſi Actio. Per Paſton J. if a *Record* be *removed out of* this Court of *C. B. into B. R. by Writ of Error, and Scire facias is brought againſt the Party, and after the Plaintiff in the Scire facias is nonſuited, and the other brings Scire facias to have Execution; and the other ſhews Writ of Error, quod penes illos reſidet, and aſſigns Errors*; yet the other ought to have Execution without anſwering to the Errors. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 9. cites 21 H. 6. 34.

5. *But* if he will *firſt ſue a Writ of Error*, and pray Scire facias againſt the Party, and after is nonſuited; there, if the other ſues Scire facias to execute, the Party, who was nonſuited ſhall have a Writ of Error, quod coram vobis reſidet, and aſſign his Error, *Contra in the Scire facias*; per Paſton. J. Ibid.

6. *And* ſo there ſeems a *Diverſity where he ſues Scire facias and is nonſuited*, and where he *prays Scire facias and does not ſue it out*; and therefore, if in the firſt Writ of Falſe Judgment no Proceſs was ſued, then 'tis ut ſupra. ibid.

7. *And* ſo it ſeems that *Nonſuit after Appearance and Proceſs ſued is peremptory, and e contra before Appearance*; For if he does not ſue out Proceſs upon it, then it cannot be * after Appearance. ibid. Br. Nonſuit. pl. 26. cites S. C. and P. per Paſton; but Br. makes a Quære as to this in Falſe Judgment.—* Orig. [Priſe] but it ſeems it ſhould be [Puis.]

8. *And* ſo it appears by this Caſe, that *if the Record comes into a more High Court, and Execution is awarded there, the Record ſhall not be remanded.* Ibid.

9. If a Writ of Falſe Judgment be brought in C. B. of a Judgment given in an Inferior Court, by which the Record came into the Bank; yet this is not of Record to have Execution, nor otherwiſe; but *whether the Judges affirm or diſaffirm the Record*, ſo that they meddle therewith, *then 'tis of Record*; *and then Execution lies*, or *a Writ of Error*, and not before, per Priſot. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 10. cites 39 H. 6. 5.

10. When the *firſt Judgment* is *reverſed* by Writ of Falſe Judgment, the Plaintiff in the Writ of Falſe Judgment may have a Writ of *Scire facias in Bank* againſt the Party to have Execution in the Writ of Falſe Judgment. Br. Faux Judgment. pl. 19. cites 8 E. 4. 19. Br. Executions. pl. 124. cites S. C.

11. Writ of Falſe Judgment was brought of a Judgment given in the County Court upon a Plaint there affirmed in an Action upon the Caſe for an Aſſumpſit to the Damage of 39 *s.* and coſts to 10 *s.* And *to delay Execution of the Coſts* and Damages the Writ was brought. And the Record was removed, and the Writ ſerved, and the Plaintiff was nonſuited; upon which the Defendant prayed a *Scire facias* againſt the *Plaintiff to have Execution.* And by good Adviſement the Writ *was granted*; for otherwiſe

therwiſe he ſhall not have any Judicial Writ to have Execution. *For the Record ſhall not be remanded* into another County, &c. Mich. 15 & 16 Eliz. D. 329. a. b. pl. 14.

12. See the like Point, 20 and 21 H. 6. But there was a *new Writ* of Falſe Judgment directed to the Juſtices of C. B. *quod coram vobis reſidet*; and Error thereupon Aſſigned, in order to prevent Execution in the Scire Facias; Et Curia aviſare vult, &c. D. 329. b. pl. 44.

(A) False Latin.

1. FALSE Latin does not overthrow *Indictments*, if by any intendment the Indictment can be made good. Cro. E. 108. Mich. 30 and 31 Eliz. B. R. Bricket and al.——Mich. 2. Jac. B. R. 5 Rep. 121. b. Long's Caſe, S. P.

2. Falſe Latin ſhall not deſtroy * *Deeds* nor *Pleadings*, tho' it will abate ‡ *Writs*. Sti. 302. Arg. in Caſe of Tailor v. Webb.

* 11 Rep. 3. b. Hill. 7 Jac. in Auditor Curle's Caſe.——S. P. by Coke, Trin. 12 Jac. 2 Buls. 241. in Caſe of Marſham v. Jolly.——‡ And that is only *original* Writs; but *judicial* Writs, or *Fines*, ſhall not be impeached for Falſe Latin, 5 Rep. 121. Long's Caſe.——4 Mod. 160. 4 and 5 W. and M. B. R. in Caſe of Bennet v. Preſton.——10 Rep. 133. a. Mich. 11 Jac. B. R. Osborn's Caſe.

3. In Debt on a Bond, if the *Obligation* be falſe Latin, the *Declaration ought to be good Latin*; as if the Obligation be Wiginti, the Declaration ought to be Viginti; and then the Court is to conſtrue if it be a Variance. 2 Show. 155. Hill. 32 and 33 Car. 2. B. R. Anon.

4. Falſe Latin does not *abate an Appeal*. 4 and 5 W. and M. B. R. 1 Salk. 328. Bennet v. Preſton.———4 Mod. 159. S. C.

5. Falſe Latin was held to be *cured by a Verdict*. 8 Mod. 380. Trin. 11 Geo. Cambridge v. Lea.

[See 4 Geo. 4. 26. at tit. Latin. Inf.]

(A) False Oath.

1. TILL the Statute 3 *and* 11 H. 7. which gives Power to examine and puniſh Perjuries in the Star Chamber, there was *not any Puniſhment* for any falſe Oath of any Witneſs *at Common Law*; and now there is a Form of Puniſhment provided for Perjuries by the 5 Eliz. yet before the Statute 3 H. 7. the King's Counſel uſed to Aſſemble and Puniſh ſuch Perjuries at their Diſcretion; and there was no Puniſhment for Perjury at Common Law but in Caſe of *Attaint*; as appears D. 272. But in the *Spiritual Court*, pro Læſione fidei, they uſe to puniſh them. Cro. E. 520. Mich. 38 and 39 Eliz. C. B. Damport v. Simpſon.

2. If one makes a Falſe Oath, the Party is puniſhable for it by an *Action on the Caſe*, if it be not Perjury for which he may be indicted; there is a *Differance* between a *Falſe Oath* and *Perjury*; For one is Judicial the other is Extrajudicial. And the Law inflicts greater Puniſhment for a Falſe Oath made in a Court of Juſtice than elſe where, becauſe of the Preſervation of Juſtice. Per Roll. Ch. J. Trin. 1652. Sti. 337. in Caſe of Howell v. Gwinn.

3. At the *Common Law* one may be indicted for a Falſe Oath in an *Affidavit*. Per Roll. Ch. J. Trin. 1652. Sti. 374. King v. Troes.

(See Perjury.)

False Plea.

(A) The Effect thereof, and how Discountenanced and Punished in Law and Equity.

1. IN *Precipe* quod reddat *against Two*, if the *One comes and takes the entire Tenancy upon him*, upon which they are at Issue, and it is *found against the* Tenant, by this he shall lose his Moiety; For it is found against the Tenant for his part, because it is tryed per Pais upon Issue; contra of Plea to the Writ by Demurrer. Note the Difference. Br. Peremptory, pl. 73. cites 8 E. 3. 17.

2. Plaintiff, in a Suit in *Chancery* against an *Executor*, shall have the same Advantage thereof, as if the same Plea were found False by Verdict at Law; and shall have all the *same Consequences here as* follow on a False Plea *at Law* to all Intents. Mich. 26 Car. 2. 2 Chan. Cases 201. Parker v. Dee.

Fallifying Recoveries.

(A) At Common Law.

1. AT Common Law, if one had suffered a Recovery in any Real Action against him *by Default*, (if he was *lawfully Summon'd and no Error* was *in the Proceeding*,) he had not (the Case of an *Infant only excepted*, for the Tenderness of his Age and defect of Intelligence,) any Remedy but by Writ of Right. And this was the Reason that Tenant in Tail, Tenant by the Curtesy, Tenant in Dower, or for Life, after a Recovery by Default, had no Remedy till the Statute of *W.* 2. *cap.* 4. gave them a Writ of *Quod ei deforceat*. Nota per Coke. 6 Rep. 8. b. in Ferrer's Case.

2. Where *Lessee for Life* was, *Remainder in Fee*, if a *Stranger had recovered against the Tenant for Life* before the Statute of West. 2. he was barred; and if it were by *Feint Action*, and after the *Tenant for Life died*, he in Remainder was barred; because he never had Possession of the Land to maintain an Action *But if* he in *Reversion had entred upon Tenant for Life, and Disseised* him, and after the Tenant for Life had *re-entered* upon him and died, he in Remainder might have had a Writ of Right against him who recovered; because the *Mise* was *joined upon the meer Right* of the Thing which was in Demand, which of them had meer Right, viz. the Demandant, or the Tenant, and not whether he has Right to the Possession upon that which was defeated by the Entry of the Tenant for Life; For if he could have gotten Possession to convey an Action unto him, altho' the Possession afterwards did fail him, yet in Trial his Right did not fail him; but it shall be found that his Right is *Eigne*, but a *Right without a Possession* gives no Action. But yet at Common Law, it was said, he was not without a Remedy before the Statute; because he might have had a *Formedon in Remainder*, tho' he never had any Possession by a Recovery in a Mortdancestor; and, it was said, that if Tenant for Life upon a Recovery had against him, had died before Execution, he in Remainder might fallify the Recovery in a Scire Facias. Hughes's Abr. 916. pl. 11. cites 12 E. 4. 21.—[But I do not find it there]

3. If

3. If *Tenant for Life*, where the *Remainder* was over *in Fee*, had ſuffered a Recovery, he in Remainder was without Remedy at Common Law. And the *Reaſon of the Strictneſs of the Common Law*, was to prevent multiplicity of Suits, Trials, Recoveries and Judgments, in one and the ſame Caſe. 6. Rep. 8. b. in a Nota of the Reporters.

(B) Falſifying. What Things may be Falſifyed; in what Caſes, and how.

1. *Præcipe quod Reddat againſt Two, who made Default*, and *at the Grand Cape they appeared and Waged their Law of Non Summons*, and at the Day *one came and the other not*; there if the *Demandant recovers the Moiety where the other is Tenant of the Whole and is Ouſted*, he ſhall have Aſſiſe; per Stone. Quære; For he mighthave taken the whole Tenancy abſque hoc that the other had any thing, and have Waged his Law, &c. Br. Aſſiſe, pl 470. cites 6 E. 3. and Fitzh. Saver Defalt, 67.

2. In Formedon the *Tenant vouched one, who came*, and joined Iſſue with the Demandant, and a *Venire Facias Iſſued*; and *before the Day of Return the Vouchee died*, and [ſo] did not come at the Day; by which *Petit Cape iſſued*, and ſo the *Demandant recovered by Default*; this Judgment may be reverſed by Action of *Diſceit*; per Cur. but *not by Aſſiſe*; and therefore ſee that the Judgment is voidable, but not void. Br. Aſſiſe, pl. 139. cites 8 Aſſ. 32.

So if the *Demandant in Præcipe quod reddat releaſes his Right meſne*

3. In Aſſiſe if a *Man recovers by Verdict*, and *before Judgment the Tenant gets a Releaſe of the Plaintiff*, he cannot plead it; but *if he be Ouſted*, he ſhall have Aſſiſe, per Tank, to which there was no Anſwer. Br. Aſſiſe, pl. 366. cites 43 Aſſ. 19.

between the Niſi prius and the Day in Bank, and recovers, and enters; the Tenant who loſt ſhall have *Aſſiſe* by the Releaſe, per Townſend. Br. Aſſiſe pl. 378. cites 5 H. 7. 40.——S. P. ibid. pl. 404. cites M 6. R. 2. and Fitzh. Aſſ. 70.———S. P. ibid. pl. 492.

4. If I Grant to you *Proximam Advocationem*, and after I *ſuffer the Advowſon to be recovered* againſt me *by Writ of Right of Advowſon*; you may in Qua. Imp. falſify this Recovery. And this was *at Common Law*, per Fitz. 26 H. 8. pl. 8.

5. *Ceſty que Uſe in Tail, before the Statute of Uſes*, ſuffered a Recovery againſt him upon a Feint Title and died, the Feoffees could not falſify it *in Aſſiſe by way of Entry*; but they ſhall have Writ of *Entry ad Terminum qui Præteriit*, or *Writ of Right*, and ſhall falſify it by this Action. Br. N. C. pl. 153 cites 30 H. 8. 147.

S. P. per Doderidge J. Cro. J. 466. S. C. Holford v. Platt.

6. In all Caſes where a Man ſhall *not have Error or Attaint*, he may falſify. Godb. 271. Hill. 15 Jac. B. R. adjudged, Plott's Caſe.

7. *Chirograph of a Fine* ſhall not be falſifyed by any Parol Evidence. Admitted. Arg. 10 Mod. 42. Mich. 10. Annæ. B. R. in Caſe of Ld Say and Seal.

8. *Nor* by the Date of the Concord; tho' that be matter of Record. 10 Mod. 43. 44. ut ſup.

9. Whenever a Recovery is falſifyed, it is by *Writ of Error*, or by *Pleading*; and in ſome ſpecial Caſes by *Motion*. Pig. of Recov. 166.

(B. 2) By Entry, &c.

1. CEſſavit is brought *againſt J. who aliened to S. pending the Writ*, and the *Demandant took the Rent and Homage of S. pending the Writ, and after had Judgment to Recover*; the beſt Opinion was, that the ſaid S. ſhall avoid the Recovery by this Acceptance; Quære, inaſmuch as it was not pleaded before Judgment, ſo that it is matter in Fact; but per Stone by this Acceptance the Writ was abated, and the Action extinct. Br. Acceptance, pl. 3. cites 21 E. 3. 18. 19.

2. Where the *Demandant* in Præcipe quod Reddat *enters upon the Tenant pending the Writ*, and the *Tenant loſes* the Land *by Default after Appearance* by Petit Cape, upon which he cannot Aver this Entry by way of Plea before his Default ſaved; by which Seiſin of the Land is adjudged, and a *Proteſtation is entered of this Entry made by the Demandant to ſave the Aſſiſe* of the Plaintiff; and ſo ſee that of this Entry he ſhall have Aſſiſe againſt him, who hath recovered the Land againſt him by Judgment after the Entry, per Cur. Br. Aſſiſe, pl. 17. cites 40 E. 3. 42.

3 In Scire Facias. A. brought *Præcipe quod Reddat againſt B.* and *pending the Writ J. N. entered*, and *A. recovered and brought Scire Facias againſt him, who entered to execute the Recovery*, and the *Tenant pleaded, that he was ſeiſed till by the ſaid B. diſſeiſed, againſt whom the ſaid A. brought the Præcipe, pending which Writ the now Tenant entered*; and by the Opinion of the Court 'tis no Plea; For he *ought to allege elder Title, or that there is Covin between the Demandant in the Præcipe and the Tenant*, quod nota. Br. Fauxif. de Recov. pl. 2. cites 3 H. 6. 34. Br. Brief. pl. 9. cites S. C.

4. *Wherefore* the Tenant alleged, that before B. had any thing J. S. was ſeiſed in Fee, and enfeoffed him, by which he was ſeiſed, till by the ſaid B. diſſeiſed by Covin, againſt whom the ſaid A. brought the Præcipe, and pending the Writ he entered, and after he omitted the Covin and pleaded ut ſupra; and ſo 'tis admitted there, that *elder Title of Entry, than the Tenant has upon whom he enters, ſuffices, tho' it be not elder than the Title of the Demandant in the Præcipe quod Reddat*; For there 'tis agreed that ſuch Entry *ſhall abate the Writ.* Ibid. Br. Brief. pl. 9. cites S. C.

5. *So* if the *Lord enters upon his Villain, or* the *Mortgagee upon the Mortgagor pending the Writ.* Ibid.

6. *Contra, if a Man Diſſeiſes the Tenant pending the Writ*, this ſhall not abate the Writ, and therefore this is no Cauſe to fallify; and per Marten there the Matter ſupra is good, but yet this *is no Plea in Scire Facias*, which is founded upon a Recovery; *But* the Demandant ſhall have Execution, and the other *ſhall be put to an Aſſiſe, and falſify there, viz. by way of Action, and* by an Original, and *not in Writ judicial* by way of defeating Quære inde; For concord. 7 H. 4. Ibid.

7. In *Præcipe quod Reddat; where Formedon* is brought *againſt C.* and *I enter pending the Writ*, and the *Demandant recovers after*; there the Recovery ſhall bind us both; contrary if I had Title before the Writ of Formedon; and therefore 'tis uſual to bring the Writ againſt the Mortgagor and the Mortgagee, the Lord and the Villein; For a *lawful Entry, pending the Writ, ſhall abate the Writ.* In theſe Caſes, and ſeveral others, the lawful Entry *of a Stranger* ſhall abate the Writ, quod nota, and by ſuch Entries the Party, who entred lawfully, ſhall falſify the Recovery, per Markeham. Br. Entre congeable, pl. 34. cites 21 H. 6. 17. Br. Brief. pl. 182. cites S. C. —— Br. Judgm pl. 31. cites S. C.

8. If *Tenant for Life* be *impleaded, and prays in aid of a Stranger*, he in Reverſion may enter; *but if he does not enter, till the other has recovered*, then he cannot enter, but is put to his Writ of Entry *ad terminum qui præterit*, or Entry at Common Law, and ſhall falſify the Recovery there. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 87. cites 24 H. 8.

[See Error (B)—Remitter (G. 2)]

(B. 3) In what Caſes. In reſpect of the Place where.

1. IN Scire Facias *againſt the Heir upon a Recovery in Aſſiſe by Default* againſt his Father, he *ſaid, his Father had nothing the Day of the Writ* of Aſſiſe, *nor at any time pending the Aſſiſe, but J. N. who was ſeiſed in Fee, whoſe Eſtate he has, Judgment*, &c. and by all the Juſtices he ſhall have the Plea, becauſe he claims by a Stranger and not by his Father; and per Choke the Father himſelf ſhall have this Plea in Scire Facias upon a Recovery by Default, quod quære. Br. Conſeſs and Avoid, pl. 6. cites 33 H. 6. 21.—And ſee 33 H. 6. Fitzh. 20. it is agreed there alſo, that Recovery by Default may be avoided as above. Ibid.

2. Aſſiſe was brought in Suſſex by B. and E. his Wife againſt J. F. and 'twas adjorned into the Exchequer Chamber, and the Plaint was of 8 Acres of Land, the *Tenant pleaded* in Bar *that a Stranger was ſeiſed and enfeoff'd him* and gave *Colour*, &c. the *Plaintiff ſaid that, at another time the Feme brought* Writ of *Dower againſt a Stranger*, and demanded her reaſonable Dower of the Franktenement which was J. F's late her Husband in 3 Vills, *and the Writ was ſerved, and the Tenant made Default, and the Demandant made her Demand of the third Part of the Manor of D. and S. of which Manor of S. this Land in the Plaint is Parcel*, upon which, Grand Cape iſſued returnable, &c. *and the Plaintiff recovered by Default and had Execution and this Land* (inter alia) *put in Execution, by which he was ſeiſed till by the Tenant diſſeiſed*; to which the *Tenant ſaid that* 4 *Acres* of the Land Parcel of the ſaid Manor of S. *are in* W. which is one of the *Cinque Ports* where the King's Writ runs not, and ſo the Recovery falſe and faint in Law, and demanded Judgment, and the Plaintiff demurred. per Forteſcue Ch. J. if the Recovery was void of the Land in the Cinque Ports, yet it is good as to this, which is now put in View; by which he awarded the Aſſize, quod nota; and quere, if this was becauſe the *Plaintiff did not make Title*, or becauſe the Recovery is good of Land in the Cinque Ports, if *Exception* be *not taken*; it ſeems to be for both Points, and ſo it ſeems the Recovery good; but ſee * that (it may be conſiſtent or) ſtand together, becauſe all was not in the Cinque Ports, nor does it appear, what part was in the Cinque Ports. Br. Fauxif. de Recov. pl. 15. cites 36 H. 6. 32.

* Orig. Que poit eſtoier ove.

3. A Recovery *of Land in the County of E. which lies in the County of H.* is void. Ibid.

4. *So* of a Recovery *of Land in Ancient Demeſne which lies not in the Manor* of Ancient Demeſne; For this is *coram non judice*. Ibid.

5. *But* a Recovery *in Formedon in B. R.* or a *Fine* levied there, is good enough, per Forteſcue Ch. J. Ibid.

But ſee Fines (C. 2)

(B. 4) How. By Plea.

1. A Man ſhall not avoid a *Judgment given againſt his Anceſtor in an Action real paſſed by Trial in Jury*, by ſaying that his Anceſtor had nothing in the Land at the time, &c. *Contra of a Recovery by Default*, there he may ſay, that his Anceſtor had nothing at the time &c. but J. D. whoſe Eſtate he has; by all in the Exchequer Chamber. Br. Judgment, pl. 95. 5. cites 33 H. 6. 17.

2. *And* 'twas ſaid there that he, who *pleads a Recovery by Default, ought to aver the Tenant to be Tenant of the Land at the time*, &c. *Contra*, where he pleads recovery *in Action tried*, by all in the Exchequer Chamber. Br.

Judgment

Judgment, pl. 95. cites 33 H. 6. 19. ——— *So* of a *Recovery in Aſſiſe againſt my Anceſtor*. The ſame Year, Fo. 19. in Scire Facias, per Judicium Cur. ibid.

3. In *Scire Facias upon Recovery* of *Land againſt A.* the *Tenant ſaid, that A. was not Tenant of the Frank-tenement the Day of the Writ purchaſed, nor ever after, but B. was Tenant whoſe Eſtate he has*, and a good Avoidance of the Recovery. Br. Conſeſs and Avoid, pl. 49. cites 14 E. 4. 2.

4. If Judgment be given *in the Marſhalſey between two, who are not of the King's Houſehold*, it is void and Coram Non Judice, and the Defendant may avoid it by Plea, or have Writ of Error. Br. Judgment, pl. 123. cites 20 E. 4. 15.

See (G. 2)—Error (A).

(C) Falſifying Recovery. In what Caſes. In the Point tryed.

1. IN Annuity. per Forteſcue where a Man hath *Iſſue a Son by one Venter and a Daughter by another*, and the Land is *entailed to him and his ſecond Iſſue*, and he loſes by falſe Verdict, and dies; *the Attaint is given to the Son*; and therefore the *Daughter may falſify the Recovery in* the ſame Point, that was tried. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 12. cites 22 H. 6. 28. ——Quære; For Tempore H. 8. 'twas held, that the Attaint goes with the Land, as a Writ of Error ſhall go, and that the Daughter ſhall have Attaint, and ſhall not falſify. Ibid. pl. 50.

He who cannot Attaint, may falſify in the Point try'd. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 20. cites 10 E. 4. 16. —Ibid. pl. 30. S. P. cites 12 E. 4. 14 & 19.

2. *So* where a Man *ſeiſed in Borough Engliſh hath two Sons*, and loſes by falſe Oath, and dies; the Attaint is given to the eldeſt Son, and therefore the youngeſt ſhall falſify in the Point tried, quod Yelverton omnino negavit. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 12. cites 22 H. 6. 28.

3. If a Recovery be had againſt Tenant in Tail, and the Title is *Tried* againſt him (ſcilicet) quod *Non dedit*, &c. the Iſſue has no Remedy but by Attaint; For he ſhall not falſify in this Point; but if the *Verdict be upon other ſpecial Matter*, and *not upon the Title*, *or* if it was a Recovery *by Default*; in theſe Caſes, the *Heir in Tail* may falſify the Recovery. Br. Faux. Recov. pl 4. cites 34 H. 6. 2.

4. *So* the *Succeſſor of a Parſon* ſhall falſify upon a Recovery *by Default*, in like Caſes, where the Title was not Tried. Ibid.

5. *So* upon a Recovery by Default *againſt Tenant for Life* who dies, *He in Reverſion* may falſify; and ſo it ſeems here, that a Man ſhall not falſify in a Point once tried. Per Priſot and Moyle. Ibid.

6. A *Feme* may falſify *in Dower*, where a Recovery is pleaded againſt her Baron by Action tried, viz. *in another Point* which was not tried; but not in the ſame Point which was tried. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 7. cites Trin. 36 H. 6. in Fitzh. Tit. Faux, &c. 27. per Forteſcue.

7. If Tenant in Tail makes *manumiſſion to his Villein whom he has in Tail*, and after the *Villein brings Action* againſt him, and the *Tenant in Tail pleads Villeinage* againſt him, and *he ſays, that Frank*, &c. and ſo to *Iſſue*, which *is found againſt the Tenant in Tail*, who has Iſſue and dies; if the *Villein brings Action againſt the Iſſue*, and *he pleads Villeinage* in the ſaid Villein, and *the other Eſtops him by the Trial againſt his Father*, there, per Littleton Juſtice, the Iſſue in Tail ought to plead the Matter, and confeſs and avoid the Trial and Record; becauſe his Anceſtor had made to him Manumiſſion. Br. Conſeſs and Avoid, pl. 49. cites 13 E. 4. 2.

Br. Eſtoppel, pl. 168. cites S. C.

8. Where Trial of Frank paſſes againſt the *Anceſtor* in Tail, who *Alleges the Villein to be regardant*, the Heir in Tail ſhall not by this be Eſtopped

Ibid.

Eſtopped to alledge that he is, and *was Villein in Groſs* to him and to his Father, &c. by the beſt Opinion. Ibid.

9. A *Termor*, who is received upon a Recovery given againſt his Leſſor, may falſify in the Point of the Writ and traverſe it; For otherwiſe the *Covin* will not aid the Termor, if it be *upon a true Title*; quod nota bene, per Pollard and Fitzherbert. Br. Faux Recov. pl. 48. cites 14 H. 8. 4.

A Recovery is not ſo ſacred but that it may be falſified as well *in Point of Recovery, for the Thing*, cites S. C.

10. Where it is ſaid in the Books, that *Privies* ſhall not falſify *in the ſame Point tryed*; the meaning is, that they ſhall not falſify in *Scire Facias upon the ſame Judgment*, or in any other *Writ of the ſame Nature*; but he may bring Action of a higher Nature, and ſo try the Matter again. 6 Rep. 8. 40 and 41 Eliz. in * Ferrer's Caſe.

as alſo betwixt the ſame Parties, per Doderidge J. Cro. J. 466.——* Pig. of Recov. 160.

11. There is a *Difference* where the *Parties* have *not the abſolute Fee* in them, as *Parſons*, *Prebendaries*, &c. there the Succeſſor is not bound, but in Action of the ſame Nature he may falſify, or have Juris Utrum; but where, by the Common Law, they have the mere Right, as Biſhop, &c. there they can't falſify. Pig. of Recov. 160. cites 6 Rep. 8. a.

[See (G. 2) (H)]

(D.) Falſifying Recoveries by Termors.

In the Eye of the Law *any Eſtate for Life*, being an Eſtate of Freehold, againſt whom a Precipe quod reddat doth lie, *is* an higher and *greater* Eſtate *than a Leaſe for Years*, tho' it be *for a Thouſand or more*, *which* never are without Suſpicion of Fraud, and they were the leſs valuable, for that at the Common Law they *were* ſubject unto, and * *under the Power of the Tenant of the Freehold*; the Learning whereof ſtandeth thus, and it is worthy to be known. When Littleton wrote, if a Man had made a Leaſe for Years by Writing, and he that had the Freehold had ſuffered himſelf to be *impleaded in a real Action by Colluſion, to bar the Leſſee* of his Term, and made Default, &c. the Statute of Glouc. gave the Leſſee for Years ſome Remedy by way of Receipt, and a Trial, whether the Demandant did move the Plea by good Right or Colluſion: and if it were found by Colluſion, then the Termer ſhould enjoy his Term, and the Execution of the Judgment ſhould ſtay till after the Term ended. But this Statute *extendeth not* to five Caſes. 1ſt If the Leaſe was * *without Writing*, for the Words of this Act are, (ſo that the Termor may have Recovery by Writ of Covenant) 2d. It extendeth only to a Recovery *by Default*. 3d. The Termor could not be relieved by this Statute, unleſs he *knew of the Recovery, and was received*. 4th. By the better Opinion of Books, it extendeth not to † *Tenants by Statute* Merchant, Statute Staple or elegit. 5th. Not to *Guardian*. But now the Statute of 21 *H.* 8. *doth give Remedy in all the ſaid Caſes, ſaving in the Caſe of the Guardian*, and giveth them Power to falſify all Manner of Recoveries had againſt the Tenants of the Freehold upon feigned and untrue Titles, &c. Co. Litt: 46. a

1. 6 *E.* 1. 11. *When a Man leaſes his Tenement in* London, *and he in Reverſion or Remainder cauſes himſelf to be impleaded by Colluſion, and to make the Termor loſe his Term, loſes by Default, or gives it up; in this Caſe the Mayor and Bailiffs may inquire by Inqueſt, whether ſuch Plea was moved upon good Right, or by Covin; and if it be found that it was upon good Right, Judgment ſhall be forthwith given; but if it be found by Fraud, to cauſe the Termor to loſe his Term, the Termor ſhall enjoy his Term, and the Execution of the Judgment for the Demandant ſhall be ſuſpended until the Term be expired: In like Manner ſhall it be of Inquiry before the Juſtices, if the Termor challenge it before the Judgment.*

* 6 Rep. 57. Brediman's Caſe.——9 Rep. 135. in Aſcough's Caſe ——Per Doderidge J. 2 Rolls R. 222.——Per Holt Ch. J. 7 Mod 42.—— * Pig. of Recov. 51. † Pig of Recov. 51. Br. Aſſiſe pl. 367.

This *Statute* which enacts that a Termor may be received to falſify, ‡ *requires a Deed, and that* the *Termor ſhould ſhew it before Judgment*, &c. as above; and *extends only* to the *Confeſſion* of the Tenant, *and to* his *Default after Default*: It does *not* extend *to feint Pleadings*; *nor* where Judgment is given upon the *Default of the Vouchee*; For the Stat goes only to the Default of the Tenant. It *aids* the *Tenant by Statute and* Tenant by *Elegit* The Termor and Tenant by Statute and Elegit after Judgment againſt the Tenant may falſify a Recovery had againſt any of them, by the Stat. of 21 H. 8. c 15. The Stat. of Glouceſter is uſed at this Day for a Termor: If he has a Deed, and comes before Judgment, he may

may be received to maintain his Leaſe upon Averment of Colluſion, and offering to maintain the Leaſe of the Leſſor. Jenk. 200. pl. 19.

By this Statute Leſſee for Years in London, may falſify a common Recovery; whereby the Judgment is not to be ſtaid, but the Execution ſuſpended during the Term: And this is done by a *Writ De Inquirendo ſuper Stat. Glouc.* and *try'd in the Huſtings.* Pig. of Recov. 51.

2. A. *Quare impedit* is brought againſt the Patron and Incumbent to preſent to a Rectory, of which the *Incumbent has made a Leaſe for Years* to B. by Deed. The *Patron* of the Incumbent *confeſſes the Action:* The Leſſee for Years is not relievable, altho' he come before Judgment, and ſhews his Leaſe, and ſhews Title of his Leſſor, and the Fraud and Colluſion; For a Parſon incumbent may, when he will reſign, his Rectory, and avoid his Leaſe; and the Abſence of a Parſon for the Space of 80 Days in a Year ſhall avoid the ſaid Leaſe; alſo, if he will ſuffer a Judgment and Recovery of it againſt him, ſuch Recovery ſhall avoid the ſaid Leaſe. The *Statute of Glouceſter* is to be underſtood of Leaſes made by ſuch Leſſors, as could not defeat ſuch Leaſes by their own Acts. Jenk. 200. pl. 19. cites 26. H. 8. * 23.

But per Fitzherbert. If one grants *Proximam Præſentationem*, and after ſuffers the Advowſon to be recovered againſt him by Writ of Right of Advowſon; there the Grantee ſhall have Quare impedit, and falſify the Recovery at Common Law, who is not in effect but Termor. Br. Fauxif. de Recov. pl. 1. cites 26. H. 8. 2. ——— * It ſhou'd be 2. pl. 3.

3. A Woman brought *Dower againſt her two Daughters and* another, and in Truth the third was but *a Termor*, and the Wife had *no Cauſe of Dower*; but this was only to make the Termor to loſe his Term; for they *all made Default at the Grand Cape*, and now *the Termor prayed to be received*, and ſhewed Cauſe that the Husband made a Leaſe for Years, and after the *Leſſee levied a Fine to the Leſſor, and they* granted and *rendered back again to the Leſſee for the ſame Years, rendering the ſame Rent*; it was argued that the Statute of Glouceſter is, that if the Farmer *have, &c.* that is, if *he may have Covenant* as in the 19 E. 3. and here he may have Covenant, and prayed to be received, and ſhewed his Plea. Anderſon Ch. J. held that a Tenant may falſify by the Common Law. And it being inſiſted, that the Leaſe is after the Title of the Dower, Peryam J. ſaid, that altho' it be after, yet if he have *Matter which goeth in the Deſtruction of the Dower*, he ſhall falſify well enough, as if ſhe have Title of Dower and five Years paſs after the Fine levied. And Anderſon and Peryam ſaid that the Statute of Glouceſter was made, that a Termor ſhould not be put out of Poſſeſſion, but here the Termor is named; Ideo quære; and after, at another Day, Shuttleworth moved it again, and ſaid the Termor ſhall *not be received, becauſe he is named in the Writ*, and the Court was of the ſame Opinion then; but they ſaid that he might *plead ſpecial Non Tenure.* Goldſ. 87. pl. 12. Paſch. 13. Eliz.

4. M. and his Wife brought *Dower* againſt E. *To parcel*, he *pleads Non Tenure, and* to the other Parcel, *Ne unque Seiſie que Dower*, which goes to the *Trial*; and there the *Tenant makes Default*, and upon that a *Petit Cape* is awarded, and now, *at a Day in Bank, one Lumbard prays to be received* upon the Statute of Glouceſter, to ſave his Term, &c. but Hendon alledged to the contrary. 1. That Statute is not to this Purpoſe in Force. By the Common Law Tenant for Years cannot falſify. 6 Rep. **Periam's Caſe.** Then, becauſe it was hard, that a Recovery ſhould be had by Covin, and the Leſſee for Years without Remedy for his Term the *Statute of Glouceſter* was made, which *gives a Reſceipt for the Leſſee for Years*; after the Statute 21 *H.* 8. was made, which *gives the Leſſee Power to falſify.* The common Experience of the Court is, that if an *habere Facias Seiſinam* iſſue, there is not any ſaving of the Term of Leſſee for Years. Hill. 39 Eliz. in **Weſt's Caſe**, a Reſceipt was moved and denied. For if the Leſſee had a good Term, he might have Treſpaſs for Entry upon him; tho' Littleton ſays in his Chapter of Tenant for Years, that he ſhall be received. Hutton ſaid, the Statute of *Glouceſter aids them only, who knew and had Notice of the Recovery; but* 21 *H.* 8. *aids them who had not Notice of*

it. And it is better to prevent Miſchief, than to remedy it after, and as to that a final Bar; that he was of Counſel in ſome Caſes, where the Leſſee was received. And if the Leaſe be not good, the Leſſor may avoid it by Plea Seil. Traverſe, or Demurrer: And he remembered the Iſſue taken upon the Term, and found againſt the Termor, in the Caſe of **Fulham** v. **Serjeant Harris**. Sed adjournatur. Hetl. 144. Trin. 5 Car. C. B. Moor v. Everay.

5. *Aſſiſe* is brought *againſt the Tenant of the Franktenement and the Termor*, who pleads and loſes; but the Termor is acquitted of the Diſſeiſin. The Termor is without Remedy to have *Attaint*; for he loſt nothing, neither the Franktenement nor Damages; nevertheleſs ſome hold contrary, and Adjournatur, quære if he ſhall not falſify. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 41. cites 43. Aſſ. p. 41.

6. Note by all the Juſtices that, of Error in a Recovery, *none* ſhall have Advantage *but the Party or his Heirs*; for a *Stranger ſhall not falſify for Error, nor by Dilatories*, but by that which diſproves the Cauſe of Action. Br. Error pl. 89. cites 9 E. 4. 13.

7. *Tenant by Elegit* or Termor ſhall not falſify a Recovery of the *Franktenement* by the common Law; for they *cannot have the Thing that is recovered*; for the Recovery is of the Franktenement and the Term is only a Chattle, per Danby contra Litt. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 14. cites 9 E. 4. 38.

8. Where Termor, Recognizor, &c. are *received in Default of the Tenant of the Franktenement*, there the *Demandant ſhall have Judgment* againſt the Tenant of the Franktenement, *with a Ceſſet Executio during the Leaſe or Extent.* Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 25. cites 7 H. 7. 10. per Mordant.

The *Reaſon why a Term for Years* was *eſteemed* in Law to be *a leſs Eſtate than a Freehold for Life* is this.

9. 21. *H.* 8. 15. *Enacts that a Termor for Years may falſify a feigned Recovery had againſt them in Reverſion, and ſhall retain and enjoy his Term againſt his Recoverer, his Heirs, and Aſſigns according to his Leaſe.*

In former Days all Action were real, and Lands being leaſed for long Terms, and Fines taken for ſuch Leaſes; it was uſual for the Leſſors, or their Heirs to ſuffer common Recoveries, and by that Means the Leſſees were evicted; becauſe they could not *falſify* thoſe *Recoveries, till* enabled by *this Act.* But in thoſe Days, the Terms for Years were uſually granted for a ſhort Time; For no body would take long Terms, becauſe the Tenant of the Freehold could deſtroy them, ad Libitum, by ſuffering a Common Recovery, as aforeſaid: Therefore thoſe Eſtates for Years were accounted the leaſt, and next to Eſtates at Will. per Cur. Mich. 11 Geo. 9. Mod. 102. in Caſe of Theobald v. Duffoy.

The former Act of 6 E. 1. 11. extended only to London; but this Act extends to all Leaſes out of London; and by this Statute the Leſſee ſhall be received to falſify the Recovery before Judgment, and it ſhall ſuſpend the Execution; but then he muſt not only aver the Colluſion, but plead ſome Bar to the Plaintiff's Title; and this Statute extends to all thoſe Caſes where the Vouchee or Tenant lets Judgment go by Default. Pig. of Recov. 51.

13. Rep. 6. per Cur. Mich. 6. Jac. C. B. in Porter and Rotheſter's Caſe. S.P.

10. Where the 21 *H.* 8. 15. *in the Preamble, ſpeaks of Leaſes made for great Fines for the Incomes*, and the Proviſo is, That all *ſuch Termors* ſhall or may falſify: It has always been taken that the Statute extends to Leaſes either for a ſmall Fine or for no Fine. 11 Rep. 33. b. Trin. 12. Jac. B. R. in Poulter's Caſe.

Roll. R. 443. S.C. gives the Reaſons of the Judgment. 1. Becauſe the Stat. 21 *H.* 8. 15. extends to Recoveries by Covin; For the Preamble is of *Recoveries by Conſent*, which this is

11. *Tenant in Tail* acknowledged a *Recognizance* of 100l. and dies. A *Scire Facias was* brought *againſt the Iſſue* in Tail, *who hanging this Scire Facias, made a Leaſe for Years* of the Land in Queſtion to the Defendant, and pleads to the Scire Facias, that he had *Riens per Diſcent* of Fee ſimple from his Father, and that he was not the Tenant of the Land, all which was *found againſt him*, that he was Tenant of the Freehold, and that he had Land by Diſcent from him in Fee ſimple, all which was put in Iſſue, and hanging this, he made the Leaſe to the Defendant. Judgment was given againſt the Iſſue in Tail, that the Land ſhould be liable to this Recognizance; the *Leaſe was made before Judgment* to the Defendant; the Defendant being the Leſſee, pleads all this Matter, and in the ſpecial Verdict this is all found: The Plaintiff's

tiff's Title was under this Recognizance, and the Judgment given againſt the Iſſue in Tail: The Defendant's Title under this Leaſe for Years made unto him by the Iſſue in Tail. The whole Court was clear of Opinion, becauſe this was *after Verdict*, the Leſſee here ſhall not be received to falſify for his Term. Afterwards, at another Time, it was clearly agreed by the whole Court, that the Leſſee for Years ſhall not falſify, and ſo the ſame was pronounced by Montague Ch. J. and accordingly by the Rule of the Court Judgment was given for the Plaintiff. 3 Buls. 245. Mich. 14. Jac. Crawley v. Marrow.

not. 2. Becauſe the Stat. is *that he ſhall avoid it in the ſame Manner as the Tenant of the Freehold ſhould avoid it.* For this was made for the Debility of his Eſtate; But in the principal Caſe, the Leſſee Pendente lite could not avoid it, nor the Leſſor himſelf, and ſo the Tenant of the Franktenement could not avoid it, and therefore neither could the Leſſee.———Bridgm. 64. S. C.

12. Tho' by the Statute H. 8. a Termor may falſify, yet *it muſt be the Termor himſelf, and not another for him.* 1 Salk. 291. Mich. 8. Annæ. in the Caſe of Lady Lindſey v. Ld Lindſey.

13. 34 *and* 35. *H.* 8 20. *Is that it ſhall not extend to prejudice the Leſſee or Leſſees, of any Tenant in Tail of any Lands, &c. whereof the* Reverſion or Remainder *at the Time of a Feigned Recovery had, ſhall be* in the King, *made in Writing indented of any Manors Lands, &c. for 21 Years or three Lives, or under, whereupon the accuſtomed Rent or Rents is, or ſhall be yearly reſerved during the ſame Term or Terms; but the ſame Leſſee or Leſſees ſhall enjoy his or their Term or Terms, according to the Stat. of* 32 *H.* 8. 28. *this Act notwithſtanding.*

14. In Replevin, the Caſe was, a *Diſſeiſor infeoffed a Stranger*, and after the *Diſſeiſee brought an Aſſiſe againſt the Diſſeiſor only*; and the *Feoffee, pending the Aſſiſe, let the Land to the Plaintiff.* The Diſſeiſor pleads to the Aſſiſe Nul Tort, nul Diſſeiſin, &c. and found againſt him; whereupon the Diſſeiſee recovered. The Queſtion was, if the Termor for Years ſhould falſify this Recovery; that is to ſay, that the Defendant in the Aſſiſe Ne Diſſeiſa pas. And it was agreed by the Court that he might; For the Termor here did *not claim by him againſt whom the Recovery was had*, and there is no Doubt that the Freehold, out of which the Term is derived, is not recovered, and the Freehold is not bound by it. And the Doubt at *Common Law* was, if the Termor might falſify, where the Recovery was againſt the Leſſor; but it was never doubted, but that, where a Recovery is *not againſt the Reverſioner but* againſt a *Stranger, who had nothing in* the Land, the Leſſee might falſify *in the Point tried.* and ſo is 1 H. 7. 19. Cro. E. 284. Trin. 34. Eliz. B. R Flower v. Rigden.

15. *And* it is a *Rule*, that *every Stranger* to a Recovery may falſify; for he *cannot have Error or Attaint*, if he *came not in pending the Writ by him againſt whom the Recovery was*, for then he is bound; and afterwards it was ſo adjudged, that he might Falſify in the Point tryed. Cro. E. 284. Flower v. Rigden.

16. *Tenant in Tail made a Feoffment* in Fee *to his own Son*, who was then of full Age, *and afterwards* he *diſſeiſed* him, and then levied a Fine; but *before the laſt Proclamation, the Son entered and made a Feoffment*; then all the Proclamations were made, and afterwards both the Father and the Son died; then the *Feoffee* of the Son *made a Leaſe to W. R.* and died ſeized, and the *Iſſue* of the Tenant in Tail *brought a Formedon* againſt the Heir of the ſaid Feoffee, who was in by Deſcent, and recovered againſt him by a *feint Defence of his Title*; and then he turned the Leſſee for Years out of Poſſeſſion, who thereupon brought an Ejectment: The Court thought that he might falſify the Recovery had by the Iſſue in Tail; becauſe the Court alſo thought, that the Eſtate Tail was bound by this Fine; but becauſe it appeared by the Pleading, that the *Fine was levied* by the Father *to that very Perſon, to whom the Feoffee* of the Son *had granted this Leaſe* for Years, and who was now Plaintiff, and it *not being averred*

Cro. E. 610. S. C. and P. as to the Fine, but Reports nothing as to the Leaſe. Nels. a. 831. pl. 7. cites S. C. and ſays it was adjudged, but that does not appear in the Book out of which he takes it.

averred to be levied to *any other Uſe*; therefore *his Leaſe was extinguiſhed*, and he was incapable to falſify the Recovery obtained by the Tenant in Tail. Mo. 391. Hill. 37. Eliz. B. R. King v. Hunt.

But by Bridgman Serjeant a *Tenant of a future Leaſe* muſt wait, till his Intereſt is turned into *Poſſeſſion*; for he cannot falſify without *Action*, and he cannot have Action till then.

17. A. *Tenant for Life, Remainder in Tail* to B. Remainder-man leaſes for Years, to begin after the Deceaſe of the Tenant for Life. A. ſuffers a Recovery with *Voucher of B.* and dies. The Leaſe is not deſtroyed, but Leſſee may falſify by common Law, and alſo by the Statutes. But if B. who had the Inheritance, had ſuffered a Common Recovery that ſhould have deſtroyed all the Remainders and Reverſions thereupon depending, and all the Eſtates derived out of ſuch Remainder; but Tenant for Life has no ſuch Power. And the *Recovery is had againſt Tenant for Life with Voucher of Tenant in Tail.* Mich. 41 and 42. Eliz. C. B. Cro. E. 718. Pledgard v. Lake.

Arg. 2 Roll. R. 406. in the Caſe of Aſcue v. Butts.

[See Recovery (C. a. 3)]

(D. 2) By Heir, Reverſioner, or Remainder-man; and How.

1. A Recovery had againſt Tenant for Life was falſified by the Reverſioner, becauſe the *Anceſtor of the Recoveror in the Scire Facias had Releaſed* his Right before the Execution of the Fine, which was pleaded in Bar *to J. S. then Tertenant*; and ſo the Execution falſe and feint in Law. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 21. cites 29 Aſſ. 1.

Br. N. C. pl. 56. S P. and that in caſe of Tenant for Life praying Aid of a Stranger, the Reverſioner may enter; becauſe *it is a Forfeiture*, cites 1 H. 7. 22. 10 H. 7. 20. per Keble. 25 H. S. 70.—Br. Entre Cong. pl. 115. cites 24 H. 8.

2. If a Man recovers againſt Tenant for Life, he in Reverſion ſhall not falſify *by Entry*; but *ſhall have Action of ad Terminum qui præteriit, or Writ of Right*, and ſhall falſify therein; *But* if Tenant for Life *praies Aid of a Stranger*, he in Reverſion *may enter before Judgment*, but after Judgment he is put to falſify. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 44. cites 24 H. 8.

32 H. 8. 31. extended not to Recoveries, where Tenant for Life came in as Vouchee, &c. and therefore that Act is * Repealed by this Act of Remainder.

3. 14 *Eliz.* 8. *Enacts that all Recoveries had or proſecuted (by Agreement of the Parties, or by Covin) againſt Tenants by the Curteſy, Tenants in Tail, after poſſibilty of Iſſue extinct, for term of Life, or Lives, or of Eſtates determinable upon Life or Lives, or any Lands, Tenements, or Hereditaments, whereof ſuch particular Tenant is ſo ſeiſed, or againſt any other, with Voucher over of any ſuch particular Tenant, or of any having Right or Title to any ſuch particular Eſtate, ſhall from henceforth (as againſt the Reverſioners, or them in Remainder, and againſt their Heirs and Succeſſors) be clearly void.*

14 Eliz. 8. and full Remedy provided for Preſervation of the Entry of them in Reverſion or Remainder. But this Statute *extends not* to any Recovery, unleſs it be by Agreement or Covin. Co Litt. 362. a.——* Bendl. 131, 132.

32 H. 8. 31. *Provided only for* the Preſervation of *Reverſion, or Remainder upon Eſtate for Life, &c. and not upon Eſtate Tail*; and ſo that by this Statute, no Proviſion was made for the Preſervation of the Reverſion, *or Remainder expectant upon Eſtate Tail.* 10 Rep. 44. b. 45. a. Trin. 38. Eliz. B. R. in Jenning's Caſe.

Where the Proviſo of this Act ſpeaks of an *Aſſent of Record* by him in Reverſion, or Remainder, it *is to be underſtood*, that ſuch an Aſſent muſt appear upon the ſame Record, either upon a *Voucher, aid Praier, Receit*, or the like; For it cannot appear of Record, unleſs it be done in Courſe of Law, and *not by any Extrajudicial Entry*, or by Memorandum. Co. Litt. 302.

4. *This Act ſhall not prejudice any Perſon, that ſhall by good Title recover any Lands &c. without Fraud, by Reaſon of any former Right or Title; alſo, every ſuch Recovery had by the Aſſent and Agreement of the Perſon in Reverſion or Remainder appearing of Record in any of the Queens Courts ſhall be good againſt the Party ſo aſſenting.*

[See Error (B)]

(E) Falſifying

(E) Falſifying Recoveries. By other Perſons than Termors. By Privies, or Strangers.

1. R *Everſhouer* falſified a Recovery had againſt Tenant for Life. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 21 cites 29 Aſſ. 1.———Even tho' the Tenant prayed in Aid of him and made Default. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 24. cites 4 H. 7. 2.

2. If *Præcipe quod Reddat* be brought *againſt Four*, and *Three confeſs the Action, or make Default*, and the *Fourth demands the* * *View*, and the *Demandant recovers* 3 *Parts*; there if the Fourth be Tenant of the Whole, and be ouſted by Judgment againſt the Three, he ſhall have Aſſiſe; For *he ſhall not be bound by Judgment againſt Strangers, where he himſelf is ſole Tenant*, per Skrene. Br. Aſſiſe, pl. 58. cites 12 H. 4. 19. and T. 4 H. 6. 26. accordingly. * *Orig.* Lieu.

3. A *Stranger* may falſify a Recovery *in the ſame Point tryed*, per optimam opinionem; and per Babington, he may do ſo *upon Plea in Bar*, but *not* upon Plea *to the Writ*. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 3. cites 9 H. 6. 41.

4. If a Man *purchaſes pending Writ*, and the Demandant proceeds, and recovers, the Purchaſor ſhall be bound as well as his Feoffor, and ſhall not falſify, tho' he be a *Stranger*. For he comes in by him, who is bound and under his Title. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 15. cites 36 H. 6. 32. per Wangford. He, that *comes in by him againſt whom* the Recovery is, ſhall not falſify. See Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 42. As if *A infeoffs B. to re-infeoff* A. and *B. ſuffers a falſe Recovery*; Now if *B. infeoffs J. A.* is bound; *but if A. enters upon B.* before Execution without taking Eſtate, he ſhall falſify —Br. Eſſoppel. pl. 90. cites 23 H. 6. as held ſo by all the Juſtices and Serjeants.

5. *In Aſſiſe*, a Recovery is pleaded againſt a Stranger, and the Poſſeſſion of the Plaintiff meſne between the Title and the Writ brought, there the Plaintiff may falſify the Recovery, as to *ſhew that the Tenant might have pleaded a Releaſe*, or that the Tenant *died pending the Writ*, or that the Tenant *had not any thing in the Land pending the Writ*; For theſe prove the Recovery void, or without Title; and therefore a Stranger may falſify, per Wangford and Forteſcue Ch. J. Br. Faux. de Recov. pl. 15. cites 36 H. 6. 32.

6. *So* where he *proves the Recovery void, or the Title Nul*, per Wangford and Forteſcue Ch. J. Ibid.

7. *But* where a Recovery is pleaded *againſt a Stranger, and the Title of the Plaintiff Meſne, &c.* he cannot falſify it *in Title*; For he is as well *eſtopped* as the Tenant himſelf. Ibid

8. *But* every Stranger may have Allegation to *prove the Title Nul, or the Recovery void.* Ibid.

9. *And* if *Præcipe quod Reddat* be brought *againſt him, who has nothing, and he appears, and pleads, and loſes*, he ſhall be eſtopped for ever; becauſe he was privy. Ibid.

10. *But his Heir* may have thereof Writ of Error, or ſhall ſave it by way of Anſwer; quære inde. Ibid.

11. He who *hath a Rent* out of Land may falſify a *Recovery of the Land*, as 'tis ſaid. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 14 cites 9 E. 4. 38.

12. If two *Coparceners make Partition*, and *one is impleaded and prays Aid* of the other, who is *Summoned, but does not come in*, and the other *deraigns the firſt Warranty paramount* as if they had joined, and ſo the other ſhall have Pro Rata, and [yet] the other ſhall never falſify the Recovery, per Keble. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 24. cites 4 H. 7. 2.

13. A. had Lands deſcended to him in *Ancient Demeſne* extended by *Statute Merchant*; B. purchaſed the Lands, and had a Recovery by Sufferance in the Court of Ancient Demeſne upon a Voucher, and ouſted A. then A. brought a Subpœna; and it was holden that A. could not falſify Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 25 S. C.

the Recovery, and therefore ſhould be *reſtored* to the Poſſeſſion *by the Chancery; for he had no Remedy by Law.* Where, notwithſtanding a double Judgment, yet the Judges directed them to the Chancery. Toth. 185. cites 7 H. 7. 10.

14 If a Man gives Land in Tail, Remainder over in Fee, and the *Tenant in Tail dies without Iſſue*, and a *Stranger intrudes*, and *Remainder-man in Fee brings Formedon* in Remainder, and *recovers by Default*, and after *makes Feoffment in Fee*; and afterwards the *Intruder brings Action of Diſceit and reverſes the Recovery*; in this Caſe he in Remainder ſhall never have any Remedy nor Action, but it ſhall go in Advantage of him who intruded. Br. Barre. pl. 76. cites 9 H. 7. 24.

15. 21 *H.* 8. 15. *Enacts, that no Statute of the Staple, Statute-Merchant, or Execution by* Elegit *ſhall be avoided by ſuch feigned Recovery, but ſuch Tenants ſhall alſo have like Remedy to falſify ſuch Recoveries as is here provided for the Leſſee for Years.*

16. Quære, if a Man *impleads the Feoffee upon Condition*, and the *Feoffor enters for the Condition broken*; it ſeems there that the Writ ſhall abate, therefore it is uſual to implead the Mortgagee and Mortgagor, and the Lord and the Villein; and ſo ſee that the Entry of a Stranger ſhall abate a Writ and avoid a Recovery. Br. Judgment, pl. 31.

17. *Debt* was brought *againſt J. S. as Executor, and* pending this Action, J. D. brought Debt againſt him *as Adminiſtrator*, for a true Debt, (whereas in truth he *was Executor)* J. S. confeſſed the latter Action, and pleads this Recovery in Bar of the firſt Action: And it was reſolved to be no good Plea; Firſt, becauſe the Recovery was had againſt him as Adminiſtrator, and ſo is void, altho' this had been only a Plea to the Writ; and a Stranger ſhall not falſify that which is only to the Writ; 2dly, he, that firſt ſueth, ſhall firſt be ſerved, and the Executor might have pleaded the firſt Action againſt him, that brought the ſecond. Trin. 27 Eliz. C. B. Cro. E. 41. Anon.

18. The Rule, that one *ſhall not falſify, where himſelf is Party*, has *three Exceptions.* 1ſt, If I can ſhew by way of Replication, that this Recovery is *void in Law*, I may falſify it in an Aſſiſe, as 36 H. 6. 32. 39 Aſſ. pl. 6. and 6 E. 3. 54. 2dly, If a Man recover againſt me certain *Tenements in B. and they lie in A.* and I bring an Aſſiſe of my Frankrenement in A. the Recovery in B. ſhall not Bar, 20 E. 2. Faux. Recovery 12. 3dly, Where the Recovery by Default was *upon a Writ abated*; as if an Aſſiſe were brought againſt my Father, and he died hanging the Iſſue, and Judgment is afterwards given againſt him; in this Caſe becauſe the Writ was abated *de facto*, I may falſify the Recovery per Doderidge J. Cro. J. 466. Hill. 15 Jac. B. R. in Caſe of Holford v. Platt.

19. An *Infant brought an Aſſiſe in B. R.* for Lands in Middleſex, depending which the *Tenant* in the ſame Aſſiſe *brought an Aſſiſe for the ſame Lands in C. B.* which laſt Writ bore Date, and was returnable after the firſt Writ; and the Demandant in the ſecond Writ *recovered againſt the Infant by Default* by the Aſſiſe, who *found the Seiſin and Deſſeiſin*; and upon a Plea in Bar of the firſt Aſſiſe of that Recovery, the Infant by way of Replication, ſet forth all the ſpecial Matter; and that the Demandant at the Time of the ſecond Writ brought, was Tenant of the Land; and prayed that he might falſify the Recovery; and it was adjudged that he might falſify the Recovery; For in all Caſes where a Man ſhall not have Error, nor Attaint he may falſify. But in this Caſe he could not have Error nor Attaint, becauſe the Judgment in C. B. was not given only upon the Default, but alſo upon the Verdict. And it ſhould be in vain for him to bring an Attaint, becauſe he ſhall not be admitted to give other Evidence than what was given at the firſt Trial; alſo he ſhall falſify the Recovery, becauſe it was a *Practice* to defeat and take away the Right of the Infant, and to leave him without any Remedy whatſoever. Hill. 15 Jac. in B. R. Godb. 271. Plot's Caſe.

(F) Falſifying

(F) Falſifying Recoveries. By other Perſons than Termors. In reſpect of Covin.

1. IN Aſſiſe the *Tenant pleaded a Recovery* by himſelf *in Formedon againſt N.* and the Eſtate of the Plaintiff meſne, the Plaintiff ſaid, that *pending the Aſſiſe againſt the Tenant*, and the ſame N. the *Tenant enfeoffed N.* and after *brought the Formedon* againſt him *by conſent* and Covin between them, and demanded Judgment; and a good Plea; and the Plaintiff recovered in Aſſiſe. And 'tis ſaid that if he was Tenant the Day of the Writ purchaſed, and the other had entred upon him of his Aſſent, and he had brought a Formedon and Recovered, that yet the Plaintiff ſhould recover by the Aſſiſe Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 17. cites 25 Aſſ. 1.

2. If *Feoffee upon Condition ſuffers one, who has good Right, to recover by a Falſe Writ*, as if he brings ad Terminum qui præteriit, as ſuppoſing the Leaſe made to A. where it was to E. and where his Entry was not lawful, Feoffor may Enter and falſify the Recovery. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 5. cites 44 E. 3. 8.

3. *So a Feme, who demands Dower*, may falſify ſuch Recovery; quod nota; For ſhe may ſay, quod non Dimiſit præfato A. Modo & Forma, &c. Ibid.

4. In *Formedon*, the *Tenant confeſſed the Action*; by which *Proclamation was made*, if any could ſay any thing why the Demandant ſhould not recover, and *a third Perſon came and alleged Covin* to toll him of his Entry, where he had infeoffed the Tenant upon Condition broken and the Tenant, [ſhewed Cauſe] &c. by which Judgment was ſtayed. Br. Judgm. pl. 18. cites 7. H. 4. 19.

5. In pleading Recovery to be *by Covin the Cauſe of Covin muſt be ſhewn*, per Cur. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 3. cites 9 H. 6. 41. See (G) S. P. Further v. Further.

6. Nota, 'twas ſaid for Law in Attaint, and not denied, that where *J. is diſſeiſed by W.* and a *Stranger recovers againſt him bona fide, or by Covin by Title*, which is *younger than the Title of J.* there J. may enter upon the Recoveror, and plead this Matter, and the Recovery itſelf, &c. and a good Plea. Br. Entre Congeable, pl. 4. cites 34 H 6. 44.

7. *Conuſee* of a Statute may falſify a Recovery had againſt the Conuſor; and it was agreed in a Manner by all, that if the Conuſee has no Remedy by the Common Law, then he ſhall be *reſtored by Equity*. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 25. cites 7 H 7. 10. See (D)—*Tenant by Statute Merchant, or his Grantee* of his Intereſt, may have Aſſiſe and falſify Recovery had by Covin againſt the Conuſor. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 48. cites 21 E. 3 1.———Ibid. pl. 57. cites 19 E. 3.

8. If one be ouſted by Covin, between the Demandant and him that ouſts the Tenant, and the Demandant brings an Aſſiſe againſt the Party that ouſted the Tenant; the Tenant may have an Aſſiſe; and on the ſpecial Matter ſhewed, ſhall avoid this Recovery. Pig. Recov. 156, 157.

[See Executor (P. a. 4)—Fraud.]

(F. 2) Falſifying Recoveries. Barred by Covin, notwithſtanding a true Title.

1. WHere a Man *pending an Aſſiſe* enfeoffs another, or *ſuffers* him to enter upon him by conſent, and *to recover by Formedon by an elder Gift*, this ſhall not hinder the *Plaintiff in Aſſiſe*, but that he *ſhall Recover*. Br. Colluſion, &c. pl. 28. cites 25 Aſſ. 1.

2. A Man *had Title of Action*, and *cauſed J. N. to enter, againſt whom he recovered*; there by this Covin the Tenant, who was ouſted may falſify the Recovery, notwithſtanding that the Title was true, and he ſhall not have Aſſiſe, and he, that recovered, ſhall not be by this remitted; quod nota

nota bene, where the *Demandant himſelf is privy to the Covin*; For otherwiſe, it ſeems that, the Covin is no Plea in another Caſe without *alledging cauſe of the Covin* in deſtruction of the Title of the Party. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 40. cites 41 Aſſ. 28

As where a Woman has *Title of Dower* and cauſes J. N. to enter, and to ſuffer her to recover againſt him, the Tenant who is ouſted thereby, ſhall have *Aſſiſe againſt her and J. N.* and ſhall falſify this Recovery by ſuch Covin, *tho' the Title be true.* Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 43. cites 44 Aſſ. 29.——5 Rep. 31. in Coulter's Caſe.—8 Rep. 132. b. 133. a. in Turnor's Caſe.—Pl. C. Arg. 51 cites Fitz. tit. Dower. pl. 42.—So ſee that a Man may falſify a Recovery, tho' it be *upon true Title by reaſon of the Covin.* Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 6.—S. P. Br. Judgmt. pl. 134. cites 25 Aſſ. 1. and 27 Aſſ. 74. and M. 39 E. 3. accordingly. *But* if a Man who has a *defeaſible Title, grants a Rent-charge*, and after is *impleaded by him, who has Title, and confeſſes the Action*, the Demandant ſhall recover, and he ſhall hold diſcharged, tho' the *Tenant agrees to the leſs of the Land*; For *in the firſt Caſe, the Poſſeſſion was altered by corrupt Means; contra in the other Caſe.*

3. It was held clearly by Parſhay, Tank, and Kirton, that if *one hath Action to certain Land*, and *by his Aſſent*, and Covin the *Tenant be Ouſted*, and *he, who has Action, brings his Action againſt the Diſſeiſor*, he, who was Ouſted, ſhall have Aſſiſe, and the Poſſeſſion of him, who recovered, ſhall be adjudged by Abatement againſt him, and not by Recovery; becauſe he was a Diſſeiſor, 44 E. 3. 46. pl. 63.——Br. Colluſion, pl. 10. cites S. C. ——ibid. pl. 31. cites S. C. and 41 Aſſ. 2.

4. In *Dower* the Tenant *ſaid, that he himſelf diſſeiſed J. N. who re-entered pending the Writ*, and prayed Judgment of the Writ; and a good Plea. The *Demandant ſaid that J. N. re-entered by Covin to abate the Writ*, and no Plea; For where his *Entry* is *lawful*, it *cannot be Covin.* But where a Man has Title of Formedon, or a Feme Title of Dower, and makes another to enter, againſt whom he or ſhe recovers, it may be avoided by Covin; For the Entry was a Wrong, and a Man may do a Wrong by Covin, but he cannot do a Right by Covin; quod nota, per Littleton and Cur. Br. Colluſion, &c. pl. 20. cites 15 E. 4. 4.

5. A Man *granted a Rentcharge*, or ſuch like, where a *Stranger who had good Title, brought a Writ againſt the Grantor*, and he *confeſſed the Action* to the intent to defeat the Rentcharge; there the Grantee hath no Remedy, nor he cannot falſify it by this Covin, becauſe the Title is true. *But* where a Man who has Title, *cauſes another to enter and after he brings an Action againſt him* and recovers, 'tis otherwiſe; nota the *Diverſity.* Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 46. cites 5 H. 7. 40.

6. Covin may be, where the Title is good, and the Title ſhall not give benefit to him, who has it, for cauſe of the Covin; For the *Mixture of good and ill together makes all ill, and the truth is obſcured by the Falſity, and the Virtue is merged in the Vice.* Per Mountague Ch. J. Mich. 4 E. 6. Pl. C. 54. b. in Caſe of Wimbiſh v. Talbois.

7. *As* where *G. T. ſeiſed in Tail to him, and the Heirs Male of his Body, diſcontinued*, and *retook to him and E. his Wife, and to the Heirs of their two Bodies*, and had *Iſſue T. and W.* and *died*, and *E.* his Wife *ſurvived*, and *T. had Iſſue E. and died* and after *W. by Covin of E.* his Mother *brought Formedon upon the firſt Tail againſt his Mother*, and ſhe appeared at the firſt Day, *and W. recovered per Nient dedire*, and *E.* the Daughter of T. the eldeſt Son and *Heir of G. entred by the Statute of* 11 *H.* 7. the Entry was adjudged lawfull by the ſame Statute, which ſays, that the Recovery is void, and *need not ſay that the Recovery was executed*; For ſince 'tis void it never ſhall be executed; and E. the Heir averr'd, that ſhe was the ſame Perſon, to whom the Reverſion belonged, and did not ſhew How ſhe was Heir to it, and yet well, per Molineux and Hales Juſtices, contrary Browne and Mountague Ch. J. of C. B. But all agreed that it was a Recovery by Covin, notwithſtanding that it was upon true Title and good, tho' that ſhe did *not ſhew cauſe of the Covin*, quod nota. Br. Entre Cong. pl. 140. cites 32 H. 8. and * Pl. C. fo. 42.——Br. Colluſion, pl. 47. cites Tempore H. 8. Wimbiſh v. Talbois.

*Wimbiſh v. Talbois.

(G) Falſifying

(G) Falſifying Recoveries for Dilatories.

1. WHERE a Baron loſes by Dilatory, which does not diſaffirm his Poſſeſſion, as *Nontenure*, *Miſnoſmer of the Vill*, &c. and dies; the Feme ſhall have Writ of *Dower*, and falſify the Recovery, per Wiche quod non Negatur. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 8. cites 50 E. 3. 9.

2. A Man ſhall not falſify in Dilatories, as in *Utlawry*, *Excommengement* in the Demandant, and the like; nor by *entry of the Demandant* into the Land *pending the Writ*, nor, becauſe the Land was in *ancient Demeſne*, and the like; For thoſe do not diſprove the Title of the Demandant. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 15. cites 36 H. 6. 32. per Forteſcue Ch. J.

3. An *Executor* ſhall not falſify for *variance between the Will and the Writ*, per Jenney. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 13. cites 9 E. 4. 12.

4. A *Stranger* ſhall not falſify a Recovery for a dilatory Matter. D. 67. pl. 16. Obiter. S. P. *as* to ſay *that a Feme Demandant took Baron pending the Writ*. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 15. cites 36 H. 6. 32. S. P. per Catesby. But he may in that which goes *in deſtruction of the Title, or Action*; For a Stranger ſhall not plead *Miſnoſmer* nor *Jointenancy*, but he may plead *Nontenure*. Becauſe in ſuch Caſe the Recovery is void where the Tenant had nothing, per Cateſby. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 13. cites 9 E. 4. 12.

Per Anderſon and Beaumont, a Stranger cannot falſifying a Recovery for *Jointenancy or Nontenancy*, or by ſuch Dilatories, but *for matter of Subſtance only*. Cro. E. 471. (bis) in Caſe of Further v. Further.—See S. C. at larg Inf.

A Stranger ſhall not falſify in a Thing which *proves the Writ abated*, as by the Death of any Party; but otherwiſe of a Thing which proves the Writ *abatable*, *as* if a Feme Plaintiff takes Baron pending the Writ, &c. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 13. cites 9 E. 4. 12. per Choke.———*But in Debt* upon an Obligation *againſt F. and 3 others*, *Adminiſtrators* of J. S. who *pleaded*, *that* one *J. D. had brought Debt* in B. R. upon an Obligation of 100 l. againſt one of the Adminiſtrators, *and recovered by Nihil Dicit*, and that they had Riens in ſes mains to ſatisfy over and above the ſaid Debt; and it was thereupon Demurred. Glanvill moved, that this was not any Plea, for in regard the *Defendant in the firſt Action might have abated the Bill by ſaying that he had Co-Adminiſtrators not named*, this recovery ſhall not bind any Stranger; this Recovery is alſo covenous being by Default, and in Proof thereof, See 9 Ed. 4. 12. But Anderſon and Beamond J. held, that it was a good Plea Prima Facie; For a Stranger cannot falſify a Recovery by reaſon of Jointenancy, or Nontenancy, or by ſuch Dilatories, but only for matter of Subſtance; and, if the Recovery be for a true Debt, it is not reaſon, but that the Adminiſtrator might ſuffer it to paſs by Default; and it is reaſon, it ſhould be allowed to all the others; and if there be any *Covin* it is to be averred by the Plaintiff; for Prima Facie, it ſhall not be ſo intended, but that it is true; and if there be any Covin in it, he may falſify it for that cauſe; and a Recovery againſt one Adminiſtrator ſhall bind him and all his Companions, and therefore it is reaſon it ſhould bind all Strangers; and of that Opinion Owen and Walmſley ſaid they were; but they would be adviſed, &c. Cro. E. 471 (bis) Hill. 38. Eliz. B. R. Further v. Further.—Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 34. cites 21 E. 4. 23.

(G. 2) By whom. For or againſt Succeſſor of Parſon.

1. *Compoſition* was made between an Abbot and Dean for Tenths to the Dean, and Annuity to the Abbot; and after the Abbot brought Writ of Annuity and Recovered; the Dean died, and the Abbot brought Scire Facias againſt the Succeſſor of the Dean, who pleaded that the Compoſition was *made by the Dean without the Chapter*, which cannot charge but for Term of Life; and a good Plea; and ſo ſhall falſify *by Plea*, per Finch, *becauſe he cannot have Writ of Right* in this Caſe; quære of the Falſifying; For Belknap held the Contrary. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 52. cites 39 E. 3. 17.

2. Judgment given againſt a *Parſon of a Church upon an Action tried* ſhall Bind the Succeſſor, tho' the Predeceſſor did not *pray Aid* before of the Patron and Ordinary; For the Succeſſor may have Writ of *Error*, *or Attaint*, and not falſify the Recovery. Br. Judgment, pl. 102. cites 8 H. 6. 25. per Strange.

See 6 Rep. 8. a. in Ferrer's Caſe.

3. A Man recovered *againſt a Parſon by Default* in *Ceſſavit* de Cantaria, the Parſon died, and the Plaintiff brought Scire Facias againſt his Succeſſor, who *prayed Aid of the Patron and Ordinary*, and they would not join; ſo the Defendant pleaded Non Ceſſavit; and per Cur. he ſhall not falſify in this manner, but ſhall be put to his *Juris Utrum*, quod nota. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 53. cites 10 H. 6. 5.

Br. Barre pl. 24. cites S. C.

4. *Parſon and Patron in Writ of Annuity* traverſe the Preſcription, which paſſed againſt them; the Succeſſor cannot traverſe this again, and falſify the firſt Verdict, inaſmuch as the *Jurors are all dead*; ſo that he cannot have Attaint; For it was the Folly of him, or his Predeceſſor to ſuffer the Time to expire. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 11. cites 19 H. 6. 39.

5. If an *Abbot* had *confeſs'd the Action in Aſſiſe* brought againſt him, the Succeſſor ſhould not falſify; and ſo it was of a *Fine* acknowledged by Abbot. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 28. cites 10 E. 4. 2.

See 6 Rep. 8. a. in Ferrer's Caſe.—— Annuity againſt a *Parſon*, who *prays Aid* of Patron and Ordinary, who make *Default*, and the Parſon *tries the Title, and loſes*; this binds the Succeſſor, and he ſhall not falſify the Recovery in the Point tried, tho' *all the Jury be dead, ſo that he can't have Attaint.* Pig. of Recov. 158, 159. cites 34 H. 6. 2. b. 10.——Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 4. cites S. C. per Priſot and Moile. [But I find no Notice in Brooke, or in the Year Book, as to the Jurors being all Dead.] But ſee ſup. pl. 4.

6. The Succeſſor of a *Vicar or Parſon* cannot falſify *in the ſame Point*, which was once *tried*; becauſe he may have Attaint; *but in a collateral Point* they may falſify; for they have not the Fee Simple, and therefore cannot have Writ of Right, but only Juris utrum; Contrary of an *Abbot*, who may have Writ of Right. But Succeſſor of a Parſon or Vicar may falſify *by Releaſe not pleaded, or* by *Condition broken not pleaded*; but he who cannot have Attaint, may falſify in the Point tried before. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 29. cites 12 E. 4. 16.

7. Patron and Parſon join in Annuity brought againſt them, and loſe. The Succeſſor ſhall falſify, *for that another was Parſon the Day of the Writ* purchaſed, and that he, againſt whom the Recovery was, was Not ſo then, vel unquam Poſtea, pending the Writ. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 33. cites 21 E. 4. 7.

Per Hawes, Davers, Townſend and Fairfax, the Succeſſor may falſify, and Huſſey and Brian the 2 Ch. Juſtices and the Ch. Baron e contra, quære. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 24. cites 4 H. 7. 2.

8. In *Annuity* by a Prior againſt a Parſon he counted by Preſcription, the *Parſon prayed Aid* of the *Patron and Ordinary*, who were *Summoned*, and made Default, and the *Parſon confeſſed the Action*; the Plaintiff recovered, the Parſon died; the Prior brought *Scire Facias againſt the Succeſſor*, who prayed Aid again, and they *appeared, and traverſed the Preſcription*; and therefore the Prior demurred; and by Award they ſhall not falſify, nor Traverſe contrary to the firſt Record, notwithſtanding that the Recovery was upon Confeſſion; becauſe the Aid was granted and they were ſummoned and came not. Br. Faux. de Recov. pl. 51. cites 12 H. 8. 7.

In Scire Facias againſt an *Abbot* on a Judgment in an Annuity had againſt his Predeceſſor, the Abbot pleads, that his Predeceſſor confeſſed the Judgment, when he had a Releaſe of the Annuity; and per Cur. he ſhall not thus avoid the Recovery; For *his Predeceſſor had the Fee Simple*, and not like a *Parſon* who *is Quodammodo Tenant for Life*, who ſhall avoid it, where it is *without Aid prayed* of Patron and Ordinary. Pig. of Recov: 158. cites 30 H. 6. 45, 46.

9. If a Biſhop or Parſon ceaſes, by which the *Lord brings Ceſſavit*, and recovers, it ſhall bind the Succeſſor. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 102. cites Doct. and Stud. lib. 2. fo. 123.

10. *So* of Alienation in Mortmain. Br. ibid.—But Brook ſays it ſeems not to be Law; For a Feme ſhall have Cui in vita of ſuch Alienation made by her Baron. Ibid.

[See (C)]

(H) By whom. Tenant in Tail.

1. IN Aſſiſe the Tenant pleaded a Recovery *by Default in a Writ of Entry Sur Diſſeiſin made to his Grandfather againſt L. Mother of the Plaintiff*, to which the Plaintiff *ſaid, that A. was ſeiſed in Fee, and gave to N. his Father and L. his Mother in Frankmarriage, and* N. died, and L. ſurvived, and died, and *we entered as Heir, Abſque hoc, that the Grandfather of the Tenant*, who was ſuppoſed to be diſſeiſed, had ever any thing, Priſt, &c. and ſo it ſeems that the Iſſue in Tail may falſify the Recovery; but it ſeems by this that he *cannot falſify it againſt him that is to execute the Recovery*; For the Iſſue was taken if the Recovery was *executed or not*. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 19. cites 28 Aſs. p. 32.

2. In Aſſiſe, the *Feme recovered in* a Writ of *Dower* againſt Tenant in Tail *by Nient dedire*, the Tenant died, his Iſſue entred, the *Feme brought Aſſiſe*, and made her Title by the Recovery; now the Iſſue in *Tail ſaid, that ne unques accouple* and ſo falſified the Recovery; quod mirum, *without* Action brought of Formedon to recover the Land. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 20. cites 28 Aſſ. p. 52.

3. If a Man recovers againſt Tenant in Tail by falſe Recovery, and *does not ſue Execution*, but dies, the Iſſue enters, the other ouſts him, the Iſſue ſhall have *Aſſiſe*, and if the other pleads the Recovery, the Iſſue ſhall falſify it with *Allegation of the continuance of the Poſſeſſion*, but if execution had been ſued it is otherwiſe; For then the Iſſue is put to a *Formedon*, and ſhall falſify in this. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 10. cites 7 H. 4. 17.

But if he dies after Judgment and before Execution, and the Demandant brings Scire Facias againſt the Heir; *he may falſify in the Scire Facias*. Br. Faux Recov. pl. 58. cites Litt. tit. Remitter.

4. *Formedon* is brought *againſt Tenant in Tail*, who pleaded that *Ne dona pas, where he had a Releaſe from the Demandant* to plead, or a *Deed of his Anceſtor with Warranty and Aſſets deſcended* in Fee; and 'tis *tried for the Demandant*, by which he recovered; the Tenant in Tail dies, his Iſſue brings Formedon; the Recoveror pleads the Recovery by Action tried; there the Iſſue in Tail may falſify by the matter ſupra, per Forteſcue, which Paſton and Aſcue Juſtices utterly denied; For he ſhall not falſify *in the ſame Point which was tried; becauſe he may have* * *Attaint*, nota. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 11. cites 19 H. 6. 39.

* S. P. *per Error* Br. Formedon pl. 35. cites S. C.

5. Tenant in Tail, *who is not the eldeſt Son*, as where he is Son by a ſecond Venter, ſhall falſify; becauſe he cannot have Attaint. Br. Attaint, pl. 124. cites 22 H. 6. 28. per Forteſcue.

6. If a Recovery be had againſt Tenant in Tail, and the Title is *tried* againſt him, viz. quod *Non Dedit*, &c. the Iſſue has no Remedy but by Attaint; For he ſhall not Falſify in this Point. But if the *Verdict be upon other ſpecial Matter*, and *not upon the Title*, or if it was a Recovery *by Default*, in theſe Caſes, the *Heir in Tail* may Falſify the Recovery. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 4. cites 34 H. 6. 2.

7. The Iſſue in Tail cannot falſify *in the ſame Point which was tried*; but *Reddition or Confeſſion* ſhall not bind the Iſſue in Tail from his falſifying; and *notwithſtanding Recovery in Value ſuppoſed*, yet the Heir ſhall falſify *in the Point, ſuppoſing that his Anceſtor was not Tenant at the Time, &c. and ſo the Recovery void*, per Choke J. and per Brian, ſuch Recovery ſhall not bind the Tail, but where the Tenant was ſeiſed by force of the Tail at the Time of the Recovery, &c. and when the Heir of the Donor is vouched. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 30. cites 12 E. 4. 14.

8. The Juſtices were of Opinion, that, if Iſſue paſſed by Jury againſt Tenant in Tail, and he *has Iſſue and dies, and all the petty Jury die*, yet the Iſſue in Tail ſhall not Falſify in this Point which was tryed. Quod nota. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 31. cites 13 E. 4. 3.

But if Treſpaſs be brought *againſt the Anceſtor in Tail and A. and B.* and it *paſſes againſt them*, if *Tenant in Tail dies*, and *A. and B. ſurvive*, the Heir in Tail ſhall not be eſtopped to falſify *in the ſame Point*, For the Attaint is given to the ſurvivor, Quere. Br. Eſtoppel, pl. 168. cites 13. E 4. 2 and 3.

3 Rep. 58. b. S. C. by Name of Lincoln Coll. Caſe—2 And. 31. S. C. by Name of Chamberlaine v. Lincoln College.—Mo. 255. S. C. by Name of Bricot v. Chamberlaine.

9. A. Tenant for Life, Remainder to B. in Tail. *A. leaſeth for Years*; a *Recovery is had againſt B.* living A. the Recoverors enter, and ouſt the Leſſee for Years; the Son and Heir of B. *Releaſeth with Warranty* to him to whom the Recoverors have aſſured the Lands; the *Leſſee enters*; B. *dieth*; the *Releaſor dieth*, &c. It was holden, that the Entry of the Leſſee before that the Warranty had attached upon the Poſſeſſion, which paſſed, had avoided the Warranty. And the Ld. Anderſon conceived, that the Recovery ſhould not prejudice the Iſſue in Tail, but that the Iſſue ſhould Falſify the ſame. Mich. 30 Eliz. C. B. 2 Le. 58. Ards v. Smith.

10. A Præcipe is brought againſt Tenant in Tail, who *prays in Aid of a Stranger as Tenant for Life*, who *enters into the Aid*, and bars the Demandant, and afterwards the Tenant in Tail dieth; his Iſſue is at large to claim the Eſtate Tail, altho' the Mouth of his Father was eſtopped as to it. 2 Le. 27. in Caſe of Ards v. Smith.

11. Tenant in Tail, brought a *Quod ei deforceat* and *counted upon an eſpecial Tail, whereas* in truth *it was a general* Tail, and recovered and died; the ſaid Recovery ſhall not conclude the Iſſue. 2 Le. 57. in Caſe of Ards v. Smith.——cites 33 H. 6. 18.

Lev. 41. S. C. Raym. 19. S. C.—8 Mod. 113. cites S. C.

12. *A. Tenant for Life*, Remainder *to B. his Son in Tail. A. entered into a Statute* and dies. The Conuſee ſued a *Scire facias againſt B.* The Sheriff returned *Scire feci*, &c. and thereupon Execution was had without any Plea pleaded by the Heir, and the Heir, being *ouſted by the Execution, brought Ejectment.* It was adjudged, that B. was bound, and that he had no Remedy by Ejectment, Error, Aud. Quer. or any Way, but againſt the Sheriff, in Caſe he made a falſe Return; But Windham J. thought B. the Heir might falſify this Recovery *in Action of a higher Nature*, but not in this Action of Ejectment, becauſe it is of a lower Nature, according to **Ferrer's Caſe**, 6 Rep. But Twiſden J. doubted if he could falſify in any Action, becauſe it is *no more than a Term.* Mich. 13 Car. 2. B R. Sid. 54, 55. Day v. Guildford.

[See Recovery Common. (C. a).]

(H. 2) By Infant or Feme Covert.

1. IF a Man *recovers againſt a Feme Covert without naming the Baron in the Writ*, the *Baron and Feme ſhall have Aſſiſe*, per Shard and Stouff. Br. Judgment. pl. 147. cites 12 E. 3. and Fitzh. Aſſiſe 147.

2. *But if it be not reformed in the Life of the Baron*, but he dies; there the Feme ſhall be barr'd by ſuch Recovery, and is put to her Writ of Right, per Shard and Stouff. Ibid.

3. Brook ſays the Caſe is briefly reported, but he believes that it is *intended of a Recovery by Action tried*; and by Appearance of the Party; For if it was *upon a Recovery by Default*, it ſeems to him that the *Feme ſhould have Writ of Error*; For *Infant ſhall have a Writ of Error* of a Recovery had by Default againſt him; and ſo 'twas uſed in the Time of H. 8. and Anno 2 M. 1. Ibid.

Br. Aſſiſe pl. 262. cites S. C.——Br. Judgment. pl. 68. cites S. C.

4. Aſſiſe by Infant; the Tenant *pleaded Recovery of the ſame Land in Aſſiſe againſt the ſame Plaintiff*; to which he *ſaid, that at the Time of the Recovery he was within Age, and the Aſſiſe was taken by Bailiff, and at the Time of the Recovery A. held it for Term of Life, the Reverſion to the now Plaintiff and his Siſter*; and the Opinion of the Court was that the Infant ſhall well have the Plea; quære cauſam, whether becauſe he was an Infant, or becauſe it was taken by Plea of the Bailiff, or becauſe the Infant was not Tenant; for it ſeems by 18 Aſſ. 16. that *Recovery upon Appearance*

cannot

cannot be confeſſed and avoided in Pleading, contrary of Recovery *by Default*; For there the Pleader ſhall aver that he was Tenant at the Time of the Recovery, to which the other ſhall have Anſwer. Br. Confeſs and avoid pl. 33. cites 26 Aſſ. 6.

(I) At what Time.

1. IN Aſſiſe, a Recovery is pleaded againſt the Plaintiff, and he hath *Cauſe to falſify* it, and does not, *but takes Iſſue upon another Point, which is againſt him*, and he is barr'd by Judgment; there if he brings another Action, and the Recovery is pleaded againſt him, he can't falſify it, becauſe the Judgment, ſtood in Force; and the Plaintiff might have taken this by Plea at firſt, quod Nota, by the Opinion of the whole Court. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 39. cites 40 Aſſ. 4.

2. *Debt* by a Prior; the Defendant pleaded the *Cuſtom of London* at large of *Foreign Attachment*, and that one H. brought Debt againſt the ſame Plaintiff, which was returned Nihil in London, and thereupon this Debt was attached in the Hands of this Defendant, and ſo the Plaintiff recovered, Judgment ſi Actio; and the now Plaintiff *ſaid, that the Recovery was by Covin*; For he ſaid he did not owe the ſaid Sum to the ſaid H. which was by him demanded in London Modo & forma prout; and per Laicon he ſhall not have the Plea to falſify the ſaid Recovery in London now, becauſe *he might have come into London within the Year*, and have pleaded and * diſproved the Debt. and have barr'd the then Plaintiff, and becauſe he did not, therefore, *now he hath paſſed his Time* and cannot falſify it. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 16. cites 39 H. 6. 19. * Orig. Reprove.

3. If *Tenant for Life* ſuffers a Recovery, he in Reverſion may falſify *during the Life* of the Tenant for Life, *or after his Death*. Pig. of Recov. 165, 166.

[See Trial (B. 2).]

(K) By Warranty and Aſſets.

1. NOTE, that where Tenant in Tail diſcontinues with Warranty, and leaves Aſſets and dies, and 2 *by Conſpiracy cauſe E. to enter and ouſt the Alienee, againſt whom the Iſſue* (within Age) of the Tenant in Tail *recovers in Scire facias upon Fine of the ſame Tail*; that in this Caſe he who loſt ſhall have Action and falſify the Recovery by the Warranty and Aſſets. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 18. cites 27 Aſſ. 74.

(L) For want of Juriſdiction.

1. IT was admitted, that a Man may falſify a Recovery had *againſt himſelf* for a Point, which proves ſuch Recovery to be void, as becauſe it was *Coram non Judice*. Br. Faux. Recovery. pl. 38. cites 39 Aſſ. 6.

2. In Treſpaſs, it was not denied, but that if a *Fine* be levied *of Land in Ancient Demeſne at the Common Law*, and *after a Recovery is had in the Court of Ancient Demeſne*, that this Recovery is feint in Law; by which he falſified it. Br. Judgment pl. 17. cites 7 H. 4. 3.

Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 15. S. C.

3. In Aſſiſe Tenant pleads in Bar a Recovery *in Dower*; Plaintiff replies, that the Lands demanded are in the Cinque Ports, Ubi breve Domini Regis non currit, and the Plea held ill; For Judgment at *Weſtminſter for Lands in the Cinque Ports* is good; Aliter of Lands in *Wales*. Pig. of Recov. 159. cites 36 H. 6. 6 32, 32.

(M) For Prior Right.

1. IF I am *ſeiſed by Title, and A. ouſts me*, and *I re-ouſt him*, and *A. recovers againſt me by Aſſiſe*, I may have Attaint or Aſſiſe of my firſt Poſſeſſion; and therefore if the Recovery in the Aſſiſe be pleaded, the Plaintiff may confeſs and avoid it, becauſe his Aſſiſe was of Elder Poſſeſſion. Per Parning. Quære inde, the Judgment of the Aſſiſe being in Force. Br. Aſſiſe. pl. 186. cites 13 Aſſ. 1.

Br. Barre pl. 9. cites S. C.

2. Note, 'twas ſaid for Law in Attaint, and not denied, that where *J. is diſſeiſed by W.* and a *Stranger recovers againſt him Bona Fide, or by Covin by Title*, which is *younger than the Title of J.* there J. may enter upon the Recoveror and plead this Matter, and the Recovery Meſne, &c. and a good Plea. Br. Entre congeable. pl. 4. cites 34 H. 6. 44.

Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 59. S. C.

3. Writ of Forcible Entry; the Plaintiff makes Title by a *Recovery in a Writ of Right againſt the Leſſor* of the Defendant; the Defendant *pleads that at the* Time of the *Writ* of Right *brought*, his *Leſſor had alien'd* the Reverſion to A. to whom he Attorned, and held good. Pig. of Recov. 159. cites 1 H. 7. pl. 7.

4. If *A. has Title* by Formedon or Cui in Vita *and enters*, and *B. recovers againſt him*; A. is remitted to his firſt Action. Br. Judgment. pl. 111. cites 23 H. 8.

5. *But* if B. *recovers* againſt A. *by falſe Title* by Action tried, *where A. is in by good Title*, he ſhall then have *Error, or Attaint, or Writ of Right*. Ibid.

(N) For Feint Pleading.

Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 1. S. C.

1. A *Parſon* made a Leaſe for Years, and afterwards in a *Quare impedit* brought *againſt him and the Patron* they pleaded feintly; Leſſee ſhall not falſify, becauſe if the Parſon had reſigned, the Leaſe had been gone. Pig. of Recov. 159. cites T. 26 H. 8. pl. 3.

(O) Pleadings.

1. IN Aſſiſe, the Tenant pleaded Recovery in Mortdanceſtor againſt N. and the Plaintiff *ſaid, that N. againſt whom &c. was not Tenant of the Franktenement*; and it was admitted a good Plea. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 37. cites 19 Aſſ. 4.

2. Where a *Recovery* is *pleaded againſt my Anceſtor*, I may ſay, that my Anceſtor *had nothing in the Land at the Time, &c. without ſhewing who was Tenant thereof*; contra in Avoidance of a *Fine*. Quære, if it ſhall not be *intended a Recovery by Default*; For it ſeems to be contrary upon a Recovery upon Appearance. Br. Judgment. pl. 24. cites 14 H. 4. 33.

3. In

3. In *Warranty of Charters*, the Defendant may *ſay, that the Plaintiff in the firſt Action entered* upon the Plaintiff then Tenant *pending the Writ*, which Matter the Plaintiff might have pleaded and did not; *Or* that the Plaintiff in this Action *had nothing in the Land loſt by the firſt Action*; and a good Plea. per Arden in a Præcipe quod reddat, quod non negatur. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 45. cites 21 H. 6. 49.

4 In Aſſiſe, if the *Tenant makes a Bar at large*, and the *Plaintiff makes Title by Recovery*, and the *Tenant deſtroys the Recovery by proving it to be void*; 'tis no Plea without making Title to himſelf; For if the Plaintiff was in by a void Recovery, this is no Reſort to the Tenant; For 'tis not lawful for the Tenant to enter upon him, if he has no Title: and ſo ſee that the Tenant ſhall not avoid the Title of the Plaintiff without making Title to himſelf. Br. Aſſiſe. pl. 103 cites 36 H. 6. 33, 34.

5. A. *pending a Writ of Entry* for Diſſeiſin againſt him, *recovered by Formedon againſt his own Feoffee* The beſt Opinion was that the *Traverſe* ſhall be of the *Diſſeiſin* and *not* of the *Feoffment*. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 27. cites 7 E. 4. 19.

6. A Man recovered Land, and brought *Scire facias againſt W. N. and after* he brought Scire facias *againſt J. Tertenant*, who *ſaid that W. N. againſt* whom the Recovery was had, *was not Tenant* of the Franktenement *the Day of the firſt Scire facias*, &c. *nor ever after, but one A. whoſe Eſtate he the now Tenant hath*, &c. and ſo the Recovery void; and this was held a good avoidance of the Recovery; and yet Nontenure generally is no Plea; and it ſeems that this Recovery was by Default; For it is ſaid elſewhere that *upon Recovery by Default*, the Tenant may ſay that, he was not Tenant the Day of the Writ, &c. nor after; For *in pleading* ſuch Recovery, the Party *muſt aver that the Writ was brought againſt ſuch a one, then Tenant* of the Land; but he who appears and pleads and loſes, ſhall not do ſo. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 32. cites 14 E. 4. 2.

7. Note, by the Juſtices, that the *Termor* may falſify a Recovery againſt his Leſſor being in Reverſion at the Time of the Recovery, as he may of a Rent which the Leſſor ſuffered to be recovered againſt him; and per Brian and Townſend, he ſhall ſay that *before the Writ brought againſt his Leſſor*, the *Leſſor granted his Reverſion* to W. N. to whom he *Attorn'd before* the Writ brought, and *ſo was not Tenant at the Time* of the Writ brought, and Recovery had. Br. Faux Recov. pl. 23. cites 14 H. 7.——pl. 59. cites 1 H. 7. 9.

8. Præcipe quod reddat Sur Diſſeiſin in the Poſt; the *Termor* for Years *by the Statute of Glouceſter* prayed to be received, and ſaid that this Recovery is by Covin to make him loſe his Term, and traverſed the Diſſeiſin; and per Pollard and Fitzherbert he cannot do otherwiſe; For *the Covin is not material without traverſing the Point of the Writ*. But per Port, if the *Tenant in Tail makes Diſcontinuance*, and the *Diſcontinuee makes a Leaſe for Years*, the *Iſſue* in Tail *brings Formedon by Covin of the Diſcontinuee* to make the Termor loſe his Term; there the Covin is only material. Per Pollard the Termor is without Remedy in this Caſe; for the Heir in Tail ſhall be remitted; for by them where the *Recovery* is *upon a true Title*, the *Covin is not material*. Br. Colluſion, &c. pl. 21. cites 14 H. 8. 3.

9. In *Præcipe quod reddat* the Tenant *pleaded in Abatement* of the Writ, that one A. after the laſt Continuance had brought an *Aſſiſe* againſt him, and *recovered by Action tried*, viz. by Verdict; and the Demandant ſaid that this Aſſiſe was brought by Covin between the ſaid A. and the Tenant to the Intent to abate his Writ; and there 'tis granted by all the Court, that this is no Plea without *ſhewing Cauſe of the Covin*. Pl. C. 46. b. Arg. cites 9 H. 6. 41.—And Plowden ſaid he agreed the Law to be ſo; and the reaſon is becauſe the Title was tried by Verdict of 12 Men, and then the Demandants ſaying that 'twas by *Covin, can't be intended* true *againſt the Verdict*. Ibid.

10. *But* where (as in the principal Caſe) the Recovery was by *Default*, in which Caſe there is no Trial; but the Default of the Defendant *was*

the

the Cauſe of the Judgment, by which in this Caſe, and where the Recovery is by Default, a Man ſhall aver that it was by *Covin generally*, and ſo the Diverſity. Arg. Pl. C 46. b. in Caſe of Wimbiſh v. Talbois.

11. By the 21 H. 8. 15. the Leſſee ſhall be received to falſify the Recovery before Judgment, and it ſhall ſuſpend the Execution. But then he muſt *not only aver the Colluſion, but plead ſome Act to bar the Plaintiff's Title.* Pig. of Recov. 51.

12. Notwithſtanding the Statute of Glouceſter, and the 21 H. 8. it never lay in the Mouth of a *Tenant to the Præcipe* to *plead* a Leaſe for Years, or to ſtop Execution upon any ſuch Plea. If an *Aſſiſe* be brought *againſt Tenant for Life*, he cannot ſay that there is a *Leaſe for Years precedent to his Right*, tho' the Tenant for Years himſelf may falſify a Recovery againſt him in Reverſion. Trin. 1 Annæ. B. R. 7 Mod. 42. Per Holt Ch J. in the Caſe of Smith v. Angell.

(P) Bar. Plea in Bar to the Falſifying.

1. *ASSISE* by A. againſt the Lord C. of Land in T. in the County of E. the *Defendant pleaded in Bar, that at another Time he himſelf recovered the ſame Tenements againſt the Plaintiff in the County of W. and the Plaintiff ſued to reverſe the Judgment in B. R. affirming them to be in the County of W. and had Judgment and Reſtitution, and after the Tenant brought Aſſiſe in the County of W. againſt the Plaintiff, and recovered the Land in the County of W.* Judgment if the Plaintiff who ſued to reverſe the firſt Judgment, affirming them to be in the County of W. ſhall now have Aſſiſe in the County of E. For he ought to have brought Aſſiſe and not to have ſued to reverſe it; For it was ſaid, that where a Man recovers Land in a Baſe Court, which does not lie within the Jurisdiction of it, and brings Writ of Falſe Judgment of it; he ſhall not have Aſſiſe after, becauſe he affirms that it lies within the Jurisdiction; quod Nota, by ſome; but here the Aſſiſe was taken, becauſe it cannot be intended to be of the ſame Tenements which are in Plaint. Br. Judgment. pl. 58. cites 10. Aſſ. 25.

2. In *Mortdanceſtor againſt the Baron and Feme and S.* the *Baron diſclaimed for himſelf and his Feme*, and *S. vouched the Baron, who* came and *pleaded a Recovery by Action tried by himſelf againſt one S. by Dum fuit infra ætatem, where in Truth he recovered againſt S. named in the Writ pending this Action; and ſaid that the Eſtate of the Anceſtor of the Demandant, of whoſe Seiſin he demanded, was Meſne between his Title and his Recovery*; to which the *Demandant ſaid, that S. was ſeized, and enfeoff'd this ſame S. with Warranty, of which Seiſin S. was ſeized at the Time of the Judgment given, and ſo* the Recovery falſe and feint in Law, Judgment, and prayed the Aſſiſe, and the *Vouchee demurred* thereupon; and becauſe by the Demurrer all the Points of the Writ are confeſſed, therefore the *Demandant releaſed his Damages and had Judgment* to have Seiſin of the Land *immediately*. Quod Nota; and ſo good Cauſe to falſify, becauſe the *Feoffment and Warranty were not pleaded in the firſt Action.* Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 22. cites 30 Aſſ. 10.

3. A Man cannot falſify, unleſs he *makes himſelf a Title* to the Land; For tho' the Recovery be void, yet when the Recoveror is in by it, it is not lawful for the Plaintiff to enter and ouſt him without Title, and therefore it is no Plea without making Title; For where the Tenant in Aſſiſe pleads a Bar, the Plaintiff muſt make a Title to himſelf before he can avoid the Bar. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 15. Per Forteſcue Ch. J. cites 36 H. 6 32.

4. In

4. In *Annuity by the Abbot of C. againſt the Vicar of T.* and *counted that he and his Predeceſſors Time out of Mind have been ſeiſed of the Annuity* in Right of his Church of C. aforeſaid; and the *Defendant traverſed the Preſcription*, and *'twas found with the Plaintiff*, and he recovered; and after *the Annuity was Arrear at another time*, and *the Abbot brought Scire facias againſt the Succeſſor* of the Vicar, *who ſaid that the Abbot and his Predeceſſors have been Parſons of T. and held it in proper Uſe* as Parſons Impariſonee in Right of their Church of C. Time out of Mind, *and that the ſaid Abbots have claimed the ſaid Annuity as Parſons*, &c. *and* that the ſaid Abbots and their Predeceſſors *were ſeiſed of* the ſaid Annuity *only as Parſons of the ſaid Church* as he has alledged, and ſo the ſaid Recovery void and null in Law. And becauſe he *does not ſay, that the Predeceſſors of the Abbot have been ſeiſed* of the ſaid Annuity in Fact *as Parſons*, &c. *nor* has *traverſed, that* the Abbot and his Predeceſſors *were not ſeiſed of any other Annuity*, therefore the Plaintiff recovered, quod Nota; but by ſeveral the Matter was good Cauſe to have falſified, &c. For otherwiſe the Abbot might have two Annuities, the one as Abbot, and the other as Parſon; and this falſifying goes to the Action; and yet if it had been pleaded in the firſt Action, he muſt have concluded to the Writ. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 29. cites 10 E. 4. 16.

5. In Annuity, one *outlawed of Treaſon brought* a Writ of *Error*, and had *Scire facias* againſt the *Lords* mediate and immediate, who are return'd warn'd, and made default, and the Utlawry is reverſed by Impriſonment. In Aſſiſe brought the Lords, cannot aver that he was at large and ſhall not falſify the Recovery; For thoſe who are ſummoned are bound for ever. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 24. cites 4 H. 7. 2.

6. *In Aſſiſe* againſt Tenant in Fee Simple the *Plaintiff recovered by Default*; he can never falſify, tho' he may have Writ of Right. per Keble. Ibid.

(Q.) Other Action. In what Caſes after Recovery againſt a Man by Default, he may have other Action, and what.

1. 13 *E.* 1. 4. recites that, *Whereas before Time, if a Man had loſt his Land by Default, he had none other Recovery than by a Writ of Right, which was not maintainable by any, that could not claim of meer Right as* Tenants for *Term of* Life, *in* Free Marriage, *or* in Tail, *in which Eſtates a Reverſion is reſerved.*

And provides, that from henceforth their Default ſhall not be ſo prejudicial, but that they may recover their Eſtate by another Writ than by a Writ of Right, if they have Right; And that,

For Land in Free Marriage loſt by Default, ſuch a Writ ſhall be made.

2. In Aſſiſe the *Defendant pleaded in Abatement of the Writ, that pending the Writ J. N. had recovered againſt him by Dum fuit infra ætatem of elder Date*, and was *by nient dedire*; and notwithſtanding this the Aſſiſe was awarded, quod Nota; quære Cauſam, whether, becauſe that the Tenant did *not ſay, that he, who recovered, entered*; or becauſe the Recovery was by Nient dedire, and *not by Action tried.* Br. Brief pl. 278. cites 22 Aſſ.

3. Per Mordaunt, Wood, Townſend and Brian, If *Tenant for Life* be impleaded, and *prays Aid of* him in *Reverſion, who is ſummoned, and makes Default*, and the Tenant for Life confeſſes, or loſes otherwiſe, yet he in Reverſion may have *Writ of Right, or ad Terminum qui præterit*, and ſhall falſify the Recovery. Quod Nota Bene. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 24. cites 4 H. 7. 2.

[See Bar. (D)]

(R) Other Action. In what Caſes a Man may falſify by other Action.

1. IF ſuch *particular Tenants* as Tenants in *Dower*, &c. *loſe by Action tried in a real Action*, it ſeems, that at this Day they themſelves are without Remedy. per Coke. 6. Rep. 8. b. and ſays that with this accords 50 E. 3. 7.

2. If *Tenant for Life* be impleaded, and *prays Aid of* him in *Reverſion, who is ſummoned, and makes Default*, and the Tenant for Life confeſſes, or loſes otherwiſe; Yet he in Reverſion may have a *Writ of Right, or ad Terminum qui præteriit*, and ſhall falſify the Recovery, quod Nota Bene; per Mordant, Wood, Townſend and Brian. Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 24. cites 4 H. 7. 2.

3. If a Man *loſes in Aſſiſe*, the Tenant is not put to his Writ of Right, but may have Aſſiſe of *Mortdanceſtor*, per Coke. 6 Rep. 8. b. cites 5 Aſſ. 1.

4. *So* Recovery in Aſſiſe is no Bar in *Formedon in Reverter*. per Coke. 6 Rep. 8. b. cites 6 H. 4. 2.

5. Real Actions, as Writs of Right, Writs of Entry, &c. and their ſeveral Appendages, as Grand Cape, &c. were ſeveral great Titles in the Year Books, but now much out of Uſe; Foe in moſt Caſes at this Day the Entry of him that has Right being lawful, Men chooſe to recover their Poſſeſſions by *Ejectment*, excepting that in common Recoveries the Form of ſuch real Actions is preſerved. And ſometimes, tho' rarely a Writ of *Dower* or *Formedon*; becauſe ordinarily, where an Entail is ſuſpected, a Common Recovery is had. And ſometimes in the Grand Seſſions in *Wales* they proceed by a *Quod ei Deforceat*. Ld. Hales's Pref. to Roll's Abr. pag. 5.

(S) Equity.

1. A. Had *Land extended* to him *in Ancient Demeſne by Statute Merchant*, and afterwards *B. purchaſed the Land*, and recovered by Sufferance in the Ancient Demeſne Court upon Voucher, and entered *and ouſted A.* who brought Subpœna; and it was Held, that A. *could not falſify* the Recovery, *and therefore ſhould be reſtored by Chancery*; Becauſe there was no Remedy at Common Law. Br. Conſcience. pl. 8. cites 7 H. 7. 11.

Father

Father and Son, or Child, &c. Or Parent and Child.

(A) What Actions a Father, &c. may have on Account of his Child.

1. TRESPASS *quare Filiam & Hæredem ſuam rapuit* & abduxit lies for the Father, but not for the *Mother*; For the Father of Common Right ſhall have the *Ward* of his Son or Daughter; per Catesby. Br. Garde. pl. 55. cites 9 E. 4. 53.

2. Father ſhall not have Action againſt a Maſter for beating his Son and Heir Apparent, and *laming him ſo as he is diſparaged as to his Marriage* Le. 50. Paſch. 29 Eliz. B. R. Gray v. Jeffes

Action lies not for the Father, tho' 'twas objected that he was *at the Charge of curing* his Son of his Wounds, Becauſe he was not compellable to it. Cro. E. 849. Rippon v. Norton.——But 'twas admitted Arg. that Action might have lain for the Father, if he had ſhewn, that the Son *was his Servant*, whereby he loſt his Service. But alleging Loſs of Service, without alleging that the Son was his Servant, is not ſufficient. Cro. E. ut ſupra.

3. If the Son *marries without Conſent* of the Father, the Father has no Remedy. Le. 50. Gray v. Jeffes.——See 5 Mod. 222. King. alias Michel v. Thorp.

4. The Father ſhall not have Action *for taking* any of his Children except *his Heir*; and that is, becauſe the Marriage of his Heirs belongs to the Father, but not of any other his Sons or Daughters: And the Father has no Property or Intereſt in the other Children, which the Law accounts may be taken from him. Cro. E. 770. Trin. 42 Eliz. B. R. Barham v. Dennis.——But Glanvil J. contra. Ibid.

(B) Inter ſe; as to Legacies, &c. to the Children by Others.

1. BONDS *releaſed* by the Father, which he had *taken in the Names of his Sons, being Infants*, thought good and allowed. Toth. 88. cites Hill. 20 Jac. Simonds v. Lomley.

2. The *Grandfather deviſed Lands to his Son to pay* 10 *l. per Annum to the Son's* 3 *Daughters*, the *Father gives* 200 *l. in Marriage with one*; whether the 10 *l.* per Ann. ſhall be included in the 200 *l.* or not? 'twas decreed that it ſhould be included. Toth. 141. cites Mich. 13 Car. Kirrington v. Aſty.

3. The Father received a Legacy of 100 *l.* and another of 50 *l.* left to B. his eldeſt Son by the Grandfather and Grandmother; afterwards the *Father gave Bond to pay his Son*, whom he had *diſinherited*, 6000 *l.* 'Twas inſiſted

inſiſted that the Bond included the Legacies. But Ld. Jefferies, in Favour of a diſinherited Heir, would allow no more than what they could prove to have been actually paid towards Satisfaction of theſe Legacies, and Eo Nomine as in Part of the Legacies, and the reſt to be paid with Intereſt. Mich. 1687. Vern. 480 Sir Wm. Cann v. Lady Cann.

4. A Legacy of 150 *l.* *to the Daughter of B.* was paid to B. who after, on her Marriage with J. S. *gave her* 1000 *l. Portion, and* ſettled *a Church Leaſe* upon her, *and maintained her and her Husband* 14 *Years* at his own Houſe. The Maſter of the Rolls decreed the Legacy with Coſts, but ſaid, tho' he would not diſcharge it, he diſlik'd the Suit. Hill. 1703. Ch. Prec. 228. Sir George Chudly v. Lee.

5. Children *not demanding* their Legacies of their Father when they come of Age, or after, is no Diſcharge of them; And the Father is bound to maintain them during their Minority, and their Portions given by a Stranger are nothing to him more than if they had not any; and where they lived to be fit for Service and *ſerved their Father*; their Service was more worth than the Intereſt of the Legacy (which was 50 *l.* a piece) and ſo *Intereſt* was allowed. But where one of the Daughters married, and She and her Husband had a *Year's Board after Marriage*, the Father muſt be allowed for it, unleſs an Agreement be proved to the contrary. Paſch. 7 Annæ. 3 Ch. R. 168. Strickland v. Hudſon and Maſon.

[See Deviſe (L. c)]

(C) Allowances to Parents for Maintenance out of Children's Fortunes.

1. A. Deviſed 250 *l.* to his Son, and made his Wife Executrix, who married another Husband. On a Bill brought againſt them by the Son for the Legacy, the Defendants would have diſcounted Maintenance and Education; but the Court would not permit it ſo as to *diminiſh the principal Sum*; For it was ſaid that the Mother ought to maintain the Child. 2 Vent. 353. Mich. 33 Car. 2. Anon.

2. *But* a Sum of Money paid for the *Binding him out an Apprentice* was allowed to be diſcounted. 2 Vent. 353. Anon.

3. *And* the Mother was decreed a *reaſonable Allowance for Maintenance* of her Son from 2 Years of Age, when the Father died, to 18, when the Son died; ſhe having received the Rents of 33 *l.* per Annum deſcended from the Father on the Son, as Heir at Law. Paſch. 7 Annæ. 3 Ch. R. 164. Wallis v. Everard.

(D) Coertion. What Acts done by a Child ſhall be ſaid to be done by Coertion, and ſo relieved againſt.

1. A Father *prepared a Bond conditioned for Payment of* 120 *l. a Year to him for Life by his Son, to whom a very large Eſtate had been deviſed*, and upon propoſing it to the Son, he refuſed to execute it, ſaying it was more reaſonable that the Father ſhould depend upon his Honour. Upon which the *Father left the Bond* with the Son, *ſaying, if he would not ſign it he might let it alone.* But *afterwards in the Father's Abſence the Son ſigned it*, juſt before he went to travel, *and directed, that it ſhould be delivered to his Father.* Ld. C. Parker ſaid that thoſe Words might be ſpoke ſo, as to amount

amount to a Threatning and to intimidate; but it might alſo be otherwiſe, and the Father ſeemed to acquieſce under the Son's Anſwer. And that for aught appeared it was his free Act, and what he thought himſelf obliged in Honour to do, and therefore without any Proof to impeach it, it ſhould not be ſet aſide in Equity. Wms's Rep. 602. 607. Hill. 1719. Blackborn v. Edgley.

2. If it ſhould ever appear that the *Power of a Parent over a Child has been abuſed*, as by his gaining a Releaſe of the Child's Orphanage Part *by Threats*, &c. a Court of Equity will certainly ſet aſide a Releaſe thus unduely gained. per Ld. C. Parker. Paſch. 1720. Wms's Rep. 639, 640. in Caſe of Blunden v. Barker.

(A) Fealty and Homage.

1. 17 E. 2. *ENACTS that when a Freeman doth Homage to his Lord of whom he holdeth in Chief, he ſhall hold his Hands between the Hands of the Lord, and ſay thus:*

I become your Man from this Time forth, for Life, for Member and for worldly Honour; and ſhall owe you my Faith for the Lands that I hold of you, ſaving the Faith I owe unto our Lord the King, and to mine other Lords.

When a Freeman doth Fealty to his Lord, he ſhall hold his Right Hand upon the Book, and ſhall ſay thus:

Hear you my Lord R. that J. P. will be to you both faithful and true, and ſhall owe my Fidelity to you for the Land that I hold of you, and lawfully ſhall do ſuch Cuſtoms and Services as my Duty is to you at all Terms aſſigned. So help me God and all his Saints.

2. *Seiſin of* Homage and Fealty is ſo ineſtimable in Law, that no *Diſtreſs* for them of any Goods or Chattles of *whatever Value*, is in Judgment of Law exceſſive; and tho' the Lord diſtrein *oftentimes* for them, that the Tenant cannot manure his Land, yet the Tenant ſhall not have *Aſſiſe of Sovent Diſtreſs* as he ſhall have for Rent or other Profits. 4 Rep. 8. b. Mich. 17 and 18 Eliz. C. B. Bevil's Caſe.

3. Fealty gives *Seiſin* of all annual Services ſufficient to make Seiſin in Avowry, but not in an Aſſiſe; but of accidental Services this gives Seiſin in Aſſiſe. per Omnes J. 2 Brownl. 99. Trin. 9 Jac. C. B. Anon.

4. A *Diſtreſs* is a good Demand of Fealty, but the Lord cannot avow for Fealty upon a Demand made *after the Death* of the Tenant. Mo. 883. Trin. 15 Jac. C. B. Kingſwell v. Crawley.

But if after Fealty *demanded, and refuſed Tenant dies*, the Lord may diſtrein after his Death for it per Hobart. Noy. 24. Crawley v. Kingſmill.

5. If a Man holds Land *at Will rendring Rent*, Fealty is not *incident* to it; For it is but a Rent diſtrainable of Common Right. Co. Litt. 37. b.

6. One *within Age* may do Homage, but he cannot do Fealty; becauſe that is to be done upon Oath. 2 Inſt. 11.

7. Homagium is either *Ligeum or Feodale.* Vaugh. 279. in Caſe of Craw. v. Ramſey.——cites 7 Rep. 7. Calvin's Caſe.

There are 2 kinds of Homage, Sovereign and Feodal; Sovereign Homage is due to the King only in Right of Sovereignty; and this commonly is called Liege Homage, from Ligando, becauſe it binds the Subject to the King; But ſo alſo was the other anciently, becauſe it likewiſe binds the Tenant to his Feodal Lord Spelm. Gloſs. Verbo Homagium. 296.

Fee-Farm Rents.

(A) Notes in General.

45 E. 3. 15. b. per Finchden--Br. Relief. pl. 8. cites S. C.—pl. 5. cites old Tenures.—

FEE-Farm, or *Feodi Firma is* when any one, of the Gift or Grant of another, holds to him and his Heirs rendering either the half or the third Part, or at leaſt the fourth Part of the true Value. And ſuch Tenant is bound to no Services, but what are contained in the Charter itſelf, except Fealty, which all Tenures are liable to. Spelm. Gloſſ. Verbo Feodum. Page 221.

This Act of Parliament was *not neceſſary to enable the King* to make a Grant of theſe Rents, *but* to encourage Purchaſers, and *to give ſuch Privileges* to the Subject, *which* the King *could transfer without Act of Parliament*, and to cure and ſupply the Defect of *Nonrecital* or *Miſrecital*; And the Act itſelf is an Authority that the King might alien; For the Act declares the Letters Patents good, which were granted before. per Holt Ch. J. Mich ⁻. W. 3. B. R. Skin. 606. In the Bankers Caſe.————Fee Farm Rents will *merge in the Inheritance.* per Parker C. Mich 10 Geo 1. 10. Mod. 526. Atcherley v. Vernon.

By 22 *Car.* 2. 6. *Sect.* 4. Letters Patents *granted by the King of certain Fee-Farm Rents*, before the 24th of June 1672. are confirmed.

Sect. 10. Purchaſors may buy *and enjoy the ſame Rents*, notwithſtanding any Statute of Mortmain.

(B) Conveyances thereof. How directed to be made by the Truſtees.

22 *Car.* 2. *Cap.* 6. *Sect.* 6. *Enacts that the* Truſtees *and the Survivor or Survivors of them*, ſhall execute *to Purchaſors*, Indentures of Bargain and Sale *containing a Conveyance of the ſaid Rents, and reciting the Conſideration of Money paid*, which ſhall be enrolled *in any of the four Courts of Weſtminſter, within ſix Months after the Date thereof.*

Sect. 12. *Inſtructions to be obſerved in the Sale of theſe Rents, yet ſo as the Non-Purſuance of them ſhall not weaken Purchaſors Titles.*

1. *Contracts for Sales ſhall be ſigned by the Lord Treaſurer or Commiſſioners of the Treaſury, or two of them.*

2. *The Truſtees ſhall convey to ſuch as by Order from the Lord Treaſurer or Commiſſioners of the Treaſury, or two of them, they ſhall be directed.*

3. *Every Contracter ſhall at or before ſealing his Conveyance, pay one Moity at leaſt of his purchaſe Money into the Exchequer; and before he receives his Conveyance give ſuch Security as the Lord Treaſurer or Commiſſioners, &c. ſhall approve for the other Moity.*

4. *Such as pay down their whole Money, ſhall be allowed for preſent Payment of their ſecond Moity, not exceeding* 10*l. per Cent.*

5. *Immediate Tenants liable to pay any Rents, ſhall be preferr'd in the Purchaſe of it before others, ſo as they tender themſelves to the Lord Treaſurer or Commiſſioners of the Treaſury, to contract within ſix Months after paſſing the ſaid Patent; and Notice thereof publiſhed by Proclamation, and perfect their Contract, and pay or ſecure the Money within ſix Months after, at ſuch Rate as ſhall be agreed, not exceeding* 20 *Years Purchaſe.*

6. *If*

6. *If the immediate Tenant, or ſome on his Behalf do not tender and perfect his Contract, all Benefit of Performance to be loſt.*

7. *The Purchaſor may have his Conveyance in the Names of any Perſon he ſhall deſire.*

8. *If any Rent be charged with an Incumbrance, Conſideration ſhall be had of it and Reprize allowed; and the Purchaſor ſhall covenant to take upon him ſuch Incumbrance.*

9. *The Truſtees ſhall hold the Rents to the King's Uſe till Sale.*

10. *The Truſtees ſhall covenant with the Purchaſers againſt their own Acts.*

22 & 23 *Car.* 2. 24. *Sect.* 9. *Impowers the Truſtees to* convey *the ſaid Rents to Purchaſors either* by the Words expreſſed in the Letters Patents, or by Particulars *to be made by the Auditors, or by the original Grants from the Crown, ſaving the Queen's Right to the Rents hereby veſted.*

(C) Purchaſors indemnifyed and favoured; and how enabled to ſue.

22 *Car.* 2. 6. *Sect.* 7. *Enacts that Purchaſors ſhall hold the ſame diſcharged of any Breach of Truſt, which may be pretended to be committed by the Truſtees, and may recover the ſame as the King might, excepting the Prerogative Proceſs out of the Exchequer.*

To encourage purchaſing Fee-Farm Rents, this Act gives the Purchaſors the ſame Power of Diſtreſs, not only on the Land out of which the Fee-Farm Rent iſſues, but on any other of the

Sect. 9. *Purchaſors of Rents reſerved by any Letters Patents of Lands and Tenements, &c. and ſold after the paſſing of this Act, ſhall enjoy them; any Cancelling, Avoidance, or Determination of ſuch Letters Patents notwithſtanding. This Act ſhall not be conſtrued to avoid any Covenants or Agreements on the King's Part, in the original Reſervation of ſuch Rents; nor Decrees in the Court of Augmentation or Court of Exchequer before the 23d of October* 1642. *or ſince 29th of May* 1660. *whereby Fee Farmers were to be diſcharged, and Allowances out of the ſaid Fee-Farm Rents to be made.*

Lands of the Tenant as the King had. Hill. 1715. 2 Vern. 713. Att. Gen. v Mayor, &c. of Coventry.

Fee-Farm Rents, when granted by the King, *became Rent Seck*, and therefore not to be extended. Arg. 9. Mod. 72. cites Cro. E. 656.——Fee-Farm Rent is *extendible upon an Elegit*, and yet the Words of the Statute, which give the Sheriff Authority, are only Land, viz. *Medietatem Terræ.* Arg. 10. Mod. 526.

A. claims a Fee-Farm Rent under this Statute, and there is a *Sequeſtration* on the Land, out of which the Fee-Farm Rent iſſues; the Court cannot order the Sequeſtrators to pay the Arrears out of the Money in their Hands, but declared the *Grantee might take his Remedy at Law, notwithſtanding the Sequeſtration.* per Cowper C. Hill. 1715. 2 Vern. 713. Att. Gen. v. Mayor, &c. of Coventry.

The Court left him at Liberty to diſtrain for his Rent at Law, without incurring any Contempt in Equity, and that no Leaſe or Eſtate deriv'd under the Sequeſtrators ſhou'd be made Uſe of in Evidence againſt the Claimant of the Fee-Farm Rent, to prevent the Diſtreſs. Wms's Rep. 308. S. C.

Tho' the King might *diſtrain* on any other Lands of his Tenant, as well as on thoſe out of which the Rent iſſues; yet, if the Tenant *Alien Deviſe or Leaſe at Will only* his other Lands, the Crown can't diſtrein on thoſe Lands. Hill. 1715. Arg. 2 Vern. 714. Att. Gen. v. Mayor, &c. of Coventry.

S. P. Held by Cowper C. aſſiſted by the Ld Ch. J. Parker and King. Wms's Rep. 307. Hill. 1715. S. C.

So, if there be an *Extent upon an Elegit* of ſuch other Lands, the Goods or Chattels on the Premiſſes ſo extended will not be liable; For this is a greater Eſtate than an Eſtate at Will. per Cowper C. aſſiſted by Ch. J. Parker and King. Wms's Rep. 307. S. C.

As to the Caſe of the Att. Gen. v. the Mayor of Coventry, the Reporter ſays, that afterwards Ch. J. Parker informed him that he thought it might have been proper to have determined, that the *Sequeſtration was as the Hand of the Court upon the Eſtate*, and where a Right to a Fee-Farm Rent appear'd to be prior and indiſputable, the Court might reaſonably enough have order'd Payment, elſe A. for ought appear'd, would be in a worſe Condition, than if there had been no Sequeſtration; For till the Sequeſtration, the Corporation paid the Rent voluntarily, and now are diſabled purely by the Sequeſtration; and putting A. to diſtrain was putting the Charge of the Suit upon the Eſtate; whereas nothing appear'd to the contrary, but that the Corporation was ſenſible of A's Right to the Rent, and deſir'd it might be paid. Wms's Rep. 308, 309.

By 22 *and* 23 *Car.* 2. 24. *Sect.* 2. *All Purchaſors thereof are to be kept harmleſs from all Incumbrances made by the Truſtees.*

(D) Extent

(D) Extent of the Act, as to the Power of the Truſtees, and what they might Convey.

22 *Car.* 2. *Cap.* 6. *Sect.* 9. *Enacts that Rent not uſually paid by the greater Space of* 40 *Years laſt paſt, ſhall not be inſerted in ſuch Letters Patents, and Tenants ſhall hold their Lands diſcharged of any Rent, reſerved by Virtue of any Patent of Concealment, or Commiſſio nof defective Titles, not uſually paid by the greater Space of* 40 *Years, until the ſame ſhall have been recovered by due Courſe of Law.* And by

Sect. 14 *So much as is due for any Uſes out of the Premiſſes to be ſettled upon Truſtees ſhall continue to be paid; and the Truſtees are hereby authorized to convey, for Performance of ſuch Uſes, ſuch of the ſaid Fee-Farm Rents &c. as ſhall amount to the Sums charged, after which Conveyance, the Purchaſors of the Reſidue to be diſcharged thereof.*

(E) How to be ordered till Sale. And liable to what Payment or Allowances.

By 22 *and* 23 *Car.* 2. 24. *Sect.* 4. *Till Sale of the ſaid Rents, the Receivers of the King's Revenue ſhall gather the ſame.*

9 *and* 10 *W.* 3. 8. *Subjected Fee-Farm Rents to Payment of Taxes.*

7 *Geo.* 2. *Cap.* 7. *S.* 5. *Enacted that Lands, &c. ſubject to Fee-Farm Rents, &c. if ſuch Rent amounted to* 20*s. per Ann. or more, the Landlord may deduct the Taxes; ſuch Deductions to be allowed by the Perſons intitled to the Rent without Fee or Charge for ſuch Allowance.*

S. 26. *Receivers of Fee-Farm Rents to allow* 2*s. per Pound to the Parties without Fee on Penalty of* 20*l.*

(F) Pleadings by Purchaſors.

22 *Car.* 2. *Cap.* 24. *Sect.* 8. *All Purchaſors may make a* general Juſtification, *without producing any Letters Patents, by* ſaying *that the* Truſtees were ſeized in Fee, and ſo granted *to them.* And by

10 *Annæ.* 18. *S.* 4. *Where any Fee-Farm Rents, intended by the Acts of* 22 *Car.* 2. *and* 22 *and* 23 *Car.* 2. *to be ſold, and which are ſold purſuant thereunto, ſhall be named and deſcribed in any Deed or Fine, Declaration, or other Pleading, by ſuch or the like Names or Deſcriptions, as the ſame were deſcribed in the Indentures of Bargain and Sale made by the Truſtees for Sale thereof, ſuch* Names and Deſcriptions *may ſerve for conveying or pleading the Title to ſuch Rents from and under the Truſtees.*

Sect. 5. *Provided, that this Act ſhall not give any Benefit in Pleading, or deriving a Title to any Rent, which hath not been paid or levied within* 20 *Years, next before the Time of ſuch Pleading or deriving a Title.*

* Fees.

(A) Fees of Sheriffs.

* It was the *Ancient Law of England* that *none having any Office concerning the Adminiſtration of Juſtice ſhould take any Fee* or Reward of any Subject for the doing his Office, to the End he might be free, and at Liberty to do Juſtice, and not be fettered with Golden Fees, as Fetters to the Suppreſſion or Subverſion of Truth and Juſtice. 2 Inſt. 146.

1. W Eſtm. 1. c. 26. **That no Sheyiff or other** Miniſter **of the King take no Reward for doing his Office, but be paid of that which they take of the King; and he who ſhall do ſo, ſhall render the double to the Plaintiff, and ſhall be puniſhed at the Will of the King.**

Here are underſtood *Eſcheators*, *Coroners*, *Bailiffs*, *Gaolers*, the King's *Clerk of the Market*, *Aulnager*, and other *inferiour Miniſters*, and Officers of the King, whoſe Office do any Way concern the Adminiſtration, or Execution of Juſtice, or the common Good of the Subject, or for the King's Serviee; That none of the King's Officers or Miniſters do take any Reward for any Matter touching their Offices, but of the King. And ſome do hold that the King's *Heraulds* are within this Act; for that they are the King's Miniſters, and were long before this Statute. 2 Inſt. 239.———See 2 Inſt 74.

A *Promoter* of the King brought an Action upon this Statute againſt J. B. Under Sheriff for taking 20*d.* over his Fee contra Formam Statuti, of a Priſoner in his Ward, &c. the Defendant ſaid that he did not take contra Formam Statuti, &c. and the Defendant gave in Evidence, that he and all Under Sheriffs there time out of Mind have uſed *to take of every Priſoner taken for Suſpicion of Felony and acquitted*, which were in their Ward, 20*d.* when they are acquitted, called *Barr Fees*, and *that the Priſoner was in his Ward for Suſpicion of Felony, and before ſuch Juſtices, &c. was acquitted* of the Felony, by which he took 20*d.* for a Barr Fee, &c. and the Plaintiff demurred upon the Evidence, &c. and by the Opinion of all the Juſtices, this is out of the Caſe of the Statute; For the Intent of the Statute is, where he ſo takes of them, that be in Ward, to eaſe them, but here, when he is acquitted, he is no Priſoner; for if he eſcapes, the Sheriff ſhall not be charged of the Eſcape, and this Fee *was aſſigned* by the Court for a Barr Fee by their Diſcretion *in Conſideration of the great Charge, which the Sheriff has in keeping, bringing, and carrying back the Priſoners, and in keeping the Number of Servants to carry them, and in Attendance* for fear of Eſcapes; and ſo the clear Opinion of the Juſtices was, that the 20*d.* for a Barr Fee is out of the Caſe of this Statute. Br. Fees, pl. 6. cites 21 H. 7. 16.

And if a Sheriff *takes of the Priſoner his Cloaths, or Money out of his Purſe in ſpite of his Teeth*, 'tis out of the Caſe of this Statute, becauſe *Treſpaſs lies*. Br. ibid.———Br. Preſcription, pl. 36. cites 21 H. 7. 15. S. C.

The Common Law giving no Fees to Sheriffs, made them backwards in executing Writs, by Reaſon of the great Danger both in taking deſperate Men, by Reaſon of Reſiſtance; and alſo in detaining them, for fear of Eſcapes, ſo that they would have great Rewards, or otherwiſe would do nothing. Whereupon the Parliament thought fit to ſtint their Fees, as in the 29 Eliz. 4. per Doderidge J. Lat. 18. in the Caſe of Walden v. Veſey.

2. Capitula Juſtiti. in Magna Charta, Fol. 155. Articulo 99, of Sheriffs and other Bailiffs and Miniſters of the King, taking Gifts or Reward for executing their Offices. See alſo there Article 121.

3. A Man was *arraign'd of two Felonies*, and *paid but for one Deliverance* only. Quod Nota. Br. Fees, pl. 8 cites 26. Aſſ. 47. Br. Corone pl 103. cites S. C. per Shard.

4. In Replevin, the *Sheriff preſcribed to have* 40*s. per Ann.* of J. N. and his Anceſtors, *for holding of his Tourne at D. for the Eaſe of the Defendant and his Tenants*, for which Sum he diſtrain'd; and per Cur. he cannot preſcribe; For he is an Officer removeable yearly, and therefore the taking of the ſaid Sum is *Extortion*. Br. Fees, &c. pl. 18. cites 42 E. 3 4. Br. Office and Off. pl. 31. cites S. C.—S. P. Br. Preſcription. pl. 9. cites 40 E. 3. 4.——but ſhou'd be 42 E. 3. 4.

5. He, who renders himſelf, and has *Superſedeas before he is arreſted* by Capias in Debt, ſhall make an Attorney in Bank at the Day, and this tho' Cepi Corpus be returned, and ſhall pay no Fees upon the ſpecial Matter returned, *tho' he does not ſhew the Superſedeas to the Sheriff till after the*

 taking

taking, if he renders himself to him before the taking. Br. Fees, pl. 4. cites 21 H. 6. 20.

6. It was held, that a Sheriff cannot take Money for Fees, *upon Delivery of Warrants General to his own Bailiffs*, but must stay till the Money is levied. *But* in Case of special Bailiffs of *Plaintiff*'s own naming, the Sheriff may take his Fees presently. Clayt. 79. 15 Car. Baynes v. Robinson.

7. If, upon a Statute, *one Sheriff takes the Body, and another the Goods*, per Cur. both shall have their Fees. And wheresoever the Sheriff hath *double Trouble*, he shall have *double Fees*. Comb. 220. Mich. 5. W. & M. B. R. Pope v. Haman.

(A. 2) Fees by Sheriff upon Executions.

1. * 29 *Eliz.* 4. ENacts, *that it shall not be lawful for any Sheriff, Under Sheriff, Bailiff, of Franchise, or Liberties in any of their Offices by Colour of their Office, to receive or take of any Person, directly, or indirectly, for serving and executing any Extent or Execution upon the Body, Lands, Goods, or Chattels of any Persons, more than* 12 *d. for every* 20 *s. where the Sum does not exceed* 100 *l. and* 6 *d. for every* 20 *s. over and above the Sum of* 100 *l. which they shall so levy or extend, and deliver in Execution, or take the Body in Execution for, upon pain that every Sheriff, &c. and every their Officers, which shall directly, or indirectly do the Contrary, shall forfeit to the Party grieved his treble Damages, and shall also forfeit the Sum of* 40 *l. one Moiety to the Queen, and the other to the Prosecutor.*

*This Statute doth only extend to their executing of Writs of Execution in Counties, and *not in Cities*, and there they are allowed 12 d. in the Pound for the first 100 l. and 6 d. in every hundred afterwards. But then they ought to pay their own Bailiffs out of their Poundage Money for their Pains. But of late, the Sheriffs of Cities do demand the same as Sheriffs of Counties have; and I have heard they have recovered it L. P. R. 598.——* The printed Book of the Year of this Statute is false, and by the Parliament Roll. it appears to be the 28th. 1 Salk. 331. in Case of **Brookwell** v. **Lock**. Trin. 7 W. 3. B. R.——Skin 364. accordingly, Mich. 5 W. and M. B. R. in Case of Pope v. Hayman.

2. *Provided that this Act do not extend to any Fees to be taken for any Execution in any City, or Town Corporate.*

It was resolved that the Proviso extends to a City Corporate, when *Judgment* is there *given within their Franchise*, and Execution upon that, and *not when Judgment and Execution issues out of Superior Courts*; For in the first Case, the Officer is not at that * Grand Care and Peril. But as to the Sheriff of a County, his Travel and Labour is all one, be it in the Body of the County, or in a Franchise; but if that *Town be a County of itself*, there the Sheriffs shall have their Fees according to this Statute. And now Judgment was given for the Plaintiff Noy. 76. Walden and Gesner v. Veaseley.

* 5 Mod. 97. Brockwell v. Lock. Because he is at less Trouble, the Jurisdiction is narrow and the Sheriff not so much in Danger of an Escape; but where in the principal Case the Jurisdiction being the Palace Court of the Bishop of Rochester, and as large as the Dioceſs, and so was insisted not to be within the like Reason. But Non allocatur.

In an Information on this Statute against the Sheriffs of Gloucester, for taking above 12 d. in the Pound for *executing Process upon a Judgment in C. B* the Defendants *pleaded the Proviso* in the Statute, *wherein all Cities and Corporations, and their Officers are excepted*, upon which it was demurred; for Owen Serjeant, moved that this Proviso extended only for serving Executions upon Judgments in their Courts but not upon Executions of Judgments in other Courts; and so it may be collected by the Preamble and Body of the Act. But all the Court Contra; for it shall be Expounded as well for serving Executions upon Judgments in other Courts, as in their own Courts. Cro. E. 263, 264. Mich. 33 and 34. Eliz. C. B the Sheriffs of Gloucester's Case.

And, whereas it was Objected, that the County *of the City of Gloucester extends four or five Miles* further than the City, and that this *Execution was not in the City*, but within the County of the City; and so is not within the Proviso, the Court said, that if it had been so Pleaded, per-adventure it should be otherwise; but as it is Pleaded, it appears not to the Court, and thereupon it was Adjudged for the Defendants. Cro. E. 264. the Sheriffs of Gloucester's Case.—Lit. 19. 52. S P. per 3 J. † Walden v. Vesley.

† S. C Pasch. 1 Car. Palm. 399.

3. The Sheriffs of London brought Debt against A. upon the Statute of 28 *Eliz.* 4 for the Fees there allowed for the making of an Execution. And upon *Nihil Debet* the special Matter was found of the Statute, which *was that the Sheriff should not take Ultra &c. [a] Sum* for making

of

of an Execution; and all the Court thought, that *this implyed*, that they *ſhould take ſo much*, which is not Prohibited; and tho' the Statute gives no Action for this, yet becauſe it is a Duty, Action is given of Neceſſity by the Law. Therefore Judgment was given, that the Sheriffs ſhould recover the 12l. which were demanded. Mo. 853. pl. 1166. Paſch. 14. Jac. B. R. Proby and Lumley v. Mitchell.

4. No Fee is due to the Sheriff for executing a *Cap. Utlag.* or for a Warrant to execute it, or for a Return of it, per tot. Cur. Het. 52. Mich. 3. Car. C. B. Wildſhire's Caſe.

A Sheriff was *Committed to the Fleet* for taking 20s. for a Warrant on a general Cap. Utlag. For all the Juſtices held, that he ſhall not take any Fees for making of a Warrant or Execution of that Writ, but *only* 2s. 4d. which is *given by the Statute* 23 *H.* 6. for it is at the Suit of the King *But* upon *Cap. Utlag. unde convictus eſt*, which is after Judgment 'tis otherwiſe. Mich. 7. Jac. 1. 2. Brownl. 285. Sheriffs of Berkſhire's Caſe.

5. There was much doubt upon the Words of the Statute, and the Court divided upon the Point, whether the Sheriff ſhould not have 12d. in the Pound for every Pound to 100l. and after that 6d. or whether he ſhould have but 6d. for every Pound when the Execution is more than 100l. Noy. 75, 76. Walden and Geſner v. Veaſely.

Per 3. Juſt. againſt Crew Ch. J. the Sheriff ſhall have 1s. in the Pound for the firſt 100l. and 6d. for what is over 100l. Poph. 173. S. C. Welden v. Veſey.——Poph 176. cites the Caſe of Empſon v. Bathurſt, where two Juſtices Contra one held, that, where the Sum exceeds 100l. he ſhould have but 6d. for levying of every 20s. of the firſt 100l. but that Judgment was given upon other Points, (but adds) that all the Court ſeemed to be of Opinion, that he ſhall have 12d. for every 20s. of the firſt 100l. and 6d. for every 20s. of the Reſidue.—Held accordingly upon the firſt Argument on a Demurrer. Sed Quære, quia adjornatur. Cro. E. 335 Gurney v. Somes——Per Hobert and Winch J. the Sheriff ſhall have 6d. only if the Sum exceeds 100l. Mich 20 Jac. C. B. Winch. 51. in Caſe of Empſon v. Bathurſt.—— Lat. 52. accordingly, Walden and Geſner v. Urſy, S. C——S. P. adjudged and affirmed in Error. Cro. C. 286 Liſter v. Bromley.——Jo. 307. Mich. 8 Car. B. R. S. C.*

6. Per Glyn Ch. J. There are *no Fees* due to the Sheriff *for executing an Habere facias Poſſeſſionem*; and ſo let it be declared, altho' they have uſually taken Fees for executing ſuch Writs. Paſch. 1659. in Caſe of Dene v. Nisbit L. P. R. 597.

7. In an Action againſt a Sheriff for his Fees it was Objected, that this was a *Ca. Sa.* the which was not a Satisfaction, and the Statute does not give any Fee to the Sheriff, but only permits him to take a Fee not exceeding ſuch a Rate. But per Cur. the Uſage has always been ſince the Statute of 28 Eliz. to take a Fee upon a Ca. Sa. and ſuch a Fee is allowed to the Sheriff for his Trouble, which he had in the Execution; and therefore, if there be a *ſecond Execution*, he ought to have a Fee for that alſo for his Trouble, as well as for the firſt; and per Holt Ch. J. an *Action* would lie for his Fee for the *Law* permitting him to take* it, *makes it a Duty*. Skin. 363. Mich. 5 W. and M. B. R. Pope v. Hayman.

* Comb 220. S. C. and P.

8. It was held by the Court, that the Statute extends to all *Judgments in Weſtminſter*, and that, whether the Sheriff executes them in a County, or a Franchiſe, he ſhall have his Fees within this Statute, viz. 1s. per Pound for the firſt 100l. and 6d. per Pound for every other 100l. and ſo it is of the Bailiff of a Liberty, when he excutes any Execution on a Judgment given in the Courts at Weſtminſter within his Liberty; but if the Bailiff or other Officer, executes Proceſs on a Judgment given *in a Court of a Corporation*, or *Liberty*, he is not entitled to Fees within this Statute. 1 Salk. 331. Paſch. 7. W. 3. B. R. Brockwell v. Lock.

9. It was reſolved, that the Statute 29 Eliz. 4. does *not extend to real Executions*, but only to Executions in Perſonal Actions, therefore it does not extend *to an Habere facias Seiſinam, or Poſſeſſionem*. Paſch. 8. W. 3. C. B. 1 Salk. 331. Peacock v. Harris.

10. *Nor* does it extend to Executions upon *Statutes-Merchant, Recognizances*, &c. for the Act is to be underſtood of Caſes *where the Judgment Redditur in invitum*, and not by the voluntary Confeſſion of the Party. 1 Salk. 332 Peacock v. Harris.

1. Upon

11. Upon a *Capias ad Satisfac'* the Sheriff ſhall have his Fees for the whole Debt. 1 Salk. 331. Paſch. 8. W. 3. C. B. Peacook v. Harris.

12. Powell jun. J. ſaid that it was the Opinion of Holt Ch. J. that the Sheriff ſhould have Fees for *executing an Elegit*, but he ſaid he doubted of that; becauſe it would be unreaſonable when the whole Debt is 500l. and perhaps the Land extended but 20l. per Ann. that the Sheriff ſhould have Fees for 500l. Treby Ch. J. ſaid, that he ſhould have Fees *according to the Sum levied*, and not according to the Debt recovered, as upon a Fieri Facias. To which Powell anſwered, that that could not be; becauſe the Party might detain the Land till he was ſatisfied the entire Debt, and the Plaintiff is, by having made his Election, barred of all other Executions. 1 Salk. 332. Peacock v. Harris.

13. If an *erroneous Writ* be delivered to the Sheriff, and he Executes it, he ſhall have Fees, tho' the Writ be erroneous. 1 Salk. 332. Paſch. 9 W. 3. B. R. Earl v. Plummer.

14. For Fees of *executing an Elegit*, Debt lies. *Extent generally* is the Word of the Statute of Eliz. and that an Extent upon an Extent upon an Elegit was an Extent within the Statute, as well as an Extent upon the Statute. 1 Salk. 333, 334. Mich. 4. Annæ. B. R. Tyſon v. Paske.

(A. 3) Fees of other Officers.

2 Inſt. 462, 463. *Weſtm.* 2. 42. *Several Ancient Fees of Marſhals, Chamberlains, Porters of Juſtices in Eyre and Serjeants, bearing Verge before the Juſtices at* Weſtminſter.

2 Inſt. 467. 468. 2. *Weſtm.* 2. 44. *Porters bearing Verge before the Juſtices of the Bench in the Circuit, ſhall take for keeping a Jury only* 10*d. for the Bills, nothing; upon a Recovery without a Jury, nothing; upon a Recovery againſt many by one Writ,* 4*d. For Homage done in the Bench they ſhall have their Upper Garment; of Great Aſſiſes, Attaints, Juries, and Battel Waged, the Fee is* 12*d. for the Pleas of the Crown the Fee is* 12*d. the Dozen; for every Priſoner delivered* 4*d. the Chirographer's Fee is* 4*s. the Clerk's Fee for writing Originals, for every Writ* 1*d.*

(A. 4) Of Coroners.

4 Inſt. 271. —1 Hawk. Pl. C. cap. 68. S. 5. ——2 Hawk. Pl. C. cap. 9. S. 46. 1. 3 *E.* 1. 10. *Weſtm.* 1. *ENACTS that they ſhall take nothing of any Man to do the Office of Coroner, in pain of great Forfeiture to the King.*

—2Inſt 176. ſays, that this Statute was made *in Affirmance of the Common Law*; this only is added, Sur paine de greve forfeiture al Roy, and this Statute ſtood in Force until the Statute made 3 H. 7. 1.

2. Coroners, who had taken *half a Mark at divers times* of the People contra formam Statuti, were thereof *indicted*, and put into the Grace of the King *and made Fine.* Br. Fees, &c. pl. 9. cites 27 Aſſ. 14.

4 Inſt. 271. —2Hawk. pl. cap. 9. S. 47. 3. 3 H. 7. 1. *Gave him a Fee of* 13*s.* 4*d. upon the View of the Body, of the Goods of the Murderer, &c.*

4. A *Coroner received* 1*d. of every Viſne* when they came before *the Judges in Eyre*, as belonging to his Office, which was neither againſt the Common Law, nor this Statute; for he took it *not for doing his Office, but a Right due to his Office*, which might have a reaſonable Beginning, viz. for and towards his Travel, Attendance, and Charges. 2 Inſt. 176.

2 Hawk. pl. Cap. 9. S. 48. 5. 1 *H.* 8. 7. *Enacts that, where any Perſon ſhall be Slain by Miſadventure, the Coroner ſhall not take any thing for doing his Office on pain of* 40*s. The Juſtices of Aſſiſe and Juſtices of Peace are impowered to hear and determine the ſaid Offence.*

(B) By

(B) By Officers in Court. [*Detainer of the Body till paid, Juſtifiable in what Caſes.*]

1. A Gaoler may retain a Priſoner for due Fees. P. 14 Car. B. R. agreed per Cur. in Jennings's Caſe. S. P Br Office and Off. p. 41. cites 8 E. 4. 18.

But a Gaoler can not retain a Priſoner for * Meat Drink, or Lodging; for theſe are not of Neceſſity for him to provide. P. 14. Cur. in B. R. per Cur. agreed. * S. P. Br. Office and Off pl. 41 cites 8 E. 4. 18.

2. If due Fees are due to an Officer and upon a Habeas Corpus he ſends the Body charged with his Fees; it ſeems that he ought to be detained till the Fees paid. A Queſtion in the ſaid Caſe of Jennings.

[See Gaoler (C) (D) Warden of the Fleet (B)]

(C) In Courts. [*Marſhall, &c.*]

1. 2 H. 4. Numero. 54. THE Fees of the Marſhall of the Marſhallie of the Kings Houſehold, and Ibidem Numero. 55. Upon Prayer of the Commons that the Marſhall of the King's Bench, and * others, and the Warden of the Fleet ſhall not take other Fees than ſhall be limited in this Parliament, under pain to loſe their Offices, and to render treble Damages. To which it is Anſwered, that this Petition is committed to his Counſel, to call to them the Chancellor and Juſtices to Examine it, and Ordain due Remedy, as to them ſhall ſeem [good] by Authority of Parliament. * *Orig. is* [d'autres & d'el Gardein, &c

2. In *Attaint*, the *Plaintiff was Nonſuited*, by which Judgment was given, and every one of the *Petit Jury paid* 12*d. to the Fee of the Marſhall*, and went quit, and ſo it ſeems that 'twas in B. R. Br. Fees, &c. pl. 7. cites 19 Aſſ. 13.

3. *By* 2 *H.* 4. 23. *The Fees of the Marſhall of the King's Houſe ſhall be as in times paſt, and no more, viz. for him that comes in by* Capias 4d. *and if he be* bailed 2d. *more; of the Defendant in Treſpaſs that findeth* Bail to anſwer the Suit 2d. *for every* Committment by Judgment 4d. *for every one* delivered of Felony, and of a Felon bailed *by the Court* 4d. *And if the Marſhall, or his Officers take more, they ſhall loſe their Offices, and pay* treble Damages *to the Party; and the Party grieved grieved ſhall have his Suit before the Steward of the ſame Court.*

Here a Server of Bills *ſhall take no more than* 1*d. for every Mile diſtant from the Court to the Place where he doth his Office; but when he ſerves a* Venire Facias, *or a* Diſtringas, *he ſhall have the Double; if ſuch an Officer* takes more *he ſhall be* impriſoned *make a* Fine to the King *at the Diſcretion of the Steward, and be from thenceforth forejudged the Court.*

4. The Marſhall *cannot detain* any Perſon *after* that he is *diſcharged* of the Court, *for any thing but for Fees of the Court*, and *not for Eating and Drinking*, and other Things, which he had bought of him in Priſon, and if he does otherwiſe, perhaps he may be *indicted of Extortion.* Br. Fees, &c. pl 15. cites 8 E. 4. 18.

5. *Gloves* were demanded by the Court *for themſelves and Officers*, before they would allow the Reading of a *Pardon.* Paſch. 22 Car. 2. B. R. Sid 452. the King v. Webſter. Two Dozen of Gloves were given to the Officers in B R. for allowance of Charter of Pardon for Felony. Br. Fees, pl. 14 cites 4 E. 4. 10.——Br. Appeal pl. 92. cites S. C.——Keling 25 S. P.——2 Jo. 56 in Ld C's Caſe.——2 Hawk. Pl. C. 399 S. 71. ſays they may do ſo.

(C. 2) *Eccleſiaſtical.*

1. M. 17. E. 3. B. R. Rot. 20. JUratores preſentant quod Raymondus Procurator Archidiaconi Buck. communiter capit pro Acquietancia Teſtament. faciend. de aliquibus 2s. & pro aliquibus 40d. ad opus prædicti Archidiaconi. Ideo præceptum eſt Vicecomiti, &c. qui venit & Profert Breve de Superſedendo uſque proximum Parliamentum.

2. P. 3. H. 5. B. R. Rot. 15. Pardonatur Archiepiſcopus Eborum pro Extorſione diverſarum pecuniæ Summarum de diverſis, &c. pro probatione teſtamentorum. Et in Rotulo. 16. Pardonatio ejus ſequeſtrationum pro conſimili.

3. Rot. Parliamenti 1 H. 5. Numero 23. The Commons pray **that where by the Law of England in time of your Noble Progenitors, it was Ordained, that no Ordinary of Holy Church of the Realme ſhould take of any Executors of the Teſtament of their Teſtators** for proving the ſame Teſtament, and for the making an Acquittance **in this Party, but 2s. 6d. and now they will take 100l. and ſometimes 40l. 20l. &c. pray, that if they take for it more than 2s. 6d. they ſhall loſe ten times as much as they ſo take, &c.**

Anſwer.

1.[4] The King has charged the Lords Spiritual to Ordain due Remedy, **and if they do not, the King will have it well in Memory, and cauſe it to be amended in Time to come. The like 2 H. 5. ſecond Part, Number 2. 3 H. 5. Number 47. where this is made an Act for a Year.**

2.[5]Rot. Parliamenti 45 E. 3. Numero 24. Complaints againſt Extortions of the Ordinaries in Fees for proving of Teſtaments.

**Orig.* Cheines. 3.[6] Rot. Parliamenti 46 E. 3. Numero 37. Complaints of the Ordinaries for taking from Executions, the Seals, and *Chains of the Teſtators, or Fines and Redemptions for the ſaid Seals, or otherwiſe they will not deliver Adminiſtration of the Teſtator's Goods, &c.

Anſwer.

[7]Let the Prelates and other their Miniſters have the Seals and Chains of thoſe who will give them willingly, ſo that none be conſtrained to give them againſt his Will.

8. *By* 31 E. 3. 4. *Biſhops ſhall retain their Officers from taking Exceſſive Fees for Probats of Teſtaments, in Pain to have them Indicted before the Juſtices for Extortion, as hath been heretofore uſed.*

9. Where a *Biſhop acts as Judge*, he ſhall have his Fees; as where the Church is litigated, he is not bound to award a *Jus Patronatus*, unleſs required by the Party, or his Clerk and at their Coſts. *But where he acts as an Officer only*, as where the Court writes to him to certify Baſtardy, Matrimony, &c. it ſhall be at his own Coſts. Br. Fees pl. 1. cites 34 H. 6. 38.

If a Man makes his Teſtament in Paper, and dies Poſſeſſed of Goods and Chattels above the Value of 40l. and the *Executor* has the Teſtament

10. *By* 21 *H.* 8. 5. *Nothing ſhall be given for the Probate of Wills, or Commiſſion of Adminiſtration, when the Goods of the Dead exceed not* 5 *l. ſave only* 6 *d. to the Regiſter. Nevertheleſs the Judge ſhall not refuſe to prove ſuch a Teſtament, being exhibited unto him in Writing, with Wax ready to be Sealed, and Proved* Communi forma, *but ſhall diſpatch the Party without Delay.*

For the Probate of a Will, and all other Things concerning the ſame, when the Goods of the Dead exceed 5 *l. but not* 40 *l. the Judge's Fee is* 2 *s.* 6 *d. as before, and the Regiſter's* 12 *d. and when they exceed* 40 *l. the Judge's Fee is* 2 *s.* 6 *d. as before, and the Regiſter's as much, or the Regiſter may refuſe the* 2 *s.* 6 *d.*

2 s. 6 d. *and take a Penny for* 10 *Lines of the Will, each Line being conceived to contain* 10 *Inches in length; and for theſe Fees they ſhall diſpatch the Party without fruſtratory delay.*

Nothing ſhall be given for Letters of Adminiſtration, when the Inteſtates Goods exceed not 5 *l. and when they exceed* 5 *l. but not* 40 *l. the Officers Fees are only* 2 *s* 6 *d.*

The Fee of the Copy either of the Will, or Inventory, is the ſame with that above allowed for Regiſtering of the Will, or elſe the Regiſter may take a Penny for every 10 *Lines of the length as aforeſaid.*

The Officer, that takes more than his due Fee, ſhall forfeit that Exceſs to the Party grieved, and beſides 10 *l. to be divided betwixt the King and the ſame Party grieved.*

This Act ſhall not alter the Cuſtom where leſs Money hath been for Probate of Teſtaments.

tranſcribed in Parliament, and brings both to the Ordinary &c. to be proved, 'tis at the Election of the Ordinary, whether he will put the Seal and Probate to the Original, or the Tranſcript; but whether he put them to

the One or the Other, there can be taken of the Executor &c. but 5 s. only viz. 2 s. 6 d. to the Ordinary, &c. and his Miniſters, and 2 s. 6 d. to the Scribe for Regiſtring the ſame; or elſe the ſaid Scribe may refuſe the 2 s. 6 d. and have for writing every 10 Lines of the ſame Teſtament, whereof every Line to contain 10 Inches, one Penny. 3 Inſt. 149, 150.—13 Rep. 24. 25. Hil. 6. Jac. Neale v. Rowſe.

If the *Executor deſires*, that the Teſtament in Paper *may be* tranſcribed *in Parliament*, *he muſt agree with the Party* for the tranſcribing; but the Ordinary, &c. can take nothing for it, nor for the Examination of the Tranſcript with the Original, but only 2 s. 6 d. for the whole Duty belonging to him. 3 Inſt. 150.

Where the Goods of the Dead do not exceed 100 s. the Ordinary, &c. ſhall take nothing, and the Scribe to have only for writing of the Probate 6 d. ſo the ſaid Teſtament be exhibited in writing with Wax thereupon affixed, ready to be ſealed. Where they do amount to above the Value of 100 s. and do not exceed 40 l. there ſhall be taken for the whole but 3 s. 6 d. viz. 2 s. 6 d. to the Ordinary, &c. and 12 d. to the Scribe for Regiſtring the ſame. 3 Inſt. 150.

Where by Cuſtom leſs hath been taken in any of the Caſes aforeſaid, there leſs is to be taken; and where any Perſon requires a Copy or Copies of the Teſtament ſo proved, or Inventory ſo made, the Ordinary, &c. ſhall take for the Search, and making of the Copy of the Teſtament, or Inventory, if the Goods exceed not 100 s. 6 d. and 12 d. if the Goods exceed 100 s. and exceed not 40 l. and if the Goods exceed 40 l. 2 s. 6 d. or to take for every 10 Lines thereof, of the Proportion aforeſaid, a Penny. 3 Inſt. 150.

11. Moſt of the Fees in the Spiritual Court are *appointed by Conſtitutions Provincial*, and they prove them by 'em. Mich. 25 Car. 2. C. B. Mod. 167. per Vaughan and Windham in Caſe of Horton v. Wilſon.

S. C. cited Arg. Mod. 240, 242.—It is Cuſtom and not the

Authority of Conſtitutions which intitles Proctors, &c. to take Fees, for which an Action will ly at the Common Law, and Rule was to declare upon a Prohibition. 4 Mod. 254. Hill. 5 W and M. B. R. Johnſon v. Oxenden.

12. A Prohibition was granted to a Suit for Fees in the Spiritual Court *by an Apparitor* upon a *Suggeſtion, that there were no ſuch Fees due by Cuſtom.* For that is triable by Law, and not by a *Decimaria*, or *Vicenaria Præſcriptio*, which is allowed in their Courts; but they may ſue there for their Due, and * *Cuſtomary Fees.* Mich. 23 Car. 2. B. R. Vent 165 Anon.

* But then it ought to be determined at Law, whether ſuch a Fee was Cuſtomary, or Not; and for

want thereof a Prohibition was granted. Mod. 167. ſaid to have been lately done in B. R. in Caſe of a Proctor for his Fees.

[See Prohibition (F)]

(D) Puniſhment for taking more than uſual Fees.

1. IF any Officer or Judge take more than the uſual Fees, he is puniſhable *at the Common Law.* Per Chamberlain J. 2 Roll. R. 263. in the Caſe of Smith v. Mall.

[See Coroner (H). Extortion.]

(D. 2) It

(D 2) In what Caſes they may not inſiſt, and Puniſhment of Officers inſiſting, on prompt Payment, before they will do the Duty of their Office.

S P. and ſo of Officer or Miniſter, as Biſhop, or the like. Br. Office and Off. pl. 1. cites 34 H. 6. 38, 39.

1. IT is no Return for the Sheriff to ſay, that he *did not execute the Writ*, becauſe the Party did not give him his Fee or Coſts. Br. Fees. pl. 1. cites 34 H. 6. 38.

Twas moved, that an UnderSheriff might attend for refuſing to execute *a Fieri Facias*, till his Shilling-Pence was paid. But the Court would not grant the Rule, but ſaid it was *Extortion*, for which he might be *indicted*. 1 Salk. 331. pl. 5. Hill. 7. W. 3. B. R. Anon.——*The Book is [*and before that.*]

2. The Sheriff may *refuſe* to make Execution, until his Fee be paid him. But then ſee if a new Sheriff be made * before the old one had made Execution, what Remedy now hath the Party; And it ſeemed to me, that he may have an Account, or an Action upon the Caſe in Nature of an Aſſumpſit. Noy. 76. Walden and Geſner v. Veaſeley. ——The Sheriff ſhall not have his Fees *before the Liberate*. Poph. 176. cites it as reſolved. M. 19. Jac. C. B. Empſon v. Bathurſt.

3. Upon a *Hab. Corp.* the Officer ought to *bring the Priſoner to the Court*, and his Refuſal to bring him, unleſs paid his Fees aforehand, is a Contempt; For the King's Writ muſt be obey'd, and the Court will tax the Charges, and compel Payment, if the Officer and Priſoner cannot agree, or Payment is not made according to the Agreement. 2 Jo. 178. Mich. 33. Car. 2. B. R. the King v. the Steward of——.

4. An Under Sheriff refuſed to *execute a Capias* ad *Satisfaciendum* till he had his Fees; and upon Motion againſt him, the Court ſaid, that the Plaintiff might bring an *Action* againſt him for not doing his Duty, or might pay him his Fees, and *then indict him for Extortion*. 1 Salk. 330. Mich. 6. W. & M. B. R. Heſtcott's Caſe.——cites Noy. 75.

(E) Fees granted, and aſcertained, how.

1. ALL new Offices erected with new Fees, or old *Offices with new Fees are within the Stat.* 34 *E.* 1. *Stat.* 4. for that is a Tallage put upon the Subject, which cannot be done without Aſſent by Act of Parliament. 2 Inſt. 533.

2. If the *King grants an Office with a Fee*, it is void; becauſe the King cannot Charge the Subject. per Rainsford J. Hill. 15 and 16 Car. 2. Hard. 353. Veale v. Prior.

3. The Queen grants an Office of *Regiſtring Policies of Inſurance*, and afterwards 43 Eliz. 12. directs, how the Office ſhall be regulated. The Patent was void; but what Validity it has, is derived from the ſaid Statute; but there being *no Fee limited*, it was objected, that there was no Office at all. But it was anſwered, that tho' there was no certain Fee, yet the Party muſt have *what he reaſonably deſerves*, as every one muſt that does any Thing for another at his Requeſt. Now the Policies muſt be entered by the Statute, and the Law will allow a reaſonable Matter for entering them. And *Uſage*, ſince the Statute has now ſettled it, *if not as a Fee, yet as a competent Recompence for his Labour*; as Labourers Rates, tho' not Fees, yet are *Quantum Meruit's*. per Hale Ch. B. Hill. 15 and 16 Car. 2. Hard. 355. Veale v. Prior.

4. *No Court has a Power of ſettling* the Fees of its Officers, ſo as to conclude

conclude the Subject; but thus far they may go; as *to judge what are reasonable Fees.* Hill. 13. W. 3. 12. Mod. 609. Ballard v. Gerard.

5. A. was libelled againſt in the Eccleſiaſtical Court for Fees, and upon Motion a Prohibition was granted; For *no Court has Power* to eſtabliſh Fees. The Judge of a Court may think them reaſonable, but that is not binding: But if, *on a Quantum Meruit, a Jury think 'em reaſonable*, then they become eſtabliſhed Fees. Mich. 3. Annæ. B. R. 1 Salk. 333. Giſford's Caſe.

S. P and by Holt Ch. J. the Judges aſſeſſing them reaſonable may be good, but not concluſive Evidence. And ſo of the *Table of uſual Fees* of a Court not newly erected. 12 Mod. 609. cites 15 Car 2. Veale v. Prior.

(F) Prohibited, or due, in what Caſes, and how much to Officers in Courts.

1. 2 *H.* 4. 10. *Enacts, that when divers Perſons are jointly indicted of one Felony or one Treſpaſs, and they all plead to any Iſſue as not Guilty; the Clerk of the Crown ſhall not take for the Venire Facias, nor for entering of the Plea, but one Fee, viz. 2s. for them all, and not ſeveral Fees for each Perſon.*

This Act is made in Affirmance of the Common Law 4 Inſt. 74.—*So*, if *one* Man be *indicted of two ſeveral Felonies* or Treſpaſſes, and is acquitted, he ſhall pay but for one Deliverance. 4 Inſt. 74.

2. 1 *Jac.* 1. 10. *Enacts that none ſhall take any Money, or promiſe for the Report of any Order or Cauſe referr'd unto them by any of the King's Judges or Court, directly or indirectly, on Pain of 5l. and to loſe his Office or Place in the ſame Court. But*

Not to prohibit the Clerk from taking for his Pains in writing the Report 12d. for the firſt Sheet, and 2d. a Piece for the reſt.

3. If a Client, when his Buſineſs in Court is diſpatched, doth *refuſe to pay* unto the Officer in Court the Fees, which are due to him for doing his Buſineſs; the Court will upon Motion grant an *Attachment* againſt the Client, to have him committed, until he pays the Fees due. per Roll Ch. J. 1650. For the not paying the Fees is a *Contempt* to the Court, and the Court is bound to protect their Officers in their Rights. L. P. R. 598.

4. It ſeems clear, that it is no Excuſe for not obeying a Writ of *Habeas Corpus ad ſubjiciendum*, that the Priſoner did *not tender the Fees* due to the Gaoler. Alſo it ſeems to be the better Opinion, that the Want of ſuch a Tender is no Excuſe for not obeying a Writ of Habeas Corpus *ad Faciendum & Recipiendum*; however, it is certain, that if the Gaoler bring up the Priſoner by Vertue of ſuch Habeas Corpus, the *Court will not turn him over, till the Gaoler be paid all his Fees*, nor, as ſome ſay, till he be paid all that is due to him for the Priſoner's *Diet*; for that a Gaoler is compellable to find his Priſoner Suſtenance, but this is denied by others. 2 Hawk. Pl C. 151. S. 21.

(F 2) Determined by Acceſſion of other Office.

1. NOte for Law, that if *a Man has a Fee of a Lord*, and after *is made a Juſtice*, this Fee is not void by the Law; but after the making him Juſtice, he is not to take any Fee, unleſs of the King. Br. N. C. 29 H. 8. pl. 116.

Br. Office and Off. pl. 47. cites S. C.

Br. Office and Off. pl. 47. cites S. C.

2. *So* of him who has the *Office of Steward*, and after is made a Juſtice. Ibid.

Br. Office and Off. pl. 47. cites S. C.

3. *And* by ſeveral, where a Man is *Bailiff of a Manor by Patent*, and after *is made Steward of the ſaid Manor*, both Patents are good; For the Suitors are Judges, and not the Bailiff. Ibid.

(G) Actions, and Pleadings in Actions for Fees.

Mo. 699. ſays Judgment was reverſed in the Exchequer, but was ended by Compoſition. Vid. Tamen.——

1. IF A. deliver'd an Execution to the Sheriff at his Suit againſt B. and in Conſideration that the Sheriff without any Fee will execute it, he promiſed the Sheriff *to pay him a certain Sum*, which *was the ſame as the Sheriff was allowed to take* by the Statute of 28 Eliz. Glanvill J. held the Conſideration not good; For at Common Law he ought not to take any Fees, but it was Extortion, which the Statute is only to diſcharge the Sheriff from; but the other Juſtices and Barons held it to be a good Conſideration, and were of Opinion to have affirmed the Judgment. But another Error being aſſigned, viz. That the Tales de Circumaſtntibus was returned by the Plaintiff, who brought the Action by the Name of Sheriff of the ſame County, and therefore Judgment was reverſed. Cro. E. 654. Hill. 41. Eliz. B. R. in Cam. Scacc. Stanton v. Suliard.

Adjudg'd that Debt lies; For when a Sum is given by a Statute tho' no Action is

2. The Sheriff may have *Debt on the Statute* for his Fees, and therefore having taken a *double Bond for Payment of his Fees*, it was reſolved that the Bond was void. Pogh. 176. cites it as reſolved M. 19 Jac. C. B. Empſon v. Bathurſt.

mentioned or appointed, yet Debt lies. Cited per Jones J. Lat 51. as the Caſe of Proby and Lumlee.——Noy. 75. cites S. C.——Becauſe it is a Duty, an Action is of Neceſſity Mo. 853. Paſch. 14. Jac. B. R. Proby and Lumley v. Mitchell.——Lat 20. Empſon's Caſe Winch 20. 51. Empſon v. Bathurſt.

Raym. 360. S. C.

3. *Caſe* was brought by a *Sheriff againſt the Grantee of a Hundred for Years* for Fees, and had Judgment. 2 Jo. 194. Paſch. 34. Car. 2. B. R. Cole v. Ireland.

4. For Fees of *executing an Elegit*, Debt lies. 1 Salk. 333. Mich. 4. Annæ. B. R. Tyſon v. Paske.

5. In the ſettling a Diſpute, whether the Warden of the Fleet might return a Non eſt Inventus whereupon to found a Sequeſtration, or that ſuch Return muſt be by the *Serjeant at Arms* before a Sequeſtration could go, Ld Chancellor ordered the Regiſter to look into Precedents, and certify him, how the Practice had gone. But ſaid, that if the Serjeant at Arms was *intitled by the ancient Courſe* to a Fee by the Caption in ſuch Caſes, *it could not be altered without an Act of Parliament.* Mich. 1720. Ch. Prec. 551. Jephſon's Caſe.

(H) Actions for Fees, in what Court.

1. A Demurrer put into a Bill for Fees for ſoliciting to diſcharge a Tenure, and which was diſcharged accordingly, yet the Demurrer to ſtand. Toth. 85. cites 12 Car. Read v. Gilbert.

2. A *Bill* for Fees was *diſmiſſed.* Toth. 84. cites 15 Car. Harding v. Tedwell,——and Moor v. Rowe.

3. *Regiſter* of Spiritual Court cannot ſue there for Fees. Mich. 13. W. 3. B. R. Salk. 333. Ballard v. Gerard

4 There is no ſuing in the *Court of Admiralty*, or *Court of Honour* for Fees, per Eyre J. who ſaid that a Prohibition was granted by all the Judges

Judges of England, in the Caſe of Donvill and Dodd. Mich. 1. Geo. 1. 10 Mod. 264. in the Caſe of Clerk v. Lee.

5. Pratt J. ſaid, he ſaw no Reaſon why Fees in the *Spiritual Court* may not be recovered at Common Law, as well as *Fees in Chancery*. 10 Mod. 264. in the Caſe of Clerk v. Lee.

6. Whether a *Proctor* may ſue *in the Spiritual Court* for his Fees, is a Matter much litigated, and Reſolutions both Ways per Parker Ch J. 10. Mod. 264. Clerk v. Lee.

2 Roll R. 59. is that he may ——— Allowed Mod. 167. Mich. 25. Car. 2. C. B. Horton v. Wilſon———Prohibition granted, and a Rule to declare upon the Prohibition. Hill. 5. W. & M. B. R.——5 Mod. 254. Johnſon v. Oxendon.———5 Mod. 242. S. P. debated, but Adjournatur. Johnſon v. Lee.

7. A Prohibition was mov'd for to the Conſiſtory Court of the Bp of London to ſtay Proceedings in a Suit commenced there by a *Pariſh Clerk*, for his *Dues*, *according to a Rate* agreed to by the Pariſh. Againſt the Prohibition, it was ſaid, that he is to be choſe by the Parſon, and that his Office is Eccleſiaſtical, and conſequently his Fees are of Eccleſiaſtical Conuſance. On the other Hand it was urg'd, that, whoever has the Nomination of him, his Office is merely Temporal, and the Profits of it muſt be ſo likewiſe, and eſpecially in the preſent Caſe, where they are demanded purſuant to a Rate. Per Cur. the Queſtions, who has the Right of Nomination, and what Eſtate the Clerk has, whether at Will only, or for Life, are quite immaterial in the preſent Caſe. The Law is certain, that his Office is Temporal, it was ſo determined in 2 Brownl. 38. And if ſo, his Salary, or whatever is given for the Service of that Office, muſt of Conſequence be of Temporal Conuſance. But whether his Office be Temporal or Spiritual, if the Matter in demand is Temporal, the Eccleſiaſtical Court can have no Juriſdiction. Now here the Demand is in Purſuance to a Rate agreed to by the Pariſh; and there is no Doubt but he may bring his Action upon that Agreement: And accordingly a Prohibition was granted. Hill. 12 Geo 2. C. B. Pitts v. Evans.

[Vide (C 2). Prohibition (F).]

For *more* of the Head of Fees, ſee under the Heads of the *ſeveral Officers*.

Feigned Action.

(A) Feigned Action, or Iſſue, in what Caſes.

1. IN ſuch *Caſes*, which are *merely local*, and the Venire can't be alter'd, they will, *upon good Reaſon*, make them try it upon feigned Action, and if no Conſent be, they will grant Imparlance. Per Pemberton Ch. J. Paſch. 34. Car. 2. B. R. Skin. 44. in the Caſe Ld of Shaftsbury v. Grayham.

2. *And* Dolben J. remember'd the Caſe of Ld Gerard of Bromley

ley and Spencer in the Exchequer when Hale was Chief Baron, who, *upon Affidavit, that the Plaintiff had lived long in Lancashire, and kept great Hospitality*, and bid every Body welcome, &c. *and the Defendant was* a Southern Gentleman, and *lately come into Lancashire*, Hale did not suffer them to proceed in their *Ejectment* in Lancashire, but made them try it in five feigned Actions by a Jury of Hertfordshire. Skin. 44. Pasch. 34 Car 2. B. R. ut sup.

3. On a Motion for a *Mandamus to the old Church-Wardens to deliver the Parish Books* to the new Church-Wardens, &c. 'twas afterwards shewn for Cause against the Motion, that 'twas new, and the like had never been made before in this Court. But 'twas insisted on, that the old Church-Wardens had a Right to keep the Parish Books, and so the Rule was discharged. For a *Contest between Parish Officers, which of them ought to keep the Books*, must be tryed at Law by a feigned Issue. 8 Mod. 98. Mich 9 Geo. 1. the King. v. Street and Stroud.

Felo de se.

(A) How considered, and what Person may be so.

1. BEING a Felo de se is not Murder within the *Exception of Murder* in a *Pardon*. Mich. 12. Car. 2. B. R. 1 Lev. 8. the King v. Ward.

2. Homicide against a Man's own Life brings him under the Notion of Felo de se, if at the Time he were *of the Age of Discretion and Compos Mentis*. 1 Hawk. Pl. C. abr. 72. cap. 27. S. 2. 1 Vol. in Fol. 67. S. 1. cites as in the Marg. *

* Crompt 30. a. b. 31. a. H. P. C. 28. Dalt. 92. 3 Inst. 54.

(B) Forfeiture of what.

1. FElo de se shall not *forfeit* his Lands, but his Goods, Chattels, Leases and Debts. Bacon's Use of the Law.. 39.

2. *Goods* of Felo de se are *forfeited before Inquisition*. 1 Lev. 8. Mich. 12. Car. 2. B. R. the King v. Ward.

3. A. was indebted to B. in 2000 l.——B. is Felo se, and Inquisition returned. An Act of *Oblivion* is passed, by which all Forfeitures, &c. are pardoned. Yet there being no *Words of Restitution* in the Act, the Administrator of *B. cannot recover against A.—Nor the King neither*; For the Pardon operated only to the Benefit of A. 1 Saund. 362, 363. Mich. 21. Car 2. Toomes v. Ethrington.

1 Lev. 120. Mich. 15. Car. 2. S. C. by Name of Tombes v. Etherington. ——Sid. 167. Mich 15. Car. 2. S. C.——And the Year in 1 Saund.. seems to be mistaken. For tho' it cites the Entry of the Case Pasch. 18. Car. 2. in Page 353. yet in Page 362. it says,—that Judgment was given for the Defendant, in Mich. Term. 15. Car. 2.——

4. A Felo de se forfeits *all his Chattels* whatever *in Possession*, and also all *personal Choses in Action*, which he has solely in his own Right; and all *Chattels real*, which he holds, either jointly with his Wife, or in her Right, and *all personal Things in Action*; and as some say, entire Chattels in Possession, to which he is *intitled jointly with another* on any Account, *except Merchandize*: But he forfeits nothing, that he has as *Executor* or Administrator; and as some say, a *Moity* only *of such joint Chattles as may be severed.* 1 Hawk. Pl. C. abr. 72. cap. 27. S. 5.——1 Vol. in Fol. 68. S. 7. cites as in the Marg. * * S. P. C. 189. F. G. 262, 3. H. P. C 29. Pl. C. 262, 3. S. P. C. 188. a. Crom. 31. a. 3 Inst. 55. 19 H. 6. 47. a. 8 E. 4. 24. b. Raym. 7. pl. C. 243, 259, 323.

5. Neither is his *Blood corrupted* or his *Lands of Inheritance* forfeited; nor does his Wife lose her *Dower.* 1 Hawk. Pl. C. abr. 73. cap. 27. S. 6. cites as in the Marg. *———1 Vol. in Fol. 68. S. 8. * Pl. C. 261, b. 262. a

(C) What shall be said such Offence.

1. IN some Cases a Man may be a Felo de se *by Construction of Law, without any Intention against his own Life*; *as*, where one is killed by the *breaking of a Gun*, which he discharges at another with an Intent to Murder him; or by falling *down on a Knife*, which a Person struck by him to the Ground, happens to have in his Hand. 1 Hawk. Pl. C. abr. 72 cap. 27. S. 3.——1 Vol. in Fol. 68. S 4. cites as in the Marg. * * Dal. cap 92. 44 E. 3. 44. 44 Ass 55 Br. Cor. 12, 14.

2. *But* if a Man be killed by *hastily running on a Knife* or Sword, which a Person assaulted by him, and driven to the Wall, holds up in his Defence; he shall not be adjudged a Felo de se, but the other shall be judged to have killed him *Se Defendendo.* 1 Hawk. Pl. C. abr. 72. cap. 27. S. 3.——1 Vol. in Fol. 68. S. 5. cites as in the Marg. * * S. P. C. 16. a 20. H. P. C. 28, 29. Pult. 119. b. Crom. 28. 3 Inst. 54. contra.

3. If a Man be killed by another *on his own Request or Command*, yet is he not a Felo de se; but the other is as much a Murderer, as if he had acted merely on his own Head. 1 Hawk. Pl. C. abr. 72. cap. 27. S. 4.—— 1 Vol in Fol. 68. S. 6. cites as in the Marg. * *Kelw. 136. a. Mo. 754. pl. 1041.

(D) Relation. To what Time the Forfeiture shall relate.

1. NO Part of a Felo de se's personal Estate is vested in the King, before the Self-Murder is *found by some Inquisition*; and therefore the Forfeiture is saved by a *Pardon* before the Inquisition. But if there be no Pardon, the whole is forfeited immediately after the Inquisition, *from the Time of the Wound.* 1 Hawk. Pl. C. abr. 73. cap. 27. S. 7.——1 Vol. in Fol. 68. S. 9, 10. cites as in the Marg. * * 5 Rep. 110. 3 Inst. 54 Saund 362. Sid. 150. 162. 2 Mod. 53 3 Mod 100, 241, 242. Lev. 8. contra. Keb. 67, 68. Pl. C. 260. H. P. C. 29. 5 Rep. 110.

(E) Inquisition, by whom, and how to be taken.

1. IF the * Body can be found, the Inquisition ought to be taken by the Coroner *super Visum Corporis*; and it was a ‡ Question, whether an Inquisition so taken be *traversable?* But if the *Body cannot † be found*, the Inquiry may be by Justices of Peace, or by the King's Bench, if the Felony were in the County where the Court sits; and such an In- * H P C 29. 3 Inst. 55.— † 3 Inst. 55. H. P C 29. 2 Lev. 141. —‡ No Traquisition

verſe can be taken to make a Man Felo de ſe. per Hale. Vent. 239. Hill. 24 and 25. Car. 2. B. R. Anon.

quiſition is certainly traverſable. 1 Hawk. Pl. C. abr. 73. cap. 27. S. 8. ——1 Vol. in Fol. 68, 69. S. 11, 12. cites as in the Marg. *

* 3 Lev. 140. 3 Mod. 100. 2 Lev. 152. Salk. 377. contra.—— ‡ Sid. 225, 229. 3 Mod. 101. Keb. 907. Saund. 273.

2. All Inquiſitions of this Kind ought *certainly and particularly* to *ſet forth the Circumſtances of the Fact*, and in the Concluſion to add, that the Party in ſuch Manner *Felonice*, &c. murdered himſelf. * And if the Premiſſes be inſufficient, as if they *ſet forth the Fact in a nonſenſical Manner*: As that the Party flung himſelf into the Water, and Sic ſeipſum emergit: Or if it *want the Word Murdravit*, &c. it ſhall be quaſhed: ‡ But if it be full in Subſtance, the Coroner may be ſerved with a Rule, to *amend* it *in Form*. 1 Hawk. Pl. C. abr. 73. cap. 27. S. 9.——1 Vol. in Fol. 69. S. 14, 15. cites in as the Marg. *

Felony under Colour of Law.

1. A Man came to Smithfield Market to ſell a Horſe, and a Jockey coming thither to buy a Horſe, the *Owner delivered his Horſe to the Jockey to ride up and down* the Market *to try his Paces*; but inſtead of that, the Jockey *rode away* with the Horſe: This was adjudg'd Felony. Keling 82.

S. C. cited Raym. 276.

2. Coming into a Houſe by Colour of a *Writ of Execution*, and carrying away the Goods is Felony. 2 Vent. 94. cites Farr's Caſe.——Sid. 254. Paſch. 17. Car. 2. B. R. The King v. Farr.

‡ 3 Inſt. 108. cites Paſch. 15. Eliz.—— 2 Sid. 254. in the Caſe of the King v. Farr. S. P. cited as held accordingly in Time of Popham Ch. J.——Raym. 276. cites Dalt. Off. of Sheriffs. Cap. 121. Fol. 489.

3. A. comes into a Semſtreſſes Shop and cheapens Goods and *runs away with the* Goods *out of the Shop, openly, in her Sight*, this is Felony. Raym. 276. Chiffer's Caſe.——So, *under Colour of Outlawry*, to take a Man's Goods, when the Officer knows there is no Outlawry, is Felony.——So ‡ *Suing a Replevin* to get another's Horſe, and then running away with the Horſe.——So *by Ejectment falſely obtained* getting into Poſſeſſion of a Houſe, and converting the Goods. Paſch. 31. Car. 2. in Scace. Raym. 276. in Chiffer's Caſe.

But, when that Truſt is determined, the Party may be guilty of Felony.

4. A *Special Truſt* prevents the Felony, until ſuch Special Truſt is determined. Paſch. 8. Geo. 8 Mod. 76. King v. Maſon.

As where a *Carrier carries Goods to the Place appointed, and after takes them away, and diſpoſes of them*, this is Felony; becauſe by bringing them to the Place appointed, the Bargain for his bringing them is determined, and the Poſſeſſion is then in the firſt Owner. Keling 83. cites 13. E. 4. 9. b.——*So*, if *one delivers Goods to a Porter in London to carry to a certain Place, and he* takes them and *carries them* away *to another Place, and there opens and diſpoſes of them*; this is Felony, which ſeems to be warranted by the 13 E. 4. 9. Ibid.

Feme.

(A) Capable of what.

1. THE *Office of Reaper or Mower of the Manor of D.* was granted to a Feme with a Fee of 20 Quarters of Corn yearly, for exerciſing the ſaid Office for Term of her Life. Br. Grants. pl. 127. cites 30 Aſſ. 4.

2. A Feme ſole may be a *Baily*, and chargeable in Account, as *Receptrix Denariorum*, & ut Balliva. Br. Account. pl. 43. cites 19 H. 6. 5.—— Ibid. pl. 68. cites 4. E. 4. 25.

3. Siſters of an Hoſpital incorporated, may by Cuſtom together with the Brothers *chooſe a Maſter*. Br. Action ſur le Statute. pl. 9. cites 34. H. 6. 27.

4. A Woman may be a *Commiſſioner of Sewers*, and the Ordinances and Decrees of Sewers made by her and the other Commiſſioners of Sewers are not to be impeach'd for the Cauſe of her Sex. Callis of Sewers 201, 202. cites Counteſs of Warwick's Caſe.

5. *Cuſtody of a Caſtle* was granted to a Feme to be exerciſed *Per ſe vel Deputatum ſuum* and held, that it may be good, tho' it was objected, that it appertains to the War, and to be executed by Men only. Mich. 1. Jac. B. R. Cro. J. 18. Lady Ruſſell's Caſe.

6. A Woman was appointed by the Juſtices to be *Governeſs of a Workhouſe* at Chelmsford, and it was moved to quaſh the Order, becauſe it was in the Nature of a Houſe of Correction, and ſo the Office was *not ſuitable to her Sex*. But per Cur. abſente Holt, 'tis a good Appointment, and ſhe may be capable of executing the Office, either by her ſelf or *Deputy*; as the Lady Broughton did, who was *Keeper of the Gatehouſe* at Weſtminſter. 3 Salk. 2. cites Mich. 2 Annæ. Anon.

7. In an Aſſumpſit for Money had, and received to the Plaintiff's Uſe, tried in London coram Lee Ch. J. the following Caſe was made for the Opinion of the Court of B. R. (viz.) that upon the Death of Robert Bly, *Sexton of the Pariſh Church* of St Botolphs without Alderſgate, two Candidates offered themſelves to be elected in his room; viz. the Widow of the Sexton deceaſed, and the Plaintiff: That upon caſting up the Books, the Plaintiff appeared to have a Majority of *Male* Votes, but that afterwards, the Widow *polled* 40 *Women*, and then ſhe had the Majority; that the Widow, and all the Female Voters were *Houſe-keepers, paying Scot and Lot*, and to all Pariſh Rates and Aſſeſſments. And the firſt Queſtion was, whether a Woman was capable of this Office. (2dly) Whether Women cou'd vote in ſuch Election. After three Arguments at Bar, it was reſolved, that the Office of Sexton was *no publick Office, nor* a *Matter of Skill* or Judgment, *but only a private Office of Truſt*; (viz.) to take Care of the Church, the Veſtments of the Miniſter, and the Books, &c. of the Pariſhioners; and therefore a Woman was very proper to execute it, and if there was any Thing to be done in this Pariſh by a Sexton, not pro-

per

per for a Woman (as in every Place the Office varies in ſome Reſpect or other) the Court ſaid, the Caſe was defective in not ſetting it forth. Trin. 13 Geo 2. B. R. Olave v. Ingram.

8. *And* ſecondly, it was reſolved, that being a Matter of no publick Concern, but only relating to themſelves and the reſt of the Pariſhioners, Women *have* likewiſe a *Right of Election* of ſuch Officer; For they have an equal Intereſt in the Church, &c. as the Male Pariſhioners, and therefore ought to have an equal Right to appoint a Perſon to take Care of it. Trin. 13 Geo. 2. B. R. Olave v. Ingram.

[See Barretor (B).]

(B) Feme Sole Merchant. Who is; and of her being a ſeparate Trader in General.

Litt R. 31. S. C. Het. 9. S. C. Bewett v. Langham. —10 Mod. 6. Anon. S. P.

1. FEME Sole Merchant *is*, where the Feme trades by herſelf in one Trade, with which her Husband doth not meddle, and buys and ſells in that Trade; there the Feme ſhall be ſued, and the Husband named only for Conformity, and if Judgment be given againſt him, Execution ſhall be only againſt the Feme. Cro. Car. 69. Paſch. 3 Car. C. B. Langham v. Bewett.

—But if the Wife *uſe the ſame Trade, that her Husband does*, 'twas adjudged, tho' not reported by Croke, that ſhe was not within the Cuſtom. Mod. 26. Mich. 21 Car. B. R. Anon.

S.P. *for Debts owing to her within the City.* But for thoſe due to her elſewhere, the Husband muſt join. Mich. 8 Annæ. B. R. 11 Mod. 253. Mrs. Poole's Caſe.

2. Such a Feme may ſue an *Action without her Husband*, per Wray. Ch. J. Paſch. 31 Eliz. B. R. Le. 131. in Caſe of Chamberlain v. Thorp.

3. Every Feme Sole, which tradeth in London, *is* not a Merchant. Cro. C. 69. Langham v. Bewett.

4. In a Writ of Execution the Sheriff returned, that the Plaintiff brought his *Action* in the Sheriff's Court in London *againſt the Defendant and his Wife* as a Feme Sole Merchant, and had a Verdict; and how that by Cuſtom in the City of London the Lord Mayor is Chancellor, and may call Cauſes before him out of the Sheriff's Court, and rule them according to Equity; and ſhews how that the Lord Mayor had called this Cauſe before him, and ordered the Plaintiff ſhould have Judgment, and that the Defendant ſhould pay Coſts within 14 Days; and that ſhe ſhould pay the Debt by 50 *s.* quarterly, or elſe that Execution ſhould go; and that this was the Reaſon why he could not make Execution: The Court held the Return ſufficient, and the *Cuſtom reaſonable*, tho' it had of late been abuſed. Skin. 67. Mich. 34 Car. 2. B. R. Barns v. Barns.

'Twas argued for Defendant, that carrying on ſuch Trade need not be in a Shop; For that ſome Trades are never exerciſed in Shops, and particularly this, and that ſo was Mr. Phillips's Reading on

5. Caſe was brought in the Mayor's Court upon an Indeb. Aſſ. for 57 *l.* according to the Cuſtom of the City. The Evidence was for Goods ſold to the Defendant's Wife in her Life, the Jury found, that Defendant had been a Freeman, but left off his Trade 20 Years before, and turned diſſenting Teacher, but the Wife lived apart from him within the Liberty of the City, and exerciſed the Art of making Gimp-Lace, and the Husband no Ways intermeddled; that ſhe paid her own Rent, *kept no Shop* but worked in the Garret; that ſhe had Goods of the Plaintiff to carry on her Trade, amounting to 57 *l.* And that *after her Death the Defendant promiſed Payment*; Judgment was given by Rider for the Defendant, and he declared, that Treby was of the ſame Opinion. Mich 2 W. and M. Show. 183. Fabian v. Plant. — The Reporter who argued this Caſe for Defendant, makes a Quære, and ſays it deſerves Conſideration, if ſuch a Feme Sole

Sole Trader dies, and leaves an Eſtate, and the Husband poſſeſſes himſelf of it, if he ſhall not be anſwerable for her Debts.

this Cuſtom which he ſays he had ſeen in Mr. Lightfoot's Cuſtody. Ibid 184.

6. If the *Huſband* relinquiſh, or become *Bankrupt*, or be *over Sea*, or of *another Trade*, or never intermeddle with her Trade, ſhe is within the Cuſtom. Show. 184. in the Caſes of **Fabian v. Plant.** cites Het. 9, 10. ——*Or* if both *exerciſe the ſame* Trade *diſtinctly* by themſelves, and not intermeddle with one another, Het. 9, 10. Paſch. 3 Car. C. B. Bowet v. Langham.

7. A Woman, whoſe *Husband had left her above* 12 *Years* before, had carried on a Trade in her own Name as a Widow, and *gave Receipts in her own Name*, being ſued for a Debt contracted in the Way of her Trade gave Coverture in Evidence, and *gave Evidence of her Husbands having been lately alive in Ireland*; and Holt Ch. J. directed the Jury to find for the Defendant, and ſo they did. 12 Mod. 603. Mich. 13 W. 3. Anon.

8. A. Widow and Adminiſtratrix of B. uſed to deal in Tea in B's Life Time, and bought 4 Tubs of C. at ſo much per Tub, one of which A. paid for and took away, leaving 50 *l.* in Earneſt for the other 3; Ruled at Guildhall, per Holt. Ch. J. that the *Husband was liable* on the Wife's Contract, becauſe they *cohabited*. Paſch. 3 Annæ. 1 Salk. 113. Langfort v. Adminiſtratrix of Tiler.

Fences.

(A) Who muſt make them: and againſt whom; And where none were before.

1. IF I am bound to Fence againſt Land, and I *purchaſe that Land*; I am not bound to make a Fence againſt my own Land. Per Newton. Br. Curia Claud. pl. 2. cites 22 H. 6. 7, 8. Sir Geo. Sackvill v. Milward.

2. A. ſeiſed of 200 Acres of *Common Moore*, *enfeoffs B. of* 50 verſus Boream.—The Purchaſer is bound to *encloſe* or * keep the Beaſts within the 50 Acres, and ſo ought A. to do of the Reſidue for his Beaſts, and adjudged accordingly. Mich. 22 and 23 Eliz. D. 372. pl. 10.——Arg. cited 2 Roll. R. 289. in Caſe of Holbeech v. Warner.

* For if the Beaſts of either, eſcape into the Land of the other, *Treſpaſs* lies, tho' wild Dogs drive the Beaſts of the one into the Lands of the other. F. N. B. 128. (298) in the Notes there cites Raſt. Ent. 621 and 20 E. 4. 10.

3. A. having 2 *Cloſes adjoining*, *ſells one* of them, per 2 Juſt the Vendor ſhall make the Incloſure, but per other 2 Juſt. the Vendee ſhall make it. Mo. 775. Trin. 2 Jac. Doyly v. Drake.

4. By *Unity of Poſſeſſion*, a Duty of Fencing may be extinguiſhed, and ſhall *not revive*, tho' the Cloſes after come into ſeveral Hands. Vent. 97. Hill. 35 Car. 2. B R. Polus v. Hanſtock.

(B) Caſes of Treſpaſſes through Fences; or, where no Fences are.

1. IF *A. has Land adjoining to his own Park*, and it belongs to him to Fence his Park; yet he is *not bound to Fence againſt his own Land.* per Newton. Ch. J. But by Paſton e contra. Br. Curia Claud. pl. 2. cites 22 H. 6, 7, 8. and Brook ſays, that he is of Opinion with Newton.

2. If *A. has Land on one Side of a very large Field, and ought to Fence* againſt it; and *B. has Land on the other Side, and ought to Fence* againſt it; if the Beaſts of A. enter into the Field, and thence into the Cloſe of B. and for Default of the Fence of B. yet B. may have Treſpaſs againſt A. and ſo Vice verſa. Br. Curia Claud. pl. 2. ut ſupra per Newton.

If A. has a Cloſe next the High-way, and Beaſts come out of the High way into the Cloſe of A. and thence they

3. If *A.* be bound to *incloſe againſt B.* and *B. againſt C.* and *Beaſts eſcape out of C's Land into B's Land, and* thence *into the Land of A.* In this Caſe A. ſhall not have Treſpaſs againſt C. *But* if A. be bound to incloſe againſt B. and *B's Beaſts eſcape into A's Land*, and thence *into the Land of one D.* a Stranger, there *D. ſhall have Treſpaſs*, and B. be put to a Curia Claudenda againſt A. F. N. B. 128. (298) in the Notes there, cites 10 E. 4. 7, 36 H. 6. Bar * 68.

go into a Cloſe of B. adjoining, and which B. ought to fence; There in Default of Incloſure, &c. 'tis a good Plea againſt A. but not againſt B. or another Stranger, &c. Noy. 107. Harvey v. Gulſton cites 36 H. 6. Barr. 168.—Jenk. 161. pl. 5. cites 22 E. 4. 49. but if ſeveral Cloſes of A. lie contiguous, and the Beaſts go into all the Cloſes of A 'tis no Treſpaſs.—* It ſhould be 168.

4. If Cattle break in at my Fence, I cannot puniſh the Owner; But if *after Notice he ſuffers them to continue there*, he ſhall be puniſhed, tho' it be thro' my Default. 2 Le. 93. Arg cites 22 E. 4. 49.

5. A. and B. *exchanged Lands*, whereupon *A. agreed to make* the Fences and maintain them.—A. did not make them, but for Want thereof, B's Beaſts break into A's Ground.—A. brings *Treſpaſs*. Per 3 J. againſt Popham, this Agreement is no Bar to Treſpaſs, tho' by Deed; but his Remedy is by an Action of Caſe on the Promiſe, if without Deed, or on *Covenant*, if by Deed. Mich. 41 and 42 Eliz. B. R. Cro. E. 709. Nowell v. Smith.

6. One cannot have *Treſpaſs* for *breaking another Man's Fence*; but if he be damnified by the breaking of it, he may have Action on the Caſe againſt the Party that broke it, per Roll. J. Mich. 24 Car. B. R. Sti. 131. in Caſe of Sir A. A. Cooper v. St. John.

7. A. ſells to B. a Piece of *Paſture lying open to another Piece* of Paſture *of Vendor's*; B. muſt keep his Cattle from running into A's Piece. So of Dung, &c. per Cur. Mich. 3 Annæ. B. R. 6 Mod. 314. in Caſe of Tenant v. Golding.

[See Conſequential Loſſes.—Diſtreſs (B).—Improvement (E. 2)—Rent (P. c).—Treſpaſs (I. a).

(C) Actions for want of Repairing Fences.

1. TRESPASS *on the Caſe* lies for not incloſing againſt the Land of the Plaintiff, by which Defendant's Cattle entered ad Damnum, &c. For in this Action he recover *Damages only.* Br. Curia Claud. pl. 5. cites 11 R. 2.

2. If A. and B. have Lands adjoining, where there is *no Incloſure*, and the Beaſts of the one eſcape into the Land of the other; Treſpaſs lies; and the Writ ſhall be *Quare Clauſum fregit*, For it a Cloſe in Law. F. N. B. 128. (298) in the Notes there, cites 22 H. 6. 9.

3. A.

3. A. and B. had Lands contiguous, and the Fences were always made by thoſe who had the Lands of B. *The Beaſts of B. eſcaped into the Lands of A.* for want of B's reparing his Fences, *and thence into the Lands of C.* for which *C. brought Treſpaſs againſt A. and recovered*; whereupon *A. brought Caſe againſt B.* and had a Verdict; but it was moved in Arreſt of Judgment for want of good Pleading, & adjornatur. Hill. 20 Jac. B. R. Cro J. 665. Holbach v. Warner.

4. A *Writ for one Vill againſt another* Vill, to make them repair their Fences, was granted; but per Cur. it ſhall be but in the Nature of a Sci. Fa. retornable in this Court. Sti. 26. Paſch. 23 Car. B. R. Anon.

5. A. was *poſſeſſed of a Cloſe adjoining to a Cloſe of* B. the Fence between the ſaid two Cloſes had Time out of Mind been repaired by the Tenants and Occupiers of B's Cloſe. The Fence was not repaired, ſo that *B's Cattle came into A's Cloſe.* A. brought an Action on the Caſe againſt B ſetting forth this Matter, and had Judgment in C. B. and upon Error brought in B. R. this Judgment was affirmed; and per Cur. *either Treſpaſs or Caſe lies*; Treſpaſs, becauſe it was the Plaintiff's Ground and not the Defendants; and Caſe, becauſe the firſt Wrong was a Non Feazance, and neglect to repair, and that Omiſſion is the Gift of the Action; and the Treſpaſs is only *conſequential Damage.* Mich. 9 Annæ. B. R. 1 Salk. 335. Starr v. Rookesby.

[See (A) (B).——Conſequential Loſſes.]

(D) Curia Claudenda. In what Caſes it lies, and for whom, and when.

1. CURIA Claudenda lies to incloſe *between Houſe and Houſe*, and *Court and Court*; and by this Action the Defendant ſhall be compelled to make the Incloſure. Br. Cur. Claud. pl. 5. cites 11 R. 2 per Richill. and Fitzh. Barre. 36.

2. If A. has a *Cloſe adjoining to a Cloſe* of B. which B. is bound to make the Incloſure between the two Cloſes, but he does not make it, a *Curia Claudenda* lies. Br. Curia Claudenda pl. 1. cites 2 H. 4. 11.

3. If *A. be bound to incloſe againſt B. who has* 20 *Acres* adjoining, and *A. purchaſes one Acre* contiguouſly adjacent to the Incloſure; A. ſhall not be compelled to incloſe. F. N. B. 128. (299) cites it as reſolved *. 21 H. 6. 3. 22 H. 6. 8.

* This ſeems to be miſ-cited, and ſhould be 21 H. 6. 5. or 33 Sackvil'e v. Milward.

4. A. was ſeiſed of the *Park of C.* in C. and *B. was ſeiſed of* 30 *Acres in C. adjoining. A.* and all thoſe, whoſe Eſtate, &c. he has, *uſed to make the Fence* between the Park and the 30 Acres. B. put his Beaſts into the 30 Acres, and they for want of a Fence entred into the Park. In Treſpaſs for this Entry, A. Proteſtando that he, &c. had not uſed to make the ſaid Fence pro Placito ſaid, that one *C. is ſeiſed of* 10 *Acres, lying between the ſaid* 30 *Acres and the Park*; and becauſe B. by pleading as above, had confeſſed the Treſpaſs; A. had Judgment; For the Replication is good; Becauſe *A. is not bound to Fence but againſt him, who has the Land next his Park, unleſs in a ſpecial Caſe.* Br. Curia Claud. pl. 2. cites 22 H. 6, 7, 8. Sackville v. Milward.

If *A. has a Cloſe which he uſed to incloſe, and after, has an Acre* of Land *contiguous*, and then *lets out his Incloſure with Limits*, &c. yet he that has the contiguous Land, ſhall not *juſtify for Default of Incloſure.* F. N. B. 128 (299) in the Notes there, cites it as reſolved. † 21 H. 6. 3 and 22 H. 6. 8.——† This ſhould be 21 H. 6. 5. or 33.

5. As

For the *Commoner has Intereſt in the Land* by Reaſon of his Common, tho' he is not owner of the Land. Ibid.

5. *As* if *B. or another had Common in the* 10 *Acres*; but then this *ought to be ſhewn*. Br. Curia Claud. pl. 2. ut ſupra.

A *Commoner* in the Land adjoining may diſtrain for Damage feaſant, but he ſhall not have a Curia Claudenda for the Damages ſuſtained by him; For the Writ ſuppoſes *ad Nocumentum liberi Tenementi*; ſo that the Plaintiff ought to have the Soile. F. N. B. 128. (C). ——F. N. B. 128. (B) and in the Notes there (d).

6. He, *who has no Land adjoining*, tho' grieved, *ſhall not have Curia Claudenda*. per Newton. Ch. J. Br. Curia Claud. pl. 2 cites 22 H. 6. 7, 8.

F. N. B. 128 (E).

7. *Curia Claudenda lies only* where a Man ought to incloſe *by Præſcription*; For if he is bound to it by Indenture, or Compoſition in Writing, then Writ of *Covenant* lies, and not Curia Claudenda. Br. Curia Claud. pl. 2. ut ſupra.

F. N. B. 127. (I) Marg.

8. One may have a Curia Claudenda *before he is damnified*, and ſhall *furniſe Damages*; For this is *not traverſable*. Br. Curia Claud. pl. 3. cites 5 E. 4. 118, 119.

9. In *Avowry*, the Plaintiff ſaid that the Land *adjoined to the High Way, and was open in Default of Incloſure of the Tenant*, and he *chaſed the Beaſts into the Way, and they eſcaped in*, and the *Defendant took them*, and the *Plaintiff made freſh Suit*; and *did not alledge Preſcription, that the Tenant ought to make the Hedges*, and yet well; the *Defendant ſaid that they were there for two Nights*, and no Plea without a Traverſe of *the Eſcape, or the freſh Suit*; For one of them *ought to be traverſed*. Br. Avowry. pl. 135. cites 15 H. 7. 17.

It lies only for a Tenant *in Fee*; For it is a Writ of Right.

10. A Curia Claudenda lies not for *Tenant for Years*. Fin. Law. 8vo. 276. Mich. 9 Annæ. B. R. 1 Salk. 336. in Caſe of Starr v. Rooksby.—F. N. B. 128. (B).

(E) Curia Claudenda. Pleadings, &c. in that and Treſpaſs.

1. TRESPASS of a Cloſe broken and Graſs eaten; Yelverton pleaded, to the Vi & Armis, and the Entry guilty; and, to the reſt, we are *ſeiſed of an Acre of Land in B. which is adjoining to your Cloſe in F. and* we *put our Cattle in our Acre* for Paſture, *and there is a Hedge between the Land of the Plaintiff and our Acre, which the Plaintiff*, and all thoſe, whoſe Eſtate he has in this Land, have *uſed to make* time out of Mind; and becauſe *the Hedge was open*, broke, and waſte, our Cattle entered into his Land, and did the Treſpaſs, &c. *which is the ſame Treſpaſs*, of which the Plaintiff brought his Writ, &c. Judgment ſi Actio, and a good Plea per tot. Cur. Br. Treſpaſs. pl. 129. cites 19 H. 6. 33.

S. P. ibid. pl. 145. cites 21 H. 6. 33. and 22 H. 6. 7.

2. Treſpaſs of a Cloſe broken, and Graſs eaten, the *Defendant ſaid that A. is ſeiſed of a Cloſe in D. containing* 100 *Acres, and B.* is ſeiſed *of another Cloſe adjoining*, containing 30 Acres, *and the Plaintiff and thoſe whoſe Eſtate, &c. have uſed*, time out of Mind, *to make the Hedge between them, and the Plaintiff abated the Hedge*, and *B leaſed his Cloſe to the Defendant for* 10 *Years*, &c. and he put his Cattle into it, and they entred into the Cloſe of the Plaintiff for Default of Incloſure, and eat the Graſs, Judgment, &c. Per Yelverton this is a good Anſwer to the Depaſture, but not to the Breaking; and per tot' Cur' the Act of the Beaſts is the Act of the Defendant, and the Entry of them is a breaking in a Manner, by which they awarded the Plaintiff not to anſwer, quod Nota. Br. Treſpaſs. pl. 136 cites 21 H. 6. 5.

3. Treſpaſs

3. Treſpaſs of a Cloſe broken and Graſs eaten, the *Defendant ſaid that T. P. was ſeiſed of a Cloſe* containing 7 Acres there, *and leaſed it to the Defendant for 7 Years*, the Term commenced, &c. during, &c. *and the Plaintiff was ſeiſed of another Cloſe adjoining*, in which the Treſpaſs is ſuppoſed, *and* that the Plaintiff and all thoſe whoſe Eſtate, &c *have uſed to make the Fence time out of mind, and the Defendant put his Cattle into his Cloſe, and they entered into the Cloſe of the Plaintiff for Default of his own Incloſure, &c. he ought to ſhew againſt whom he ought to make the Fence*, &c. and ſo he did; *and that the other Defendants, as Servants of the Defendant, came in Aid to put the Cattle into the Land*, &c. and no Plea; but *ſhall ſay Not Guilty for them*; For they did nothing but put the Cattle into the Land of their Maſter. Br. Treſpaſs, pl. 155. cites 22 H. 6. 36. Br. Preſcription, pl. 25 cite. S. C.

4. *Contra, where they Juſtify for Common of their Maſter*; For *there they confeſs that they put the Cattle into anothers Soil which is Treſpaſs*, unleſs it be excuſed; but in the firſt Caſe, the Maſter only is the Treſpaſſor with his Cattle, and not the Servants. Ibid. Br. Preſcription, pl. 25. cites S. C.

5. *And for other Cattle*, the *Defendant juſtify'd, that they eſcaped* into the Land of the Plaintiff, and eat his Graſs, *and he freſhly retook*, and no Plea, but is a *Confeſſion of the Treſpaſs*, by which he *preſcribed in the Eſcape*, as appears. Ibid. The Defendant ſaid, that *T. P. his Leſſor, and all thoſe whoſe Eſtate, &c. have uſed to have Eſcape in the Cloſe of the Plaintiff*, and that for the Eſcape the Plaintiff, nor any of thoſe whoſe Eſtate he hath, ought to have Satisfaction, or Amends, if they are freſhly re-taken, &c. but per Port, this Preſcription does not lie in the Mouth of the Tenant for Years, but he *ought to ſay, that the ſaid T. P. his Leſſor, and all thoſe whoſe Eſtate, &c. for them and their Tenants for Life, for Years, and at Will have had ſuch Cuſtom*; by which he pleaded accordingly: And per tot. Cur. it is a good Preſcription; For it may have lawful Commencement, as by Grant of thoſe who were ſeiſed of the Land, where the Treſpaſs was, &c. Br. Preſcription, pl. 25. cites S. C.

6. Curia Claudenda may be in the Right, (viz.) *in the Debet*, as well as in the *Debet and Solet*. Br. Curia Claud. pl. 3. cites 5 E. 4. 118, 119. Where the Queſtion is as to the *Right of Incloſing* to charge the Inheritance, the Title ſhould be ſhewn in the Debet and Solet, but not where it is *in Excuſe of Treſpaſs only*. Yelv. 75. Mich. 3 Jac. B R. Faldo v. Ridge ——— Ibid. 76 ſays, that this Judgment was reverſed in the Exchequer Chamber. [But does not ſay for what]

7. If in Curia Claudenda the *Defendant ſays*, that it is *well incloſed*, the Plaintiff ſhall recover immediately; For by this Bar the *Matter is confeſſed*, per Keble. Br. Barre. pl. 111. cites 16. H. 7. 9.

8. The *Judgment* in Curia Claudenda, *is to recover the Incloſure and Damages* for the Non-incloſure. Br. Barre. pl. 111. cites 16 H. 7. 9. per Fineux.

9. The Declaration muſt *ſhew the Certainty of the Land*, which the Plaintiff hath *adjoining* to the Defendant, and the Certainty of the Land which the Defendant hath there adjoining, which he ought to incloſe; and to *alledge a Preſcription* of the Incloſure. F. N. B. 128. (E). See a Precedent F. N. B. 128. (298) in the Notes there.

10. If *A's Beaſts eſcape into the Land of B. where B. ought to incloſe*, A. ſhall have no Advantage thereof on the general Iſſue; but ought to *plead it ſpecially*. F. N. B. 128. (298) in the Notes there cites 18 H. 8. 6.

11. It is a good Iſſue to *traverſe the Preſcription*; For if the Plaintiff be not bound to Incloſe (tho' he *has voluntarily Incloſed*) it will be to no Purpoſe. F. N. B. 128 (298) in the Notes there.

12. If the Defendant *pleads that he is ſeiſed in his Demeſne as of Fee* of the Cloſe of D. the Plaintiff may *reply, that J. S. was ſeiſed, Abſque hoc, that the Defendant was ſeiſed in his Demeſne as of Fee*, and ſo cauſe the *preciſe Eſtate* to come in Queſtion. *But if Defendant* had *pleaded generally* that he was *ſeiſed* of the Cloſe adjoining, or that the Cloſe adjoining was his Freehold; there the Plaintiff ſhall *reply*, that he had *nothing in the Cloſe adjoining at the Time*, &c. and this ſhall make the Iſſue. F. N. B. 128. (298) in the Notes there cites D. 365 * Sir Francis Leak's Caſe. * D. 365. a. b pl. 32, 33. Mich. 21 and 22 Eliz. S. C.

13. In *Caſe*, the Count was, *that A. the Plaintiff was poſſeſſed of a Cloſe 30 Mar. 18 Jac. called H. in W. and that B. the Defendant was poſſeſſed of a* 2 Roll R. 288. S. C. and Palm 331.

S. C. and they both Report, that Chamberlain J. was of the ſame Opinion with Doderidge and Houghton, that the Preſcription was Inſufficient.

a Cloſe called G. in W. and that *Omnes Poſſeſſores of the Cloſe called G. had uſed time whereof, &c. to make the Fences betwixt, &c. ſo as the Cattle in the Plaintiff's Cloſe ſhould not come into the Defendant's Cloſe, and that for Default of Fences, the Defendant's Cattle went out of his own into the Plaintiff's and from thence into a Cloſe of J. S. who ſued and Recovered againſt him.* After Verdict, it was moved in Arreſt of Judgment, that this Preſcription by *Omnes Poſſeſſores* was not good; becauſe that may be for Years, or at Will, tho' * *Terrarum Tenentes* implied a Fee Simple; and of this Opinion were Doderidge and Houghton J. but Lea Ch. J. Contra; becauſe it was in Action on the Caſe. And adjornatur Cro. J. 665. Hill. 20 Jac. B. R. Holbach v. Warner.

* S. P. 1 Salk. 336. Mich. 9. Annæ B. R. in Caſe of Starr v. Rookesby.

14. A. was *Poſſeſſed of a Cloſe adjoining to a Cloſe of B.* the Fences between the ſaid two Cloſes had, Time out of Mind, been repaired by the Tenants and Occupiers of B's Cloſe. The Fence was not repaired, ſo that *B's Cattle came into A's Cloſe*; A. brought an Action on the Caſe againſt B. ſetting forth this Matter, and had Judgment in C. B. and upon Error brought in B. R. this Judgment was affirmed; and per Cur. the Plaintiff has made himſelf a ſufficient Title in his *Declaration*, by *ſhewing the Defendant bound to this Charge by Preſcription*, which Preſcription is ſufficiently alleged; For by * *Tenentes* is meant the Owners of the Fee Simple, and by *Occupatores* thoſe that come in under them That Tenentes is ſo taken, appears by the Writ de Curia Claudenda, which is a Writ of Right, and lies only for a Tenant in Fee; and as this is a Charge upon the Land, which runs with it, there is good Reaſon, why every Occupier ſhould be bound; and it is ſufficient for the Plaintiff to Charge the Tenentes, and Occupatores; becauſe it is impoſſible, that he, who is a Stranger, ſhould be able to know, and ſet forth their particular Eſtates, Titles, and Intereſts; but the Preſcription is annexed to the Tenentes, that is to ſay, Tenants of the Fee; yet, on a Traverſe of the Preſcription, it would be good *Evidence*, that the Tenants for Years have from Time to Time fenced, and repaired; For perhaps the Eſtate has not ſince Time of Memory been in the actual Occupation of the Owner of the Fee. 1 Salk. 335, 336. Mich. 9 Annæ. B. R. Starr v. Rooksby.

* Cro. J. 665. Holbach v. Warner.

[See (C)]

Fens.

(A) Contracts relating to Draining them.

1. 43 *Eliz.* 11. *Enacts that all Contracts, or Bargains made of part of ſuch waſts Commons, or ſeveral Grounds, (lying in or near the ſame) as are ſubject to ſurrounding, between the Lords, Commoners, or Owners thereof, on the one Part, and the Drainers on the other Part, ſhall be good in Law according to the Manner and Forms of ſuch Contracts, or Bargains.*

Where the Queen, her Heirs and Succeſſors, hath an Intereſt in ſuch Waſtes, &c. ſuch Contracts or Bargains, ſhall not bind them, unleſs they be written in Parchment, indented and certified in Chancery, and the Royal Aſſent thereunto firſt obtained and ſignified under the Privy, or Great Seal, when the Waſtes or Soils are of the Poſſeſſions of the Crown; but under the Seal of the Dutchy of Lancaſter, and enrolled in that Court, when they are of that Kind.

This

This Act shall not impair, or take away the Interest of such Lords, Commoners, or Owners in any Part of the Residue of the Wastes or Commons not Assigned to the said Drainers, or any Franchise, or Liberty, but that the same may be lawfully used, as if this Act, or such Contract, or Bargain had not been made.

This Act not to be prejudicial to Ports, or Havens, neither shall it be put in Execution within 8 Miles of Yarmouth, or 6 Miles of Lynn.

Feoffment.

(A) Livery. [*Or what is a Feoffment.*]

1. A **Feoffment** properly is, **where there is a** Transmutation of Possession **from one Person to another.** 11 H. 4. 33. Br. Feoffmt. de terres, pl. 10.

2. A Feoffment *properly betokens* a Conveyance in *Fee*, tho' sometimes 'tis so called, when a Freehold only passes. Co. Litt. S. 1. 9. Feofare dicitur qui, feodum Simplex feofatorio confert; *Donare* qui feodum Talliatum. Spelm. Glos. Verb. Feofare, &c.

3. A Feoffment is by the Feudists, called an *Investiture*. See Spelm. Glos. verbo Feofare.

4. If a Man makes a Deed of Feoffment to another, and *delivers the Deed to him in the Land, or upon the Land*, 'tis a good Feoffment, by all the Justices in C. B. Br. Feoffment de terre pl. 74. cites 35 H. 8.

5. A. seised in Fee leased to B. for Years; after A. made Deed of *Feoffment to Lessee of the same Lands in Fee, by* the Words, *Dedi & Concessi, with Letter of Attorney*, within the same Deed, *to make Livery to Lessee.* The Deed of Feoffment was delivered to J. to deliver the same to B. who delivered the same accordingly.—(Lessee may take the Conveyance as a Feoffment, or *Confirmation*) Lessee delivered the same to the Attorney named in the Deed, who made Livery accordingly—By Acceptance of which Livery B. has determined his Election to take by Feoffment. 2 Le. 192. Trin. 28 Eliz. C. B. Lennard's Case.

6. If *Tenant in Tail* be *disseised*, and *makes a Deed* of Feoffment, *and delivers* the same *to the Disseisor*, who delivers the same to the *Attorney named* in the Deed, who *makes Livery* accordingly; this is a good Feoffment and Discontinuance, per Anderson. 2 Le. 192. Lennard's Case. Ow. 1. S. C. by Name of Leonard v. Stephens.

7. 'Tis not a Feoffment without *Livery and Attornment*. Cro. J. 637. Pasch. 20. Jac. B. R. Smith v. Melser. Notwithstanding a Consideration expres'd the Use shall not change, nor any Estate shall pass by it but at will, untill the Livery be made thereupon, per Popham Ch. J. and agreed by all the Justices Poph. 49. in Case of Collard v. Collard.

[See (B. 2.)]

(A. 2) The Force of a Feoffment. And what is Extinguished by it.

1. IF my *Entry be taken away*, and I oust the Tenant, and after Enfeoff him by Deed, he is remitted, and I shall be Barred; For this is a good Confirmation. Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. 84. cites 11 H. 7. 20.

2. *And if a Feme who hath Title of Dower, enters and Enfeoffs the Heir* by Deed, her Title of Dower is determined; For 'tis a good *Confirmation* and

and discharge of the Dower, and e contra, without Deed. Br. Feoffment de terre, pl. 84. cites 11 H. 7. 20.

See (A. 4)

3. *Future Right*, and *Right of Action*, is gone by Feoffment. Arg. 2. Roll. R. 323. cites 9 H. 7. 24.——Per Trevor Ch. J. Gibb. 234. in Case of Arthur (alias Archer) v. Bokenham.

4. *Power of Revocation* is extinct by Feoffment. Arg. 2. Roll. R. 337. cites 1 Rep. Diggs's Case.

5. Possibility to be *Tenant by the Curtesy* is gone by Feoffment; so of *Attaint*; and so of *Writ of Deceit*. Arg. 2 Roll. R. 337. cites 9 H. 7. 1. 4 H 6. 38 E. 3.

*Arg. Godb. 301. 320. cites 1 Rep. 111. Albany's Case,—See Co. Litt. S. 1. 9.

6. A Feoffment *excludes the Feoffor* of all *Right*, *Entries*, *Actions*, *Titles*, *Possibilities*, and *Conditions*, per Jones and Hutton J. Jo. 72.—It * Barrs of all *present* Rights, and all *after Rights* arising to the same Parties by Causes before the Feoffment, and that without Respect to the Loss of Strangers. Hob. 337. in Case of Sheffield v. Radcliff.——Per Hobert Ch. J. 2. Roll. R. 506. in S. C.——1 Rep. 174. a. S P.——'Tis a Bar to a *Writ of Error*. Arg. Godb. 320. cites Barton v. Ewers.

[See Fines (C. 2)—As to barring Entails see Estates (X. 2) &c.]

(A. 3) Uses Vested, or Changed. In what Cases by a Feoffment.

If a Man makes a *Feoffment*, and *annexes a Schedule* to the Deed, *containing the Use*, he cannot change the Use afterwards. Br. Feoffments al Uses, pl. 47. cites 30 H. 8.

1. A. made a *Feoffment* to B. *to the Use of his last Will expressed in the same Deed*, viz to his own proper Use for his Life, and after to F. C. his Son in Tail, &c. and after he made a Lease for Years, and died; and 'twas the Opinion of the Court, and of all except Shelly, that he may alter his Will in this Case; for where this *word Will is expressed in the Deed*, or Schedule, he may *alter* his Will notwithstanding the other Words; but where the Use is declared upon the Livery without this word Will, there he can't alter his Will. Br. Feoffment, &c. pl. 1. cites 19 H. 8. 11.

So if he *expresses the Use in the Deed* of Feoffment. *But* contrary where he declares the Use *by Words of a Will*, viz. I will, that my Feoffees shall be seised to such a Use; there he may change the Use, because it is by Will, &c. Br. Feoffments al Uses, pl. 47. cites 30 H. 8.

4 Le. 166 210. S. R. D. 166. a. pl. 8. Hill. 1 Eliz. S. C.—324. b. pl. 37. Pasch. 15 Eliz. S. C.—Dal. 88. pl. 3. 15 Eliz. in Ejectment, says, it was held that an Use was raised presently. Mo. 515. 516. cites S. C.

2. The Lord Audley made a Feoffment to B. G. and others, and afterwards by *Indenture reciting the said Feoffment he declared*, *the same was made to the Intent his Feoffees should perform his last Will*, to this Effect (viz.) *my Will is*, *that my Feoffees shall stand seised*, &c. *to pay all my Debts*, *and afterwards* that they *make an Estate* of the Lands *to me and Elizabeth my Wife*, *and to the Heirs of our Bodies*, with divers Remainders over; the said Lord had Issue by one Wife a Son, and by another a Daughter; the Feoffees made no Estate to the Lord and his Wife; adjudged, that, by this Feoffment and Deed, no Use was changed; For tho' the Feoffees shall be seised to the Use of the Feoffor and his Heirs (for there was *no Consideration*, for which they should be seised to their own Use) yet the same can't make a new Use to the Lord and to his Wife in Tail; neither can this Writing take Effect as a Will; because it appoints an Estate to be made to the Lord himself, and he can't take by his own Will. 2 Leon. 159. 21 Eliz. in Canc. Ld Audley's Case.

3. If a Feoffment is made, but *no Livery*, and *Feoffee enters*, he is become *Tenant at Will* to the Feoffor; because he enters by his Consent; but Feoffor may oust him when he please. Co. Litt. S. 70. pag. 56. b.

4. A Feoffment to a Man *upon Condition*, *that he will kill B.* shall be good; but a *Bond* with such a Condition void For in the one Case, lest the Man should have any Temptation to do the Act, the Law secures him the Possession of the Land without performing the Condition; and in the other,

other, frees him from the Penalty of the Bond; ſo that the Law has the ſame End in View in making the Feoffment good, and the Bond void, viz. the Prevention of the Fact; per Parker Ch. J. in delivering the Opinion of the Court. Hill. 11 Annæ. B. R. 10 Mod. 134. in Caſe of Mitchell v. Reynolds.

[See Eſtate (I. 6) Jointenants (L) Uſes (A. a. 4)]

(A. 4) The Difference between Feoffments at Common Law, and Feoffments by the Statute 1 R. 3.

1. THERE is a Difference betwixt a Feoffment at the Common Law, and a Feoffment according to the Statute of R. 3. which Operates Sub modo. Feoffments are the Ancient Conveyances of Lands; but Feoffments according to the Statute of 1 R. 3. are Upſtarts and have not had continuance above 150 Years. In Caſe of Feoffments *at* the *Common Law* the *Feoffor ought to be ſeiſed* of the Lands *at the time* of the Feoffment, but if a Feoffment be according to the Statute of 1 R. 3. in ſuch Caſe the Feoffor need not be in Poſſeſſion. Feoffments at the Common Law, *give away both Eſtates and Rights*, but Feoffments by the Statute of R. 3. give the Eſtates, but not the Rights. In Caſe of Feoffment at the Common Law, the *Feoffee is in, in the Per*, viz. by the Feoffor; but in Caſe of Feoffments by the Statute of R. 3. the Feoffees are in, in the Poſt, viz. by the firſt Feoffees. So a Feoffment by Ceſty que Uſe by force of the Statute of 1 R. 3. will not faſten upon any thing but what the Statute requires. Godb. 318. Arg. Paſch. 21 Jac. in Caſe of the Ld Sheffield v. Ratcliff.——cites 5 H. 7. 5. 21 H. 7. 25. 2 Roll. R. 334. S. P. Arg. in S.C.

(B) Livery. In what Caſes, [*and of what Things*] a *Livery* is *Neceſſary*. Upon what Conveyance.

1. LESSEE for Life **may** ſurrender to him in Reverſion, **without making any Livery.** 44 Aſſ. 3. **Curia.** But if he *grants to him in Reverſion during the Life of the Leſſor Rendering Rent* during his Life, this Leaſe is not good without Livery. And 33. pl. 81. Paſch. 8 Eliz. Brown v. King.

2. By Exchange **a Frankfenement may paſs without Livery.** Co. Litt. 1. 49. 2 Salk. 620. by Holt. Ch. J.

3. **If a** Houſe **or Land** appertaines to an Office, **this may paſs by Grant of the Office without Livery.** Co. Litt. 49.

4. **If a Houſe or Chamber** appertaines to a Corody, **it may paſs by Grant of a Corody without Livery.** Co. Litt. 49.

5. A *Freehold* may, *by Cuſtom, be ſurrendered* without Livery. Co. Litt. 49. a.

6. 'Twas held by all the Juſtices in the Exchequer Chamber, that if the *King makes Feoffment of the Land, which he hath by the Dutchy of Lancaſter, in Fee, or for Life*, he muſt make Livery as well as a common Perſon, if it be *not of the Lands within the County Palatine*; for they paſs by Letters Patents of the Dutchy without Livery; but a Leaſe for Years of them, or of other Lands ought to be by Deed, quod nota bene. and quære if the Act of 1 E. 4. which annexed it to the King and his Heirs, Kings, was remembred. Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. 51. cites 21 E. 4. 60.

7. If a Man makes Feoffment *to the King* by Deed, 'tis good without Livery, if he *inroll the Deed*, otherwiſe Not, quod nota; For the King cannot take but by matter of Record. Br. Feoffment de terre. pl 69. cites 29 H. 8.

8. If a *Deed* be *inrolled in London*, it binds as a Fine at Common Law, but not as a Fine with Proclamations; and Livery of Seiſin is not requiſite

upon ſuch Deed; and it is Diſcontinuance without Livery; and becauſe the Cuſtom there is ſaved by diverſe Acts of Parliaments, it ſhall bind as a Fine. Br. Fines, pl. 110. cites 31 H. 8.

9. Gift of *Land*, *Rectory*, *and Tythes* in Fee and no Livery made, the Tythes do not paſs; tho' words of Grant will paſs them without Livery. Mo. 496. Arg. cites Paſch. 24 Eliz. Boſome's Caſe.

10. *Leſſee for Years leaſes for Life* without Livery; the Term ſhall paſs. Mo. 423. Paſch. 37 Eliz. Buckler v. Harvey.

So a *Gift in Tail, &c. to* the Leſſee at Will, or *Tenant at Sufferance*,

11. A. is *Leſſee at Will*, Leſſor leaſes to A. *for Years*, Remainder to B. in Fee; 'tis good tho' no Livery be made; For **Poſſeſſion countervails Livery*. D. 269. b. Marg. pl. 20. cites Paſch. 38 Eliz. C. B. Cooper v. Calambil.

is good without Livery of Seiſin, becauſe of the Poſſeſſion which countervails Livery per Walmſley and Beamond J. Noy 56. Cooper v. Columbell. —— cites D. 61.——* D. 145. b. pl. 65. Paſch. 3 & 4 P. and M. Litchfield (Bp.) v. Fiſher.

12. Grant by Deed of *all my Trees growing within my Manor of D.* to A. and his Heirs; A. ſhall have Inheritance in them without Livery and Seiſin. 11 Rep. 49. b. Mich. 12 Jac. in Liford's Caſe.

13. *Inheritance in Land* may be granted without Livery, tho' the Land itſelf cannot, as *Veſturam Terræ* per Morton, J. cites 17 E. 4. 6. and Fitzh. Præcipe. 55. And Windham, J. ſaid, that ſo may *Trees*, which are an Inheritance in the Land. Lev. 171. Trin. 17 Car. 2. in Caſe of Jemmot v. Cooly.

14. A. ſeiſed in Fee of a *Truſt Eſtate*, and having two Daughters B. and C. conveyed the ſame to B. and her Heirs by Deed in Nature of a Feoffment without Livery and Seiſin; and held that the Truſt paſſed tho' the Deed was not executed by Livery, and that 'twas ſufficient to declare the ſame, which as the Law then ſtood might be declared by Parol. N. Ch. R. 86. Cranburn v. Delmahoy.

15. Where Grants are made for Life or Lives *in purſuance of a Power*, Livery and Seiſin is not neceſſary; becauſe it it only the Execution of an Authority. *As* in Caſe of Leaſes for 3 Lives made by bare Tenant for Life who has ſuch Power; and ſo of a Sale of Land by Executors by Virtue of the Will. 12 Mod. 201. per Holt Ch. J. in delivering the Opinion of the Court. Trin. 10 W. 3. in the Caſe of Saunders v. Owen.

(B. 2) What amounts to a Feoffment.

Leaſe * *for Years, and a Releaſe* after to Leſſee *in Fee is*, in a manner, agreed to be a Feoffment, per Fitzh. Contra to Ingham.

1. *Leaſe and Releaſe* countervailes a Feoffment, Br. Feoffment de terres. pl. 5. cites 44 E. 3. 3. — Leaſe for Years and Releaſe is good Feoffment, becauſe Franktenement paſſes by the Releaſe, per Culpepper ſaid to have been ſo adjudged, per Belknap. But Culpepper ſaid, if it was of a *Grant of a Reverſion after the Death of Tenant for Life*, it would be otherwiſe, as he thought. 11 H. 4. 33. a. b. — Br. Feoffment de terres pl. 10. S. C. adds, that it would be otherwiſe, if it be *with Warranty*.

But it ſeems that Leaſe *for Life, and Releaſe in Fee, countervailes* a Feoffment, but is not a Feoffment in Fact; For the Fee and Franktenement do not go *uno Flatu* as in Caſu ſupra. Br. Feoffment. de terres. pl. 30. cites 31 Aſſ. 25.—In Formedon, the *Tenant in Dower grants his Eſtate to W. N.* and after he in *Reverſion releaſes to him in Fee*; this is no Feoffment, and yet this countervailes Feoffment; but if the Iſſue be taken, if the Heir enfeoff'd him, this is no Feoffment; quod caveat placitand. Br. Feoffment de terre pl. 44. cites 5 E. 4. 5.——* Ibid. pl. 58. cites 21 H. 6. 8. Per Paſton. Co. Litt. 207. a.

For Franktenement will not paſs by a Releaſe. Ibid. pl. 58. cites 21 H. 6. 8. Per Paſton.

2. *Releaſe to Diſſeiſor* is Extinguiſhment of the Action and Right, and not a Feoffment. Br. Feoffment de terres. pl. 10. cites 11 H. 4. 33. per Hankford. And per Thirning, Feoffment is, where there is a Tranſmutation of Poſſeſſion from one to another, which there is not upon a Releaſe by Diſſeiſee to Diſſeiſor. Ibid.

3. A. made a Feoffment to the Uſe of himſelf in Tail, *Remainder to B.* his Son *in Tail*. A. died. *B.* entred, and by Indenture *bargained and*

ſold

ſold (without any Words of Dedi & conceſſi) the Lands to the Uſe of J. S. *in Fee*, and the in Indenture was a Letter of Attorney to make *Livery* which was made accordingly. J. S. by the ſaid Indenture covenanted, that if B. before ſuch a Day paid 40 *s.* then J. S. and his Heirs would ſtand ſeiſed, &c. to the Uſe of B. and his Heirs; and *if B. did not pay*, &c. *Then if the ſaid J. S. did not pay to the ſaid B.* within four Days after, 10 *l.* that *J. S. and his Heirs ſhould thenceforth be ſeiſed to the Uſe of the ſaid B. and his Heirs*, &c. and B. covenanted further, to make ſuch further Aſſurance, as the Counſel of B. ſhould adviſe; *both failed of Payment*; *B. levied a Fine to J. S. without any Conſideration*; 'twas adjudg'd a good Feoffment well executed by the Livery, notwithſtanding the Words of Bargain and Sale only, and that the Covenant to be ſeiſed to the *new Uſes conditionally* upon Payment and Nonpayment being in one and the ſame Deed, ſhould raiſe the Uſe upon the Contingency according to the Limitation of it. Trin. 26 Eliz. B. R. Le. 25. Benicombe v. Parker.

4. Where one, who hath a *Freehold in Poſſeſſion*, levies a Fine *come ceo*, &c. this enures as a *Feoffment with Livery on Record*; but where he hath but a *Reverſion or Remainder*, it enures *only as a Grant* thereof, without Tort preſumed or done to the Poſſeſſion of a Stranger, who hath the Freehold. Arg. Mo. fol. 629.

5. A. ſeiſed in Fee *enfeoffed B. his Son in Fee, to the Uſe of the ſaid A. for Life*, and after to the Uſe of *B. in Fee*; and after this to the Intent that A. ſhould be able to make a Leaſe to B. for 60 Years; B. without any Writing Feoffavit Dictum A. de Tenementis prædictis habend. eidem A. & hæredibus ſuis. The Court held the Feoffment good, and in this is implied, that A. ſhall have the Land to him and his Heirs for the Uſe intended. And. 51. pl. 126. Lancaſtel v. Aller. D. 358. pl. 48. S. C.—Bendl. 288. pl. 288. Paſch. 17 El. S. C.

6. A *Bargain and Sale* was made to J. S. and his Heirs by Deed indented but not inrolled, and the Bargainor *made Livery* of the Land, ſecundum Formam Chartæ, &c. This was Held a good Feoffment. 2 And. 68. Denton's Caſe. But *Feoffment inrolled without Livery* is not of any Force to make the Land to paſs; but the Inrolment may *eſtop* the Feoffor to ſay Not his Deed. Agreed per Omnes. Poph. S. Gibbons v. Maltyard and Martin.——Trin. 26 Eliz. B. R. S. P. Le. 25. Benicomb v. Parker.

(B. 3) Void; what ſhall be ſaid a void Feoffment.

1. 1 *R.* 2. 9. *Every Gift of Feoffment of Lands made by Fraud, or Maintenance ſhall be void, and the Diſſeiſee (notwithſtanding ſuch Alienation) ſhall recover againſt the firſt Diſſeiſor both his Lands and double Damages; provided he commence his Suit within a Year after the Diſſeiſin, and that ſuch Feoffor be then Pernor of the Profits.* The *Preamble* recites, that many People, having Right and juſt Title to Lands and Tenements, are wrongfully delayed of their Rights and Actions, by Gifts and Feoffments made, &c. and alſo recites that many diſſeiſe others, and made Feoffment to Perſons unknown, &c. And ordains and enacts, that the Diſſeiſees ſhall have their Recoveries againſt the Diſſeiſors who are Pernors of the Profits, (which is as much as to ſay, that they are Ceſties que Uſe,) ſo that they commence their Suit within a Year after the Diſſeiſin done. And ſo the Preamble declares, that the Miſchiefs, which the Makers of the Act intended to remedy, was to thoſe who had right and juſt Title, or were diſſeiſed; and the Purview gives the *Remedy only to Diſſeiſees*, and *ſo it muſt be a Diſſeiſin in Fact*, and after this Uſe made; in which Caſe Remedy is given to ſuch Diſſeiſee againſt Ceſty que Uſe, and a Recovery againſt him ſhall bind him and the Feoffees; and ſo this Act makes no other but Ceſty que Uſe able to loſe the Land of the Feoffees in a juſt Action brought by the Diſſeiſee, but does not make him able to loſe the Land of the Feoffees in a feint Action brought againſt him. Pl. C. 3 b. Baſſet and Morgan v. Manxell. alias Manxell's Caſe.——By this Statute, Feoffments made to Great Men for Maintenance, are declared *void*; But this is *as to* * *Strangers*, but *not between the Feoffor and Feoffee*. Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. 1. cites 28 H. 8. 23. per Fitzherbert.——S. P. and that Strangers ſhall have Action againſt the Pernor of the Profits. Ibid. pl. 19. cites it as Held by Fitz-James Ch. J. and Englefield J. and divers Others.—— And ſuch Feoffment would not make a *Remitter* in Prejudice of a third Perſon, as it ſeems. Ibid.——* Co. Litt. 369——Hawk pl. C. 263. S. 3

2. Where

2. Where *Baron and Feme, being Ceſty que Uſe in Right of his Wife,* make a Feoffment, and the *Baron dies*; this Feoffment is not void ab initio, but is now determined. Br. Feoffment de terres. pl. 1. cites 27 H. 8. 23. Per Fitzh.

3. A Feoffment *by a Feme of her Jointure* made by her firſt Baron in Poſſeſſion, or in Uſe is void by the Statute of 11 H. 7. *as to the Heir,* but *not as to all.* Per Fitzh. Br. Feoffment de terres. pl. 1. cites 27 H. 8. 23.

(B. 4) Good. In what Caſes a Feoffment may be good, where a Grant is not good.

1. If a Grant be *made to B. by the Name of Knight,* where *B. is no Knight,* it is a void Grant. But Contra of ſuch Deed of Feoffment, by Reaſon of the *Livery* of Seiſin. Per Roll and the beſt Opinion. Br. Grants. pl. 50. cites 4 H. 6. 1.

[See Grant (D).]

(C) *Of what Things* it may be made.

1. A Feoffment cannot be made of incorporate Things; Becauſe no Livery can be of them. Co. Litt. 49.

Contra. It may be of an Advowſon, *by Livery of the Door of the Church.* Inf. (Y) pl. 1. cites 43 E. 3. 1. b.——See (Y) pl 3. Pannel v. Hodgſon.——S. P. Br. Grants pl. 18. cites 43 E. 3. 1. It may be. Br. Feoffment de terres. pl. 49. cites 29 E. 4. 15. per Fairfax.——Arg. Bridgm. 95.

2. A Feoffment cannot be made of an Advowſon in Groſs; Becauſe no Livery can be of it. Contra 11 H. 6. 4.

Br. Feoffment de terres. pl. 79. cites 5 H. 7. 9. accordingly. But cites 21 H. 6. Contra.

3. A Feoffment and Livery may be made in an Upper Chamber; For a Man may have an Inheritance in it, and it is Corporeal. Co. Litt. 48. b.

4. Feoffment by *Tenant in Common* is good *of his Moiety, tho' undivided,* and not in Severalty. Br. Feoffment de terres. pl. 75.

5. No Livery can be made of *a running Water,* becauſe it is fugitive. Secus of *Water in a ſtanding Pool.* 4 Le. 238. pl. 385. Mich. 6 Jac. B. R. Anon.

6. Livery cannot be of a *Reverſion.* Arg. Brigm. 96.

(C. 2) What amounts to a Livery upon the Land, or in Law.

9 Rep. 137. b. 138. Thoroughgood's Caſe.

1. If *Words* may amount to a Livery within View, much more it ſhall upon the Land, as *I am content you ſhall enjoy this Land,* &c. *according to the Deed, &c.* Co. Litt. 48. a.

Cro. E. 482. Sharp v. Sharp.——9 Rep. 137. b. Thoroughgood's Caſe,——Per Popham. Ch. J. Poph. 49. in Caſe of Collard v. Collard.

2. *But* bare *delivering the Deed upon the Land* amounts to no Livery of the Land; For it has another Operation, (viz.) to take Effect as a Deed. But if he deliver the Deed on the Land *in Name of Seiſin of all the Lands contained in the Deed*; this is a good Livery. Co. Litt. 48. a.

But this by the Feudiſts is called, *Inveſtitura Impropria.* Spelm. Gloſs. Verb. Feofare.—9 Rep. 138. Thoroughgood's Caſe.

3. *So* Delivery *of any Thing* upon the Land in the Name of Seiſin of that Land, *tho' it be nothing concerning the Land,* as a Ring of Gold, is good. Co. Litt. 48. a. ſays that it had been ſo reſolved by all the Judges.

4. *Exchange* amounts to a Livery. Co. Litt. 51. b.

5. If

5. If a Feoffment be *of diverſe Lands, and an Houſe*, in which the Feoffor dwells, and *delivers the Feoffment in the Houſe, but ſays nothing of the Land*; yet 'tis good for all. For they having an *Intent* to give and take Livery, 'tis a good Feoffment; For they aſſembled there for that Purpoſe. Cro. E. 142. Tr. 31 Eliz. C. B. Mills v. Snowball.—Ow. 44. S. C. 'Tis good Livery if Feoffor intended to make Livery.—But Le. 207. ſtates this Caſe thus; if a Feoffment be of a *Houſe*, and the *Deed is delivered in the Houſe* without other Circumſtance; the ſame does not amount to a Livery of Seiſin. But if he *does any Act, by which the Intent* of Feoffor appears, that the Feoffee ſhould have Livery of Seiſin; as *if the Parties go of Purpoſe to the Place* intended to paſs, to the intent the Deed may be delivered in that Kind; it amounts to a Livery. Le. 207. Mills v. Snowball.

Where 2 Tenants in Common, of a Houſe and Land, made Partition within the Houſe, of the Houſe and Land by Parol without Deed, it was held, that tho' it might have been good upon the Land, becauſe it would have amounted to a Livery in Law; yet not being found that the Land was *within View*, it could not amount to a *Livery in Law*. Cro. E. 95. Paſch. 30 Eliz. Docton v. Prieſt.

6. If A. makes a Deed of Feoffment of Land, and delivers the Deed, and ſays no more but, *take and enjoy* the Land, or *take the Land according to the Deed*, or ſuch Words which amount to a Livery, when he delivers the Deed nothing paſſeth; For the Law requires more Ceremony than the Delivery of the Deed on the Land. Cro. J. 80. Vaughan v. Holdes.

So where the Feoffor ſaid, *I am content you ſhall have this Houſe* according to the Deed to you made. This is not a good Livery; For there is no Intent expreſſed, either by Words or Circumſtances, to make Livery. But rather import an Aſſent and Promiſe to do a future Act. Ley. 3. Hill 6 Jac. Maund's Caſe.

[See (T).]

(D) Feoffment. By what *Name* a Feoffment may be made *of the Thing*.

1. A Houſe may paſs by a Deed of Feoffment, which makes mention only of a Curtelage. 13 H. 4. 10. 6. Dubitatur.

2. A Feoffment may be of a Manor by the Name of a Knight's Fee. 17 E. 3. 8. b.

3. If a Man ſeiſed of a Manor leaſes Parcel of the Demeſnes for Life, and after makes Feoffment of the Manor to which the Leſſee, and the Tenants of the Manor attorn. The Reverſion of this Land ſo leaſed for Life, ſhall paſs by this; Becauſe it is Parcel of the Manor. Mich. 15 Ja. B. R. becauſe Bore and Palmer per Houghton. Fol. 2.

4. If a Manor be known only by the Name of Sarret, and he, who is ſeiſed of this Manor, makes Deed of Feoffment by the Name of Seroit, and delivers Seiſin ſecundum Formam Chartæ; The Manor ſhall paſs by it. For the making Delivery ſecundum Formam Chartæ, refers to the Eſtate, and not to the Name. M. 40 and 41 El. B. R. 26. by 2. between Ewer and Heidon.

5. If a Man by Deed grants Veſturam to another and his Heirs, and makes Livery ſecundum Formam Chartæ he ſhall have by this Veſturam terræ, viz. the Corn, Graſs, Underwood, Sweepage, and ſuch like, and he ſhall have Action * Quare Clauſum fregit. Co. Litt. 4. b. See Grant (P. 2). * See Treſpaſs (H).

6. But in this Caſe he ſhall not have the Soile by this Grant; Becauſe he has by this but a particular Right in the Land. For by this he ſhall not have the Houſes, Timber-Trees, Mines and other real Things, Parcel of the Inheritance. Co. Litt. 4. b. See Grant (P. 2).—It paſſes not the *Soil*, For the Livery cannot enlarge the Grant. Co. Litt. 4. b.

See Grant (P. 2).

7. So it is of Grant of Herbage of Land, the Soile shall not pass, but he shall have only a particular Interest; But shall have * Trespass Quare Clausum fregit. Co. Litt. 4. b.

* See Trespass (H) pl. 1.

8. If a Man by Deed grants Separalem Pischariam in a River, and makes Livery secundum Formam Chartæ, the Soile shall not pass by it, nor the Water. For if the River becomes dry, the Grantor may take the Benefit of the Soile. Co. Litt. 4. b.

9. So if a Man grants Aquam suam; the Soile does not pass, but the Fishery within the Water shall pass. Co. Litt. 4. b.

10. But if a Man by Deed grants the Profits of his Land, and makes Livery Secundum Formam Chartæ, the Soile shall pass. Co. Litt. 4. b.

11. By the Grant of Boilloury of Salt, the Soile will pass. Co. Litt. 4. b.

And he may bring *Assise of Common of Turbary*, and shall recover

12. If a Man grants to another to dig Turves in his Land, and to carry them at his Will and Pleasure, the Land shall not pass; Because he has granted only Parcel of the Profit. Co. Litt. 4. b.

but he cannot bring Assise of the Soile. Br. Feoffment de terres. pl. 21. cites 5 Ass 9.

13. Scire facias upon *a Fine of certain Lands*, the *Tenant pleaded a Feoffment* by the Ancestor of the Plaintiff with Warranty of the same Land, *by Name of the Manor of D.* where in Fact the Land *is no Manor*, and yet a good Plea by Judgment, by Reason of the Livery of Seisin of the same Land. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 200. cites 22 *H.* 6. 39.

14. If a Man has a *Manor in the County of N.* and *Land is held of the Manor which lies in the County of S.* By Grant of the Manor with the Appurtenances, in the County of N. the *Services of the Land in the other County shall pass*; and by Livery of the Manor made in the one County, the Services of the Land in the other County shall pass. Br. Grants. pl. 32. cites 21 E. 3. 18.

Cro. E. 421. Mich. 37 & 38 Eliz. B. R. Welden v. Bridgewater. —Mo. 302. S. C.

15. If a Man has a *moveable Estate* of Inheritance *in* 13 *Acres Parcel of a Meadow of* 80 *Acres*, the Charter of *Feoffment ought to be generally of* 13 *Acres*, *lying within the Meadow* of 80 Acres, without bounding or describing of it in Certainty; and *Livery may be of the* 13 *Acres allotted to the Feoffor for the Year*, secundum Formam Chartæ, and this is good Livery to pass the Content of 13 Acres in what Place soever it lies in that Meadow. Co. Litt. 48. b.

(E) What Persons may make [*Feoffment or*] Livery of Seisin, and to whom. [*In Respect of Incapacity in the Person.*]

It is only voidable. Br. Feoffment de terres. pl. 48

1. If Infant makes Feoffment, and makes Livery himself, it is a good Feoffment 'till it be defeated. 42 E. 3. 12. b. 9 H. 6. 5.

cites 18 E. 4. pl. 27.——Br. Coverture. pl. 1. cites 26 H. 8. 2.

2. And it is not material of what Age the Infant is at the making of the Feoffment; For whether he be within Age of Discretion, viz. of 5 or 7 Years, or beyond the Age of Discretion, viz. 16 or more, his Feoffment is not void. 9 H. 6. 6. b.

Br. Entry Cong. pl. 106. cites 7 H. 4. 12.

3. If a Man de non sanæ Memoriæ makes Feoffment and Livery himself, it is not void. Contra 9 H. 6. 6.

—All his Acts in Pais are void, except his Feoffments, and Livery, and Seisin, and those are only voidable. The Reason is because of the Respect the Law gives to a Feoffment on the Account of its Solemnity in the Transmutation of a Freehold. And the *Writ De non Compos Mentis*, which says

Denisit

Demiſit, muſt be underſtood of a Feoffment, or a Fine. Tho'e being the ancient and only Conveyances at that Time. Per Holt. Hill. 9 W. 3. B. R. 2 Salk. 427. in Caſe of Thompſon v. Leach.

4. But **if he makes Livery** by Attorney, **it is void.** 7 H. 4. 5. b. 12. See Faits (A) pl. 5.—Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. 8. cites 7 H. 4, 5.—Ibid. pl. 9. cites 7 H. 4. 12. — Ibid. pl. 48. cites 18 E. 4. 27.

5. **If a Man makes Feoffment** by Duteſs, **it is not void. Contra** 9 H. 6. 5. b. It is only voidable. Br. Feoffment de terres. pl. 48. cites 18 E. 4. 27.

6. **If** Baron and Feme **are** Jointenants, **and** Baron makes **Feoffment and** Livery, the Feme being upon the Land, and diſagreeing to it, **yet it is good.** 21 E. 3. 6. b. *But* tho' a married Woman may be *ſeiſed in her own Right* with her Husband, yet *Livery* and Seiſin made *by her alone, without the Agreement of her Husband*, is void; inſomuch that her Husband and She may have an Aſſiſe, notwithſtanding ſuch Livery of Seiſin, if the Husband be ſeiſed of the Freehold in the Right of his Wife: *But* in ſuch Caſe, if he was *ſeiſed in his own Right*, then, notwithſtanding ſuch Livery of Seiſin made by the Wife, he ſhall have an Aſſiſe in his own Name, &c. Perk. S. 186.

7. **If** 4 join **in a Feoffment, whereof** one only is ſeiſed of the Land, **yet it is a good Feoffment.** 42 E. 3. 12. b. Br. Feoffment de terres. pl. 4 cites S. C.

8. **If** Infant ſeiſed **of Land**, joins **in Feoffment** with a Stranger, who has nothing in it, **yet it is a good Feoffment.** 42 E. 3. 12. b.

9. Feoffment by one *Deaf and Dumb* is not good; For if he *makes Livery himſelf* it is voidable, as it ſeems; like Feoffment of an Infant, or one non ſanæ Memoriæ. If it be by Letter of *Attorney*, it ſeems a *Diſſeiſin*. Quære. Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. 7. cites 2 H. 4. 8. See Faits (A).

10. He, who is outlawed *in Action perſonal*, and Office is found, that he was ſeiſed of ſuch Land the Day of the Outlawry, *may make Feoffment* of his Land well enough; *For the King is not ſeiſed.* Br. Office Devant, &c. pl. 2. cites 9 H. 6. 20.

11. The *King cannot be infeoff'd without Deed inroll'd*; For *no Livery can be made to him.* Br. Office devant, &c. pl. 41. cites 5 E. 4. 8.

12. There are *ſome* Perſons, who *may make Livery* of Seiſin *in their own Right, and alſo as Servants to others*: And *ſome cannot* make Livery of Seiſin *in their own Right, but as Servants* unto others they may. And *ſome may* make Livery of Seiſin *by themſelves in their own Right unto ſome Perſons*, and unto others they cannot; and *ſome ſhall make* Livery of Seiſin, *and take by the ſame Livery*, &c. Perk. S. 183.

13. *All ſuch Perſons, as may Grant by themſelves, may make Livery* of Seiſin *themſelves*, viz. in their own Right, and as Servants unto others, in the ſame Manner and Form, as they may grant, &c. Mutatis mutandis, &c. Perk. S. 184.

14. If a Man *enfeoffs a married Woman, and makes Letter of Attorney unto the Husband to make Livery* of Seiſin according to the Deed, and he makes Livery of Seiſin accordingly, it is a good Feoffment; For the *Huſband is but a Means* to convey the Freehold to the Wife; for by this Act done, no Freehold doth paſs from the Perſon, &c. Perk. S. 196.

15. Livery *to a Corporation* is not good, unleſs it be executed *by Letter of Attorney*. Admitted 14 Jac. B. R. Cro J. 411. in Caſe of Ipſwich Bailiffs v. Martin and Parker.

[See (R. 2)]

(E. 2) What Perſon may make Livery, and to whom; *In Reſpect of Eſtate.*

1. If a Man leaſes Land for Life, and the *Leſſee* thereof *enfeoffs a Stranger*, and makes a *Letter of Attorney unto his Leſſor* to make Livery of Seiſin

Seiſin accordingly, *and he makes Livery*; in this Caſe it hath been ſaid by ſome Perſons, that the Leſſor might enter upon the Feoffee for a Forfeiture, notwithſtanding the Livery of Seiſin made by himſelf; For they ſay that the *Feoffee took nothing* by him; for the Leſſor had nothing to do upon the Land, if not to ſee whether Waſt were done, and to diſtrain for his Rent and Services, if they were behind. Perk. S. 200.

2. If *A. and B. Jointenants in Fee, leaſe to C. for Life*, and *C. grants his Eſtate to B.* Some think that this ſhall enure by Way of Surrender; becauſe every of the Leſſors is ſeiſed of the Whole, and of the whole Reverſion; and the *Grant* of the Eſtate *of the particular Tenant cannot take Effect by Way of Grant, without Livery of Seiſin*; and the Grantee cannot take Livery of Seiſin of the ſame Land; becauſe he hath the Reverſion in Fee of the whole Land in him immediate to the ſame particular Eſtate, and in his own Right. Perk. S. 82.

3. *Diſſeiſor* cannot infeoff *Diſſeiſee* by matter in Fact; Becauſe the Entry of Diſſeiſee is lawful upon him, &c. Perk. S. 197.

4. If *Feoffment* be made to the Uſe of W. N. *for Life, and after*, to the Uſe of *J. S. and his Heirs*, there Ceſty que Uſe in Remainder or Reverſion may ſell the Remainder or Reverſion in the Life of W. N. but he cannot make Feoffment till after his Death. Br. Feoffments al. Uſes. pl. 44. cites 25 H. 8.

5. A. grants *Leaſe to commence at Mich.* to B. *Remainder in Fee* C. Tho' A. makes Livery and Seiſin to B. yet the Livery and Seiſin, and the Remainder ſhall be *void*, becauſe he has no preſent Eſtate to which the Livery may be annexed, nor on which it can reſt on the mean Time. Arg. Pl. C. 156. Paſch. 3 Mar. 1. in Caſe of Throgmorton v. Tracy—cites Litt. 12.—See And. 8. Okeden v. Sands.

6. A. leaſes *to B. for Years*, the Remainder *to the Right Heirs of the ſaid B.* and makes Livery; the Remainder is void; becauſe there is not any Perſon in eſſe, who can take by the Livery preſently; and *every Livery ought to have its Operation preſently*; *But* where a Leaſe is made *to B. for Life*, the Remainder *to his right Heirs*; there he has a Fee executed; and it ſhall not be in Abeyance; For there he takes the Freehold by the Livery. per Dyer and Manwood. Mich. 19 Eliz. 4. Le. 21. pl. 67. Anon.

Bendl. 12. pl. 10. S. C.—And. 28. pl. 66. S. C.

7. *Ceſty que Uſe* before the Statute of 27 H. 8. of divers Lands *by ſeveral Conveyances*, the Uſe of ſome being raiſed upon Recovery, of ſome upon Fine, and of ſome upon Feoffment; and he *made a Feoffment* of all theſe Lands by Deed, *with a Letter of Attorney* to make Livery; the Attorney entered into part of the Land, and made Livery in the Name of the Whole; and it was agreed by all the Juſtices, that the Lands paſſed, notwithſtanding in other's Poſſeſſion, viz. other Feoffees. cited by Dyer. 20 Eliz. C. B. Le. 265. in Bracebridge's Caſe, as Kellet's Caſe.

This Caſe is in other Books called by the Name of Hamington v. Rider, and Hamington v. Richards, and Rudyard v. Hamington, but the Point ſomething varying, they are not here cited.

8. *Feme* was *Deviſee for* 30 *Years of the Occupation and Profits of a Term, if ſhe ſhould ſo long live a Widow*, and after her Widowhood, the Reſidue of he Term in the Leaſe to go to B. his Son. The Feme entered, and afterwards *Reverſioner* by Indenture *dedit, conceſſit*, &c. totum illud Tenementum, &c. *to the Feme and her Heirs*. It was reſolved, that a *Leſſee for Years in Poſſeſſion* may take a Feoffment, altho' it be by Deed, *and may take Livery after the Delivery of the Deed*, altho' the Leſſee may take the Deed by way of *Confirmation*, and then the Livery is but *ſurpluſage* and void. Trin. 28 Eliz. C. B. Ow. 6, 7. Haverington's Caſe.

* S. P. per Anderſon. Owen 1. Leonard v. Stephens.

9. *Diſſeiſee* cannot make Feoffment, tho' to the Diſſeiſor by Agreement. Goldsb. 25. in pl 6. Trin. 28 Eliz.

10. A Leſſee for Years, *Remainder to B. in Tail*; Remainder over. *A. infeoff'd J. S. and made a Letter of Attorney to W. R.* to enter into the Lands and ſeal the Feoffment, and deliver it in his Name, *to the Uſe of B. and his Heirs.* B. made Letter of Attorney to C. to enter in his Name, who entered accordingly. This was held a good Feoffment, tho' *both A. and* the *Attorney were Diſſeiſors.* For it is good between the Feoffor and Feoffee For the Remainder Man by the Feoffment, and Entry, is remitted, and the Term gone, the Freehold having come to it. Gouldsb. 92. Trin. 30 Eliz. Mounton v. Weſt. Cro. E. 480. and Mo. 431. S. C. but not S. P Hill. 38 Eliz.

11. If *Leſſee for* 10 *Years, makes a Leaſe for* 1 *Year to Reverſioner*; there he in Reverſion, who has the Land for a Year, may make a Feoffment to the Leſſee for 10 Years; and it is good, per Cleneh. 41 Eliz. Trin. B. R. Ow. 66. in Caſe of Knotts v. Everſtead.

12 *A. Leſſee for Years, Remainder to B. for Life, Remainder to C.* and *C. enfeoff'd A. by Deed, and made Livery.* The Conveyance was held void; For it could not work by Livery to the Tenant for Years, who *was in Poſſeſſion before.* Arg. Vent. 360. Hill. 33 and 34 Car 2. in Caſe of Moor v. Pitt.

13. [*Some* Perſons *may make* Livery *to ſome, who cannot* do it *to others*, who yet may take by Livery from others. *As*] if one* *Jointenant* makes Feoffment *to the other*; This cannot be a good Deed at Common Law; For he cannot make Livery and Seiſin, becauſe the other is jointly ſeiſed with him. Yet this Deed ſhall enure by way of Confirmation, and muſt be ſo pleaded; and not literally as the Deed is worded. 4 Mod. 150. Mich. 4 W. and M. B. R. in Caſe of Barker and al. v. Lade. *Perk. S. 193. — It is void. Br. Feoffment de terres. pl. 48. cites 18 E. 4. 2.—It hath been ſaid, that if 2 Jointenants are in Fee, and *one leaſes to a Stranger for Years, the Remainder for Life, in Tail, or Fee to his Companion*, and *Livery is made to the Leſſee for Years*; that this Remainder is good; But yet it ſeems not good; Becauſe it had not been good, if Livery had not been made to the Leſſee for Years; ſo it appeareth, that the Remainder ſhall paſs by the Livery; and one Jointenant cannot make Livery to his Companion, &c. Ideo. Quære. Perk. S. 197.

14. *But* if 2 *Coparceners* are, one of them may enfeoff the other of her Part, or Portion. Perk. S 193.

[See (A. 4) pl. 1.——Non-Compos (C).]

(F) What Name [*a Man*] may make Feoffment [*by*].

1. W. Porter **may make Feoffment** by the Name **of** W. Fammifworth. 14 H. 4. 35. b. Fol. 3.

[See Faits (B).——Grants (B).]

(G) To what Perſon (*),---[*In Reſpect of Eſtate* (†)]---- [*and what is Name ſufficient of Feoffee*(‡).]

1.† **One** Coparcener **may make Feoffment** to the Other. 17 E. 3. 47. b. If ſhe does it by *Deed & Conceſſi*, it ſhall *enure by Confirmation* without Livery; For it countervailes Remiſi & Confirmavi. Br. Confirmation pl. 18. cites 10 E. 4 3. per Littleton.

2. † **One** Jointenant **cannot make Feoffment** to the Other; **Becauſe he is ſeiſed of all before. Contra** 32 E. 3. **Age. admitted per Shard.** S. P. But ſuch Feoffment will enure *by Confirmation*. Br. Confirmation. pl. 11 cites 22 H. 6. 42, 43 per Shard.

3. ‡ A Feoffment may be made to an Abbot, or Prior, by the Name of Abbot or Prior of ſuch a Place, &c. without naming them by their Names of Baptiſm. 39 E. 3. 13. b.

4. ‡ The ſame Law is of a Mayor, or Dean. 39 E. 3. 13. b.

Br. Grants. pl. 50. cites 4 H. 6. 1.

5. ‡ If Deed of Feoffment be made to J. S. and Letter of Attorney to make Livery to J. S. Capellano, he cannot make Livery to J. S. unleſs he be a Chaplain. 4 H. 6. 1. b.

6. * Livery can't be made to the *King*; For he can't be enfeoff'd, but by Deed inrolled of Record. Br. Prerog. pl. 66. cites 5 E. 4. 7.

(H) By what Name the Feoffment may be made to the Feoffee. Name of Feoffee. [*Miſnamed*].

Br. Miſnomer. pl. 38. cites S. C.

1. A Feoffment to J. S. Militi, is good, tho' he be not a Knight; Becauſe it paſſes by the Livery. 4 H. 6. 1. b.

2. A Feoffment may be made to Julian, by Name of Gilder or Gill. 29 Aſſ. 16.

3. If a Feoffment be made to J. and A. his Wife, where his Wife's Name is M. ſhe ſhall take nothing by this Feoffment. 3 Aſſiſe 4. But Quære.

[See Grants (D).]

(I) What Thing is neceſſary to perfect the Livery. Feoffment by Livery within the View.

1. If a Deed of Feoffment be delivered, and Livery within the View made, yet it is not a good Feoffment, if the Feoffee does not enter into the Land; For it is not executed before Entry. 38 E. 3. 11. b. admitted 38 Aſſ. 2. Co. Litt. 48. b.

D. 233. Marg. pl. 10. Vent. 186. Arg. Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. 70.

2. When a Livery is made within the View, if the Feoffor, or Feoffee, dies before Entry of the Feoffee, it is void. Co. Litt. 48. b.

3. If a Man makes a Charter of Feoffment, and makes Livery within the View; and the Feoffee dares not enter for fear of Death, but claims it; this ſhall be good Execution of the Livery, and ſhall veſt the Franktenement in him. Co. Litt. 48. b.

Br. Feoffment de terre pl. 11. cites S. B.—Perk. S. 214. cites 38 E. 3. 5.

4. In Aſſiſe, 'twas found by Verdict, that A. was ſeiſed in Fee, and made a Deed of *Feoffment to M. and her Heirs*; and before Livery *A. marries M.* and *at the Church Door, extra Terram, ſhewed her the Land, which was in another County*, and *delivered her the Deed, and ſaid*, that he would that *ſhe ſhall have the Land Secundum Formam Chartæ*; and *were married*, and *after* they *entered*; and the Baron, in the Life Time of M. his Wife, claimed nothing, but in Right of M. his Wife; and M. died; and after the Baron deviſed the Land to J. S. in Fee, and died; and the Iſſue of M. brought Aſſiſe againſt the Deviſee; and upon this Matter he recovered by Judgment; For the ſhewing of the Land and their Entry was taken inſtead of a Livery, and the Baron in his Life did not diſagree to it; and the *Deviſe was not* taken for a *Diſagreement*; and it is ſaid in the time of H. 8. that expreſs mention ſhall be made in the Pleading, that the Land was within the View. Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. 50. cites 38 E. 3. 11.

5. Tho'

5. Tho' the Livery be made within View, yet the Leaſe ſhall be pleaded to be made where the Land is; For 'tis no Livery nor Leaſe till the *Entry of Leſſee*, per Dyer and Weſton Juſtices. D. 233. Marg. pl. 10. Mich. 6 and 7 Eliz. Aprice v. Rogers,——or Sir Walter Dennis's Caſe.

(K) What ſhall be ſaid an *Execution*, of the Livery.

1. IF a Man makes, and delivers a Feoffment to a Feme at the Door of the Monaſtery, and makes Livery to her within the View, and after takes her to Wife, and after they both go from the Houſe to the ſame Land; and the Baron never after claimed any thing in the Land, but in right of the Feme. This is an Execution of the Livery. For by this he agrees to the Entry of the Feme; Or his Entry ſhall be an Entry for the Feme. 38 E. 3. *12. Adjudged 38 Aſſ. 2. Adjudged. For there is no Alteration of the Eſtate conſequent upon the Intermarriage. Arg. Vent. 186.

He ſhewed her the Land after he had delivered her the Deed, and ſaid he willed that ſhe ſhould have that Land according to the Form of the Deed; after Marriage ſhe entred, and he never diſagreed or claimed, but in her Right. The Wife died. The Baron deviſed the Land. But tho' the *Land lay in another County*, yet in Aſſiſe the Heir recovered againſt the Deviſee. Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. 11. cites * 28 E. 3. 12.

* This ſhould be 38 E. 3. 11. b. 12.

2. *A. and B. Femes Jointenants in Fee*; *A. made* a Charter of Feoffment to *J. S.* and Livery within View, and bid him enter; and after, before it was executed, *married him.* Reſolved that this Livery was well executed after Marriage; For an Intereſt paſſed by the Livery within View, which cannot be countermanded. Hill. 23 and 24 Car. 2. B. R. Vent. 186. Parſons v. Perus. Mod. 91. S. C Parſons v. Perns. ——2 Lev. 34 Parſons v Pierce.

(K. 2) Livery to one, where it will ſerve for others.

1. If a Man *enfeoffs 4 by Deed*, and makes Livery *to the one in the Name of all*, this is a good Feoffment to all; but if a Man enfeoffs 4 *without Deed*, and makes Livery to the one in Name of all; there it veſts nothing but in him, that takes by the Livery, per Choke, quod Nota Diverſity, quod nullus negavit. Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. 16. cites 15 E. 4. 18.—— pl. 72. S. P. cites Temp. H 8. Ibid. pl. 42. cites 18 E. 4. 12. S. P. Br. Eſtates pl. 81.

2. Livery is not good to a Mayor and Commonalty, or other *Corporation*, without Deed to receive it by an Attorney; But per Keble a Feoffment made to them, *and to another* is good without Deed, if *the other takes the Livery*; but Huſſey Contra; For they ſhall be Tenants in common by their ſeveral Capacities; For which they ought to have *ſeveral Liveries* of the Seiſin. Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. 41. cites 7 H. 7. 9.

3. If a Feoffment is made *to 2, Habend. one Moiety to one, and the other Moiety to the other*; this Operates as ſeveral Conveyances, and not as one; For *there muſt be 2 Liveries*, becauſe there are ſeveral Freeholds and Livery to one ſecundum Formam Chartæ will not enure to the other per Holt. Ch. J. Wms's Rep. 18, 19. Hill. 1700. in Caſe of Fiſher v. Wigg.

(L) What Poſſeſſion, or Eſtate, will *hinder* the Livery.

1. IF a Statute Merchant be extended, if Feoffment be made by Reverſioner and Livery, the Tenant by the Statute continuing in Poſſeſſion, it is void. 7 H. 4. 19. b.

2. So if Reverſioner makes Feoffment and Livery without ouſting of the Leſſee for Years in Poſſeſſion, it is a void Feoffment. 11 H. 4. 71. 19 H. 6. 56. 2 Aſſ. 1. adjudged. 5 Aſſ. 8. adjudged. Co. Litt. 48. b. D. 29 H. 8. 33. 13. Contra 29 Aſſ. 60. Fol. 4. Peak S. 229. D. 33. pl. 13. — S. P. if the Leſſee v. neither ouſted nor attorned. Br. Feoffment. pl. 60 cites 2 Aſſ. 1.

3. So

3. So if a Man be ſeiſed of a Manor in Leaſe for Years, and makes Feoffment of this and of another Manor whereof he is ſeiſed in his Hands in the ſame County, and makes Livery in that not in Leaſe, in the Name of both, without ouſting the Tenor of the other Manor; This Manor ſhall not paſs by it. 11 H. 4. 71.

D. 18. pl. 106. — So in Caſe of a *Leaſe of 2 Houſes in the ſeveral Poſſeſſion of B. and C.* the Delivery of both. Paſch. 32. Eliz. B. R.

4. If a Man has 2 Leſſees by ſeveral Leaſes of Land in one County, and makes Feoffment of all, and makes Livery upon the Land of one of the Leſſees, ouſting him in the Name of the whole; Nothing paſſes of the other Leaſe. D. 28 H. 8. 18. 106.

and a Letter of Attorney to make Livery; if B. and C. are Tenants for Years or Life, of the 2d Houſe is void; But if B. and C. are Tenants at Will, the Delivery is good for Cro. E. 181. Williams v. Aſh et Aſh.

5. But in the ſaid Caſe otherwiſe it is of a Tenant at Will; Becauſe this determines the Will, and both paſs. D. 28. H. 8. 18. 106.

Carth. 110. Hill. 2 W. and M. B. R. Swift v. Heath.

6. If Leſſee for Life be, the Reverſion over; and he in Reverſion makes Feoffment and Livery, without ouſting of the Leſſee; this is a void Feoffment. 5 Aſſ. 11. adjudged. 2 E. 3. 31. adjudged. As if he makes Feoffment and Livery, a Feme Covert Leſſee for Life continuing in Poſſeſſion; it is void. 5 Aſſ. 11. adjudged.

Br. Feoffment. pl. 80. cites 8 E. 1. and Fitzh. Aſſiſe. 418.

7. If he in Reverſion or Remainder makes Feoffment and Livery, in the Abſence of the Leſſee for Life or Years, who never attorn or aſſent to it after, yet this is a good Feoffment. D. 17 El. 340.

—— D. 340. pl. 49. per Manwood and Dyer, who aſſented to a Caſe in Point cited by Mounſon as the Lady Umpton's Caſe——*Reverſioner in Tail*, expectant on the Death of Tenant for Life, made a Feoffment to Leſſee for Years, *by Conſent of Tenant for Life* This is no Diſcontinuance, becauſe he had no Freehold Carth. 110. Hill 2 Jac. 2. B R. Swift v Heath.

8. If Leſſee for Years, the Remainder for Life, are; and he in Reverſion in Fee makes Feoffment and Livery to Leſſee for Years; Tho' this Acceptance of the Feoffment, cannot enure as a Surrender for the Eſtate for Life in Remainder; yet it ſhall enure as a Grant of his Eſtate for the Time to the Feoffor, or at leaſt a Licence to him to make Livery, and ſo a good Feoffment. P. 40 El. B. R. between *Eedes* and *Knotsford*. But Mich. 40 and 41 El. B. R. this was adjudged to the contrary.

9. If a Man makes a Charter of Feoffment of 2 Acres, whereof one is in Leaſe for Years to an Infant, and, of the other, he is ſeiſed in Demeſne; but the Feoffor is Tutor or Guardian to the Infant, by which he is poſſeſſed of this Acre alſo, and makes Livery in the Acre in Demeſne, in the Name of both; this is good to paſs both. H. 8 Ja. in the Exchequer, per Cur.

Mo. 250. pl. 397. S. C. Paſch. 22 El. Heyword v. Bettiſworth. ——* Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. 22 cites 5 Aſſ. 11.—A *Boy* of the Leſſee's being *upon the Land* at the time of the Livery, makes it void. Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. *66.* cites 8 E. 1. and pl. 80. cites S. C.——When a Meſſuage is demiſed with Land, the *Meſſuage is the Principal, and the Land but acceſſary*; and without Doubt the Poſſeſſion of the Houſe is good Poſſeſſion of the Land demiſed therewith. 2 Rep. 31. b. Paſch. 22 Eliz. C. B. S. C.

10. If a Man leaſes a Houſe and divers Cloſes in one County, to B. for Years, and after makes a Deed of Feoffment of all to C. and makes Livery of Seiſin in the Cloſes, the Leſſee or his * Wife, or Servants then being in the Houſe, the Livery is void in toto; For the Leſſee cannot be upon every Parcel of the Land to him demiſed, for the Continuance of his Poſſeſſion in it, and therefore his being upon any part of the Thing demiſed is ſufficient to continue his Poſſeſſion in the whole. Co. Litt. 48. b. Co. 2. *Bettiſworth* 31 b. Adjudged. Vide D. 28 H. 8. 18. 107.

D. 18. b. pl. 107. Trin. 28 H. 8. Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. *66.*

11. But if the Leſſee be abſent, and has not any Wife or Servants in Poſſeſſion, tho' he has Cattle upon the Land, yet if the Leſſor makes Livery of Seiſin of the Land, it is good. Co. Litt. 48. b.

12. If

cites 8 E. 1. Br. Aſſiſe. pl. 452. cites S. C.—Br. Feoffment. pl. 82. cites S. C. Br. Aſſiſe. pl. 418. cites S. C. — By ſome, If *Goods* of Leſſee are on the Land, it does hinder Livery. Mo. 11. pl. 42. Quære.

12. If Leſſee for Years leaſes Parcel of the Land for a certain time, and after the Leſſor makes a Deed of Feoffment, and makes Livery in this Parcel, which is in the Poſſeſſion of the 2d Lenee, putting him out of Poſſeſſion. This is good Livery, tho' the firſt Leſſee was in Poſſeſſion of the Reſidue. For by his Leaſe he has divided the Poſſeſſion of it from the Reſidue. 2 Rep. 32. Bettiſworth's Caſe.

13. But otherwiſe it would be, if he had leaſed this Parcel at Will. 2 Rep. 32. Bettiſworth's Caſe. There is no pl. 14.

Fol. 5.

15. If a Man leaſes a Houſe for Years, and after makes Feoffment with Letter of Attorney, and the Attorney comes to the Houſe to make Livery in the Abſence of the Leſſee, and commands the Servant of the Leſſee to come out of of the Houſe, who does ſo, and in his Preſence makes Livery; and immediately the Maſter returns, to whom the Attorney notifies the Livery, to which the Termor agrees, ſaving his Term; this is a good Livery and Feoffment. D. 20 El. 362. 22. But if the Servant continues in the Houſe, and the Attorney makes Livery by his Aſſent, it is void; For the Servant cannot put the Maſter out of Poſſeſſion, he himſelf continuing in Poſſeſſion. Cr. 7 Ja. B. per 2. S. C. And. 130. Darrel v. Stukely.

16. If he in Reverſion makes Feoffment and Livery in a Houſe in Leaſe for Life or Years, the Termor being at Market, and his Wife and Children being in the Houſe; this does not paſs. D. 28 H. 8. 18. 107. If *Wife of Leſſee for Years aſſents* to Livery of the Houſe, in the Abſence of the Husband, tho' the *Servants and Children be, and continue in the Houſe*, 'tis a good Livery. Quære if the Wife aſſents, but continues in the Houſe? but if a Man commits his Houſe to his Servants, and *one aſſents* to the Livery, and goes out; if *the Reſt continue there*, and Livery is made, 'tis no good Livery of Seiſin. Godb. 158. pl. 215. Mich. 6 Jac. b. R. Anon.

17. If a Man makes a Leaſe for Life, and after makes a Deed of Feoffment of it, and makes Livery upon the Land, by the Aſſent of the Leſſee, and in his Preſence, this is a good Livery; For the Aſſent of the Leſſee ſhall be a Leaſe at Will, or a Surrender for the Time. Cr. 40 El. 6. per Cur. between Sheppard and Gray.

18. If the King be Leſſee for Years, the Reverſion in Fee to J. S. and J. S. enters upon the Land, and makes Feoffment, this is a void Livery; Becauſe he cannot put the King out of Poſſeſſion. Hil. 9 Ja. B.

19. If the King, Leſſee for 40 Years, makes Leaſe for 20 Years, and after he in Reverſion enters upon the Leſſee for 20 Years, and makes Feoffment, this is a good Livery; For this future Intereſt of the King cannot preſerve the Poſſeſſion of the Leſſee, but that he may be ouſted. Hil. 9 Ja. in the Exchequer. —— adjudged between Wickham and Wood. So in the Caſe of a common Perſon, if the Feoffer makes Livery with Sufferance of the *Under-Leſſee*, it is good without Attornment of the firſt Leſſee. Br. Feoffment. de terres. pl. 68. cites 28 H. 8.

20. If Leſſee for Life be, the Reverſion in Fee to J. S. who dies, his Heir being to ſue Livery for this Reverſion, and after Leſſee for Life, before Livery ſued, makes Feoffment of the Land; this is a good Feoffment, and the Reverſion diſcontinued by it, notwithſtanding the Intereſt of the King. D. 43 El. between Chaſton and Starkey, cited H. 9 Ja. B.

21. If Baron and Feme are ſeiſed of Land in Fee, and the Baron makes Feoffment, the Feme continuing upon the Land; yet this does not hinder the Livery; but it is a good Feoffment. 21 Aſſ. 25.

22. So if when the Baron makes the Livery, the Feme continues upon the Land, and claims in of her Eſtate, * diſagreeing to the Livery; yet this is good Feoffment. 21 Aſſ. 25. adjudged. * Orig. [Diſagreement.]

23. If Land deſcends to J. S. who enters into Part of the Land, and not into the Reſidue; and after makes Feoffment of the whole, and makes Livery only in that into which he had entered in the Name

of the whole, yet all shall pass. M. 13 Ja. B. R. adjudged upon Evidence, between Bridgman and Chalton.

Roll. R. 260. S. C. 24. If Tenant in Tail makes Feoffment in Fee to the use of himself in Fee; and after leases for Years and dies,, by which the Issue is remitted before Entry, and the Estate of Lessee changed into a Tenancy at Sufferance; and after the Issue makes Deed of Feoffment of this Land, into which he has not entered, and of other Land which is descended to him; and into which he has entered, and makes Livery in that into which he has entered in the Name of the whole; all shall pass, tho' the Tenant at Sufferance was in Possession of Parcel. M. 13 Ja. B. R. adjudged upon Evidence between Bridgman and Chalton.

25. If it be found by Office, that A. was seised in Fee of Land held of the Queen in Socage, and died without Heir, by which it escheated to the Queen; whereby the Lands are seised into the Hands of the Queen. Upon which B. comes, and says that he is next Heir to A. and traverses the Office; and upon this Issue is joined, and pending the Issue, B. makes a Deed of Feoffment with Letter of Attorney to C. to make Livery, and after the Issue is found for B. viz. that he is next Heir to A. and upon this Judgment is given, that the Hands of the Queen be amov'd, and after C. the Attorney makes Livery according to the Warrant of Attorney *, and after an Amoveas Manum is awarded and executed. This is a good Livery; For now by the Judgment against the Queen, the Possession of the Queen was utterly defeated and disaffirmed, and the Heir restored to the Right of the Possession; so that he may enter at his Pleasure. New Entries. 197. 1. adjudg'd between Terry and Brown and Others.

* Fol. 6.

[25] If a Man seised in Fee of an Orchard, makes a Feoffment of it, and goes into the Orchard, and cuts a Turf and Twigg, and delivers it in the Name of Seisin to the Feoffee over a Wall of the same Orchard, the Feoffee then being in other Land not being [mentioned] in the Feoffment; this is a void Livery. P. 2 Ja. B. adjudged.

26. If a Man be disseised of one Acre, and is seised in Fee of another Acre, and makes Feoffment of both, and makes Livery in this of which he is seised in Fee in the Name of both; yet nothing of the other Acre whereof he is disseised, shall pass. D. 28. H. 8. 18. 106. where Disseisor had made Lease at Will of this Acre.

27. If Lessee for Life of one Acre makes Feoffment of this and of other Land, whereof he is seised in Fee, and makes Livery in this, whereof he is seised in Fee, in Name of the whole; all shall pass. 9 H. 7. 25. b.

28. If Lessee for Years of one Acre makes Feoffment of this, and of other Acre whereof he is seised in Fee, and makes Livery in this, whereof he is seised in Fee, in the Name of the whole; yet the other Acre does not pass. 9 H. 7. 25 b.

29. If Cesty que Use within [the Statute of] R. 3. makes Lease for Years, and after during the Term, makes Feoffment of the Land, and makes Livery in other Land in the Name of the whole; nothing passes of this Land in Lease; Because he hath nothing in Use nor in Possession there. D. 36 H. 8. 58. 4

30. *Baron seized in jure Uxoris made Lease for Years*, and *died*; *the Feme enfeoffed J. S.* but the *Termor was not ousted*, and after, the *Feme released to the Termor, &c.* and yet the Feoffee recovered the Assise; For the *Lease was void by the Death of the Baron* and the *Feoffment* of the Feme, which *was an Entry*; Quod Nota; and therefore the Release void. Br. Feoffment de terre pl. 61. cites 7. Ass. F. 19.

31. In Assise it was found that the *Father of the Plaintiff*, whose Heir he was, *gave all* the Tenements that he had in D. to the Tenant, *except the Chamber in which he lay sick, and after the Seisin gives the Chamber, and removed himself into the Hall, and then died*; and good by the Opinion of the Court, and said that he entered into the Hall by Sufferance

of

of the Tenant, without claiming any Thing there to his Uſe, by which the Feoffment was awarded good, and the Plaintiff barr'd of it, Nota & ſo it ſeems here, that a Man cannot make Livery of the Chamber in which he lies, * quod non videtur Lex. Br. Feoffment de terre, pl. 24. cites Aſſ. 6.

* Perk. S. 211. acc. cites 11. Aſſ. 6. 17 Aſſ. 61———If a Man *lying ſick with in a Manor*, ſells the Manor to a Stranger, and ſays unto him, that he *will that he ſhall take Seiſin preſently, and commands all his Servants to be Attendants upon him, as their Lord* and Maſter, and thereupon the *Vendee takes Seiſin, and* perhaps giveth unto the Servants 20s. to drink, and the Tenants of the Maſter attorn unto him, and the Vendee *goes from the Manor* about his Buſineſs, *and the Feoffor dies upon the ſame* Manor; yet it is a good Livery of Seiſin, according to the Words of the Eſtate, &c. Perk. S. 212. cites 43. Aſſ. P. 20. Br. Feoffment. pl. 35. cites S. C.

32. If the Diſſeiſor enfeoff the Diſſeiſee and two others, all accrues to the Diſſeiſee; For *his Entry was lawful, and he remitted before the Livery*, and ſo the Livery void; contra if the Entry had not been lawful. Br. Feoffment de terre, pl. 99 cites 29. Aſſ.

33. Feoffment made *during the Cuſtody of the King by Reaſon of Ward*, &c. was void. Br. Feoffment, pl. 63. cites 50. Aſſ. 2.

34. If a Feoffment be made of a Houſe or Land by Deed, and the *Feoffor, in coming to the Houſe or Land with the Feoffee and others*, &c. *reads the Deed* of Feoffment, *and afterwards* goes into the Houſe or Land, and *delivers Seiſin accordingly*, 'tis good, notwithſtanding that the *Feoffor remains upon the Land, or in the Houſe all the Time, and takes the Profits at the Sufferance of the Feoffee* Perk. S. 210.

35. If a Man *enters into my Lands by wrongful Title, and I being there, he enfeoffs a Stranger* thereof, *and delivers Seiſin unto him*, 'tis void; For he can't give Seiſin before he himſelf hath Seiſin, and he had not Seiſin at the Time of Livery of Seiſin; for the *Law will adjudge the Poſſeſſion in me, who have a Right* unto the Poſſeſſion; becauſe I am preſent at the Time of the Delivery of Seiſin. Perk. S. 219.

36. If *Husband and Wife purchaſe Land jointly in Fee*, and the Poſſeſſion being executed in them accordingly, and afterwards the *Husband enfeoffs a Stranger in Fee*, and the *Wife* ſays that ſhe *will not agree* thereunto, *nor go off the Land*, but continues there at the Time of the Livery of Seiſin; notwithſtanding the ſame, all the Land paſſes by the Feoffment. Perk. S. 223. cites H. 21. E. 3. 6.

For the Feme could not contradict the Livery of the Baron. And in Aſſiſe brought by the Heir of the Feme after the Death of the Baron, the Plaintiff was nonſuited. Br. Entre Cong. pl 28. cites S. C. and ſays it ſeems a perfect Diſcontinuance, and that the Heir of the Feme ſhall have *Cui in Vita*, and not Aſſiſe.

37. *But* if *Mayor and Commonalty* be *jointly ſeiſed* of any Land *in Fee*, and the *Mayor* againſt the Will of the Commonalty *enfeoffs a Stranger* of the ſame Land, the *Commonalty being upon the Land*, when Livery of Seiſin is made; nothing paſſes by this Feoffment, &c. Perk. S. 224. cites T. 12. E. 3. 3, 4.

So of Dean and Chapter. Perk. S. 220.

38. If a *Leaſe for Years* be made *to A. Remainder to B. in Fee*, in Tail, or for Life. If *A. enters before the Livery*, it is good; but the *Remainder is void*, Co. Litt. S. 60. a. Pag. 49. a.———Arg. Pl. C. 156. in the Caſe of Throgmorton v. Tracy.

39. A *Termor for* 1000 *Years made* a Deed of *Feoffment*, by *Dedi conceſſi & Feoffavi*, and a *Letter of Attorney* to make Livery, and after, the *Attorney delivered Seiſin, the Leſſor being preſent upon the Land, not contradicting it*. Quære, if the Land paſſes by the Feoffment, ſo that the Leſſor may enter for a Forfeiture, or that the Term paſſes firſt by the Words, Dedi & conceſſi Terram before Livery? &c. As Wray thought prima Facie, but Dyer econtra; but by both, the Livery by Attorney is good enough, and the Preſence of the Leſſor upon the Land is no Impediment to the Feoffment. D. 362. b. pl. 20. Paſch 20. Eliz. Anon

40. A. ſeiſed of a Manor *leaſes Part*, and then gives Grants, Bargains, and ſells the Manor, and makes Livery in that Part in Poſſeſſion, in the Name

Name of the whole *Manor*; nothing paſſes but what was in his Poſſeſſion, and the Reverſion of ſuch Part, as was in Leaſe, ſhall not paſs without *Attornment*; but if the *Deed be enrolled* after, then the whole paſſeth; and the Reverſion being ſettled by the Inrolment, the Attornment, coming afterwards, has no Relation, per Wray Ch. J. Mich. 25 and 26. Eliz. B. R. Le 6. Stoneley v. Bracebridge.

If *Leſſee for Years enfeoffs a Stranger*, the *Leſſor being upon the Land*; yet the Land ſhall paſs by the Feoffment; but perhaps, if he continues upon the Land, claiming the ſame after the Feoffment, this countervails an Entry for a Forfeiture. And the Reaſon why it paſſes by ſuch Feoffment, is, becauſe the *Leſſor had nothing to do to meddle with the Poſſeſſion* of the Land, *during the Term*: But he may come and ſee, whether Waſt be done, or to diſtrein for his Rent if it be behind, &c. Perk. S. 222.

41. *Leſſor and Leſſee being on the Land*, the Law judges the Poſſeſſion in him that has the Right to it, and that is, the Leſſee; and Livery ought always to be given of the Poſſeſſion, and the * *Preſence of the Leſſor*, who has nothing to do there, cannot diſturb it; but the Preſence of the Leſſee will hinder Livery by the Leſſor. Paſch 36. Eliz. B. R. Cro. E. 322. Read and Morpeth v. Errington.

(M) In what Caſes Livery may be made within the View.

So if a Man *delivers* me a *Deed of Feoffment*, *and ſhews* me *the Land a far off*, *and I agree and accept the Deed, and durſt not enter for fear of Death*; 'tis a good Poſſeſſion to have Aſſiſe. Quære inde. Br. Aſſiſe pl. 350. cites S. C.———Br. Feoffment pl. 32. S. C. without any Quære.

1. If a Man be diſſeiſed: if Diſſeiſee dares not to enter the Land, he may come as near to the Land, as he dare for fear of Death, and make his continual Claim, and then make Livery of it within the View; For this Claim ſettles the actual Poſſeſſion in him. 38. Aſſ. 23.

S. P. per Brown and Weſton J. D. 233. Marg. pl. 10. Mich. 6 and 7 Eliz. Apprice v. Rogers Alſ. Sir Walter Dennis's Caſe.

2. If a Man makes a Deed of Feoffment, with a Letter of Attorney to J. S. to make Livery, the Attorney cannot make Livery within the View; For his Warrant is to be intended of an actual Livery, and not of a Livery in Law. Co. Litt. 52. b. cites it to be reſolved, P. 3. El. B. in Tamham's Caſe.

3. A *Corporation* cannot execute a Feoffment by Livery within View. D. 233. pl. 11. Mich 6 and 7. Eliz. Apprice v. Rogers. alias Sir Walter Dennis's Caſe.

(N) In what Caſes Feoffment may be made by Livery within View. To whom.

1. If A. leaſes for Years to B. the Remainder to C. in Fee, and makes Livery to B. within the View; This Livery is void; For none can take by Force of a Livery within the View, but he who takes the Franktenement himſelf. Co. Litt. 49. b.

(O) In

(O) In what Place.

1. If a Man be in one County within the View of Land in another County, he may well make Livery within the View of it. 38. E. 3. 11. b. adjudg'd Co. Litt. 48. b.

S. P. If the *Feoffee enters.* Br. Feoffment. de terre. pl. 11. cites

28. E. 3. 12.——But Feoffee ought to execute it, and *take Poſſeſſion preſently*, will not avail him; becauſe a Franktenement cannot be in Abeyance. Mo. 85. Paſch in the Caſe of Bullock v. Burdet. or the Livery 7. Eliz. C.B.

2. Livery within the View is good, tho' there is * not any Charter of Feoffment of it. Co. Litt. 48. b.

* But the Law is alter'd in this Point. See 29. Car. 2. 3.

(P) How, and in what Manner, Livery of Seiſin within the View may be made, [*or on the Land*, &c.].

* Fol. 7.

1. 9 Rep. 137. Thoroughgood's Caſe. A Man makes Charter of Feoffment, and within the View of his Lands, ſaies to the Party, See you the Land; Enter into * it and enjoy it according to the Effect of this Charter; and the Feoffee enters, this amounts to a good Livery and ſeiſin of the Land. But otherwiſe it would be, if he had been out of the View of the Land at the ſpeaking of the Words. 18 H. 6. 16. b. 6 Rep. *Sharp's Caſe.* Co. Litt. 48. A Man bails the Charter of Feoffment, and ſaies to the Feoffee, God give you Joy of it; this is adjudg'd a good Feoffment; yet no Livery was made, and it does not appear that it was within View. 41 E. 3. 17. b. But it ſeems, it is to be intended, that it is a Livery within the View, but it appears there that the Feoffor was not upon the Land. 41. Aſſ. 10. adjudg'd. Co. Litt. 48.

S. P. per Popham Ch. J. Poph 49. in Caſe of Collard v. Collard. Co. Lit. 48. a. Br. Feoffment de terres pl. 62.

2. If a Man within the View of Land delivers a Charter of Feoffment of it to the Feoffee, and ſaith, I will that you have the Tenements which you ſee there, the which are comprized in this Charter according to the Purport of the Charter, and ſhews the Land; this is a good Livery within the View. 38 E. 3. 11. b. 12. adjudg'd. 38. Aſſ. 2. adjudg'd. Co. Litt. 48.

Perk. S. 213.

3. If a Man delivers a Deed of Feoffment to the Feoffee within the View, and ſhews the Land to him without ſaying any more, and the Feoffee enters, and Feoffor agrees to this Entry; yet it ſeems that it is not a good Feoffment. Contra 38 E. 3. 12. per Mowbray.

4. If A. enfeoffs B. his Son in Fee, and after B. comes within the View, and ſays to A. that where he had given to him the Land, as fully as he had given it to him, he vouchſafes it in him, [he gives it him again], and after, A. enters; this is not good Livery within the View. Contra 39. Aſſ. 12. adjudg'd. But Quere.

5. If a Man lying ſick upon certain Land, of which he is ſeiſed in Fee, and agrees to make a Feoffment of the Land to another, and ſays to him, that he vouchſafes, that he ſhall take ſeiſin immediately, and commands all his Servants, that they take the Feoffee as their Lord, and Maſter; this is good Livery within the View. 43. Aſſ. 20.

Perk. S. 212. cites S. C.

6. If a Man ſeiſed in Fee, in Conſideration of the Marriage of his Son with another, comes upon the Land, and ſays to him theſe Words, Stand forth Euſtace, (which was his Name) I do here give this Land to thee and thy Heirs; this is good Livery, (it ſeems that this is an actual Livery). M. 37. El. in the Exchequer Chamber, per Cur. between Callard and Callard.

Cro. E. 344. S. C. in B. R. Mo. 687. S.C.

Poph. 47. S. C. ——Mo. 68. S. C.—2 And. 64. Twiſden J. held, that tho' this had been by Deed, yet no uſe would have ariſen; Becauſe ſuch a Reſervation could not be; Sid. 82. Trin. 14. Car. 2. B. R. in the Caſe of Foſter v. Foſter.

7. But if he had ſaid, Stand forth Euſtace, I do here, reſerving an Eſtate to me and my Wife for our Lives, give thee this Land [and] to thy Heirs. This ſhall not be a Livery, and ſo by Conſequence a Feoffment to the uſe of himſelf and his Wife for Life, the Remainder to Euſtace, tho' Euſtace cannot have any Eſtate without ſuch Operation; becauſe he makes the Reſervation firſt, and ſo good, and his Intent does not appear to paſs it by way of Feoffment to uſe. M. 37. El. Exchequer Chamber, between *Callard* and *Callard*, adjudg'd, and the Judgment before given in B. R. reverſ'd accordingly.

———cites 38. H. 6 38.

8. If it appears, that a Man intended to make an actual Livery, this ſhall never amount to a Livery in Law. M. 2. Ja. B. agreed. D. 28. H. 8. 18. 107. If he makes Livery in the Houſe, and this being in Leaſe [is] void, it ſhall not paſs a Cloſe then in the Poſſeſſion of the Feoffor. Dubitatur.

For to every Livery is requiſite, either an Act, which the Law adjudges Livery, or apt Words amounting to it.

9. If A. ſeiſed of a Houſe, comes into the Houſe, and ſays to B. I here demiſe unto you my Houſe, as long as I live, paying 20l. per Ann. &c. This is not any Livery, but only a Limitation of the Eſtate, and therefore nothing paſſes, but an Eſtate at Will. 6 Rep. 26. per Cur. *Sharpe's Caſe*. Co. Litt. 48.

6 Rep. 26. Paſch 42 Eliz. C. B. Sharp's Caſe, alias Sharp v. Swan.

A *Feoffment* was made *of a Houſe and Land* which was within the View of the Houſe, and no Livery made, but only the *Deed* of Feoffment *delivered as his Deed, in the Houſe*; and this was adjudged no Livery for the Land; and per Popham, nor for the Houſe, without *mentioning that he ſhould take the Houſe*. Mo 458. pl. 632. Mich 38 and 39 Eliz. B. R. Sharpe v. Swaine. ———9 Rep 137. b. Thoroughgood's Caſe.

10. If a Man delivers a Charter of Feoffment upon the Land, to the Feoffee, in Name of ſeiſin of the Land contained in the Deed; this is good Livery. Co. Litt. 48.

9 Rep. 137. b. Thoroughgood's Caſe.

11. The Delivery of any Thing upon the Land, in Name of ſeiſin of the Land, tho' it nothing concerns the Land, as a Gold Ring, is good Livery. Co. Litt. 48. and there cites 50. E. 3. Rot. Parliamenti Munero 30. to be reſolv'd by all the Judges.

(P. 2) Livery within the View Countermanded. By what Act.

Mod. 91. S. C. Parſons v. Perns.——2 Lev. 34. Parſons v. Peirce.

1. *A. and B. Femes, Jointenants in Fee*; *A. made* a Charter of *Feoffment to J. S.* and Livery within View, *and bid him enter*, and after, before it was executed, *married him*. Reſolved, that this Livery was well executed after Marriage; For an Intereſt paſſed by the Livery within View, which cannot be countermanded. Hill. 23 & 24. Car. 2. B. R. Vent. 186. Parſons v. Perus.

Fol. 8.

(Q) [Livery.] By Letter of Attorney. How it is to be executed.

1. If the Deed of Feoffment be to J. [S.] and the Letter of Attorney to J. S. Capellano; he cannot deliver ſeiſin to J. S. unleſs he be a Chaplain. 4. H. 6. 1. b.

Some hold the Livery ſo made to be void. Co Litt.

2. If a Deed of Feoffment, with Letter of Attorney to make Livery, be ſimple, and the Attorney makes Livery upon Condition, yet it is good Execution of the Letter of Attorney, in as much as he has perform'd

performed all which he was commanded, and more. (But the Condition is void) 26. Aſſ. 39. Agreed. 25S. a. b —— Br. Feoffment de terre pl. 27 cites 26. Aſſ. 39 that Thorpe held it good, but Mowbray the Contrary. Perk. S. 192. S. P. and that it has been held a Diſſeiſin; but adds a Quære, becauſe the Attorney has done all the Commandment of his Maſter and more.

3. If a Deed of Feoffment and Letter of Attorney to make Livery be ſimple, and after the Feoffor commands the Attorney to make Livery upon a certain Condition, and he does it accordingly; it ſeems this is not a good Feoffment, but a Diſſeiſin to the Feoffor. For it ſeems that it is a Revocation of the firſt Letter of Attorney, and then this cannot create a new Power to make the Feoffment without Deed. Dubitatur 26. Aſſ. 39. Br. Feoffment pl. 27. S. C. and that Thorp held it good, but Mombray Contra.—Br. Conditions. pl. 108. cites S. C. that Skipwith held it good, but Mombray Contra.

4. If a Man makes a Deed of Feoffment to two, with a Letter of Attorney to J. S. to make Livery, and the Attorney makes Livery to one of them in the Name of both. This is a good Livery; For it is an actual Livery to both. Tr. 1651. Intratur Tr. 1650. Rot. 1768. But if he makes Livery unto one only, and *not in the Name of both*, nor according to the Deed, it ſeems this is a Diſſeiſin to the Feoffor; becauſe he has diſobeyed the Commandment of his Maſter. See Perk. S. 188.——Feoffment to two, with Letter of Attorney to make Livery; *one dies* ——Livery may be *made to Survivor*, per Anderſon. Mo. 280, 281. Mich 31 and 32. Eliz. C. B. Battey v. Trevillion.

5. If the Attorney *does the Command of his Maſter, and more*, yet it ſhall be good for that, which hath Reference to his Commandment, and void for the reſt, unleſs in ſpecial Caſes. Perk. S. 189.

6. *As if* the Warrant of Attorney be *to make Livery unto one* Man, and the Attorney *make Livery unto two*; it is good to him to whom the Warrant doth extend, and void unto the other. Perk. S. 189.

7. And *ſo* is it, if the Warrant of Attorney be *to make Livery of black Acre*, and the Attorney *makes Livery of white Acre and black Acre*; in this Caſe all is not void; for it is good for black Acre, becauſe the Attorney hath done all the Commandment of his Maſter, and more. Perk. S. 189.

8. If a Warrant of Attorney be made to make Livery of ſeiſin *unto two*, and *one of them die* before the Livery of ſeiſin made, *and the Attorney make Livery* of ſeiſin, *according unto the Deed, unto the other* Feoffee who is Living, it is good unto him for all the Land. Perk. S. 192. cites 22. Aſſ. 9.

9. The Attorney *muſt purſue his Warrant*, otherwiſe he does not deliver Seiſin by Force of the Deed. Co. Litt. 52. a.

10. If Letter of Attorney be to deliver Seiſin *upon Condition*, and the Attorney *delivers it abſolutely*, 'tis void. And ſo ſome hold; if the Warrant be abſolute, and he delivers it on Condition, it is void. Co. Litt. 258. a. b.——Co. Litt. S. 359.

11. If Letter of Attorney be *to three jointly and ſeverally* to make Livery; one only may make Livery, or all three may; but two cannot. Br. Jointenant. pl. 1. cites 27. H. 8. 6.

12. *But* in ſuch Caſe it was doubted, if Livery *made by two, the other being preſent, and ſaying or doing nothing*, be good Livery. It was agreed, if the third had been abſent, it had not been good. Paſch. 38. H. 8. D. 62 pl. 34. Pennington v. Morſe.

13. Letter of Attorney to A. B. and C. *Conjunctim vel Diviſim in omnia & Singula*, &c. each by themſelves, in ſeveral Parts of the Lands, and at ſeveral Times made Livery, and good. Le. 192 Mich. 31 and 32. Eliz. C. B. Petty v. Trevillian——4 Le. 195. S. C. And. 245. Petty v Trevillian. S. C—— Mo 2-8. S. C. Battey v. Trevillian. S C cited Mo. 516

14. When

14. When Letter of Attorney is made to four *Conjunctim & Divisim*, and one executes Livery in one Part. By this Act the Authority is not absolutely executed or determined, but that they Conjunctim & Divisim may after proceed to give Livery in the other Parts entirely, or by piecemeal, and Livery is well executed *by one in one Parcel, and by other in other Parcel.* Mo. 280. Mich. 31 and 32. Eliz. C. B. Battey v. Trevillion. ——And 264. S. C.

If a Man makes Letter of Attorney to make Livery *to W.* or *to S.* and he *makes Livery to* either of them, 'tis good; *but* if he makes Livery *to both*, 'tis void; for 'tis contrary to his Warrant. Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. 83. cites 11 H. 7. 13. per Davers and Hussey.——S. P. Br. Grants pl 172. says, that this seems to be intended, where he makes one Deed of Feoffment to W. and another to S. And yet he makes a Quære, if Livery by Attorney be not good by the Letter of Attorney without Deed of Feoffment; for the Feoffor himself may make Livery by Parol without Deed.

15. Feoffment of 20 Acres with Letter of Attorney to make Livery. If 1 Acre or 19 Acres are *evicted* by lawful Entry or Action after the Letter of Attorney was made——Yet the Attorney may make Livery in that which remains. Per Anderson Ch. J. Mo. 280. ut sup.

16. If he makes *General Livery* of all *where all cannot pass*, by reason of the Eviction, yet it shall be good for that which may pass. Mo. 280. ut sup.

17. *Feoffment of two Acres, whereof one is in Lease for Years*, with Letter of Attorney to make Livery thereof, and says not, (or of any Part thereof); yet may the Attorney make Livery in the Acre in Possession alone; and if he makes Livery *in the Acre in Possession only*, in the Name of both; this shall be good of the Acre in Possession, tho' it cannot be of that in Reversion, because it is in Lease. per Anderson Ch. J. Mo. 280. ut sup.——Poph. 103. Slanings Case.

18. If a Letter of Attorney be *made to enter into all, or any Part of Lands in the Name of the whole*, and to make Livery; the Attorney may enter into any Part, tho' in the Possession of *several Tenants*, and make *Livery severally* of the several Tenements apart that he enters into the Possession of. per Hale Ch. Baron and tot. Cur. Mich. 14. Car. 2. in Scacc. Hard. 314. Friend v. Drury.

S. C. cited Arg. 2 Mod. 8. Pasch. 28. Car. 2. in Case of Norris v. Trist; but Serjeant Maynard reply'd, that my Ld Coke err'd much in this, and that it is not Law; but if the *Authority* be *general*, as *to make Livery and Seisin*, and he (enters into or) takes Possession of one, and then makes Livery of more Secundum Formam Chartæ, it is good; and said that this is the Difference taken in the Books 5 E. 3. 65. 3 E. 3. 32. 27 H. 8. 6.

19. A. seized of 2 *Acres*, makes Feoffment of both, and *Letter of Attorney to enter into both, and deliver Seisin* of both according to the Form, &c. of the Deed. The Attorney *enters into one only*, and delivers Seisin Secundum Formam Chartæ; this Livery is good, tho' he said not in the Name of both; For when he deliver'd Seisin of one *secundum Formam Chartæ*, it is Tantamount, and implies a Livery of both. Co. Litt. 52.

20. A Deed was made to *three, Habend. to two for their Lives*, Remainder *to the third for Life*, and there was a *Letter of Attorney to make Livery to the two*, but instead of making Livery to the two, he *made Livery to all three.* The whole Court held the Livery good, and the Chief Justice said, that whatever the ancient Opinions were about pursuing Authorities with great Exactness and Nicety, yet this Matter of Livery upon *Indorsements of Writings* was always *favourably expounded* of later Times, *unless* where it plainly appeared that it was *not pursued at all. As* if a Letter of Attorney be made *to three jointly and severally, two cannot execute* it, because they are not the Parties delegated; For they do not agree with the Authority, and Judgment was given accordingly. 2 Mod. 78, 79. Pasch. 28. Car. 2. C. B. Norris v. Trist.

(R) Feoffment by Letter of Attorney.

1. A Feoffment may be made by Attorney 11 H. 4. 71. 26. Aſſ. 39.

2. So it may be received by Attorney 11 H. 4. 71.

3. A Stranger cannot make Feoffment of my Land by my Aſſent; For it is not my Feoffment. 40. Aſſ. 38. S. P. per. Manwood Dal. 95. pl. 23

4. A Feoffment and Livery cannot be made by an Attorney of the Feoffor by Parol without Deed. Co. Litt. 48. b. 52.

5. An Attorney of the Feoffee by Parol, without Letter of Attorney by Deed made to him, cannot take Livery. Co. Litt. 48. b. Mich. 11. Car. B. R. per Cur. upon Evidence at the Bar, between Palfreman and Goble.

6. If Leaſe for Years be made to A. by Deed, or without Deed, the Remainder in Fee to B. and Livery is made to A. This is good, tho' he be but an Attorney to take Livery for him in Remainder; For this enures only to him in Remainder. Lit. 8. 60. Co. Litt. 49. b.

7. If a Leaſe be made to A. and B. for Years without Deed, the Remainder in Fee to C. and Livery is made to A. in the Abſence of B. in the Name of both; This is good Livery to veſt the Remainder in C. Co. Litt. 49. b. Tho' Livery can't be made to one in Name of him, and of another, who is abſent, by which any Eſtate of Freehold ſhall paſs to him, who is abſent, *without Deed*, becauſe his Eſtate is only to commence by the Livery; yet, when a Leaſe is made to two for Years without Deed, the Remainder for Life, the *Leſſees* immediately *have an Intereſt in the Land, before any Livery made.* And therefore, Livery made to one, who has Intereſt, in Name of him and the other, ſuffices to this Purpoſe. 5 Rep. 95. a. 39. Eliz. in the Exchequer, in Barwick's Caſe.

8. But if a Warrant of Attorney be made to two to take Livery jointly, and Livery is made to one of them, in the Abſence of the other, in the Name of both, it is void. Co. Litt. 49. b. In Caſe of a *Leaſe for Years to A. and B. Remainder to C. for Life*, a *Diverſity* was taken by ſome *between two joint Attorneys*, who have expreſs Authority to take Livery and Seiſin by Deed, *and two joint Leſſees*, who have Power to receive Livery for the Benefit of another, by Warrant in Law; For *Livery* made *to one Attorney in Name of both, is not good*; for he does not purſue his expreſs Warrant; for himſelf only had not Warrant; for they both make but one Attorney. But in Caſe of two joint Leſſees, the Livery made *to one Leſſee in Name of both*, is good; For they had an Intereſt in the Land before their Entry, and the Livery to one in Name of both makes an actual Poſſeſſion in both, which is ſufficient to ſupport the Remainder to C. And in the one Caſe the Livery is made to the *Leſſees*, who *have Intereſt*; and in the other, to him, who made the Warrant of Attorney by his Attornies, who *have but a bare Authority*. Trin. 39. Eliz. in Scacc. 5 Rep. 94. b. 95. a. in Barwick's Caſe.——Co. Litt. 49. b.

9. If A. makes a Deed of Feoffment to B. and C. with Letter of Attorney to make Livery, and he makes Livery to B. in the Abſence of C. in the Name of both, it is good. Co. Litt. 52.

10. If the Land be in Leaſe, if Letter of Attorney be made, the better way is to add this Clauſe, Ac Omnes alios inde expellendi, otherwiſe it is a Queſtion, if he may enter upon Leſſee. D. 2 and 3. M. 131. * 11. It is no good Feoffment, becauſe it is a Diſſeiſin to the Leſſee, and not a lawful Act, per 2 J. But 5 J. and the Attorney, and Sollicitor General e contra. Paſch 2 and 3. P. & M. D. 131. pl. 11.——It ſeems, that the giving the Attorney Power to make Livery is ſufficient. See Mo. 91 pl. 226. Trin. 10 Eliz. per Dyer and Welch, who cited it as the E. of Warwick's Caſe.——* It ſhould be 71.

11. But if it has not this Clauſe, it ſeems he may enter and make Livery. D. 2 and 3. Ma. 71. Opinion. P. 31. El. 6. Rot. 514. between *Carter* and *Cleypole* adjudged, and this affirmed in Writ of Error. H. 32. El. Rot. 791. Co. Litt. 52 b. D. 17 El. 340. 49

12. If a Charter of Feoffment be made, by Deed indented, between A. and B. with Letter of Attorney to C. to make Livery; tho'

* Fol. 9.

C. be not any Party * to the Deed, yet the Warrant of Attorney is good, and the Eſtate ſhall paſs by this Livery. B. R. between *Dicker* and *Moland*, Rot. adjudg'd per Cur. upon ſpecial Verdict, in which the Opinion of Coke is denied, Contra Co. Litt. 52 b.

13. One Attorney cannot make Letter of Attorney to another, to make Livery. 18 E. 4. 12. b. 19 H. 8. 10.

Perk. S. 188.

14. If the Letter of Attorney be to deliver Seiſin upon Condition, and he delivers it without Condition; this is not good, but is he a Diſſeiſor. 11 H. 4. 3.

15. An Attorney cannot make Livery within the View; For his Warrant is intendible in Law of an actual and expreſs Livery, and not of a Livery in Law. Co. Litt. 52. H. 3. El. B. reſolved *Tarham's Caſe.*

16. If A. be diſſeiſed of black Acre and white Acre, and a Warrant of Attorney is made to enter into both and make Livery, and the Attorney enters into black Acre only, and makes Livery ſecundum Formam Chartæ; there the Livery is void, becauſe he does not purſue his Warrant; For the Eſtate of the Diſſeiſor in white Acre cannot be deveſted without an Entry. Co. Litt. 52.

17. If a Man makes 20 *ſeveral Deeds* of Feoffment *of one Acre* of Land, ſo that they *all accord in Subſtance*, and delivers *Seiſin upon all*, it is good. Held in Cam. Scacc. Br. Feoffment de terre, pl. 12. cites 7 H. 6. 44.

18. If a Man makes Letter of Attorney to make Livery *to W. or to S.* and he *makes Livery to either* of them, 'tis good. *But* if he makes Livery *to both*, 'tis void; for it is contrary to his Warrant. & hence it ſeems, that the Feoffment is good by the Livery, *by the Letter of Attorney without Deed of the Feoffment.* Br. Feoffment de terre. Pl. 83. cites 11 H. 7. 13.

Arg. 2 Roll. Rep. 274.

19. If Letter of Attorney to receive Livery on a Feoffment *miſrecites the Feoffment*, the Livery is void. Cro. E. 603. Hill. 40. Eliz. C. B. Marriot v. Smith.

(R. 2) Who may be Attorney to make Livery.

Monks, &c. and Feme Coverts may be Attornies to make Livery for a Perſon able

1. Few Perſons are diſabled to be private Attornies, to make Livery of Seiſin. For *Monks*, *Infants*, *Feme Coverts*, Perſons *attainted*, *Excommunicated*, *Villeins*, *Aliens*, &c. may be; and a Feme may be Attorney to deliver Seiſin *to the Husband*, *and the Husband to the Wife*, and he in *Remainder to Leſſee for Life.* Co. Litt. 52.

to make a Feoffment, becauſe the Feoffee in ſuch Caſe is not in the Land, by him that makes the Livery of Seiſin, but is in the Land by the Feoffor. But if they do not make ſuch Livery of Seiſin, according to their Warrant of Attorney: Then in ſome Caſes it is a Diſſeiſin unto the Feoffor, &c. Perk. S. 187.——Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. 48. cites 18 E. 4. 27.——Br. Coverture, &c. Pl. 55. cites 21. E. 4. 18.——Br. Attorney, pl. 5. Perk. S. 199.

2. If *a Man*, *ſeized* of Land *in the Right of his Wife*, *Leaſe* the ſame Land *for Life reſerving Rent*, and makes a *Letter of Attorney unto the Wife* to make Livery of Seiſin, *and ſhe makes Livery* of Seiſin accordingly. and the Husband dies, and the Wife accepts the Rent, yet ſhe ſhall have Cui in Vita; for this Acceptance cannot make the Leaſe good, inſomuch as ſhe is a Stranger unto the Leſſee; for the Leſſee took nothing by the Wife, notwithſtanding that ſhe made Livery of Seiſin; for ſhe made that but *as Servant* unto her Husband. Perk. S. 199. cites 26 H. 8.

And. 247. S. C.——Mo. 280. the 4th Reſolution in S. C. By Name of Battey v. Trevillion.

3. If a Letter of Attorney be made to *Leſſee* to make Livery, and he makes it accordingly; yet this does not determine his Intereſt in the Land; For what he does, is as Officer or Servant to the Leſſor. Mich. 31 and 32. Eliz. C. B. Le. 192. Petty v. Trevillian.

(S) Feoffment

(S) Feoffment by Attorney. At what time it may be made.

1. If a Man makes a Deed of Feoffment with Letter of Attorney to J. S. to deliver Seiſin after his Death, the Attorney cannot deliver Seiſin during his Life, and if he dies he is a Diſſeiſor. 40. Aſſ. 38. Curia. (yet he cannot make Livery * after his Death.)

If the *Warrant* of Attorney be *to make Livery* of Seiſin *after the Death of a Stranger*, and he make Livery of Seiſin in his Life time; this is a Diſſeiſin unto the Feoffor Perk. S. 188. cites 11 H. 4. 3. 40 Aſſ. 38.——Br. Feoffments, pl. 34. S. C.——* Ibid. S. P. per Brooke.—Agreed to be Law. Holt's Rep. 463, 464.——* Co. Litt. S. 66.

2. If a Man makes a Deed of Leaſe for Lives rendering Rent payable at 4 Quarters of the Year with Letter of Attorney to J. S. to make Livery. J. S. may make Livery after 3 of the Quarters paſt well enough; For the Leſſor in the mean time continuing in Poſſeſſion has not any Prejudice. P. 10. Ja. 6. adjudged; between Walters, and the Dean and Chapter of Norwich.

Mo. 875. S. C.——2 Brownl 161. S. C.

3. If A. be diſſeiſed of Land, and after makes a Charter of Feoffment to B. with Letter of Attorney to make Livery, who doth it accordingly; this is a good Feoffment, tho' he was out of Poſſeſſion at the Time of the Charter made; For the Authority given by the Letter of Attorney was Executory, and nothing paſſed by Delivery of the Deed, till Livery made. Co. Litt. 48. b.

Co. Litt. 48. b. ſays, with Letter of Attorney (*to enter and take Poſſeſſion and after*) to make Livery (*Secundum formam Chartæ*)——And Nelſ. a. 845. pl. 7. takes in thoſe Words, but without quoting the Book. But there it is miſprinted (Diſſeiſor for Diſſeiſee) but he quotes 37 Eliz. Brown v. Terry, as is in the Marg. of Co. Litt.—The Caſe was, Land was ſeiſed for the Queen on an Office wrongfully found, and the Heir, after iſſue tried and Judgment given againſt the Queen, made a Feoffment; Hanging this Iſſue, and before the Writ of Amoveas Manum executed, the Attorney made Livery according to the Deed. Adjudged that the Livery was good; For by the Judgment the Queen's Hands were immediately amoved, and he had Authority to Execute Livery on the Land. Cro. E. 523. Mich. 38 and 39 Eliz. C. B. Brown v. Terry.——S. C. cited 2 Buls. 303. Arg.

4. If *Mayor and Commonalty generally, without naming the proper Name of the Mayor, make a Feoffment, and Letter of Attorney* to make Livery, and the *Mayor dies, and another* Mayor *is Elected*, and the *Attorney makes Livery*, this is good enough, per Moor Juſtice. Br. Corporations, pl. 34. cites 14 H. 8. 2. 29.

5. Leaſe for 21 Years, and a Covenant after in the ſame Deed, that after the expiring of the ſaid 21 Years, the ſaid Leſſees ſhall enjoy for Term of their Lives. *To make* this a *Remainder for 3 Lives*, the *delivery of the Deed and the Livery of Seiſin muſt be at the ſame time*; But if Leſſor firſt delivers the Deed, and the Attorney delivers Seiſin after, the Livery is void; For by this Livery it cannot paſs as a Remainder. 2 Eliz. C. B. And. 8. Okeden v. Sendy.——Mo. 14. S. C. Helier v. Okeden.

Bendl. 85. S. C. See Co. Litt. 49. a. b.

6. Feoffment on *Condition to re-enfeof Baron and Feme* and the Heirs of their Bodies. Feoffee makes Gift in Tail accordingly, and Letter of Attorney to make Livery; *before Livery executed Baron dies*; yet the Attorney may make *Livery to the Widow*, and ſhe ſhall take in Tail according to the Gift, per Periam J. Mich. 31 and 32 Eliz. C. B. Mo. 280. Batty v. Trevillion.

7. The Demiſe was to A. for Life; *Habend' a die Indenturæ prædictæ*, the Jury found that he demiſed the 10th June 44 Eliz. by Indenture of the ſame Date; 'tis a Demiſe at that time, and the Livery not being made by the Attorney till the 23 July was void, per 3 J. And per Popham Ch. J. if the *Deed had been delivered after the Day of the Date*, and then Livery had been made by Attorney, it had been well enough, and had been ſo adjudged. Cro. J. 153. Paſch. 5 Jac. B. R. Hennings v. Paucharden.—Roll. 828. pl. 5, 6. S. C.

8. William Lord Dacres the Father made a Feoffment in Fee *to his two Sons, upon Condition*, that they ſhould *make a Feoffment over to Thomas Dacres*

Dacres and one *Middleton with a Letter of Attorney*; All the Deeds were ready to be delivered; but *before the Father had delivered the Deed to his Sons, they* had *delivered their Deed* of Feoffment *to Thomas Dacres and Middleton, with a Letter of Attorney to B. G. to make Livery*; afterwards the Father delivered his Deed, and then Livery was made by Virtue of the Letter of Attorney; adjudged that the Livery was void; becauſe the Sons, at the Time they made the Feoffment, had nothing to paſs. Cited by Coke Ch. J. 2 Bulſt. 304. Hill. 12 Jac. in the Caſe of Butler v. Finch, as Lord Dacres Caſe.

Feoffment was made *Habendum after Mich.* and the Attorney made Livery *after Mich.* yet it was Held void, cited per Popham Cro. E. 585.

9. Leaſe for Life to commence at Mich. and Leſſor makes Livery *after Mich.* 'tis good Livery.—*So* if he makes Letter of Attorney to make Livery after Mich.—*But* if he makes Letter of Attorney *to make Livery generally*, and the Attorney makes Livery after Mich. This is a Diſſeiſin to the Leſſor. 2 Roll. R. 366. Hill. 17 Jac. B. R. Tiler's Caſe.——And if Leſſor or Attorney had made Livery before Mich. it had been void. Arg. 2 Roll. R. 109. cites 13 Jac. * Butler v. Finch.

Difference is, where the Livery is made *by the Leſſor in Perſon*, and where *by Letter of Attorney*, being in the ſame Charter, *generally* made; but if the Letter of Attorney be *to make Livery after Mich.* then in both Caſes 'tis good enough; For there is *no Intention, that the Livery ſhould operate futurely*, but that Livery ſhall be made, when it ſhould operate, and the Eſtate ſhould be good preſently. Cro. J. 563. Hill. 17. Jac. B. R. Greenwood v. Tyler.—Dal. 111. Stileman v. Warren——— * 2 Buls. 302. S. C.

[See (U. 3)——Eſtate (B)]

(T) Livery. How it may be made.

1. IF diverſe Parcels of Land are contained in a Deed of Feoffment, and the Feoffor delivers Seiſin of one Parcel according to the Deed, tho' he doth not ſay in the Name of the Whole, yet all the Parcels paſs; becauſe the Deed contains the whole. Co. Litt. 48. a.

But 'tis otherwiſe, if the Feoffment had been *by Parol.* P. 14. pl. 71. Trin. 28 H. 8. Jopſon v. Underdon.

2. So if there are diverſe Feoffees named in a Deed, and Feoffor makes Livery to one of the Feoffees according to the Deed, without ſaying in the Name of the whole; yet the Land ſhall paſs to all. Co. Litt. 48. a.

Trin. 28 H. 8. D. 14. a. pl. 71. S. P. Jopſon v. Underdon.

3. If A. be to make a Feoffment to B. and C. without Deed, and he makes Livery to B. in the abſence of C. in the Name of both, this is void as to C. becauſe a Man, who is abſent, cannot take a Frank-tenement by Livery, but by an Attorney, lawfully authorized to receive Livery by Deed. Co. Litt. 49. b.

4. But if a Charter of Feoffment be made to A. and B. and Livery is made * to A. in the Abſence of B. in the Name of both, this is good; becauſe it is by Deed. Co. Litt. 49. b.

* Fol. 10.

5. The manner to deliver Seiſin of Land by force of a Feoffment is to *remove all Perſons off the Land, and one* being *upon the Land, in the Preſence of all* the Perſons that are there, *to ſhew Cauſe of their coming, and* if the Feoffment be by Deed, *to read the Deed in Engliſh, and* the Deed being read, the *Feoffor to enter on the Land and take a Clod* of the ſame Land, *and deliver the ſame, together with the Deed*, unto the Feoffee, *in the name of Seiſin* of the ſame Land, to have, hold and enjoy, according unto the Purport of the ſame Deed, &c. Perk. S. 209. cites 39 Aſſ. * 12.

* The Book ſeems miſcited.

6. *So* ſhall it be done, *if Livery* of Seiſin *be to be made by* a Stranger, by force of a Warrant of *Attorney*, Mutatis mutandis, &c. Perk. S. 210.

Br. Feoffment de terre pl. 67. cites

7. If there are *four Feoffees*, and *one makes Letter of Attorney* to one R. to take Livery in the Name of the Feoffee and the Co-feoffees, according to the Deed, and to do all other Things for him and his Feoffees,

which

which he might have done if he was Perſonally preſent, and the *Feoffor makes Livery to the Attorney* in Name of that Feoffee and the other Co-feoffees to their Uſes according to the Deed; this is good to all. 2 And. 196. in the Court of Wards, Davy and Abbot. Nothing paſſes but only to him, who made the Letter of Attorney.

8. Of *Water in a ſtanding Pool*, Livery ought to be with a Diſh of part of the Water; but no Livery can be of *running Water*. Mich. 6 Jac. B. R. 4 Le. 238. pl. 385. Anon.

9. Feoffment to *Corporation and another Perſon*, there ought to be *ſeveral Liveries*, in reſpect of their ſeveral Capacities which makes them Tenants in Common. Finch. 23. b.

10. Livery can't be made to operate *in futuro*. Raym. 207. Mich. 22 Car. 2. B. R. Dal. 111. 16 Eliz. Stileman v. Warren.—Roll. Rep. 423. Hill. 21 Jac. B. R. in the Serjeant's Caſe.

11. A Feoffment was made *Habendum to A. and B. for Life, Remainder to C.* and Livery was made to all three. Reſolved 'twas good to two for their Lives Remainder to the third. 2 Mod. 79. Paſch. 28 Car. 2. C. B. Norris v. Triſt.

(T. 2) Livery. At what Time to be made.

1. If a Man makes a *Leaſe for Years to A. and B. Remainder to C. for Life*; in this Caſe the Leſſor *ought to make Livery to A. and B. before their Entry*; and by the Livery to A and B. C. ſhall take a preſent Eſtate for Life by way of Remainder, by force of the Livery made to the Leſſees for Years. And with this agrees * Littleton, lib. primo fo. 12. b. 5 Rep. 94. b. Trin. 39 Eliz. in Scacc. agreed in Barwick's Caſe. * Litt. S. 60

2. Livery made *after the Day, not working futurely*, is good enough. Hill. 15 Jac. B. R. Cro. J. 458. Smith v. Bole. *As* Leaſe for Life to commence at Mich. and Leſſor makes Livery *after Mich.* 'tis good Livery, Hill. 17 Jac. B. R. 2 Roll. R. 366. Tiler's Caſe.—But if Leſſor had made Livery before Mich it had been void. Arg. 2 Roll. R. 109. cites 13 Jac. * Butler v. Finch.——Dal. 111. 16 Eliz. Stileman v. Warren.——* 2 Buls. 302. S. C.——See (S) pl. 9. and the Notes thereon.

3. Feoffment *Habendum a Die datus*; if the Seiſin be not made at the laſt Inſtant of the Day, it is not good, per Roll. Ch. J. 811. 189. Hill. 1649. in Caſe of Watts v. Dix.

(U) Livery. How it may be made, Secundum formam Chartæ, [*as to the Name and Thing.*]

1. IF a Man makes a Charter by which he grants the Land in Fee and delivers Seiſin for Life, Secundum formam Chartæ, the Fee ſhall paſs; For this ſhall be taken moſt ſtrong againſt the Feoffor; for by the ſaid words, Secundum formam Charte, are intended according to the Quantity and Quality of the effectual Eſtate in the Deed. Co. Litt. 48. See (U. 2)

2. If a Man leaſe for Years by Deed, and delivers Seiſin according to the Form and Effect of the Deed; yet he has but an Eſtate for Years, and the Livery is void. Co. Litt. 48. b.

3. If A. by Deed gives land to B. to have after the Death of A. to B. and his Heirs, this is void; becauſe he cannot create a particular Eſtate in himſelf, and if Livery be made according to the Form and Effect of the Deed, this is void; becauſe it refers to a Deed which is void in Law. Mich. 33 and 34 Eliz. B. R. adjudged between *Hogg* and *Croſs*, cited Co. Litt. 48. b. 5 Rep. 94. b. 11 Rep. 78. Cro. E. 254 S. C. S. C. cited Hob. 171.

D. 281. a. pl. 19.

4. If a Man Covenants to make a Feoffment of the Value of 50 Marks Land to J. S. and after, makes Feoffment of Land of a far greater Value without aſſigning where the 50 Marks Land ſhall be. This is void, for the uncertainty, and no more ſhall paſs than the Place, where the Livery was made, P. 13. Ja. B. R. per Cur. between Woodhouſe and Futter.

5. So in the ſame Caſe the Feoffor cannot after the Livery aſſign 50 Marks of Land, to make ſo much to paſs by the ſaid Livery, in as much as it does not paſs at firſt, P. 13 Ja. B. R. per Cur. between Woodhouſe and Futter.

6. But otherwiſe it would be, if he had aſſigned where the 50 Marks Land ſhould be, before the Livery made. P. 13 Ja. B. R. per Cur. between Woodhouſe and Futter.

7. So it ſeems it would be, if he had aſſigned it upon the Livery made; For then the aſſignment is Uno Flatu with the Livery, Contra P. 13 Ja. B. R.

8. If a Man Covenants to make a Feoffment of all his Land, whereof 50 Marks Value ſhall be to ſuch a Uſe, and the other to other Uſe, &c, and after makes the Feoffment of all accordingly, without aſſigning the 50 Marks Value, he cannot after aſſign it. P. 13 Ja. B. R. between Woodhouſe and Futter.

9. If a Man has a moveable Eſtate of Inheritance in 13 Acres Parcel of a Manor, they will paſs by Name of the Manor. Co. Litt. 48. b.

This is to be underſtood if the 13 Acres are in Groſs and not Parcel of a Manor. Co. Litt. 48. b.

10. If a Man has a moveable Eſtate of Inheritance in 13. Acres Parcel of a Meadow of 80 Acres, the Charter of Feoffment ought to be generally of 13 Acres lying within the Meadow of 80 Acres generally without bounding, or deſcribing of it in Certainty and Livery may be of the 13 Acres allotted to the Feoffor for a Year, Secundum formam Charte; and this is good Livery to paſs the Content of 13 Acres in what Place ſoever it lies. Co. Litt. 48. b.

11. If a Manor be ſeparated, and divided between two, ſo that the one has one Part one Year, and the other Part the next Year, and ſo the other, and ſo they have moveable Franktenements; in this Caſe, Livery ought to be made in the Manor. Co. Litt. 48. b.

12. But where two Manors are ſeparated, and divided, alternis Vicibus; there the Charter of Feoffment ought to be made in Both, and Livery in this Manor whereof he is ſeiſed in any one Year, Secundum formam Charte, and the next Year in the other, Secundum formam Charte *; For there are two diſtinct Manors and ſeveral Eſtates in them. Co. Litt. 48. b.

* Fol. 11.

[13] 12. If A. ſeiſed of 100 Acres of Land in Fee enfeoffs B. of 18 of the ſaid 100 Acres verſus auſtrum, or verſus Orientem, and makes Livery; this is good; For this is certain at the Time of the Feoffment. D. 11 El. * 181. 19. 23 El. 372. 10.

* This ſhould be 281.

In this Caſe the *Feoffee died before Election*, and the Judgment according to And. 11. ſeems to be grounded

[14] 6. But if A. ſeiſed of 100 Acres in Fee, enfeoffs B. of 18 of the ſaid 100 Acres, Habendum ſibi & Hæredibus ſuis ad Electionem ipſius B. & Hæredum ſuorum quandocunque eis placeret, and makes Livery accordingly, this is a void Feoffment for the uncertainty, where the 18 Acres ſhall be among the 100 Acres; For the Franktenement of the 18 Acres ought to paſs abſque aliquo temporis intervallo, from the Feoffor to the Feoffee; For a Livery cannot Operate in futuro. D. 11 El. * 218. 17. 18. 19. adjudged.

only upon the *Election by the Heir*; and Anderſon puts a Quære, if the Feoffee himſelf might have made Election, or Not, and the Livery take Effect by ſuch Election and Hob. 174. cites it ſo, as that the Election of the Feoffee, himſelf makes the Grant good. See And. 11. and 12. Bullock's Caſe, cited 2 Rep. 36. b. f.——And. 11 Bullock v. Burdet.—Mo. 81. S. C.—Bendl. 148.—* This ſhould be 281.

15. *Deed* of Feoffment is *dated at Mich. next*, and *Livery made now* Secundum formam Chartæ. The Freehold is in the Feoffee preſently. Mo. 85. 86. Paſch. 7 Eliz. in Caſe of Bullock v. Burdet.

16. Where

16. Where the *Deed is void*, Livery Secundum formam Chartæ is void alſo. Co. Litt. 48. b.—Cro. E. 603. Hill. 40 Eliz. C. B. Mariot v. Smith. 30 E. 3. 31. b. 2 Buls. 302. Butler v. Fincher.—Roll. R. 229. S. C.

17. A Leaſe for Life is *made 25 March, Habendum a Die Datus*, with Letter of Attorney in the Deed to make Livery Secundum formam Chartæ, the Attorney *makes Livery the 26th*, this is not good. 2 Buls. 302. Hill. 12 Jac. B. R. Butler v. Fincher. Roll. R. 229. S. C.

18. Tho' a Grant of Land to A. and B. Habendum *one Moiety to one, and the other to the other*, makes a Tenancy in Common; yet they are diſtinct Conveyances, tho' it be really one Deed, and Livery *to the one*, Secundum formam Chartæ, will not avail the other, per Holt Ch. J. 12 Mod. Mich. 301. 11. W. 3. in Caſe of Fiſher v. Wigg.

(U. 2) Secundum formam Chartæ. Where the *Deed containes more or leſs* than Seiſin is delivered of.

1. If a Man be enfeoffed by Deed *of two Acres, to have* and to hold *three Acres, and Livery* of Seiſin is made to him, according to the Deed, *in the two Acres*; the third Acre, of which there was no Speech in the Premiſſes of the Deed, ſhall not paſs by the Deed; *but if Livery* of Seiſin *be made in this Acre*, then it ſhall paſs by the Livery of Seiſin, &c. Perk. S. 165.

2. If Livery be made *to one of the Feoffees* according to the Deed, it paſſes the Land to all, ſo of the Seiſin of one Parcel; but the beſt way is to ſay in the Name of the whole, or of all the Feoffees. Co. Litt. 48. a.

3. *If a Man makes a Charter in Fee, and makes Livery for Life*, Secundum formam Chartæ, it paſſes the whole Fee Simple. Co. Litt. 48. S. P. if it be for Life expreſly, and alſo according to the Deed; becauſe in this Caſe being made Secundum formam Chartæ, the Livery has a *Reference* to the Deed. But if Feoffor delivers Seiſin for Life in ſuch Caſe, and not Secundum formam Chartæ, the Feoffee ſhall hold but for Life. Co. Litt. 222. b.

4. If a Deed contains no *Condition*, but Livery does, the Land paſſes not by the Deed. Litt. S. 359. S. P. and *ſo Vice Verſa* Co. Litt. 258 a. b.

5. If the Livery be *larger than the Agreement*, ſome hold, that the Eſtate ſhall be according to the Agreement. Co. Litt. 222. b.

(U. 3) Livery. Secundum formam Chartæ, *at what Time* it may be.

1. Leaſe for Lives to commence *a Die Datus* was reſolved good; becauſe Livery was executed after the Day of the Date. But if before, it ſhould not. Mo. 637. Mellow v. May.——See 1 Roll. 828. 50. S. P. But where the *Date was* the 30 July 21 *Eliz.* and the *Livery was* 23 *Eliz.* Secundum formam Chartæ; the Livery *ſo long after* will not help the Leaſe, which was Habend' a Die Datus. Cro. E. 873. Hill. 44 Eliz. C. B Mellows v. May.——*So* if the Attorney makes Livery *the ſame Day*, Secundum formam Chartæ, 'tis void. Cro. Car. 388 Mich. 10. Car. B. R. Bull v. Wyatt.——*But* ſuch Livery *muſt be* made *the next Day* if it be to be made Secundum formam Chartæ; For that is Forma Chartæ, per Doderidge J. 2 Buls. 306. Hill. 12 Jac. in Caſe of Butler v. Fincher.

(X) Livery. How it may be, where *of Parcel in* the *Name of the Whole.*

1. If a Man makes Feoffment of Land in diverſe Places in the ſame County, and makes Livery in the Land in one Place in Name of all, the whole ſhall paſs. Perkins S. 226. Perk. S. 226. cites 9 H. 7. 25.

2. If

Dr. Entre Cong. pl. 35. cites 22 H. 6. 10.

2. If a Man makes a Deed of Feoffment of Land in two Counties, and makes Livery of the Land in one County in the Name of the whole; yet the Land which is in the other County shall not pass by it. 22 H. 6. 10. b. Doctor and Student 100. b. Perkins 227. Contra 26 Ass. 40.

3. If divers Parcels of Land be contained in a Deed of Feoffment, and the Feoffor delivers Seisin of one Parcel according to the Deed, tho' he does not say in the Name of the whole, yet all the Parcels pass, because the Deed contains all. Co. Litt. 48.

4. If a Man is *seised of two Acres, the one in Fee and the other for Life*, if he makes *Feoffment of both* Acres, and makes *Livery in the Acre of Fee in Name of both* the Acres, this is a good Livery, and both the Acres shall pass. Br. Feoffment de terre, pl. 42. cites 9 H. 7. 25.

5. *But if he had* two Acres, *the one in Fee, and the other for Years*, and makes Livery in the Fee Acre in the Name of both; *the Acre for Years shall not pass*. Ibid.

* Perk. S. 233. S. P.— So of an Entry into one Acre of *two Acres purchased* in Fee *by a Villein*, and the Lord claim'd not the other Acre, but afterwards infeoff'd a Stranger of both Acres, and made

6. If a Man be *disseised of two Acres* of Land *in one County*, and he *enters into one* of the Acres, *claiming the said Acre only*, and *makes a Deed of Feoffment of both Acres unto a Stranger, and makes Livery* of Seisin according to the Deed *in the Acre into which he entred*; it is said, that both Acres shall pass unto the Feoffee, because this Claim is nothing to the Purpose; For he had Right of entry before, &c. and both Acres are in one County; so as his Entry into one Acre shall be entry into both Acres, notwithstanding the Claim, &c. against which it may be said, that the Acre, into which the Feoffor did not enrer, shall not pass by the Feoffment; For when a Man is out of Possession of a **Thing severable*, he is at Liberty to continue his Possession in it, in which Part he will, and shall not be compelled to re-continue his Possession unto all in despight of him. Perk. S. 232. cites † P. 9. 7. 25.

Livery in the Acre, which he entered into, Secundum formam Chartæ; yet the Acre into which he did not enter, sho ld not pass by the Feoffment. Perk. S. 234.——So where one has *Title to enter into two Acres for a Condition broken*, &c. or for an Alienation in *Mortmain*, &c. Mutatis Mutandis. Ibid. S. 235. ——† It seems it should be Pasch. 9 H. 7. 25.

Bendl. 12. pl. 10. S. C. D. 283. pl. 30. Pasch. 11 Eliz. S. P. Anon.—— Ibid. 337. b. pl. 37. Trin. 16 Eliz. Anon.

7. *A. seised of* 3 *Acres, by several Feoffments, enfeoffed B. C. and D. of the said Acres*, viz. each of them *of one Acre to the Use of A.* &c. A. before the Statute of 27 H. 8. by a Deed of Feoffment, and a Letter of Attorney enfeoffed J. S. of the said 3 Acres, and the Attorney entered into one of the said Acres, and delivered Seisin to J. S. in the Name of that and the 2 other Acres; and by this the 3 Acres passed by the Statute of 1 R. 3. as was adjudged in B. R. after Argument by the Court. But How it passed, viz. by Grant or Feoffment quære; &c. nota the Statute. Pasch. 25 H. 8. And. 28. pl. 66. Kellet's Case.

8. A Man hath *two Lessees for Years by several Leases of Lands in a Common*, and made a Feoffment of all his Land within the same County, and made *Livery upon the Land; one of the Termors* outed him in Name of all; nothing of the other Lease passes by the Feoffment, inasmuch as the other Termor hath an Interest, and remains upon the Land. *But* it is otherwise of *a Tenant at will*; For there both Lands shall pass, inasmuch as 'tis a Determination of his Will. D. 18. pl. 106. Trin. 28 H. 8. Anon.

9. *But* note by Knightley, that if I be *seised of Land, and another is Tenant at Will to another Man of Land, to which I have a Right to enter*; in this Case tho' I make *Feoffment of all; and Livery* of Seisin *in that part of which I am seised in Name of all*; nothing passes of my Land, of which the other is Tenant at Will to a Stranger; inasmuch as it is no Determination of the Will of the Stranger. So note a *Diversity* where he is my Lessee at Will, and where he is Lessee at Will of another. D. 18. b. pl. 106. Trin. 28 H. 8. Anon.

Br. Feoffmt. de terre, pl. 77. cites S. C.

10. If a Man *seised of one Acre* of Land *in Possession, and of another in Use*, had *made* a Deed of *Feoffment of both, and Livery in the Acre in Possession*

Poſſeſſion in the Name of both; the Land in Uſe ſhould not paſs; *Contrary*, if the Livery was *in the Land in Uſe*, by Reaſon of the Statute, &c. Br. Feoffments al Uſes pl. 55. cites 37 H. 8.

(Y) In what Caſes Feoffment may be without Deed. Of what Thing.

1. Feoffment may be of an Advowſon by Livery of the Door of the Church without Deed. 43 E. 3. 1. b. (C) Pl. 2.

2. A Feoffment may be with Attornment of a Manor, without Deed, and the Services will paſs by Letter of Attorney. 3 Rep. 29. Butler and Baker's Caſe. * 20 H. 9. 7.

*This ſhould be 20 H. 6. 7. a

3. Letter of Attorney to deliver Poſſeſſion, if there *is no Deed of Feoffment*, is void. Per Frowick Ch. J. Kelw. 51. Trin. 18. H. 7.

4. The Queſtion of a Caſe drawn was, whether the *Advowſon* in Queſtion did paſs by the Livery made *in the View of the Church*, without Deed or not, (the *Church being full of an Incumbent*,) and reſolv'd by the Lord Ch. J. of the King's Bench, and Juſtice Manwood, to whom the ſame was referred, that the Advowſon could not paſs by that Livery. Cary's Rep. 74. cites 18 and 19 Eliz. Pannel v. Hodgſon, alias Hodſon.

5. The *Father enfeoffs the Son to the Uſe of the Father himſelf, for* Term of his *Life, and after* his deceaſe, then to the Uſe *of the Son and his Heirs*; and after the Father and Son, (upon Communication that the Father ſhould re-have the Land in Fee) came together to the Land, and upon the Land by Parol, without any Deed, the *Son delivered Seiſin* of the Land *to the Father*, Habendum ſibi & hæredibus ſuis, &c. if this be a good Feoffment or not, Quære? it being found by ſpecial Verdict in Eject. Firm. And by the Opinion of the Court 'tis a good Feoffment, and that in Law this Acceptance of Livery implies two Effects, Viz. *Firſt, a Surrender, and after a Feoffment*; as a Surrender to the Grantee of a Reverſion amounts to an Attornment and Surrender. D. 358. pl. 48. Paſch. 19 Eliz. Anon. ——Ibid Marg. cites it as ſo held M. 28. Eliz. in Leonard's Caſe. Bendl. 288. Paſch. 17 El. S. P. Langaſtell v. Aller.

6. Livery and Feoffment without Deed, by way of *Mortgage*, was good. Mo. 144. Mich. 25. and 26. Eliz. Ivers Keale's Caſe.

7. Livery of Seiſin (contrary to the Opinion of Coke Ch. J.) may be *received without* Deed, as a Stranger may take Livery *to the Uſe of J. S.* and after J. S. agrees to it 'tis good. 2 Sid. 61. per Glyn Ch. J. Hill 1657. B. R. in Caſe of Blunt and Clerk.

8. 29. *Car.* 2. 3. Puts an end to all Feoffments, &c. without Deed, in writing and ſigned by the Parties, or their Agents authorized by writing ſo as to have any greater Effect than as *Eſtates at Will*.

(Z) By Letter of Attorney. Revocation. What Act (*) or Thing ſhall be Revocation.

* Orig is (un)

1. If a Man makes a Deed of Feoffment with Letter of Attorney to make Livery, he may before Execution of the Livery revoke it. 84. H. 6. 14. Per Choke. 5 Rep. 90 b.

2. If a Man makes Charter of Feoffment with Letter of Attorney to deliver Seiſin and before Livery made, by Malady he becomes Paralitick, ſo that he is * mute at the Time, when Livery is made, but by all Signs, which a Man could perceive, he agreed to the delivery of the Seiſin; this is a good Feoffment, and no Revocation of the Letter of Attorney. 25. Aſſ. 4. adjudged.

*Orig (ruit) Br Feoffment pl. 26. cites S. C ——

But if a Letter of Attorney to make Livery of Seiſin is made of certain Land, by a Man of unſound Memory, and the *Charter* of Feoffment of the ſame Land *was made before, when he was*

was of good Memory, and then *Livery* of Seisin is *made by Force of the Letter of Attorney, without other Assent of the* Feoffor, and the *Feoffor dies*. Now his *Heir may enter* upon the Feoffee; but the Feoffor himself in his Life can't enter. Perk. 10. 11. S. 23. cites 17 Ass. pl. 17. ——— Perk S. 22.

3. If the Feoffor dies before Livery made by the Attorney, the Letter of Attorney is revoked in Law, because the Land is descended by his Death to his Heir. Co. Litt. 52. b.

*Fol. 12. [3.] So if the Feoffor dies before Livery be made by the Attorney, the Letter of Attorney is revoked in Law, because Livery cannot be made to his * Heir, for then he shall take by Purchase, where he was named by way of Limitation, Co. Litt. 52. b.

4. If a Corporation aggregate, as Mayor and Comminalty, Dean and Chapter, or such like, make a Charter of Feoffment, with Letter of Attorney to make Livery and before Livery made, the Mayor or Dean dies, yet the Letter of Attorney is not revoked because the Corporation never dies. Co. Litt. 52. b.

5. But otherwise it is of a sole Corporation, as a Bishop, Parson, &c. Co. Litt. 52. b.

6. If a Man makes a Deed of Feoffment of Land in two Vills, with Letter of Attorney to make Livery, and before Livery made by the Attorney, the Feoffor himself makes Livery of the Land in one Vill, this is a Countermand of the Letter of Attorney, so that the Attorney cannot make Livery in the other Vill. per Tanfield B. 8. Ja. in the Exchequer, between Smith and Jennyson.

7. If a Man makes Charter of Feoffment of two Acres, whereof the one is in Lease for Years, and the other in Demesne, and makes Letter of Attorney to make Livery, and after the Feoffor himself makes Livery in the Acre in Demesne in Name of the Whole, tho' the other Acre, which is in Lease, cannot pass by it, yet the Letter of Attorney is revoked for this Acre; For it appears, that so was the Intent of the Feoffor. B. 8. Ja. in the Exchequer, per Cur'

8 A *Fine* passed *between the Grant and the Livery*, is *no Countermand*. Dal. 111. 16 Eliz. Stileman v. Warren.

9. Tho' there be a Letter of Attorney to deliver Seisin, yet if before Seisin delivered by Virtue thereof, the Feoffor *gives Authority*, *Ore tenus* to the Attorney to make Livery, he may give Seisin by Virtue of the Authority Ore tenus, notwithstanding the Letter of Attorney; but then, (as in Case the Letter of Attorney was in any wise defective,) the Attorney must swear he did it by Virtue of the Authority Ore tenus, for if he did it by Virtue of the Letter of Attorney the other Authority will not avail the Delivery. Pasch. 24 Car. B. R. Allen. 53. Bamfield v. Brown.———'Twas said he could not deliver it by Virtue of both Authorities; Quod Quære. Ibid.

(A. a) Who may make Livery by Attorney.

1. IF an *Infant* makes Livery by Attorney, 'tis void, contra if he makes Livery in proper Person; For there 'tis only voidable. Br. Feoffment de terre Pl. 48. cites 18 E. 4. 27.

2. Vid. (Z) pl. 2. from which Case Ld. Brooke concludes, that it seems, that a *Man Dumb*, who has Reason to perceive by Signs, may make Feoffment. Br. Feoffment. pl. 26. [and in that Case the Livery was by Attorney.]

If a Man be *disseised*, and makes a Deed of Feoffment, and a *Letter of Attorney to enter, and take*

3. A *Disseisee* may make a Feoffment. But when he makes a Letter of Attorney to one to make Livery, where he himself *has no Estate*, it is not good; For he has neither Jus in Re, nor ad Rem. per Doderidge J. 2. Bull. 305 Hill. 12 Jac. in Case of Butler v. Fincher.

Possession, and after to make Livery secund' formam chartæ; this is a good Feoffment albeit he was

he was out of Poſſeſſion, at the Time of the Charter made; for the Authority given by the Letter of Attorney is *Executory*, and nothing paſſes by the delivery of the Deed, 'till Livery of Seiſin be made. And in ancient Letters of Attorney, Power is given to others to take Poſſeſſion for the Feoffor. Co. Litt. 48. b. (d).

4. *Tenant for Life with Power to make Leaſes* cannot make Livery by his Attorney; ſo where *Executors* have *Power to ſell*; but where they have Intereſt they may. Arg. 2 Roll. R. 393. cites Rep. Combes's Caſe. 9 Rep. 77. a. in Combes's Caſe.

5. *Ceſty que Uſe*, having Power to make Feoffment, may make Livery by Attorney. Arg. 2 Roll. R. 394. cites 9 H. 7. 26. Br. Feoffment to Uſes. pl. 28. cites S. C. and that it was held by all the Juſtices, that Ceſty que Uſe might make Livery by himſelf, but not by Attorney, for that the Statute is taken ſtrictly. But Brooke makes a Quære, for he ſays, it is held otherwiſe at this Day.

(B. a) What paſſes by the Livery, by Relation.

1. ASSISE by R. F. where it was found that *M. leaſed* the Tenements *to the Plaintiff for* 11 *Years, and* in ſurety of it, *made a Charter* upon Condition, *that if he was diſturbed of his Term, that he ſhould have the Tenements in Fee*; which *Charter was delivered to* C. to *keep and to deliver according to the Condition, and delivered Seiſin upon this Charter*, and that *M. ſold within the Term*, and for the Diſturbance, F. *delivered the Charter to the Plaintiff*, and Livery of Seiſin was upon the one Charter and the other, Viz. upon the Sale alſo, as it ſeems, by which it was awarded, that the Plaintiff Recover; the Reaſon ſeems to be, inaſmuch as the *Seiſin was delivered upon the Charter to the Termor*; for otherwiſe the Condition had come too late, as appears in the Caſe of **Pleſington** 6 R. 2 tit. Quid juris Clamat in Fitzh. 20. Br. Conditions. pl. 101. cites 10 Aſſ. 15.

2. A. makes a *Feoffment to B. of* 17 *Acres to be taken at the Election of B. or his Heirs, out of* 1000 *Acres* as they pleaſe. By the Death of B. the Election determines. *Quære* If B. might have made Election? For if he might, then the 17 Acres paſs by the Livery, which it ſeems they cannot; for 'twas not then known, which were the Acres; but the Livery, being the Act of the Feoffor, ſhall have its Effect and Operation by the Election of the Feoffee, or elſe 'tis good for nothing. Paſch. 7. Eliz. And. 11. Bullock v. Burdot. D. 280. pl. 17. S. C. Mo. 81. S. C. Bendl. 148. 2 Rep. 36. b.

3. If *Infant* make a Feoffment, or Leaſe for life, to commence *in futuro*, and *at full Age makes Livery*; this is a good Feoffment. Arg. 2 Roll. R. 109, ſeems admitted; but the Reporter makes a *Quære* of Feme Covert; For her Deed is void. Trin. 17 Jac. B. R.

(C. a) Who may take by the Livery.

1. IF *J. S. le enfeoff'd* to have and *to hold to J. S. and T. K.* and Livery of Seiſin is made unto *J. S.* according to the Deed, it is void unto T. K. Perk. S 164.

2. *But if Livery* of Seiſin had been made unto *T. K.* according to the Deed; then he takes by the Livery of Seiſin, and not by the Deed. Perk. S. 164.

3. *Some may make Livery of Seiſin, and take by the ſame Livery*; but then they do *not make Livery* in their own Rights *or* otherwiſe they do *not take* by the Livery of Seiſin *in their own Right*, unleſs in ſpecial Caſes, &c. Perk. S. 198.

4. *Therefore*

Br. Attorney. pl. 5.

4. *Therefore* if Land be *leaſed for Life unto J. S.* the *Remainder unto T. K. in Fee.* And a *Letter of Attorney is made unto T. K.* to make Livery of Seiſin unto the Leſſee accordingly; in this Caſe he takes by the ſame Livery of Seiſin, which he himſelf made, but not of his own Grant; For he made the ſame *as Servant* to the Grantor. Perk. S. 198.

5. If a Man *enfeoffs two* by Deed, and makes a *Letter of Attorney unto one of them* to make Livery of Seiſin, and he makes Livery of Seiſin *according to the Deed* to his Companion; he himſelf, who makes the Livery of Seiſin, ſhall take by the ſame Livery of Seiſin, becauſe he ſhall be *in by the Feoffor*, and not by himſelf, &c. Perk. S. 199.

6. If a Man makes a Deed of *Feoffment* of his own Land unto *himſelf and unto a Stranger*, and *makes Livery* of Seiſin *unto the Stranger according to the Deed*, all ſhall paſs unto the Stranger and nothing to himſelf; for that he cannot give unto himſelf, as this Caſe is, &c. Perk. S. 203.

7. If a Feoffment be made to *a Monk profeſs'd, and to a Stranger*, by Deed, and *Livery* of Seiſin *is made to the Stranger* according to the Deed, all paſſeth to the Stranger. *But* if Livery and Seiſin be *made to the Monk* according to the Deed, and not to the Stranger, nothing ſhall paſs thereby. Perk. S. 204.

8. Unto divers Reſpects a *Man may take by Livery* of Seiſin, *which he made his own Right*; *but* then he *ſhall not take in his own Right*, unleſs in ſpecial Caſes. Perk. S. 205.

9. *And therefore* if *Dean and Chapter* are, and *one of the Chapter is ſole ſeized in Fee in his own Right* of Lands, and thereof by Deed *enfeoffs the Dean and Chapter*, and makes Livery of Seiſin according to the Deed; in this Caſe the Feoffor giveth and taketh by the ſame Gift in divers Reſpects. Perk S. 205. cites 22 H. 6. 43.

10. *And ſo* ſhall it be *of Mayor and Commonalty*; if one of the Commonalty be ſeiſed of Land in his own Right, and thereof enfeoffs the Mayor and Commonalty. Perk. S. 205.

11. Such *Perſons* as are *in Poſſeſſion* of Land for *Years or Life, &c. can't take* Livery of Seiſin of the ſame Land. Perk. S. 205.

12. In Feoffment to the *Dean and Chapter* they *cannot take but by Letter of Attorney under Seal.* per Brook Juſtice, Br. Corporations. pl. 34. cites 14 H. 8. 2. 29.

13. A. Lord of the Manor of D. by Indenture between him of the one Part, and J. S. his *Copyhold Tenant in Fee*, and R. S. Son and Heir Apparent of J. S. of the other Part, in Conſideration of 100 l. paid by J. S. enfeoffed, releaſed and confirmed, &c. to J. S. the ſaid Land Habend' to J. S. and R. S. and their Heirs, and covenanted that all Aſſurances ſhould be to the Uſe of J. S. and R. S. and Livery was made Secundum formam Chartæ; reſolved, that J. S. only took, by the Livery, and R. S. took nothing thereby; but R. S. took, by the Limitation of the Uſe in the Habendum, as Jointenant with J. S. and by the Statute of Uſes of 27 H. 8. was jointly ſeized of the Intereſt, and Poſſeſſion with J. S. Ley. 13. Trin. 7 Jac. Sammes's Caſe.

(D.a) What Thing, or Eſtate ſhall be ſaid to *paſs* by the Livery.

1. IF a Man makes Feoffment of his Manor, in which he hath a Warren, the *Warren ſhall not paſs.* Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. 81.

2. If a Man makes a Deed of *Feoffment* of his own Land *to himſelf and unto a Stranger*, and *makes Livery* of Seiſin *unto the Stranger according to the Deed*, all ſhall paſs unto the Stranger, and nothing unto himſelf, as this Caſe is, &c. Perk. S. 203.

3. If *two Jointenants* are in Fee, and *one* of them *enfeoffs a Stranger of the Whole* againſt the Will of his Companion being upon the Land; by this Feoffment nothing, but the *Moiety*, paſſeth. Cauſa patet. Perk. S. 220.

4. By

4. By Livery of Seiſin in one County, the Lands and Tenements in another will not paſs; yet if the *Scite of the Manor of D. be in the County of Eſſex, and Parcel of the ſame Manor doth extend into* the County of *Middleſex*, and a *Feoffment* be made *of the Manor of D.* and *Livery* of Seiſin *is made of the Scite* of the Manor, *which lies in* the County of *Eſſex*; by this Livery of Seiſin, the Parcel of the Manor, which lies in Middleſex ſhall paſs, becauſe 'tis Parcel of the Thing, viz. the Manor, of which the Feoffment was made, the which Manor is but as one thing to ſuch Purpoſe, &c. Perk. S. 227.

But if a *Feoffment* be made *of the Manor of Dale in Dale*, which Manor *extends into Dale and Sale*, and *Livery* of Seiſin *is made* accordingly *in Dale*; By this Feoffment nothing paſſes but that which is in Dale; becauſe the Feoffment is not of more, but of that which is in Dale, and the Livery of Seiſin is made in Dale, and not elſewhere, &c. Perk. S. 228. cites T. 9 E. 4. 17.

5. A. ſeized of a Houſe for Life made a Feoffment of it, and Letter of Attorney to deliver Seiſin ſecundum formam Chartæ; *before Livery Tenant for life purchaſed the Fee*, and after Livery was made. Per Cur' all paſſes. ——But if the Feoffment had been of all his Lands in D. and the Letter of Attorney accordingly;—and before Livery the Feoffor had many Lands there. — If he purchaſed one Acre after; — the Livery ſhould not extend to that Acre, becauſe the Authority was ſatisfied by the other Acre. 3 Le. 73. pl. 112. Hill. 20. Eliz. C. B. Anon.

6. Feoffment was of a *Manor, to which an Advowſon was appendant*, and Livery was made; tho' the *Tenants did not attorn*, yet the Advowſon paſſed as Appendant to the Demeſnes. D. 70. b. pl. 41. Marg. ſays that it was ſo ruled 32. Eliz. in C. B. in Hamlington's Caſe.—And ſays, that it was alſo agreed 30. Eliz. in the ſame Court. Ibid.

7. Doderidge J. cited a Caſe, where 'tis held, that if one make *two ſeveral Deeds, one purporting* an Eſtate in *Fee, and the other an Eſtate Tail*, and thoſe are made to one and the ſame Perſon, and he brings both in his Hands upon the Land, and makes *delivery of both* Deeds *with the Land*; by this both Deeds ſhall take Effect, and by them Eſtate Tail, and alſo Eſtate in Fee Simple paſſes. Paſch. 16. Jac. B. R. 2 Roll. R. 23. in Caſe of Thurman v. Cooper.

(D. a. 2) What Eſtate ſhall be ſaid to paſs by the Livery; without the Words, Heirs, or Succeſſors.

1. IF Lands be given *to a Mayor and Commonalty for their Lives*, by intendment they have an Eſtate not determinable. *So* if a Feoffment be made of Lands unto a *Dean and Chapter* without Speech of their Succeſſors. Perk. S. 240. cites T. 22 E. 4. 38.

2. If my *Feoffee in Fee* of an Acre of Land *re-infeoffs* me *of the ſame Acre by Deed, reciting* in the ſame Deed, *that I have infeoffed* him of an Acre of Land, to have and *to hold to him and his Heirs*; *and ſaith* farther in the ſame Deed, *that as fully as I have given the Lands unto him, he doth give me them back again*, and delivers to me the Deed as his Deed, and Seiſin of the Land according to the Deed; in this Caſe it ſeems, that I have an Eſtate of Inheritance in this Land, notwithſtanding that it is not given unto me and my Heirs, becauſe that my Eſtate doth rely upon an Eſtate of Inheritance, recited within the ſame Deed, tamen quære. Perk. S. 241. cites T. 11 H. 4. 84. & 39 Aſſ. p. 12.

But if Land be given unto me by Deed to have and *to hold to me in Fee*, without ſpeaking of my Heirs, and Livery of Seiſin be made unto me according to the Purport of the Deed; by this Feoffment I have an Eſtate but for the Term of my Life, &c Perk. S. 243. cites T. 20 H. 6. 46.

(D. a. 3) Paſſes; what, by the Feoffment or Livery.

1. A Man ſeized of a *Manor with Advowſon appendant*, made a Feoffment *de tertia parte Manerii*. The Advowſon does not paſs, nor any Part of it. Br. Incidents, pl. 30. cites 6 E. 3. Fitzh. tit. Quare Imp. 40. per Parne.

(E. a) Pleadings.

1. IN Aſſiſe, where Deed of Feoffment is *pleaded in Bar*, *Nient Compriſe is no Plea*, But *ſhall ſay that Riens paſſa*, &c. Stouf. where a Thing of Record, as Fine, &c. is pleaded, there Nient Compriſe is no Plea, but in Caſe of a Feoffment, he ſhall ſay that Riens paſſa, nevertheleſs after Perſey aſſented to the Averment, quære. Br. Compriſe, &c. pl. 12 cites 29 Aſſ. 56.

S. P. per Cur. Br. Pleadings. pl. 5. cites S. C. and 27 H. 8. 4.

2. *Formedon in Reverter*, the Tenant ſaid, *that the Donor enfeoff'd the Donees in Fee*, &c. Judgment Si Actio; and this is no Plea, per Cur', if he does *not traverſe the Gift in Tail*. By which he ſaid, that after the Gift, the Donor enfeoff'd the Donees in Fee; and no Plea, per Cur', without *ſaying*, *that after the Gift the Donor was ſeiſed in Fee, and enfeoff'd the Donees in Fee*; wherefore he ſaid accordingly, and the Demandant imparled, and yet this is in Effect only in Confirmation. Br. Barre. pl. 4. cites 2 H. 6. 15.

3. *In Ward*, the Defendant pleaded a Feoffment by which the *Tenant*, *Anceſtor of the Heir enfeoff'd N. P. in Fee*, *whoſe Eſtate he hath*; and per tot Cur' this is no Plea without a *Traverſe*, *that he did not die his Tenant*, *or* that he did *not die ſeiſed*; nevertheleſs as it ſeems, he ſhall traverſe, that he did not not die in his Homage. Br. Barre. pl. 37. cites 4 H. 6. 29.

4. *And* in *Eſcheat* becauſe his Tenant died ſeiſed without an Heir, 'tis no Plea, *that the Tenant enfeoff'd N. whoſe Eſtate he hath*, without a *Traverſe that he did not die ſeiſed*, per Martin, which the Court agreed. And ſo ſee, that where the Plea is contrary to the ſuppoſal of the Writ, 'tis no Plea without traverſing the Point of the Writ, Quod nota. Br. Barre. pl. 37. cites 4 H. 6. 29.

5. *And* in *Aſſiſe*, the Tenant pleaded a *Deed of Feoffment by the Plaintiff to J. N. whoſe Eſtate he hath*; 'tis a good Plea; and yet if he pleads the *Feoffment of the Plaintiff to him*, this is no Plea, per Paſton, which Martin agreed; and ſo ſee there, a Difference is taken between a Feoffment pleaded *by Que Eſtate*, *and* a Feoffment *made immediately to him who pleads it*, note the Diverſity. Br. Barre. pl. 37. cites 4 H. 6. 29.

6. In Præcipe quod reddat, if the *Defendant pleads Feoffment of the Father of the Demandant*, *whoſe Heir he is*, *ſimply and without any Condition*, it was held by Babb. and Paſton, that theſe Words (without Condition) are void, and the Effect of the Plea is no more, but the Feoffment; and the *Demandant ſhall allege the Condition of his Part to confeſs and avoid* it, and then the *Tenant by Rejoinder ſhall anſwer to the Condition*. Br. Pleadings. pl. 8. cites 9 H. 6. 59.

7. In Treſpaſs, the Defendant ſaid, that it was his Franktenement, &c. the *Plaintiff ſaid*, *that before the Defendant had any Thing*, *A. was ſeiſed in Fee*, *and enfeoff'd B. who enfeoff'd C. who enfeoff'd F. who enfeoff'd the Plaintiff*, and the Defendant enter'd, upon whom the Plaintiff re-enter'd and brought the Action; and was compell'd by the Court to *emit all the Feoffments*, *except the Feoffment of F. to him*; For this is ſufficient, and he *may give the other in Evidence*. Br. Pleadings. pl. 23 cites 19 H. 6. 30.

8. Where

8. Where a Man pleads Feoffment, the other may ſay, that it was *upon Condition, without Traverſe*; for it may be intended one and the ſame Feoffment. Br. Traverſe per, &c. pl. 382. cites 32. H. 6. 4. Pleading a Feoffment in Fee upon Condition *without Deed, and Reentry* is good, if the other Party *confeſſes the Action.* 5 Rep. 40. b. in Dormer's Caſe. cites 7 H. 6. 7 b.

9. Entry in the Quibus, the *Tenant ſaid, that J. S. was ſeiſed in Fee, to whom J. D. releaſed by his Deed all his Right*, &c. *and J. S. enfeoff'd H. in Fee, whoſe Eſtate the Tenant has*, and gave Colour. Billing prayed to be diſcharged of the Releaſe, and that it be not entred; for *Poſſeſſion, nor Right is alleg'd in J. D. who releas'd*, and yet it was an Entry; for it may be that J. D. was ſeiſed in Fee, and releaſed, and then this made Title to the Tenant; and per Priſot the Releaſe may make Iſſue. Br. Pleadings pl. 54. cites 38. H. 6. 5.

10. If Feoffment be *made* by Livery *by Letter of Attorney*, it ſhall be *pleaded generally*; and he ſhall not ſay, that the Livery was by Attorney. Br. Licences. pl. 11. cites 10 E. 4. 4.

11. In Treſpaſs, 'tis no Plea in Avoidance of *a Feoffment* to ſay, that the Feoffor *had nothing in the Land at the Time* of the Feoffment; *for it paſſes by Livery*; therefore *he ſhall ſay that Ne enfeoffa pas.* Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. 46. cites 10 E. 4. 8. S.P. Br. Confeſs and avoid. pl. 58. cites 18 E. 4. 25.—*But* 'tis a good Avoidance *of a Leaſe for Years* to ſay, that the Leſſor had nothing in the Land at the Time of the Demiſe; *for there is no Livery.* Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. 46. cites 10 E. 4 8.

12. Feoffment *by A. B. and C. to J. S.* and *J. S. pleads that B. and C. were ſeiſed and enfeoffed him*, &c. [It ſeems to be intended that A. was dead.] If this Feoffment be traverſed, it ſhall be found againſt him. For the Feoffment is *one joint Act by all three.* * 14 E. 4. 1. b. pl. the laſt, per Littleton. The Feoffee cannot plead a Feoffment from the Survivor of the Whole; becauſe each of them gave but his Part. Co. Litt. 186. a.—S.P. per Holt Ch. J. Williams's Rep. 17. cites S. C.—*Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. 65. cites S. C.———Br. Jointenants. pl. 64. cites S. C.———Br. Pleadings. pl. 105. cites S. C.

13. *But* if *J. S. make a Feoffment to A. B. and C.* and *B. and C. die*, ſo that A. has the Whole by Survivorſhip, in ſuch Caſe A. may plead the Feoffment to himſelf only. 1 E. 4. 1 b. per Littleton. S. C. cited Cro. C. 506. Trin. 14 Car. B. R. in Caſe of Man v. the Biſhop of Briſtol.———Br. Feoffment de terre. pl. 65. cites S. C.———Br. Jointenants. pl. 64. cites S. C.——— Br. Pleadings. pl. 105. cites S. C.

14. If a Man be *bound to make a Feoffment of the Manor of D.* and *pleads, that he made a Feoffment*, he *ſhall ſhew where the Manor is*; for it cannot be done, but upon the Land. Br. Pleadings. pl. 31. cites 15 E. 4. 14.

15. There is a *Diverſity* between the Pleading of *Void* Feoffments, or ſuch as are *voidable only*; as a Feoffment by one *Jointenant to his Companion, or by Feme Covert*, or Monk is void, and the Party may *ſay, Ne enfeoffa pas*; But *otherwiſe* of a Feoffment *by Infant*, or one in Priſon. 18 E. 4. 29. a. per Littleton.

16. *In Aſſiſe*, if the *Tenant pleads Feoffment* made *to him of the ſaid Land*, and *the Deed is of all his Lands in B. which deſcended to the Feoffor of the Part of the Father*, and does *not aver, that theſe Lands were deſcended to him of the Part of the Father*, yet it is good; becauſe he *ſaid that he enfeoff'd him de Prædictis terris in querela ſpecificatis*; by all the Juſtices and Serjeants. Br. Pleadings, pl. 66. cites 1 H 7. 28.

17. *So* in Aſſiſe againſt *J. S* and he *pleads a Feoffment made to him by Deed* and *the Deed is J. N.* and yet good; For he *may be known by two Surnames*; but the Pleading is the better, if he pleads *per Nomen*, &c. For where he pleads a Deed to *J. S.* and ſhews Deed made to *W. S.* [it is not good]; For he cannot be known by *two proper Names*; Per all the Juſtices and Serjeants. Br. Pleadings. pl. 66. cites 1 H. 7. 28. *So* where he pleads it of *Manor of B.* and ſhews *Deed of the Manor of S.* per all the Juſtices and Serjeants. Br. Pleadings. pl. 66. cites 1 H. 7. 28

18. Where a Man *pleads, that a Stranger was ſeiſed and enfeoff'd him*, he need not, in any Caſe whatſoever ſay, *that it was to his own Uſe*; For Prima facie, it ſhall be ſo *intended*, 'till the contrary be ſhewn. 5 H. 7. 33. a. per Brian.

19 In pleading of a Feoffment, Leaſe, &c. by Ceſty que Uſe, he *need not* [*ſay*], *that he at the Time, &c. was of full Age, Sound Memory*, &c. but *this ſhall come by the other Party*. Br. Pleadings pl. 171. cites 16 H. 7. 2.

20. In Treſpaſs the Defendant *ſaid, that A. and B. were ſeiſed in Fee to the Uſe of the Plaintiff*, and that the *Plaintiff ſold the Land to him*, &c. and admitted good, notwithſtanding that he does *not ſhew, who enfeoff'd A. and B.* to the Uſe of the Plaintiff; quod nota bene inde. Br. Pleadings, pl. 43. cites 21 H. 7. 6.

21. In *Dower*; if the Tenant pleads Diſſeiſin by the Baron, and the *Feme pleads Feoffment by J. N. to the Baron, who after enfeoff'd the Tenant, and after diſſeiſed him*, ſhe *ſhall ſay that the Feoffment of J. and the Seiſin of the Baron, were during the Coverture*. Br. Pleadings, pl. 147. cites 26 H. 8.

22. *Mention* ſhall be made in the pleading, that the *Land was within View*. Br. Feoffment de terres. pl. 57.

23. If A. pleads a Feoffment in Fee, he muſt conclude, *Virtute cujus prædict. A. fuit ſeiſitus*, &c. and this holdeth not only in Caſe of *Lands*, which lie in Livery, but alſo of *Rents, Advowſons, Commons*, &c and other Things, that lie in Grant, whereof he hath an Eſtate for Life, or Inheritance. Co. Litt. 201. a.

24. When a Man pleads a Leaſe for Life, or any higher Eſtate, which paſſes by Livery, he is not to plead any *Entry*; for he is in actual Seiſin by the Livery itſelf. Co. Litt. 201. a.

Such Pleading of a Feoffment by *Teſtatum eſt* is not good, but it ſhould be alledged directly, quod Feoffavit. Arg. 2 Roll. R. 110. in Caſe of Buttifant v. Holman cites 21 E. 4. 44. 22 E. 4. Brief. 380. 22 H. 6. 3. 4 E. 4. 5. 28 H. 6. 29.—*But* it was argued e Contra, that it had been reſolved, Mich. 31, and 32 Eliz. that where the Pleading the Feoffment *is only by way of Inducement*, it is good by Teſtatum; As where the Action is only to recover Damages, as in Covenant, as the Principal Caſe was, and adjudg'd accordingly. 2 Roll. R. 110. Trin. 17. Jac. B. R. Buttifant v. Holman.

25. In pleading a Demiſe for Life after the Death of two former Lives, the Indenture was pleaded by a Teſtatum only, viz. quod per quandam Indenturam, *teſtantur quod Demiſerunt*, and *no Livery of Seiſin was ſhewn*; and it was held Ill. D. 117. b. 118. Paſch. 2 and 3. P. and M. Jones v. Weaver, alias Sentloe's Caſe.

In a Plea of the Feoffment of a Manor, *Livery and Attornment are imply'd*. Co. Lit. 303. b. (t.) —Vid. the next Caſe.

26. In Treſpaſs for taking his Ox, the Defendant juſtified as Servant of A. and that he took it as a Heriot, by Reaſon of a Cuſtom within the Manor to pay a *Heriot* on the Death of every Tenant dying ſeiſed of a Meſuage, and that J. N. enfeoff'd W. R. and W. S. of the Manor, to the Uſe of A. The Plaintiff demurred, becauſe the Defendant entitles A. as a Purchaſor, viz. by Feoffment, *and ſhews not the Attornment of the deceaſed Tenant, whoſe Services are demanded*, and that he cannot otherwiſe entitle him to the Services of that particular Tenant; and tho' a Feoffment of a Manor may be pleaded, and that by Force thereof he was ſeiſed of that Manor without ſhewing the Attornment of the Tenant, (for that is neceſſarily intended, as Livery without pleading it,) yet *in this Caſe of a particular Tenant*, he ought expreſsly to ſhew his Attornment. But the Court held that there was no difference, and the *Attornment may well be intended*, and if he did not attorn, the other ought to have pleaded it. And all agreed, that by the Feoffment of the Manor the Services paſſed not without an expreſs Attornment, but that may be well intended, *if the contrary be not ſhewn*. Cro. E. 400. Trin. 37. Eliz. B. R. Ferrers v. Wignall.

27. Executor brought *Debt for Arrearages of Rents, as well Copyhold as free, belonging to the Manor of D.* whereof his Teſtator died ſeiſed, and for Rents due at the Teſtator's Death, the Action was brought upon the

the Stat. 32. H. 8. It was held, that it lies not for the Copy old Rents, within the Statutes; Nor for the free Rent, becauſe the Plaintiff had *not declared that Defendant attorn'd to Teſtator*; and tho' in pleading it is ſufficient to alledge *Feoffment of a Manor without pleading* Livery, or *Attornment of the Tenants*, yet when the Rent of any Freeholder comes in Debate, it behoves both the Owner of the Manor, or his Executor, who demands it, to *convey Privity* between the Tenant and the Lord, which ought to be by Attornment; For the Rents and Services do not veſt without Attornment. Quod Nota. Yelv. 135. Mich. 6. Jac. B. R. Appleton v. Doily.

28. A Man pleads * *feoffavit*, *dedit*, or *dimiſit*, for Life. This implies Livery; for without Livery, it is no Feoffment, Gift, or Demiſe. Trin. 7. Jac. 8 Rep. 82. b. in Vinyor's Caſe.

* When a Feoffment is pleaded, it is not uſual to plead Livery and Seiſin thereof, becauſe it is to be admitted. Hill. 3 Car. C. B. Cro. C. 101. in Caſe of Peto v. Pemberton. —S. P. Cro. J. 636. Paſch. 20 Jac. B. R. Smith v. Melter.—S P. admitted. Mich. 6 Jac. B. R. Yelv. 135. in Caſe of Appleton v. Doily. — Livery ſhall be intended. Becauſe he who made the Livery ſhall be intended to be upon the Land, and to Execute it. Admitted Arg. Pl. C. 149. b.——*Mention* ſhall be made in the Pleading that the *Land was within View*. Br. Feoffment de terres pl. 57.

29. Upon a Demurrer in Debt for Rent, it was objected, that the Plaintiffs, being a *Corporation*, *intitle themſelves by Feoffment*, *and ſhew not Livery to be executed by Letter of Attorney*; For that they may not take unleſs by Letter of Attorney. *Sed non allocatur*; For all neceſſary Circumſtances ſhall be *intended* to be executed, as well as in a Feoffment pleaded to other Perſons. Wherefore it was adjudged for the Plaintiffs. Cro. J. 411. Mich. 14 Jac. B. R. Ipſwich (Bailiffs, &c.) v. Martin and Parker.

30. It was pleaded that Sir Thomas Parret was Seiſed in Fee, and enfeoff'd two Truſtees to ſuch Uſes, Virtute cujus, they were ſeiſed; yet, becauſe 'twas ſaid, *feoffavit inde*, it was adjudged ill, and *Virtute cujus* did not help it. Cr. J. 588. Mich. 18 Jac. B. R. Dowſewell v. Reynolds.

31. If a *Feme ſole* makes a Feoffment, and *Livery within View*, and directs him to enter, and after *marries the Feoffee before his actual Entry*, yet an Intereſt paſſes by ſuch Livery, and the Marriage is no Countermand, and when he enters it has a ſtrong Retroſpect to the Livery, and ſhall be *pleaded as a Feoffment when ſhe was Sole*. Vent. 186. Hill. 23 and 24. Car. 2. B. R. Parſons v. Perus.

(E. a. 2) Pleadings, Traverſe.

1. IN Avowry, the *Plaintiff pleaded Feoffment* of twenty Acres *by T. Lord of the Manor, before the Statute, to hold by leſs Services by Deed, which he ſhew'd*; and the *other ſaid that R. was ſeiſed before this, and enfeoff'd W. to hold as in the Avowry, abſque hoc, that T. any Thing had* in the Manor *at the Time of the Feoffment made* of the 20 Acres; this Traverſe is as well, as if he had ſaid, *Abſque hoc that T. enfeoff'd N.* &c. Br. Traverſe per &c. pl. 106. cites 22 H. 6. 50.

S. P. Br. Avowry. pl. 60. cites S. C. per Port. and Newton.

(F. a) Livery *preſum'd* at Law, *or ſupply'd* in Equity.

1. IF a Man *ſell Lands in two Counties* for Money, and *makes Livery in one only*, he ſhall be compell'd in Conſcience to perfect the Aſſurances by another Livery; For the Contract faileth in a *Circumſtance*, *or Ceremony*. Cary's Rep. 24. cites Doct. and Stud. 37.

Toth. 105. S. P. cites Hill. 16. Jac. Moreton v. Briggs. —— Ibid. 116. S. P. cites Mich. 2 Car. Barrow v. Barrow.—Ibid. 117. cites Mich. 13 Car. Row v. Cheſwick.

2. Where one would have avoided a Conveyance for *want of Livery*, the Grantee, on a Bill by him, was reliev'd. Toth. 104. cites Mich. or Hill. 9 Jac. Conqueſt v. Newdigate.

3. The Perſon *died before the Livery* and Seiſin, and before the Aſſurance perfected; yet it it was ordered to be perfected. Toth. 237. cites Paſch. 7 Car. Higham v. Ladd.

So there were 3 *Coparceners* and *one ſold* his Land for a valuable Conſideration, and died before Execution of the Deed; it was decreed againſt the Defendant. Toth. 106. cites Mich. 14 Car. Paul v. Wilkins.

Toth. 116. S. C. 14 June. 11 Jac. Byden v. Loveden.

4. After a Leſſee for Life had been *twenty five Years in Poſſeſſion*, and Leſſor would avoid the Leaſe for want of Livery, *Chancery preſumes* Livery, and Decreed the Leſſee ſhould hold out during the Countinuance of his Life; tho' after long Poſſeſſion Courts at Law will preſume Livery. Vern. 196. cites 11 Car. 1. Biden v. Loveday.

So after Eſtate of Freehold determined, Livery ſhall be *intended*, and need not be pleaded by the Reverſioner. Pl. C.

5. If, at the Aſſiſes, a Deed of Feoffment be given in Evidence to be made *forty Years paſt*, but it cannot be proved, that *Livery* was made; yet *if Poſſeſſion has gone all the Time according to the Deed*, 'tis good *Evidence* to the Jury, and I will direct them to find a Livery; for it ſhall be intended; but if the Jury find all this ſpecially, we cannot adjudge this to be a good Feoffment without Livery; per Coke Ch. J. Roll. Rep. 132. Hill. 12. Car. B. R. in Caſe of Iſaak v. Clerk. p. 149.

149. Throgmorton v. Tracy.

S.P.Arg.Hill. 7 Annæ G. Equ. R. 14.

6. A Feoffment was made by Way of *Mortgage*, but *no Livery and Seiſin*.—Bill was brought by Executors of Mortgagee to ſupply the Defect, and to be reliev'd againſt Judgments ſuffered by the Heir of the Mortgagor. And Decreed accordingly, and that the Judgments ought not to incumber the mortgaged Premiſſes, 'till the Mortgage-Money be all paid, eſpecially ſince the Mortgagor had covenanted for *further Aſſurance*, Mich. 25 Car. 2. Fin. R. 28. Burgh v. Francis and al.

Fin. R. 174. S. C. and that at any Trial at Law to be brought by E. (the Plaintiff) F. the Defendant ſhould admit Livery and Seiſin, and that this Decree was affirmed on a Rehearing.

7. A. Tenant in Tail, by Settlement on Marriage of B. his Son with M. made a Feoffment to the Uſe of himſelf for Life, Remainder to B. for Life, Remainder to firſt, &c. Sons by M. This Deed was indorſed generally (viz. *Livery* made to J. S. appointed by W. R. the Feoffee thereto) B. and M. had C. D. E. the Plaintiff, and F. the Defendant, and ſix other Sons. A. levied a Fine to W. then his eldeſt Son, to the Uſe of A. and his Heirs; W. dies; A. convey'd the Land to F. and died; [C. and D. the two elder Sons died, as it ſeems, and without Iſſue] F. enter'd, ſuppoſing that Livery was not well given. Ld Keeper decreed, 1. that the *Letter of Attorney* ſhould be *ſupplied, and Livery admitted*; *tho'* it was *objected, that this was in Effect to Decree a Diſcontinuance*, which is a wrong and unlawful Act, *and* that it was 2. *to aſſiſt a Remainder-Man in Tail* in a third Remainder, (for he was the third Son) *againſt a legal Fine of* his Father *Tenant in Tail*, and whoſe Fine was a Bar to him in Law; and alſo againſt the Acceptance of the Fine by W. who join'd with A. who had Power by the Recovery to have barr'd the Eſtate of the Plaintiff. But to this laſt the Ld Keeper ſaid, the Grandfather might have the Conveyance, made by himſelf, in his own Hands: and it is apparently ſo; for he recites in that Deed, that he was Tenant in Tail, and he recites not the Feoffment made by himſelf. Mich. 26 Car. 2. 1 Chan. Caſes. 240. Bokenham v. Bokenham.

8. Lands were conveyed by Feoffment, as a *Marriage Settlement*, on the Wife, but no Livery was made; the Husband died, and by his Will left to the Wife more, than ſhe would have by the Settlement, and gave the Lands to A. and B. Decreed that A. and B. execute Conveyances to her for Life, and deliver the Poſſeſſion to her. Fin. R. 388. Trin. 30 Car. 2. Marlow v. Maxie and al.

Tho' generally a Defect in a voluntary Conveyance ſhall not be ſupplied, and made good here, yet if a Man voluntarily makes a Conveyance ſhall

9. Where the Deed, under which the Plaintiff claimed, appeared to be fairly executed by the Defendant's Father, and that there was no Defect therein, ſave only the Form of Livery and Seiſin, and made on ſuch Valuable *Conſideration* as *Marriage*; *Decreed* the *Defendant to execute Livery* and Seiſin in the ſaid Deed, and make farther Aſſurance of the ſaid Premiſſes to the Plaintiff and his Heirs, and the Plaintiff is decreed to enjoy the ſame againſt the Defendant. 33 Car. 2. 2 Ch. Rep. 218. Thompſon v. Atfield.

Settlement, as a Proviſion for his *Children*, and for their Maintenance; ſuch a Voluntary ſhall be ſupplied and made good here. Vern. 40. Paſch. 1682. Thompſon v. Atfield.

10. A.

10. A. made a *Feoffment* in Fee, *by way of Mortgage*, of ſeveral Houſes in London, for ſecuring the Payment of 400*l.* and Intereſt; and being likewiſe indebted to ſeveral other Perſons by Bonds, he died before the Money due on the Mortgage was paid. After his Death, the *Bond-Creditors* demanded their reſpective Debts of his Heir, who had nothing to pay them, but the Equity of Redemption of this Mortgage. A Creditor undertook to ſatisfy the Mortgage, which he did, in order to let himſelf into the Eſtate, and hold it, 'till his Bond-Debt was paid; but having diſcovered that there was *no Livery and Seiſin* endorſed on the Feoffment, he brought an Action of Debt againſt the Heir upon the Bond of his Anceſtor, and got Judgment: But before Execution, the Seal was opened on purpoſe for a Subpæna, which was taken out and a Bill filed to help this defective Conveyance, which was ſupplied accordingly, and the Mortgagee had his Money. N. Ch. R. 183. cites the Caſe of Burgh v. Francis.

Fin. R. 28. S.C. Mich. 25 Car. 2. and that tho' the Heir of the Mortgagor, after diſcovering the Defect of Livery, ſuffered Judgments to be obtain'd by ſeveral Bond-Creditors, in order to prevent the Mortgagee's having his Money, yet the Heir was

Decreed to convey a perfect Eſtate of Inheritance, ſubject to Redemption on payment of the Principal, and Intereſt due on the ſaid defective Deed: and a perpetual Injunction for quiet Poſſeſſion againſt the Heir, and all other Defendants; and to ſtay all Proceedings at Law. ——— S. C. cited by Mr Vernon. Arg. Wms's Rep. 279. as firſt heard, by Ld K. Bridgman, and decreed by him, and after affirmed by Ld Nottingham.

11. A Deed of *Lands in two different Counties*, by way of Feoffment and *Livery* and Seiſin, was *indorſed of the Lands in one County only*, but nothing mentioned of any Livery of the Lands in the other County. But decreed that by Reaſon of the *Poſſeſſion and great Length of Time*, (being upwards of 70 Years before) Equity will ſuppoſe and ſupply it. And ſaid, that it would have been much ſtronger on the other Side, had the Livery been *indorſed of the Lands in one County, in the Name of both*; for that would have imply'd. that none was of the other, and that one was deſign'd for both. Sel. Ch. Caſes. 81. Mich. 1730. Jackſon v. Jackſon.

In this Caſe it was inſiſted, that, as to the Poſſeſſion and Length of time, the Intendment endeavoured to be made out from thence can have no Weight, be-

cauſe the ſame *Perſons, that enjoy'd the Lands under the Deed, were alſo Heirs at Law, and as ſuch muſt have enjoy'd them otherwiſe*, tho' there had been no ſuch Deed; yet Lord Chancellor declared, that, was he to try this Matter [at Law], he ſhould preſume, and ſo direct, that Livery was executed as to all the Lands, according to the Deed, after this Length of Time; but however, that this Court would aid a Defect of this Kind. Gibb. 146. Mich. 4 Geo. 2. S. C.

(G a) Equity. Miſtakes.

1. WHERE *more Lands paſſed* in a Feoffment, *than were intended*, it was holpen in Equity, notwithſtanding it was *after a Verdict and Judgment* at Law, ſuppoſing ſome *Circumvention*. Toth. 186. cites Eborall v. Hunt.

(A) Feræ Naturæ.

1. FOR Pidgeons, Fiſh kill'd, nor other ſavage Beaſts found in * their Range, a Man ought not to ſuffer Death, unleſs they were *feloniouſly ſtole out of a Houſe*, &c. Br. Corone. pl. 92. cites 22. Aſſ. 95.

* Orig. (lour Savage.)

2. If a Man breaks a Pidgeon-Houſe, and *takes young Pidgeons feloniouſly*, which can neither go nor fly, this is Felony; For the Property is in the Owner of the Pidgeon-Houſe; becauſe they *cannot go nor fly*, therefore

fore he may take them at his Pleaſure. *Contrary* of taking *of old Pidgeons*; For a Man has not Property in them; for they are not ameſnable at Will. Br. Corone pl. 163. cites 18. E. 4 8.

3. And taking of *Fiſh out of a Trunk in a Pond*, is Felony; *contrary* if they are taken *out of a River*. Ibid.

4. So of *young Goſ-Hawks* in my Park, *which cannot go nor fly*; this is Felony; contrary of old Goſ-Hawks. Ibid.

5. *Larceny* cannot be committed of Things Feræ Naturæ, while *at their natural Liberty*; but if they are *made fit for Food, and reduced to Tameneſs*, and known by the Taker to be ſo, it may be Larceny to take them. And ſo he thinks, it may be of wild Pidgeons in a Dove-Houſe ſhut up, or Hares, or Deer in a Houſe, or even in a Park incloſed in ſuch a Manner, that the Owner may take them whenever, he pleaſes without the leaſt Danger of their eſcaping. 1 Hawk. pl. C. 94. Cap. 33 S. 26.

(B) Pleadings in Treſpaſs, for taking Things Feræ Naturæ.

1. TReſpaſs quare Vi & Armis *Damam ſuam cepit.* &c. and becauſe he did *not ſay* Damam ſuam *Domitam, nor that the taking was in Park nor Warren*, therefore the Writ was abated by Award. Br. Brief. pl. 63. cites 43. E. 3. 24.

2. Treſpaſs, quare *Clauſum fregit, and four young Goſ-Hawks* in their Neſts, being of the Price of 4*l.* ibidem *cepit & Aſportavit.* Per Moyle, he *ſhall ſay, they were reclaimed*; as of four *Deer, he ſhall ſay Domeſtick*; *otherwiſe there is no Property*, and then an Action does not lie. But per Aſcue and Newton the Writ is good; and ſo it is, that his 4 Deer ibidem Inventas cepit, &c. And ſo of a Writ, quare Clauſum fregit, and four Herns taken, &c. Br. Treſpaſs, pl. 162. cites 22 H. 6. 59.

3. *But if it be quod talia cepit*, &c. *and does not ſay quod Clauſum fregit, & cepit*; then the Writ does not lie; quod Curia conceſſit: And ſo note, that if it be in his Cloſe, or in his Soil, or in his Park, or Warren, Writ lies, and not otherwiſe. Br. Treſpaſs, pl. 162. cites 22 H. 6. 59.

(A) Ferry.

S. P. and C. Savil. 14. *And* every Ferry *ought to have* expert and *able Ferrymen*, and to have *preſent Paſſage, and reaſonable Payment* for the Paſſages.

1. A Ferry *is in Reſpect of the Landing Place*, and not of the Water; the Water may be to one, and the Ferry to another; as 'tis of Ferries on the Thames, where the Ferry in ſome Place belongs to the Arch Biſhop of Canterbury, where the Mayor of London has the Intereſt in the Water; and in every Ferry the Land of both Sides of the Water ought to be to the Owner of the Ferry, or otherwiſe he cannot land on the other Part. 13 Apr. 23. Eliz. in Scacc. Savil. 11. Inhabitants of Ipſwich v. Brown.

And it is requiſite to have one, who has Property in the Ferry, and not to allow every Fiſherman to carry, and recarry at their Pleaſure, for diverſe Inconveniences; and eſpecially when a Place is between the Diviſions of two Counties, any Felon may be convey'd from one County to another, ſecretly, without any Notice.

2. A Ferryman, if it be on Salt Water, ought to be *privileg'd* from being preſs'd as a Soldier, or otherwiſe. Savil. 11 and 14. ut ſup.

Carth. 193. S. C. 1 Salk. 12. S. C.

3. Owner of a Ferry cannot *ſuppreſs* that, and put up a *Bridge* in its Place without Licence, and *ad quod Damnum*, per Holt Ch. J. Pach. 3. W. and M. Show. 243. 257. Pain v. Patridge.

4. If

4. If a Ferry be granted at this Day, he that *accepts ſuch Grant* is bound to keep a Boat for the publick Good, per Holt Ch. J. Show. 257. in the Caſe of Pain v. Partridge.

5. Cuſtom for the *Inhabitants to be diſcharged of Toll*, may have a reaſonable Beginning by Agreement; as that the Inhabitants of the Town might be at the Charge of procuring the Grant, and in Conſideration thereof, one Man to find the Boat, and take Toll; but the Inhabitants to pay none, per Holt Ch. J. Show. 257. ut ſup.

6. A common Ferry was for all Paſſengers paying Toll, but the Inhabitants of A. were *Toll Free*. An Inhabitant of A. may bring an *Action for taking Toll*, but not for not *keeping up the Ferry*; Becauſe the former is a private Right, but the latter a Publick. 1 Salk. 12. Trin. 3. W. 3. Pain v. Partridge.

But he can't maintain an Action for not paſſing; For ſo, any other Subject might bring an Action, which would be endleſs; but the taking Toll was a Special Damage, and *without Special Damage*, he *can only indict, or bring Information.* 1 Salk. 12. Pain v. Partridge.

(A) Feudall Barony.

1. FEudall Baronies were, when the King, in the Creation of Baronies, gave Rents and *Land to hold of him for the Defence of the Realm.* Per Holt Ch. J. There is no Feudall Barony remaining at this Time, except *Arundell.* 1 Salk. 253. Ld Gerard v. Lady Gerard.

Feudal Barons held a certain Territory of Land, per Baroniam, wherein there was a Caſtle, whereunto all the Inhabitants in Time of War reſorted; and theſe were called the *Capita Baroniæ*; and there was no Dower of them, becauſe they were for Defence. No ſuch have been *granted ſince R. 2d's. Time.* Mich. 7. W. 3. B. R. 12 Mod. 84. Ld Gerard's Caſe.

(A) Fictions.

1. ALL Fictions of Law are *to certain Reſpects and Purpoſes*, and *extend only to certain Perſons*; as the Law ſuppoſes the *Vouchee* to be Tenant of the Land, where in Rei Veritate he is not, but this is as to the Demandant himſelf, and to enable him to do Things as to the Demandant, and which the Demandant may do to him; and therefore a Fine levied by Vouchee to the Demandant, or Fine or Releaſe from the Demandant to the Vouchee is good; but Fine levied by the Vouchee to a *Stranger*, or Leaſe made to him by a Stranger is void, per Coke. Mich. 33 and 34. Eliz. B. R. 3 Rep. 29. b. in Butler and Baker's Caſe.

2. The *King* is not to be anſwered, bound, nor defeated by Fictions; and therefore he would not have been bound in his Reverſion, or Remainder by a feigned Recompence upon a Common Recovery, or Warranty Collateral, without true and actual Aſſets, &c. Hob. 339. in Caſe of Sheffield and Ratcliffe, cites 6. E. 5. 56. and 1 Rep. 43. Altonwood's Caſe.

3. Thoſe Things are *properly* Fictions of Law, *that have no real Eſſence in their own Body, but are ſo acknowledged and accepted* in Law *for ſome ſpecial Purpoſe.* Hob. 222. cites Co. Litt. 265. b.

4. Fiction *is never admitted where* Truth may work; as where Ceſty que uſe, and his Feoffee join in a Feoffment, it ſhall be the Feoffment of the Feoffee. Hill. 15 Jac. Hob. 311. in Caſe of Wright v. Gerard.

The Law often makes Fictions *for Preſervation of Rights*, per Gould. J. 12 Mod. 290.

5. The Law never ſhall make any Fiction but for *Neceſſity*, and to *avoid a Miſchief*, per Coke 3 Rep. 30. in Caſe of Butler v. Baker——— ibid 36. per Doderidge J. 2 Roll R. 502. in Caſe of Sheffield v. Radcliff———Jo. 73. S. C. and to avoid *Abſurdity*, and preſerve the Right of a Stranger. per Doderidge J. Paſch. 1. Car. In Cam. Scacc.

6. There are *five Sorts* of Fictions in Law, *Abeyance*, *Remitter*, *Relation*, *Preſumption*, and *Repreſentation*, per Doderidge J. Jo. 73.

Co. Litt. S. 224. 150.

7. *In Fictione juris ſemper ſubſiſtit Æquitas* 11. Rep. 51. Liford's Caſe. ———it muſt do Prejudice to none, per Doderidge J. 2 Roll. R. 502.——'tis to prevent Miſchief. Jo. 427. Hill. 14. Car. in the Caſe of Harper v. Derby (Burgeſſes).

8. Fictions of Law muſt not be of a Thing *impoſſible*; For the Law imitates Nature, per Doderidge J. 2 Roll R. 502. in the Caſe of Radcliff v. Sheffield.

9. You ſhall never make a Man ſubject to the *Penalty of a Statute* upon a Fiction of Law. Arg. Godb. 388. cites 11 Rep. 51.

10. No *Eſcape* can *amount to a Capital Offence*, unleſs the Crime, for which the Party was committed, were actually ſuch at the Time of the Eſcape; for it is not ſufficient that it *become ſuch afterwards* from the Beginning by a Fiction of Law; as where one is committed for having given a dangerous Wound, and eſcapes, after which the Party dies. 2 Hawk. Pl. C. 135. S. 25.

Figures.

Keb. 19. S. C. by the Name of Buſhel v. Bland.

1. IN *Aſſumpſit* in an inferiour Court, the *Time of the Promiſe alledg'd* was in Figures, and upon Error brought, Judgment was reverſed for this Cauſe. Sid. 40. Paſch. 13. Car. B. R. Ducket v. Bland.

2. It was moved to quaſh an *Indictment*, becauſe the Year of our Lord in the Caption was in Figures. But per Hale Ch. J. the Year of the King is enough. Mod. 78. pl. 40. Mich. 22. Car. 2. Anon.

3. In *Debt for Rent*, the *Sum demanded* was in Figures, and not in Words; upon a Writ of Error brought, the Court held it was a material Exception, and reverſed the Judgment, unleſs Cauſe, &c. Hill. 23. Car. Sti. 88. Hobſon v. Heywood.

3 Keb. 301. S. C.—Vent. 256. ſeems to be S. C.

4. *Roman* Figures are good in *Pleading*, but otherwiſe of Engliſh Figures. 2 Lev. 102. Paſch. 26. Car. 2. B. R. Hawkins v. Mills.

———If an *Indictment* ſets forth the Stile of the Day or *Year*, in any Figures but *Roman*, it is inſufficient. 2 Hawk. pl. C. 255. S. 129.

5. In Indeb. Aſſump. *pro opere & Labore*, it was excepted, becauſe the Sum was in Figures, ſed non Allocatur, for they were (XII) *Latin Figures*, which is well enough; otherwiſe, if they had been (12) *Engliſh Figures*; and it would have been *otherwiſe*, if they were in Figures *in an inferiour Court*, and therefore it was adjudg'd for the Plaintiff. This was in a Writ of Enquiry. Skin. 409. Hill. 5. W. & M. B.R. Hebbert v. Corithorp.

6. *6 Geo. 2. 14. Allows the expreſſing Numbers by Figures in all Writs, &c. Pleadings, Rules, Orders and Indictments, &c. in Courts of Juſtice, as have been commonly uſed in the ſaid Courts, notwithſtanding any Thing in the 4 Geo. 2. 26.*

File.

(A) Of putting upon the File, and taking off.

1. A *Cauſe* was *between Father and Son*, and there having been great Heat, and *indecent Reflections* on both Sides, in Bill and Anſwer, and the Mattter being *ended* this Vacation *by Compromiſe*; upon Motion this Day made in Court by Mr Porter, the Bill and Anſwer were taken off the File by Conſent. Mich 1683. Vern. 189. Tremaine v. Tremaine.

2. *Information* filed, *without Recognizance* entered into by the Party, is ill, but the Court cannot take it off the File; when once a Thing is on the File, it *cannot be taken off without an Act of Parliament*; no, *not by Conſent of Parties*; as in the Caſe of Dr **Woodrington** on a Mandamus, the College made a very ſcandalous Return, and which he and the College agreed; and then they moved to take the Return off the File, but the Court refuſed it, ſaying, it could not be done without an Act of Parliament; only they *ordered a Vacat* to be entered thereupon; that in this Caſe, the Method may be, to enter the Irregularity on the Roll, with a Ceſſet proceſſus Superinde. Sed Cur. adviſare vult. 12 Mod. 155. Mich. 9. W. 3. the King v. Lambert.

3. If a *Bill againſt an Attorney* be filed *irregularly*, it may be taken off the File. per Cur. 12 Mod. 164. Hill. 9. W. 3. in Caſe of Broadwaite v. Blackerby and Perkins.

[See, Report. (A)]

Fine.

(A) The Antiquity of Fines.

Fol. 13.

1. A **Fine is pleaded to be levied** 2 E. 1. but not pleaded as a Fine, becauſe **he had** no Chirograph **of it**. 20 H. 6. 3.

2. 7 E. 1. **Rot. Clauſarum Membrana** 5. **in Dorſo a Fine levied** between the King and Bigod **Earl of Norfolk in ſuch Form, as at this Day, &c. Hec eſt finalis Concordia, &c.** 8. E. 1. **Membrana** 11. **Fine** upon Releaſe of an Advowſon.

2 Inſt. 511.

3. 18 E. 1. **Libro Parliamentorum, among the Reaſons of the Judgment there given, it is ſaid,** Nec in Regno iſto provideatur, vel ſit aliqua Securitas Major ſeu Solempnior, per quam aliquis vel aliqua ſtatum certiorem habere poſſit, vel ad ſtatum ſuum Verificandum aliquod Solennius Teſtimonium producere quam Finem in Curia Domini Regis levatum; qui quidem Finis ſic Vocatur, eo quod Finis & Conſummatio omnium Placitorum eſſe debet, & hac de Cauſa providebatur.

4. It is certain, that Fines were frequent *before the Conqueſt*. 2 Inſt. 511.——Catlin cited ſome Fines before the Conqueſt, touching the Poſſeſſions of the Abbot of Crowland. Pl. C. 369.

(A. 2) The

(A. 2) The Original of Fines.

1. The Ancient manner of Conveyancing was of two Sorts, either by Fine or Feoffment. The Fine was *in the Lord's Court*, and by this they *paſſed all Feudal Right*, which was *in Poſſeſſion*; and there are Inſtances as low as the Time of *H.* 2. and *E.* 2. of Fines in the Court of the Lord: and they were *called Fines*, *becauſe* a Fine was paid to the Lord for ſuch Agreement, for that it transferred the Feudall Right held of the Lord. G. Treat. Ten. 93. cites Madox 15.

2. *But* tho' in ſuch Courts, they paſſed all the Right the Tenant had in Poſſeſſion; yet the *Right of Action could not be transferred*, becauſe that would encourage Maintenance; therefore, whatever ſuch Grantee could ſeiſe paſſed by this Feudall Conveyance. But the Right of Diſtreſs and of Action did not paſs without Attornment. G. Treat. Ten. 93.

3. The *Feoffment conveyed* the Feudal Poſſeſſion, *Coram-paribus* out of Court; for it was neceſſary to convey ſometimes before the Court was held, and then the Poſſeſſion was delivered over *coram Paribus*; but as there were two Conveyances of *Copyhold*, one in the Lords Court, and the other to the cuſtomary Tenants; ſo in *Freehold*, where the immediate Grant was to the Feoffee, and not to the Lord, as in the Copyhold; yet there were two Sorts of Conveyances, one by Fine in open Court, the other by Feoffment coram Paribus; the Right only paſſed by Fine, becauſe the Poſſeſſion being in the Grantee, they might well ſtay till the next Court to transfer the Right; but *where the Poſſeſſion was to be parted with*, or Service to be done, or Money paid, there the *Uſual way was coram Paribus*, that the Feoffee might not loſe the Profits in the mean Time, or the Poſſeſſion be delivered before the Contract could be compleated. G. Treat. Ten. 93, 94.

4. *Thus it ſtood till ſometime after the Conqueſt*; but the after Kings endeavouring to retrench the Privilege of the Great Lords, they firſt in *Magna Charta*, and after by the Statute of *Quia emptores terrarum*, began to admit of Alienations without Fine to the Lord; and the Acts of Court-Baron were only eſteemed to create *Notoriety among the Tenants* of the Manor. From hence Grants in the Lords Courts were omitted, and the *Attornments in Pais* were the only Notorieties of ſuch Grants, no Fine being paid to the Lord; and the Kings Courts creating a Notoriety all over the Land, the uſual Way was to make the Grant in the King's Court, in this Manner: They uſed to ſuppoſe that the Parties had Covenanted to Alien; and all Writs of Covenant, (as being an Action of publick Concern to the Juſtice of the Kingdom,) were ſuable only in the King's Court; and by Conſequence this Covenant to Alien was ſuable there; and that Court being poſſeſſed of the Matter as an Adverſary Cauſe, they were admitted to make all manner of Agreement, touching ſuch Suit depending; and theſe Agreements being amicably made by way of Compoſition before the King's Court, it became the Juſtice of the King's Court to ſee them performed; and therefore a Scire facias iſſued to execute the Fine, and a Quid juris Clamat to the Tenant. G. Treat. Ten. 94, 95.

(A. 3) Fine. How and in what Manner to be levied.

Tho' this Act *is repealed*, yet it may ſerve in many Reſpects to explain the Statute of 4 H. 7. and 32 H. 8. 2 Inſt. 218.

1. 18 *E.* 1. *Stat.* 4. S. 1. Enacts that, *when the* Writ Original *is delivered in the Preſence of the Parties before Juſtices, a Pleader ſhall ſay thus: Sir Juſtice, Conge de accorder.*

S. 2. *And the Juſtice ſhall ſay to him, what ſaith Sir R. and ſhall Name one of the Parties.*

S. 3. *That*

S. 3. *Then, when they be agreed of the Sum of Money that muſt be given to the King, the Juſtice ſhall ſay, Cry the Peace.*

S. 4. *And after the Pleader ſhall ſay, inſomuch as Peace is Licenſed thus unto you, W. S. and A. his Wife, that here be, do acknowledge the Manor of B. with the Appurtenances contained in the Writ, to be the Right of our * Lord the King, which he hath of their Gift.*

S. 5. *To have and to hold to him and his Heirs, of the ſaid W. and A. and the Heirs of A. as in Demeſnes, Rents, Seigniories, Courts, Pleas, Purchaſes, Wards, Marriages, Reliefs, Eſcheats, Wills, Advowſons of Churches, and all other Franchiſes and Free Cuſtoms, to the ſaid Manor belonging, paying yearly to R. and his Heirs, as chief Lords of the Fee, the Services and Cuſtoms due for all Services.*

S. 6. *And it is to be Noted, that the Order of the Law will not ſuffer a final Accord to be levied in the King's Court without a* * Writ Original, *and that muſt be at the leaſt* before † four Juſtices in the Bench, or in Eyre and ‡ not otherwiſe, *and* in Preſence of the Parties *Named in the Writ, which muſt be of full Age, and good Memory, and out of Priſon.*

* So are the Statutes at large, both of Kebleand Raſtal, but this ſeems a Miſtake and and that it ſhould be R. as the Name of a Common Perſon, and ſo is 2 Inſt. 510.

* If there be no Original Writ, yet the Fine is *not void*, but *voidable* by Writ of Error. 2 Inſt. 513.——See (F) pl. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.——† The Number of Juſtices here mentioned are not requiſite at this Day; but there muſt be *above* the Number of *One*. And therefore a Fine levied before *Thoma Brian Milite & Sociis ſuis* Juſticiariis de Communi Banco was not good. 2 Inſt. 514, 515.—4 *H.* 7. 24. *Enacts, that it ſhall be good tho' levied in C. B. before*, 2 Juſtices only there.——‡ It, was Reſolved, that a Fine may be levied of *Lands in Ancient Demeſne in the Court of Ancient Demeſne*, notwithſtanding this Statute, which ſays, that Fines ſhall be levied in C. B. & non alibi. For this Statute *only takes away the Validity of Fines levied in Borough Courts, or other Inferior Courts*, which was the Miſchief intended to be prevented by this Statute, and does not extend to Courts of Ancient Demeſne; for it would be unreaſonable, that they ſhould be barred of levying Fines in C. B. (as they may be by Writ of Diſceit) and yet not be able to levy Fines in their Courts of Ancient Demeſne. And it was Reſolved, that ſuch Fine levied in Ancient Demeſne makes a Diſcontinuance, and has all the Effects of a Fine levied in C. B. except that it is no Bar, which is only by Force of the Stat. of 4 H. 7. Lutw. 781. Hunt v. Bourne, and al.——1 Salk. 340. Hill. 1 Annæ. B. R. S. C.

* S. 7. *And if a* Woman Covert *be one of the Parties, then they muſt be firſt* examined *before four of the ſaid Juſtices,* † *and if ſhe doth not Aſſent thereunto, the Fine ſhall not be levied.*

* See (F) pl. 1, 2. and (M) per totum.

† But if the Fine be *received and Recorded*, the Feme, or her Heirs ſhall *not* be allowed to *aver*, that *ſhe was not examined nor aſſented.* 2 Inſt. 515.

S. 8. *And the Cauſe wherefore ſuch Solemnity ought to be done in a Fine, is, becauſe a Fine is ſo high a Bar, and of ſo great Force, and of ſo ſtrong Nature in itſelf, that it concludeth not only ſuch as be* * Parties and † Privies *thereto, and their Heirs, but* ‡ *all other People of the World, being* || of full Age, out of Priſon, of good Memory, *and within the four Seas the Day of the Fine levied.*

* 2 Inſt. 516. Parties are thoſe, that are Parties *to the Original.*

† 2 Inſt. 516. Firſt this is to be underſtood of Privies *in Blood*; *not only* of the *Heirs by the Common Law*, which are here named, *but Heirs by the Cuſtom*, here comprehended under this Word (Privies) as Borough-Engliſh, Gavelkind, or the like, which claim as Heirs by Cuſtom, and is *not* intended *of Privies in Eſtate*, as Jointenants, the Donor and Donee, Leſſor and Leſſee, or the like. Alſo, this is to be underſtood of Privies *in Succeſſion*, as Biſhops, Abbots, and the like.——*Privies* ſignify thoſe that are Partakers, or that have an Intereſt in any Action, or Thing with another, or any Relation to another. Theſe are either Privies in Eſtate, as Donor and Donee, Leſſor and Leſſee, Jointenants, &c. or Privies in Blood, as the Heir to the Anceſtor, or between Coparceners; For by Privies in Blood, Privies *in Blood Inheritable* are to be underſtood; Privies *in Repreſentation*, as Executors to Teſtators, Adminiſtrators to Inteſtates; Privies *in Tenure*, as Lord and Tenant, &c. all which may be reduced to two General Heads, (viz.) Privies *in Deed*, and Privies *in Law*; Privies only in Eſtate are not to be underſtood here; but Privies in Eſtate and Blood, and by Repreſentation. Privies therefore, being Heirs to the Parties, are bound or barred preſently for Ever by a Fine if they Claim the ſame Title, that their Anceſtors had, that levied the Fine, whether under Impediments, or no; For tho' the Iſſue in Tail is under Impediments (as within Age, under Coverture, Non Compos. Mentis, in Priſon, or beyond Sea,) yet ſuch Iſſue in Tail is barred; For ſuch Iſſue is out of the ſaving of the 4 H. 7. 24. Wood's Inſt. 244.

The words Parties and Privies are to be *underſtood* as to a *Fee Simple*, as the Statute 18 E. 1 intended them. Jenk. 192. pl. 97.——See 2 Jo. 241. &c. in Ld Darby's Caſe acc.——He that is *Privy in Blood only and not in Eſtate* alſo, is not within theſe Statutes, neither ſhall he be barred by the Fine. *As* if Lands be given *to a Man and the Heirs Females of his Body*, and he *hath a Son and a Daughter*, and the *Son leyes a* Fine, *and dies without Iſſue*, this is no Bar to the Daughter; For tho' ſhe be Heir to his Blood, yet ſhe is not Heir to the Eſtate, nor hath ſhe need to make her Conveyance to it by him; but if the

Father had levied it, it would have been otherwiſe. 3 Vol. R. S. L. 215, 216. cites Trin. 21 Jac. C. B. Godfrey's Caſe.——By the words Privies and Strangers in the Statute, if Tenant in Tail is party to the Fine, and his *Iſſue claims per formam Doni*, yet he is Privy; For he *cannot convey himſelf as Heir to the Tail but as of the Body of his Father, which is Privity.* Br. Fines, pl. 109.—*So* if Lands be given *to Husband and Wife in ſpecial Tail*, the *Remainder to the right Heirs of the Husband in Fee*, and *he alone levies a Fine* with Proclamations of it, by this the Iſſue in Tail may be barred; For he cannot otherwiſe convey himſelf to the Tail and Deſcent, than as Heir of the Body of Father and Mother. 3 Vol. R. S. L. 216. cites * D. 3. 251. and Br. Fines 109.——* D. 3. b. pl. 6. Trin. 19 H. 8.

‡ In theſe words are included as well *Tenant for Years*, Tenant by *Statute-Merchant* and *Staple*, *Copy-holders* and *Cuſtomary-holders*, as Tenants of *Freehold and Inheritance*, if they be *out of Poſſeſſion or Seiſin* at the Time of the Fine levied; For a Fine levied by a Stranger cannot barr him, that is in Poſſeſſion. And albeit, the Words of this Law are very general, yet do they not abrogate the Statute of W. 2. de Donis conditionalibus, 2 Inſt. 517.——If *Tenant in Tail levies a Fine*; this Fine bars the Intail, and every other Perſon who has Right, if he does not enter or claim within 5 Years after the Fine and Proclamations; unleſs ſuch Perſon be aided by ſome of the *Impediments* mentioned in the Statute. By all the Judges of England. Jenk. 192. pl. 9. cites 19 H. 8. 6.

‖ By this Act, if any Stranger was within Age, or in Priſon, or Non Compos, or beyond the Seas, at the Fine levied, he was totally and for ever excepted; ſo as *after his full Age, coming out of Priſon, &c.* he or his Heirs *need not make any Claim.* 2 Inſt. 516.——*But* this is altered by the 4 H. 7. 24. Ibid. in Marg.

* Tho' the Words are, if they put not in their Claim, yet in ſome Caſes the *Right of one*, who might *Claim*, and *doth not*, ſhall be *preſerved*. As if Diſeiſor be diſſeiſed, and the ſecond Diſeiſor levy a Fine; in this Caſe, if the *firſt Diſſeiſor enter within the Year*, this ſhall preſerve the Right of the Diſſeiſee; becauſe the firſt Diſſeiſor, by his Entry, avoided the whole Eſtate given by the Fine, and yet the Diſſeiſee might have entered himſelf. 2 Inſt. 518. —See (B)

S. 9. * *If they make not their Claim of their Action within a Year and a Day by the Country.*

2. 27 *E.* 1. *Cap.* 1. *S* 3. *Enacts that, the Juſtices ſhall ſee that ſuch Notes and Fines, as hereafter ſhall be levied in our Court, be* read openly and Solemnly, *and that in the mean time all* Pleas ſhall ceaſe. *And this muſt be at two certain Days in the Week according to the Diſcretion of the Juſtices.*

Ha. F. N. B. 544 (a)

3. *At Common Law*, a Man might *levy a Fine by Attorney*, as well as confeſs an Action; and the Attorney himſelf might enter, and Record it, tho' the Party did not make Conuſance, and of this great Miſchief followed, and oftentimes Diſheriſon; and therefore it was Ordained by the Statute * *de Finibus & Attorn.* that a Fine ſhould not be levied, until the Parties went before the Juſtices in proper Perſon, ſo that the Juſtices might have Conuſanre of their Age, and other Defaults; yet at this Day a Man may take Eſtate by Fine by Attorney. Alſo, a Man *may take a Grant and Render by Fine by Attorney*, as in proper Perſon. Denſh. R. of Fines 7.

* 15 E. 2.

* *Orig.* is (Seignior.) but Quære? if it ſhould not be (Feme.)

4. *And* the *Baron and Feme* may take Eſtate by Fine by Attorney made by the Baron; but this ſhall not bind the * Lord to Claim other Eſtate after the Coverture diſſolved. Denſh. R. of Fines 7.

5. *But* Mayor and Comonalty, Dean and Chapter, *recluſe & ſimul* can't levy any Fine, nor take any Eſtate by Fine by Attorney. Denſh. R. of Fines 7.

[See *Stat.* 4 *H.* 7. *Cap.* 24. *S.* 12. at (W. 4) Infra.]

(A. 4) How Conſidered in Law.

1. A Fine is no more in Effect, than *a Covenant made between the Parties before Juſtices, and entered of Record.* Br. Fines, pl. 97. cites 21 E. 4. 4. per Tremaile.

Tho' a Fine be a Feoffment of Record, yet it is but ſo *Fictione Juris*.

2. A Fine *ſur Cognizance de Droit come ceo, &c.* is a Fine executed, and is a *Feoffment of Record*, and ſo are the other Fines executed; as Fines, *ſur Releaſe Confirmation, or Surrender.* 2 Inſt. 513.

If another were in by Tort, it will not amount to an Entry, as a Feoffment ſhall, per Bridgman Ch. J. Cart. 176.——Jo. 16 Eliz. 459. cites D. 333. b. 334. a.——Co. Litt. 332. b.——D. 334. pl. 30.——* But ſee pl. 5.

3. Where one, who hath a *Freehold in Poſſeſſion*, levies a Fine *Come ceo* &c. this enures as a *Feoffment with Livery on Record*; but where he hath but

but a *Reverſion or Remainder*, it enures *only as a Grant* thereof, without Tort preſumed, or done to the Poſſeſſion of a Stranger, who hath the Freehold. Arg. Mo. 629. in Sir Cha. Danvers's Caſe.

4. A Fine *is a perſonal Action*, tho' the Covenant is real in reſpect it concerns Land. Arg. Hill. 6 Car. Cro. C. 270 in Caſe of Favely v. Eaſton.

5. The Court denied a Fine to be a Feoffment of Record, and ſaid it was *improperly* ſo called, but that the *meaning* was, that it had the Effects of a Feoffment to ſome Purpoſes, if he that levied the Fine was ſeiſed of the Freehold at the Time of the Fine levied. 1 Salk. 340. Hill. 1 Annæ B. R. in Caſe of Hunt v. Bourne.

6. While a Fine remains on Record, *entire Credit* muſt be given to it. per Cur. 10. Mod. 45. Mich. 10. Annæ. B. R. in Lord Say and Seal's Caſe.

(B) Plea of the Fine [*Anciently.*]

1. 11 H. 3. **Plea Rolls at the Tower Rot. 7. in a Writ of Right by Galfrid de Cerlanda & Matillidem verſus Jollanum Nevil; the Tenant pleaded a** Fine upon Releaſe **acknowledged by the Anceſtor of the Demandant** in time of H. 2. & inde ponit ſe ſuper pedem Curiæ qui eſt in Theſauro, **and the Plaintiffs** deny the ſaid Fine & inde ponunt ſe Super Recordum Curiæ & pes Curiæ inventus eſt in Theſauro domini Regis & Curia avocat & warrantizatus eſt a Iuſticiariis & Ideo **adjudged that the Plaintiff be barred, &c.**

(C) Who [*might, or*] may take a Fine Ex officio. [*Anciently and Now.*]

1. A Fine may be levied in Eyre. 11 H. 4. 68. b. 16 E. 3. 19. E. 3. Abbe 13. per Thorpe anciently. 2 E. 3. 35. b. West. S. 16. cites Lib. Intrat. tit. Scire fac. in Ayde. 2.——Denſh. R. of Fines 2.

2. Anciently a Fine might be levied before the Juſtices of Aſſiſe in an Aſſize. 16 E. 3. 19 E. 3. Abbe 13. adjudged.

3. A Fine might be levied before the Juſtices Itinerants. 8 E. 1. Rot. Clauſarum Membrana 10.

4. Where a Vill *preſcribes to hold Pleas, and to make Proteſtation, in Nature of whatſoever Writ they will*, yet *they cannot levy a Fine in a Writ of Right, and make Proteſtation of a Covenant*, &c. For the Action is Real and the Proteſtation perſonal, per Knevet J. therefore if it be not *expreſſed* to levy a Fine, it is a great Queſtion. Br. Fines, pl. 104. cites 50 Aſſ. 9.

5. Conuſance of Fines may be levied in *Parliament* by a ſpecial Suit of any * coming to the *Parliament*. Denſh. R. of Fines 2. * *Orig.* (Devinire al.) Olim Coram ipſo Rege & Magnatibus Regni peragebatur

6. The *King* may take Conuſance of a Fine, and ſend it into Bank by Writ; and alſo the Lord *Chancellor* of *England*. Denſh. R. of Fines 2. See the Statute de Finibus. Spelm. Gloſs. Verbo, Fines.

7. *Juſtices in Eyre* may take Conuſance of Fines, and ſo might *Juſtices of the Common Bench*, before that it was a certain Place; and now *Juſtices of the Common Bench*, may take Conuſances of Fines, &c. Denſh. R. of Fines 2.

8. *So Juſtices of Aſſiſe*, of Tenements in Plaint before them, and the *Juſtices of Niſi Prius* may take Conuſance of Fines, and Darrein Preſentments in *Quare impedit* of Advowſon, in the ſame County, where the Advowſon

vowſon is; but *Juſtices of Niſi Prius* in entring Pleas of Lands cannot take Conuſance of Fines. Denſh. R. of Fines 2. cites 37 Aſſ. 17.

9. At Common Law, the *Barons of the Exchequer* held common Pleas, and took Conuſance of Fines; but now they are prohibited by the Statute called *Articuli ſuper Chartas*, made Anno 28 Ed. 1. Denſh. R. of Fines 2.

Br. Judge. pl. 6. cites 8 H. 6. 19. per Strange. Br. Judgmt. pl. 116. cites 8. H. 6. 19. per Martin.

10 A *Juſtice*, or other Perſon *being Cogniſee* in a Fine may not take Cogniſance thereof himſelf; for if he ſo do the Fine thereupon levied is void. 8 H. 6. 21. Weſt Symb. S. 17.

Coke in his Reading on Fines, 10. ſays, he thinks that if a Fine be levied before any by Ded. Pot. that is no Judge, Knight or Serjeant, it is Error, and may be Reverſed in B R. by Writ of Error: But that it is ſaid in V. N. B. that a Serjeant ſworn to the King may take Counſance by Ded. Pot. and yet he is not named in the Statute.——Br. Fines pl. 120. S. P. but adds a Quære if a *Serjeant at Law* be not *taken as Juſtice* by the Equity of the Statute.——Trin. 5 Eliz. D. 224. b. pl. 31. Quilter's Caſe.

11. The *King by Patent or Commiſſion, with a Non obſtante, gives Power to A. and B. Juſtices of Aſſiſe* in a Circuit, to take the Conuſance of all Fines and Recognizances, Conjunctim and Separatim. *A. is not a Judge of one of the Benches at Weſtminſter*, nor one of the Barons of the Exchequer; A. takes the Conuſance of a Fine by the Authority abovementioned; the Caption is good by Force of this Patent, without any Dedimus Poteſtatem ſued before or afterwards. This Judgment was affirmed in Error. Without ſuch ſpecial Patent the Ch. J. of the Common Pleas only has the Prerogative to take the Conuſance of Fines without any Dedimus Poteſtatem ſued before the Caption, or afterwards. This Caſe was reſolved upon good Conſideration; theſe Juſtices were the Attorney General and a Serjeant at Law. The *Statute of* 18 *E.* 1. *de Modo levandi Fines* ordains the Caption of Fines before the Judges of the Common Pleas; the *Statute of Carliſle* 15 E. 2. Ordains in Caſe of Sickneſs, or Impotency of the Conuſor, that one of the Judges of one of the Benches, with a Serjeant, or a Knight, ſhall have Power to take ſuch Conuſance. Theſe are *only Affirmative Statutes*, and *do not take away the King's Prerogative* to Grant Power by *Dedimus Poteſtatem* to other Perſons than thoſe named in theſe Statutes, to take Acknowledgments of Fines. And ſo 'tis uſed at this Day. Jenk. 227. pl. 90.

This is *per Conſuetudinem Regni.* Jenk. 227. pl. 90. —Jenk. 169. pl. 28.— 2 Inſt. 512.— Co. R. on Fines, Lect. 9. Pag. 10. S. P. as to the Ch. J. of C. B. and ſays, that the *Chief Juſtice of England*, nor any other Juſtice of the King can take Conuſance in the Country without Writ of Ded. Poteſt. and this *ſeems to be by Cuſtom and Uſage*; For he ſays he does not find any ſuch ſpecial Authority given to the Ch. J. of C. B. by any Statute.——* Weſt. S. 16. ſays, that the Chief Juſtice of C. B *by the Privilege and Prerogative of his Place* and Office may take Cognizance of Fines *in any Place out of Court*, and certify the ſame without Writ of Dedimus Poteſtatem. cites D. 224. pl. 31.

12. *Juſtices of* B R. and C. B. and Barons of the Exchequer *in their Circuits* without Ded' Pot. may take Conuſance of Fines; and a Writ of Covenant and Ded' Poteſt. is ſued out afterwards with an Antedate. But none elſe may do ſo. * *Chief Juſtice of C. B.* only may take Fine without Ded' Poteſt. ſued out either before, or after, as by the Prerogative of his Place. Jenk. 279. pl. 3.

13. Fines may be acknowledged *before the Lord Ch. J. of C. B* or *two of the Juſtices in open Court*; this is called acknowledging a Fine at Bar, but the *Ld Ch. J. may take* Fines *in any Place out of Court* without a Commiſſion, and certify the ſame. *Juſtices of Aſſiſe* may do it by the General Words of their Patents; but they do not Uſe to certify the ſame before a ſpecial Writ of Dedimus Poteſtatem is Sued out. Wood's Inſt. 242.

14. A Fine can't be levied by any that have *Conuſance of Pleas*, or Power to hold Pleas, it muſt be done only before the Juſtices of the Common Pleas; For the King can't grant Power to hold Plea for the Levying of a Fine. Wood's Inſt. 242, 243. (cites 34 and 35 H. 8. 22. concerning Fines in Towns Corporate.)

[See *Stat.* 18 *E.* 1. *S.* 6. and the Notes thereon at (A. 3.)]

(C. 2) At

(C. 2) At Common Law, and Now. Levied in what Places or Courts, other than C. B. and who may take Fines elſewhere.

1. In Aſſiſe, the Tenant ſaid that the *Uſage of the Soke of Wincheſter* is, and Time out of Mind hath been, *that if any Baron and Feme* make Alienation of the Land of the Right of the Feme by Charter, and the Baron and Feme *come before the Bailiff of the Biſhop of Wincheſter, Lord of the Soke, in the Court of the Soke, and the Feme is* Confeſſed and *Examined before the Bailiff in the ſame Court*, and they acknowledge the ſame Deed; this ſhall bind as a Fine at Common Law; and this Matter was Pleaded in Bar of the Aſſiſe, and Hank and Knivet J. were clear, that *they ſhall not Preſcribe in ſuch Cuſtom, if it was not a City or Borough*; and after the Aſſiſe was Awarded; quod Nota, and ſo no Bar. Br. Cuſtoms, pl. 39. cites 45 Aſſ. 48.

2. A Fine may be levied and acknowledged in *B. R.* when the Record is there *by Error*; but not upon *Original* to be Commenced there. Denſh. R. of Fines 3.

It ſeems to me that *before the Fine* be *engroſſed, the Record* of the Fine *ſhall remain with the Chirographer*; and this is the Reaſon, that a Fine can't be levied *in B. R.* becauſe *there is no Chirographer*. Co. R. on Fines 12.

3. If a Fine be levied *in B. R. 'tis not void, but voidable* by Writ of Error. Co. R. on Fines 9. cites 36 H. 6. 34.———Br. Faux. Recov. pl. 15. cites 36 H. 6. 32. that Forteſcue held it good enough.

Br. Fines pl. 71. cites S. C. that a Fine levied in B. R. is good, but Brook makes a Quere thereof.

4. Thoſe who have Conuſance of Pleas *by Charter*, after Conuſance granted in ſuch Licences, &c. may take Conuſance of Fines in their Courts of Lands in the Writ; but they ought to have Power of levying Fines by ſpecial Words in their *Charter*, &c. and they ought to pray Conuſance in theſe Caſes, before the Fine acknowledged, or they ſhall not have it. Denſh. R. of Fines 2.

By *ſpecial Grant* a Fine may be levied *in a Baſe Court*. Weſt. S. 18. cites 44 E. 3. 38. —But Fine levied *in Ancient Demeſne, by any Cuſtom*, ſeems void. Weſt. S. 18. cites 44 E. 3. 38. and that it is the ſame in other inferiour Courts, cites 50 Aſſ. pl. 9.

5. *And* upon Conuſance granted, a Fine may be levied before the *Mayor of London* of Lands in the Writ contained; and ſo it may in *Writ of Right* in *London*. Tamen quære. Denſh. R. of Fines 2, 3.

And Deeds inroll'd in *London* are as ſtrong as Fines. Denſh. R. of Fines 3.

6. *But* a Man can't *Preſcribe* to levy Fines in his Court of Lands *within his Manor*; becauſe Fine is a Record, which no Man ſhall have by Preſcription; and the *King upon every Concord is Donor*, which a Man can't be by Preſcription. Denſh. R. of Fines 3.

7. A Fine levied in C. *B.* of Lands within the *Cinque Ports* is good, and ſhall not be reverſed by *Error*. Denſh. R. of Fines 3.

8. A Fine levied of Lands in *Ireland* in C. B. here is void. Denſh. R. of Fines 3.

9. In *Marſhalſea, Hundred, County, Leet*, or *Court Baron*, Fines can't be levied, becauſe a *Præcipe quod reddat* lies not there, nor a *Writ of Covenant*; yet upon *Writ of Right*, the Suitors in Court Baron ſhall hold Plea of Land, and ſhall be tried by Battle, and not by Grand Aſſiſe; yet none of theſe Juſtices, nor Courts, have Power of recording a Fine upon Proclamation, but only the Juſtices of the King in C. B. nor any of the Fines levied in the ſaid Courts at this Day are of other Force, but as the Fines there levied, were before the Statute of 4 H. 7. 24. except the

Fines levied in C. B. with Proclamation; ſo that 'tis in the Election of every one to levy a Fine by the ſaid Statute, or according to the Forme before Uſed. Denſh. R. of Fines 3. 4.

10. By 34 *and* 35 *H.* 8. 26. *Fines may be levied in* Wales.
11. By 37 *H.* 8. 19. *In the County Palatine of* Lancaſter.
12. By 2 *Ed.* 6. 28. *In the County Palatine of* Cheſter.
13. By 5 *Eliz.* 27. *In the County Palatine of* Durham.
14. By 43 *Eliz.* 15. *In the City of* Cheſter.

But Fines in thoſe Counties muſt be of Lands lying in thoſe Counties. Wood's Inſt. 243.—Fines may be levied within the County Palatine of Lancaſter and Cheſter but that is (as Coke ſays he apprehends) by Force of divers Acts of Parliament and ſo it may be in any Cities or Towns Corporate, where they have *uſed to levy Fines, if their Uſages are confirmed by Act of Parliament.* But ſuch Fines ſhall not bar any Eſtate, Tail, nor any Strangers, who have preſent, or future Right. Co. R. on Fines 9.

[See Prerogative (D. c)—Conuſance.]

(D) Fine of Land. What Perſons in reſpect of Eſtate, [*may levy Fines.*]

S.P. per Tremaile and yet no Original is between them. 21 E. 4. 5. pl. 8.

1. IN Writ of Right **againſt Tenant for Life [who makes Default]** after Default, [it be in] Remainder is received, **a Fine may be good** between the Demandant and him **[in Remainder]** who is received 21 E. 4. 5.

After he has *entred into the Warranty* he may levy a Fine to the Demandant, tho' in Fact neither of them is ſeiſed; For ſuch Vouchee is *Tenant in Law*, and may confeſs the Action; becauſe of the Privity between him and the Demandant. *But* a Fine by him ſo levied *to a* * *Stranger* is void. 8 H. 4. 5 H. 7. 40. Weſt. Symb. S. 13.——Br. Fines pl. 34. cites 8 H. 4. 5.———3 Rep. 29. b. in a Nota of the Reporter's.——In regard to the Demandant, Vouchee is Tenant; but in Regard to a Stranger he is not. 1 Rep. 87. b. per Walmſley J.——* Br. Fines pl. 105. cites S. C. and that it is void for want of Privity.

2. A Vouchee **may levy a Fine.** 8 H. 4. 5. 5 H. 7. 41.

* Fol. 14.

† 12 H. 4. 21. b. pl. 13.

3. A Prior preſentable, who had Covent and Common Seale, **might levy a * Fine; For he had the Right in him.** 12 H. 4. † 11. 21 E. 1. b. **adjudged** 16 E. 3. 19 E. 3. **Above.** 13. **adjudged** 8.

If Tenant for Years levies a Fine *without firſt making a Feoffment*, the Fine is void, as to the making of any Title by way of Non-claim, by reaſon of the Imbecillity of the Eſtate. Wms's Rep. 519. cites it as ſo Held by Holt Ch. J. in delivering the Reſolution of the Court in the Caſe of Hunt v. Bourne; Which Ld Chancellor agreed, and thence it was inferred, that if in Caſe of Leſſee for Years, as before, the Fine might be ſaid to be void, becauſe Parties finis Nihil habuerunt; a Fortiori, it might be ſo ſaid in Caſe of *Tenant at Will*; But Ld Chancellor Held it otherwiſe, where a Fine was *levied by one, who had a defeaſible Right, and ſuch Leſſee join'd with him*, as in the Principal Caſe there. Mich. 1718. Wms's Rep. 519, 520. in Caſe of Carter v. Barnardiſton.——(alias. Loddington v. Kime. Vid.)

4 Note, that *Tenant for Years*, Tenant *by Statute*-Merchant, or Staple, or *Guardian in Chivalry*, or *Tenant at Will* cannot levy a Fine; and if they do, 'tis void, tho' it be with Proclamation. Denſh. R. of Fines 11.

5. *Ceſtuy que Uſe in Fee Simple* may levy a Fine, and this ſhall bind his Feoffees. Denſh. R. on Fines 12.

6. *Executors*, that have *Power to re-enter* by Will, cannot levy a Fine. Denſh. R. of Fines 12.

7. A Fine levied *to a Corporation*, that is *aggregate*, is good enough; For a *Man may receive a Fine by Attorney, but not levy a Fine by Attorney*, by the expreſs Words of the Statute, Anno 15 *E.* 2. *made* at *Carliſle*, by which 'tis Provided, that *Partes finis perſonaliter veniant coram Juſticiariis, ut eorum ætas, facultas, ſeu alii defectus per eos adjudicari poſſint*; Co. R. on Fines 9.

8. A. *deviſed to J. S.* in Fee *Lands held by Knight's Service*, J. S granted a Leaſe for Years of the whole, and the Leſſee occupied under this

Leaſe

Leaſe for 3 Years; afterwards the *Heir at Law* levied a Fine: Reſolved, that this Entry and Leaſe by J. S. did not gain Poſſeſſion but of 2 Parts, and the Heir was never out of Poſſeſſion, and ſo his Fine is good. Mich. 40 Eliz. B. R. Cro. E. 641. Hempſley v. Brice.

9. Albeit every Fine be good to bind the Parties, yet for the Validity of the Fine it is Convenient, that either the Cogniſor, or the Cogniſee be *ſeiſed of the Lands alienated*, 41 Ed. 3. 14 22 H. 6. 13. For the Fine is void, if neither of the Parties be ſeiſed at the levying thereof. Weſt's Symb. S. 13 cites. 41 Ed. 3. 14. 33 H. 6. 18. 3 H. 6. 27. 27 H. 8. 4. and 20. 37 H. 6. 34. 13 Aſſ. p. 8. 3 H. 7. 9. 5 Ed. 3. 22 H. 6. 57. Denſh. of Fines. 14.

10. The *King* levy'd Fines by Grant and Render of *Lands deſcended* to him *from* the E. of G. *a Subject*, his Anceſtor, by Advice of Popham and Coke. After the Render made, they adviſed it neceſſary to have Letters Patents granting to the Conuſee by expreſs Words, that he might enter into the Land; For otherwiſe the Fine being Executory, upon Grant and Render, it might be doubted, if the Conuſee without any ſuch Grant might enter on the King. 7 Rep. 32. b. Mich. 2 Jac. Caſe of Fine levied by the King, Tenant in Tail.

11. *Tenant in Fee-ſimple*, in *Tail General or Special*, or Tenant in *Remainder* or *Reverſion*, may levy a Fine; Tenant *for Life* may levy a Fine *of Lands*, &c. which he holds for Life, to hold to the Cognizee for Life of the Tenant for Life. If he Grants a greater Eſtate, it is a Forfeiture. *So* 'tis of Tenant in *Tail* after poſſibility of Iſſue extinct, Tenant in *Dower*, Tenant by *Curteſy*. A Tenant for *Years* cannot levy a Fine of his Term, nor Tenant *by Copy of Court-Roll* of his Eſtate. A Tenant *in Common*, *Jointenant*, or a *Coparcener*, may levy a Fine of their Parts. Wood's Inſt. 241.

12. Note, That the *Cognizor* or *Cognizee muſt be ſeiſed of a Freehold*, be it by Right or Wrong. Wood's Inſt. 242.

13. A Man by his Will *deviſes* his *Lands to Truſtees for* 99 *Years for* the *Payment of* his *Debts and Legacies*; *and* afterwards *in Caſe they ſhould not Act*, and take upon them the Truſt *within ſix Months* after his Death, *then* he deviſed the ſaid Lands *to another*, *and his Heirs in Truſt to pay* his Debts and Legacies; *and afterwards to A. in Tail*; Remainder in Tail to B. *A. levies a Fine*, *and dies without Iſſue*; Five Years paſſed and Non Claim. The Ld Keeper was of Opinion, that this Fine by *Ceſty que Truſt* in Tail, and Non Claim, ſhould bar the Remainder Man in Tail. For equitable Rights are as well to be bound by Fines, as Actions and Titles at Law; and cited the Caſe of **Freeman** and **Barnes**, where a Fine by Ceſty que Truſt was adjudged a good Fine and Bar; and he was of Opinion, that it would bind at Law. Hill. 1683. Vern. 226. Basket v. Peirce.——

But it being urged for the Plaintiff, that in the Caſe of **Freeman** v. **Barnes**, the Fine was levied by the Ceſtui que Truſt, who had the Whole entire Eſtate in him, and ſo was to work upon his own Equity only;

but that here the Ceſtuy que Truſt had but an Eſtate Tail only, which was ſpent, and there were other Remainders over; And it being inſiſted in this Caſe, that the Remainder Man was not barr'd by Non Claim; For that all the Debts and Legacies were not paid, and ſo his Title was not commenced; and that the Term for 99 Years did ſubſiſt, and was not expired; and further, that the entire Eſtate at Law, being in the Truſtee, he ought to have entered, and it was againſt Equity, to ſuffer the Ceſtui que Truſt to be barr'd by Non Claim for the Laches of his Truſtee. Whereupon the Ld Keeper decreed, that the Truſtee ſhould give Leave to the Plaintiff to bring an Action in his Name to try his Title; and ſaid, it *being a Title at Law, he would not determine it himſelf*; tho' his Opinion was, that the Plaintiff was barr'd. Vern. 226, 227. Hill. 1683. Basket v. Peirce.—— S. C. cited Paſch. 11 Geo. 9 Mod. 144. in Caſe of Webber v. Earl of Montrath.

14. A. *deviſed Land to B. for Payment of his Debts*, *and when his Debts are paid* then *to B. for Life*, with Power to make Leaſes for 99 Years, if three Lives ſo long live; *Remainder to the Heirs Male of his Body*, Remainder over. This Eſtate to B. tho' Executory, and expreſsly limited to A. for Life is yet an Eſtate Tail, and barrable by Fine and Recovery. Wms's. Rep. 142. Paſch. 1711. per Ld Harcourt, and thereby revers'd a Decree of Ld Cowper's. Bale v. Coleman.

(D 2) By whom: Tenant in Tail; or by Perſons not ſeiſed of the Eſtate Tail.

1. A. Tenant for Life, *Remainder to B. in Tail, Remainder to the right Heirs of B.* If B. Bargains and ſells all his Eſtate, * or levies a Fine with Proclamations of it to D. Nothing paſſes to the Grantee, as to the Remainder in Tail, but during the Life of B. 3 Le. 60. Hill. 18. Eliz. C. B. Owen v. Sadler.

* Tenant for Life dies, and then B. dies, the Tail is Barred. 3 Rep. 84. Paſch. 44 El. The Caſe of Fines.

——Jenk. 274. pl. 96. S. P. But if there had been *no Proclamation*, there had been no diſcontinuance, becauſe the Conuſor was not ſeiſed of the Entail.

2. *Grand-father and Grand-mother Tenants in Tail of the Gift of A.*—Remainder to the *right Heirs of Grand-father*. Grand-father dies—Grand-mother enters—Father by Deed inrolled and Fine with Proclamations, conveys to King Philip and Queen Mary, and the Heirs and Succeſſors of the Queen. If this Barrs the Son, the Grand-mother Tenant in Tail being ſeiſed? Mo. 146. Trin. 24 Eliz. Twine's Caſe.——Mo. 455. S. P. adjudg'd a Barr. Trin. 38 Eliz. Lynn v. Spencer.——Cro. E. 513. S. C.

Jenk. 275. pl. 96. States the Father's dying firſt, and ſays, that the Heir in Tail is barred, — and per Hobert Ch. J. accordingly; For tho' the Son ſhould claim as Heir in Tail to the Grandfather, as laſt ſeiſed by the Intail, yet he *muſt claim as Heir in Blood by the Father*; and ſo falls plainly within the Words, as *Heir of him that levied the Fine*, and claiming only by an Entail made to the Anceſtor of him that levied the Fine. Trin. 15 Jac. Hob. 258. in Caſe of Duncomb v. Wingfield.——D. 3. pl. 3. Paſch. 19 H. 8.——4 Mod. 5.

3. Grand-father, Father and Son. Grandfather was Tenant in Tail. *Father in life of Grandfather*, levies a Fine to a Stranger, who has nothing in the Land—Grandfather dies—Father dies—The Son is barred of the Land by the Fine of the Father.—But * if the Grandfather had ſurvived the Father, the Son ſhould not be barred. Hill. 27 Eliz. per J. Peryam. Mo. 252. Vid. Jo. 33. cites **Archer's Caſe**, that the Father died, living the Grandfather, and yet the Son barred becauſe of the *Lineal Deſcent*. 1 Rep. 66. b.—— * Jo. 41 Trin. 21 Jac. C. B. contra.

S. C. Le 84. Mich. 29 and 30 El. per Anderſon Ch. J. who ſaid it was lately adjudged in Stamford's Caſe. — S. P. Jenk. 275. pl 96. — S. P. but no Judgment.

4. *So* if the Father has two Sons, and the *Eldeſt Son levies Fine of the Eſtate Tail to the Father*, and the Father dies, and the Eldeſt Son dies without Iſſue, the Youngeſt is barred by the Fine of the Eldeſt; yet he claims as Iſſue of the Body of the Father; But becauſe the *Tail was deſcended in Right upon Eldeſt Son*, his Fine is a Bar to all claiming the ſame Tail. But if he had died without Iſſue in the Life of the Father; the youngeſt Son ſhould not be Barred by the Fine; Becauſe the eldeſt, who levied it, never was in Poſſeſſion, nor in Right had the Eſtate Tail. Hill. 27 Eliz. Mo. 252. Zouch v. Bampfield.

Cro. C. 524. 543. Edwards v. Rogers.

5. A. Deviſed Land to his Wife, the Remainder to his Son and his Heirs, and *if he dye before his Age of twenty-one Years*, that then it ſhall *remain to J. S. in Fee*—The Son levies a Fine, and dies before twenty-one Years—J. S. ſhall have the Land after the Death of the Wife; For 'tis a plain *Limitation*. Trin. 31 Eliz. C. B. Cro. E. 142. Mills v. Snowball.

It was held, that this was not a Fine, which enured by way of *Eſtoppel*; But that it paſſeth the very Right. 3 Le 227. M. 31 Eliz. C. B pl. 304. Anon

6. Deviſe of Land in Tail General to A. *To have, &c.* at his Age of *twenty-five Years; after twenty-one and before twenty-five, A. levies a Fine* with Proclamations, and after A. attains to twenty-five, and has Iſſue; tho' the Conuſor had only a poſſibility at Time of the Fine, yet the Eſtate Tail was Barred. 10 Rep. 50. **Grant's** Caſe cited in **Lampett's Caſe**, as adjudged. Hill. 29 Eliz.——The Bar in the Caſe above is by 32 H. 8. 36. for by 4 H. 7. 'twas not barred. Raym. 149, 150. cites S. C.

——The Deviſe in **Grant's Caſe**, was *to the Deviſor's Wife for Life, and when A. comes to 25, he to have in Tail*, &c. A. died before 25, leaving Iſſue, and the Wife ſtill living

living; and ſeiſed, ſo that *Partes ad finem nihil habuerunt*, yet adjudged, that the Eſtate Tail was utterly extinct and deſtroy'd. Hill. 31 Eliz. 2 Le. 36. S. C. by the Name of Johnſon v. Bellamy.——Parties and Privies, as the Heir is, ſhall have no ſuch Averment. Goldsb. 107. S C. by Name of Johnſon v. Carlile.——————Cro. E. 122. Johnſon v. Gabriel, alias Bellamy. S. C.——————Cro E. 610. S.C. cited in Caſe of Hunt v. King. —— cited Jo. 36. per Jones J. —— 40. per Hob. Ch. J——cited Cro. C. 435.

7. If Tenant in Tail has Iſſue *three Sons*, and the *ſecond Son levy a Fine* with Proclamations *in the Life of his Father, who dies*; this ſhall not bar the elder Brother: But if the *Elder die without Iſſue* in the Life of the Father, the Second ſhall be barred: And if the Elder die without Iſſue after the Death of the Father, ſo as the Elder had the Whole Tail, yet if *the Second or his Iſſue ſurvive, and then die*, it ſhall bar the Younger, (for he is plainly within the Words) as well as the Second, that levied the Fine. The Words of the Stat. of 32 H. 8. are, that a *Fine levied of Lands in any wiſe entail'd to the Conuſor, or any of his Anceſtors, ſhall be a Bar againſt the Perſon and his Heirs claiming only by Force of ſuch Entail*, any Doubt; &c. per Hobart Ch. J. Trin. 15 Jac. Hob. 258. In Caſe of Duncomb. v. Wingfield.

In Fines *among Collateral Iſſues*, and Heirs among themſelves, it receiveth *Diſtinction according to Contingency*; for it is *not neceſſary, that the Collateral Iſſue, claiming* by an Intail, muſt *make mention of every Collateral Iſſue Inheritable before him*, as in the Caſe of Lineal Anceſtors it is; and therefore make the Caſe, that the Father being Tenant in Tail to him, and the Heirs Male of his Body, hath Iſſue three Sons, and the ſecond Son levies a Fine in the Life of the Father, and then the Father dies without diſpoſing of the Eſtate; Firſt, clearly the eldeſt Son is not barred, becauſe he is not a Privy to his Second Brother, tho' he be within the Rigour of the Words; for he is * Heir to him that levied the Fine, and doth claim [not] only by the Intail, but above him, and not as Heir, which is the meaning of the Law. Then again, if the *ſecond* Brother *die without Iſſue, in the Life of the Elder, or of his Iſſue, the third* Brother ſhall claim this in Tail after the Death of the Elder Brother, notwithſtanding the Fine of the Middle Brother; becauſe he *doth Claim immediately from his Elder Brother*, and need not to convey himſelf by, or make mention of his Middle Brother, no not in his Pedigree. *But* if the *Elder* Brother *die without Iſſue, in the Life of the Middle Brother, or his Iſſue*, without diſpoſing the Eſtate, and then they all die; now the third Brother and his Iſſue ſhall be barred; For tho' he may bring his Formedon in Deſcender, and lay down the Intail, and then bring it to his Eldeſt Brother, that was laſt ſeiſed, and make himſelf immediate Heir unto him, without mention of the ſecond Brother; yet the Tenant in the Formedon may plead the Fine of the Middle Brother, and that he or his Iſſue did ſurvive the Elder and his Iſſue; for by that it appears, that the Middle, or his Iſſue, were the Perſons inheritable to the Intail before the Younger Brother, in whom the Title of the Intail had been totally, but for the Fine which bars him, and the whole Intail, as well againſt his Younger Brother as againſt his own Iſſue. By which it appears, that the Fine Bars, or Bars not the Younger Brother, by Contingency of Survivor, or not Survivor of either Party. Whereof the Reaſon is, that if after the Fine of the Second Brother, the Elder had died without Iſſue, and the Father had died, the whole Tail had been bound againſt all the Brethren in the ſame Manner as it were upon a Fine, againſt the Brethren in Fee Simple. Hob 333. Mich. 19 Jac. in Mackwilliams's Caſe.——*[Quære, if the Younger Brother is not intended dead?]

8. *Baron and Feme, Tenants in Tail*, have a Son and a Daughter; the Baron dies, the *Son levies a Fine in the Life of the Mother, and dies*; per 3 Juſt. the Daughter, being a *Collateral Heir*, ſhall not be bound; but per 3 Juſt. ſuch Fine ſhall bar a *Lineal Heir*; but by one J. ſuch Fine ſhall bar neither Collateral nor Lineal Heir; but per 1. J. ſuch Fine ſhall bar both Lineal and Collateral. Trin. 21 Jac. Jo. 41. Godfry v. Wade—Adjudged no Bar to the Daughter after the Death of the Mother. Becauſe the Son had only a poſſibility to inherit the Tail, which was only in his Mother after the Death of his Father; and the Mother ſurviving both her Husband and Son, the Land ſo entail'd ſhall deſcend to her Daughter immediately on her Death. Mich. 19 Jac. Hob. 332. * Mackwilliams's Caſe.

S. P. adjudg'd, and affirm'd in Error, to be no Bar; For Collateral Heir need not make Title by the Son. Cro. C. 434. Bradſtock v. Scovel.——Jo. 31 Godfry v. Wade. S. C.——Cro. J. 689. cites M. 13 Jac. Godfrey v. Paſton. S. P.——* Win. 41. S. C. argued.

9. Tenant for Life the Reverſion to an Ideot——*Uncle Heir apparent* to the Ideot levied a Fine and died——Tenant for Life died——The Ideot died——The Iſſue of the Uncle is not barred——Becauſe *he claims in the Collateral*, and not in the Right Line;——and his naming his Father here is not by way of Title, but *Pedigree*. Mar. 94. Paſch. 15 Car. B. R. Edwards v. Rogers.——Jo. 456 S. C. per 3 J. againſt Jones.——Cro Car. 524. 543. S. C. per 2 J. againſt Jones.

For the Eſtate never paſs'd thro' the Uncle, and conſequently the Iſſue of the Uncle do not claim from

their Father (the Uncle) but from the Ideot, and is in Effect a Stranger to the Fine of their Father (the Uncle) and may aver *Quod Partes*, &c. per Hale Ch. J. Vent. 418. cites Cro. C. and says, it was so Ruled in Case of Edwards v. Rogers.——The Ideot died without Issue. Cro. C. 524. S. C.——Jones J. who was the Judge, that held the Fine a Bar to the Heir of the Uncle, Reports, that Judgment was given, that it was no Bar. Jo. 462. S. C.

10. *A. made a Feoffment* to the Use of *himself for Life, and after the Death of him and M. his Wife*, to the Use *of B.* (eldest Son of A.) *for his Life, and after the Death of A. M. and B.* to the Use *of B. and the Heirs Male of his Body*, and for Default of such Issue to the Use *of the Heirs of B.—B. had Issue, a Daughter*, and then, by Fine and Indenture, *granted to G. for 500 Years.* B. dies. M. dies. A. still living. Upon a Reference out of Chancery to the Ld Ch. J. Hale, and after hearing the Arguments of Counsel, his Lordship was of Opinion, that the Estate as above limited to B. was a Contingent Remainder; that the Fine of B. did Operate at the Beginning by Conclusion, and passed no Interest, yet that this Estoppel shall bind his Heir, and he shall be in the same Case with his Ancestor; that if the Fine had been levied by B. in Fee, this would have barr'd the Estate of the Heir, destroy'd the contingent Use, and have Operated to the Benefit of the Possession, as the Fine of a Disseisee to a Stranger; but being only for Years, the Fee is vested, and the Term is good, it being drawn out of the Fee. January 3, 1672. Pollex. 55, 65, and 66. Weale v. Lower.

11. Lands devised to A. and B. for 99 Years, *in Trust for Payment of Debts and Legacies, and after to C. in Tail the Remainder to D. in Tail.* ——C. before the Payment of, &c. levied a Fine and died without Issue, and 5 Years passed without Claim;——'twas urged for D. that C's Title was not commenced, and the Term for 99 Years was still subsisting, and that the Trustees ought to have entered, and that Cesty que Trust should not be barred by Non-claim for the Laches of the Trustees, but North. K. was of Opinion the Trustee should give leave to the Plaintiff, to bring an Action in his Name to try the Title, and said that it being a Title at Law, he would not determine it himself; tho' his Opinion was, that the Plaintiff was barr'd. Hill. 1683. Vern. R. 227. Basket v. Peirce.—S.C. cited per Cur. Pasch. 11 Geo. 9 Mod. 144. and that the Court was of Opinion, that the Plaintiff was barred.

(D 3) By Tenant in Tail after a Conveyance.

1. A *Tenant in Tail conveys* to the Use of *himself for Life, Remainder to B. his Heir Apparent*; A. levies a Fine, B. enters for the Forfeiture, before Proclamation passed; A. dies, B. is not remitted to the first Entail, altho' afterwards Proclamations passed in the Life of A. For notwithstanding that the Issue in Tail, by that *Entry*, hath defeated the Possession which passed by the Fine, and so he enter'd Quodammodo in Assurance of the Fine; * as if Tenant in Tail *discontinues and disseises the Discontinuee*, and levies a Fine with Proclamation, and the Discontinuee enters within the 5 Years; Now tho' the Fine, as to the Discontinuee, be avoided, so as the Possession, which passed by the Fine, is defeated, yet the Right of the Entail continues bound. Arg. Mich. 25 and 26 Eliz. B R. Le. 7. Stonely v. Bracebridge.

* Per Anderson Ch. J. Le. 85. in Case of Zouch v. Bampfield.

2. A. Tenant in Tail *discontinues*, and then *disseises his Discontinuee, and levies a Fine*, the Discontinuee before the Proclamation re-enters, and then the Proclamations are made; A. re-enters and dies seised; his Issue shall not be remitted against this Fine. per Anderson Ch. J. Hill. 27 Eliz. Le. 85 in Case of * Zouch v. Bamfield———Le. 67. Mich. 29 and 30 Eliz. C. B. Stonely v. Bracebridge. ——— The Estate Tail is barred, and the Entry shall go to the Benefit of him that has most Right to the † Possession, and that is the Discontinuee. Owen 76. Hunt v. King.——Mo. 391. S. C. Hill 37 Eliz.

*3 Rep. 91. a. S. C. cited in the Case of Fines, and that the Heir in Tail was barred by the Stat 32 *H.* 8. tho' the Estate, which passed by the

3. Tenant

Fine, was utterly avoided before the Proclamations paſſed. By which it appears, that tho' the Eſtate, which paſſed by the Fine, be utterly defeated before the Proclamations; yet after the Proclamations paſſed, the Eſtate Tail ſhall be barred. ———Mo. 114. pl. 256. S. P.—252. S. P. —— And. 43 pl. 109. Anon. but ſeems to be S. C.———Bendl. 122. pl. 156. Anon. ſeems to be S. C.———S. C. cited And. 172. and 2 And. 177. in pl. 99.———Jenk. 275. pl. 96.———† If *Diſcontinuee enfeoffs Tenant in Tail*, the Inheritance is involved in the Poſſeſſion. Vid. Jenk. 286. pl. 21.

3. Tenant in Tail *diſcontinued* to B. and afterwards levied a *Fine to C.* ——The Fine bound the Eſtate Tail. 3 Le. 211. cites it as the Caſe of Lord Zouch.—Mo. 252. 253 —Jo. 36.—Cro. E. 610. Hunt v. King. S. P.—Jenk. 275. pl. 96.——Ow. 75. Hunt v. King.

3 Rep. 90. a. Tenant in Tail was *diſſeiſed*, and levied a Fine to a Stranger, it barred the Intail.

4. *Tenant in Tail Covenanted with his Son to ſtand ſeiſed to the Uſe of himſelf for Life*, and afterwards *to the Uſe of his Son in Tail*, the Remainder *to the right Heirs of the Father*; the Father levied a Fine with Proclamations and died. It was moved by Fenner, if any Eſtate paſſed to the Son by the Covenant, for it is not a Diſcontinuance, and ſo nothing paſſed but during his Life, and all the Eſtates which are to begin after his Death are void. Anderſon ſaid, The Eſtate paſſeth until, &c. Le. 110. pl. 150. Paſch. 30 Eliz. Anon.

5. *And* he cited the Caſe of one **Pitts**, where it was adjudged, that if *Tenant* in Tail of an *Advowſon in Groſs* grant the ſame in Fee, and an Anceſtor *Collateral* releaſeth with *Warranty*, and dieth, the ſame is a good Bar for ever. Le. 111. Anon. pl. 150. ut ſup.

6. If *Tenant in Tail* grants *Totum Statum*, and after levies a Fine thereof with Proclamations *Come ceo*, &c. the Iſſue is barred.—Secus, where the Fine is *on a Releaſe*, &c. per Wray. Trin. 33 Eliz. B. R. Le. 260. in Caſe of Manning v. Andrews.

7. *Remainder Man in Tail diſſeiſed Tenant for Life*, and levied a Fine, *Tenant for Life enters before Proclamation* paſſed, ſo as he defeated the Fine, and after the Proclamations were paſſed.——Tho' neither the Freehold, nor Inheritance in Fee were bound by this Fine, yet adjudged that the Intail was bound by it. Cited per Popham as Lord Sturton's Caſe.—And ſaid, ſo it ſhall be in all Caſes, where the Fine is levied by one, *to whom the Lands are entailed*, or who may claim as Heir in Tail. Paſch. 39 Eliz. B. R. Cro. E. 610. in Caſe of Hunt v. King.

8. A. Tenant in Tail, Remainder in Tail to B. Reverſion to the Right Heirs of A.—A * *Bargains and ſells* to J. S. in Fee, and then levies a Fine. This being levied after the Bargain and Sale, was no diſcontinuance; as it would have been, if levied before the Bargain and Sale; but operated only upon, and corroborated the Eſtate paſſed by the Bargain and Sale, which is an Eſtate in Fee, but determinable on the Entry of Iſſue in Tail, and on Failure of Iſſue of A. then ſubject to the Remainder to B. and a Fee expectant on the Determination of the Remainder to B. 10 Rep. 95. b. Mich. 10 Jac. † Seymour's Caſe.—— Jenk. 51. S. C.———Bulſt. 162.

A. Tenant in Tail, *Bargains and ſells to B. and his Heirs*, and after levies a Fine to C. and his Heirs to the Uſe of C. and his Heirs. B. has an Eſtate now to him and his Heirs during the Continuance of the Eſtate Tail. per Holt, Ch. J. Farr. 19. in Caſe of Machil v. Clerk.—† A. paſſed all his Eſtate by the Bargain and Sale, and had nothing more to paſs, but to extinguiſh the Eſtate Tail, by Way of Releaſe, and to leave the Remainder untouch'd. Jenk. 51. pl. 97. S. C.——* The Fine is void, becauſe the Bargain changed the Uſe, and ſo the Conuſor had nothing in Uſe, or Poſſeſſion, at the Time of the Fine. Br. Feoffment al. Uſes. pl. 7. cites 27 H. 8. 28.—— It was by Deed Indented and Inrolled, See the firſt Reſolution. 10 Rep. 96. S. C.———† Holt Ch. J. Held this Caſe to be good Law. 2 Salk. 619.

9. A Fine levied by Tenant in Tail *after a Bargain and Sale in Fee* works no Diſcontinuance or Wrong. But the Law, to avoid a Tort, doth *expound* it to Operate upon the Baſe Fee, that was formerly granted, which wrought no Diſcontinuance; as is adjudged, 10 Rep. 98. in Sir Edward Seymour's Caſe. And yet if the Fine had been levied *before the Bargain and Sale*, there it had been a *Diſcontinuance*; for then the Law had no

no Means to expound it otherwiſe. Arg. Paſch. 1653. C. B. Raym. 147. in Caſe of Corbet v. Stone.

10. Tenant in Tail *Covenants to ſtand ſeiſed* to the Uſe of *himſelf for Ninety-nine Years, if he ſhall ſo long live*, Remainder to his *firſt Son in Tail*, Remainder over, and afterwards levies a Fine.———Whether this Fine ſhall enure to the Conuſee, or to make good the Eſtate Tail levied by the Covenant was the Doubt? For per Hale, the Tenant in Tail does not limit the Eſtate *to himſelf for Life*, but *for Years*; ſo 'tis not like to **Blithman's Caſe**. Cro. E. 279. Nor to **Bedingfield's** 895. Where the firſt Eſtate, being to himſelf for Life, is all, that he had Power to diſpoſe of. But here he diſpoſes, by the firſt Limitation to himſelf, only an Eſtate for Years; and the Remainder to his Son may well ariſe out of the Reſidue of his Eſtate Tail, which he had Power to diſpoſe of for his Life; and ſo a *Remainder executed in the Son, corroborated by the Fine*; as **Duncomb and Wingfield's Caſe**. Hob. 254. where Tenant in Tail *Bargains and ſells*, and then levies a Fine; this corroborates the Eſtate of the Bargainee.——But the Deed being found forged, the Cauſe dropped. 2 Lev. 84. Paſch. 25 Car. 2. B. R. Whatley v. Greenfield.

(D. 4) By Feoffee, &c. of Tenant in Tail.

3 Rep. 87. a. b. Caſe of Fines. —— * Cro. E. 896. Penyſton v. Lyſter. — Noy. 46. S. C. — Pl. C. 374. a. —Godb. 301. Arg.

1. Tenant in Tail diſcontinues; the *Diſcontinuee* levies a Fine with Proclamations; *five Years paſs* without Claim *in the Life-time of Tenant in Tail*. In this Caſe the Iſſue ſhall have a Formedon, and ſhall not be barred; for his Father could not claim. 'Tis otherwiſe where he is diſſeiſed, and the * *Diſſeiſor* levies ſuch Fine; for in ſuch Caſe the Tenant in Tail may claim, &c. Jenk. 192. pl. 97.

2. *Feoffment by Tenant in Tail*, and then a Fine is levied by Conuſee, [Feoffee] the Tenant in Tail has no Right remaining in him, and the Iſſue in Tail is the firſt, that has Right to impeach it. Cro. C. 430. Mich. 11 Car. B. R. in the Caſe of Stone v. Newman.

(D. 5) Where it is levied by a Remainder Man, and a Conveyance is after made by Tenant in Tail in Poſſeſſion.

The *Son levied a Fine* in his Life of his Mother, ſhe afterwards leaſed the Land for 21 Years, not reſerving the ancient Rent, and died. The Son had Iſſue a Daughter, and deviſed the Land to J. S. adjudged a good Leaſe to bind the Deviſee. Cro. J. 688. Trin. 21 Jac. S. C.——affirmed in Cam. Scacc. Cro. J. 689. and ſaid there to have been reſolved in Caſe of York v. Sparham.

1. *Husband and Wife were Tenants in Tail, Remainder to the Husband in Fee, he died*, and after his Death, the Son and *Heir of the Husband and Wife levied a Fine*, &c. to the Uſe of him and his Heirs; and afterwards the *Wife made a Leaſe of the Lands* for 21 Years, and died; the Son deviſed the ſaid Lands to G. D. and died, and the Queſtion being whether this Leaſe ſhall be good againſt the Deviſee; it was adjudged, that the Iſſue in Tail himſelf was barred by this Fine to avoid the Leaſe; and that tho' the Eſtate Tail was barred, yet 'tis not quite extinguiſhed; but ſhall have a Being to ſupport the Leaſe, ſo long as any of the Iſſue in Tail are living. Bridg. 28. Crocker v. Kelſey.

2. If Tenant in Tail, after Fine levied by the Iſſue, makes *Feoffment*, and dies, the Feoffee ſhall hold the Land againſt the Iſſue and his Conuſee; For if the Iſſue brings Formedon, the Feoffee may plead his Fine againſt him; and the Iſſue ſhall be concluded to avoid the Fine, by ſaying, Partes Finis nihil habuerunt; and the Conuſee cannot have a Formedon,

don, or any other Action or Entry to recover the Land; and ſo the Feoffee ſhall hold as long as there is any Iſſue, and then Remainder Man, or Reverſioner, ſhall have Formedon to recover the Land, per Jones J. and not denied by any. Hill. 22 Jac. B. R. Jo. 61. in Caſe of Crocker v. Kelley.

3. A. has Iſſue 2 Sons B. and C.—*B. in the Life of A.* levies a Fine with Proclamations; now *A. may convey*, and paſs *this Land, to whom he pleaſe, by Virtue of the Fine by his Son*, and the Vendee may plead againſt the Conuſee, Quod Partes nihil habuerunt; and againſt the Heir in Tail, he may plead the Fine of his Father. Jenk. 275. pl. 96. S. P. per Hobert. Ch. J. Hob. 258. For the Fine in this Caſe, does *only extinguiſh the Tail*, but cannot give it by his Conveyance, who had not ſo much as a Right, [nor] a *Poſſibility, tho' there were a Poſſibility* [in him.] So the Statute leaves the Form and Effect of the Fine (as to all Purpoſes and Perſons, but the Iſſues in Tail) to the ordinary Rules of Law; whereof one is, that a Conveyance to one by him that hath but a naked Right or Poſſibility, works by the Extinguiſhment of it in the Poſſeſſion.

(D. 6) Where there is a Diſſeiſin.

1. *A. Diſſeiſor enfeoffs B. on Condition*; *B. levies Fine* with Proclamations; 5 Years paſs; the Condition is broken; the Diſſeiſor re-enters; the *Diſſeiſee* is bound; For by the Fine and Nonclaim the Right of every Stranger is barred; and when A. enters for the Condition broken, the Fine is not annoyed, but rather affirmed; and *former Rights* ſhall not be revived. Le. 84. Mich. 29 and 30 Eliz. C. B. in Caſe of Zouch v. Bampfield.

2. Tenant in Tail enfeoffed his Son of full Age, and after *diſſeiſed* him, and levies a Fine with Proclamations; and *before the laſt Proclamation* the Son *enters, and makes Feoffment*. Now the Proclamations expire, and the Father and Son die.—Feoffee makes Leaſe to a Stranger and dies ſeiſed.—It ſeemed to the Court, that the Entail was bound by the Fine with Proclamations. Mo. 391. Hill. 37 Eliz. King v. Hunt. Cro. E. 610. S. C. and the Court being of Opinion, that the Eſtate Tail was bound by the Fine, they reverſed a Judgment to the contrary given in C. B. Hunt v. King.

3. If Tenant in Tail be diſſeiſed, and *Diſſeiſor levies a Fine*, and *Tenant in Tail ſuffers* 5 Years to paſs without Claim; that ſhall bind the Iſſue. For Tenant in Tail had a Right at the Time of the Fine levied, and therefore the Iſſue is not within the Saving. Cro. E. 896. Trin. 44 Eliz. in the Court of Wards, in the Caſe of Penyſton v. Lyſter. Jenk. 192. S. 97. 3 Rep. 87. a. b. Caſe of Fines. —Pl. C. 374. a. per Dier. —S. P. per Dyer and Catlin, for the Right was preſent to the Tenant in Tail at the Time of the Fine levied, and he *cannot claim but by the ſame Title, which his Father had*, which was barred in his Life Time. Weſt's Symb. S. 183. cites Dy. 3. pl. 6. 19 H. 8. 7.

The like it is of the Laches of him in the *Remainder or Reverſion*, for it barreth him and his Heirs. Weſt's Symb. S. 183. cites Dy. 3. pl. 6.

4. A *Diſſeiſor makes a Leaſe for Life*, and afterwards levies a Fine with Proclamations to a Stranger; *altho' he had only a Reverſion*, yet this Fine and Nonclaim ſhall bar the Diſſeiſee. Jenk. 254. pl. 45.

(D. 7) By Tenant in Tail Diſſeiſee.

1. Tenant in Tail is diſſeiſed, and *during Diſſeiſin* levies a Fine to a Stranger, Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo, &c. The Heir in Tail is barred. He cannot aver, Quod Partes nihil, &c. by Force of 27 *E.* 1. of Fines. But before the Statute 4 *H.* 7. he might have had Formedon. At this Day the Diſſeiſor ſhall have Advantage of this Fine; and ſhall plead the *Fine to the Stranger*, whoſe Eſtate he has; and the Heir in Tail muſt anſwer to the Fine, and ſhall not be received to traverſe the *Que Eſtate*. Jenk. 274. pl. 96. Arg. to which Popham and Fenner J. agreed. Noy. 59. in Caſe of Hart v. Ameredith.

2. Tenant in Tail *diſſeiſed accepts a Fine* Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo, &c. *of a Stranger, and renders* the ſame Land to the Stranger.

This being *with Proclamations*, bars the Intail by the 4 H. 7. and 32 H. 8. In this Caſe, the Fine, being a Fine by Concluſion, ſhall bar the Heir in Tail; for he is privy to the *Eſtoppel*. Jenk. 275. pl. 96.

3. If he that is ſeiſed of Land, to which an *Advowſon* is Appendant, be diſſeiſed, and the Diſſeiſee levies a Fine to a Stranger of the Land, to which the Appendancy is; the Diſſeiſor ſhall keep the Land, and by Conſequence the Advowſon for ever; For the Diſſeiſee againſt his own Fine cannot claim, and the Conuſee cannot enter; the Right which the Diſſeiſee had, being extinct by the Fine. Wats. Comp. Inc. fol. 443, 444. cites 2 Rep. * 56. and Terms of Law, Verbo Diſſeiſor; but ſays that † 1 Cro. 484. ſeems contra.

* Buckler's Caſe.
† This ſeems miſ-cited.

(D. 8) By whom. In Reſpect of Eſtate. Before actual Commencement.

1. If one, who has but a *Condition*, levies a Fine; and *after levying the Fine, enters for Condition broken*, his Iſſue is barred by the Fine. See 3 Le. 227. pl. 304. Anon.

2. A. *deviſed* his Lands *to Truſtees for* 99 *Years*, for Payment of his *Debts*; and *if they did not act*, he deviſed them *to T. S. and his Heirs, in Truſt, to pay his Debts*, and afterwards *to B. in Tail*, Remainder to *C.--B. levied a Fine*, and died without Iſſue; and 5 Years paſſed with *Nonclaim*. Decreed that C. the Remainder Man in Tail was bound, tho' 'twas inſiſted that the Title of C. was not yet commenced, becauſe the *Debts were not paid*, and the Term of 99 Years was ſubſiſting, and that the entire Eſtate at Law being in the Truſtees, they ſhould have entered; yet 'twas decreed to be barred P. 11 Geo. 9 Mod. 144. in Caſe of Webber v. E. of Montrath.——cited per Cur. as the Caſe of Basket v. Pierce.

3. A. by Fine *conveyed the Manors of K. and N. to B.* viz. *K. to the Uſe of B. his Heirs and Aſſigns*, and *N. to the Uſe of M.* the Wife of C. *for her Life, and after to the Uſe of the Heirs of C. until M. ſhould evict B. his Heirs, Aſſigns*, &c. *of the Manor of K.* or any part thereof; and *after to the Uſe of B. his Heirs and Aſſigns, till ſatisfied by the Profits*. B. by Fine, conveyed the Manor of K. to D. in Fee. C. died, and M. recovered Dower againſt D. of Parcel of K. and entred. D. entred into N. Reſolved that D. could not enter as Aſſignee, but that by the Words, Heirs and Aſſigns, which are Words of Limitation, the Uſe on Eviction ought firſt to veſt in B. and his Heirs; and that before the Eviction, D. had no Title of Entry as Aſſignee, it not being an Intereſt aſſignable over before the Eviction. Hill. 9 Car. Cro. C. 358. E. of Kent v. Steward and Scott.

(D. 9) Who may be Cognizees.

1. All Perſons, that may be Grantees, or that might take by Contract, may be Cognizees, or take by Fine; as *Infants Perſons of full Age, Feme Coverts, Ideots, Lunaticks, Corporations Spiritual, or Temporal, Men attainted of Felony, or Treaſon*, Men *outlawed in perſonal Actions, Baſtards, Clerks convict, Villains*, **Aliens*, &c. but not thoſe that are civilly dead, *as Monks*, &c. Weſt. Symb. S. 15.

* A Fine ſhall not be levied to an *Alien*; for after Office the King ſhall have the Land. Denſh. R. of Fines 13.

2. An Abbot, *Dean and Chapter, Mayor and Commonalty*, and ſuch like *Corporations*, may be Cogniſees in Fines: *but before the ingroſſing* of the Fines to ſuch a Corporation, *a Writ ought to be directed* to the Juſtices of the Common Pleas, *Quod permittant Finem illum levari*, 5 H. 7. 25. 19 H. 6. 15. A Prior may be a Cogniſee, 22 Ed. 4. 15 Ed. 4. 22. Weſt. Symb. S. 15.

3. The *Queen* at this Day, and at Common Law, may levy a Fine; and a Fine may be levied to her. Denſh. R. on Fines 12. cites 13 H. 4.

(D. 10) What Perſons may levy a Fine. Ideots, Infants, &c. and at what Time ſuch Fines may be reverſed, &c.

1. 18 *E.* 1. *Stat.* 4. §. 6. *Enacts that the Parties be of full Age, ſound Memory, and out of Priſon.*

2. If an *Ideot* levies a Fine, *and after it be found by Office, that he is Ideot* from his Nativity, *yet the Fine is good; but if it be found by Office, that one is an Ideot, and ‡ after he levies a Fine; this Fine will bind him and his Heirs; yet the King hath the Freehold during the Life of the Ideot. Quære, if it will bind the Heir as to the Reverſion, in as much as the Title of the King was to the Freehold, during the Life of the Ideot. Denſh. R. of Fines 12. cites 12 E. 1.

* S.P. 2 And. 193. Lewis v. Winne—‡ S. P. 12 Rep. 123. Mich. 12 Jac. Manſfield's Caſe.—Fine levied by an *Ideot, a Nativitate* ſhall ſtand good. For by the Common Law,

3. Fine by *Ideot* ſtol'n from his Guardian, and who was after found an Ideot, by which the King had Poſſeſſion. After the Death of the Ideot, 'twas decreed in Chancery, that the Remainder Man ſhould give the Conuſee 60*l.* and he ſhould make a Reconveyance. Arg. Roll. R. 115. in Caſe of Dey v. Hungat—cites Ruſhly's Caſe.

neither the King in this Caſe upon Office, nor the Heir, nor any other can defeat or avoid this Fine, by Error, Averment or otherwiſe; and by admitting an Averment of Ideocy, the Act of the Court (which is judicial) will be falſified, which is not convenient; and the Court by allowing of the Fine, having teſtified that he was no Ideot at the time of his levying the Fine, it ſhall not be controuled by an Office found after his Death. 2 And. 193. Lewis's Caſe, alias Lewis v. Wynn.———Br. Fines pl. 75. cites 17 E. 3. 52. and 78.—and 17 Aſſ. p. 17.———Remainder Man in Fee was relieved againſt the Purchaſor. Toth. 104. cites Trin. 10 Jac. Ruſhley v. Mansfield.

4. *Ideots and Madmen*, if they are admitted, are barred as Parties. Wood's Inſt. 243.—See Co. R. on Fines. 9.

If they are *of Age* a Fine by them ſhall conclude their Heirs, and the Fine ſhall not be reverſed. Co. R. on Fines. 17.

5. *Error ſhall be brought* to reverſe a Fine levied by an Infant within Age, by the ſame Infant *during his Nonage*; ſo that he may be adjudged by *Inſpection*, whether he be within Age or not. Br. Fines. pl. 79. cites 27 Aſſ. 53.

If an Infant, being a *Feme Covert*, or *other *Infant*, levies a Fine by Grant and Render to her or him in Tail, or for Life, and the *Husband dies*; the Widow ſhall not have a *Writ of Error*, becauſe ſhe is Tenant of the Land; and ſhe cannot have Error againſt herſelf, and ſo is without Remedy, per Catlin. Owen 33. Hill. 40 Eliz. Anon.—But it ſeems it ſhould be Trin. 6 Eliz. as in Mo. 74. pl. 202.——* S. P. per Catlin, that the Infant ſhall not have a Writ of Error to deſtroy the Fine, *Becauſe he himſelf is ſeiſed of the Land*; and ſo he is without Remedy. Trin. 6 Eliz. in the Star-Chamber. Mo. 74. pl. 202. Anon.——If the Fine of an Infant is *not avoided during his Minority*, it ſhall bind him. Co. R. on Fines 8. ſays it has been ſo adjudged; contrary to Catlin's Opinion in Stowel's Caſe.——*So* Wood's Inſt. 243. becauſe his Infancy muſt be tried by Inſpection of the Judges: But if he dies in his Infancy, his Heir is not limited to any Time.——*At*, in a Writ of Error brought by an Infant upon a Fine levied; the Plaintiff ſued a *Scire facias* againſt the Conuſee; for whom a † *Protection* was caſt; and the *Court examined* the Age of the Plaintiff, *and by Inſpection adjudged him within Age; and recorded the ſame*, and then allowed the Protection; and this can be no Miſchief to the Plaintiff; whereupon it follows, that albeit the *Plaintiff dies afterwards before the Fine be reverſed, yet* after his Age adjudged and recorded, *his Heir ſhall* in that Caſe *reverſe the Fine*, for the Nonage of his Anceſtor. And ſo it was reſolved in the Caſe of Kettewiche, in a Writ of Error brought by him, by the Opinion of the whole Court of B. R. otherwiſe it is if the Plaintiff dies before his Age inſpected. Co. Litt. 131. a.——† Br. Error pl. 60. cites 21 E. 3. 20. and that the Infant was firſt examined, and then his Godfather and Godmother, and that they put the Plea ſine Die, ſaving to the Defendant his Anſwer at the new Garniſhment, and all this was *upon the Tranſcript of the Note*, but the Judgment ſhall be upon the Note itſelf.

6. *Infant dies*, the Fine muſt ſtand. 1 Mod. 246. Paſch. 29 Car. 2. C. B. Barrow v. Parrot.——2 Vent. 30. S. C. Perrot's Caſe. Co. R. on Fines 17.

7. Fines levied *by Infants, vacated* upon Complaint of Remainder Man in Fee, expectant upon Eſtate Tail, and on bringing the Infants into Court; and Information ordered againſt Commiſſioners that took the Conuſance. 3 Lev. 36. Mich. 33 Car. 2. C. B. Hutchinſon's Caſe.

8. If

See (A. 3.) *Stat.* 18 *E.* 1. *S.* 7. and the Notes thereon.——Writ of Error was brought to reverſe a

8. If a *married Woman under Age*, (of which the Judges may examine her upon Oath) doth levy a Fine with her Husband of her own Lands, ſhe can't reverſe it during her Husband's Life; nor after his Death, if ſhe is of full Age, when he dies. She can only reverſe it, if her Husband dies during her Minority. Wood's Inſt. 243.

Fine levied by a Feme Covert during her Nonage, and *at the Scire facias* ad Audiendum Errores the *Defendant caſt Protection*, and yet the Juſtices tried the Age of the Infant by *Inſpection*, and did not ſtay it till the Expiration of the Protection. Co. R. on Fines 1-. Marg.

Error was brought by both of a Fine ſo levied, ſhe being yet within Age, and per Cavendiſh, if they reverſe the Fine for Nonage of the Feme, *yet no Execution ſhall be awarded during her Life*, *Quod non negatur.* Br. Fines. pl. 29. cites 50 E. 3. 5.——* The Year Book of 50 E. 3. 5. b. 6. pl. 12. is that Execution cannot be till *after the Death of the Baron.*

Denſh. R. on Fines. 11, 12.

9. Perſons *blind*, *deaf*, *or dumb accidentally*, may make Cogniſance if they can expreſs their Meaning by Writing. Weſt. Symb. 2. b. S. 5.

Denſh. R. on Fines. 11, 12. See Co. R. on Fines. 9. ——So one born Deaf, and Dumb, and he was brought before Judge Warburton to levy a Fine. Judge Warburton would do nothing, till he had acquainted his Brothers; then he examined him, and found him intelligent, and ſo he took the Fine; cited per Bridgman. Ch. J. Cart. 53. as Hill's Caſe.

10. Lord Ch. J. Bridgman acquainted the Court of C. B. that a Woman, *born Deaf and Dumb*, came before him to levy a Fine. She and her 3 Siſters have an Houſe and Land. An Uncle hath maintained her, and taken great Care of her, and he is to buy the Houſe and Land of them; and he agrees to maintain her, if ſhe will paſs her Land for Security. As for her *Intelligence*, the Siſters ſay, ſhe knows and underſtands the meaning of all this. He demanded, what *Sign* ſhe would make *for paſſing away her Lands*; and, as it was interpreted to him, ſhe put her Hands that Way, where the Lands lay, and ſpread out her Hands. It being a Buſineſs of this Nature, and for her own good, he thought fit to communicate it to them; and the Fine was taken by the Conſent of the other Juſtices. Cart. 53. Trin. 18 Car. 2. Elliot (Martha's) Caſe.

11. *Monks*, *Friars*, *Nuns*, &c. ought not to be received; yet *if they are admitted*, their Fines are good and unavoidable. Wood's Inſt. 241.

12. If the *Heir* being *in Ward* of any other, levies a Fine; this will bind the Heir for ever, if it be not reverſed by Error within Age; and if he be of full Age, in Ward of the King, it never ſhall be avoided. But where the Heir in Ward of the King at his full Age, intrudes upon the Poſſeſſion of the King, and levies a Fine; this is void as to the Title of the King, *Quia nullum accreſcet ei liberum Tenementum*, *ſi ingrediatur*, *antequam Homagium & Seiſinam ceperit de Rege.* But it ſeems good againſt the Party and his Heirs. Denſh. R. on Fines. 12. cites 1 H. 7. 26.

13. *But* where the *King* is *ſeiſed of Land*, *as in Name of Diſtreſs*, as for Alienation without Licence, &c. and he, who hath Right, enters, and levies a Fine; 'tis good, and will bind him and his Heirs for ever. Denſh. R. on Fines 12.

14. The *Queen* at this Day, and at Common Law, may levy a Fine. Denſh. R. on Fines 12 cites 13 H. 4.

But it ſhall not conclude the *King* after Office found. Co. R. on Fines. 17.

15. An *Alien* who hath purchaſed Land in England, can't levy a Fine, if the Court perceive it; but if the Fine be levied, it ſeems that 'tis good, and ſhall never be reverſed. Denſh. R. on Fines. 13.

16. Fine was levied *by A. in the Name of B.* but a Reconveyance decreed. Roll. R. 115. in Caſe of Day v. Hungate.——cites the Caſe of Gilderbrand v. Hubard.

[See (D. 11).]

(D. 11) Vacated.

1. *Feme Infant*, Tenant in Tail, levies a Fine *with her Baron*. The Fine was vacated, tho' the King's Silver was paid; and the Exemplification was brought into Court, and delivered up, and the Commiſſioners ordered to be proſecuted. But the Vacat was *Quoad the Feme only*, and not as to the Baron. 3 Lev. 36. Mich. 23 Car. 2. C. B. Hutchinſon's Caſe.

Skin. 23. S. C. by Name of Serjeant Buckby's Caſe. — And Tr. 34 Car. 2. another Fine was vacated for the ſame Cauſe. 3. Lev. 36. cites it as Sir Robert Maſſam's Caſe.

2. *But the Feme dying before any thing was ſtirred* as to the Fine, it was agreed per tot. Cur. that they could not meddle with the Fine. But if ſhe had been alive, and ſtill under Age, they might bring her in by *Habeas Corpus*, and inſpect her, and ſet the Fine aſide upon Motion. 2 Vent. 80. Paſch. 29 Car. 2. C. B. Herbert Perrot's Caſe.

3. In the Common Pleas, they will *ſet aſide* a Fine levied by an Infant (*during his Life and Infancy*) *upon Motion*, as null and void, and without any Writ of Error; as they will do a Judgment irregularly obtained by Trick or Surprize, and puniſh the Commiſſioners beſides, if taken by Dedimus; and they will do this by *Inſpection and Examination of Witneſſes in Court*; but if he be affirmed to be of Age, they will order a *Trial by a feigned Action*, if Infant or no? But the Complaint muſt be before he comes of Age, and then it matters not if after the Motion, (and ſo if after a Writ of Error) he arrives at Age, this will not prejudice him. So if the *next Heir*, or any Relation come and *inform the Court*, *that the Party was a Feme Covert*, and levied a Fine without her Husband, they will ſet it aſide as void. 2 Show. 281. Hill. 34 and 35 Car. 2. B. R. Caſe of vacating Fines in C. B.

4. Several Precedents were produced of Fines, Recoveries and Declarations of Uſes thereupon, being vacated on Motions, becauſe of their being by *Femes Covert under Age*; and one of the Rules produced was, that the Feme ſhould not be admitted to levy any more Fines, till ſhe came of Age. And another, that the Counſel, who had adviſed it, ſhould be fined 14*l.* becauſe no Writ of Error could lie. And another, that the Huſband be fined 100*l.* And in the Caſes of * **Sir Robert Marſham**, a 6 Clerk procured his Wife under Age to levy a Fine; and being ſent for into Court, he was fain to deliver the Fine and the Deed of Uſes to be cancelled in Court. And per Powell, if the Commiſſioners, before whom the Fine was taken, knew the Feme to be under Age, they are finable: But there are *no Precedents of Vacats* of this Kind *ancienter than* † 4 *Jac.* 1. But the true *ancient Way* was to bring a Writ of Error; but becauſe the Husband would not join in the Writ of Error, &c. this Way was introduced: And ſome Books ſay, that if Feme Covert be outlawed without her Huſband, there is no Remedy for her; but now in ſuch Caſe the Court will diſcharge her upon Motion. But in this Caſe, there appears that there is a *Purchaſor*; and therefore we ought to be well adviſed. But in Regard the *Feme* is to be *of Age in* 2 *or* 3 *Days* Time, let us De bene eſſe *examine* her Age by *Affidavits and Inſpection*; and that was done, and the Inſpections *entered on Record*; and the Rule was to ſee Precedents, and to give Notice to the Purchaſor. Hill. 12 W. 3. C. B. 12 Mod. 444. Sarah Griffith's Caſe.

* S. C. cited 3 Lev. 36. as of Trin. 34 Car. 2. and cited Skin. 24. as of Mich. 33 Car. 2. between Boyer and Hutchenſon.

† Hill. 4 Jac. 1. Rot. 70. Pierpoint's Caſe cited in 3 Lev. 36. in Hutchinſon's Caſe—and in Skin. 24. in Serjeant Buckby's Caſe.

5 A. having *inveigled his Wife* to levy a Fine of her Land to him, *when ſhe lay on her Death-Bed*; pretending as was ſuggeſted, he was to have it only for his Life; and a Dedimus was ſent into the Country to take the Fine, and the *Caption* was *taken about* 100 *Miles from London*, *the very Day ſhe died*; and becauſe the Fine would not have ſtood, the Party being dead before the King's Silver was paid, the *Writ of Covenant* was *razed in the Teſte*, and made to bear Date 10 Days backwards; and all

other Parts of the Fine were razed likewiſe, and made to correſpond with it; and the King's Silver was paid, and ſo *all appeared on the Record to have been done before the Death of the Woman*; on a Bill brought to have the Fine ſet aſide, or to have a Reconveyance, it was held by the Court, that tho' *Chancery has a Power* to relieve, as much againſt a Fine, obtained by Fraud or Practice, as any other Kind of Conveyance; yet that ſuch Relief was *not by decreeing a Vacate of the Fine, but by ordering a Reconveyance*; but that for any Error in the Fine, or Irregularity, or ill Practice in the Commiſſioners, it was a Matter properly cognizable in that Court where the Fine was levied, and for which that Court may vacate the Fine; and there being no Proof of Fraud or Practice in this Caſe, the Bill was diſmiſſed. Hill. 1700. Abr. Eq. Caſes. 259. St. John v. Turner.

[See (E. b. 2)]

(D. 12) By Tenant in Tail. In Reſpect of his Eſtate. What Eſtate barred.

1. Land was given by A. and others *to B. for his Life, Remainder to C.* (who was Heir apparent) to B. *et* * *Primogenito Filio & Hered. Maſcul. of the ſaid C.* to be begotten, *& ſic de Primogenito Filio & Herede Maſculo ipſius C.* de Corpore ſuo procreand' *in Primogenitum Filium et Hæred. Maſcul.* de Corpore ſuo procreand. *et pro Defectu* talis Exitus remanere inde *to D.* the 2d Son of the aforeſaid A *& Primogenito Filio ipſius D.* with Remainders over in like manner as are limited to C. &c. and then limits a *Remainder to the Heirs Males of the Body of the ſaid D. and A. the Father, to be begotten.* 'Twas agreed per Cur. that D had Eſtate Tail in Remainder, after the Death of his Father, in the one Moiety, and the Father had Eſtate Tail in the other *Moiety*; and that a Fine with Proclamations might bar his Moiety, and adjudged accordingly; and the Court held that the Words *Primogenito Filio in Primogenitum Filium, &c.* were *void* Words. And. 264. Smye v. Chown, alias Cotton's Caſe.

* Thoſe Words make no Entail. Cro. E. 220. S. C.—Le. 211. S. C. Cotton's Caſe.—Savil. 127. S. C. Trin. 32 El.

(D. 13) By whom Fines may be levied. Perſons under legal Diſabilities by Crimes.

1. Perſons *attainted or waived in Perſonal Actions* may alien by Fine or otherwiſe; for their Eſtates remain in them ſtill, tho' they thereby forfeit the Profits of their Lands. 9 H. 6. 20. 21 H. 7. 7. Weſt. Symb. S. 13.

S. P. Wood's Inſt. 241.

2. Perſons attainted of *Felony and Treaſon* may not be Cognizors, by Reaſon that by their Offences their Eſtates are forfeited: * But if they do, their Fines are *good againſt all Perſons but the King and the Lord*, of whom the Lands are holden, for their Times. 8 Aſſ. pl. 25. For their Eſtates remain in them during their Lives. Weſt. Symb. S. 13.

Denſh. R. of Fines. 13. * S. P. Wood's Inſt. 241.

[See (D. 10)—Utlawry.]

(E) To whom it may be levied; [*or who may take by it, in Reſpect of Eſtate.*]

1. A Fine Sur Releaſe may be levied to the * 2d Tenant by his Warranty. 18 E. 3. 12. b.

* *Orig.* is (2. Tenant per garranty.)

This Caſe ſeems obſcure, and therefore have taken it from the Year-Book and Fitzh. which are as follows, viz.

Note, that in Writ of Dower brought by the Baron and Feme, where the 2d Tenant by his Warranty was Party; a Fine Sur Releaſe was levied between him and the Demandants, viz. that the Demandants ſhould

ſhould releaſe to the Tenant all, which they had of the Right of the Feme by his Warranty, [Per ſa Garrantie.] Paſch. 18 E. 3. 12. b. pl. 3.

In Dower the 2d Tenant by his Warranty entered into the Warranty, and a Fine was levied between the Demandant and him, by which the Demandant releaſed and quitclaimed all the Right, &c. which was admitted, and yet none of them had any thing in &c. Fitzh. tit. Fines. pl. 102. cites P. 18. E. 3. 12.

[See (D. 9) S. P.]

(F) Fine of Land, upon what Writ. In what Caſes being levied by a Feme Covert, ſhe ſhall be examined.

N. B. *This Letter* (F) *might be more properly divided thus, viz.*
In what Caſes being levied by Feme Covert, *ſhe ſhall be* examined (F).
Levied without Writ, *in what Caſes it may be* (F. 2).
Levied upon what Writ (F. 3).

1. IF Baron and Feme grant by Fine, **the Feme ſhall be examined** 33 H. 6. 31. **per Priſot.** As to Examination. Vid. (A. 3)

Statute 18 *E.* 1. *S.* 7. and the Notes thereon, and (M) per totum.

2. But **upon a** Grant and Render to a Feme Covert **ſhe ſhall not be examined: For ſhe is at no Prejudice, but ſhall be in her Remitter,** (Quere the Remitter.) 33 H. 6. 31. Where they take by a Fine, *and depart from nothing*, ſhe ſhall not be examined. 2 Inſt. 215.——————Br. Eſtoppel. pl. 92. cites 15 E. 4. 28

[(F. 2) *Without Writ.*]

3. **A Fine** cannot be levied without a Writ. 12 H. 4. 12. 18 *E.* 1 *Stat.* 4. *The Order*

of the Law, will not ſuffer a final Accord to be levied in the King's Court, without a Writ Original.

The Ignorance, or Error of ſome Judges, was the Cauſe of the declaring the Law herein. 2 Inſt. 513.—The Writ is the very Baſis, Ground and Foundation of the Fine, whereby the Parties have Day in Court to levy the ſame, and containeth the Perſons and Things to be paſſed certainly. Weſt's Symb. S. 23.——————Co. R. on Fines. 3.

4. **In** ancient Times **a Fine might be levied without an Original.** 21 E. 4. 62. 16 E. 3. 19 E. 3. Abbe 13.

5. But now **a Fine cannot be levied without a Writ.** 12 H. 4. 12. Nor can it be levied

upon an Original determined. As where the Plaintiff entered a *Retraxit*, by which it was awarded, that Defendant *eat inde ſine Die*; the Parties can not come and have a Compoſition between them, in Nature of a Fine; for the Original is determined, and they have no Day in Court. Br. Fines. pl. 82. cites 37. Aſſ. 17.—Co. R. on Fines 10.

6. But **if ſuch Fine be levied at this Day without Original, it is not void, but** * good 'till it be reverſed. 21 E. 4. 62. Com. Count ‡ Leſtrange. 394. b. S. P. and it is voidable by Writ of Error; and ſo it is, when

there is an Original Writ, and the Fine is levied, as well *of a Thing contained in the Writ, as of another Thing not contained in it*, it is voidable for what is not contained in it. 2 Inſt. 513, 514.

So if the Fine is *levied immediately to a Perſon not named in the Writ of Covenant*; as if A. be Plaintiff in the Writ againſt C. and C. levies the Fine to A. and B it is voidable by Writ of Error. 2 Inſt. 514.—Denſh. R. on Fines. 16. cites 21 E. 3. and 2 E. 3——Co. R. on Fines. 10. For it is not Coram non Judice, inaſmuch as the Juſtices have Power of the Thing, tho' they proceed *Inverſo Ordine.*——* Br. Fines. pl. 97. cites 18 E. 4. 22. by Brian.——It is not void, but Error; For they are Judges of the Thing. Br. Aſſiſe. pl. 397. cites 26 H 6 ——————‡ It is in the Caſe of the Count, or Earl of Leiceſter v. Heydon, and ſo ſeems miſprinted.

7. But **it is** Erroneous. 21 E. 4. 60. b. Com. 394. b.

(F. 3)

In Aſſiſe, the *Plaintiff appeared, and after made Retraxit*, and then *the Juſtices of Aſſiſe recorded an Agreement between them in Nature of a Fine*, and by the beſt Opinion it is void, and Coram non Judice, and ſhall not be executed, by Reaſon that *no Original was pending*, but was *determined before by the Retraxit*; and ſo ſee, that Judgment, where there is no Original, is void by this Opinion. Br. Judgment. pl. 114. cites 37. Aſſ. 17.——and ſee 26 H 6. where it was held, that it was Error, and * not void. But quære inde; For without Original they have no Commiſſion to hold Plea, and then they are not Judges of this Cauſe; and of this Opinion was Bromley. Ch. J. H. 2. M. 1. Ibid.——————* For they are Judges of this Cauſe, and therefore Nul tiel Record of Writ of Covenant, upon which ſuch Fine was levied is no Plea. Ibid. pl. 130. cites 26 H. 6.

[(F. 3) *Upon what Writ.*]

They are now thought to be againſt the Height and Force of a Fine. 2 Inſt. 514.——* Orig. (Perſonal.)

8. In ancient Times Fines were levied upon Actions mixt with the * Perſonalty. 18 E. 4. 22. The Prior of Merton's Caſe.

9. But at this Day ſuch Fines are not good; but only ſuch Fines as are levied upon Writ of Covenant or upon Actions in Right or Realty. 18 E. 4. 22. per Litt.

Co. R. on Fines. 10.

10. A Fine may be levied of an Annuity upon Writ of Annuity. 18 E. 4. 22. 11 H. 4. 68. b. 20 H. 6. 3. Contra admitted 44 E. 3. 37, 38.

11. A Fine may be levied upon a Writ of Right Patent. 19 E. 4. 8. b. 21 E. 4, 5.

On ſuch Writ a Fine may be levied *of Rent* or *Services*, &c. But *not of Land*.

12. Fine may be [upon a] Writ of Right of Cuſtoms and Services. 19 E. 4. 8. b. 18 E. 4. 22. 21. E. 4. 4. b. 21 E. 3. 18. b. 53. 21 Aſſ. 1. 20 Aſſ. 1. 24 E. 3. 29. b.

Denſh. R. on Fines. 16.——————D. 179. b. pl. 46. Paſch. 2 Eliz. Bruce v. Bonet.——————Bendl. 116. S. C. See a Precedent there.

In antient Time, in *Quare impedit*, a Fine might have been levied of an Advowſon; but at this Day, ſuch Fine is not receivable, becauſe *'tis only a perſonal Action*, but in the Time of K. Henry 3. Fines were often levied in ſuch Perſonal Actions. Co. R. on Fines. 10.——————2 Inſt. 514.

13. A Fine has been levied in a Quare Impedit. 18 E. 4. 22. 19 E. 4. 8. b. of the Advowſon.

In Times paſt Fines were as uſually levied upon a Writ of *Warrantia Chartæ*, as now they are upon a *Writ of Covenant*. Co. R. on Fines 10.——Weſt's Symb. S. 23. cites 18 E. 4. 22.——[* And ſo it ſeems it ſhould be here.]

14 So in a Warrantia Chartæ. * 18 E. 4. 2. 21 E. 4. 4. b. 61. b. of the Land. 42 E. 3. 5. 12 H. 4. 12.

In a Writ of *Rationabilibus diviſis*, if a *Piſcary*, *or other Thing be allotted* by the Dividers *to one* of the Parties; in Conſideration thereof the ſaid Party *may levy a Fine of an Annual Rent to the other* for the ſaid Piſcary, and this Fine is good enough, and receivable. Co. R. on Fines 10. cites 20 H. 6 3. a. but the Book ſeems miſ-cited.

15. So in a Rationabilibus diviſis. 19 E. 4. 4. b. 29 E. 3. 3 b. 25 E. 3, 46. 20 H. 6. 3. 1 E. 3. 14 b.

2 Inſt. 514. ——Co. R. on Fines 11. cites 31 E. 3. and Br. Fines. pl. * 90.——* This ſeems miſprinted.

16. So in Aſſiſe of Darrein Preſentment. 21 E. 4. 4. b. of the Patronage. 43 E. 3.

17. In a Franchiſe upon a Writ of Right Patent by Proteſtation in Nature of a Covenant, a Fine cannot be levied; For the Proteſtation cannot change the Plea Real into the Perſonalty. The ſame Law is of ſuch Fines in Ancient Demeſne. 44 E. 3. 38.

18. A Fine may be levied in an Aſſiſe. 16 E. 3. 19 E. 3. Abbe 13 adjudged.

19. So in a Præcipe quod reddat. Abbe 13. per Thorp.

20. A

20. A Fine upon Releaſe may be levied in Writ of Dower. 18 E. 3. 12. 29 E. 3. 46 b. Co. R. on Fines 10.

[21] 22. A Fine may be levied in a Quid Juris clamat. As the Defendant may grant, that he holds of the Conuſor, and Renders his Eſtate to the Grantee. 12 E. 3. 60. * Fol. 15.

22. In a **Writ of Meſne, Warrantia Chartæ, Quem redditum reddit, Per quæ ſervitia, Quid* juris clamat, a Fine may be levied of Lands compriſed within the Writ; and yet no Land is demanded, or ſhall be recovered in them. But as Statham ſaid, ‡ *in all Writs where Land is demanded, or* upon other Writ, *that charges Land*, a Fine may be levied of the Land comprized within the Writ. Co. R. on Fines 10. * S.P.Co.R. on Fines 10 cites 20 H. 6. 3. a.—S. P. 5 Rep. 39. cites for this, 5 E. 2. tit. Fines, Statham, and 18 E. 4. 22. a. b. 19 E. 4. 2. 21 E. 4. 4. b. 32 E. 3. Scire facias. 100.—‡ *But* in all Actions, where Land is *not demanded, nor to be charged*, a Fine cannot be levied. But in perſonal Actions a Fine may be levied. Co. R. on Fines 10.

23. A Fine may be levied, and acknowledged in *B. R.* when the Record is there *by Error*, but not upon *Original* to be commenced there, Denſh. R. of Fines 3.

24. A Fine ſhall be levied in the Court of *Ancient Demeſne* upon a petty *Writ of Right-cloſe*; but not upon *Plaint*; and becauſe 'tis no Court of Record. Denſh. R. of Fines 3.

25. In *Attaint* upon *Writ of Ayel* a Fine may be levied. Co. R. on Fines 10.

26. *So* in a *Quod Permittat of a Way*, a Fine may be levied of it. Co. R. on Fines 10. S. P. and yet no Præcipe lies of it. Co. R. on Fines 11. cites 2 E. 3. 13.

27. A Fine may be levied on a Writ *of Right-cloſe*, or *in any Real Action*, but *not in an Original or Perſonal Action*; and a common Writ of Covenant, on which a Fine is levied, is not a Perſonal, but a Real Action; for tho' it is to have Damages for a Breach of Covenant, as in Perſonal Actions, yet it is to have an Execution and Performance of the Covenants. 1 Salk. 340. Hill. 1 Annæ B. R. in Caſe of Hunt v. Bourne.

(F. 4) Levied by whom, and to whom. *Strangers* to the Writ. Take by it, who.

1. Where a Fine is levied *between A. and B.* by which A. *acknowledges to B.* and *B. renders to A. to hold to him and E. his Wife*, and the Heirs of their Bodies, &c. there E. has not any Eſtate; for ſhe is only in the Habendum, and is no Party to the Writ of Covenant. Br. Fine pl. 61. cites 24 E. 3. 28.

2 *So* a Writ of *Covenant was between A and B.* and after *A. acknowledged* the Tenements *to be the Right of B.* and then *B. granted, and rendered to A. for Life, Remainder to M. his Wife for Life*, the Remainder to A. and his Heirs. This is not good, becauſe the Feme was not named in the Writ. See Br. Fines. pl. 108 and 114. cites 30 H. 8. and 7 E. 3. 64. and Fitzh. Tit. Sci. Fa. 136. It is not void but voidable by Error. 3 Rep. 5. cited by Coke as adjudg'd. Trin. 27 Eliz. C. B. in Caſe of Owen v. Morgan.

3. Fine ſur Conuſance de Droit *Come ceo, &c.* can't be levied to any Perſon that is not Party to the Writ of Covenant, neither can the *Grant and Render* of the Land, &c. be immediately, in Primo gradu, to any that is not Party to the Writ, but mediately or *in 2do Gradu*, &c. it may. For Example, if a Writ of Covenant be brought by A. againſt B. of the Manor of D. and B. levies a Fine to A. *Come ceo*; A. may grant and render the ſame to B. for Life, or in Tail, the Remainder to F. in Fee; For albeit the Writ of Covenant be inter A. querent' and B. defore', ſo as F. is a meer Stranger to the Writ, yet ſeeing he takes it *by Way of Remainder, depending upon an Eſtate warranted by the Fine*, it hath been allowed in our Books, and hath been compared to a Deed Indented between A. and B. whereby A. doth give Lands to B. To have and to hold Co. R. on Fines 9.

to B. for Life, or in Tail, the Remainder to C. (who is a Stranger to the Deed) in Fee. 2 Inſt. 514.

*S.P. and *ſo of a Prayee in Aid.* Co. R. on Fines 11. cites 5 H. 8. 7. ——*So* if a *Præcipe* be brought *againſt a Tenant for Life*, and *upon his Default*, he in *Reverſion is received*; he in Reverſion may levy a Fine to the Demandant of this Reverſion, and yet no Writ is pending between them. Co. R. on Fines 11. cites 18 E. 2. 82. 21 E. 4, 5.——The Words being in the Affirmatiative do not reſtrain them. 2 Inſt. 515.

4. Where the 18 *E.* 1. De modo levandi Fines, ſays, that the Order of Law does not ſuffer that the final Accord be levied in the King's Court, *without Writ Original, &c.* It does *not ſay, without Writ Original between the Parties*, but generally; and therefore a Fine may be levied *by* a * *Vouchee* to the Demandant, *or by the Demandant to him*; and *ſo* likewiſe by *Tenant by Reſcett* to the Demandant, or by the Demandant to him; and yet they are not Parties to the Writ. 2 Inſt. 514.

(F. 5) Take. Who ſhall take by the Limitations.

1. In Scire Facias, Theſe Words *Procreavit* vel Hæredibus *procreatis*, ſhall ſerve as well thoſe, which ſhall be born after the Gift, as thoſe which were at the Time of the Fine. Br. Fines. pl. 61 cites 24 E. 3. 28.

(G) Covenant.

1. A Fine may be levied of an Annuity upon Writ of Covenant. 18 E. 4. 22.

2. A Fine cannot be levied upon a Bill of Covenant. 44 E. 3. 38.

3. A Fine may be levied in Writ of Covenant. 29 E. 3. 31. b. 16 E. 3. 19 E. 3. Abbe 13.

Salk. 340. S. C. Hill. 1 Annæ. B.R.

4. A Fine Sur Conceſſit was levied *of Lands in Ancient Demeſne in the Court of Ancient Demeſne.* In Ejectment it was found by Verdict, that upon *Writs of Right-cloſe, Fines* have been Time out of Mind levied, and leviable in the ſame Court; and upon ſetting forth the Fine, it appeared to be levied *in Placito Conventionis ſecundum Conſuetudinem Manerii come ceo que il ad de ſon Done*, with Warranty. It was reſolved, that the Fine found in this Caſe is good, notwithſtanding that the *Cuſtom* is *found to levy Fines founded upon Writ of Right-cloſe*, and that the Fine levied is in Placito Conventionis inter eos, &c. For it is found to be ſecundum Conſuetudinem Cur' and there is not any Inconſiſtency between Writ of Right-cloſe and this Action of Covenant; For the Action of Covenant is not Perſonal in this Caſe, but Real, *quod Teneat Conventionem*, &c. and not for Damages for Breach of Covenant. Lutw. 781. Hunt v. Bourn and al.

(H) How it ſhall be [*expreſs'd in the Writ of Covenant.*]

1. If it be of a Rent-ſeck, Charge, or Service, it ought to be put in the Writ of Covenant, who is Tenant of the Land. 19 E. 4. 3. Becauſe otherwiſe it cannot be known againſt whom to bring the Quid Juris Clamat, or Quem Redditum.

2. If it be of Rent Service the Writ ſhall be, ſo much of Rent, with the Appurtenances in D. and of Rent-Charge ſo much of Rent iſſuing out of the Land in D. 21 E. 4. 61. b.

3. If a Man grants by Fine a Reverſion, the Writ ſhall be Quod teneat Conventionem of the Land, &c. 19 E. 4. 9.

4. Where the Fine is levied of Rent and other Services, as Homage and Fealty, the Covenant mentions only the Rent. 19 E. 4. 8.

(I) Render. [*How the Writ ſhall be:*]

1. Where the Conuſance is of Land, and a Render of Common out of it the Writ ſhall be quod teneat Conventionem of the Land, &c. 19 E. 4. 9.

(K) Fine at Common Law. What Perſon may levy a Fine.

1. If an Infant levies a Fine, he may reverſe it during his Nonage. 17 E. 3. 53. 79. 17. Aſſ. 17.

2. But if he does not reverſe it during his Nonage, this ſhall bind him perpetually; becauſe he ought to be try'd by Inſpection, which cannot be now, being of full Age. 17 E. 3. 53. 79. 17 Aſſ. 17.

But where the *Commiſſioners knew, that the Conuſor was within Age,* the Commiſſioners were fined, but the Fine ſtood. 12 Rep. 122. cites it as the Caſe of Cavendiſh v. Worſeley, and Lanter and al.——Roll. R. 115. 12 Rep. 121. Ann Hungate's Caſe.

3. Note, that every one who have *Power to implead, and to be impleaded*, may levy a Fine. He, *againſt whom Præcipe quod reddat lies*, may levy a Fine, and every one that may levy a Fine at common Law, may levy a Fine by this Statute. Denſh. R. 11. upon 4 H. 7, 24. cites 8 E. 2.

4. The King, and *all Perſons, who may lawfully Grant by Deed*, may be *Cognizors*, or levy a Fine. Wood's Inſt. 241.

Denſh. R. on Fines. 12. ——A Fine was levied by *the King*, viz. K. James the firſt, and was held to be good. 7 Rep. 32.

5. *Civil Corporations*, as *Mayor and Commonalty*, may levy a Fine of Land belonging to their Body: *But Biſhops, Deans and Chapters, Prebendaries, Parſons, Vicars, Heads and Fellows of Colleges*, are reſtrained by Statutes from levying of Fines of their Inheritances to bind their Succeſſors. Wood's Inſt. 241.

[See (D. 10)]

(L) Of what Thing it may by levied. Of what Thing a Man may levy the Fine upon the Writ, [*and of what a Render may be*].

1. If the Deforeeant acknowledges all his Right to be to the Plaintiff, for which Conuſance he grants and renders 20*s.* Rent, De Novo; this is a good Grant, 19 E. 4. 2. b. For it is comprehended by Implication in the Covenant. 16 E. 3. 19 E. 3. abbe 13. per Thorp. 2 R. 3. 5. 49. E. 4. 8. b. 21. E. 4. 4. b. 60. b. 19 E. 4. 8. adjudg'd.

2. So, if he, for ſuch Conuſance, grants and renders to the Defendant the Land for Life, it is good. 19 E. 4. 2. b.

3. So he may render a Common out of the Land. 19 E. 4. 9. 21. E. 4. 61. b. Or ſo many Load of Wood, to take upon the ſame Land. For this, which is comprehended within the Covenant, expreſsly, or by Implication, will paſs by the Fine. 19 E. 4. 2. b. 21. E. 4. 61. b.

4. In Writ of Cuſtoms and Services, if the Lord releaſes all his Right by Fine. and the Tenant grants to him 20*s.* Rent, it is good. 19. E. 4. 8. b

Fol. 16.

5. If the Writ and Conuſance be of the Manor of D. and the other renders the Manor to S. this is void; becauſe it is not comprehended within the Original. 21. E. 4. 4. b.

6. In Aſſiſe of Darrein Preſentment, Plaintiff acknowledges the Right of

of the Patronage to the Patron, Parson, and Ordinary, who render an Annuity out of the same Church to the Plaintiff; this is good. For the Parson is not charged, but the Land. 21. E. 4. 61. 2 R. 3. 5. b.

7. In a Rationabilibus Divisis, a Render may be of a Free-Fishery, in his Several Fishery 21. E. 4. 4. b.

8. So, in this Writ, a Render of an Annuity is good. 21. E. 4. 62 b.

9. So in the said Writ of Pischary, Defendant renders an Annuity to the Plaintiff. 2. E. 4. 62. b. 2 R. 3. 5.

10. If the Fine be of a Manor, Defendant may render to find Capellanum Divina Celebrantem in another Manor. 2 R. 3. 5. b. (Quere).

11. If Conusor acknowledges the third Part of a Manor to be the Right of the Conusee, he cannot render all the Manor. Contra 42 E. 3. 12.

12. An Acquittal may be acknowledged by Fine in Writ of Mesne. 46. E. 3. 31. 49. E. 3. 8. b.

A. may grant and render to B. a *Rent out of the same Manor*, contained in the Fine,

13. If the Writ be of certain Land, yet a Render may be of a Rent out of this and other Land. Time of E. 2. 75 b. admitted, and Note.

but not out of any other Land; *neither* can the Grant and Render be of any *thing Collateral to the Land*, &c. contained in the Writ, *or of another Nature*, and neither issuing out of, nor incident to the Land, &c. contained in the Original. 2 Inst. 514.

14. If the Writ be of Tenements in D. and the Fine is levied of Tenements in S. this is void. For the Writ does not warrant it. 19 E. 4. 9. 7. b. 3.

15. So if it be levied of Land in D. where I have nothing there, the Fine is void. 19. E. 4. 4.

16. So, if it be of Meadow, where I have not any, it is void. 19. E. 4. 4. It seems nothing can be granted immediately by Fine, unless it be upon a Render which is not immediate if it was not in Esse, at the Time of the Writ of Covenant sued. Dubitatur 19 E. 4. 7. b.

As concerning the Thing whereof the Fine is levyed, it is to be known, that in Case of a Fine, *Sur Grant and Render*, which contains a double Fine;

17. A Rent de Novo cannot be granted by Fine. Dubitatur 19 E. 4 7. b. (Quere) if it may, how the Covenant shall be? For if the Covenant may be of the Land, it seems that [a Man] may levy a Fine of any Thing out of the Land. It is a sure Course, first to grant the Rent, and after to levy the Fine of it. 19 E. 4. 3. Contra 21 E. 3. 44. b. It seems in the other Case, if the Writ be brought of a Rent, where there is not any such, and he acknowledges it by Fine, it will be estoppel against him, and all claiming under him.

there is a great *Diversity* between the Fine *Sur Conusans de Droit Come ceo*, &c. for that must be levied of the Land, &c. in the Original; but the Grant and Render may be of another Thing, than is expressed in the Original. As A. brings a Writ of Covenant against B. for the Manor of D—B. can't levy a Fine to A. of a Rent to be issuing out of the Manor of D. but he must levy the Fine of the Manor of D. according to the Writ, and his Covenant therein expressed. 2 Inst. 514.

* As to 20. the Party shall be discharged. 21 E. 4. 61. a. by Pigot.

18. If the Writ be of 20 Acres, and the Fine of 40 Acres, it is not good of * 20. 21 E. 4. 4. b. 61. For it is not in the Writ. So, if the Writ be of Land, and the Conusance of Pasture, Meadow or Wood; it is not good, nor e contra; For it is of other Nature, and not contain'd in the Writ. 21 E. 4. 61. b.

19. If the Covenant be of Land, he may grant the Reversion by the Fine. 21 E. 4. 62.

A Concord can *not* be of *any other Thing than is contained in the Writ of Covenant*,

20 If the Covenant be of Rent, yet the Fine may be levied of the other Services, as Homage and Fealty. 19 E. 4. 8.

and not of a foreign Thing, *if it be not consequent*; as in a Writ of *Land*; *Rent*, *Common*, &c. may be rendered issuing out of it. 18 Ed. 4. 22. West's Symb. S. 30.

21. Upon

21. upon a Covenant of a Manor, a Rent may be reserv'd by the Fine. 2 R. 3. 5.

22. If the Writ be of a Rent with the Appurtenances; the Conusance may be of an Annuity. 21 E. 4. 60. The Prior of Bingham and Yerton's Case adjudg'd.

23. The Writ may be of a Rent, and the Conusance may be of Rent 21 E. 3. 44. b.

24. Two might anciently exchange by Fine. 16 E. 3, 19 E. 3. Abr. 13.

25. Upon a Writ of *Covenant of one Acre*, a Fine hath been levied of it, and further, *by a Præterea* in the same Fine, *a Manor hath been conveyed*, and the Fine received. Dersh R. on Fines 16.

[See (O) pl. 16, &c.]

(M) In what Case a *Feme Covert* shall be *examined*.

Fol. 17.

1. If a Fine sur Conusance de Droit be levied to a Baron, and Feme rendring Rent; the Feme shall be examined, because she is to be charg'd with the Rent. 46 E. 3. 15. b. Dersh. R. on Fines. 14.

2. If A. acknowledges to B. and B. grants and renders to A. and his Feme for Life, to hold of * A. by the Services of 10s. per Ann. &c. and doing for him to the chief Lord, the Services due, &c. tho' the Feme shall be charged of the Services, yet she shall not be examined. 1 E. 3. 5. S. P. Br. Examination pl. 29. cites 24 E. 3. 30. and 62.——Br. Fines, pl. 63 cites 24 E. 3. 62.——* It seems it should be (B).——*It should be E. (3.)

3. If a Fine upon Grant and Render be made to the Baron and Feme, she shall not be examined. 8 H. 4. 8. b. (It seems it is intended as the principal Case there was) that here was not any Conusance by Baron and Feme, but only a Grant and Render by the other.

4. If A. render certain Land to the Baron and Feme in Tail, to hold by certain Rent, the Feme shall not be examined; because she hath not dismissed herself of any Right. 24 E. 3. 30. adjudged. Br. Fines, pl. 63. cites 24 E. 3. 62.

5. If a Fine upon Release be levied to the Baron and Feme, she shall not be examined, because the Fine is not Estoppel, but for her Advantage. 3 H. 6. 42. Quere.

6. So if Fine Sur Conusance de Droit Come ceo, be levied to the Baron and Feme; For this shall not estopp the Feme to claim other Estate. Contra * 4 H. 6. 42. ‡ 8 H. 6. 4. b. * This seems mistaken, for 3 H. 6. 42. a. pl. 12.—and S. C. is cited Br. Examination. pl. 4. but says, that it is said elsewhere, that she shall not be examined, where she takes, but where she departs by Fine; and, that where she is not examined, she shall not be estopped after to claim a greater Estate.——‡ Br Fines, pl. 51. cites S. C. that the Feme, who took Estate for Life, was examined, if it was her Will to have that Estate, and no other; and Brooke, says that by this it seems, the Feme, who took the Estate, shall be *estopped to claim a better Estate.*

7. If upon a Warranty of Charters a Fine sur Conusance de Droit Come ceo, which they have of this Gift, be levied to the Baron and Feme, to have to them, and to the Heirs of the Baron; the Feme shall not be examined, and therefore the Estate of the Feme shall not be chang'd by it. 21 E. 3. 32. b. Br. Estoppel. pl. 73. cites S. C.

8. In Quid Juris clamat against Baron and Feme, if the Defendants come into Court, and grant that they hold of the Consisor, and surrender their Estate to the Grantee, the Feme shall be examined. 21 E. 3. 60.

9. If Baron and Feme render Land by Fine to another, the Feme shall be examined. 25 E. 3. 44. b. adjudg'd. If a Fine be levied of *Land to the Husband and Wife, and the Husband and Wife grant and render the Land*, there the Wife shall be exa-

mined, and the Examination muſt ever be upon the Writ; and therefore a Baron and Feme, upon a Fine *levied to them of Land, can't grant and render a Rent out of the Land*, becauſe that Rent is not contained in the Writ. 2 Inſt. 515.——Co. R. on Fines 8.——Br. Fines, pl. 27. cites 46 E. 3. 15. per Finch. ——Ibid. pl. 39.

See the Notes at (A. 3) on this Sect.

10. 18 *E.* 1. *Stat.* 4. *S.* 7. *A Feme Covert muſt be examined by four of the Juſtices of C. B. and if ſhe conſent not, the Fine cannot be levied.*

11. In every Caſe, *where the Feme ſhall make any Eſtate* by the Fine, or *depart from any Intereſt*, ſhe ſhall be examined. Denſh. R. of Fines 13.

12. The Court have no Authority to examine the Feme, but *where ſhe is named in the Writ, upon which the Fine is to be levied.* And in ancient Books, the Court would not examine the Feme, but *of ſuch Things*, which were *contained within the Writ.* Denſh. R. on Fines. 13.

13. A Fine was levied *Sur Conuſance de Droit* to the Baron and Feme, and to the Heirs of the Baron to *hold of the Chief Lord*; and the Feme was examined upon this *Render*, and ſo bound, Denſh. R. on Fines. 14 cites 11 E. 3.

14. Where ſhe is *not examined*, ſhe ſhall *not* be *eſtopped from claiming a greater Eſtate.* Br. Fines, pl. 7. cites 9 H. 6. 42.

[See (F) pl. 1, 2.]

(M. 2) Grant and Render, upon what Fine.

1. The Fine *Sur Grant and Render cannot be levied upon a Fine executory*; and therefore, if a Man levies a Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit tantum to J. S. he cannot Grant and Render the Lands back to the Conuſor, becauſe the *Conuſee has nothing in the Lands till Execution ſued*, and a Man *can't Grant that which he hath not.* Co. R. on Fines 8.

But upon a Fine executed, as a Fine Sur Conuſance de droit *Come ceo*, &c. or a Fine *Sur Releaſe* or a Fine *Sur Surrender*, Grant and Render may be made; For thoſe Fines are immediately executed, and therefore the Conuſee may well Grant and Render. Co R. on Fines, 8. cites 24 E. 3. Fol. 36.

2. One would have drawn a Fine *Sur Conuſance de Droit tantum*, and that the Conuſee ſhould Grant and Render a Robe annually for Life to the Conuſor, with Clauſe of Diſtreſs; and ſuch Render was not received, becauſe the Conuſee cannot *charge that which he hath not.* Co. R. on Fines, 8. cites Hill. 7. 3. Fol. 14.

3. Quære, if one may Render upon a Fine Sur *Releaſe*, *which ſhall enure by Way of Extinguiſhment*; for the Conuſee takes nothing. Co. R. on Fines, 8. Marg. cites 2 H. 5. 2.

(N) Who may Grant and Render.

1. IF A. brings Writ of Covenant againſt B. B. without any Conuſance by A. may Grant and Render the Land to A. 8 H. 4. 8. admitted good, and 11. ſo held. (But it ſeems that B. ought to be Tenant of the Land, otherwiſe it is not good.) But Fo. 12. per Markham it is ſaid, that it is not neceſſary.

(N. 2) Render to whom and how, Strangers, &c.

Note, that per Dicr a Render cannot be but *only to him that is named in the Fine.*

1. If *two levy* a Fine, the Grant and Render may be *to one* of them. 2 Inſt. 514. cites 24 E. 3. 35.——*As* if *Baron and Feme* levy a Fine to J. S. he may Grant and Render *to the Baron, and to his Heirs* for ever. Co. R. on Fines. 8. cites 24 E. 3. tit. Fines 61. 66.

But a Remainder may be limited to one, by the Fine, tho' he be not named in the Præcipe. Weſt's Symb. S. 145.

2. *So*

2. *So* if the Baron and Feme acknowledge by Fine, the Conuſee may Grant and Render *Parcel to the Baron only, and the other Parcel to him and to his Feme.* Co. R. on Fines 8. cites 17 E. 3. 31. 12 E. 3. 33. Tit. Fines 61.

3. A. and M. his Wife levied a Fine to J. S. and J. N. of the Manor of D. &c. Come ceo &c. and they Grant and Render to A. and M. for their Lives, the *Remainder of one 3d Part to the eldeſt Daughter of A. and M. in Tail,* Remainder *to the Right Heirs of A; the Remainder of another 3d Part to the ſecond Daughter* of A. in Tail, Remainder as above; *Remainder of another 3d Part Reſidue, to the 3d Daughter in Tail,* the Remainder in Fee as above. Quod Nota. Br. Fines. pl. 111. cites 18 H. 7. and Brooke ſays, that he ſaw and read the ſaid Fine.

4. In a Fine Sur Grant and Render none can take the firſt Eſtate upon the Render, but ſome of the Cogniſors; but *Reverſions* or Remainders any *Stranger* may take: For if A. acknowledges a Fine to B. and B. * *renders to the ſaid A.* habendum *ſibi & E. Uxori ejus,* and the Heirs of their Bodies, &c. by this Fine E. can have no Eſtate, becauſe ſhe is *not named in the Writ.* Weſt's Symb. S. 30. cites 24 E. 3. 27. 30 H. 8. Br. Fines 108. 7 Ed. 3. 63.

* Co. R. on Fines 8. ſays, that he takes this Caſe to be miſreported. For this ſhall be no taking of the immediate Eſtate by the Grant and Render, but by him who was Party to the Conuſance; but in Remainder a Stranger may take, as by a Caſe put there for Example plainly appears, and ſo are the Books in 42 E. 3. 2. 16 E. 3. Br. tit. Fines. 3. 7 E. 3. 64——Br. Eſtates pl. 23. cites 24 E. 3. 28.

5. A. levied a *Fine to B and C.* and to the Heirs of B. who Grant and *Render to A. and M. his Wife.* Tho' *M. was neither Party to the Writ nor to the Conuſance,* and tho' it appears by the ſame Record, that ſhe was a Stranger and not Party, yet the Grant and Render to her was *not void, but voidable by Error.* 3 Rep. 5. cited there by the Reporter as adjudged. Trin. 27 Eliz. in C. B. in Caſe of Owen v. Morgan.

See Br. Fines 108. and 114. Contra.

[See (F. 4)]

(O) How being it may be received.

1. BARON and Feme **may** Grant and Releaſe without Warranty **in the Fine.** 44 E. 3. 36. b.

Candiſh would have drawn a Fine in this manner, *the Baron and Feme Granted and Rendered all which they had* in the Tenements compriſed in the Writ, *for Term of their Lives to J. S to have and to hold to him and to his Heirs for ever,* and it was not received by the Court. Then they *Granted and Releaſed what they had for* Term of their 2 Lives to the ſame J. S. and to his Heirs for ever; and this was accepted *without Warranty.* 44 E. 3. 36. pl. 27. Sir Giles Daubeny's Caſe.

2. **If Baron and Feme** acknowledge their Right **to another by Fine** and Releaſe, and the Feme only obliges her and her Heirs to Warranty, **it is good.** 44 E. 3. 21. b.

Baron and Feme join in a Fine Sur conceſſit with Warranty.

The Baron dies. *Covenant on the Warranty lies againſt the Feme.* Lev. 301. Mich. 22 Car. 2. B. R. Wotton v. Hale.——2 Saund. 180. S. C.

3. **If Baron and Feme levy Fine** (of Land whereof they are ſeiſed in Right of the Feme) Come ceo, &c. **this ſhall not be received** with Warranty by them and the Heirs of the Baron; **But ſhall be [received], being warranted** by them and the Heirs of the Feme. 42 E. 3. 14. **It ſeems the Reaſon is, becauſe it is the Inheritance of the Feme. Baron and Feme may levy a Fine, Sur Conuſance de Droit Come ceo que il ad, &c.** to A. and A. may Render * to the Baron in Fee, **and this ſhall be received.** 24 E. 3. 34.

42 E. 3. pl. 26. Br. Fines. pl. 15. cites 42 E. 3. 13.

* Br. Fines. pl. 103. cites 24 E. 3. 35.

4. **Baron and Feme cannot** acknowledge **certain Land** to be the Right of A. as that **which he has of their Gift,** and alſo releaſe all their Right

Fol. 18.

Denſh. R. of Fines 6. cites 3. 91.

Right to the Conuſee; For they cannot do both in one Fine. 28 E. 27 E. 3. contra, that a Fine *Sur Conuſance de Droit* & *Sur Releaſe* may be in one and the ſame Fine, *to one and the ſame Perſon, and of one and the ſame Land*; and may be *of Part Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo, &c.* and *of Part Sur Releaſe.*

And there may be in one Fine *Sur Conuſance &c. come ceo, &c. Grant* and *Sur Releaſe*; and the Conuſee by the ſame Fine, may *render to the Conuſor.* So at this Day, two or three * Sorts of Fines are in one. Denſh. R. of Fines 6.—— * *Orig.* (Partes Fines.)

Br. Fines. pl. 19. S. C.

5. Fine levied of a Manor, except 4 Acres, and of the 4 Acres alſo when certain Monies are levied, for which the ſame are now in Extent, was received. 44 E. 3. 21. b.

6. A Man may acknowledge the Tenements contained in the Writ to be to the Conuſee to have in Taile, and ſhall not acknowledge the Right. 1 E. 3. 6. b.

7. In a Fine, a Man cannot acknowledge the Right of a Conuſee, and after Grant it to him in Taile. For the Conuſance is of a Fee, being of the Right. 1 E. 3. 4. b. a. b.

Co. R. on Fines 9.—— Yet if received *to two and their Heirs*, it ſhall ſtand. 5 Rep. 38. b. Tey's Caſe.——And in Caſe of a Fine *levied by the King*, the Juſtices will not refuſe a Fine *to ſeveral, and their Heirs*, for the Benefit of the King. Co. R. on Fines. 9. cites 33 H. 6. 52. 7 H. 4. 7.

8. In a Fine, a Man ſhall acknowledge the Right to be only in one, and not in more of the Conuſees. Contra 17 E. 3. 9. b.

But *if received* it ſhall * *ſtand.* 5 Rep. 38. b. Tey's Caſe.——A Fine *levied* to one *in Tail* upon Condition *with Remainder*, is holden to be good. 27 H. 8. 24. Plowd. 34. b. 24 Ed. 3. 62. Contra per Priſot. 33 H. 52. and 44 Ed. 3. 22. *But* a Fine *with a Re-entry* was rejected 44 Ed. 3. 22. Weſt's Symb. S. 30.—See (O. 5).—Br. Fines. pl. 20. S. C.——Fitzh. Fines. pl. 15. 33 H. 6. 52.—Co. R. on Fines. 5. Br. Fines. 5. cites 28 H. 8. 24.

9. A Fine levied upon Condition, ſhall not be received. 44 E. 3. 22. 5 Rep. 38. b. Tey's Caſe.

A Fine was levied of Land in Tail, *upon Condition to carry the Standard of the Conuſor*, and for Default thereof *Remainder to W. N.* And per Fitzh. J. the Remainder is good, and is in the Grantee preſently before the Condition broken or never; for if the Remainder be not good at firſt, it never ſhall be good. And per Montague Serj. contra and Fitzh. after doubted. Br. Done &c. pl. 3. cites 27 H. 8. 24.

A Clauſe of *Re-entry* cannot be in a Fine. Weſt. Symb. S. 145.

I. Covenant to levy a Fine, the Writ was *Quod teneat Conventionem of* 120 *and* 10 *Acres of Land*; and Herle would not accept the Fine upon ſuch Form of Writ. But per Shad. the Writ ſhall not abate without Challenge of the Party. But per Herle we will not abate the Writ, but we will ſuffer the Writ to lie in Peace. Br. Office del &c. pl. 22. cites 7 E. 3. 39. and Fitzh. Office de Court. 27.

II. *Baron and Feme* tendered to *Grant the Reverſion* by Fine *for their Lives, which Reverſion they had in Tail*, and becauſe 'twas notified to the Court, therefore the Juſtices refuſed to accept the Fine. Br. Fines. pl. 80. cites 29 Aſſ. 34.

III. In Quare impedit, a Fine was levied *of the Advowſon by J. N. to the Abbot of B. who Granted to the ſaid J. N. that he and his Heirs at every Avoidance ſhould name a Clerk to the Abbot and his Succeſſors, and that he ſhould preſent him to the Biſhop*; and 'twas admitted a good Fine. Quod Nota, the Form of this ancient Fine, and was Tempore H. 3. Br. Fines. pl. 42. cites 14 H. 4. 10.

IV. A Fine *Sur Grant and Render* is executory, and therefore the Law preſuppoſes, that he who renders is ſeiſed; yet if the other, at the Time of the Fine levied, be ſeiſed, the Fine is good and executed preſently; and therefore the Court will receive this Conuſance de Droit only, and that the Conuſee by the ſame Fine renders to the Conuſor the ſame Land, that he who ſurrendered by the Conuſance ſhall have nothing in the Land, nor can the Conuſee in this Caſe grant Rent to the Conuſor by the ſame Fine, &c. Denſh. R. of Fines. 6.

V. And

V. And a *Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit Come ceo, &c.* the Conuſee by the ſame Fine, *renders to the Conuſor the ſame Land*, and this is commonly uſed. Denth. R. of Fines. 6. cites 8 E. 3.

VI. Note, a Fine for the Maſter and Fellows of the College in Oxon, of the Foundation T. White Militis, Civis & Alderman' London, of certain *Land to be amortiſed* to the ſaid College, was refuſed to be ingroſſed *pro Defectu brevis inde Direct' Juſticiar. de Banco to paſs ſuch Fine*; ſicut fuit Anno 19 H. 8. pro hujuſmodi Fine pro Collegio Cardinalis Wolſey in Oxon' in Banco prædict' levand'; Item pro Collegio Reginæ in Cantabrigia ſimilis finis fuit reject' hoc Termino, ex cauſa Præd'. D. 188. pl. 9. Mich. 2 and 3 Eliz. St. John's College's Caſe (Oxon)

VII. In *Warrantia Chartæ quod Warran. unam Acram*, the Defendant may *acknowledge all his Right which he hath in this Acre* to the Plaintiff; and the Fine is well enough receivable. Co. R. on Fines. 10.

VIII. *So* if at this Day the Defendant will levy a Fine *of the ſame Acre, and of one other Acre*, the Fine is not good for the other Acre; For 'tis not compriſed within the Original. Co. R. on Fines 10. cites 20 H. 6. 3. a.

[See (P).]

[(O. 2) *Reſerved what.*]

10. If Tenant for Life renders his Eſtate, he may reſerve a Rent. 29 E. 3. 7. b. Contra 3 E. 3. 1.

But it ſeems to me in the Caſe aforeſaid, if the *Reverſion of Leſſee for Life be granted for Life*, that the Tenant *for Life may grant* the Land by Fine *to the Grantee for Life, the Grantee rendering Rent*, becauſe 'tis not an abſolute Surrender; For if the Grantee dies, the Tenant for Life ſhall have the Land again, as our Books ſay. Co. R. on Fines 5. cites 7 H. 6. 13 R. 2. 29 Aſſ. Brook. tit. Eſtates 69.

11. But if Fine be levied of Land in Fee in Taile, he may reſerve ſeveral Rents at ſeveral Times. 44 E. 3. 22. ſo received. 17 E. 3. 48. b.

12. A Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit, which reſerves a Rent, may be received. 46 E. 3. 15. 49 E. 3. 10. Contra 17 E. 3. 24. b. Pl. 14.

13. But otherwiſe it is of a Grant and Render reſerving Rent; Becauſe this Fine is executory. 46 E. 3. 15. (Quere the Reaſon.) Contra 4 E. 3. 8. b. 50 E. 3. 9. b. Contra 17 E. 3. 48. b. 29 E. 3. 7. b. Br. Fines pl. 27. cites 46 E. 3. 15.

14. Upon a Fine Sur Conuſance, &c. Come ceo, &c. a Rent cannot be reſerved, becauſe it is executed. 50 E. 3. 9. b. Pl. 12. This Reſervation is void

Becauſe the Fine is executed; For *no Reſervation can be but on a Fine executory*, as Sur Render. Weſt's Symb. S. 30. cites 50 E. 3. 9 24 E. 3. 26. 29 E. 3. 1.—*But* it may be *rendered* on ſuch Fine. Br. Fines pl. 27. cites 46 E. 3. 15. per Finch.

15. A Diſtreſs for a Rent may be reſerved by Fine. 44 E. 3. 22. 46 E. 3. 15. 29 E. 3. 7. b.

1. In Aſſiſe, the *Tenant held by finding certain *Maſſes, &c. and rendring 6 Marks Rent per Annum*, and the *Lord brought Writ of Cuſtoms and Services* againſt the Tenant, *in which he releaſed the Services, reſerving the 6 Marks, and a Mark more*; and awarded a good Reſervation, which Brooke ſays ſeems not to be Law. Br. Fines. pl. 78. cites 26 Aſſ. 37. * *Orig.* (Meſſes.)

II. A Man made a *Leaſe for Life*; and *after granted the Reverſion for Life*, the *Remainder in Tail by Fine*; the Grantee for Life brought Quid Juris clamat againſt *Tenant for Life*, who *would have ſurrendered by Fine to the Grantee, with Reſervation of Rent during the Life of him that ſurrendered*; and this Fine was rejected; and the reaſon of the Refuſal, as I apprehend was, becauſe the Eſtate of him who ſurrendered was extinct and merged in the Eſtate of him in the Remainder for Life; and then if he in the Remainder dies, during the Life of him who ſurrendered, and

he in the Remainder in Tail enters, he ſhall hold it diſcharged. Co. R. on Fines 5.

[(O. 3) *Rendred, what may be.*]

16. In a Fine upon Releaſe by Baron and Feme, and Warranty againſt the Feme a Rent **may be Rendred to them** for Life of the Feme, **by the Conuſee**, with Diſtreſs, **and this ſhall be received.** 17 E. 3. 57. 24 E. 3. 36. b. 28 E. 3. 95.

Br. Fines pl. 2. cites 44 E. 3. 22.—

17. A Rent **may be granted and rendered** with Clauſe of Diſtreſs. 29 E. 3. 40. b.

As, Baron and Feme Granted, Releaſed and Quit-claimed all *their Right*, which they had in the Tenements, &c. viz. *the Franktenement, for Life of the Feme, to D. and G.* and for this Grant *D. and G. granted to the Baron and Feme, for Life of the Feme, a Rent of* 30 *Quarters of Barly per Annum*, &c. *and if* the Rent be *Arrear, that they ſhall diſtrain*; &c. and per Wilby and Cur. the *Right ſhall not be acknowledged to two in Common*, but to one alone, and therefore it was made accordingly. Br. Fines pl. 64. cites 24 E. 3. 64.

See (P) pl. 3. —And becauſe it was not received they *granted and releaſed*

18. Baron and Feme grant and render **whatſoever they have in the Lands in the Writ** for Term of their Lives to the Conuſee and his Heirs, **and not received. But if they** grant and releaſe **&c. as aforeſaid, it ſhall be received.** 44 E. 3. 36. b.

all which they had for their Lives to the Conuſee and his Heirs, and ſo it was received. Quære. Br. Fines pl. 21. cites 44 E. 3. 36.

19. **Baron and Feme** ſeiſed for Life of the Feme; **he in** Reverſion **levies a Fine, and** grants, that after the Deceaſe of the Feme it ſhall remain to the Baron for his Life rendring Rent. 44 E. 3. 45. b.

20. *Baron and Feme acknowledge* the Tenements *to be the Right of T.* and they releaſe and quit Claim for them, and the Heirs of the Feme, to him and his Heirs for ever, *to hold of the chief Lord*, &c. the Baron and Feme, and the Heirs of the Feme Warrant, &c. and *for their acknowledging, Releaſe*, quit Claim and Warranty *T. granted* 40 *s. Rent to the Baron and Feme for Life, to take of the ſame Tenements with Clauſe of Diſtreſs*, &c. and 'tis received. Br. Fines. pl. 60. cites 24 E. 3. 26.

21. The Baron and Feme *Granted a Meſſuage* to J. &c. which they held *for Life of the Feme, rendering to them* 4 *s. Rent with Clauſe of Diſtreſs*, and 'twas refuſed; and after they granted and rendered as above; for which Grant, J grants back 4 *s.* of Rent out of the Meſuage, &c. and 'twas refuſed, Quære Cauſam; and after they granted and rendered to J. and releaſed and quit-claim'd to him and his Heirs for Term of the Life of the Feme, for which J. grants 4 *s.* &c. cum Clauſula Diſtrictionis, and it was accepted. Br. Fines. pl. 68. cites 39 E. 3. 1.

22. A Fine was levied with a Render, and the Render was *with Warranty*; and the Officers of the Fine refuſed to take it, by reaſon of the Warranty annexed, which had not been known before Time; but all the Juſtices conceived it was good; for altho' it was *not uſual*, that he, which renders, ſhould warrant the Land, becauſe he takes no Benefit; yet if he will warrant it, it is not to be doubted, *but* it is *good enough*, and the Officers were commanded to receive the Fine. Cro. E. 17. pl. 9. Paſch. 25 Eliz. C. B. Anon.

(O. 4) Done. What Things may be done by Fine, and How.

See Manor.

1. A *Manor* may be *divided* by Fine. Br. Fines. pl. 17. cites 43 E. 3. 11.

2. If a Man will, he may make a *Jointure* by Fine, thus: J. viz. levies a *Fine*

Fine to A. in Fee Sur Cognizance de Droit Come ceo, &c. and after *A. renders to J. for Life, without Impeachment of Waſt*, the *Remainder to B. his Wife for Term of her Life*, the Remainder to J. and his Heirs. Weſt's Symb. S. 30. cites 38 H. 8. Br. Fines 108.

3. A *Leaſe for Years* may be made by a Fine in *this Form:* The Leſſee muſt acknowledge the Tenements to be the Right of the Leſſor, as that &c. and then the Leſſor muſt grant the Lands back again to the Leſſee, for ſo many Years as are agreed upon, reſerving a Rent with a Clauſe of Diſtreſs: But this Fine will not bind the Iſſue in Tail, becauſe he taketh by the Fine, but giveth nothing thereby. Weſt's Symb. S. 30. cites Br. Fines 106. tempore H. 8. 36. H. 8. Br. Fines 118. Plow. 455. 14 Eliz. See Goldsb. 87. pl. 12. Anon.

4. *Or* a Leaſe for Years, may be made by Fine, *to bind the Tenant in Tail thus:* The *Tenant in Tail, and the Leſſee to acknowledge* the Tenements *to be the Right of a Stranger, as that*, &c. and the Cogniſee to grant and *render* the Tenements *to the Leſſee for certain Years*, yielding a Rent with a Clauſe of Diſtreſs, *and then grant the Reverſion to the Tenant in Tail.* Weſt's Symb. S. 30. cites 39 H. 8. Br. Fines 118.

5. If a *Stranger, who has nothing* in the Lands, *levies a Fine to him in the Remainder in Tail dependant on Eſtate for Life*, Sur Cognizance de Droit Come ceo que il ad de ſon done &c. and the Cogniſee by the ſame Fine, renders to the Cogniſor for Years, to commence at Mich. enſuing, and dies, and all the Proclamations are made after his Death. The Tenant for Life, after ſuch time as the ſaid Leaſe is limited to begin, dies; it is adjudged a good Leaſe, to *bar the Iſſue in Tail for the Term.* Weſt's Symb. S. 30. cites 14 Eliz. Plowd. 437. b. Smith v. Stapleton——which ſeems contrary to the Opinion before. Br. Fines. 106. 118. Weſt's Symb. S. 30.

6. A *particular Tenant*, as for Life, &c. *cannot ſurrender* his Term to him in the Reverſion, or Remainder, by Fine; *But* he *may grant and releaſe* it to him by Fine. Weſt's Symb. S. 30. cites 44 Ed. 3. 36.

(O. 5) How being, it may be received; want of *Certainty*, &c.

1. Note, that *'tis againſt the Nature and Credit of a Fine to omit any thing*, in which *Certainty* is not repoſed, or in which the Thing *cannot take Effect* and Continuance, *according to the Purport of the Fine.* Co. R. on Fines. 5. cites 19 E. 3. [Quære, For there is no ſuch Year.] For it is againſt the Nature of a Fine; *becauſe* a Fine, of its Nature, *is a Final Concord*, and rejects certainly all Incertainty; for Certainty (as is ſaid) begets Repoſe, and Incertainty, Contention; and it is againſt the Credit of a Fine, *becauſe Credit always attends* and accompanies with *Certainty*; and of the contrary Part, Incertainty and Falſity begets Trouble and Diſcredit. Co. R. on Fines 5. cites 2 H. 5. 33 H. 6. 45 E. 3. 18 H. 7. 24 E. 3. 36. 21 E. 3.

Therefore Fine cannot be levied, *de Tenemento*; Becauſe Tenementum is of uncertain Signification.

A Fine *upon Condition* is not good; Becauſe ſuch Fine, Finem litibus non imponit. See Br. Fines pl. 5. cites 28 [27] H. 8. 24——But the Year Book is, that if it be ſo taken, it is good.]

2. *And* therefore in our Books, a Grant and Render was drawn by Fine to A. for the Life of B. Remainder to C. in Fee; and there Chard ſaid, that the Fine *ought* to be certain, and *to limit in what Perſons the Land ſhould remain*; and becauſe it was uncertain, who ſhould have the Land, if the *Tenant for Life died, living Ceſty que Vie.* Upon this Thorp drew the Fine *to A. and his Heirs for the Life of B. Remainder to C.* and yet Stone doubted; Becauſe, as I apprehend, ſome ſay the Limitation to one and his Heirs during the Life of J. S. is void; and notwithſtanding this, there ſhall be an *Occupant*, becauſe a Fee Simple cannot depend upon the Life of a Man. But I hold the Law e contra as to this; and ſo is Litt. 168. 19 E. [3.] Accompt. 56. 33 Aſſ. p. 17. 22 Aſſ. p. 31. and 11 H. 4. 43. But I agree that this ſhall not be ſaid in Fee Simple, but that the Heir ſhall take it as a ſpecial Occupant named in the Deed. Co. R. on Fines 5.

3. So

3. *So*, if a Fine be drawn, that J. S. *acknowledges* the Land *to be the Right of J. D. and J. G.* and to their Heirs; ſuch Fine the Juſtices ought not to receive, becauſe the Fee Simple ſhall not be certainly repoſed in any certain Perſon; for it may be that J. D. ſhall ſurvive, and then he ſhall have the Fee; or it may be, that J. G. ſhall ſurvive, and then he ſhall have the Fee; the which (as I have ſaid) ſhall be againſt the Nature and Credit of a Fine. Co. R. on Fines. 5.

Br. Fines. pl. 24. cites 45 E. 3. 12. S. C. And after Kirton drawed the Fine *of the 3d Part of every Parcel of the Manor and Advowſon, &c. and that the firſt Tenant for Life, ſhall have the firſt Preſentment*, or he in Remainder, if it falls not in the Life of the Tenant for Life, or his Heirs, &c. *and the other*, in the other 3d Part of the Manor, *the 2d Preſentment*, &c. and alſo the other, to whom the 3d Part was granted &c. the 3d Preſentment, &c. & ſic de Singulis, &c. quære if this Matter ſhall ſever the Preſentments.

4. A *Fine* was levied *of a Manor*, unto which an Advowſon was appendant, wherein a *3d Part was rendered back to A.* for Life, with divers Remainders over, and *ſo of the other 2 Parts, with the Advowſon of every 3d Part as aforeſaid*; if they cannot agree to preſent, a Lapſe ſhall incur. They are all Tenants in common, and being *firſt named*, or laſt named, is of no Privilege or Prejudice. For being *by one Deed*, it ſhall be Uno Flatu. Arg. Godb. 128. cites 45 E. 3.

[See (O) pl. 9. (P) pl. 2. (Z. 3) (Z. 4) (Z. 5).]

(O. 6) *Uncertainty* in Fines. *Made good* or explained by the Intent.

1. A Fine was levied Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo, &c. to J. N. and he *rendered to the Conuſor and W. is Son*, and to their Heirs, where there were 2 *W's elder and younger*; and the Contention came between W. the younger, and the Heir of W. the elder, and *the Iſſue was joined*, whether the Fine was levied (to give the Inheritance) to W. the elder, or W. the younger; and ſo ſee Iſſue taken upon *the Intent*. Br. Fines. pl. cites 47 E. 3. 16.

And if they had no Communication, then it ſhall paſs the Manor, which

2. *And* where a Man hath the *Manors of over S. and nether S.* and levies *a Fine of the* Manor of *S.* this ſhall be taken the Manor of S. of which they diſcourſed or have Communication, and the Manor that the Conuſor intended to paſs. Br. Fines. pl. 28. cites 12 H. 7. 6.

the Conuſor intended. Br. Fines. pl. 88. cites 12 H. 7. 6. Per Vaviſor and Davers, and denied by none; and that the ſame was agreed. 27 E. 3.

Circumſtances ſhall be given *in Evidence* to prove what Manor they intended. And Phraſes of Speech declare the Intent of Perſons. Per Mountague Ch. J. Pl. C. 85. in Caſe of Partridge v. Strange and Crocker.

[See (J. b. 2).]

(O. 7) Received or not. In Reſpect of the Grant.

1. Fine was drawn, by which A. granted a certain Rent in the Writ to B. to have and *receive of J. N. and his Heirs Tenant of a Houſe*, with the Appurtenances *in E. & hered' ipſius B. imperpetuum cum Warrantia*, and this Fine was accepted; and B. prayed a Writ to put him in Poſſeſſion; and it was granted. Br. Fines. pl. 49 cites 21 E. 3. 44.

2. A. brought a Writ of Covenant againſt B. who was *ſeiſed of a Manor, to which an Advowſon was appendant*; and he levied a Fine *Sur Conuſance de Droit tantum*; and thereby *granted*, that the Conuſor ſhould have *the next Preſentment, and himſelf the 2d, and Conuſor the 3d, and he the 4th; and ſo they and their Heirs to preſent by Turns for ever*. D. 259. b. pl. 20. Paſch. 9 Eliz. cites 43. E. 3 35.

(P) How the Fine being, ſhall be received. [*Being with Render, or not.*]

1. A Fine ſhall not be received, being with Warranty to four and their Heirs, unleſs they are Coparceners. Contra 17 E. 3. 9. b. But *being received, ſhall ſtand.* 5 Rep. 38. b. Tey's Caſe.

2. A Fine ſhall not be received, being with Render to A and B. and to the Heirs of the one for the Life of A. the Remainder to the other, for the Uncertainty of the Eſtate. Contra 17 E. 3. 48. b. See (O. 5).

3. A Grant and Render by 2 Barons and their Femes, of as much as they have for the Lives of the Femes to another and his Heirs with Warranty, for the Lives of the Femes ſhall not be received. 17 E. 3. 66. b. Becauſe no Right is ſaved in the Renderor, nor granted over by Render as ought to be. But a Fine upon Releaſe, in ſuch manner ſhall be received. 17 E. 3. 66. b. See (O) pl. 18.

4. A Fine by Grant and Render of a Reverſion to 2. ſhall not be received, but it ought to be to one in certain. 21 E. 3. 13. Fol. 19.

5. The ſame Law of Land in Poſſeſſion.

6. But otherwiſe it is if the Render be to two, and to the Heirs of one. 21 E. 3. 13.

7. The ſame Law of Land in Poſſeſſion. 21 E. 3. 27. b.

8. A Man ought not to acknowledge the Right to two, but to one of them, as that which the two have of the Gift, &c. For otherwiſe the Fine ſhall not be [received]. 27 E. 3. 84.

9. A Fine by Grant and Render by two to another with Warranty for them and their Heirs, ſhall not be received. 21 E. 3. 27. b. Warranty. See (B. b. 3). But in Caſe where the Land was *Gavelkind*, the Render by 3 Conuſees, and Warranty for them and their Heirs, was received. Br. Fines. pl. 65. cites * 24 E. 3. 66.——Co. R. on Fines 5.——* Br. Fines. pl. 48. cites S. C.

10. But if the Warranty be for them, and the Heirs of one, it ſhall be received. 21 E. 3. 27. b.

11. A Warranty cannot be limited to two, and their Heirs, by Fine. For this ſhall not be received. 5 Rep. 38. b.

12. But it may be limited to two, and the Heirs of one. 21 E. 3. 27. b.

13. If Baron and Feme by Fine, Grant, Releaſe and Confirm to two, all that * which they have of the Tenements of the Feme, which they hold for the Life of the Feme of the Heritage of the ſaid two. This Fine ſhall not be received; Becauſe the Inheritance is not granted to one. 24 E. 3. 36. b. * *Orig.* (ove)

14. A Fine may be levied of Land in ſeven Counties together. 1 E. 3. 4. b.

15. *Rent* of 20 *l.* per Annum was granted by Fine *to J. N. and his Heirs upon* ſuch *Condition, that if after the Death of J. N. his Heir*, or any of his Heirs, *be within Age, that during the Nonage he ſhall be quit of of the Payment* of the Rent, & it was received, and diſputed after if the Fine be well accepted, or not; quod mirum; For at this Day they *will not ſuffer a Condition*, becauſe Finis *Finem Litibus imponere debet.* Br. Fines. pl. 62. cites 24 E. 3. 61.

16. If *Covenant* be *brought by two*, the Defendant may acknowledge the one *Moiety* [to the one, and the other Moiety] to the other; or the *one Part in Severalty to the one and other Part in Severalty to the other* Co. R. on Fines 8.

17. *But* it ſeems if 3 *bring Writ* of Covenant, the Fine *ſhall not be levied to 2 only.* Co. R. on Fines 8. cites 7 E. 3. 25.

18. *But* in Writ of Covenant by two, the Defendant may levy a *Fine to one*, the *Remainder to the other*, *or* levy a Fine *to one rendering Rent*, and by the ſame Fine grant the *Reverſion to the other*. Co. R. on Fines 8. cites * 16 E. 3. Br. tit. Fines † 5. 7. 36 H. 8.

* Quære. For there is no ſuch Year. † This ſeems a Miſtake, and that it ſhould be pl. 118. Br. Fines. pl. 1[7]. cites 43 E. 3. 11. S. C.

19. The *Manors* and Tenements *contained in the Writ may be divided: As* if a Fine be levied between R. and M. of 2 Manors, and M. acknowledgeth all his Right of the ſaid 2 *Manors* to be the Right of the ſaid R. as that which &c. for which R. granteth and *rendreth* the *one* Manor *to M. for Life, with 2 Parts of the other* Manor, *which N. holdeth in Dower; to have the one* Manor, *and two Parts of the other* Manor, *to M. for Life*, the *Remainder after her Death to R. in Tail*, and that *after the Death of A. the third Part ſhall remain to another*. Weſt's Symb. S. 30. cites 43 E. 3 11. 45 E. 3. 12.

20. Fine levied to Baron Come ceo &c. and they grant and render to the Conuſor the Land, to hold for Term of the Lives of Baron and Feme, and after their Deceaſe *the Remainder to the Heirs of the Baron*. The Fine was not received; For a Man cannot *entail a Remainder to his Heirs living himſelf*, unleſs he commences firſt with himſelf; and this becauſe of the Reverſion ſaved. Paſch. 7 Eliz. D. 237. b. pl. 32. Vide.

21. A Fine was levied with a Render, and the *Render was with Warranty*—'tis good tho' unuſual, and that he, that renders, takes no Benefit. Cro. E. 17. Paſch. 25 Eliz. C. B. Anon.

22. *Render with Warranty* was commanded to be received. Cro. E. 17. pl. 9. Anon. ut ſupra.

23. Exception was taken, that the Writ of Covenant, and the Caption was *De Manerio & Tenemento, and 5 s. Rent*; and the Fine engroſſed was *De Manerio & Tenemento*; But 'twas agreed, that the Courſe of Fines is, that if the *Rent be under 5 l.* they uſe not to mention it in the Fine engroſſed. Cro. E. 275. Hill. 34 Eliz. C. B. Argenton v. Weſtover and Lucas.——Cro. J. 11. Paſch. 1 Jac. B. R. Arundel v. Arundel. S. P.

(P. 2) Certified. How Fine acknowledged ſhall be certified, and when, and by whom.

1. *By 15 E. 2. Stat. of Carliſle. The Commiſſioners, that take the Cognizance, ſhall make a Certificate thereof to the Juſtices, to the End the Fine may be lawfully levied according to the former Ordinance.*

2. If *two Juſtices* have *Dedimus Poteſtatem* to take the Conuſance of a Fine, the one alone cannot take it; but if it be taken by both, *the one may certify it* alone, *after the Death of the other*. Denſh. R. on Fines. 9.

If they who have taken Cogniſance of a Fine, *will not certify* the ſame in convenient Time, a *Certiorari* is to awarded unto them, comprehending the matter of the Ded. Pot. and commanding them to certify, &c. which if they do not, there lies againſt the Commiſſioners, an *Alias*, *Pluries*, *and Attachment*, &c. Weſt's Symb. S. 156. cites F. N. B. 147. b.

3. 23 *El.* 3. *Enacts, that the Day and Year of the Acknowledgment of a Fine, and the Warrant of Attorney for the Suffering a Recovery, ſhall be certified together with the Concord or Warrant; and none ſhall be enforced ſo to certify, but within one Year after ſuch Acknowledgement made, or Warrant given.*

No Officer ſhall receive any Writ or Entry without the Day ſo certified in Pain of 5 l.

But they are *not bound* to certify ſuch Recognizances *but within the Year* after ſuch Caption thereof; but if they do, it is good enough by this Act. And with every ſuch Certificate, they muſt certify the Day and Year, wherein the ſame was acknowledged, thus, viz. *Capt' apud R. in Com. Ebor. 20 Die Octob. Anno Reg' Ja. Regis, &c.* Weſt's Symb. S. 156.

4. Tho' *Juſtices of Aſſiſe*, by the general Words of their Patents may take and certify Cognizances of Fines without any ſpecial Ded. Pot. yet ſuch Juſtices uſe not now to certify them without a *ſpecial Writ of Ded. Pot.*

Pot. ſued forth of the Chancery directed to them, and *giving them thereby Power* to take and certify ſuch Cognizances as they have already taken. Weſt. S. 16. cites D. 224. pl 51. [but it ſhould be pl. 31.]

5. If a *Judge takes the Conuſance, and dies*, a Certiorari ſhall be awarded to *his Executors* to certify the Conuſance. Co. R. on Fines 10 cites Fitzh. 147.

Br Fines pl. 84. cites 1 H. 7. 9.——S. P. *So* * if he be *diſcharged before he has certified*; he may certify it by Writ, but not otherwiſe; notwithſtanding that he be *reinſtated*. Br. Fines. pl. 34. cites 8 H. 4. 5 ——* Weſt. Symb. S 156. cites S. C. and 1 H. 7. 9. *So* if a *Commiſſioner dies* after the Cognizance, his Executors may certify on a Certiorari. Weſt. Symb. S. 156. cites 8 H. 4. 5. 1 H. 7. 9. F. N. B. 147 (B).

6. A Writ of *Covenant* is proſecuted *Jan.* 23. *returnable Oct. Purificat.* The Dedimus Poteſtatem is *teſted* 23 *Jan.* the Judge certified the Concord *taken Feb.* 14. which is 2 Days after the Term, at which Time the Writ of Covenant is not depending; the Fine is, Hæc eſt finalis *Concordia facta in Oct. purif.* And after it is recorded in 15 Paſch. and yet adjudged a good Fine. Hutt. 135. Sir Richard Champernoon's Caſe.

(P. 3) Executed. How; and in what Caſes neceſſary.

1. *Weſtm.* 2. 13 *E.* 1. 45. *Enacts that for all Things recorded before the King's Juſtices, or contained in Fines, (whether Contracts, Covenants, Obligations, Services for Cuſtoms acknowledged, or any other Things inrolled) a Writ of Execution ſhall be within the Year, but after the Year a* Scire facias, *whereupon if Satisfaction be not made, or good Cauſe ſhewed, the Sheriff ſhall be commanded to do Execution.*

'Tis ſaid in our Books, that at Common Law before this Statute, if a Fine executory was not executed, that the Party ſhould not have *Brief de Fine Fracto*, in the which the Plaintiff will recover only Damages; but under Correction, *before the ſaid Statute of W.* 2. the *Conuſee might have entered upon the Conuſor, and his Heirs. For* the ſaid *Statute does not give Entry* to the Conuſee or his Heirs. Co. R. on Fines 12.

2. A Fine may be executed by Writ of *Habere facias Seiſinam*, and if *Reſcous* be made, the Sheriff may take the *Poſſe Comitatus*, and make Execution. Br. Fines pl. 112. cites 19 E. 2. Fitzh. tit. Execution. 247.

He, to whom a Remainder was made by Fine, ſued *Habere facias Seiſinam* to the Sheriff, and the *Sheriff returned*, that he cannot make Execution for *Reſiſtance*, and 'twas adjudged that his Return was not good; and the Sheriff was *amerced* 20 *Marks*. Co. R. on Fines 12.

3. Scire facias upon *a Fine between T. and H.* by which *T. acknowledged the Land to be the Right of H.* &c. and *H. granted and rendered to T. Habend' to him and E. his Feme, and to the Heirs which T. ſhould beget on the Body of E.* ſo that *if they died without ſuch Heirs*, that *then it ſhould revert to the ſaid H. for his Life*, the *Remainder to C. and S. his Feme in Tail*, &c. *T. died without Heirs of the Body of E*; and the Tenant ſaid that *after the Death of H. and S. who was the Mother of the Plaintiff, C. the Father of the Plaintiff entred and was ſeiſed*; and ſo the Fine executed &c. Judgment, &c. and the Opinion was; that becauſe it was *once executed*, it ſhould not be executed again by Scire Facias of the ſame Eſtate which was executed; But *the Heir is put to his Formedon for the Miſchief of Warranty*; for tho' the Tenant in the Scire facias may have Writ of Warranty of Charters, yet his Feoffor ſhall loſe his Warranty Paramount, which he may have by way of Voucher in a Formedon, which he loſt in Writ of Warranty of Charters, & adjornatur. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 125. cites 24 E. 3. 57.

4. Land was given *to J. N.* by Fine *in Tail*, the *Remainder to P. in Tail*, the *Remainder to the right Heirs of J. N.* the firſt Donee; and A. as right *Heir of the firſt Donee ſued Execution*, becauſe *the others were dead without Iſſue*, and it well lay; For the *Fee was not executed during the firſt Eſtate*. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 89. cites 39 E. 3. 17.

5. Scire

5. Scire facias to execute a Fine was *ſued by the Heir of S.* becauſe *the Fine was levied to A. for Life*, the *Remainder to J. in Tail*, the *Remainder to S. in Fee*; and that *all are dead, and J.* [*died*] *without Iſſue*; and the Tenant ſaid, that *A. ſurrendered his Eſtate to J. and after S. died, and J.* [*died*] *without Iſſue*; and that *A. entered as Brother and Heir to S.* whoſe Eſtate he has, Judgment if Execution. And the other ſaid, that A. by his Entry after the Death of S. had only his firſt Eſtate for Life; which is a great Error; For it is a Surrender; and then *after the Death of J. and S. A. was in of Fee, and* then *the Fine executed in the Fee*, and never ſhall be executed again; and per Finch, becauſe the *Eſtate for the Life of A. merged in the Seiſin of J. and he is in in Tail*, and not for the Life of A. the Wife of J. ſhall be endowed. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 21. cites 42 E. 3. 9.

6. Eſtate by *Fine is made to two, and to the Heirs of one*; and he who had the *Fee died*; and after the *Tenant for Life died*, and *J. N.* abated; the *Heir of him who had the Fee, may have* an Aſſiſe of Mortdanceſter, or a Writ of Right, or a *Scire facias*, per Kirton, to which Finch agreed; quod mirum, that it ſhall be *executed to ſome Actions, and to ſome not.* Br. Sci. fa. pl. 21. cites 42 E. 3. 9.

7. Fine *levied by him in Reverſion, without expreſs mention of the Reverſion*, is not executory; nor ſhall the Party have Execution where it is levied *Sur Conuſance de Droit, or Sur Grant and Render.* 43 E. 3. 15. but ſuch Fine was executed the ſame Year, fol. 22. and there 'tis ſaid clearly that the Right paſſes, tho' the Conuſor had nothing but Reverſion in Tail; but it ſeems clearly, that *by Fine ſur Conuſance de Droit come ceo, &c. Reverſion paſſes.* Br. Sci. fa. pl. 28. cites 43 E. 3. 22. per Thorp.

8. Scire facias. The Caſe was, that Land was entailed for *Life* by Fine, the *Remainder to Baron and Feme in Tail*; the *Baron died*, and after the *Tenant for Life died*; the *Feme entred and died*; and the Son brought Scire facias as Heir to his Father and Mother of their Bodies; and by Award *it is a good Execution by the Entry of the Feme after the Death of her Huſband*, as well as if the Baron and Feme had been ſeiſed; quod nota. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 51. cites 49 E. 3. 22.

9. A Fine is levied *to J. N. in Tail, Remainder to the right Heirs*; the Heir *lineal* ſhall not have Execution; For this is executed of the Tail; but *the Heir collateral*, after the Tail determined, ſhall ſue Execution of the Fee Simple in the Remainder. Br. Fines pl. 32. cites 7 H. 4. 16.

10. If a Fine be levied *to the Husband and Wife in ſpecial Taile*, the *Remainder to the Heirs of the Body of the Husband*, and the *Wife dies without Iſſue*; the Remainder is executed in Poſſeſſion in the Husband; For the *Eſtate Tail meeteth with the Freehold, and drowneth it.* Weſt. Symb. S. 176. cites 7 H. 4. 23.

11. *Some* Fines are to be executed *by Entry only, ſome by Scire facias, or Entry*, as long as the Entry of the Conuſee is lawful. But *at Common Law*, our Books ſay that the Conuſee has no Remedy, if the Fine be not executed, but only *Writ of Fine Fracto*, which (as it ſeems to me) is to be intended, *when the Entry of the Conuſee was taken away.* For by the Order of the Common Law, the Conuſee might have entred; But the *Scire facias is given by the Statute of Weſtm. 2. Cum de hiis quæ recordata ſunt, &c.* Co R. on Fines 3. cites 21 E. 4. 4. b. 45 E. 3.

Br. Fines. pl. 97. cites 18 E. 4. 22.

12. A Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo, &c. is executed; Becauſe it *ſuppoſes a Gift precedent*; but tho' it be executed *between the Parties*, yet, *as to all Strangers, the Conuſor remains ſeiſed of the Land. But* if ſuch Fine be levied *of a Rent, Common, Advowſon, Liberties*, or ſuch like; the Conuſee has a Freehold in Law in him, before any Poſſeſſion or actual Seiſin had. Co. R. on Fines 4.

If Conuſee is *in Poſſeſſion*, the Fine is executed, ſo that he may have Formedon or other Action; and

If the Conuſor be in Poſſeſſion, he may enter upon him or upon his Heir; but if the Land be recovered or aliened, ſo that his Entry be taken away, the Fine is void. Br. Fines. pl. 12. cites 41. E. 3. 14.—Weſt's Symb. S. 126.

(P. 4) Execution barred, by what. Diſſeiſin, &c.

1. If a Man *Seiſed in Fee levies a Fine* to another ſur Conuſance de Droit *Come ceo*, &c. and, *before Entry* made *by the Conuſee*, *a Stranger enters, and dies ſeiſed*; neither Conuſee nor Conuſor has any Remedy. 41 E. * 1. 14. b. per Finch. *But if*, after the Fine levied, the *Conuſor continues Poſſeſſion*, and dies in Poſſeſſion, the Conuſee *may enter upon the Heir*, and if he enters after the Deſcent, he ſhall avoid the Ward. * 12 H. 4. 16. per Thirning. Co. R. on Fines 4.

*This ſhould be 41 E. 3. 14 according to Br. Fines. pl. 12.

* Br. Fines, pl. 41. cites S.C.

2. *But* if ſuch Fine (as it ſeems to me) be levied *of a Reverſion expectant* upon the Eſtate for Life, or in Tail; in ſuch Caſe, after the Death of the Leſſee, or the Eſtate determined, the Conuſee ſhall have *Scire Facias*; and therefore if the Leſſee be diſſeiſed, and a *Deſcent*, and after the Leſſee dies, the Conuſee is not without Remedy, as I think. Co. R. on Fines 4.

3. 'Tis ſaid in the 1 E. 4. 6. that if a Fine was *levied before Time of Memory*, a Man ſhall not have Scire Facias at this Day to have Execution of it. Co. R. on Fines. 12.

[See (N. b. 5)]

(P. 5) Abatement. By Death of the King.

1. If a Juſtice takes a Conuſance, and after, the King dies *before any Writ of Covenant, or Ded. Poteſtatem* upon the Conuſance, 'tis utterly void. So it ſhould be (as it ſeems to me) at Common Law, if the Writ of Covenant or Ded. Pot. had been Sued, and Conuſance taken, and after the King dies, that ſuch Conuſance ſhall not be received: But now at this Day, 'tis otherwiſe; For now a Writ ſhall not abate by the Death of the King. Co. R. on Fines 10.

Br. Fines, pl. 85. and 124. cites 1 H. 7. 9.

2. 1 *Annæ.* 8. *S.* 5. *Enacts that no Original Writ, Proceſs, or Proceedings whatſoever, ſhall abate or diſcontinue by the Death of any King or Queen of his Realm.*

(P. 6) Execution, by Entry, at what Time it may be, and in what Caſes tolled by Deſcent, Alienation, Recovery, &c.

1. If a Man levy a *Fine* to another, *ſur Conuſance de Droit Come ceo*, &c. the *Conuſee may enter upon the* Conuſor, or his *Heir*, quod nota. *But if Recovery or Alienation be*, ſo that his Entry is toll'd, he is without Remedy, nota; and ſo it ſeems, that he cannot enter upon the Alienation, Quære inde. Br. Entre Cong. pl. 7. cites 41 E. 3. 14.

2. In Ward, 'twas agreed, that where a Man levied a Fine, *Sur Conuſance de Droit* to another, and yet continued Poſſeſſion, and *died ſeiſed*, and his Heir entered; yet the *Entry of the Conuſee is good* and lawful *upon the Heir*, per Thir. clearly, which none denied. Br. Entre Cong. pl. 23. cites 12 H. 4. 16.

Br. Fines, pl. 41. S.C.

(P. 7) Execution of Fines. What amounts to it, or what Fines need it.

1. Sci. fa. was brought to execute a Fine, becauſe the Fine was *levied to A. B. and C. and to the Heirs of the Body of B.* the Remainder *to the right Heirs of C.* and becauſe *all were dead, and B without Iſſue*, the Plaintiff, as Right *Heir of B. brought Writ to execute* the Fine. The *De-*

fendant ſaid that A. died, and B. alſo, without Iſſue, living C. and ſo the Fee Simple executed in his Life, and therefore Sci. fa. does not lie; For it now is as if an Eſtate for Life had been granted to C. the Remrinder to his right Heirs, in which Caſe he has Fee ſimple. Br. Scire Facias, pl. 16. cites 40. E. 3. 20.

2. *But* where a Fine was *levied to Baron and Feme and C. and the Heirs of C.* and *C. died*, and then the *Baron and Feme died*, and the Heir of C. brought Sci. fa. It was agreed that the Fine was *executed for a Moiety in the Life of C.*. Quod Nota. Br. Scire facias, pl. 16. cites 40. E. 3. 20. But Brooke ſays it is *Contra in the Caſe above*; *For B. had Eſtate Tail*, and therefore the Fee Simple in that Caſe could not be executed for any Part. Note the Difference.

3. If at the levying of Executory Fines, the Party, unto whom the Eſtate is limited, be *in Poſſeſſion of the Lands* paſſed, he needeth no Writ of Execution for the ſame; for then ſuch Fines do *enure by Way of Extinguiſhment of Right*, but alter not the Eſtate nor Poſſeſſion of the Cogniſee, but perchance better it. Weſt's Symb. 6. S. 20 cites 7 H. 7. 12 and 22. 2 Ed. 3. 6 21 Ed. 3. 44 8 H. 4 8. 41 Ed. 3. 14. 7 H. 4. 23.

Weſt's Symb. S. 177. 4. Note, that a Fine is either executed by Writ of *Habere Facias Seiſinam*, which is a Writ to the Sheriff to put the Cogniſee or his Heirs in Poſſeſſion; and this muſt be ſued forth within a Year after the Fine ſued forth, or after Judgment upon a *Sci Fa.* Or elſe he muſt have a Writ of *Sci. Fa.* which is to be ſued forth after a Year and Day after the Fine is levied; and thereby the Sheriff is to warn the Tenant to appear and ſhew Cauſe, if he can, why the Cogniſee or his Heirs ſhould not have Execution: At the Return whereof, if the *Tenant appear, and can ſhew Cauſe* to the contrary, the Plaintiff ſhall have an *Habere Facias Seiſinam* to the Sheriff, to put him or his Heirs in Poſſeſſion; or the Cogniſee, where the Fine is *ſur Cognizance de Droit Come ceo, que il ad de ſon done*, may obtain the actual Poſſeſſion of the Land contained in the Fine, *by an Entry*: For in this Caſe of a Fine executed, if the Cogniſor be ſtill in Poſſeſſion of the Land, whereof the Fine is levied, the Cogniſee may, without any Writ of Habere Facias Seiſinam, enter upon him, and ſo get the Seiſin and Poſſeſſion of the Land. Brown of Fines 167.

Weſt's Symb. S. 178.

Weſt's Symb. S. 176. cites 41. E. 3. and 14. E. 3. 5.

5. *And* note, that if a Fine be *levied to a Huſband and Wife in ſpecial Tail*, the Remainder *to the Heirs of the Body of the Huſband*, and *the Wife dieth without Iſſue*, the Remainder is executed in Poſſeſſion in the Huſband; For the Eſtate Tail meeteth with the Fee Simple, and is drowned. Brown of Fines 167. cites 41. Ed. 3. 14. 14 Ed. 3 5 7 H. 4. 23.

Weſt's Symb. S. 176. cites 7 H. 4 23.

(Q) What ſhall be good Cauſe to ſtay a Fine.

S. P. Hob. 330. Farmer's Caſe. S. P. 2 Lev. 12. ——See (H. b)

1. If Baron and Feme levy a Fine, and the Conuſance is taken ſix Days before Eaſter Term 7 June, and the Writ of Covenant is returned 15 Paſchæ, which was the 3d of May, and the Baron dies the 9th of May, the King's Silver not being enter'd; yet if upon Examination it appears, that the Clerk had enter'd the King's Silver in Paper before any Exception taken to it; and that now he had entered the King's Silver upon the back of the Writ of Covenant as it ought to be, the Fine ſhall not be ſtaid. Pl. 7. * Ja. B. *Booth's Caſe* per Cur. preter Foſter. For when this is entered, it has Relation to the Return of the Writ of Covenant.

* Orig. is (Ju. b.)

2. If J. S. with the Feme of another levies a Fine (by the Name of J. S. and Jane his Wife) of the Inheritance of the Feme and he who is her true Baron comes into Court, and ſhews [this] Matter, and prays to ſtay the Fine, yet the Court will not ſtay it. For the Court will not determine the Legality of Matrimony, and if the Truth be that ſhe is not the Wife of J. S. this will not hurt the Right Baron. Tr. 7. Ja. B. per Cur. between Kebleth waite and Wade.

3. If

3. If a Man levies a Fine, and before the King's Silver is entered, there is ſhewn to the Court an Office, by which it is found that the Land is held in Capite, and a Licence of Alienation before granted of the ſame Land, the Court may ſtay the Fine till he has purchaſed a Licence of Alienation, and a Writ of Quod permittat comes to them. 9. 11. Ja. B. per Cur. Ld Arundel's Caſe.

4. If a *Feme ſole* by Dedimus Poteſtatem *acknowledges a Fine*, and *before the Return* thereof *marries*; this Fine *may be certified*, and ingroſſed, *as of a Feme Sole*, becauſe the taking of her Husband, after the Fine acknowledged, is her own voluntary Act, and ſuch Fine ſhall barr her and her Heirs for ever; and the taking the Baron was after the Teſte of the Writ of Covenant; and it was held, that a *Releaſe of the Baron to the Conuſee* of all his Right made all clear. D. 246. pl. 68. Mich. 7 and 8. Eliz. Anon. West. S. 156.

[See (H. b)]

(Q. 2) Stay'd, by Death of any of the Parties.

1. A Fine was ready to be ingroſſed, and Laicon came and ſhewed that the *Conuſor had before levied other Fine to another*, and prayed that it be not ingroſſed. & non Allocatur; For the firſt Conuſee may have his Remedy by Aſſiſe, vel aliter, upon the firſt Fine. *But if the Court be aſcertained, that the Conuſor is dead*, the Fine ſhall not be engroſſed, per Priſot; wherefore Licence was ſhewn upon the firſt Fine, and that the Land was held of the King, upon which they ſtayed the Ingroſſing; and by him no Fine ſhall be ſuffered *upon Condition, nor to divers Perſons, and their Heirs*, but ſuch as are held of the King; and by him, notwithſtanding the Licence, the Fine ſhall not be engroſſed without *Writ* out of Canc. *of Quod permittat*. Quære of this Writ. Br. Fines pl. 10. cites 33 H. 6. 52.

2. A. Tenant for Life, and B. Remainder Man in Fee, acknowledge a Note of a Fine; A. *dies*; per Hobart, the Conuſee might proceed with the Fine, as againſt B. only, and take his Writ of Covenant accordingly. Hob. 329. Erſheld's Caſe. Winch. 4. Paſch. 19 Jac. S. C. Sackville v. Earnsby.

3. A Feme Covert one of the Cognizors died *after the Caption*, and *after the Teſte, but before the Return of the Writ of Covenant*; and a Caveat being enter'd, it was inſiſted that the *King's Silver was not paid before the Wife's Death*; and therefore the Fine ought not to paſs. But it was anſwered, that Fines are common Aſſurances, and that the Acknowledgment makes the Fine compleat, and that the King's Silver is the Fine, pro Licentia Alienandi, which is the Præ-fine paid at the Alienation Office, and for which a *Receipt was indorſed on the Writ of Covenant* and is not Part of the Poſt-Fine, which is never collected till after the Fine is compleated; and the Court after Conſideration was of that Opinion, and ordered the Fine to paſs. Barnes's Notes of Caſes in C. B. 141. Mich. 6 Geo. 2. Harneis v. Micklethwaite.

4. A *Year having lapſed ſince the Caption* of a Fine, it was ſtopped at the King's Silver Office, for Want of an *Affidavit, that the Parties were living*; and *one of the Conuſors being dead*, Application was made in the Treaſury, to the Judges, to ſtrike him out, and that the Fine might paſs as to the other, which they denied, but made a *Rule, that the ſurviving Conuſor ſhew Cauſe, why the Fine ſhould not paſs generally, as to all Parties*; and upon Affidavit of Service, the Rule was made abſolute. Barnes's Notes of Caſes in C. B. 142. Cotton & Tyrrel, Bart. v. Baylie & Ryder.

5. In a like Caſe of Want of Affidavit, the Court, upon inſpecting the Writ of Covenant and Conuſance, made a *Rule upon the Clerk of the King's Silver Office to ſhew Cauſe, why the Fine ſhould not paſs*, and upon hearing Counſel for the Conuſee, and the Clerk of the Office, and it appearing that *all the Parties were living at the Time, when the King's Silver*

was

was paid; the Fine was ordered to paſs. And the Court ſaid, that ſuch Affidavit was all which the Office ought to require. Barnes's Notes of Caſes in C. B. 142 Mich. 7 Geo. 2. Gregory v. Croucher.

6. A Fine *acknowledged in South Carolina, ſworn to before the Chief Juſtice there to be duely acknowledged*, was *atteſted by a Publick Notary*. But it was held by the Judges in the Treaſury, that it cannot paſs without *Oath before one of the Juſtices of C. B.* of the due Acknowledgment. Barnes's Notes of Caſes in C. B. 143. Paſch. 8 Geo. 2. Dean v. Tidmarſh.

(R) ‡ In what Caſes the Fine being received, ſhall be good. [* *Lieu Conus.*]

Adjudg'd, that the Fine is good enough; For it is but the *Agreement of the Parties*, which being recorded is good enough.

1. * If a Fine be levied of a Common of Paſture in A. this is good, tho' A. be no Vill, Hamlet, or Lieu Conus out of the Vill, &c. but only the Name of the Paſture, where the Common is to be taken, and this within a Vill. P. 17. Ja. B. R. Rot. Per Cur. tho' Judgment given of the other Part for other Cauſe. Cro. J. 574. Trin. 18. Jac. B. R. Monk v. Butler.

For the Fine *is drawn according to the Writ of Covenant*, which is *guided by the Indenture and Agreement of the Parties*, viz. What they agree to paſs by ſuch Names, and it ought not to vary, and if it *varies* from the Deed, the other is not bound to levy the Fine. Cro. C 269, 276. Faveley [alias Staveley] v. Eaſton. ——Jo. 301. Mich. 8. Car. B. R. S. C.

2. * If a Fine be levied of Land in Eaſton, and there is a Farm called Eaſton in the Pariſh of B. and there is not any Lieu Conus, by Name of Eaſton out of the Vill; yet this is a good Fine, being received by Conſent of the Parties, without Exception to the Writ, and it being alſo a common Aſſurance. M. 8 Car. B. R. adjudg'd per Cur. upon a ſpecial Verdict, between *Eveleigh* and *Eaſton*. Intratur Hill. B. Rot. 1075.

3. * Scire Facias upon a *Fine of a Houſe, three Acres of Land, and of the Manor of U.* and becauſe he *did not ſhew in what Vill* the Tenements are, the Writ was abated, by Reaſon of the Viſne; For in the Writ of Covenant there was a Vill, and this Writ ſhall not be brought out of the Vill, Quod nota. And yet Thorpe ſaid, that he had ſeen a Fine levied in a *Hamlet*, and the *Writ brought in the Vill where the Hamlet was*, and was not abated for the Variance. Br. Brief, pl. 141. cites 38 E. 3. 20.

4. ‡ If a Fine be *to two and their Heirs*, or if the *Conuſance de Droit be to two*, or if Fine be *on Condition*, yet being received, ſuch and like Fines ſhall ſtand. 5 Rep. 38. b. Tey's Caſe.

5. ‡ If a *Feme Covert* is of full Age, and joins with her Husband to levy a Fine of her Lands, ſhe muſt be privately examined, whether ſhe parts with the Right in her Land freely, or by Compulſion. But tho' ſhe is not examined, if the Fine is *received and recorded*, it is good. Wood's Inſt. 241.

[See (O) (E. a).]

(R. 2) Bound by the Fine. Who? Perſons that muſt mention the Conuſor in conveying their Title.

1. If the *Son diſſeiſes the Father*, and levies a Fine, and afterwards the *Father dies*, and then the Son dies, the Land ſhall not deſcend to the 2d. Son; but if the eldeſt *had died in the Life of his Father*, it had been otherwiſe. Arg. Lat. 66. cites 8 H. 5. 7.

2. *Grandfather*

2. *Grandfather Father and Son are*, and the *Father diſſeiſes the Grandfather*, and levies a Fine, and then the *Father dies*, the Son is barr'd, becauſe he muſt make his Conveyance from his Father. Arg. Lat. 73. cites 19 H. 8. D. 3.

but if my *Uncle diſſeiſe my Father*, and he levies a Fine in Life of my Father, it ſhall not barr me, becauſe my Uncle is not mention'd in the Conveyance to the Land. But if the Father dies, and the Uncle after levies a Fine, the Son ſhall be barred. Arg. Lat. 73, 74. cites D. 3.

3. A. Tenant for Life, *Reverſion to B. an Ideot in Fee, C. (who was B's Uncle)* [and Heir apparent, as Mar. 95, S. C. calls him] levied a Fine Come ceo, &c. with Proclamations to J. S. and afterwards C. died; then A. died; and then B. died without Iſſue. C. left Iſſue D. his Son and Heir. D. entered as Son and Heir of C. who was Heir of B. It was held by Crook and Barkley J. that the Entry of D. was lawful, and that the Fine of C. his Father was no Bar. For tho' there was a Neceſſity of naming the Uncle in deriving the Deſcent of the Inheritance to D. his Son, as C. the Uncle (Father of D.) was Heir to B. the Ideot, who was laſt ſeiſed of the Inheritance; yet the naming him here, is *not by Way of Title, but Pedigree only*: But Jones J. Contra. Cro. C. 524, 543. Adjornatur. Hill. 14 Car. B. R. Edwards v. Rogers.

Jones J. who held the Fine a Barr to the Heir of the Uncle, reports that it was adjudg'd no Barr. Jo. 462. S. C — And Serjeant Rolls, who was of Counſel with D. in the Argument of the Serjeant's Caſe (which was the very Point) ſaid, that this Caſe was adjudged no Barr. Mar. 95. S. C.

[See (D. 2)

(S) Who ſhall be bound by the Fine. Party.

1. **If a Man by Fine** acknowledge all his Right **of certain Land** to me, and I render to him again in Fee, **where** none of us had any Thing **in the Land, and** after I purchaſe the Land; **this Fine will bind me, for it is executory upon me.** 17 E. 3. 53. b. 776.

2. If a *Son diſſeiſe his Father*, and *levies* a Fine with Proclamation to a Stranger, upon whom *the Father enters and dies*: The Son may re-enter againſt his own Fine. Paſch. 4 Car. C. B. Het. 97. Iſham v. Lawne.

(S. 2) Bound who. Conuſee of a Fine, by Leaſes, &c. preceding the Fine.

1. *A Stranger levies a Fine to Tenant in Tail in Remainder* expectant on two Eſtates for Life, and he *renders to the Conuſor for 54 Years*, and *dies before the Proclamations* are any of them made; afterwards the Proclamations are made, and the Tenants for Life (after the Time in which the Years are limited to commence) dye. Adjudged that the Term was good againſt the Iſſue in Tail. Pl. C. 437. b. Paſch. 15 Eliz. Smith v. Stapleton.

2. *A. Tenant in Tail, Remainder in Fee to B. A. makes a Leaſe for Life*, according to the Statute, and *dies without Iſſue*; afterwards B. grants his Remainder by Fine before any Entry; the Conuſee cannot now enter on Tenant for Life, and avoid his Leaſe; For by the Livery to Tenant for Life a Freehold paſſes, which cannot be avoided without an Entry; and then, when B. grants his Remainder, the *Grantee ſhall have it but as a Remainder*, and ſo the Eſtate of Tenant for Life, which before was voidable, is now made good; per Fenner and Windham J. but per Mead and Dyer, by the Death of Tenant in Tail, the Leaſe for Life is become void, the Eſtate out of which &c. being determined by the dying without Iſſue. 4 Le. 118. 23 Eliz. C. B. Anon.

3. A. ſeiſed in Tail of the Manor of S. leaſes W. Acre, Parcel thereof, to W. for 40 Years, and after to G. G. for 70 Years. G. G. aſſigned to C. and M. the Wife of A.—A. afterwards by Indenture gave the ſaid Manor to the ſaid G. G. by the words (Dedi, Conceſſi, Barganizavi & Vendidi)

Vendidi) upon Condition, that G. G. pay to A. within 15 Days 1000 *l.* and on failure, then after the 15 Days, G. G. ſhould be ſeiſed of a Tenement Parcel of the ſaid Manor of the yearly Value of 60 *l.* until he had levied 500 *l.* for Payment of the ſaid A.'s Debts, &c. and after to the Uſe of B. the eldeſt Son of A. in Tail; and of the Reſidue of the ſaid Manor, to the Uſe of the ſaid A. and M. for their Lives, &c. A. made Livery to G. G. in a Place, Parcel of the ſaid Manor, which was in his own Occupation, in name of the whole Manor; the 1000 *l.* is not paid at the Time; the Indenture is Inrolled; W. Attornes; M. dyes; A. grants the Lands to R. by *Fine*, and *before Proclamation B.* (the Defendant) *enters for Forfeiture*; *Proclamations are made*; A. dies; the 40 Years Leaſe expires; C. enters and leaſes to the Plaintiff. Adjudged that the *Moiety of M. the Wife of A. and Aſſignee with C. by* G. G. was *extinct by the Livery*; and as to the *Moiety of C.* it *is in being*; For here is *no Remitter to B.* For if any Remitter had been in the Caſe, it ſhould be after the Uſe raiſed, which is not as yet raiſed; for the Land ought to remain in G. G. till the 500 *l.* be levied, and that is not found by the Verdict; and therefore for the ſaid Moiety, the Plaintiff had Judgment. Mich. 25 and 26 Eliz. B. R. Le. 7. Stonely v. Bracebridge.

4. *Tenant in Tail* makes a Leaſe for Years not warranted by the Statute, and dies, *the Iſſue aliens the* Land by Fine; before Affirmance or Diſaffirmance by Acceptance or Entry, the Counſee cannot avoid this Leaſe; For the Liberty is not transferred; per Gawdy J. Mich. 29 and 30 Eliz. B. R. 3 Le. 154.——Jo. 61. in Caſe of Crocker v. Kelſey.

* Arg. 3. Buls. 273. cites 2 Rep. 77. b. Harvey's Caſe put in Cromwell's Caſe. —If the Husband makes a Leaſe of the Wife's Land *for* 100 *Years*, the Wife may avoid it after his Death; but if after they both levy a Fine, the Leaſe ſhall be good for ever. Arg. Goldsb. 13. Paſch. 28 Eliz.——S. P. agreed Arg. ibid. 14.

5. Husband and Wife are ſeiſed of Land in the Right of the Wife; *Husband alone makes a Leaſe for Years by Word*; afterwards the Husband and Wife levy a Fine, and both dye; per tot. Cur. the Conuſee ſhall avoid the Leaſe. Mich. 30 and 31 Eliz. B. R. Le. 247. * Harvy v. Thomas.——Becauſe it was merely void by the Death of the Husband. 2 Le. 141. S. C. cited.——4 Le. 15. per Wray Ch. J. the Leaſe is void, but Gawdy J. Contra, S. C.——Becauſe all paſs'd from the Feme. Arg. S. C. cited Roll. R. 402.——Arg. Bridgm. 45. S. C. cited.——Cro. E. 216. S. C.

6. *A. Tenant for Life, Remainder to B. in Tail*, join in a *Leaſe to J. N. for Life, Remainder to J. S. for Life* Rendring Rent; A. dies; B. accepts the Rent and dies; *the Iſſue of B. accepts the Rent of J. N.* and after enters and makes a Feoffment, and levies a Fine to W. R. Afterwards J. N. re-enters and dies; J. S. as in his Remainder enters. Adjudged that the Eſtate of J. S. in Remainder was good, and could not be avoided by a Purchaſor. Cro. E. 252. Mich. 33 and 34 Eliz. B. R. Jeffry v. Coyte.

7. Alienee of Iſſue in Tail by Fine may enter, and avoid a Leaſe *made by a Jointreſs* Tenant in Tail for 3 Lives contrary to the 11 H. 7. 3 Rep. 51. Hill. 36 Eliz. Sir Geo. Browne's Caſe.——cited Show 378. Arg. Paſch. 4. W. and M.

A. ſuffered a Recovery *with Voucher of B.* and dies, the Leaſe to C. is not deſtroyed. Cro. E. 718. Mich. 41 Eliz. C. B. Pledgard v. Lake.

8. A. Leſſee for Life, *Remainder to B. in Tail*; *B. leaſes to C. for Years to commence after A's Death*; B. ſuffers a common Recovery to D. and dies; the Leaſe for Years is good againſt D. Dyer 51. b. Marg. pl. 17. cites M. 41 and 42. Eliz.

9. A. conveyed Land to the Uſe of *himſelf and his Wife in Tail*; *Remainder to his Right Heirs*; and had Iſſue a Son and a Daughter, and dy'd; and the *Son leaſed for Years to begin after the Death of his Mother, and dyed without Iſſue*; the Daughter levied a Fine; the Wife, who was Tenant in Tail, dyed. The Queſtion was, if this Leaſe for Years iſſued out of the Eſtate Tail by way of Eſtopple; For then the Conuſee ſhall not avoid it. It was adjudged, that this Leaſe was drawn out of the Reverſion in Fee, and the Conuſee of the Daughter ſhall avoid it. Arg. Winch. 44. cites

44. cites it as 10 Jac. B. R. Errington v. Errington.——2 Buls. 42. Mich. 10 Jac. S. C. but ſays, that no Judgment was given. Coke Ch. J. was ſtrong in Opinion againſt the Leaſe of the Son to bind the Conuſee; and Dodderige for it; and that the Cauſe was ended by Agreement as he heard.

10. A. levies a Fine *to B. to the Uſe of C. in Tail*, Remainder *to his own right Heirs*; A. in the Life of C. makes a Leaſe for 100 Years; C. dies without Iſſue; it is a good Leaſe againſt A. For tho' it is called a Remainder, yet *it was a Reverſion in A.* and in ſuch Caſe his Heir ſhould be no Purchaſor, but ſhould take by Deſcent. Jenk. 267. pl. 78. 2 Rep. 91. Bingham's Caſe.

11. If *Tenant in Tail* makes a Leaſe for Years, and levies a *Fine* with Proclamations *to the Donor* and dies having Iſſue, the Donor ſhall avoid the Leaſe. Arg. Bridgm. 28. cites 6 Rep. Ld * Abergany's Caſe. * 6 Rep. 58. b. Paſch. 5 Jac. C. B.

12. *Tenant in Tail makes Leaſe for Years*, and *levies a Fine* to another, this makes the Leaſe unavoidable. Arg. 2 Roll. R. 490. Hill. 22 Jac. B. R. Crocker v. Kelſey. So where the *Reverſion was in the King*, and the Tenant in Tail levied a *Fine to the King*, he ſhall not avoid the Leaſe; Becauſe he came in in the *Reverter*. But if Tenant in Tail was Attainted of Treaſon, the King ſhould avoid the Leaſe. Arg. Godb. 324. cites 2 Mar. Auſtin's Caſe, cited in Walſingham's Caſe.

13. *Baron and Feme* [*Tenants in ſpecial Tail*, by a Conveyance made by the Baron during Coverture. Cro. J. 688. S. C.]—Remainder to the Heirs of the Baron, had Iſſue a Son; the Baron dies; the *Son levies a Fine* with Proclamations to the Uſe of himſelf and his Heirs; the *Feme makes Leaſe for* * 21 *Years*, rendring Rent; the Son having deviſed the Land; the Feme dies; adjudged that the Leaſe continues. Hill. 22 Jac. B. R. 2 Roll. R. 490. 499. Crocker v. Kelſey.——Jo. 60. S. C.——but when the *Iſſue are all Dead*, then the Conuſee having the Reverſion ſhall avoid the Leaſe; but till then the Eſtate Tail continues in Right as to a Stranger. Jo. 62. S. C. affirmed in Error. Ibid. S. C. Bridgm. 28. but the Report there is, that the *Wife and Iſſue joined* in the Fine, and that afterwards ſhe made a Leaſe. —Cro. J. 688. S. C. reported as in Roll.

——Hutt. 84. S. C. Bridgm. 28. S. C.—S. P. Sid. 62. Mich. 13. Car. 2. B. R. Cudmore v. Betiſon, in which the Leaſe was made for 100 Years ——Bridg. 29. S. C—S. C. cited Sid. 62. in Caſe of Cudmore v. Betiſon ——* Roll. Eſtate (I. a) S. C. pl. 3. Reports the Leaſe to be for 30 Years.——The Eſtate Tail in the Feme, was by the Proviſion of the Baron during Coverture; and the Leaſe made by the Feme, was for 21 Years *without reſerving the Ancient Rent*, and then ſhe died; the Son deviſed the Land and died leaving a Daughter: This was adjudged a good Leaſe to bind the Deviſee. Cro. J. 688. Trin. 21 Jac. Crocker v. Kelſey.

The Juſtices ſaid, that the Reſolution of Crocker and Kelſey's Caſe went very far, and perhaps, if to be adjudged at this Day, it would be Contrary. Skin. 31. Hill. 33 and 34. Car. 2. B. R. in Caſe of Bettiſon v. Elways.

14. If there are Father (Tenant in Tail) and Son; and the *Son levies a Fine*, and the *Father afterwards makes a Leaſe for Years* and dies; the Conuſee ſhall not avoid it; For ſuch Leaſe was good at Common Law againſt the Iſſue; and the Statute of W. 2. ſhall aid none but the Iſſue in Tail; and when the Iſſue are extinct, ſhall aid only the Reverſioner. Jo. 61. Hill. 22 Jac. B. R. in Caſe of Croker v Kelſey.——And in all the ſaid Caſes, when the Eſtate Tail is ſpent by Death of all the Iſſues, the *Reverſioner* ſhall avoid the Leaſes. Ibid.

15. *Baron and Feme*, *Tenants in Tail*, and *to the Heirs of the Baron*; they have *iſſue two Daughters*; the two *Daughters levy a Fine to a Stranger and his Heirs*; the *Baron dies*; the *Feme makes Leaſe for* 100 *Years* and dies, under which Leaſe the Plaintiff in this Ejectment claimed, there being Iſſue in Tail alive; and if this be a good Leaſe againſt the Conuſee of the Fine, was the ſole Queſtion. And thoſe for the Plaintiff cited the Caſe of Crocker and Kelſey. 2 Cro. 688. for Authority in Point, that the Leaſe was good as long as there ſhall be any Iſſue in Tail alive; which Caſe is more largely reported in Bridgman's Rep. 27. And they alſo cited Mackwilliams's Caſe. And this Caſe not being within the Stat. 11 H. 7. the Feme may, without doubt, have and diſpoſe of all the Eſtate as long as there

there ſhall be Iſſue in Tail. And of this Opinion was all the Court in the Principal Caſe; but they offered to the Counſel of the Defendant to have Special Verdict if they thought neceſſary; but they knowing the Authority before to be againſt them in Point, and perceiving the Opinion of the Court, would not pray ſpecial Verdict; wherefore the Court directed the Jury to find for the Plaintiff. And they gave their Verdict accordingly. Mich. 13 Car. 2 B. R Sid. 62. Cudmore v. Bettiſon.

See Eſtate (Y. 2) pl. 1.

16. If *Conuſee of* a Fine by Tenant in Tail ſhall *avoid a voidable Leaſe*, made by the Tenant in Tail, as the Iſſue in Tail might have done? Per 2. J. that he may, Twiſden J. Contra. Lev. 167. Trin. 18. Car. 2. B. R. Opy v. Thomaſius.———Adjudged, that he cannot. Hill. 2 W. and M. B. R. 4 Mod. 4. * Simmonds v. Cudmore.———In the Caſe of Opy and Thomaſius, the Leaſe was a Leaſe *in Futuro*, made by the Father Tenant in Tail, and the Fine was levied by the Son, before a former Leaſe determined; and therefore the Court thought the Cognizee not bound by it; otherwiſe, had it been a *Leaſe in præſenti*. 4 Mod. 6. ibid.

* S. C. adjudged Carth. 258. and 1 Salk. 338. S. C.—Sid 261. S. C. and P.

17. *A. Tenant for Life, Remainder in Tail to B.* B. makes a Leaſe *to commence after A's Death*; A. ſuffers a common Recovery with Voucher of B. and dies. Held that the Leaſe is not deſtroyed, and that ſuch Leſſee might well *Falſify* ſuch *Recovery*, both at Common Law and by the Statute 21 *H.* 8. 15. Arg. Paſch. 4 W. and M. Show. 381. cites Cro. E. 718. Pledger v. Lake.

1 Salk. 338. S. C. Show. 370. S. C. 12 12 Mod. 32. Skin. 328. S. C.

18. *A. Tenant for Life, with Power to make a Leaſe for* 3 *Lives*, executes his Power, and dies; and after *B.* being *ſeiſed in Tail of the Reverſion* (after the Determination of the Term, for which the 3 Lives was granted) *and alſo of the Remainder to him in Fee, makes a Reverſionary Leaſe for* 2 *Lives, and dies, (the other* 3 *Lives being ſtill in Being)*; upon B's Death the *Eſtate Tail and Remainder in Fee deſcended to C.* and afterwards *C. levied a Fine* with Proclamations to J. S. and R. S. to the Uſe of F. and his Heirs. It was adjudged that this Reverſionary Leaſe iſſued out of both the Eſtates of B. (viz.) as well out of the the Remainder in Fee as out of the Eſtate Tail; and that the Eſtate Tail being extinguiſhed by the Fine, the Reverſionary Leaſe (iſſuing out of the Remainder in Fee, which B. had at the Time of the Leaſe made) was good and unavoidable. Hill. 4 W. and M. B. R. Carth. 257. Simmonds and Cudmore.

12 Mod. 33. S. C. and P. Skin. 330. S. C. and P.

19. *But* per 3 J. Contra Holt Ch. J. *if B. had been only Tenant in Tail*, without having the Remainder in Fee *at the Time of the Leaſe* made by him, the Cognizee ſhould not avoid the Leaſe; *becauſe the Power of avoiding* ſuch Charges *was annexed to the Eſtate Tail*, and reſts in Privity thereof, *being given* to the Iſſue *by the Statute De Donis*, and is not transferrable by the Iſſue to the Cognizee, or any Stranger, but is as a Power of Revocation, which is determined by changing or deſtroying the Eſtate, to which it is annexed; *nor* is ſuch future Leaſe *merely void* by Death of Tenant in Tail Leſſor before the Commencement. But that after his Death it is voidable only by ſome Act of Iſſue in Tail. But per Holt Ch. J. even in ſuch Caſe the Cognizee, or Feoffee of the Iſſue in Tail, might avoid this Leaſe; For he held, that by the Death of the Tenant in Tail before the future Intereſt could commence, the ſame would become *Ipſo facto void* as to the Leſſee; *For Leſſor*, Tenant in Tail, *dying before the Leaſe is to begin, is the ſame in Reaſon, as* where Tenant in Tail makes *a Leaſe to commence after his Death*, which is admitted to be void ab Initio; For upon the Death of Tenant in Tail the Eſtate deſcends to the *Iſſue*, and he *is in Paramount the future Intereſt; and the Leſſee*, in that Caſe, *has only a Right or Poſſibility of an Eſtate, which, by the Death of Tenant in Tail before that Right is to veſt as an Eſtate, is extinct* and gone. Carth. 259. in Caſe of Simmonds v. Cudmore.

(T) Fine

(T) Fine of Land. What Perſon might, and may be bound by it at Common Law. [*Baron and Feme, or Feme without her Baron.*]

1. IF Feme Covert **levies a Fine** as Feme ſole; **if the** Baron does not defeat it, **it ſhall bind the Feme and her Heirs for ever.** 7 H. 4. 23. 17 Aſſ. 17. **Dubitatur.** 17 E. 3. 52. b. 79. If a Feme Covert, as a Feme ſole, levies a Fine Executory, and after Execution is ſued againſt her and her Baron, the Baron makes Default, and the Feme is received, ſhe ſhall defeat her own Fine, for the Benefit of the Baron; as in one Book is adjudged, and yet ſhe appears in manner as a Feme ſole. Co. R. on Fines 9. cites 17 Aſſ 17.——*But* if ſhe, without her Husband, levies a Fine *by the Name of A. the Wife of J. S.* (her Husband) the Fine is merely void; Becauſe it *appears by the Record that ſhe is Covert*, per Bridgman Ch. J. Sid. 122.——Hob. 225. 7 Rep. 8. 10 Rep. 43. Perk. S. 20.

2. If Feme Covert take ſecond Baron, and they levy a Fine, **this ſhall bind the Feme and her Heirs for ever.** 7 H. 4. 24. 9 H. 6. 33. b. It ſhall not bind; For ſhe is Nam'd by the Name of the ſecond Baron, and not of the firſt, and ſo it is not good. Br. Fines, pl. 33. cites 7 H. 4. 23. per Gaſcoigne.——Br. Eſtoppel, pl. 55. cites S. C. but adds a Quære.——Br. Scire facias pl. 60. cites S. C.——Weſt's Symb. 2. b. S. S. cites 7 H. 4. 22. 23. that it ſhall not bind her, becauſe ſhe is *miſnamed.*—*Yet* if ſhe *with her right Husband, by a wrong Chriſtian Name*, levy a Fine, ſhe is eſtopped during her Life. Ibid. cites 1 Aſſ. 11. Br. Fines 17.

3. But **in thoſe Caſes the** Baron may defeat it. 7 H. 4. 23. 9 H. 6. 34. b. 17. E. 3. 52. b. 79. 17 Aſſ. 17. But if *the firſt Baron dies before Entry* by him, this ſhall bind her and her Heirs for ever. Co. R. on Fines 9. and yet he cites a Book to the Contrary. 32 H. 6. 27.———Br. Entre Cong. pl. 129. cites S. C.—Kelw. 205. b. pl. 7.——Dal. 50. pl. 16.

4. **And** if the Baron avoids the Fine, **it ſhall avoid the Fine againſt the Feme and her Heirs for ever.** * 17 Aſſ. 17. He may Enter and Defeat it, as to the Franktenement, which he claims for his Life in Jure Uxoris to be *Tenant by the Curteſy*. Br. Fines pl. 33. cites 7 H. 4. 23. per R. Hull and Hulls———Kelw. 205. b. pl. 7. Dyer Ch. J. doubted, but he ſaid that Fineux was of Opinion that the Fine was avoided in toto.———Dal. 50. pl. 16.———* Br. Fines pl. 75. cites S. C. and 17 E. 3. 52. and 78.

5. If **Baron and Feme** levy a Fine, and after they are Divorced, Cauſa Præcontractus, **yet the Fine Remains good.** 9 H. 6. 34. b.

6. **And this remains** good **as well** againſt the Heirs of the Feme **as againſt the Feme herſelf. Contra.** 18 H. 6. 34. b.

7. If a Fine be levied *by Baron and Feme during the Nonage of the Feme*, the Reverſal muſt be during the Nonage of the Feme, but *Ceſſet Executio during the Life of the Baron*; For he has Authority thereof given for his Life. Br. Error, pl. 28. cites 30 E. 3. 5. 6.

8. In Scire facias, the Caſe was, that a *Feme had two Barons together*, and the *ſecond Baron levied a Fine and died*, and the *firſt Baron* ſurvived and *died*, and the *Feme was always ſeiſed, and no Party to the Fine*, and after died, and *the Heir of the Feme entred*, and Scire facias was brought againſt him to execute the Fine, and held that the Fine does not bind; and the Tenant pleads that M. his Mother was ſeiſed before the Fine, at the time of the Fine, and always after, and was the Feme of Rich. and never the Feme of Rob. who levied the Fine; and by ſome, he ſhall ſay, that thoſe, who were Parties to the Fine had nothing, but M. whoſe Eſtate he hath, &c. and per Finch, the Iſſue ſhall be, whether M. Feme of Rob. who was Party to the Fine, had anything? quære, quia non adjudicatur. Br. Fines, pl. 16. cites 42 E. 3. 20.

9. If a *Feme Covert* only *without her Baron* levies a *Fine executory*, tho' the *Baron continues in Poſſeſſion during his Life*, and after dies, yet this ſhall conclude the Feme and her Heirs; but if *Execution* had been ſued,

and after the Baron had died, this had avoided the Fine for ever. Co. R. on Fines 17.

*Becauſe ſhe was examin'd and had Power over the Land. 10 Rep. 43. in

10. If the *Wife alone, without her Husband*, levy a Fine of her own Lands, wherein ſhe hath Fee Simple, it will be a * Bar againſt her and her Heirs, unleſs the Husband avoid it during her Life, or after her Death, if he is *Tenant by the Curteſy*. Wood's Inſt. 243.

Poxtington's Caſe.—And (after ſo Solemn an Act) ſhe ſhall not be admitted to ſay that ſhe was Covert, tho' her Husband ſhall, and he may enter and reſtore the Land to himſelf and his Wife both. Hob. 225.———For by the Entry of the Baron the Eſtate of the Conuſee was defeated and the Ancient Eſtate of the Feme reveſted in him, and he is ſeiſed of the Intire Eſtate as in Right of his Wife. 7 Rep. 8. a. b. in Counteſs of Bedford's Caſe, and cites 17 E. 3 52. b. 17 Aſſ. 17. 7 H. 4. 23. 2 R. 3. 20. 9 H. 6. 33.——Weſt's Symb. S. 8. cites 17 E. 3. 52. and 78. 17 Aſſ. 17. 7. H. 4. 23.——Co. R. on Fines 9.

11. *Husband and Wife* levied a Fine of the Lands of the Wife, ſhe being within Age, and afterwards they ſuffered a common Recovery; the *Husband died*; the Widow married again, and her Husband and ſhe brought a *Writ of Error* to reverſe this Fine and Recovery; the Court was of Opinion to Reverſe the Fine, but would adviſe on the Recovery; becauſe it was had againſt them after Appearance, and not by Default. Golds. 181. Sir Henry Jones's Caſe.

(U) Bound. Corporation.

1. If, upon a Writ of Annuity againſt a Prior preſentable, who has Covent and Common Seal, the Prior levies a Fine; this ſhall bind the Succeſſors; because the Annuity was before, and this is but as a Judgment. 12 H. 4. 21. b.

2. If an Abbot levies a Fine ſur Conuſance de Droit of Land of the Right of his Houſe, this ſhall not bind the Succeſſor, but he ſhall recover it again. 20 H. 6. 46.

There ought to be a general *Conſent of the whole Corporation.* Manb. of Fines 24.

3. If they be *ſuch* civil Bodies or Corporations, *as have in themſelves abſolute Eſtate and Authority* of their Poſſeſſions, *ſo as they may maintain a Writ of Right* thereof, as *Mayor* and Commonalty, *Dean* and Chapter, *Colleges*, *Societies Corporate*, and ſuch like, and their Succeſſors; they are barred by Fines preſently. Weſt's Symb. S. 181. cites Pl. C. * 338. a. Trin. 20 Eliz.

* It ſhould be (538.)

1 *Eliz.* 19. *diſabled* Archbiſhops and Biſhops from granting any Parcel of their Poſſeſſions to any

4. *But Deans*, *Biſhops*, Priors, Abbots, *Maſters of Hoſpitals*, *Parſons*, *Vicars*, *Prebendaries*, Chauntrie Prieſts, and ſuch like, which *may not have a Writ of Right*, but either a *Juris Utrum*, F. N. B. fol. 48. (R) or *ſine Aſſenſu capituli* F. N. B. fol. 118. (I) are not barred by ſuch Fines if the Patron and Ordinary join not with them. Weſt's Symb. S. 181. cites Pl. C. 538. a. 20 Eliz. 375. b. 11 Eliz.

but the Crown, and afterwards the 1 *Jac.* 1. 3. *enacted that all Aſſurances of the Lands of Archbiſhops or Biſhops ſhould be void, tho' made to the Crown.* And the Stat. 13 *Eliz.* 10. *makes void* all Eſtates made, or ſuffered by any *Maſter, or Fellows of any College, Dean and Chapter* of any Cathedral, or Collegiate Church, *Maſter* or Guardian *of any Hoſpital, Parſon, Vicar, or any other having any Spiritual or Eccleſiaſtical Living*, of any Houſes, Lands, &c. Parcel of their College, &c. Promotion, or belonging thereunto, other than for 21 *Years or* 3 *Lives from the making*, and whereupon the Accuſtomable yearly Rent, or more ſhall be reſerved and payable yearly during the Term. Wats Comp. Inc. 427. fol. and 478.

S. P. and ſo of *Warden and Chaplains Contra* of an *Abbot or Biſhop*; For they are Sole ſeiſed in Fee in Right of the Church.

5. If a *Dean* be *ſeiſed of* certain *Lands*, *as of his diſtinct Poſſeſſions*, the Dean may make Conuſance; *but* if he be *ſeiſed Jointly with his Chapter*, he and the Chapter can't levy a Fine; *ſo* 'tis of a *Mayor* and *Commonalty*, and of all other *Joint Corporations*, they cannot make any Conuſance. But otherwiſe, 'tis of all *Sole Corporations*; and the Reaſon is, Becauſe *none can make Conuſance by Attorney*; and Corporations aggregate of ſeveral cannot appear in proper Perſon. Co. R. on Fines 8.

But a Parſon cannot diſcontinue; For he *is not ſeiſed in Fee to all intents.* Br. Diſcontinuance de Poſſeſſion, pl. 22. cites 21 E. 4. 86.

6. A * *Corporation*, that has abſolute Eſtate and Authority of itſelf, is bound by 4 H. 7. 24. of Fines. But Biſhops, Deans and Chapter, that cannot bind their Poſſeſſion without *Aſſent of others*, and ſo Parſon, Vicar are not. But by ſome of the Juſtices tho' every *Biſhop's Succeſſor*, &c. ſhall have 5 Years to claim, or enter, yet every one that ſuffers the 5 Years to paſs ſhall be *bound during his Time*; but tho' he is bound, his Succeſſor ſhall have other 5 Years by the Saving and Proviſo in the Act; ſo of *Officers for Life*, as Parker, Foreſter, Gaoler, &c. Pl. C. 538. b. Trin. 20 Eliz. Croft v. Howell.

* Hill. 15 Car. B. R. 60. 452. Mayor of London v. Alford. Wood's Inſt. 243.

7. Deviſe was to a Corporation upon Limitation, that they ſhall pay ſo much to a Charitable Uſe; a *Stranger enters* into the Land, and levies Fine with Proclamations and 5 Years paſs; and Tota Curia agreed, that this ſhall bar the *Corporation, tho' they have no Notice of the Deviſe.* Hill. 15. Car. 2. 1. Jo. 452. the Mayor and Commonalty of London v. Alford.

(W) Statute 27 *E.* 1. *Cap.* 1.

1. 27 *E.* 1. *Cap.* 1. §. 1. Enacts, that *foraſmuch as Fines levied in our Court ought and do make an End of all Matters, and therefore are called Fines principally, where after Waging of Battail, or the great Aſſiſe, in their Caſes, ever they hold the laſt and final Place.*

The *Miſchief before* this Statute was, that when the *Conuſance de droit*, &c. was made *to him that had never any Thing before*, and the *Conuſee* granted, and *rendered* the ſame *back again*, at the ſame Inſtant *to the Conuſor for Life, or in Tail*, with *Remainder over to one*, who always was ſeiſed, and *in Poſſeſſion* of the Land; Privies (by Colour that there was *no Tranſmutation of Poſſeſſion*) were, againſt Law, permitted to avoid Fines by the Averment aforeſaid. 2 Inſt. 254. —— Co. R. on Fines, 15.

So, where Tenant in Fee had accepted an Eſtate by Fine from him, that had Nothing *for Life*, or *in Tail*, ſo that by the Law the Conuſee and his Heirs are concluded, and Eſtopped for ever to claim other Eſtate; yet before the making of this Statute, *the ſaid Averment was received* in Avoidance of ſuch Fines, and for thoſe two Cauſes, and in Affirmance of the Ancient Common Law of England, this Statute was made. Co. R. on Fines, 15.

But it ſeems to me, that the firſt of the ſaid two Errors, or Miſpriſions of the Law, permitted and ſuffered before this Statute was made, was *very abſurd*, and manifeſtly contrary in itſelf; *For* the Heir of the Conuſor endeavoured, by ſuch Averment, to avoid the particular Eſtate re-taken by his Anceſtor by the Render; becauſe he, that rendered, had Nothing, but, as I think, *in endeavouring to gain the Fee Simple he loſes not only* the Fee Simple, but alſo *the Eſtate for Life, or other particular Eſtate*, which alſo was rendered; For tho' the Render was void, as then Minus juſte was allowed, yet the Fine Sur Conuſance de droit come ceo, &c. was good, and then the ſaid Fine being good (for the imperfect or inſufficient Render cannot impeach it) and the Render being void, the Recogniſee ſhall retain the Land, *and the Heir* of the Recogniſor is *utterly barred* for ever; and therefore the Words of this Statute are true, viz that ſuch Averments were contra leges & conſuetudines Regni noſtri antiquit. uſitat. and thoſe (as I think) were the Cauſes of this Statute. Co. R. on Fines 15.

§. 2. *And now by a certain Time paſſed as well in the Time King Henry of Famous Memory, our Grandfather as in our Time, the Parties of ſuch Fines and their * Heirs contrary to the Laws of our Realm of Ancient Time uſed, were admitted to adnul and defeat ſuch Fines alledging, that before the Fine levied, and at the levying thereof, and ſince, the Demandants, or Plaintiffs, or their Anceſtors, were always ſeiſed of the Lands contained in the Fine, or of ſome Parcel thereof, and ſo Fines, † lawfully levied, were many times unjuſtly defeated and adnulled by Jurors of the Country Falſly and Maliciouſly procured.*

2 Inſt. 524. ſays, that this happened in the Reign of H. 3. in the Time of Inſurrections and *Civil Wars* by the Grandees of this Realm, and that it was Uſed *by the Maintenance of the Grandees*, that Parties and Privies might avoid Fines by ſuch Averments, which Averments in the Reign of Ed. 1. were continued until the making of this Act.

* In this Act *Earum Partium Hæredes*, is to be underſtood of ſuch *Heir, who Claims the Inheritance of that Anceſtor who levied the Fine.* Arg. 3 Rep. 89. in the Caſe of Fines.

Tho' this Statute ſaith, that the Parties to the Fines and their *Heirs* ſhall not have Averment againſt Fines levied, &c. viz. that they, or their Anceſtors were ſeiſed, &c. yet our Books are adjudged, that againſt a Fine levied by my Father, I ſhall ſay, that before the Fine, and at the Time of the Fine and after, I my ſelf was ſeiſed, and ſo avoid the Fine; For as I have ſaid before in this Caſe, I am not Heir to my Father; For *Hæres dicitur ab hæreditate*, and I do *not Claim this Land by Inheritance*. Co. R. on Fines 15 ——— This is *not intended of an Heir in Blood only*, but of the Heir of the Land of which the Fine was levied, and not of Land which he has otherwiſe than as Heir. See 2 Inſt. 523.

This

This Statute is intended *of Eſtates in Fee Simple only*, where the Heir claims only by the ſame Anceſtor; but, upon an Eſtate Tail, he claims by the Gift, per Brooke. Br. Fines in pl. 35.

† A Fine may be ſaid to be *Rite Levatus*, tho' Partes Finis nihil habuerunt; For Rite Levatus is, within the Meaning of this Act, the ſame as Duly levied, that is, *in due Form of Law*, and a Fine may be ſaid to be levied in due Form of Law, tho' it be only *by way of Concluſion*. Arg. 3 Rep. 89. in the Caſe of Fines——Theſe Words *Rite Levatus*, as to the *external Form* of a Fine, are to be taken as to a Fine levied *coram Edmundo Anderſon* (viz. the Name of the Chief Juſtice) *& Sociis ſuis*, where all the Juſtices ought to be named; per Windham J. and ſo it ſeemed to Periam and Anderſon. Mich. 29 and 30 Eliz. Le. 85. in the Caſe of Zouch v. Bamfield.

§. 3. *We therefore intending to provide a Remedy in the Premiſſes in our Parliament at Weſtminſter, have Ordained that ſuch Exceptions, Anſwers or Inquiſitions of the Country, ſhall from henceforth in no wiſe be admitted contrary to ſuch Recognizances or Fines. And further, we Will, that this Statute ſhall as well extend to Fines heretofore levied, as to them that ſhall be levied hereafter.*

(W. 2.) Statute 24 *E.* 3. 16.

Before this Statute Strangers having preſent Right ought to make Claim, and their Claim availed for all in Remainder, or Reverſion. For all had but one Year by the Common Law after the Fine levied, and this Miſchief was a great Reaſon of making this Statute. Arg. Pl. C. 359.——The Statute 4 *H.* 7. only intended to Remedy the Miſchief which this Statute 34 E. 3 16. introduced. Jenk. 192. pl. 97.

1. 34 *E.* 3. 16. Enacts, that *the Plea of* Nonclaim *of Fines ſhall be no Bar hereafter.*

This Statute ouſts Nonclaim only to Fines levied, and *extends not to a Judgment in a Writ of Right* at this Day, and therefore the Common Law in that Caſe remains to this Day, viz. that Claim muſt be made within a Year and a Day after Judgment. If a Fine be levied without Proclamations, or without ſo many as the Law requires, then this Statute extends to ſuch a Fine. A *Feme Covert* had no Privilege of Nonclaim, as ſome have ſaid; For ſhe had a Husband, that might make Claim for her. Alſo, they in *Reverſion or Remainder expectant upon any Eſtate of Freehold* were barr'd by the Common Law, and yet they could make no Claim; For it belong'd to the particular Tenant and not to them; becauſe their Entry was not lawful, which was one of the principal *Cauſes of making this Statute*; but theſe Caſes of Coverture and of them in Remainder or Reverſion are now holpen, and their Rights and Titles ſaved by Statute 4 H. 7. 24. as by the ſaid Act appears. Co. Litt. 262. a. b

(W. 3) Statute 1 *R.* 3. 7.

Per Dyer this Statute has all the Words of 4 H. 7. touching the Purview & Body of the Act, but the word (*Firſt*) which is added to 4 H. 7. Pl. C. 372 b.

1. 1 *R.* 3. 7. Enacted, that *Fines ſhall be* Proclaimed 4 *times*, 4 *ſeveral Terms, and at the Aſſiſes, &c.*

And that a Fine ſo Proclaimed ſhall conclude all Perſons, both Privy and Strangers (except Women Covert, *other then ſuch Women as are Parties to the Fine,* Perſons under Age, *in Priſon,* out of the Realm, *or* not of found Mind) *if they purſue not their Right, Title, Claim, or Intereſt, by way of Action, or lawful Entry, within 5 Years after the Proclamation ſo made and Certified as aforeſaid.*

The Right of Strangers which happens to come unto them after the Fine is Ingroſſed, *is ſaved, ſo that they lawfully purſue their Right or Title within 5 Years after it ſo comes to them: and here an Action againſt the Pernor of the Profits is maintainable.*

If the Parties, to whom ſuch Right or Title comes, be Covert, under Age, in Priſon, out of the Land, or not of ſane Memory, they or their Heirs have time to purſue their Right or Title within 5 Years after ſuch Imperfections removed; ſo alſo, have they in Caſe they had Right of Title at the Time of the Fine levied.

(W. 4) 4 *H.* 7. *Cap.* 24.

This is an Original, and not an Explanatory Statute, per

1. 4 *H.* 7. *Cap.* 24. Enacts, that *after Ingroſſing of every Fine, to be levied after the Feaſt of Eaſter, that ſhall be in the Year of Our Lord* 1490 *in the King's Court before his Juſtices of the Common Place of any Lands, Tenements,*

Tenements, or any other Hereditaments, the ſame Fine be openly and ſolemnly Read and Proclaimed *in the ſame Court, the ſame Term, and in 3 Terms* * *then next following the ſame ingroſſing, in the ſame Court, at four ſeveral Days in every Term, and in the ſame time that it is ſo Read and Proclaimed,* all Pleas to ceaſe. Hobert Ch. J. Winch. 123. in Caſe of Fillard v. Sanders. —It is ſaid in the Preamble of this Act, *that Fines ought to be of the greateſt Strength to avoid Striſes and Debates, &c.* and therefore this Statute does not extend to any Fines levied by *Covin.* See 3 Rep. 77. b. Former's Caſe.

This Statute *extends* only to Fines, and not to Nonclaim on a *Judgment in a Writ of Right.* Co. Litt. 262.

So it extends not to Land in *Ancient Demeſne*; for the Lord may avoid ſuch Fine by Writ of Deceit. Pl. C. 370. b.

And it does not extend to *Lancaſter.* Arg. 1 Roll. R. 305. Holland v. Lee.

The Lord Keeper's Opinion was, that howſoever 4 H. 7. was, at the making thereof, as to Barring, or not barring an Eſtate Tail, yet when 32 H. 8. comes, and declares upon 4 H. 7. now all Fines are good to bar Eſtates Tail. Skin. 97. Hill. 35. Car. 2 in the E. of Derby's Caſe.

This Statute enures and operates *by way of Bar to the Right,* which anſwers Saul and Clerk's Caſe. Jo. 210, 211. 2 Salk. 422. Hill. 1. Annæ. B. R. in Caſe of Hunt v. Bourne.

* If one of the Terms limited by this Statute be *adjourned,* (becauſe the Statute ſays, *then next enſuing*) all the Proclamations before are void, till the Statute 1. Mar. 7. Raſtal. Fines 12. becauſe the time limited by the Act, ought to be purſued, and once *attached in part ought to be continued.* Pl. C. 371. b.

See words (*Term adjorned.*)

§. 3. *And the* ſaid *Proclamations* ſo had *and made, the Fine to be a* * *final End, and conclude as well* Privies as Strangers *to the ſame, except Women Covert, other than being Parties to the ſaid Fine, and every Perſon then being within Age of* 21 *Years in Priſon, or out of this Realm, or not of whole Mind, at the Time of the ſaid Fine levied, not Parties to ſuch Fine.* * By theſe words it binds *Eſtates Tail,* per Pemberton Ch. J. Skin. 95 Hill. 35 Car. 2. B. R. in E. of Darby's Caſe.

Per all the Judges but 3, the Iſſue of Tenant in Tail was barred by a Fine levied by his Anceſtor, by Virtue of the Stat. 4 H. 7. before the Statute of 32 H. 8. Hill. 31 and 32 Car. 2. in Scacc. Raym. 359. Murray v. Eyton, & al.

The Fines levied according to this Statute are, ab initio, as ſtrong againſt Entails, as 32 *H.* 8. Hob. 332. Mackwilliams's Caſe.——And therefore if a Woman be *Tenant in Tail,* having *iſſue a Son and a Daughter,* and the *Son* (being the firſt Iſſue of the Entail) *levies a Fine, living the Mother, and dies,* and ſhe ſurvives him, this ſhall not bar the Daughter, to whom the Land Entailed deſcends immediately from the Mother, adjudged by 3 Judges againſt 1. Hob. 332. Mich 19 Jac. Markwilliams's Caſe.—— *But* in Caſe of *Collateral Iſſues* it is otherwiſe.——Ibid. 333. S. C.——Jo. 32. S. C.

Tenant in Tail, having Iſſue, levies a Fine, and *dies before all the Proclamations are made,* and afterwards (the Iſſue being beyond Sea) the Proclamations are all made, and then the Iſſue Claims; and it was reſolved by all the Judges, that tho' a Right deſcended to the Iſſue, becauſe the Father died before all the Proclamations, and a Fine without Proclamations, or Proclamations without a Fine, will not bar the Iſſue in Tail, and tho' there was no Fine with Proclamations levied after the Death of the Father, yet, as he Claims as Heir by Force of the Eſtate Tail, he is barred by the Words of the Statute. 3 Rep. 84. Paſch. 44 Eliz. the Caſe of Fines.

Neither this Statute, nor the 18 *E.* 1. of Fines, ſays, in expreſs words, *that Fines with Proclamations ſhall bar the Intail*; theſe Statutes only ſay, that Fines with Proclamations *ſhall be Bars to all Parties and Privies and to Strangers, if* the Stranger doth *not* bring his Action, or *make* his *Claim within* 5 *Years after* ſuch Fines levied with Proclamations; and the true Intention of the 4 H. 7. was to take away the Statute of Nonclaim enacted the 34 Ed. 3. ch. 16. and not to Bar the Eſtate Tail any more than 18 Ed. 1. had done; as appears by the Statute of 32 H. 8. 36. which ordains Fines levied, ut ſup. & Nonclaim ut ſup. to Bar the Tail. Jenk. 87. pl. 68.

As the Saving is general *to all Perſons and their Heirs,* notwithſtanding Nonage, Inſanity, &c. ſo is the Condition general, to all Heirs whatſoever they are, the words being, *ſo that they purſue their Title, Claim, &c. within* 5 *Years after Proclamations*; for otherwiſe the Saving ſhall be for all Heirs, and the (*So*) ſhall be of all Heirs within Age, and then the (*So*) is not ſo large as the the Saving; and ſo the Heir within Age is bound to the Condition of the firſt Saving, as well as he is ſaved in the ſame. Pl. C. 371. a.

Heir *in Tail and Heir in Fee are all one* by this Statute. 3 Le. 227. pl. 304. Anon. M. 31 El. C. B.

Tenant in Tail levies a Fine with Proclamations, and the 5 *Years paſs in his Life* time, and he dies; and per 5 Judges againſt 3, his Iſſue ſhall be barred by this Fine. D. 3. pl. 3.—cited 3 Rep. 87. in the Caſe of Fines.——S. P. Br. Tail & Dones, &c. pl. 2. cites 19 H. 8. 6. that by the beſt Opinion, the Iſſue ſhall be bound by the Statute of 4 H. 7. c. 24. Brook ſays, and ſo ſee that this Statute, and the New Statute of 32 H. 8. 36. are of one and the ſame Effect, except that the *one is an Explanation of the other,* and by the one and the other, *Privies ſhall be bound immediately after Proclamations* which may be finiſhed in 4 Terms quod nota, *and the* 5 *Years is for Strangers.*

§. 4. *And* ſaving *to every Perſon or Perſons, and to their* * Heirs, *other than the Parties in the ſaid Fine,* † *ſuch Right, Claim and Intereſt as they have to, or in the ſaid Lands, Tenements, or other Hereditaments at the Time of ſuch Fine ingroſſed*; ſo that *they purſue their Title, Claim or Intereſt by* * Hobert Ch. J. ſaid that it was adjudged in the Caſe of Godfrey v.

Made, that the Fine of the *Youngeſt Son may not Bar the Eldeſt*; and yet, within the words, the *Eldeſt is Heir to him*; but he ſaid that this word (Heir) ſhall be expounded as (*his Heir*) and that ſo they uſe to expound this Statute which binds Parties and Privies, and that in ſuch Caſe the *Eldeſt is not Privy to the Youngeſt*; *For he Claims before him.* Winch. 123. Hill. 22. Jac. C. B. in Caſes of Hilliard v. Sanders.—2 Roll. R. 500, 501.

way of Action, or lawful Entry within 5 Years next after the ſaid Proclamations had and made.

Such Right, Claim, and Intereſt, &c. It was Reſolved, that theſe words extend to the Intereſt of a *Leſſee for Years*, Tenant by *Statute Merchant*, *Statute Staple*, *Elegit*, *Guardian by Chivalry*, *Executors having Lands till Debts and Legacies paid*, and every other ſuch Intereſt. Paſch. 3. Jac. C. B. 5 Rep. 124. Saffyn's Caſe.——cites Pl. C. 374. a.

Copyhold Lands are within the Words and Meaning of this Act. Paſch. 10. Jac. 9 Rep. 105. Podger's Caſe.

A Fine with Proclamations and 5 Years bars all *Corporations*, which have *abſolute Eſtates in their own Right*, and their *Succeſſors*, for ever, (by Equity of this Statute tho' it ſpeaks only, of Men and their *Heirs*) as Mayor and Commonalty, Dean and Chapter, &c. but 'tis otherwiſe of Corporations which have *not abſolute Eſtate*, without others, as Biſhop, Dean, Parſon, &c. but *themſelves* ſhall be barred by *Nonclaim* by 5 Years, and every Succeſſor, ſhall have a New 5 Years. Pl. C. 538. Trin. 20 Eliz. Croft v. Howell.

So an *Officer* having *Land pertaining to his Office*, as a Parker, &c. ſhall be barred by a Fine levied by his Diſſeiſor and 5 Years paſſed; but not his *Succeſſor*, unleſs 5 Years paſs in his Time. Ibid.

It was Reſolved, that this Act ſhall bar a Woman of her *Dower* by a Fine levied by her Husband with Proclamations, if ſhe does *not bring her Writ* of Dower *within* 5 *Years after the Death of her Huſband.* 13 Rep. 20. in Canc.——cites Hill. 4 H. 3. Rot. 344. C. B. 5 El. D. 224.——Pl. C. 373. b. Roll. R. 306. Arg. cites 15 El. D. Graves's Caſe.

If the 5 *Years Commence in the Life of the Anceſtor*, the Heir, tho' within Age, muſt Claim within thoſe 5 Years, or he ſhall be barred; adjudged. Trin. 20 Eliz. Pl. C. 356. Stowell v. Zouch.

A. *Leſſee for Life*, Remainder in *Fee to B.*—A. levies a Fine, B. ſhall have 5 Years for the Title, and the Forfeiture, and after the Death of A. he ſhall have other 5 Years for the Title to him accrued by the Death, and Determination of the Eſtate of A. D. 3. b. Marg. pl. 5. cites 32 El. Davies's Caſe.

Tenant for 99 Years, if he lives ſo long, levie a Fine, and dies; and it was Reſolved, per Cur. that he in Reverſion ſhall have 5 Years after the Death of the Tenant to avoid the Fine, and per Hale Ch. J. there can be *no Difference between* a Fine levied by *Tenant for Life and for Years*, the Reaſon being the ſame in both Caſes; and ſaid that Lord Coke's Opinion, 9 Rep. Podger's Caſe was made to be a Queſtion. Trin 24 Car. 2. B. R. 2 Lev. 55. Whaley v. Tankard.—Raym. 219. S. C. acc.—2 Vent. 241. S. C. 3 Keb. 30. S. C.——2 Vent. 334. in Caſe of Dighton v. Grenvill, Ventris J. in his Argument cites both the Caſe of Podger, and this Caſe of Whaley v. Tankard, and ſays, that tho' he admits this Caſe to be good Law, yet he obſerves that it is a Reſolution carried *beyond the words* of the Statute; For the Right is not purſued within 5 Years after it firſt came, and ſays, it is only a Conſtruction by Equity, and that he ſhould not have gone ſo far, if not led by Authority.

§. 5. *And alſo, ſaving to all Perſons ſuch Action, Right, Title, Claim and Intereſt in, or to the ſaid Lands, Tenements, or other Hereditaments, as firſt ſhall grow, remain, or deſcend, or come to them, after the ſaid Fine ingroſſed, and Proclamation made by Force of any Gift in the Tail, or by any other Cauſe or Matter, had and made before the ſaid Fine levied: ſo that they take their Action, or purſue their ſaid Right and Title, according to the Law, within 5 Years next after ſuch Action, Right, Claim, Title or Intereſt to them accrued, deſcended, fallen, or come.*

§. 6. *And that the ſaid Perſons and their Heirs may have their ſaid Action againſt the Perſon of the* Profits *of the ſaid Lands, and Tenements, and other Hereditaments, at the Time of the ſaid Action to be taken.*

But if Stranger to the Fine who is *of good Memory, becomes of not good*, or is *Impriſoned in the* 3d. *Year after* the Proclamations made, *and ſo continues* till the 5 Years are expired, and after he *Recovers* his Memory, or is out of Priſon, he *ſhall not be barred*; For Laches cannot be aſſigned in ſuch Caſe. But if in the 3d. Year the Stranger to the Fine *goes beyond Sea, or takes Baron*, and ſo continues till the 5 Years are paſt they ſhall be bound; For *theſe are Voluntary Acts*, which the other are not; per Browne and Saunders J. Pl. C. 366. a. in Caſe of Stowell v. Zouch.

§. 7. *And if the ſame Perſons at the Time of ſuch Action, Right and Title accrued, deſcended, remained, or come unto them, be* Covert de Baron, *or* within Age, in Priſon, *or* out of this Land, *or* not of whole Mind, *then it is Ordained by the ſaid Authority, that their Action, Right and Title, to be reſerved and ſaved to them and to their Heirs unto the Time they come and be at their full Age of* 21 *Years, out of Priſon, within this Land, uncovert, and of whole Mind,* ſo that *they, or their Heirs, take their ſaid Actions, or their lawful Entry, according to their Right and Title, within 5 Years next after that they come and be at their full Age, out of Priſon, within this Land, uncovert, and of whole Mind, and the ſame Actions purſue, or other lawful Entry take according to the Law.*

Tho'

Tho' the *Iſſue in Tail be beyond Sea*, yet inaſmuch as *he is privy and out of the Savings* of the 4 H. 7. he is bound notwithſtanding. As if the Iſſue in Tail be *within Age*, *or under Coverture*, or *Non Compos*, or *in Priſon*; Reſolved by all the J. 3 Rep. 91. the *5th* Reſolution in the Caſe of Fines.——And the Reporter infers, that if Infancy, Coverture, Nonſanæ Memoriæ, or Impriſonment of the Heir in Tail, ſhould give him Power, in ſuch Caſe, to avoid the Fine, no Man could be aſſured of the Land conveyed to him by any Fine, and denies what is ſaid by the Counſel Pl. C. 430. in Smith and Stapleton's Caſe. 3 Rep. 91. b. Paſch. 44 Eliz. in the Caſe of Fines.

But if the *Diſſeiſee dies*, *the Feme enſeint with* a Son, and *the Diſſeiſor levies a Fine*, and after the Son *is* born, now he is not excepted by the Letter of the Act; for the Act excepts no Infant but ſuch who at the time of the Fine levied was within the Age of 21 Years; and none is within the Age of 21 Years but only ſuch who is in rerum natura, and the Son in this Caſe was not born; nor in rerum Natura at ſuch time, nor could he ſay, that he was within the Age of 21 Years at the time of the Fine levied; For his Age is accounted from the time of his Birth. And he was not born at this time, and ſo he is *out of the Letter*, but yet is *within the Intent*, and ſhall be aided by the Exception. Pl. C. 366. a. 366, b. Stowell v. Lord Zouch.

A. Tenant for Life, Remainder *in Tail to B.*—B. being *beyond Sea*, and leaving a Son *within Age* in England, A. Levies a Fine; B. never returned, but died, immediately after the Fine, abroad; and it was agreed by the whole Court, that the Son was not barred; for tho' the Condition of the Saving is that the Party purſue his Right within 5 Years after his Return, and this Condition was never performed, becauſe he never returned, yet there was no Default in him to exclude him from the Saving, and then the Son is aided by the other Saving which relates to Infants. Trin. 32. Eliz. Sav. 128. Sir Robert Cotton's Caſe.——Le. 211. S. C.——And 264.

§. 8. *And alſo, it is Ordained by the Authority aforeſaid, that all ſuch Perſons as be* Covert de Baron, *not party to the Fine, and every Perſon being* within Age *of* 21 *Years*, in Priſon, *or* out of this Land, *or* not of whole Mind *at the Time of the ſaid Fines levied and ingroſſed, and by this ſaid Act afore excepted, * having any Right, or Title, or Cauſe of Action, to any of the ſaid Lands, and other Hereditaments, that they or their Heirs, Inheritable to the ſame, take their ſaid Actions, or lawful Entry, according to their Right and Title within 5 Years next after they come and be of Age of* 21 *Years, out of Priſon, uncovert within this Land, and of whole Mind, and the ſame Actions ſue, or their lawful Entry take and purſue according to the Law.*

* So that a Fine with Proclamations binds ſuch only as have Title to the Land, and *binds not ſuch as have Rent, Common, Eſtovers, Way* or the like *out of the Land*, ſo that they ſhall not be concluded of their Rent, Common, Eſtovers, Way, or the like, tho' they Claim not within the 5 Years. For the Statute ſpeaks only of binding the Lands, and ſays nothing of the *Profit apprender* out of the Land. Br. Fines, pl. 123.

So of an *Authority to ſell Land*, he, who has ſuch Authority, may ſell after the 5 Years after Proclamations; For he has no Intereſt in the Land, but has Power only to ſell it. Br. Fines pl. 123.

§. 9. *And if they do not take their Actions and Entries as is aforeſaid, that they and every of them and their Heirs, and the Heirs of every of them be concluded by the ſaid Fines for ever, in like Form as they be that be Privies or Parties to the ſaid Fines.*

If Tenant in Tail levy a Fine, the *Iſſue in Tail* is privy, and therefore barred of averring Quod Partes Finis nihil habuerunt, adjudged, per tot. Cur. Le. 85 Mich. 29 and 30 Eliz. C. B. Zouch v. Bamfield——cited 3 Rep. 88. in the Caſe of Fines.——Mo. 250 S. C.——Iſſue in Tail is Privy; becauſe if the Fine be Erroneous, he may have Writ of Error, which he could not have, if he was not Privy. And. 171. S. C. Arg. cites 19 H. 8. 6.

§. 10. *Saving to every Perſon or Perſons, not Party nor Privy to the ſaid Fine, their* Exception *to void the ſame Fine by that that thoſe which were Parties to the Fine, nor any of them, nor no perſon or Perſons to their Uſe, nor to the Uſe of any of them* had Nothing in the *Lands and Tenements compriſed in the ſaid Fine, at the Time of the ſaid Fine levied.*

This Statute *ſays, that immediately after the Fine leviedby any Perſon, and Proclamation paſſed the Cerniors and their Heirs are barred*; yet if the *Father diſſeiſe his Son*, and levy a Fine, and Proclamation paſs, and the Father dies within the 5 Years, the Son is not barred; For *he is not Heir* to his Father, *as to this Land*; For *Hæres dicitur ab. Hereditate.* Co. R. on Fines 16.

§. 11. *And it is Ordained by the ſaid Authority, that every Fine, that hereafter ſhall be levied, in any of the King's Courts, of any Manors, Lands, Tenements, and other Poſſeſſions, after the Manner, Uſe, and Form, that Fines have been levied afore the making of this Act be of like Force, Effect and Authority, as Forces, ſo levied, be or were afore the making of this Act. this Act, or any other Act in this ſaid Parliament made, or to be made notwithſtanding.*

§. 12. And

§. 12. *And every Perſon ſhall be at Liberty to Levy any Fine hereafter, at his Pleaſure, whether he will after the Form contained and ordained in and by this Act, or after the Manner and Form aforetime uſed.*

(W. 5) 32 *H.* 8. *cap.* 36.

This Statute *is not properly a Statute*, nor do Fines receive any Strength or Virtue by it; but it is only *a Conſtruction of* 4 *H.* 7. and whereas this

32 *H.* 8. *cap.* 36. § 1. Enacts, that *all Fines levied before the Juſtices* (viz. of the Common Place) *with Proclamations, according to the Statute*, (viz. 4 H. 7. cap. 23.) *by Perſons of full Age of Lands* * *before the Fine levied intailed to the Perſons levying the Fine, or to any Anceſtor of the ſame Perſon, ſhall be, after the Fine levied, ingroſſed, and Proclamations made, a Barr againſt the Perſons and their Heirs claiming the ſaid Lands, by Force of ſuch intail, and againſt all other Perſons claiming the ſame to their Uſe, or to the Uſe of any Heir of the Bodies of them.*

Statute conſtrues 4 H. 7. to extend to Fines levied by Tenant in Tail, the Eſtate Tail ſhall be adjudged in Law, to be bound by 4 H. 7. and not by the Statute, which is rather a Judgment upon 4 H 7. than any new Statute. Per Periam J. Le. 76. Mich. 29 and 30 Eliz. C. B. in the Caſe of Zouch v. Bamfield.

* W. *deviſed Lands* to J. *when he ſhould come to the* Age of 25 *Years*; J. *after* 21, *and before* 25 *Years, levies a Fine* with Proclamation, and then attains to the Age of 25 Years, and had Iſſue M. and died; and the Queſtion was, whether the *Eſtate Tail in futuro*, and Contingency, at the Time of the Fine levied, was barred or not; and it was reſolved that it was, and yet the Conuſor had but a *mere Poſſibility*, to have the Eſtate Tail, at the Time of the Fine levied, and tho' he was not ſeiſed by Force of the Tail, at that Time, yet by Force of the Words, (*before the Fine levied in any wiſe entailed*) Eſtate Tail in futuro is comprehended.; but no Judgment was entered. Per Warberton J. 10 Rep. 50 in Lampet's Caſe. cites Hill 29. El. Rot. 824. Grant's Caſe.——Raym. 150. S. C. cited.——*Poſſeſſion in the Conuſor* is not requiſite to the Fine's being a Barr of an Eſtate Tail. See Fines (D. 2)——By the Words of the Statute, a Fine doth barr the Entail in many Caſes, *where the Conuſor cannot give the Land*, becauſe he has it not. Per Hobart Ch. J. Hob. 258. Mich. 16 Jac. in the Caſe of Duncombe v. Wingfield.

Tenant in Tail *diſcontinues and Diſſeiſes the Diſcontinuee, and levies a Fine* with Proclamation to A. Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo, &c. and *takes back an Eſtate in Fee by Render*, in the ſame Fine. The *Diſcontinuee, before all the Proclamations are made, claims*, and after the *Proclamations paſs*, and *within a Year after he claims*; and after, *Tenant in Tail dies ſeiſed*; and by all the Juſtices of C. B. the *Heir is not remitted* to the ſaid Lands; and this was by Vertue of this Statute, which barrs Tenant in Tail and his Heirs by the ſaid Fine. Kelw. 210. b. pl. 17, Trin. 4. Eliz: Anon.

A. before this Statute gave Lands in Tail, *Remainder to the King* in Fee; *Tenant in Tail* had Iſſue 3 Daughters; *one of the Daughters, in Q. Eliz's. Time, levies a Fine of her Part* with *Proclamations*, and they *are had during her Life*, and *ſhe dies without Iſſue*; and it was adjudged, that this Fine, by Force of this Statute barred the Daughters and their Heirs, and yet it did not make any Diſcontinuance. Mich. 15 and 16 Eliz. Bendl. 223. pl. 254.——————Tenant in Tail, *Remainder to the King*, levied a Fine, had Iſſue, and died; and it was adjudged, that the Iſſue was barred, and yet the Remainder, which was in the King, was not diſcontinued; for by that Fine, an Eſtate in Fee Simple, determinable upon the Eſtate Tail, paſſed unto the Conuſee. Mich. 16. Eliz. C. B. 3 Le. 57. Jackſon v. Darcy.——— The Statute 34 H. 8. 20. has a Proviſo generally, that no Act done by Tenant in Tail ſhall prejudice the Iſſue; but this ſhall be intended where the King is Donor, and not otherwiſe, as appears by the Preamble of that Statute; and therefore the General Words in that Act cannot reſtrain the General Law, made by 32 H. 8. and this Statute ſays nothing of *Reverſions*, but only of *Remainders*. Mo. 115. S. C.——————And. 46. pl. 118. S. P. and ſeems to be S. C.

It was reſolved by all the Judges of C. B. that this Statute extends to *Fines levied by Concluſion*, and ſhall bind the Eſtate Tail, *tho' Partes Finis nihil habuerunt*. 3 Rep. 90. in the Caſe of Fines, cites Paſch 28. El. Rot. 13. Zouch v. Bamfield.——Le. 84. S. C.

Tenant in Tail to him and his Heirs Male, the *Reverſion* being *in the King*, ſuffers a Common Recovery, or levies a Fine, and by the Opinion of the Judges, the Heir is barred, tho' it be no Diſcontinuance of the Tail, nor againſt the King, of the Reverſion; and Englefield ſaid, that he had known this Caſe, and the Caſe was held by good Advice to be a Barr; but Shelley doubted. D. 32. a. pl. 1.—— It was reſolved that if Tenant in *Tail, of the Gift of the King*, levies a Fine, and ſuffers a Recovery of the Eſtate Tail, 'tis no Barr; For 34 *H.* 8. ſaves it; but otherwiſe if the *King for Money grants in Tail*, per Coventry, Hide and Richardſon. Ibid. in Marg. cites Hill 5 Car. in Canc. E. of Nottingham v. Ld Munſon.

Paſch 28 H. 8. Fine levied by Tenant in Tail, the *Reverſion in the Crown*, bound the Iſſue by 4 *H.* 7 and 32 H. 8. provides, that the ſame Statute ſhall not extend to Fines levied by Tenant in Tail, the Reverſion in the Crown; but that the ſame ſhall be of like Force, as they ſhould have been, if that Act had not been made, which amended not their Caſe. Whereupon in Stafford's Caſe, the Judges deviſed to help that Slip, by a very oblique and indirect Strain, upon the Statute of 34 H 8 20. Whereby it was provided that no Common Recovery in that Caſe ſhould bind the Iſſue, but that he might enter after the Death of Tenant in Tail, the ſaid Recovery, or any Thing done or ſuffered by or againſt ſuch Tenant in Tail, to the contrary notwithſtanding. 8 Rep. 78. Stafford's Caſe ‡ and Notley's Caſe.—— Per Hobart. Hob. 332, 333. Mich. 19. Jac. in Mackwilliams's Caſe.————‡ Sav. 105.

A Point intended for a Special Verdict was, whether a Non-Claim for five Years after the Fine, ſhould

ſhould *barr the Iſſue that omitted to claim*, ſo as to bind him for his Life, tho' it would be no Barr to his Iſſue. But the Jury found a Claim by him, and ſo the Point came not in Queſtion. See Sid. 166. Loyd v. Pollard.———and 1 Keb. 620. S. C.———and cites Cro. E. 595. where 'tis the Opinion of ſome of the Judges, that ſuch Fine ſo levied by Diſſeiſor, &c. ſhall barr the Tail; and that it is Caſus Omiſſus out of the Statute, and according to it this Caſe is cited 1 Inſt. 373. a. but ſeems that 'tis not Law; And ſo held Levins in the Caſe of the E. of Derby, in the Exchequer Chamber. Sid. 166. Mich. 15 Car. 2. B. R. in Caſe of Loyd v. Pollard.

A. a Woman Tenant for Life, Remainder to B. in Tail. A. married, and then ſhe and her Huſband levied a Fine to B. the Remainderman, and took back, by *Render, a Rent-charge*; A. and B. die, and the Iſſue in Tail enters; and by the Opinion of the Judges, the Grant and Render by the ſaid Fine is out of this Statute, and ſhall not bind the Iſſue in Tail. But the Parties agreed. Kelw. 210. Parker v. Paynet.———The Ld Keeper's Opinion was, that howſoever 4 H. 7. was, at the making thereof, as to barring or not barring an Eſtate Tail; yet when 32 H. 8. comes, and declares upon 4 H. 7. now all Fines are good from 4 H. 7. to barr Eſtates Tail. Skin 92. Hill 35. Car. 2. B. R. in the Earl of Derby's Caſe.

§. 2. *Provided that this Act ſhall not bar any Perſons by Reaſon of any Fine* levied by any Woman *after the Death of her Huſband* contrary to *the Statute* 11 H. 7. cap. 20. *of Lands of the Inheritance or Purchaſe of the Huſband, or his Anceſtors, aſſigned to any ſuch Woman in Dower, for Term of Life or in Tail.*

§. 3. *Provided alſo, that this Act do not extend to any Fine* levied *of Lands, the* Owners whereof, by *any expreſs Words in* any Act of Parliament *made ſince the* 4 H. 7. are reſtrained from making any Alienations.

§. 4. *Provided, That this Act ſhall not extend to any Fine to be levied by any Perſon of any Lands, before the levying of the ſame Fine, given to the Perſons ſo levying the ſame, or to their Anceſtors,* in the Tail, by Letters Patent, or *by* Acts of Parliament, the Reverſion whereof, *at the Time of the Fines levied*, being in our Sovereign Lord, his Heirs or Succeſſors.

In two Caſes this Statute ſeems to weaken the Statute of 4 H. 7. in the Caſe of Fine by *Tenant in Tail, by Act of Parliament*, and Tenant in Tail with *Reverſion in the Crown.* Per Hobert Ch. J. Hob. 332. Mich. 19. Jac. in Mackwilliams's Caſe.———See the Notes againſt Sect. 1.——— See (D. a. 2) pl. 5. ———Recovery.

See more Matter, as to the Statutes relating to Fines, under the proper Diviſions of this Head of Fines.

(X) What may be *given by* a Fine.

1. A Man cannot give *a Right* by a Fine, unleſs to him, who has the Poſſeſſion. Arg. Godb. 304. cites 27 H. 8. 20. per Montague.

(X. 2) Privity. Barr. In what Caſes a Fine ſhall be no Barr for Want of *Privity*.

1. If my *Uncle diſſeiſe my Father*, and levies a Fine with Proclamations, and my *Father dies*, and then my *Uncle dies within the 5 Years*; I am not barred to claim, tho' I am Heir to him that levied the Fine; For my Title is not as Heir to him, but as Heir to my Father. Arg. Lat. 66. cites 19 H. 8. D. 3.

2. Land is given *to the eldeſt Son of J. S. in Tail, Remainder to J. S. in Fee*, or in Tail. If the *eldeſt Son levies a Fine, and dies without Iſſue*, and the *Father dies*; this is no Barr to the 2d. Son. Arg. Lat. 66. cites 2 Eliz. Dal.

[See (D. a)

(X. 3) Paſs. What *paſſes by* a Fine.

1. If a Man levies a Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit *Come ceo*, &c. *and does not limit to the Conuſee, and to his Heirs*; yet the *Conuſee has Fee Simple*. Co. R. on Fines 4.

2. *But*, if he levy ſuch Fine with *expreſs Limitation to* the Conuſee, and *his Heirs of his Body*; this Limitation is a Qualification of the general Intendment. Co. R. on Fines 4.

3. A *Fine of itſelf is ſufficient to paſs an Eſtate* without the Aſſiſtance of any other Conveyance; and ſo it appears by the Pleading of a Fine, which is *Quidam*; *finis ſe levavit* and *ſince the Statute of Uſes it veſts immediately*; if no Conſideration, then to the Uſe of the Conuſor; but if a Conſideration, then to the Uſe of the Conuſee, per Pemberton Ch. J. Skin. 184. Trin. 36 Car. 2. C. B. in Caſe of Herring v. Brown.

(X. 4) Paſs. *How much* paſſes by the Fine.

So where it *extends into A B. and C.* and the Fine is levied of the Manor *in A. and B*, No more paſſes than what lies in A. and B. Br. Fines pl. 89. cites 5 E. 4. 103.

1. If a Fine be levied *of the Manor of D. in D.* and the Manor *extends into other Vills*; nothing paſſes but that which is in D. only. The ſame Law ſeems of a Leaſe, and ſuch like; Contra if it had been *of the Manor of D.* there all paſſes. And if Feoffment be made of all his Tenements in D. and there is a Manor, which *extends into D. and S.* nothing paſſes in S. and ſo ſee that a Manor may paſs by the Word Tenementum. Br. Fines pl. 66. cites 9 E. 4. 6.

2. The *Tenant levies a Fine to the Lord of his Chief Rent, he ſhall Render two Rents.* Br. Fines pl. 97. cites 18 E. 4. 22.

3. A. and his Wife were ſeiſed of certain Lands in S. in the County of W. called Kirkian, in Tail General, of the Gift of the Father of the ſaid Wife in 11 H. 8. Afterwards in 25 H. 8. *R. S. the Son and Heir of J. S. the Donor*, levied a Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit Come ceo, &c. *with Proclamations to A. of the Manor of Downan, and* 100 *Acres of Land*, 300 *of Meadow*, 300 *of Paſture, and* 1000 *Acres of Furze and Heath in D. S. and T. and ſeveral other Towns* named in the Fine; and *A. rendered* the ſame back *to R. S. in Tail with diverſe Remainders over.* After which the Poſſeſſion continued with A. and his Heirs according to the firſt Entail; And the Manor of Dowman, and the Remainder of the Lands in thoſe Towns, which were [limited] to A. and his Heirs by the Render, [continued in the Poſſeſſion of A.] until about 9 Years paſt, when, by Niſi Prius in the Country, upon the Opinion of Manwood late Ch B. the Land called *Kirkian was recover'd againſt the Heir of the ſaid A.* by Vertue of the ſaid Fine and Render, becauſe all the Land, which the ſaid R. S. and the ſaid A. alſo had in all theſe Towns named in the Fine, were *not ſufficient to ſupply the Contents of Acres compriſed in the ſaid Fine*; and what the Law was in this Caſe, was referred to the Chief Juſtices, the Maſter of the Rolls, Egerton, and the now Ch. B. out of the Chancery, who all agreed, upon all this Matter appearing, that * *nothing ſhall be ſaid* to be *rendered, but that which indeed was given by the Fine*, and Kirkian does not paſs to the ſaid A. by the Fine; For as to that, the Fine is but as a Releaſe of R. S. to him, and therefore ſhall not be ſaid to be rendered to the ſaid R. S. by the Fine, where no Matter appeareth, whereby it may be known, that it was the *Intent of the Parties*, that this ſhall be rendered; and it was decreed in Chancery accordingly. Poph. 104. Kellie's Caſe.

* *More* Acres of Land do *not* paſs by a Fine, *than the Fine mentions, altho' the Indenture* that leads the Uſes of it *mentions more*, than are in the Fine; For the Fine is the Foundation of the Eſtate, and the Eſtate ought to riſe out of it. Jenk. 254. pl. 45.

4, *And therefore*, if a Man be to *paſs his Manor of D.* to another *by Fine Executory*, and he *levy the Fine* to him, *by the Name of the Manor of D. and* of *ſo many Acres* of Land *in D. and S.* (being the *Towns in which the Manor lies*) after which the *Conuſor purchaſeth other Lands* in theſe Towns; the Fine, before the Statute of Uſes, ſhould not be executed of theſe Lands purchaſed after the Conuſance; and the Fine ſhould work to

thoſe,

thoſe, which he had Power and Intent to paſs, and no further. per Popham. Ch. J. Poph. 105. in Kellie's Caſe.

5. *And* therefore, ſuppoſe *I have* 100 *Acres* of Land, *in a Cloſe in D. and J. S. hath* another 100 *Acres in the ſame Cloſe and Town, and* J. S. hath 100 *Acres* of Land *in the ſame Town, not in this Cloſe*; and my Intent is to *levy a Fine to J. S. of the whole Cloſe, by the Name of* 200 *Acres* of Land, *with a Render*, as before, and I levy it accordingly; ſhall the Render enure to the Land which J. S. had in the ſame Town? It is clear, that it ſhall not, altho' it be without Deed; why then ſhall the Fine here be taken to work rather to the Land called Kirkian, than to any other Lands, which any other had in the ſame Towns, when it appeareth plainly, that it never was the *Intent of the Parties*, that the Fine ſhould extend to thoſe Lands called Kirkian; (and it was decreed in Chancery accordingly.) per Popham Ch. J. Poph. 105. in Kellie's Caſe.

D. 251. b. Marg. pl. 92. ſays it was cited by Yelverton, Paſch. 40 Eliz. C. B. to have been adjudged in 21 Eliz. that the Lands of J. S. ſhould paſs, and that Crew, in the Argument of the Caſe of Dun v. Burcrell. Mich. 16. Jac. 1. cites this Caſe alſo to be adjudged; but that, upon a like Caſe Verbatim between Kellie and Downham, Hill 38. Eliz. referred out of Chancery to the two Chief Juſtices and Chief Baron and the Maſter of the Rolls; and by them reſolved, that the Land, which the Conuſee himſelf had in this Vill, ſhall not paſs to ſupply the ſmall Number of Acres, of which the Conuſance was made; For this Render is a Releaſe to the Conuſor, and no Intent appears to paſs the Land of the Conuſee himſelf.

(X. 5) Paſſes. How much. Where the Things lie in *ſeveral Counties*; and where there muſt be one only, or ſeveral Fines and Recoveries.

1. A Fine may be levied of *Shares in the New River Water*, and wherever a Fine and Recovery are neceſſary for cutting off the Entail and Remainder of ſuch Shares, one Fine or Recovery only, is not ſufficient, in regard the New River Water *runs thro'* 3 *Counties* viz. Hartford, Middleſex and London, *there muſt be* 3 ſeveral Fines and Recoveries paſſed as to any of theſe Shares (viz.) *a Fine and Recovery in each County*. This is a Note in 2 Wms's Rep. 128. in the Caſe of Drybutter v. Bartholemew.

(Y) Barred, what. *Copyhold.*

IF I *ouſt a Copyholder*, it is a Diſſeiſin to the Lord, and if I levy a Fine of ſuch Lands, and 5 Years paſs, not only the Lord is bound, as to his Freehold and Inheritance, but alſo the Copyholder for his Poſſeſſion. Arg. per Popham, Att. Gen. Le. 99. Mich 30. Eliz. in Scacc. in Caſe of Suliard v. Everard.

S. P. Of Copyholder for Life, or in Fee, and the Lord, in ſuch Caſe, ſhall not have 5 Years after the Death of the Copyholder for Life. per Coke, in a Note, 9 Rep. 105. b. Paſch. 10 Jac. in Podger's Caſe.——The Right of the Copyhold does not paſs by the Fine, but 'tis barred by the Fine. Cart. 24. Paſch. 17 Car 2. C. B. in the Caſe of Taylor v. Shaw.

2. *So*, If a Copyholder makes a *Feoffment in Fee*, and the *Feoffee levies a Fine* with Proclamation, and 5 Years paſs, the Lord is barred. *But* if a *Copyholder levies a Fine*, and 5 Years paſs, the Lord is not barred; For the Fine levied (the Copyholder having no Franktenement) is utterly void. Coke's Cop. S. 55.

3. *Copyhold was granted to A. B. and C. to hold ſucceſſively* for their Lives; the Lord grants the *Freehold to A.*——A. levies a Fine, and 5 Years paſs; it ſeems no Bar to the Remainders. See Brownl. 181. Trin. 9 Jac. Bicknall v. Tucker. 2 Brownl. 134. Mich. 9. Jac. B. C.

4. *But*, if a *Copyholder for Years* be put out of Poſſeſſion, and a Fine levied, and no Entry by him, he is barred by the Statute (but in the Caſe above,

above, the Remaindermen were not out of Poſſeſſion). Brownl. 181. Trin. 9 Jac. Bicknall v. Tucker.

S. C. cited Vent. 81. Trin. 22 Car. 2. in the Caſe of Freeman v. Barnes, where Twiſden ſaid, that he wholly rejected that Authority; For it was but an Abridgment of Caſes by Serjeant Size, who, when he was a Student, borrow'd Noy's Reports, and abridg'd them for his own Uſe.

5. A Copyhold Eſtate is is not barred by Fine and 5 Years Nonclaim. Noy. 23. Mich. 15 Jac. in Caſe of Archbold v. Cook.

[See Copyhold.]

(Y. 2) Barred, what. *Entry.*

Becauſe the Tenant in Tail in Remainder had nothing at the Time of the Fine, nor the Conuſee; yet the Heir has given his Right to the Entail, and concluded himſelf, that he cannot enter; and the Conuſee cannot enter, becauſe he has nothing, but by Eſtoppel, and no Reverſion.——But in Sir G. Brown's Caſe, where the Heir in Tail had a Reverſion in Fee expectant, and by his Fine gave that Reverſion to the Conuſee, he had the Reverſion of the Conuſor's Eſtate, and might well enter in Regard of the Prejudice. Cro. J. 175. Ward v. Walthew.——Yelv. 101 S. C. & P.

1. *Forfeiture for Diſcontinuance by* 11 *H.* 7. 20. Afterwards, and before Entry, the Remainderman in Tail levies a Fine. He cannot now take Benefit of the Forfeiture; nor can the Conuſee; For 'twas a *Fine by Eſtoppel* only, and no Intereſt paſſed. Paſch. 5 Jac. B. R. Noy. 123. Ward v. Matthew alias Walthew.

2. Feoffment to *A. and his Heirs Quouſque* ſuch Sums be paid, and on Failure, the Feoffees to enter, &c. There is a *Failure*; Feoffor levies a Fine, and 5 Years paſs; Feoffees enter not; the Fine barrs. Cart. 82. Trin. 18 Car. 2. C. B. Thomaſin v. Mackworth.——Before the Fine levied, A. makes a Leaſe and Releaſe, then A. levies a Fine, and 5 Years paſs; per Bridgman Ch. J. by the Leaſe and Releaſe the Eſtate is now turned to a Right. For after Failure, A. is but Tenant at Sufferance, and his making a Leaſe is a Diſſeiſin, and ſo the Eſtate turned to a Right; and alſo by the Releaſe which was a medling with the Land; and being ſo turned to a Right, Fine and Non-Claim barrs. Ibid.

3. *Feoffee upon Condition is diſſeiſed*, and a Fine levied, and 5 Years paſs; then the Condition is *broken*; the Feoffor may enter; For the Diſſeiſor held the Eſtate ſubject to the Condition, and ſo did the Conuſee; Becauſe he cannot be in of a better Eſtate than the Conuſor was himſelf. Mod. 4. Mich. 21. Car. 2. B. R. Medlycott v. Joyner.

(Y. 3) Barred, what. *Error* and Pleadings.

1. 23 Eliz. 3. *This Act ſhall not barr any from a Writ of Error upon any Fine or Recovery heretofore had, and purſued within 5 Years after this Parliament, or which, before the firſt of June* 1582. *was exemplified under the Great Seal, nor a Feme Covert Infant, Non Compos Mentis, one in Priſon, or beyond Sea, ſo as they or their Heirs purſue ſuch Writ within 7 Years after ſuch Imperfection, Reſtraint, and Abſence removed, and if any of them happen to die hanging the Suit, their Heir may undertake it within one Year after the 7 Years; and if the Heir be under Age, then within one Year after his full Age.*

2 Le. 211. S. C.——3 Le. 232 S. C.

2. A, Tenant in Tail had Iſſue two Sons B. and C. and dies. B. levies two Fines of the Land, and dies without Iſſue. C. brings two *Writs of Error* on theſe Fines. Defendant, to the firſt Fine, *pleaded* the ſecond Fine not reverſed; and to the ſecond, he pleads the firſt not reverſed. Per Cur. you may plead that the ſaid Fine pleaded in Bar, is alſo erroneous, and ſo aid yourſelf. Cro. E. 151. 31 & 32 Eliz. B. R. Molton's Caſe. ——cites 7 H. 4. 39.

An *Erroneous* Recovery ſhall barr a Writ of Er-

3. Tenant in Tail levied an erroneous Fine, and afterwards ſuffered a *Common Recovery, in which he came in as Vouchee*, and vouch'd over, &c.

This

This is a Bar to the Iſſue, to bring Writ of Error, to reverſe ſuch Fine. Mo. 365. Barton v. Lever and Brownloe.———cites * Carington's Caſe. reverſed, but a *void* Recovery is no Bar. Cro. E. 390. Paſch. 37 Eliz. B. R. Barton v. Lever & al ———* Roll. 788, 789. pl. 14.

ror of an *erroneous Fine*, untill it be

4. A *ſecond Fine* rightly levied is a Bar to a Writ of Error upon the firſt Fine. Mo. 366. Barton v. Lever and Brownloe.

5. Fine, and 5 Years Non-claim will bar *Writ of Error* brought to reverſe an erroneous Recovery. Roll. R. 37. Trin. 12 Jac. B. R. Benfield v. Bartlemew.

Cro. J. 332. Barthol-mew v. Blowfield. S. C.——2 Buls. 244. S. C. by Name of Bartholemew v. Belfield.

6. *Infant* levied a Fine, and before reverſal came to full Age; if he levies a ſecond Fine of that Land to another, 'tis an *Extinguiſhment* of his Title of *Error*, per Popham, but Gawdy, contra, (but the other Juſtices ſeemed to agree with Popham) Noy. 59. Hart v. Ameredith.

But the 2d. Fine muſt be pleaded. Roll. 788. pl. 13. S. C——

7. A Fine with Proclamation and 5 Years paſt doth bar the Lord in *ancient Demeſne of his* * *Writ of Diſceit*; and likewiſe a *Writ of Error* is alſo thereby barred. 2 Inſt. 518.

The Perſon who had Right to the Lands in Ancient Demeſne ſhall be barred, yet the *Lord* ſhall not be barred to defeat it; For *his Intereſt comes after the Fine levied.* And. 74. cites it as ſo held in Plowden in Stowell's Caſe.———So * And. 172. S. P. Becauſe the Lord does not claim the Land, but to correct Diſceit to him done. Paſch. 28. Eliz. in the Caſe of Ld Zouch. v. Baimfield.—S. P. That a Fine levied in Ancient Demeſne ſhall not be pleaded in Bar to a Writ of Diſceit brought by the Lord. Skin. 14. Mich. 33 Car. 2. B. R. in Caſe of Cockman v. Farrer.——S. C. Raym. 462. where 2 Inſt. 518. is cited, and ſays it is intended another Fine, and not the ſame which was firſt levied.

8. A Fine *upon a Grant and Render* was *levied in the Time of E* 4. upon which afterwards a *Scire Facias* was brought, and *Judgment given*, and a Writ of *Seiſin awarded, but not executed* Afterwards a Fine *Sur Conuſance de Droit Come ceo, &c. with Proclamations was levied*, and *5 Years paſſed*, and now another Scire Facias is brought to execute the firſt Fine, to which the Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo is pleaded; ſo as the only Queſtion is, whether the Fine with Proclamations ſhall bar the Scire Facias, or not? And it was ſaid by the Judges, that here is no avoiding of the Fine, but it ſhall ſtand in Force; but yet, notwithſtanding, it may be barred; and they all ſaid, that he, who hath Judgment upon the Scire Facias upon the firſt Fine, might have entered; and they ſtrongly inclined, that the Scire Facias is barred by the Fine, and doth not *differ from the Caſe of a Writ of Error*; but they delivered no Opinion. Mar. 194. Paſch 18 Car. Apſly v. Boys.

9. *Conuſor Tenant in Tail after Conuſance* by Dedimus Poteſtatem, and *before Return of the Writ of Covenant, dies without Iſſue.* Proclamations are made, and 5 Years paſs, after Death of the Conuſor, yet *he in Remainder may have Error* to reverſe this Fine. 2 Jo. 181. Mich. 33 Car. 2. B. R. Cockman v. Carrer.

Raym. 461. S. C—2 Sid. 94, 95. per Cur. Row. v. Evelyn.

10. Where there is *Error in the Fine*, 5 Years Poſſeſſion cannot be pleaded in Barr. Raym. 462. Mich. 33. Car. 2. B. R. Cockman v. Carrer.

Skin. 13. S. C. ——2 Jo. 181. S. C. adjudged in both Reports.———The Court inclined, but adjournatur. Vent. 353. Anon. S. P. and ſeems to be S. C.

(Y. 4) Barred what. Infant and Truſt.

1. A Fine, ſuppoſed to be levied by an Infant, was examined in Chancery *after it had been allowed by Examination of the Juſtices of the Common Pleas*; but whether theſe and ſuch other may ſeem rather to examine the *Manner*, than the very *Matter* and Subſtance of the Thing adjudged, it is worthy of Conſideration. Cary's Rep. 5. cites Ann. 3. and 13. Eliz. D. 201 and 301.

Cro. C. 109. Iſham v. Morris.

2. Fine *of a Leaſe* made to the Conuſor's Uſe is ſufficient to bind the *Truſt*. 6 Car. 1. fol. 644. Chan. Rep. 51. Earl of Newcaſtle v. Earl of Suffolk.

3. An *Eſtate* is made to Friends *in Truſt, to the Uſe of the Woman, to commence after her Husband's Death*; ſhe joins in a Fine with her Huſband of the Land leaſed in Truſt; this Fine ſhall cut off the Truſt. Toth. 148. cites Trin 15. Car. Litter v. Yelverton.

Chan. Caſes 213 in Caſe of Waſhborn v. Downs, it was ſaid, that this Caſe was without a Preſident, and that the Plaintiff did not rely on his Decree, but the Matter was afterwards compromiſed.

4. The Fine or Recovery of a Ceſty que Truſt ſhall bar and transfer the Truſt, as it ſhall an Eſtate in Law, if it were *upon a Conſideration*: But otherwiſe, Windham J. doubted of it; For he look'd upon the Court of Chancery as remedial to thoſe, that come in upon a Conſideration. Reſolved Chan. Caſes 49. Paſch. 16. Car. 2. Goodrick v. Brown.

A Fine with Proclamation and Non-claim will bar a Truſt, per Ld Keeper, who ſaid it was ſo reſolved in the Exchequer. Mich. 27 Car. 2 Chan. Caſes 268. in Caſe of Clifford v. Aſbley.

5. Fine and Non-claim will bar *a Truſt*, if *levied by a Stranger*, and not by the Truſtee himſelf; For then the Truſt will go along with the Land. Hard. 512. Trin. 21 Car. 2. in Scacc. Woolſton v. Aſton.

6. Fine and Non-claim bars *all Truſt* and *Equity*, per Finch C. who ſaid, it was ſo reſolved, by all the Judges, in the Caſe of Cary v. Chiln, where the Equity was of a Practice in gaining a Conveyance of Lands, and ſince reſolved in the Exchequer, where a Truſt was barred; elſe no Man could know, when he was ſure of an Inheritance. *But* this is on *two Differences*——1. Where the Equity *charges the Land*, as in the aforeſaid Caſes, there the Fine bars; but where it *charges the Perſon in Reſpect of the Lands*, it does not bar, as in the Ld Knowls's Caſe.——2. If the Equity or Truſt be *created by the Fine*; that Fine ſhall never bar the Equity, which it created. Tr. 28 Car. 2. Chan. Caſes. 278. Salisbury v. Baggot.

——A *Title in Equity* or a *Truſt*, is and ſhall be barred by Fine and Non-claim, but that muſt be where the Perſon, to whom the Fine is levied, has *no Notice*, and in ſuch Caſe, the Claim muſt be in a proper way; if it be of a Truſt or Title in Equity, it cannot be by Entry, but by *Subpæna*; and if he have Title by Writ at the Common Law, and that his Entry is not lawful, an Entry is not good to ſave the Right, per Finch C. Mich. 34 Car. 2. 2 Chan. Caſes 126. Bovy v. Smith and Bony.——See Vern. 144. 150 S. C.

7. A. ſeiſed in Fee *deviſed Portions* to ſeveral of his Children or Friends *payable at ſeveral Times by 50l. per Ann.* with which Sums he charged his Lands to be thereout paid and died;——*50l.* one Payment incurred due, and then the Lands were aliened by Fine with Proclamations;——5 Years paſſed——Deviſee ſued in Chancery for the whole—Decreed for the Plaintiff for what grew due after the Fine was barred by the Fine, but not the *50l.* due before. For a Truſt is barred by Fine, &c. Hill. 31. Car. 2. 2 Chan. Caſes 247 Wakelin v. Warner.

'Tis the ſame of a *Fine by Truſtee*, per Finch. C. 2 Chan. Caſes 125, 126. S. C.

8. The Ld Keeper put the following Caſe. A. ſeiſed in Fee, in *Truſt for B.* for full Conſideration conveys to *C.* the *Purchaſor having Notice* of the Truſt; and afterwards C. to ſtrengthen his own Eſtate, levies a *Fine*; and the Counſel were all of Opinion, that the Ceſty que Truſt was not bound to enter within 5 Years; For that here C. having purchaſed with Notice, notwithſtanding any Conſideration paid by him, is but a Truſtee for B. and ſo the *Eſtate not being diſplaced*, the Fine cannot bar. Hill. 1682. Vern. 149. in Caſe of Bovey v. Smith.

Cro. C. 110. in Caſe of Iſham v. Morris.

9. Fine and Non-claim bars a *Term in Truſt* for ſecuring Childrens Portions. Cumb. 67. 3 Jac. 2. B. R. Hanmer v. Eyton.

——The Truſtees of a *Term, to attend the Inheritance*, are barred by a Fine, by the Leſſor or Purchaſor, and can never afterwards claim any thing: *But* yet the Term is not ſo barred, but that *Puiſne Incumbrances* may be let in upon the Purchaſor; For a Fine ſhall barr no Eſtates, but thoſe which were intended by the Parties to be barred. Per Holt Ch. J. Carth. 123. Mich. 1. W. & M. B. R. in Caſe of Smith v. Pearce.

10. A.

10. A. *deviſes* Lands *to Truſtees till Debts paid*, and then *to J. S. an Infant, and his Heirs*; Defendant entered on the Eſtate, and levied a Fine, and Non-claim paſſed. J. S. when of Age, brought Ejectment, but was Nonſuit by the Fine and Non-claim, the Truſtees (in whom the legal Eſtate was) not entering as they ſhould have done; yet being then an *Infant*, and having as ſoon as of Age made his Entry, and brought Ejectment, and alſo his Bill, *before 5 Years incurred after his full Age*, the Court decreed him the Poſſeſſion, and an Account of the Profits, declaring the Fine and Non-claim ſhould not run upon the Truſt in the Infant's Minority, and he *ſhall not ſuffer for the Laches of his Truſtees*. Mich. 1699. 2 Vern. 368. Allen v. Sayer.

Note, it did not appear, whether the Debts were all paid, nor whether the Plaintiff became intitled to the Poſſeſſion. Ibid.

(Y. 5) Barred what. Leaſes.

1. Where one is Leſſee for Years, and *aſſigns over* his Leaſe *in Truſt for himſelf, and then purchaſes the Inheritance*, and occupies the Land, and then levies a Fine with Proclamations, and the *Truſtee does not claim* his Leaſe within the 5 Years, the Truſtee is barred; For the Conuſor has the Poſſeſſion, by reaſon of the Truſt, and this Truſt is included in the Fine, and the Truſtee's Intereſt barred by his Nonclaim. Cro. C. 110. Paſch. 4 Car. C. B. Iſham v. Morris.

2. A *Sleeping Leaſe* which the Leſſee never knew or accepted of, and of which he never was in Poſſeſſion, is bound by Fine and Nonclaim. 8 Car. 1. Chan. Rep. 66. Harding v. Counteſs of Suffolk.

Show. 14. S. P. per Holt Ch. J. in the Caſe of

Pierce v. Smith. Mich. 1 W. and M. that where there are Acts done, and a Poſſeſſion continued againſt a Termor, a Fine may bar; but where another Perſon continued the Poſſeſſion for 5 Years, it may be a Quære, ut ante.——— S. C. argued. Carth. 100.

3. ‡ *Leaſe to begin at Eaſter next* is not barred by a Fine levied in the mean time; For Leſſee could not enter, his Right being future. But if the Leaſe had been in * Poſſeſſion, tho' the Leſſee had never entred, yet he had been barred. Brownl. 181. Bicknall v. Tucker.—155. S. C. and P. ——Cro. J. 60. † Saffin v. Adams. S. P.—5 Rep. 124. S. C.——Arg. 2 Le. 157. cites the Caſe of Saunders v. Starkey.——Cart. 82. Bridgman Ch. J. cites Saunders's Caſe.——Cro. J. 60. cites it as adjudged, M. 21 and 22 Eliz. in B. R. in Caſe of Saunders v. Stanford.

Le. 99. per Popham Att. Gen. S. P. but he ſaid, if the ſame Point was to be handled again, the Law would be taken otherwiſe

———But if he makes not his *Claim within 5 Years after his Title Comes in eſſe*, he ſhall be barred. Adjudged per 3 J. againſt 2. Cro. J. 60. Saffin v. Adams.—* Cart. 196. Arg. cites Cro. E. 15. Bruerton v. Rounsford.——† cited per Hale Ch. B. Hard. 413. in Caſe of Edwards v. Slates.——Show. 40. Arg. ——‡ Goldsb. 171. cites Stamford's Caſe. S. P.

4. *A. leaſed for Years to B. but* yet *A. continued the Poſſeſſion*; and afterwards A. levied a Fine with Proclamations, &c. It was ſaid by Warburton, Winch and Hutton, that it is no Bar to the Leſſee for his Term, but only as a Grant of the Reverſion by A. But *otherwiſe of a Leſſee in Poſſeſſion*. Mich. 15. Jac. Noy. 23. Archbold v. Cook.

This Caſe was denied by Twiſden J. who ſaid that this Report of Noy; was but an Abridgment by Serjeant Size, who when a Student borrowed Noy's Reports, and abridged them for his own Uſe; and that this is directly againſt the Reſolution in Saffin's Caſe, and relied on the Caſe of Cro. C 109, 110. Iſcham v. Morris, and adjudged accordingly, tho' the Caſe there was much ſtronger. Vent. 81. Trin. 22 Car. 2. B. R. Freeman v. Barns.

5. 4 *H.* 7 of Fines, *extends* to bind a Right of a *Term*, if the *Leſſee were or might have been* ever *in Poſſeſſion, before the Fine*. per Anderſon. Goldsb. 171. Cootes v. Atkinſon.

6. *Leaſe for* 100 *Years in Truſt for* him in *Reverſion*, (* to attend the Inheritance. Leſſee enters; then he in Reverſion enters and leaſes to W. for 5 Years, and at the End of the 5 Years, he) *makes a Leaſe for* 50 *Years to another*, and levies a Fine to corroborate; and 5 Years paſs; Reſolved, The *firſt Leaſe is deveſted by making the* 3*d*, but *at the Election of* him in *Reverſion*;

* Vent. 80. S C.——Cart 161. 195. S. C. in C. B. ——Sid. 349. 458. S. C. Vent. 55. So S. C.

Reverſion; and that the Leaſe for 100 Years is barred by the Fine, becauſe this was turned to a Right, by making the Leaſe for 50 Years before the Fine, and 5 Years Nonclaim; and the Chief Juſtice ſaid, and it was not denied, that *Incumbrances kept on Foot by Purchaſers*, ſhall not be barred by Fines; nor where Mortgagor retains Poſſeſſion, and pays the Intereſt, a Fine *by Mortgagor*, ſo holding the Poſſeſſion, ſhall not bar Mortgagee. 1 Lev. 270. Trin. 22 Car. 2. B. R. Freeman v. Barnes.——And ſo Judgment in C. B. was affirmed. Ibid.

7. *Deviſe of a Term for Payment of Debts, Remainder in Tail*; He in *Remainder enters* with conſent of Truſtees, and levies a Fine, and Settles the Land on his Wife for Life, and dies; The Wife Survives, the Debts unpaid; Quære whether this Term is barr'd by Fine and Nonclaim? 3. Mod. 195. Paſch. 4 Jac. 2. B. R. Smith v. Pearce.

8. In an Ejectione Firmæ for Lands in Wales, the Caſe upon a Special Verdict was, that a *Man ſeiſed in Fee* of Lands, *for the Continuance of them in his Name, and for the Maintenance of his Brother makes a Leaſe for 500 Years, in Truſt, that himſelf ſhould receive the Profits during his Life*, and that afterwards *his Brother ſhould* enjoy them, with ſome other Truſts; And *afterwards being in Poſſeſſion* according to the Truſt, *he covenanted with other Perſons* (not with the Leſſees) *to ſtand ſeiſed* of the ſaid Lands *upon the ſame Conſideration*, as was mentioned in the Leaſe, *to* the Uſe of *himſelf for Life* with *Remainders over*, according to the Truſts; *and* further, *that the ſaid Leaſe and all Eſtates made, or to be made by himſelf, ſhould be*, and enure *to the ſame Uſes*; *and levies a Fine*, and *5 Years paſſed*, the *Leſſor being in Poſſeſſion* according to the Truſt, and enjoying the Profits during his Life; afterwards the *Leſſor dies*, and *one of the Leſſees enters into Part* of the Lands *in one County, which was not compriſed in the Fine, claiming all* the Lands *in the other County*. Hale Ch. B. held, that nothing had been done here to diſplace the Eſtate of the Leſſee; For the Leſſor continued in Poſſeſſion by the Leſſee's Leave and Permiſſion, as muſt be preſumed, and ſo is a Tenant at Will, as Littleton ſays. Hard. 401. Paſch. 17 Car. 2. in Scacc. Focus v. Salisbury.

9. *So* if Leſſee for Years be, the Remainder over for Life; and Leſſee for Years levies a Fine, and 5 Years paſs; the Leſſor is not barred by any Nonclaim, becauſe the Fine operates nothing, & Partes ad Finem nihil habuerunt may be pleaded to it; *otherwiſe* it is where *Tenant for Life* levies a Fine; for he has a Freehold; and his Fine diſplaces the Remainders; and therefore an Entry is requiſite within 5 Years after the Death of the Tenant for Life; for which reaſon when a Leſſee for Years or at Will is to levy a Fine, 'tis uſual for the Leſſee to make a Feoffment firſt, to diſplace the other Eſtates. But here the *Leaſe for Years is antecedent to the Eſtate of the Leſſor*, who levies the Fine, and he has a Freehold expectant upon the Leaſe, and not precedent to it, per Hale Ch. B. Hard. 401, 402. Focus v. Salisbury.

10. *And* a Fine with 5 Years Nonclaim muſt bar an *Eſtate precedent* to the Fine, *not ſubſequent* to it. And there is here a *Privity* betwixt the Leſſor and the Leſſee, and therefore the Fine ſhall not bar; as in Caſe of a Mortgage, where the Mortgagor continuing in Poſſeſſion, levies a Fine, per Hale Ch. B. Hard. 402. Focus v. Salisbury.

11. *And* this very Caſe was adjudged in Terminis for 2 Reaſons, 1ſt By Reaſon of the *Privity* betwixt the Perſons. 2dly, Becauſe the Leſſor was in the Nature of a *Tenant at Will*, and there was a *mutual Confidence* betwixt the Parties, per Hale Ch. B. Hard. 402. cited it as the Dutcheſs of Richmond's Caſe.

(Y. 6) Barred what. Legacies and Deviſes.

1. A. deviſed Land to B. an Infant 3 Years old in Fee, and dies. The Heir of A. enters and levies a Fine with Proclamations. B. dies within Age,

Age, leaving M. his Sifter and Heir; *Deviſee* never entered; M. was a *Feme Covert*; five Years paſſed. Reſolved that the Baron of M. was bound, and all claiming under him; but M. ſhall have 5 Years after Baron's Death to claim. Cro. C. 200. Mich. 6 Car. B. R. Hulm v. Heylock.

2. A. deviſed *Lands to B. in Truſt*, Remainder to C. in Truſt, *ſubject to the Payment of Legacies*. C. levies a Fine, and 5 Years Nonclaim paſs, and then mortgaged the Land. Fine and Nonclaim is no Bar of the Legacies. C. having no Title but under the Will, the Mortgagee muſt be *ſuppoſed to have Notice* of the Will, per Cowper C. Tr. 1710. 2 Vern. 662. Draper's Company v. Yardley.

(Z) What *Things* are *barred* by Fine.

1. IF *Falſe Recovery* be had againſt Tenant in Tail, and the *Recoveror levies a Fine*, the Iſſue ſhall not reverſe this after five Years. D. Marg. 3 pl. 2. cites 34 Eliz. B. R. Holme v. Gee.

2. Baron had a *Power to declare that his Feme ſhould have an Eſtate for Life* in certain Land; but, before any ſuch Declaration was made, the Baron and Feme levied a Fine come ceo, &c. This *Poſſibility* of the Feme was included in the Fine. 7 May. 41 Eliz. in Canc. Mo. 554. Poole v. Veere.

3. Feoffment by A. to the Uſe of himſelf for Life, *Remainder to ſuch, as Feoffor ſhould name at his Death, in Fee.* A. and the Feoffees levy a Fine for good Conſideration to a Stranger, and afterwards A. names and dies. The Party named ſhall have the Land, notwithſtanding the Fine. Arg. 3 Le. 253. cites it as adjudged. in B. R. in Ld Paget's Caſe.

4. *Attending Term*, by Fine and Nonclaim by him that has the Inheritance, and is in Poſſeſſion of the Land, is barred. Cro. C. 110. Paſch. 4 Car. C. B. in Caſe of Iſham v. Morris. Per Holt Ch. J. Carth. 103. in Caſe of Smith v. Pierce.

5. *Ceſſavit* is not barred by a Fine and Nonclaim, becauſe the Title is puiſne to the Fine. Arg. Roll. R. 306.

6. *Collateral Uſes*, not depending on the other Eſtates, may be deſtroyed by Fine, if they are *contingent Remainders*. But if there be a *collateral Clauſe*, by which a Uſe limited, as Proviſo, if 100 *l.* be not paid, it ſhall be to ſuch Uſe; that contingent Remainder is not deſtroyed by Fine. Arg. Het. 98. cites 1 Rep. 130. 134 Chudleigh's Caſe.

7 A *Thing, that will not paſs by a Fine*, may be barred by a Fine; as a *Right to a Copyhold*; and ſo of a *Rent Charge*, by levying a Fine of the Land, as is Conings by's Caſe. And ſo of a *Truſt*, as Feme Covert has a Truſt, ſhe cannot transfer it; but if ſhe and her Husband levy a Fine of the Land, as the Rent is gone by way of Diſcharge, ſo the Truſt is gone by way of Diſcharge; per Bridgman. Ch. J. Cart. 24. Paſch. 17 Car. 2. C. B. in Caſe of Taylor v. Shaw. *So*, if there be Iſſue in Tail with Remainder in Fee to him, the *Election* and Power, which he has *to avoid a Leaſe of his Anceſtor* Tenant in Tail, is deſtroyed by a Fine with Proclamations. Hill. 4. W. and M. B. R. Carth. 259. Simmonds v. Cudmore.

8. Fine and Nonclaim ſhall not bar an *Eſtate*, that is *not* * *turned to a Right*. Cart. 82. 18 Carth. 2. C. B. Thomalin v. Mackworth. *But a Right to an Eſtate by Extent* will be barred by a Fine and Nonclaim. per Ventris J. 2 Vent. 329. cites 5 Rep. 123. Saffin's Caſe.—If one, that has *Intereſſe Termini*, *enters* after the Term commences, and *is ouſted*, then 'tis not any Intereſt in him, but a Right. Cro. J. 61. Hill 2 Jac. B. R. in Saffin's Caſe v. Adams.

* The Law conſtrues ſuch Acts to *amount to* a deveſting or not deveſting, as is *moſt agreeable to the Intention of the Parties, and the Right of the Thing*. per the Chief Juſtice. Vent. 81. in Caſe of Freeman v. Barnes.——Vern. 149. Hill. 1682. Bovey v. Smith.

9. Thoſe that have *neither preſent, nor future Right, nor Poſſibility of Right* to the Lands, &c. in the Fine at the Time of levying it, but a

Right to ſomething iſſuing out of the ſame, as Rent, Common, a Way, &c. are not bound at all. For the Fine extends only to ſecure the Right or Title of the Eſtate, but does not bind the Profits to be taken out of the Eſtate. Wood's Inſt. 246.

S. C. cited 2 Vern. 190.

10. Fine with Proclamation according to the 4 *H.* 7. by Deviſee on Condition of Non-payment of Money to her, (and the Condition not being performed) will bar an *Equitable Power of Redemption*, as well as a Right of Action; per Hale. Hard. 512. Trin. 21 Car. 2. In Scacc. Sir N. Woolſtan v. Aſton.

Vern. 132. Hill. 1682. Welden v. Duke of York.

11. *But* Fine by *Mortgagee* will not bar Equity of *Redemption*. Hard. 512. Woolſton v. Aſton.

———Fine levied on the mortgaging the Eſtate, and to ſtrengthen the Mortgagee's Security, is no Bar to the Equity of Redemption. For the very Eſtate which then paſſed by the Fine was a redeemable Eſtate, per Lord Hutchins. Mich. 1690. 2 Vern. 190. Lingard v. Griffin.

So of a Fine levied *by Mortgagor*. Sid. 460. it was ſo ſaid for Law, in Caſe of Freeman v. Barnes.

But if a Man has *Judgment in Debt*, on

12. *Lands extended* upon Elegit are bound by Fine and Nonclaim within 5 Years; otherwiſe, if the Land had not been actually extended. 1 Mod. 217. Trin. 28 Car. 2. C. B. Ognel v. Ld Arlington & al.

which he may have an Elegit, and after Judgment the Defendant aliens the Land by Fine with Proclamations, and 5 Years paſs, the Plaintiff may have *Scire facias & Elegit*, per Lord Keeper. Ch. Caſes 268. Mich. 27 Car. 2. in Caſe of Clifford v. Aſhley.

13. If an *Inquiſition upon an Elegit* be found, the Party before Entry has the Poſſeſſion, and a Fine with Nonclaim ſhall bar his Right; For *before actual Entry*, he may have Ejectione Firmæ or Treſpaſs, and ſo not like an *Intereſſe Termini*. Ch. Caſes 268. in Caſe of Clifford v. Aſhley.

But Wood's Inſt. 44. ſays that a Baronet by Deſcent levied a Fine of his Honour to another who enjoyed it, and took Place in Seniority from the Date of the Patent, as if his Anceſtors had been *Baronets*. [But ſee the Caſe above Contra.]

14 *Dignity of Peerage* is not barrable by Fine. Parliament Caſes 11. The King v. Ld Purbeck.

15. A Fine ſhall bar *no Eſtates, but thoſe which were intended by the Parties to be barred.* per Holt Ch. J. Carth. 103. Mich. 1. W. and M. B. R. in Caſe of Smith v. Pierce.

16. A Fine and Nonclaim is a good Bar to a *Bill of Reveiw*, per Hutchins Commiſſioner. Mich. 1690. 2 Vern. 190. in Caſe of Lingard v. Griffin.

Adjudged. Mich. 39 and 40 Eliz. C. B. Cro. E. 594. Edwards v. Peel.

17. A *Reverſion* may be barred by Fine and Nonclaim. Arg. Show. 42. cites Pl. C. 374.

But afterwards the Reverſal was reverſed in the Houſe of Lords. Ch. Prec. 106. S. C.——Parl. Caſes 137. S. C.

18. One *Coparcener* in Conſideration of 4000 *l.* paid to her by C. who was about to marry B. her Siſter, joined with B. in a Conveyance to *B. and C. for their Lives*, Remainder *to the Iſſue of the Marriage*, Remainder *to the right Heirs of C. Provided if no Iſſue be living at the Death of the Survivor of B. and C. and that the Heirs of B.* within 12 Months after the Deceaſe of B. and C. *ſhall pay* 4000 *l. to the Heirs or Aſſigns of C.* then *the Remainder to C. to ceaſe*, and the Premiſſes to remain *to the right Heirs of B. for ever.* B. and C. levied a Fine to extinguiſh this Proviſo, and declared the Uſe to C. and his Heirs and directed the Truſtees to convey accordingly. B. and C. died without Iſſue; a Bill was brought by the Heir of B. to have a Conveyance on paying the 4000 *l.* but was diſmiſſed by the Maſter of the Rolls, but was afterwards reverſed. Paſch. 1697. Ch. Prec. 72. Sir Evan Loyd v. Carew.

(Z. 2) Bar. In what Caſes *in General.*

1. When an *Eſtate* is *put to a Right*, and then comes a Fine and Non-claim; it is a perpetual Bar. Cart. 82. in Caſe of Thomaſin v. Mackworth.—But where the Eſtate is not turned, a Right, it is no Bar. Cart. 164. Arg. cites Saffin's Caſe, and 9 Rep. 106. Marg. Podger's Caſe, and 8 Rep. Symmes's Caſe, and Pl. C. Stowell v. Zouch.

(Z. 3) Good. In Reſpect of the *Form.*

1. Fines levied in C. B. *without ſhewing in the Fine the Names of the Juſtices*, is good. Denſh. R. on Fines. 4. See Le. 85. Contra.

2. And Note, that the Form in *C. B. and* the form *in other Courts, where Fines may be levied, is all one*, and no other Words in the one, than was and is in the other; but the one part of the Fine ſhall be ſent into the Treaſury, and the other deliver'd to the Parties, and ſhall be indors'd *Deliberatur per proclam. &c.* and a Record of this is put in Bank. Denſh. R. of Fines 4.

3. And if it be levied *before J. D and others who are Juſtices*, it is void; *but if* it be *before the Juſtices, and others who are* * *Juſtices:* it is good; and the *Names of others void.* Denſh. R. of Fines 4. * The word [not] ſeems omitted

4. And if the Fine be *levied to one of the Juſtices, he ſhall be named in the Coram &c.* and among the Juſtices by the Conuſance now uſed; yet albeit he be * named, (as to me ſeems) the Fine is good. Denſh. R. of Fines 4, 5. * The word [not] ſeems omitted.

5. The Statute of 4 H. 7. 24. does not alter the Form and Subſtance of the Fine, but the *ancient Form* remains. per Omnes J. Mich. 4 and 5 Eliz. B. R. Pl. C. 265. b. Fiſh v. Brocket.

(Z. 4) Good. In Reſpect of the *Deſcription.*

1. In Aſſiſe againſt A. of the 4th part of a Mill, Defendant ſaid, Aſſiſa non; For ſuch a Day and Year before Herle, Fine was levied between A. B. Plaintiff, and C. F. Deforceants of the Manor of G. with the Appurtenances, of which the Mill was Parcel; by which *A. acknowledged the Manor to be the Right of C. come ceo*, &c. and C. *granted and rendered* the Manor to A. and the Heirs of his Body; the Remainder of the *fourth Part* of the Manor, *againſt the Weſt, to Alice the now Tenant and her Heirs*; and another *fourth Part* of the Manor *againſt the Eaſt, to J. the Plaintiff*; and another *fourth Part againſt the South* to remain to Richard in the ſame Manner; and the *Remainder of the fourth Part againſt the North*, to remain to *W. and her Heirs*; and that after, A. died without Iſſue of his Body, by which Alice entered into the fourth Part againſt the Weſt, as in her Remainder in which the Mill is; and the Plaintiff entered into the 4th Part againſt the Eaſt, as in his Remainder; and the Plaintiff, ſuppoſing that the Mill was in his Part, entered, and the Tenant re-enter'd, Judgment if Aſſiſe. And the Plaintiff ſaid, that after this, Partition was made, and the Mill allotted to the Plaintiff, who was ſeiſed thereof, till diſſeiſed by the Defendant; and the other ſaid, that at the Time of the Partition, ſhe was Covert Baron, and her Part was too little; and the Aſſiſe was awarded. Br. Fines. pl. 83. cites 44 Aſſ. 11. Br. Partition pl. 24. cites S. C. and per Belk, it *ſhall be intended*, that every one ſhall have one fourth Part *in equal Value*, and *not according to the Quantity*; For one 4th Part may be in Value of 2 fourth Parts; per Tank, this is true, *where it is limited by Moieties*, 3 *Parts or* 4 *Parts without other Determination*, but when it is ſaid, the Part againſt the Eaſt to the one, and the Part againſt the Weſt to another, &c. there it *ſhall be intended according to the Quantity*, and not according to the Value. Erook ſays, *Quære*, for the Aſſiſe was awarded.

2. Where a Fine and Recovery is *of ſo many Acres in D.* the Parties intereſted ſhall have their *Election*, in what part of the Eſtate it ſhall operate. MS. Rep. ſaid to be Ld Harcourt's cites 27 March 1723. Ld Blaney v. Mahon.

(Z. 5) *Limitations* in Fines. What good or allowable.

1. *Two acknowledged a Fine of four Acres to be the Right of W. and granted that the Tenements aforeſaid, which N. held for his Life, and which, after his Death, ought to revert to them, to remain to P. and his Heirs*; and the Court would not accept it without limiting the *Fee in one of the Conuſors certain*; by which they acknowledged the Tenements to be the Right of W. and granted, that the ſame Tenements, which N. held for his Life, and which after his Death ought to revert to them and to the Heirs of one of them, ſhould remain to P. and his Heirs; and this Fine was accepted. Br. Fines. pl. 46. cites 21 E. 3. 13.

2. In Dower, *Rent* was granted by Fine, *with Condition, that when any Heir is within Age*, that *the Rent ſhould ceaſe during the Nonage*; and the Feme recovered Dower during the Nonage, & ceſſet Executio till the full Age of the Heir. Nota. Br. Judgment pl. 41. cites 24 E. 3. 61.

3. A Man acknowledged the Tenements in the Writ, to be the Right of one A. *come ceo*, &c. *except four Acres* of the Land, *and granted that the four Acres (which J. S. held by Recognizance, till* 10 *l. was levied)* after they ſhould revert to him, *ſhould remain* to the ſaid A. and his Heirs for ever; and the Fine was received. Br. Fines. pl. 19. cites 44 E. 3. 21.

If A. levy a Fine, *Remainder in Tail to himſelf*, Remainder *to B. in Fee*; this

4. A Man cannot by Fine, *by Way of Remainder, reſerve a leſs Eſtate to himſelf, than Fee.* And therefore if A. acknowledge a Fine to B. in Fee, and he render to A. in Tail, the Remainder to himſelf for Life, this Remainder is void; For A. had Fee Simple before. Weſt's Symb. S. 30. cites * 24 E. 3. 28. 14 H. 4. 31.

Remainder in Tail is void; For he cannot give to himſelf. Br. Fines. pl. 113. cites 14 H. 4. 31. and †42 E. 3. 5. where he ſays it is not adjudged; yet he ſays it ſeems to be a void Remainder.—* Br. Fines. pl. 61. cites S. C. Br. Eſtates. pl. 23. cites S. C.———† Br. Eſtates. pl. 66. S. C.

5. Tho' a Fine be acknowledged *to ſeveral*, yet *the Right ſhall be limited to one of them only, and the Heirs of one*, and not to the Heirs of all. Br. Fines. pl. 7. cites 9 H. 6. 42.

6. A. B. C. and D. were Siſters and Coheirs of J. S. and A. B. and C. and their Husbands brought Writ of Covenant to levy a Fine againſt D. and her Husband. And thereby D. and her Husband acknowledged the Tenements to be the Right of A. as thoſe which her Husband, and She, and the other two Husbands and their Wives, had of the Gift of D. and her Husband, and further releaſed accordingly. A. B. and C. rendered to D. in Tail, to hold of the Chief Lord by Services due *et ſi contigerit ipſam obire ſine Hærede de Corpore &c. tunc poſt deceſſum ejus præd' Tenementa integra remanerent præd'* A. B. & C. *& Hæredibus de Corporibus earum legitime Procreatis tenendum, &c. remanere ulterius rectis Hæredibus J. S. defuncti.* D. died without Iſſue, and A. B. and C. and their Husbands brought a *Scire facias* to execute the ſaid Remainder in Tail to them as above; and the Writ was *oſtenſur' &c. quare Tenementa præd' poſt Mortem præd' D. præfatis A. B. & C.* and their Husbands, as in the Right of their Wives, *remanere non debeant juxta Formam Finis præd'. Eo quod præd' D. Mortua eſt ſine Hærede de Corpore ſuo exeunte, &c.* Paſch. 29 H. 8. D. 69. a. b. pl. 32, 33.

7. A Fine *Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo* que il ad de ſon done *generally implies a Fee Simple*; but it is only *by Implication*, and therefore there is *no Repugnancy to limit an Eſtate for Life* to the Conuſee; for the precedent Donation or Feoffment, which is ſuppoſed, might be for Life only, or * in Tail, and the general Intendment of the Conuſans, may be *qualified by an expreſs Limitation.* 1 Salk. 340. Hill. 1 Annæ. B. R. Hunt v. Bourne.——cites 41 Ed. 3. 14. Co. Litt. 9. b.

* Br. Fines. pl. 12. cites 41 E. 3. 14.

(A. a) Extinguiſhed. What.

1. A. Seiſed of *divers Manors* in the Counties of *B. and C.* by *Indenture enrolled* in Chancery for 200 *l.* did *demiſe*, grant, and to farm let *to D.* and his Heirs his ſaid Manors, *rendering thereout annually* to the ſaid A. and his Heirs *a Rent, with Diſtreſs and Re-entry for Non-payment*, and covenanted to do all Acts, which ſhould be deviſed, for Aſſurance of the ſaid Manors, to the Intents and Uſes aforeſaid; after which, *by other Indenture* between them, it was covenanted that the ſaid A. ſhould *levy a Fine* to the ſaid D. of the ſaid Manors, and that the ſaid Fine and all other Aſſurances to be made of the ſaid Manors, by the ſaid A. to the ſaid D. ſhould be *to the Uſes or Intents contained in the firſt Indenture, and to no other Uſes or Intents*; after which the ſaid A. inſeoff'd the ſaid D. to the Uſes and Conditions in the ſaid firſt Indenture mentioned; and after the ſaid A. at Requeſt of the ſaid D. and to the Uſes in the ſaid firſt Indenture, levies a Fine to the ſaid D. of the Manors in the County of C. and upon all this matter found by Office in the Court of Wards it was, by the Opinion of the Juſtices, ruled that the Rent remained not extinguiſhed by the Fine, and yet the *Fine* is only *of Part, viz. in the County of C.* and *not purſuant to the Indenture*; For that is, that the Fine ſhould be *of Manors in the ſaid Counties*, &c. Note, a ſtrange Caſe, but it ſeems that this is Law by Branch of 27 H. 8. which ſee. 2, 3. P. M. Cur. Ward. 1 And. 18. Puttenham's Caſe. D. 15. pl 28. S. C. confines the State of the Caſe to one and the ſame Manor. And ſo where it is cited in Mo. 106. 384. and 2 And. 85. and 2 Rep. 73. (d). and Palm. 506. there is no mention of more than one Manor.

2. A. ſeiſed of a Manor, made a *Leaſe for Years rendring Rent*, with Clauſe of *Re-entry*; and afterwards levied a Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit *to the Uſe of himſelf and his Heirs*. The Rent, being demanded, is behind. Per Dyer Ch. J. A. cannot re-enter; For tho' in Right the Rent paſſes without Attornment, yet he is without Remedy. For it is without Attornment, and it would be hard *without Attornment* to re-enter.--Per Manwood J. tho' the Conuſee himſelf could not, yet the Conuſor being Ceſty que Uſe, who is in by the Act of Law, ſhall avow, and ſhall re-enter without Attornment; For the Conuſor is in by the 27 H. 8.—Per Harper J. The Heir of the Conuſee ſhall avow and re-enter before Attornment. 3 Le. 103. pl. 152. Paſch. 26 Eliz. C. B. Anon. 4 Le. 34. S. C.

3. A Fine *by one Jointenant to his Companion* enures by way of Releaſe. Mich. 21 Jac. B. R. 2 Roll. R. 398. 444. 472. 485. Euſtace v. Scowen.

4. If I have *Land* covered with Water, and another has *Liberam Piſcariam* in it to him and his Heirs; clearly if he joins in a Fine with me of the Land, this extinguiſhes the Fiſhery, per Hobart. 2 Roll. R. 500. Hill. 22 Jac. B. R. in Caſe of Foliot al. Heliar v. Sanders.

5. Where a Fine is levied by him who hath the Fee and Freehold in him, whatever *Right, Eſtate, or Intereſt*, there is in him beſides, paſſes incluſively in the Fine, not by way of transferring the Intereſt, but (as it were) *conſolidating with the Fee, ſo as to determine and extinguiſh ſuch Intereſt*. per Ventris J. 2 Vent. 332. in Caſe of Dighton v. Greenvill. Skin. 260. S. C. Knight v. Greenvill.

6. *A Term* was *veſted in Truſtees for raiſing* 1000 *l. payable to J. S.* who afterward levies a Fine of the Land, or ſuffers a Recovery of it; this is an Extinguiſhment of the Charge. 2 Wms's Rep. 605. Trin. 1731. in Caſe of D. of Chandois v. Talbot.

(A. a. 2) *Relation* of Fines to what Time, *to avoid Meſne Incumbrances*, &c.

1. It is no Plea to plead a Fine in Bar and *the Eſtate of the Plaintiff Meſne between the Conuſance of it, and the Execution*; For it ſhall not have

Relation before the Execution; quod Nota. Br. Relation. pl. 27. cites 21 H. 6. 17. 8 E. 3.

2. *A. covenants* with B. *to levy a Fine, Oct. Mich.* 1 *Car. A. acknowledges a Statute to C.* 8 *Oct.* the ſame Year; the Fine is levied according to the Covenant, and the *Conuſance taken the* 12*th Oct.* aforeſaid. This Conuſee ſhall *avoid the ſaid Statute*, by Relation to the Day of the *Eſſoin*, which was before the ſaid 8th Day of October. Mich. Term now begins the 23d October by an Act made 16 Car. 1. Then the Eſſoin was 7th October, and the firſt Day of full Term the 9th. Jenk. 250. in pl. 40.

(B. a) Of what a Fine may be levied.

S. P. and yet no Præcipe lies of it. Co. R. on Fines 11. cites 19 Aſſ. 12. but it ſhould be 9 Aſſ. 12.

1. FINES have been levied heretofore of a *Boillonry of Salt*, and by ſuch Name the Profit of the Franktenement paſſed. Br. Aſſiſe. pl. 145. cites 9 Aſſ. 12.

2. Fine has been levied of a *Common*, and of a *Corody*; & Sci. fa. lies of it and Execution accordingly. Br. Common pl. 45. cites 4 E. 4. 1, 2.

3. 32 *H.* 8. 7. S. 7. Directs Writs of Covenant, and other Writs for Fines to be levied, and other Aſſurances to be had and made *of Parſonages, Vicarages, and other Profits called Spiritual*, to be deviſed and granted in Chancery, as have been uſed for Fines and Aſſurances of other Lands.

So of an *Annuity*; and yet it is a Thing perſonal. Co. R. on Fines 11. cites 11 H. 4. But ſee pl. 11.—Covenant was brought of a *Market*, and Keles would have drawn the Peace, and the Court would not receive it; For Præcipe lies not of it. Co. R. on Fines 11. cites 13 E. 3 Tit Fines. 68.———* Denſh. R. on Fines 14. contra——Wood's Inſt. 242.

4. A Fine may be of a * *Rent-charge de novo*, which had no Being before. 21 Ed. 3. 44. Or of a *Chief Rent*, or other *Rent in Being*. 18 Ed. 4. 22. Or of a *Seigniory*. 48 Ed. 3. 23. Or of an *Acquittal*. 50 Ed. 3. 23. Or of a *Chauntry*. 37 Ed. 3. 33. Weſt. Symb. S. 25.

S. P. For that ſhould be a Wrong to the Lord of whom the Land is holden; For by the Fine it ſhould become Frankfee, and not impleadable in his Court. 2 Inſt. 513.

5. *But* Fines may not be levied of *Lands in Ancient Demeſne*; For if any Fine be levied of ſuch Lands, it may be reverſed by a Writ of Deſceit brought by the Lord of Ancient Demeſne; and thereby he ſhall be reſtored to his Seigniory; and it ſeemeth to be *void between the Parties*, becauſe coram non Judice. 7 H. 4. 44. 8 H. 4. 23. 21 Ed. 3. 20. Reg. fol. 13. b. de Fine adnullando, &c. Yet it is holden good to *bind the Parties*, 17 Ed. 3. 3. and 7 H. 4.[44] Bro. Fines 101. which ſeemeth not to be Law. *But if* ſuch Fines be *of Lands in Ancient Demeſne, and of Lands at the Common Law*, it ſhall be ſtill good for the Lands at the Common Law. Weſt. Symb. S. 25. cites 7 H. 4. 44.

Fines may be levied *of all Things inheritable*, being * *in eſſe Tempore Finis* and certainly expreſſed in the Writs. Weſt's Symb. S. 25. cites 18 E. 4. 22.——* S. P. Br. Fines. pl. 97. cites 18 E. 4. 22.

6. Regularly a Fine may be levied *of any Thing, whereof a Præcipe quod reddat or faciat lies*, as the Writ of Cuſtoms and Services; or whereof a Præcipe *quod permittat*, as to have Common a Way, &c. *or* to be ſhort, where Præcipe *quod teneat* doth lie, as the Writ of Covenant to levy a Fine and the like. 2 Inſt. 513.

7. *But in ancient Times* Fines were levied *of other Things, than will be at this Day allowed*; and yet thoſe Fines ſhall be holden now as available, as they were taken to be, when they were levied. 2 Inſt. 513.

Jenk. 275. pl. 96.

8. Tenant in Tail of a *Rent* or *Common* levies a Fine with Proclamations; it is very clear that the Iſſues ſhall be barred thereby; per Walmſley J. 2 Le. 158. 21 Eliz. C. B. in the Caſe of Segar v. Bainton.

9. Of

9. Of a *Leaſe for Years*, the Fine is void as to any Strangers; for a Freehold muſt be in the Cognizor or Cognizee; however it may be *good betwixt the Parties* by Way of Eſtoppel, ſo as to conclude them. Wood's Inſt. 242.

10. A Fine cannot be levied *of Money agreed to be laid out in a Purchaſe of Land to be ſettled in Taile.* But a Decree can bind ſuch Money, equally as a Fine alone could bind the Land in this Caſe, if bought and ſettled. per Cur. Wms's Rep. 130. Mich. 1710. Benſon v. Benſon.

S. P. in a MS. Report, ſaid to be Ld Harcourt's, of Caſes in the Houſe of Lords, ſaid there to be decreed. 24 Feb. 1723. Lady Warwick v. Edwards.

11. Of an *Annuity* to a Man and his Heirs, no Fine can be levied. Parliament Caſes 1. Arg.——becauſe it is a Thing perſonal. Arg. 3. in Caſe of the King v. Ld Purbeck.

Of an Annuity *in eſſe* it is good. Otherwiſe not. Denſh. R. on Fines 14.

12. A Fine may be, and uſually is, levied of *Shares in the New River-Water.* 2 Wms's Rep. 128. Paſch. 1723. Drybutter v. Bartholomew.

13. Fines may be levied of *all Things* in Being *which are inheritable*, whether Eccleſiaſtical and made Temporal, or Temporal; as of an *Advowſon*, *Rectory*, *Portion of Tithes*, &c. of an *Honour*, *Manor*, *Barony*, *Leet*, *Meſuage*, *Dove-Houſe*, *Garden*, *Orchard*, *Land*, *Meadow*, *Paſture*, *Wood*, *Underwood*, *Office*, *Fiſhing*, *Warren*, *Fair*, *Toll*, *Waifs*, *Strays*, &c, *Rent*, *Common*, *a Hundred*, &c. And * as Fines may be levied of Things in Poſſeſſion, ſo may they be levied *of a Remainder* or *Reverſion*, or of a *Right in Futuro*, or of a *Poſſibility*. Wood's Inſt. 242.

So of a *Way*. Denſh. R. of Fines 15.—So of a *Free Chapel*. Ibid.—Not of a *Court Baron or Piepowders*. Ibid.—They are ſeverable

of *all Things whereof a Præcipe quod reddat lies*. Weſt. Symb. S. 25.—Co. R. on Fines 11. S. P. And of ſome Things whereof *no Præcipe lies*, as of *Paſture for two Oxen*. Co. R. on Fines 11. cites 4 E. 4. 2. 27 H. 8. 12.——*So* of an *Office*. Ibid. cites 19 Aſſ. 12.——*So* of *Common of Paſture*. Ibid.——*So* of a *Way* in a Quod permittat. Ibid. cites 2 E. 13 ——*So* of a *Rent newly created*. Ibid. cites 22 E. 4.——So of *Eſtovers*, *Houſebote*, *Hayboot*, *Plowbote*, *and Firebote*. Denſh. R. of Fines 14.——So of an *Office in Eſſe*. Denſh. R. ——So of a ‡ *Bailywick or Wardſhip of a Foreſt*. Ibid.——So of *any Profit Apprender*, which is *certain*; but not where it is *uncertain*, as Common Sans Number, &c. Such Things cannot be granted by Fine, becauſe Finis Finem litibus imponit, and that cannot be where the Thing is not certain. Ibid.—It may be of *ſo many Loads of Buſhes* in Fee, or for Life, to be taken annually in ſuch a Wood. But then this muſt be *In eſſe*, and one of the Parties poſſeſſed thereof before the Fine. Ibid.——* Weſt. Symb. S. 25. cites 42 E. 3. 7. 44 E. 3. 45.——‡ Co. R. on Fines 11. cites 27 H. 8. 12.

(B. a. 2) *Of what Eſtate* a Fine may be levied, in Reſpect of its *having been in* Poſſeſſion of *the King*.

1. Where the *King is intitled by a Diſſeiſor or other, who has a defeaſible Title*, and the *Hands of the King are amoved by due means*, and *after a Fine is levied*, and then the Land is *reſeiſed*; yet the Fine is good. Br. Fines pl. 102. cites 24 E. 3. 65.

2. *But* where the King amoves his Hands by *undue means*, and after a Fine is levied, and after the King for Cauſe re-ſeiſes; this ſhall avoid the Fine, by the beſt Opinion. Br. Fines. pl 102. cites 24 E. 3. 65.

(C. a) Of what a Fine may be. By what *Name*.

1. A *Manor* may paſs by the Name of a *Tenement*. Br. Fines. pl. 66. cites 9 E. 4. 6.

2. The Thing of which a Fine is to be levied, *ought to be in eſſe* at the Time of the Fine, *and expreſſed in the Fine directly, or by Implication*. Br. Fines. pl. 97. cites 18 E. 4. 22.

3. *As* where the Writ is Quod teneat *Conventionem de* tali *Terra*; there upon Conuſance of Right of the Land by him to another, the other may grant and *render à Rent*, *Common*, &c. For it is implied; becauſe it *is iſſuing out of the ſame Land as is in the Writ*. Br. Fines. pl. 97. cites 18 E. 4. 22.

But where the Writ is of a *Maner*, the Fine cannot be levied *of a Houſe*.

And where it is of *Land in D.* Fine cannot be levied *of Land in S.* Br. Fines. pl. 97. cites 18 E. 4. 22.

4. An

4. An *Honour* may paſs *by the Name of a Manor*, or by its proper Name; as de Honore de Tickhill, or de Manerio de Tickhill. Weſt. Symb. S. 26.

For if any of the Towns, into which the Manor extends, be omitted, nothing of the Manor in that Town paſſes.

5. It ſufficeth alſo to demand a *Manor* by his proper Name, *without naming the Town wherein it lieth*; For it may be out of any Town, or extend into ſeveral Towns and Counties, as de Manerio de D. cum Pertinentiis; yet it ſeems *beſt to expreſs all the ſeveral Towns*, into which it extendeth; as de Manerio de S. cum Pertinentiis in D. & E. Weſt. Symb. S. 26. cites 19 E. 4. fo. 9. a. 43 E. 3. fo. 9. a. Bract. lib. 4. c. 31. §. 3. 9 Ed. 4. fo. 61. 9. a. 16. a. 17. b. 11 H. 7. fo. 22. b. 49. Weſt's Symb. S. 26. cites 5 E. 4. 103.

6. A *Caſtle* or an *Hundred* may be Parcel of a Manor, and paſs by the Name of the *Manor*, *whereof they are Parcel*, 26 Aſſ. 54. And one Manor may be Parcel of another, 2 Ed. 3. fo. 36. And a *Caſtle* may be demanded *by his proper Name*, as de Caſtello de B. cum Pertinentiis, 1 E. 3. fo. 4. and an *Hundred* may be demanded *by itſelf*, as de Hundredo de S. 27 H. 6. fo. 2. Weſt. Symb. §. 26.

7. A *Chapel* or an *Hoſpital* muſt be demanded by the Name of a *Meſuage*. Weſt. Symb. §. 26. cites 13 Aſſ. 2.

8. *Molendinum* is good, *without* adding *Ventriticum or Aquaticum*; albeit the latter be more uſual. Weſt. Symb. §. 26. cites 44 E. 3. 13.

In Sci. fa. it was agreed, that a Fine is good to *paſs a Reverſion in Tail, without expreſſing the Reverſion*; For it was levied by him in Reverſion in Tail *Sur Conuſance de Droit* to two, and they rendered again to the Conuſor in Tail, the Remainder to the Plaintiff in the Sci. fa. and he ſued Execution & habuit; quod Nota; and yet Thorp dixit pro Lege eodem Anno. fo. 15. that where a Fine is levied Sur Conuſance de Droit, or by Grant and Render, *by him, who hath nothing but the Reverſion*, the Conuſee ſhall not have Action thereof, where there is no *mention of the Reverſion*; Sc. it is not * compriſed, but it ſeems clearly that by Fine levied *Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo*, &c. 'tis good to paſs the Reverſion. Br. Fines. pl. 18. cites 43 E. 3. 22. pl. 39. cites 37 H. 6. 5. — Br. Fines. pl. 97. cites 18 E. 4. 22. —* The larger Edition of Brook in Folio, is (e Contra), the ſmaller in Folio is (Examin); the 4to Edition is (Exie).

9. Of a *Reverſion* by the Name of the *Land*, or otherwiſe. Weſt's Symb. §. 26. cites 43 Ed. 3. 22.

10. Land is to be demanded *by the certain Meaſure of the ſuperficial Quantity* thereof, Hida, Carucata, Bovata, Virgata, Acra, Roda Terræ. And in like manner, Boſcus, Subboſcus, Bruera, Mora, Juncaria, Mariſcus & Alnetum, & Ruſcaria, may be demanded by the Number of Acres thereof. 16 Aſſ. 9. Weſt. Symb. §. 26.

11. *Turbary* may be demanded by the Name of *Moore*. Weſt. Symb. §. 26.

12. *Houſeboot, Hayboot and Plowboot*, may be demanded by the Name of *Eſtovers*: thus, de rationabili Eſtoverio in Boſcis, viz. in decem Acris Boſci ipſius A. in D. &c. Weſt. Symb. §. 26.

And of all *Vicarages endowed* the Writ muſt be *de Advocatione* Vicariæ Eccleſiæ de S. and *not cum Pertinentiis*. And where *no Vicarage is endowed*, it paſſes under theſe Words *de Advocatione Eccleſiæ de S. &c.* Weſt. Symb. S. 26.

13. *Parſonages, Rectories, Advowſons, Vicarages, or Tythes impropriate*, paſs not by the Name de Advocatione Eccleſiæ, but *de Rectoria Eccleſiæ* de S. *cum Pertinentiis*. *But* when it is only of *a Preſentation*, it muſt be *de Advocatione* Eccleſiæ de S. and *not cum Pertinentiis*. Weſt. Symb. §. 26.

As if the *Manor* of D. be *divided into* 2 *Parts*, the Fine of the one Part (if the Diviſion be ſo made, that the Manor of that Part be not extinct) muſt be *de Manerio de D.* Weſt. Symb. S. 26.

14. If an entire Manor, Meſuage, or other *entire Thing* be *divided* or parted, and after a *Fine* is *to be levied of ſome of the Parts* of the Thing ſo ſevered, then *muſt not* the Fine *be de Medietate*, or *quarta Parte*, or other part of the Manor, Meſſuage, or other Thing; *but* ſuch Part muſt be demanded *by the name of the whole Thing*. Weſt's Symb S. 26.

15. *So* if a *Meſuage and* 20 *Acres of Land be parted into two Parts*; the Fine of the one Part muſt be *de uno Meſuagio & decem Acris Terræ, &c.* and not de Medietate unius Meſuagii, & 20 Acrarum Terræ: For the

Things

Things new divided from the reſt, are now become whole Things by themſelves, tho' leſs in quantity than the whole was before Diviſion thereof made. If a Thing be twice named in a Writ of Covenant, it hurteth not, as a Manor and a Hundred, Parcel of the ſame Manor. Weſt. Symb. §. 26. cites 27 H. 8. 2.

16. A Fine was levied *de duobus Tenementis*, and for that reaſon was reverſed; For the Word Tenement does not comprehend any Certainty; For it takes in Meſuage, Land, Meadow, Paſture, &c. and whatſoever lies in Tenure; and it will paſs Rent or Common. Le. 188. Trin. 31 Eliz. B. R. Steed v. Courtneys.

17. A *Manor in Reputation*, which is not a Manor in Truth, does not *paſs* by the name of a Manor *in a Fine or Recovery*; For they are grounded on original Writs, which ought to be certain, and not to be taken by Intendment; but otherwiſe of a Grant, or Feoffment; For there the Intent of the Parties ſhall help it. Noy 7. Johnſon v. Heydon.

A Manor, in Reputation only, will paſs by the name of a Manor, tho' not demandable by it. Lat. 63. in Caſe of Hems v. Stroud.——Cro. E. 524. 707. Mich. 38 and 39 Eliz. B. R. Mallet v. Mallet.——Lev. 28. * Thynn v. Thynn, contra to Noy 7. the Indenture to lead the Uſes, ſhewing the Intent to paſs the Manor and all Land Parcel——and by the Grant of ſuch a reputed Manor, an *Advowſon*, ſhall paſs as Appendant. Mich. 32 and 33 Eliz. C. B. Le. 207. Long v. Hemmings.——Dod. of Adv. 28.———See Preſidents (B).——S. P. Savil. 113. Paſch. 28 Eliz. Thetford's Caſe.——— * S. C. adjudged accordingly. Vent. 51.——And Sid. 190. Paſch. 16 Car. 2. B. R.

18. A Fine of *Land* will not be a Bar of * *Rent*; as Leſſee for Life, Remainder for Life of Rent; the firſt Leſſee purchaſeth the Land, and levies a Fine of that; this ſhall not bind him in Remainder of the Rent, per Winch J. 2 Brownl. 155. in Caſe of Bicknell v. Tucker.——cites Palmer's Caſe, † and Smith and Stapleton's Caſe.

For Rent is a *collateral Thing*, and the Fine is not levied of it. See Cro. J. 60.——

The ſame of *Common*. Ibid.———But where the Rent was granted in Tail, and iſſuing out of a Manor, a Fine of the *Manor*, with an *Averment, that the Agreement was to bar the Rent*, per Hobert Ch. J. and Harvey J. v. Hutton J. is a Bar of the Rent, Cro. J. 699. Hill. 22 Jac. B. R. Helliar v. Sanders——2 Roll. R. 500. Foliot v. Sanders. S. C.———Winch. 109. 121. adjudged by two J. againſt Hutton. S. C. by the Name of Hilliard v. Sanders.

* Jenk. 275. pl. 96. contra. cites it as adjudged, that by Fine with Proclamations the Rent paſſes incluſively. 20 Jac. 1. Hilliard's Caſe.———† Pl. Com. 435.

19. If Tenant in Tail of any *Office* levies a Fine of *Land belonging* to the Office, this ſhall bind his Iſſue; yet the Land was not entailed, but the Office; per Hobart Ch. J. 2 Roll. R. 500. Hill. 22 Jac. in Caſe of Folliott v. Sanders.

Winch. 123. S. P. per Hobert.

20. A Fine may be levied of a *Share in the New River Water*, by the Deſcription of *ſo much Land, Aqua Coopert*. 2 Wms's Rep. 128. Paſch. 1723. Drybutter v. Bartholomew.

(D. a) Who ſhall be barred by the Fine.

1. IF one hath a *Remainder, or a Reverſion*, depending *upon an Eſtate for Years*, or by Statute *Staple*, Statute *Merchant*, or *Elegit*, and the *Termor be diſſeiſed*, and a Fine levied, &c. and 5 Years paſs; they be all barred thereby: for that *theſe Termors might preſently have entered*, and *he in the Reverſion* or Remainder, for ſuch Diſſeiſin *might have had an Aſſiſe*. So the Stat. 4 H. 7. 24. ſeems to bar the Termors thro' Negligence, by this Word Intereſt, which comprehends a Term. Weſt's Symb. S. 183. cites Pl. C. 374. a.

2. If an *Infant Heir of one beyond Sea* dying there, makes not his Claim within 5 Years after the Death of his Father, being of full Age, and without any *Impediment*, &c. he ſhall be barred; per Anderſon, Ch. J. Le. 215. Mich. 32 and 33 Eliz. C. B. in Cotton's Caſe.

Vid. (H. a) ——2 Inſt. 519. S. C by the Name of Punie v. Howes.

———Cro. E. 219. S. C. by Name of Smy v. June alias Chown.

3. *Deviſee* is barred by Fine, tho' *levied before his Entry*. Cro. C. 201. Mich. 6 Car. B. R. Hulm v. Heylock.

4. Fine and Non-claim bars not a Man in *Ireland*; but not becauſe Ireland is not a Member of England, but *becauſe of Abſence*, as in Caſe of Impriſonment. Arg. Cart. 187.

S. C. cited Arg. Show. 40.

5. If there be *Tenant by Elegit* of Land, and a Fine be levied of that Land, and 5 Years with Non-claim paſs; the Intereſt of the Tenant by Elegit is bound, according to Saffyn's Caſe. 5 Rep. 124. Otherwiſe if the Land had *not been actually extended*; and if an Inquiſition upon an Elegit be found, the Party before Entry has the Poſſeſſion, and a Fine with Non-claim ſhall bar his Right; for before actual Entry, he may have Ejectment or Treſpaſs, and ſo not like to an Intereſſe Termini. Mod. 217. Trin. 28 Car. 2. C. B. Ognel v. Ld Arlington & al.

Show. 36 Trin. 1 W. & M. S. C. debated.

6. A Fine and 5 Years Non-claim will bar the Intereſt of Tenant by *Statute Staple*, *after Liberate*, before Entry. See 2 Vent. 321, &c. Dightoir v. Greenvill.

——Skin. 260. Knight v. Greenvill. S. C.

7. A Fine *by Mortgagor to a ſecond Mortgagee* will not bar the *firſt Mortgagee*, tho' more than 5 Years paſs; the Mortgagor being all that Time in Poſſeſſion, and paying the Intereſt, and ſo was Tenant at Will to the firſt Mortgagee. Carth. 414. Trin. 9 W. 3. B. R. Hulm. v. Hatton.

(D. a. 2) *Barred.* Who. Iſſue in Tail. Where Tenant in Tail is Cognizee.

1. A. by Fine gives an Eſtate Tail to B. Remainder in Tail to C. afterwards A. the *Donor*, *by another Fine limits*, *(vice verſa)* viz. *to C. in Tail*, *Remainder to B. in Tail*; yet the firſt Intail ſtands unaltered. For the Fine being levied to the Tenants in Tail, the Words were all the Words of A. and not of B. and C. and tho' B. and C. could be eſtopp'd, yet their Iſſue ſhould be remitted. Br. Fines. pl. 73. cites 8 Aſſ. 33.

2. Where a *Fine for Life is levied to Tenant in Tail on* [*Grant and*] *Render*, his Eſtate by this is changed. But Brook makes a Quære, and ſays, that it ſeems the beſt Opinion is Contra, unleſs it be a *Fine Executed*; but a Fine for Grant and Render, &c. which are not Executed, is no Diſcontinuance nor Concluſion to the Heir in Tail; nor does the Statute de Finibus of Averments hold Place, but of Fee Simple, and where he claims as Heir; but the Heir in Tail claims by the Donor, therefore it ſeems, his Entry is lawful. Br. Eſtoppel. pl. 60. cites 8 H. 4. 7.

3. *No Fine* levied by Tenant in Tail barreth his Iſſue immediately, *but where the Tenant in Tail is Cogniſor*. Weſt's Symb. S. 180.

After the Death of the Tenant in Tail, the Iſſue accepted the Rent. The Queſtion was, if this ſhould bar the Iſſue of his Entry? D. 279. pl. 7. but no Judgment.

4. *As* if Tenant in Tail bring a Writ of *Covenant againſt a Stranger*, and he recognize the Land to be the Right of the Tenant in Tail, as that which he hath of his Gift, &c. and the *Tenant in Tail grant and render* the Land *to the Cogniſor for Years*, yielding Rent, &c. and dies; this Fine is void againſt the Iſſue in Tail. Weſt's Symb. S. 180. cites M. 10 and 11 Eliz. Dy. 279. pl. 7. 36 H. 8. Br. Fines. 118.

S. P. and ſeems to be S. C. D. 213. b. pl. 41. Paſch. 4 Eliz. by the beſt Opinion. But ſays, that the Caſe was ne-

5. *A. and M.* his Wife were *ſeiſed for Life of the Wife*, as in her Right, the *Remainder to E. C. in Tail*, the Remainder *to the ſaid E. C. in Fee*. *A. and M.* his Wife *levied a Fine* for Conuſance de droit, *come ceo*, *&c. to the ſaid E. C.* with Proclamations, who *granted and rendered Rent of 27 l. 10 s. to the Conuſors for Term of their Lives*, with Clauſe of Diſtreſs; and after *E. C. dies*, and the Land deſcended to H. C her Son and Heir in Tail, who leaſes the Land to one P. for Years, and after M. dies; A. diſtreined

diſtreined for the Rent, and he brought Replevin; and in this Caſe 2 Points were reſolved and adjudged. 1. That, againſt ſuch Fine accepted by Tenant in Tail, the *Iſſue may aver continuance* of the Seiſin by Force of the Tail, and the Iſſue in Tail is not eſtopped by the Admittance and Acceptance of his Anceſtor. 2. That the Grant and Render of the Rent was not within the Act of 4 H. 7. or 32 H. 8. becauſe the Fine was not levied of the Land itſelf, that was intailed, but of the Rent newly created out of the Land. 3 Rep. 89. b. 90. a. cites it as adjudged M. 3 and 4 Eliz. C. B. Rot. 1483. Conisby's Caſe.

ver argued. —Kelw. 210. pl. 15. S. C. by Name of Parker v. Payne —— And. 6. pl. 11. S. C. —— Weſt's Sym. S. 180. cites Pl. C. 435. b. 15 Eliz. per Thornton. ——— S. P. Jenk. 275. pl. 96.

6. Grandfather, Father and Son; the Grandfather by Indenture makes *Feoffment in Fee, rendering Rent* to him and his Heirs, and dies. the Father *accepts* the Rent; the Feoffee levies a Fine with Proclamation; *5 Years paſs*, and then the Father dies. The Point was, whether the Acceptance of the Rent by the Father had extinguiſhed his Right to the Intail, or whether 'tis an Eſtoppel only? For if he is only eſtopped, then he having a Right at the Time the Fine was levied, and the 5 Years incurring in his Time, the Son was barred; but if he had extinguiſhed his Intereſt, then the Son, being the firſt to whom the Right came after the Fine levied, is not barred by the 5 Years incurred in the Life of the Father. 'Twas adjudged per Walmſley and Clench, J. at Lancaſter Aſſiſes, that the Iſſue was barred. But the Court here thought that he is not barred. Becauſe the *Acceptance is a Concluſion only, and does not extinguiſh the Right.* Mo. 301. Paſch. 33 Eliz. Hulme v. Jee, alias Ice.

7. If a Fine be *levied to Tenant in Tail*, and he grants and *renders* the Land *to him and his Heirs*, and *dies before Execution*, this is no Diſcontinuance; otherwiſe it is, if it had been executed in the Life of the Tenant in Tail. Co. Litt. 333. b.

8. If Tenant in Tail *accepts a Fine, with Render to another for Years*, this ſhall bar him, becauſe it works a Diſcontinuance; but otherwiſe, where it is *for Life*; per Hutton. J. Winch. 123. Hill. 22 Jac. B. R. in Caſe of Hilliard v. Sanders.

9. Tenant in Tail *accepts a Fine ſur Conuſance de Droit come ceo*, and then ſuffers a Recovery; this makes no Alteration of his Eſtate. Vent. 257. Paſch. 26 Car. 2. B. R. Anon.———Per Hale Ch. J. Mod. 117. Green v. Proud. S. C.

(E. a) Of Lands, &c. in *Lieu Conus.*

1. ASSISE of Tenements in W. the Defendant *pleaded Eſtoppel by Fine* levied *of the ſame Tenements* by the Anceſtor of the Plaintiff in O. *Judgment, if the Plaintiff ſhall ſay that they are in W.* and the *Plaintiff ſaid, that O. is a Hamlet of W.* and a good Plea; by which they pleaded over. Br. Brief. pl. 292. cites 28 Aſſ. 6.

2. Aſſiſe brought in *Nova Forreſta* is good, and yet no Vill nor Hamlet. Co. R. on Fines 12. cites 18 Libr. Aſſ. 30.

3. And yet in Scire facias to execute a Fine levied *of Lands in D.* the Tenant *ſhall not ſay, that there is no ſuch Vill.* Co. R. on Fines 12. cites 18 E. 4. 51.

4. A Fine may be levied of a *Caſtle, or* of a *Manor, without expreſſing in what Vill, or Hamlet.* Co. R. on Fines 12.

5. A Fine is good in a * *Hamlet.* 38 Ed. 3. fo. 19. 18 Ed. 4. fo. 6. and 7 Ed. 6. Br. Fines 44. and 91. or in a *Town decay'd*, 7 Ed. 6. Br. Fines 91. Nevertheleſs it is alſo *good to name the Town wherein* the Hamlet is, as it ſeemeth; and that *with Addition* for Diſtinction, if there be divers Towns of the ſame Name in the ſame County, Weſt's Symb. S. 27.

Co R. on Fines 12. ſeems to think Fine of Lands in a Hamlet, ought not to be

be received, but if it is received, then it is good.———Hale ſaid in 1 H. 8. 9. a. That if a Fine be levied in A. B. and C. and none of them is a Vill, nor Hamlet, but *certain Manſions, or Houſes*, if it be accepted 'tis good. Co. R. on Fines 12.

A *Scire Facias* lies on a Fine levied in a *Hamlet* which proves ſuch Fine to be good. Br. Fines. pl. 93. cites 8 E. 4. 6.———* Co. R. on Fines 12. cites † 38 H. 3. 20. per Thorpe, and 8 E. 4. 6. — —† This ſhould be 38 E. 3. 20. a. in Principio.

But if a Man have *divers Manors of one Name:* as *South S. and North S.* it is good, in a

6. If a *Manor extend into* divers Towns as *A. B. C.* it is good to expreſs all or none: as *de manerio de S. in A. B. C.* for if any of the Towns be omitted none of the Manor in that Town paſſeth. Yet a Fine of a a Manor, *cum pertinentiis* would have *carried the whole Manor.* 9 Ed. 4. 6. Weſt's Symb. S. 27.

Writ of one of the ſame Manors, to expreſs certainly which of them is intended to be paſſed, 47 Ed. 3. 12 H. 7. 6. Albeit it is thought good enough by the Name of the Manor of S. without Addition; For Certainty is always beſt. Weſt's Symb. S. 27.

7. An Action of Covenant was brought upon an Indenture of Feoffment by Defendant's Wife before Marriage of *Lands* lying *in Ilton in the Pariſh of Marſham*, whereby ſhe Covenanted to aſſure, &c. the Plaintiff aſſigns a Breach, that he *tender'd a Note* of a Fine to the Defendants, before certain Commiſſioners, *of Lands in the Pariſh of Marſham*, and requeſted the Defendants to acknowledge the Fine, but that the Defendants refuſed. To this Defendants plead, that *they were ſeiſed of other Lands, in the Pariſh of Marſham, no Part whereof were contained in the Deed*, and becauſe thoſe Lands not contained in the Deed, were contained in the Note of the Fine, therefore they refuſed to acknowledge it. To this the Plaintiff demurred. But after Argument, the Court were of Opinion for the Defendants; for tho' a Man is not obliged in a Fine, to ſet out the Parcels exactly agreeable to the Deed, and it is uſual to put in rather more, leaſt, in Caſe of a Miſtake, he may loſe Part of the Land; yet here the Covenant was, to levy a Fine of Lands in Ilton, in the Pariſh of Marſham, and the Note tender'd, is of Lands in the Pariſh of Marſham. Now a Fine may be levied of Lands lying in a Vill; and therefore thoſe, not being Lands in the Vill, of which Defendant Covenanted to levy the Fine, it ſeems a good Excuſe. And thereupon Judgment was given for the Defendants, unleſs Cauſe, &c. before the End of the Term. Paſch. 12 Geo. 2. C. B. Danby v. Gregg and Ux.

(E. a 2) Of Lands in ſeveral Vills, &c.

But where in the Hamlet there was *only a Tything-Man and the Conſtables of the Vill exerciſed Authority in the Hamlet*,

1. A Fine was levied of Lands *in Blandford Forum.* Reſolved that this ſhall not paſs Lands in a *Hamlet in that Town, there being Conſtables diſtinct* in Blandford Forum from others that were in the Hamlet; So that they were as 2 Vills. Vent. 143. Trin. 23 Car. 2. B. R. Anon.

(which proves it to be but as a Hamlet) it was reſolved that the Fine conveyed the Lands in the Hamlet. A *Pariſh* may contain Ten Vills, and if a Fine be levied of Lands in the Pariſh, this carries whatſoever is in any of the Vills. *So* where there are *diverſe Vills*, if the *Conſtablewick of one* * *goes over all the reſt*, that is the Superior or Mother Vill, and the Land, which is in the other, ſhall paſs *per Nomen* of all the Lands in that. But if found that they had diſtinct Conſtables, and could not interfere in their Authority, it would be otherwiſe. Vent. 170. Mich. 23. Car. 2. B. R. Waldron v. Ruſcarrit.———Mod. 78. S. C.——* In ſuch Caſe theſe may go for ſeveral Vills, or one Vill. per Hale, Ch. J. Mod. 117. in Caſe of Green v. Proude.

If the *Pariſh of D. contains* 10 *Vills*, and a Fine or Recovery is had *of Land in D.* this does not extend to the Lands in the other Vills out of the Vill of D. Trin. 4. Jac. B. R. Cro. J. 120. Stork v. Fox. ———S. C. cited and agreed. Sid. 10. in Caſe of Weſton v. Carter.

If there be a *Vill called R. within the Pariſh of R.* and a Recovery is ſuffered of *Lands in R.* and ſays not in the Pariſh of R. but in the Deed, to make the Tenant to the Præcipe, and in which he covenanted to ſuffer the Recovery, the Lands were mentioned to be in the Pariſh of R. The Lands in the Pariſh of R. do paſs; For the Indenture and Recovery make but one Conveyance; and it was found by Verdict, that the Intention of the Parties was to paſs both. And as to this Purpoſe, the Court was all of Opinion, that there was no difference between a Fine and a Recovery. 2 Mod. 233 Trin. 29 Car. 2. C. B. Addiſon v. Otway.

2 *But*

2. *But* if a Fine be levied *of Lands in a* * *Parish*, it shall extend to all the Vills in that Parish. Vent. 143. Anon. ut sup.

* The Curſitors of late have been directed to make out Writs of Lands in Parochia. 2 Vent. 32. in Sir John Otway's Case.——2 Mod. 238. S. C.

(E. a. 3) Claim, or Entry to avoid a Fine. Made How. Entry into Part of the Land, &c.

1. If a *Diſſeiſor of 2 Acres levies a Fine of both*, the Diſſeiſee may enter into one Acre only, and this shall not be an Entry in both, tho' they are *in the Seiſin of one and the ſame Perſon, and of one and the ſame Title.* Co. R. on Fines 13.

2. *But* if the Diſſeiſor *leaſeth for 20 Years Part of the Land*, whereof the Diſſeiſin was committed, and the *Diſſeiſee* afterwards *entereth into the Land*, which continueth *in the Poſſeſſion of the Diſſeiſor, in the Name of the Whole*, the ſame Entry shall not extend to the Land leaſed; for here the Leſſee is in by Title. Le. 51. Paſch. 29 Eliz. C. B. Potter v. Steddall.

3. *But* if *Tenant for Life*, of Land, *leaſe Parcel* thereof to hold *at Will*, and being in Poſſeſſion of the Reſidue, *levies a Fine of the Whole*; the Leſſor *enters into the Land*, which was *let at Will*, in Point of *Forfeiture* in the Name of the Whole; it was holden, that the ſame is a good Entry for the Whole; for in this Caſe he is *not in by Title*; becauſe when Tenant for Life leaſeth it at Will, and afterwards levies a Fine, the ſame is a Determination of the Will. Le. 51, 52. Paſch. 29 Eliz. C. B. Potter v. Steddall.

4. If Diſſeiſor, &c. make *ſeveral Leaſes of ſeveral Parcels*, viz. of diverſe Houſes, *for Years to ſeveral Perſons*, the Entry into one, in the Name of all, is good for all. *But* otherwiſe it is, if the Leaſes were *for Lives*. D. 337. b. Marg. pl. 37. cites M. 42, and 43 Eliz. B. R. Goodman v. Gerners.

If the ſeveral Leſſees of the ſeveral Parcels *claim under the ſame Title*, the Entry upon one Parcel, in the Name of all, is good for the Whole. D. 337. b. Marg. pl. 37. cites M. 42 and 43 Eliz. B. R. Dalton v. Hammond.

In the Caſe of Leaſes for Years (as above) of Lands in the ſame County, it was held good by Jones, Doderidge and Crew, becauſe the *Freehold is in One and the ſame County*. D. 337. b. Marg. pl. 37 cites Hill. 22 Jac. B. R. Rot. 133. Argolll (Lady) v. Cheyney ——Lat. 71. S. C. Palm. 402. S. C.

(E. a. 4) Claim or *Entry* to avoid a Fine. How, *into Part. In Reſpect of the Place where.*

1. In an Ejectione firmæ for Lands in Wales, the Caſe upon a Special Verdict was, that a *Man ſeiſed in Fee* of Lands, *for Continuance of them in his Name, and for the Maintenance of his Brother, makes a Leaſe for 500 Years in Truſt, that himſelf ſhould receive the Profits during his Life*, and that afterwards, *his Brother ſhould* enjoy them; with ſome other Truſts. And *afterwards being in Poſſeſſion* according to the Truſt, he *Covenanted with other Perſons*, (not with the Leſſees) *to ſtand ſeiſed* of the ſaid Lands, *upon the ſame Conſiderations* as were mentioned in the Leaſe, *to* the Uſe of *himſelf for Life*, with *Remainders over*, according to the Truſts; *and* further, *that the ſaid Leaſe and all Eſtates made, or to be made by himſelf*, ſhould be and enure *to the ſame Uſes; and levies a Fine*, and *5 Years paſs*, the *Leſſor being in Poſſeſſion* according to the Truſt, and enjoying the Profits during his Life; afterwards the *Leſſor dies*, and *one of the Leſſees enters into part* of the Lands *in one County* (*which was not compriſed in the Fine*) *claiming all* the Lands *in the other County*. It was inſiſted among other Things, that this Claim was not well made, being *in another County*. And Hale, Ch. B. ſaid, that if a Claim had been requiſite in this Caſe,

Diſſeiſee of Lands in the Counties of A. B. and C. entered by Attorney into the Lands in B. and C. in the Name of all the Lands in A. B. and C. The Court held that this was not a good Entry for the Lands in A. Becauſe *Ceſty que Uſe*, who is

the Conuſee, is in by Title, &c. where-fore the Plaintiff had Judgment to recover. D. 337. b. pl. 37. cites 9 H. 7. accordingly.

(which he thought it was not) there was no Colour whereby to make this Claim good. Hard. 400, 401. Paſch. 17 Car. 2. In Scacc. Focus v. Salisbury.

(F. a) *Claim* to avoid Fines. *When* to be made. And in what Caſes it may be made at any Time.

1. 1 *R.* 3. 7. *Confines, the Claim of all Perſons, both Privy and Strangers, (except Women Covert not Parties to the Fine, Perſons under Age, in Priſon, out of the Realm, or not of ſound Mind) to 5 Years after Proclamation.*

Strangers, to whom a Right comes after the Fine engroſs'd, muſt claim within 5 Years after ſuch Right accrues.

Femes Covert, &c. or their Heirs muſt claim within 5 Years after ſuch Imperfections remov'd.

Baron ſeiſed in Fee levy'd a Fine with Proclamations, and then was *outlaw'd of Treaſon*, and died, the Feme living. The Conuſees convey'd the Lands to the Queen. The 5 Years paſs after the Death of the Baron. The *Attainder is revers'd for Error* by the Heir of the Baron. It was reſolved, that the Feme was not aided by this Clauſe to demand her *Dower*; For in reſpect of the Baron's Attainder, ſhe had no Right of Dower after the Death of her Husband, nor can have Action to recover it according to the ſaving. But by the former Clauſe ſhe is to be aided; For in this Caſe the Action and Right of Dower accrued to her after the Reverſal of the Attainder, by Reaſon of a Title of Record before the Fine, becauſe of the Seiſin in Fee, and the Marriage before the Fine levied. 13. Rep. 19 Ninian Menvil's Caſe.——3 Inſt. 215. S. C. ——Mo. 639. S. C.

3. The *Year and Day*, in which a Stranger was to make his Claim at Common Law, was to be computed *from the Time of the Fine levied*, and *not from the Execution ſued.* Co. R. on Fines 13.

So 'tis of *an Infant being Party* to the Fine, *and having a preſent Right*; if he *dies during his Infancy*, he or his Heirs may enter or take his Action at any Time. 2 Inſt. 519.

4. For that *Perſons out of the Realm, at the Time of the Fine levied*, amongſt others *having a preſent Right* are excepted out of the Body of the Act, (which worketh the Bar;) therefore, where he, that is beyond Sea at the Time of the Fine levied, and never returns, is within the Exception, of the Act, he and his Heirs *may enter or take his Action at any Time*; but in Caſe he *doth return*, he and his Heirs muſt enter, or take his Action *within 5 Years after his Return.* 2 Inſt. 519.

So 'tis of a Perſon that is *Non compos mentis*, which is by the Act of God, if he *die while he is Non compos* mentis. 2 Inſt. 519.

Or a *Man in Priſon*, which is by Act in Law, if he *die in Priſon.* 2 Inſt. 519.

Or a *Feme Covert*, (which is by her own Act) if ſhe *die* while ſhe is *Covert*, being no Party to the Fine; For all theſe are within the Reaſon of the Caſe adjudged of him that is out of the Realm (which going out of the Realm was his own Act) and never returned. 2 Inſt. 519, 520.

2. Weſton J. ſaid, that upon the Word *(Accrue) in the Stat.* 4 *H.* 7. if the *Father die ſeiſed*, and his *Eldeſt Son be in Religion*, and the *Youngeſt Son* [enters and] *is diſſeiſed*, and then a *Fine is levied* with Proclamations, and 5 Years paſs, and *after the 5 Years the Eldeſt is deraign'd*, he ſhall be aided by the 2d Saving. Pl. C. 373.

2. If the *Tenant ceaſe one Year, part whereof was before the Fine*, and Proclamations paſſed, *and another Year ended after the Proclamations:* Now thoſe 2 Years are but one Cauſe or Matter which gives the Ceſſavit, and not two Matters, and therefore the *Lord ſhall have his Ceſſavit 20 Years after* the Proclamations, and ſhall not be bound to 5 Years. For the Purview was not againſt him, he having no Right at the Time of the Fine, nor was this Title in Eſſe at the Time, tho' the *Ceſſer commenc'd before the Fine*, but the Title accrued all after, viz. at the End of the 2 Years. Pl. C. 373. a. b. a Nota of the Reporter.

West'sSymb. 69. a. b. S. 138. cites Pl. C. 373.

9. Thoſe that have *neither preſent nor future Right, but only a Poſſibility* at the Time of levying the Fine, *or* whoſe Right *groweth either entirely after the Proclamations*, or *partly before and partly after*, may Enter and Claim when they pleaſe. As if the Husband doth levy a Fine of his Lands, whereof his Wife is Dowable, and dies, and then 5 Years paſs, &c. Yet the

the Wife is not barr'd of her *Dower*. For before his Death the Wife had only a *Poſſibility of Dower*, *and not a Title* to it. Wood's Inſt. 246.

10. A *Man ſeiſed in Fee* of Lands, *makes a Leaſe for 500 Years in Truſt; that himſelf ſhould receive the Profits during his Life*, with Remainders over, and *afterwards being in Poſſeſſion*, according to the Truſt, *he Covenanted with other Perſons*, (not the Leſſees) *to ſtand ſeiſed* of the ſaid Lands, *upon the ſame Conſideration*, as was mentioned in the ſaid Leaſe, *to* the Uſe of *himſelf for Life*, with *Remainders over*, according to the ſaid Truſts, *and* further, *that the ſaid Leaſe, and all Eſtates made, or to be made by himſelf, ſhould be*, and enure *to the ſame Uſes, and levied a Fine*, and *5 Years paſſed*, the *Leſſor being in Poſſeſſion* according to the Truſts, and enjoying the Profits during his Life; afterwards the *Leſſor dies*, and *one of the Leſſees enters into Part* of the Lands *in one County, not compriſed in the Fine, claiming all* the Lands *in the other County*. It was inſiſted among other Things, that this Claim was not well made, being *after the Death of the Leſſor*, and Hale Ch. B. ſaid that if a Claim had been requiſite in this Caſe, (which he thought it was not) there was no Colour whereby to make this Claim good. Hard. 400, 401: Paſch. 17 Car. 2. In the Exchequer. Focus v. Salibury.

11. A. deviſed Lands *to B. for Life, and if B. leave Iſſue Male, then to ſuch Iſſue Male and his Heirs for ever*, and *if B. leave no Iſſue Male, then to C.* in Fee, Remainder over. *B. ſuffered a Recovery* to the Uſe of him and his and died. Ld C. Parker held, that upon this Recovery by B. he being but Tenant for Life, and the Heir of A. having the Reverſion deſcended to him, he had a *Right of Entry commenced on B's ſuffering the Recovery, but had no new Right of Entry on B's Death*; and that this was not like the common Caſe of Tenant for Life with Reverſion in Fee to J. S. where Reverſioner may ſtay 'till the Death of Tenant for Life; but that here, *the only Title, which the Heir could poſſibly have, muſt be by the Forfeiture of B.* For if there was no Forfeiture, the Remainder muſt go, upon B's Death, either to B's Iſſue, if any, or if none, then, to the Remainder Man. Wms's Rep. 505, 506, 520. Mich. 1718. Carter v. Barnardiſton.

(F. a. 2) *Claim* or Entry to avoid a Fine. *By whom* to be made.

1. *Ceſty que Uſe in Tail, Remainder over in Tail*, after the Statute of 27 H. 8. levied a Fine with Proclamations, and had Iſſue and died within 3 Years after the Fine levied. And the Iſſue after dies without Iſſue, before any Entry made by the Feoffees; and after, *within 5 Years a Stranger*, (Friend to the Remainder Man,) *without any Warrant, Requeſt, or Commandment of the Feoffees*, or any of them, *entered pro* *[*et in*] *Nomine of the Survivor, or the Heir of the Survivor of the Feoffees*, to the Intent to revive the Uſe of the Remainder Man, *without naming the Survivor in certain, who he was*. This was found ſo by Special Verdict. And the Queſtion was, if Good or not? See D. 312. Trin. 12 Eliz. pl. 87. Anon. Bendl. 305. ſeems to be S. C. ſays, that he was of Counſel with the Demandant, and that no Judgment was given.—D. 312 b. Marg. pl 87. ſays, the Verdict was uncertain and void, becauſe the Entry was uncertain. Ld Sands v. Bray.——Br. Entre Cong. pl. 123. S. P. cites 31 H. 8. that it is good and ſhall avoid the Fine; for that the Frank-tenement is in the Feoffees 'till they diſagree, or 'till another enters. But Vid. Poſtea Ld Awdley's Caſe.——* Bendl. 307. *Pro & in Nomine Hered. prædict. W. Epiſcopi L. tunc defuncti ſi idem Epiſcopus fuit ſupervivens eorundem, &c.*

2. It was agreed by the Ch. Juſtices, that if the Diſſeiſor levy a Fine with Proclamations according to the Stat. 4 H. 7. and a *Stranger* within 5 Years after the Proclamations *enter in the Right of the Diſſeiſee*, without the Privity or Conſent of the Diſſeiſee, that this ſhall not avoid the Bar of the Fine, *unleſs* that *he aſſent* to it *within the 5 Years*; for the Words of the Statute are *ſo, that they purſue their Title, Claim*, or Intereſt, *by way of Action, or lawful Entry within 5 Years, &c.* And that, which is done by of This Fine is not avoided; For by the expreſs Words of Statute of 4 H. 7. *a Fine ſhall bind unleſs avoided*

by Entry, Claim, or Action of him who has Right thereto, within the 5 Years.

another without their Aſſent, is not a purſuing by them according to the Intent of the Statute; for otherwiſe, by ſuch Means againſt the Will of the Diſſeiſee, every Stranger may avoid ſuch a Fine, which is not the Intent of the Statute. Poph. 108. Pollard v. Luttrell.

And it is not ſufficient for a *Stranger* to enter, unleſs it be *by Command of him that has the Right.* But Gawdy J. ſaid, that peradventure the *Agreement of Diſſeiſee within the 5 Years* after ſuch Entry made in his Name would ſerve. But Agreement afterwards would not. Quære. Popham, Ch. J. ſaid, that all the Juſtices in Serjeant's-Inn were of the ſame Opinion in the Principal Caſe. Cro. E. 561. Ld Audley v. Pollard ——— This was an Ejectment, and in Evidence in B. R. it was directed by all the Juſtices, Popham, Gawdy, Clench and Fenner, that if one be ſeiſed of Land, to which another has Right of Entry, and the Tenant in Poſſeſſion levies a Fine with Proclamation, that he, who Right has, ought to enter in Perſon, or make Warrant ſpecial or *Commandment to one to enter for him*, otherwiſe he does not preſerve his Right; For tho' he has Right of Entry, which naturally by the Common Law may be reduced into Poſſeſſion by the Entry of a *Stranger* in his Name, yet it is not ſo of a Claim to avoid a Fine. Becauſe *the Body of the Statute of Fines binds the Right unleſs the Party claims within 5 Years*, by which Election is given to him that has Right at the Time of the Fine to claim or not, and ſo he ought to determine whether he will claim, or not; and a Stranger cannot make this *Election* without his Direction. And Popham Ch. J. ſaid that it was ſo reſolved about the 4 Eliz. in the Ld Sturton's Caſe. Mo. 450. Lutterell's Caſe ——— Mo. 457. is, that Ld Audley the Diſſeiſor levied a Fine with Proclamations in 5 Eliz. the Diſſeiſee not knowing thereof, and a Stranger entered to the Uſe of the Diſſeiſee before the Proclamations and 5 *Years expired. And now the Diſſeiſee agrees to the Entry.* And Popham and Gawdy reported that it was the Opinion of all the Juſtices of England, that this Agreement is not ſufficient to make the Entry ſo perfect to avoid the Fine. Becauſe the *Statute of Fines is to be taken ſtrictly*, being for Repoſe and Tranquility. Ld Awdley's Caſe ——— The Entry by the Stranger was *without any Commandment precedent or Aſſent ſubſequent within the 5 Years*, and it was reſolved that this Entry will not avoid the Fine; for the Saving in the ſaid Act has *appropriated the Purſuit, by way of Action or lawful Entry, to him that Right has either by Command precedent, or Aſſent ſubſequent within the 5 Years.* Omnis enim *Ratihabitio* retrotrahitur, & Mandato æquiparatur. 9 Rep. 106. cited per Coke, who ſaid, that Popham reported openly in Court that ſuch was the Opinion of all the Juſtices in Serjeant's-Inn in Fleet-Street, againſt the Opinion in 31 H. 8. Tit. Entre Congeab'e Br. 123.

3. *Tenant for Life is diſſeiſed*, a *Collateral Anceſtor of him in Reverſion releaſed to the Diſſeiſor with Warranty*, he in Reverſion came to the Land, and there he claimed his Reverſion to avoid the Warranty; this Claim ſhall not avail him. Co. R. on Fines 14.

4. *So* (as it ſeems) if *Leſſee for Years be ouſted*, and *he in the Reverſion* is diſſeiſed, the Leſſor cannot make continual Claim; becauſe *every continual Claim ought to countervail in Law an Entry*, and *becauſe his Entry is not lawful, his Claim is not good.* Tamen quære. Co. R. on Fines 14.

(F. a. 3) Claim or Entry *by one.* In what Caſes it will ſerve *for another*, ſo as *to revive it* after a Lapſe.

4 Le. 217. S. C.

1. *Two Tenants for Life are diſſeiſed by A. and B.* if one of the Tenants for Life releaſes to A. and the other Tenant for Life re-enters, he has the Moiety in Common with A. and he has reveſted the *entire Reverſion* in him in whom the Reverſion was before. Le. 264. per Manwood J. pl. 354. 19 Eliz. C. B. Anon.

If one enters lawfully, or Recovers by Action within the Year and the Day after the Fine levied, the

2. If a *Diſſeiſor le diſſeiſed*, and the *ſecond Diſſeiſor levies a Fine*, in this Caſe if the *firſt Diſſeiſor enter* within the Year, this ſhall preſerve the Right of the Diſſeiſee; becauſe the firſt Diſſeiſor by his Entry avoided the whole Eſtate given by the Fine, and yet the Diſſeiſe might have entered himſelf (& ſic de ſimilibus;) but it muſt not have been an empty Fine that ſhould have barred the Right of a Stranger, but a *Fine compleat*, as hath been ſaid. 2 Inſt. 518.

Fine is thereby defeated, not only againſt him that enters lawfully and recovers, but alſo againſt all thoſe who had more *ancient Right* than he who entered or recovered. per Saunders. Pl. C. 358. a. in Caſe of Stowell v. Zouch. ——— And Dyer accorded and ſaid, that if *Lord by Diſceit avoids a Fine at common Law*, he has reſtored the Right to him who levied the Fine, and ſo has he whoſe Entry was lawful, deſtroy'd, by his Entry, the Fine, and *ſet at large the former Right of others*, which otherwiſe without Claim or Action within the Year and Day would be bound. Ibid. 358. b. ——— Co. R. on Fines 13. cites 19 E. 2. Fitzh. continual Claim. ——— Arg. Mo. 346. cites 6 E. 2. Fitzh tit. Continual Claim.

3. If

3. If a *Diſſeiſor* had *made Feoffment in Fee upon Condition*, and the *Feoffee levy a Fine*, and the Year and Day paſs, now the Diſſeiſee is barr'd; But if the *Feoffor enter for the Condition broken*, now the Diſſeiſee may enter upon him. Co. R. on Fines 13. cites Pl. C. Stowell's Caſe. After the Entry the Heir may have Aſſiſe of Mort-dance-ſor againſt the Abator, (Diſſeiſor) and he has no Defence againſt him; for he *cannot claim by the Conuſee, nor under his Eſtate*, becauſe he has defeated his Eſtate; and if he will plead the Fine in Bar of the Aſſiſe, and that he has the Conuſee's Eſtate, the Matter of the Avoidance of the Eſtate may be ſhewn in Avoidance of the Concluſion; for he cannot claim Priviledge by the ſame Eſtate which he has defeated. Pl. C. 358. b.

4. *Baron* ſeiſed in Fee *levied a Fine*, and afterwards was *outlawed for Treaſon*. The Conuſee conveyed the Land to the Crown, and afterwards the Daughters and *Heirs Reverſed the Outlawry*. And 5 Years after the Outlawry and Death of the Baron, but within 5 Years after the Outlawry reverſed, the Feme ſued to the Queen for Dower. Reſolved that ſhe is not barred by the 5 Years after the Fine or Death of the Baron, becauſe then the Outlawry of her Baron was a Bar to her, but that ſhe might have 5 Years after the Outlawry reverſed. Mo. 639. 27 Eliz. in Chancery. Menvill's Caſe. 13 Rep. 19. S. C. 3 Inſt. 215. S. C.

(F. a. 4) Claim or Entry, *at what Time* to be made where there are ſeveral future *Rights*, *by* ſeveral *diſtinct Titles*.

1. If *A. has Eſtate for the Life of B.* the Remainder *to A. for the Life of C.* the Remainder *to A. for the Life of D.* and *A. is diſſeiſed*, and *Diſſeiſor levies a Fine* with Proclamations. Now for the preſent Right he has 5 Years by the firſt Saving; and if after 5 Years *B. dies*, A. ſhall have other 5 Years for the next Remainder, by the *ſecond Saving*, *which gives them to other Perſons who have future Right*; and if after the 5 Years C. dies, he ſhall have other 5 Years for the ſecond Remainder; per Walch. and Brown, J. aſſented to it, and cited the Rule, *Quando duo Jura concurrunt in una Perſona, æquum eſt ac ſi eſſent in Duobus*, (or *Diverſis*) And ſo of three ſeveral Rights, &c. and ſo ſaid the others of this ſide. Pl. C. 368. a. Mich. 4 and 5 Eliz. in Caſe of Stowell v. Zouch.

2. *Baron*, *ſeiſed* of Land *in Right of his Wife*, *makes Feoffment upon Condition*, and the *Condition is broken*, and after the *Feoffee levies a Fine* with Proclamations, and the *Baron dies*, *in the fourth Year after the Proclamations*, leaving Iſſue by the Feme, and after the *Feme dies*, and the 5 Years paſs, the Heir is barred to enter for the Condition broken, as Heir of the Part of his Mother for her Right. per Bendloes. Pl. C. 367. b. in Caſe of Stowell v. Zouch.

(F. a. 5) Claim, &c. at what Time. Where there are *ſeveral Impediments* or Defects.

1. If a *Feme* who had preſent Right, or when the future Right happened, was *Covert*, *and within Age*, *and of Non Sanæ Memoriæ*, *and impriſoned* at the Time of levying the Fine. Now if 1 or 2 or 3 of theſe Defects or Impediments be removed; as if the Baron dies, and ſhe comes to her full Age, and is let out of Priſon, yet the *5 Years ſhall not commence till the laſt Impediment is removed*; and when ſhe is void of all Impediments, then the 5 Years ſhall commence. Pl. C. 375. a. Weſt. S. 185

2. *But* if theſe Impediments are all *once removed*, and any of them *happen again within a Month after* ſuch Removal, (as if ſhe be again impriſoned, or become Non Sanæ Memoriæ, and *ſo continue all the reſt of the 5 Years*, *or* if at the End of the Month ſhe *dies*, *her Heir within Age*,) the 5 Years once commenced ſhall proceed, and the Non-claim Weſt. S. 185

within 5 Years ſhall bind the Party and her Heirs, as well as if ſhe had been void of all Defects or Impediments during all the 5 Years. Pl. C. 375.

3. *And tho'* the Perſons compriſed in the Exception of the Act, as Non Sanæ Memoriæ, &c. were not under ſuch Imperfections at the Time of the Fine levied, but *became ſo, againſt their Wills, after the Fine, and before the laſt Proclamation*, and ſo continued at the laſt Proclamation, they are not bound to the 5 Years next after the laſt Proclamation, but ſhall have 5 Years next after the Impediments or Imperfections removed. Affirmed by ſeveral Juſtices, and denied by none. Pl. C. 375. in Caſe of Stowell v. Ld Zouch.

(G. a) What ſhall be ſaid, a Claim or Entry to avoid a Fine.

1. TO avoid Fines *by the common Law*, were 4 *Claims*; viz. 2 *by Record and* 2 by Acts *in Pais*: viz. *By Record*, [One was] *a real Action* brought within the Year, according to the Truth of the Caſe; and the other was an *Entry of the Claim in the Record at the Foot of the Fine*; *By Pais*, [One was] a *lawful Entry into the Land*, by him who had Right (and Expulſion of the Cogniſee, or Tertenant) *the* other was *Continual Claim*. Pl. C. 359. Mich. 4 and 5 Eliz. in Caſe of Stowel v. Zouch.

2. Claim to avoid a Fine by *Bill in Chancery* is not ſufficient, but *ought to be by Action*, per Catlin. Dal. 116. pl. 9. 16 Eliz. Anon.

3. *But* if an *Action* to recover Lands, of which a Fine was levied, be *brought and diſcontinued* by the Demandant, this will not amount to a Claim. Vent. 45. Mich. 21 Car. 2. B. R.

S. P. For by 4 H. 7. it muſt be by Action or Entry. 2 Inſt. 518. (b.)

4. Note, It was agreed by all the Juſtices, and by the Prothonotaries, that if the Diſſeiſor levies a Fine, and the Diſſeiſee in Preſervation of his Right againſt ſuch Fine, *enters his Claim in the Record on the Foot of the Fine*, that the ſame is not any ſuch Claim as ſhall avoid the Statute of 4 H. 7. 2 Le. 53. Mich. 29 Eliz. C. B. Braſier's Caſe.

5. Bringing a *Writ of Dower*, within the 5 Years after the Death of the Husband, is not ſufficient to avoid the Fine, unleſs it be ſhewn, that the Writ was returned by the Sheriff; and delivering the Writ to him only, is not a *Purſuing*, &c. within the Statute. Hill. 30 Eliz. C. B. 3 Le 221. Fitzhugh's Caſe.

But if Diſſeiſor be of 3 *Acres*, and *leaſes one* of them *to J. S. for Years, and another to J. N. for Life, and the third he retains* in his Poſſeſſion, and the Diſſeiſee *enters upon the Diſſeiſor in the Name of all*; this ſhall veſt in him, as well the Acre which was in Leaſe for Years, as the Acre which was in the Seiſin of the Diſſeiſor; and the Reaſon of this Diverſity is, *becauſe every Entry ought to purſue the Nature of his Action*, and as the Diſſeiſee ought to have *ſeveral Præcipes* againſt ſeveral Tenants of the Frank-tenement, ſo he ought to make *ſeveral Entries*. Co. R. on Fines 13.

6. If a *Diſſeiſor make ſeveral Leaſes for Life, or Feoffments* in Fee *of divers Parcels*, and the Diſſeiſee *enters upon the Diſſeiſor in Name of all, or upon one Leſſee or Feoffee* in Name of all, this ſhall not diveſt the Frank-tenement, which is in the other Perſon; tho' it is all of one and the ſame Title. Co. R. on Fines 13.

But if the *one diſſeiſe the other*, ſo that all *comes into one Hand*, there the Entry into one Acre, in Name of both, is an Entry into both; for he may have a Præcipe. Co. R. Fines 14. cites 9 H. 7. 25.——Co. Litt. 252. b.

7. If 2 *Men diſſeiſe* me *of* 2 *ſeveral Acres, ſeverally*, now the Entry upon one cannot be the Entry upon the other. Co. R. on Fines 14.

8. But if I *enfeoff one upon Condition of one Acre, and after* I enfeoff him *of another Acre* upon Condition, and after *both the Conditions are broken*

broken, if the Feoffor enters upon one Acre, in the Name of both, this ſhall not veſt both in him; For by one Title the Feoffor could not have an Action, and always an *Entry ought to purſue his Action*. Co. R. on Fines 14. Co. Litt 252. b

9. If I be *diſſeiſed of* 2 *Acres*, which lie ſeverally, and *in ſeveral Places, or Vills*, and I enter *generally* into one Acre, 'tis not an Entry into both. Co. R. on Fines 10.

10. *So* in all Caſes, *when the Frank-tenement is out of a Perſon*, if the Diſſeiſee enters *generally* into one Parcel, this ſhall not re-continue *both*; For it *may be, that the Diſſeiſor, or the Feoffee hath Warranty*, and therefore the general Entry into one Parcel ſhall not defeat both. Co. R. on Fines 14.

11. *But* if a Man be ſeiſed of 1000 Acres in Fee, and dies ſeiſed, leaving Iſſue a Son and a Daughter by one Venter, and a Son by another Venter, and the *Eldeſt Son enters into one Acre generally*, this ſhall cauſe *Poſſeſſio fratris* in all; For *the whole Frank-tenement in Law was in him before*, and no Frank-tenement veſts out of any Perſon in prejudice of him, by his Warranty, or otherwiſe. Co. R. on Fines 14. cites 21 H. 7. 33.

12. Continual Claim made *out of the Land*, when the Party may enter without *fear of Death, or Battery*, is void. Co. R. on Fines 14.

13. *So* Continual Claim ſhall not avail the Party, *when his Entry is not lawful*, if it be not in Special Caſes. Co. R on Fines 14.

14. *As* if the Diſſeiſee dares not enter without fear of Death, or Battery, and he comes within the View of the Land, and claims the Land, the Claim is void; and yet Livery may be of the Land within the View, but nothing ſhall paſs, 'till the Feoffee enters. Co. R. on Fines 14.

15. 'Tis ſaid in our Books, that if the Diſſeiſee *dare not enter* into the Land for fear of Death or Battery, yet *he ought to come within the View* of the ſame Land, or otherwiſe his Claim ſhall not avail him; and Iſſue hath been taken in ſuch Caſe if he was within the View, or not: Yet Littleton ſaid, that he ought to *go as near to the Land as he dares*. 38 Aſſ. pl. 23. is that if the Diſſeiſee dares not enter, *Claim made among his Neighbours* is good enough. Co. R. on Fines 14.

16. A Writ of *Dower* was brought by A. *againſt the Tenant* of the Land, and *he pleaded a Fine with Proclamations levied by her Husband*, 14 *Jac.* in which Year the Husband died, and the Wife had not claimed within the Stat. of the 4 H. 7. 24. the Demandant *replied, that* 15 *Jac. ſhe brought* a Writ of *Dower againſt the now Tenants, and* againſt *two others, and that* the *Writ abated by the Death of the two others*, and that ſhe brought a Writ by *Journey's Accounts*, the Tenant replied, that the others were not Tenants, but one B. and it was moved that this Rejoinder was evil, for they confeſſed that they themſelves are Tenants, by which the Writ is good againſt them at leaſt; per Hobert, if ſhe brought a Writ of Dower againſt one who is not Tenant, that is not any Claim within the Statute; but if ſhe be brought a Dower againſt four, who are Tenants, and two die, and ſhe bring a Writ againſt the others by Journey's Acounts, this is a good Claim within the Statute, tho' the ſecond Writ was after the Time limited; but quære here, if the two who died were not Tenants. Winch. 66. Paſch. 21 Jac. C. B. Summer's (Anne) Caſe.

17. Entry in *Ejectment* is not ſufficient to avoid a Fine. Mich. 21 Car. 2. 1 Sand. 319. Clark v. Pywell. Arg. S. C. cited Show. 93.——S. C. adjudged. Vent. 42. Clerk v. Phillips & al.——Per Holt Ch. J. Comb. 249. Smart v. Williams.

18. Claim of an Equity to avoid a Fine can be made no other Way but by *Subpœna*, in Caſes of lawful Entry or Action, Equity makes not an Entry lawful. Trin. 28 Car. 2. 1 Ch. Caſes. 278. Salisbury v. Baggot If it be of a *Truſt* or *Title in Equity*, it cannot be by *Entry*, but muſt be by Subpœna. Per Finch C. 2. Chan. Caſes. 126. Mich. 34 Car. 2. Bovy v. Smith and Bovy.——S. P. per Ld Keeper, Mich. 27 Car 2. 1 Chan. Caſes. 268. Clifford v. Aſhby.

19 *Entry*

It must be *by Fermeden.* Ch. Cases. 2-8. in Case of Salisbury v. Baggot.

19. *Entry of Remainder Man*, within 5 Years after a Fine levied by Tenant in Tail, will not save his Right; for the Fine being a Discontinuance, he ought to make his Claim by *Action*; per North. K. Hill 35 and 36 Car. 2. Vern. 212. Stapleton v. Sherard.

If a Man has *Title by Writ at the Common Law, and his Entry not lawful* an Entry is not good to save the Right. per Finch. C. 2 Ch Cases. 126. Mich. 34 Car. 2. Bovy v. Smith and Bovy.

20. *A. was Lessee for* 99 *Years*, Remainder *to B. for Life*, Remainder *to C. in Fee*; *B. levied a Fine*, and *living B. the Lease determined*; on a Trial at Bar 'twas ruled that C. might enter, notwithstanding the five Years; for *A. continued the Possession*, which amounted to a Continual Claim by C. Arg. Skin. 262. in Case of Knight v. Greenvil.

At the End of the Case is a Note, that it did not appear whether the Debts were all paid, nor whether the Plaintiff became intitled to the Possession.

21. *Lands devised to* Trustees 'till Debts paid, and then to an Infant and his Heirs, a *Stranger enters and levies a Fine, and Non-claim* pass'd; At full Age, he brought Ejectment and was barred, because the Trustees should have entered. Within 5 Years after Age he brought his Bill in Equity, and the Court decreed him the Possession, and an Account of the Profits, declaring the Fine and Non-claim should not run upon the Trust in the Infant's Minority, nor he suffer for the *Lackes of his Trustees*. Mich. 1699. 2 Vern. 368. Allen v. Sayer.

22. 4 *and* 5 *Annæ* 16. *S.* 16. Enacts, That *no Claim or Entry shall avoid a Fine with Proclamations within the Stat.* 21 *Jac.* 1. *of Limitations unless an Action be brought within one Year after the making thereof, and prosecuted with Effect.*

23. A Special Verdict was found in Ejectment, that the *Lessor* of the Plaintiff, some Time *after the Entry in order to demise to the Plaintiff*, had *entered to avoid a Fine levied by the Defendant*; and because this last Entry *ought to have been previous* to the Former, in order to maintain the Demise of the Lessor of the Plaintiff, it was debated, whether the first Entry in Ejectment was not of itself sufficient to avoid the Fine. But resolved per Cur' that it was not. For there must be an *actual Entry*, made * *animo clamandi*, which, in Case of an Ejectment, there is not, but only a fictious or supposed Entry for the Purpose of making a Demise, and so the Word *Entry* in the Statute has been always expounded, and extends not to an Ejectment; for the *Statute meant thereby only real Actions*; whereas an Ejectment is brought to recover a Term only; and tho' the Lessor of the Plaintiff is considered to some Purposes, as the Plaintiff himself, yet that is only by a Fiction of Law, and extends not to the present Case. Berrington on the Demise of **Dormer v. Parkhurst** & al. Hill. 11 Geo. 2. B. R. which Judgment was afterwards affirmed in the H of Lords, with the Advice of the Judges.

* 6 Mod. 84. Mich. 2 Annæ. B. R. Ford v. Ld Grey.

(G. a. 2) *Barr immediate.* In what Cases the Fine shall be a present Barr.

1. By the Statutes, 1 *Ric.* 3. 7. *&* 4 *H.* 7. 24. *Privies in Blood*, as Heirs of the Conisors, *claiming by the same Title*, that their Ancestor had that levied the Fine, be barred presently thereby, whether they be void of Impediments or no. West's Symb. S. 182.

Dal. 225. pl. 257. Mich. 16 El. Anon. —Dal. in Kelw. 213. b. pl. 24. S. C. Anon.—And. 39. pl. 101. S. C. Anon.

2. *As* if Land of *Socage* Tenure be given *to Baron and Feme, in Special Tail*, the Remainder *to the right Heirs of the Baron in Fee*, and the *Baron alone levieth a Fine with Proclamations* to his own Use in Fee, and after deviseth the same Lands to A. in Fee, and hath Issue, and then the Baron and Feme die; the Issue in Tail is barred, because he cannot otherwise convey himself to the Title and Descent in Tail, than as the Heir of the Body both of his Father and Mother. West's Symb S. 182. cites Trin. 18 Eliz. Dy. fol. * 251. pl. 24. Anon. ‡ 9 H. 8. Dy. fol. 3. pl. 6. 32 H. 8. Br. Fines 109.

* It should be (351. b.)
‡ It should be (19.)

3. If

3. *So* if Husband and Wife, Tenants in Special Tail, *have Iſſue*, and the Wife die, and the *Husband marries another Wife, and has Iſſue*, and levies a Fine Sur Conuiſance de Droit come ceo, &c. *and by the ſame Fine takes Eſtate in Special Tail*, the *Remainder over*, &c. *and* dies; the Iſſue by the firſt Wife is barred, becauſe he is privy in Blood, the Continuance of the Poſſeſſion, in the Husband notwithſtanding. Weſt's Symb. S. 182. cites 32 Ed. 3. * Dy. pl. 16 Eliz. f. 354. p. 31 and 32.

* It ſhould be 16 Eliz. Dy. 334. pl. 31.

4. *But* if my *Father's Brother diſſeiſe him and levy* a Fine with Proclamation, and my *Father and Uncle within 5 Years after Proclamation die, yet* may I avoid it by Entry at any Time before the End of the 5 Years, notwithſtanding that I am privy in Blood unto my Uncle; for that *my Title* to the Land *groweth by my Father*, and not as Heir unto my Uncle. Weſt's Symb. S. 182. cites Paſch. 19 Eliz. Dy. 9. pl. * 3.

* It ſhould be (pl. 2.)

5. *Nevertheleſs*, if my *Father diſſeiſe my Grandfather of an Eſtate in Fee*, and thereof levy a Fine with Proclamations, and *firſt my Grandfather and then my Father dies*; I am now barred as Privy; becauſe I *cannot otherwiſe convey* myſelf to the Lands, *than as Heir unto my Father* the Conuiſor. P. 19 H. 8. Dy. fol. 3. pl. 3. Weſt's Symb. S. 182.

6. Tenant in Tail, *ſeiſed of* 300 *Acres*, *levies a Fine of* 100, 'tis no Bar of all, or any Part, 'till *Election* made; and 'till Election the Lands remain entail'd. Arg. 2. Ch. Caſes. 185 and 187.

(H. a) *How* the Five Years *Non-claim* and Entry to be *Accounted.*

1. A *Tenant in Tail, Remainder to B.* in Fee, A. levies a Fine with Proclamations, *B. dies, his Heir within Age*, ſc. of the Age of 5 Years; A. dies without Iſſue; ſo that the Infant may bring his Formedon in Remainder, but ſuffers 5 Years more to paſs after the Title accrued; yet he may have his Action after, within Age; notwithſtanding the 4 *H.* 7. 24. which ſaves and reſerves the Action or Claim of the *Infant* 'till his full Age, and that then he ſhall have 5 Years. Mich. 3 and 4 P. and M. Dy. 133. pl. 2. Baſſet's Caſe.

Cro. E. 219 Hill. 33 El. B. R. Smy v. Chown.

2. A. *Diſſeiſor marries* B. *the Diſſeiſee*, and they have Iſſue; *C. diſſeiſes A.* and levies a Fine with Proclamations, and A. dies in the fourth Year after the Proclamations, leaving Iſſue of full Age; afterwards B. dies; the 5 Years paſs. The Iſſue is bound as Heir to A. his Father; For in that Reſpect he and his Father had 5 Years together. But, as Heir to the Mother, he ſhall have 5 Years from the Death of his Father; For tho' 'tis the *ſame Land*, yet he has *ſeveral Rights*; one as Heir to his Father, which is the laſt, and another, (which is firſt) as Heir to his Mother; and ſo has *ſeveral Times*; per Walſh J. Mich. 4 and 5 Eliz. Pl. C. 367. b. in Caſe of Sowell v. Zouch.

If Tenant in Tail is diſſeiſed, and *Diſſeiſor levies a Fine* with Proclamations, and 5 Years paſs, and then *Tenant in Tail dies*, the Iſſue in Tail is barr'd.

For after the Fine levied, the Tenant in Tail himſelf had Right, ſo that the Iſſue was not the firſt to whom the Right accrued and deſcended after the Fine levied. 3 Rep. 87. b. Paſch. 44 Eliz. The Caſe of Fines.

3. *Two Jointenants* are diſſeiſed, whereof *one is within Age*; the Diſſeiſor levies a Fine with Proclamations; 4 *Years paſs* after the Proclamations; and after the *Jointenant, being of full Age, dies before the 5 Years paſs*, the other within Age; the Infant Survivor ſhall have 5 Years after his full Age, as well for the Moiety, which was in his joint Companion, who was of full Age, as for the other Moiety; For the Right of this Moiety, which was in his Companion of full Age, firſt accrued to him after the Proclamations made, by Force of the Cauſe or Matter, viz. by the Jointure made before; And ſo 'tis within the Words and the Intent of of the Branch, notwithſtanding that the Moiety was in his Companion

before; for 'tis in him now in other Form. per Bendloe. Serj. Pl. C. 367. in Caſe of Stowell v. Zouch.

4. A *Diſſeiſor*, or a Feoffee of a Diſſeiſor, *levies a Fine* with Proclamations, 4 *Years paſs in the Life of the Diſſeiſee*; the Diſſeiſee dies, his *Heir* being *within Age*; he *has only one Year* to claim in; For ſuch Fine with Proclamations, without any Claim in 5 Years, is as a Condition annexed to the Eſtate; and altho' ſuch Condition deſcends upon an Infant, yet he is liable to the Breach of it, as well as an Heir of full Age. *Expedit Reipublicæ ut ſit finis litium.* By all the Judges of England. Jenk. 266. pl. 74. cites 5 Eliz.

Pl. C. 375. 5. If a Man has *many Impediments*, he is not compellable to make his Claim before all the Impediments are *removed*; ſo if the *Anceſtor* has one of the ſaid Impediments, and dies before it be removed, and his *Heir within Age*, or hath other Impediment, he is not bound to make his Claim 'till 5 Years after his Impediment is removed. per Anderſon Ch. J. Le. 215. Mich. 32 and 33 Eliz. C. B. Cotton's Caſe.

6. *Tenant for Life and J. S. joined in a Fine* Sur Cogniſance de Droit come ceo, &c. to a Stranger, who rendered to J. S. for 80 Years, Remainder to the Tenant for Life in Fee. Proclamations paſſed, and the 5 Years paſſed without Entry by him in the Reverſion. *Tenant for Life died*; the Queſtion was, if he in Reverſion ſhould have *other 5 Years*, and it was adjudged he ſhould, and ſo it was adjudged in Somers's Caſe. 7 Eliz. Cro. E. 254. Trin. 33 and 34 Eliz. B. R. Laund v. Tucker.

* *To the Father in Tail.* Dal. 71. Cro. E. 370. Cro. E. 391. 5 Rep. 17. 3 Rep. 62. Mod. 182. S. P. Fowle v. Doble.

7. Grandfather, Father and Son, the *Grandfather* is *ſeiſed for Life, the Remainder to the* * *Son in Tail*, Remainder *to the right Heirs of the Grandfather*. The *Grandfather* covenants by Indenture to make Aſſurance to J. S. and that it ſhould be to the Uſe of him and his Heirs; and after he ſuffers a common Recovery againſt him, and *levies a Fine* to the ſaid J. S. *come ceo, &c.* and Proclamations upon it, and *after the Statute of* 27 *H.* 8. is made, and the *Grandfather makes Feoffment to the Son* and dies. It was held, that the Entry of the Father upon the Son is lawful, and ſhall not be eſtopped upon the *Warranty of the Grandfather*; for this *is gone by the re-taking of the Eſtate*; For *when the Statute veſts as high a Poſſeſſion in him, as he had when he alien'd, the Warranty is extinct*; For the Stat. of 27 H. 8. does not ſave the Warranty. And there Dyer ſaid, that tho' the 5 Years are paſſed in the Life of the Grandfather, ſo that the Entry which was given by *Cauſe of Forfeiture* is taken away, yet when the Grandfather died, now he ſhall have other 5 Years to make his Claim or Entry, for Cauſe of the *Title coming to him by Remainder in Tail*; and this by the Statute of 4 H. 7. Mo. 71. pl. 192.

* S. C. cited Arg. Godb. 301. that tho' 5 Years paſs in the

8. *Diſcontinuee* of Eſtate Tail *levies a Fine*, the Iſſue ſhall † not have 5 new Years. D. 3. pl. 2. Marg. cites 34 Eliz. B. R. Holme v. Gee.—— * Contra. per 5. J. againſt 3. D. 3. b. Paſch. 19 H. 8. Anon.

Life of Tenant in Tail, yet the Iſſue ſhall have other 5 Years. For he is the *firſt to whom the Right doth accrue after* the Fine levied. For Tenant in Tail himſelf after his Fine with Proclamations hath not any Right. But if *Diſſeiſor* of Tenant in Tail levy Fine with Proclamations, and 5 Years paſs and afterwards Tenant in Tail dies, the Iſſue is barred; becauſe after the Fine, the Tenant in Tail had Right, and ſo the Iſſue was not the firſt to whom the Right accrued after the Fine.——3 Rep. 87. a. b. Caſe of Fines.——Reſolved accordingly Trin. 44 Eliz. C. E. Cro. E. 896. Peniſton v. Lyſter. ——Pl. C. 373. b. 374.—— * Arg. Godb. 313. Contra.

9. If a *Lunatick, or Non compos, levy a Fine* of Lands, the 5 Years begin at his recovering his Senſes, and he muſt bring his Action within 5 Years after; and in Pleading he ſhall ſhew, that at the Time of the Fine, he was Non compos, and all the ſpecial Matter; but if he die without recovering his Senſes, *his Heir* ſhall have his Action, or make his *Entry* when he will; for he is *excepted out of the Act*, and is bound to no Time. So of *being over Sea*. 4 Rep. 125. b. Paſch. 1 Jac. B. R. Beverley's Caſe.

10. A. having an *Intereſſe Termini* died. The firſt Term expired. Leſſor enters and levies a Fine with Proclamations, before any Adminiſtration committed, and *after 5 Years Adminiſtration is had.* Reſolved that the Adminiſtrator ſhall have 5 Years; for none had Title of Entry before. Cro. J. 61. Hill 2 Jac. B. R. cites it as the true State of the Caſe of Sanders v. Stanford.

11. *Infant in Ventre ſa mere* has 5 Years after he comes to full Age. Weſt's Symb. S. 183.

12. *A. Tenant in Tail Male*, Remainder *to B. in Fee, makes a Leaſe for three Lives, with Warranty* againſt all Perſons, which was *not Warranted by the Statute* 32 *H.* 8. 28. and afterwards levies a Fine with Warranty againſt all Perſons, and with Proclamations, and dies without Iſſue Male, leaving M. a Daughter. About 2 Years after the Fine levied, the Leaſe for Lives expired; and about 12 Years after, *B.* died without Iſſue, M. being Heir at Law to him as well as to A. Adjudged that M. was barred, and that B's Claim muſt have been within 5 Years after A's Death, and not after the Determination of the Lives, at which Time B. had no other Title than he had before. For his Title was by A's Death, without Iſſue Male, and then he might have brought his Formedon. Cro. C. 156. Paſch. 4 Car. B. R. Salvin v. Clerk.———This differs from Seymour's Caſe. For there the Reverſion was not diſplaced, nor a *Fee gain'd*, as in this Caſe it was by the Leaſe having in it a Warranty againſt all Perſons, and ſo not warranted by the Statute. Ibid. cites 10. Rep. 95, 96. Seymour's Caſe.

Jo. 209. S. C. and P.—(N B. The Leaſe was warranted, but becauſe it was with Warranty that made it become not warranted.) —But Cro. E. 602. in Caſe of Keen v. Cope is otherwiſe, viz. that it is warranted by the Statute.—— Vaughan Ch. J. ſaid that this Caſe is all falſe and miſ-reported; and that, 1. becauſe it ſays that the Leaſe for Lives was a *Diſcontinuance of the Reverſion*, and thereby a *new Fee gained to Tenant in Tail*, which he paſſed away by the Fine with Warranty, which (he ſaid) could not be; for that it appears in the Caſe, that the Leaſe was warranted by the Stat. 32 H. 8. 28. and ſo could make no Diſcontinuance, nor no new Fee of a Reverſion could be gain'd, and then no Eſtate to which the Warranty was annexed, and that ſo it was reſolved 40 Eliz. Reine v. Cope; and 2dly, that Opinion was Extrajudicial, it being concerning a Point not in the Caſe, but ſuppoſed; as ſuppoſing there had no Proclamations been made, and no Non-claim; and 3dly, It was reſolved upon the Point of Non-claim, and not upon the Warranty which was not a Point in the Caſe. Vaugh. 383. Mich. 25 Car. 2. in Caſe of Bole v. Horton.—— The Statute of 4 *H.* 7. operates by way of *Bar to the Right* which anſwers Saul and Clerk's Caſe. Jo. 210, 211. 2 Salk. 422. in Caſe of Hunt v. Bourne.

13. A. *deviſed Land to J. S. an Infant in Fee.* The Heir at Law of A. Levies a Fine and the *Infant dies, leaving M. his Siſter married* to W. R. who lets 5 Years paſs without Claim. Tho' W. R. and all claiming under him are bound, and the Wife herſelf during the Coverture; yet ſhe ſhall have a new 5 Years after her Baron's Death. Cro. C. 200. Mich. 6 Car. B. R. Hulm v. Heylock.

Cro. C. 129. S. C. debated by Name of Chamberlain v. Turner, but on a D. P.

14. *A. ſeiſed in Fee, acknowledged a Statute Merchant to B.* and after *a Recognizance* in the Nature of a Statute Staple *to C. and* then *another Recognizance* of the ſame Nature *to D.* and *E.—D. and E. extend and had a Liberate*; and after *B. extends and has a Liberate*; *and then C. extends and has a Liberate*; *B. and C. aſſign to F. — A. being in Poſſeſſion, levied a Fine* with Proclamations *to J. S. who* being ſeiſed in Fee *deviſed* the Lands in Queſtion *to F. (who had Poſſeſſion* of the Lands *by* Virtue of the *Aſſignment of B. and C.) and to his Heirs Male, Remainder to the Daughters of A.*—And *F. being ſo ſeiſed levied a Fine* with Proclamations, *and died without Iſſue Male*; and L. and M. are the Daughters and Heirs of A. and alſo Heirs to F.—*5 Years paſs*; and after the Wife of the Defendant, being *Executrix* of the Survivor *of* E. and *D. took Adminiſtration* de Bonis non *to C. and acknowledged Satisfaction upon Record, to the Statute made to C.* and upon this the Defendant entered, upon whom the Plaintiffs (having married one the L. and the other M. the Daughters and Heirs of A. and Heirs of F.) brought their Ejectments, & ſi, &c. It was argued, that B's Statute was extinct, and C's in Eſſe, but this is by their coming both into the ſame Hand, and not by the Fine of A. For when both B's and C's Statutes are aſſigned to F. he is ſolely poſſeſſed by Virtue of the Statute to C. becauſe B. had a ſurrenderable Eſtate, and C's Extent was of a Reverſion, and

and capable of a Surrender, and for this cited D. 280. **Corbett's Case**, and that when the second Statute is extended it is of a Reversion, and being after *in the same Hand, is an Extinguishment of the first*, and for this cites Cro. J. 424. **Farrington v. Garroway**, and 4 Rep. 66. and further that B's Statute is drown'd, and C's is not, but the intermediate Estate of D. and E. prevents it, and if this is *in esse*, then *after Satisfaction acknowledged a new 5 Years accrued*; For acknowledgment of Satisfaction is a natural Way to determine a Statute. And Judgment was given for the Defendant. Skin. 260 to 264. Hill. 2 and 3 Jac. 2. B. R. Knight v. Greenvill.

15. *A. was Lessee for* 99 *Years*, Remainder *to B. for Life*, Remainder *to C. in Fee*; *B. levied a Fine, and living B. the Lease determined*, 'twas ruled on a Trial at Bar, that C. might enter notwithstanding the 5 Years; For *A. continued the Possession*, which amounted to a Continual Claim by C. Arg. Skin. 262. in Case of Knight v. Greenvil.

16. If *Tenant for Life* levies a Fine, and he in Revetsion does not enter or claim within 5 Years, he cannot *enter* for that Forfeiture; but *must stay 'till a new Right of Entry accrues* to him by Death of the Tenant for Life. Arg. Show. 43. cites Pl. C. 573.

Lessor has *5 Years during the Life of the Lessee for Life* to claim in; *or 5 Years after his Death*, at his Election;

17. Lessee for Life is *dissersed*, and a Fine is levied, and 5 Years pass; the Lessee is barred, and the *Remainder-man* has 5 Years after the Death of Lessee for Life. But can the Remainder-man have 5 Years, if *Lessee for Life surrenders*, or can he surrender after his Estate is barred? per Pollexsen, Ch. J. Show. 46. Trin. 1 W. and M. in Case of Dighton v. Greenvil.

for he *has* 2 *Titles*, one after the Death of Lessee for Life, the other by the Forfeiture of the said Lessee; and if he does not claim within 5 Years as above, after the said *Forfeiture*, he shall have other 5 Years after the *Death* of the Lessee for Life. Jenk. 254. pl. 45.

18. If an *Heir in Tail brings a Formedon within 5 Years after Fine levy'd by a Discontinuee*, and pending the Formedon, and after the 5 Years, the Issue *dies*; Holt, Ch. J. thought it reasonable that the *next Heir* in Tail should *have Benefit* of this Formedon, *by bringing a new one in convenient Time*. But he said that this has not been determined. And that it is plain that *Journey's Accounts* will not lie; for that must be between the Parties to the first Writ; and the new Writ must be the same as the former; and the Writ, which lay for the Ancestor, is not the same, which lies for the Issue, but is of another Nature. 12 Mod. 572. per Holt Ch. J. Mich. 13 Will. 3.

19. He that has a *Right of Reversion, or Remainder expectant on an Estate Tail, or for Life*, shall have 5 Years after their Title come unto them, as appears by the 4th H. 7. 2 Inst. 518.

S. P. and *so* if a *Mortgagee be disseised*. West's Symb. S. 186.—

20. Those that have *no present, but a future Right upon a precedent Cause*, and whose Right and Title *comes to them after the Proclamations*, such Strangers to Fines, being void of Impediments, have 5 Years after the coming of such Rights to enter and make their Claim. (Vid. 1 Ric. 3. 7. 4 H. 7. 24.) *As* in the Cases of a **Remainder or Reversion*. But if these have Impediments, they shall have 5 Years too *after the Impediments removed*, before their Laches shall be prejudicial to them. Therefore if a Wife does surcease her Time, and 5 Years pass, after the Death of the Husband; upon a Fine levied of her Inheritance or Freehold, she is barred of her Right, and cannot enter by Force of the Statute of the 32 H. 8. 28. Wood's Inst. 246.

* Pl. C. 374.

Where *Lessee for Years makes a Feoffment, and levies a Fine*, and 5 Years pass, the

21. *And* if Tenant for Life *makes a Feoffment in Fee*, (*to one who has Land in the same Vill.* 3 Rep. 79. in Fermor's Case.) and the Feoffee levieth a Fine with Proclamations, it shall not bind the Lessor; but he shall have 5 Years after the Death of the Tenant for Life. Wood's Inst. 247.

Court

Court reſolved the Leſſor ſhould have 5 Years after the Term expired, as well as where a Fine is levied by Leſſee for Life, which differs not from this Caſe; for there the Leſſor may have his Writ de Conſimili Caſu, as here he may bring his Aſſiſe. Vent. 241. Hill. 24 and 25 Car. 2. B. R. Whaley v. Tancred.——2 Lev. 52. S. C.——Raym. 219. S. C.——3 Keb. 30. S. C.

22. *But* upon a *Diſſeiſin of Tenant for Life*, and Fine levied, the Leſſor and Leſſee have but 5 Years after the Fine. For Diſſeiſor comes in openly, and without the Conſent of the Leſſee. But Quære; For the Leſſor ſeems to be within the ſecond ſaving of the Statute of the 4 *H.* 7. *Saving to all Perſons ſuch Actions, &c. as ſhall come after the Fine levied, &c.* And therefore he ſhall have 5 Years after the Action accrueth. Wood's Inſt. 247.

(H. a. 2) Barr by Non-claim. The *Eſtate being turn'd to a Right.* In what Caſes the Eſtate ſhall be ſaid to be turn'd to a Right.

1. It was agreed, that Feoffment or Fine *Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo, que il ad de ſon done*, are diſcontinuances; For theſe are executed in themſelves, and are a Tranſmutation of Poſſeſſion; contrary of Fine *Sur Conuſance de Droit tantum*, or Fine *of Grant and Render*. Br. Diſcont' de Poſſeſſion. pl. 2. cites 8 H. 4. 7.

2. *Tenant in Tail*, the *Remainder in Tail*; the *Tenant* in Tail *Bargains and ſells* the Land * to A. and *afterwards levies a Fine* to A. Sur Cognuzance de Droit come ceo *with Warranty*; this Warranty was made by the Collateral Anceſtor of him in Remainder, whoſe Heir he is, and therefore ſhall not bar him; For his *Remainder was not diſplaced*: It had been *otherwiſe if* the Fine had been levied by the Tenant in Tail *before the Bargain and Sale*; For then it had been a Diſcontinuance; but by the Bargain and Sale, made as above, the *Bargainee had a Fee determinable upon the Entry of the Iſſue*, and he in the Remainder has his Remainder open upon Default of Iſſue of Tenant in Tail, who in this Caſe has *paſſed all his Eſtate by the Bargain and Sale*, and has nothing more to paſs, but to extinguiſh the Eſtate Tail, by Way of Releaſe, and to leave the Remainder untouched. Jenk. 51 pl. 97. cites 10 Rep. 95. b. Mich. 10 Jac. † Seymor's Caſe.

* By Indenture inrolled in Chancery. 10 Rep. 95. b. Seymour's Caſe.——S. C. cited per Holt Ch. J. thus, Tenant in Tail bargains and ſells to B. and his Heirs; and the Court held that the Bargainee had a deſcendible Eſtate, whereof his Wife was dowable, and that by the bare Bargain and Sale; and tho' there was a *Fine after*, which barred the Iſſue, yet that *only excluded the Iſſue in Tail, but not enlarged the Eſtate of the Bargainee*; For if he had not a Fee before, the Fine could not have given it to him; For it did *not work by Way of Enlargement of an Eſtate* Farr. 24. In Caſe of Machill v. Clerk.——Holt Ch. J. held this Caſe to be good Law. 2 Salk. 619.—— † Buls. 162. Trin. 9 Jac. B. R. S. C. by the Name of Heywood v. Smith.

3. Tenant *for Life, Remainder in Tail*; he in *Remainder levies a Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo*; Tenant *for Life dies*; he in Remainder dies; his Heir claims or brings a Formedon *after* the Proclamations and 5 Years are paſſed: This Fine bars the Eſtate Tail. If the *Proclamations* had not been made, there would have been no Diſcontinuance in this Caſe; For he in Remainder was *not ſeiſed* by Force *of the Intail. If* he had been *ſeiſed* by Force *of the Intail*; ſuch Fine *without Proclamations*, had been a Diſcontinuance. By all the Judges of England. Jenk. 274. pl. 96.

3 Rep. 84. a. 2 And. 177. Sir Cha. Danvers's Caſe.—Mo. 628. S. C.

4. If Land is deviſed to A. and *before the Entry of Deviſee, the Heir at Law levies a Fine*, and 5 Years paſs without Claim, yet this is no bar; For Deviſee not having entred the Eſtate was not turned into a Right. Cro. C. 200. Mich. 6 Car. B. R. Hulm v. Heylock.

5. Feoffment to *A. and his Heirs, Quouſque* ſuch Sums be paid, and on failure, the Feoffees to enter; &c. there is a *Failure*; Feoffor levies a Fine, and 5 Years paſs; Feoffees enter not; the Fine bars. Cart. 82. Trin. 18 Car. 2. C. B. Thomaſin v. Mackworth.

Before the Fine levied, *A. makes a Leaſe and Releaſe*, then A.

levies a Fine, and 5 Years paſs. Bridgman Ch. J. held that by the Leaſe and Releaſe, the Eſtate is now turned to a Right; For *after Failure, A. is but Tenant at ſufferance*; and his making a Leaſe is a Diſſeiſin and ſo the Eſtate turned to a Right, and alſo by the Releaſe, which was a Medling with the Land, and being ſo turned to a Right, Fine and Nonclaim bars. Cart. 82. Thomaſin v. Mackworth.

6. The Law conſtrues ſuch Acts to *amount to* a Deveſting, or not Deveſting as is *moſt agreeable to the Intention of the Parties, and the Right of the Thing*, per the Ch. Juſtice. Trin. 22. Car. 2. B. R. Vent. 81. in Caſe of Freeman v. Barns.

7. *A. ſeiſed in Fee* of Lands, *makes a Leaſe to W. R. and W. S. for* 500 *Years in Truſt, that himſelf ſhould receive the Profits during his Life*; and that afterwards *B. ſhould* enjoy them, &c. *Afterwards A. being in Poſſeſſion* according to the Truſt, *Covenanted with J. N. and J. D. to ſtand ſeiſed* of the ſaid Lands *upon the ſame Conſiderations* as mentioned in the Leaſe, *to* the Uſe of *himſelf for Life*, with *Remainders over* according to the Truſt; *and* further, *that the ſaid Leaſe, and all Eſtates, made, or to be made by himſelf, ſhould be* and enure *to the ſame Uſes*; *and levies a Fine*, and 5 *Years paſſed A. being in Poſſeſſion* according to the Truſt, and enjoying the Profits during his Life; *A. dies*; and *W. R. enters*. Hale Ch. B. held that Nothing had been done here to diſplace the Eſtate of the Leſſees; For the Leſſor continued in Poſſeſſion by the Leſſee's Leave and Permiſſion, as muſt be preſumed, and ſo is a Tenant at Will, as Littleton ſays. Hard. 401. Focus v. Salisbury.

8. *So* if *Leſſee for Years* be, the Remainder over for Life, and Leſſee for Years levy a Fine, and 5 Years paſs; the Leſſor is not barred by any Nonclaim; becauſe the Fine Operates nothing, and Partes ad finem nihil habuerunt may be pleaded to it. *Otherwiſe* it is where a *Tenant for Life* levies a Fine; for he has a Freehold, and his Fine diſplaces the Remainders; and therefore an Entry is requiſite within 5 Years after the Death of the Tenant for Life, for which Reaſon when a Leſſee for Years, or at Will, is to levy a Fine, 'tis uſual for the Leſſee to make a Feoffment firſt, to diſplace the other Eſtates; but here the *Leaſe for Years is antecedent to the Eſtate of the Leſſor*, who levies the Fine, and he has a Freehold expectant upon the Leaſe, and not precedent to it, per Hale Ch. B. Hard. 401, 402. Focus v. Salisbury.

9. A Fine with 5 Years Nonclaim muſt bar an *Eſtate precedent* to the Fine, *not Subſequent* to it; and where there is a *Privity* betwixt the Leſſor and the Leſſee, the Fine ſhall not bar; as in Caſe of a Mortgage, where the Mortgagor continuing in Poſſeſſion levies a Fine, per Hale Ch. B. Hard. 402. Focus v. Salisbury.

10. *And* this very Caſe was adjudged in Terminis for two Reaſons, Firſt, by Reaſon of the *Privity* betwixt the Perſons; Secondly, becauſe the Leſſor was in the Nature of a *Tenant at Will*, and there was a *mutual Confidence* betwixt the Parties, per Hale Ch. B. Hard. 402. cited it as the Dutcheſs of Richmond's Caſe.

11. If I make a *Leaſe for Years* of my Land, rendring Rent, and a *Stranger levies a Fine* of the Land; and the *Leſſee* for Years *payeth his Rent to* me duly, I am not barred of my Reverſion; becauſe I was always in Poſſeſſion, and not put to a Right only. Wood's Inſt. 248.

12. So if there is *Tenant in Tail, Remainder in Tail*, or Tenant for Life Remainder for Life, and the *firſt Tenant in Tail*, or the firſt Tenant for Life doth *Bargain and Sell* the Land by Deed indented and enrolled, *and after* doth *levy a Fine* to the Bargainee; in theſe Caſes the Remainders are not bound, tho' the 5 Years paſs without Claim; For the Law adjudges them always in Poſſeſſion. Ibid.

13. **So* if *Tenant for Life and the firſt Remainderman in Tail levy a Fine*; This is no Diſcontinuance of the Remainders after; For each paſſed only what he lawfully might. 1 Rep. 76. a. Bredon's Caſe.

But if Tenant for Life and the firſt Remainder in Tail *make a Feoffment*, it is a Diſcontinuance contra to that Part of Bredon's Caſe in 1 Rep. 76 b. and that it was ſo adjudged becauſe it is of a different Nature from a Fine. Sid. 83. cites the Caſe of Baker v. Hacker. ——* Mo. 634. S. P. Peck v. Channell.——Cro. E. 827. S. C.——Ow. 129. S. C.

(I. a) *Enure.* How; *not* being *directed by Deed* of Uſes.

1. A Fine *Sur Releaſe* cannot be intended to the Uſe of any other, but *of him to whom it is levied*, unleſs an Uſe be expreſſed in the Fine, or by another Deed, per Catline. 3 Le. 36. Mich. 15 Eliz. B. R. in Ld. Windſor's Caſe.

2. A. enfeoffs B. and 'twas Covenanted between them, that *if A. pay B. at Midſummer* 47 *l.* then the Feoffment ſhould be to the Uſe of A. and his Heirs, and *if A. fails and B. do not pay A.* 20 l. *at Michaelmas*, then alſo the Feoffment to be to the Uſe of A. and his Heirs, and Covenanted to make further Aſſurance. A. and B. both failed of payment at the Days, and afterwards in Hillary Term next after both the Feaſts, a Fine is levied to B. and *no Uſe expreſſed*, and all this was found by ſpecial Verdict, and that the Fine was only to the Uſes of the Indenture. The Queſtion was if the Conuſee of the Fine, or the Heir of the Feoffor ſhould have the Land? and 'twas adjudged for the Heir of the Feoffor. Cro. E. 32. Trin. 26 Eliz. B. R. Wencomb's Caſe.

3. *A.* was ſeiſed in Fee of Land, and he, *and B. (a Stranger*, and who had Nothing in the Land) levied a Fine thereof to J. S. *without Conſideration*; the Uſe implied ſhall be to A. only, and his Heirs; For an Uſe is nothing but a Truſt and Confidence; and a Thing in Equity and Conſcience ſhall be by Operation of Law *to him who in Truth was Owner of the Land* without having Regard to *Eſtoppels*, or Concluſions, which are contrary to Truth and Equity. 2 Rep. 58. b. Trin. 27 Eliz. in Beckwith's Caſe.

If the *Conuſee* of a Fine, levied of Lands, do *pay Money unto the Conuſor* of the Fine at the Time of the Fine levied, and there is no Uſe declared to lead the Uſe of the Fine levied of theſe Lands; the Law will conſtrue the Fine to be levied of theſe Lands to the Uſe of the Conuſee, to whom the Fine is levied; * *but if* there be *no Money paid* by the Conuſee, nor any Uſe declared, the Fine ſhall enure to the Uſe of the Conuſor that levied the Fine. Paſch. 23 Car. B. R. For Nothing appears whereby it can be ſuppoſed that the Parties had any Intention the Eſtate in the Lands ſhould be altered by the Fine, but that the Fine was levied for the Corroboration of the Title of the Conuſor; but where Money is paid, the Law will intend that he that paid it, is to have Benefit by the Fine. L. P. R. 614.——See 2 Rep. 58. b. Beckwith's Caſe.——Pig. of Recov. 53, 54.——* Per Vaugh. Ch. J. it is common Experience. Vaugh. 43.

4. A. levied a Fine *to B. and C.* with *Render to A. for* 80 *Years, if* A. ſhould ſo long live, *Remainder to D.* It was agreed per tot. Cur. that the Conuzance muſt neceſſarily be intended to the Uſe of the Conuzees; becauſe otherwiſe, they could not render by the Fine. But if the *Render be void in all*, as 'tis in Part, then they thought that the Uſe of the Conuſance would go *according to the Intent of the Render*, but not in the principal Caſe, becauſe the Render for the 80 Years is good, which makes the Conuſance of Neceſſity to be to the *Uſe of the Conuſees*. Mo. 488. Paſch. 38 Eliz. Holcroft's Caſe.

5. Fine was levied *to A. and B. to the Uſe of A. B. and C.* they are all *Jointenants* tho' A. and B. were in by the Fine at Common Law. Noy. 124. Watts & Lee v. Ognell.——Says, 'twas adjudged on a Feoffment, 21 El. cites * D. 200.

* D. 200 a. pl. 59 Paſch. 3 Eliz. Anor.

6. A Fine, which *Operates upon the Poſſeſſion*, ſhall not *alter* the Poſſeſſion upon which it works, and tho' there are *words contrary* in the Fine, yet the ſame ſhall enure upon the Eſtate precedent and not otherwiſe, per Yelverton J. Buls. 164. Trin. 9 Jac. B. R. in Caſe of Heywood v. Smith.

7. If *Tenant for Life, and Remainder-man in Fee join* in a Fine, but declare no

no Uſes, each ſhall have the Uſe, which the Law veſts in them according to the Eſtate, which they conveyed over. 2 Rep. 58. a.

8. A Fine was levied of a Rent *to A. and B and the Heirs of A.* and the Uſe was limited only by the Fine itſelf, and there was *no Deed to lead the Uſes*; adjudged, that A. and B. were in by the Stat. 27 H. 8. of Uſes, and were Jointenants of the Rent; For elſe there would be ſuch a Fraction of Eſtate that A. ſhould be in by the Common Law, and B. by the Statute, and that is not according to the Statute, which is, that where two or three are ſeiſed to the Uſe of one or two of them, Ceſty que Uſe ſhall be adjudged to have ſuch Eſtate in Poſſeſſion, as they have in Uſe. Trin. 8 Car. Hutt. 112 Purnell v. Bridges.

9. A Fine, levied *purſuant to a Decree*, for a particular End and Purpoſe, ſhall not be ſuffered in Equity to work farther than the Decree intended it. Paſch. 16 Car. 2. 1. Chan. Caſes 49. Goodrick v. Brown.

10. Upon the Trial of this Cauſe at Niſi Prius in Middleſex, before Holt Ch. J. a Caſe was made for the Opinion of the Court, viz. H. levied a Fine, and afterwards ſuffered a Common Recovery, wherein the Conuſee was Tenant, and there being no Deed in the Caſe, it was Objected that the Uſe of the Fine reſulted to the Conuſor; and tho' the Intent of the Fine might be to make a *Tenant to the Præcipe*, yet no Uſe or Truſt can be averred, ſince 29 Car. 2. 3. Sed non Allocatur; For *at Common Law* the Uſe was always intended to be to the Feoffee or Conuſee, and in Pleading never was Averred. Co. Ent. 114. 273. Plowd. 477. But if it be to the Uſe of the Feoffor or Conuſor, then it muſt be *averred*. 2dly, the Court held the Party *was in by the Fine immediately*, and ſo there was a good Tenant to the Præcipe. 3dly, The *Statute extends not to Uſes by Operation of Law, but to ſuch Uſes as are to a third Perſon*, and that neither the Conuſor, nor the Conuſee could aver the Fine to the Uſe of a third Perſon ſince the Statute. 2 Salk. 676. Paſch. 8 W. 3 B. R. Ld Angleſey v. Ld Altham.

Pig. of Recov. 54, 55. cites S. C.

11. Baron and Feme levy a Fine of the *Wife's Land*, and *no Uſes are declared, or ſuch Uſes* are declared *as are void* and can never take Effect; ſuch Fine is to the Uſe of the Wife and her Heirs, and the Eſtate remains as it was; or if the Fine Operates any Thing, 'twill be for the Benefit of the Party, to whom it belonged before. Arg. Parl. Caſes 106. Davis v. Speed.

(K. a) *Enure.* How. Where 'tis *levied to a particular Purpoſe.*

1. FINE levied by *Feme Covert to confirm a Leaſe*; after the Debt on the Leaſe ſatisfied by the Profits, no other Debt ſhall bar her of her Thirds. 15 Car. 1. Chan. R. 132. Naylor v. Baldwin.

2. An Eſtate Tail was *created by the Crown*, and afterwards, ſome Family diſputes ariſing, an *Act of Parliament, for confirming an Award made for the Peace and Quiet of the Family*, was Aſſented to by the King, and afterwards one of the Family, ſeiſed of an Eſtate Tail, levied a Fine; yet the King's Reverſion is not removed by the Act, which was not as a New Gift, nor did the King intend to paſs away any Right; but his Aſſent was only to confirm the Award; and the Reverſion is ſtill within the Protection of 34 H. 8. and therefore the Fine no bar to his Iſſue; per Pemberton Ch. J. who ſaid, he was ordered to deliver Lord Keeper's Opinion, that it was a *New Eſtate* by the Act of Parliament, yet within the Protection of 34 *H.* 8. Hill. 35 Car. 2 B. R. Skin. 95. E. of Derby's Caſe.

Decreed Paſch. 16 Car. 2. Ch.

3. Where a Fine is ordered to be levied *by Decree in Chancery*, if it be ſo done as to paſs a greater Eſtate, or to Operate farther in Law than this Court

Court intended it, this Court will *reſtrain* it to what was the Original Intention of levying it. Arg. Mich. 1682. Vern. 95.

Cases 49. Goodrich v Brown ——

Arg. Paſch. 1688. 2 Vern. 56. cites it as Reſolved in the Caſe of Goodrick v. Brown.

4. A. ſeiſed in Tail, and having a *Term in Truſt to attend* the Inheritance, by Fine, and Deed *ſubjects the Land to a Debt of* 1000l. but declares, that after that Debt is paid, the Land ſhould be *to the ſame Uſes as before*; afterwards A. deviſed the Land for payment of his Debts. Decreed that the Land was liable to all the Debts in general. Sed Quære tamen; For it ſeems, he was but *Tenant in Tail* of the Inheritance, and ſo could not charge it by his Will; unleſs it be intended he had a full Power of doing it lodged in him by reaſon of the Fine, notwithſtanding he had declared that after Payment of the 1000*l.* it ſhould go to the former Uſes. Mich. 1682. Vern. 99. Turner v. Gwyn.

Tenant in Tail ſuffers a *Recovery to let in a Mortgage of* 500 *Years*, and then limits the Land to the Old Uſes, and makes his Will, and *deviſes all his Lands for payment of his Debts.* The Court thought the Equity of Redemption ſhould be Aſſets to ſatisfy Creditors, or a Subſequent Grantee of an Annuity. Note, the *Redemption was limited to him, his Heirs or Aſſigns.* Hill. 1691. Ch. Prec. 39. Foſſet v. Auſtin.

5. The *Wife joins* with her Baron in a Mortgage, and levies a Fine with intent *to bar Dower*, and in Conſideration thereof, the Baron *agrees*, that *the Wife ſhall have the Redemption of the Mortgage.* The Baron afterwards *Mortgaged the Eſtate twice more.* This Agreement is Fraudulent as againſt the ſubſequent Mortgagees, ſo far as to intitle the Wife to the whole Equity of Redemption. But her Dower was decreed, in Caſe ſhe ſhould ſurvive her Baron, notwithſtanding the Fine, without putting her to her Writ of Dower. By North. K. Hill. 1684. Vern. 294. Dolin v. Coltman.

(L. a) *Enure to make good Prior Eſtates*, and how.

1. IN Sci. fa. upon a *Fine of an Annuity*, Thirne held that a Prior preſentable who has a Patron, may charge the Church in perpetuity with his Covent, if he has a Covent and Common Seal; but contrary of a Parſon. Becauſe the one may have a Writ of Right, and the other only Juris utrum; and therefore it ſeems that a Prior preſentable by a Patron, who has not Covent nor Common Seal, cannot charge but for his Life; for he is but *merely as a Parſon*; note a Diverſity; and then *becauſe the Annuity had Eſſence before the Fine*, and *ſo the Fine is but as a Judgment or Recovery of the Annuity*; therefore, tho' the Fine was acknowledged by the Prior without the Covent, yet the Plaintiff ſhall Recover the Annuity, and the Church is bound by the Judgment, quod nota, and ſo ſee that a *Prior by his Fine without the Covent may charge the Church* in Perpetuity of a Thing which *had Eſſe* before. *Contrary of a Thing newly Granted by him by Fine*, nota a Diverſity. Br. Charge pl. 8. cites 12 H. 4. 11. 21.

2. If *Diſſeiſee* levies a Fine *to a Stranger* the Diſſeiſor ſhall have the Benefit of it. Noy. 59. in Caſe of Hart v. Amerideth.

Mar. 105. Contra.—per Popham & Gawdy J. Goldsb. 162. pl. 96.——If Diſſeiſee *declares the Uſes to Conuſee*, it ſhall be to the Conuſee's Uſe only, and not to the Diſſeiſor's; but otherwiſe if no Uſe is declared; For then it would be to the Uſe of the Diſſeiſor and extinguiſh the Right of Conuſee. Per Bridgman Ch. J. Lev. 128. Hill. 15 & 16 Car. 2. at the Aſſiſes at Southwark. Co. of Peterburgh v. Bludworth.——Per Bramſton Ch. J. accordingly; but by Jones J. that whoever has the Land ſhall have the Advantage of a Fine by Eſtoppel. Jo. 462.——Poph. 65 in Caſe of Harrey v. Farry.——But if the Diſſeiſin be *only at the Election* of Diſſeiſee, 'tis otherwiſe. Cro. C. 305. in Caſe of Blunden v. Baugh.——Or if the Diſſeiſin be *ſecret and unknown to Diſſeiſee*, it ſhall be to the Uſe of the Conuſor. Cro. C. 484. per two Juſtices. Fitzherbert v. Fitzherbert.

3. *Tenant for Life and Remainder-man in Tail joined in a Grant of a Rent-charge in Fee* out of the Land, and then they *joined in a Fine to a Stranger and his Heirs*; the Eſtate of the Rent which was before determinable, is now made abſolute. Winch. 102. Holbeach v. Sambeach.

Hutt. 96. S. C.—Cro. C. 103. Hill. 3. Car. C. B. Holt v. Sambach. S. C.

4. A. by Will *bequeathed* 1000l. *to D. his Neice, payable at* 25 Years of Age, and *charged his Lands with Payment thereof*; D. intermarried with J. T. *her Husband and ſhe, before her Age of* 21, *aſſigned over the ſaid* 1000l. *to W.* for 750*l.* afterwards D. attained her Age of 21, and her Husband and ſhe (an Eſtate Tail being deſcended to her in the ſame Lands) *levied a Fine* and ſuffered a Recovery *of the Lands charged, and declared other Uſes.* It was held, that this was a good Aſſignment, and that the ſubſequent Fine did not hurt it. Trin. 1731. 2 Wms's Rep. 601. 607. D. of Chandos v. Talbot.

(L. a. 2) *Enure.* How. *By Eſtoppell.*

But if ſhe, who takes by the Fine, be *examined*, ſhe ſhall be eſtopped to claim a better Eſtate, as it ſeems. Br. Fines, pl. 51. cites 8. H. 6. 4.

1. IF a Fine be levied *to a Feme Covert*, of Land in which ſhe had a *better Eſtate before the Fine*, the Fine ſhall not conclude her to claim it. Weſt. S. 15. cites 3 H. 6. 42. 41 E. 3. 7. 50 E. 3. 9. 24 E. 3. 62.

Br. Eſtoppel, pl. 60. cites S. C. per Hank.

2. If a *Fine ſur Render* be *levied to two*, where the *one is ſeiſed before and at the Time of the Fine*, and the *other hath nothing*; there he who has nothing, has gained joint Poſſeſſion with the other by Concluſion; per Hank. Br. Fines pl. 35. cites 8 H. 4. 8.

3. If *two are ſeiſed in Fee*, and a *Stranger levies a Fine to them and to the Heirs of one*; in this Caſe, the other ſhall be Eſtopped to claim other Eſtate than for Life. Br. Eſtoppel, pl. 92. cites 15 E. 4. 28. per Catesby.

But if the *Tenant accepts a Fine of a Stranger* for Life, or in Tail, *and after dies without Heir*; now the Ld. ſhall be concluded (as I think) For how he claims Eſtate in the Land under the Eſtate of the Tenant who was concluded Co. R. on Fines 16.

4. If there be *Lord and Tenant* by Knight's Service, and a Stranger levies a Fine to the Tenant in Tail, to hold to him and his Heirs; in this Caſe, Herle ſaid, that the Lord ſhall be concluded; becauſe he is not a meer Stranger, but is Privy in Law. But this is not Law, (as I think) for no Man ſhall be Eſtopped, but *only Parties and Privies in blood*, as Heirs; *or* Privies *in Eſtate*, as thoſe who have derived any Eſtate out of the Eſtate of him that is Eſtopped; For Privies in Law, as the Lord is, ſhall not be Eſtopped, having regard to his Seigniory; For in reſpect of this he is wholly a Stranger; For he does not claim the Land, but a Thing out of the Land. Co. R. on Fines 16.

5. And Note, that as well *he who claims* Eſtate *en le Poſt* ſhall be concluded, as he who claims the Land *en le Per, if he claims the Eſtate in the ſame thing*, upon which the Concluſion is made; *as* if a Feme be ſeiſed of Land in Fee, and be Eſtopped, and after ſhe takes Baron and has Iſſue, he ſhall be Eſtopped alſo. Co. R. on Fines 17. cites 8 Aſſ. p. 33. Br. Fines 73. 21 E. 3. 3. 5.

6. Eſtoppel *is reciprocal* of both Sides; For he, that ſhall not be concluded by a Record, or other Matter of Eſtoppel, ſhall not conclude another by it; and yet in our Books *the King* eſtopped the Succeſſor to ſay, that M. had nothing in the Land, by reaſon that M. held of the King, and levied a Fine to his Predeceſſor Sur Conuſance de droit come ceo, &c. and tho' the King was a Stranger to it and had Nothing but the Seigniory out of the Land, yet the King took Advantage of this Eſtoppel. Quære the Reaſon of this Caſe; For this ſeems * to be the Prerogative of the King, of which I ſhall not ſpeak; but otherwiſe 'tis in the Caſe of a Common Perſon, as 22 E. 3. 17. and 40 E. 3. 30. are agreed. See 41 E. 3. per Finch, that *a Stranger* ſhall be concluded by a Fine levied Sur Conuſance de droit come ceo, &c. Co. R. on Fines 17.

* *Orig.* (d'eſtate.)

Cro. E. 610. Paſch. 40 Eliz. B. R. Hunt v. King

7. The Statute of 4 H. 7. and 32 H. 8 *extends* to Fines levied by Concluſion, and ſhall bind the Eſtate Tail, tho' Partes finis nihil habuerunt; *as* if *Tenant in Tail make Feoffment in Fee, or be diſſeiſed*, and after *levies a Fine* with Proclamations *to a Stranger*, this ſhall bind the Eſtate Tail

Tail, and the Iſſues in Tail are barred for ever. 3 Rep. 90. cites it as Reſolved by all the Juſtices in C. B. in Ld Zouche's Caſe.

8. A *Fine* may be by Way of Concluſion, tho' neither Conuſor nor Conuſee have any Thing in the Land at the Time; but if they *Purchaſe it after*, the Conuſee ſhall have the Land againſt the Conuſor who purchaſed it afterwards; per Jones J. and granted by Barkley J. Jo. 495. Trin. 14 Car. B. R. in Caſe of Edwards v. Rogers.

If *none of the Parties have any Thing at the Time* of the Fine, then it is a Fine by Concluſion between the Parties; but all *Strangers may avoid it* by the Averment of Partes Finis nihil &c. Br. Fines pl. 109.

9. *A. made a Feoffment* to the Uſe of *himſelf for Life, and after the Death of him and M. his Wife*, to the Uſe *of B.* (eldeſt Son of A.) *for his Life, and after the Death of A. M. and B.* to the Uſe *of B. and the Heirs Male of his Body*, and for default of ſuch Iſſue, to the Uſe *of the Heirs of B.*—*B. had Iſſue a Daughter*, and then by Fine and Indenture *granted to G. for 500 Years.* B. dies; M. dies; A. ſtill living; upon a Reference out of Chancery to the Lord Ch. J. Hale, and after hearing the Arguments of Counſel, his Lordſhip was of Opinion, that the Eſtate as above limited to B. was a Contingent Remainder; and that the Eſtate which cometh to the Heir upon the happening of the Contingency feeds this Eſtoppel; and then the Eſtate by Eſtoppel becometh an Eſtate in Intereſt, and ſhall be of the ſame Effect, as if the Contingency had happened before the Fine levied. January 3, 1672. Pollex. 55. 65 and 66. Weale v. Lower.

(L. a. 3) Enure. How. By Eſtoppel, Pleadings.

1. A Man has Iſſue M. by his firſt Feme; ſhe dies; and he takes another Feme, Iſabel by Name, and *enfeoffed A. who by Fine gave back to the Baron and Sibel his Feme* (where *his Feme is Iſabel*) *in Tail*, the *Remainder to the Right Heirs of the Baron*; he *dies without Iſſue by Iſabel*; M. enters as Heir, and Iſabel ouſts her. *M. brings Aſſiſe*, and *Iſabel pleads that her Name was Sibel, and* pleads *the Fine to the Aſſiſe*, and it was found that ſhe had to name Iſabel; and it was awarded, that M ſhould recover; and ſo Note, that the Fine is not good by a contrary Name. And after Iſabel, by Name of Sibel, brought Scire facias againſt M. and had Execution by Default, and M. brought Aſſiſe, and per G. Scrope, the ſaid Feme Plaintiff may plead the Fine by Concluſion againſt M. to ſay that the Name of the Feme is Iſabel, becauſe the Fine was levied by Name of Sibel, and becauſe *the Father of M. whoſe Heir ſhe is, was Party and took by the Fine*, * *affirming the Name of his Feme to be Sibel*, and that upon this Plea M. ſhall be barred of the Aſſiſe; it ſeems that this is good Law. Br. Fines pl. 72. cites 1 Aſſ. 11.

* *Jointly with the Feme.* Br. Eſtoppel, pl. 113. cites S. C. & 3 Aſſ. 4.

2. A Man levied a Fine *Sur Grant and Render* (which is Executory) *of Land, of which he had Nothing at the Time if the Fine*, and *after purchaſes the Land*, he ſhall render Execution thereof, and cannot confeſs it and avoid; it becauſe he had Nothing at the Time of the Fine; but ſhall be Eſtopped by the Fine, per Tanke and Finch. But per Finch *Contra* of a Fine *Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo*, &c. for this is Executed, and there it ſuffices to *ſay, that after the Fine his Anceſtor was ſeiſed and died ſeiſed*, and he entred as Heir. But Kirton ſaid that it ſhall be a good Voidance of the Fine Sur Render, but not of the Fine Sur Conuſance de droit come ceo, &c. Quære, for moſt think the Opinion of Finch. to be marvellous, and *it ſeems that the one Fine, and the other ſhall be Eſtoppel.* Br. Eſtoppel, pl. 41. cites 46 E. 3. 5.

3. Note, that a *Fine Sur Releaſe, levied by J. N. to the Baron and Feme, and to the Heirs of the Baron*, is no *Eſtoppel to the Feme after the Death of her Baron, to ſay, that ſhe never had any Thing of the Leaſe of J. N.* For a Fine Sur Releaſe does not prove a Leaſe to her, but rather that ſhe was Tenant at the Time of the Fine; for otherwiſe a Releaſe cannot Enure to them,

them, unleſs they had Seiſin before; quod Nota, per Cur. Br. Eſtoppel, pl. 200. cites 50 E. 3. 6. 7.

Br. Eſtoppel, pl. 60. cites S. C. and that it was held by Hank & Gaſcoigne and Others that it is a Diſcontinuance; becauſe it was *levied to him who had the Poſſeſſion*, and therefore *he cannot otherwiſe execute the Fine*, and that by the Statute W. 2. which ſays, that Fines ipſo Jure ſit Nullus, it is yet a Diſcontinuance, and that the Statute of Averment of Continuance of Poſſeſſion againſt Fines made 22 E. 1. was 11 Years after the Statute of W. 2. and therefore the Iſſue in Tail, not excepted, ſhall be bound by them.——Br. Diſcontinuance of Poſſeſſion, pl. 2. cites S. C and ſays, that the beſt Opinion is, that it is a Concluſion to the Tenant in Tail for his Life, but yet he makes a Quære thereof where all are the words of the Conuſor and he ſays Nothing, &c. But the Iſſue in Tail ſhall not be bound, and that the *Statute of Averment againſt Fines, is of Fee Simple*, and where he *claims as Heir, but in this Caſe he claims per formam Doni*, &c & adjornatur.——† And by Hill. Br. Diſcontinuance of Poſſeſſion, pl. 2. cites S. C.——* *Orig.* (Jeo die rien.)

4. In Aſſiſe, a Fine was levied *to the Tenant in Tail in Poſſeſſion for his Life Sur Grant and Render*, the *Remainder over in Fee to a Stranger*; the *Tenant in Tail had Iſſue and died*; and the *Iſſue entred*; he in *Remainder ouſted him*, and *he brought Aſſiſe*, and the Tenant pleaded the Fine, and the *Plaintiff pleaded the Tail before, and averred the Continuance of Poſſeſſion in his Anceſtor all his Life; abſque hoc, that thoſe who levied the Fine had any Thing at the Time of the Fine, before or after*; and per †Cokine and Firwit, the Fine does not bind the Iſſue in Tail, but per Hank and Gaſcoign contra, & adjornatur. Brook makes a Quære, and ſays, that it is inconvenient that where I am ſeiſed in Fee, or in Tail, a Stranger (I not knowing of the levying of the Fine to me for Life Sur Grant and Render the Remainder over) ſhall make me loſe the Fee Simple, where all is the Act of the Conuſor and * I ſay Nothing; and an Infant ſhall be in the ſame Caſe by ſome, and the beſt Opinion is, that, if it be not a Fine Executed, the Iſſue in Tail is not bound by the Statute de Finibus of Averment; For this is intended of the Eſtate of the Fee Simple, where the Heir claims only by the ſame Anceſtor; but upon Tail he claims by the Gift. Br. Fines, pl. 35. cites 8 H. 4. 8.

5. If there be *Father and Son*, and the *Father levies a Fine of the Manor of D.* and *after purchaſes the Manor*, and the Conuſee enters, and after the Father dies; now (as I think) the Son ſhall be barred. But 'tis good to ſee the Manner and Form of pleading ſuch Caſe. Co. R. on Fines 16.

6. If *in the ſame Caſe* the Son brings an *Action Anceſtrel*, and as Heir, and the Fine be pleaded in Bar, the Son can't ſay *quod Partes Fines nihil habuerunt*; but if the Son enter and be ouſted, and brings Aſſiſe, and the Tenant pleads, that the Father of the Plaintiff was ſeiſed in Fee, and ſo ſeiſed levied a Fine, &c. the Son may ſay, quod Partes Finis nihil habuerunt, *but ſuch a one whoſe Eſtate he hath.* By this way the Plaintiff ſhall be * trick'd; and therefore the ſure way for the Tenant in ſuch Caſe to plead, is to *ſhew all the ſpecial Matter*, how his Father levied the Fine, and after purchaſed the Land; For be the Fine Executory, or executed, the Fine ſhall bar his Heir, as I think. Co. R. on Fines 16.

(* *Orig.* Trie.)

(M. a) *Declaration of Uſes, Good.* In reſpect of the Perſon, *by whom.*

Infant may declare the Uſes of a Fine. 2 Le. 159. pl. 193. 21 Eliz. in the Star-Chamber. Anon.—— And Mr Plowden affirmed, that 't was ſo adjudged in his own Caſe, by which he loſt Lands of 40*l.* a Year.——Arg. 4 Le. 89. ſays, 'twas adjudged Contra, in the Court of Wards.

1. *Bargain and Sale inrolled* by *Infant*, and a *Fine afterwards* levied to the Bargainee come ceo, &c. during his Nonage. 'Twas held that tho' the Indenture was void againſt the Infant, in reſpect of the Thing which ought to paſs by the Deed, yet the Deed indented was but voidable; and then when the Fine was levied upon it, this makes the Bargaine and Sale irrevocable, unleſs by Writ of Error; For the Indenture ſerves to declare the Uſe, and direct the Fine. Dal. 47. pl. 6. 5 Eliz. Anon.

2. Declaration

2. Declaration of the Uſe of a Fine, by a Man in *Dureſs* is good, but per Anderſon Ch. J. Contra. 2 Le. 159. pl. 193. 21 Eliz. in the Star-Chamber, Anon.

3. If *Ideot* levy a Fine and declare Uſes upon it, the Declaration is void, and the Fine ſhall be to his own Uſe, 4 Le. 89. ſays, 'twas ſo adjudged in the Court of Wards. Arg. Goldsb. 13. S. P. — The Law of Uſes and Truſts pag. there cites 2

42. ſays, that a Man Non Sanæ Memoriæ may declare the Uſe of a Fine, and in the Marg Rep. 58. a. but I do not find ſuch Point there.

(N. a) *Declaration Good.* In reſpect of the Perſon *to whom.*

1. USE of the Fine of a *Thing in Grant* cannot be declared to a *Stranger* without Deed; yet it may be averred, that the Uſe was to a Stranger, without ſhewing the Deed, or making mention of it. The ſame Law of Reverſion. Roll. R. 73. Mich. 12 Jac. B. R. Parvis v. Yeaton.

(O. a) Declaration, &c. *good*, in reſpect of the *Manner* of doing it.

1. A Seiſed of a Manor and Advowſon Appendant conveyed it to B. and covenanted for further Aſſurance by levying a Fine, *proviſo, that B. ſhall regrant the Advowſon to A. that he may preſent during his Life*, and if A. dye before any Avoidance, then B. to grant the next Preſentation to the Executors of A. and a *Covenant that all Aſſurances ſhould be to the Uſes of this Indenture*; a Fine was levied Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo, &c. to J. S. who rendered the Rent to A. in Tail, Remainder over; and B. died without making any Regrant to A. The Church avoided, and in Qua. Impedit by A. Judgment was given for him; Becauſe B. in his Life did not perform the Condition, which remains notwithſtanding the Fine, which was with Render of Rent, according to the Agreement between A. and B. ſo that the Fine upon Render ſhall be to the Uſes declared by Indenture as before, and not extinct or determined by it. And. 17. Andrews v. Blunt. And. 230. 2 Rep. 69. b Bendl. 201. —2 And 69. S. C.—Mo. 106. S. C. Mich. 17 & 18 Eliz. Andrew's Caſes. —Jenk. 252. pl. 43.

2. A Declaration of the Uſe, either *expreſs or in Law*, is ſufficient; as if A. Covenants with B. for Money to do all Acts which B. ſhall require for Aſſurance to B. and his Heirs, and then levies a Fine to B. This Covenant and Fine will give B. the whole Land. Hob. 275. Mich. 13 Jac. Clanrickard's Caſe.

3. If a Man makes a *Bargain and Sale*, and the Deed is not *enrolled*, or make a Charter of *Feoffment*, and there is no *Livery*; yet they will be ſufficient to declare the Uſe of a Fine afterwards levied between the ſame Parties. Hill. 9 W. 3. 12 Mod. 163. Jones v. Morley.

4. Before the *Statute of Frauds*, even a *Parol* Declaration of the Uſes of a Fine was good. 4 Mod. 262. Jones v. Morley. And even *ſince* that Statute it may be good by *writing only, without a Seal*, per Holt Ch. J Farr 6. Mich. 1 Annæ. B. R. in Caſe of Shortridge v. Lamplugh.

5. *By* 4 & 5 *Annæ.* 16. §. 15. *Declaration of Uſes or Truſts by Deed, made* after the Fines, or Recoveries *ſhall be good in Law, as if the* 29 *Car.* 2, 3. *of Frauds had not been made.*——See Infra. (R. a)

(P a.) Declaration of Uſes, *good*; notwithſtanding *Variance* as to the *Uſes*.

1. USE imply'd in a Fine ſhall not be *averr'd* againſt the Uſe expreſſed in the Indenture of Uſes. D. 311. b. pl. 84. Paſch. 14 Eliz. Andrews v. Blunt——2. And. 70. Ld Cromwell alias Blunt v. Andrews

2 Rep. 69 b. Hill 43 Eliz. C. B. Lord Cromwell's Caſe.

2. Covenant was to levy a Fine of the Manor with a *Render of Rent in Fee* to the Covenantor and his Heirs, the *Conuſee by Covenantor's conſent Renders in Tail only to the Covenantor*, and *Remainder to J. S. in Fee*; This being by Conſent of the Covenantor, and the Conuſee being only an Inſtrument, Acceptance of the leſs Eſtate by the Covenantor is good, and as if the Fee of the Rent had been rendered to him. Jenk. 252. pl. 43.

3. In the Caſe of declaring the Uſes of a Fine, it is *not always neceſſary, that the Wife's Name be ſet to the Indenture*, which declares the Uſes. per Coke Ch. J. Godb. 180. Trin. 8. Jac. C. B. in Caſe of Bury v. Taylor.

This Writing was only a Deed between the Husband of the one Part,

4. Where there is *a Deed, and a laſt Writing* by Husband and Wife, the laſt Writing, tho' not a Deed, amounts to a ſufficient Declaration of Uſes upon the Fine, being levied * at a *Time different* from the Deed. Cumb. 429. Hill. 9. W. 3. B. R. Jones v. Morley.

and the Wife of the other Part. But the Deed was between them and others. Carth. 410. S. C. ——2 Salk. 677. S. C.——4 Mod. 261. S. C.——Parliament Caſes. 143 S. C. and Judgment affirmed.——* Cart. 5. in Caſe of Davis v. Kemp.

(P. a. 2) Declaration of Uſes, notwithſtanding Variance, *as to the Time* of levying, &c.

*Cro. J. 512. cites 5 Rep. 26. b. Earl of Rutland's Caſe.

1. Where the Deed is, that the Fine ſhall be levied of certain Lands, *by the Name of* 100 *Acres to A. and B.* and that they ſhall grant, and render the ſame in Fee ſimple, which ſhall be to certain Uſes. The Fine is levied of the Land, but ſome * *Variance is in the Number of Acres*, or in the Fine, as where the Fine is *levied to A. only*, who grants and renders the Land, yet it may be *averred* to be to the Uſe of the Indentures, and that there was *no new Conſideration*, or Agreement between the Parties. 2 Rep. 76. Hill. 43. Eliz. C. B. Ld Cromwell's Caſe.

But it may in ſuch Caſe be *averred by Parol to be to other Uſes*. But if the Fine be levied in

2. If A. covenants to levy a Fine before ſuch a Day, tho' the Fine levied *differs from the Indenture* in * Time, Place, Quantity of Acres, or in the Perſon that occupied it; yet, when the Fine is levied, it ſhall be intended to be to the ſame Uſes in the Indenture. Arg. 3 Buls. 251. cites 2 Rep. 69. Ld Cromwell's Caſe.——

all Things purſuant to the Indenture, no Averment can be but by Writing; For in this Caſe, the Indenture *is Directory to the Fine*, and in the other Caſe, it is *but Evidence*. Cro. J. 29. Paſch. 2 Jac. B. R. Counteſs of Rutland v. the Earl of Rutland.

Covenant to levy a Fine within the Year of 100 Acres, the Year expires, and a Fine is levied of 80 Acres. The Fine ſhall be to the firſt Uſe, cited per Coke J. and Montague Ch. J. Cro. J. 512. as the Earl of Rutland's Caſe. 5 Rep. 26. b.——9 Rep. 1. Downam's Caſe.——* Carth. 412. Jones v. Morley.

Carth. 411. S. C. Parl. Caſes. 144. S. C. and P.—— Per Holt Ch. J. He ſhould not plead that the *Uſes were declared by a Deed ſubſequent*. But

3. If a Declaration of Uſes be ſubſequent to a Fine or Recovery, 'tis good; but there may be an *Averment*, that they were to *other Uſes*, but with this Difference, that where the Declaration is ſubſequent, there the Heir of the Conuſor is *eſtopped to aver* other Uſes, but a *Stranger* is not. But where the *Deed is Precedent*, there, neither the Heir nor a Stranger is eſtopped to aver other Uſes, in Caſe the *Fine varies in any Circumſtance*; but if the Fine was levied purſuant to the Deed, no Proof whatſoever, either by Writing or Parol, ſhall be admitted, that the Fine was to other

Uſes

Uſes, than what are contained in the Deed, that being an Eſtoppel to the Parties, per Holt Ch. J. Cumb. 429. Trin. 9. W. 3. B. R. Jones v Morley.

that Recuperario habita fuit, &c. quæ quidem Recuperatio in Forma predict. habita fuit, to ſuch and ſuch Uſes; and, in Caſe of a Deed Precedent, if the Party ſet up other Uſes, he muſt *confeſs and avoid*; and if a Deed ſubſequent be ſet up, the other may traverſe thoſe Uſes. Adjournatur. 2 Salk. 676. Hill. 8. W. 3. B. R. Tregame v. Fletcher.——— 9 Rep. 10. b. Dowman's Caſe.——2 And. 78. cites Vavaſor's Caſe.

4. Where there is a Deed for levying a Fine, but *the Fine is not levied according to the Deed*, other Uſes may be *averred*, tho' thoſe other are declared by Writing, and not by Deed; For, by the Variance, there is Room and Occaſion to enquire, and receive Information, that the old Agreement was relinquiſhed, and by the ſame Reaſon, that the Uſe of a Fine may be declared by Parol, upon an *original Agreement*, it may now; as in this Caſe, where the original Agreement was *relinquiſhed*; yet without ſuch Averment, the Fine ſhall be intended to the Uſe of the firſt Agreement, notwithſtanding the Variance. 2 Salk. 677. Hill. 9 W. 3. B. R. Jones v. Morley.

Carth. 412. S. C.—12 Mod. 159. S. C.—Cro. J. 29. * Counteſs of Rutland v. Earl of Rutland.——1 Rep. 99. b. Arg. in Shelly's Caſe.——* 5 Rep. 26. b. Trin. 12 Jac. B. R. Earl of Rutland's Caſe.

5. A. Covenants *before the End of Eaſter Term*, in Conſideration of the Mariage of B. his Son with M. and a Portion, *to levy a Fine to the Uſe of B. and M. for Life, and to the Heirs of the Body of B. Remainder to C.* the ſecond Son of A. and the Heirs of his Body. A Fine was *levied as of Eaſter Term*, but the Marriage being put off till after Eaſter Term, the *Deed was not executed, nor dated till after Eaſter Term*, ſo that the Fine was levied before the Date of the Deed, and ſo the Deed was no Declaration of the Uſes of that Fine. B. dies, leaving a Son, who Mortgages the Land, and dies without Iſſue. Decreed that the Conſideration of B's Marriage did not extend to C. ſo that C. was no Purchaſor; and as he cannot, by means of the above Defect, maintain an Ejectment at Law, he being only an equitable Remainder-man at beſt, ſo neither will Chancery relieve him, but he muſt diſcharge the Mortgage made by B who was Tenant in Tail in Equity; And any ſuch may, by any Conveyance, bar the Settlement. Mich. 1703. Ch. Prec. 224. Staplehill v. Bully.

Abr. Equ. Caſes 258. (D) pl. 2. S. C.

(Q. a) Where there are *ſeveral Declarations* of the Uſes.

1. FEme, before the 27 H. 8. of Uſes, being ſeiſed of Land, ſuffered a common Recovery, and intending to marry A. B. ſhe, before the Marriage, declared by Indenture that the Feoffees ſhould be ſeiſed *to the Uſe of herſelf and A. B.* whom ſhe intended to marry, *and their Heirs.* The Feoffees executed an Eſtate after the Marriage to the Husband and Wife and their Heirs, in Fee, without any Uſe expreſſed. Afterwards the Baron and Feme *by other Indenture, declare that the firſt Indenture was miſtaken*; For that it *ſhould have been to the Heirs of their two Bodies*, and for Default *to the Heirs of the Wife.* And they Covenant, Bargain, and *agree, to ſtand ſeiſed to the Uſe of* themſelves in Tail, and after, to the right Heirs of the Wife; and the Husband covenanted, if the Wife died without Iſſue, during his Life, that he would execute an Eſtate accordingly. The Wife died without Iſſue, and after the Statute of Uſes the Baron died ſeiſed; and 'twas held, that the *firſt Indenture was corrected by the ſecond*, and the firſt Uſe is ſufficiently altered without Eſtate executed, and the Conſiderations are reaſonable and ſufficient, and adjudged for the Heir of the Wife. D. 307. b. pl. 71. Paſch. 14 Eliz. Vavaſor's Caſe.

And. 261. S. C. cited but adds a Quære if the Feme ſhould be bound, &c. and it ſeems not.

2. Fine by *Grant and Render*; no new Declaration ſhall be to croſs the Grant and Render; but the Regrant in the Fine ſhall amount to a Declaration

Fine with Render may be to a Uſe

expreſſed in Writing. Agreed. Mo. 472. in Caſe of Ld Cromwell v. Andrews.

ration of the Uſe, and it ſhall be intended done by the Procurement of the Conuſor himſelf. Clayt. 94. Jennings v. Chantery.

Carth. 410. S. C. 4 Mod. 261. S. C. Cumb. 429. S. C. Parl. Caſes 143.—

3. A Deed is made declaring the Uſes of a Fine to be levied; afterwards (but before the Fine levied) a *ſecond Deed of Declaration of the Uſes* is made; by Reaſon of this ſecond Deed, other Uſes, than according to the firſt Deed, may be *averred*. 2 Salk. 677. Jones v. Morley.

Two ſeveral Indentures were made Precedent to the Fine of different Uſes, *between different Perſons*; and in a ſubſequent Term, to what the Fine was covenanted to be levied in, the Conuſor *acknowledged two ſeveral Fines the ſame Day, to the different Covenantees*; firſt, to the firſt Covenantees, and after to the ſecond. It was reſolved, that the Uſes cannot be directed by theſe different Indentures, and to make a Commixtion of different Eſtates, tho', perhaps it was the Intention of the Parties; but that the ſecond Declaration controll'd the firſt. 5. Rep. 26. b. Earl of Rutland's Caſe ——————In the Caſe of two Indentures, it may be *averred to which* of the Uſes in the ſecond Indenture the Fine was levied; For the firſt Indenture does not bind the Land, nor create any Uſe, till the Fine is levied; and upon thoſe Indentures it ſtands indifferent, upon which Uſes the Fine was levied. 2 And. 46. Mich. 38 and 39 Eliz.——— S. C. cited. 2 And. 78. per Anderſon Ch. J. in Caſe of Cromwell v. Andrewes.——————Mo. 107. in Andrews's Caſe.————Clayt. 51. Allen's Caſe.

4. If a Fine is levied by Husband or Wife of Lands, which he hath in Right of his Wife, and there is a Deed made at the ſame Time to declare the Uſes thereof, and afterwards this *Deed is loſt*, and then *another* is *made to the ſame Effect, and dated as the firſt*; that Deed is ſufficient to declare the Uſes of the Fine, per Holt Ch. J. Holt's Rep. 735 Mich. 7. Annæ. in Caſe of Buſhell v. Burland.

(R. a) Declarations of Uſes, Good; where made after the Fine or Recovery.

In Dowman's Caſe. Mo. 191, 192. and 9 Rep. 7. b. the Jury found the Deed of Uſes was ſubſequent; but *that the Intent of the Parties, at the Time of* ſuffering the Recovery, *was to the Uſes in the Indenture* declared.——Two, or three, or four Years, or more, after a Fine levied, or Recovery ſuffered, the Uſes may be declared of ſuch Fine and Recovery; but *Leaſes and other Charges made in the mean Time* ſhall ſtand, and the Fine and Recovery ſhall be to the ſaid Uſes, ſubject to the ſaid Leaſes and Charges. Jenk. 212. pl. 50.

1. IF a *Fine* be levied, and an Indenture to lead the Uſe of it be ſealed and delivered *afterwards*, this is not ſufficient to lead the Uſe of the Fine, except it can be *averred*, and proved, that the Conuſor intended, before the Fine levied, to levy it to this Uſe. Quære. Cro. E. 218. Hill. 33. Eliz. B. R. Foſter v. Fountain.

In Ejectment on a ſpecial Verdict, the Caſe in Subſtance was this, viz. A. and B. his Wife levied a Fine, and four Years afterwards declare the Uſes; in which Deed, are the Words following, viz. *All and every Fine and Fines levied or to be levied, ſhall be to the Uſes of this Deed.* Holt Ch. J. delivered the Opinion of the Court, that the Uſes were ſufficiently declared; (the Jury having *found, that the Fine was levied to the Uſes therein declared.*) And that, notwithſtanding the *Statute of Frauds and Perjuries*, a ſubſequent Deed is now as good as it was before the Statute. And that it was *doubtful, whether the Statute extends to Uſes*, becauſe they are not mentioned there, but only *Truſts*; yet that they took Truſts and Uſes to be the ſame, in Reſpect of Truſts in their larger extent, &c. ſo within the Statute of Uſes. Holt's Rep. 733. Mich. 7. Annæ. Buſhel v. Burland ———*And* this Caſe is much ſtronger than Dowman's Caſe; For the Jury there found, that the Deed of Uſes was ſubſequent, and the Queſtion was, whether the Deed was ſufficient to declare the Uſes? And in that Caſe it was objected, that there was a Limitation of the Uſe *without any Impeachment of Waſte*, which cannot be without Deed. At the Time of granting the Reverſion, there was no Deed; but when the Deed came, and declared the Intent of the Party, then it was a ſufficient Manifeſtation of the Uſe, and the Intent of the Party. And it is true, Waſt could not be diſpuniſhable without Deed, but when the Deed came and made good the Uſe, it was well enough. per Holt Ch. J. Holt's Rep. 736. Mich. 7 Annæ. in the Caſe of Buſhell v. Burland.

2. 4 *and 5 Annæ.* 16. *S.* 15. Enacts that *all Declarations or Creations of Uſes or Truſts of any Fines or common Recoveries manifeſted by Deed after the levying or ſuffering thereof ſhall be as good in Law, as if the Act of* 29 *Car.* 2. *cap.* 3. *for Prevention of Frauds or Perjuries had not been made.*

(S. a) Enure.

(S. a) Enure how. Where levied by ſeveral, and the *Uſes* are *declared by one only, or differently by each.*

1. IF *two* * *Jointenants* ſuffer a Common Recovery, and *one only declares* the Uſes, that does not bind the Moiety of the other, unleſs the Conſent of the other to that Declaration be proved. Noy. 77. in Caſe of Argoll v. Cheyney. cites 2 Rep. 57.

So where *Tenant for Life, Remainder in Tail* join in a Common Recovery, in which the Remainder-man in Tail is Vouchee, but the Tenant for Life only declares the Uſes, the Remainder-man being neither Party to the Indenture, nor aſſenting to the Uſes. Noy. 77. Argol v. Cheyney.——————* D. 143. a. pl. 52.

2. If *two Jointenants*, or *two having different Eſtates*, *join* in a Fine, and one declares the Uſe in one Manner, and the other in another Manner, this is good for every one of their Parts; For the Declaration of the Uſe ſhall be directed, and governed according to their Eſtates and Intereſts. Trin. 27 Eliz. 2 Rep. 58. Beckwith's Caſe.

3. If *Baron and Feme*, ſeiſed in Right of the Feme, agree in Limitation of the Uſe of Part of the Land, and vary in the Limitation of the Reſidue of the Land, 'tis *good for Part*, and void for the Reſidue. 2 Rep. 48. Trin. 27 Eliz. Beckwith's Caſe. 4 Le. 88. S. C. by the Name of Blithe v. Colgate.——But if Baron alone declares Uſes, and the Wife * not, it ſhall be to the Uſes declared by the Baron. S. C. cited 2 And. 78.——————Becauſe ſhe did not diſaſſent in her Husband's Life Time. Jenk. 238. pl. 17.——————Mo. 196. S. C adjudged.——————* If ſhe does not diſagree, the Law intends that ſhe conſented thereunto; becauſe ſhe joined in the Fine, per Windham J. Goldsb. 69. in Caſe of Colgate v. Blythe.

If *ſhe does diſagree*, yet the *Baron* by his Declaration, *ſhall be bound as to his Intereſt*, during the Coverture. See Mo. 197. Beckwith's Caſe.——————But after, it ſhall be to the Uſe of the Feme and her Heirs. Jenk. 238. pl. 17.

4. *But* if the *Feme alone declares* the Uſes, the *Aſſent of the Baron ſhall not be intended*, if nothing appears to the contrary, but the Declaration is void, unleſs an Expreſs Aſſent be proved, per Cur. Paſch. 2 W. & M. B. R. Skin. 275. Johnſon v. Cotton.

5. If *Tenant for Life and Reverſioner levy a Fine, and both of them declare ſeveral Uſes*, It ſhall enure according to their ſeveral Intereſts. Noy. 20. ſeems to be Hill. 35 Eliz. in the Caſe of Yelverton v. Yelverton. S. P. Noy. 77. Argol v. Cheyney.

(T. a) Enure, how. Where the Uſes declared are *repugnant*, or ſeemingly ſo.

1. *Baron and Feme* ſeiſed of Lands to them, and the Heirs of the Baron bargain and ſell the Land to J. S. upon *Condition*, that if they or any of them, or the Heirs, Executors, Adminiſtrators or Aſſigns of the Baron, *pay* 500*l.* at ſuch a Day to J. S. that then it ſhould be lawful for the Baron and Feme to *enter and hold in their firſt Eſtate*, and that *after the Payment*, this Indenture and all Fines and other *Aſſurances ſhall be to the Uſe of the Baron and his Heirs*. A Fine was levied to J. S. before the Inrolment of the Deed; the Baron dies, his Wife living; the Heir pays the 500*l.* the Feme ſhall have the Land for her Life, becauſe J. S. was in by the Fine, and not by the Bargain and Sale; and alſo upon the Payment, the Uſe was *reveſted* in the Feme, as was the ancient Uſe before the Fine, and this, by the expreſs Words, in the firſt Part of the Proviſo aforeſaid; and the laſt Part, which appoints the Uſe to the Baron and his Heirs, ſhall be repugnant, and ſo void, or otherwiſe ſhall ſtand in ſuch Conſtruction, that it ſhall be to the ſole Uſe of the Baron for the Reverſion only. Hill. 43 Eliz. Mo. 680. Wilmot v. Knowles.

And when both Clauſes may by any Conſtruction ſtand together, it is to be conſtrued accordingly. And in this Caſe was a Clauſe at laſt, that *all Aſſurances ſhould be to the Uſes contained in the Indenture*, whereof this is one. And if all the Clauſes cannot ſtand together, the firſt ſhall ſtand rather than the laſt. Hill. 42 Eliz. B. R. Cro. E. 744. S. C. by the Name of Southcoat v. Manory.——————Cro. E. 917. S. C.

2. *Two Deeds of Settlement*, the later was contrary to the former, and left out the Limitation to the Heirs Male, the firſt was decreed to ſtand againſt Fine levied to the Uſe of the laſt. 12 Car. 2, fol. 170. Chan. Rep. 192. Bingham v. Huſſey.

(T. a. 2) Uſes well limited, or Enure how; where the *Limitations* in the Fine *vary* from the Limitations in the Deed.

1. A Fine was levied *by Baron and Feme*, and the Cogniſee *rendered* the ſame Lands *to the Baron and Feme, and to the Heirs of the Feme*; and an *Indenture* was made, by which it was *recited, that* the Render *ſhould be to the Uſe of the Baron and Feme, and of the Heirs of the Baron*; the Queſtion was, if the Limitation of the Uſe by Indenture ſhall hold? Dyer Ch. J. thought that it is well enough; For the Indenture ought to rule the Uſe, altho' in the Render be a Uſe implied to their own Uſe.——Per Brown J. the Poſſeſſion is transferred to the Uſe by the Statute, and therefore a Uſe cannot be expreſſed upon a Uſe. As Feoffment to J. S. to his own Uſe, and that he ſhall be ſeiſed to the Uſe of R. H. this is void to R. H. becauſe the Uſe and Poſſeſſion was to J. S before. And ſo if a Man bargains and ſells the Land for Money, and limits an Uſe upon it, 'tis void. But here the Render, of Neceſſity, muſt be to the Heirs of one of them, and for ſo much, no Uſe is implied. Weſton held to the ſame Intent, for there is not any Uſe implied upon a Fine, no more than upon a Feoffment, by which they thought the Limitation over good enough; Dyer ſaid, if the Render be made in Tail, the Cogniſee is ſeized of the Reverſion to his own Uſe. Quod Bendlows and other Serjeants conceſſerunt. Mo. 45. pl. 138. Mich. 5 Eliz. Anon.

2. By the Rule of Law, a *general Covenant* directs the ſpecial Uſes of a Fine, and the ſpecial Operation of theſe is by the General Covenant, and according to the Intent of the Parties; and this is proved by 6 R. 2. Fitz. tit. Eſtoppel. Placito. 2. A *Feoffment* was *to two and their Heirs* by Deed, and a Fine to be levied; which is [was levied] to them, and *the Heirs of one of them*; this ſhall be to the Heirs of both of them; which Caſe is put 2 Rep. 74. b. in the Ld **Cromwell's Caſe**; where 'tis ſaid that the Precedent Feoffment ſhall rule and direct the ſubſequent Fine, and preſerve the joint Eſtate in them of Fee Simple, againſt the expreſs Limitation of the Fine; and the Fine ſhall be ruled, and *directed according to the precedent Agreement*, and Eſtate made by the Parties. 3 Buls. 256. Mich. 14 Jac. in Caſe of Havergill v. Hare,

[See (O. a) Andrews v. Blunt.]

(U. a) *What Eſtate* ſhall *paſs* by the Declaration.

Without mentioning any Eſtate in particular this is an Eſtate for Life; For it is *as a Grant.* Jenk. 332. pl. 65.

1. A Fine was levied, and the Indenture declared the Uſe to be *to the Wife of J. S.* It was adjudged in C. B. to be an Eſtate for Life, and Judgment affirmed in B. R. tho' 'twas not expreſſed to be for Life. For per Doderidge J. tho' the Fine be but as a Grant, yet an *Eſtate for Life* may paſs. Hill. 16 Jac. B. R. Cro. J. 525. Egerton's Caſe.

(W. a) *Enure*

(W. a) *Enure* how. Where the *Lands* lie *in ſeveral Vills.*

1. A PARISH may contain 10 Vills, and if a Fine be levied of *Lands in the Pariſh*, this carries whatſoever is in any of thoſe Vills. If the *Conſtablewick* of the one goes over all the reſt, that is the ſuperiour or Mother Vill, and the Lands which is in the other ſhall paſs *per Nomen* of all the Lands in that; and tho' it be found that A. had a Tythingman, (Decenarius,) which, prima Facie, is the ſame with a Conſtable, and differed little in the Execution of that Office concerning keeping the Peace; yet Hale ſaid, he was not the ſame Officer and 'tis found that the Conſtables of A. have a Superintendency over B. and therefore 'tis but a Hamlet of A. But if found that they had diſtinct Conſtables, and could not interfere in their Authority, it would be otherwiſe. Mich. 23 Car. 2. B. R. Vent. 170. Walden v. Ruſcarrit. Mod. 78. S. C.——1 S. in Caſe of Green v. Proud.

(X. a) *Second Fines.* How they ſhall enure.

1. IN Aſſiſe; *Fine* was levied *to two Femes and to the Heirs of their Bodies*, and *after the Donor, by Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo*, &c. in Writ of Warranty of Charters, *acknowledg'd the Land to both, and the Heirs of the Body of the one* the *Remainder to the other in Tail*; and both have Iſſue and die, and the Iſſue of the eldeſt claims by the Fine, and brought Aſſiſe of all againſt the Baron of the youngeſt, who was Tenant by the Curteſy, and could not recover but only the Moiety. And ſo ſee that this Fine is only as a Confirmation, and ſhall not alter their Eſtates. Br. Diſcontinuance de Poſſeſſion. pl. 28. cites 8 Aſſ. 33.

2. A. levied a Fine to the Uſe of himſelf for Life, Remainder to his Wife for Life, *Remainder to his Executors for* 20 *Years*, Remainder in Tail to B. his Son, Remainder over; afterwards A. levied another Fine *to the ſelf ſame Uſes, leaving out the Eſtate for Years to the Executors.* A. died; Reſolved that the Remainder to the Executors for 20 Years, being in Abeyance, was *extinct* by the ſecond Fine. Mo. 745. Trin. 42 Eliz. Remington v. Savage.

3. A Fine is acknowledged to A. and afterwards a *ſecond* is acknowledged *to B.* If the *firſt is not recorded*, the ſecond Fine is good. But if the firſt had been recorded in Court, in Time convenient, viz. the *next Term*, it had been good, and the firſt merely void. Cro. C. 284. Mich. 8 Car. B. R. in Caſe of Burgaine v. Spurling.

4. A. Tenant in Tail levied a Fine to the *Uſe of B. for the Life of B. with Warranty*; and afterwards he levied *another to the Uſe of himſelf and his Heirs*, with Warranty; and afterwards bargained and ſold the Lands to C. and his Heirs. Adjudged that the firſt Fine thus levied by Tenant in Tail made a *Diſcontinuance*, but 'twas only during the Life of B. For it remains no longer a Diſcontinuance, when the wrongful Eſtate is gone by which 'tis cauſed; that the ſecond Fine did not enlarge the Diſcontinuance; becauſe the Eſtate raiſed by the Fine returned back to the Coniſor, and by Conſequence, the Warranty annexed to it was extinguiſhed. 1 Salk. 244. Hill. 1 Annæ. B. R. Hunt v. Bourne. Lutw. 781. S. C. and Judgment.

(Y. a) By

(Y. a) By Grant and Render. Enure How. *Conſtruction* of ſuch Fines.

1. FINE is levied *reciting, that the Conuſor held certain Land of the Conuſee by 5 Marks*, the *Conuſor acknowledged and rendered 5 Marks Rent to the Conuſee out of his Land*; this is taken to be a *New Rent*, and not the ancient Rent, nor ſhall it have Relation to the Recital. Br. Relation, pl. 33. cites 21 E. 4. 60.

2. Feoffment by Deed, rendering 3*l.* Rent, with Clauſe of Diſtreſs, and Covenant by Feoffor to make further Aſſurance of the Land; Feoffor *levies Fine* to the Feoffee, who *renders 3l. Rent*, adjudged that he may avow for rhe firſt Rent, notwithſtanding the Fine, and that the Render is not a Grant of new Rent, but Confirmation of the old Rent, and the old Rent was preſerved by the Intent of the Fine. Mo. 298. Trin. 32 Eliz. Sherrot v. Holloway.

3. Where there was a *Repugnancy between a third and a fourth Render*, the one limiting the Remainder in Fee to the Conuſor, and the other limiting it to a Stranger, it was reſolved, that what was contained in the third Render, ſhall be of the ſame Condition and Quality in *Conſtruction, as a Charter or other Conveyance between Party and Party*, and need not have ſuch preciſe Form as a Writ or a Judgment. But a Conuſance of a Fine, and a Grant and Render ſhall have ſuch Conſtruction as another Conveyance between Party and Party; For it has Words of Grant and Render, becauſe it is a Conveyance of Record. Trin. 34. Eliz. B. R. 5 Rep. 38. a. b. Tey's Caſe.

S. C. cited 1 Rep. 174. b.

4. If *A. Tenant in Tail, and J. S.* a Stranger, levy a Fine to W. R. a Stranger, who *grants and renders to J. S. for Years rendering Rent to W. R.* and by the ſame Fine grants the *Reverſion to A. and his Heirs*; it is good; and tho' all be by one and the ſame Fine at an Inſtant, yet in Judgment of Law, the Leaſe precedes the Grant of the Reverſion, as is held in 36 H. 8. Br. Fines 118. and ſo was it adjudged upon a Demurrer. 1 Rep. 76. b. cites M. 41 and 42 Eliz. C. B. Rot. 336. White v. White.

5. If Baron and Feme levies a Fine to B. who *renders again for Life*, the *Reverſion remains in the Conuſor* to his own Uſe. Arg. Gouldsb. 68.

2 Salk. 590. Contra. Trin. 7 Annæ. B.R. Abbot v. Burton.

6. *Fine with Grant and Render* is Tantamount to a Feoffment and Refeoffment, and creates a new Eſtate. Paſch. 2 W. & M, B. R. 1 Salk. 337. Price v. Langford.

(Y. a. 2) Fine. Enure. *By Way of Surrender.* In what Caſes.

1. A. and B. *Jointenants, A. for Life*, and *B. in Fee, make Leaſe to J. S. for* Term of his *Life*, and after *J. S.* ſurrenders by Fine *to A.* It ſeems to me, that this is a Surrender, and ſhall enure to both A. and B. as I think. Tamen Quære. Co. R. on Fines 5.

2. *But if J. S.* had granted his Eſtate by Fine *to A.* it ſhall be a *Surrender* in Law *for one Moiety, and a Grant* of his Eſtate *for the other* Moiety, and B. cannot enter into any Part with A. as I think. Co. R. on Fines 5.

(Z. a) Enure. Where Conuſors, or one of them *takes* back *no greater Eſtate than before.*

1. A. Sold Land to the Husband and Wife, and the Heirs of the Husband; afterwards the Husband and Wife levied a Fine to J. S. and J. N. to the Uſe of Husband and Wife during their Lives, Remainder to the Husband in Tail Special, Remainder over. It was held in the Court of Wards, that after the Death of the Husband, the Wife need not ſue out Livery, becauſe the Lands *being originally purchaſed in the Names of the Husband and Wife*, and then they joining in a Fine whereby the Wife had no greater or leſs Eſtate, than ſhe had before, the Eſtate to her by the Fine was no Conveyance for the Advancement of the Wife within the Meaning of the Statute of 32 H. 8. Trin. 15. Jac. Ley 51. Menfield's Caſe.

[See (B. b.) pl. 7.

(A. b) Enure; By Way of *Extinguiſhment.*

1. F. *Eoffment* was made by Indenture *rendering 3l. Rent*, with a Clauſe of Diſtreſs; and the Feoffor *covenants for further Aſſurance* of the Land. The Feoffor levies a Fine to the Feoffee, and *renders 3l. Rent by the Fine*; adjudged, that the Feoffor may avow for the firſt Rent, notwithſtanding the Fine, and that the Render *is not a Grant of a new Rent*, but Confirmation of the old Rent, and the old Rent was preſerved by the Intent of the Fine. Trin. 32 Eliz. Mo. 298. Sherrot v. Holloway.

The like of a *Condition.* Mo. 106. Mich. 17. & 18. Eliz. Andrews's Caſe. ——And. 18. Puttenham's Caſe. ——D. 157. b. 29. Hill. 4 and 5. P. & M. S. C.

2. *A. Tenant for Life, B. and C. Coparceners being Reverſioners in Fee*; A. and B. join in a Leaſe to J. S. of the whole Eſtate, for 21 Years at 10*l.* Rent per Ann. to A. during her Life, and after to B. Afterwards A. B and C. all join in a Fine to W. R. and W. S. to the Uſe of the Husband of B. The Court inclined that A's Eſtate for Life was not ſurrendered by joining in the Fine, nor the Rent extinct. For every one granted what he Lawfully might, tho' twas urged that the Reverſion, to which the Rent was incident, was gone. Cro. E. 285. Trin. 34 Eliz. B. R. Farrar v. Johnſon.

3. If Tenant in Tail makes *Leaſe by Indenture for* 30 *Years*, rendering Rent with *Reentry*, and after, *for further Aſſurance, he demiſes the Land by Fine for* 30 *Years to Leſſee*, rendering the Rent: This is no Surrender of the firſt Leaſe, but a Confirmation, and the Leſſee ſhall hold ſubject to the Rent and Reentry, tho' no Uſe can renew by the Fine being but Demiſe for Years. Arg. Mo. 384 Mich. 36 and 37 Eliz. in Perrot's Caſe.

4. Fine levied by A. and B. to C. with Render of the Land to B. *rendering 5l. Rent*, with Clauſe of Diſtreſs to C. the Conuſee, *Remainder of the Land to* A. and his Heirs; the limiting the Remainder over by C. (to whom the Rent was firſt reſerved upon the Render of the Land in Tail) was Extinguiſhment of the Rent, and cannot go to the Remainder. Mo. 575. Paſch. 41 Eliz. White v. Geriſhe.

Reſolv'd that the Reverſion and Rent paſſed, being by Fine, and that it ſhou'd *enure as ſeveral Fines.* But if one *by Deed* makes a Gift in Tail rendering Rent, Remainder over in Fee; this being by Deed, is a good Reſervation of the Rent to the Donor, and the Remainder only ſhall go to the Stranger; but in a Fine it is otherwiſe, and ſo is the Courſe of Fines, and adjudg'd acc. Cro. E. 727. S. C.——————It ſhall be taken as a Grant in Tail, rendering Rent, and after a Grant of the Reverſion. Ow. 126. S. C. ——1 Rep. 76. S. C. and P. cited, and 174. b. S. C. and P. cited.

The Words were *Quod Tenementa Prædicta remanebunt to A.* It was adjudged a Grant of the Reverſion, and that the Rent paſſed. Ow. 129. White v. Geriſh ——————The Rent paſſes to him, to whom the Word Remainder limits the Eſtate, and it paſſes the Reverſion with the Rent. 2 And 131 pl. 76.

5. If one makes a *Feoffment on Condition*, and afterwards levies a Fine to a Stranger, his Condition is gone. Cro. E. 665. per Coke Attorney General.

6. Fine to the Uſe of himſelf for Life,—Remainder to his Wife for Life—*Remainder to his Executors for* 20 *Years*, Remainder over in Tail, &c. After, he levies *another Fine* to the very ſame Uſes, only *omitting the* 20 *Years to his Executors*; he dies and makes his Wife Executrix. It was reſolved per two Ch. J. that the Remainder to the Executors for 20 Years, being *in Abeyance*, was extinct by the Fine. Mo. 745. Trin. 42 Eliz. Remington v. Savage.

7. A. ſeiſed of Lands acknowledged *a Statute to B.* and afterwards levied a Fine of the Lands to the Uſe of himſelf for Life, and after, as to Part of them, to the Uſe of J. S. in Tail, and of the *Reſidue to B in Fee*, and died. This Purchaſe, in this Manner, is a ſufficient Diſcharge of the Statute. Cro. E 756. Paſch. 42 Eliz. C. B. Humphrey v. Harneage.

8. If the Party, to whom the Eſtate is limited, *is in Poſſeſſion*, ſuch Fine enures by Way of Extinguiſhment of Right. Weſt's Symb 6. S. 20.

9. A. by Indenture of Uſes raiſes an Eſtate in Fee to B. who regrants Turbary to A. by another Deed, and after levies a Fine *to confirm the Eſtate* and Uſes above declared; and 'twas ruled, that this Fine touches nothing upon the Grant to A. of the *Turbary* to extinguiſh it, or otherwiſe hurt it. Clayt. 42. Barton v. Colethirſt.

10. A. upon Marriage, ſettles an *Annuity on his Wife as a Jointure*, to be iſſuing out of D. and afterwards they both join in a Fine *to mortgage Part* of the Lands; but, before the Mortgage, the Mortgagee had Notice of the Annuity, and it was *excepted in the Mortgage*; and it appeared that it was never intended to extinguiſh the Annuity by the Wife's joining, and decreed accordingly, and that ſhe be paid the Arrears. Hill 29. Car. 2. Fin. R. 277. Solly v. Whitfield.

G. Equ. R. 18. Trin. 9 Annæ. S. C. by Name of Shotbolt v. Biſcow.

11. A. on Marriage with B. gave a *Bond for* 600*l. to a Truſtee*, and a Warrant of Attorney to *confeſs Judgment* thereon defeaſanc'd for *Payment of* 300*l. to the Wife, if ſhe ſurvive* the Husband; ſhe afterwards joined with him in a Conveyance by Leaſe and Releaſe and Fine of all his real Eſtate. 'Twas agreed that the Leaſe and Releaſe did not extinguiſh her Intereſt in the Judgment, but the Fine extinguiſhed all her Right in the Land, per Ld Harcourt. Paſch. 1712. Ch. Prec. 333. Goodrick v. Shotbolt.

(A. b. 2) Enure; to make a *Diſcontinuance*. In what Caſes

If *Tenant in Tail, the Remainder in Fee*, levy a Fine, Sur Conuſance de Droit *come ceo*, &c. he in Remainder may aver the Continuance of Poſſeſſion, notwithſtanding the Fine and Statute, becauſe *he is neither the Party nor his Heir*; and ſo may a Feme Covert, where her Husband alone levies the Fine, per Fairfax. Weſt's Symb. S. 191. cites 12 E. 4. 12.

1. 27 *E.* 1. *Stat.* 1. *Cap.* 1. Enacts that *neither Parties to Fines nor their Heirs may plead in Avoidance thereof, that before the levying, and at the levying of the ſame, and ſince, the Demandant or Plaintiff, or their Anceſtors were always ſeiſed of the Lands contained in the Fine, or of ſome Parcel thereof.*

2. The Iſſue in Tail may aver Continuance of Poſſeſſion againſt a Fine *Sur Conuſance de Droit tantum*, or *Sur Render*, *but not* againſt a Fine Sur Cognizance de Droit come *ceo que* il ad de ſon done; becauſe that Fine is executed, and the other executory. Weſt's Symb S. 191. cites 12 E. 4. 15 and 19. 11 H. 4. 85.

3. *A. B. and C. Coparceners* of a Manor; *A. infeoff'd J. S.* of his Part, to the *Uſe of himſelf for Life*, and after his Deceaſe, to the Uſe of *his eldeſt Son and Heir apparent in Fee.* And after *A. levied a Fine de Tertia Parte* 200 Acrarum Terræ, 400 Acrarum Paſturæ, &c. (amounting to more Acres than the whole Manor contained) *Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo*,

ceo, &c. *with Warranty of him and his Heirs*, and *retook by the ſame Fine for his Life only*, and then died, and his Son entered. The Queſtion was, if the third Part of the ſaid Acres be ſevered from the Manor by this Fine againſt the Heir, or that againſt this Fine, it ſhall be taken, that he had a continual Poſſeſſion and Continuance of Seiſin ante Finem, Tempore Finis, & poſt Finem, &c. in the Tenement for Term of Life? It was held ſtrongly by Plowden, Bromley Sollicitor, and Lovelace, that this Averment by him in Remainder, who was a *Stranger to the Fine* ſhould be received, *Quia neque Pars Finis nec Partium Hæres, &c.* But Dyer, Saunders, Manwood, Southcote, Harper, and Catlin, held the Law clear contrary, and that ſuch Fine amounted to a Feoffment of Record, which makes Diſcontinuance of the Remainder or Reverſion. D. 333. b. 334. a. pl. 30. Paſch. 16. Eliz. Anon.

4. If a Fine be *levied to a Tenant in Tail*, and he grants and *renders* the Land *to him and his Heirs*, and *dies before Execution*, this is no Diſcontinuance; otherwiſe it is if it had been executed *in the Life of* Tenant in Tail. Co. Litt. 333 b.

5. *A. Tenant for Life, Remainder in Tail to B.*—*B.* levies a *Fine to A. and to A's Husband* upon a Conceſſit Tenementa to the Baron and Feme *for the Life of A.* and dies after Proclamations. Reſolved, that it was not any Diſcontinuance or Bar of the Entail, but during the Life of Tenant for Life; nor is it any Bar or Alteration of the Entail after that Eſtate determined. Cro. J. 40. Mich. 2 Jac. in Court of Wards. The Earl of Rutland's Caſe.

6. If Tenant in Tail *accepts a Fine with render to another for Years*; this ſhall bar him, becauſe it works a Diſcontinuance, but otherwiſe where it is for Life, per Hutton J. Winch 123.

7. The Statute De Donis ſays, that a Fine ſhall be *Ipſo Jure nullus*. The meaning is not, that it ſhall be abſolutely void; but only that it ſhall not be a Fine to bar the Iſſue; For it is a Fine to make a Diſcontinuance, &c. Arg. 10. Mod. 179.

(B. b) By *Baron or Feme* ſingly.

1. HUSBAND *and Wife Tenants in Special Tail. Husband aliens by Fine and Deed inrolled.* If this bars the Heir, is left a Quære? Mo. 28. pl. 90. where, ſome hold that 32 *H.* 8. 28. provides only for the Eſtate of the Wife, and not of the Heir, others the contrary. T. 3. El. Anon.

Husband and Wife Tenants in Special Tail. Husband levies a Fine with Proclamations, and dies—Wife enters.—The Iſſue in Tail is barred.—But if the *Wife enters* after the Death of her Huſband, and *before the Proclamations paſs*, the Iſſue is not bound by the Fine. Le. 260. 18 Eliz. B. R. in Caſe of Manning v. Andrews.———Kelw. 205. b. pl. 7. Contra.—213. b. Contra. tho' the Eſtate was in Truſtees.——He cannot claim as Heir to both; For by the Father he is barred. Arg. Godb. 312. cites 8 Rep. 72.

2. Husband and Wife *Donees in Special Tail.* The *Husband alone levies a Fine* of the Lands. 'Twas held, that if the Proclamations be made in his Life Time, or before the Wife, by her Entry, had avoided the Fine, the Iſſue ſhould be barred; otherwiſe, if the Husband had died before the *Proclamations paſſed*. 4 Le. 2. Trin. 8 Eliz. Manning v. Andrews. ———The Heir is bound by the Statute 32 H. 8. of Fines, which does not bind the Wife. But Quære what Eſtate the Wife ſhall have, when the Son of their 2 Bodies ſhall not inherit? And. 39. pl. 101. Anon.—Bend. 225. S. C. Mich. 16 Eliz.———* She is Tenant in Tail, but if ſhe make Feoffment, her Feoffee ſhall not have it; For the Feoffment of the Baron had diſpoſed of the Fee Simple, and took away the Poſſibility of the Wife. Litt. R. 29. in Beck's Caſe, cites 9 Rep. 139. Beaumont's Caſe.

She continues Tenant in Tail, and may make Leaſe for 3 Lives or Years, and the Conuſee has nothing in her Life, per Hobart Ch. J. Jo. 40. cites 9 Rep. 140. b. Greenly's Caſe.———

* After the Fine levied by the Baron, the Feme is not Tenant in Tail, but is like to a Tenant in Tail after

after Poſſibility of Iſſue extinct. Arg. 2 Roll. R. 427. in the Serjeant's Caſe —The Iſſue is totally and finally barred, and ſo are the Caſes, 18 Eliz. D. 351 & 269. & Beaumont's Caſe; yet the Entail remains to the Wife in Right, as to herſelf, and to all Eſtates and Remainders depending upon it; and to all the Conſequences of Benefit to herſelf, and to others by her, as long as ſhe lives, as amply as if the Fine had not been levied. Hob. 257. in Caſe of Duncomb v. Wingfield.—Per Omnes J. The Heir ſhall be barred; For he cannot claim by the Gift in Tail; Becauſe, when he makes Conveyance to himſelf, he muſt make himſelf Heir as well to the Father as the Mother; and this he is eſtopped to do by the Fine; and tho' the Feme might have entered, this was by Reaſon of the Statute, and not by Force of the Tail; and the *Right given by the Statute does not deſcend to the Heir by the Mother, but only the Right of the Entail, which deſcends from both.* Dal. 50. pl. 16. Trin. 18 Eliz.——Kelw. 205. b. pl. *. S. P.———Mo. 28. pl. 90. S. P.—D. 351. b. pl. 24. Trin. 18 Eliz. Anon.

3. *Feme was Deviſee for* 30 *Years* of the Occupation and Profits of a Term if ſhe ſo long ſhould live a Widow; and after her Widowhood the Remainder to B. his Son. She enters, and the *Reverſioner*, by Indenture, *granted, &c.* the ſaid Tenement *to the Feme and her Heirs.* The *Reverſioner and his Feme levied a Fine to the Uſes aforeſaid*, and afterwards the Feme married. Reſolved that the Wife of the Reverſioner is concluded of her Right of Dower, by the Declaration of the Uſes of the Fine by her Husband only, which was after levied by them jointly, becauſe *no Contradiction of the Feme* appears, that ſhe did not agree to the Uſes declared by the Husband by his Indenture ſolely. Trin. 28 Eliz. C. B. Ow. 6. Haverington's Caſe.

4. *Baron and Feme exchanged* the Lands of the Feme, which Exchange was executed, and they levy a Fine of the Lands taken in Exchange. Per Rhodes & Windham J. the Feme, after the Death of her Baron, may *enter into her own Lands*, notwithſtanding the Fine; and Judgment for the Feme. Le. 285. pl. 386. Hill. 28 Eliz. C. B. Anon.

5. *Feme, without her Huſband*, levies a Fine of her Land as a Feme Sole; the ſame ſhall bind her after the Coverture, if the Husband do not enter on the Conuſee during the Coverture, and interrupt the Poſſeſſion gained by the Fine. per Periam J. Le. 82. Paſch. 29 Eliz. C. B. Zouch v. Bamfield.

6. *Baron Tenant for Life*, Remainder *to the Heirs of the Body of the Wife, by the Baron to be begotten*; they have Iſſue a Daughter; the Wife dies; a Fine by the Baron only is no Bar to the Daughter. Yelv. 131. Trin. 6 Jac. B. R. Repps v. Bonham.

7. A. and his Wife were *ſeiſed in Special Tail, Remainder to A. in Fee*; A. alone levied a Fine to King E. 6. in Fee, which Eſtate came to B. in Fee; A. having Iſſue, died; his Wife enter'd; B. confirm'd the Eſtate in the Wife, Habendum to her, and the Heirs of the Body of her and her Husband. And it was ruled that the Confirmation wrought nothing, becauſe ſhe had as great an Eſtate before; and alſo the Iſſues could not be made inheritable, which were before barred by their Father's Fine, and the Eſtate Tail, as againſt them, lawfully given to another. And it was further reſolved by way of Admittance, that *if the Remainder in Fee had not been to A. himſelf, but to a Stranger*; the Entry of the Wife had reſtored that Remainder to the Stranger, and had left nothing in the Cogniſee, but a meer Poſſibility; ſo ſhe hath the Tail not only for herſelf, but to the Benefit, and Advantage of other Eſtates, growing out of one Root with his. And yet during the Life of A. the Entail had been barred, and all had been in the Cogniſee; and the Wife had had nothing but a Poſſibility. Hob. 257. cites 9 Rep. 140. Paſch. 10 Jac. in the Court of Wards. Beaumond's Caſe.

8. If Land be *Specially entailed to A. and his Wife*, the *Remainder to B.* in Tail; the *Remainder to C. in Fee*; and A. the Husband levies a Fine alone to D. in Fee, and dies, leaving Iſſue, and the Wife enters; ſhe is in of her Eſtate in Tail, and *her Entry* alſo *remits B. and C.* to their ſeveral Remainders, and hath put D. out of his whole Eſtate. And therefore I am clear of Opinion, that the Wife in that Caſe *may ſuffer a common Recovery* againſt herſelf, as Tenant in Tail, and vouch the common Vouchee; and that ſhall bar the old Remainders of B. C. For ſhe cannot be ſaid to be in

of

of other Eſtate at all, much leſs to them. If the Wife after ſuch common Recovery paſſed againſt her die, leaving Iſſue by her Husband; now D. is to have the Land (as hath been ſaid) neither can the Recovery had againſt her, hurt him; For *as to him, ſhe was eins de autre Eſtate*, and therefore the Value can't come to him. And if ſhe had come in as a Vouchee, yet it could not have hurt D. For his Eſtate and hers never ſtood together, nor had Dependance the one upon the other. And he had his Eſtate divided from hers, and by contrary means; tho' both out of the Root of the Entail, per Hobart Ch. J. Mich. 16 Jac. Hob. 259. in Caſe of Duncombe v. Wingfield.

(B. b. 2) *Amendment* of Fines and Common Recoveries, and of Writs relating thereto.

1. *Scire facias upon a Fine levied by King E. 2. Reddendo eidem Regi & Hæredibus ſuis 10 s. per Annum Tenendum de nobis & Hæredibus noſtris*, where it *ſhould be of E. 2. quondam Rege & Hæredibus ſuis*; and becauſe it was a Writ Judicial, therefore it was not abated. Br. Amendment. pl. 104. cites 39 E. 3.

2. *Scire facias upon a Fine*, which *was to him and his Heirs Male*, and the *Mittimus was, ad Proſecutionem J. T. conſanguinei & Hæred'* without (Maſcul';) and it was doubted, if it may be amended. Br. Amendment. pl. 48. cites 9 E. 4. 15.

But where Land was *given by Fine to Baron and Feme, and to the Heirs of their Bodies*, and *Certiorari* iſſued to remove the Record out of the Treaſury into the Chancery, and now it came into C. B. by Mittimus; and the Plaintiff brought *Scire facias* upon it, *as Heir to the Baron and Feme of their Bodies*; and *in the Mittimus, he made himſelf Heir to the Baron only*; and *in the Scire facias he had made himſelf Heir to the Baron and Feme*; the Opinion was that the Scire facias ſhould abate; For the *Fine warrants the Mittimus*, and the *Mittimus warrants the Scire facias*, and therefore they *ought to agree*. And per Vaviſor, Reade and Fineux it ſhall be amended, becauſe it is *founded upon Record*. *Contra* of Scire facias, which is *founded upon Surmiſe*; note the Diverſity. Br. Amendment. pl. 63. cites 9 H. 7. 1. S.

3. 23 *Eliz. cap.* 3. §. 10. Enacts that *none of the Fines or Recoveries heretofore levied, paſſed, or ſuffered, which ſhall be exemplified under the great Seal according to the Form of this Act, ſhall, after ſuch Exemplification had, be in any wiſe amended.*

4. 27 *Eliz. cap.* 9. §. 10. Enacts that *no Fines or Recoveries heretofore levied, paſſed or ſuffered; which ſhall be exemplified under any Judicial Seal of any the Shires of* Wales, *or Town or County of* Haverford-Weſt, *or under the Seal of any of the* Counties Palatine, *ſhall after ſuch Exemplifications had, be in any wiſe amended.*

5. The *Return of the Writ of Covenant* was *Oct. Purif.* 31 *H.* 8. and in Truth was *ingroſſed Trinit. Sequent.* but was entered thus, viz. *& poſt Conceſſ. & Recordat. in Craſtin. Sanctæ Trin. Anno* 30 *H.* 8. where it ſhould be 32 *H.* 8. And upon this, Writ of Error was brought and pending the Writ of Error, by the Reſolutions of Wray, Gawdy, Clench and Shute Juſtices of B. R. Sedente Curia, the Record was amended in his Verbis; (*Et poſtea Conceſſ. Craſtino Trinit.* 32.) 5 Rep. 44. cited as Mich. 27 & 28 Eliz. Kettle's Caſe.

At the Foot of the Fine a *Proclamation* was *indorſed* to have been made 30 *July* which was *after the End of Trinity Term*. A Writ of Error was brought, and this aſſigned for Error. But it was amended by the Court according to the Note of the Fine, which was 30 *Junii*. 5 Rep. 44 b. cited as Mich. 38 & 39 Eliz. C. B. Down's Caſe.

6. In a Formedon, the Tenant pleaded a Fine with Proclamations; the Demandant replied, Nul tiel Record; and the Truth of the Caſe was, that the *Record* of the Fine, *which remained with the Chirographer*, did warrant the Plea; but that, which remained *with the Cuſtos Brevium*, did not warrant it; and both theſe Records were ſhewed to the Court. And Rhodes J. cited a Preſident 26 Eliz. Where, by the Advice of all the Juſtices of England, where ſuch Records *differ*, the Record, remaining with the Cuſtos Brevium, was amended and made according to the

5 Rep. 44. a. cites Trin. 26 El. Dowling's Caſe. —3 Le. 106 pl. 167. Trin. 26 Eliz. B. R. Ragg v. Bowley

Record remaining with the Chirographer. Which Windham conceſſit. And afterwards, the ſaid Precedent was ſhewed, in which were ſet down all the Proceedings in the Amending of it, and the Names of all the Juſtices, by whoſe Direction the Record was amended, particularly; and that the ſaid Precedent was written, and the Amendment of the ſaid Record, entered, by the Commandment and Appointment of the ſaid Juſtices in perpetuam rei Memoriam. And the Reaſon which induced the ſaid Juſtices to make ſuch Order, is there written; Becauſe they took it, that the *Note, remaining with the Chirographer*, eſt *Principale Recordum*. 3 Le. 183. pl. 234. Mich. 29 Eliz. C. B. Anon.

So two Fines were amended, and inſtead of Civitate Ebor, were made *Ebor.*

7. The Records, before Amendment, were *in Com' Suſſex*; but were amended and made *Kanc.* as the Truth was. 5 Rep. 44. b. cited as the Caſe of Payn v. Covert.

5 Rep. 44. b. cites Mich. 33 & 34 Eliz.

8. A. levied a Fine to B. of *the Manor of D. and* 1000 *Acres of Land, &c.* according to the uſual Form of Fines, which were valued at 20 Marks a Year; ſo that the Fine in the Hamper was 1 *l.* 6 *s.* 8 *d.* and conſequently the Fine *Pro Licentia Concordandi* or poſt Fine was 40 *s.* in the whole, and yet the Clerk entred the King's Silver or Poſt-Fine thus, *B. dat. Dominæ Reginæ* 40 *s. pro Licentia Concordandi &c. in Placito Conventionis of* 1000 *Acres of Land, &c.* and purſued all the other Words, only that he *omitted the Manor*. It was aſſigned for Error, that the King's Silver was not paid as well for the Manor as for the Tenements; but becauſe it appeared, upon Examination and View of all the Parts of the Fine, on a Motion to the Court of C. B. for Amendment of this Fine, that it was only the *Miſpriſion of the Clerk* that entered the King's Silver, and that the ſaid Sum of 40 *s.* in Verity was the Fine, as well for the Manor as for the Reſidue; and always the Value entered upon the Back of the Writ of Covenant is the Warrant for the Entry of the King's Silver; and tho' the Tranſcript of the Fine was removed by Writ of Error; yet ſince the Body of the Record remained with them, they unanimouſly reſolved that the ſaid Entry ſhall be amended, and ſhall be *made* in the Writ *de Conventione of the Manor aforeſaid, &c. and of all the Acres, &c.* as it ought to be. And after, upon Diminution alledged in the Omiſſion of the ſaid Manor in the Entry of the King's Silver, the Writ was directed to this Purpoſe to the Ld Anderſon, who, one Day this Term, moved all the Juſtices of Serjeant's Inn in Fleetſtreet to know their Opinions concerning the ſaid Amendment in this Caſe, pending the ſaid Writ of Error. And it was reſolved by Popham Ch. J. of Eng. Periam Ch. Bar. Clerk, Walmſley, Fenner, Owen and Ewyns, that the ſaid Entry of the King's Silver ſhould be amended; and this pending the Writ of Error. 5 Rep 43. b. 44. a. Mich. 38 & 39 Eliz. Bohun's Caſe.

9. *Alſo* where the Writ of *Covenant* ſhould be *Teſte meipſo*, the Writ was *Dede meipſo*, which was inſenſible and vitious; and this was alſo amended by all their Opinions. Mich. 38 & 39 Eliz. 5 Rep. 44. Bohun's Caſe.

10. The Certificate of the Note of the Judge, &c. was thus—In *Præcipe de duabus Partibus Rectoriæ*, & duabus Partibus. Tenement, by Miſtake of the Clerk who wrote the Concord, the *Cognizance* was *Partem ultimam quam, &c.* But *the Foot* of the Fine, *and the Note* in the Hands of the Chirographer, *were* right, viz. *Partes quas*, ut illas quas, &c. and by theſe the Certificate of the Judge was amended, pending a Writ of Error, which had been brought in B. R. Upon which the Plaintiff in Error moved the Court of C. B. that the Fine ſhould be made in Statu Quo, as it was before the Amendment; but all the Court denied the Motion, and directed that the Amendment ſhould ſtand, tho' made after the Writ of Error brought. 5 Rep. 44. cited as Hill. 38 Eliz. C. B. Morgan's Caſe.

11. In

11. In the Writ of Covenant, and the Note and Foot of the Fine, the Village was *Calehurſt*, but was amended by the Court, and made *Salehurſt* according to the Acknowledgment to the Judge, which was right. 5 Rep. 44. b. cited as Wealch's Caſe.

12. In a Writ of Error to reverſe a Fine the 4 Eliz. and aſſigned for Error, that the *Writ of Covenant bore Teſte* 24 *Apr. returnable* 15 *Paſchæ, which in Truth was* 15 *Apr.* and ſo the *Return before the Teſte.* Reſolved that it ſhall be amended. Trin. 41 Eliz. B. R. 5 Rep. 45. b. Gages Caſe. ———This was afterwards reverſed and adjudged not amendable. Mo. 571. Gage v. Toper. D. 220. contra. Pl. 13. Hill. 5 Eliz. Bolderow v. Futter.--Per Holt Ch. J. contrary to toCoke's Report of Gages Caſe, it was not amended, but Judgment reverſed. 6 Mod. 196.—Jenk. 258. pl. 53.

13. A Writ of Entry Sur Diſſeiſin en le Poſt was of 15 *Acres of Land, and one Acre of Meadow in Alphamſton and Lamarſh* in the County of Eſſex; whereas by the Feoffment produced, the ſaid Acre of Meadow lay in Great Henney. It was ordered to *expunge Lamarſh, and, in the Place thereof, to inſert* the Name of the Village of *Great Henney*, and that the Prothonotary's Clerk amend the Entry, &c. Pig. of Recov. 228, 229. cites Mich. 6 Car. 1. Skinner v. Land.

14. The Writ of Covenant in the Certificate, is *ſi fecerit eos ſecur. &c.* where it ought to be (*vos.*) But upon View of the Return of that Writ, certified from Cheſter, where the Fine was levied, it was (vos;) whereupon it was awarded, that the Roll ſhould be amended, and the Fine was affirmed. Mich. 11 Car. B. R. Cro. C. 415, 416. Done v. Smetheir & Leigh.

15. A *Fine, to make a Tenant to the Præcipe*, was of *two Meſuages and one Garden*, but the *Recovery was* of *one Meſuage and one Garden.* Ordered, upon Affidavit, Examination in Court, and Conſent of Parties, to be amended. Pig. of Recov. 222, 223, 224. cites 13 Car. 1. Drake v. Biddulph.

16. *Præcipe and Concord* were of *Tenements lying in the Pariſh of Lanceſton in Com' Cornwall*; when in Fact there is no ſuch Pariſh within all the County of Cornwall, but ought to have been *in the Pariſh of Saint Stephens near Lanceſton*; it was ordered by the Court, that as well the Præcipe and Writ of Covenant, as all Entries and Records of the ſaid Fine in all Offices, which it has paſſed thro', be amended and rectified, by *inſerting the Words (St. Stephens near)* as by Law it ought to be done. Pig. of Recov. 218, 219. cites P. 34 Car. 2. Tregeare v Gennys.

17. It was ordered, that the *Writ of Covenant* be amended, *by inſerting* theſe Words, *(and Knowſton)* in the ſaid Writ; and that all Entries and Proceſs made thereon, be amended by the ſaid Writ according to the ſame Rule. Pig. of Recov. 220. cites Hill. 3 Annæ. Courtenay v. Blake. ———Then he adds two preceding Orders made to ſhew Cauſe why the ſaid Writ, and all the Entries and Proceſſes ſhould not be amended, and the ſaid Words inſerted. Ibid. 221, 222. S. P. as to inſerting the Name of the Village of *Waterfall*, upon Oath of one of the Conuſees, and Conuſor made in Court, and Conſent of Conuſor. Pig. of Recov. 232. Mich. 1650. 2 Car. 2. Parker and Jolly v. Cotton & Ux'.

18. Ordered that the Words *(Clarendon and Clarendon Park)* which were mentioned in a Deed produced in Court, declaring the Uſe of a *Fine and Recovery* levied and ſuffered of Tenements in Laverſtock, Pitton, Purton, &c. in the County of Wilts, be, by the Curſitor of the ſaid County, inſerted in the Writs of Covenant and Entry, next after the Word Purton; and alſo that all Parts of the ſaid Fine, between the Parties thereto, and the Recovery aforeſaid, and the Exemplification thereof, and the Writs of Seiſin between the ſaid Parties, be amended on Record in the ſame aforeſaid Words, (Clarendon & Clarendon Park) *in all Places neceſſary.* Pig. of Recov. 225, 226, 227. Hill. 5 Annæ. Abney v. Ld Clarendon.——& Heck v. Abney & al. S.P. as to the Word (*New-Church*) in a Recovery. Pig. of Recov. 230, 231. cites 13 Car. 1. Wightwick & al. v. Maſters.

19. Fines

19. Fines were levied of Lands in the Iſland of Antegoa, and Error was brought to reverſe the ſame, the Lands being mentioned in the Writs, &c. thus, *in Inſula de Antegoa in America, in Partibus Tranſmarinis, viz. in Parochia ſanctæ Mariæ Iſlington in Com' Midd.* and the ſame was ordered to be amended by ſtriking out the Words (*in America in Partibus Tranſmarinis*) And Articles of Agreement between the Parties to the Fines being read, which were to convey and aſſure Lands in the Iſland of Antegoa; the Court ſaid, that the Repugnancy inſerted merely thro' want of Skill, and which would vitiate the Fines, muſt be rejected, and the Fines made effectual, viz. in common Form; but that, if then they ſhould be inſufficient, Advantage may be taken thereof. Barnes's Notes of Caſes in C. B. 143. Paſch. 8 Geo. 2. Forſter v. Pollington, & Forſter v. Brooke.

(B. b. 3) *Warranties in Fines. How* they may be.

1. A Fine was levied by the *Baron and Feme*, who acknowledged the Tenements to be the Right, &c. and releaſed, and quit-claimed from them, and the Heirs of the Feme, and *bound the Heirs of the Feme to Warranty, without a Word of the Baron.* Br. Fines. pl. 19. cites 44 E. 3. 21.

* Weſt's Symb. S. 147.

2. If *divers join* in a Fine, it is ſaid the Warranty muſt be by them, and the Heirs of one of them, who is the Owner of the Land. Yet if there are divers Conuſors, they may warrant ſeverally, and either *generally or ſpecially*; for *Warranties are ſometimes general, that is, againſt all Men, ſometimes *againſt all except a ſingle certain Perſon*, ſometimes *againſt certain Perſons only*; ſometimes *againſt every Conuſor and his Heirs ſeverally*, ſometimes *againſt one of the Conuſors* and his Heirs only, ſometimes *of all except a certain Part*; and ſometimes *of a Part only* certainly expreſſed. Manb. of Fines 9. cites 44 E. 3. (but there is no Page, Plea or Term mentioned.)

(C. b) By *Baron and Feme.*

1. BARON *makes Gift in Tail of his Wife's Land*, and after they *join in a Fine of the Reverſion*; this bars the Wife of all. But if they had *granted the Rent only by Fine*, then the Wife might have entred after the Death of her Baron, per Caril. as Brown and Walmſley J. vouch it. Mo. 91. pl. 224. Trin. 10 Eliz. Anon.

2. Baron and Feme are ſeiſed of Land *in Jure Uxoris*; *Baron alone ſells the Land* by Indenture in his Name alone, or without Deed indented, and afterwards *Baron and Feme levy a Fine to the Vendee.* This ſhall be to the Uſe of the Vendee. For her Agreement by the Fine ſhall be intended, unleſs ſomething be to the contrary. Agreed per Omnes. And. 164. Mich. 29 & 30 Eliz. in Caſe of Colgate v. Blith al. Kenn's Caſe.

Cro. E. 216. Hill. 33 Eliz. B. R. Harvy v. Thomas.

3. Baron ſeiſed of Land in Right of the Wife, makes a *Leaſe to A. for 21 Years*, and after he and his Wife levy a Fine Sur Cogn. de Droit come ceo, &c. to C. and his Heirs; the Baron dies; the Leaſe is determined by his Death, and the *Conuſee ſhall avoid it*; For the Baron join'd but for Conformity and Neceſſity, 2 Rep. 77. b. cited in Cromwell's Caſe, as the Caſe of Harvy v. Thomas.

4. A Baron and Feme *in Facto, & non de Jure*, levy a Fine of the Wife's Land, it ſhall bind the Feme and her Heirs. Mo. 477. Mich. 39 & 40 Eliz. in the Caſe of Prat v. Phanner.

Cro. E. 917. S. C. by the Name of Wilmott v. Knowls, ſaith that the

5. Baron and Feme ſeiſed of Land to them and the Heirs of the Baron. They bargain and ſell by Deed in Fee, in which is a Proviſo, that if either of them pay 100*l.* then they to behave *as in their former Eſtate*; and that this Indenture, and all other Fines, &c. *ſhould be to the Uſe of the Baron and his Heirs*, omitting the Feme. And lastly it is agreed, that all

all Fines and Aſſurances to be made between the Parties within &c. ſhould be to *the Uſes, Intents, &c. and Agreements before herein expreſſed, and to no other Uſe, &c.* The Deed was not inrolled; A Fine was levied within the Time; The Baron dies; The Feme pays the 100 *l.* Reſolved ſhe ſhall have her Eſtate for Life. Hill. 42 Eliz. B. R. Cro. E. 744. Southcot v. Manory.

Bargain and Sale was inrolled after the Fine levied, and that the Baron paid the Money at the Day and re-entered.——Mo. 680. S. C. Wilmott v. Knowles.

6. If Baron and Feme join in a Fine Sur Conceſſit with Warranty, and the Baron dies; *Covenant on the Warranty lies againſt the Feme.* Lev. 301. Mich. 22 Car. 2. Wootton v. Hale.

Mod. 66 S. C. & S. P. admitted per the Counſel of the Defendant, who then excepted to the Pleadings.———2 Saund. 180. S. C.

7. *Feme Tenant for Life*, Remainder to her firſt Son in Tail; ſhe and and her Baron (before any Son born) *accept a Fine of the Fee.* The Contingent *Remainder* is *deſtroyed*, and not preſerved by the Poſſibility of ſurviving the Baron and ſo waving the Eſtate taken by the Fine. 2 Lev. 39. Hill. 23 and 24 Car. 2. B. R. Purefoy v. Rogers.

8. *Feme Tenant in Tail, Remainder to her Siſters in Fee.* The Tenant in Tail and her Husband levy a Fine to the Uſe of Husband and Wife, and the Heirs of the Body of the Wife, Remainder to the Husband in Fee, with *Warranty againſt them and the Heirs of the Wife.* Feme dies without Iſſue. The Siſters are barred by the Warranty. And the Husband by taking back as great an Eſtate as he warrants, deſtroys the Warranty. Cart. 243. Mich. 25 Car. 2. C. B. Fowle v. Double. Mod. 281. S. C.

9. An Annuity was made payable out of Lands for the *Jointure* of the Wife, afterwards Baron and Feme join in a Fine to B. to whom A. after the Marriage, had *mortgaged* Part of thoſe Lands; B. had *Notice* of the *Annuity* before his Mortgage, and 'twas *excepted* in the Mortgage. Decreed that her joining in the Fine was no Extinguiſhment of her Annuity. Hill. 29 Car. 2. Fin. R. 277. Solly v. Whitfield.

10. Husband and Wife covenant to levy a Fine of the Wife's Land *to the Uſe of the Heirs of the Body of the Husband on the Wife begotten.* Here can be no Eſtate to the Husband for Life *by Implication*; Becauſe the Eſtate was the Wife's, to which he was a Stranger, ſo 'tis merely void; For taking it as a Remainder, there is no precedent Eſtate of *Freehold to ſupport it*; and taking it as a ſpringing Uſe, then 'tis a *ſpringing executory Uſe, to ariſe after a dying without Iſſue*, which the Law will not expect; ſo that 'tis either way void, and it muſt be one of theſe; per Cur. Hill. 3 W. & M. B. R. 2 Salk. 675. Davis v. Speed. Affirmed in Dom. Proc. Parl. Caſes. 104.

(D. b) By *Other Perſon* of the Lands of a Feme Covert, either in Poſſeſſion, Remainder, &c.

1. A Tenant for Term of Life, *Remainder in Fee to Feme Covert.* The *Tenant for Life levies a Fine.* The *Baron dies*, and Feme takes other Baron; and *Tenant dies.* 5 Years paſs. The ſecond Baron dies. The Feme ſhall be barred. D. 72. b. pl. 3. Marg. 43 Eliz. Whetſtone v. Wentworth.

(D. b. 2) Proclamations. Made *at what Time.* After the Death of the Parties.

1. The Writ of Covenant, and Ded. Pot. with the Concord, was certified; and the *King's Silver entred*, the ſame Term that the Fine was acknowledged; *but the Fine was not engroſſed, but remained in the Chirograph Office*; and now the Conuſee being dead, his Heir moved to have the Fine ingroſſed with Proclamations; and becauſe a *Formedon is pending now for Part* of the Land, Curia aviſare vult; & poſtea, viz. Michaelmas Term, 'twas held per Cur. that the Fine ſhould be ingroſſed, but that the Proclamations ſhould not be entered nor *engroſſed*; becauſe the Parties to the Fine are dead, to whom by the Statute of 4 H. 7. Election is given to have the Fine with Proclamations, or without. And no Party is here to make Election. D. 254. pl. 104. Trin. 8 Eliz. Compton's Caſe.

2. In Formedon. The Tenant *pleads a Fine with Proclamations* in Bar, *by* one *Richard*, the *Demandant's Anceſtor.* The Plaintiff *replies, that Richard entered upon his Father, being Tenant in Tail, and levied the Fine; and before the* Proclamation paſſed, the *Father re-entred, and died*, &c. And by the whole Court it was held to be a good Replication, and the Bar well avoided. For when the Father re-entered before all the Proclamations paſſed; the Fine thereby is avoided to all Purpoſes, as well to himſelf, as to the Son who levied it: But if the Proclamations had incurred before his Entry, altho' he had re-entered within the five Years, and died, yet it ſhould have bound the Son and his Heirs for ever. Cro. E. 361, 362. Mich. 36 & 37 Eliz. C. B. Archer v. Green.

3 A. Tenant for Life of certain Land, the *Remainder to B. in Tail*, the *Reverſion to B. and his Heirs* expectant. *B. levied a Fine to* C. and D. and to the Heirs of C. to the Uſe of them and their Heirs, and *had Iſſue, and died before all the Proclamations* were paſſed, the *Iſſue* in Tail *then being beyond Sea*; the *Proclamations are made*, and after the Iſſue in Tail returned, and immediately made Claim upon the Land to the Remainder in Tail; if in this Caſe the Eſtate Tail was barred or not, was the Queſtion. It was reſolved by all the Juſtices and Barons of the Exchequer, nullo contradicente, that tho' by the Death of Tenant in Tail a Right of Eſtate Tail deſcended to the Iſſue, inaſmuch as he died before all the Proclamations were paſſed; yet when the Proclamations paſſed without any Claim made by the Iſſue in Tail upon the Land, this Right that deſcended to him is barred by the Statutes of 4 H. 7. and 32 Hen. 8. For tho' the *Fine without Proclamations, nor the Proclamations without the Fine, can't bar an Eſtate Tail*; and tho' after the Fine levied, and before all the Proclamations paſſed, a *Right is deſcended to the Iſſue* in Tail *per Formam Doni*, which is *Paramount the Fine*; and tho' there is no Fine with Proclamations levied after the Death of the Tenant in Tail to bar this Right, ſo deſcended to the Iſſue in Tail; yet inaſmuch as 'tis provided by the Stat. of 32 *H.* 8. *That all Fines levied with Proclamations of any Lands, &c. entailed to the Perſon, ſo levying the ſame, or to any of his Anceſtors in Poſſeſſion, Reverſion, Remainder, or in Uſe, ſhall be immediately after the Fine levied,*

vied, ingroſſed and Proclamations made, adjudged a ſufficient Bar againſt the ſaid Perſon and their Heirs, claiming the ſame only by Force of any ſuch Entail; and the Iſſue in Tail, in this Caſe, claimed as Heir by Force of the ſaid Eſtate Tail; therefore by the expreſs Letter of the ſaid Act, he is barred; and with this agrees the Judgment in **Smith** and **Stapleton's** Caſe. Pl. C. fo. 430. 3 Rep 84. a. 86. b. 87. a. Paſch. 44 Eliz. Caſe of Fines.

(E. b) With *Proclamations*. And how to be read and proclaimed. And the Effect thereof.

1.1 *R.* 3. *c.* 7. §. 1. Enacts that *a Fine ſhall be openly read and proclaimed the ſame Term, and three Terms after, at four ſeveral Days.* But ſee pl. 6.

A Tranſcript of the Fine ſhall be ſent to the Juſtices of Aſſiſe of the County where the Land lies, to be there proclaimed.

§. 2. *A Tranſcript ſhall be ſent to the Juſtices of Peace.*

2. If *Proclamations* be *before the Ingroſſment*, 'tis void, and not granted by the * 4 H. 7. 24. as I think. Denſh. R. upon the ſaid Statute. * Vid. Sect. 2. of that Statute, and the Notes thereon at (W. 4).

3. 1 *Ma. St.* 2. *cap.* 7. §. 1. *Strengthens Fines when Proclamations are not made, &c. by Reaſon of* Adjornment of the Term. It has been reſolved, that this Act extends, where but *Part of the Term is adjerned.* For it is a favourable Law, and to be taken by Equity. 2 Inſt. 519.——D. 186. pl. 68. Mich. 2 & 3 Eliz.

4. Nothing can diſturb the Operation of the Proclamations, but the Re-continuance of the Tail by Judgment in a Formedon, Entry, Claim or Remitter, as the Caſe requires. Vid. Pl. C. Smith v. Stapleton. If the *Proclamations paſs after the Conuſor's Death*, the Entry or Claim of the Iſſue in Tail, prior to the Proclamations, will not render the Fine ineffectual. Vid. 3 Rep. 60. b. 61. in Caſe of Fines. cites Purflow's Caſe.——And Vid. Poph. 65, 66. cites 23 Eliz. Ld Sturton's Caſe.

5. Fine to bar an Entail muſt be *alleged* to be with Proclamations, otherwiſe it will be intended to be without Proclamations; and ſo the Bargainee will only have an Eſtate for the Life of the Tenant in Tail, becauſe it is no Diſcontinuance. Mo. 220. Mich. 27 & 28 Eliz. Owen's Caſe.

6. 31 *Eliz.* 2. Enacts that *all Fines with Proclamations to be levied in the Common Pleas, ſhall be proclaimed* 4 Times only, *viz. once in the Term in which it is ingroſſed, and once in every of the* 3 *Terms holden next after the ſame ingroſſing; and every Fine ſo proclaimed ſhall be of Force, as if the ſame had been* 16 *Times proclaimed according to the Statutes heretofore made.*

7. If the *Conuſee dies*, the Heir has Election to have the Fine with Proclamations, as well as the Anceſtor. For 'tis for his Benefit, and the Statute does not reſtrain it. And the reaſon of 8 Eliz. 254. why the Proclamations there made were *ſtayed* after the Conuſee's Death was, becauſe a *Formedon was depending*, and that was only in the Diſcretion of the Court. Cro. E. 693. Mich. 41 & 42 Eliz. B. R. Wakefield v. Hodgeſon.

8. The Proclamations *do not make the Eſtate, but enure to* the Eſtate made by the Fine, and make the Bar according to the Eſtate; which paſſed before by the Fine. Poph. 63. in Caſe of Harry v. Farcy. The Proclamations *ſerve only to diſtinguiſh, that it is a Fine according to the Stat.* 4 *H.* 7. For tho' the Iſſue having Notice by the Proclamations brings his *Formedon* accordingly, yet it ſhall not avail him. 3 Rep. 91. Paſch 44 Eliz. in the Caſe of Fines.

9. Where a Fine and 5 Years paſt are urged to bar a Right, &c. by Non-claim within the Statutes, he muſt *ſhew the Proclamations under Seal*; and

and the Chirographers mentioning that 'tis a Fine with Proclamations, as is uſual, will not ſerve. Clayt. 51. 13 Car. Allen's Caſe.

10. A Fine *with Proclamations* when *given in Evidence*, ought to have the Proclamations *indorſed* on it; and 'tis not enough to ſay that it is ſecundum Formam Statuti. Held on a Trial per Scroggs Ch. J. 2 Show. 126. pl. 105. Trin. 32 Car. 2. B. R. Anon.

(E. b. 2) *Reverſal.* What muſt be done in Order to reverſe Fines. *Scire facias* againſt Tertenants, &c.

1. In Scire facias, *W. acknowledged the Manor of Dale to be the Right of R.* by Force of which Acknowledgement *R. granted and rendered again to the ſaid W. and his Heirs*; and after *W. died*, and F. his Son and *Heir brought Scire facias to execute the Fine*; per Fencot, Fine ſur Conuſance de Droit, is to be executed by Scire facias; For ſuch Fine is Executory. Contra elſewhere of a Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo, &c. nevertheleſs it ſeems in the Caſe above, that the Conuſee or his Heir *may enter*, as upon a Recovery. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 199. cites 38 E. 3. 17.

2. Scire facias to execute a Fine, it ſeemed by the Argument of the Caſe, that where a *Fine* is levied *to the Baron and Feme in Tail*, the *Remainder to W.* And the *Baron died without Iſſue*, and the Feme *leaſed her Eſtate, to W.* and he died, his Heir ſhall not have a Scire facias, for it was *ſurrendered* to his Father, and ſo he is ſeiſed by Force of the Fine. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 38. cites 45 E. 3. 18.

Br. Nontenure. pl. 21. cites S. C.— Br. Scire facias. pl. 110. cites S. C.

3. Scire facias upon a Fine, the *Defendant ſaid that he had nothing but for Term of Years of the Leaſe of J. N. and that he is not Pernour*; and ſo ſee if he be Tenant of the Franktenement or Pernour, the Writ lies againſt him. Br. Brief. pl. 434. cites 8 H. 6. 32.

2 Le. 211. S. C.

4. Coke demanded the Opinion of the Court in this Caſe, M. being *Tenant in Tail, had Iſſue two Sons R. and J.* and dies. *R. levies two Fines* of the Land *and dies without Iſſue.* J. brings two Writs of Error upon theſe Fines; the *Defendant, to the firſt Fine pleads the ſecond* Fine not reverſed; *and to the ſecond he pleads the firſt* not reverſed; the Queſtion was, what is to be done? Curia, you may reply, that the ſaid Fine pleaded in Bar is alſo erroneous, and ſo aid your ſelf. 7 H. 4. 39. Cro. E. 151. Mich. 31 & 32 Eliz. B. R. Molton's Caſe.

5. Fine by Tenant in Tail was reverſed by Writ of *Deceit.* The *Iſſue in Tail is remitted*, and ſhall avoid all Eſtates made by him; For the Fine is void between the Parties. But the *Tenant in Tail, after that Fine levied*, and before it was reverſed, had *made a Leaſe for Years*, the *Remainder* over *for Life.* And whether the Iſſue might *enter* to avoid thoſe Eſtates, was the Queſtion? And 'twas held, that he could not, without a *Scire facias ſued againſt him, who had the Freehold*; for he, who is to defeat a Record, is always to commence his Suit againſt him, who is privy to the Record; But when he hath reverſed it againſt him, he ought always to have a Sci. fa. againſt him who is Tertenant; For it may be, he hath ſome matter to bar him of Execution; And otherwiſe he ſhall not be bound, unleſs he be made privy by a Sci. fa. or that 2 Nihils be returned. Cro. E. 471, 472. Paſch. 38 Eliz. B. R. Cary v. Dancy.

6. A. & B. his Wife, the Wife being then *within Age*, *levied a Fine* of the Lands of the Wife, *and a Præcipe quod reddat* was brought againſt the *Conuſee, who vouched the Husband and* the *Wife*, and *they appeared in Perſon*, and *vouched* over the Common Vouchee, who appeared, and after made Default, whereby a Recovery was had; and now the ſaid *Wife and* her *2d Husband brought* a Writ of *Error to reverſe the Fine, and another Writ of Error to reverſe the Recovery*, by reaſon of the Nonage of the Woman; and the Court was of Opinion to reverſe the Fine, but they would adviſe upon the Recovery, for that the ſaid A. and his Wife appeared in Perſon and vouched over; and ſo the *Recovery was had* againſt them *by their Appearance*

Appearance, and not by Default, and ſo it ſeemeth no Error; and to prove that, Gawdy cited 1 & 2 Mar. D. 104. and 6 H. 8. 61. Saver Default 50. Alſo, as this Caſe is, it ſeems, that by general Entry into Warranty, the Error upon the Fine is gone; but upon Examination, it was found that the *Recovery was before the Fine*; For the Recovery was *Quindena Trin.* and the Fine was *Tres. Trin.* and ſo the *Recovery doth not give away the Error in the Fine.* Goldsb. 181. pl. 116. Sir Henry Jones's Caſe.

7. It was agreed by the Counſell at Bar and Coke Ch. J. that *Writ of Error muſt be brought againſt a Party or Privy* to Reverſe a Fine, *and not againſt the Tertenant.* Roll. R. 37.

A. Tenant in Tail leaſed for 60 Years, and afterwards *levied a Fine to W. R. and W. S.* Sur Conuſans de droit *come ceo*, &c. with

8. *But* in a Writ of *Attaint or Diſceit*, the Writ ſhall be againſt the Tertenant; and the Court was of the ſame Opinion as to the firſt Part of the Diverſity; but Coke only ſpoke to the ſecond Part. Roll. Rep. 37. Trin. 12 Jac. B. R. Benfield v. Bartholemew.

a *Render to him and his Heirs* in Fee; and upon a *Scire facias againſt the Conuſees, ſuppoſing the Lands to be Ancient Demeſne*, the *Defendant made Default*, for which the Fine was avoided, and now the Iſſue in Tail entred upon the *Leſſee for Years*, and he *brought an Ejectione firmæ*, and it was *found* that the Land was *Frank-fee*; and all the Queſtion was, if the Reverſal of the Fine by Writ of Diſceit, without ſuing forth a Scire facias againſt Tertenant, ſhould bind him, or ſhould be void only againſt the Conuſee, and not againſt the Leſſee? Kingſmill conceived the Scire facias brought againſt the Parties only is good enough, for they were *Parties to the Diſceit*, and not Tertenants; it was adjourn'd. 3 Le. 120. Trin. 27. Eliz. Lee and Loveday's Caſe.——1 Le. 290. S. C.

9. The Court will not reverſe a Fine without a Scire facias returned againſt the Tertenants; For the *Conuſees are but nominal Perſons*; and tho' it was otherwiſe in the Precedent in Co. Ent. and Hern's Plead. 375. and the Law perhaps does not ſtrictly require it, yet the Courſe of the Court does; per Cur. 1. Salk. 339. Hill. 6 W. 3. B. R. Anon.

(E. b. 3) Avoided or Reverſed, &c. for *Fraud*; and Pleadings.

1. Colluſion may be *averred* contrary to a Fine. Br. Fines, pl. 115. cites 27 Aſſ. 53. and Trin. 33 H. 8.

2. If there be 2 *R. D.*'s of one Name, and the *one levy a Fine of the Land of the other*, the other may avoid the Fine by pleading, *that there are two of one Name, and the other R. D. levied the Fine, and not he.* Weſt's Symb. S. 191.

S.P. Br. Fines pl. 11. per Danby, but he ſaid it was otherwiſe, if there was

only one of that Name, and a Stranger acknowledged the Fine *in the Name of R. D.* But Brook ſays, that it ſeems to him all one; For in pleading he ſhall ſay, that there are two, viz. R. D. of S. and R. D. of P. and that R. D. of S. is and was Owner of the Land, and R. D. of P. acknowledged the Fine, abſque hoc, that R. D. of S. acknowledged it; ſo Nothing is in Iſſue, but if R. D. of S. acknowledged it. Br. Fines, pl. 11. cites 34 H. 6. 19.——Co. R. on Fines 9. S. C.——Br. Fines, pl. 54. cites 19 H. 6. 44.——Br. Diſceit, pl. 17. cites S. C.

3. *And* in like manner, if any *Stranger* levy a Fine *in the Name of another*, that is Owner of the Land, 34 H. 6. 19. Contra held 19 H. 6. 44. becauſe 'tis a Matter of Record; therefore, he hath no other remedy in ſuch Caſe, but an *Action of Deceit.* Weſt's Symb. S. 191.

If a Man *levies a Fine of my Land in my Name*, and I am ouſted by the

Conuſee, I ſhall have an Action againſt him; and if he pleads the Fine, I ſhall ſay, that 'twas another *of the ſame Name who levied the Fine, abſque hoc, that I levied* the Fine, *or was Party or ever appeared*, per Littleton, which Danby Ch. J. agreed; becauſe the Party can't reverſe it by Action of Diſceit. Br. Confeſſe and Avoid, pl. 40. cites 5 E. 4. 40.

4. A. levies a Fine *in the Name of B. B.* being beyond Sea; and Sentence was given that the Fine ſhould be void. Noy. 99. in the Star Chamber, Gillibrand v. Hubbard.

The Perſon was Fined and Impriſoned, and *Vacat enter'd*

on the Roll. Cro. E. 531. S. C by Name of Hubert's Caſe.——Mo. 630. Mich. 38 & 39 Eliz. in the Star Chamber, S. C.——12 Rep. 123. cites S. C. but ſays, that part of the Sentence was, that if Defendant did not *re-aſſure the Land to the Plaintiff*, he ſhould forfeit a greater Fine to the Queen. But that there was no Sentence to draw the Fine off the File, nor Damages awarded to the Plaintiff.—— A Reconveyance was Decreed Roll. R. 115. cites S. C.

44 Eliz. 3 Rep 77. Fermor's Caſe.—Tho' there were many notorious Circumſtances of Fraud in Fermor's Caſe which Co. in his Report of it lays much weight upon; yet it does not thence follow, that the Law is not the ſame where there are not ſuch Evidences of Fraud. In other Books where that Caſe is reported, the Reſolution does not ſeem to go ſo much upon the Particulars of the Fraud; 'tis Fraud apparent in the Leſſee. Vent. 241, 242. Hill. 24 & 25 Car. 2. B. R. in Caſe of Whaley v. Tancred.

5. *A. leaſed to B. for Years*, Land in D. rendring Rent; *B. has other Lands of Inheritance in D.—B. Leaſes to C. for Life the ſaid Lands leaſed to to him for Years*; and afterwards *B. levies a Fine* with Proclamations *of all* the ſaid Lands which were his Inheritance, and of thoſe which were leaſed to him for Years; (the Number of Acres in the Fine amounted to the whole) *B. paid his Rent yearly to A.* during the Years; the ſaid Fine was levied of all the ſaid Lands with Proclamations; and 5 Years paſſed; A. ſhall not be barred in this Caſe, for there is apparent Covin in levying this Fine; by all the Judges of England. Jenk. 253. pl. 45.

6. If a Fine be levied to *ſecret Uſes to deceive a Purchaſor*, an *Averment* of Frand may be taken againſt it by the Stat. 27 *Eliz.* 4. 3 Rep. 80 Hill. 44 Eliz in Chancery, in Fermor's Caſe.

7. So if a Fine be levied *upon uſurious Contract*, it may be avoided by *Averment* by the Stat. of 13 *Eliz.* 8. 3 Rep. 80. in Fermor's Caſe

8. *By* 21 *Jac.* 1. 26. §. 2. *It is Felony without Benefit of Clergy, to acknowledge, or procure to be acknowledged any Fine, Recovery, &c. in the Name of any Perſon not Privy, or conſenting thereunto.*

(E. b. 4) Avoided or Reverſed for *Error*; for what Errors in General; and at what Time.

A Fine is not good by a *contrary Name* as *Sibell* for *Iſabell*. Br. Fines, pl. 72. cites S. C.—Br. Eſtoppel, pl. 113. cites S. C.——Br. Grants, pl. 63. cites S. C.——Weſt's Symb. S. 15. cites S. C.

1. A Fine was levied *to the Baron and B. his Wife*, where her *Name was M.* it was ſaid by Bereford, that Nothing paſſed to her; but per Scroope, ſhe may conclude the Heir of the Baron, who took by the Fine with her to ſay, that ſhe had other Name than B. Br. Feoffment, pl. 20. cites 1 Aſſ. 11.

2. A Fine was levied *by A. and B. his Wife*, where the *Name of the Wife was M.* yet this ſhall bind her by Eſtoppel, and the Tenant may plead, that ſhe, by the Name of B. levied the Fine. Br. Fines, pl. 117. cites Tempore H. 8.

3. 'Twas reſolved that the Conuſor ſhall not aſſign Error, *in the Grant and Render, by which himſelf takes Eſtate*, no more than the *Conuſee* ſhall *in the Conuſance*; for this is to defeat the Eſtate, which by the Fine is given to himſelf; neither ſhall the Recoveror bring a Writ of Error to defeat the Record, in which himſelf was Recoveror; For the Judgment in the Writ of Error *is to be reſtored to all that he loſt* by the Fine or Judgment; *and not to avoid* and *loſe that which he had gained by the Fine or Judgment*, 7 E. 3. 25. b. a Man ſhall not reverſe Judgment for Error, if he cannot ſhew that the Error is in his Diſadvantage, 8 H. 5. 2. b. and F. N. B. 21. accordingly; and after the Fine was Affirmed. 5 Rep. 39. b. Trin. 34 Eliz. B. R. Tey's Caſe.

4. In the Conuſance of a Fine *falſe Latin, or Incongruity*, will not hurt the Fine; as where a Fine is levied de Maneriis (in the plural Number) of B. and H. where (in Truth) B. and H. are only one Manor. 9 Rep. 48. a. Coke's Notes there, Trin. 8. Jac. in the E. of Shrewsbury's Caſe.

5. Fines and Recoveries being Conveyances by Conſent, are as Feoffments or Deeds; and an Error to reverſe them, *ought to be palpable, groſs, and abſur'd*; *and* ought to be *in the Eſſence of the Fine* or Recovery. Jenk. 258. pl. 53.

6. 10 & 11 *W.* 3 14. §. 1. *For quieting Men's Titles and Poſſeſſions under Ancient Fines and Recoveries, and ancient Judgments; it is enacted, That no Fine,*

Fine, or Common Recovery, nor any Judgment in any real or perſonal Action, ſhall after 1 May 1699, be reverſed for any Error therein; unleſs the Writ of Error or Suit, for reverſing ſuch Fine, Recovery, or Judgment, be Commenced and Proſecuted with Effect, within 20 Years after ſuch Fine levied, Recovery ſuffered, or Judgment ſigned, or entred on Record.

Saving the Rights of Infants, &c. ſo as they bring their Writ of Error within 5 Years after ſuch Impediments removed.

(E. b. 5) Error in Fines. *Barred. By what Act.*

1. By *Releaſe of all Right in the Land* by him, who has Title to Reverſe a Fine or Recovery by Writ of Error, the Error is extinct; per Fenner J. Ow. 22. 37 Eliz. B. R. in Wright's Caſe v. Wickham (Mayor). Cro. E. 469. (bis) S. P. per Fenner J

2 By *general Entry into Warranty*, the Error upon the Fine is gone. See Goldsb. 181. pl. 116. Sir H. Jones's Caſe.

(E. b. 6) Pleadings to Reverſe Fines; and where there is *Variance between Writ* of Error *and the Record.*

1. Writ of Error on a Fine mention'd 105 *Acres*, and the Fine certified was 150 *Acres*; it was inſiſted that this was good, becauſe it agrees with the Record which is with the *Cuſtos Brevium*. But Wray ſaid, that the principal Part of the Fine is with the *Chirographer*, and it ought to agree with that, or otherwiſe it is not good; and afterwards the Fine was Reverſed, Quoad one of the Conuſors only, he being an Infant. Cro. E. 124. Hill. 31 Eliz. B. R. Pigot v. Ruſſell.

2. Mr. Carthew moved for Leave to quaſh his own Writ of Error to reverſe a Fine, becauſe *one of the Parties to the Fine is omitted in the Writ of Error*; per Holt Ch. J. we can't do it; how can we take Notice of any Thing but what is on Record? We can't quaſh it on a foreign Suggeſtion; but let them ſhew Cauſe why you ſhould not Diſcontinue. Writs of Error are rarely diſcontinued, but ſome times they may be. 5 Mod. 67. Mich. 7 W. 3. Winchurſt v. Maſely.

3. A *Fine* was levied *by three*, and *two* of them *brought Error* to reverſe it; *perhaps the other had Nothing* in the Land, and it was reverſed, per Holt Ch. J. who ſaid it was ſo done in time of Pemberton Ch. J. 5 Mod. 67. Mich. 7. W. 3. in Caſe of Winchurſt v. Maſely.

(E. b. 7) Error in the *Return of the Caption*; what.

1. Error to reverſe a Fine, becauſe, upon the Back of the Dedimus Poteſtatem, it was *Executio* iſtius brevis *patet in quodam panello huic brevi adnexo*; whereas it ought to have been, *in quadam Scedula* huic Brevi annexa. For it is not any Panel, but a Schedule. Sed non Allocatur, for it is but *matter of form*, and not material; For altho it be not properly ſaid to be a Panel, yet a Panel and a Schedule are all one in Subſtance, and no Cauſe to reverſe it. Cro. J 77, 78. Trin. 3 Jac. B. R. E. of Bedford v. Forſter.

(E. b. 8) Pleadings. *Setting forth the Title.*

1. Note, per Thirning, that 'tis no Avoidance of a Fine to ſay, that thoſe who were Parties to the Fine had nothing, without ſaying, but *one J. N. whoſe Eſtate he hath*; For he muſt ſhew who had any Thing in the Land at the Time, &c. but where a Recovery againſt my Anceſtor is pleaded againſt me, 'tis Sufficient to ſay, that the Anceſtor had nothing in the Land at the time, &c. without ſhewing who was Tenant thereof. Br. Fines, pl. 43. cites 14 H 4. 33.

2. A

2. A Man may confeſs and avoid a Fine levied by his Anceſtor whoſe Heir, &c. of the Manor of D. by ſaying that there are *two Manors, viz. Over D. and Nether D. and* that *the Fine was levied of Over D.* &c. [*whereas the*] *Action is of Nether D.* and a good Plea, per Vaviſor, Davers, and Brian Juſtices; contrary Conſtable and Woode; For by them the Anceſtor was Eſtopped, and therefore his Heir ſhall be Eſtopped likewiſe, quære; For the beſt Opinion is, that he may Confeſs and Avoid, if it be well pleaded. Br. Confeſſe and Avoid, pl. 39. cites 12 H 7. 6.

3. *Error* to reverſe a Fine levied by A. and brought the Writ as *Couſin and Heir of A.* and aſſigns the Errors, and brings a *Scire facias ad audiend. Errores*, and doth *not ſhew in either of the ſaid Writs, how* he was Couſin to the ſaid A. and for this Cauſe, the Defendant pleaded in Abatement of the Writ, and it was thereupon demurred in Law; and after Argument, the Court reſolved, that it was good enough, without ſhewing how in the Writ of Error, or in the Scire facias; For the one is but a Commiſſion to hear the Errors, and needs not ſuch certainty; and the other is but a Writ founded thereupon. And therefore, How Couſin, need not be ſhewed in the Writ; nor is it requiſite that the Title be ſhewed therein, unleſs it be *in a ſpecial Caſe*, varying from the Common Courſe; *as where an eſpecial Heir* in Tail brings a Writ of Error, *or he in Remainder*; becauſe he is to intitle himſelf, he ought to ſhew ſpecially, *How Couſin*, or how he hath the Remainder; but otherwiſe not; and altho' in ſome ſuch Writs, 'tis ſhewn, How Couſin, as in **Denner's** Caſe, and is good enough, yet 'tis not of Neceſſity, and the Omitting thereof, is no Cauſe of Abating the Writ. See 33 H. 6. 54. 34 H. 6. 44. * 38 H. 6. 17. & 39. 45 E. 3. 25. the Book of Ent. 272. wherefore it was adjudged accordingly. Cro. J. 160, 161. Paſch. 5 Jac. B. R. Sir Rich. Champernoon v. Sir Wm. Godolphin.

* Br. Fines pl. 45. S. C.

(F. b) Reverſed by Reaſon of ſome *Default* as to the *Proclamations*, and the Effect thereof; and Pleadings.

1. IF the Fine with *Proclamations be not read openly*; or be read for one Day in every Term, *or only one Term*, or if the *Pleas do not ceaſe at the time of reading*; *or if it be read there*, and *none of the Juſtices preſent*; and this Form, which does not accord with the Statute, appears there of Record; the Fine, ſo levied, has not the Force of this Statute; but if the *Record be, that the Fine was Proclaimed according to the Statute*, the Fine is good, and has the Force of this Statute. Denſh. R. 5. upon 4 H. 7. 24.

2. 1 *Mar.* 7. §. 2. Enacts that, *Proclamations not duly made, by Reaſon of Adjornment of the Term, ſhall not prejudice the Fine.*

Yet it ſtands as a good Fine at Common Law. Buls. 206.

3. *Where* 15 *Proclamations* were made, and *one of them out of Term*, it was adjudged, that the Fine ſhould ſtand, and *makes a Diſcontinuance*, and the Proclamations be reverſed. 4 El. D. 216. pl. 54.

Paſch. Jac. Anon.——See D. 181. b. pl. 53. 182. a. pl. 55. Paſch. 2 Eliz. Fiſh v. Broket.

For the Fine, by itſelf, is a Matter of *Record perfect and full before the Proclamations made*, and binds the Parties, and the Right of the Land between them before the Proclamations; and the *Proclamations*, that are made after, *are other Matter of Record*, which have other entry in the Record after the Fine; and ſo the Proclamations, tho' they are grounded upon the Fine, and are purſuant upon it, are *ſeveral from the Fine*, and they and the Fine are *ſeveral Matters of the Record*, and therefore Error in them is not Error in the Fine. Pl. C. 266. Mich. 4 & 5 Eliz. Fiſh v. Brokett.

4. If any Proclamation be *made on a Sunday*, it is Error; becauſe it is not Dies Juridicus. D. 181. b. pl. 52. 182. pl. 55. Fiſh v. Broket.

5. Tenant in Tail levies a Fine, and *dies before the Proclamations* paſs; a *Writ of Error is brought* before the Proclamations; yet the *Proclamations may paſs* in the Common Pleas; For only the Tranſcript of the Fine is removed by the Writ of Error. Jenk. 193. pl. 97. cites 21 Ed. 3. 40 Aſſ. Dy. 95.

6. *Proclamation made in a ſubſequent Term, by Reaſon of Adjornment* of the former Term, was held good. 4 Le. 202. Hill. 25 Eliz. C. B. Wingate v. Sands.

7. Error was brought upon a Fine, and the Error was aſſigned in the Proclamations; whereupon iſſued a *Certiorari* to the *Cuſtos Brevium*, who *certified* the Proclamations, by which Certificate it appeared, that two of the ſaid Proclamations, *were made in one Day*, upon which the Defendant prayed another Scire facias to the *Chirographer*, in whoſe Office it appeared, *that all* the Proclamations *were well and duly made*. It was the Opinion of Wray Ch. J. in this Caſe, that the Defendant ought to have his Prayer; For the *Chirographer makes the Proclamations, and he is the principal Officer as to them*, and the *Cuſtos Brevium hath but the Abſtract of the Proclamations*, and we may in Diſcretion amend them upon the Matter appearing; but the other Juſtices ſeemed to be of a contrary Opinion; For that the Proclamations being *once Certified* by the Cuſtos Brevium, who is the principal Officer, we ought not afterwards to reſort to the Chirographer, who is the inferior Officer; and afterwards the Clerks of the Common Pleas were examined of the Matter aforeſaid by the Juſtices of the King's Bench, and they anſwered according to that which was ſaid by Wray Ch. J. wherefore it was awarded by the Court, that a new Certiorari be directed to the Chirographer, who certified the Proclamations to be well and duly made. And thereupon the Court awarded, that the Proclamations in the Office of the Cuſtos Brevium, ſhould be amended according to the Proclamations in the Cuſtody and the Office of the Chirographer. 3 Le. 106, 107. Paſch. 26. Eliz. B. R. Ragg v. Bowley.

3 Le. 183. pl. 234. S. P. Anon. —Godb. 103. pl. 121. Anon.

8. A. Tenant for Life, Remainder to B. in Tail. B. dies leaving two Daughters L. and M.—L. takes Husband, and ſhe and her Husband levies a Fine Sur Cognizance de Droit come ceo, &c. and *before Proclamations L. dies*; M. claims the Land, and afterwards Proclamations are made. See the Arguments, 2 And. 109. Mich. 36 & 37 Eliz. but no Judgment, Harvy v. Facy.

3 Rep. 91. S. C. cited in the Caſe of Fines, and ſaid that the Doubt conceived in B. R. in the Caſe of Harvy v. Facy, was well Reſolved in the Caſe adjudged in C. B. reported by Serjeant Bendloes Bendl. 122. pl. 156. (which ſee ſup. D. 3.) that the Heir in Tail was barred by the Fine of his Anceſtor, tho' the Anceſtor died before all the Proclamations paſſed; tho' in that Caſe the Eſtate which paſſed by the Fine was utterly avoided before the Proclamations paſſed. But when they paſſed afterwards the Eſtate Tail was barred.

9. A. by Fine was Tenant for Life, Remainder to M. his Wife for Life, Remainder to the Heirs Males of the Body of A. Remainder to the Heirs Males of B.—A. and M. levy another Fine to the Uſe of A. for Life, and after to the Uſe of M. for Life with diverſe Remainders in Uſe; *After one of the Proclamations made, A. died*; the eldeſt Iſſue of A. was beyond Sea; After A's Death, the Reſt of the Proclamations were made; 'twas agreed by all the Judges that this Fine ſhall be bar to all who might claim by the Eſtate Tail, created by the firſt Fine. 2 And. 177. Hill. 44 Eliz. Sir John Danvers's Caſe.

Mo. 628. S. C.—3 Rep. 84. the Caſe of Fines ſeems to be S. C. and there in the third Reſolution page 87. 'tis held that the Iſſue in Tail, being Heir and Privy, cannot by any *Claim*, which he can make, ſave the Right of the Eſtate Tail, which deſcends to him, but that after the Proclamations paſſed the Eſtate Tail ſhall be barred by the *Statute* 4 *H.* 7. & 32 *H.* 8. notwithſtanding any Claim, which may be made by him.

10. Upon a Fine the *firſt Proclamation* was made in *Trin.* 5 *Jac.* and the *ſecond* in *Mich.* 5 *Jac.* and the *third* in *Hill.* 6 *Jac.* (where it *ſhould be Hill.* 5 *Jac.*) and the *fourth and fifth* in *Eaſter* 6 *Jac.* and this was agreed to be a palpable Error; For the fourth Proclamation was not entered at all, and the fifth was entered in Hillary Term 6 Jac. (where it ſhould have been in Hillary Term 5 Jac.) and it ſhall *not be amended*; *becauſe it was of another Term*, and the Court conceived that this was a *Forfeiture of the Office of Chirographer*; For it was abuſing of it, and the Statutes of 4 H. 4. 23. and Weſtm. 2. are that Judgments given in the King's Court ſhall ſtand until reverſed by Error. 2 Brownl. 300 Paſch. 7. Jac. C. B. Anon.

D. 216. pl. 54. 11. *No Proclamation made the first Day* is Error apparent to reverſe the Proclamations, but the Fine ſtill remains a good Fine *at Common Law*. 1 Buls. 206. Paſch. 10 Jac. B. R. Anon.

(F. b. 2) Avoided for what Cauſe, Dureſs, &c.

Co. R. on Fines 9. 1. If Men, compelled by *Threatnings* or Impriſonment, ſhould be *admitted to levy Fines*, they ſhould thereby be barred; becauſe the Law intendeth ſuch Perſons are at Liberty when they acknowledge Fines. Weſt. Symb. 3. S. 11. cites 17 Ed. 3. 52. 78. 17 Aſſ. 17.

(F. b. 3) Reverſed for *Default in the Dedimus*, or Writ of Covenant.

Co. R. on Fines 10. Br. Fines, pl. 116. cites 35 H. 8. 1. If the *Dedimus Poteſtatem* bears Date before the *Writ of Covenant*, the Conuſance taken upon it is void; becauſe the *Dedimus Poteſtatem* recites *Cum Breve noſtrum de conventione inter A. petentem & B. deforceantem, &c.* ſo that the Conuſance was taken without Writ of Covenant; or otherwiſe, *Præcipe quod reddat*, is void, albeit 'tis taken by the Juſtices of C. B. but they Uſe to have *Writ of Covenant* pending before the *Certificate*, and this makes the Conuſance, and Note good; becauſe the Writ is intended before Conuſance. Denſh. R. of Fines 8.

2. The *Caption* of the Conuſance of the Fine was before Sir Roger Manwood Ch. Bar. 27 *Martii* 27 Eliz. and the *Writ* of *Covenant*, and Dedimus Poteſtatatem bore *teſte* 9 *Aprilis*; ſo the Conuſance taken without Warrant, and by the Stat. of 23 Eliz. the Day of the Caption is always to be certified; but the Court over ruled it, and would not hear it argued; for they ſaid it is good enough, and otherwiſe they ſhould reverſe diverſe Fines. Cro. E. 275. Hill. 34 Eliz. C. B. Argenton v. Weſtover & Lucas.

Where the Writ of Covenant bore Teſte *after the Teſte of the Ded. Pot.* it was held manifeſt Error. And a Fine levied in Cheſter was 3. Error to reverſe a Fine levied 21 Eliz. becauſe the Writ of *Covenant*, whereupon it was levied, *bore Teſte the 2d. of January* 21 *Eliz.* and the *Dedimus* Poteſtatem to take the Conuſance *bore Date the ſame 2d Day of January, reciting quod cum breve conventionis pendet*, &c. whereas it was not depending until the Return, which was Octab. Hillarii. Gawdy and Fenner only in Court held, that is was not Error; For the Writ is pending preſently upon the Purchaſe thereof. Cro. E. 677. Trin. 41 Eliz. B. R. Arundel v. Arundel.

Reverſed for this Cauſe. Cro. E. 740. Hill. 42 Eliz. C. B. Goburn v. Wright.

But if ſuch erroneous Conuſance upon Ded. Pot be taken, and the Fine is after *drawn up as a Fine acknowledged in Court*, 4. If Dedimus Poteſtatem be *awarded to two*, and the *one of them takes Conuſance* of a Fine, and this Fine is after *drawn up in C. B.* yet the Party may well have Error upon this Fine, viz. *that the Conuſance was without Warrant*, for 'tis not contrary to the Record; For the Dedimus Poteſtatem is Parcell of the Record, and the Aſſignment of Error agrees with it, per Popham. Paſch. 1 Jac. B. R. Yelv. 34. in Caſe of Arundel v. Arundel.

now no Miſpriſion in the Ded. Pot. ſhall avoid it; for it ſhall be adjudged as a Fine acknowledged in Court only, per Popham. Yelv. 34. in Caſe of Arundel v. Arundel.

5. Where a *Sheriff was one of the Cognizees*, the *Writ was directed to the Coroners*, with this Clauſe at the end of the Writ, *Quia prædict Johannes Done* (one of the Cognizees) *eſt vicecomes Comitatus Ceſtriæ, fiat Executio Brevis prædict. per Coronatores, Ita quod Vicecomes non ſe intromittat*; and Reſolved by all the Court, that it was not Error, tho' he is not the ſole Party

Party, but others are joined with him; For if the Writ be directed to the Sheriff, and he is Party, it is doubted in the Books, if he, as Plaintiff, may execute a Writ for himſelf, and, as Defendant, may do it upon himſelf. And therefore it is good, and the general Courſe is to award the Writ to the Coroners, *to avoid the doubt of Delay*; and when the Party *appears, and levies a Fine thereupon*, he never ſhall aſſign it for Error afterwards, that it ought not to have been directed to the Coroners, eſpecially upon this amicable Writ to make Aſſurance, &c. Cro. C. 415. Mich. 11 Car. B. R. Done v. Smethier & Leigh.

(F. b. 4) Error. *Variance* between the Caption and Fine ingroſſed.

1. By the Caption of the Fine upon the Dedimus Poteſtatem the *Land was given to W. and his Wife*, and to the *Heirs of the Body of the Baron of the Body of the Feme begotten*; and the Fine ingroſſed was, to the Heirs of the Body of the Baron *upon the Wife begotten*, ſo is variant. But all the Juſtices conceived, that it was not material; For in both Caſes the Feme had but an Eſtate for Life, and the Baron an Eſtate Tail, and the Words are of the ſame Senſe. Cro. E. 275. Hill. 34 Eliz. C. B. Argenton v. Weſtover & Lucas.

2. The Caption was, *ſi contingat the Baron to die without Iſſue*, that it ſhould remain over, and the Fine engroſſed was, ſi contingat, that the *Baron and Feme die without Iſſue*, that it ſhall remain over, ſo it is variant; but it was held all one; For the *Eſtate in Remainder is always limited upon the more long Eſtate*, which is the Eſtate Tail, yet it was all of one Senſe; and afterwards, the Fine was affirmed. Cro. E. 275. Hill. 34 Eliz. C. B. Argenton v. Weſtover & Lucas.

3. Error, the Writ of *Covenant was de Manerio de Corthuther*, and the Dedimus Poteſtatem was de Manerio *de Cortheder*, and for this Variance, it was inſiſted there is no Conuſance upon the Writ; but it being with an *alias Corthuther*, it was held good. Cro. E. 275. Hill. 34 Eliz. C. B. Argenton v. Weſtover & Lucas.

4. Error aſſigned was, that the Writ was, *Inter Nicholaum Forſter* querentem *& Johannem Forſter* deforceantem; and *ſo was the Dedimus* Poteſtatem. And in the *Caption* of the Fine annexed to the Writ of Dedimus Poteſtatem (which was certified) it was in this Manner; Præcipe *Johanni Foſter militi*, quod teneat Nicholao Foſter, &c. ſo it varies from the firſt Writ & Dedimus Poteſtatem, ſed non allocatur; For they held, that the Names are all one, *Forſter* and *Foſter*, and are of the ſame Sound, & *quaſi one and the ſame Name*. Cro. J. 77, 78. Trin. 3 Jac. B. R. E. of Bedford v. Forſter.

5. The Writ of *Covenant was*, Præcipe, &c. quod teneat, &c. *de octo Meſuagiis, decem gardinis*, &c. ſo it varies from the firſt Writ or Commiſſion, and there is not any Warrant for the Commiſſion; ſed non Allocatur, it is not any Cauſe to reverſe the Fine; For altho' *duobus Meſuagiis* is *pro duobus Toftis*, yet they held it not material; For the *Concord hath Relation to the* Writ of *Covenant, and the Dedimus* Poteſtatem; and the *Entry of the Præcipe upon the Teſte of the Concord*, is a Rehearſal of the Subſtance of the Writ of Covenant, and *is more than needs to be*, and being variant from the Writ of Covenant, is idle, immaterial, and meerly void; wherefore the Fine is good enough, and it was affirmed. Cro. J. 77, 78. Trin. 3 Jac. B. R. E. of Bedford v. Forſter.

(F. b. 5) Reverſed for Errors, in the *Caption.*

1. Error to reverſe a Fine in Cheſter, the *Conuſance* was *taken* of it *by one*, and the *Dedimus* Poteſtatem was *to him, and another* jointly; and this was Erroneous. Cro. E. 240. Trin. 33 Eliz. B. R. Downes v. Savage.

(F. b. 6) Reverſed in Reſpect of Payment of the *King's Silver.* And what the King's Silver is, &c.

1. The King's Silver *is* the Fine paid to the King, Pro Licentia Concordandi.

2. *A. and his Wife acknowledged a Note* of a Fine the *26th of March* 1621. before Commiſſioners by Dedimus Poteſtatem, and the *Wife died the 27th* Day of the ſame Month. The *28th* Day *Compoſition was made* in the Alienation Office upon a *Writ of Covenant made returnable in Hill. Term before*, and the *King's Silver was entered* in the Office of the King's Silver *as of* the ſame *Hill. Term*, and ſo the Fine was paſſed and engroſſed, and now in Eaſter Term the Heir of the Wife moved againſt this Fine; but upon Debate the Court reſolved, that the Fine muſt ſtand. Hob. 330. Farmer's Caſe.

Co. R. on Fines 10.

3. It was aſſigned for Error, that *one of the Conuſors died before the Return of the Caption*, and alleged a Diminution in the Record before the Judge in Cheſter (where the Fine was levied) and after before the Prothonotary there, who *returned* no ſuch Diminution, but *that in a Paper Book, in which the Things of the Office were written, it was entred, that* ſuch a Day *was paid for the King's Silver* (without ſhewing what). The Queſtion was, whether this Fine was Erroneous for this Reaſon (amongſt others) 2 Sid. 54. 55. &c. Row v. Evelyn.———And afterwards it was held by Newdigate J. and as it ſeems by Warburton J. that it was; and Glyn Ch. J. held the Fine Erroneous for other Reaſon, and ſo thought that the King's Silver came not in Queſtion in the Caſe; For to proceed upon the Fine, the Conuſor being dead before the Return of the Writ, is, as to him, a Building without a Foundation. 2 Sid. 93, 94, 95. Trin. 1658. B. R. Row v. Evelyn.

4. *And* Glyn Ch. J. ſaid, that if, in the Caſe above, one of the Conuſors had not been dead, he thought, that the King's Silver might well be paid; For if it was not paid, yet *there was a Compoſition for it* before the Original; and in favour of Common Aſſurances, we ought to preſume that it is paid, if nothing appears to the contrary. 2 Sid. 95. 96. Trin. 1658. B. R. in Caſe of Row v. Evelyn.——cites * Carrell's Caſe.

*D. 220. b. pl. 15. Paſch. 5 Eliz.

5. Four Conuſors, *two die before the Fine ingroſſed, or King's Silver* paid; whether the Fine ſhall be Reverſed for part, or for all? It was argued that it is a Fine without an Original, and therefore ſhould be reverſed in Toto, and cited Hill. 1662. B. R. to have been ſo adjudged in Caſe of Roe v. Yeatly. 2 Lev. 127. Hill. 26 & 27 Car. 2. B. R. Biddulph v. Harriſon.

See (Q.) pl. 1.—2 Sid. 96. per 2 Juſtices againſt Glyn Ch. J. Row v. Evelyn.

6. *Husband and Wife levied a Fine* of the Lands of the Wife, and this was *by Dedimus in the Lent Vacation, ſhe being then but* 19 *Years of Age*; the *King's Silver was entered in Hillary Term before, and ſhe died in the Eaſter Week*; and upon a Motion made the firſt Day of Eaſter Term, to ſtay the engroſſing of the Fine, it was denied by the Court; For they held it to be a good Fine. 3 Mod. 141. cites it as the Caſe of * Warnecomb. v. Carrill.

*Dy. 220. b. pl. 15. S. C. 12 Rep. 124. S. C. Paſch. 5 Eliz.

3 Mod 140. S. C. Cumb. 66. S. C.

7. A Fine was acknowledged before Herbert Ch. J. by a Man and his Wife 7 *December* 1689. And by Reaſon that the late *King James had deſerted* the Kingdom, *and taken away the Great Seal*, there followed a *Stop of Proceedings at Law*; and the *Woman died the 20th of February* following,

ing, and *upon the 22d of February, the King's Silver was paid, as upon a Writ of Covenant in King James's Time*, tho' *no Writ was then ſued out.* But afterwards a *Writ of Covenant was taken out returnable* in Michaelmas Term, which was Sealed with the Seal of King William and Queen Mary; and the Fine was engroſſed, and made as a Fine in Michaelmas-Term. The Court, (after the Cauſe had been twice moved, and full Conſideration of it) gave their Opinions ſeriatim, that the Fine ſhould ſtand. For the Entring of the King's Silver after the Parties Death could not be now Examined, in Regard the Fine was *engroſſed*, and compleated *as a Fine in Michaelmas-Term.* 2 Vent. 47. Trin. 1 W. and M. C. B. Ball v. Cock.

8. Fine acknowledged before Commiſſioners in Long Vacation, and *no Writ of Covenant* taken out, the Party dies immediately.—They ſhall after, enter the King's Silver, and take out a Writ of Covenant as of the Term before. per Holt. Farr. 95. Mich. 1 Annæ B. R. in Caſe of Oades v. Woodward.

Jenk. 169. pl. 28.—The Death of the Conuſor before the *Entry of the King's Silver*, is an apparent Error. Cumb. 59. Trin. 3 Jac. 2. B. R. Paul v. Claxton.

(G. b) Reverſed or avoided for what *Error.*

1. 23 *Eliz.* 3. Enacts that, *No Fines, Proclamations upon Fines, or common Recovery, ſhall be reverſible by Writ of Error for falſe Latin, Raſure, Interlining, miſentring of any Warrant of Attorney, or of any Proclamation, miſreturning or not returning of the Sheriff, or other want of Forms in Words and not in Matter of Subſtance.*

This Statute extends only to Fines, *taken by Ded. Pot.* and is only to regulate, and not to annul Fines. Arg. 10. Mod. 43. in Ld Say and Seal's Caſe,——But was intended to protect and ſupport them. per Cur' Ibid. 45. Mich. 10. Annæ B.R.

2. A Fine is before ſuch Juſtices and *aliis fidelibus*, and if there be *no ſuch Judge* as one of them which is named, yet the Fine, being levied before other Judges, is good. Cro. E. 320. Paſch. 36 Eliz. B. R. Walſh v. Collinger.——Obiter.

3. Writ of *Covenant bore Teſte after* the Teſte of the *Ded. Pot.* and the Fine was reverſed for that Cauſe. Cro. E. 740. Hill. 42 Eliz. C. B. Goburn v. Wright.——This is a common Error, and becauſe 'tis a common Aſſurance 'tis not now to be diſallowed. per Coke and Doderidge. Roll. R. 223. Trin. 13 Jac. B. R. Herbert v. Binion.

4. A Writ of *Covenant bore Teſte* 15 *April*, returnable Quindena Paſch. and that Year Quind. Paſch. was the 14 *April*, and ſo the Return was before the Teſte, and the Fine was reverſed. Noy. 171. Gage v. Taylor.

5. A Fine *levied in the Vacation* was agreed, by the Court of Common Pleas, to be, *at the Election of the Parties*, a Fine either of the *precedent or ſubſequent Term.* Now whether *the Intervening of a Term* can make ſuch a Difference, as that in the one Caſe the Fine ſhall be good, and in the other utterly void, cannot be diſcovered from the Reaſon of the Thing; But muſt depend entirely upon *the Practice of the Court of C. B.* every Court being Judge of its own Rules. Such Kind of Evidence was refuſed in the Caſe of **Clerk and Ward**, even by a Court of Equity, viz. the Chancery and this Judgment was confirm'd in Error in the Houſe of Lords. per Cur. Mich. 10 Annæ B. R. 10 Mod. 44. In Ld Say and Seal's Caſe.

(G. b. 2). *Error* to reverſe Fines. *By whom* the Writ muſt, or may be brought.

1. A. made a *Feoffment to* the Uſe of *himſelf and B. his Wife, and to the Heirs of their two Bodies*, the Remainder *to the right Heirs of the Huſband.* They had *Iſſue M.*—then A. died; B. *the Wife ſold* the Land in Fee; M. married J. S. And afterwards B. M. and J. S. her Husband joined in Fine, come ceo, &c. in Confirmation of the Eſtate. But before the Certificate and Ingroſſment *M. died without Iſſue*; now J. S. and B. and one *C. as Couſin and Heir of M.* brought a Writ of Error to reverſe the Fine, and then to avoid the Sale of B. the Widow, upon the Statute 11 H. 7. Note, that the Writ of Error is brought by C. as Couſin and Heir Collateral to M. and it appears, that *no Right* is *deſcended to him by M.* ſo that *ſhe had but an Eſtate Tail*, which is determined by her Death without Iſſue. *And non Conſtat, that the Fee Simple was in her as right Heir of A. her Father*; for it might be, that A. had Iſſue a Son and another Daughter beſides M. for any Thing that is ſhewn to the contrary; for ſhe is not named Heir to her Father, in any ſhewing before; And then he is not damnified by this erroneous Judgment, as the Writ ſuppoſes, as right Heir to M. from whom no Right is deſcended; And the Writ of Error ſhall be brought *by him, who ſhall have the Thing; whereof the Judgment was erroneouſly given*, and that is the right Heir of A. ſo this Judgment is reverſible by him in the Remainder by the common Law, or by the Equity of the Statute of 9 R. 2. 3. (Quære hoc.) and not by the Heir General of M. and admit that it ſhould be intended, that M. was right Heir to A. yet becauſe this *Fee Simple was not then executed in her*, but was *expectant upon the Tail*, he, who ſhall demand this Fee Simple, when the Tail is ſpent, muſt make himſelf right Heir to A. according to the Limitation of the Remainder; For tho' C. was of the half Blood to M. yet he ſhall have this Remainder of the Fee-Simple as right Heir to A. if he be of the whole Blood to him, by whom, &c. D. 89. b. and 90. Mich. 1 Mar. Reynolds v. Dignam, als. Verney's Caſe. ———Ibid cites 3 H. 4. where the *Iſſue Female in Tail Special brought a Writ of Error*, becauſe that ſhe is to rehave the Land, and not her Brother, who was general Heir to the Anceſtor. And cites alſo Hill. 10 E. 3. to the like Purpoſe.

It ought to be a Remainder, or Reverſion *in Deed*, and *not in Right*, which

2. He in *Remainder, or Reverſion expectant on Eſtate Tail*, may have Error. Trin. 25 Eliz. 3. Rep. 3. b. 4. a. the third Reſolution in the Marqueſs of Wincheſter's Caſe.

is a ſufficient Ground to maintain Writ of Error. Arg. Palm 237. cites 50. Aſſ. 3 Br. Error 132.———And 32 E. 3. Error 73. where it was required to *ſhew how he came to the Reverſion, and that he had a Reverſion, and not a Right only.*———Le. 273. the Queen v. Braybrooke S. C——— S. S. cited per Haughton J. Palm. 245.———S. C. cited and agreed per Counſel. Arg. Roll. R. 301.———See 3 Lev. 36. Hutchinſon's Caſe.

Le 270. S.C. by the Name of the Queen v. Braybrook. ——See Braybrooks Caſe. —See Marq. of Wincheſter's Caſe.

3. Mich. 21 & 22 Eliz. 'Twas argued, and 25 adjudged between **Braybrooke** and the **Lo Mouis**, that *he in Remainder* may have Writ of Error; but if he in Remainder be *attainted, during the Life of the Tenant for Life*, , the *Queen* ſhall not have it. D. 188. Marg. pl. 9. Mich. 21 and 22 Eliz.

4. *And* 17 Eliz. ſo adjudged, as there was ſaid, between **Denningham** and Juſtice **Wyndham.** D. 118. Marg. pl. 917 Eliz.

S. C. cited D. 89. b. Marg. pl. 2

5. A. ſued two Writs of Error, one to reverſe a Fine, the other to reverſe a Common Recovery, by Reaſon of his Nonage. Tanfield moved that the Writ to reverſe the Fine, was not well brought. The Caſe was, *B. was, Tenant Right*

for Life, in Right of his Wife, the *Remainder to the Plaintiff in Fee*, and they *joined in a Fine* to D. It was inſiſted, that they all ought to join in the Writ, and there ought to be Summons and Severances, and he can't bring it alone; but it was anſwered, that this Writ is well brought by the Plaintiff alone; For it is *brought for an Error in Fait*, viz. his *Nonage*, and of his Nonage, the other can take no Advantage; ſo the *Cauſe of the Action being ſeveral*, and not joint, they cannot join in the Action, 34 H. 6 in Caſe of Attaint, 7 H. 4. 44. and they relied upon the Caſe, 29 Aſſ. 14. The Court held the Writ was well brought, becauſe it is *no Error in the Record*, but an Error in Fait; and if *two Infants bring* a Writ of *Error*, they muſt aſſign the Errors ſeverally; and therefore if one be within Age he muſt bring the Writ alone. Cro. E. 115. 30 and 31 Eliz. B. R. Pigott v. Ruſſell.

6. If *Husband and Wife* levy a Fine of the Wife's Land unto a Stranger, the *Wife being within Age*, they ſhall have a Writ of Error during her Nonage. F. N. B. 21 (D).

7. *A. levies a Fine* of Lands *to B.*—*C. can't have* a Writ of *Error* to reverſe this Fine, *altho'* C. be *in Poſſeſſion, and Tenant in Fee Simple* of the Land. Jenk. 161. pl. 6.

(G. b. 3) Reverſal. How. *By Plea*, without Writ of Error, and by what Plea.

1. Where a Fine is pleaded, it is no Plea, that there is *no ſuch Record of Writ of Covenant, upon which 'twas levied*; For a Fine levied without Original is not void, but Error; For they are Judges of the Thing. Br. Aſſiſe. pl 397. cites 26 H. 6. and Fitzh. Aſſiſe. 13.

3. If Error be *in the Proclamations* of a Fine, they ſhall be reverſed by Plea without Writ of Error; but that Fine nevertheleſs remains of good Force ſtill; For they are ſeveral Matters of Record; yet if Error be in the Fine, the Proclamations are void; becauſe the Fine is the firſt Record, whereupon the Proclamations depend, and *Sublato Subjecto tollitur ejus Accidens*. Weſt's Symb. S. 192. cites Pl. 266. a. D. fol. 216. pl. 54. 4 Eliz.

(G. b. 4) Pleadings. Where a Fine is pleaded, How it may be *avoided by Pleading* Partes Finis non, &c. Or by confeſſing and avoiding.

1. The Fine is good, if any of the *Parties* be *ſeiſed at the Time*, &c. Br. Eſtoppel, pl. 26. cites 40 E. 3. 30.

2. If a Fine be levied *to a Monk, by a ſtrange Name*, it ſhall be Eſtoppel to plead *Profeſſion*. Br. Eſtoppel. pl. 2. cites 3 H. 6. 23.

3. Where a Recovery, or Fine of my Anceſtor is pleaded againſt me, I ought to *ſhew how my Anceſtor came to it after*, and otherwiſe, he cannot confeſs and avoid it; For it is not ſufficient to ſay, that the Anceſtor was ſeiſed after, without ſhewing how he came to it. Br. Confeſs and Avoid pl. 57. cites 6 E. 4. 11. per Neale.

4. It hath been reſolved, that againſt a *Jointenancy pleaded* by Fine, the Demandant may confeſs and avoid the Fine; as to *ſay that the Jointenant not named, releaſed before the Writ brought, or that they both infeoffed one who re-infeoffed the Tenant*, or the like; For theſe, or the like Pleas, Confeſſing and Avoiding the Fine do in no Sort weaken the Strength or Force of the ſame. 2 Inſt. 524.

5. 'Tis

Br. Fines. pl. 87. cites S. C. and that he may confeſs the Fine, and avoid it by elder Title and Regreſs;

5. 'Tis ſaid in one Book, that a Fine may be *avoided in two Manners*, viz. either to ſay Quod *Partes Finis nec eorum aliquis Tempore Levationis Finis nihil habuerunt; nec eorum aliquis aliquid habuit, &c. ſed quidam J. S. cujus Statum ipſe habet*; *or* to *confeſs and* to *avoid* the Fine, *as* to ſay, *that J. S. was ſeiſed, till by the Conuſor diſſeiſed, who levied the Fine*, viz. *that J. S. enter'd, who enfeoffed him.* Co. R. on Fines, 17. cites 3 H. 7. 9.

and where he, that ſo pleads, *concludes, & de Loc ponit ſe ſuper Patriam*, he, who pleads the Fine, ſhall ſay *& idem Querens ſimiliter*: And there it appears, (he ſays) that there are diverſe Forms of Pleading in Avoidance of a Fine ——————Br. Iſſues join'd, &c. pl. 3. cites 33 H. 6. 21.

S. P. Br. Eſtoppel. pl. 26. cites 40 E. 3. 30. if he is a Stranger to the Fine.

6. Upon a *Formedon of Gift* in Tail by Fine, *Ne Dona pas* is a good Plea, and Averment againſt the Fine, and in Avoidance of the Fine, per Cur. Co. R. on Fines, 17. cites 38. E. 3. 3. a.

S. P. and there is no other *Rejoinder* made. The Reaſon ſeems to be becauſe the Defendant pleads in the Negative, and then this makes Iſſue immediately,

7. Et Notandum eſt, if one plead in Avoidance of a Fine, Quod Partes Finis, nec eorum aliquis, &c. the *other*, *in Maintenance of the Fine, need not to ſhew, that the Parties had the Eſtate*; *But* he, that pleads in Avoidance of the Fine, ought to *conclude*, *& de hoc ponit ſe ſuper Patriam*; then he that maintained the Fine, ſhall not ſay more than, *& Predictus quer. ſimiliter*, &c. and if he, that pleads the Fine, *can prove*, *that any of the Parties* to the Fine *had any Thing*; this is good enough for him. Co. R. on Fines, 17

as Ne Dona pas, Nul Tort, Not Guilty, &c. Br. Iſſues join'd, &c. pl. 3. cites 33. H. 6. 21. per Littleton, who ſaid that it was adjudg'd by Sir John June in C. B.

Nor need he *ſhew how he had the Eſtate of J. S.* and it is as well as if the Que Eſtate had been limited in him who was Party to the Writ.

8. And upon this, that hath been ſaid, it appears clearly, that if one plead Quod Partes Finis, &c. ſed quidam J. S. cujus Statum ipſe habet, &c. the *Seiſin of J. S. is not traverſable*; but he, that pleads the Fine, ought to maintain the Fine, as is aforeſaid. Co. R. on Fines, 17.

Br. Fines pl. 70. cites 37 H. 6. 34.

9. If a *Feme Covert* only, *without her Baron*, levies a *Fine executory*; tho' the *Baron continues in Poſſeſſion during his Life*, and after dies, yet this ſhall conclude the Feme and her Heirs; but if *Execution* had been ſued, and after the Baron had died, this had avoided the Fine for ever. Co. R. on Fines, 17.

10. Scire facias to execute a Fine *levied by D. where he had but two Parts in Common with J. S.* at the Time of the Fine, who was ſeiſed of the third Part in Common with the ſaid D. who levied the Fine of the third Part, &c. it is dangerous to ſay that D. had nothing at the Time of the Fine, but *ſhall ſay that he had nothing but in Common with J. S. which Eſtate he has*; nota. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 1. cites 26 H. 8. 9.

11. 'Tis a good Plea to ſay, *that J. S. was ſeiſed Tempore levat'*, *and before* the Fine levied, *without that*, that the Parties in the Fine had any Thing therein at the Time of the Fine levied. Weſt's Symb. S. 291. cites 9 H. 4. 27. 3 H. 6. 27.

12. *Or* to ſay, that the Parties to a Fine had nothing, &c. *but A. B. whoſe Eſtate he hath*, Et de hoc ponit ſe ſuper Patriam, Weſt's Symb. S. 191. cites 33 H. 6. 18. 26 H. 6. fo. 9. 42 E. 3. 20. 4 H. 4. 8. 14 H. 4. 33. 4 H. 7. c. 24.

13. A. *deviſed to B. for Life, and if B. have Iſſue Male, then to ſuch Iſſue Male and his Heirs for ever*; and after B's Death, *if he leave no Iſſue Male*, then *to C. and his Heirs*. B. ſuffered a Recovery, in which he was Vouchee, and the Uſe was declared to B. and his Heirs. The Coheirs of A. were E. and F. two Femes, then of Age and unmarried. *B. by Will gave* the Land *to J. N. in Tail*, *Remainder over*. B. died, and C. entered; afterwards, *J. N. and W. R. joined in levying a Fine, and ſuffered a Recovery to the*

the Uſe of W. R. and his Heirs. It was objected that Partes Finis nihil habuerunt, in Regard, that *before the levying it, W. R.* (who was ſaid to be the Diſſeiſor of the Premiſſes), *by Leaſe and Releaſe did convey the Inheritance of the Premiſſes to W. S. in Mortgage*, and that tho' W. R. had the Poſſeſſion, yet this was under the Proviſo of the Mortgage, as Tenant at Will to the Mortgagee, until Default of Payment. But Ld C. Parker, held, that in this Caſe, it could not be ſaid, that Partes Finis nihil habuerunt; becauſe J. N. as *Deviſee of B. had a Right againſt all Perſons but the Heirs of A. and that W. R. entering upon him was a Diſſeiſor*, and tho' W. R. afterwards mortgaged in Fee, yet he continuing in Poſſeſſion, and joining with J. N. in the Fine, it could not be ſaid, that Partes Finis &c. when one of them, viz. *W. R. had the Poſſeſſion, and J. N. the Right* againſt W. R. and alſo againſt his Mortgagee; and alſo that E. and F. the Coheirs of A. being of Age, and unmarried at the Time of Recovery, ſuffered by B. were barred by the Statute of Limitations. Wms's Rep. 505, 506, 507, 519, 520. Mich. 1718. Carter v. Barnardiſton.

(G. b. 5) Reverſed *by one*, where it ſhall *benefit others*.

1. The Law, after the Statute of 4 H. 7. is, that if the *Eſtate* contained in the Fine *was defeated within the 5 Years*, the Fine thereby had *loſt its Force*, not only againſt him, who had defeated it, but againſt *all others that had Right* or Title *Paramount*, and *who do not put in their Claim within the 5 Years after the Proclamations, tho'* he who defeated it had brought his Action within 5 Years, but had *no Judgment and Execution till 7 Years were paſſed after the Proclamations.* per Saunders. Pl. C. 358. b. in Caſe of Stowel v. Ld Zouch. See Mo. 251. contra per Periam J.

2. Tenant for Life, Remainder for Life, Remainder in Fee; if the firſt *Tenant for Life alien*, and the *Alienee levy a Fine*, he in *Remainder for Life* may enter, and defeat the Fine, and not he in Remainder in Fee; and if he *enters*, this ſhall give Benefit to him in Remainder in Fee; For the Fine againſt him ſhall be ouſted. And by the ſame Reaſon, if he makes continual Claim, he in Remainder in Fee, at all Times after ſhall take Advantage of it, and ſhall avoid the Fine, as Saunders ſaid. Pl. C. 359.

3. Fine being levied *by A. in the Name of B.* a Reconveyance was decreed. and that a Vacat ſhould be made, if by Law it might be. Roll. R. 115. in Caſe of Day v. Pungate, cites 38 & 39 El. the Caſe of Gellerband v. Hubard.

(H. b) Reverſed or Avoided by *Death* of Conuſor, or Conuſee.

1. If Fine be *acknowledged before a Judge*, and the Conuſor dies, it may be inroll'd after. Co. R. on Fines, 10.

2. If *one of the Conuſees dies before Return of the Writ*, this makes not the Fine void, but voidable only by Writ of Error. Per two Juſtices againſt Glynn Ch. J who held it void, for this Reaſon. 2 Sid 94, 95. Trin. 1658. B. R. Row v. Yeveley.

3. The Father and Son join in a Fine in order to make a Settlement upon the ſecond Wife of the Father, who was only Tenant by the Curteſy, the Remainder in Tail to his ſaid Son. *One of the Cogniſors died* after the Caption, and *before the Return of the Writ of Covenant*; and now the Writ of Error was brought to reverſe it, and this was aſſigned for Error. Per Cur. If it had been in the Caſe of a *Purchaſor for a valuable Conſideration*, the Court would have ſhewed him ſome Favour; but it being to do a *Wrong to a young Man*, they would leave it open to the Law. 3 Mod. 99. Paſch 2 Jac. 2. B. R. Okell v. Hodgkinſon.

4. Conuſor died *between the Teſte and Return* of the Writ of Covenant, for which Reaſon the Fine was reverſed, Hill 3 and 4 Jac. 2. B. R. Cumb. 57, 71. Price v. Davis.

5. If the *Caption* of a Fine be taken *in the Vacation*, and the *Writ* be *returnable the next Term*, the Death of the Party determines it; but if it be returnable *the Term before*, it ſhall be well, notwithſtanding the Party's Death. Farr. 2. per Cur. Paſch. 1 Annæ. B. R. in Dr. Woodward's Caſe.

(H. b. 2) Reverſed by *Error* brought *in B. R.* How.

Per Berkley J. Mar. 10. pl. 27. —Br. Error. 137. cites 1 H. 7. 19. 20. S. P. Br. Record. pl. 48. cites S. C.

1. If a Writ of Error be brought in B. R. to reverſe a Fine levied in C. B. the very Record of the Fine itſelf is never removed hither, but on a Tranſcript of it: *But if this Court adjudge it erroneous*, then a *Certiorari* goes to the Chirographer, *to certify the very Fine*; and when it comes up, it is *actually cancelled*; per Holt Ch. J. 1 Salk. 341. Fazacharly v. Baldo.

——Ibid. pl. 46. cites 40 Aſſ. 29.——Upon a Tranſcript of a Record, a Man ſhall not aſſign Errors, if it be not upon a Writ of Error ſued upon a Tranſcript of a Fine, and there he ſhall aſſign Errors upon the *Tranſcript of the Note of the Fine*; and if the Juſtices do conceive it Error, then they ſhall ſend for the Note of the Fine, and ſhall reverſe the ſame. F. N. B. 20 (F).——But Br. Record. pl. 49 cites 5 Ma. 1. Nota, that in B. R. they have diverſe Precedents, that in Writ of Error upon Fine the Record itſelf ſhall be certified, ſo that no more Proclamations ſhall be made, and if they are reverſed, this makes an End of all, but if they are *affirmed*, then the *Record ſhall be ſent into C. B. by Mittimus to be proclaim'd and ingroſſed.* Quod Nota, For if nothing be removed but the Tranſcript, they may proceed in B. C. notwithſtanding.——*Certiorari* was awarded out of B. R. directed *to the Cuſtos Brevium*, which was *to remove the Foot and Record of a Fine*, levied Tempore Reg. and Reginæ P. & Ma. (whereof, in Law and Truth, only the Tranſcript was removed before by Writ of Error, and *Error found and adjudged* in this) to the Intent, that the Record of the Fine ſhould be removed *a Filaciis in C. B. and cancelled in B. R.* and of this are Books and Precedents. And Egerton, Clerk of the Office of Chirographer, ſhewed a Precedent Tempore E. 3. of Certiorari out of the Chancery directed to the Juſtices of C. B. *& pro Tenore Pedis Finis pro Errore*, and by *Mittimus* ſent over into B. R. Anno. 16 E. 3. D. 274. b. pl. 44. Paſch. 10 Eliz. Anon.

2. Where a Writ of Error brought in B. R. was directed to the Cuſtos Brevium of the C. B. *to remove Recordum & Proceſſum* (leaving out the Word *aforeſaid*) *cum Omnibus ea tangentibus*, which was done accordingly, It ſeems that the Writ of Error, in Form, is not good, becauſe the Tranſcript ought to be removed, and not the very Record itſelf, till Judgment be given of Reverſal. And this appears in diverſe Books and Precedents, as 21 E. 3. 40. Lib. Aſſ. 24. Becauſe there is no Chirographer in B. R. if the Fine be affirmed. D. 89. b. pl. 2. 4. Mich. 1 M. Reynolds v. Dignam al. Verney's Caſe.

3. When a Fine is to be reverſed for Error, the Courſe is for the Plaintiff in the Writ to have *ſeveral Writs of Error*; viz. one, directed *unto the Ch. J.* of the Court of Common Pleas, *to certify the Record and Proceſs* of the Fine, and another *to the Cuſtos Brevium* of the ſame Court *to certify the Tranſcript of the Foot of the Fine*, and the third, *to the Chirographer to certify the Tranſcript of the Record and Proceſs* of the Fine. Weſt's Symb. S. 192.

*The *Reaſon* why Tranſcript of the Fine only, and not the Record of the Fine, ſhall be removed by Writ of Error, is, becauſe *in B. R. there is no Chirographer.* Co. R. on Fines. 12.—Br. Record. pl. 46. S. P. cites 40 Aſſ. 29.

4. Error being brought in B. R. of a Fine in C. B. *the Fine was affirmed*; and now a Writ of Error, *coram Vobis Reſiden.* was brought here; and Exception was taken, that the Writ ought to abate; for that no ſuch Writ lies in this Caſe, becauſe * *only a Tranſcript* of the Fine *is removed* into this Court; and it was likened to the Caſes of Error in the Exchequer Chamber, where only a Tranſcript goes up, and if the Writ abates, no Writ of Error Coram Vobis lies. Sed per Cur. the Reaſon of that is not, becauſe *they in the Exchequer Chamber* have only a Tranſcript, but becauſe they *have only a particular Authority to affirm or to reverſe.* It was admitted, that the Tranſcript of the Record of a Fine is only removed, becauſe, upon Judgment of Reverſal, a Certiorari goes for the very Foot of the Fine, and it is cancelled. But notwithſtanding that, the Court held, that Error coram Vobis Reſiden. lay. Paſch. 4 W. & M. B. R. 1 Salk. 337. Winchurch v. Belwood.

(H. b. 3) Re-

(H. b. 3) Reverſed. *Ancient Demeſne.* Fines levied there Reverſed by Writ of Diſceit.

1. Scire facias was ſued upon a Writ of Diſceit, which was to reverſe a Fine levied of Land, which is ancient Demeſne; the Lord brought the Writ of Diſceit, and the Record of the Exchequer was ſhewn, proving the Manor of E. to be in Ancient Demeſne; and the Plaintiff ſaid, that *Parcel* of the Land in the Fine, *was Parcel of the Manor, and Parcel at the Common Law*, and the Defendant cannot deny it; and becauſe the *Tranſcript* was ſent, therefore the *Court ſent to the Chamberlain of the Exchequer for the Fine itſelf*; and upon this, they adjudged that the Fine, as to this which was Ancient Demeſne, ſhould be reverſed, and * annull'd; and the Lord reſtored to his Seigniory; and the Fine was *marked of this Parcel, and not drawn off the File*; For 'tis good for the reſt, and therefore it ſeems here, that by theſe Words, (Void and Annulled,) that it is void, as well to the Parties as to the Lord; and yet by 17 E. 3. the Conuſee ſhall have the Land. Br. Fines, pl. 47. cites 21 E. 3. 20. and 7 H. 4. 28. * Orig. (Ancient).

2. Fine was levied of Land in Ancient Demeſne at Common Law, the Lord brought Writ of *Diſceit againſt thoſe only, who levy'd the Fine and not againſt the Terre-tenants*, and had *Scire facias againſt the Tertenants*, and well; and it was agreed that the Fine ſhall be *annull'd againſt the Lord*; but quære, if by this it ſhould be void *between the Parties*, and ſo ſee in this Action Non-tenure is no Plea, if it may be againſt thoſe who are not Terretenants. Br. Deſceit, pl. 38. cites 7 H. 4. 44.

3. If a Man levy a Fine at the Common Law unto another of Land, which is in Ancient Demeſne; the Lord of Ancient Demeſne ſhall have a Writ of Diſceit againſt him, who levied the Fine, and he, who is Tenant, ſhall avoid the Fine; and there he, who ought to give the Land, *ſhall be reſtored unto his Poſſeſſion or Title, which he had given by the Fine*; becauſe the Fine and Gift thereby is avoided; *But if he*, who levies the Fine, had after by his Deed *releaſed* unto him, who hath the Poſſeſſion by the Fine, *or by* the *Deed confirmed his Eſtate in the Land*; then he, unto whom the Releaſe or Confirmation is made, ſhall have and keep the Land, notwithſtanding that the Fine be avoided; becauſe that Releaſe, or Confirmation, made unto him being in Poſſeſſion hath made his Eſtate firm and rightful againſt him and his Heirs, who releaſed or confirmed the ſame. F. N. B. 98. (A.)

(H. b. 4) *Reverſal* of Fines, of *Ancient Demeſne. At what Time.*

1. Where a *Man recovers* Land *in Ancient Demeſne Court*, which was made *Frank Fee* before *by Fine levied at Common Law*, this Judgment in Court of Ancient Demeſne is void, & coram non Judice. Br. Judgment. 19. cites 7 H. 4. 27.

2. 'Twas argued, and at length agreed, that a Lord in Ancient Demeſne ſhall have a Writ of Deſceit, *after* a Fine levied, and *the King's Silver paid, tho' the Fine be not ingroſſed.* Mo. 6. pl. 21. Hill. 3 E. 6. Anon.

(H. b. 5) Plead-

(H. b. 5) Pleadings. In Maintenance of Fines.

1. He, who maintains the Fine, may ſay, *that the Conuſor was ſeiſed in Fee.* Br. Fines. pl. 50.

2. *As* in Ward, the *Defendant intitled himſelf by joint Eſtate to the Anceſtor and himſelf by Fine, and that he ſurvived*; the Plaintiff ſaid that thoſe who were Parties to the Fine, had nothing at the Time of the Fine, &c. *and* the Defendant ſaid, *that the Conuſors were ſeiſed in Fee, at the Time of the Fine*, &c. Br. Fines, pl. 50. cites 7 H. 6. 21. and 33 H. 6. tit. Replic. and Rejoinder.

(I. b) Avoided, &c. *Not being perfected.*

S.P.254.D.pl. 104. as to the Fine, but the Proclamations denied to be engroſſed, the Parties being dead. Compton's Caſe.—The Reaſon of the Caſe in D. 254. why the Proclamations there made, were *ſtayed* after the Conuſee's Death, was, becauſe a *Formedon was depending*, and that was only in the Diſcretion of the Court. Cro. E. 693. Mich. 41 and 42 Eliz. B. R. Wakefield v. Hodgeſon.

1. A. in 33 H. 8. acknowledged a Fine of certain Lands; the King's Silver was enter'd, and the Conuſance taken; but the *Fine was never ingroſſed.* * He who claimed under the Fine came into Court (29 El.) and prayed that the Fine be ingroſſed. The Court examined them on their Oaths, to what Uſe the Fine was levied, and in the Seiſin and Poſſeſſion of what Perſons the Lands, whereof the Fine was levied, had been after the Fine?——On which Examination it appeared fully to the Court, That, the Party, to whom the Fine was levied, was ſeiſed after the Fine, and ſuffered a Common Recovery of the Land; and that the ſaid Land had been ſo enjoyed, according to the ſaid Fine, at all Times ſince, &c. whereupon the Court commanded that the Fine be ingroſſed. 4 Le. 96. Trin. 29 Eliz. C. B. Sir J. Brome's Caſe.

---

* See (W) (P. a. 2).

(I. b. 2) * *Averment* againſt Fines. *Continuance of Poſſeſſion*, and dying ſeiſed, &c.

1. A *Fine* was levied *between Baron and Feme and H. R.* by which Fine *H. R. rendered to the Baron and Feme in Tail, Remainder to the Plaintiff in Fee*; and he in *Remainder ſued Execution, ſuppoſing the Baron and Feme to be dead without Iſſue* of their Bodies; the *Tenant ſaid, that before the Fine H. R. gave to the Baron, who was Party to the Fine, in Tail*, the *Remainder over*, who *had Iſſue P. by another Feme, and died, whoſe Eſtate P. the Tenant has*, and *did not ſhew where the Fee Simple was*, and yet well, and *averred the Continuance of the Poſſeſſion in the Donee*, at the Time of the Fine, and was not eſtopped by the Fine to the contrary thereof. But per Thirning, if it had been Conuſance de Droit *come ceo*, &c. it had been contra, by which the Plaintiff ſaid that H. R. was ſeiſed in Fee, at the Time of the Fine, abſque hoc, that he gave in Tail before the Fine. Br. Eſtoppel pl. 67. cites 11 H. 4 85.

S. P. Becauſe *this is by the Statute* of 27 E. 1. de Finibus, and not at Common Law, which was after the Statute of W. 2. de Donis Conditionalibus, made 13 E. 1. *Contra of a Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit tantum*; *For this was at Common Law* Co. R. on Fines 4. cites 12 E. 4 15. 19.———Br. Fines pl. 74 S. P. cites 13 Aſſ. 8.

2. The *Iſſue in Tail can't aver Continuance of Poſſeſſion againſt a Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit* come ceo, &c. *but contrary of his Wife, and him in Remainder*; For they are not Parties nor Privies. Br. Averment, pl. 57. cites 12 E. 4. 15.———Nevertheleſs, where the Baron is eſtopped, the Feme, who claim'd by him ſhall be eſtopped. Br. Averment pl. 57. cites 4 E. 3.

3. Againſt

3. Againſt a Fine *Sur Conuſance de Droit tantum, & ſur Grant and Render, and* againſt a Fine *ſur Releaſe*, levied to the Tenant in Tail, or by Tenant in Tail, the Iſſues may aver Continuance of the Poſſeſſion in their Anceſtor. For, altho' the Statute *de Donis Conditionalibus* was made 13 E. 1. and our Statute made 27 E. 1. yet 'twas not the Intention of this Statute to take away the Liberty and Benefit of the Iſſue in Tail, which the Statute, *de Donis Conditionalibus* had given to them; For it appears, that the Intention of the Makers of this Statute was to reform ſuch Averments, which were *Contra Leges & Conſuetudines Angliæ Antiquit. Uſitat.* and not to toll ſuch lawful Averments, as by the Statute *De Donis Conditionalibus* were given to the Tenant in Tail; but againſt a Fine *Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo*, &c. to which the Anceſtor in Tail is a Party, the Iſſue in Tail ſhall have Averment of Continuance of Poſſeſſion in his Anceſtor againſt the Fine in ſome Caſe, and in ſome not. And therefore I have taken this Diverſity, that againſt a Fine *levy'd by Tenant in Tail Sur Conuſance de Droit Come ceo, &c.* the Iſſue in Tail ſhall have no Averment of Continuance of Poſſeſſion; but if a Fine *Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo, &c.* be *levied to the Tenant in Tail*, this ſhall not conclude the Iſſue (as divers Books ſay) to aver Continuance of Poſſeſſion. Co. Read. of Fines. 16.

Br. Averment 6. cites 8 H. 4. 7.

Br. Aſſiſe pl. 51. cites 8 H. 4. 7.

See Br. Fines pl. 35. cites 8 H. 4. S.

4. *And* in ſome Caſes, *Privies in Blood and inheritable* alſo ſhall have an Averment againſt the Fine, notwithſtanding the Statute of 18 *Ed.* 1. And therefore, if *Tenant in Tail accepts a Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo, &c.* yet the *Iſſue in Tail*, that is Privie and Heir in Tail, ſhall aver Continuance of Poſſeſſion in the Father; For it ſtandeth well with the Fine, which is (Come ceo que il ad de ſon done). 2 Inſt. 517.

5. *So* it is in the Caſe above, if *Tenant in Tail* had *granted and rendered* the Land to the Conuſor, the *Iſſue* in Tail *might have averred Continuance of Poſſeſſion* in the Father; For the Fine was Executory, and nothing veſted in the Conuſor until Execution. 2 Inſt. 517.

6. *But* if Tenant in Tail *levy a Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo*; the Iſſue in Tail, tho' he be not barred by the Fine, yet he ſhall not againſt this Fine aver Continuance of Poſſeſſion in the Father; and that Diverſity was holden for Law after the Statute 18 *Ed.* 1. neither after this Statute could the Iſſue in Tail have generally pleaded, that *Partes Finis nihil habuerunt*, but was ouſted thereof by this Statute, albeit ſome have relied much upon theſe Words in this Act *Rite Levatus*; now the Statutes of 4 H. 7. and 32 H. 8. and the Expoſition thereof makes this out of Queſtion. 2 Inſt. 517.

(I. b. 3) Averment againſt Fines. *Death* of Conuſor *before* the Teſte of the *Dedimus*, Return of the Writ of Covenant, *Execution*, &c.

1. In Aſſiſe, the *Tenant pleaded in Bar by Fine of the Anceſtor of the Plaintiff*, whoſe Heir, &c. It is no Title for the Plaintiff, that the ſame *Anceſtor was ſeiſed, and died ſeiſed*; For if he died ſeiſed *before Execution* of the Fine, the Entry of the Conuſee is lawful. *But* 'tis a good Title, *that, after the Execution* of the Fine, *his Father, or the ſame Party to the Fine, was ſeiſed, and died ſeiſed, and he entered as Heir*, and was ſeiſed until, &c. Quod Nota, Diverſity of dying ſeiſed before Execution, and dying ſeiſed after. Br. Aſſiſe. pl. 483. cites 33 E. 3. and 10 H. 4. 9. and Fitzh. Title. 4. and 14.

2. A Man may be received againſt the Conuſance of a Fine *taken before the Ch. J. of the C. B.* (which may be without a Dedimus) to ſay, *That the Conuſor died before the Return of the Writ of Covenant*, per Popham Ch. J. Cro. E. 469. (bis) Paſch 38. Eliz. B. R. in Caſe of Wright v. the Mayor, &c. of Wickham.

D. 89. b. Reynolds, Verney, & al. v. Dignam & al.

3. A Fine was levied by a Feme Covert, who *died before Certificate and Ingroſſment*, and the Fine afterward certified; 'twas alledged for Error in fait, that the Woman died *before the Teſte of the Dedimus*, whereas the Judge had *certified the Concord taken after*; and this was not admitted to be queſtioned after the Certificate. Hard. 127. Arg. Trin. 1658. in the Exchequer. cites D. 89. b. Verney's Caſe.

[See Error (U.) pl. 4, 5, 6, 7.]

(I. b. 4) Averment againſt Fines. *Colluſion* or *Uſury*, &c.

Colluſion may be averr'd againſt a Fine. Br. Fines. pl. 115. cites S. C.—— Ibid. ſays, that the principal Caſe was agreed to be Law. T. 33 H. 8.

1. Error to reverſe his own Fine, becauſe he was within Age at the Time, &c. and the Court adjudged him within Age by Inſpection; the *Tertenant cannot aver that he was of full Age, but* ſhall have Averment, *that another of the ſame Name levied the Fine, and not he who appeared.* Br. Averment, pl. 55. cites 27 Aſſ. 53.

S. P. Br. Garde. pl. 74. cites 7 H. 4. 15. But cites 38. E. 3. contra. de droit; come ceo, &c.

2. The *Lord may aver Colluſion*, againſt a Fine levied by his Tenant, to the Intent *to take his Ward from him.* Br. Averment, pl. 64. cites 12 H. 4. 16. that the Lord cannot aver Colluſion againſt the Fine of his Tenant ſur Conuſance

3 Rep. 80. in Fermor's Caſe.

3. Upon the Statute of 13 *Eliz. againſt Uſury*, and 27 *Eliz. againſt Fraud*, although Fines be levied; yet where there is *Uſury*, or *Fraud*, or Covin, they may be averred ſo to be againſt any Act whatſoever. Jenk. 254. pl. 45.

(I. b. 5) Averment againſt Fines. *Other Matters.*

1. In Scire Facias upon a Fine levied of *Land in D.* the Tenant ſhall not *ſay*, that there is *no ſuch Vill*; for this will avoid the Fine, which will not be ſuffered. Br. Fines, pl. 98. cites 21. E. 4. 51.

2. If the *Record be, that the Fine was proclaimed according to the Statute*, the Fine is good, and has the Force of this Statute. Denſh. R. 5. upon 4 H. 7. 24.

3. If *J. S. has Warrant of Attorney for* J. D. and this is taken by a Judge in C. B. and the Record is accepted in Court, it ſhall not be averred after, that *there is no ſuch J. S.* becauſe contrary to that which the Court has recorded; yet, if the Judge had been informed of it at firſt, he would, and ought to have ſtay'd it. Per Popham. Yelv. 34. Paſch. 1. Jac. in Caſe of Arundel v. Arundel.

4. A. levied a Fine *to W. his Son, and his Heirs*; upon this Fine the Judge cannot make Queſtion for any Matter in Law; but if the Party comes and avers matter in fact, and ſays that *A. had two Sons named W.* Elder and Younger. This Averment out of the Fine is good of this Matter of Fact, which *ſtands well with the Words of the Fine*, and ſhall be tried per Pais. Mich. 8. Jac. 8 Rep. 155. in Altham's Caſe.

5. Againſt *Jointenancy by Fine* the Demandant *cannot take a general Averment, that the Tenant is ſole ſeiſed*; for that ſhould ſeem to weaken the Force of the Fine; and the Statute of *Conjunctim Feoffatis*, Anno 34. *E.* 1. extends not to Jointenancy by Fine, but to Jointenancy by Deed only, to take the general Averment againſt the Deed, that the Tenant is ſole ſeiſed. 2 Inſt. 524.

6. If

6. If the *Fine* be *received and recorded*, the *Feme covert*, or her Heirs, ſhall not be received to aver, *that ſhe was not examined* nor aſſented; for this ſhould be againſt the Record of the Court, and tending to the weakening of the general Aſſurances of the Realm. 2 Inſt. 515.

Co. R. on Fines. 8. — Ibid. 17. cites 32. E. 3. Br. Replication. 63.

7. In ſome Caſe the *Party himſelf* ſhall not be concluded of his Averment againſt the expreſs Fine; *as* if 2 *Jointenants* be in Fee, and they *accept a Fine ſur conuſans de droit come ceo*, to them and the Heirs of one, the Eſtate is not changed, and they may plead the former Feoffment to them and their Heirs, and that by Law they could have no other Fine. 2 Inſt. 517.

8. A *Dedimus poteſtatem*, to take Conuſance of a Fine, is *directed to J. S. Knt.* and he takes the Conuſance, and certifies it by the Name of J. S. Knight, whereas in Truth he is *not a Knight*. This is not erroneous, nor aſſignable for Error that he is not a Knight, for it is againſt the Record. Jenk. 280. pl. 3.

So if the Conuſance was taken by J. S. one of the Juſtices of C. B. *Eſq. who is after made a Knt.* and Chief Baron of the Exchequer; Though the Dedimus, which neceſſarily muſt overreach the Conuſance, be directed to J. S. Knt. who returns it, yet it ſhall not be aſſigned for Error. Yelv. 33. Paſch. 1 Jac. Arundel v. Arundel.

(I. b. 6) Averment againſt Fines. By *Stranger*.

1. *Baron and Feme levied a Fine to C. who* granted and *rendered* back *to the ſaid Baron and Feme, and to the Heirs of the Feme*. Afterwards *J. S. brought Formedon in Deſcender* againſt the Baron and Feme. After many Delays the Feme was received, and vouched to Warrant C. which Voucher J. S. counterpleaded, and thereupon it was demurred; but the Judges of C. B. neglecting to proceed to give Judgment, though by the King's Writ commanded ſo to do, for which Purpoſe J. S. had applied to the Houſe of Lords, and at length the Record being brought thither by the Juſtices of C. B, it was there agreed, that J. S. being a Stranger to the Fine, might aver, that the Baron had nothing in the Premiſſes; and agreed that J. S. recover. Pryne's Abr. Cott. Rec. 30. 14 E. 3. Sir John Stanton's Caſe.

2. In Formedon, the *Tenant denied a Gift by J. R.* &c. and becauſe it was *by Fine, and executed by the Words of the Fine*, therefore Finch awarded the other to anſwer; for he ſaid, that *Party*, *Privy*, *nor Stranger* ſhall not have Averment *againſt a Fine executed*. But Brook makes a Quere thereof as to the *Stranger*. Br. Eſtoppell. pl. 31. cites 42 E. 3. 9.

3. Tho' the Statute of 27 *E.* 1. 1. extends to Averments taken by Parties and Privies, and *extends not to Averments made by Strangers*, that are *no Parties nor Privies* to the Fine, *yet by the Common Law*, the puiſſant Force and Nature of Fines was ſuch, that a *meer Stranger could* not have *a general Averment* againſt a Fine; and therefore it is reported by Shard, one of the Juſtices of the Court of C. B. that it was reſolved by the Sages of the Law, that the Parties, or their Heirs, ſhould have no Averment againſt Fines levied, contrary to the Fine levied, to avoid it; and that a Stranger ſhould have no general Averment directly to avoid a Fine, if it were *not upon ſome ſpecial Matter*; for he, that is *Tenant after the Fine levied, is intended* Tenant *under* the Eſtate of *ſome of the Parties to the Fine*, to whom, by the Common Law, a general Averment is not given, more than to the Party or Privy; and the ſpecial Matter, which gives him the Averment, is, that after he pleads, that the Parties to the Fine had nothing in the Land at the Time of the Fine levied, he doth formally *add*, that *either he himſelf, or ſome other whoſe Eſtate he hath, was ſeiſed at the Time of the Fine levied*, &c. But yet the Matter is *not traverſable*, but a Mean to traverſe

traverſe and avoid the Fine, and therefore the Tenant that pleads ſuch Plea doth conclude, Et de hoc ponit ſe ſuper Patriam, with a further Replication. 2 Inſt. 522, 523.

(K. b.) Unduly gained. Equity.

1. A Fine was levied *by a Feme Covert, Infant, of her Inheritance*, and the Father of the Baron was one of the Commiſſioners, that took the Fine, and the Uſes were declared to her and her Husband, and the Heirs of their two Bodies, *Remainder to the Heirs of the Survivor*. The Feme dies without Iſſue, and under Age. The Husband, after her Death, mortgages the Land to J. S. of whom the Heir at Law of the Wife gets an Aſſignment, and then levies a Fine and 5 Years Paſs. W. R. who was entitled under the firſt Fine, brought a *Bill to redeem*, and for a *Diſcovery of the Deed of Uſes*. The Heir of his Wife *pleads the ill Practices, and his own Fine and Non-claim*, and denied that there was any ſuch Deed of uſes, and if there was, that it was obtained by Practice. And per Cur, all Titles at Law, that are not directly againſt Conſcience, ſhall be aſſiſted here to a Redemption, and if there were *only a Blemiſh in the Title*, ſo ſhould the Plaintiff; but could not get over the Fine and Non-claim. The Plea is good, and ſo diſmiſs the Bill. Paſch. 1703. Ch. Prec. 218. Packington and Barrow.

(K. b. 2) Pleading a Fine in Bar of Actions; In what Caſes it is a good *Eſtoppel*, unleſs the Plaintiff ſhews how he came to the Land after.

1. In Aſſiſe, a Man ſeiſed in Fee acknowledged a *Fine* Sur conuſance de droit *come ceo*, &c. the *Conuſee granted, and rendered to the Conuſor for Life*, Remainder *to A. in Tail. A. after the Death of Tenant for Life, entred and was ſeiſed, and granted a Rent-charge of* 10 *l. and died*; the *Iſſue in Tail entred*; the *Grantee is ſeiſed and diſſeiſed of the Rent, and brings Aſſiſe*; the *Heir alleges this Matter of the Tail* to avoid the Grant; the *Plaintiff ſaid, that the Anceſtor of the Tenant was ſeiſed in Fee at the Time of the Grant, abſque hoc, that he was ſeiſed in Tail at the time*, &c. and *the other pleaded the Fine for Eſtoppel*; and the Opinion of the Court was againſt the Plaintiff, and that he ſhould be eſtopped, as well as he who took by the Fine, and that he ſhould not have the Averment without *ſhewing how his Eſtate was changed*, as by Recovery of a more high, &c. or, that another was ſeiſed at the time of the Fine; quære; for he in Remainder, who changed, was not party to the Fine. Br. Eſtoppel. pl. 135. cites 30 Aſſ. 9.

2. If a *Man levies a Fine, or loſes by Recovery*, and enters *after the Fine executed, or* after the *Execution of the Recovery, and dies ſeiſed, this is no Title for his Heir* in Aſſiſe, *if the Fine or Recovery be pleaded in Bar, without ſhewing how he came to the Land after*. And it is ſaid, that there is a great Diverſity between a Fine executory and executed pleaded in Bar. Nota. Br. Aſſiſe, pl. 483. cites Fitzh. Title 5.

Br Eſtoppel. pl. 4. cites 3 H 6. 27, 28.

3. In Treſpaſs, the *Defendant ſaid, that the Anceſtor of the Plaintiff, whoſe Heir*, &c. *levied a Fine* ſur conuſance de droit *come ceo, &c. to J. N. and conveyed from him*, Judgment, if he ſhall be received to ſay that it is his Frank-tenement, without *ſhewing how he came by it after*, and it was held a good Eſtoppel. Br. Fines, pl. 6. cites 3 H. 6. 27.

(K. b. 3) Plea good; By or againſt Strangers to the Fine.

1. In Formedon, the *Tenant prayed Aid of* 2, becauſe *W. was ſeiſed in Fee, and leaſed to the Tenant for Life, and granted the Reverſion to* 2 *in Fee*, of whom the Tenant prayed Aid, and had it, and the *Prayees came and vouched* W. and the *Demandant counter-pleaded, that W. had nothing in Demeſne, nor in Service after*, &c. and the Opinion was, that the Demandant ſhould not be eſtopped to counter-plead the Voucher by the Suffering of the Aid Prayer, and though the Gift be by Fine, yet the *Tenant ſhall not be eſtopped to plead ne dona pas*, and this where the Fine was *levied by a Stranger*, as it ſeems. Br. Eſtoppel. pl. 70. cites 38 E. 3. 23.

2. The *Tenant vouched to Warranty J. Son and Heir of R.* and the *Demandant counter-pleaded generally by the Statute*, and the *Tenant ſaid, that* to this he ſhall not be received, for *at another time R. levied a Fine* ſur conuſance de droit *come ceo*, &c. *to our Anceſtor*, &c. and demanded Judgment, &c. & non allocatur; For the *Demandant is a Stranger to the Fine*, and alſo the Fine is good if any of the Parties be ſeiſed at the Time, &c. Br. Eſtoppell. pl. 26. cites 40 E. 3. 30.

3. And *in Formedon upon a Gift by Fine*, the Tenant may ſay, that *ne dona pas*, if he is a Stranger to the Fine. Quod nota. Br. ibid.

(L. b.) Avoided in Part.

1. A Writ of Error is Quaſi a Commiſſion, and may *reverſe for part*, and affirm for part, and is not abatable; becauſe the Fine is good for part. Mo. 366. Mich. 36 and 37 Eliz. Barton v. Lever and Brownloe.

2. A. brought a Writ of Error againſt the Mayor and Commonalty of B. to reverſe a *Fine levied by his Anceſtor of* 20 *Acres of Land, the Defendants*, in Abatement of the Writ of Error, did *plead that the Plaintiff after the Death of his Anceſtor, did diſſeiſe the Defendants* of the Land, *and made a Feoffment* to a Stranger; the Plaintiff *replied that they did re-enter* upon him, *without that, that he did enfeoff a Stranger* modo & forma; the Jury found, that there was a Fine of 20 Acres, and that *the Plaintiff* being *Diſſeiſor of all, made a Feoffment of* 6 *of the Acres* to a Stranger. Et ſi ſupra totam materiam, &c. But it was reſolved by the Court, that the Feoffment does not deſtroy the Title of the Writ of Error for more than ſo much as a Feoffment was made of, and thereupon they firſt took a Difference between Suſpenſion and Extinguiſhment of an Action; for, peradventure, if he ſuſpend his Action as to any part for any time, this is a Suſpenſion unto all, but extinguiſhment of part is a Bar to that part only. And the Opinion of all the Court was, that the Fine ſhould be reverſed for that part of the Land only, whereof no Feoffment was made, but for ſome Defects in the Writ of Error, Judgment was ſtayed. Owen 21. Wright's Caſe. Cro. E. 468. (bis) S. C. Paſch. 33. Eliz. B. R. Mo. 413. S. C.

3. Gawdy cited the Caſe in 9 H. 6, where Judgment was reverſed for part only, and it is not unuſual to have a Fine reverſed for part, as if a Fine be *levied of Lands in ancient Demeſne*, 47 E. 3. 9. a. there, by Parſley, if there *be Error in Law as to one Parcel, and Error in Fact as to another Parcel*, the Judgment, as touching the Matter in Law may be reverſed. Owen 22. in Wright's Caſe.

4. *Baron and Feme* (the *Feme within Age*) levy a Fine, and upon Inſpection the Wife was adjudged to be within Age, and Judgment was given, quod finis predict. reverſetur, and Wray ſaid, he had conferred with many of the other Juſtices who were of the ſame Opinion. Gawdy, the Fine ſhall be reverſed in all, for this is an *Error in Law of the Court*, F. B. 21 D. for by this Fine the Husband giveth nothing divided from the Eſtate Cro. E. 129. Becauſe it is an intire thing. Paſch. 31 Eliz. B. R. S. C. —— Ow. 21. S. C. cited Arg. F. N. B. 21. (D)

Eſtate of the Wife, but all paſſeth from the Wife, therefore all ſhall be reverſed, and if the Fine ſhould be reverſed as to the Wife only, then the Fine levied now by the Husband alone, is a Diſcontinuance, by which the Wife at the Common Law ſhall be put to her Cui in Vita, and that is not Reaſon. And we cannot, by this Reverſal, make the Conuſee to have a particular Eſtate during the Life of the Wife, and therefore the Fine is to be reverſed for the Whole, and as void for the whole to the Conuſee. 1 Le. 115, 116. Trin. 30. Eliz. B. R. Charnock v. Worſeley.

5. If there be *Tenant for Life, Remainder to an Infant in Fee*, and they join in a Fine; upon a Writ of Error brought, it ſhall be reverſed only as to the Infant. Le. 317. Mich. 30 and 31 Eliz. B. R. Pigot, v. Harrington.

3 Le. 120 Trin. 27 Eliz. C. B. in Caſe of * Lee v. Loveday. —— * 1 Le. 290. S. R.

6. Baron and Feme, and a third Perſon, levied a Fine, and the Writ of Covenant was againſt the Baron and the third Perſon, and *in the Summons the Feme was left out.* Coke moved, that for this Error the whole Fine ſhould be reverſed, and it being ill in part, is ill in all, and ſo was the Opinion of the Court, but they would adviſe. Cro. E. 290. Hill. 34 and 35 Eliz. B. R. Baxter and Ux. v. Mounting.

7. *And* it is not a ſtrange thing for a Fine to be reverſed in part, and to be in force for the Reſidue. Arg. Cro. E. 469.

And a *Mark ſhall be made* upon the Fine, in Nature of a cancelling of that, which is ancient Demeſne Land, and the Record ſhall ſtand for the Remainder. Per Vaviſor. Kelw. 43. a. pl. 10.

8. *As* a Fine levied *of guildable Lands and* of Lands *in ancient Demeſne*, in which Caſe, though the Lord by a Writ of Diſceit avoids the Fine for the ancient demeſne Land, yet it is good for the other. Arg. Cro. E. 469. (bis) Paſch. 38. Eliz. B. R. in Caſe of Wright, v. Mayor, &c. of Wickham.

—F. N. B. 98. (P.) cites 7 H. 4. 44. 17 E. 3. 31. 21 E. 3. 20. —— S. P. but it ſhall not be cancelled, nor taken off the Files. Br. Fines pl. 36. cites 7 H. 4 44. and 8 H. 4. 23. Per Hull. —— Ibid. pl. 47. cites 21 E. 3. 20. ——Jo. 374. in Caſe of Done v. Smithurſt.

9. *So* where a Fine was levied in Cheſter, and D. as Heir Male brought Error to reverſe it, and the Defendant appeared, and *pleaded a common Recovery*, in which the *Conuſor came in as Vouchee*, and he vouched over, and the Plaintiff *replied* by *Non-tenure in the* Party ſuppoſed to be *Tenant in the Recovery*, upon which they are at Iſſue, and *found* that he was *Tenant of Parcel, and not of the other Parcel*; the Queſtion was, whether the Plaintiff ſhall be barred for all; and agreed not, but for Parcel only, and therefore Rule was given that the Lands ſhould be examined. Jo. 352. Mich. 10 Car. B. R. Donne v. Smithurſt.

This Point is held per Hobart, Ch. J. Hob. 278. in Clanrickard's Caſe.

10. *So* where an *Infant Tenant in Tail, Remainder to B. in Fee, join* in a Fine, this may be reverſed againſt the Infant for Non-age, and ſhall ſtand againſt Remainder-man. Arg. 2 Jo. 182. cites Hob. 278. Engliſh's Caſe there cited, and 17 H. 7. Kelw. 43.

—— Le. 115 cites Engliſh's Caſe thus (viz.) a Fine was levied *by Tenant for Life*, [and Reverſioner] and he in *Reverſion being within Age* brought Error, it ſhall be reverſed as to the Reverſioner, and not as to the Tenant for Life.

2 Sid. 96. per 2 J. againſt Glyn. Ch. J. Row v. Evelyn.

11. Error of a Fine levied by 4 *Conuſors*, and aſſigned the *Death of* 2 *before the Fine engroſſed or Silver paid*; and if by this the Fine ſhall be reverſed in toto or quoad thoſe two, was the Queſtion? and it was argued by Newdigate Serjeant, that it ſhall be reverſed for all; for by it the Writ was abated, and ſo it is a Fine without Original. 2 Lev. 127. in Caſe of Biddulph v Harriſon, cited it to have been ſo adjudged Hill. 1662 B. R. Rot. 1179. in Caſe of Roe v. Yeatley.

Cro. E. 124. Pigot. v. Ruſſel.

12. A Fine may be reverſed *quoad one*, and ſtand in Force againſt others. 2 Jo. 182. Mich 33 Car. 2. B. R. Cockman v. Farrer.

—Popham, Ch. J. ſaid it was otherwiſe of a Fine *at Common Law*. Ow. 76. Hunt. v. King.

(L.b. 2) Nient Comprize.

1. A Fine cannot be levied but of that which is ſpecified in the Writ of Covenant, and *not of a foreign thing, unleſs it be conſequent.* Br. Fines. pl. 97. cites 18 E. 4. 22.

S. P. If it does *not iſſue out of the ſame thing contained in the Writ* of Covenant, or other Original. Co. R. on Fines 11.

2. *As* in a Writ of Covenant of Land, he acknowledges the Tenements to be the Right of the Plaintiff, &c. there the Plaintiff may grant and render 20 s. Rent to the Conuſor, and it is good; For *this is conſequent to the Land to grant a Rent out of it.* Ibid.

S. P. Co. R. on Fines 11. cites 19 E. 3. Br. tit. Grant. 90. — *But* ſee there for the ſame Caſe in 9 E. 4. adjudged, that a Writ of *Covenant* was brought *of* 5 *s. Rent*, and the *Fine was* levied *of an Annuity.* Co. R. on Fines 11.

3. *And* in the ſame Caſe where a Writ of Covenant to levy a Fine makes mention of Land, where the *Party has only in Reverſion*, and *acknowledges all his Right in the Land*, &c. to be the Right of the other; there the Reverſion paſſes. Br. Fines. pl. 97. cites 19 E. 4. 9. which Chocke agreed the ſame Year. Fo. 3.

4 *And* it is adjudged in our Books, that where one R. brought *Aſſiſe of darrein Preſentment* againſt a Prior, who came into Court, and levied a *Fine and Releaſe of the Advowſon* to the Plaintiff, for which the ſaid R. by Aſſent of the Ordinary, *granted an Annuity* to the ſaid Prior and his Succeſſors *imperpetuum, percipiend. per manus Perſonæ Eccleſiæ quicunque fuerit*; and it was adjudged a good Grant, and yet the *Annuity was not contained in the Writ* of Covenant, *nor iſſuing out of the thing contained* in the Writ. Co. R. on Fines. 11. cites 31 E. 3. Br. tit Fines 90.

5. If a Writ of *Covenant* be brought *of a Manor except a Meſuage*, and of this the *Fine is levied without any Exception*, yet the Meſuage ſhall not paſs, becauſe it was not contained in the Writ. Co. R. on Fines 11. cites 38. E. 3. 17.

6. In *Warrantia Chartæ, quod Warran. unam acram*, if the Defendant will levy a Fine *of the ſame Acre, and of one other Acre*; the Fine is not good for the other Acre, for it is not comprized within the Original. Co. R. on Fines 10. cites 20. H. 6. 3. a.

So, if *quod Permittat* be brought *of a Way*, and the Defendant levies a *Fine of the Way, and alſo of a Mill, and of Paſture*, which was not compriſed in the Writ, it is adjudged that the Suit was void for all the Things not compriſed in the Writ or Covenant, and yet in ancient Time, ſuch Fines have been received. Co R. on Fines 11. cites 2 E. 3. 19. 19 E. 3.

7. A *Scire Facias* lieth ſometimes of things not compriſed in the Writ; as if *in a Fine ſur releaſe*, the *Conuſee render Rent in Tail.* 48 E. 13. 8. Weſt's Symb. S. 179.

8. In a Formedon a Fine with Warranty was pleaded, and as *to part* the Tenant ſaid, that himſelf was *ſeiſed tempore finis* levati, and *to the reſt* he ſaid *not compriſed*, &c. Br. Fines pl. 26. cites 46. E. 3. 14.

9. Scire Facias upon a Fine levied of the *Manor* of D. and was of 40 *Acres of Land, and* 10 *s. Rent as parcel of the Manor*, and the Tenant ſaid, that the 40 Acres and 10s. are not comprized in the Fine, and it is held there that he ſhall ſay, *Not parcel at the time of the Fine levied*, &c. for if he does not deny, but that the Fine was levied of the Manor, and that this is Parcel, then this is comprized, &c. Br. Scire facias, pl. 47. cites 48. E. 3. 11.

Br. Compriſe. pl. 5. cites S. C.

10. Forcible Entry; in Scire facias upon a *Fine* brought *of* 3 *Acres*, which is *alleged to be parcel of the Manor of D.* of which Manor the Fine was levied, where their Intention is of 3 Acres parcel of a Manor, which was recovered, there *not Parcel is no Plea*, but *ſhall ſay, Not Parcel and ſo not comprized*; and in Recovery of Aſſiſe he ſhall ſay, that it was not put in

in View, and ſo not Parcel; Quod non negatur. Br. Compriſe, &c. pl. 9. cites 36 H. 19, 20.

In this Caſe *ſome may be taken which Manor, the Conuſor intended* to paſs. For it is Matter of Fact not apparent in the Fine, of which the Judge cannot take Conuſance, but ſtands well with the Fine, and may be tried by Jury. 8 Rep. 155. a. Trin 8. Jac. in Althom's Caſe.——Br. Compriſe, pl. 21. cites 12 H. 7. 6. —— Br. Scire Facias, pl. 168. cites S. C.

11. A Fine is levied of the *Manor of D.* and I have *another Manor of D. in the ſame County*, and after a Scire Facias is brought againſt me to execute the Fine of my Manor; if I plead Nient Comprize generally, it will be found againſt me, but I may well ſay, that I have 2 Manors of D. in the ſame County, that is to ſay, one called *Eaſt Dale*, *and* another called *Weſt Dale*, and that the Fine was levied of Weſt Dale, without this, that my Manor of Eaſt Dale was comprized within the Fine, and this was adjudged in the Sci. Fa. in the 10th Year of H. 7. Keilw. 49. pl 6. Ld. Brook v. Ld. Latimer.

Roll. R. 103. 117 S. C. but ſays the two other Meſuages deſcended to A.

12. *A. ſeiſed of the Manor of W. and 2 Meſuages in W. bargained and ſold his Manor of W. and all his Lands and Tenements in W. to B.* and covenanted to levy a Fine for further Aſſurance of all his Lands in W. B. tendered a Fine to be levied by A by the Name of 4 Meſuages comprehended in the ſaid Indenture of Covenant. A. after entering into the Covenant, and before the tender of the Notes of the Fine, had *purchaſed two other Meſuages*, and therefore refuſed to acknowledge. Coke Ch. J. held clearly, that A. was not bound by his Covenant to acknowledge this Fine, and that a Nient Compriſe cannot be pleaded againſt an *expreſs thing*, and cited 48. E. 3. 11. and Dodderidge J agreed; and yet per Dodderidge and Houghton J. if the Fine comprehend 4 Meſuages, 2 only ſhall paſs, and per tot. Cur. the Refuſal was no Breach of Covenant, and Judgment was given againſt the Plaintiff. 2 Buls. 317. Hill. 12 Jac. Wilſon v. Welſh.

Roll. R. 118. per Coke and Doddridge. in S. C.

13. A Man cannot plead Nient Compriſe in a Fine upon Intention that he did not intend to paſs more than is contained in the Indenture, when the *certain number of Acres is comprehended in the Fine.* Per Coke, Ch. J. Roll. R. 103. Hill. 12 Jac. in Caſe of Wilſon v. Welſh.

14. A Fine was levied in the Iſle of Ely, in Court of Record there, by the Name of *one Meſuage, one Garden, one Orchard, and Common of Paſture.* In a Formedon in Deſcender for one Meſuage and 15 Acres of Land, the Queſtion was, whether thoſe 15 *Acres of Land* were contained in the Fine, and ſuch Fine was a Barr? And upon Demurrer, Judgment was given for the Demandant; for admitting the Fine to be good, which will be difficult to maintain, it is but a Diſcontinuance of the Eſtate Tail. Lutw 959. 2 Jac. 2. White v. Auſtin.

S. C. cited 2 Buls. 318. Hill. 12 Jac. in Caſe of Wilſon v. Welch.

15. A. the *Conuſor had ten Acres in D. and* B. the *Conuſee had ten Acres in the ſame Vill*; and A. levied a Fine to B. of 20 Acres, and *B. granted and rendered* 20 *Acres to A. in Fee*; yet A. ſhall not have the ten Acres of B. unleſs there had been *an eſpecial Agreement* between them to ſuch Effect; for otherwiſe the Conuſee ſhall be ſaid to render more than he received, 2 Rep. 76. b. cites it as agreed upon a Reference to the Judges out of Chancery in Taverner's Caſe.

(L. b. 3) Pleadings at what Time. And how.

1. It was agreed, that the *Note of a Fine* is pleadable before the Fine be engroſſed, and *ſhall ſhew the place, where it was acknowledged, and before whom*, &c. but after the Fine is engroſſed, he ſhall not plead the Note, but the Fine itſelf, which Fine *ſe levavit in C. B. coram*, &c. Quod Nota. Br. Fines. pl. 41. cites 12 H 4. 16.

2. A ſecond Fine, *before it be engroſſed*, cannot be pleaded to a Writ of Error brought for reverſing the firſt, and the engroſſing was ſtaid on Purpoſe by the Conuſee of the Second. Noy. 59. Hart v. Ameredith.

(L. b. 4) Pleadings of Fines. What Good, and in what Caſes neceſſary.

1. A Fine is no Plea in *Aſſiſe*, or in any other Action, unleſs it be ſhewn *ſub pede ſigilli*, which is the Great Seal of England. Br. Fines. 103. cites 24 E. 3, 35.

2. In pleading a Fine, *every one of the Juſtices of C. B. muſt be named by their Names*, tho' other Writs which come out of Chancery are directed to J. S. Capitali Juſticiario de Communi Banco & Sociis ſuis, without expreſſing the Names but contrary of a Fine. Br. Fines. pl. 125. cites 1 H. 7. 10.

3. He who pleads a Fine ought to *ſhew in what Term, and what Place, as at Weſtminſter*; for the Party may ſay no ſuch Record or Fine. Br. Pleadings. pl. 167. cites 10 H. 7. 28.

4. Note, per Fitzh. and the Prothonotaries, that in Pleading of a Fine, they ſhall not ſay that the Fine was levied generally, but *that ſuch one was ſeiſed, &c. and ſo ſeiſed the Fine was levied.* Br. Fines. pl. 3. cites 27 H. 8. 4.

5. And if Ceſty que Uſe levies a Fine, which is pleaded by ſuch Words ut ſupra, viz. *that he was ſeiſed and levied* the Fine, &c. and the *other ſays, that the Parties to the Fine had not any Thing*, it ſhall be found againſt the other; for Ceſty que Uſe, had nothing in Fact; but in this Caſe he ſhall plead that J. N. was ſeiſed, &c. to the Uſe of P. and ſo ſeiſed to the Uſe Finis ſe levavit. Br. Fines. pl. 3. cites 27 H. 8. 4.

6. Fines are as *effectual to bind the Right* of the Intail, when they are *found by Special Verdict*, as when they are pleaded in Bar. per Cur' 2 Le. 37. Hill. 31 Eliz. C. B. in Caſe of Johnſon v. Bellamy. Goldsb. 107. Johnſon v. Carliſle.

7. One cannot be ſaid ſeiſed upon a Fine Sur Render, without an *Entry alleged*. And the Pleading *by Force whereof he was ſeiſed*, &c. doth not ſupply the Entry; But upon a Fine Sur Conuſance, &c. come ceo, &c. 'tis otherwiſe. For that is executed, per Cur' Cro. E. 903. Mich. 44 and 45 Eliz. B. R. Buſtard v. Coulter. *But* Cro. E. 915. S. C. Hill. 45 Eliz. They held that it was well enough. For when it is pleaded, *virtute cujus* he was ſeiſed in Fee, it is to be *intended, that he entered.* For otherwiſe he could not be ſeiſed, which is the uſual Pleading in ſuch Caſes upon Fines with Render, and have been always admitted to be good, as appears in Plow. 503 Grendon's Caſe. And ſo are all the Precedents. Wherefore this Exception was diſallowed.

8. Exception was taken to the pleading a Fine; Becauſe it was *Quædam finalis Concordia facta fuit & poſtea Conceſſum & Concordatum*, where the uſual Form is *Quidam finis ſe Levavit*, which includes all. But when they would plead by Parts, they ought to ſhew the Whole, and that perhaps no King's Silver was paid. But the Exception was over-ruled; for the ancient Courſe of Pleading was as here, 2 Lev. 31. Mich. 23 Car. 2. B. R. in Caſe of Hudſon v. Benſon and Baron.

9. The Defendant pleaded a Fine *with Proclamations*, and concluded it with demanding *Judgment, if againſt this Fine which contains Warranty, the Plaintiff ſhall be received* to bring Error; and the Court held it ill pleaded, and that he ought to ſay, *if againſt this Fine with Proclamations ſo levied*; For a Fine at common Law makes a Diſcontinuance, but does not bar the Right; and by the Concluſion it ſhall be intended to be without Proclamations, and as a Fine only at common Law, nor will the Word *(So)* aid it. For the *Concluſion* ought to take the Subſtance of the Bar, that it was a Fine with Proclamations, and not a Fine only. Palm. 243. Mich. 19 Jac. B. R. Darcy v. Jackſon.

(L. b. 5) Pleadings. As of what Term.

1. The Iſſue in Tail brought a *Formedon in Deſcender*, and the Deſendant pleaded in Bar, and *confeſſed the Eſtate Tail*, but *ſaid, that before the Death of the Tenant in Tail, J. S. was ſeiſed in Fee* of the Lands in Queſtion, *and levied a Fine* to him, and *5 Years paſſed, and then Tenant in Tail died*, and whether this Plea be a Bar to the Plaintiff or not, was the Queſtion; and it reſted upon this whether J. S. upon this general Plea ſhall be *intended to be in by Diſſeiſin or by Feoffment?* For if in by Diſſeiſin, then he is barr'd; if by Feoffment, not; and the Opinion of the Whole Court was clear, without any Debate, that he ſhall be intended in by Diſſeiſin, and ſo the Plaintiff is barr'd as the Books are. 3 Rep. 87. a. Pl. C. Stowell's Caſe. And Bankes Ch. J. ſaid, that it ſhall not be intended, that Tenant in Tail had made a Feoffment to bar his Iſſue, unleſs it be ſhewed, and it lies on the other Part to ſhew it; and a Feoffment is as well an unlawful Act as a Diſſeiſin, for it is a Diſcontinuance. Mar. 195, 196. Paſch. 18 Car. Taylor's Caſe.

S. C. 10. Mod. 40. to 48.

2. A Fine was thus; Hæc eſt finalis Concordia facta in Cur' Regis apud Weſtm. a die ſancti Michaelis in tres ſeptimanas Anno Decimo Willielmi tertii coram Thom. Trevor, &c. & Poſtea in Craſt. Sanctæ Trinitat. 1 Annæ conceſs. & Recordat. coram eiſdem Juſticiar' ſo that the *Concord of* the Fine *was of one Term, and the Recordat. of another* Term *following*; and therefore the Queſtion was, of which Term this ſhould be ſaid to be a compleat Fine. Per Cur' 'tis a Fine of that Term when the Concord was made, and of which the Writ of Covenant was returnable; for the *Concordia facta in Curia is the Compleat Fine*, the Conceſſit Recordat' is the Leave of the Court to inroll it. 1 Salk. 341. Mich. 10 Annæ. B. R. Lloyd v. Viſcount Say and Seal.——cites 6 Rep. 68. Hob. 330. 2 Vent. 47.

(L. b. 6) Pleading. Partes Finis nihil habuerunt. By whom.

But the *Heir of one* of the Parties cannot aver, that the Parties had nothing at the Time of the Fine levied. Br. Fines. pl. 81. cites 31 Aſſ. 24.

1. *A Stranger* may plead this Plea. Vid. Prynn's Abr. Cott. Rec. 30. Stanton v. Stanton. 14 E. 3.

S. P. for he ought to ſhew who had any thing in the Land at that Time. *But* where a *Recovery* of my Anceſtor is pleaded againſt me, it is ſufficient to ſay that the Anceſtor had nothing in the Land at the Time without ſhewing who was Tenant thereof. Br. Fines. pl. 43. cites 14 H. 4. 33.

2. Note, that in the Exchequer Chamber 'twas ſaid by Yelverton and affirmed by others, that if my *Father* Tenant in Tail, or in Fee-Simple, *grants Land by Fine*, if *I* will *convey by the Anceſtor*, I *ſhall not ſay that thoſe, who were Parties to the Fine, had nothing, but ſuch a one whoſe Eſtate I have*. Br. Conſeſs & avoid. pl. 5. cites 33 H. 6. 18.

3. *But* 'tis ſaid that I *ſhall ſay, that after the Fine ſuch a one was ſeiſed of it in Fee and enfeoff'd me* in Fee. Quære, if without ſhewing how he came by it after. Br. Conſeſs and avoid. pl. 5. cites 33 H. 6. 18.

4. Diſſeiſor *levied a Fine to A. B.* and after *Diſſeiſee re-entred and enfeoff'd Diſſeiſor*, and *A. B. re-entred*, the *Diſſeiſor brought Aſſiſe*, and A. B. pleaded the Fine; Diſſeiſor ſhall avoid the Fine by the Matter aforeſaid, and ſo ſhall take Advantage of his own Wrong; per Littleton. Br. Conſeſs and avoid. pl. 21. cites 15 E. 4, 5.

5. N. D. is *ſeiſed of* 2 *Parts* of certain Land *in Common with J. S. who hath the third Part* of it, and N. D. *leyes a Fine* to W. P. *of the third Part*, and he brought Scire facias againſt the Feoffee of J. S. It is dangerous to ſay quod *Tempore* Finis levati N. D. had nothing, &c. by which 'twas agreed that he may ſay, quod Tempore Finis levati *N. D. had nothing but in common with J. S.* whoſe Eſtate he hath. Br. Fines. pl. 2. cites 26 H. 8, 9.

6. 4 *H.* 7. 24. Enacts, that *the Exception that none of the Parties, nor any to their Uſe had any Thing in the Lands at the Time of the Fine levied is ſaved to all Perſons, except Parties and Privies.*

7. *A. B. and C. Coparceners* of a Manor; *A. enfeoff'd J. S.* of his Part to the *Uſe of himſelf for Life*, and after his deceaſe to the Uſe of *his Eldeſt Son and Heir apparent in Fee*, and after *A. levied a Fine de tertia Parte*, 200 Acrarum terræ 400 Acrarum Paſturæ, &c. (amounting to more Acres than the whole Manor contained) *Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo*, &c. *with Warranty of him and his Heirs*, and *re-took by the ſame Fine for his Life only*, and then died, and his Son entered. The Queſtion was, if the third Part of the ſaid Acres be ſevered from the Manor by this Fine againſt the Heir, or that againſt the Fine he ſhall be received to aver a continual Poſſeſſion and Continuance of Seiſin ante Finem, Tempore finis, & Poſt finem, &c. in the Tenant for Term of Life. It was held ſtrongly by Plowden, Bromley Solicitor and Lovelace, that this Averment by him in Remainder, who was a *Stranger to the Fine*, ſhould be received *quia neque pars finis nec Partium hæres, &c.* But Dyer, Saunders, Manwood, Southcote, Harper and Catlin, held the Law clear contrary, and that ſuch Fine amounted to a Feoffment of Record, which makes Diſcontinuance of the Remainder or Reverſion. D 333. b. 334. a. pl. 30. Paſch. 16 Eliz. Anon.

8. Parties and Privies are concluded to ſay *Partes ad finem nil habuerunt, &c.* by the Statute of 4 H. 7. but a Stranger may plead this Plea. Hob. 334. Mich. 19 Jac. in Mackwilliams's Caſe.

Le. 83. in Caſe of Zouch v. Bampfield. —Mo. 251. in S.C.

(L. b. 7) Exception; That the Defendant was always ſeiſed; And by whom to be taken.

1. 27 *Ed.* 1. *Stat.* 1. *c.* 1. Enacts, that *it ſhall be no good Exception to a Fine, that before, or at the Time of the Fine levied, the Demandant, or his Anceſtors were ſeiſed of the Land contained in the Fine, or ſome Part thereof.*

2. In Aſſiſe, *Fine upon Render of the Anceſtor of the Plaintiff* was pleaded in Bar, and the *Plaintiff ſaid, that he was continually ſeiſed at the Time of the Fine, before the Fine, and after, till he was diſſeiſed*; and the Court held, that he ſhall have the Plea, notwithſtanding the Privity of Blood. M. 9 E. 3. The Reaſon ſeems to be, becauſe he claims of *himſelf and not by ſuch Anceſtor.* And for Tenant in Tail, this *Averment lies well, that his Father was ſeiſed, and died ſeiſed after*, notwithſtanding the Fine upon Render levied by the Father, and that he entered after as Heir. H. 17 E. 2. and M. 18 E. 2. But Sharde made a great *Diverſity between ſuch Fine* of Render, *and* * *Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo*, &c. For this is *executed*, *and* the other is but *Executory.* And therefore *the Heir is remitted by the Entry by Deſcent before the Execution*, as he thought. Vid. Statute de finibus inde. Br. Fines. pl. 74. cites 13 Aſſ. p. 8.

* Br. Fines. pl. 96. cites 12 E 4 15, and 19.

3. A. was Tenant in Tail, Remainder to B. and A. levied a Fine come ceo, &c. B. the *Remainder-man* may aver Continuance of Poſſeſſion, notwithſtanding the Fine; for he *is not Party nor Heir to the Conuſor.* And the ſame Law of a *Feme Covert*, where the Baron alone levied the Fine. Br. Fines pl. 95. cites 12 E. 4. 12. per Fairfax, to which Littleton agreed.

(L. b. 8) Pleadings. In what Caſes *Seiſin* muſt be *alleged* in the Cogniſor.

1. In *Replevin*, the Defendants made Cognizance as Bailiffs to R. M. who was ſeized of the Place where, &c. as a *Remainder-man under a Marriage Settlement made by S. M.* the Father, *and a Fine* levied thereof, &c. the former Tenant in Tail and Remainder-man being dead. The *Plaintiff travers'd the Seiſin in Fee of S. M.* at the Time of levying the Fine, &c. and upon this they were at Iſſue, and after a *Verdict for the Plaintiff*, it was moved in Arreſt of Judgment, that this was an *Immaterial Iſſue*, whether S. M. was ſeiſed in Fee at the Time, &c. becauſe the Tenant in Tail who claimed under him, joined with him in the Fine, and conveyed the Lands to R. M. and his Heirs, and therefore the Seiſin of S. M. was but formal and to induce the Matter, and not traverſable, and ſo the Judgment was ſet aſide.——Serjeant Lutwych ſays, that he could not diſcover what were the particular Reaſons given by the Court for the ſaid Reſolutions, and therefore (citing the Caſes, * &c. in the Margin) obſerves, that 'tis ſaid by Fitzherbert in 27 H. 8. 4. a. that in pleading a Fine, Seiſin ſhall not be intended if not ſhewn, and that the Prothonotaries ſay, he who pleads a Fine ought to ſhew Seiſin of one of the Parties, and that ſo are all the Entries. But in Dyer, 291. a. 'tis ſaid, that the antient Courſe was otherwiſe, and that to ſay generally, quidem finis ſe levavit, was well enough; for it might be of a Reverſion, of which Seiſin cannot be alleged. But admitting that the conſtant Form of Pleading hath been to allege Seiſin in one of the Conuſors, yet it does not follow that a Traverſe may be taken to the particular Eſtate, for the Fine is good if any of the Parties hath an Eſtate in the Lands. * Br. Tit. Fines 109. And if a Fine Sur Cognizance de Droit, &c. be pleaded in Bar, and the Averment be quod Partes finis nihil habuerunt, the Demandant need not reply and ſhew a Seiſin; for the Defendant ought to have concluded his Bar to the Country, without any Rejoinder, and ſo it is held in 2 Inſt. 527. and by Lord Coke in his R. on Fines, Sect. 22. Nor is there any Caſe that gives Countenance to the traverſing the Seiſin in Fee in this Caſe, but that of **Jouch** and **Bamfield**. 1 And. 185. Sav. 84, and 1 Le. 75. in reporting which Caſe, the Ch. J. Anderſon makes no mention at all of a Traverſe of the Seiſin in Fee; ſo that upon the Whole, it ſeems that the alleging of Seiſin, &c. is only Matter of Form to induce a Plea to a Fine, and not of Subſtance to be traverſed. 2 Lutw. 1608 to 1625. Trin. 1 Anne. Walters v. Hodges and al.

* Stat. 1 R. 3. of Uſes Stat. 32 H. 8 4 H. 7. Old Entries 121. a. Eaſt. Ent. 280. b. 10 H. 6. 21. pl. 71. 3 H. 7. 9. a. Mich. 10 H. 6. 21. b. pl. 71. 22 H. 6. 57. a. 33 H. 6 21. pl. 21. 12 E. 4. 13 a. 8 H. 4. 7 & 8. 46 E 3. 14. pl. 20. 3 H. 6. 27 & 28.

* Mr Nelſon in his Lutw. page 518. ſays this is a miſtake, and that there is nothing relating to it. But Mr Nelſon might have found it at. Br. Fines. pl. 57

(L. b. 9) Pleadings. *Profert* or Monſtrans neceſſary, in what Caſes.

1. *Aſſiſe* by an Infant; the Tenant pleaded a Fine in Bar, and becauſe he did not ſhew it ſub pede Sigilli, nor any Part of it, the Aſſiſe was awarded, and this for that Cauſe only as it ſeems, and not becauſe the Plaintiff is an Infant to enquire of the Circumſtances. But Note, That the Jury cannot find Matter of Record in their Circumſtances. And 'tis ſaid elſewhere, that if a Fine be *pleaded in the ſame Court*, it ſuffices to be *exemplified* in the ſame Court. *But* if he pleads it *in another Court*, he muſt ſhew it exemplified *under the Great Seal of England in Chancery*, if he would plead it, but he may *give it in Evidence under the Seal of C. B.* Br. Monſtrans. pl. 68. cites 24 E. 3. 46.

2. *Formedon*

2. *Formedon in Deſcender*, and the Writ rehearſed, that *N. granted the Reverſion of a Tenant for Life to the Baron and Feme in Tail by Fine*, and for default of Iſſue, the *Remainder to the Anceſtor of the Demandant in Tail*; and made the Deſcents to him; and notwithſtanding that he might have declared upon an immediate Gift, and now has made mention of the Fine; yet by the beſt Opinion 'tis only Surpluſage, and he need not *ſhew the Fine*, becauſe the Action is of a Gift *Executed*; for in Formedon in Deſcender, which is always executed, a Man need not ſhew Deed, quod Nota; and ſo ſee that *before the Remainder be executed*, Deed or Fine *is neceſſary to be ſhewn*, and e contra after 'tis executed. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 34. cites 11 H. 4. 39. and 14 H. 4. 31. accordingly. Br. Nugation pl. 4. cites S. C.—Ibid. pl. 10. cites S. C.

3. In *Quare Impedit*, the Plaintiff makes his Title to the Advowſon by Grant by Fine to J. N. in Fee, who after *granted it to W. for Life, and after* [*by another Deed*] granted the *Reverſion to the Plaintiff*, and that W. is dead, and ſo makes Title to himſelf; and the Plaintiff was compelled to ſhew the Deed of Grant of Reverſion; for it belonged to him, but not the Grant for Life to W. and per Hank. he ſhall ſhew the Fine alſo, and ſo he did. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 40. cites 14 H. 4. 10, 11.

(L. b. 10) Pleading in Bar in General.

1. An Exception was taken to the Pleading of a Fine, by ſaying, *that a final Concord was made*, and becauſe it did *not* ſay, *that a Fine was levied*, as the uſual Form is; but it was anſwered, that the Matter and Subſtance of the Fine is ſhewn as fully by this Form of Pleading, as by the other, ſo that there is no Variance in Subſtance, and in ſuch Caſe a Man is not bound to a Form of Pleading; but if he ſhews his Matter effectually, it is ſufficient. Pl. C. 431. a. b. Paſch. 15 Eliz. Smith v. Stapleton.

2. Another Exception was taken, becauſe it was *not ſaid, that the Fine was levied in C. B.* to which it was anſwered, that the *uſual Form is to ſay*, that *the Fine was levied in Curia Dominæ Reginæ apud Weſtmonaſterium*, as before was pleaded, and not to ſay in C. B. Pl. C. 431. b. Smith v. Stapleton.

(M. b) Taken by Dedimus Poteſtatem.

1 15 *E.* 2. *Stat. of Carliſle.* Enacts, that *If the Party be not able to come before the Juſtices in the Court, then two or one of them (by the Aſſent of the reſt) ſhall go to the Party, and receive his Cognizance, and if but one go, he ſhall take with him an Abbot, Prior, or Knight being of good Fame and Credit.*

The Commiſſioners, that take the Cognizance, ſhall make a Certificate thereof to the Juſtices, to the End the Fine may be lawfully levied according to the former Ordinance.

Coke's R. on Fines 9. ſays, that the Uſage now of taking Cognizance by one Judge, Serjeant, or Knight by Ded. Pot. is directly contrary to this Statute.—If a *Knight be Created an Earl*, yet he may take Cognizance by Ded. Pot. But if an Abbot was created a Baron, he could not. Co. R. on Fines 10.

2. If a Perſon, able to take a Fine, *takes the Conuſance of a Fine to himſelf*, it is utterly void. Becauſe he is Judex in propria Cauſa. Co. R. on Fines 10. cites 8 H. 6. by Martin.

3. One Juſtice alone with a *Dedimus Poteſtatem* may take it; and the Ch. J. of C. B without *Dedimus Poteſtatem*, may take Conuſance of the Fine, as well as other Juſtices by Ded. Pot. But the *Ch. J. of B. R.*

cannot without Ded. Pot. and therefore there is a Special Writ in the Register for him of *Dedimus Poteſtatem.* Denth. R. of Fines 7.

Vid. (J. b.) S. C.

4. Conuſance of a Fine Hill. 20 H 8. where the Ded. Poteſtat. *made no mention of the County*, and *all is certified the ſame Term*, and the King's Silver entered, but the Fine was *not engroſſed*, but remained in the Office of the Chirographer. And it was reſolved that it may be now engroſſed: But becauſe it is at the Election of the Party to have it either with or without as before 4 H 7. and he *is dead*, ſo that now no Election may be made, it ſhall be a Fine without Proclamations, as at the Common Law. D. 254 pl. 104. Trin. 8 Eliz. Compton's Caſe.

5. Dedimus was to take the Conuſance of a Fine *of four Perſons.*—The Commiſſioners *return the Conuſance of three only.*—The Name of the fourth may be *raz'd* out of the Dedimus, and make the Writ of Covenant to accord therewith, and 'twas ſaid to have been ſo done about 30 Years ſince. Cro. E. 576. pl. 24 Trin. 39 Eliz. C. B. Anon.

6. A Dedimus was awarded to take the Conuſance of a Fine from *Baron and Feme*, and the *Conuſance of Baron only was returned*, and the Feme would not acknowledge it. Lord-Keeper ordered, that a *new Dedimus* Pot. ſhould be awarded to take the Conuſance of the Baron only, and that it ſhould be of the ſame Date as the firſt was, and that the Return of the Commiſſioners ſhould be annexed thereto; and Anderſon ſaid, ſo it might be done here, or otherwiſe, if the Fine be levied between the Plaintiff and *the three others only*, it ſhall be good without Queſtion; for there is no Prejudice to the *fourth*; for the Writ of Dedimus might be amended, and the Writ of Covenant made to accord with it, and any of the three Ways it would be well enough. Cro. E. 576, 577. Trin. 39 Eliz. C. B. Anon.

7. If a Dedimus Pot. be to take the Conuſance of a Fine of three Perſons, the Commiſſioners may take the *Conuſance of one at one Time, and of another at another Time*; for it may be they cannot come to one Place at the ſame Time; and when the Conuſance of one is duly taken, 'tis againſt Reaſon, that the Refuſal of the other ſhould impeach it. Quod alii Juſticiarii Conceſſerunt. Cro. E. 577. Trin. 39 Eliz. C. B. Anon.

Mich. 12 Jac. Roll. R. 113. Day v. Hungate. S. C. In the Star-Chamber.

8. A Fine by Dedimus was taken of an *Infant*, but becauſe it was not Apparent to the Commiſſioners, that the Infant was within Age, the Court acquitted them. 12 Rep. 122, 123. Hungate's Caſe.

Per North and Windham, J. there is a great Truſt

9. The Court of C. B. ordered the Reverſioner to proſecute an *Information againſt Commiſſioners for taking Conuſance of a Fine of an Infant*, Mich. 33 Car. 2. C. B. 3 Lev. 36. Hutchinſon's Caſe.

reposed in the Commiſſioners, and they are to inform themſelves of the Party's Age, and a *voluntary Ignorance* will not excuſe them. Mod. 246, 247. Paſch. 29 Car. 2. C. B. in Caſe of Barrow v. Parrot.

10. A Ded. Pot. was directed *to two*, and *one of them executes it, the other cannot certify it*; for the Execution of it ought to be upon his own Knowledge. Godb. 356. Trin. 21 Jac. B. R. in Leonard's Caſe.

11. A Ded. Pot. is directed *to four*, to take a Fine of Lands in *ſeveral Counties.* If *two take it in one County and certify*, and the *other two take it in the other and they certify it*, none of the Certificates are good. Godb. 356. per Haughton, J. in the Caſe above.

A Dedimus was *directed to A. B. Eſq;* and was *returned by A. B. Knight*, and held good. Jenk. 279. pl. 3. cites Arundell v. Arundell.——Yelv. 33. S. C.—Cro. E. 677. Trin. 41 Eliz. B. R.—Cro. J. 11. Paſch. 1 Jac. B. R. S. C.

12. A *Dedimus Poteſtatem*, to take a Conuſance of a Fine is *directed to J. S. Knight*, and he takes the Conuſance and certifies it by the Name of J. S. Knight; whereas in Truth he is *not a Knight*; this is not erroneous, nor aſſignable for Error that he is not a Knight; for it is againſt the Record. Jenk. 280. pl. 3.

13. Tho'

13. Tho' now moſt Fines are in fact taken by Dedimus, yet they *are Recorded as taken in Court*, and this to prevent Queſtions about Captions. per Cur' 10 Mod. 45. Mich. 10 Annæ B. R. in Ld Say and Seal's Caſe.

(M. b. 2) The ſeveral *Parts* of a Fine.

1. It was reſolved by all the Court, that there are *five Parts* of every Fine, viz.

1. *Original Writ.* For without Original Writ a Fine can't be levied, as appears by the Statute de Modo levandi Fines, that the Order of the Law ſuffers not, that final Accord be levied in the King's Court without Original Writ, and ſo 'tis held 37 Aſſ. pl. 17. 5 Rep. 38. b. Trin. 34 Eliz. B. R. in Tey's Caſe.

2dly, *Licence*, or Leave to accord. For which Licence, there is a Fine due to the King, which is the ancient Revenue of the Crown, and this is called the *King's Silver*, and this appears fully by the ſaid Statute de Modo levandi Fines, and the Entry of the *King's Silver* in ſuch Caſe at Bar was thus, Robertus Drury Armiger dat Dnæ. Reginæ Septem Libr. pro licentia Concordandi cum Tho. Tey Armigero & Elianora uxore ejus, de placito Conventionis, de maneriis de, &c. & habet Chirographum per pacem Admiſſum, coram Jacobo Dyer. Et nota bene, the Cuſtom is, that *he in whom the Fee is repoſed pays the King's Silver*, and not the other Conuſee, who had only for Life; and all the Preſidents are according to this. And Note, *the King's Silver* is entered upon the Writ of Covenant, and it ought to expreſs, Firſt the Sum given for Licence to accord. 2. The Party that paid it, viz. he in whom the Fee is repoſed. 3. The Plea, and between whom, &c. 4. The Land, for which the Fine is paid; and all this was well obſerved in the Principal Caſe. 5 Rep. 39. Trin. 34 Eliz. B. R. in Tey's Caſe.

3dly, The *Concord*. The *Concord* commences thus. Et eſt Concordia talis, Sc. quod præd' Tho. & Elianora Recognoverunt maneria, &c. eſſe jus, &c. Et notandum eſt, that this is the Foundation and Subſtance of the Fine; for if upon this the *King's Silver* be entered, tho' the Conuſor dies after, the Fine is good, as was adjudged in Carrel's Caſe. 3 Eliz. D. 220. b. and the Note and the Foot of the Fine are not only Abſtracts out of it, but the Concord is the Ground and Subſtance of the Fine.—5 Rep. 39. Trin. 34 Eliz. B. R. in Tey's Caſe. —Co. R. on Fines. 3. calls the Concord the Foundation, Ground, Life, and Heart of the Fine.

4thly, The *Note of the Fine*. This is only an Abſtract out of the Original and the Concord, and commences in this Manner, Sc. inter Robertum Drury and Thomam Cannock querentem, and Thom. T. & E. uxorem ejus deforcian. de maneriis, &c. unde Placitum Conventionis Summonit. fuit inter eos, Sc. quod Prædict' Tho. Tey & Elianora Recognoverunt maneria, &c. But 'twas obſerved, that in ancient Books, the Note of the Fine is taken for the Concord, as in 12 H. 4. f. 16. a. that the Note of the Fine is pleadable before the Fine engroſſed; and 22 H. 6. 51. accordingly. But this is intended of the Concord itſelf; and all the Pleadings in Quid juris clamat, &c. that the Leſſee had Fee the Day of the Note levied, are to be intended of the Concord itſelf. 5 Rep. 39. Trin. 34 Eliz. B. R. in Tey's Caſe.—The Note of the Fine may be *entered three or four Years after the Record made*, Co. R. on Fines 3.

5thly, The *Foot of the Fine*. This Commences thus, viz. Hæc eſt finalis Concordia facta in Curia Domini Regis apud Weſtm. a die Paſchæ in quindecim dies, Anno, &c. Coram Jacobo Dyer, &c. ſo that the Foot of the Fine includes all, and has the Day, Year and Place, and before what Juſtices the Concord was made. 5 Rep. 39. a. 39. b. Trin. 34 Eliz. B. R. in Tey's Caſe.

The Foot of the Fine *may be entered three or four Years after the Record made*. Co. R. on Fines 3.

(M. b. 3) Effect. At what Time Fines take Effect.

1. Note, that a Fine, before *it is ingroſſed, is a perfect Record*, and may be executed; and the Conuſee muſt ſue his Quid juris clamat, Per quæ Servitia, or Quem Redditum reddit as his Caſe is, before the Ingroſſment of the Fine; For the Fine being ingroſſed, the Conuſee has no means Br. Fines. pl. 56. cites 22 H. 6. 13.

means to compel the Tenant to attorn; and then the Conuſee may by this way loſe his Service, and all Actions, that the Law, after Attornment, gives him. Co. R. on Fines. 3.

(M. b. 4) Sur Releaſe. To whom good. In Reſpect of Eſtate, &c. And how.

1. If Land be given *to the Baron and Feme in Tail, for Jointure of the Feme, by the Anceſtor of the Baron*; and after the *Baron dies*, and the *Feme ſuffers a Recovery againſt the Statute of* 11 *H.* 7. by Covin, and after *the Iſſue in Tail releaſes all his Right by Fine*, and dies, *his Iſſue may enter*; For the ſaid Statute ſays, that the Recovery ſhall be void, being ſuffered by ſuch Feme, unleſs he in Reverſion aſſents to it by matter of Record, which ought to be by Voucher in the ſame Action, or ſuch like; For if there be *meſne Inſtant between the Recovery and the Aſſent* as above; then if the Recovery be once *void by the Statute*, an Aſſent by Fine after, which is matter of Record, will not make the Recovery good, which was once void before. Br. Judgment. pl. 148 cites Doct. & Stud. lib. 1.

2. *Tenant in Tail* made a *Leaſe for his own Life*, and he in *Reverſion releaſed to the Leſſee for Life by Fine, and to his Heirs*; it ſeems to me, that this Releaſe is utterly void.—For tho' Littleton ſays, that in every Caſe, where he, to whom the Releaſe is made, hath a Freehold in Deed, or in Law, ſuch Releaſe is good; this is true, but not in all Caſes. And therefore I have taken a Diverſity, viz. In all Caſes, when a Releaſe ſhall enure by way of *Mitter l'Eſtate*, it is not ſufficient to him, to whom the Releaſe is made, to have Freehold only, but there ought to be *Privity between Releaſor and Releaſee*; But when a Releaſe ſhall enure by way of *Mitter le Droit* to him without Privity (as if the Diſſeiſor makes a Leaſe for Life, and after the Diſſeiſee releaſes to the Tenant for Life,) this is good; *But* if *Tenant in Tail* make a *Leaſe for another's Life*, the *Releaſe of the Donor* is good to ſuch Leſſee. Co. R. on Fines 6.

3. If a Man makes *Leaſe for Years*, and *before* the *Entry of the Leſſee* the *Leſſor by Fine releaſes to him and to his Heirs*; now this is a void Releaſe For the Leſſor, againſt his own Fine might ſay, that the Leſſee had not entred into the Land before the Fine levied; and yet 31 Aſſ. 24. 'tis adjudged contra, in ſuch a Caſe; but other Books are all contrary, and ſo is the Law. Co. R. on Fines 6. cites 16 H. 7. 5. 50 E. 3. 37. 3 H. 6. 23. 46 E. 3. 13. 15 H. 7. 14. 47 E. 3. 27. &c.

(N. b) The *ſeveral Sorts* of Fines, and what are executed, &c. and how enure.

1. THERE are 2 Kinds of Fines, viz. one *executed*, and the other *executory*. Executed; that is, where the preſent Eſtate paſſeth unto, or is ſuppoſed in the Conuſee; For ſuch a Fine is a Feoffment of Record, as this Fine *come ceo*, or *Sur Releaſe*, *or Confirmation*, *or Sur Surrender*; executory, as when no Eſtate is veſted in the Conuſee, until it be executed by Entry or Action; as Fines *Sur Grant and Render* by the Conuſee, which muſt be made upon a Fine come ceo, or ſur Releaſe, &c. or other Fine which is executed; or otherwiſe the Conuſee could not make any Grant and Render of that Land, &c. which he had not. 2 Inſt. 513.

Weſt. Symb. S. 20.—If a Fine Sur Coniſance de Droit *come ceo* &c. be levied *of a Reverſion by the name of the Land*, it is not executory. Weſt. Symb. S. 179. cites 43 E. 3. 15.——It is not called executed, becauſe the Conuſee is in Poſſeſſion; but *becauſe* the Fine *is executed between the Parties*; ſo that the Conuſee cannot ſue Execution, becauſe the Fine in itſelf is ſuppoſed to be executed. A Fine is not called executory, becauſe the Fine does not ſuppoſe any Execution, but the Conuſee may execute it, either by Entry or by Scire Facias. Co. R. on Fines 4.

2. Of

6. Fines are either *without Proclamations*, or *with Proclamations*. The firſt at Common Law, the other by *Stat.* 4 *H.* 7. 24. Weſt's Symb. §. 19.

7. *And* they are either *ſingle* or *double*, and are ſuch as are either *with Render or without Render*. See Weſt's Symb. §. 21.

8. A. Leſſee *for Life*, Remainder *for Life* to B. *A. levies* a Fine *to B.* Sur Conuſance *de Droit*; this in Truth enures by way of *Surrender*. Co. R. on Fines 5. cites 3 Aſſ.

But if B. accepts a Fine from A. Sur Conuſance de Droit *come ceo*, &c. this is a *Forfeiture* of both the Eſtates of A. and B. and ſhall not enure by way of Surrender; but he in Reverſion may enter immediately for the Forfeiture. Co. R. on Fines 5. cites 1 H. 7.

9. If a *Leaſe* be made *for Life*, the Remainder *to the Feme in Fee*, and *Tenant for Life levies a Fine* Sur Conuſance de Droit *to the Baron and Feme, and to the Heirs of the Baron*; in this Caſe, if the *Feme dies without Heir*, the Lord ſhall have the Land by Eſcheat, for this amounts to a Surrender in Law. Co. R. on Fines 5. cites 39 E. 3. 30 Aſſ. Osborn's Caſe.

But if a Leaſe be made *for Life*, the Remainder in Tail to B. Remainder in Fee to C. Tenant for Life levies a Fine to A. and his Feme in Fee A. dies without Iſſue. C. enters for the Forfeiture, this is not a Surrender. Co. R. on Fines 5. cites 41 E. 3. 41 Aſſ.

10. Of Fines there are 4 *Kinds*. 1ſt, a Fine *Sur Cognizance de Droit come ceo que il ad de ſon done*, (i. e.) upon Acknowledgment of the Right of the Cogniſee; as that which he had of the Gift of the Cognizor. It is a ſingle Fine, and admits the Poſſeſſion (at leaſt in Law) of the Lands, by Virtue of a Feoffment or former Gift of the Cognizor, and works by way of Releaſe; a Fee Simple paſſing without the Word Heirs, and nothing being rendered back to the Cognizor. This is the principal and ſureſt Fine, and is a Fine executed; ſo that the Cogniſee may preſently enter

There are 5 *Sorts* of Fines, of which 3 are *executed*, viz. Sur Conuſance de Droit *come ceo*, &c. Sur *Releaſe*, and Sur *Surrender*; and 2 *executory*, viz. Sur Conuſance *de Droit tantum*, Sur *Grant and Render*. Co. R. on Fines 4. Fines upon *Surrender* are either ‡ *expreſly* ſo, or *amounting to* a Surrender. Co. R. on Fines 5.—‡ A Fine *upon expreſs Surrender, is* when *the Leſſee for Life, or* for other's Life or

2d, A Fine *Sur Done*, **Grant* and *Render*; which is a double Fine (being in a Manner two Fines, (viz.) a Fine *Sur Cognizance come ceo*, &c. and a Fine *Sur Conceſſit*, &c.) and where the Cognizee, after a Releaſe and Warranty made to him by the Cognizor, doth grant and render back to the Cognizor, the Lands, &c. limiting often times thereby Remainders to Strangers not named in the Writ, if the Party is in Poſſeſſion, this Fine is executed, otherwiſe he muſt enter, or have the Writ of *Habere facias Seiſinam*, &c.

3d, A Fine † *Sur Cognizance de Droit tantum*; which is commonly uſed to paſs a Reverſion. It may be expreſſed in ſuch Fines, that the particular Eſtate is in another, whom the Cognizor is willing ſhould have the Reverſion. Sometimes it is uſed by Tenant for Life, to make a Grant and Releaſe to him in Reverſion. In a Fine Sur Cognizance de Droit tantum, the Cognizee hath a Freehold in Law in him before he enters.

4th, A Fine *Sur Conceſſit* is, where the Cognizor is ſeiſed of the Lands contained in the Fine, and the Cognizee hath no Freehold therein, but it paſſeth by the Fine. It is commonly uſed to grant away Eſtates for Life or Years. And if the Cognizees are not in Poſſeſſion, they muſt enter, or have a Writ of *Habere facias Seiſinam*, &c. Wood's Inſt. 240.

Tenant in Tail after Poſſibility, Tenant in Dower, or by the Curteſy, by Fine ſurrender their Eſtates *to him in Reverſion*; and the Form of the Fine is ſuch in Effect, as the Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit; ſaving that theſe Words *ſurſum reddidit* are in the Fine upon Surrender, and the Clauſe of the *Warranty omitted*. Co. R. on Fines 5.

* This Fine is executory only, and therefore the Law pre-ſuppoſes, that he who rendered is ſeiſed; yet if the other, at the Time of the Fine levied be ſeiſed, the Fine is good, and executed preſently; and therefore the Court will receive this Conuſance de Droit only; and that the Conuſee by the ſame Fine, renders to the Conuſor the ſame Land, that he who ſurrendered by the Conuſance, ſhall have nothing in the Land; the Conuſee in this Caſe, cannot grant Rent to the Conuſor by the ſame Fine, &c. Denſh. R. of Fines 6.

† This Fine pre-ſuppoſes the Conuſor to be in Poſſeſſion at the Time, &c. and therefore may be executed by *Entry*, or *Scire facias*; and tho' the Conuſee be in Poſſeſſion, the Fine is good. Denſh. R. of Fines 6. cites 10 E. 3. 1.

(N. b. 2) What Fines *proper for what Eſtates,*

1. 'Twas agreed that a Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit *come ceo*, &c. is *always intended of Fee Simple*, and no leſs Eſtate; and that after the Party is ſeiſed by the Fine, Scire facias lies not, but a Formedon. Br. Fines. pl. 13. cites 42 E. 3. 5.

2. *Tenant for Life* may levy a Fine *Sur Grant and Releaſe* of the Lands which he holdeth for Life, to hold to the Cogniſee *for Life of the Tenants for Life*, and it is no Forfeiture 44 Ed. 3. 36. But if the Eſtate were larger, or the Fine Sur Cognizance de Droit come ceo que, &c. it were a Forfeiture of his Eſtate. Weſt. Symb. §. 13. cites 4 H. 7. fol.

3. *So* of ſuch Fines by *Tenant in Tail after Poſſibility*, Tenant *in Dower*, or *by the Curteſy*, 39 Ed. 3. 16. *But* ſuch Fine *of a Rent* ſeemeth to be no Forfeiture 2 H. 5. 9. Yet a particular Tenant as in Dower, by Curteſy, or for Life, cannot by Fine *grant and ſurrender* their Eſtates to the Owner of the Reverſion, or Remainder, but may by Fine grant and releaſe the ſame. Weſt's Symb. §. 13. cites 17 Ed. 3. 62. 24 Ed. 3. 26. 20 Ed. 3. & 14 Ed. 3.

4. A *Leſſee for Years* levies a Fine *Sur Conuſans de Droit come ceo:* This Fine is void; For he had no Freehold; Partes ad Finem nihil habuerunt. Jenk. 254. pl. 45.

In the Argument of this Caſe, it was ſaid, that the Fine Sur conceſſit was deviſed to be levied by thoſe who had *Eſtate for Life, and alſo Remainder in Fee expectant on Eſtate Tail*, and that it is more innocent than Fine Sur Conuſance, and is like to a Grant of Totum Statum ſuum. But then this Fine ſhould expreſs the Eſtate of the Conuſors; and if it does not, even this Fine Sur Conceſſit may be a *Forfeiture*. 2 Jo. 69 S. C.——cites 17 E. 3. 66. 44 E. 3. 36.——2 Mod. 109. S. C. Pollexf. 146. S. C. 2 Keb. 580. S. C.——* Remainder to the Feme in Fee. 2 Jo. 68.

5. *Feme Tenant for Life*, Remainder *to J. S. in Tail*, Remainder *to the Baron of the Feme for Life*, * Remainder over. *Baron and Feme* by Fine Sur Conceſſit *granted Tenementa prædicta & totum, & quicquid habent in Tenementis prædictis pro Vita of the Baron and Feme, with Warranty*, which deſcended upon J. S. The Queſtion upon this was, whether this ſhall be conſtrued to paſs one entire Eſtate for the Lives of the Baron and Feme, or ſeveral diſtinct and divided Eſtates for the Lives of them? Hale Ch. J. & Wild J. Held clearly, that the Intent here was to prevent a Forfeiture; But what Operation it ſhould have as one entire Freehold for both their Lives, or a divided Eſtate they would conſider & adjornatur. The Parties agreed, ſo no Judgment was given. 2 Lev. 154. Hill. 27 & 28 Car. 2. B. R. Piggot v. Ld Salisbury.

(N. b. 3) The *Operations* of the ſeveral Sorts of Fines.

A Fine *Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo, &c. generally implys a Fee Simple*;

1. As well the Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit *come ceo*, as Sur Conuſance *de Droit tantum, gives a Fee Simple* to the Conuſee, *without* the Words *his Heirs*; For every Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit is intended Fee Simple. Co. R. on Fines 7.

but it is only *by Implication*, and therefore there is *no Repugnancy to limit an Eſtate for Life* to the Conuſee; For the precedent Donation or Feoffment, which is ſuppoſed, might be for Life only, or in Tail, and the general Intendment of the Conuſance may be *qualified by an expreſs Limitation*. 1 Salk. 340. in Caſe of Hunt v. Bourne——cites 41 Ed. 3. 14. Co. Litt. 9. b.——Lutw. 781. S. C.

2. Any Eſtate by Fine that operates by Way of *Grant*; the Law, to avoid Wrong, *expounds* it ſo, that every one grants, what he lawfully may. Arg. Raym. 147. cites 10 Rep. 98. Mich. 10 Jac. Sir Edward Seymour's Caſe.

3. *A. Tenant for Life, Remainder to B. in Tail; B. levies a Fine with Proclamations Sur Conceſſit to A. & C. for their Lives:* this Fine bars the Intail, during the ſaid two Lives only, and is not a Diſcontinuance omnino: For B. was not ſeiſed by Force of the Tail, and the Fine is Sur Conceſſit: It ſeems that *A's Acceptance* of this Eſtate to him and C. *is a Surrender* of the former Eſtate which he had: As in Caſe of a Leaſe for Years made to A and during the Years he accepts a Leaſe for Years of the ſame Land to him and B. Jenk. 321. pl. 28.

4. A Fine *Sur Cognizance de Droit come ceo, &c.* is a Feoffment upon Record of the Lands compriſed in the Fine, and doth *imply a Livery and Seiſin* of thoſe Lands, Hill. 1649. 26 Jan. B. S. *to paſs the Eſtate out of the Conuſor* to the Conuſee, *but* if another Perſon were in by Tort, it will *not* amount *to an Entry*, as a Feoffment will, to purge that Tort. L. P. R. 615.

(N. b. 4) Ancient Demeſne. The Force and *Effect* of Fines *in Ancient Demeſne.*

1. In Aſſiſe the Tenant pleads that the Land is Parcel of the Manor of D. which is Ancient Demeſne, Judgment &c. He ſhall not be received to ſay that 'tis Ancient Demeſne; For a *Fine of Releaſe* was levied between us and you of the ſame Land, and becauſe this is a Judgment in Curia Regis, therefore tho' *there was no Transmutation of Poſſeſſion, yet 'tis a Judgment which made it Frank-fee between the Parties*; But the *Lord and Strangers ſhall not be bound by it*, but ſhall have Advantage of Ancient Demeſne, per Wilby. Br. Auncient Dem. pl. 17. cites 21 E. 3. 25.

2. *And* note, that *the Lord himſelf was one of the Deſcendants in the Aſſiſe, and* becauſe he *pleaded by Bailiff*, and did not take the Tenancy upon him; 'tis ſaid that *it does not eſtop him in a Writ of Deceit to reverſe the Fine*, and to make it Ancient Demeſne again; and ſo ſee, that tho' it was Sur Releaſe, which is not Tranſmutation, yet 'tis a Judgment in Curia Regis, and ſo *Frank-fee for the Time*; and it ſeems there that *none can plead Ancient Demeſne but only the Tenant.* Br. Auncient Dem. pl. 17. cites 21 E. 3. 25.

3. A Fine levied in Ancient Demeſne is *not good*, for *'tis no Court of Record*; but at this Day *Common Recoveries* by Sufferance are uſed there to bind the Tail, per Knivet, which note, and well; for the Land ought to be impleaded there by Writ of Right-Cloſe, and not elſewhere; contra of a Fine. Br. Auncient Dem. pl. 47. cites 50 Aſſ. 9.

4. By the beſt Opinion, if a Fine levied of Land, which is Ancient Demeſne, be reverſed by Deceit, yet it *is good between the Parties.* Br. Fines. pl. 101. cites 7 H. 4. 44. And alſo 17 E. 3. 31. that nothing is effected by the Reverſal, but to reſtore the Land to be Ancient Demeſne, but it remains good between the Parties. Ibid.

If a *Fine* or Recovery paſs in *Bank of Land, which is Ancient Demeſne, and the Lord brings Deceit and reverſes it*; the Fine or Recovery is by this *reverſed, between the Parties, and is void*; Becauſe now it was, *coram non Judice*; and he who had the Land before may enter, per Littleton & Needham. Br Auncien Dem. pl. 30. cites 8 E. 4. 6. S. P. Br Fines. pl. 36. cites 7 H. 4. 44——& 8 H. 4. 23. and ſays that the beſt Opinion is ſo; For that it is reverſed as a Judgment is reverſed by Writ of Error as it ſeems, and that Hull ſaid, that the Judgment proved that the Court had no Juriſdiction of it, and therefore was void againſt all.——Br. Fines. pl. 47. S. P. cites 21 E. 3. 20.

5. If in Ancient Demeſne, a Writ of *Right Cloſe* be brought againſt A. and it be proſecuted *in the Nature of a Formedon* in the Deſcender, a Fine levied there, and *without Proclamations* by the Cuſtom there, *is a Bar.* If this Judgment be reverſed in the Common Pleas, the Common Pleas ſhall only Judge that the Plaintiff ſhall be reſtored to his Action in the Court of Ancient Demeſne, unleſs there be ſome other Cauſe which takes

Fine *Sur Conceſſit* levied in Ancient Demeſne, makes a *Diſcontinuance and has all the Effects*

takes away the Juriſdiction of the Court of Ancient Demeſne, for which the Judgment given for the Plaintiff in Ancient Demeſne is reverſable; the Court of Common Pleas ought not to judge the ſaid Plea in Bar bad; For the *Statute* of the 4 *H.* 7. *That Fines ſhall bar an Eſtate Tail*, and the Statute of *Weſt.* 2. *c.* 1. *Quod Finis levatus* by Tenant in Tail *ipſo Jure ſit nullus*, are to be underſtood of Fines at the Common Law; and *not to extend* to the ancient Cuſtom of Ancient Demeſne. The Formedon in the Deſcender and Eſtates Tail, were at the Common Law: ſuch Tenant had Power to alien, only after he had Iſſue. 10 Ed. 2. Fitz Formedon 55. and *generally Statutes* are not to be conſtrued to deſtroy the Cuſtoms of Ancient Demeſne, which by Intendment of Law, concern Agriculture and the Subſiſtance of the King and his Subjects. Jenk. 87. pl. 68. cites Hob. 47. Barnſly and Coxe's Caſe.

a Fine levied in C. B. except that it is no Bar, which is only by Force of the Stat. 4 *H.* 7. Reſolution the ſecond. Lutw. 781. Hunt v. Bourne.—— 1 Salk. 340. S. C. and ſays the Diſcontinuance is becauſe the Freehold is recovered in the Action. For every Recoveror recovers a Fee Simple, and a Recovery of a Fee Simple, muſt work a Diſcontinuance; and if this be allowed to be a Fine, it ought in Conſequence to have the Effect of Fines. But Note, that it is *no Bar to the Entail*; For it is by the Statute 4 *H.* 7. that a Fine with Proclamations ſhall bar an Eſtate Tail, and no Fine, but with Proclamations is within the Statute, nor can bar an Eſtate Tail.—It is only a Diſcontinuance. Lutw. 959. White v. Auſtin.——Lutw. 781. S. P. Hunt v. Bourn.———D. 373. a. b. pl. 13.

6. *And tho'* Coke in the 3d Part of his Inſtitutes ſeems of another Opinion: For it ſeems to him that *no Cuſtom ſhall prevail againſt a Statute made within Term of Memory*. Under Correction neither the Stat. 4 *H.* 7 of Fines, *nor* the 18 *Ed.* 1. of Fines concerns this Caſe; for neither of them *ſays* in expreſs Words, that *Fines with Proclamations ſhall bar the Intail*: Theſe Statutes only ſay, that Fines with Proclamations *ſhall be bars to all Parties and Privies, and to Strangers, if* the Stranger doth *not* bring his Action, or *make* his *Claim within 5 Years after* ſuch Fines levied with Proclamations. And the true Intention of the 4 H. 7. was to take away and repeal the Statute of Non-claim the 34 Ed. 3. c. 16. and not to bar the the Eſtate Tail any more than 18 Ed. 1. had done, as appears by the Statute of 32 H. 8. c. 36. which ordains Fines levied as above, and Non-claim as above to bar the Tail. Jenk. 87. pl. 68.

(N. b. 5) Scire facias. *In what Caſes.* And *How.*

1. Sci. fa. lies to execute a Fine levied *of an Acquittal*. Br. Fines. pl. 100. cites 3 E. 5. 23.

2. Land is *rendered* by Fine *to* an *Husband and Wife, and* to *the Heirs of their two Bodies*; they have *Iſſue A.* the *Husband and Wife die*; *A. enters and enfeoffs B. with Warranty*; A. *dies*; D. his Iſſue brings a Scire facias againſt B. to execute this Fine: It does not lie; For Executio facta eſt, & non reſtat facienda, as Weſt. 2. c. 48. ſpeaks; and if this Scire facias ſhould lie, the Feoffee ſhould loſe his Warranty. Reſolved, that the Heir in Tail is put to his *Formedon* in this Caſe: In a Scire facias, a Voucher doth not lie; the Feoffee ſhall not loſe his Warranty, and therefore a Formedon only lies for the Heir in Tail in this Caſe. Jndgment affirmed in Error. Jenk. 18. pl. 34 cites 20 E. 3.

So if a Fine be *levied to a Baron and Feme, and to W. and his Heirs*, and he *dieth*; and then the *Baron and Feme do die*, the Fine is *executed for one Moiety in the Life of W.* Weſt's Symb. S. 179. cites Fitz. Sci. fa. 19. 43 Ed. 3. 9. 24 Ed. 3. 57.

3. Scire facias upon Fine *levied to T. R. and W.* and to the *Heirs of the Body of R.* the *Remainder to the right Heirs of the ſaid W.—T. died*, and *R. died without Iſſue*, and *W. ſurvived and died*; his Heirs need no Scire facias to execute this Fine, becauſe it is executed in his Life, by the *Fee and Franktenement in W.* Weſt's Symb. §. 179. cites 40 E. 3. 20.

4. Scire facias upon a Fine, the *Tenant for Life prayed in Aid of him in the Remainder in Tail*, and had it notwithſtanding that delays are ouſted in Scire facias by the Statute, quod Nota. Br. Sci fa. 16. cites 41 E. 3. 16.

5. After

5. After the *Party is ſeiſed by the Fine* a Sci. fa. does not lie, but a *Formedon*. Br. Fines. pl. 13. cites 42 E. 3. 5.

6. If the Plaintiff have *ſeveral Eſtates created by one Fine*, he needeth but *one Writ* of Sci. fa. 43 E. 3. 11. *tho'* it be *of ſeveral Things againſt ſeveral Tenants*. 11 H. 4. 15. 21 Ed. 3. 14. 24 Ed. 3. 25. Weſt's Symb. §. 179.

7. If Land be given by Fine *for Life*, the *Remainder to Baron and Feme in Tail*, and the *Baron dieth*; and then the *Tenant for Life dieth*, and the *Feme entreth*, the Fine is executed, ſo as their Iſſue needeth no Scire facias. Weſt's Symb. §. 179. cites 49 E. 3. 12.

8. Per 4 Juſtices and Serjeants, where a Fine is levied *to the Baron and Feme in Special Tail, Remainder to the Heirs of the Body of the Baron*, the *Feme dies without Iſſue*; the Remainder is executed in the Baron, becauſe he is not as Tenant for Life, and then the Remainder in the Heirs of his Body veſts the Tail in him, quod vide ibidem; and yet notwithſtanding this, and a Bar in Aſſiſe by Judgment againſt the Plaintiff himſelf in this Scire facias he had Execution; quod mirum! for it ſeems that 'twas executed before, and alſo the Judgment in the Aſſiſe, being in Force, binds him. Br. Fines. pl. 33. cites 7 H. 4. 23.

9. If a Fine be levied to *A. in Tail*, the *Remainder to B. in Tail*, the *Remainder to C. in Fee*. And the *Record is ſent into the Chancery*, and the *firſt Tenant in Tail dieth without Iſſue*, and the Record cometh back into the Bench by *Mittimus*, *at the Suit of him in the firſt Remainder*, and thereupon he had a Scire facias to execute the Fine, and *died without Iſſue, before Execution had*; he in Remainder in Fee, ſhall not hereupon have a Scire facias without a new Commandment, becauſe the Record was once out of the Court, and came in again at the Suit of him in the firſt Remainder, unto whom he in the Remainder in Fee is a Stranger; yet the * Iſſue of him which removed the Record, in this Caſe might have a Scire facias without any new Commandment, becauſe he is *Privy*. Weſt. Symb. §. 176. cites 14 H. 7. 16. 9 E. 4. 15. 11 E. 4. 13.

Co. R. on Fines 12. Br. Fines. pl. 59. cites 14 H. 7. 16.—Br. Scire facias. pl. 120. cites 14 H. 7. 17. —Br. Executions. pl. 60. cites S. C. ——None ſhall have Execution of a Fine, which is in C. B. without a new Commandment to them to make Execution, unleſs he only, at whoſe Suit it was brought into C. B. per Cur. For per Choke, the Writ is ad Proſecutionem A. B. Quære of his *Heir*, quod nemo negavit. Br. Fines. pl. 67. cites 9 E. 4. 15.

* D. 29. pl. 196. Hill. 28 H. 8. Anon. cites 14 H. 7. and 11 E. 4. fo. ultimo accordingly. But in Dyer it is ſaid, that the Heir muſt have a *New Certificate* of the Fine, by a new Writ out of the Chancery; For the Mittimus was to impower the Juſtices to proceed *ad Proſecutionem of ſuch an one* (the Anceſtor) and when he is dead, the Warrant is determined, and the Court cannot proceed at the Proſecution of another.

10. If a Man grant the *Reverſion of an Acre of Land*, where he *hath nothing in the Land*, by Fine executory, and *afterward he purchaſeth the Reverſion*; now the Grantee ſhall enter when the Reverſion doth fall, or ſhall have Execution thereof, by a Scire facias. Perk. §. 66.

11. Upon a Fine *Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo*, &c. with a Grant and Render; the *Fee was limited by the Word Remanere*, as a Remainder when it was a Reverſion, it was doubted if a Sci. fa. lay; For the Fine was executed before, and Sci. fa. lies only on Fine Executory. But now he is put to a *Formedon*. See D. 199. pl. 55, 56. Paſch. 3 Eliz. Gale v. Gale. ——And ſee Dal. 29. pl. 4.—The Opinion of the Court was againſt the Plaintiff. D. 199. b. pl. 56. S. C.

A. and M. his Wife and B. levied a Fine to C. with Grant and *Render to B. in Taile, Remainder to M. and her Heirs* J. S. brought Sci. fa. in Remainder, as Heir of M. after B's Death without Iſſue, and had Judgment. D. 199. pl. 55. Marg. cites M. 13 & 14 Eliz. Ld Shandois's Caſe.

12. *But* where 3 *Deforceants* granted and rendered *to the Plaintiff in Tail*, with diverſe Remainder over in Tail, the *Reverter to the Grantors, and the Heirs of one* of them in Fee, *without any Conuſance de Droit come ceo que &c. at the Beginning*, and the Heir of him who had the Fee Simple limited to him, brought the Sci. fa. ſuppoſing all the *Tails ſpent*, ſo that there ſeems difference between this and the Caſe above. D. 199. a. b. pl. 56. cites a Precedent in T. 18 H. 6. Rot. 111.

(N. b. 6) Scire facias. *At what Time* it lies *to execute* a Fine.

1. A Scire facias may be ſued upon the Note of the Fine, *before it be ingroſſed* by the Chirographer. Weſt. Symb. §. 179. cites 22 H. 6. 13.

2. *But* of a Fine *levied before Time of Memory*, a Man ſhall not have Execution by Scire facias. Weſt. Symb. §. 179. cites * 1 E. 4. 6. but cites † 16 H. 7. 9. contra.

* Br. Fines. pl. 90. cites S. C.—† Br. Fines. pl. 126. cites S. C. accordingly.

(N. b. 7) Scire facias. *By whom.*

1. If Land be given by Fine *to A. for Term of Life, Remainder to B. and C. and the Heirs of their two Bodies*, and *each have Iſſue and die*; the *Tenant for Life dies*; the *one Iſſue and a Stranger enter*; the *Iſſues ſhall have ſeveral Writs*; for the Inheritance is ſeveral, and the Iſſue held out may have Action of *Scire facias* againſt the Stranger * only *to execute the Fine for his Moiety, and not join the other Iſſue*; *For he is in by Title in his Moiety*, and the Stranger in the other Moiety by Tort; and when he has recovered, he and the other are Tenants in Common. Br. Brief. pl. 444. cites 24 E. 3. 29.

* *Orig.* (tamen.)

2. Fine was levied to *A. and M. his Wife in Tail*, Remainder *to M. in Fee*. They had *Iſſue a Son* named *B.* The Baron died, and *M. by an after Husband had Iſſue C.* then M. died, and *B. entered and died without Iſſue*. C. ſhall have Sci. fa. to execute the Fine, and not the collateral Heir of B. For B. was ſeiſed in Tail only, and the Fee was in Abeyance and not executed in him; and now C. is Heir of the whole Blood to A. tho' but of the half Blood to B. And whoſoever is *Heir to the Anceſtor when the Fee falls*, ſhall have Execution thereof. Br. Scire facias. pl. 126. cites 24 E. 3. 30. 62. and 37 E. 3. lib. Aſſ. 4.

Br. Executions. pl. 67. cites S. C.

3. *J. N. acknowledged all the Right* which he had in 100 Acres of Land in D. *to be the Right of W. N. and his Heirs, and obliged himſelf and his Heirs to Warranty, and to acquit W. N. and his Heirs*; and the *Lord Paramount diſtrained W. N.* and *he brought Scire facias*, which is *returned warned*, and the ſaid *J. N. did not come* to acquit him, *by which he prayed Execution*; and per Belknap, he ſhall have Writ of Meſne; but per Kirton, he ſhall have Writ of Execution by Scire facias; For *the Thing is Executory*, and this by the Statute de hiis que Recordata ſunt, &c. Br. Scire facias. pl 50. cites 49 E. 3. 8.

4. A Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit, &c. *levied to A. and B. and to the Heirs of A.* the *Jointenant for Life ſurvived and died*; *the Heir* of the other who had the Inheritance, ſhall not have Scire facias to execute the Fee; For 'twas executed before. Co. R. on Fines 4. cites 11 H. 4. 5. b. per Hill & Thirning.

But (as I think) *if B. dies before* A. then is the Fine executed in the Tenant for Life, and he ſeiſed in Fee.

5. *But* if a Fine be levied Sur Conuſance de Droit, &c. *to A. for Life, Remainder to B. in Tail, Remainder to A. in Fee*; there B. after the Death of Tenant for Life, ſhall have Scire facias to execute the Eſtate Tail, and the Son alſo of Tenant for Life, after the Death of Tenant in Tail. Co. R. on Fines 4.

As if Land be given for Life, Remainder in Tail; Remainder to the right Heirs of the Tenant for Life, and Tenant in Tail dies, the Tenant for Life is ſeiſed in Fee. Co. R. on Fines 4. cites 40 E. 3. 9. 33 H. 6. 5.

6. If

6. If *two sue a Sci. fa.* to execute a Fine, and the *one dieth*, the Survivor shall have a Scire facias without any new Commandment. West. Symb. § 179. cites 1 E. 4. 13.

But if diverse Persons, as Heirs unto A. B. pray a Scire facias, it is not grantable until they have sued *several Writs* to the Justices of the Bench, commanding them to make Execution. West. Symb. S. 179. cites 11 E. 4. 13. T. 21 E. 4.

13. A Fine was levied *between the Prior of B. and J. S.* that the Prior should find so many Masses in the Manor and Chapel of C. and, *for Non-Performance, the Heir of C. brought Sci. fa.* and yet *C. was a Stranger to the Fine.* However because it was an *ancient Fine in the Time of H.* 3. and also the Heir of C. was to have Advantage of the Fine, the Sci. fa. was awarded to lie. Br. Fines. pl. 126. cites 16 H. 7. 9.

(N. b. 8) Execution. *Of what* Conusee shall have Execution.

1. A Man gives in *Tail by Grant or Render, saving to himself the Reversion*, and dies; and the Tenant in *Tail dies without Issue*; and R. enters and *endows the Feme of the Tenant in Tail*; the *Heir of the Donor brings Sci. fa.* against R. *of two Parts*, and recovers, *and another Scire facias against the Feme of the third Part*, and she prays to have Aid of R. And *so see a Scire facias of a Reversion that was reserved*, and never was out of the Donor and his Heirs, and which was not given by the Fine, but reserved, and yet the Scire facias lies. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 95. cites 21 E. 3. 12.

2. If the Services *escheat after a Fine levied of the Seigniory*, the Conusee shall have Execution of the Land escheated, West. Symb. §. 179. cites 48 E. 3. 11.

So if the Fine be levied to A. for Life, Remainder to B. The *Remainder-Man, after the Death of Tenant for Life*, shall have Sci. fa. of the Land escheated. For now it is Parcel of the Manor, and is come in Lieu of the Services; and yet it was not properly comprised in the Fine. Br. Scire facias. pl. 47. cites S. C.

3. A Man shall have Writ of Execution, of *Things* which are *not comprised in the Writ of Covenant*, by some. Br. Sci. Fa. pl. 50. cites 49 E. 3. 8.

As of a Fine *upon a Release.* Br. Sci. fa. pl. 50. cites 49 E. 3. 8.

4. If the Conusee *renders Rent*, Scire Facias lies upon it. Ibid.

5. *So*, where a Man levies a Fine *in Tail rendering Rent*, Scire facias will lie for the Rent, per Belknap. And so see that a *Thing executory* shall be executed by Scire facias. Ibid.

6. Scire facias lies of a *Common* or *Corody* upon Fines levied of them. Per Ashton Quod not fuit Contradictum in Entry in Nature of Assise. Br. Scire facias. pl. 171. cites 4 E. 4. 2.

4 E. 2. b. & Idid. 2. b. 3. as to a Corody cites 18 H. 6.

(N. b. 9) *Pleadings* in Scire Facias.

1. In a Scire Facias *by* him in the *Remainder upon an Estate Tail* against A. B. *supposing the Donee to be dead without Issue*, if A. B. *plead that he is Issue* to the Donee, and the Plaintiff *replieth*, that he is *a Bastard*, it is a good *Replication.* West's Symb. S. 179. cites 40 E. 3. 16.

Br. Sci. Fa. pl. 15. cites S. C.

2. Scire Facias upon a Fine, the *Tenant said, that those who were Parties to the Fine, had nothing*, &c. *but one J. was seised*, &c. *whose Estate he has*, &c. and the *Plaintiff said, that J. had nothing at the time of the Fine*, &c. and no Plea, but he ought to maintain his Writ, that the Parties to the Fine were seised, &c. Br. Maintenance de Brief. pl. 22. cites 40 E. 3. 30.

3. In

3. In Scire Facias upon a Fine, Berk. prayed Judgment of the Writ, for the Writ is *Quare deſcendere non debet*, which *proves Poſſeſſion*, & non allocatur, by which he demanded Judgment of the Writ, becauſe the Fine *in itſelf proves Execution*. For it was ſur Conuſance de droit *come ceo*, &c. To have and to hold to him, and the Heirs of his Body, &c. And the Opinion of the Court was, that it is executed; ſo that Formedon lies, and not Scire Facias. Nota. Br. Brief pl. 47. cites 41. E. 3. 13.

4. In Formedon in Reverter or Remainder, the Demandant muſt *mention the Death of every one that had Eſtate, and ſurvived his Anceſtor*, but not ſo in a Scire Facias ſur Fine. Symb. S. 179. cites 42 E. 3. 19

5. If in a Scire Facias the Sheriff *returns the Party ſummoned*, and he *appear not*, Execution ſhall be awarded. Weſt's Symb. S. 179. cites 43 E. 3 13.

6. Where a Man *alleges the Death of ſeveral in Scire Facias to execute a Fine*, which he need not, it is only Surpluſage. Br. Negation pl. 21. cites 43 E. 3.

7. *Feoffment with Warranty from the Plaintiff's Anceſtor* is a good Plea in Scire Facias upon a Fine. Weſt's Symb. S. 179. cites 22 H. 6. 39.

* Br. Sci. Fa pl. 13 cites S. C. Brook ſays, and ſo ſee that the Coſinage is not compriſed in the Writ, but is entered in the Roll. Quod Nota. * In the ſmaller Editions it is pl. 246.

8. In a Scire Facias, *to execute a Fine as Couſin and Heir* to him in the Remainder or Reverſion; after the Death of the particular Tenant the Plaintiff *needeth not to ſhew how* Couſin and Heir, ſo long as the Plea hath Continuance by *idem dies*, &c. given to the Tenant, nor at his Appearance, nor *until the Plaintiff pray Execution*; and then the Coment Coſin and Heir is to be entered thus in the Roll only, *Et predictus J. dicit, quod ipſe eſt conſanguineus & heres J. W. videlicet Filius, & hæres T. W. Fratris & Hæredis ejuſdem J. W.* Weſt's Symb. 179. cites * 33 H. 6. 54. 41 Ed. 3. 13. & 24. 8 H. 4. 31.

9. *If the Tenant* be one who *entered by Title prior to the Fine*, it *ought to be ſo pleaded*; for it ſhall be intended, that he is in under the Fine, if it be not pleaded *ſpecially*. Per Priſot. Br. Brief pl. * 242. cites 36. H. 6. 16, 17.

10. In Scire Facias to execute a Fine *of Lands in D.* the *Tenant ſhall not ſay*, that *no ſuch Vill as D.* For that would avoid the Fine; per Chocke, quod fuit conceſſum. Br. Eſtoppel. pl. 172. cites 21 E. 4. 51. 53. and 54.

11. Scire Facias to execute a Fine *of 200 Acres of Land*, Sulyard ſaid, that *pending this Scire Facias, J. B. had brought a Formedon of 100 of the Acres* of Land *(inter alia) and had recovered and had Execution, and prayed that the Writ ſhould abate of this Parcel*; 'tis no Plea, becauſe he pleaded *inter alia*; For Recovery ſhall be pleaded *certain to every Intent*, and theſe Words (inter alia) is not certain to any Intent; for he *ought to have ſaid that he brought Formedon of 100 Acres, and recovered and had Execution, of which theſe 100 Acres which are now in Demand are parcel.* Br. Pleadings pl. 115. cites 22. E. 4. 8.

(N. b. 10) Scire Facias. *How the Writ ſhall be.*

Br. Fines pl. 45. cites S. C.

1. Where the Writ of Scire Facias *againſt a Prior, for not ſaying of Maſſes, upon a Fine* levied *by his Predeceſſor to P. M. and his Heirs* was brought *by W. Son of R. M.* againſt the Succeſſor, and *did not make himſelf Heir to P.* 'twas held good, *becauſe he was Heir to him*, and it was *quare Executio fieri non debet*, and *did not ſhew what Execution*, and yet good; for it *refers to the Fine*, and therefore good, though he does *not ſay, quare diſtringi non debet*, and the *Writ ſaid nothing of Succeſſor* to the Prior, for *it appears that he is Succeſſor, and that the Plaintiff is Heir to P.* and therefore the Writ is good, and Judgment that the Plaintiff diſtrain the Prior to make the Chantery. Br. Sci. Fa. pl. 91. cites 38 E. 3. 33.

* Br. Sci Fa. pl. 40. cites 45. E. 3. 18.

2. Scire Facias upon Fine, the Writ was *quare querenti* * *deſcendere non debet*, where it ſhould be *executionem habere non debet*, Judgment of the Writ; & non

non allocatur, for the *Writ is judicial.* Next he demanded Judgment of the Writ, becauſe it is *brought* † *as Coſin and Heir, and not ſhewn How Coſin,* & non allocatur ; For though *this ſhall be ſhewn in Formedon, yet in Scire Facias the one or the other is ſufficient.* Then he demanded Judgment of the Writ, becauſe the Writ is * *quare deſcendere non debet,* which proves Poſſeſſion, and ſo executed, & non allocatur ; and again demanded Judgment of the Writ, becauſe the *Fine was ſur conuſance de droit come ceo* que il ad, *&c. Habendum* & tenendum *ſibi & heredibus de corpore ſuo,* and therefore by the Opinion of the Court, this proves it executed, and this goes to the Action. And per Finch, an original Writ, which wants Form, ſhall abate ; for it is made in the Chancery, and pleadable here ; otherwiſe of a *Judicial Writ as* Scire Facias, for if this *wants Form, and hath Matter ſufficient, it is good,* and therefore (deſcendere debet) for (Executionem habere non debet) is not material. Br. Si. Fa. pl. 18. cites 41. E. 3. 13.

acocrdingly But Brook ſays, Quod Mirum ; Becauſe 44 E. 3. Fol. 18. it was abated. —— But it ſeems by the Year Book of 44 E. 3. 18. b. that the Writ was abated for not alleging Seiſin of the Father, and for other Matter ; but as to the Miſtake of (Deſcendere debet) inſtead of (remanere) it was amended, and nothing here mentioned of Quare Executionem, &c. —— † S. P. Br. Sci. Fa. pl. 148. cites 38. H. 6. 39. that the Writ was abated.

3. Scire Facias to execute a *Fine levied of one Manor, and of two Parts of another Manor to one for Life,* the *Reverſion in Tail to R. D. of one Part* ; and *of another Part to A. for Life, the Reverſion in Fee to R.* And the *Heir of R. brought Scire Facias to execute the Tail,* and ſet forth that the Tenant for Life, on whom this depended, was dead, and alleged A. dead alſo, which was pleaded to the Writ, becauſe he alleged the one and the other dead ; where he need ſay nothing of *the Death of A.* till he demands Fee Simple ; & non allocatur, for it is only Surpluſage. And another Exception was, that the Writ was, that it ought to *revert* to him ; *where it ſhould be, that it ought to remain,* becauſe no Poſſeſſion was in him before ; & non allocatur, becauſe it agrees with the Fine. Br. Sci. Fa. pl. 24. cites 43. E. 3. 11. Br. Nugation. pl. 21. cites S. C.

4. Scire Facias upon a Fine, *againſt A. and C. of two Manors,* (and ſet forth) *that A. entered into the one Manor, and C. into the other Manor* ; and after it was *quod ſint apud Weſtmonaſterium oſtenſuri,* &c. and yet the Writ is good ; and they *anſwered ſeverally and not jointly,* for the *Writ was alſo* quod *ipſi ſeparatim ea tenentes* ; *and* it was *quare to the Baron and Feme Plaintiffs remanere non debet, where it was de jure uxoris,* and yet good ; For it cannot remain to the one without the other ; *contrary in Formedon* in deſcender, reverter, *or* Writ of *Eſcheat.* Per Hill, which was not denied. Br. Sci. Fa. pl. 72. cites 11 H. 4 15.

5. Scire Facias to execute a Fine, *ſuppoſing* the Fine to be levied *to the Baron ſur Conuſance de droit come ceo, which the Baron and Feme have of the Gift* of the Conuſor, *and to the Heirs of the Baron,* and *ſuppoſing that they are dead,* and now the Plaintiff, as Coſin and Heir to the Baron, brought this Writ, to execute the Fine in Fee. Per Norton, if the Feme ſurvived, the Writ well lies. But Hill denied it. Per Thorne, if this Matter ſhall aid, as I do not think it will, yet it ſhall not come by Surmiſe, but *ſhall be expreſſed in the Writ.* Per Culpeper, the Writ cannot lie, becauſe the Fine was levied ſur Conuſance de droit come ceo, &c. which is always executed, by which it was awarded, that the Tenant go ſine die ; and ſo ſee that *it is not alleged that the Feme ſurvived,* and therefore it ſeems that it is not very clear. Br. Sci. Fa. pl. 77. cites 11 H. 4. 55.

(N. b. 11) Scire facias. *How* the Writ muſt be, *in reſpect of the Fine. Writ varying from* the Fine.

1. Scire facias to Execute *a Fine of Lands in C.* according to the Fine, the Tenant ſaid that *C. is neither a Vill nor a Hamlet,* and yet becauſe it was according to the Fine, the Defendant was compelled to Anſwer over. Br. Variance, pl. 88. cites 21 E. 3. 14. Br. Brief, pl. 148. cites S. C.

2 Scire facias upon a Fine; the Fine was *to J. S. & Hered' quos ipſe procreavet* de Corpore, &c. and the *Writ was*, & Hered' quos *procrearet*, and yet well by Judgment; for all is one and the ſame meaning, quod nota bene. Br. Variance, pl. 91. cites 24 E. 3. 28.

3. In Scire facias the Caſe was, that *W. acknowledged the Manor except one Acre to be the Right of F.* who *render'd the ſame Manor as is aforeſaid, to W. in Tail*; and *R. as Heir of W. ſued Execution* by Scire facias of the Manor, (quære, it ſeems that it ſhall be *intended* the ſame Manor which was given to F. by the Fine; for) per Thorp the *Writ is good without Exception.* Br. Brief, pl. 139. cites 38 E. 3. 17.

S. P. and becauſe he did not put in the Vill, in which the Land lay, therefore the Writ was abated, quod nota. Br. Variance, pl. 86. cites S. C.——Br. Fines, pl. 44. cites S. C. acc.

4. Tho' the Scire facias iſſues out of the Record, and therefore, as the Books ſay, ought to accord with the Fine in all Points, yet if the *Vill be omitted in the Fine*, the *Scire facias ought to expreſs it*, tho' by this means the Sci. Fa. varies from the Fine. Co. R. on Fines 12 & 13 cites 38 E. 3. 19.

Thorp ſaid, he had ſeen, that a *Fine* had been *levy'd in a Hamlet*, and the *Scire facias* had been ſued, *ſuppoſing the Tenements to be in the Vill in which the Hamlet is*, and this Challenged for Variance from the Fine, and the Writ was maintainable. Br. Variance, pl. 86 cites 38. E. 3. 19.

5. *So* it is ſaid in ſome Books, that if a Fine be levied *in a Hamlet*, the *Sci fa. ought to be* brought *in a Vill.* Co. R. on Fines 13. cites 21 E. 3. 14. 38 E. 3. 19.

6. Scire facias of Tenements *in Eſtgrave*, and the Fine was of Tenements *in Depegravé*, and therefore the Writ was abated for the Variance. Br. Variance, pl. 16. cites 42 E. 3. 3.

West's Symb. S. 179. cites S. C.

7. A Fine Executory was levied of a *Seigniory*; and then *Land eſcheated to the Seigniory*, or the Tenant was forejudged, &c. the Conuſee ſhall have Sci. fa. *of the Land inſtead of the Services.* Br. Fines, pl. 99. cites 48 E. 3. 11.

S. P. Br. Fines pl. 8. cites 27 H. 8. 2. but it ſhould be 27 H. 6. 2. —Br. Brief, pl. 20. cites S. C.—Br. Variance, pl. 84. cites S. C. ——*So* of

8 Scire facias upon a Fine *to have Execution of a Manor and Hundred*, the Tenant demanded Judgment of the Writ, becauſe the *Hundred is Parcel of the Manor*, and ſo he demands one Thing twice, & non allocatur; for he cannot vary from the Fine, and therefore the Writ is good by award; contrary upon a Recovery; For if the Writ be not good, he may have a new Suit, but not a new Fine as here, and ſo note the Difference. But quære if a Hundred may be Parcel of a Manor. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 7. cites 27 H. 6. 2.

Manor and Advowſon, where the Advowſon is *Appendant*, or of Manor *and three Acres*, where the three Acres are *Parcel*. Br. Scire facias, pl. 147. cites 36 H. 6. 16.———Br. Variance, pl. 58. cites S. C.—— And he, who is Party or Privy to the Fine, or comes in under it, ſhall be concluded. Br. Brief, pl. 242. cites 36 H. 6. 16, 17.

9. In Scire facias upon a Fine, if the Defendant be *made a Knight meſne between the Fine and the Scire Facias*, he ſhall be named Knight, per Cur. Br. Variance, pl. 98. cites 5 E. 4. 5.

10. Scire facias out of a Recovery *of a Manor to have Execution in A. and B.* the Tenant demanded Judgment of the Writ; For the *Manor extends into A. B. and C.* Per Brian, this is no Plea; For it ought to agree with the Recovery or Fine, whence it Iſſues. Br. Brief, pl. 315. cites 4 H. 7. 7.

The Caſe was, *B. render'd to A. in Tail*, and for Default of Iſſue *Remanere to B.* the Conuſee & *Hæredibus ſuis in perpetuum quiet. de aliis Hære-*

11. Scire facias was brought upon a *Fine*, by which A. *gave Land to B. for Life*, *Remainder* to himſelf *in Tail*, where it ſhould be *Reverter*, and the Writ was *Remanere debet* according to the Fine; and it was held by all the Juſtices, that the *Writ ought to be Revertere debet*, as the Fine ought to have been, and not Remanere according to the Fine; Becauſe, tho' in Fact the Fine was Remanere, yet *in Law it is a Reverſion*, and ſo the *Writ ought to Accord to the Form of the Law and not to the Form of the Fine.* For in many Caſes the Writ ought to vary from the words of the Fine. Dal. 29. pl. 4. Paſch. 3 Eliz.

dibus

dibus dicti B. &c. See D. 199. a. pl. 55. Paſch. 3 Eliz. Gate v. Gate. S. C.———Becauſe the Scire facias iſſues out of the Record of the Fine, it is therefore ſaid in the Books, that it *ought to agree with the Fine in all Points.* Co. R. on Fines, 12. cites 4 H. 7. 7.

12. *So*, where a *Remainder is limited to a Feme ſole, who takes Baron*, the Scire facias ſhall be *Remanere &c. to the Baron and his Wife.* Dal. 29. in pl. 4. 3 Eliz. Br. Scire Facias pl. 72. S. P. cites 11 H. 4. 15. For that it cannot remain to the one without the other.———Br. Scire facias pl. 88 cites 38 E. 3. 16. that in Caſe of a *Reverter* to Feme Covert it is good to ſay, Revertere debet to the Baron and Feme; For that it cannot revert to the one without the other. But that it is ſaid Contra there of a Remainder; but Brooke makes a Quære of the Remainder.

13. *So* where a Fine is levied to the Baron and his Wife, and *in the Fine the Name of the Feme is put before the Name of the Baron*; yet in the Scire facias the Name of the Baron ſhall be put firſt. Dal. 29. in pl. 4.

14. *So* where a Fine was levied *to A. for Life, Remainder to a Monk, Remainder to B. in Fee*, or in Tail. B. ſhall have Scire facias *without mentioning the Monk*; becauſe he is no Perſon in Law. cited to have been adjudged. Dal. 29. in pl. 4.

(N. b. 12) Scire facias *awarded in B. R.* in what Caſes.

1. Note, that the *Chancellor delivered a Fine levied* of Land *in C. B. to the Juſtices of B. R.* by which the Party brought Scire facias in B. R. to Execute the Fine levied in C. B. and the Defendant pleaded to the Juriſdiction the Statute of Magna Chartæ, quod communia placita non ſequantur Curiam noſtram, &c. and yet Hank ſaid that becauſe the Record was there, they would hold Plea thereof, *tho' it does not come there by Certiorari nor Mittimus*; quod mirum inde mihi. Br. Juriſdiction, pl. 84. cites 5 H. 5. 1.

2. If a *Fine* be *removed into B. R. for Error*, and after it is *affirmed*, the *Juſtices may award Scire facias of Execution*; For it ſhall not be remanded, and ſo that, which at firſt was not within their Juriſdiction, ſhall be now within their Power, and yet if the Fine had been levied there it had been Error. Br. Juriſdiction, pl. 77. cites 18 E. 4. 6.

(N. b. 13) Scire facias. Bar. What is a *Bar to the Execution* of a Fine by Scire facias.

1. Scire facias to Execute a *Fine levied to J. for Life*, the *Remainder to B. in Tail*, and *J. is dead*; and the Plaintiff as *Heir to B. brought the Action*, the Tenant pleaded the Confirmation of B. Father to the Plaintiff with Warranty for Term of the Tenant's Life, and Aſſets deſcended, Judgment if Execution; and admitted a good Bar, and ſo ſee that *Confirmation with Warranty and Aſſets of the Tenant in Tail is a Bar*; contrary without Warranty. Br. Scire facias, pl. 23. cites 43 E. 3. 9.

2. In Scire facias upon a Fine, the *Tenant pleaded Jointenancy to part, and Nontenure to the reſt*, and *ſhewed who was thereof Tenant* as he ought; the Plaintiff prayed Execution of this Parcel at his Peril, and could not have it; by which he *maintained the Writ, that ſole Tenant as the Writ ſuppoſes, abſque hoc that the other any Thing has*, priſt, &c. Br. Nontenure, pl. 12. cites 11 H. 4. 16.

3. Scire facias upon a Fine, the Tenant *pleaded that R. brought Formedon in Reverter againſt W.* 22 E. 3. *and recovered and had Execution*, and ſet forth all in certain, *and after enfeoff'd F. who enfeoffed the Tenant*, and the

Fine

* Orig. (meſne.)

Fine * *meſne between the Gift and the Recovery of the Execution of it*; Judgment if you ought to have Execution; and the Plaintiff ſaid nothing to it, therefore it ſeems a good Bar. Br. Fines, pl. 53. cites 8 H. 6. 28.

4. In Scire Facias the Defendant demanded Judgment of the Fine, for *'twas levied of ſeveral Manors, and in divers Counties, and the Per-cloſe was unde placitum conventionis ſum. fuit inter eos*, where it ſhould be *Placita Conventionis*. Per Brian, the Fine is good; For there *is no other Form*, and alſo it is good for the Manor in the County, where the Writ is brought, tho' it was not good for the other Lands, by which he was awarded to Anſwer. Br. Fines, pl. 58. cites 15 E. 4. 33.

(N. b. 14) Scire Facias. *New Writ.* In what Caſes there muſt be a new Writ.

1. Fine is ſent into Bank by *Mittimus*, *at the Suit of R. S.* commanding them, *that they proceed to Execution of the Fine at the Proſecution of the ſaid R. S.* and he brought Scire facias, and *died*; and the *Heir prayed another Scire facias*; and ſome held that they could not proceed without another Writ, commanding them to proceed at the Proſecution of the Heir, and ſo the Heir ought to ſue a new Writ. Per Choke, the Heir may have Scire facias by the firſt Removal, for *he is privy to R. S. his Father* who brought it; contrary of him in Remainder, for he is a Stranger. And Trin. 21 E. 4. it was done according to the Opinion of Choke, and the like H. 15 E. 3. where the Heir had a Writ commanding the Juſtices to proceed, and 16 E. 3. it is ſaid, he ſhall ſue a Writ to bring in *another Tranſcript of the Fine*. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 184. cites 11 E. 4. 13.

2. *And if a Fine comes* into Bank *at the Suit of two, who ſued Scire facias*, and after the *one dies*, the other ſhall have Scire facias by Force of the firſt Mittimus, without ſuing a new Writ. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 184. cites 11 E. 4. 13.

3. *And by* Littleton, if *divers Perſons come as Heirs* to R. S. and pray a Scire facias, the Court will not grant it without ſuing *ſeveral Writs* to the Bank, commanding them to make Execution. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 184. cites 11 E. 4. 13.

4. If a Fine is levied with *Remainder over, and, after Death of the Tenant, a Stranger abates*, and he in *Remainder recovers by Sci. fa.* and after the *Recovery is reverſed for Error*. Now he ſhall have a new Sci. fa. or his Heir, tho' it was once Executed; For the Cauſe now ceaſes. D. 60. b. pl. 23. Paſch. 36 & 37 H. 8. B. R. in Trewinniard's Caſe.

(N. b. 15) Scire facias. *Abatement* by what, and How.

1. Scire facias upon a Fine levied *to Baron and Feme, and to the Heirs which the Baron ſhould beget of the Body of the Feme*; the Heir brought the Writ, and *made himſelf Heir to the Baron of the Body of the Feme begotten*; and becauſe he *did not make himſelf Heir to both*, therefore the Writ was abated; quod nota. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 103. cites 21 E. 3. 43.

2. Scire facias upon a Fine *againſt three, by ſeveral Demands of a Manor* &c. *that J. M. into the aforeſaid Manor, cum pertinentiis, except two Carves* of Land, *and J. L. into one Carve* of Land, *without* the words (*cum pertinentiis*) and *M. P. into one Carve of Land, cum pertinentiis, which are Parcels of the Manor aforeſaid enter'd*; and exception was taken, becauſe that the *one Carve had not (cum pertinentiis)* and yet Wilby awarded the Writ good; becauſe that after the *Manor was* put *(cum pertinentiis)* which *goes to all.* Thorp ſaid, that never was ſuch a Writ before now awarded, nor

nor never will be again; and the Fine *was levied by A. C. to W. of B. for his Life*, the *Remainder to R. in Tail*, and *if he die without Iſſue; living P. of B. then* the Remainder *to P. of B. in Fee*; and the Writ was ac jam *ex * inſinuatione T. Son and Heir of the aforeſaid P. of B. accepimus that the aforeſaid W. and P. died, and that the aforeſaid R. died without Heir of his Body*, &c. *and the aforeſaid Peter ſurviving, and that I.* &c. *enter'd as above.* Defendant prayed Judgment of the Writ; For where it is *that the aforeſaid W. and P. died*, &c. it ought to be that the aforeſaid W. and R. died without Heirs of their Bodies, &c. P. ſurviving, and P. died, &c. Per Grene, all is of one Effect, by which he awarded the Writ good. And held there that Scire facias againſt three ſeverally in it ſelf and the Per-cloſe of the Summons joint is good; quod nota. Br. Brief, pl. 194. cites 24 E. 3. 23. † 37. 38.

* But it ſeems that at firſt, the Writ was (ex inſumatione) inſtead of Inſinuatione, and therefore it abated. See 24 E. 3. 22. a. pl. 10.

† This fol. 37. ſhould be omitted, this Caſe being only at fol. 23. pl. 1. & 38. pl. 13.

3. Scire facias to Execute a Fine *by two*, the *one was ſummoned and ſevered*, and the Tenant *pleaded the Death of him who was ſevered*, and *did not ſay, if he died before the Severance or after*, and the Writ was awarded good, by Reaſon of the Severance. Br. Brief, pl. 55. cites 42. E. 3. 8.

4. Scire facias to Execute a Fine levied *to A. for Life*, Remainder *to B. Father of the Plaintiff in Tail*, and that *A. is dead*, and the *Defendant* had Entred, &c. the *Defendant ſaid that B. Father of the Plaintiff confirmed his Eſtate for* Term of his *Life with Warranty, and that the Plaintiff has Aſſets by Deſcent*, and 'twas held a good Bar. Br. Barre, pl. 12. cites 43 E. 3. 9.

5. Scire facias upon a *Fine levied of the Manor of D.* to have Execution *of 12 Acres Parcell of the Manor in D.* and the Tenant pleaded to the Writ; becauſe it *was not brought in a Vill*; & non allocatur, inaſmuch as it is Parcell of the Manor of D. and Manor is ſufficient without Vill. Br. Brief, pl. 470. cites 43 E. 3. 9.

6. Scire facias upon Fine againſt B. becauſe *H. acknowledged 100l. of Land in D. to be the Right of B. come ceo, &c.* for which *B. granted and rendred again to H. and the Heirs of his Body*, and that the Tenant enter'd into Parcel of the Tenements, and the Plaintiff ſued Execution as Heir of H. in Tail; Belknap pray'd *Judgment of the Writ*, becauſe *no mention is made of the Value of the Land in demand*; For if it was of a Carve of the Land, the Writ ſhall be, that the Tenant enter'd into the 3*d.* Part, 4*th.* Part, &c. & non allocatur; quod mirum inde. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 204. cites 43 E. 3. 27.

7. If a Fine be levied *of the Land which A. holds for his Life, and of Land which W. holds for his Life*, and *which after their Deaths ought to revert to the Conuſor, the Remainder to the Conuſee and his Heirs*, and the *Conuſee brings Scire facias* againſt the ſeveral Tenants of thoſe Lands, *ſuppoſing that A. and W.* Tenants for Life *are dead*; there *it is a good Plea, for the one to ſay, that A. who is ſuppoſed to be dead is alive*, Judgment of the Writ for this Parcell; but by this all the Writ ſhall not abate, quod nota. And ſo ſee that Writ may abate in Parcell. Br. Brief, pl. 70. cites 44 E. 3. 39. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 34. cites S. C.

8. Scire facias to Execute a Fine, the *Writ was*, in the Premiſſes, *cum quidam finis levaſſet* (but cum Pertinentiis was wanting) and in the *render* it *was* Manerium *cum Pertinentiis*, and this was pleaded to the Writ, & non allocatur; therefore the Tenant *ſaid, that E. who is ſuppoſed to be dead without Iſſue, had Iſſue * W. who ſurvived him, and prayed Judgment of the Writ*, & non allocatur; *contrary* of ſuch Omiſſion *in Writ of Formedon*; note the Difference. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 35. cites 44 E. 3. 40. * Br. Omiſſion pl. 3 cites S. C.

9. Scire facias upon a Fine, per Philippum D. & Johannam his Wife &c. quare prefatæ Johannæ uxori dicti Philippi revertere non debet; becauſe *Philippi was razed in the Original*, the Writ was abated. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 39. cites 45 E. 3. 18.

10. In Scire facias upon a Fine, *one is received by the Default of the Tenant, and pleaded a Gift in Tail by the Anceſtor of the Plaintiff* by Deed with Warranty, *Judgment if againſt Deed with Warranty*, &c. and the other *demurred*, Br. Barre, pl. 13 cites S. C.

demurred, because the *Leaſe to the Tenant for Life is a Diſcontinuance of the Tail*; For *he is received by Reverſion in Fee, and pleaded in Bar by Eſtate Tail*, and yet well, per Cur. becauſe 'twas by way of *Rebutter*; *contrary*, if it was *by way of Voucher*; For there the Vouchee Warrants only the Eſtate Tail. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 206. cites 45 E. 3. 18.

11. Scire facias upon a Fine *by the Heir of him in the Remainder*; the Tenant ſaid that the Fine was *levy'd to H. for Life*, the *Remainder to the Father and Mother of the Plaintiff in Tail*, and that the *Mother* of the Plaintiff, *after the Death of the Tenant for Life, enter'd* into the Land *and was ſeiſed* by Force of the Fine, *Judgment of the Writ*; and admitted a good Plea to the Writ; quære, if it be not to the Action of the Writ, and the other ſaid, that H. infeoffed his Mother, and prayed Execution. And per Perſey, Kirton and Clopton, *this is a Surrender*, and ſo ſeiſed by Force of the Fine; and if the ſaid H. the Tenant for Life had charged, and infeoffed him in Remainder, yet he ſhall hold charged for Life of the Tenant for Life and not after, and yet Belknap awarded the Writ good; quod mirum! Br. Sci. fa. pl. 53. cites 50 E. 3. 6.

12. In Scire facias upon a Fine *as Coſin and Heir* the Writ was general, and *did not ſhew the Coſinage, but in the Count*, and good; for it is a *Writ judicial*; *contra in Writ Original*, as Formedon, &c. Br. Brief, pl. 518. cites 8 H. 4. 22.

Br. Sci. fa. pl. 107. cites 7 H. 6. 16.—Ibid. pl. 110. cites 8 H. 6. 32. S. P.

13. Scire facias upon a Fine *againſt three, who, as to one Parcel, ſaid that they had nothing but for Term of Years of the Leaſe of J. N.* Judgment of Writ; *and another Anſwer for the reſt.* Paſton ſaid as to the Parcel of which they have pleaded *Special non-tenure*, viz. the Leaſe for Years only, that the Defendants are Tenants in Common, Priſt, &c. and ſo it ſeems that Special non-tenure is a *good Plea* in Scire facias; *but* 'tis ſaid elſewhere that *general non-tennre is no* Plea, *but there the Plaintiff may have Execution at his Peril.* Br. Sci. fa. pl. 108. cites 7 H. 6. 25.

14. In Scire facias the Defendant *pleaded to the Writ*, becauſe it was *of Land and Rent, & quod terram tenet & redditum deforceat*, and ſaid, *that the Defendant is Pernour of the Rent, and* therefore it *ought to be redditum tenet*; but *where he is Ter-tenant, it ſhall be redditum deforceat.* Babb. Ch. J. ſaid, where there is Lord Meſne and Tenant, the Meſne is called Pernour of the Rent, and in Aſſiſe of Rent the Pleading is, that the Defendant anſwer as Pernour of the Rent, and where there is Deforceant it is that ſuch a one Deforc. dict. &c. and therefore ruled him to anſwer, quod nota, and ſo the Writ good. Br. Brief, pl. 171. cites 8 H. 6. 27.

15. Scire facias upon Fine *of Rent levied to one in Tail, the Remainder in Fee to the Plaintiff*, and that the *Tail is extinct*, &c. Markham ſaid, that thoſe who were *Parties to the Fine had nothing in the Rent* at the Time, Priſt, & non allocatur, wherefore he ſaid *that one A. was ſeiſed of the Land, whereof &c. diſcharged and infeoffed him, without* that, that *thoſe who were Parties to the Fine had nothing.* Br. Sci. fa. pl. 113. cites 19 H. 6. 59.

16. A Man brought Scire facias to Execute a Fine *as Coſin and Heir*, and *did not ſhew that the Anceſtor is dead*; and yet good; for it ſhall be *intended*; for he is not Heir in the Life of the Anceſtor, therefore this word Heir intends that the Anceſtor is dead. Br. Brief, pl. 497. cites 33 H. 6. 54.

17. Scire facias upon a Fine *of the Manor of C. and two Houſes and* 20 *Acres of Land*, and becauſe *it is not ſhewn in what Vill the Houſes and Land lie*, therefore the Writ was abated; *contra if* it had been *of one Manor only*; For a Manor may be out of any Vill, and known by the Name of a Manor; quod nota. Br. Brief, pl. 383. cites 19 E. 4. 9.

(N. b. 16) Fines. Of the *Ingroſſing, Inrolling and Tabling* of Fines and Recoveries; and the further Ordering them.

1. Immediately after the Fine is ingroſſed, it ſhall be *ſent into the Treaſury*. Co. R. on Fines 12. cites 17 E. 3.

2. *And then* when the Fine is *ingroſſed and ſent into the Treaſury*, he, that will have *Execution ſued, muſt remove it out* of the Treaſury *by a Certiorari* directed to the Treaſurer and Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Chancery, and from the Chancery ſend it into C. B. by a *Mittimus*; and then out of this the Conuſee, or his Heirs, or he in Remainder (as the Caſe is) ſhall ſue Execution by *Scire facias*. Co. R. on Fines 12. See (N. b. 14.)

3. 5 H. 4. 14. Enacts, that *All Writs of Covenant, and all other Writs whereupon Fines ſhall be levied with the Writs of* Dedimus Poteſtatem *with all Knowledges and Notes of the ſame before they be drawn out of the Common Bench by the Cyrographer ſhall be inrolled of Record, to remain in Cuſtody of the Chief Clerk of the Common Bench for the old Fee of* 22 d. *for entring of the Concord.* Note that *before this Statute* the *Cuſtos Brevium* had not any Record of the Fine, but the *Chirographer*, and nothing remained with the *Ch. J.* of the Common Bench, but the *Licence* to accord. Trin. 34 Eliz. B. R. 5 Rep. 39. b. in Tey's Caſe.

The *Cuſtom is* to direct *one Writ* of Error *to the Ch. J. of the Bank, another to the Cuſtos Brevium* to certify a *Tranſcript pedis Finis*, and another *to the Chirographer* to certify *Tranſcriptum Notæ* Finis. And note, theſe Words are added in the Writ to the Cuſtos Brevium, cum omnibus eundem finem tangen. by Force of which words he certifies the Original Writ. 5 Rep. 39. b. Trin. 34 Eliz. B. R. in Tey's Caſe.

Before this Statute 5 H. 4. 14. the *Cuſtos Brevium had nothing to do* with Fines; but 'tis given by the ſaid Statute, *that the Chief Clerk of C. B.* who is the Cuſtos Brevium, *ſhall keep a Record*, viz. the Note *of the Fine*, or Fine; *and* if the Notes in the Cuſtody of the Chirographer, or the Notes of the Fines are imbezzelled, &c. that a Man ſhall have *Recourſe to the ſaid Roll to have Execution*, &c. Upon which it appears clearly that the Record remains with the Chirographer, [and] if it be not imbezzelled, 'tis ſufficient whereof Execution may be ſued. Co. R. on Fines 12.

4. 23 *Eliz.* 3. §. 1. Enacts, that *Fines and Recoveries, and all Matters concerning them, now Extant and in Being, may be Inrolled, which Inrollment ſhall be of as great Validity as the ſame ſo Extant and remaining in Being.*

§. 6. That *there ſhall be an Office of the Inrollment of Writs for Fines and Recoveries, and one of the Juſtices of the Common Pleas (other than the Chief Juſtice) ſhall have the Care thereof.*

And Aſcertains *The Fees for Inrollment of Fines and Recoveries.*

And Directs *the Juſtices to Aſſeſs Fines for Miſpriſion, Contempt, Negligence.*

§. 7. That *a Table, containing the Content of every Fine, ſhall be ſet up in the Common Pleas, and at every Aſſiſes.*

And aſcertains, *the Chirographer's Fee for Writing the Content of the Fine.*

§. 9. *The Record ſhall not be carried forth of the Office.*

5. A Fine is *ſaid to be ingroſſed, when the Chirographer makes the Indentures* of the Fine, *and delivers them to the Party*, to whom the Conuſance was made. 5 Rep. 39. b. in Tey's Caſe. Co. R on Fines 3.

6. A *Fine was double*, viz. *Sur Cognizance de droit come ceo, &c.* and *Sur Conceſſit*, in one and the ſame Concord, and therefore the Chirographer refuſed to make out the Indentures. It was urged for the paſſing the Fine that a Fine is a real Agreement and ought to be conſidered as a Conveyance, and that the Party at his Peril may have it in what Manner he pleaſes; But per Cur. ſuch double Fine is unprecedented; and after on Agreement of the Counſel to ſtrike out the Conceſſit Part of the Fine, it was Ruled, that it paſs as a Fine Sur Conuſance de Droit come ceo, &c. Barnes's Notes of Caſes in C. B. 144. Paſch. 8. Geo. 2. Lazenby v. Knight.

(N. b. 17) Of the *Certiorari* and *Mittimus* to remove Fines.

1. Scire facias upon a Fine, which came out of Chancery into Bank by Mittimus, which *Mittimus makes no mention, that the Fine came there at the Suit of the Plaintiff*; and this notwithstanding, because the Fine is **brought in*, the Opinion was, that it is good; and so see that *the Bank awarded the Scire facias and Execution, and not the Chancery.* Br. Sci. fa. pl. 33. cites 44 E. 3. 18.

*Orig. (ciens)

2. In a Scire facias in B. R. to execute a Fine levied in C. B. the Tenant took *Exception, that Certiorari was sued, but no Mittimus* to send it into this Court, and the Execution of this Record belongs to C. B. But Hawk said, that *the Chancellor himself delivered it* to him, which countervail'd Mittimus, and so ruled Defendant to answer, quod Nota. Br. Cause de Remover. pl. 15. cites 5 H. 5. 1.

But Br. Sci. fa. pl. 203. cites 9 E. 4. 15. Contra. That if the Chancellor of England write to the Treasury for a Fine by Certiorari, and it comes into Chancery, and the *Chancellor brings it in his Hand into C. B.* yet the Justices there shall not execute it; for it *must come by Mittimus.*

3. Where *Scire facias* issues *upon Transcript of a Fine* sent into C. B. by Mittimus, *if no Roll be made of it*, it is ill by the best Opinion. Br. Brief pl. 412. cites 11 H. 6. 43.

4. Neither the Mittimus nor the Certiorari to the Chamberlaine do make any *mention if the Fine be ingrossed* or not. Br. Scire facias. pl. 115. cites 22 H. 6. 13.

S. P. they make no other mention but Cum quidam Finis levasset; tho' per Browne.

the Fine be levied in one Term, and engrossed in another. Br. Fines. pl. 56. cites S. C.

5. A Certiorari with a Mittimus to remove a Fine *bearing Date before the Fine comes into Chancery*, is good enough. West's Symb. §. 193. cites 1 R. 3. 4.

(N. b. 18) *Exemplification* of Fines.

1. When any of the Parts of a Fine are inrolled according to the Statute 23 *Eliz.* 3. then may the same be exemplified either *under the Seal of the Office*, or under *the Great Seal of England*. But to exemplify such a Fine under the Great Seal, hath this Discommodity, that if any *Errors appear in the Record* of the same Fine, they *are not amendable after the Exemplification* thereof. West's Symb. §. 175.

2. *But* it seems that this *extends only to Fines levied before the same Statute.* West. Symb. §. 175.

3. And he says, that these Inrolments and Exemplifications seem very necessary, because of the Privity and Warrant of the said Court, many Errors happening in the former Records thereof, may be amended, and these Inrolments will suffice, if the *former Record, or any Part* thereof *be embezzelled, or otherwise defaced.* Ibid.

(N. b. 19) Pleadings. *Variance* between the Fine and the Writ on which the Count, or Pleadings are.

1. Fine was levied, by which *J. and Alice acknowledged their Right to K, as that which W. and K. his Feme* had of his Gift, and *W. and K. rendered*

dered to J. and A. for Life, rendering one Mark a Year *to K. and the Heirs of her Body begotten by W. her Baron,* the *Remainder to K. and her Heirs aforesaid*; the Demandant *sued Execution as Heir to W. and K.* where he ought to have been made Heir to K. only; For W. is not named, but to shew what Heirs of K. shall inherit, and therefore the Writ was abated. Br. Sci. fa. pl. 20. cites 41 E. 3. 24.

2. Error was assigned, where a Fine was *levied of the Manor, except* 10*l. Rent to one who rendered again* to Consor *for Life, Remainder over in tail,* and he in *Remainder brought Scire facias to Execute the Fine, and rehearsed how the Fine was levied of the Manor, except* 10*l. Rent* &c. and now, *ex Insinuatione,* &c. *accipimus, quod A. & B. duas Partes Manerii prædicti ingressi sunt, without making mention of the Exception, and Execution was awarded of the two Parts of the Manor, without mentioning of the Exception, and* therefore Error. Br. Error. pl. 27. cites 47 E. 3. 7.

3. *Also* 'twas *Quare Executionem of two Parts of the Manor habere non debet without mention of the Exception,* and therefore Error ut supra, Ibid.

4. *And* assigned Error in the *Return,* which *was* quod *scire feci* &c. *essendum apud Westm. secundum tenorem hujus brevis,* and *says not ad faciendum quod istud breve requirit,* &c. Ibid.

5. *And to Parcel, the Defendant said that he had nothing now, nor the Day of the Writ purchased,* &c. and it was permitted. And so see *Nontenure* in Error, and this *by him who was named as Tenant.* But Brook says it seems that it *is no Plea for the Heir*; For it lies against the Heir, be he Tenant or not; and per Persey where there is one *Error in Law in a Record, and another Error in Fact*; there they may reverse the Judgment as to the Error in Law, and take Averment of the rest, quod non negatur; and therefore it seems that Record may be reversed in Part, and good for the rest; and this seems to be *where the Record is several in itself,* as where a Man pleads *several Pleas to several Parcels,* and otherwise not. Ibid.

6. In Waste, supposing that he had the Reversion of the Assignment of J. S. who had it of the Assignment of W. and shewed a Fine of the 1st Assignment, which would that *W. and R. granted the Reversion*; and Deed of the 2d Assignment; the *Defendant pleaded to the Writ for the Variance,* and the Plaintiff *averred, that R. never had any thing*; and 'twas not received contrary to the Fine; For as the said J. S. is bound by the Fine, so shall the Plaintiff who claims by him; and see that the Defendant, who is a Stranger to the Fine, pleaded this to the Writ upon the shewing of the Plaintiff; but note that it was but as a Variance, and by Demurrer, and not by pleading, as by way of Estoppel. Br. Fines. pl. 37. cites 11 H. 4. 1.

(N. b. 20) *Execution.* At what *Time* it may be.

1. A. brought a Sci. fa. and *had Execution* of the Fine, *and made a Feoffment upon Condition to B.* and after *re-entered for the Condition broken*; after which the *Tenant in the Sci. fa. reversed the Judgment by Writ of Disceit,* it being found upon Examination, that he was *not warned.* And upon arguing whether such Seisin and Execution and Feoffment Conditional, reversed by Entry, be a Discharge of Execution, Issue was taken, if the Feoffment was in Fee Simpliciter, or upon Condition; quod Nota. And hence it follows, that tho' he had made Feoffment, and the *Judgment* had been *reversed before the Re-entry,* it *should* be a *Bar and Discharge* of *the Execution for ever. But by* his *Re-entry* for the Condition broken *before the Reversal of the Judgment,* so that the Feoffment is avoided, *the Reversal* of the Judgment *revives the Execution, so as it may be sued again.* Quod Nota. Br. Scire facias. pl. 88. cites 38 E. 3. 16.

2. A Fine Executory, may be executed *before that the Fine be engrossed*; before the Indentures of the Fine made and delivered to the Parties. Co. R. on Fines 12.

It is a Record, tho' not engrossed, and when the Court is seised of the Fine, it has sufficient Warrant to award Scire facias. Br. Fines. pl. 56. cites 22 H. 6. 13.——And diverse Fines have been executed, which never were engrossed. Br. Scire facias. pl. 115. cites 22 H. 6. 13.

(O. b) Equity and Defects ſupplied.

1. SUCH *Aſſurances* as are uſed *for the common Repoſe of Men's Eſtates*, the Chancery will not draw in Queſtion; For a Fine with Proclamation ought, after the 5 Years, to be a Bar in Conſcience, as it is in Law; ſo ſhall it be of a Common Recovery for docking the Intail. Cary's Rep. 6. cites Doctor & Stud. 33. 155.

2. A Fine and Recovery *got by Circumvention*, the Party who got it, may be *compelled* in Equity, *to recompence the Party circumvented*; as the Maſter of the Rolls was of Opinion, at the hearing of the Cauſe. 1 May 1595. Toth. 164. Welby v. Welby.

3. The Plaintiff (being *ſimple*) was drawn in to levy a Fine of his Lands, yet ordered that the Lands ſhould be *re-aſſured*, if the Defendant did not pay a valuable Conſideration; or if he failed of Payment thereof, then the ſaid Lands ſhould be re-aſſured. 3 Jac. li. B. fo. 508. Toth. 166. Wright v. Booth.

4. Becauſe a Fine was *not levied according to Covenant*, a Power became void to make Leaſes; but decreed in May 13 Car. Toth. 166. Scambler v. ———

5. *Tenant in Tail*, upon Marriage, covenants to levy a Fine for further Aſſurance of Land which he had ſettled, and of which he had covenanted that he was ſeiſed in Fee. He *acknowledged a Fine, but died before 'twas perfected.* Equity will not ſupply this Defect againſt the Iſſue in Tail. The Deſendant's Title being per Formam Doni. Tr. 1686. 2 Vern. 3. Wharton v. Wharton.

2 Vern. R. 56. Paſch. 1688. S. C. cited in the Caſe of Baden v. E. Pembroke.

6. Fines *purſuant to a Decree*, ſhall *operate* no farther than the Decree intended they ſhould. Paſch. 16 Car. 2. Chan. Caſes 49. Goodrick v. Brown.

———Mich. 1682. 1 Vern. R. 93. S. P.

Mich. 27 Car. 2. Ch. Caſes 268. Clifford v. Asbley. —— Hill. 1682. of Suffolk.

7. Fine or Recovery of a *Ceſty que Truſt* ſhall *bar* and *transfer* the Truſt, as it ſhould an Eſtate at Law, if it were on a Conſideration. Ch. Caſes 49.

Vern. 148. Bovey v. Smith.———6 Car. 1. fo. 644. Chan. R. 51. E. of Newcaſtle v. E.

* S. C. cited Roll. R. 115. Mich. 12 Jac. in the Star-Chamber, in Caſe of Day v. Hungate.— ‡ See (G. b) S. C. cited in the Caſe of Lord Say & Seale.

8. A Fine *fraudulently obtained*, and much razed to make it correſpond, is not relievable in Chancery; and were it examinable here, it would be a great weakning of Fines, and can only be *examined here* to puniſh the Party Criminaliter that did it, and in * Gellybrand's Caſe, where one was *perſonated*, yet the Fine was not ſet aſide, but a Re-conveyance ordered per Ld Wright, who diſmiſſed the Bill. 'Twas argued that the Examination, as of a Judgment irregularly entred, or obtained at Law, is proper only for the Examination of that Court, where the Fine was levied, or Judgment entred. Hill. 1700. Ch. Prec. 150. ‡ Clark v. Ward.

9. On a Bill brought to have a Fine ſet aſide, or to have a Reconveyance, it was held by the Court, that tho' *Chancery has a Power* to relieve as much againſt a Fine obtained by Fraud or Practice, as any other kind of Conveyance; yet that ſuch Relief was *not by decreeing a Vacate of the Fine, but by ordering a Reconveyance*; But that, for any Error in the Fine, or Irregularity, or ill Practice in the Commiſſioners; it was a Matter properly cognizable in that Court where the Fine was levied, and for which that Court may vacate the Fine; and there being no Proof of Fraud or Practice in this Caſe, the Bill was diſmiſſed. Hill. 1700. Abr. Equ. Caſes. 259. St. John v. Turner.

10. The *Intention of Marriage Articles*, for a Settlement to be made afterwards, will be ſo conſidered in Equity, that if a Fine be levied to different

ferent Uſes; the Court of Chancery will ſet a Fine aſide. 10 Mod 436. Trin. 5 Geo. In Chancery. Trevor v. Trevor.

11. Whether a Fine and Non-claim can *ſkreen a fraudulent Purchaſe?* And whether the *Conuſor* ſhall not be *deemed a Truſtee?* Quære. For this was compounded. MS. Rep. ſaid to be Ld Harcourt's. tit. Fines. 6 March 1724. Martin v. Martin.

Firſt-Fruits and Tenths.

(A) Original thereof; and Statutes relating thereto.

1. NOTE, Annates, Primitæ, and Firſt-Fruits, are all one; it was the Value of every Spiritual Living by the Year, which the Pope, claiming the Diſpoſition of all Eccleſiaſtical Livings within Chriſtendom, reſerved out of every Living. Mich. 5 Jac. 12 Rep 44.

2. Decimæ, id eſt, the Tenths of Spiritualties, were perpetual, which in ancient Times were paid to the Pope, until Pope Urban gave them to R. 2. to aid him againſt Charles, King of France, and others who ſupported Clement the 7th againſt him. 12 Rep. 45.

3. By 26 *H.* 8. *cap.* 3. §. (2.) *The Firſt-Fruits and Profits for one Year, of all Spiritual Livings are granted to the K. to be paid or ſecured before actual Poſſeſſion of the Benefice.*

By the 26 H. 8. 3. Firſt-Fruits are due *upon Inſtitution*, and *before Induction*: and the Profits of the Vacation are given by the 28 H. 8. 11. for the Payment of them. And even in the Caſe of the King's Preſentee, or an Uſurper to a Benefice of his Gift, tho' the Church is not ſo filled by Inſtitution, but that the King may preſent another any time before Induction; yet, as the Church in ſuch Caſes is full to other Purpoſes, ſuch Clerk is intitled to the Profits of the Vacation, and chargeable with the Payment of Firſt-Fruits, even tho' the King ſhould preſent another before his Induction. Wats. Comp. Inc. 8vo. 754.

§. 3. *Commiſſioners are to enquire into the Value of the Benefices, and compound for the Firſt-Fruits and the Money taken for the ſame to be delivered to the Treaſurer of the Chamber.*

§. 4. *Whoſe Acquittance ſhall be a ſufficient Diſcharge for the ſame. And Bonds given for Payment thereof, ſhall be of the ſame Force with Statutes Staple.*

§. 5. *And Perſons entring upon Benefices before Compoſition made, ſhall forfeit double the Value of the Firſt-Fruits.*

§. 6. *And Firſt-Fruits payable to other Perſons, ſhall ceaſe and be paid to the King.*

§. 7. *Provided that Biſhops may inſtitute and induct as before this Act.*

§. 9. *A Rent or * Penſion to the Value of the Tenth Part of every Benefice ſhall be paid to the King annually at Chriſtmas.*

* It was held per Cur. that all Penſions reſerved by the King, or granted to him out of Lands, are in Nature of Rents, and triable in the Exchequer, and liable to be extinguiſhed by Unity of Poſſeſſion; But ſuch as are reſerved to the King, or veſted in him by this Statute, are of another Nature, and collateral to the Land, and not loſt by Unity, no more than Proxies. Hard. 388. Mich. 16 Car. 2. in the Exchequer. Biſhop of Ely v. College of Clarehall in Cambridge.

§. 10 *The Value of each Benefice to be inquired of, and certified by the Commiſſioners.*

§. 11. *Who are to be upon Oath.*

§. 12. *Spiritual Perſons ſhall be charged for their Tenths in their Dioceſes, where they are, tho' their Poſſeſſions lie in other Dioceſes.*

§. 13.

§. 13. *And Biſhops to be charged with the Collection of them in their proper Dioceſes.*

§. 14. *And Proceſs to be awarded againſt them for Payment thereof.*

§. 15. *Which they are impowered to levy in their Dioceſes by Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures, Diſtreſs, or otherwiſe at their Diſcretion.*

§. 16. *And in the Vacation of a Biſhopric, the Dean and Chapter thereof are chargeable in the ſame Manner.*

§. 17. *Every Incumbent, who, being reaſonably demanded, and required at their Dignities, &c. or* * *Houſes, by the Biſhop or Perſon* ‡ *charged with the Collection of the Tenths, or by their Servants or Officers, to pay the ſame, ſhall neglect to pay it within* 40 *Days after ſuch Requeſt, ſhall, upon* † Certificate *of ſuch Default given into the Exchequer under the Seal of the Biſhop, &c. be adjudged* Ipſo ¶ facto *deprived of his Benefice, which ſhall be adjudged* void, to all Intents and Purpoſes, *as if he were dead.*

In Ejectment it was found Specially, that an Apparitor came to *Church* to the Parſon, and there ſaid to him, that he muſt pay his Tenths to ſuch a one; that the Parſon refuſed and his Default was certified; upon which another Perſon was preſented, and the Queſtion was, whether the Demand was made according to the Statute. And all the Juſtices held it was not; For that a *Summons to pay* is not a ſufficient Demand, but it muſt be an *expreſs Demand* to pay. Mo. 541. Mich. 39 & 40 Eliz. Reyner v. Parker.——* It was held that the Demand muſt be *at the Houſe* of the Incumbent, and there the Refuſal muſt be. Mich. 29 & 30 Eliz. Mo. 915. Q. v. Blanchel.——Sav. 1. pl. 2. Paſch. 22 Eliz. Anon. S. P.

‡ It was held by all the Juſtices, that a Demand of Tenths, by Virtue of the Statute, ought to be by one who has Authority to receive them; and that an *Apparitor* has not ſuch an Authority. Mo. 541. Mich. 39 & 40 Eliz. Reyner v. Parker.———It was held that the *Biſhop muſt authorize one* to demand and receive them. Mo. 915. Q. v. Blanchel.——Cro. E. 80. Mich. 29 & 30 Eliz. In the Exchequer. S. C. The Queen v. Blancher.

† Upon a Special Verdict, whereby it appeared a ſufficient Demand had not been made according to the Statute, all the Juſtices held, that tho' the Biſhop had certified a Refuſal after a Demand duly made, yet the Judges are to rely upon the Verdict, and not the Certificate. Mo. 541. Mich. 39 & 40 Eliz. Reyner v. Parker ——And Popham cites it to have been adjudged ſo in Brooks Caſe ——It was held that the Certificate of the Biſhop of a Refuſal to pay Tenth's is not peremptory, but *traverſable.* Mo. 915. The Queen v. Blanchel.———Cro. E. 80. Mich. 29 & 30 Eliz. in the Exchequer, S. C.——— ———Bro. Certificate of Biſhop. pl. 31. ſays it was held in Time of E. 6. & H. 8. that in ſuch Caſe there can be *no Averment againſt* the Certificate.

A Certificate of a Refuſal to pay Firſt-Fruits and Tenths was in theſe Words, Adhibuimus omnimod' Diligentiam per Subcollectores noſtros per totam Dioceſim Eborum, & *comperimus* J. C. Vicarium de G. *Recuſantem ſolvere* ſubſidia Vicariæ ſuæ, qui nullo modo Metu Pœnarum hujuſmodi produci potuiſſet ad Solutionem Subſidii Prædict', ſed perſeverans in Obſtinatiori ſua Malicia.—Quære, whether by this Certificate the Vicarage be void or not. Dy. 116. pl. 69. Paſch. 2 & 3 P. & M. The Vicar of Gargrave's Caſe.

¶ In Caſe of an Avoidance, by Refuſal to pay the Tenths, the Benefice is void to all Intents Ipſo Facto, as it would by the Death of the Incumbent. Dy. 237. pl. 29. Paſch. 7 Eliz. Anon.

In a Qu. Imp. the Queſtion was, if a Benefice becomes void for Non-payment of Tenths according to the Statute, and the Default is certified into the Exchequer, whether the Ordinary muſt give *Notice* thereof to the Patron? And it was held by all the Juſtices, that he need not; For the Certificate is in the Exchequer of Record, and notorious to every one; and the Statute, which makes the Avoidance, is a General Law, of which all are to take Notice; and the Certificate is a Temporal Act, and made to the Temporal Judges; as where an Incumbent is made a Biſhop, and not like the Caſe of a Reſignation or Deprivation, which is a Spiritual Act privately done, of which the Biſhop himſelf is the Judge, and muſt therefore give Notice to the Patron. Dal. 59. pl. 9. 6 Eliz. Anon.

§. 18. *Biſhops certifying ſuch Default ſhall be diſcharged thereof, and Proceſs ſhall iſſue againſt the Defaultor.*

§. 19. *Acquittances by the Treaſurer or Commiſſioners ſhall be a full Diſcharge.*

§. 20. *Nothing ſhall be taken of the Biſhop or his Collector for his Account or Quietus eſt.*

§. 21. *Parſons, which pay Penſions to others out of their Benefices, may retain the Tenth thereof.*

§. 22. *No Penſion ſhall be reſerved upon the Reſignation of a Benefice above the Value of a 3d thereof.*

§. 25. *Perſons, which in one Corporation have ſeveral Poſſeſſions belonging to them, ſhall only pay for their own Poſſeſſions, and not for others.*

§. 27 *No Firſt-Fruits ſhall be paid for a Benefice not above the yearly Value of* 8 *Marks, unleſs the Incumbent lives* 3 *Years after Induction thereto, and in Bonds given by ſuch Incumbent for Payment of Firſt-Fruits, there ſhall be inſerted a Proviſo to that Effect.*

S. 30. *All Fees payable by Biſhops, &c. for Temporal Juſtice, ſhall be deducted out of the Valuation of their ſeveral Dignities.*

4. By 26 *H.* 8. *cap.* 17. *Farmers of Spiritual Perſons ſhall not be charged with Firſt-Fruits and Tenths.*

5. By 27 *H.* 8. *cap.* 8. *S.* 1. *Tenths to be allowed on Compoſition for Firſt Fruits.*

S. 4. *Succeſſor may diſtrain the Goods of his Predeceſſor, if he leaves the Tenths unpaid, or ſue in Chancery or at Common Law for them.*

6. 28 *H.* 8. *cap.* 11. *S.* 3. *Directs at what Time the Firſt-Fruits ſhall begin to be paid after an Avoidance.*

7. 37 H. 8. *cap.* 21. *S.* 5. 17 *Car.* 2. *cap.* 3. *S.* 3. *Tenths and Firſt-Fruits, how payable for Churches united.*

8. By 32 *H.* 8. *cap.* 22. *S.* 5. *Biſhops are diſcharged as to what they can't levy.*

S. 7. *Exchequer is impowered to enter any Promotion omitted.*

How to be anſwered, where a Benefice is not certified.

9. By 2 & 3 *Ed.* 6. *cap.* 20. *S.* 3. *Incumbent may be deprived only of the Benefice for which the Tenths are in Arrear.*

10. By 7 *Ed.* 6. *cap.* 4. *S.* 2 *Collectors are to indemnify Biſhops.*

S. 4. *The Crown may levy the Tenths of a vacant Benefice on the Glebe.*

11. By 2 & 3 *P. & M. cap.* 4. *The aboveſaid Statutes are repealed.*

12. By 1 *El. cap.* 4. *S.* 26. *Revived again.*

S. 23. *Advowſons of Vicarages reſtored to the Crown.*

S. 29. *Small Livings diſcharged of Firſt-Fruits.*

S. 30, 31, 32, 33. *What Proportions of Firſt-Fruits an Incumbent dying or removing ſhall pay.*

S. 34. *Grants of Firſt-Fruits to Colleges ratified.*

13. If a Man be inſtituted to a Benefice, he ought to *pay* the Firſt-Fruits *before Induction* by the Statute; but *by the Common Law it was otherwiſe*; For he is not now to have the Temporalities till Induction, and therefore he could not pay the Firſt-Fruits. Lane 20. Paſch. 4 Jac. in the Exchequer. Anon.

14. A. recovers for the King in Quare Imp. becauſe the Incumbent was preſented by the King, as in Right of Lapſe, where the King had the very Patronage, which was a void Preſentation; upon which A. for the King recovers, who was preſented, admitted and inducted; But for the Aſſurance of his Title, was *inſtituted and inducted again*, but never reſigned; Per Walters Ch. B. Firſt-Fruits in this Caſe ſhall not be paid *double*, there being no Reſignation. Litt. R. 139. Mich. 4 Car. in the Exchequer. Curtis's Caſe.

15. 2 *Annæ. cap.* 11. *S.* 1. *Enabled the Queen to incorporate a Body Politick, and to grant to ſuch Corporation the Firſt-Fruits and Tenths of all Benefices, for the Maintenance of the poor Clergy.*

S. 2. *Provided that all Statutes for levying the ſame, ſhould continue in Force.*

S. 3. *And not to affect any Grant of the ſame.*

S. 4. *Enabled Perſons to convey Lands or Goods to the ſaid Corporation.*

And the ſaid Corporation to purchaſe Lands, &c.

S. 5. *But not to extend to enable Infants, &c.*

S. 6. *And directs one Bond only to be given for the Firſt-Fruits and Tenths, and the ſame to be paid according to former Rates.*

16. By 5 *Annæ. cap.* 24. *S.* 1. *Benefices under* 50 *l. per Ann. are diſcharged of Firſt-Fruits.*

S. 2. *Biſhops to certify the ſeveral Livings under* 50 *l. per Annum.*

S. 3. *Saving for Tenths already aliened.*

S. 4. *All Curates and Miniſters entitled to this Bounty.*

S. 5. *To be taken as a* Publick Act.

S. 6. *Not to be conſtrued to diminiſh any* Stipend or Penſion *granted and charged on the Firſt-Fruits.*

17. By 6 *Annæ cap.* 27. *S.* 5. *Biſhops are allow'd four Years to pay their Firſt Fruits.*

S. 6. *Dignitaries to be uſed as beneficed Clergymen.*

18. 1 *Geo.* 1. *cap.* 10. *S.* 1. *Biſhops are to certify the improved Value of all Livings in their Dioceſſes.*

S. 3. *Orders by the Governors of the Queen's Bounty approved under the Sign Manual to be good.*

S. 4. *Churches augmented to be perpetual Cures, and the Miniſters Bodies Corporate.*

Impropriators, Patrons and Rectors and Vicars of the Mother Churches to have no Profit by the Augmentation.

S. 5. *Parſon of the Mother Church not to be diveſted of his Rights.*

S. 6. *Such augmented Cures to lapſe to the Biſhop, if not filled in ſix Months.*

S. 8. *Agreements made with Benefactors to poor Livings about the Right of Patronage ſhall be good.*

S. 9. *Agreements of Guardians for Infants, &c. good.*

10. *Patron and Ordinary's Conſent required.*

S. 11. *If any ſuch Agreement be made by a Perſon ſeiſed in Right of his Wife, ſhe ſhall be Party to the Agreement, and ſeal and execute the ſame.*

S. 13. *Exchanges of Lands allowed.*

S. 14. *Donatives augmented are to be ſubject to the Biſhop.*

S. 16. *Agreements made with a Patron, Impropriator and Parſon of a Mother-Church for yearly Allowances to the Miniſter, ſhall be good.*

S. 19. *Governors, &c. impower'd to adminiſter Oaths.*

S. 20. *Augmentations to be recorded.*

S. 21. *Settlement of any Augmentation to be valid after Inrolment.*

By 3 *Geo.* 1. *cap.* 10. *S.* 1. *Biſhops are diſcharged from collecting the Tenths.*

S. 2. *A General Collector appointed.——Who is to give Security to account truly.——And ſhall keep his Office in London.———And Perſons not paying him their Tenths ſhall forfeit double the Value.*

S. 3. *Proceſs to iſſue out of the Exchequer againſt Perſons in Arrear.*

S. 4. *Statutes concerning Firſt Fruits and Tenths, not hereby alter'd, to remain in Force.*

(B) How Firſt Fruits and Tenths were to be received and accounted for before 2 Annæ. 11.

1. BY the Stat. of 26 *H.* 8. 3. The Revenue of the Firſt Fruits and Tenths of the Clergy was granted to the Crown, and *the ſeveral Biſhops were thereby appointed Collectors* thereof, in their reſpective Dioceſs. The *Auditor was to make up their reſpective Accounts*, which were by him tranſmitted into the Office of the Pipe, according to the Courſe of the Exchequer, where the Biſhop had his Quietus eſt, and where all Accountants accountable in the Exchequer have their Quietus eſt at this Day. *But* the Auditor *was not* thereby *enjoyned to give the Biſhop a Duplicate* of his Account; and it was needleſs then, becauſe he had his *Quietus eſt from the Pipe*, without Fee or other Reward for the ſame.

The Statute of 32 *H.* 8. 45. *altered this Courſe, and a Court of firſt Fruits and Tenths was erected*, conſiſting of a Chancellor, Treaſurer, Attorney and two Auditors, who were to make up the *Accounts of that Revenue*, and *being fairly ingroſſed, were to remain in the ſame Court* as the King's Records, and not tranſmitted into the Pipe: But *no Quietus eſt or Duplicate* of his Account *was thereby enjoined* to be made and given to the Biſhops.

By

By the Stat. of 7 *E.* 6. *c.* 1. The *Auditors were enjoined to make* forth and give *Duplicates* of their Accounts, *at the* reaſonable Requeſt and *Coſt of the Accountant*, wherein the Biſhops were included, and accordingly the Practice has gone ever ſince the beginning of Queen Elizabeth: And I never heard it was diſputed by any, until the Arch Biſhop of York, when the Biſhop of Carliſle was pleaſed to call his Duplicate of his Account a Quietus eſt, and ſo would pay nothing for it.

By an Act made, the 1 *Mar. Seſſ.* 2. *c.* 10. She by her Letters Patents *diſſolves the ſaid Court* of firſt Fruits, *and* then *creates a new Office and Officer*, viz. The Remembrancer of the firſt Fruits and Tenths, who was to take all Compoſitions and enter all Accounts, and to make out all Proceſs againſt Non-ſolvents and all Proceedings therein, to be under the Survey of the Court of Exchequer.

In the 2 *and* 3 *Phil. & Ma.* the *Clergy* were *exonerated from Payment of* firſt Fruits and Tenths.

In the 1 *Eliz. c* 4. The *Payment* of Firſt Fruits and Tenths *was reſtored to the Crown, and all Things concerning the ſame, that remained untaken away* the *8th of Auguſt* in the 2 *and* 3 *Phil & Mar. was* then *reſtored and ſettled under the Survey* and Government *of the Exchequer*; but the Court of Firſt Fruits was not revived; for that was diſſolved before the ſaid 8th of Auguſt, and the Remembrancer being then eſtabliſhed, continues to this Day in every Degree, Sort or Condition, as it was, at or before the 8th of Auguſt, in the ſaid 2 *and* 3 *Phil. & Mar.* at which Time the Clergy were exonerated from Payment of Firſt Fruits and Tenths.

The *Arch Biſhop ſent up an Account* for the Years 1675, 1676 and 1677. which he required the Auditor to examine State and Paſs, but the ſame was not purſuant to the Auditor's Truſt, and would be prejudicial to the King, by the loſing to him all Arrears owing by the Incumbents; for in his State thereof *no Arrears of the Clergy are continued in Charge*, not underſtanding the true Nature of thoſe Accounts, in that they *relate not barely and ſimply to the Biſhop's Receipts and Payments, but to the whole Revenue of the reſpective Dioceſſes* each Incumbent is thereby charged and diſcharged. And if no Arrears are continued in Charge upon the Incumbents, they all, or any of them, *may plead the Account made out in the Biſhop's Name* (when entered on Record) in their Diſcharge. Raym. 312, 313, 314. Trin. 31 Car. 2. in the Exchequer. in Caſe of Bambridge v. Bates & al.

Forcible Entry and Detainer.

(A) At Common Law, and now. What is, and where the Writ lies, and for whom.

1. IT ſeemeth that (before the troubleſome Reign of K. Richard the 2d) the *Common Law permitted any Perſon* (*which had good Right* or Title to enter into any Land) to win the Poſſeſſion thereof by Force if otherwiſe he could not have obtained it. For a Man may ſee (in Britton fo. 115.) that a *certain Reſpite of Time was given to the Diſſeiſee*, (according to his Diſtance and Abſence) in which, it was lawful for him to gather Force, Arms, and his Friends to throw the Diſſeiſor out of his wrongful Poſſeſſion. And at this Day, if (in a Common Action, or Indictment of Treſpaſs for entering into Land) the Defendant will make Title thereunto; the Matter of the Force alledged againſt him will reſt altogether upon

Hawk. pl. C. 140. cap. 64 S. 1.

upon the Validity of his Title, as appeareth 7 H. 6. 13. and 40. *But* after the rebellious Tumults, and Inſurrection of the Villains, and other, the baſe Commons, which happened the fourth Year of the Reign of R. 2. the Parliament thinking it neceſſary to provide againſt all ſuch Occaſions of further Sedition, Uproar, and Breach of the Peace, did ordain among other Things Lamb. Eiren. 127.. ——as follows, viz.

* So it is in Cay's Abridgment, but in Rastall and Keble, it is cap. 7.

2. *5 R. 2. Stat. 1. cap.* * 8. Enacts that, *None ſhall make Entry into Lands but where Entry is given by Law, and in ſuch Caſe not with ſtrong Hand, nor with Multitude of People, but only in lawful and eaſy Manner. And if any do to the contrary, and thereof be convict; he ſhall be puniſhed by Impriſonment, and ranſomed at the King's Will.*

3. *8 H. 6. 9. S. 7.* Enacts, that *Thoſe who keep their Poſſeſſion by Force in any Lands, whereof they, or thoſe, whoſe Eſtates they claim, have been in Poſſeſſion three Years, or more, ſhall not be endamaged by this Statute.*

S. P. Lamb. Eiren. 136.

4. If ſeveral enter with Force *to the Uſe of one, who does not enter, and he after agrees* to it; this makes him a Diſſeiſor or Treſpaſſor, but not to be puniſhed for the Force; For he cannot make forcible Entry, *without an actual Entry.* By the beſt Opinion. Br. Forcible Entry pl. 25. cites 2 H. 7. 16.

* One Perſon *alone* may commit a Forcible Entry. Lamb. Eiren. 135.

5. Forcible Entry is, if * *one*, or more Perſons, *come weapon'd* to a Houſe or Land, *and violently enter*; or if they there *offer Violence* to any poſſeſſed; or if they forcibly or furiouſly *expel* another out of his Poſſeſſion. Lamb. Eiren 134.

6. If one *enters peaceably*, and when he is *come in, uſeth Violence*; this is a Forcible Entry. Lamb. Eiren. 134.

* It was ſaid, for Law in B. R. that if a Man *come with more than he had accuſtomed to attend upon him*, that this is a Force, which was not denyed. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 30 cites 10 H. 7. 12. ——S. P. Lamb. Eiren 135.——‡ S. P. and ſo of *drawing the Latch.* Noy. 136. Beade v. Orme. ——But See pl. 9. and 1 Hawk. Pl. C. cap. 64. S. 26. Where the Serjeant is of Opinion, that ſuch inconſiderable Circumſtances, which commonly paſs between Neighbours without any Offence at all, can never bring a Man within the Meaning of the Statutes, which ſpeaks of Entering with ſtrong Hand or Multitude of People.

7. If one enter into an Houſe, where *no Man is in the Houſe*, and the Entry is with *Men armed*, or * *Company unuſual*; this is Forcible Entry: Alſothe ‡ *putting back the Bolt* or Bar of the Door, is Force; tho' *no Body is in the Houſe.* Mo. 656. Mich. 44 and 45 Eliz. in the Starr Chamber. Pollard v. Moreton.

8. *A.* being *Tenant for Years, B. purchaſed the Reverſion*, and A. *payed Rent unto B. for 15. Years.* Before the End of the Term, one C. came to A. and perſuaded him, that D. had Title to the Land, and adviſed him to take a Leaſe from him; whereupon he took a Leaſe of him for 10 Years, rendering 70*l.* per Ann. and the Land was worth 140*l.* per Ann. and willed him to hold Poſſeſſion againſt all Perſons; and he, *at the End of the firſt Term, kept the Poſſeſſion with Drum, Guns and Holberts, &c.* (The Drum was only to give Notice, if any came to enter, but no Body offered to enter) he was cenſured for this, being a Riot and forcible Detainer; altho' none other offered to enter; For it was held, that the Poſſeſſion of the Termor, was the Poſſeſſion of the Leſſor; And when, at the End of the Term, he kept it againſt him, to whom he had paid the Rent ſo long, it was a forcible Detainment. And whereas the Statute is, that where one hath had Poſſeſſion for 3 Years quietly, he might hold the Poſſeſſion with Force; that is to be intended, where the Eſtate is continued. Cro. J. 199. Mich. 5 Jac. in the Starr Chamber. Snigg v. Shirton.

Noy. 136, 137. S. P. if it be an ordinary Dwelling Houſe.

9. If one *break the Houſe*, and ſo enter into the Houſe, *none being in the Houſe*, 'twas reſolved that this *is* Forcible Entry. But it ſeemed by them, that if he had *entered by the Window*, or if he had *opened the Door with a Key*; this will not be forcible. Hill. 15 Jac. B. R. 2 Roll. R. 2. Anon.

If 3 *or* 4 *come to make ſuch a forcible Entry*, and *one only uſe Force*, all the reſt are Guilty with him.

10. If *two come to make* a Forcible Entry, and *one breaks open the Door* of the Houſe, and 2 or 3 Hours after, the *other enters peaceably*, without a Weapon, the Door being open; yet 'tis a Forcible Entry by him. Noy. 136. Beade v. Orme. Lamb. Eiren. 134.

11. If

11. If *A. claim Common*, in the Land of B. and *B. with Force and Arms keeps A. out from his Common*, whereupon a Juſtice of Peace committed B. and another, who aſſiſted B. upon View of the Force. It was held, per tot. Cur. Abſente Brampſton, that this Commitment was not warranted by the Statute of *15 Ric.* 2. For altho' one may be diſſeiſed of a Rent or Common, by Force, which is inquirable in Aſſiſes, and puniſhable, if it be found: Yet one may not be indicted or committed for entering his own Land with Force, *or holding his own Land with Force againſt a Commoner*; For it ought to be *Ubi ingreſſus non datur per Legem*; and one in his own Land may enter lawfully, and may detain with Force againſt any who pretend to have Common there, he being allowed to be *Owner of the Soil*; and this Statute is not to be extended againſt any, but him who *enters unlawfully, and ouſts another of his lawful Poſſeſſion*; wherefore the Cauſe of Committing and Detaining them in Priſon was held unlawful, and the Priſoners were diſcharged. Cro. C. 486. Mich. 13 Car. B. R. Sydnam and Parr's Caſe.

12. This Writ lies, where one is *ſeiſed of any Eſtate of Freehold* in Lands or Tenements, and is thereof diſſeiſed *with Force*; *Or*, tho' he be diſſeiſed thereof *peaceably*, yet if it be *detained with Force*, he may have this Writ. F. N. B. 248. (C).——and 8 *H.* 6. 9.——And tho' the Words of the Statute are in the *Diſjunctive*; yet, if the *Entry and Diſſeiſin are both with Force*, the Writ lies. For the Intent of the Makers was to puniſh ſuch Force, whether upon the Entry and Diſſeiſin, or upon the Detaining, &c. F. N. B. 248. (D).

It lies where one is expuls'd of his *Rent*, Hales's Notes on F. N. B. 248. (C) cites 20 H. 6. 11. and See Ibid 4^. Co. Litt. 257. a. b.

13. A Man ſhall not have Action upon the Statute, [5 R. 2.] Ubi ingreſſus non datur per Legem, where a Man *enters with Force, and his Entry is lawful*; For the *Force is only to be convicted for the King*, as Vi & Armis, & contra Pacem, but *otherwiſe* it ſeems *upon* the Statute of 8 *H.* 6. Per tot. Cur. Br. Action ſur le Statute. pl. 7, cites 9 H. 6. 19.

14. One *Jointenant*, or *Tenant in Common*, may maintain this Action againſt his Companion, if he be put out with Force, &c. F. N. B. 249. (D)

(B) What is Forcible Detainer.

1. IF one Perſon *obſtinately keep the Door ſhut againſt the Juſtice*, or if he find *Perſons harneſſed*, or in other warlike Sort appointed, or Furniture lying by them ready to be uſed; it is a Forcible Detaining. Lamb. Eiren. 136.

But, if one *peaceably enter* into a Houſe, and there *find Armour*, or other Weapon for the War, the *ſuffering of it to remain there (without the Uſe thereof)* will not charge him as a Forcible Holder. Lamb. Eiren. 136.

2. If a Man, being entered into a Houſe, *beſtow Men with Force and Arms ſome other Place, not far diſtant*, to the Intent they ſhall aſſault them that would attempt Entry upon him; this is a Detaining with Force. Lamb. Eiren. 137.

3. *Or*, if a *Diſſeiſor foreſtall the Way* of the Diſſeiſee, *with Force, &c.* ſo that he dare not enter for Fear of Death; 'tis a Detaining with Force. Lamb. Eiren. 137.

Or, if the Diſſeiſor *threaten to kill him that hath Right, if he come to enter*; this is a Forcible Holding. Lamb. Eiren. 137.

(C) Of what Things it may be.

1. *The Statute of 5 R. 2. cap. * 7. Againſt Forcible Entry mentions* Lands and Tenements.

In Cay's Abr. of Stat. it is called cap. 8.

2. *The Statute* 15 *R.* 2. 2. *mentions* Lands, Benefices and Offices of the Church.

3. *The Statute* 8 *H.* 6. *cap.* 9. *S.* 2. *mentions* Lands, Tenements or other Poſſeſſions.

Br Forcible Entry. pl. 7. S. P. cites 22. H. 6. 23.—— * F. N. B. 249. (B) Cro. Car. 201. Mich. 6 Car. Anon.——

4. Forcible Entry was brought *of* * *Rent*, and awarded good, as well as of the Land; for a *Man may diſtrain for Rent with Force*, and therefore this ſhall Countervail the Entry with Force, by which the Defendant was awarded to anſwer. Br. Forcible Entry. pl. 1. cites 20 H. 6. 11.

5. An Indictment on the Statute of 8 H. 6. was, That the late Queen, by her Letters Patents under the Great Seal, had granted to J. S. the *Office of Cuſtody of the Caſtle of D.* with all Profits, &c. and an annual Fee for exerciſing thereof; and *that the Defendant with Force expell'd her and diſſeiſed her of that Office.* Exception was taken, that an Indictment lies not on that Statute for ſuch an Office; But that there ought to have been a Diſſeiſin alleg'd of the Tenant of the Freehold of the Houſe. But the Court delivered not any Opinion herein. Cro. J. 17, 18. Mich. 1 Jac. B. R. Lady Ruſſell's Caſe.

This Caſe was upon the Statute, 21. *Jac* 15. per Holt Ch. J. Farr 123.——Yelv. 81. Hill. 3 Jac. B. R. Sir And. Nowell's Caſe.——Raym 67. Hill. 14 and 15 Car. 2 B. R. The King v. Hardy.

6. Indictment of Forcible Entry lies of a *Copyhold.* Poph. 205. M. 2 Car. The King v. Ployden, & al.

7. Forcible Entry lies of *Tithes*, tho' it was objected, and agreed, that Aſſiſe lies of Tithes by the Statute 32 H. 8. and that they are recoverable as Lay Inheritance Cro. C. 201. Mich 6. Car. Anon.

And that there ought to be a *direct Allegation of the Life.* per Roll Ch. J. Ibid. cites the Lady Morley's Caſe.

8. Indictment was of a *Forcible Entry on a Leſſee for Years upon Statute* 21 *Jac.* 15. Exception was taken, 1ſt. That it did *not appear* by the Indictment that the Leſſee had *any Title* to the Land *at the Time of the Force committed.* For the Force is *ſuppoſed to be done before the Leaſe commenced.* 2*d.* The Leaſe is ſuppoſed to be a *Leaſe for ſo many Years, if J. S. ſo long live*, and it is *not averred, that J. S. was alive at the Time* of the Forcible Entry made. And the Indictment was quaſhed. Sty. 147. Mich. 24 Car. the King v. Bray.

The Entry was into the *Church and the Parſonage Houſe*, and it was held, that ſuch Forcible Entry was within the Statute of R. 2. and alſo of 8 H. 6. and refuſed to quaſh the Indictment. 1 Lev. 90. the King v. Larking & al. S. C.

9. An Indictment was of Forcible Entry *into a Church*; and Exception was taken, that Indictments for Forcible Entry, is by Statute Law only, and that they ſpeak of Meſſuages or Tenements, &c. and ſo extend not to a Church, for which the Common Law has provided proper Remedy, viz. *Breve de Vi Laica removenda.* But per Cur. The *Statutes for Quieting Poſſeſſions, ſhall have liberal Conſtructions*, and extend to Churches, and in the Statute R. 2. Churches are particularly named; & Vi Laica removenda, is but a feeble Remedy; becauſe it does not reſtore the Party to his Poſſeſſion. Sid. 101. Hill. 14 and 15 Car. 2. B. R. the King v. March, Hollingworth, &c.

10. An Indictment was of a *Meſſuage Paſſage or Way*; and it was objected, that a Paſſage or Way is no Land or Tenement, but an Eaſement. And as to that, the Court thought it not good; tho' otherwiſe, as to the Meſuage. Mod. 73. M. 22 Car. 2. B. R. the King v. Holmes.

(D) Of

(D) Of what Poſſeſſions it may be.

1. LEſſee for Years cannot maintain the Action, becauſe of the Words, Expulit & Diſſeiſivit and Tenant for Years, cannot be diſſeiſed. F. N. B. 248. (E). Yet note, the Words in the Statute are, *Put out, or Diſſeiſe*. Notes can have it; on F. N. B. 248. (E) and cites Br. Action Sur Statute 17. And adds a Quære, if a *Leſſor* For he is not expulſed. cites D. 142.——Jenk. 118. pl. 37.

2. An *Inquiſition* of Forcible Entry was *quaſhed*, for that it did *not appear, what Eſtate* the Party, on whom the Entry was made, had; For if he were *Tenant at Sufferance*, it would not lie. 12 Mod. 417. Mich. 12 W. 3. B. R. the King v. Dorney.

(E) Juſtifiable by whom, and in what Caſes.

1. IF a Man continueth *three Years in peaceable Poſſeſſion, without Interruption*, then he may hold the Lands with Force, and ſhall not be puniſhed for that Force, and that by the Statute of 8 H. 6. 9. F. N. B. 249. (C). If a Man entereth with Force into Lands and Tenements, to which he hath Title and Right of Entry, and put the Tenant of the Freehold out of thoſe Lands or Tenements; now he, who is ſo put out with Force, may indict him for this entering by Force, and by this Indictment, he ſhall be reſtored to his Poſſeſſion again; But he, who is ſo reſtored, cannot maintain the Poſſeſſion with Force, altho' he has had a peaceable Poſſeſſion for 3 Years before the Expulſion. For the Poſſeſſion is interrupted. F. N. B. 248. (H) and the Notes thereupon.——And if a juſt and lawful Poſſeſſor *for* 20 *Years* be once removed clearly and neatly from his Poſſeſſion, he cannot retake Poſſeſſion by Force, and detain with Force. D. 141. b. pl. 48. Paſch. 3 and 4 P. & M. Dalabar v. Lyſter ——S. P. Farr 138. Hill. 1 Annæ. B. R. Hardeſty v. Goodenough ——See (E) the King v. Burgeſs. ——Br. Forcible Entry. pl. 6. 17. cites 22 H. 6.

2. A *Tenant at Will* can't juſtify a Forcible Detainer, *till he has been* 3 *Years in Poſſeſſion*; but he ought to quit Poſſeſſion, and apply to the Juſtices for a Reſtitution upon the Forcible Entry. 11 Mod. 32. Paſch. 4 Annæ. B. R.

3. *Tenant at Sufferance* is not within the Statute of Forcible Entries. Arg. ſays it has been often adjudged 11 Mod. 273. in pl. 18. Hill. 8 Annæ B. R. Queen v. Depuke.

4. None can be guilty in Reſpect of Land, whereof he *himſelf hath the* * *ſole lawful Poſſeſſion*, and *another the bare Cuſtody* ‡ (Ch. 64. S. 32.) but a † *Jointenant* may be guilty (Ch. 64. S. 33.) ſo may every Perſon, who has a || *defeaſible Poſſeſſion* (Ch. 64. S. 34.) So, alſo may an § *Infant* or *Feme Covert*, acting in their own Perſons, and not barely commanding others. (Ch. 64. S 35.) 1 Hawk. Pl. C. Ind. tit. Forcible Entry and Detainer (G). The Book at large, cites as follows, * Mo. 786. Cro. J. 18. 2 Keb. 495. † 8 E. 4. 9. a. 19. a. 10 H. 7 27. a. Latch. 224. Palm. 419. || Co. Litt. 256, 7. Crom. 69 b. Lamb. 160, 1. Dal. Ch. 77. § Dal. Ch. 77. Crom. 69. Co. Litt. 357. Br. Impriſon. 43, 45, 75, 101. ‡ Nor by Forcible Entry into the Land *of his own Tenant at Will*. Sed Quere. 1 Hawk. Pl. C. 147. cap. 64. S. 32.

(F) Inquirable by whom. What Power the Juſtices of Peace, and other Officers have.

1. 8 *H.* 6. cap. 9. *S.* 4. Enacts, that *when Complaint is made of any ſuch Entry or Detainer, to any Juſtice of the Peace, he or they, by Warrant or Precept, ſhall command the Sheriff to ſummon a ſufficient Jury, to enquire of the Force committed*

committed, and upon Force found, the Juſtice or Juſtices ſhall cauſe the Lands, &c. to be re-ſeized, and ſhall put the Party diſſeiſed in Poſſeſſion, in the Abſence, as well as Preſence, of the Party offending; and every Alienation of the Premiſes, to have Maintenance, ſhall be void.

Every Juror ſhall have Lands or Tenements to the Value of 40 *s.* per Ann. *and every Sheriff, not duly executing the ſaid Precepts, to forfeit* 20 *l. to be divided between the King and the Proſecutor.*

2. If any hold a Houſe or Land with Force, it was agreed, that *one Juſtice of Peace may remove it*; and ſo may more, and ſo are the Words of the Statute. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 19. cites 21 H. 6. 5.

3. The Juſtices of Peace *may record without Preſentment, if* any *Aggregation with Force be before them at their Seſſions.* 7 E. 4. 18. a. per Yelverton.

4. *So if* the Juſtices are *diſturbed to come to their Seſſions with Force.* Br. Peace. pl. 14. cites 7 E. 4. 18. a. per Yelverton.

5. *And* they *may enquire of coming together with Force, and* of *Diſſeiſin with Force, and* this *before the Statute* of Forcible Entry; and *contra of Entry with Force before the Statute*; for they could not inquire it before the Statute. Ibid.

There may be an *Indictment* of Forcible Entry

6. In no Caſe *one* Juſtice *only may make Inquiſition*, if it be not given by Statute. Br. Peace, pl. 14. cites 7 E. 4. 18. per Yelverton.

upon the Statute 8 H. 6. c. 9. *before one Juſtice of Peace*; and *Reſtitution* may be made *by one Juſtice*, by Force of the ſaid Statute. Jenk. 221. pl. 74.

Dal. 25. pl. 8. 4 & 5. P. & M. cites - E 4. 1. — Dal. at the End of Kelw. 204. pl. 2. — 11 Rep. 59. a. (h)

7. *Commiſſioners of Oyer and Terminer* have no Power to enquire upon the Statute of Forcible Entry; for the Statute of 8 *H.* 6. 9. which provides an Enquiry and Reſtitution in this Caſe, *appropriates it to the Juſtices of Peace.* But the * *Judges of B. R.* are within this Statute; for the King ſits there, and where the King ſits eſt Plenitudo Poteſtatis. Jenk. 197. pl. 6.

* 11 Rep. 65. a.

8. An *Order* made by Juſtices of Peace, upon Conviction of Force upon the View, may be *quaſhed upon Motion.* Sid. 156. Mich. 15 Car. 2. B. R. the King v. Challoner.

9. Upon a *Conviction* of Forcible Entry, the Juſtices ought to *commit* the Offender. If they *find Force*, they are, upon the View, to remove it, and commit the Offender; but not to award Reſtitution without Inquiſition; and this they may do, though the Entry be peaceable, if the *Detainer* be *with Force*, in which Caſe they may convict the Offender upon the View. Per Holt, Ch. J. 12 Mod. 495. Paſch. 13. W. 3. Anon.

S. P. by Coke Ch. J. 3 Buls. 92. the King v. Sagar. — Sid. 156. S. P. 15 Car. 2. the King v. Challoner. — Vent. 308. Paſch. 29. Car. 2. Anon.

10. Juſtices of Peace, upon their View of a Force, *cannot meddle with the Poſſeſſion*; *but* all they can do, is to *remove the Force, and commit* them that uſe it, *and* to *make a Record thereof*; and here the Record of the Commitment was *arreſtavi* in the Preterperfect Tenſe, and not in the *preſent Tenſe*, as it ought to be; and all Records of Commitment are; as Committitur Mareſcallo in this Court of B. R. and the Record was quaſhed, Niſi. per Holt, Ch. J. 12 Mod, 516. Paſch. 13. W. 3. the King v. Brown.

——They may not alter the Poſſeſſion *without an Inquiſition*, nor does it become them to *go armed* on that Occaſion, Per Holt, Ch. J. and he ſaid, that if a J. of P. *convicts all the Perſons in Poſſeſſion for Offenders, and ſets the Doors open*, this is an altering of the Poſſeſſion by neceſſary Conſequence, and therefore it was ruled, that there ſhould be a Reſtitution, Niſi. Comb. 260. Paſch. 6. W. 3. B. R. Lady Lovelace's Caſe.

11. Holt Ch. J. ſaid, that the Juſtices of Peace, in the Caſe of Forcible Entries and Detainers, ought to adjourn their Courts, and *give the Party an Opportunity to traverſe the Force*, or elſe the Party has no Remedy but by Certiorari; and every Inquiſition is traverſable by the Stat. of Weſtminſter; but generally the Juſtices enquire into the Poſſeſſion only,

and

and award Reſtitution without trying the Forcible Detainer or Entry upon a Traverſe. 11 Mod. 42. Paſch. 4 Annæ B. R. Anon.

12. A Juſtice of Peace may *ſet a Fine*, but he ought to *commit him immediately*, where, by his *own View*, he finds a forcible Detaining; and then, as he is a Judge of Record, he *may adjourn his Court*, and then ſet a Fine upon him, and commit him in the mean time. Per Holt Ch. J. 11 Mod. 47. Paſch. 4. Annæ. B. R. in Col. Layton's Caſe.

And *ſo long as the Party is under Examination*, the J. of P. may adjourn. Per Holt, Ch. J. 11. Mod. 52. pl. 23. Paſch 4 Annæ. Anon.

13. Upon the Return of a Habeas Corpus it appeared, that A. was convicted by Sir B. Lord *Mayor of London upon View*, by Vertue of the 15 Ric. 2. 2. for a forcible Detainer of the Priſon of the Fleet, and that he was committed until delivered by due Courſe of Law, et quouſque he paid the Fine of 100 l. ſet upon him: Exceptions were taken, 1ſt. That it did not appear that the Mayor was a Juſtice, ſed non allocatur; for the 8 *H.* 6. gives the ſame Power to Mayors, &c. 2d. That the Complaint was of a forcible Entry and Detainer, and here is no forcible Entry at all; and a Man's Houſe is his Caſtle, which it is lawful for him to defend with Force. Curia adviſare vult. 1 Salk. 353. Paſch. 4 Annæ. B. R. the Queen v. Layton.

14. *And* at another Day it was farther objected, that the *Fine was ſet at another Time*, but the Court held that it might be ſet *after the Conviction*, as in Lambard's Eirenarcha. 1 Salk. 353. Queen v. Layton.

(F. 2) Inquiry, as to the Force, prevented or diſcharged by what finding.

1. *If the ſpecial Matter alleged* in the Bar *befound for the Defendant*, he ſhall be excuſed; and the Force *ſhall not be enquired of*; and *if* it be found for the Plaintiff, and *againſt the Defendant*, the *Defendant ſhall be attainted* of the Force, *and ſhall pay treble Damages and Coſts*, * *without Enquiry of the Force*; and the ſame is the Uſage at this Day. F. N. B. 249. (D).

Br. Peremptory. pl. 87. cites S. C. — * And ſo it is on an Indictment of Forcible Entry † 7 H. 6. 13. Vide contra. where he pleads Non eſt Ingreſſus contra formam Statuti. 1 H. 7. 19. 15 H. 7. 17. Hales Notes on F. N. B. 249 (D) —— † Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 2. cites 7 H. 6. 13. Acc. —— *So*, if *all the Points of the Writ are traverſed, and the Title is found for the Plaintiff*, he need not enquire of the Force, as it is ſaid. Br. Forcible Entry. pl. 24. cites 1 H. 7. 19.

2. In Forcible Entry for entering with Force and Arms into a Houſe, and 24 Acres of Land; the Defendant ſaid, that J. S. was ſeiſed in Fee, and enfeoff'd him, and gave Colour to the Plaintiff, by which he entered peaceably, abſque hoc that he entered with Force; the Plaintiff made Title and traverſed the Bar, and the Iſſue is found for the Plaintiff; therefore by all the Juſtices, the *Force ſhall not be enquired where the Title is found againſt the Defendant, nor where it is found for the Defendant; but* yet the *Defendant, who intitled himſelf ought to traverſe the Force*; but the Title, found with the one or the other, makes an End of all as to the Parties; *but he who made the Force may be indicted*, and ſhall make Fine to the King, *notwithſtanding that he has a good Title*; and *he that enters peaceably, where his Entry is not lawful, may plead* in this Action, *that he did not enter contra formam ſtatuti*, and *there the Force and Diſſeiſin ſhall be inquired*; *but contra upon Title made*, quod Nota; and therefore this Iſſue here ſhall ſerve him where the Title cannot ſerve. Br. Forcible Entry. pl. 11. cites 15 H. 7. 17.

(G) What ſhall be ſaid three Years quiet Poſſeſſion. And Pleadings.

1. THOUGH the Diſſeiſor had held with Force for three Years before the Indictment, *yet the Party ſhall be barr'd, but contrary of the King*; and though he has kept by Force for 20 Years *upon* an *Indictment, the Party ſhall have Reſtitution*, and yet he ſhall not have an Action per Fineux, to which Read and Tremail agreed. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 10. cites 14 H. 7. 28.

2. One, who has been ſeiſed peaceably for three Years, may detain with Force; *but if the Diſſeiſor has continued his Poſſeſſion for three Years peaceably, and* after the *Diſſeiſee re-enters*, (as he may lawfully) *and then the Diſſeiſor re-enters*, he cannot detain with Force; becauſe the firſt Diſſeiſin is determined by the Entry of the Diſſeiſee, and the *Diſſeiſee is thereby remitted*, and this Entry is a new Diſſeiſin. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 22. cites 23 H. 8.

3. *But* if a Man has been *ſeiſed by good and juſt Title for three Years*, and after is diſſeiſed by Tort, and then he re-enters, he may retain with Force, by ſome; For he is remitted and in by his firſt Title, by which he firſt continued peaceably for three Years; nevertheleſs, by others it is not Law in this laſt Caſe, therefore quære; for it ſeems to them, by the Proviſo in the End of the Statute, that this is good Law, and ſtands well with the Statute, quære. Br. Forcible Entry. pl. 22. cites 23 H. 8.

Note; he who is reſtored cannot maintain the Poſſeſſion with Force, although he has had a

4. The three Years Poſſeſſion, which ſhall barr a Reſtitution, muſt have an *uninterrupted Continuance*, (ch. 64. S. 53) and regularly ought to be *lawful* (ch. 64. S. 53.) but perhaps does not neceſſarily require that the *firſt Entry* was *peaceable*. (ch. 64. S. 54.) 1 Hawk. Pl. C. Ind. tit. Forcible Entry and Detainer (L.) The Book at large cites Dal. ch. 79. 22 H. 6. 18 b. Crom. 71.

peaceable Poſſeſſion for three Years before the Expulſion; For the Poſſeſſion is interrupted. Hale's Notes on F. N. B. 248. (H) cites Dy. 141.

But after Reſolved, that the Plea was not good, becauſe it is not ſaid that the Defendants were in *Poſſeſſion three Years before the Inquiſition found* according to Dyer. Raym. 85. S. C.——Keb. 614. S. C.

5. *Poſſeſſion* for three Years, *without ſhewing How*, is a good Plea in Forcible Entry. Trin. 15. Car. 2. B. R. Sid. 149. the King v. Burgeſs.

And it has been holden, that the Plea of ſuch a Poſſeſſion is good, *without ſhewing under what Title, or of what Eſtate* ſuch Poſſeſſion was; becauſe it is not the Title, but the Poſſeſſion only, which is material in this Caſe. 1 Hawk. pl. C. 153. cap. 64. S. 55.

6. It was objected that it ſhould *appear by the Conviction, that* the *Defendant had been three Years in Poſſeſſion*, upon the 8 H. 6. 9. But per Cur. that comes in by a *Proviſo*, and he that would have the Benefit of it, *muſt plead his Poſſeſſion*. Vid. Cro. J. 199. and Statute 31 Eliz. Alſo, the 3 Years Poſſeſſion is intended where the Eſtate is continuing, not elſe. 1 Salk. 353. Paſch. 4 Annæ. B. R. the Queen v. Layton.—cites Mo. 848.

(H) In whoſe Name the Suit or Recovery ſhall be.

But ibid. cites Trin. 38 Eliz. Sir Mat. Arundel's Caſe. That Leſſee for Years muſt ſue in the Name of the Reverſioner.

1. IF *Leſſee for Years* be *expulſed*, he ſhall not have Action in his own Name, by himſelf, upon 8 H. 6. nor ſhall the Reverſioner in his by himſelf; but *he and Reverſioner muſt join in the Action*, and then Reſtitution ſhall be awarded, and the *Statute ſhall be recited as* it is *in the disjunctive, but the Concluſion of the Court ſhall be, that the Defendant expulſed and diſſeiſed* in the Copulative. D. 142. a. Marg. pl. 48. cites Paſch. 36 Eliz. B. R. per Cur.

2. If

2. If *Leſſee for Years of a Copyholder by Licence* is ejected by Force, he *muſt ſue in the Name of the Lord* to have Reſtitution; for the Reſtitution ſhall be to the Lord who has the Frank-tenement. D. 142. a. Marg. pl. 48. cites Trin. 38 Eliz. Sir Mat. Arundell's Caſe.

(I) *Reſtitution.* In what Caſes, and *at what Time.*

1. *Quare Impedit* by the King againſt the Diſturber and Incumbent; the *Title of the King was found* for him, by which * his *Clerk was inſtituted by Writ*, and after the *firſt Incumbent entered with Force*, and great Rout, *and took continually the Profits*, and the *Incumbent of the King pray'd a Writ to the Sheriff to remove the Force*, and the Court ſaid, that if the Defendant had diſturbed the Biſhop from putting the Incumbent of the King in Poſſeſſion, that he ſhould have ſuch Writ, but when Judgment is given here, and the *Judgment executed*, then they have no more Power. Br. Forcible Entry. pl. 20. cites 12 H. 4. 26.

* In all the Editions of Brook, the Word (Si) Anglice (if) is inſerted, which confounds the Senſe, and is not in the Year-Book.

2. It is not uſual to make Reſtitution to the Party, unleſs theſe Words *Extra tenet* are contained in the Verdict. Br. Forcible Entry. pl. 13. cites 14 H. 6. 16.

3. In Indictment of Forcible Entry *it was not mentioned, that it was found at the Complaint of the Party according to the Statute*; yet the Party had Reſtitution. Br. Forcible Entry. pl. 16. cites 7 E. 4. 18.

Br. Peace. pl. 14. cites 7 E. 4. 18.

4. By the Words of the Stat. (of H. 6.) no Reſtitution can be made, *unleſs the Forcible Entry be found by Inquiſition.* Quod Nota. Bro. Forcible Entry. pl. 27. cites 4 H. 7. 18.

5. If a *Writ of Entry* be brought *upon the Statute* 8 *H.* 6. and it be *found with the Plaintiff*, yet he ſhall not have Writ of Reſtitution of the ſame Land. Bendl. 37. pl. 68. M. 1 and 2. Ph. and M. in C. B. Paſchall v. Tendring.——And ſays, that the like Judgment was there. M. 6 E. 6.

6. If a Man be *indicted* for a Forcible Entry upon 8 H. 6. and *before Reſtitution, the Force is pardoned by Statute or general Pardon.* Now there ſhall not be any Reſtitution upon that Indictment; For the firſt Force and Offence is pardoned. *But* if the Party had brought his *Action for Forcible Entry*, &c. ſuch a Pardon ſhall not reach the Reſtitution. per Cur' that ſo it has been adjudged. Noy. 119. Fawcet's Caſe.

When the K. has pardoned the Force, the Strength of the Indictment is gone. For the Party is not to have Reſtitution by means of the King, who has given away his Title, (viz. his Fine) by the Pardon. Yelv. 99. S. C.——Fawcet had tendred a *Travers* to the Indictment. And after a Ven. fac. awarded and returned, and a Diſtringas with a Niſi Prius, the Pardon came, which diſcharged the Fine for the King. Whereupon 'twas moved, that the Trial ought to be ſtay'd, for there ought not to be any further Proceedings thereupon; For it, being the King's Suit, is diſcharged by his general Pardon. But it was *ſhewn to the Court, That the Party indicted, was outed from his Poſſeſſion by Colour of this Indictment, it being falſe*; The Writ of Reſtitution being awarded upon it. Wherefore he *prayed, that he might proceed, and he would relinquiſh any Benefit of the Pardon.* For he *had not any other Means to be reſtored* to his Poſſeſſion; and it was not Reaſon, that the general Pardon ſhould prejudice And of that Opinion were Fenner and Tanfield. It appearing here upon Record, that his Poſſeſſion was taken away by a Writ of Reſtitution upon this Indictment, 'tis Reaſon he ſhould proceed upon the Iſſue joined before the Pardon to be reſtored to his Poſſeſſion, for which, otherwiſe, he had not any Remedy. But Williams and Yelverton, (abſente Popham) held, that there ought not to be any Proceedings upon this Indictment, the Offence being Pardoned by the General Pardon, whereof they are to take Notice, and the Party cannot proceed to have Reſtitution, when, if it ſhould paſs againſt him, the King ſhould not have the Benefit of any Fine. Afterwards, being moved again, Yelverton ſaid, They had conferred with all the Judges in Serjeant's-Inn in Fleet-Street; who held, that * the Offence being pardoned, there ought not to be any Proceeding to have Reſtitution. Wherefore by the Rule of the Court, it was ordered to be ſtayed.——And Williams ſaid, it was ſo reſolved in this Court upon Conference with all the Judges of England, by expreſs command from the Queen, in a Caſe betwixt the Lord Stafford, and Sir Thomas Thynn; And it was commanded to make Search for that Preſident; but there could not any ſuch be found. Cro. J. 148, 149. Hill. 4 Jac. B. R. Fawcet's Caſe.——* S. P 1 Hawk. Pl. C. Abr. 181. cap. 24. S 40. tho' the Defendant would wave the Benefit of the Pardon.

Vid. Sid. 414.

7. Reſtitution upon Forcible Entry and Detainer was awarded Niſi Cauſa, *where the Jury found peaceable Entry*. Mich. 14 Car. 2. and Hill. 14 and 15 Car. 2. Sid. 97, 99. the K. v. Sadler and Honeſty.

8. If a Juſtice *convicts all* the Perſons *in Poſſeſſion* for Offenders, and *ſets the Doors open*, this is an altering of the Poſſeſſion, and therefore it was Ruled, that there ſhould be a Writ of Reſtitution, Niſi, per Holt. Paſch. 6 W. and M. Cumb. 260. Lady Lovelace's Caſe.

9. A Motion was made for a Reſtitution upon quaſhing an Inquiſition of forcible Entry; the Caſe was, That the *Leſſor arreſted the Leſſee for Rent, and, while he was in Cuſtody, entered* the Houſe, *under pretence of Forfeiture by a Proviſo in the Leaſe*; but the Motion was denied, becauſe here appears a Title ſtanding out, which he ſhall not avoid by ſiniſter Means, but ought to purſue his Remedy by *Ejectment* according to Law; otherwiſe, had no Title appeared. 2 Salk. 587. Hill. 10. W. 3. B. R. the K. v. Toſlin.

Contra as to the Traverſe, and that there is no Way to prevent Reſtitution, but by *Certiorari* or pleading *three Years Poſſeſſion*.

10. If *Inquiſition be removed into B. R.* no Reſtitution can be, if Defendant *traverſes* or *pleads three Years Poſſeſſion*. Paſch. 11 W. 3. 1 Salk. 260. the K. v. Harris.

6 Mod. 115. Hill. 2 Annæ. B R. Morgan v. Tomkins.——And the Juſtices ought to accept ſuch Plea, and try it as well in Forcible Entry as in the Caſe of Reſtitution; and ought to ſtop Reſtitution 'till ſuch Iſſue is tried. Per Holt. Ch. J. 11 Mod 47. in Colonel Laiton's Caſe.

S. C. by the Name of the King v. Harris reports it thus, Upon a Vi Laica Removenda, a Parſon had forcibly ſeiſed the Church, and upon Inquiſition, the Force was found, but the J of P. did not reſtore the Poſſeſſion (as he ought to have done) but *had a Record of it made up and deferred the Delivery of the Poſſeſſion for two or three Years*; and the Court held this Proceeding very irregular, and that Reſtitution ought to be awarded. 5 Mod. 443.

11. Inquiſition of a forcible Entry was taken, and *Reſtitution preſently granted*, which was *ſoon after ſet aſide by a Vi laica Removenda*, and *ſome Years after*, (viz. two or three Years or more,) a *new Reſtitution was granted*, whereupon the Inquiſition was removed by Certiorari into B. R. and there the Reſtitution was ſet aſide, by Reaſon of the long Delay, which might be a great Inconvenience and Prejudice to Purchaſors; and they grounded this Reſolution on 8 Rep. 19. Dr. Bonham's Caſe. and Holt, Ch. J. ordered a *Special Entry* to be made, that becauſe it appeared on Examination, that Reſtitution was not awarded 'till three Years after the Inquiſition, that therefore Reſtitution was granted to Harris. 12 Mod. 268. Hill. 11 W. 3. K. v. Harris.

12. After a Man is *found guilty* of forcible Entry, Reſtitution muſt be *awarded preſently*; and where ſuch Perſon was put out after 3 Years after Conviction, Reſtitution was awarded to him. Trin. 11 W. 3. B. R. Carth. 496. the K. v. Harris.

13. Tho' *Inquiſition* of forcible Entry be *quaſhed*, yet Reſtitution is *not of Courſe*, contrary to Raym. 85. per Holt. Ch. J. Mich. 12 W. 3. 12 Mod. 423. Anon.

14. After *Certiorari* to remove Inquiſition of Forcible Detainer, Juſtices cannot Award Reſtitution. But if after the Certiorari there be a *New Forcible Detainer*, they may record the Force. Paſch. 5. Annæ. 1 Salk. 151. Sir. Godfrey Kneller's Caſe.

2 Salk 260, 2. Br. Force. 13. Lamb. 153 Dal. ch. 81.

15. No Indictment can Warrant a Reſtitution, unleſs it *ſhew a Continuance of the Ouſter*, (ch. 64 S. 41.) 1 Hawk. Pl. C. Ind. tit. Forcible Entry and Detainer. (H) The Book at large cites as in the Marg.

(K)

(K) Reſtitution. Of what Kind of Poſſeſſions. And to whom.

1. *Copyholder for Life leaſed for Years to B. by Licence* of the Lord; *B. is ejected with Force*, the *Reſtitution ſhall be to the Lord*, in whom the Franktenement is, and *B. ought to ſue in the Name of the Lord* to have Reſtitution. D. 142. a. Marg. pl. 48. cites Trin. 38 Eliz. Sir Mat. Arundel's Caſe.

2. Indictment was laid of an *Entry into a Copyhold Tenement of B. of which A. was Lord, and had the Franktenement by diſſeiſing A. and expelling B.* thereof, &c. Tho' A. oppoſed a Reſtitution to B. (the Entry being in Truth made by A's Order upon B. who had forfeited his Copyhold) and tho' it was objected, that Reſtitution is to be made in reſpect of the Franktenement, which A. does not deſire, but the Contrary; yet the Court granted Reſtitution in reſpect of B. the Copyholder; For ſince the Indictment is a Record, by which the Expulſion by A. and the Diſſeiſin of B. appears, the Court in Diſcretion, and the Jury alſo, ought to reform the Wrongs in their ſeveral Degrees, and that is by firſt reſtoring B. who was expelled, and thereupon enſues conſequentially the Reſtitution of the Franktenant. Yelv. 81. Hill. 3 Jac. B. R. Sir And. Nowell's Caſe.

3. *But if the Indictment had been only of a Diſſeiſin without any Expulſion*, in ſuch Caſe no Reſtitution may be, but upon the Prayer of him who has the Franktenement. Yelv. 81.

4. J. S. was Indicted of a Forcible *Entry upon the Poſſeſſion of B. Leſſee for Years of A. and diſſeiſing A. and expelling B.* and tho' *A. oppoſed the the Reſtitution*, yet, Nolens Volens, it was granted to redreſs the Tort done to B. the Termor, who by the Indictment was found to be expulſed; cited per Williams J. Yelv. 81. Hill. 3. Jac. B. R. as adjudged in Ld Norris's Caſe.

5. By 21 *Jac.* 1. *cap.* 15. *Upon Forcible Entry or Detainer, a* Juſtice of Peace *is impowered, after the Indictment found, to give Reſtitution of Poſſeſſion to Tenants for Years, Tenants by Elegit, Statute, Merchant, or Staple and Tenants by Copy of Court-Roll, as well as thoſe who claim a Freehold or Inheritance.*

6 One was indicted upon the Stat. 21 Jac. 1. for entring into a *Houſe* in C. in the County of O. *adtunc exiſtens liberum Tenementum* of ſuch a Feme *ad voluntatem Domini ſecundum Conſuetudinem Manerii*, &c. The Party came into Court, and, being put out of Poſſeſſion upon this Indictment by a Juſtice of Peace, prayed that the Court would grant her Reſtitution, and it was granted to her by Dodderidge and Whitlock, Jones abſent. The Reaſon was, becauſe the Words of the Statute gives Power to a Juſtice of Peace, or to a Judge, to make Reſtitution to the Leſſor for Years, Guardian in Chivalry, or Tenant by Copy of Court Roll, at Will, &c. But for any thing here alleged, the Feme may be *Tenant at Will, by Verge, and not by Copy*, but the Statute ſhall not be taken by Equity; and therefore he that will have Reſtitution upon this Statute, *muſt be within the Words of the Statute.* And at another Day Dodderidge, and Whitlock, continued their Opinion. But Dodderidge agreed, that if one has a *Widow's Eſtate by Cuſtom after the Death of her Baron Copyholder*, ſhe is within the Statute; Becauſe her Eſtate is mediately by Copy. Lat. 182. Widow Stacy's Caſe.

7. Reſtitution can be awarded only of *Tenements viſible and corporeal*, * (ch. 64. S. 45.) and *to one, who was ſeiſed of an actual Freehold*, † (ch. 64. S. 46.) which alone ſeems neceſſary *whether* it were *by Right or Wrong*. ‡ (ch. 64. S. 47.) 1 Hawk. Pl. C. Ind. tit. Forcible Entry and Detainer. (J.) The Book at large cites as in the Margin.

* Dal. 81. Lamb. 153. Co Litt. 325.
† Dal. ch. 83. Lamb. 153. 154. Cro. J. 199. ‡ Crom. 162. b. 163. a. b.

(L.) Reſtitution. By whom. And How.

(*) 3 Inſt. 161. Crom. 162 a. Dalt. cap. 80.

1. BY 2 *E.* 3. commonly called the Stat. of Northampton, if there be any Uſe made of *Arms to ſtrike a Terror* into the Perſons upon whom a Forcible is made, any *Juſtice of Peace*, or other Officer, who is within the Purview of that Statute, *may ſeize the Arms* for the King's Uſe, *and alſo impriſon the Offenders, but not reſtore* the Party injured to his Poſſeſſion. 1 Hawk. Pl. C. 141. cap. 64. S. 5. cites the Books in the Marg. *.

2. *None may grant* Reſtitution *but* thoſe *Juſtices before whom the Force is found*; and the Writ ſhall be under the Teſte of one of them, and then *no other Juſtices but thoſe of B. R. can grant a Superſedeas.* Hale's Notes on F. N. B. 249. (A.) cites D. 187.

3. Upon an Inquiſition, return'd in the *King's Bench*, of a Forcible Entry, the Court, upon Argument, awarded a Writ of Reſtitution. Br. Forcible Ent. pl. 27.

4. Wray Ch. J. ſaid, that he never uſed to grant Reſtitution without *hearing the Party indicted.* Sav. 68. pl. 141. 19 Dec. 27 Eliz. at Newgate; And the Reporter there ſays, that it ſtands with good Reaſon. For in the principal Caſe, the Party that preferred the Indictment had no Eſtate but as Tenant, by Reaſon of an Execution, who cannot prefer ſuch a Bill upon this Statute of 8 H. 6. For he has no Freehold. Ibid.

M. 2 & 3 Eliz. D. 187. a. b.——Reſtitution cannot be awarded by any *Juſtices* but thoſe *before whom the Indictment was found, or the King's Bench.* (ch. 64. S. 49.) 1 Hawk. Pl. C. Ind. tit. Forcible Entry and Detainer. (K) The Book at large cites Dal. ch. 82. D. 187.

5. An Indictment of Forcible Entry was found before the Juſtices of the Peace at their Quarter Seſſions, or ſpecial Seſſions; they grant a Reſtitution: This Writ of Reſtitution *ought to be* made *under the Teſte of one of the Juſtices of Peace before whom it was granted.* Jenk. 221. pl. 74.

Lamb. 157. Dal. ch. 82.

6. The Sheriff may *raiſe the Poſſe* to execute it, (ch. 64. S. 52.) 1 Hawk. Pl. C. Ind. tit. Forcible Ent. and Detainer. (K.) The Book at large cites as in the Margin.

(M) Reſtitution ſtayed. For what Cauſes.

* N. B. the Plea in Dyer is 26. but it ſhould be only 24. but the next after is 35, and ſo goes on.——

1. IT was held in B. R. per Cur. that *notwithſtanding a Traverſe* tendered to an Indictment of Forcible Entry upon the 8 H. 6. they may grant or ſtay the Writ of Reſtitution *at their Diſcretion, according as the Truth of the Title appears to them.* Nota. D. 122. b. pl. * 26. 2 & 3 Ph. & M. Anon.——But the Book adds a Nota, that there are Precedents both Ways.

Reſtitution is of Duty, but Re-Reſtitution is of Grace. Per Twiſden and Keyling, J. Raym. 85. in the Caſe of the King v. Burgeſs.——Vent. 265. cites the Caſe of D. 122. But ſays Arg. that now, *ſince the Statute of Eliz.*, where ſuch Plea is tendered, the Court cannot grant Reſtitution; though they would have done it in the principal Caſe, if by Law they might; For the *Party that made the Entry had loſt the Land juſt before by Verdict in Ejectment*, and by this Means the Effect of it ſhould be diſappointed M. 26. Car. 2. B. R. Anon.——D. 123. a. Marg. pl. 26. ſays, that it is a good Plea for the Stay of Reſtitution to ſay, that the Party had been in *Poſſeſſion for three Years*, before the Day of the Indictment, by the Stat. 31 *Eliz.* 11. and that the *Clerk of the Peace, upon ſuch Traverſe* tendered, may grant Superſedeas for the Stay of Reſtitution.——If the Party, againſt whom the Inquiſition is found, will traverſe the Force, that was always a Reaſon to ſtay Reſtitution; and it has been held a *Superſedeas to the awarding Reſtitution*, and that it was ſo in Sir Richard Bray's Caſe; where an Inquiſition found a Forcible Entry; and the Defendant offered immediately, before the Juſtice, to traverſe the Force; but the Juſtice refuſed the Traverſe, and granted Reſtitution; and Keyling, Ch. J. granted Re-Reſtitution; per Holt, Ch. J. And Powel J. ſaid, that notwithſtanding the Caſe in D. 122. a. — Traverſe of the Indictment was ſaid to be only a Superſedeas at Election, yet laterly it had been held an abſolute Superſedeas. 2 Salk. 588. Paſch. 4 Annæ. B. R. in the Caſe of the Queen v. Winter.—— If an Inquiſition of Forcible Entry be removed into B. R. there can be no Reſtitution, if Defendant either

either traverſes the Force, *or pleads three Years. quiet Poſſeſſion* before the Force. 1 Salk. 260. P. 11. W. 3 The King v. Harris.

2. If Juſtices of Peace award Reſtitution, and, *before Reſtitution made, a Certificate comes from the Juſtices of B. R. to remove* the Indictment, which is delivered to a J. of Peace, who was not at the Seſſions; he may award Superſedeas. D. 187. b. Marg. pl. 5. cites it as adjudged. Hill. 45 Eliz. in Fitzwilliams's Caſe.

3. By 31 *Eliz. cap.* 11. *S.* 3. *No Reſtitution upon any Indictment of Forcible Entry, or holding with Force, ſhall be made, if the Perſons indicted had the Occupation, or been in quiet Poſſeſſion three Years next before the Day of ſuch Indictment found, and their Eſtate therein not ended, which the Party indicted may allege for ſtay of Reſtitution; and if the other traverſe the ſame, and the Allegation be found againſt the Party indicted, he ſhall pay Coſts.* It ſeems clear, from the expreſs Purview of this Statute, that wherever the Defendant *pleadeth quiet Poſſeſſion for three Years*, in Bar of Reſtitution upon ſuch an Indictment, either before the Juſtices of Peace, or in the King's Bench, *no Reſtitution ought to be awarded till the* Truth of the *Plea le tried.* 1 Hawk. Pl. C. 153. cap. 64. S. 55. cites Keb. 538. the King v. Burges. —— and Salk. 261. pl. 1.

4. Reſtitution muſt be ſtayed till the Defendant have *Notice of the Charge* againſt him, *(ch. 64. S. 59.) and if he appears and tenders a *Traverſe*, it muſt ſtay till ſuch Traverſe be *tried*, † (ch. 64. S. 57) *and* ſo much *found* as will warrant a Reſtitution. ‡ (ch. 64. S. 58.) 1 Hawk. Pl. C. Ind. tit. Forcible Entry and Detainer. (L) The Book cites as in the Margin. * Savil. 68. pl. 141. All. 78, 79. † 2 Keb. 343. 2 Keb. 49. 571. Sid. 284. Salk. 587, 588. 9. Keb. 427. ‡ Sid. 97,

(N) Reſtitution. Superſeded before or after Execution. How, and by whom.

1. AFTER an Indictment of Forcible Entry upon the Statute 8 H. 6. before the *Juſtices of Peace* in Eſſex, *they awarded Reſtitution, and before Reſtitution made*, there was *a Certiorari delivered* to Sir T. M. Cuſtos Rotulorum, which was not received by him; nor would he read it till after the Reſtitution made. * And yet the Judges thought clearly that the Reſtitution was well awarded and made; and a Diverſity was taken between an Act Judicial and Miniſterial; the Act of the Juſtices of Peace is Judicial, and their Negligence in not awarding the Superſedeas, ſhall not prejudice; but where a Miniſter receives a Countermand as if the Sheriff be ſuperſeded, this is a Diſcharge of the Authority which he had before. And if the Juſtices of Peace receive a Certiorari, all that they do after is without Warrant; but all that the Sheriff does after, upon their Warrant before, is not erroneous; and yet their Negligence is puniſhable by Attachment, as Contempt. Mo. 677. cites Hill, 45 Eliz. B. R. Fitzwilliams's Caſe. * Cro. E. 915. Hill. 45 Eliz. B. R. S. C. contra, that, as touching the Reſtitution made after the Writ of Certiorari delivered, Gawdy and Yelverton conceived it to be void and ill; becauſe, by the ‡ Certiorari delivered, the Hands of the Juſtices of Peace were cloſed; For the Writ is an expreſs Prohibition unto them, viz. Ulterius terminari coram vobis nolumus. So every Act done by their Authority, after its Delivery, is void. And although the Writ of Reſtitution was awarded by all the Juſtices of the Seſſions, yet the Writ of Certiorari being delivered to any of them, they ought to have allowed thereof, and awarded a Superſedeas; quod Popham conceſſit. —— ‡ S. P. and it avoids any Reſtitution which is executed after its Teſte; but does not bring the Juſtices into a Contempt without Notice, &c. 1 Hawk. Pl. C. Abr. 181 cap. 64. S. 39.

2. Where a Writ of Reſtitution is made, *no other Juſtices* can award a Superſedeas to ſuch Writ of Reſtitution, *except thoſe who granted it*, and the *Judges of the King's Bench*; for the Law preſumes the King himſelf ſits there. Jenk. 221. pl. 74. S. P. Hawk. Pl. C. Abr. 181. cap. 64. S. 39. the Book at large cites D. 187. pl. 6. H. P. C. 140.

(O) Re-Reſtitution.

(O) * Re-Reſtitution. In what Caſes.

*Vid Z. pl. 1.

2 Salk. 588. in pl. 3. has a Nota, that the ſame Queſtion was, viz. whether Re-Reſtitution ſhould be granted, becauſe the Juſtice had refuſed a Traverſe to an Inquiſition of Forcible Entry, but that it was not reſolved; and cites it as Tr. 11 W. 3. the King v. Scarlett.

1. TWO were indicted of a Forcible Entry into a Meadow, and *offered to traverſe the Force, but the Juſtices of Peace refuſed it, and awarded Reſtitution.* And the Indictment being removed into B. R. was *quaſhed upon Affidavit* that they were not permitted to traverſe the Force, but Reſtitution awarded preſently. And it was moved for a Re-Reſtitution; and the Court ſaid, that the Juſtices ought to have accepted of the Traverſe; For *the firſt finding is in the Nature of Preſentment, which, upon traverſe* of the Party, *ought to be tried immediately*; and if it be found no Force, no Reſtitution ſhall be; and therefore they awarded Re-Reſtitution. 1 Sid. 287. Tr. 18 Car. B. R. the King v. Parker, Stacy, & al.

* Sav. 68. pl. 141. H. P. C 140, 141. Cro. E. 31. † Cro. E. 41.

2. The Court of * *King's Bench* has ſuch *a diſcretionary Power* over theſe Matters, from an equitable Conſtruction of the Statutes, that if a Reſtitution ſhall appear to have been illegally awarded or executed, the ſaid Court may ſet it aſide, and *grant a* † *Re-Reſtitution to the Defendant.* As where the *Indictment*, on which the Juſtices Proceeded, is *quaſhed for Inſufficiency*; or where it appears that the Juſtices were irregular in their *Proceedings*, as by refuſing to try a Traverſe of the Force, &c. or where the Defendant *traverſes the Force, and gets a Verdict* in the King's Bench. 1 Hawk. Pl. C. Abr. 181. cap. 24. S. 40. The Book at large cites S. 62. 65. as in the Margin.

(P) *Indictment. Lies.* In what Caſes.

* He ſhall not maintain it on the Stat. R 2. See 9 H 6. 19. but the Party ſhall make Fine to the King for his Forcible Entry. See 31 H. 6. 39. (17 H. 7. 17.) That if the Title be found for the Plaintiff or Defendant, they ſhall make Fine, &c. Hales's Notes on F. N. B. 248. (H)

1. IF a Man enters with Force into Lands or Tenements, in which he *hath Title and Right of Entry*, and puts the Tenant of the Freehold out of thoſe Lands or Tenements; Now he, who is ſo put out with Force, ſhall not maintain an *Action of Forcible Entry againſt him who had Title or Right of Entry; becauſe that Entry is not any Diſſeiſin of him; but he may *indict him* for this entering by Force. F. N. B. 248 (H).

2. After Judgment in Qua. Imp. againſt the *Incumbent*, he was, *by Aſſent* of Parties, to *continue in the Vicarage* for a certain Time. After the Time ended, he *kept Poſſeſſion*, and committed great Waſt. Attachment is not grantable, becauſe his Stay was not by Rule of Court, but by Aſſent of Parties. Vi Laica will not lie, becauſe he is a Parſon; But you muſt bring an Indictment of Forcible Entry, or an Ejectment. per Coke Ch. J. 3. Buls. 91. Mich. 13 Jac. the King v. Sakar.

(Q) Indictment. Good or not in Reſpect of *not ſhewing what Eſtate* or Title.

1. IN Preſentment of Forcible Entry, the Defendant pleaded to the Vi & Armis, and to all that which is contra pacem, &c. *Not guilty*, and yet he was *compelled to anſwer to the Entry*; for otherwiſe this is not ſufficient; by which he *entitled himſelf by Remainder, as Heir of his Father.*

And

And where the Defendant juſtifies between him and the King, there the *King himſelf ſhall make Title.* Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 2. cites 7 H. 6. 13.

2. Exception was taken, that there *was no Word of Freehold* in the Indictment, *or to prove that the Party grieved had any Freehold*, whereof he might be diſſeiſed, ſed non allocatur; becauſe * *Expulit & Diſſeiſivit were there*, which could not be true, if the Party expelled and diſſeiſed had not Freehold. 3 Le. 102. pl. 149. P. 26 Eliz. B. R. Wroth v. Capel.

4 Le. 10. S. R.—In an Indictment on the 8 H. 6 it was *not ſhewn, in whom the Freehold was*, and per Coke, Ch. J. clearly, this ought to be ſhew'd, and to ſay, *Diſſeiſivit & intraverunt*; and therefore *Tenant by Elegit or Statute Merchant, cannot indict* one on the Statute of 8 H. 6 *but he ſhould ſhew, that he did expulſe and diſſeiſe the Reverſioner*; *But* per Cur. *this may be on* the Statute of 5 *R.* 27. He ought to purſue the Words of the Statute, *ubi ingreſſus non datur per legem ibi non*, &c. and the Indictment was quaſhed. 3 Buls. 71. Tr. 13 Jac. Anon.——— * *Expulſion muſt be poſitively charged*, and the Words (*being expelled and diſſeiſed, they held him out*) are a Concluſion without Premiſes. per Holt, Ch. J. and the Inquiſition was quaſh'd per Cur. 1 Salk. 261, 262. M. 12, W. 3. the King v. Dorney.———Indictment was quaſhed for not ſhewing what Eſtate the Party had, and tho' the Word *Diſſeiſivit had been in*, the Court held it would not be ſufficient, tho' it might be taken to imply a Freehold. 1 Vent. 306. Hil. 23, and 29. Car. 2. Anon.

3. *So* becauſe the Words were, *In unum Tenementum intravit*, it was objected, that the Word Tenementum is too general and uncertain; And as to that the Party was diſcharged. 3 Le. 102.

4. *But* the Indictment was further, *In unum Tenementum & decem acras terræ eidem pertinent.* and therefore as to the ten Acres, the Party was inforced to anſwer. 3 Le. 102.

5. In every Indictment of Forcible Entry, *the Eſtate of the Perſon grieved* ought to be ſhewn, and 'tis not enough to ſay, *Quod Poſſeſſionatus fuit*, &c. which ſhall be intended to be but as * Tenant at Will, which is not within the Statutes. 1 Sid. 102. Hill 14 & 15 Car. 2. A Note of the Reporter's.

*1 Salk. 260. Mich. 12 W. 3. B. R. the K. v. Dorney.

* S. P. Hill. 3 Car. Ret. 13. Hobſon's Caſe.——— Lat. 109. S. P. Anon.———S. P. Palm. 426. P. 2. Car. Turner's Caſe——Exception was taken, becauſe the Word (Adtunc) was omitted, ſo that non conſtat, whoſe Freehold it was at the time of the Entry, ſed non allocatur; For when it is found, that ſuch a Day they entered into a Meſuage Exiſtens ſolum & liberum Tenementum, &c. this Word (Exiſtens) muſt neceſſarily refer to the Day and Time of the Entry. Yelv. 27. 28. M. 44 & 45 Eliz. the Queen v. Fenton, Pecke, & al.——Such Exception was diſallowed. All. 49. Hill 23. Car. the King v. Simmons, & al.———If the *Indictment* had *began with the Day, Time, and Year*, then all which follows after ſhall be taken, and *intended to be at the ſame time*, per Williams J. and for this cited 5 E. 6. Dy. pl. 68. & 23 H. 7. Kelw. 98. and ſaid, that an Indictment was reverſed the laſt Term, for want of the Word (*Adtunc*) becauſe it might be *exiſtens liberum Tenementum* 20 Years before. But per Fleming, Ch. J. and Williams J. *the Day, the Time, and the Place being all coupled together* in the principal Caſe, then the Words make all good; For thereby it appears, that it was his Freehold, and the Time being here laid when he entered, this Indictment may be good enough without ſaying (Adtunc) and ſo they both ſeemed clearly to hold the Indictment good, but did not overrule it, but gave time to ſearch for Precedents. 1 Buls. 177. Tr. 9. Jac. Moor and Lankfoord's Caſe. ——Cro. J. 214 M. 6 Jac. B. R. S. P. Sir Nicholas Poynt's Caſe. ——— 639. Tr. 20 Jac. Bridges's Caſe.———*But* upon a *Conviction of Forcible Detainer*, by View of the Juſtices of Peace upon the Stat. 15 *R.* 2. 2. the Word Adtunc is not material; Becauſe *no Reſtitution is to be awarded*, but the Maleſactors, being convicted by the View of the Juſtices, are to be fined and impriſoned. 1 Vent. 23. Paſ. 21. Car. 2. the King v. Serjeant.——— † 2 Roll. R. 65. Hill. 16. Jac. B. R. Ailing's Caſe.

6. Nor is it enough to ſay, *Quod fuit Liberum* Tenementum; But ought to be * *Adtunc exiſtit*, &c. and † *adhuc exiſtens*. Sid. 102. A Note of the Reporter's.

7. Indictment *by a Parſon, for* a Forcible Entry *into the Church*, ſaid, that the Parſon was *ſeiſed pro termino Vitæ*, and it was held good; For a Parſon may make a Leaſe for Life of the Rectory, and by this the *Church paſſes*, though the Pariſhioners have the Uſe, as in the Caſe of an Impropriation. Nota. 1 Sid. 102. Hill. 14 & 15 Car. 2. at the End of the Caſe of the King v. March, &c.

8. An *Inquiſition* of Forcible Entry was *quaſh'd*, for that it did *not appear, what Eſtate* the Party, on whom the Entry was made, had; for if he were *Tenant at Sufferance*, it would not lie. 12 Mod. 417. Mich 12 W. 3. The King v. Dorney.

9. It was moved to quaſh an Indictment of Forcible Entry, which ſet forth, that the Defendant entered forcibly into the Cloſe of J. S. and turned him out; whereas, before the Time, J. S. *poſſeſſionatus fuiſſet de Termino ult' elaps'*; his Exception was, that the *Eſtate of J. S, ſhould have*

been particularly ſet forth; for he might have been Tenant at Sufferance; and it has been often adjudged, that Tenant at Sufferance is not within the Statute of Forcible Entries; likewiſe he ſaid, that by the Word (ſuiſſet) it does not appear, but that the Eſtate of J. S. was determined before the Entry, Ergo quaſhed per Cur. Holt abſente. 11 Mod. 273. Hill. 8. Annæ B. R. Queen v. Depuke.

2 Keb. 495. 3 Buls 71. 1 Vent 23, 25. Salk. 260, 262. Het. 73. Latch. 109.

9. An Indictment *on 15 Ric.* 2. needs only *ſhew, that ſome Perſon was in Poſſeſſion*; But an Indictment *on* 8 *H* 6. muſt ſhew, *that the Party had a Freehold*, and *on* 21 *Jac.* 1. *that he had a Term for Years*, &c. (ch. 64. S. 38) 1 Hawk. Pl. C. Ind. tit. Forcible Entry and Detainer (H). The Book at large cites as in the Margin.

2 Keb. 477, 499. 1 Keb. 191. Cro. E. 754. Noy. 131. 2 Roll. R. 65. Palm. 426. Sid. 102. Yelv. 28. Buls. 177. Vent. 306. 3 Le. 102. All. 49. Palm. 277. 2 Roll. Abr. 80. pl. 9. Cro. J. 633, 634. 2. Keb. 477. 2 Roll. Abr. 80. pl. 3. Yelv. 165 Mod 73. 2 Keb. 709

(R) Indictment. Good or not, in Reſpect of the *Deſcription of the Place where*, &c. And Uncertainty.

So Exception was, becauſe the Entry was laid to be *into a Rood of Land, or into half a Rood of Land*, which is uncertain, and this was held by the whole Court, except Williams J. to be a good Exception, and the Indictment was quaſhed. 1 Buls. 201. Paſch. 10. Jac. Anon.

1. INdictment on 8 H. 6. was of *entering into a Cloſe called Serjeant Hern's Cloſe*. Exception was taken, that it was uncertain, ſo as there can be no Reſtitution, but that it ſhould have ſaid a Cloſe containing 20 Acres of Land, more or leſs, ſed non allocatur. Cro. E. 458. Paſch. 38 Eliz. B. R. Humphrey's Caſe.

2. Indictment was ad Seſſionem pacis tent. apud B. and ſhews not in *what County*, but the County was in the *Margin*; Nor was it ſhewn *before what Juſtices* it was taken. Ruled ill. Cro. E. 738. Hill. 42 Eliz. B. R. Ludlow's Caſe.

3. Juſtices of P. *certified* to the Court, *that Complaint was made to them, that R. and S. riotouſly made a Forcible Entry* in London, whereupon *they repaired to the Place and found it true*, according to the Complaint, *and they removed the Force and fin'd the Defendants* 20 *l.* This Certificate was challenged, becauſe they did *not ſhew the Time when the Complaint was made* to them. Haughton J. asked, to what Purpoſe ought it to be ſo alleged, ſince this Certificate is not traverſable as an Indictment of Force is? And thereupon it was adjourned; but it was afterwards reverſed, becauſe it is in the Nature of an Indictment of Force, which *ought to have Certainty*. 2 Roll. R. 39. Trin. 16. Jac. B. R. Anon.

A Conviction was of a Forcible Detainer *of a Chamber in a Houſe in King Street in the Pariſh of St. Margaret Weſtminſter, by Force*, but did not allege whoſe Houſe it was, or where ſituate, nor whether forwards or backwards, or up how many Pair of Stairs, ſo that the Sherriff might not know of what to deliver Poſſeſſion; But it was anſwered, that the Court will not intend ſo, but that it ought to appear. 8 Mod. 65 Hill. 8. Geo. the King v. Watſon.

4. The *Poſſeſſion*, wherein the Force was committed, *muſt be certainly deſcribed*, and is not ſufficiently aſcertained by the Word *Tenement*, or *a disjunctive Expreſſion of Things of different Natures*. (ch. 64. S. 37) 1 Hawk. Pl. C. Ind. tit. Forcible Entry and Detainer. (H). The Book at large cites Dal ch. 81. Dal. 15. 2 Roll. R. 46. 2 Roll. Abr. 80. pl. 6. 3 Le. 102. Co. Lit. 6. 2 Roll. Abr. 80. pl. 4, 5. 1 Roll. R. 334. Cro. J. 633. Palm. 277. 2 Roll. Abr. 81. pl. 4. 1 Buls. 201. 2 Le. 186. 3 Le. 101. Br. Forcib. Ent. 23. 2 Roll. Abr. 8. pl. 7. Cro. E. 458. 2 Roll. Abr. 80. pl. 8.

(S) Indictment. Good or not, by Reaſon of *Repugnancy*.

1. INdictment was, that *expulit Vi & Armis*, &c. *out of a Houſe*, (and ſhewed all Things requiſite to a Certainty) *adtunc & adhuc* * *in quieta Poſſeſſione of J. S.* and it was quaſhed for *Repugnancy*. 2 Roll. R. 511. Paſch. 21 Jac. Anon.

* So where it was *adtunc & adhuc liberum Tenementum ipſius J. S.* it was held ill on Exception to it, as repugnant; For it could not be his Freehold after a Diſſeiſin; Becauſe then the Diſſeiſor was ſeiz'd, and no Præcipe could be brought againſt the Diſſeiſee. Show. 272. Tr. 3 W. & M. The King v. Hayes. —— S. P. 2 Buls. 121. Trin. 11 Car. The King v. Skeit & al.—— And after the adhuc Exiſtens, there was the Word *Extratenet*, which alſo was repugnant. Ibid.

2. Indictment was, that *pacifice intraverunt, & eum adtunc, & ibidem Vi & Armis diſſeiſiverunt*, and upon Exception it was quaſhed for the *Repugnancy*. All. 49, 50. Hill. 23. Car. the King v. Simmons.

S. C. cited Show. 272. in the Caſe of the King v. Hayes.

(T) Indictment. Good or not; In Reſpect of wrong or *improper Words*, &c.

1. A was *Leſſee for Years*, *Reverſion to B.* An Indictment againſt J. S. was, that *expulit & diſſeiſivit B. & quendam A. Tenentem expulit.* Exception was taken, that a Perſon might be *diſſeiſed*, *tho' not in poſſeſſion*, as a Reverſioner on a Leaſe for Years, *but not expulſed*; For Privatio præſupponit habitum, and that two cannot be expulſed where only one was in Poſſeſſion; and therefore it ſhould have ſaid, that the Tenant of the Freehold was diſſeiſed, and the Termor expuls'd; whereas, here the Word expulit is apply'd to both. But Clench. J. anſwered, as to the expelling the Tenant of the Freehold, out of the Poſſeſſion of the Freehold, that the *Poſſeſſion of the Termor, is the Poſſeſſion of him in the Reverſion.* Godb. 45, 46. Mich. 28 and 29 Eliz. B. R. pl. 56. Anon.

Upon an Exception taken to an Inquiſition, viz. that by the Statute 8 *H.* 6 *Reſtitution is to be granted where the Tenant of the Freehold is put out of Poſſeſſion*, and that the Stat. of 21 *Jac.* makes no Alteration, but *only grants Reſtitution, where a Termor for Years, &c. is put out* of Poſſeſſion, and that in the preſent Caſe it is *not ſaid, that the Tenant of the Freehold was cuſted, but that the Leſſee for Years was* ouſted, and compared it to the Caſe above, [tho' it cites not the Book] and re-cites the very Words, viz. that it ſhould have ſaid, that the Tenant of the Freehold was diſſeiſed, and the Leſſee for Years expelled; and for this Reaſon the Indictment was held to be naught, per Dolben and Eyre, J. only in Court. 4 Mod. 248. Mich. 5 W. & M. B. R. the King v. Waite.

2. An Indictment was *Quare intravit in Medietatem Vi & Armis*, and Exception was taken to it, for that it cannot be, and that a Man cannot enter, without entring into the Whole, ſed non allocatur; For Jones ſaid, that if a Man be *Tenant in common with the King*, a Stranger may enter into a Moiety Vi & Armis, and gain a Moiety. Palm. 419. Paſch. 1 Car. B. R. Anon.

3. Indictment of Forcible Entry, *into a Copyhold* muſt not have the Word *(Diſſeiſivit)* in it, becauſe a Copyholder has no Freehold. Poph. 205. Mich. 2 Car. the King v. Ployden, & al.

For this is by the Statute of 21 *Jac.* 15. and becauſe the Indictment had (Diſſeiſivit) in it, it was quaſhed. Ray*m.* 67. Hill. 14 & 15 Car. 2. the King v. Hardy. —And cited 4 Inſt. 176. ——And per Holt. Ch. J. upon this Statute, it ſuffices to ſay, that the *Entry was made on a Copyholder or Leſſee for Years, and that he was expelled.* Farr. 123 Hill. 1. Annæ. in the Caſe of the Queen v. Taylor. ——The Indictment mentioned *Cuſtomary Tenants*, and Exception was taken becauſe it did *not ſhew* the ſame to be *Secundum conſuetudinem manerii*; and for that and other Exceptions, the Indictment was quaſhed. 2 Buls. 121. Tr. 11 Jac. the King v. Skeit and al.

4. The Indictment was *expulſatus* where it ſhould have been *Expulſus & fortiori Modo*, where it ſhould have been *forti Modo* [Manu] and therefore the Party was diſcharged. Noy. 155. Anon.

(U) Indictment.

(U) Indictment. Good or not, in Reſpect of *Words implied.*

S P. 1 Hawk. Pl. C. ch. 64. S. 44.——Noy. 120. contra. Anon. So of *Illicite Expulit.* 1 Hawk. Pl. C. ch. 64. S. 44.——So if it wanted *Illicite* in an Indictment on 8 H. 6, Noy. 125. Watts's Caſe.——Cites a Precedent in Lambert's Juſtice of Peace. 155.

1. THE Indictment was *eum Diſſeiſivit*, but ſaid not, *(Inde)* but the Exception was not allow'd; For it ſhall be *intended.* Cro. E. 186. Trin. 32. Eliz. Farr v. Eaſt.

2. *Diſſeiſivit* alone, omitting the Word *(Expulit)* is well enough; For Diſſeiſin implies Expulſion. Cro. J. 31, 32. Trin. 2 Jac. Andrews v. Ld Cromwell.

3. Exception was taken to an Indictment of Forcible Entry, becauſe it not ſaid that he was diſſeiſed. But, per Cur. *Expulit* implies it. Comb. 70 Mich. 3 Jac. 2. B. R. Anon.

(W) Indictment. Good or not, in Reſpect of *Omiſſion of Vi & Armis*, &c. and Want of Certainty.

1. AN Indictment on 8 H. 6. wanted *Vi & Armis*; For it was *Paciſice intravit, & ſine Judicio diſſeiſivit, & a Poſſeſſione expulit & amovit*; and Exception being taken to it, it was ſaid, 1ſt. That the Entry being *Paciſice*, it was not the Courſe to lay it, Vi & Armis. 2dly. That 37 *H.* 8. 8. ſupplied the Defect of Vi & Armis in an Indictment. But as to the later, the Court were of Opinion, that the Statute *ſupply'd only* the Want of the Words *Gladiis, Baculis & Cultellis*, as are mention'd in the Statute. Vent. 265. M. 26. Car. 2. B. R. Anon.

2. Indictment not alleged to be *Manu forti* is ill, altho' it was laid to be Vi & Armis. Cro. E. 461. 38 Eliz. B. R. Warner v. Collins.

'Twas moved to quaſh a Conviction of Forcible Entry, becauſe there wanted *Manu Forti* intravit; upon reading the Conviction *it was Vi & Armis* intravit, which the Court ſaid was bad; For it might be Vi & Armis, and not Manu Forti, which are the *Words of the Statute.* Ideo quaſhed. 11 Mod. 235. Trin. 8 Annæ B. R. the Queen v. Baker, & al.

3. Indictment ſaid, that he *Entered and diſſeiſed* Injuſte, *&c.* but does *not* ſay, whether he entered *Paciſice* or *Manu Forti*, and Exception was taken, for Want of the Word Paciſice, which is uſually inſerted, where the Indictment is *Forcible Detainer*; For that otherwiſe it might be, that the Entry was alſo with Force, which ought to be mention'd certainly, and every Indictment ought to be certain in every Point; And for that Reaſon, Gawdy and Yelverton J. held the Indictment inſufficient, but Popham and Fenner conceiv'd it well enough. Cro. E. 915. Hill. 45 Eliz. Fitzwilliams Caſe.——And the Reaſon, why Popham and Fenner J. held it good enough, was, that the *Indictment may be upon* 8 *H.* 6. *upon both Branches* thereof, viz. for the *Entering with Force, and Detaining with Force*, or, *upon any of them by itſelf*: And that, when the Indictment mentions that he enter'd generally, it ſhall *never be intended to be with Force, unleſs it be ſhewn.* And an Indictment, charging any with a Tort, ought to be preciſe in the Point of Charging the Offence or Tort; But where the Indictment is not to charge him for his Entry, but *for Forcible Detainer* only, it is good enough; For no Force ſhall be intended, unleſs ſpecially alleged. And tho' Indictments uſe to mention that he enter'd peaceably, it ſhall not be intended, but that, without thoſe Words, it may be good enough, when it is not to charge him with any Forcible Entry. Cro. J. 20. M. 1 Jac. S. C. Sir Wm. Fitzwilliams's Caſe.

Cro. J. 639. Trin. 20. Jac. B R. Bridges's

4. An Indictment upon 8 H. 6. was quaſh'd, becauſe it was *in quoddam Meſſ exiſtens Lib. Tenement. in, &c.* and did not ſay, *adhuc exiſtens*, and for

for that Fault, the Party was discharged. Noy 131. * Sir Nicholas Pogar's Case.———cites it as ruled *accordingly*. P. 42 Eliz. B. R. Rot. 27. Stansby v. Croxton.

Case.—* Cro. J. 214. Mich. 6. Jac. Sir N. Poynt's Case. —So saying

Existens Liberum Tenementum J. B. without saying *adtunc Existens*, was ill; For it may be, that at the Time of the Indictment it was the Freehold of J. B. but not at the Time of the Entry. Cro. J. 214. Mich. 6 Jac. B. R. Sir Nich Poynt's Case.

5. The Conclusion of the Indictment should be *Contra Formam Statut.* See 3 Buls. 71. Tr. 13. Jac. Anon.

Whether if the Word (Statute) was

wrote at length, it should be *Statuti* or *Statutorum*. See All. 49, 50 Hill. 23 Car. where this Point was differently held by Roll. Ch. J. and Bacon J.

6. In the Conclusion of the Indictment *(Manu Forti)* and *(Contra Coronam & Pacem Regis)* were omitted, the Indictment being *(Fortitudine & Potentia magna)* but no *Manu Forti* also; and because the same was *taken before one J. of Peace only*, and yet it did *not appear*, *upon which Statute* the Indictment was taken, *there being two Statutes*, it was quashed, the whole Court being clear of Opinion that it was not good. Tr. 12 Jac. 2 Buls. 258. the King v. Cox.

Exception was taken, that it was said *Quod adhuc detinet* (which is a Tort) and yet says not *Contra Pacem* Domini Re-

gis; but held well enough; For the *Detainer* may be without Force, and not against the Peace. Cro J. 31, 32. Trin. 2. Jac. Andrews v. Ld Cromwell.

7. *So*, because it did *not conclude Contra Pacem*. 2 Buls. 258. ut sup.

But where the Words

(Contra Pacem) were in, and the Words (*Contra Coronam*) omitted, it was held good. All. 49. Hill. 23 Car. the King v. Simmons, & al.———Tho' Contra Pacem be omitted, yet if the Words *Vi & Armis, &c. and contra Formam Statuti* are there, they *imply as much*. per Wray. Cro. E. 186. Trin. 32 Eliz. Farr v. East.———But if *Contra Formam Statuti* be omitted, the Plaintiff cannot have Restitution, per Haughton J. 2 Roll. R. 65. Hill. 16 Jac. B. R. Ailing's Case.

8. Exceptions were taken. 1. That the Inquisition was *taken before A. and B. Justices of the Peace*, and doth not say, *Nec non ad diversas Felonias, Transgressiones, &c.* so that they have no Power to inquire. Sed non Allocatur. For, upon this Statute, Justices of Peace only, tho' not Justices ad Audiend. & Terminand. &c. have Authority to inquire. 2. Because the Entry is supposed, *In unum Messuagium sive Domum*, which was alleged to be uncertain, as a *Messuage or Tenement* hath been ruled to be ill. Sed non Allocatur. For it was said, true it is, that an Entry into a Mesuage or Tenement, is not good; because Tenementum is uncertain what it is; but Mesuagium sive Domus, are all one and the same. 3. For that the Indictment is, that he was * *Seisitus sive Possessionatus*, which is not certain, sed non Allocatur. For it is *of a Messuage sive Domum adhuc existent. Liberum Tenementum*, which proves, that he was seised of such an Estate, whereof he might be disseised; wherefore the Indictment was good, and Ellis submitted himself to a Fine, &c. Cro. J. 633. Hill. 19 Jac. B. R. Ellis's Case.

Palm. 277. S C. and as to the third Exception, says that Seisitus & Disseisivit implies Franktenement, and *Possessionatus* aggravates the Fault of those who enter; For it intimates that they ousted him of *actual Freehold vested with a Pos-*

session, whereas he might be disseised, tho' he had not the Possession. As if he makes Lease for Years, and the Lessee is ousted. Emmot, Ellis & al. Case.——1 Hawk Pl. C. 147. cap. 64. S. 36. S. C.—— * Indictment was quashed, because it alleg'd the Party to be seised, or Possessed, and so uncertain which. Vent. 108 Hill. 22 and 23 Car. 2. Anon.

9. Nota, That it was said, that an Indictment was avoided, because the Persons indicted were *without Additions*. Lat. 109. Anon.

It was held that a *School-master* was a

good Addition in such Indictment 2 Le. 186. Farnam's Case.

10. An Indictment of Forcible Entry into a Mesuage, &c. was *by Way of Recital*, with a *Quod cum he was possess'd*, &c. *Et sic Possessionatus, &c.* and upon an Exception taken to it, Twisden J. held it well enough. But another Exception being taken, that it said, he was

* S. P. But the Court held, that if it had been Pro termino Annorum,

 possess'd,

without saying for how many Years, it had been well enough.

poſſeſs'd, de quodam Termino * without ſaying *Annorum*; Twiſden ſaid it was naught, and the Indictment was quaſhed. Mod. 73. Tr. 22 Car. 2. B. R. the King v. Holmes.

1 Vent. 306. Hill. 28 and 29 Car. 2. Anon.

11. Exception was taken to an Inquiſition, for ſaying, *Per Sacramentum Duodecim, &c. Jurat. & Impanellat. &c*, without ſaying *Adtunc & Ibidem jurat*, &c. For that if the Time and Place are not ſufficiently aſcertained, the Inquiſition cannot be good; becauſe the Fact might be committed above a Year paſt. But notwithſtanding this, and an Authority cited out of Dy. 68. b. in a Caſe of Murder, it was held not material here to ſhew the Place, &c. For the Party could not be amov'd, ſo as to make the Defendant guilty of a Forcible Entry from another *Place*, but from the Land, per Dolben & Eyre J. Cæteris abſentibus. 4. Mod. 248. Mich. 5 W. & M. B. R. the King v. Waite.

Cro J 41. D. 68. pl. 28.

12. The *Ouſter ſhall* be *intended* to have been *at the ſame Time and Place with the Entry*, without adding *adtunc & ibidem.* (Ch. 64. S. 42.) 1 Hawk. Pl. C. Ind. tit. Forcible Entry and Detainer (H) The Book at large cites as in the Marg.

13. *Before the Day of the Indictment*, and *before the Indictment*, in 31 El. 11. have the ſame Meaning. (Ch. 64. S. 56.) 1 Hawk. Pl. C. Ind. tit. Forcible Entry and Detainer. (L)

(X) Indictment. Good or not. *Varying from the Statutes.*

So, where the Indictment alleg'd, that the Fine, mention'd in the Statute, was by the Statute given

1. INdictment upon 8 H. 6. was *quod Finem faciat Dominæ Reginæ, &c.* where the *Statute is Finem faciat Domino Regi.* And it was held by Wray, Anderſon, Shute, Windham and Fleetwood, to be Vitious. And the Party put out was reſtored. Sav. 68. pl. 141. 19 December, 27 Eliz. at Newgate Seſſions. Anon.

Dicto Domino Regi; whereas the Words in the Statute are Domino Regi, without the Word (*Dicto*;) this was held per tot. Cur. to be a good Exception, and ſaid to have been ſo adjudged ſeveral Times before. 1 Buls. 218. Trin. 10 Jac. The King v. Cole.

2. An Indictment was upon the Statute 8 *H.* 6. 9. and the Statute was *recited to be made at Weſtminſter*, but *ſhewed not in what County*, and the Indictment was diſcharged. Cro. E. 106. Trin. 30 Eliz. Eaſt v. Wilſon.

3. Indictment was for entering *in Domum Rectoriæ de P. ac in certas Terras eidem Domui Pertin' jacen' in P.* And Exception was taken, becauſe it *recited two Parts of the Statute* (of 8 H. 6.) 1. *Expulſion* and Diſſeiſin with Force, 2. *Holding out*; and there *is no Offence contained in it, as to* one of them, viz. *the Holding out*; and tho' it was not neceſſary to *recite the Statute*, yet if the Party meddles with it, and does *not apply it to the ſpecial Matter*, it is naught, and for this cites Pl. C. Strange v. Partridge. 2. The Entry is ſuppoſed, *In Domum & certas Terras*, eidem Domui Pertinen. jacen. in P. which is uncertain, as to Lands and naught for the Houſe alſo. For it is not ſhewn in what Town the Houſe is. For this Clauſe, *& Certas Terras* eidem Domui Pertin. jacen. in P. *is a diſtinct Clauſe* of itſelf, *and refers only to the Lands*, and does not extend to the Houſe The firſt Exception was diſallow'd; For it is not like Partridge's Caſe. ——For there, the Statute is recited, which needed not; and therefore, being miſrecited, made the Indictment inſufficient: But here the Statute is well recited, and therefore, as to the Matter, the Indictment is ſufficient. As to the 2d Exception, the Juſtices thought the Indictment, in that Reſpect, too general and uncertain. The 3d. Exception was not allow'd; For the later Words (*in Putney*,) refer to the whole, and *extend as well to the Houſe as the Lands.* But, as to the Words, *Lands to the ſaid Houſe belonging.* See Pl. C. 85. b. where it is good enough, becauſe the *Number of Acres* is *ſet in certain.* 1 Le. 186. Mich. 32 Eliz. B. R. Farnam's Caſe.

4. In

4. In reciting the Statute, it ſaid *vel aliquod Feoffamentum aut Diſcontinuationem*; whereas the Statute is *poſt talem ingreſſum aliquod Feoffamentum*, and upon Exception taken, the Indictment was held inſufficient for this miſrecital. Cro. E. 307. Mich. 35 and 36 Eliz. B. R. Hall v. Gaven & al. *So* where the Word (*thereof*) after the Words (Feoffment and Diſcontinuance), was *omitted*, it was, upon Exception taken, held ill. For there is not any ſuch Statute, and the Miſrecital of a Statute is Cauſe to avoid it. Cro. E. 697. Mich. 41 Eliz. B. R. Eden's Caſe.

5. Indictment *recited the Statute in the Conjunctive*, where it is in the Diſjunctive, *Si aliquis expulſus ſit vel Diſſeiſitus*; yet Gaudy and Fenner J. held it not much material; For they are always expounded as copulative. And if he be not Expulſus & Diſſeiſitus, Action lies not upon the Statute. Cro. E. 307. Mich. 35 and 36 Eliz. B. R. Hall v. Gaven, & al. Cro. E. 697. S. P. Mich. 41 Eliz. Eden's Caſe.

6. Exception was taken, that the Indictment *did not ſay*, that the Party entered *Illicite & Manu Forti*, as the Words of the Statute direct: And Roll Ch. J. ſaid that there ought to be Manu Forti in the Indictment according to the Statute, *to diſtinguiſh* this Kind of Entry *from an ordinary Treſpaſs* by entering into another's Land, which is not ſo violent, as a Forcible Entry is ſuppoſed to be. Sty. 135. M. 24 Car. B. R. Anon. Manu Forti and Illicite *are not Æquipollent*, and the Words of the Statute ought to be preciſely purſued, Otherwiſe it is ill. See 3 Buls. 71. Trin. 13. Jac. Anon.

7. An Indictment *on* 15 *Ric.* 2. muſt ſhew, that *both the Entry and Detainer were Forcible*; *but* an Indictment on 8 *H.* 6. needs only ſhew that one of them was ſo. (Ch. 64. S. 40.) 1 Hawk. Pl. C. Ind. tit. Forcible Entry and Detainer (H) The Book at large cites as in the Marg. 2 Roll. Abr. 80. pl. 10. Palm. 195. &c. Cro. J. 19, 20, 32. Cro. E. 915.

2 Roll. Abr. 80. pl. 11. Yelv. 99. Cro J. 151. Sid. 97, 99, 414. 2 Keb. 505. B. 2. ch. 25. S. 2.

(Y) Indictment. *Certiorari.* And *how* it muſt be *obeyed.*

1. A. was indicted of a Forcible Entry, upon the 8 H. 6. and afterwards the ſame Indictment being in Force, he was *indicted a ſecond Time upon the ſame Statute, upon the ſame Day, and upon the ſame Entry.* The *firſt Indictment was removed* by Certiorari into B. R.. And *upon the ſecond* Indictment, *the Juſtices of Peace awarded Reſtitution*, but *before it was executed, a Certiorari was deliver'd* to one of the J. of Peace, who *refuſed to open it*, and granted no Superſedeas, by which *Reſtitution was made.* Afterwards the Indictment was removed into B. R. and *Reſtitution* granted per tot. Cur. upon great Deliberation. For the Certiorari, coming to the Hands of one of the J. of Peace, is in itſelf a *Prohibition to all*, and the not obeying the Writ was a *Miſdemeanor*, and he was much check'd by the Court. Yelv. 32. Hill. 45 Eliz. B. R. Fitzwilliams's Caſe. Cro. E. 915. S. C.

2. Juſtices of Peace may ſend the Indictment into B. R. by Certiorari, or *deliver it per Proprias Manus*; but not by the Hands of another. Palm. 277. Hill. 19 Jac. B. R. in Ellis's Caſe.

3. No *Writ of Error* lies on a Conviction of a Forcible Entry, on the View of the Juſtice of Peace; but it may be *examined by Certiorari.* per Cur. Vent. 171. Mich. 23 Car. 2. B. R. Anon.

(Z) *Conviction* of Forcible Entry *quaſhed* in what Caſes, and How.

1. AN Inquiſition of a Forcible Entry was denied to be *quaſhed*, tho' it had not the Words *Ad Inquirendum pro Corpore Comitatus*, ſince it is a particular Offence, and at the Suit of the Party by the Statute; and the Reaſon, why in Preſentments at the General Quarter Seſſions it is neceſſary

neceſſary to ſay Ad Inquirendum pro, &c. is, becauſe their Commiſſion is ſuch, and the Jury muſt inquire according to their Commiſſion, but here their *Commiſſion is by a Statute*; per Holt Ch. J. and the Inquiſition was confirm'd, per Cur. 6 Mod. 95 Hill. 2 Annæ B. R. the Queen v. Watton.

2. Upon a *Conviction* of Forcible Entry, if a Fine be ſet, the Conviction cannot be *quaſhed upon Motion*, but the Defendant muſt bring a *Writ of Error*. Otherwiſe if no *Fine be ſet*; for then it may be quaſhed upon Motion. 2 Salk 450. Paſch. 4 Annæ. B. R. The Queen v. Layton.

3. A Conviction of a Forcible Detainer was quaſhed, becauſe the *Adjudication was in the Preterperfect Tence*, inſtead of the Preſent. 8 Mod. 65, 66. Hill. 8 Geo. 1. the King v. Watſon ——And ſays that in Trin. T. following, the like Judgment was given for the ſame Fault in the Caſe of the King v. Morgan.

(A. a) Action, &c. In what Caſes. *By whom* in reſpect of *Eſtate.*

1. IF a Man be *ouſted by Force by him that has Lawful entry*, in ſuch Caſes *Ceſty que Uſe* ſhall not have Action; For the Force is only to the King as Vi & Armis & contra Pacem, and of this he ſhall make *Fine to the King, but the Party ſhall not have Action* where the Entry of him who enter'd is Lawful, per Bab. which was agreed. Br. Forcible Entry pl. 18. cites 9 H. 6. 19.

2. *Termor* ſhall have this Action, per Priſot. Br. Action Sur le Statute pl. 15. cites 37 H. 6. 31 ——But per Needham * Termor cannot have this Action, but Brian contra, that at this Day Termor may have the Action. Br. Action ſur le Statute, pl. 23 cites 5 E. 4. 34.

* Littleton accordingly, but per Jenney, the *Statute is that none ſhall make entry into Lands or Tenements, unleſs in Caſe where entry is given by Law*, &c. and Lands or Tenements in the Hands of a Termor [for Years, are Lands or Tenements] as well as in the Hands of the Tenant of the Franktenement. Br. Action ſur le Statute, pl. 25. cites L. 5. E. 4. 25.

3. Treſpaſs upon the Statute 5 R. 2. ubi ingreſſus non datur per legem lies *for Termor*; but ſee elſewhere that *contra* it is *of Action upon* the Statute of 8 *H.* 6. quod *expulit & diſſeiſivit*; becauſe *it is only for Tenant of the Franktenement*, quod Mirum! for the Statute in the ancient Book is *expulit vel diſſeiſivit*. Br. Action ſur le Statute, pl. 17. cites 38 H. 6. 4.

4. *And* the *Baron* may have the Action *alone on* 5. *R.* 2. *quære of* 8 *H.* 6. it ſeems he may; for he *recovers only Damages* in the one, or in the other, *and no Land*, and therefore all is one, as it ſeems. Br. Action ſur le Statute, pl. 17. cites 38 H. 6. 4.

5. *Tenant by Statute Merchant*, by *Elegit*, &c. may have ſuch Actions, per Brian. Br. Action ſur le Statute, pl. 23. cites 5 E. 4. 34.

6. If a Man has no Eſtate but as *Tenant by Reaſon of an Execution*, he cannot prefer an Indictment upon the 8 H. 6. becauſe he has no Freehold. Sav. 68 pl. 141. 19 Dec. 27 Eliz. at the Seſſions at Newgate, Anon.

(B. a) Actions. *Writ* or *Declaration* good or not. And in What Caſes the Writ ſhall abate.

1. Forcible Entry the Writ was, that *illicite intravit*, and not ſaid *vi & armis* and therefore the Writ was abated quod nota. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 18 cites 9 H. 6. 19.

2. It is confeſſed, that *Vi expulit & Diſſeiſivit*, and ſo of *Vi tenet*, after peaceable Entry is within the Caſe of the Statute 8 H. 6. but theſe words

ad

adhuc extra tenet are not in the Statute but are at Common Law; nevertheleſs note, that it is not uſual to make *Reſtitution to* the Party, unleſs theſe words are contained in the Verdict, wherefore Ellerker pleaded to the Writ, becauſe *extra tenet* is in the Writ and not in the Statute. But Juyn ſaid, it is only a *Surmiſe*, as, Alia enormia, and ſuch like; therefore the Writ was awarded good. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 13 cites 14 H. 6. 16.

3. It was agreed, that if it be, quod *in tres Acras* ingreſſus eſt, and *not ſaid ipſius querentis*, the Writ is not good. Br. Action ſur le Statute, pl. 15. cites 37 H. 6. 31.

4. Forcible Entry, the *Defendant in another Term demanded Judgment of the Count, becauſe the certainty of the Land*, as 12 Acres of Land, 4 Acres of Meadow, &c. *is not alleged*; and therefore the Writ was abated and cannot be amended; For it was counted of another Term; and ſo ſee that for Default in the Count, *Judgment ſhall not be that the Count* ſhall abate, *but that the Writ ſhall abate.* Br. Brief, pl. 247. cites 38. H. 6. 1. Br. Count. pl. 54. cites S. C.—— Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 23. cites S. C.— Treſpaſs upon 5 R. 2.

that the Defendant *entered into divers Lands and Tenements of the Plaintiff in D.* &c. and per Danby Ch. J. and Catesby, this Writ is not good, *into diverſe Lands*, &c. for the *Incertainty*, tho' he *declares the Certainty in the Count*; Pigot, and Comberford, Prothonatory ſaid, that there are ſeveral ſuch Writs in Chancery, and ſeveral ſuch Precedents in C. B. And after the Defendant paſſed over and pleaded in Bar. Br. Brief, pl. 348. cites 4 E. 4. 18.

5. In Forcible Entry, becauſe the Defendant *ouſted* the Plaintiff of the Land *with Force, & diſſeiſivit & adhuc extra tenet*; and Exception was taken to the Writ, that the Statute is in the *Disjunctive*, viz. where a Man diſſeiſes another with Force, or enters peaceably and holds with Force; and yet the Writ was awarded good; and it is ſaid there, that 20 H. 6. and 14 H. 6. agrees herewith. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 15. cites 1 E. 4. 19.

6. Treſpaſs upon 5 R. 2. *by Baron and Feme*; Catesby prayed Judgment of the Writ; for the Baron has nothing but in *Jure Uxoris*, and the Writ is, *that the Baron and Feme entred into the Manor*, where it ſhould be the Feme enter'd into the Manor; & non Allocatur, but the Writ good. Br. Brief, pl. 345 cites 4 E. 4. 13.

7. Treſpaſs ubi Ingreſſus non datur per legem *in the Manor of P. in A. B. and C.* Littleton ſaid that *one Acre Parcel of the Manor is in P. not named* in the Writ, Judgment of the Writ; and no Plea, by clear Opinion of the Court; for the Plaintiff does not make his Plaint but of entry into the 3 Vills, and ſhall not recover Damages but in thoſe 3, and not in the 4th. and if he *gives the Manor in the* 3 that which is in the 4th. does not paſs, and ſo of a Fine of it in 3 Vills. Br. Brief, pl. 330. cites 5 E. 4. 103. Forcible Entry *into the Manor of D.* and did *not ſay in what Vill*, and good; For it may be a Vill, and ſo this is well known. Br. Brief, pl. 435. cites 19 H. 6. 49.

8 'Tis agreed, that if the Plaintiff declares that, the Defendant *with* 10 *Perſons entered*; it is not good without ſaying with 10 Perſons *ignotis*, quod nota. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 24. cites 1 H. 7. 19. S. P. Br. Pleadings, pl. 159. cites S. C. *unleſs he ſhews their Names.*

9. Treſpaſs was brought for *Entry* into, &c. ſuch a Day, and *detaining* the Poſſeſſion, *to the Time of exhibiting the Bill without alleging any Day when the Bill was exhibited.* After Verdict for the Plaintiff, it was moved in Arreſt of Judgment, that the Time of the Detainer ſhould have appeared to the Jury; For they ought to give Damages, according to ſuch Time, and his Loſs thereby, and the Appearing thereof of Record, is not ſufficient, and of that Opinion was Doderidge J. and Broome informed the Court, that the Courſe was to limit a Day certain in the Declaration. 2 Roll. R. 135. Mich. 17 Jac. Sliford v. Goodrick.

(C. a) *Pleadings.* Good or not.

1. TRespaſs upon 5 *R.* 2. the *Defendant ſaid, that his Predeceſſor, Maſter of the Hoſpital of D. was ſeiſed and died, and he enter'd as Maſter* and gave *Colour*, and held no Plea, becauſe he did not *ſhew the Foundation, and that he was Elected and Profeſſed Maſter*, quod nota, by which he amended his Plea, and ſaid, that he had the Hoſpital of St. John, *incorporated of Maſter, Brothers and Siſters Time out of Mind*, and that they *Uſed after the Death of every Maſter, that the Brothers and Siſters ſhould chooſe another Maſter, and that A. late Maſter, was ſeiſed and died; and that this ſame Defendant, before the Entry, &c. was elected Maſter by the Brothers and Siſters, and enter'd*, &c. as above, and well, *without expreſſing the Number* of Brothers and Siſters; For the Corporation was made before Time of Memory, and peradventure no expreſs Number. Br. Action Sur le Statute, pl. 9. cites 34 H. 6. 27.

But if the Number be expreſſed in the Foundation, there it ought to be expreſſed, which was agreed. Br. Action Sur le Statute, pl. 9. cites 34 H. 6. 27.

2. Treſpaſs upon 5 *R.* 2. *Feoffment of the Moiety of the Land where*, &c. and giving *Colour* is no Plea; For it may be of a Moiety ſevered. Br. Action Sur le Statute, pl. 43. cites 38 H. 6. 8.

Contra, if he ſays, *of one Moiety per my & per tout*; For otherwiſe it is no Anſwer, when the Plaintiff makes his Plaint of entry into the Whole, if the one Moiety be ſevered. Br. Action Sur le Statute, pl. 43. cites 38 H. 6. 8.

3. Treſpaſs upon the Statute 5 *R.* 2. the *Defendant ſaid, that the Place is* 20 *Acres*, which is *Parcel of the Manor of B. which is his Franktenement*, and per Choke Juſtice, it is no Plea in this Action. Br. Action Sur le Statute, pl. 27. cites 2 E 4. 6.

And the ſame was ſaid for Law in the Time of * H. 8. For the Defendant ought to intitle himſelf to a lawful Entry; for *Diſſeiſor has Franktenement*, and yet he entered where Entry is not given by Law. Ibid ——* Br. Action Sur le Statute, pl. 40. cites P. 23 H. 8. accordingly, per Sherwood and others.——S. P. and the Reaſon ſeems to be, becauſe this Plea *may be true by Diſſeiſin*; and the Action is to try the Title of Entry. Br. Action Sur le Statute, pl. 5. cites 27 H. 8. 26.

4. In Treſpaſs ubi ingreſſus non datur per legem, or in Treſpaſs of Forcible Entry *in A. B. and C.* it is no Plea to *ſay, that C. is a Hamlet of B.* Judgment of the Writ; for nothing is to be recovered but Damages in thoſe Actions; but it was ſaid, per Jenny, that to ſay, that * *No ſuch Vill, Hamlet, nor Place known*, &c. is a good Plea in thoſe Actions, *but* the firſt Plea is a good Plea *in an Action in which a Man ſhall recover the Land*; For he ſhall not demand a Thing 'twice; but in this Action nothing is to be recovered but Damages; and after the Defendant was awarded to Anſwer; quod nota. Br. Brief, pl. 329. cites 5 E. 4. 88.

* S. P. in Treſpaſs upon 5 R. 2. for Entry into the Manor of E. at E. but it does not appear whether he concluded to the Writ or in Bar. It ſeems that he *ought to conclude to the Writ*; For after he pleaded to the Writ, *becauſe two Acres Parcel of the Manor extended into C. another Vill*; and therefore it ſeems that the one Plea and the other were to the Writ. Br. Barre, pl. 40. cites 9 E 4. 3.

5. In an Action upon the Statute 5 R. 2. 7. the *Defendant ſaid, that he was ſeiſed, till by B. diſſeiſed, who enfeoffed the Plaintiff, upon whom he entered peaceably*, the *Plaintiff ſaid, that B. did not diſſeiſe him.* Priſt, &c. Per Fairfax and Catesby, the *Plaintiff has not made Title to himſelf*, therefore ill. But per Pigot and Jenny, the *Defendant has given Title to the Plaintiff in his Bar, and therefore 'tis ſufficient for the Plaintiff to maintain it.* Br. Treſpaſs, pl. 188. cites 9 E. 4. 49.

But where the Defendant pleads Bar, and gives Colour, there the Plaintiff *ought to make Title.* Br. Treſpaſs, pl. 188. cites 9 E. 4. 49.

Br. Barre, pl. 81. (bis) cites S. C.

6. Treſpaſs upon 5 *R.* 2. *of entring into* 20 *Acres in D.* the *Defendant ſaid, that A. was ſeiſed of* 20 *Acres in S. and infeoffed him, by which he enter'd*, and gave *Colour*, &c. *Abſque hoc, that he entered into the* 20 *Acres of Land in D.* and a good Plea to make the Vill parcel of the Iſſue, for inveigling of the Jury, and a good *Replication, which was acknowledged by the one, and*

and by the other, which was agreed by the Juſtices. Br. Action Sur le Statute, pl. 32. cites 11 E. 4. 9.

7. *Treſpaſs upon the 5 R. 2.* the Defendant *ſaid, that the Plaintiff had another Writ pending of the ſame Entry upon the Statute* 8 *H.* 6. and averred, that all was of one and the ſame Entry; and no Plea per Cur. becauſe, *nothing is to be recovered but Damages* and no Land, as in *Precipe quod reddat*, and diverſe Entries may be made in one and the ſame Day. Br. Brief, pl. 317. cites 5 H. 7. 15.

5 Rep 61 b. in Sparrit's Caſe, ſays, the Reaſon in this Caſe (which as it ſeems the Reporter miſtook) was utterly denied by the Court, where it is ſaid, that becauſe diverſe Treſpaſſes may be done in one and the ſame Day, therefore it is no Plea (as it is there ſaid) in Treſpaſs, that other Action is pending, &c. for the ſame Treſpaſs; For by the ſame Reaſon, after the Plaintiff has recovered in Treſpaſs, and brings Action for the ſame Treſpaſs again, the Defendant cannot aver, that all is for one and the ſame Treſpaſs.

8. In an Action upon the Statute 5 *R.* 2. the Defendant *ſhall not plead by a Name*; for there the *certainty of Acres is compriſed in the Writ*; contrary in Treſpaſs, per Bryan and Choke Juſtices, quod Catesby conceſſit; *but* by him, *where the Plaintiff gives Name* in his Count, the *Defendant may vary* from it, and ſo note a Diverſity. Br. Treſpaſs, pl. 360. cites 21 E. 4. 80.

So Action upon the Statute of 8. H. 6. of *Entry into a Houſe and* 20 *Acres* of Land with the Services, the *Defendant pleaded in Bar, and gave the Acres a Name, and was not ſuffered* to give Name no more than in Aſſiſe or Precipe quod reddat, *becauſe the Plaintiff has given certainty in his Declaration*, and ſo the Defendant ſhall plead to it at his peril; as in Writ of Entry in Nature of Aſſiſe he ſhall not give Name. Br. Pleadings pl. 134 cites 5 H. 7. 28.—Br. Action ſur le Stat. pl. 21 cites S. C. ——Br. Treſpaſs pl. 277 cites S. C.

9. In Forcible Entry, the Defendant pleaded a Deed of * *Feoffment with Warranty of the Anceſtor of the Plaintiff whoſe Heir he is*, &c. and the Plea good, per Townſend, but Brian e contra. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 31. cites 11 H. 7. 15.

* In Treſpaſs upon 5 *R.* 2. it was held no Plea, notwithſtanding that it be pleaded *by Deed*, quod nota Br. Action Sur le Statute, pl. 20. cites 1 H. 7. 12.

10. In Action upon the Statute of 8 H. 6. of Forcible Entry, *or* in Treſpaſs upon 5 *R.* 2. ubi ingreſſus non datur per legem, *Non ingreſſus eſt contra formam Statuti*, is a good Plea. Br. Action Sur le Statute, pl. 40. cites P. 23 H. per Sherwood and others.

11. In an Action upon the Statute 5 *R.* 2. in Treſpaſs, it is a good Plea, that the Defendant was *ſeiſed till by the Plaintiff diſſeiſed, upon whom he entered*; for the Defendant ſhall not be compelled to make Title to himſelf unleſs he will, per Fitzh. Arg. Br. Treſpaſs, pl. 1. cites 26 H. 8. 4.— but cites 27 H. 6. 3. contra. But 21 E. 4. fol. 74. is accordingly, if he *ſays, that it is the ſame Treſpaſs, &c. of which the Plaintiff brought his Action*, and herewith agrees 5 H. 7. fol. 11. and 9 H. 6. fol. 32. and 27 H. 6. fol. 1. and in 15 H. 7. fol. 11. it is a good Plea for the Defendant, *that J. infeoffed him, by which he was ſeiſed till by the Plaintiff diſſeiſed upon whom he entered*, but there he made Title; contra ſupra. Br. Treſpaſs, pl. 1. cites 26 H. 8. 4.

S. P. And it is a good *Replication, that the Plaintiff was ſeiſed till the Defendant enter'd contra formam Statuti, abſque hoc, that he diſſeiſed him*; nota. Br. Action Sur le Statute, pl. 1 cites 26 H. 8. 4.

12. It ſuffices upon the *Statute* 21 *Jac.* 1. 15. that entry was made on a *Copyholder* or *Leſſee for Years*, and that he *was expelled*; but upon the Statute 8 *H.* 6. 9. you muſt always allege a Freehold and Seiſin in ſome Body; and if it be an Entry upon a Leſſee for Years, you muſt ſay, that the Entry was made *on the Freehold of A. in the Poſſeſſion of B.* and that ſo he *diſſeiſed A.* and of Neceſſity there muſt be a Diſſeiſin of the Freehold laid; and upon Reſtitution the Poſſeſſion is reſtored to the Leſſee, and the Freehold to the other, and on this Statute, Diſſeiſin is a Term of Art not to be ſupply'd by any other word, per Holt; and Rule abſolute, per tot. Cur. Farr. 123. Hill. 1 Annæ B. R. Queen v. Taylor.——Poph. 205. Anon. was a Caſe upon the Stat. 21 Jac. 1. 15. per Holt ibid.

* See (Q) pl. 1.

(D. a) Pleadings. * *Not Guilty*, &c. In what Caſes it is a good Plea.

1. NOTE, on an Indictment of Forcible Entry found before Juſtices of Peace and removed hither on the Statutes 5 Eliz. and 15 R. 2. the Party pleads, as to the Entry with Force, Not Guilty, and he was forced to anſwer to the Entry, wherefore he juſtified the Entry. Hale's Notes on F. N. B. 248 (H) cites 7 H. 6. 13.

S. P. F. N. B. 249. (D)

2. In Action for a Forcible Entry, *Not Guilty* is a good Plea. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 13. cites 14 H. 6. 16.

3. Treſpaſs upon Forcible Entry againſt E. D who *ſaid that J. N. was ſeiſed in Fee, and leaſed to the Defendant for Life*, and by this he was ſeiſed; *and the Plaintiff, by Colour of a Deed, &c. made by J. N. where nothing paſſed, &c. entered upon him, and he re-ouſted peaceably, abſque hoc*, that the Defendant ouſted him *with Force, or detained with Force*, and ſhewed that he in Reverſion was in Ward of the King, *and pray'd Aid of the King*; and by the beſt Opinion, becauſe he is *Tenant for Life*, and has Frank-tenement, he *ſhall not have Aid in Treſpaſs* of the King, nor of a Common Perſon; by which the Defendant pleaded *Not Guilty*, and 'twas admitted a good Iſſue; for 'twas argued, whether he ſhall have it or not, and at laſt 'twas admitted for Plea and well; For 'tis ſaid elſewhere, that in *Aſſiſe and Treſpaſs the Defendant may waive the Pleading and plead the general Iſſue*. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 6. cites 22 H. 6. 17.

4. Treſpaſs of Forcible Entry by G. againſt K. Prioreſs of B. and *counted, that he diſſeiſed her with Forces, and yet detains with Force*; the Defendant pleaded, that the Plaintiff was *ſeiſed of the ſame Land the Day of the Writ purchaſed*, Judgment of the Writ, & non allocatur; for per Moyle, *in Replevin, and counted quod adhuc detinet, it is no Plea, that the Plaintiff is ſeiſed* of the Beaſts, *and was the Day of the Writ purchaſed*. Per Newton, the Plea *does amount only to quod non detinet with Force, which is no Plea by it ſelf, nor to ſay, that he did not Diſſeiſe him with Force*. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 8. cites 22. H. 6. 37.

6. And in Treſpaſs of Graſs ſpoyled, it is no Plea, that Non depaſcit herbas, &c. but ſhall ſay, Not Guilty, by which he was ruled to anſwer, wherefore he *ſaid that D. his Predeceſſor was ſeiſed in Fee in Right of the Church, till by J. S. diſſeiſed, who enfeoffed M. whoſe Eſtate the Plaintiff has, and the Predeceſſor died, and his Succeſſor entered peaceably, abſque hoc*, that he entred with Force, or detained with Force; the Plaintiff, *Proteſtando, that he did not confeſs any Thing by the Defendant alleged, pro placito* [ſaid] *that M. his Mother was ſeiſed and died ſeiſed, and the Land deſcended to the Plaintiff who was ſeiſed, till* by the Defendant, with ſtrong Hand, ouſted the Defendant Proteſtando [that] he did not confeſs ſuch *Deſcent, pro placito [ſaid] that the *Defendant made continual Claim, in which time M. died*, by which the Proteſtation was ouſted as being repugnant; for he confeſſes and avoids the Deſcent by the continual Claim. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 8. cites 22 H. 6. 37.

* The Words in larger Edition of Brooke is (detent) and in both the other Editions is (deſens) but the Year Book is (diſcent).

6. In Treſpaſs upon 5 *R.* 2. 'twas admitted, that *Colour* ſhall be given in this Action, as in Treſpaſs, and the Defendant may plead, *Not Guilty*, and ſo to Iſſue, and admitted there. But 'tis ſaid at this Day, that it is no Plea, but *ſhall ſay*, that *Non ingreſſus eſt contra formam Statuti*. Br. Action Sur le Statute, pl. 29. cites 3. E. 4. 1.

7. Treſpaſs upon the Statute of 5 *R.* 2. *againſt A. B. and C.* which *B. came and pleaded Not Guilty*; and ſo ſee that Not Guilty is a good Iſſue; and *A. and C.* came and *ſaid, that one B. was ſeiſed, and, a long Time before that the Plaintiff any Thing had, infeoffed the ſaid A. and C.* and gave *Colour* to the Plaintiff; and the *Plaintiff ſaid, that this B. is the ſame B. which is one of the Defendants, and they make Title of their own Poſſeſſion*, and yet good; for two may make Title by the third as well as by a Stranger, and

it is well; For there is no Reaſon, that the Name of the Feoffor, put in the Writ by the Plaintiff, ſhall ouſt the Defendants of their bar. Br. Action ſur le Statute, pl. 36. cites 1 E. 5. 4.

(E. a) Pleadings. * *Juſtification.* In what Caſes it is a good Plea.

* See (F. a) pl. 3.

1. IN Action upon the Statute 8 H. 6. the Defendant pleaded that the *Franktenement, at the Time of the Entry ſuppoſed, was in J. N. and that he, as Servant to J. N. and by his Commandment, entered peaceably, Abſque hoc, that he entered with Force*; but this was held no Plea per Cur. and he ſhall *make Title*, becauſe the word *Diſſeiſivit ſuppoſes Franktenement at the Time* &c. in the Plaintiff. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 13. cites 14 H. 6. 16.

S.P. in Treſpaſs upon the Statute 5 R. 2. the Defendant ſaid, that the Place where, &c. is the *Franktenement of J. N. and he, by his Command, enter'd*, and Littleton and Danby Juſtices held it no Plea; for the Action is given by the Statute, and therefore *ought to have a ſpecial Anſwer, and not as in general Writ of Treſpaſs.* Br. Action Sur le Statute, pl. 15. cites 37 H. 6. 31.

2. *Whereupon* the Defendant pleaded, *that J. N. was ſeiſed in Fee, till by the Plaintiff diſſeiſed*, by which the Defendant, *as Servant* of J. N. and by his Command, entered peaceably, *Abſque hoc, that he entered with Force, or Diſſeiſed him with Force*; and per Juyn, if he had ſaid *Abſque hoc, that he diſſeiſed him with Force*, it had been a good Plea. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 13. cites 14 H. 6. 16.

Treſpaſs upon 5 R. 2. by A. The *Defendant ſaid, that R. and W. were ſeiſed, till by the Plaintiff diſſeiſed, upon whom, the Defendant, as Servant to them, and by their Command, enter'd*; the *Plaintiff ſaid, that T. was ſeiſed, till by the ſaid R. and W. diſſeiſed, which R. and W. were ſeiſed, till by the Plaintiff diſſeiſed, upon whom T. re-enter'd and infeoffed the Plaintiff, by which he was ſeiſed till the Defendant did the Treſpaſs*; and by this the bar is *confeſſed and avoided.* Br. Confeſs and Avoid, pl. 48. cites 11 E. 4. 5.

3. In Treſpaſs upon 5 R. 2. the *Defendant ſaid, that the Plaintiff, in the Court of A. was * attached for taking Beaſts, and Diſtreſs awarded, and the Bailiff prayed the Defendant to aid him to aſſiſt the Bailiff to diſtrain the Plaintiff in the Place where the Entry is ſuppoſed, who did ſo*, which is the *ſame* Entry, &c. and per Aſhton and Needham Juſtices, this is no Plea; For by ſuch entry he claims no Intereſt in the Soil, and therefore he does not confeſs and avoid, nor traverſe; by which he ſaid *Abſque hoc, that he entered in any other manner*, and then a good Plea, per Chocke, for the Inſtruction of the Lay Jury if general Iſſue ſhall be joined, but Aſhton and Needham contra; for per Needham, it ſhall be *Abſque hoc, that he entered as the Writ ſuppoſes*; contra Aſhton, therefore quære. Br. Action ſur le Statute, pl. 30. cites 4 E. 4. 13.

Action upon the Statute 5 R. 2. ubi ingreſſus non datur per legem, the *Defendant ſhewed how Replevin was ſued, and returned that the Beaſts were eſloign'd and Withernam was awarded, and he, as Servant and Officer of the Court, enter'd and ſued the Withernam, Abſque hoc, that he ſued as the Writ ſuppoſes*, and by the Opinion of the Juſtices, this is a good Plea. Br. Action Sur le Statute, pl 23. cites 5 E. 4. 34.

4. Treſpaſs upon 5 R. 2. the *Defendant juſtify'd for a Way*; and per Brian and Needham, this is no Juſtification; becauſe he *claims nothing in the Soil of Intereſt*, as Leaſe for Years, &c. nor any Manurance, but Catesby contra, quære. Br. Action Sur le Statute, pl 31. cites 8 E. 4. 8.

5. In Treſpaſs upon 5 R. 2. Ubi ingreſſus non datur per legem *by* 3. Defendant pleaded a *Recovery of the* 3d. *part of the Moiety againſt one of the Plaintiffs, and Execution had*; and 'tis a good Bar. Br. Barre, pl. 83. cites 18 E. 4. 28.

6. The *Defendant juſtified* his Entry *by Common Appendant, Abſque hoc, that he diſſeiſed the Plaintiff.* Per Fiſher, this is no Plea; for Claim of Common *is no Property in the Land*, but per Keble contra; For Common *is Intereſt* in the Land; *contra*, if he enters *to ſee Waſt, or* to *diſtrain, or* if he enters *as Sheriff to ſerve a Writ*, but to enter to have Common of Eſtovers

or of Turbary is a good Plea, and ſo was the Opinion of the Court. Br. Barre, pl. 109. cites 10 H. 7. 9.

*Orig. (bote.)

† All the Editions of Brooke have the Word [Car] or [For]

7. *Confirmation with Warranty* is no Plea in an Action upon the Statute of 5 R. 2. For the *Action is in the Perſonalty*, but he is * put to Writ of Covenant; and where 'tis pleaded by way of Covenant, † he cannot Vouch by it; for the Warranty is Perſonal. Br. Barre, pl. 55. cites 21 H. 7. 32. per Fineux & Brudnell.

8. The King grants *Cuſtodiam Caſtri to A.* and after grants *Caſtrum to B.* and his Heirs; B. ſends his Servants to prepare his Lodgings, &c. A. ſhuts the Door. The Servants of B. break it open and enter. The Poſſeſſion of A. was held the Poſſeſſion of B. and this can only be Treſpaſs to B. their Maſter; and the Commandment of B. is a good Plea to an Indictment by A. Mo. 787. Mich. 4 Jac. in the Starr Chamber. Lady Ruſſel v. Earl of Nottingham.

(F. a) Pleadings. *Traverſe* in what Caſes.

1. IF the Defendant doth *plead Matter in Bar*, yet *he ought*, in the end of his Plea in Bar, *to traverſe* the Entry with Force which is alleged, as to ſay *Abſque hoc, that he did enter with Force*, &c. but yet the Demandant or *Plaintiff ought to anſwer to the ſpecial Matter alleged in the Bar*, without anſwering to the Traverſe with Force, &c. F. N. B. 249. (D).

See (E a) pl. 3.

2. Forcible Entry, *ſuppoſing* him to be *diſſeiſed with Force*; the *Defendant conveyed himſelf in by Diſcent*, by which he entered peaceably, *Abſque hoc, that he entered with Force, or detained with Force*, and no Plea; for the Plaintiff alleged diſſeiſin with Force and not Entry with Force, and alſo the Plaintiff did not allege Detainer with Force, and the *Defendant cannot traverſe that which is not alleged* by the Plaintiff; by which he ſaid, that he did not diſſeiſe with Force, nor detain with Force. Per Newton, this is not good; for it is two Matters; by which he ſaid, Not diſſeiſed with Force, Priſt; and the others e contra. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 12. cites 14 H. 6. 1.

9. The Defendant ſaid, that *J. and S. were ſeiſed, and* thereof *infeoffed T. and P.* in Fee, and he *as Servant*, &c. entered peaceably, and gave Colour to the Plaintiff, *Abſque hoc quod intravit manu forti & ipſum expulit & extra tenuit modo & forma prout, &c. and did not traverſe the Diſſeiſin*, and yet well, becauſe diſſeiſin cannot be but by expulſion, and therefore this word expulit anſwers to it. Br Forcible Entry, pl. 24 cites 1 H. 7. 19.

4. In Forcible Entry, if an *Abatement* be alleged, *and Gift in Tail* by the Abator, and that the Donee died ſeiſed; the dying ſeiſed is *traverſable* and not the Abatement; for the dying ſeiſed takes away the Entry. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 26. cites 3 H. 7. 8.

5. The Court held, that tho' the Conviction was only of Forcible Detainer upon view, yet it was *traverſable* upon the 8 H. 6. 9. *by him that had been 3 Years in quiet Poſſeſſion, as well as upon a finding by Inquiſition*; and that, becauſe the Party is to be impriſoned. 1 Salk. 353. Paſch. 4 Annæ B. R. Queen v. Layton.

(G. a) Pleadings. *Monſtrans* or Profert *of Deeds*. In what Caſes.

1. IN *Treſpaſs* upon the Statute of 8 H. 6. the Defendant pleaded a *Gift in Tail by an Abbot and Covent to A. B.* the *Remainder in Tail to J. S.* and after *A. B. died without Iſſue*, and J. S. entred and died, and one N. entered as Heir in Tail to the ſaid J. S. whoſe Eſtate he hath, which

which N. is yet alive, and gives *Colour* to the Plaintiff; and per Littleton, Choke and Brian J. the Defendant who pleaded ought to ſhew the Deed of Gift; for an Abbot and Covent cannot give but by Deed; and the Defendant ought to ſhew the Deed. Br. Monſtrans. pl. 60. cites 15 E. 4. 16.

(H. a) *Iſſue.* Of what the Iſſue ſhall be.

1. THE *Iſſue* in Forcible Entry of entring with Force, and detaining with Force, *ſhall be always upon the Title, and not upon the Force*; and yet both ſpeak of the Force; but if the Title be found againſt the Defendant, he is eo Facto convicted of the Force; and if the Title be found for the Defendant, he is excuſed of the Force, quod Nota; for ſo it is put in Ure. Br. Forcible Entry pl. 5. cites 21 H. 6. 32.

(I. a) Verdict. How the Jury may find. Supported or intended by it, what; or what is a ſufficient finding.

1. IN Forcible Entry *againſt two*, who pleaded not guilty, it was *found that the one entered with Force, and the other held with Force*; and the Plaintiff recovered againſt both in ſuch a Writ in B. R. per Greenfield, which was not denied. Br. Forcible Entry pl. 15. cites 1 E. 4. 19.

2. Treſpaſs upon 5 *R.* 2. the *Defendant ſaid*, that *Non ingreſſus eſt contra Formam Statuti*; and *'twas found, that in 2 Parts divided from the third Part Non ingreſſus eſt prout*, &c. the *Defendant alleged in Arreſt of Judgment, that it ſhall be intended, that the Plaintiff and Defendant, by this Verdict, are Tenants in Common*; and then this Action does not lie by one Tenant in Common againſt another; and upon good Argument it was *agreed, that it ſhall not be ſo intended*; by which the Plaintiff recovered; quod Nota. Br. Action ſur le Statute pl. 34. cites 21 E. 4. 10.

But if he had *lawful Entry into any Part*, he might enter into the whole; but it ſeems that this is intended *before Partition*. Br. Action ſur le Statute. pl. 34. cites 21 E. 4. 10.

3. Forcible Entry upon 8 H. 6. the Defendant pleaded Not guilty, and 'tis *found*, that the Defendant *diſſeiſed the Plaintiff peaceably, and detained with Force*; and the Plaintiff recovered, per Cur. For the Statute is in the Disjunctive; and if the one Point or other be found, the Plaintiff ſhall recover. Br. Forcible Entry. pl. 14. cites 6 H. 7. 12.

4. Indictment on 8 H. 6. that he *entered with Force, and diſſeiſed H. with Force, and held him out with Force.* The Bill was *found Quoad the Detainment with Force*, and thereupon Reſtitution was awarded. Upon removing the Indictment, Exception was taken, that the Indictment was ill; For it is *not found that he entered peaceably*, as it ought, according to the Words of the Statute. And of that Opinion was the whole Court. Cro. J. 151. Hill. 4 Jac. B. R. Ford's Caſe.——Yelv. 99. S. C.

The Jury on a like Indictment, *found Peaceable Entry and Forcible Detainer*; and therefore it was moved, that no Reſtitution ſhall be, part of the Indictment being found to be falſe. But the Court held clearly, that inaſmuch as the Jury had given their *Verdict as to both*, tho' the Detainer be found peaceable, yet the Indictment is good. *Otherwiſe if* they had given *no Verdict as to the Detainer*, but had omitted it; For there it ſhould be ill, and no Reſtitution ſhould be, according to Ford's Caſe. 1 Sid. 99. Hill. 14 & 15 Car. 2. B. R. The King v. Sadler.——1 Keb. 427. S. C.

5. Indictment laid, that they, *Manu forti, entered upon the Poſſeſſion of J. S. the Farmor of A. B. and diſſeiſed A. B. and him ſo diſſeiſed extra tenuit till the Day of the Inquiſition.* Upon Exception taken, it was agreed per totam Cur. that the Indictment was inſufficient, becauſe they have *not found that J. S. the Farmer was amoved and expulſed*, which is the Force of all the Matter; For the Poſſeſſion of the Farmer or Termor, is the Poſſeſſion

The Concluſion of an Indictment, where a Leſſee for Years is ouſted with Force, ſhall be (*and*

diſſeiſed him in Reverſion) otherwiſe the Indictment is not good, and the *Reſtitution ſhall be made to him in Reverſion*; *and if he will not have Reſtitution, the Leſſee is without Remedy*, and ſo it was ruled. D. 142. a. per Sanders Ch. J. and in Marg. pl. 48. cites Trin. 38 Eliz. B. R. Matthew v. Comber.———* See D. 142. in Marg. pl. 48. cites Paſch. 38 Eliz. Contra. The King v. Loceſter.

ſeſſion of the Reverſioner, *and without ouſting the Leſſee, there can be no Diſſeiſin to him that has the Franktenement*; and the Indictment was diſcharged. Yelv. 165. Mich. 7 Jac. B. R. * Freiſton v. Shellito.

6. *But if the Indictment had not expreſſed J. S. to be Farmer, but generally* that the *Cotage &c. were in his Occupation*; then, per Williams J. the Indictment, which found the Diſſeiſin only, had been good; Becauſe no Title is found in any other but in him only, who is found to be diſſeiſed; But finding J. S. to be Farmer is an Eſtate known and certain, and ſuch Farmer muſt be ejected, otherwiſe he, who has Franktenement, cannot be diſſeiſed. Quod Nota. Per tot. Cur. Yelv. 165. Freiſton v. Shellito.

7. In an Indictment againſt two for a Forcible Detainer upon the 8 H. 6. it was found, *Quod intraverunt & Manu forti extratenuerunt*; it was objected, that the finding Quod intraverunt was not ſufficient *without ſhewing How*, whether *peaceable or with Force*. But per Lea Ch. J. and Houghton and Chamberlaine J. Reſtitution muſt be awarded, for there is no Mean between a Peaceable and Forcible Entry, and both go before the Forcible Detainer found here; and Lea Ch. J. ſaid, that the Word (Peaceable) in the Statute, is to ſupply what was not remedied by 5 R. 2. and he thought the Entry ſhould be intended Vi & Armis. But Doderidge doubted if by the Tenor of the Statute it be good; for there cannot be a Detainer without a tortious Entry, and this Entry might be either with Force or without, and by the Indictment it does not appear what the Entry was. But upon the Opinion of the 3 other Judges, Reſtitution was awarded. Palm. 194. Trin. 19 Jac. B. R. Ld Salisbury v. Sir Anthony Aſhley.

The Indictment was quaſhed, and Reſtitution awarded. 1 Sid. 414. S.C. ——Yelv. 99. Hill 4 Jac. B. R. The King v. Ford, &c. S. P. See pl. 4. ſup.

8. An Indictment of Forcible Entry and Detainer was preferred againſt S. and the *Jury found, as to the Detainer* with Force, *Billa Vera*, but *as to the Entry, Ignoramus*. This upon Exception was held not good; For they ought to have found all or none. 1 Vent. 25. Paſch. 21 Car 2. The King v. Serjeant.

(K. a) Puniſhment thereof, and what ſhall be recovered.

In Treſpaſs upon this Statute, the Plaintiff ſhall *not* recover *Damages for the Iſſues and Profits, but only for the Entry*, quod Nota. Br. Action ſur le Statute. pl. 28. cites 2 E. 4. 23.———Br. Damages pl. 120. cites S. C. For the Action is, that he entred where his Entry is not given by Law.

1. *5 Ric. 2. cap. 7.* Enacts that *none ſhall enter into Lands or Tenements, but where Entry is given by Law, and in a peaceable Manner, upon Pain of* Impriſonment, and ranſomed *at the King's Will.*

But becauſe that Statute provided *no ſpeedy Remedy* in this Point, *nor extended to holding with Force*, nor left any Special Power therein to the Juſtices of Peace in the Country. Whereas the Experience of that unquiet Time, required a more ready Hand to the Suppreſſion of ſuch Diſorder, and Juſtices of Peace were (by 13 Rich. 2. Stat. 1. 7. then newly conſtituted. Lamb. Eiren. 128. ſays that therefore

2. *15 Ric. 2. cap. 2.* Enacted, that *when a Forcible Entry is made into Lands, Beneſices, or Offices of the Church, one or more Juſtices of the Peace taking ſufficient Power, and going to the Place ſo kept by Force, and finding any that hold ſuch Place Forcibly, may* commit *the Offender to the next Gaol, there to remain Convict by the Record of the Juſtice till he hath made* Fine and Ranſom *to the King; And all People in the County ſhall be aſſiſting to the Juſtice to arreſt ſuch Offender upon Pain of Fine and Impriſonment.*

But

But yet again foraſmuch as this laſt Statute did *not extend to thoſe that entred peaceably, and then held with Force, nor* yet *reached* to the Offenders, if they were *removed* before the Coming of the Juſtices, *nor made Reſtitution* of the Poſſeſſion ſo Forcibly gotten; nor gave any Pain againſt the Sheriff that did not obey the Precepts of the Juſtices in this Behalf. Lamb. Eiren. 129. ſays that therefore.

3. 8 *H.* 6. *cap.* 9. §. 2. Enacted that *upon Complaint made to the Juſtices of Peace, or one of them, of a Forcible Entry or Detainer by the Party grieved, they or one of them ſhall cauſe the Statute of* 15 *Ric.* 2. 2. *to be duly executed at the Coſts of the Party grieved.*

If, upon Diſtreſs of Rent by Jointenant Survivor, for Rent due in the Tenements of his Companion deceaſed, Reſcous be made, and *not Vi & Armis*, the Plaintiff ſhall recover but *ſingle Damages*, and if 'twas Vi & Armis, then *treble Damages* by this Statute. Br. Aſſiſe. pl. 7. cites 33 H. 6. 20.

§. 6. *And if any Perſon be put out or diſſeiſed of any Lands or Tenements in Forcible Manner, or put out peaceably, and afterwards holden out with Force, or after ſuch Entry any Feoffment or Diſcontinuance thereof be made to defraud the Right of the Poſſeſſor; the Party grieved ſhall have* Aſſiſe of Novel Diſſeiſin, or *a Writ of* Treſpaſs *againſt ſuch Diſſeiſor; and if the Party grieved recover, and if it be found by Verdict* * *or in other Manner, that the Defendant entered with Force, or after his Entry did hold with Force; the Plaintiff ſhall recover* treble Damages, *and make Fine and Ranſom to the King.*

In Treſpaſs on this Statute of *ouſting with Force, and holding out with Force*, per Needham & Moyle, he ſhall not have any *Damages*, For the Statute is in the *Diſjunctive*, where he is ouſted by Force, or if he be ouſted peaceably and held out with Force; to which Danby and Choke agreed. Br. Forcible Entry pl. 17. cites 10 E. 4. 11.

* *In Treſpaſs or Aſſiſe* upon this Statute, the Defendant is condemned by *non ſum informatus*: He ſhall pay *treble Damages and treble Coſts*; ſo adjudged and affirmed, in Error. The Words of the Statute gives them, where the Recovery is by *Verdict, or otherwiſe, in due Manner*; and this Judgment is in due Manner, tho' not by Verdict. Jenk. 197. pl. 8.

4. Where the Writ is, that *Vi diſſeſivit & Vi tenuit*, and this is found, the Plaintiff ſhall recover *treble Damages for the Diſſeiſin* with Force, *and alſo* treble Damages *for the Detainer* with Force, per Paſton; but Cot. e contra. Br. Forcible Entry. pl. 13. cites 14 H. 6 16.

5. For Entry to the Damage of &c. *found* for the Plaintiff *to the Damage of* 20 *l.* and the Court awarded that the Plaintiff recover the 20 *l.* taxed by the Jury, and 40 *l.* over by the Statute, viz. 60 *l.* in the whole for *treble Damages*; and that the Defendant capiatur, quod Nota, and therefore he ſhall be fined. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 3. cites 19 H. 6. 6. Br. Damages pl. 10. cites S. C.

6 In Forcible Entry, the *Defendant* pleaded Not guilty, and *was found Guilty to the Damage of* 100 *l. viz.* 80 *l. for the Tort, and* 20 *l. for the Coſts*, and with great Deliberation, the Plaintiff *recovered* 300 *l.* notwithſtanding that treble Damages are given by the Statute; and ſo he recovered *treble Damages and treble Coſts*, quod Nota. Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 9. cites 22 H. 6. 57.

7. Forcible Entry againſt ſeveral, and the Plaintiff counted according to the Statute, and upon this they were at *general Iſſue*, and *found that ſome entered with Force and held peaceably, and ſome entered peaceably and held with Force*, and taxed the Damages *ſeverally*; by which he had *ſeveral Judgments of treble Damages* againſt the one, and the like alſo againſt the other; *and* that he recover the *Coſts* of his Suit, and yet contrary in Waſte, for there are no Coſts; and in this Caſe the Plaintiff was amerced, Br. Forcible Entry, pl. 4. cites 19 H. 6. 32. Br. Damages pl. 11. cites S. C. & P. as to the Damages.

8. If a Man enters with Force into Lands or Tenements, into which he *hath Title and Right of Entry*, and puts the Tenant of the Freehold out of thoſe Lands or Tenements; in this Action of Forcible Entry, the Plaintiff ſhall recover *treble Damages*, as well *for the occupying the Lands, as for* the firſt *Entry* therein. F. N. B. 248. (H).

9. If a Man enters and diſſeiſeth another by Force, and afterwards the *Diſſeiſee re-entreth* again; *yet* the *Diſſeiſee may bring his Action* of Forcible

Entry, *and recover his treble Damages*, altho' he be ſeiſed of the Land at the Time of the Action brought. F. N. B. 249 (C).

10. If a Man *enters* with Force, *and detains with Force* any Lands or Tenements, the Party may have his Action upon the *Statute of Northampton*, made An. 2 *E.* 3. *c.* 3. F. N. B. 249 (E).

11. Per Cur. not only the *Coſts aſſeſſed by the Jury*, but alſo thoſe which were adjudged *de Incremento*, ſhall be *trebled*, and the Party ſo convicted of the Force at the Suit of the Party ſhould be *fined*, *tho' fined before* on Indictment for the ſame Force. Paſch. 28 Eliz. C. B. Le. 282. Rollſton v. Chambers.

12. Termor paid his Rent unto B. for 15 Years, and at the End of the Term, he kept it againſt him to whom he had ſo long payed his Rent; this was adjudged a Forcible Detainment; and for this Offence he was fined in the Star Chamber 500 *l.* Cro. J. 199. Mich. 5 Jac. in the Star Chamber. Snigg v. Shirton.

17 H. 7. 17. a. b. 21 H. 6. 39. b. F. N. B. 249 (D) Bro. Force. 5, 11, 29.

13. In an *Action* of Forcible Entry grounded on thoſe Laws, if the *Defendant make himſelf a Title which is found for him*, he ſhall be diſmiſſed without any Inquiry concerning the Force; for howſoever he may be *puniſhable at the King's Suit* for doing what is prohibited by Statute, as a Contemner of the Laws and Diſturber of the Peace; yet he ſhall *not* be *liable to pay any Damages* for it *to the Plaintiff*, whoſe Injuſtice gave him the Provocation in that Manner to right himſelf. 1 Hawk. Pl. C. 141. cap. 64. §. 3. cites the Books in the Margin.

Foreign.

(A) Foreign Courts. Decrees, Judgments &c. there, How far binding or Regarded here.

Vid. 2 Ch. Caſes. 238. Mich. 29 Car. 2.

1. THE Ship being unladen at *Barcelona*, where the Freight was payable by the Charter Party, the Factor refuſing to pay the Freight, the Maſter of the Ship litigated there in the Admiralty for it; and the Cauſe was heard, and Judgment there given, that the Maſter ſhould have his Freight, but that the Damages the Goods had ſuſtained in the Voyage, by Reaſon of the Deviation, ſhould be deducted, and the *Account transferred to the Deliquidators*, (who are in the Nature of our Maſters in Chancery) to take the Account, and the Money ordered to be brought into Court; But the Factor had appealed to a higher Court there. Ld Chancellor declared, that he would not ſlight their Proceedings beyond Sea; and if in this Caſe the Damages had been there aſcertained, or a *peremptory Sentence given*, the ſame ſhould have been concluſive to all Parties: But it appearing, the *Factor was a Native* of that Place, and therefore, in all probability, might againſt Juſtice prevail, and Defendant being willing to deſiſt his Suit there, his Lordſhip directed a Trial here by Jury, to aſcertain the Damages ſuſtained by the Deviation. Mich. 1681. Vern. 21. Newland v. Horſeman.

(B) Foreign Lands. Judgments, &c. of Things done there.

1. A. was ſued in the Admiralty upon an *Obligation* ſuppoſed to be *made and delivered in France*, and now he prayed a Prohibition; Per Cur', ſuch a Bond may be ſued here in B. R. but being begun in the Admiralty, we cannot prohibit them, becauſe perhaps the Witneſſes of the Plaintiff are beyond Sea, which may be examined there but not here. 3 Le. 232. Mich. 31 Eliz. B. R. Delabrock v. Barney.

(C) Foreign Laws and Cuſtoms. How far regarded here.

1. ON *Marriage* of two French People in *France* the *Contract* was, *That the Husband, ſurviving the Wife, ſhould have two thirds* of her Fortune for Life, (whereas *by the Cuſtom of Paris*, where they married, *the Husband ſurviving, is to have but a Moiety)* and 300 Livres in the firſt Place by way of Preſent, *and that the reſt ſhould go according to the Cuſtom of Paris.* Afterwards they fled hither from the Perſecution, and ſeveral Years after the Wife died. Her Relations brought a Bill for an Account of the Eſtate, and to have the Benefit of the Contract. It was objected, that they could not bring over the French Law hither, but muſt now be governed *by the Laws of England*; *the Husband ſurviving is intitled to all the Wife's Perſonalty*, or that at leaſt there was no Colour to carry it further than the Sum ſtipulated in the Contract, and not to that which was left to go according to the Cuſtom of Paris, which is only a local Law, and ſo could have no Benefit of it here. It was anſwered, that Marriage Contracts are to be ſupported in all Countries, without Regard to the Place where made, and that this Contract extended to the whole Fortune of the Wife, and not only to the Particulars mentioned, and the ſaying that the Reſt ſhould go according to the Cuſtom of Paris, is as much as if the Cuſtom had been recited at large, and that the Fortune ſhould go ſo. Ld Keeper decreed Relief only as to the Sum ſtipulated; But on Appeal to the Lords they had Relief for the Whole. Chan. Prec. 207. Mich. 1702. Feaubert v. Turſt.

S. C. cited in a Caſe of Marriage Articles made *in Holland*, and that by the Law of Holland, *Marriage Articles take Place of any other Debts*, and it was inſiſted, that therefore they ſhould be conſtrued here, according to the Law of Holland, where they appear'd to have been made. But it was anſwered, and ſo Ruled, that it *ought to have been proved* in this Caſe, *what is the Law of Holland*, as in the Caſe of Foubert and Turſt, it was proved, what was the Law of France, *without which Proofs, our Courts cannot take Notice of Foreign Laws.* Wms's. Rep. 451. Paſch. 1718. Freemoult v. Dedire.

(D) Foreign Money.

1. WHEN one Demands Foreign Coin in Specie, the Writ ought to be in the *Detinet* only; but when the Value of it in Engliſh Silver is demanded, it may be in the *Debet & Detinet.* per Counſel, to which Holt and Eyre, J. ſeemed to agree, and by Eyre, J. *Guineas* are as Foreign Coin. Lutw. 488. Mich. 5 W. & M. in Caſe of Pope v. St. Leger.——Jo. 69. Paſch. 1 Car. B.R. Ward v. Kedgrove al. Kedgerow.

It ought to be in the Detinet only, and they may *Count of the Value.* per Holt, Ch. J. Skin. 573. in Caſe of St Leiger v. Pope.———Per Holt Ch. J. They muſt *demand Engliſh Money*, and not Foreign Money, and they are to value it according to the Value it bears here in England; but if a Man will bring an *Action* for for Foreign Money, it muſt be *Detinue.* 12 Mod. 541. Trin. 13 W. 3. B R. Brown v. Gullock.

(E)

(E) Foreign Plantations. Barbadoes, &c.

S. C. cited Parl Cafes 33. and cites alſo 21 H. 7. 3 that

1. A *Writ of Error* lies here upon any of their ultimate Judgments in Barbadoes, viz in any Dominions belonging to England. Vaugh. 402. in Caſe of Proceſs into Wales.

it doth ſo to all ſubordinate Dominions, tho' the Diſtance of the Place prevents the common Uſe of ſuch Writ, yet by Vaughan's Opinion it clearly lies. Parl. Caſes. 33. in Caſe of Dutton v. Witham.

2. In Barbadoes they *have Laws different from ours*, as that a Deed ſhall bind a Feme Covert, &c. 2 Mod. 46. Trin. 37 Car. 2. C. B. Arg. in Caſe of Dawes v. Pindar.

3. An *Appeal* lies from thoſe Lands to the King in Council here, but that is by Conſtitutions of their own. Arg. 2 Mod. 46. in Caſe of Daws v. Pindar.

But in Writ of Error in the Houſe of Lords, it was argued, that tho' it

4. The King *Conſtituted a Governor and Council of State of Barbadoes.* In Action of falſe Impriſonment brought againſt the Govenor for Impriſoning the Plaintiff by Order of the Council Judgment was given for the Plaintiff in B. R. Hill. 3 Jac. 2. 3 Mod. 159. Witham v. Dutton.

did not appear, that the King gave any Authorty to the Governor and Council to commit, yet 'tis *Incident* to their Authority, *as being a Council of State*; the Council here in England commit no otherwiſe. And where the Commitment is not authorized by Law, the King's Patent gives no Power for it. But the Government muſt be very weak, where the Council of State cannot commit a Delinquent, ſo as to be forth coming to another Court that can puniſh his Delinquency. And therefore prayed that the Judgment ſhould be reverſed, and the ſame was accordingly reverſed. Parl. Caſes 34. Dutton v. Witham, Howell & al.

5. Theſe Plantations are *Parcel of the Realm*, as County Palatines are; their Rights and Intereſt are every Day determined in *Chancery* here, only that, for Neceſſity and Incouragement of Trade, they make *Plantation Lands as Aſſets* in certain Caſes to pay Debts; in all other Things they make Rules for them, according to the common Courſe of Engliſh Equity. Arg. Parl. Caſes 33. in Caſe of Dutton v. Howell, Witham & al.

To make a Plantation in Barbadoes, liable to a Debt contracted here, 'tis ſaid, the Method is by Procura-

6. 'Twas inſiſted by Council, that by the Cuſtom of the Iſland of Barbadoes, a Plantation there, tho' it be a *Fee Simple* Eſtate, is in the firſt Place *liable to the Payment of Debts*, ſo that the Owner cannot, by his Will, ſo deviſe his Plantation, but that will be liable to the Payment of his Debts; but theſe Debts muſt be either Debts *contracted on the Place*, *or* elſewhere, for Matters *relating to the Plantation*, &c. Paſch. 1687. Vern. R. 453. Noel v. Robinſon.

tion from hence under the *Seal of the Mayor of London*, and getting that Recorded there; or an acknowledgment of the Debt by the Owner of the Plantation upon the Place will do it. Trin. 1687. Vern. 469. Noel v. Robinſon.

7. A. recovered a Debt contracted here againſt an Executor of an Owner of a Plantation in Barbadoes, and brought an Action of *Trover*, and had Judgment for the *fourth Part of a Negro*. Arg. Paſch. 1687. Vern. 453. cited as Serj. Maynard's Caſe.

8. A Plantation in Barbadoes is not a *Teſtamentary Eſtate* by the Laws now in Force. per Cur' Trin. 1687. Vern. 469. Noel v. Robinſon.

9. In Barbadoes, all *Freeholds* are ſubject to Debts, and are eſteemed *as Chattels 'till the Creditors are ſatisfied*, and then the Lands deſcend to the Heir. 4 Mod. 226. 5 W. & M. B. R. in Caſe of Blankard v. Guldy.

(F) Foreign Plantations. Jamaica and others.

1. A Plaintiff may *Sue in* the Admiral *Court*, if he will ſuppoſe the Contract in Virginia. But if he *ſuppoſes the Contract in England*, he may ſue here. But if part of the Contract be here, and part over the Sea in Virginia, or upon the Sea, the common Law only ſhall have Juriſdiction, and thoſe are the true Differences. Per Jones, J. 2. Roll. R. 492. Hill. 22 Jac. B R. Capp's Caſe.

2. The Reaſon why an *Ejectment will not by* of Lands in Jamaica, or any of the King's Foreign Territories is, becauſe the Courts here cannot command them to do Execution there; For they have no Sheriffs. Per Twiſden J. Vent. 59. Hill. 21 and 22 Car. 2. B. R. Criſp v. the Mayor, &c. of Barwick.

3. The Court cannot Judge of the *Uſualneſs of Covenants* of Lands lying in Jamaica, but they muſt be tried by Jury. 2 Mod. 240. Trin. 29 Car. 2. C. B. Goſſe v. Elkin.

4. Lands lying in Jamaica paſs by Grant, and no *Livery and Seiſin* is neceſſary. 2 Mod. 240. Trin. 29 Car. 2. C. B. in Caſe of Goſſe v. Elkin.

5. *Treaſon* done in Carolina, in raiſing a Rebellion there, may be tried in *Middleſex*, by 25 *H.* 8. 2. 3 Salk. 358. Mich. 1 W. & M. The King v. Speke.

6. If a Man *lives in New York, and would paſs Land in England*, 'tis uſual to *join a nominal Perſon* with him in the Deed, who acknowledges it here, and it binds. 1 Salk. 389. Mich. 8 W. 3. B. R. Tailor v. Jones.

7. Laws of England do not extend to *Virginia*, being a conquered Country; their *Law* is what the King pleaſes. per Holt. Ch. J. 2 Salk. 666. Smith v. Brown and Cooper.

(G) Foreign Plantations. Actions for Matters there. In what Caſes may be brought here.

1. Leſſor brought Debt againſt Leſſee for Rent, upon a Demiſe of Lands in Jamaica, and laid his *Action in London*; Defendant pleaded, that the Lands were in Jamaica, and that there are Courts there, &c. that if Entry and Ouſter were pleaded, it could not be tried here, and that the Right of Plaintiff and Defendant depending on Foreign Laws, cannot be given in Evidence here. And per Cur. Where an Action is local, it muſt be laid accordingly. Therefore if the Leſſor declares on the *Privity of Eſtate*, and that lies in Ireland, &c. the Action muſt be brought there; For the Eſtate is *local*, therefore ſuch Leſſor cannot maintain *Debt* here, againſt an Aſſignee of a Term in Ireland; For the Action is founded on a Privity of Eſtate, otherwiſe where 'tis founded on a *Privity of Contract*, which is Tranſitory, as Debt for Rent by Leſſor againſt Leſſee, for that may be maintained where the Land lies not; and if *a Foreign Iſſue*, which is local, ſhould happen, it may be tried where the Action is laid; For that Purpoſe there may be a Suggeſtion entered on the Roll, that ſuch a Place in ſuch a County is next adjacent, and it may be tried here by a Jury from that Place, according to the Laws of that Country, and on *Nil Debet* pleaded, you may give the Laws of that Country in Evidence. 2 Salk. 651. Trin. 3 Annæ. B. R. Way v. Yally. 6 Mod. 194. Wey v. Yally.

(H) Foreign Plantations. Governed by what Laws.

1. IF there be a *new uninhabited Country found out by Engliſh Subjects*, as the Law is the Birth-Right of every Subject, ſo where-ever they go, they carry their Laws with them, and therefore ſuch newfound Country *is to be governed by the Laws of England*. 2 Wms's. Rep. 75. ſays it was ſaid by the Maſter of the Rolls. 9 Auguſt, 1722. to have been ſo determined by the Lords of the Privy Council upon Appeal.

2. *But* after ſuch Country is Inhabited by the Engliſh, *Acts* of Parliament, *made in England, will not bind them without naming* the Foreign Plantations. Ibid.

3. *Therefore* it has been determined, that the Statute *of Frauds* and Perjuries, which *requires three Witneſſes to a Will*, and that theſe ſhould ſubſcribe in the Teſtator's Preſence, in Caſe *of a Deviſe of Land*, does not bind Barbadoes. Ibid.

(I) * Foreign States.

* See (A)(B) —See Admiralty.

1. A. *By Authority of the King of Denmark*, ſeiſed and *condemned Goods* in ſome of the Dominions of the King of Denmark, according to the Law of that Country, and coming into England was *proſecuted here for the ſame*. The Court thought this was a Matter of State, and concerned the Juſtice of another King in Amity with the King of England, and that what was done *was according to their Law*, and that 'twas not properly triable here, whether the King of Denmark had Power to make ſuch a Grant, and decreed a perpetual Injunction. Mich. 26 Car. 2. Fin. R. 186. Badtolph v. Bamfield & al.

2. If a Man obtains a Judgment or *Sentence in France*, yet here the Debt muſt be conſidered as a Debt by Simple Contract. He can maintain no Action here, but an Indeb. Aſſ. or an Inſimul Computaſſet, &c. tho' both Parties were *Foreigners*, that will not help the Plaintiff. per Lord Keeper. Hill. 1705. 2 Vern. R. 541. Duplein v. De-Roven.

3. Where a *Foreign Court has Juriſdiction* of a Cauſe, *and the Perſons are within it*, the Santence muſt bind without regard to what Law is here; and the Sentence appearing, is not to be controlled by Evidence, that the Law is not ſo there. Sel. Ch. Ca. in Ld King's Time. 69 Mich. 1726. Burrows v. Jemineau.

Foreigners.

(A) Suits by them.

1. THE Plaintiffs, being Creditors of Colley, preferred their Bill againſt the Defendant, being all Foreigners, but the Goods were paſſed over into England, into Merchants Hands by Colley, and this Court taking Notice, in reſpect of the *different Computation of the Realm*, firſt, *to be paid at the Feaſt of the three Kings Heads*, ſecondly, becauſe the *Bill was not ſealed*, thirdly, becauſe the *Debts grew in France*, and he came over hither to keep his Body from Arreſts, the Court decreed the Debts, and cauſed a *Decree* to be drawn up *pro Confeſſo*, *becauſe the Defendant would not anſwer*, and ſequeſtred Monies in other Mens Hands, to pay the Debts, altho' they were paſſed over to others, to the Uſe of an Infant. Toth. 131, 132. cites 8 Jac. Sere & Eland v. Colley.

2. The

2. The Plaintiff being a Dutch Woman brought 4000 *l.* Portion to her *Husband*, who *agreed* with her *before Marriage, to leave a compleat Maintenance for herſelf and her Children*, but *not expreſſing what*; the Marriage took Effect, but he declining in Eſtate, her Friends called on him; and he thereupon aſſigned certain Bonds, wherein M. was bound to him, and a Letter of Attorney was made after to S. to receive the Money upon the Bonds, who received the Money of him. The Bill was to have the Money from M. and S.—M. by Plea ſets forth the Payment to S. and that he had no Notice of the Aſſignment of the Bonds. And this was allowed a good Plea for M. But S. pleaded a Letter of Attorney, and Payment to him on good Conſideration, but did not deny Notice, and therefore his Plea diſallowed, and the *Agreement and Aſſignment of the Debt in Holland*, where ſuch Agreement between Husband and Wife, and ſuch Aſſignment of Bonds are good, they are to be *allowed* here; by the Lord Keeper. Chan. Caſes. 232. Trin. 26. Car. 2. Aſhcomb's Caſe.

Foreign Plea.

(A) In Civil Caſes. What; and how granted, and received,

1. 6 *R.* 2. 2. IF *in Writ of* Debt Account, and the like, *it ſhall be declared, that the* Contract thereof was made in another County *than is contained in the Original Writ, ſuch Writ ſhall be abated.*

But at the Common Law, one that had a *particular Juriſdiction* to hold Plea of Debt, Contract, Detinue, Covenant or Treſpaſs within his Manor, &c. could not hold Plea of a Debt, Contract, &c. *alleged to be made out of* the Manor, &c. Becauſe albeit it was tranſitory, yet (being ſo alleged) it was not within his Power or Juriſdiction, which he had by Preſcription or Grant. For all Pleas holden there, muſt be *Infra Juriſdictionem Curiæ.* 2 Inſt. 231.

As if a Lord had *Probate of Teſtament*, made within the Precinct of his Manor, he cannot prove a Teſtament, made out of the Precinct of it. 2 Inſt. 231.

So of the Court of *Piepowders of Contracts*, &c. made out of the Fair or Market, &c. 2 Inſt. 231.

But before this Statute, Writ of *Debt, and Account againſt a Receiver*, and ſuch like Actions might be brought in any County, where the Party might be beſt brought in to anſwer, and the Plaintiff might have counted of a Contract or Receipt, &c. in any other County; becauſe *Debitum & Contractus, &c. ſunt nullius loci.* 7 Rep. 3. Mich. 26 and 27 Eliz. in Bulwer's Caſe. cites 2 E. 3. 44. 6 E. 3. 266. and 275. 8 E. 3. 380. 10 E. 3. 7. 19 E. 3. Juriſd. 29. 29 E. 3. 26. 33 E. 3. Juriſd. 57. 40 E. 3. 7. 3 H. 6. 30. 5 E. 4. 19. 21 E. 4. 88

In Debt *upon Bond*, the Defendant *pleaded*, that it was *made in another County* than is alleged in the Declaration, and prayed, that the Attorney might be examined thereupon, by Force of this Statute. The Plaintiff demurred, as if it had been a Plea in Bar to the Action, and Defendant joined and concluded, *quod ab Actione precludatur.* But it was reſolved, that the Plea was Ill, and not warranted by the Statute, which *provides only, that the Original ſhall not be laid in one County and the Declaration upon a Bond made in another*, and if ſo, that the Writ ſhall abate; and this Courſe of pleading had been diſallowed. cites 3 H. 6. 35. And ſecondly, becauſe the *Demurrer was joined as to the Action*, Judgment was given, Quod Recuparet, &c. Allen. 17 Hill. 22 Car. 2. Shalmer v. Slingsby.

2. Debt upon a *Bond* in Banco, and counted that it was *made in London*; Paſton pray'd Judgment of the Writ, for that he has a *Plaint* upon the ſame Bond yet *pending in N. by which he ſuppoſes the Bond to be made at N.* Judgment of the Writ, & non allocatur; for it is out of the Caſe of the Statute of 6 *R.* 2. *c.* 2. that if a Man brings Action in one County, and declares in another, his Writ ſhall abate, but *here he declares in the ſame County.* Br. Brief. pl. 8. cites 3 H. 6. 15.

3. *Debt in the County of N.* and *declared at H.* where *it extended into the County of N. and of L.* and the *Defendant ſaid, that* the Bond upon which he declares *was made in the County of L.* Judgment of the Writ, by reaſon of the Statute of 6 *R.* 2. *c.* 2. and per Martin, this is a good Plea; by which

which Rolf paſſed over, quod Mirum; For the Statute is no other, but where a Man brings Action in one County, and declares in another, that the Writ ſhall abate, but *here he declares in the ſame County*. Br. Brief. pl. 10. cites 3 H. 6. 35.

4. If Defendant in a Corporation Court pleads a Foreign Plea, which is *collateral*, *as in Debt upon Bond*, if he pleads *Releaſe* made in a Place *out of the Juriſdiction* of the Court, it need not be received without Oath. Litt. R. 236. Mich. 4 Car. C. B. Corporation Court.

5. *But* if *in Covenant or Debt for Money; to be paid at another Place; he he pleads Payment accordingly*, or the Covenants performed in the Place limited, which was out of their Juriſdiction, it ought to be received *without Oath*. Agreed by all the Juſtices. Quod Nota. Ibid.

If the Action be tranſitory, and Defendant carries it into another County, the Plea is naught, except in *Special Caſes*; *But if the Action be local*, the removing it into another County, than where the Plaintiff has laid it, it is properly a Foreign Plea, which is not done in the Principal Caſe; For there the Action is laid in Cheſhire, and the Defendant does not in his Plea remove it thence. Quod Curia Conceſſit, and ſo Judgment ſet aſide. 12 Mod. 123. Paſch. 9 W. 3. Cholmley v. Bloom.

6. If Defendant plead a Foreign Plea, which is *tranſitory*, the Plaintiff may *demur* to it. But if it be *not tranſitory*, it muſt be *upon Oath*, otherwiſe it will not be received. Sid. 234. Mich. 16 Car. B. R. Collins v. Sutton.

* S. P. and ſays, that many Inſtances may be given of Foreign Pleas, which, if *not collateral to the Action*, muſt be received without Oath.

7. If it *appears by the Declaration, that the Money was to be paid out of the Juriſdiction* of the Court, the Judgment is not good; and 'tis not neceſſary to *ſwear* the Plea, if it appears *on the *Obligation*, that the Money was to be paid out of the Juriſdiction of the Court, and he *pleads Payment according* to the Condition. But if one *will not ſwear* a Foreign Plea, where he ought to do it, the Plaintiff may enter Judgment on a *Nihil Dicit*, for ſuch a Foreign Plea, not Sworn, is no Plea upon the Matter. Sti. 225. Trin. 1650. Dudeny v. Collier.

5 Mod. 335. Cholmondley v. Broom.

8. A Prohibition was pray'd to the Court of the Compter, to an Action of *Debt* there commenced; for that the Defendant had *pleaded before Imparlance*, That *the Cauſe of Action did ariſe at a Place out of their Juriſdiction*, and offered to have ſworn his Plea, and they refuſed to accept this Plea; and a Prohibition was granted; For Inferior Courts have not Cognizance of *tranſitory Things*, which ariſe out of their Juriſdiction, as F. N. B. 45. is: But then 'tis not ſufficient to ſurmiſe ſuch Matter for a Prohibition, but a *Plea* to that Effect *muſt be tender'd in the Inferior Court*, and that *before any Imparlance* taken, (whereby the Juriſdiction would be admitted) and it muſt be *upon Oath*; and then if refuſed, a Prohibition ſhall be granted; or upon ſuch refuſal, a Bill of Exceptions may be made, and Error aſſigned. Vent. 180. Hill. 23 and 24 Car. 2. B. R. St. Aubin v. Cox.

12 Mod. 123. S. C. But vid. Mod. 81

9. A Foreign Plea *is*, where the Action is carried out of the County where 'tis laid, and is to be *Sworn*, which a Plea to the Juriſdiction is not. Carth. 402. Paſch. 9 W. 3. B. R. Cholmly v. Broom.

10. *Debt* was brought *in B. R. on a Bond* made *at Cheſter*; The Defendant did not imparle, but *pleaded* by Attorney, *that he is, and at the Time of the Action* brought, *was an Inhabitant, and notoriouſly Converſant at Nantwich, within the County Palatine of Cheſter*, and ſo pray'd Judgment if the Court of B. R. ought to hold Plea of this Matter. But the Plaintiff taking this to be a Foreign Plea ſigned Judgment, becauſe it was not ſworn to. And to ſet aſide this Judgment, it was inſiſted, that tho' this is a Plea to the Juriſdiction, yet it is not a Foreign Plea, and therefore need not be ſworn to. And accordingly the Judgment was ſet aſide. Vid. Carth. 402. Paſch. 9 W. 3. B. R. Chumley v. Broom: and

and 5 Mod. 335. Cholmondley v. Broom. S. C.———and 12 Mod. 123. Cholmeley v. Bloom. S. C.

11. *Ancient Demeſne*, and all *Pleas of Privilege*, are Pleas to the Juriſdiction, and not Foreign Pleas, and therefore not to be ſworn to, but may be received without an Oath. Arg. and Judgment accordingly. 5 Mod. 335. Cholmondley v. Broom. 12 Mod. 123 S. C. and P.

12. *Debt* was brought *in London*. A *Prohibition* was moved for, and granted *Niſi*, upon Suggeſtion that the Defendant had tendered for Plea below, that the Cauſe did ariſe out of their Juriſdiction, and offered to make Oath of the Truth of it. Now it was *ſhewed*, *that he tendered the Plea after the Court was up*, whereas it *ſhould be*, *in Propria Perſona*, *and in Court*. And tho' an Affidavit was offered in B. R. of the Truth of the Plea, and one * **Turner's** Caſe, 4 Jac. 2. was cited out of Lutwitch, where a Prohibition had been granted *upon Affidavit in B. R. without Oath below*, yet by three Juſtices abſente Holt, the Rule was diſcharged. For in all Pleas that ouſt a Court of Juriſdiction, whether Inferior or Superior, there *muſt be Oath*, *in that very Court*, *of the Truth of Plea*. 6 Mod. 146. Paſch. 3 Annæ. B. R. Sparks v. Wood. * Lutw. 1023. Turner v. Weſton.

(B) When and how Granted.

1. IN Debt, if the *Defendant pleads Foreign Plea in another County in Perſon*, he ſhall not be examined, but if it be by Attorney, the Attorney ſhall be examined. But in this Caſe they uſe to examine the Party at this Day without Oath. Br. Examination. pl. 23. cites 20 E. 4. 10.

2. If one be ſued *in an Inferior Court*, for a Matter out of the Juriſdiction, the Defendant may either have a *Prohibition from one of the common Law Courts*, *or may*, if it happen *in the Vacation*, and it happens then, when the Chancery only is open, *move the Court of Chancery for a Prohibition*, but then it muſt appear *upon Oath* made, *that the Matter aroſe out of the Juriſdiction*, *and that the Defendant tendered a Foreign Plea*, *which was refuſed*. Wms's. Rep. 476. Trin. 1718. Anon.

3. *But if* a Prohibition has been *granted Improvide*, and without theſe Circumſtances, the *Court will grant a Superſedeas* thereto. Ibid.

4. *But if* it ſhall *appear on the Face of the Declaration*, that the Matter is *out of the Juriſdiction* of the Court, *then* a Prohibition will be granted *without Oath* of having tender'd a Foreign Plea. And in theſe Caſes Equity imitates the Common Law. Ibid. 477.

5. *And* in a late Caſe, which was moved the laſt Seal after Trinity Term, where the Court had granted a Prohibition to an Action in the Courts of London, upon an Affidavit, that the Matter aroſe out of the Juriſdiction, it appearing at another Day, that the *Defendant had imparl'd generally*, (which admitted the Juriſdiction) and ſo could not afterwards be allowed to plead a Foreign Plea, the Court granted a *Superſedeas* to the Writ of Prohibition. Ibid. 477.

(C) Foreign Plea. In Criminal Caſes.

1. 4 *H.* 8. 2. *Where a Murderer or Felon*, (*to delay his Arraignment*) *pleads that he was taken out of a privileged Place*, *in a Foreign County*, *and it is alleged by the King's Attorney*, (*or ſome other in the King's Behalf*) *that he was taken in the County where he is ſo to be arraigned*, *they ſhall be tried by the Inqueſt who are to try the Murder or Felony*, *and before the ſame Juſtice*, *and if it be found that he was taken in the ſame County*, *ſuch Foreign Plea ſhall do him no Advantage or Benefit*.

Foreſt.

(A) Foreſt, Park, Chaſe, &c.

1. THE Parker may receive Beaſts **into the Park**, to Paſture for Money. 46 E. 3. 12. b.

2. But **the Parker** cannot give Power **to another** to cut the Branches of the Trees, **without the Aſſent of his Maſter**, 46 E. 3. 12. b.

(B) Parke, Chaſe. By whom it may be made.

1. NONE **can make a Park** without Licence of the King, **becauſe it is to appropriate Things which are Fere Nature & nullius in Bonis to himſelf.** 11 **Rep.** 87. b. **Monopolies**, 18 H. 6. 21.

Nor a Warren or Chaſe; and if he does it of his own Head in a *Quo Warranto*, they ſhall be ſeiſed into the King's Hands. 11 Rep. 86 in the Caſe of Monopolies.—87. b. ibid.——2 Inſt. 199.

*Trin. 44. Eliz. 3.

2. So **none can make a Chaſe without Licence of the King.** 11 **Rep.** 87. b. * **Monopolies.**

(C) Law of the Foreſt.

1. *Juſtices of Foreſt ſhall have Determination of Hart Proclaim'd killed*, and *not the King's Bench*; and therefore the Defendant may plead to the Juriſdiction. Per Fineux Ch. J. Br. Juriſdiction, pl. 55. cites 21 H. 7. 30.

2. The Foreſt Law *is not the Common Law of the Land*, and we are not bound to take Notice of it, but it ought to be pleaded. Trin. 29 Eliz. C. B. 2 Le. 209. Ruſſel v. Broker.

3. The Earl of Lancaſter, who was *Lord of a Foreſt*, *granted* to one H. *to make a Park within the Foreſt*; it was adjudged, that if the Grantee incloſed it ſo ſlightly that the Deer of the Foreſt might get in, it was a Forfeiture of the Grant, and that the Lord might enter and take the Deer. Bridgm. 27. Arg. cited in the Caſe of the King v. Sir John Byron.

(D) What is a Foreſt, and the Antiquity, and Extents thereof.

1 1 *E.* 3. *Stat.* 2. *cap.* 1. *Aſcertains the Bounds of Foreſts.*

2. Beſides other Prerogatives of the *Saxon Kings*, they had alſo a Franchiſe for Wild Beaſts of Chaſe, which we commonly call Foreſts, being *a Precinct of Ground, neither Parcel of the County, nor the Dioceſs, nor of the Kingdom, but rather Appendant thereunto.* Bac. of Government 82.

3. Foreſts *will appear by* Matter of Record as by *Eires* of Juſtices of Foreſts, *Swanimotes*, Officers of Foreſts, as Regardors, Agiſtors, Verderors,

derors, &c. but the *Appellation* of it by the Name of a Foreſt, *in Grants, Offices and Conveyances*, is not any Proof that it is a Foreſt in Law. 12 Rep. 22. Paſch. 5 Jac. in Leiceſter Foreſt's Caſe.

4. A Foreſt may well be *in the Hands of a Subject*, and ſhall be Uſed as a Foreſt if the King gives Authority by expreſs words for the Adminiſtration of Juſtice there, and for his Juſtices to come there; and if ſuch Grantee might have Commiſſion in ſuch Caſes to Uſe and have Officers of a Foreſt, then it ſhall continue a Foreſt in the Hands of a Subject. Otherwiſe, without ſuch Liberties, it is but a Chace, being in the Hands of a Common Perſon; Per all the Juſtices and Barons. Cro. J. 155. in the Caſe of Leiceſter Foreſt.———And Popham ſaid, that he had ſeen ſuch Liberties of a Foreſt granted in that manner. Cro. J. 155. Paſch. 5 Jac. B. R. ut ſup.

5. 16 *Car.* 1. *cap.* 16. §. 4. Enacts that, *the Meets and Bounds of Foreſts ſhall extend no further than the ſame were commonly known or taken in the twentieth Year of King James, and all Preſentments, ſince the ſaid twentieth Year, and all other Preſentments, Perambulations and other Acts, by which the Meets or Bounds of the Foreſts are further extended, ſhall be void.*

6. There are 3 Manner of Foreſts; 1ſt. *Ancient Foreſts de temps d'ont, &c.* before Charta de Foreſta, called *Charta Parva*, in reſpect to Magna Charta which paſſed in the ſame Year. *2dly*, There are *New Foreſts* made in the Reigns of King Henry 2. Richard 1. King John, &c. A third Sort of Foreſts, are ſuch as were *partly Ancient and partly New*; in regard the Ancient Bounds of the Foreſts were enlarged, and Ground taken in to the Foreſt that did not anciently belong to it. And that is the Reaſon of the Saving in 9 H. 3. *in Charta de Foreſta*; *ſaving all Commons Accuſtomed*, tho' the Lands of the Owners were diſafforeſted by the Act; becauſe they had been Afforeſted in the Reign of King *Hen.* 2. or *King John*, &c. to the Prejudice of the Owners of the Land who had Common there; and were not rightfully within the Foreſt, and therefore it was but Reaſon that, upon the Diſafforeſtation of thoſe Lands, the Owners ſhould enjoy their Cuſtoms; and this is the true Ground of that ſaving in the Act. But afterwards in the 12 *H.* 3. and 10 *Ed.* 1. there were *other Perambulations*, whereby *many Foreſts were enlarged* to the Prejudice of the Subjects. And thereupon, afterwards, in 21 *Ed.* 1. there was *another Perambulation* made, by which the King conceived himſelf much prejudiced in Abridging the Bounds of the Foreſt, and exempting the Lands out of the Foreſt, which in Truth were part of it. Upon theſe Grievances on both Sides, both to the King and Subject, occaſioned by theſe Perambulations made *after* 9 *H.* 3. *the King and his Subjects concerned therein came to an Accord* and Agreement; and thereupon *Anno* 33 & 34 *Ed.* 1. *Ordinatio Foreſtæ was made*; whereby it is declared, by Aſſent of both Parties, that the De-afforeſtations made upon thoſe Perambulations (be they Right or Wrong) ſhould be quite diſcharged of the Foreſt: But then the Owners of the Ground were not to have Common there. But ſuch, who were Content to continue their Lands within the Foreſt, were to have Common as they uſed formerly to have it. Per Hale Ch. B. Hard. 438. Hill. 18 & 19 Car. 2. in the Exchequer, in Caſe of the King v. Inhabitans of Rodley in Glouceſterſhire.

(E) What may be claimed by a Subject in Foreſts.

1. 9 *H.* 3. *Stat.* 2. *cap.* 4. Enacts, that *Freeholders, who have their Woods in Foreſts, ſhall have them as at the Coronation of King H.* 2. *and thoſe that make Purpreſture, &c. in them without Licence ſhall anſwer for it.*

2. 9 *H.* 3. *Stat.* 2. *cap.* 9. *Allows Agiſtment and Pawnage to the Owners of Woods.*

Where Lands were *not duly* and of Right *afforeſted at firſt, and that they had Common by Preſcription in the Foreſt*,

3. 33 *E.* 1. *Stat.* 5. Enacts, that *thoſe, to whom the King hath granted Purliew, (whereby their Woods are diſafforeſted) ſhall be quit of the Charge of the Foreſt, but then they are to have no Common there: Howbeit ſuch as are willing to return their Woods into the Foreſt, ſhall enjoy Common and other Eaſements there as they did before.*

it was not the Intent of the Ordinatio Foreſtæ to toll ſuch a Common; but if they were well afforeſted at firſt, and afterwards diſafforeſted unduly by ſome Perambulation, then the Common is loſt, if the Owner will have the Land remain diſafforeſted; and this is the true Meaning and Interpretation, and Intent of this Act of Ordinatio Foreſtæ. Hard. 438. Hill. 18 & 19 Car. 2. in the Exchequer, in Caſe of the King v. Inhabitants of Rodley in Glouceſterſhire.

This Act of Ordinatio Foreſtæ *makes but a Temporary Suſpenſion of the Common Law*, viz. ſo long as the Owners of the Lands would be out of the Foreſts, et non Ultra. Hard. 439. in Caſe of the King v. Inhabitants of Rodley in Glouceſterſhire.

4. 34 *E.* 1. *Stat.* 5. *cap.* 6. Enacts, that *they, who had Common of Paſture, and were reſtrained of it by the Perambulation, ſhall have their Common as before.*

5. A Man may *cut Wood in his own Soil in a Free Chaſe*, without View of the Foreſter. Br. Foreſt, pl. 6. cites the Time of E. 1. and Fitzh. Treſpaſs 239.

6. One Claimed before the Juſtices in Eyre, to be quit of Pannage in the Kings Foreſt; and alſo claimed in the ſame Foreſt, *Pannage for* the *Hogs of his Tenants* agiſted; but they would not meddle with it, becauſe this belonged to the Juſtices of the Foreſt. Keilw. 150. b. in Itin. E. 3.

A being ſeiſed of Hatfield Chace *granted and ſold to B. and his Heirs all the Wood growing, and to grow*

7. 22 *E.* 4. 7. Enacts, that *if any, having Woods in his own Ground, without any Foreſt, Chaſe, or Purliew, ſhall cut, or cauſe the ſame (or any Part thereof) to be cut by the King's Licence (where ſuch Foreſt, Chaſe, or Purliew are his) or without Licence (where they belong to others) he may keep them ſeveral, and incloſed during 7 Years next after their Felling.*

upon a Part thereof, and *excepted the Soil*; and further, *that he might incloſe every Year 16 Acres* thereof, and to hold it in ſeveralty, for the Preſervation of the Spring, *according to the Statutes of the Realm*; and this Grant was *confirmed by a private Act of Parliament*, and that the Grantee might hold it in ſeveral, without Suit of the King's Officers, with a *Saving of the Right of all Strangers*; and a *Commoner put in his Beaſts*, to take his Common in one Parcel of that which was incloſed, againſt whom the Grantee brought an Action of Treſpaſs; and in this the only Queſtion was, if the Grantee of the Trees, which had not any Intereſt in the Soil might incloſe againſt a Commoner by this Statute. It was agreed by Coke Ch. J. and Foſter, that this Statute *was repealed by* the Statute of 35 H. 8. for this *is in the Negative*, and therefore is a Repeal of a Former Statute, but if the laſt had been in the Affirmative, otherwiſe it ſhould be, and it was alſo agreed, that this was not within the Statute of 35 *H.* 8. for that *appoints of what Age the Wood ſhall be incloſed, and by this Recompence is given to the Commoner*; but here 'tis not averred by pleading, of what Age this Wood was which was incloſed; and therefore it was adjudged that the Action is not maintainable againſt the Commoner. 2 Brownl. 289, 290. Chalk v. Peter.——8 Rep. 136. b. Sir Francis Barrington's Caſe S. C.——Godb. 167. S. C——2 Brownl. 328. per Coke Ch. J. acc.

This Statute doth *not extend to any Woods* in Foreſt, *in which another hath Common*, for it doth *but* extend *only to ſuch Woods which a Common Perſon hath in the King's Foreſt*, or Common Perſon's, and that it might be incloſed for the Space of 3 Years after the cutting of the Wood therein before the making of this Statute, and this was no Wood in which a Stranger had Common, as it appears by the Preamble of the ſaid Statute; and then after in the ſaid Statute it is ſaid, ſuch Woods may be incloſed, per Coke Ch. J. 2 Brownl. 327. Paſch. 8 Jac. Chalk v. Peter.

8. Preſcription may be for *Warrens* in Foreſts, tho' they were in the King's Hands, but without a Special Preſcription it cannot be; and in ſuch Caſe of *Preſcription* for Warren, if it was by *Grant*, or he can prove it by Preſcription, a *Non Uſer* is no Cauſe of Forfeiture thereof. Cro. J. 155. Paſch. 5 Jac. B. R. Leiceſter Foreſt's Caſe.——Jenk. 316. pl. 6.

2 Roll. R. 190. Trin. 18 Jac. B. R. S. C.—2 Buls. 295. S. C.—

9. If the King grant a *Foreſt*, the Grantee ſhall have but a Chace, unleſs *Power* be granted to hold a *Swanimote Court, Juſtice Seat, Court of Attachment, &c.* But if this be granted a Subject may have a Foreſt and this has been twice adjudged; Per Coke. Roll. R. 195. Paſch. 13 Jac. B. R. the King v. Briggs.

Subject can't have a Foreſt;

but what is Foreſt in the Hands of the King when granted to a Subject is a Chace. Palm. 93. Bridges's Caſe.——Roll. R. 112. S. C.——By *ſpecial Words* of Grant, as to have Foreſt, to conſtitute Juſtices and Verderors, a Subject may have Foreſt, but not by general Words, and ſo Popham ſays, it was adjudged. Palm. 94 37 Eliz. B. R. Jennings v. Rock.——Roll. R. 194——12 Rep. 22. per Popham Ch. J. that the Subject may have a Foreſt. But this is intended, if he hath Power to have Swanimotes and Juſtices in Eyre, and *Foreſters appendant to* his Foreſts. Paſch. 5 Jac B. R. Anon.

10. A *Subject may have* a Foreſt, but cannot have a Juſtice Seat, but he may have a Swanmark Court and the other Courts, and a Commiſſion to execute them. Mich. 3 Car. C. B. Het. 60. Comins's Caſe. Kelw. 15. &c.—Cro. J. 155. Leiceſter Foreſt's Caſe.—Jenk. 316. pl. 6.

11. An *Allowance in Eyre bindeth the King*, the Subject being in Poſſeſſion, *'till removed by another Judgment*; but B. R. hath no Juriſdiction in Foreſt Cauſes; and therefore an Allowance there of Liberties within the Foreſt, will not put the King out of Poſſeſſion. 8 Car. Jo. 267. Caſe of the Hundred of Wargrave.

12. A Purchaſor of a Manor in a Foreſt, liable to *repair a Bridge* there, may be compelled to repair the ſame, and he muſt ſeek his Remedy at Law for *Contribution* from the others, who have any Part of the Lands; and the Court (of Eyre) is not to let the Bridge lie in Decay, 'till it be determined between the Parties, whether they ought to contribute or no. 8 Car. Jo. 273. Caſe of Lodden Bridge.

13. A. ſeiſed of the Manor of W. claimed *to Hunt Foxes, Hares and Wild Cats* therein, *under a Charter* granted by R. 1. to the Abbot of Waltham Holy Croſs, and ſhewed the Diſſolution of the Abbey, and a new Grant of the ſaid Manor to one N. with the Words of tot, tanta, talia, &c. Libertates &c. quot, &c. and ſo deduced the Title down to himſelf, by ſeveral meſne Conveyances. It was held by Noy, and ſo adjudged, that the Words of *tot, tanta, talia*, &c. are no Warrant for him; for the Abbot had 20 Manors, and yet there was but one Hunter; but if theſe Grants be allowed, Hunters will be multiplied, and ſo the Foreſt ſpoiled; and ſo this Point was adjudged in the Foreſt of Waltham againſt Sir **Thomas Fanſhaw**, who claimed the like Privilege within his Manor of B. which was the Abbeſs of Barking's, who had the like Charter, and Sir Thomas the like Words as here. 8 Car. Jo. 286. in Sir Edmund Sawyer's Caſe.

14. A. claimed in like manner as aforeſaid, *to be free from the Repair of Bridges*, but 'twas not allowed; For thoſe Bridges, which by Law he ought to Repair, no Grant can diſcharge; for the *Subject hath an Intereſt* therein; and for thoſe Bridges, which are not known by whom they ought to be amended, the Statute of 22 H. 8. 5. hath made all Men chargable. Ibid.

15. He made alſo a like Claim *to be quit from Carriages*, & a Navigio & Domorum Regalium Edificatione, &c. but they are all of the Nature of Purveyance, and were *reſumed by* 27 *H.* 8. 25. *and* ſo *not revived by Grant* of tot, tanta & talia, &c. Ibid.

16. So he likewiſe Claimed *to incloſe his Woods of W. with as great Ditches and Hedges as he pleaſe*; but 'twas not allowed, becauſe this was but Matter of Election, which the Abbot might chuſe, or not; and *Matters of Election are not revived*, as aforeſaid; and if the Abbot himſelf were living, he could not incloſe it by Virtue of that Licence, which is 400 Years ſince; becauſe it can't be known whether that Power was not once Executed, and if it was, and after thrown out again, it cannot be incloſed again; for then one Power ſhould be executed divers times. Ibid. 2 Brownl. 326. per Coke Ch. J. in Caſe of Chalke v. Peter.

17. A Preſcription *to be out of the Foreſt* is not good, without ſhewing an Allowance in Eyre; by Noy, and ſo adjudged. Ibid. 290. Caſe of the Tenants of the Manor of Bray.

18. So, no *Liberty* within a Foreſt, *in Deſtruction of the Vert or Game*, is good by Preſcription, without an Allowance in Eyre, except only in Caſe of *Common*; by Noy. Ibid. 291.

19. Common of *Paſture for Sheep*, is good only in two Caſes within a Foreſt; the firſt is, when an Officer of the Foreſt hath Land belonging to his Office, and claims Common for Sheep belonging to that Land; and this was allowed in one **Blanchard's** Caſe, in the Time of R. 2. and adjudged for him in Eyre, and in Chancery, and after in Parliament; and ſuch another was for Claringdon Foreſt in Wiltſhire. The other Caſe is for Paſture of Sheep, which a Man may preſcribe for in his own open Waſte Grounds, but not in his Coverts; by Noy. Ibid. 292.

20. One claimed all *Windfalls and Profits* whatſoever *within his Baily-wick*; but held by Noy, that it was not good; For he cannot have the Profits of every Man's Land within that Bailywick. 8 Car. Jo. 294. Sir Charles Howard's Caſe.

Jo. 281. in Reſton's Caſe.

21. So the *Claim of Office of Keeper*, or Bailiff *of ſeveral Walks, una cum vadiis & Feodis*, &c. is not good, by Mr Noy; becauſe *no Fee certain is claimed*; and theſe Words una cum vadiis & Feodis, &c. debit. & conſuet. & tot, tanta, &c. quot, quanta, &c. aliquis, &c. will not help it without an Averment what they were. Ibid.

22. So a Claim of *as much Firewood as he ſhould think fit to be burn'd in New Lodge* is void, by Noy; becauſe otherwiſe he might take as much Wood as he thought fit, and ſell it when done. But if the Claim had been of as much as he ſhould burn in New Lodge, it had been good. Ibid.

23. The *Inhabitants* of Haley *claimed Common of Paſture* in the Foreſt; 'tis not good, by Noy; for Inhabitants cannot claim any Profit apprendre, as Gateward's Caſe, Co. 6. but an Eaſement they may, as a Way to Church. Ibid. 297.

24. A Claim for *Common for Cattle, without ſaying Levant and Couchant upon Land in certain*, is not allowable. Ibid. 298.

25. In *Ejectment*, a ſpecial Verdict was found, upon which the Queſtion was, whether or no a *Preſcription for Common or Paſture for all Cattle and Swine*, in a Foreſt *at all times of the Year*, were a good Preſcription, or not. It was argued pro Quer. that the Preſcription was naught, which was agreed by the Court, and the Counſel of the other Side; but for *not finding expreſsly that it was a Foreſt*, Judment was given pro Defendente. Hard. 87. Mich. 1656. in the Exchequer. Woolridge v. Dovey.

26. In *Replevin* of a Heifer, the Defendant avowed Damage Feaſant; the Plaintiff, in Bar, *preſcribed for Common omni anno omni tempore anni*; Iſſue upon the Preſcription, and Verdict found the Iſſue for the Plaintiff; but further found, that the Land, and Place where, is *infra Regardum Foreſtæ de Whittlewood in Com' Northamton*; upon which Judgment was given for the Plaintiff that the Preſcription is good, notwithſtanding that the Place where is a Foreſt, and that in the Preſcription *Fence-month* is not excepted, according to Trig and Turner's Caſe. 3 Lev. 127. Trin. 35 Car. 2. C. B. Brabrooke v. Carter.

Within a *Free Chaſe, in the Hands of the King*, the Owner of the Soil, by *Preſcription*, may,

27. A Man may *Preſcribe for Common for Sheep* in a Foreſt, but not for *Goats*. See Lutw. 81 Grammer v. Watſon.———and ſuch Preſcription may be for Common for Sheep in the *Fence-month*. Lutw. 81. Paſch. 1 Jac. 2. C. B.——Adjudged 3 Lev. 98. Paſch. 35 Car. 2. C. B. Trigg v. Turner.———2 Show. 9. S. C.

have Common for his *Sheep and Warren for Conies by Grant or Preſcription*. But he cannot *Surcharge* with more than has been uſed Time out of Mind, unleſs, &c. nor *make Burroughs* in other Places than *hath been uſed Time out of Mind*, unleſs he has Warren *by Grant*, and then he may Uſe it according to his Grant. But he cannot *erect a New Warren* without Charter. 12 Re—p. 22. *And* he that has ſuch a Warren may lawfully *Build* upon his Inheritance, within his Warren, *a convenient Lodge* for Preſervation of his Game. 12 Rep. 22. Paſch. 5 Jac. B. R. per all the Juſtices and Barons in Leiceſter Foreſt's Caſe.——4 Inſt. 298.——Cro. J. 155.

Common for Sheep cannot be in a Foreſt, per Doderidge J. to which Coke Ch. J. agreed, unleſs it be by Preſcription. 3 Buls. 213. Trin. 14 Jac. in Webb's Caſe.———And Coke ſaid that Charta de Foreſta is but in Affirmance of the Common Law. ibid.———Roll. R. 411. S. C.

28. If there be Park or Foreſt where the Lord has the Game, another Man may *Preſcribe to have the Herbage*; For the Lord has conſiderable Profits of the Ground by his Deer, which is ſo conſiderable, that if the *Franchiſe comes to be determined*, it has been held, that ſuch a Preſcription for Herbage being but Surpluſage after the Feeding of the Deer, and ſubordinate to it, ſhall rather be *loſt*, than carry the whole Profit of the Feeding and exclude the Owner. And it has been the Caſe of many Parkes, that have been *diſparked by the King, after the Herbage granted away*, per Sir Francis North, Arg. Vent. 391. in Caſe of Potter v. North.

(F) What

(F) What may be done by a ſubject therein.

1. BY 9 *H.* 3. *Stat.* 2. *cap.* 11. *A Nobleman paſſing by the Foreſt, is allow'd to kill a Deer or two,* by View of, or a Horn being blown for the Foreſter. 2 Inſt. 309. ſays, that after the blowing the Horn, it ſhould be *Propriis ſuis Canibus aut Arcu ſuo Proprio.*

2. 9 *H.* 3. *Stat.* 2. *cap.* 12. Enacts, that *Every Freeman ſhall make in his own Wood, Land, or Water, within the Foreſt, Mills, Springs, Pools, Marſhes, Dikes or Arable Ground, without the Cover, ſo as not to annoy his Neighbour.*

3. 9 *H.* 3. *Stat.* 2. *cap.* 13. *Allows Ayries for Hawks, &c.*

4. 1 *E.* 3 *Stat.* 2. *cap.* 2. Enacts, that *Every Man, that hath Wood within the Foreſt, may take Houſebote and Heybote in his Wood.*

5. *Building a new Houſe* in the ſeveral Soil or Waſte of any Man in a Foreſt is a Purpreſture, and an Annoyance to the Foreſt and Game, and *finable or arrentable* for the tolerating or permitting it to ſtand, at the Diſcretion of the Juſtice in Eyre, or he may demoliſh it at Pleaſure. D. 240. b. Trin. 7 Eliz. pl. 45. The Owner of Land in the Foreſt cannot build a Houſe there *without Licence* of the King or the Juſtice in Eyre. Jenk. 230. Pl 100.

6. *Erection of a Beacon* upon a Man's own Land in a Forſt, is a Purpreſture. D. 240. b. Marg. 45. cites Atkins's Reading upon the Statute of Foreſts, Auguſt 1632. in Lincoln's Inn.

7. *So,* where a Man deviſed a ſum of Money for erecting *of a Cauſey* in Waltham Foreſt, and the ſame was done accordingly; he was Fined for Purpreſture. D. 240. b. Marg. ut ſup.

8. A Man cannot *cut down Wood* in his own Land in a Foreſt, without View of the Foreſter. Co. Litt. 115. a. (o) cites Statute 34. E. 1. But he ſays, that, inaſmuch as this Act is *in Affirmance of the Common Law,* a Man *may preſcribe* to cut down his woods there without ſuch View, and ſays that it was ſo adjudged, 16. Eliz. in the Exchequer. as Popham Ch. J. reported to him.

9. In ſuch Foreſts or Chaſes *being in the Hands of a common Perſon,* thoſe, that are *Owners of Woods, may cut* them down at their Pleaſure without Licence or View of the Foreſters; but yet ſo, as to leave ſufficient *Vert* for the Deer there. Cro. J. 155. Paſch. 5. Jac. B. R. Leiceſter Foreſt's Caſe——So tho' it be in the Hands of the King. ibid.—— Jenk. 316. pl. 6. S P. 12. Rep. 22. And if they are not Foreſts in Law, but *free Chaſes only,* the Freeholders there, tho' the Chaſes are *in the Hands of the King,* may cut the Wood and Timber growing on their Lands, without View or Licence. But if the Owner leaves not ſufficient Covert to maintain the King's Game, he ſhall be puniſhed at the Suit of the King. P. 5 Jac.

10. *Parks laid open to Foreſts* for 40 Years, may yet be incloſed again, and they may kill Deer that come therein. Cro. J. 156. Paſch. 5 Jac. B. R. Leiceſter Foreſt's Caſe. Jenk. 316. pl. 6.

11. *Incloſures* cannot be in Foreſts or Chaſes, unleſs with *low Hedges,* which may not diſturb the Game; and tho' Incloſures have been continued for 40 *Years* together, if they were no ancienter, they may well be deſtroyed and laid open. Cro. J. 156. Paſch. 5. Jac. B. R. Leiceſter Foreſt's Caſe. Jenk. 316. pl. 6.

12. If the *King grants* away *part of his Demeſne Lands, cum Omnibus Boſcis there growing,* for a valuable Conſideration; the King's Intent was not to diſaforeſt this, but only to paſs the Intereſt in the Timber, as well as the Soil; but the Timber cannot be fell'd by Virtue of this Grant. And if the Patentee will fell any of it, he muſt take the ſame Way as others do in like Caſes. Jo. 268. 8 Car. in Itin. Windſor. Whitlock's Caſe.

(G) Grant

(G) Grant of a Foreſt to a Subject. Good. And how conſidered.

D. 169. b. pl. 1. Mich. 1 & 2 Eliz. Ld North v. Cromwell.

1. THE King grants the Foreſt of W. and S. in the County of S. to *A. for 60 Years*; A. covenants with the King *to maintain* 100 *Deer there, during the ſaid Term, and* at the End thereof, *to leave the Foreſt ſo ſtocked* to the King; the *King grants the Fee* of the Foreſt *to B.*—*B. during the Term cannot kill, nor give a Warrant for any Deer there*; By all the Judges of England. For the Foreſt was granted for 60 Years, and the Game paſſed by the Grant of the Foreſt, and the ſaid Covenant does not controul the Grant: And if B. might have ſuch Liberty, he might diſable A. from performing his ſaid Covenant. Jenk 218. pl. 63.

2. The Honour of Pickering has a Foreſt appendant to it. A Patent granted by the King, of the *Honour cum Pertinentiis*, paſſes the Foreſt; and the Grant of the Foreſt paſſes the Game. Jenk. 218. pl. 63.

3. A common Perſon may have Foreſt *by ſpecial Words of Grant*. As to have Foreſt, and to conſtitute Juſtices and Verderors; but not by General Grant of Foreſts, per Popham J. and he ſaid it had been ſo adjudged. Palm. 94. 37 Eliz. B. R. in Caſe of Jennings v. Rock.

(H) Of the Officers of the Foreſt.

1. 9 *H.* 3. *Stat.* 2. *cap.* 5. Enacts, that *Rangers of the Foreſts ſhall exerciſe their Offices, as uſed at the Coronation of H.* 2. *and not otherwiſe.*

2. 9 *H.* 3. *Stat.* 2. *Cap.* 7. *Prohibits Extortion by Officers of the Foreſt.*

3. 34 *E.* 1. *Stat.* 5. *cap.* 2. Enacts, that *On the Death or Abſence of any Foreſter, &c. another ſhall be put in his Place.*

4. 34 *E.* 1 *Stat.* 5. *cap.* 3. Enacts, that *No Foreſter; &c. ſhall be put upon any Aſſiſe, Jury or Inqueſt, taken out of the Foreſt.*

5. 34 *E.* 1. *Stat.* 5. *cap.* 4. Enacts, that *If Officers of the Foreſt ſurcharge the Foreſt, they ſhall be impriſoned.*

6. 25 *E.* 3. *Stat.* 5. *cap.* 7. Enacts, that *No Foreſter, &c. ſhall gather Victuals or other Thing by Colour of his Office, but that which is due of old Right.*

7. 32 *H.* 2. 35. *Impowers Juſtices of the King's Foreſts, by writing under the Seal of their Office, to make Deputies.*

8. If *one of the Officers* of the Foreſt *put one Seal to the Rolls by Aſſent* of all the Verderors Regardors, &c. it is *good*. 8 Car. Jo. 268. Ld Lovelace's Caſe.

9. If *Officers* of the Foreſt *break their Truſt*, it is *a Forfeiture* of their Places. per Noy. 8 Car. Jo. 272. in Ld Lovelace's Caſe.

10. Office of *Agiſtors*, is *only to preſent Treſpaſſes done by Cattle*; and any other Preſentment by them, not belonging to their Office, is void; and *ſo* it is *of other Officers*, &c. per Noy. Ibid. 280.

11. If a Man claim the Office of *Keeper*, &c. and *no Fee* for the Execution thereof; this is but a Burthen, and therefore he is *removeable at Pleaſure*: By Noy. Ibid. 292.

12. By *Acceptance of the Office of Verderor, all other Offices*, as Keeper and Bailiff of ſeveral Walks, and of the Game, and Riding Foreſter, *are determined, becauſe ſubordinate* thereto; and the Objection, that a Verderor was by Election, which might be againſt a Man's Will, and therefore ſhould not determine other Offices by Letters Patents, was diſallow'd, becauſe of the Acceptance of what he might have waved. 8 Car. 1. Jo. 295. in Sir Cha. Howard's Caſe.

13. Tho'

13. Tho' Men may cut their *Woods* for neceſſary Boots, by View of Foreſters or Verderors, yet at the next Court of Attachment, the Officers ought to preſent what was *felled*, and that it was *by View*, ſo as it may appear on Record. Per Noy. Ibid 295.

(H. 2) How far the Beaſts are privileged when * out of the Foreſt, Park, or Chaſe.

* See (K) pl. 2, 3. (L) See Hunting (B).

1. IF a Man has *Land adjoining to a Chaſe*, and Savages enter into his Land, he may chaſe them out with *ſmall Dogs*, but *not with* * *Greyhounds*. Br. Foreſt. pl. 1. cites 43. E. 3. 8.

* Orig. (Leverets).

2. *And* by ſome, if the *Dogs follow them into the Chaſe*, and the *Owner recall them*, and yet they kill the Savages, Treſpaſs does not lie. Quære. Br. Foreſt. pl. 1. cites 43 E, 3. 8.

S. P. by Doderidge J. Poph. 162.

3. Foreſter alleg'd Cuſtom, that when the Savages went out of the Foreſt, that he might *enter into the* [*Land*] *of another, and rechaſe them*; but per Newton, it is not a lawful Cuſtom; For they are Feræ Naturæ, and when they are out of the Foreſt, none has Property in them. Br. Cuſtoms. pl. 64. cites 7 H. 6. 36.

S. P. by Brian Kelw. 30. b.

(I) Diſafforeſted, and the Effects thereof.

1. 9 *H.* 3. *Stat.* 2. *cap.* 1. Enacts, that *all Foreſts, taken out of the Subject's Lands, ſhall be diſafforeſted, ſaving Common of Herbage, and other Things within the Foreſt, to ſuch as were accuſtomed to enjoy them.*

2. 33 *Ed.* 1. *Stat.* 5. *They, whoſe Woods are diſafforeſted, ſhall not have Common within the Foreſt.*

Exception was taken, that this was not a Statute, but *an Ordinance only*; But all the Juſtices over-ruled it. For Popham ſaid that he was a Counſel in a like Caſe 9 Eliz. between Sir Chriſt. Hatton and Sir J. St. Leger in the Exchequer, which continued till 19 Eliz. and by good Advice adjudged a Statute. Palm. 93. Jennings v. Rocke.

They, which will return their Woods into the Foreſt, ſhall have Common as they had before.

3. If one has *Common in a Foreſt*, and by Letters Patents of the King, this Land is diſafforeſted, yet he ſhall have Common, per Popham Ch. J. Quod fuit conceſſum by all the Juſtices. Palm. 94. 37 Eliz. B. R. Jennings v. Rock.

4. 16 *Car.* 1. *cap.* 16. §. 8. Enacts, that *all Grounds de-afforeſted ſince the twentieth Year of King James ſhall be left out of the Meets and Bounds of the Foreſts, which are to be enquired of, and ſhall be de-afforeſted.*

§. 9. *Provided that the Owners and Occupiers of Tenements left out of the Bounds of the Foreſts to be returned and certified by Virtue of Commiſſions granted to enquire of the Meets and Bounds and Foreſts, may enjoy ſuch Common and other Profits within the Foreſts as anciently.*

5. Upon a Bill in Equity concerning *Common*, claimed by the Inhabitants *in the Foreſt* of Sherwood *in certain Lands there lately encloſed* by the King and his Patentees, it being a *Common by Preſcription*, and the Lands of the Inhabitants there, being now diſafforeſted, whether this Common be deſtroyed by the De-afforeſtation upon the Statutes of Charta de Foreſta, Ordinatio Foreſtæ & 34 Ed. 1. was the Queſtion? And by the Opinion of Baron Raynesford, and Turner, the Common is gone by the expreſs Words of the Statute of Ordinatio Foreſtæ, and of 34 Ed. 1. And in an Iter, 8 Ed. 3. a Judgment was cited in Point in a like Caſe, in this very Foreſt, of a Common by Preſcription. But the Ch. Baron doubted: For if the Lands were not duly afforeſted at firſt, *and that they*

had Common by Preſcription in the Foreſt it was not the Intent of the Ordinatio Foreſtæ to toll ſuch a Common. But if they were well afforeſted at firſt, and afterwards diſafforeſted unduly by ſome Perambulation, then the Common is loſt, if the Owner will have the Land remain diſafforeſted; and this is the true Meaning, and Interpretation, and Intent of this Act of Ordinatio Foreſtæ, and this being matter of Fact; and it not appearing of what Nature theſe Lands are, that are now diſafforeſted, nor whether there be a Common by Preſcription in the Caſe; this Caſe is not yet ripe for a Decree, which muſt be made one Way or other, as the matter of Fact ſhall guide them; and this was the firſt Ground of his Doubt. 2d This Act of Ordinatio Foreſtæ *makes but a temporary Suſpenſion of the Common Law*, viz. ſo long as the Owners of the Lands would be out of the Foreſt, & non ultra: So that there cannot be, in ſuch a Caſe, an abſolute Decree, or a perpetual Injunction. His 3d Reaſon was, becauſe now by the Statute 17 Car. 1. 16. the Lands cannot *be afforeſted again*; and therefore it would be hard to take away Common, where it is due of Right. For theſe Reaſons he would not deliver any poſitive Opinion in the Caſe, which he ſaid was a Caſe of great Importance; and deſerved another Kind of Argument than upon an ordinary Demurrer in Law; which, yet, the Court never refuſeth to hear upon the leaſt Difficulty, (tho' the Conſequence be many Times of ſmall Concernment,) that this Cauſe deſerved more Conſideration than to be determined upon a ſudden Opinion upon the Hearing. But becauſe the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the other Barons were againſt him, the Decree paſſed pro Rege. Hard. 437, 438, 439. Hill. 18 & 19 Car. 2. in Scacc. the King v. Inhabitants of Rodly in Glouceſterſhire.

6. A *Manor* may be *within the Metes and Bounds of a Foreſt*, and yet *not within the Regard*. As if the Manor were *diſafforeſted* by Charta Foreſtæ, becauſe it was a Subject's Manor, and not the King's; yet it remains within the Metes and Bounds of the ſaid Foreſt, but not within the Regards; For now by the diſafforeſting, 'tis made *Purlieu*, and not ſubject to the Regards and Laws of the Foreſt, as to the Owner of the Manor. See Charta Foreſta 1. and yet, notwithſtanding this Statute, if the *King had granted* this Manor *to be free of the Regards*, 'tis ſtill within the Metes and Bounds of the ſaid Foreſt. Arg. Bridgm. 25. in Caſe of the King v. Biron.

See (K. 2).

(K) Offences in Foreſts, other than killing and hunting Deer. How puniſhed.

1. A. was *amerced at a Juſtice-Seat* in the Foreſt for *putting in his Sheep to depaſture* there, and being queſtioned for it, he juſtified; for which Contempt he was *fined* 20 *Marks*, and for *refuſing to pay it, he was committed to Priſon*, and being brought up by *Hab. Corp.* the Court refuſed to bail him, and thought he ought to be puniſhed for the Juſtifying. 3 Buls. 213. Trin. 14 Jac. Webb's Caſe.

2. If a Man be preſented for any Offence in a Foreſt, as *Waſte*, &c. and puts in Claim to be quit of Waſte, &c. he ſhall be fined for the preſent; and when the *Claim is allowed*, that *diſchargeth the Fine*. 8 Car. Jo. 267. Caſe of the Hundred of Wargrave.

3. A Man may *fell by the View* of the Foreſters or Verderors *for Fire-Wood* and other neceſſary Boots, *but not* any Thing *to ſell* but by Writ of Ad quod damnum, per Noy 8 Car. Jo. 268. Whitlock's Caſe.

4. If a Man make an Aſſart, either by his *ſtubbing up Wood and plowing* it, or *plowing up Meadow or Paſture*, the Party ſhall be fined, and the Value of the Corn ſown ſhall be anſwered to the King. 8 Car. Jo. 269. Whitlock's Caſe.

5. It

5. It was very ſtrongly held (contrary to Ld Coke's Opinion in Litt. 115. a. b.) that *no Preſcription* can be *to fell and ſell Wood without View* of the Foreſters, except with the Help of an Allowance; per Ld Richardſon and Noy. 8 Car. Jo. 270 & 271. Ld Lovelace's Caſe. It was argued by Noy, that a Preſcription to fell Wood, per Viſum is not good, but it muſt be *per Viſum & Allocationem*; For if it be per Viſum only, then if the Foreſter, being required, refuſe to come, it may be cut without View; For which he cited a Caſe in the Dutchy, of one Leiceſter. But in Sir Thomas Palmer's Caſe 5 Rep. 25. a. it is held, there is no Diverſity between per Viſum, and per Viſum & Allocationem; for in both Caſes, *upon Requeſt* made, *and Refuſal*, the *Party may take Wood without View or Delivery* 8 Car. Jo. 275, 276. Caſe of the Inhabitants of Egham.—A Caſe was alſo cited by Noy as reſolved 6 Jac. that *in a Chaſe* one may preſcribe to fell, &c. becauſe *not within the Statute* of Charta de Foreſtæ; from whence he ſtrongly inferred, that it could not be preſcribed for in a Foreſt. Ibid.

It was agreed by Noy, that a Preſcription to cut down Wood *in a Chaſe* without View, is good. Jo. 389. in Caſe of the Tenants of the Manor of Bray.

6. One B. was fined 4 *l.* for *making a Ferry* where there was none before; For by this means the Foreſt may be abuſed by ſtealing Deer, and carrying them over the Water. 8 Car. Jo. 274. Blagrave's Caſe.

7. One was indicted for *threatning Words to hinder a Complaint* to be made againſt him *for cutting Wood*, and fined 100 *l.* and committed till he found Sureties for his good Behaviour. 8 Car. Jo. 274 Street's Caſe. Ibid. Sir Ch. Howard's Caſe. S. P.

8. Divers were fined for *concealing the Killing Deer*. Ibid. 275.

9. One was fined 50 *s.* for *carrying a Gun with Intent to kill Deer*. Ibid.

10. It was ſaid by Mr. Noy, that in H. the 2d's Time, *the Inhabitants* in the Foreſt were *fined* 100 *Marks for burning Heath*. 8 Car. Jo. 276. In Caſe of the Inhabitants of Egham.

11. It was preſented that one had *erected a Brick Wall, and thereby ſtraitned the Highway*. Mr. Noy ſaid it could *not be arrented without an Inquiry*, per Miniſtros Foreſtæ, ſi ſit competens Paſſagium. 8 Car. Jo. 277. Brown's Caſe.

12. The Foreſters may not take any Thing for their View, per Noy. 8 Car. 1. Jo. 277. in Brown's Caſe.

13. If the *four Men and Reeve* of any Town *make Default upon the firſt ſitting of the Juſtice Seat*, the whole Vill ſhall be amerced; but after Appearance, they only who make Default. Per Noy. Ibid. 279.

14. One, for *drawing* the *Preſentments* of the Agiſtors, *whereby* he made them *preſent what did not belong to their Charge*, was fined 10 *l.* Ibid. 280.

15. If there be *a Warrant to cut Wood*, yet they *muſt cut fair*, and ſo, that the Remainder may not thereby come to Deſtruction, per Noy. Ibid. 280.

16. Thoſe who claim *Common* of Paſture in the Foreſt, if they uſe Staff-herding, i. e. to have one *follow their Cattle*, &c. their Common may be ſeiſed till they pay a Fine for the Abuſe, per Noy. Ibid. 282.

17. Upon a Diſallowance of a *Claim of Fee-Trees*, the Spoils are to be anſwered to the King; and the *Horſes and Carts* which carried them away, are to be enquired of; for they are all *forfeited*; by Ld Richardſon. Jo. 282. In Reſton's Caſe.

18. For *erecting a Windmill on his own Ground* within the Foreſt a Man was fined 5 *l.* Becauſe it frighted the Deer, and drew Company to the Diſquiet of the Game. 8 Car. Jo. 293. Sir Sampſon Darrel's Caſe.

19. Where *Treſpaſſers* in a Foreſt, Chaſe, Park, Warren or incloſed Ground, wherein Deer are kept, *will not render themſelves* to the Keepers *upon a Hue and Cry* to ſtand to the King's Peace; but fly or defend themſelves, in ſuch Caſes *they may be* lawfully *ſlain*. Hawk. Pl. C. cap. 28. S. 15. cites as in the Marg. S. P. C. 15. b.—Crom. 30. b.—D. 326. pl. 3.

20. As to *Impriſonments for Offences* in the Foreſt, which are *not within the Benefit of a* * *Replevin*, they muſt be for Offences in Foreſts ſtrictly ſuch, and not in † Parks or Chaſes, but 'tis not material whether the Foreſt be the King's, ‡ or a Subject's. 2 Hawk. Pl. C. Abr. cap. 15. S. 20. the Book at large. S 38. cites as in the Marg. * Regiſter 77. b.—4 Inſt. 314. — † Regiſter 80. b.—F. N. B. 67. (D)—Pl. C. 124. a. 2. a. 233. a.

—‡ 1 Inſt.

21. *Perſons*

4 Inſt. 290. — Regiſter 80. b. — F. N. B. 6-. (A) (B) (C). — 45 E. 37. pl. 8.

21. *Perſons* indicted or *taken with the Manner*, being impriſoned, have their *Election*, either to purſue the *Remedy* given by the Statute 1 E. 3. Stat. 1. cap. 8. or to be bailed by the Judges of Weſtminſter Hall on a Habeas Corpus. *But* if a Perſon be *impriſoned* for an Offence relating to the Foreſt *without having been indicted* for it, or taken with the Manner, he may have an Action of *falſe Impriſonment*, &c. 2 Hawk. Pl. C. Abr. cap. 15. S. 22. the Book at large. S. 39. cites as in the Marg.

See (K.)

(K. 2) Offences in hunting and in killing Deer. Puniſhed how; and Pleadings.

D. 238. Ld Shandois v. Wye & al.

1. The Court of B. R. were of Opinion, that upon a Conviction of hunting on the Stat. *W.* 1. 20. The *Fine and Impriſonment is for the King and not the Party*; and the Defendant ſhall not be diſcharged out of Priſon, but by the King's Warrant directed to the ſame Juſtices. Trin. 13 H. 7. Keilw. 39. pl. 5.

2. Indictment of *killing of a Hart proclaimed*, found *before Juſtices of Peace*; there it is ſaid, that *the Place ought to be ſhewn where 'twas proclaimed, and where it was killed*; For if it was killed out of the Foreſt, it is lawful for every one to kill him, quod non negatur. And per Fineux Ch. J. he may plead this Matter to the Juriſdiction of the Court; For the *Juſtices of the Foreſt ought to determine it*. Br. Indictments pl. 8. cites 21 H. 7. 31.

3. A Man having a *Chace within a Foreſt*, is yet *finable for hunting* or killing any *Beaſt of the Foreſt*; *ſo* if one have a Chace *adjoining* to the Foreſt, and *denies the Keepers of the Foreſt to fetch back any Stag*, &c. he is finable. 8 Car. Jo. 278. the Caſe of the Manor of Windleſham.

Carth. 77. S. C. it is there ſaid, that the Warrant being directed to a Meſſenger, when no Officer of the Foreſt is known by that Name, was the eſpecial Reaſon the Commitment was held illegal. And that it was agreed by three of the Judges that *taking in the Manner is*, when a Man was taken in the very Fact, or ready to do it, or with his Bow bent, or ready to ſlip his Dogs, or Hands bloody; but that finding Timber of the Foreſt in a Man's Poſſeſſion, viz. in his Yard, was not a taking in the Manner within the Statute, tho' of this the Ch. J. doubted; but all agreed, that the taking upon a freſh Purſuit, was a taking in the Manner.

4. Several were committed on the Warrant of the Chief Juſtice in Eyre of the Foreſt, directed to a Meſſenger; and on their Removal by Hab. Corp. cum Cauſa into B. R. it was argued, that *by Charta de Foreſta & 1 E. 3. c. 8. & 7 R. 2. c. 4. None ſhall be impriſoned before Preſentment* at the Swanimote, and the *C. J. in Eyre is within thoſe Statutes*, and ſo reſtrained, and the Regiſter de B. 80. and F. N. B. 67. (C.) was cited to the ſame Purpoſe. Holt Ch. J. ſaid the Statutes do not by expreſs Words exclude the Ch. J. in Eyre from committing, till Preſentment made; but yet he is within the general Words of them; and by Eyres J. the C. J. in Eyre *cannot commit*, *but only where the Party is taken in the Manner*, viz. with bloody Hands, or with Veniſon in the Foreſt, or in the Act of cutting down Trees, &c. But Timber found in a Yard, which was cut in the Foreſt, is not in the Manner; to which Dolben J. and the reſt agreed. Pemberton Serjeant, ſaid, altho' one be taken in the Manner, yet the C. J. in Eyre can't commit; for he can ground his Warrant on nothing but a Preſentment; but Holt thought he might, on Oath made that the Party was taken in the Manner. Per tot. Cur. the Warrant was illegal, and the Priſoners diſcharged. Mich. 1 W. & M. B. R. Comb. 159. Lord Lovelace's Caſe.

(L) Pleadings

(L) Pleadings and Proceedings.

1. 9 *H.* 3. *Stat.* 2. *cap.* 2. Enacts that *Men that dwell out of the Foreſt, ſhall not come before Juſtices of the Foreſt by common Summons, unleſs they be impleaded there, or be Sureties for others that are attached for the Foreſt.*

2. 9 *H.* 3. *Stat.* 2 *cap.* 8. *Directs when Swainmotes ſhall be kept, and who ſhall repair to them.*

3. 9 *H.* 3. *Stat.* 2. *cap.* 16. *Directs how Pleas of the Foreſt ſhall be holden.*

4. 34 *E.* 1. *Stat.* 5. *cap.* 1. *Directs how Offences done in Foreſts ſhall be preſented.*

5. 34 *E.* 1. *Stat.* 5. *cap.* 6. *The Juſtice of the Foreſt or his Lieutenant, in the Preſence or by Aſſent of the Treaſurer, ſhall take Fines and Amercements of thoſe indicted for Treſpaſſes in Foreſts, and ſhall not tarry for the Eyre.*

6. 7 *R.* 2, 3. Enacts that *a Jury, for the Trial of a Treſpaſs within a Foreſt, ſhall give their Verdict where they received their Charge.*

7. 7 *R.* 2. 4. Enacts that *none ſhall be taken or impriſoned by any Officer of the Foreſt, without Indictment, or being taken with the Mainour, or treſpaſſing in the Foreſt.*

8. Treſpaſs *of a Cloſe broken*, the *Defendant ſaid that the Place where* &c. *lies adjoining to the Foreſt of W. of which he is Foreſter of Fee*; and he and his Anceſtors Time out of Mind, have *uſed in the ſame Place where to chaſe the Savages of the Foreſt with his Dogs, and to re-chace them to the Foreſt*; and that 4 Deer came out of the Foreſt there, wherefore he re-chaced them &c. to the Foreſt &c. and a good Preſcription, per Mordant, Frowicke, Vaviſor & Brian; for it may have a lawful Commencement. Br. Preſcription. pl. 107. cites 13 H. 7. 16.

9. *Indictment* for *killing of a Hart proclaimed*, found *before the Juſtices of the Peace*, the Indictment was challenged, becauſe *it was not ſhewn* in the Indictment, *in what Place the proclaiming was made, nor* in what Place *the Hart was killed*; for if it was killed out of the Bounds of the Foreſt, it was lawful for him to kill it. Per Fineux J. he may plead to the Juriſdiction of the Court, becauſe the Juſtices of the Foreſt ought to determine this Matter, &c. Br. Foreſt. pl. 9. cites 21 H. 7. 30.

S. C. cited 8 Car. Jo. 267. in the Caſe of the Hundred of Wargrave.

10. In *Ejectment* a ſpecial Verdict was found, upon which the Queſtion was, whether or no a *Preſcription for Common of Paſture for all Cattle and Swine* in a Foreſt at all Times *of the Year*, were a good Preſcription, or not? It was objected, that it does not appear that it is a Foreſt; for it does appear to have been diſafforeſted; and a few Words in a Special Verdict found afterwards, ſhall not by Inference and Conſtruction make it a Foreſt again. And it muſt have been a Foreſt Temps d'ont, &c. or the Preſcription cannot come here in Queſtion. It was argued pro Quer', that the Preſcription was naught, which was agreed to by the Court and the Counſel of the other Side; But for *not finding expreſly that it was a Foreſt*; Judgment was given pro Defendente. Hard. 87. Mich. 1656. in the Exchequer. Woolridge v. Dovey.

11. The *Proceſs* in Eyre is *de Hora in Horam*; and the Party may plead preſently: and the Preſentment of all the Officers is ſufficient *Evidence*. 8 Car. Jo. 268. Whitlock's Caſe.

12. *Warrant* from the King *to fell for Repairs*, was held to be not legal; for the *Decay ought firſt to have been viewed, and an Eſtimate* thereof *made*, and then thereupon the Warrant to have gone. 8 Car. Jo. 269. Sir Cha. Howard's Caſe.

An *Underkeeper*, on a Preſentment *for cutting unlawful Browſe Wood, ſaid* he did it *by the King's Command to buy Hay* for the Deer in hard Times, but he was fined 10 *s.* for not having it firſt viewed. Ibid. 279. Rapley's Caſe.——S. P. where although the Verderors affirmed that it was employed in Repairs, yet the Party was fined 5*s* for the undue Way of taking. Ibid. Clifton's Caſe.

12. One being preſented for *felling Trees* in 3 Acres of his Woods, ſhewed the *General Pardon*; Mr. Noy, on reading it, ſaid that *Treſpaſſes* were there pardoned, but not *Vaſta*, and therefore he was fined 40*s*. Jo. 279. Sir W. Tichborn's Caſe.

14. Per Cur. *Certiorari* may be granted out of this Court *to the Juſtices in Eyre*; but they would not grant it in this Caſe, which was to remove a Record before them, concerning Pickering Foreſt, *for cutting Wood there*, becauſe the Matter is *only a Preſcription* of a Thing, *and enquirable and puniſhable by the Regarderors* there; For by their Law, whoſoever is Owner there, can't cut his Wood without *leave of the King*. And to the Intent that ſuch Offences againſt Foreſt Law ſhould not go unpuniſhed, they reſolved that *they would not grant a Certiorari upon Preſentment till Conviction there*; but they further declared for Law, that *no Preſentment nor Conviction* upon it *before Juſtices in Eyre*, concerning Matters of the Foreſt, *ſhall conclude the Right of the Party*; but that he may, notwithſtanding this, have his Action at Common Law for the *Treſpaſs*, or for the Recovery of his Right. Sid. 296. Trin. 18 Car. 2. B. R. Duke of Norfolk v. Duke of Newcaſtle.

Foreſtallers, &c.

(A) What was a Foreſtalling, Puniſhable at Common Law.

Fitzh. Aſſ. 354. S. C. Br. Indictment. pl. 40. S. C. omits the Words (Non allocatur) ——Lord Coke cites S. C. and ſays, that hereby it appears, that an Attempt by Words, to enhance the Price of Merchandizes, was puniſhable by Law, and did found in Foreſtalment. 3 Inſt. 196.

1. A Lombard was indicted *for attempting, by Words, to enhance the Prices* of Commodities; and it was objected, that this did not found in Foreſtalment, ſed non allocatur. 43 Aſſ. 38.

* 43 Aſſ. 38. 3 Inſt. 195, 196. Br. Indictment. 40. Præſentment 12. † Crom. 80. b. ‡ Crom. 80. b.

2. *All endeavours whatſoever to enhance the common Price* of any Merchandize, and *all kinds of Practices* which have apparent Tendency thereto, whether by *ſpreading* * *falſe Rumours*, or by † *buying* Things *in a Market before the accuſtomed Hour*, or by buying and ſelling again the ſame thing in the ſame ‡ Market, or by any other ſuch like Devices, are highly criminal at Common Law, and all ſuch Offences anciently came under the general Notion of Foreſtalling, which included all kinds of Offences of this Nature. 1 Hawk. Pl. C. 234. cap. 80. S. 1. cites as in the Marg.

3 Inſt. 196. H. P. C. 152.

3. *But* any *Merchant* may lawfully *bring Victuals*, or any other Merchandize, *into the Realm in groſs, and ſell them in groſs*; *But* no one can lawfully buy *within the Realm*, any Merchandize in Groſs, and ſell it in Groſs again. 1 Hawk. Pl. C. Abr. 269. cap. 80. S. 1. cites as in the Marg.

4. *Alſo* it is an Offence at Common Law, for a Man *to ingroſs* a whole Commodity, *with an Intent to ſell it again at an unreaſonable Price*, whether he ſell any part of it or not; And even the buying *Corn in the Sheaf*, is an Offence at Common Law. 1 Hawk. Pl. C. 4. cites 3 Inſt. 197. H. P. C. 152.

(B) What

(B) What is Foreſtalling; And who a Foreſtaller, &c. by Statute.

5 & 6. Ed. 6. 14. *S.* 1. ENACTS, that *if any Perſon ſhall buy, or cauſe to be bought, any Merchandiſe, * Victual, or other Thing, coming by Land or Water towards any Market or Fair, to be ſold in the ſame; or coming towards any City or Port from beyond Sea to be ſold, or make any Bargain, Contract, or Promiſe, for the having or buying of the ſame, before it ſhall be in the Market, Fair, City, or Port, ready to be ſold, or ſhall make any Motion by Word, Letter, Meſſage, or otherwiſe, to any Perſon for enhancing the Price, or dearer ſelling any of the Things aboveſaid, or diſſwade, or move any Perſon coming to any Fair or Market, to forbear bringing the Things abovementioned to any Market, Fair, City or Port; he ſhall be adjudged a Foreſtaller.*

S. 2. *Directs who ſhall be deemed a* Regrator.

S. 3. *And whoſoever ſhall ingroſs or get into his Hands by buying, contracting, or Promiſe-taking, other than by Grant or Leaſe of Land, or Tythes, any Corn growing, or any other Corn, or Grain, Butter, Cheeſe, Fiſh, or other dead Victuals, to the Intent to ſell the ſame again, ſhall be deemed an* Ingroſſer.

S. 7. *Provided that the buying of any Barley, Big, or Oats, as any Perſon ſhall buy to convert into Malt or Oatmeal in his own Houſe; or the buying by any Fiſhmonger, Butcher, or Poulterer, ſuch Things as concern their Trade, otherwiſe than by Foreſtalling, who ſhall ſell the ſame again at reaſonable Prices by Retail, or the taking of any Cattle, Corn, Grain, Butter, Cheeſe, or other Things aboveſaid, reſerved upon any Leaſe for Life or Years; or the buying of any Wine or other dead Victual, by any Innholder or Victualler, to ſell by Retail in his Houſe, or to his Neighbours for reaſonable Prices; or the buying any † dried or ſalted Fiſh; or of any Corn, Fiſh, Butter, or Cheeſe, by any Badger, Lader, Kidder, or Carrier, as ſhall be allowed to that Office, by three Juſtices of Peace of the County, who ſhall ſell or deliver in open Fair or Market, or to any other Victualler, or to any other Perſon, for the Proviſion of his Houſe, within one Month after he ſhall ſo buy the ſame, without Foreſtalling; or any common Proviſion made without Fraud by any Perſon of the Things aboveſaid, for any City or Town corporate; or for Proviſion for victualing of any Ship, Caſtle, or Fort, without Foreſtalling, ſhall not be deemed or taken to be any Offence againſt this Act.*

S. 12. *Corn may be tranſported from one Port to another.*

S. 13. *Provided, That it ſhall be lawful for any Perſon inhabiting within one Mile of the main Sea, to buy all manner of Fiſh freſh or ſalted, not foreſtalling the ſame, and ſell them again at reaſonable Prices.*

Buying of Corn to make into Meal, and ſelling it afterwards, was held by Popham and Fenner, *not* to be ingroſſing within this Stat. Paſch. 35 Eliz. Mo. 595. pl. 810. Anon. —— *But* if a *Miller buys Corn, and grinds it, and ſells it* within his Houſe, this is within the Statute. Cited Ow. 135. by Coke Ch. J. as Paſch. 42 Eliz. Reynolds v. Gerret. —— *But* it was adjudged, that where a Man buys *Meal, and makes the ſame into Starch*, and ſells it, he *may juſtify the ſelling*, and it is out of the Stat. becauſe 'tis *not the ſame Thing*. Mich. 5 Jac. 1. Le. 241. pl. 392. ——

* *Hops* were adjudged not to be Victuals within this Statute. Cro. C. 231. Mich. 7 Car. 1. B. R. the K. v Maynard. ——— S. P. per Roll. Ch. J. Sty. 190. ——— *And* Paſch. 15 Jac. Rot. 36. it was adjudged, that buying *Apples* to ſell again, was not within this Statute. Cro. Car. 231. ——— For the Law *intends only thoſe Things* that are *uſually ſold in Markets in great Quantities*, as Corn, Cattle, Butter, Cheeſe, &c. to be within the Statute. Ibid. ——— † *So much of this Statute as concerns Sea Fiſh unſalted, or Mud Fiſh, is repealed by the Stat. of 5 Eliz. 5.*

2. By 13 *Eliz. cap. 25. S.* 21. *The aboveſaid Act of 5 & 6 Ed. 6. 14. is made perpetual; and it is provided, that the ſaid Act againſt Foreſtallers, Regrators, and Ingroſſers, ſhall not extend to any Wines, Oils, Sugars, Spices, Currants, or other Foreign Victuals imported from beyond Sea, (Fiſh and Salt only excepted.)*

3. In Information for buying *Seed Corn*, having ſufficient of his own, and *not bringing ſo much of his own unto the Market*, it was ſaid by the Judges to be Law, that a *Contract in the Market, for Corn not in the Market*, or which was not there that Day, is not within the Breach of the Statute. *But* if Corn or Grain be in the Market, although the *Contract* be *made out of the Market, and delivered to the Buyer out of the Market*, yet it is within

within the Statute; And that the Market ſhall be ſaid, the Place in the Town where it hath been uſually kept, and not elſewhere. Hill. 29 Eliz. in C. B. Godb. 131. pl. 148. Anon.

4. One bought *Barley*, and becauſe it was of ſuch Quantity that he could not make Malt of it in his own Houſe, he made it in another Man's, by his own Servants; And it was reſolved; Firſt, that the Converſion of Corn *into Malt* in his own Houſe, *to ſell again*, was within the Statute, unleſs there be a ſaving for it: Secondly, Becauſe it was in another's Houſe, he is out of the Proviſo, and ſo within the Penalty of the Statute. Cited Ow. 135. by Coke, Ch. J. as Mich. 39 & 40. Eliz. B. R. Framlington's Caſe.

* S. P. Bridgm. 5. Daviſon v. Culier—S P. held, by 3 of the Judges, to be within the Statute, but Coke contra.

5. Information on the Statute 5 E. 6. 14. for buying *Wheat-Meal, and converting it into* * *Starch*; Reſolved, by 3 of the Judges, that this is not within the Statute; but they agreed, that if one *buys Corn, and makes it into Meal or Oatmeal, and ſells it*, it is within the Stat. for there is *no Alteration* in this Caſe, but it remains the ſame Corn; *but Starch is altered* by a Trade, and ſo is not the ſame Thing. But Coke, Ch. J. contra. Ow. 135. Trin. 9. Jac. C. B. the King v. Weſt.

Mich. 9 Jac. C. B. 2 Brownl. 108, 115. Croſs v. Weſtwood.

6. One was indicted and convicted by the Name of Davies Fiſhmonger, for ingroſſing and buying ſeveral *Salmons*, quas tenuit & vendidit; it was objected, that every Fiſhmonger, by the Statute, might buy and ſell at Pleaſure; but the contrary was adjudged, if at *unreaſonable Prices*; And the Book ſays, that ingroſſing Fiſh *going to Market* is puniſhable. Paſch. 12 Jac. in B. R. Roll. R. 11. The King v. Davies.

S. P. Per Roll. Ch. J. Sty. 190.

7. Information on the Statute 5 E. 6. 14. for ingroſſing 100 *Buſhels of Salt* to ſell again, and upon Demurrer thereto it was objected, firſt, that foreſtalling and regrating, are not in themſelves Offences puniſhable before the Statute; Secondly, that Salt is not any Victual within the Statute, but only a Condimentum, and for Preſervation of Victuals, tho' if any one ſhall *engroſs Salt to ſell it at unreaſonable Prices*, he may be indicted at common Law, ſed adjournatur. Mich. 7 Car. 1. B. R. Cro. C. 231. the King v. Maynard.

* By Coke, Ch. J. Maltſters, if they buy and ſell again, at unreaſonable Rates, ſhall be within the Statutes of Ingroſſers. Trin. 12 Jac. 2 Bulſt. 249. in Caſe of Suckerman and Coates v. Sir Henry Warner.———So likewiſe in 1 Roll. R. 12. the King v. Davies.

8. And a Record of Paſch. 18 Eliz. was cited, where * *buying Barley, and converting it into Malt*, and ſelling it, had been adjudged no Offence, puniſhable in a Mayor, nor made him a Victualler, (the Mayor being prohibited to ſell Victuals) Ibid.

Jo. 320. S. C. the King v. Salmon. ——By Coke, Ch. J. Fiſhmongers may well juſtify the buying of Fiſh, if they ſell it again at reaſonable Rates, otherwiſe they ſhall be within the Stat. Trin. 12 Jac. 2 Bulſt. 249. in Caſe of Suckerman and Coates v. Sir Henry Warner.

9. Indictment for ingroſſing *divers Kinds of Fiſh*, viz. *Smelts, Whitings, &c.* to ſell again, contra Formam Stat. Upon Not Guilty pleaded it was found againſt him, and being removed by Certiorari into B. R. it was moved in Arreſt of Judgment; for that by expreſs Words of the Statute, 5 & 6 E. 6. 14. *Fiſhmongers and Butchers*, &c. are not Ingroſſers within the Stat. if they buy only Things belonging to their Trades; But held, per tot. Cur. that if they *regrate and ſell at unreaſonable Prices*, they are within it. Trin. 9 Car. 1. B. R. Cro. C. 314. Penn's Caſe.

A Coſter-Monger, who bought Pippins to ſell again, was adjudged in Error brought in the Exche-

10. On an Indictment at the Aſſizes in Kent, upon the Statute made againſt Ingroſſers of Victuals, for ingroſſing *Apples, Pears, and Cherries*, it was inſiſted againſt the Defendant, that Apples, Pears, and Cherries, are Victuals within the Stat. and ſo expounded by Stat. 2 E. 6. where *Fruiterers* are called Sellers of Victuals; But Roll. Ch. J. ſaid, that 4 Jac. Apples were adjudged no Victuals; and after, upon Writ of Error, that Judgment was affirmed in the Exchequer Chamber. Jerman, Juſtice, differed,

differed, and Nicholas, Juſtice, held, that Apples are Victual within the Stat. becauſe better than Fiſh. Aſh, Juſtice, held, that Apples are Victual, but not within the Stat. for a Stat. cannot alter by Reaſon of Time, but the Common Law may. Adjournatur: Hill. 1649. B. R. Sty. 190. Anon.

quer Chamber, not to be within the Statute. cited by Coke, Ch. J. Ow. 135. as the Caſe of Baron v. Briſe.——The Barons of the Exchequer held clearly, that Apples were not within the Stat. and adjudged accordingly; which afterwards, on a Writ of Error brought in the Exchequer Chamber, was affirmed. Although the 2 *E.* 6. 15. *mentions Butchers, Brewers, Bakers, Cooks, Cheſemongers, and Fruiterers, as Victuallers*, yet Apples are not dead Victuals within the Stat. 5 E. 6. and no Information before this Time hath been exhibited for them, no more than for Plumbs or other Fruit, which ſerve more for Delicacy than neceſſary Food. But the Stat. 5 *E.* 6. is to be *intended of Things neceſſary, and of common Uſe for the Suſtenance of Man.* But the Stat. 2 *E.* 6. 15. made *againſt Conſpiracies to enhance the Prices, extend to Things more of Pleaſure than Profit.* Mich. 6 Jac. in the Exchequer, 13 Rep. 18. Baron v. Boys.——S. P. adjudged in Error in the Exchequer Chamber. Mich. 6 Jac. Cro. J. 214. Braddon v. Brown; And per Coke, Ch. J. there is *not any Thing prohibited* within the Stat. *but it has a Proviſo, how, in ſome kind, it may be bought*; but *there not being any* Proviſo *for Apples, therefore* they are *not within the Intent* of the Statute.

11. In Debt upon the Stat. 5 E. 6. 14. for ingroſſing 2000 Quarters of *Oats*; after Nil debet pleaded, it appeared in Evidence, that they were *foreign Oats*, and *exempted by* 13 *Eliz. cap.* 23. and alſo, that the Defendant was a *licenſed Badger*, and by that too, exempted; to all which the Court agreed. Trin. 14 Car. 2. in Scace. Hard. 231. Hammond v. Taylor.

12. A poor Woman that cried Fiſh was indicted for Foreſtalling, by *buying of Fiſh at Billingſgate*; Holt, Ch. J. on the Trial at Niſi Prius held, that ſhe was Not Guilty; For Billingſgate was a *Market Time out of Mind*, and ſo the Party was acquitted; And he ſaid, that were it otherwiſe, all Fiſhmongers would be liable to Proſecutions. 1 Show. 292. Mich. 3 W. & M. the King v. .....

(C) Puniſhed or Reſtrained. How.

31 Ed. 1. 1. ENacts, that *no Foreſtaller ſhall be ſuffered to dwell in any Town, and if any be convicted of that Offence, for the firſt Time he ſhall be amerced, and loſe the Thing ſo bought; For the Second, ſhall have Judgment of the Pillory; for the Third ſhall be impriſoned and make Fine; and for the Fourth ſhall abjure the Town; and like Judgment alſo ſhall be given his Acceſſaries.*

And by Serjeant Hawkins, 1 Hawk. Pl. C. Abr. 270. cap So. S. 2. At this Day all ſuch Offenders are liable to *Fine and Impriſonment*, on an Indictment at Common Law.

2. 5 & 6. *Ed.* 6. 14. *S.* 4, 5, 6. Enacts, that *every Perſon who ſhall offend in any of the Things contained in this Act, ſhall, for the* firſt Offence, *ſuffer* two Months Impriſonment, *without Bail or Mainprize, and* forfeit the Value of the Goods, Cattle, *and Victual ſo by him bought or had; and for the* ſecond Offence, *one half Years Impriſonment, and forfeit double the Value of the Goods, &c. And for the* third Offence, *ſhall be ſet in the* Pillory, *in the City, Town, or Place where he dwells, and* forfeit all his Goods and Chattels, *and be impriſoned during the King's Pleaſure.* 3 Inſt. 195.

S. 8. *And if any Perſon, having ſufficient Corn of his own, do buy any Corn in any Fair or Market, for change of Seed, and do not bring to the ſame Fair or Market, the ſame Day, ſo much Corn as he ſhall buy for Seed, and ſell the ſame if he can, he ſhall forfeit double the Value of the Corn ſo bought.*

S. 9. *And if any Perſon ſhall buy any Oxen, Sheep, or other live Cattle, and ſell the ſame again alive, unleſs he keep and feed them by the ſpace of five Weeks before he ſell them again, he ſhall forfeit double the Value of the Cattle ſo bought and ſold again, one Moiety of all which Forfeitures, to go to the King, the other to him that will ſue for the ſame in any Court of Record by Action of Debt, Bill, Plaint, or Information.*

S. 11. *None ſhall be* puniſhed twice *for the ſame Offence.*

3. Information againſt ſeveral for ingroſſing 1000 Quarters of Corn; upon Not Guilty pleaded, the Jury *found one* of the Defendants *guilty* for 700, *and the others not* guilty at all. After much Debate, Judgment was given againſt him found guilty. Trin. 7 Jac. in Scacc. Lane 59. Vaux v. Auſtin & al.

4. Information againſt a Foreſtaller, who *pleaded guilty, and prayed* the Court *to mitigate the Forfeiture*; Coke, on hearing the Stat. 5 E. 6. 14. read, ſeemed to think they might mitigate the Forfeiture becauſe it was only of the Value. Paſch. 13 Jac. B. R. 1 Roll. R. 194. the King v. Wray.

(D) Pleadings.

1. ON an Information on the Stat. of 23 Eliz. 25, for ingroſſing Barley, and converting it into Malt, the Queſtion was, whether the Defendant might plead *Not Guilty*, and give the *ſpecial Matter in Evidence?* and held that he might. Mich. 29 Eliz. B. R. Godb. 144. pl. 180. Anon.

2. Information upon the Statute 5 E. 6, 7. for buying *Wools*; the Defendant *pleaded to all, except 50 Stone* of Wool, *Not Guilty*; and *as to that, he pleaded an Information depending* againſt him *in C. B. at the Suit of B. G. and averred, it was for the ſame Offence*, unde petit Judicium, &c. Upon Demurrer it was objected, that the Plea was not good, becauſe it was *not ſet forth, that any Proceſs iſſued upon the Information*; and if no Proceſs, then the Information was not depending; but adjudged, that as ſoon as the Information is filed, 'tis depending; and therefore the Plea is good. Mich. 33 & 34 Eliz. Cro. E. 261. the Queen v. Harris.

(E) Indictment and Information. How laid; And where.

1. 5 & 6. *E.* 6. 14. ENacts, that *the Juſtices of Peace in every County, at their Quarter Seſſions, are impowered to hear and determine the Offences, by Inquiſition, Preſentment, Bill, or Information before them, and award Proceſs thereupon.*

S. 10. *Proſecutions for this Offence muſt be within two Years after the Offence committed.*

2. Upon the Statute of 5 E. 6. of Ingroſſers, if the Information be, that the Defendant *hath bought Corn*, &c. it is not ſufficient; for the Words of the Statute are, *Get into his Hands*. Arg. 2 Le. 39. Trin. 30 Eliz. in the Exchequer, in Martin Van Henbeck's Caſe.

S. P. Hawk. Pl. C. 238. S. 20. and ſays, that in every ſuch Information, the Words of the Statute muſt be quickly purſued.

3. By 31 *Eliz.* 5. *S.* 5. *It is provided, that nothing in this Act ſhall extend to any Information, &c. for any Offence in any Statute againſt Ingroſſing, Regrating, or Foreſtalling, where the Penalty ſhall appear to be to the Value of* 20 *l. but that every ſuch Offence may be laid in any County.*

2 Show. 302. Trahurne v. Deane; It was holden, that the Stat. 5 E 6. 14. was revived, though the Day of making thereof miſtaken in the 13 Eliz. 25.

4. Exception was taken by Foſter Juſtice to an Information for Ingroſſing that it concluded, *contra formam ſtatuti*, whereas it ought to have been, contra formam *ſtatutorum*; for this Stat. of 5 E. 6. 14. was determined by the 8 Eliz. and revived by the 13 Eliz. and ſo there were two Statutes; but Warburton contra; for the Information did intend only, 5 E. 6. 14. the Words whereof it recited. Trin. 9 Jac. Ow. 135. in Caſe of the King v. Weſt.

——— Skin. 110. Trin. 35 Car. 2. S. P. and ſeems to be S. C.

5 An

5. An Information on 2 E. 6. for ingroſſing *diverſos Cumulos grani* was adjudged ill for the *Incertainty* of the Word Cumulos; for the ſame might be a Heap *thraſhed, or in Shocks*; Alſo a Detinue lieth not, nor is an Indictment good, de uno Cumulo tritici, pretii; And this Information being on a *penal Law*, the *certain Quantity* of Corn engroſſed *ought to appear*. 2 Buls. 317. Hill 12 Jac. Gouldesborow v. Whider. 1 Roll. R. 134. the King v. Gouldsburrough. S. C.

6. One was indicted on the Stat. 5 E. 6. as a Foreſtaller, and the Indictment was, *that he met with J. S. at D.* near Briſtol, *and* bought ſo much Lead of him, *which was to have been ſold at Briſtol Market*; it was objected, that the Indictment was ill, becauſe it did *not ſet forth that J. S. was coming towards the Market with the Lead*; for the Statute, is, that a Foreſtaller is he, who buys any thing of one coming to Market with it, and the Averment ought to be, that it was coming to the Market *at that Time*. Mich. 14 Jac. B. R. 1 Roll. R. 421. the King v. Hook. S. P. Hawk. Pl. C. 237. cap. 80. S. 13.

7. Information in the Exchequer for engroſſing *Butter and Cheeſe*; Upon Not Guilty pleaded, it was found againſt the Defendant, and a Writ of Error being brought in the Exchequer Chamber, the Exceptions, amongſt others, were, for that the Forfeiture was pray'd, *legalis Monetæ Angl. (with a Blank) ad Valorem predict. Butyr. & Caſ.* but held well enough, *without mentioning any particular Sum*, that being to be ſettled by the Jury, ſo for that it was *not alleged* in the Information, *that the Defendant had it not by Demiſe, Grant*, &c. but this was alſo held good, it being a Matter for the Defendant himſelf to give in Evidence; laſtly, for that the Plaintiff *demanded his own Moiety, and took no Notice of the Moiety belonging to the King*; but this was diſallowed, for all the Precedents agree therewith, and accordingly the Judgment was affirmed. Mich. 20 Jac. B. R. Jo. 156. Bedoe. v. Alpe.

8. Several were indicted, for that they ingroſſed *magnam quantitatem Straminis & Feni*, at C. with an Intent to ſell and make it dearer; it was objected, that the Indictment was ill, becauſe it did *not ſay, quilibet eorum ingroſſed*, ſed non allocatur; then it was objected, that it was ill, for that the Indictment did *not mention how many Loads of* Hay and Straw they ingroſſed; and for that Cauſe the Indictment was quaſhed. Mich. 10 Car. Cro. C. 380. Anon.

9. Indictment for ingroſſing upon 5 E. 6. Exception was taken, that the Indictment was *laid in London, and the Sale in Surry*; Ruled, that it was well enough, (on a ſpecial Verdict) Comb. 3. Mich. 1 Jac. 2. B. R. the King v. Copeland.

(F) Cogniſable; In what Court.

1. JUdgment was given in a Court of *Piepowders*, upon an Information on the Statute of *buying Leather*; the Defendant was in Execution, and being brought up by Habeas Corpus, it was objected, that the Judgment was coram non Judice; for though the Court of Piepowders is the King's Court, yet they have not Authority to hold Pleas upon penal Statutes; and ſo it was adjudged; but having Power to hold Pleas in Debt, and ſo having Colour to hold Plea in this Action, the Judgment is not void, but voidable by Writ of Error. Mich. 38 Eliz. C. B. Cro. E. 530. Wilkinſon v. Netherſal.

2. Information *by the Attorney General in B. R.* on the 5 E. 6. 14. *for ſelling live Cattle within five Weeks after they were bought*; upon Not Guilty pleaded, there was a Verdict againſt the Defendant, and it was moved in Arreſt of Judgment, that *no Information would lie in this Court*; becauſe by 21 Jac. Jac. 1, 4. *all Informations by the Attorney General, upon any penal Statute in any of the Courts at Weſtminſter, ſhall be void*; And the Court was of Opinion, that ſince it was clear, the Defendant might have been indicted at the Seſſions, on the 5 E. 6. therefore this Caſe was within the Reſtraint 1 Salk. 372. S. C. the K. v. Gaul. — An Action brought in the Sheriff's Court, in London, for buying and ſelling live Cattle, on

the Stat. 3 & 4 E. 6. was, upon Reſtraint of the 21 Jac. and *the Information was quaſhed* accordingly. Mich. 10 W. 3. Carth. 465. the King v. Galle.

Removal into B. R. held ill, becauſe it ought to have been brought in the Seſſions of the Peace, according to 21 Jac. 4. though there it was held, that B. R. was not reſtrained. Latch. 192. Anon.

(G) Licences; And Pleading thereof.

1. 5 & 6 E. 6. 14, S. 16. ENACTS, that *it ſhall be lawful for any common Drover, licenſed by three Juſtices of the Peace, Quorum un. to buy Cattle in ſuch Shire where Drovers were uſed to buy Cattle, and ſell the ſame in common Fairs and Markets, forty Miles diſtant, ſo that ſuch Cattle be bought without foreſtalling.*

S. 17. *Provided, that no ſuch Licence ſhall continue in Force above one Year, unleſs the ſame be renew'd.*

2. Information for ingroſſing *Cattle*, the Defendant *juſtified as to a certain Number under two ſeveral Licences, without ſhewing how many by one, and how many by the other*; and on Demurrer it was adjudged for the Plaintiff. Mo. 879. Dawkes v. Hill.

3. It was ſaid by Hubbard, Ch. J. and Winch, but Warburton contra, that a Man, having a Licence of Foreſtalling on 5 E. 6. *need only*, in Pleading, *recite the Statute of* 5 E. 6. without pleading; For the Licence is grounded only on the 5 E. 6. and the 13 Eliz. only qualifies the Perſon. Noy. 27. Anon.

4. Information on 5 E. 6. for ingroſſing *Corn*, the Defendant *juſtified as to part, by Licence* from three Juſtices of Peace, *but did not aver his ſelling it again within one Month* after. It was held not good without ſuch Averment, it being Parcel of the Statute, and not in Nature of a Condition ſubſequent, which is to be alleged by him that will take Advantage thereof. Trin. 16 Jac. in B. R. 2 Roll. R. 33. the King and Smith v. Carter.

5. It was doubted, whether a Defendant, on an Information brought againſt him *on the* 2 E. 6. for ingroſſing, might plead *Non Culp. and give a Licence* from Juſtices of Peace *in Evidence*, or plead it in Juſtification; or whether the general Plea of Not Guilty is good, without ſaying, *contra formam Statuti*. Quære. Trin. 17 Jac. B. R. 2 Roll. R. 92. Anon.

Forfeiture.

(A) Forfeiture. In Caſes of Treaſon. In what Caſes.

This Act ſaves nothing to the King, but what was

1. 34 E. 3. 12. ENACTS, that *there ſhall be no Forfeitures of Land for Treaſon of* dead Perſons not attainted *in their Lives.*

in Eſſe, and pertaining to him at the making it. 3 Inſt. 12. and cites a Judgment in Parliament. 29 H. 6. cap. 1. Jack Cade's Caſe; that he being ſlain in open Rebellion, could no way be puniſhed, or forfeit any thing, and therefore was attainted by that Act of High Treaſon.

2. If a Man be *adherent to the Enemies of the King, in France or elſewhere*, it is a Forfeiture of his Land. Br. Forfeiture de terres. pl. 94. cites 5 R. 2.

3. 11 *H.*

3. 11 *H.* 7. *cap.* 1. Enacts, that *none ſhall forfeit any thing for ſerving the King for the Time being in the Wars within the Realm or without.*

4. At this Day, tho' a Man be aiding and aſſiſting the King's Enemy, or be *killed in open Rebellion* againſt the King, he ſhall not forfeit his Land or his Goods; but if the *Ch. J. of England*, (who is ſovereign Coroner of all England) in Perſon *upon View of the Body* of him killed in open Rebellion *makes Record of it, and returns it into B. R.* he ſhall forfeit his Land and Goods, as was done and reſolved in time of H. 7. per Fineux. Ch. J. 4 Rep. 57. b. in a Nota of the Reporters, in the Caſe of the Commonalty of Sadlers.

5. 33 *H.* 8. *cap.* 20. *S.* 1. Enacts, that *if any Perſon commit High Treaſon when he is of perfect Memory, and after Accuſation, Examination, and Confeſſion thereof before any of the King's Council, ſhall fall into Lunacy, he ſhall be enquired of in any County, where the King by his Commiſſion ſhall aſſign; and if he be there indicted, he ſhall there be arraigned without his perſonal Preſence, and if he be found guilty, he ſhall ſuffer Death, and forfeit as if he had been of perfect Memory*; but this is altered by 1 & 2 P. & M. cap. 10. S. 8.

S. 3. *If any Perſon be attainted of High Treaſon, by the common Laws or Statutes of this Realm, ſuch Attainder by the common Law, ſhall be of as good Force, as if it had been done by Parliament, and the King ſhall have as much Benefit thereby, viz. of Lands, &c. of ſuch Offender, and ſhall be as well adjudged in actual and real Poſſeſſion of all ſuch Things of the Offender which the King ought or might lawfully have, or which the Offender ought or might lawfully loſe or forfeit, or as if he had been attainted by the Parliament, without any Office or Inquiſition to be found of the ſame.*

S. 4. *The Rights, &c. of all others, (except the Offenders, &c.) is ſaved.*

6. 5 & 6 *E.* 6. *cap.* 11. *S.* 9. Enacts, that *the Offender in Treaſon being lawfully convicted thereof, ſhall forfeit to the King all ſuch Lands, Tenements, and Hereditaments, as he ſhall have of an Eſtate of Inheritance in his own Right, in Uſe or Poſſeſſion in the King's Dominions, at the Time of the Treaſon committed, or at any Time after.*

7. 7 *Ann. cap.* 21. *S.* 10. *After the Deceaſe of the Perſon who pretended to be Prince of Wales, during the Life of the late King James, &c. no Attainder for Treaſon ſhall extend to the diſinheriting of any Heir, nor to the Prejudice of any Perſon, other than the Offender, during his Life.*

8. Tho' the *Act of K. W.* 3. ſaves Corruption of Blood in Caſes of Treaſon by *Coining*, yet, notwithſtanding, the real Eſtate is forfeited; For there are *other Acts which give the Forfeiture to the Crown in all Treaſons*; And when two Acts ſeem to croſs one another, ſuch Conſtruction ſhall be made, that both ſhall ſtand together: Beſides, it is not like the Caſe of Felony; For there it is the Corruption of Blood only, that prevents the Deſcent, and occaſions the Eſcheat. MS. Rep. ſaid to be Lord Harcourt's. tit. Forfeiture. 21 Jan. 1710. Horton v. Hinton.

(B) In Caſes of Treaſon; What Things or * Eſtate ſhall be ſaid to be Forfeited.

* See Copyhold.

1. *RIGHT of Action* is not forfeited by the Words in the Statute 33 *H.* 8. 20. 3 Rep. 2. b. Trin. 25 Eliz. Marq. of Wincheſter's Caſe. S. P. reſolved, but a *Difference* taken, between a *naked Right of Action*, and an *Eſtate of Inheritance, which is forfeitable, coupled with an antient Right, for which the Forfeiture of the Poſſeſſion is barred, by the* 26 *H.* 3. 13. Mich. 4 Jac. 1. 12 Rep. 6. Anon.

2. By the general Words in Attainder of *all Hereditaments*, neither a *Condition*, nor an *Uſe* was given to the King, for they were not forfeitable

at the common Law; But there is a *Difference* in this Caſe, *becauſe Inheritances and Chattels.* 3 Rep. 2. b. 3, Trin. 25 Eliz. Marqueſs of Wincheſter's Caſe.

Tenant in Tail diſcontinues, and commits Treaſon, and is attainted,

3. *Right of a diſcontinued Eſtate Tail, before* 27 *H.* 8. is barr'd againſt the Iſſue of that Entail, by the 26 *H.* 8. 13. notwithſtanding the Remitter. M. 4 Ja. 12 Rep. 6. Anon.

this Right of Action is not forfeited, Jenk. 286. pl. 21.——*But if the Diſcontinuee enfeoffs the Tenant in Tail*, the Right of the Tail is forfeited; for the Inheritance is involved in the Poſſeſſion. Jenk. 286 pl. 21.——*But* if the Diſcontinuee had *made a Leaſe for Life to* the *Tenant in Tail*; the Tail had not been forfeited; for in this Caſe, at the Time of the Treaſon, he had not any Inheritance to forfeit, as the Statute 26 H. 8. requires. Jenk. 286. pl. 21.

So was it held in 24 Eliz. in one Armſtrong's Caſe. Ibid.

4. *Truſt of a Leaſe for Years*, granted by the King's Patent, is forfeited to the King by Attainder of Felony. Cro. J. 512. Mich. 16 Jac. B. R. the King v. Daccombe, Exec' of the E. of Somerſet.

——'s But it was ſaid to be held by all that in one.....s's Caſe, that a *Truſt of a Freehold* was not forfeited upon Attainder of Treaſon. Ibid.

5. The *Truſt of a Term upon the Marriage of W.* was conveyed *to H. till W. payed* ſo much, and *then in truſt for W. and his Wife, and their Iſſue.* W. is attainted of Treaſon, and by the new Stat. *all Eſtates, Truſts*, &c. of ſuch Perſons, are given to the King. The *Money is paid by the Wife of W.* and upon a ſpecial Verdict in Ejectment, it was held, that this Truſt is not forfeited to the King; for it is a Purchaſe to the Wife and their Iſſues; And Twiſden J. ſaid, that it had been a great Doubt, whether the Truſt of an Inheritance ſhould be forfeited for Treaſon before the new Statute; but ſome have been of Opinion, that the Truſt of a Term ſhould be forfeited before for Treaſon. Sid. 260. Trin. 17 Car. 2. B. R. Whaley v. Anderſon.

6. A *Subject of England, attainted* of Treaſon, was ſuppoſed to have *married a Foreigner*, who was *Ceſty que Truſt of S. S. Annuities* of the Value of 50,000 l. It was inſiſted, that if ſhe was married, the Law of England ſhould not be the Meaſure of the Decree of this Court, (as to Forfeiture or not) but the Law of another Country, this being a *bare Truſt for a Foreigner*, and that the Court has always a Regard for the Laws of other Nations, as of Holland, and of the Plantations; And that ſince all Foreigners are *encouraged by Act of Parliament, to place their Money in the publick Funds*, it would be very hard that this Money ſhould be forfeited; But this Point was not determined, the Marriage being denied by the Lady's Affidavit, and no Proof made to the contrary, and ſo the Securities decreed to be aſſigned to her. 9 Mod. 101. Mich. 11 Geo. in Chancery, Drummond v. Decker.

(C) Forfeiture in Caſes of Treaſon. What Lands, in Reſpect of the Limitations of the Eſtate; or of Statutes made.

This Act *extended* only to Lands, which the attainted Perſon had in Poſſeſſion, and *not to*

1. 26 *H.* 8. *cap.* 13. §. 5. ENACTS that *every Offender, convict of High Treaſon by Preſentment, Confeſſion, Verdict or Proceſs of Outlawry, ſhall forfeit to the King all ſuch Lands, Tenements, and Hereditaments, which he ſhall have of any Eſtate or Inheritance in Uſe or Poſſeſſion, by any Right, Title or Means within the King's Dominions, at the Time of ſuch Treaſon committed, or after.*

Rights, Conditions, &c. nor did it extend to *Attainders by Parliament*, or when the Party *ſtood mute*. But the Act of 33 *H.* 8. 20. extends to all manner of Attainders of Treaſon. 3 Rep. 10. b. Trin. 26 Eliz. in the Exchequer in Dowtie's Caſe.

The

The Rights, Titles, Intereſts, Poſſeſſion, Leaſes, Rents, Offices, and other Profits of all Perſons, their Heirs and Succeſſors (except of the Offenders or others claiming to their Uſe) are ſaved.

2. 33 *H.* 8. *cap.* 20. §. 3. Makes a Forfeiture of Lands, Tenements, Hereditaments, Goods, Chattles, *Uſes, Rights, Entries, Conditions, Poſſeſſions, Reverſions, Remainders, and all other Things of ſuch Offender*; and that the *King ſhall have as much Benefit thereby, and ſhall as well be adjudged* * *in actual and real Poſſeſſion, without any Office or Inquiſition to be found of the ſame.*

* Yet when a *Diſſeiſee* is attainted, now by his Attainder, the King has only a Right; For thoſe

Words ſhall be conſtrued thus, viz. that he ſhall be in actual Poſſeſſion without Office; that is, as if an Office had been found of it; and at Common Law if the Diſſeiſſee had been attainted of Treaſon, and the Seiſin and Diſſeiſin had been found by Office, the Poſſeſſion ſhould not be in the King, till Sci. fa. ſued, &c. or Seiſure at leaſt; becauſe when a Stranger is ſeiſed at the Time of the Office found, the King ſhall not be in Poſſeſſion till Seiſure. And all Poſſeſſions are ſaved by this Act, as if the ſaid Act had not been made; and therefore the Poſſeſſion of the Diſſeiſor is ſaved by it, in the ſame manner as if an Eſpecial Office had been found at the Common Law. 3 Rep. 11. Trin. 26 Eliz. in the Exchequer. Dowtie's Caſe.

The Words of this Statute, that the King ſhall be in actual Poſſeſſion, ſhall not be conſtrued to extend to an actual and abſolute Poſſeſſion; but ſuch a Poſſeſſion only, which he had at Common Law after Office found; ſo as the Statute doth not give to the King a larger Poſſeſſion, but an eaſier without the Circumſtance of an Office. Trin. 26 Eliz. Le. 21. In the Duke of Northumberland's Caſe.—— 2 Hawk. Pl. C. 452. ch. 49. S. 23.

3. Note that Sir John Huſſey, Knight, *enfeoffed certain Perſons in Fee, to the Uſe of Anne his Wife for her Life, and after to the* Uſe of the *Heirs Male of his Body*; and for Default of ſuch Iſſue, *to the Uſe of the Heirs Male of the Body of Sir W. H. his Father*; and for Default of ſuch Iſſue, to the Uſe *of his right Heirs*; and after *had Iſſue W.* Huſſey, and then *Sir John was attainted of Treaſon* Anno 29 H. 8. *and put to Execution*; and after *Anne died*, and the ſaid *W. Huſſey prayed Ouſter le Main of the King*; and by the King's Attorney he ſhall have it; For this Name *Heirs Male of the Body, is only a Name of Purchaſe; and Sir W. Huſſey* [the Grandſon] *ſhall not have it as Heir to Sir John, but as Purchaſor*; but it was agreed, that the *2d Remainder to the right Heirs of Sir John* Huſſey *was forfeited by the Attainder*; For none can have it but he who is Heir in Fact; note the Difference. Br. Noſme. pl. 1. cites 37 H. 8.

Br. N. C. 37 H. S. pl. 302. S. C.—— Br. Livery. pl. 1. S. P. cites S. C but Brook makes a Quære.

4. Where *Tenant in Tail is attainted of Treaſon, before the Statute of* 26 *H.* 8. his Son ſhall have the Land; For he does not claim only as Heir, but by the Statute, & per Formam Doni. Br. Noſme. pl. 1. cites 37 H. 8.

5. *Thomas Duke of Norfolk* in Anno 11 Eliz. *conveyed* his Lands *to the Uſe of himſelf for Life, and after to* the Uſe of Philip Earl of Arundel, *his eldeſt Son in Tail*, with divers Remainders over, with a *Proviſo, that if he ſhould be minded to alter and revoke the ſaid Uſes, and ſignified his Mind in Writing, under his proper Hand and Seal, and ſubſcribed by* 3 *credible Witneſſes, that then* &c. and after the ſaid Duke was attainted of High Treaſon; this Proviſo or Condition was not given to the Queen, by the Act of 33 H. 8. becauſe the Performance of it was *perſonal and inſeparably annexed* to his Perſon, viz. to ſignify his meaning by Writing under his proper Hand, which no other can do but the Duke himſelf. Upon which Point, all the Poſſeſſions of the Dukedom ſo conveyed, ut ſupra, were ſaved, and not forfeited by the Attainder. 7 Rep. 13. a. cited per Cur. as reſolved 11 Eliz. in Duke of Norfolk's Caſe.

S. C. cited Mod. 40. 1 Lev. 279.

6. Cranmer the Biſhop of Canterbury, made a *Feoffment* of Land *to the Uſe of himſelf during his Life*; and *after his Deceaſe, to the Uſe of his Executors and Aſſigns for* 20 *Years*; and *after to the Uſe of T. Cranmer in Tail*, &c. after the Archbiſhop was attainted of Treaſon; and if this was an Intereſt in the Biſhop or not, was the Queſtion; For if ſo, then it appertained to the Queen; and if not, then otherwiſe. And 'twas agreed by the Juſtices, that the Biſhop had no Intereſt in the Term and Remainder; now it cannot be becauſe the Biſhop *did not, nor could he make an Executor*, &c. And. 19. pl. 39. Hill. 14 Eliz. Kirke v. Bails, al. Cranmer's Caſe.

D. 309. pl. 76. Paſch. 14 Eliz. S. C. Mo. 100. Hill. 14 Eliz. Cranmer's Caſe.—— Le. 196 S.C. —2 Le. 5. S. C.—Ben. 207. S. C.

7. King

S.C. D. 332. b. pl. 27. Paſch. 16 El. —S. C. cited Hob. 346.— Entailed Lands were never forfeited till the Statute 26 H. 8. in Caſes of Treaſon, and this not by the general Words, *all Lands, Tenements, and Hereditaments,* but by the Words following, viz. *Of any Eſtate whatſoever.*

7. King *H.* 8 *granted* a certain Manor *to A. and his Wife, and the Heirs of their two Bodies,* &c. afterwards A. by Act of Parliament was attainted of Treaſon, and *executed leaving his Wife and a Son*; and by the ſame Act it was *ordained, that he ſhould loſe all the Lands whereof he was ſeiſed,* &c. The Wife died, and the Queſtion was if the Son ſhould have the Manor by the Entail, or the King by Attainder; reſolved that the King ſhould have it as forfeited; tho' 'twas argued for the Son, that his Mother ſurviving, he was inheritable to the Manor, by Deſcent from her, and might claim from her *per Formam Doni*; and tho' the Blood between his Father and him was corrupted, yet 'twas not ſo between his Mother and him. 1 And. 39. pl. 102. Ld Effingham v. Carew.

Arg. 2 Lev. 170 Trin. 28 Car. 2 B. R. in the Caſe of Brown v. Wayte.——If Tenant in Tail be attainted of Treaſon and dies, the Land ſhall not veſt in the King before Office found; For the Act of 26 H 8. gives the Forfeiture, but neither the Act nor the Attainder makes a Corruption of the Blood, as to the Deſcent of the Land in Tail, and ſo it was agreed as Popham ſaid, in the Caſe of Ld. Lumley, that where the *Grandfather* was *Tenant in Tail*, and the *Father was attainted of Treaſon, and died in the Life Time of the Grandfather*, the Land ſhould deſcend to the Son notwithſtanding the Attainder, which was affirmed per tot. Cur. to be good Law, in which 2 Caſes the Act of 26 H. 6. gave the Forfeiture only, and his Attainder is not Corruption of the Blood for Land intailed. But now *by the* 33 *H. 8. the actual Poſſeſſion is* transferred and *veſted in the King preſently* by the Attainder, as well in the Life Time, as at the Death of the Perſon attainted, and as well of Lands entail'd, as of Lands in Fee Simple. 3 Rep. 10. b. In Dowtie's Caſe.

Mo. 95. 125. S.C 3 Rep. 1. S.C by the Name of the Margs of Winchſter's Caſe.

8. Lands were given *to A. and M.* (whom he afterwards married) *in Tail, Remainder to B.* in Tail, *A. alone ſuffered a common Recovery and died,* and *M. ſurviving died without Iſſue*, by which Writ of Error accrued by the Stat. 9 R. 2. to *B.* in *Remainder*, and he *was Attainted of Treaſon by Parliament, and all his Rights and Conditions given to the Crown*, upon which the Queen would have brought *a Writ of Error* to reverſe the Recovery againſt W. R. who was the Tertenant, and adjudged that ſhe could not have it in Reſpect that it was a *Thing in Privity*, ſo *united to the Perſon* of B. that it could not be given by Parliament to the Crown. Arg. Mo. 323. cites Trin. 25 Eliz. B. R. Braybrocke's Caſe.

Mo. 303. S. C.—4 Le. 135. 169. S.C. — And. 293. S. C.—Poph. 18. S. C.

9. A. ſeiſed in Fee, by Indenture *in Conſideration of Blood Covenants with B. his Nephew to ſtand ſeiſed to the Uſe of himſelf for Life*, and after to the Uſe *of B. in Tail*, the Remainder *to the Right Heirs of B. Proviſo if the ſaid A. by himſelf, or by any other during his natural Life tender to B. a Gold-Ring to the intent to make void the ſaid Uſes, that then the ſaid Uſes ſhall be void*; afterwards A. is Attainted of Treaſon and Outlawed upon it; the Attainder is confirmed by Act of Parliament; the King by Letters Patents under the Great Seal, reciting the Uſes, the Proviſo, and the Benefit thereof given him by Act of Parliament, *authoriſed E. to deliver the Gold Ring to B. to the Intent to make void the Uſes*; E. reads the Patent to B. and offers the Ring to him, which he *refuſeth to accept*; all which with the Patent he certified into the Exchequer. Upon which an Information was brought in the Exchequer, averring the Life of A. an d it was reſolved; (1) that the Condition in the principal Caſe, viz. the Tender of the Gold Ring was *not annexed to the Perſon of A.* but that any one might make the Tender, and that is was given to the King by the Act of Parliament. (2) That the *Tender* and Certificate *was good*, without Office found. (3) That preſently by the Tender, according to the Proviſo, the Uſes were determined, and the Land veſted in the King by Force of the Act of Parliament. Mich. 33 & 34 Eliz. in the Exchequer. 7 Rep. 11. b. Engleſield's Caſe.

Jenk. 286. pl. 21.

10. *Tenant in Tail* attaint of Treaſon, the King ſhall have Fee determinable on Death without Iſſue and has no greater Eſtate. 2 And. Arg. 139.

11. Tho' an *Earldom* be a Dignity, and within the Statute de Donis Conditionalibus yet it had been Forfeited by Attainder of Treaſon tho' the Statute of 26 H. 8. had never been made; adjudged. Mich. 2 Jac. 1. 7 Rep. 34. in Nevil's Caſe.

12. A.

12. A. Covenants by Indenture *to ſtand ſeiſed to himſelf* for Life, Remainder to B. his Brother's eldeſt Son for Life, Remainder to the firſt Son of the ſaid B. and ſo to the 8th. Son, &c. Remainder to the Right Heirs of A. A. is Attaint of Treaſon, and executed before the Birth of any Son to B. the *Sons born after* are all utterly barred by that Attainder, and the King ſhall have the Fee diſcharged of all the Remainders limited to the Sons not yet born. Noy 102. Trin. 9 Jac. Sir Thomas Palmer's Caſe.

13. *Tenant in Tail* 6 H. 8. *made a Feoffment in Fee* to W. and others, to the Uſe of his laſt Will, and died; the Right of the Land, together with the *Intail deſcended to D. who*, 21 H. 8. *made a Feoffment to* the Uſe of *himſelf and K. his Wife, and the Heirs of their two Bodies*, and *had Iſſue E. a Son, and F. a Daughter.*—D. in 26 H. 8. *was Attainted* of Treaſon and Executed; and 31 H. 8. a ſpecial Act of Parliament was made of his Attainder and Forfeiture; 5 Eliz. *E.* Son and Heir of D. *was reſtored in Blood* by Parliament, *and died without Iſſue*; *F. married* J. S. *and* they *had Iſſue* W. S. 8. Eliz. K. died; 33 Eliz. all was found by Office; 34 Eliz. the Queen granted the Lands to R. and the Heirs Male of his Body. It was reſolv'd; 1ſt. That the Feoffment gave away all the Eſtate, which the Tenant in Tail had concerning himſelf; but concerning his Iſſue in Tail there remained a Right by force of the Statute of Weſtminſter 2. And 2d. That this *old Right of Intail* was Forfeited by the Statute of 26 H. 8. for that there was an actual Entail in the Perſon Attainted at the time of the Attainder. 3d. That their Rights were bound by the expreſs Words of the Statute, there being no Saving therein for them. Then 4thly. when the Office was found the Iſſue in Tail was barred *notwithſtanding any pretended Remitter.* Mich. 13 Jac. in the Exchequer Chamber. Hob. 334. Lord Sheffield v. Ratcliff. 2 Roll. R 312. 333. 374. 421. 428. 496. 501. S. C.——Het. 150. S. C.—Jo. 69. S. C. Palm. 351. S. C.—Godb 314. S. C.

14. A. made a *Feoffment to divers Feoffees, to the Uſe of the Feoffor for Life*, with divers *Remainders over, provided always, that if the Feoffor during his Life, tender a Ring, or a Pair of Gloves, or any Sum of Money, to any of the Feoffees, or to any of ther Heirs (ipſo A. declarante that his Intent ſhould be to alter the Uſe and to make thoſe Uſes void)* that then all thoſe Uſes ſhould be void; and after this, the ſaid A. was Attainted of Treaſon, and by a ſpecial Act of Parliament, 28 Eliz. that he ſhould forfeit to the Queen all his Lands, Tenements, Hereditaments, Rights, Conditions, &c. and after this the *Queen by her Patent*, reciting all the Matter aforeſaid, *authoriſed Sir John Forteſcue to Tender a Ring accordingly*; and he did ſo, and certified it in the Exchequer; after this B. obtained a Leaſe of this Land, &c. now the Queſtion was, whether the Power of the Tender of the Ring, &c. be forfeited to the Queen by the Attainder aforeſaid, or be tied to the Perſon of A. becauſe 'tis a Declaration of the Intent annexed to the Perſon of A. And adjudged not forfeited. Lat. 24. Harding v. Warner. Palm. 429. S. C. Noy 79. S. C.—S.C. cited, Lev. 279. —Mod. 16. 38.—Moreton J. Mod. 40. cited this Caſe as a Caſe that had walked thro' all the Courts of Weſtminſter Hall and that by Reaſon of the Words *ipſo Declarante* it could not be forfeited.——Jo. 134 Trin. 2 Car. B. R. Warner v. Harding. 2 Roll. 393. Warner v. Hargrave.

15. *Tenant in Tail* to him, and the Heirs Males of his Body, *Reverſion in the Crown, made a Feoffment* of the Lands, and afterwards was Attainted and Executed for Treaſon, and by a *ſpecial Act of Parliament*, by which his Attainder was confirmed, it was *Enacted that* he ſhould loſe *all his Lands*, &c. and that they *ſhould be veſted in the Queen without Office* found; the Queſtion was, whether there was any Eſtate, or Right remaining in the Tenant in Tail after the Feoffment, which was not forfeited by the Attainder and Act of Parliament? the Judges on Arguing this in the Exchequer Chamber were divided, ſome held, that by the Feoffment of Tenant in Tail (the Reverſion ſtill remaining in the Crown) there could be no Diſcontinuance of the Eſtate Tail, and therefore, being in him at the Time of the Attainder, was by the Forfeiture veſted in the King, by the Stat. 26 H. 8. but if the Eſtate Tail was not in him, yet the Right of the Intail remained, which was given to the King by the 33 H. 8. The other Judges argued that tho' the Reverſion was in the King and In this Caſe it was agreed by all, that if Tenant in Tail of a common Perſon, where *no Reverſion is in the King*, make a Feoffment, it is a Diſcontinuance and if he be attainted of Treaſon, there is no Forfeiture according to 5 Rep. 2.

b Cro C. 428 in Caſe of Stone v. Newman.

and ſo no Diſcontinuance, yet all was diveſted out of the Feoffor as ſtrongly as if there had been a Diſcontinuance, and ſo nothing remained to be Forfeited; * No Judgment was given. Paſch. 7 Car. in the Exchequer Chamber, Cro C. 427. Stone v. Newman.

* Exceptions being afterwards taken in B. R. to the Pleadings, it was there agreed, that according to the greater Opinion in the Exchequer Chamber, Judgment ſhould be entered in B. R. for the Plaintiff, [and ſo the Eſtate was adjudged Forfeited] Paſch. 12 Car. Cro. C. 460.

16. Land is conveyed by A. *to J. S. and his Heirs, to the Uſe of him and his Heirs, in Truſt for A. and his Heirs*; the King in this Caſe upon the Death of A. ſhan't have Ward, nor Forfeiture for Treaſon, or Felony; but if J. S. dies, his Heir within Age ſhall be in Ward; if J. S. be attaint of Felony, or Treaſon, the Land and the *Truſt is loſt*. In Caſe of *Chattel* ſo conveyed upon Truſt by A. and A. commits Felony, or Treaſon the Truſt is loſt. Jenk. 219. pl. 66.

17. *Lands* are given *upon Condition not to commit Treaſon*, and afterwards the Party commits Treaſon the King's Title ſhall be preferred and he ſhall have the Land. Arg. Hard. 24.

Lev. 279. S. C.—Vent. 128. S. C.

18. A Writ of Error was brought in B. R. to reverſe a Judgment given in C. B. upon a ſpecial Verdict in Ejectment; the Jury found that one *Simon Mayne* was *poſſeſſed of a Rectory for a long Term*, and having *conveyed the whole Term in Part of it to certain Perſons abſolutely*, he *conveyed his Term in the reſidue*, being 2 Parts in this Manner; viz. *in Truſt for himſelf during Life, and afterwards* in Truſt *for the Payment of the Rent reſerved* upon the Original Leaſe, *and for ſeveral* of his *Friends*, &c. *provided* that *if he ſhould have* any *Iſſue* of his Body *at the Time of his Death then the Truſts to ceaſe*, and the Aſſignment to be in Truſt for ſuch Iſſue, &c. and there was another *proviſo that if he were minded to change the Uſes*, or otherwiſe to diſpoſe of the Premiſſes, that *he ſhould have Power ſo to do by writing in the Preſence of two or more Witneſſes*, or by his laſt Will and Teſtament; *He had Iſſue* Male at the Time of his Death, *but made no diſpoſition* purſuant to his Power; all which was found by Verdict, and that in his Life time he had committed Treaſon, and they find the Act of his Attainder. The Queſtion was, whether the reſt of the Term that remained unexpired at the Time of his Death were forfeited to the King; 'twas inſiſted that the Deed was fraudulent, becauſe he took the Profits during his Life, and *the Aſſignees knew not of the Deed of Truſt*. But adjudged that nothing was forfeited but during Simon Mayne's Life, and the Judgment before given in C. B. was Affirmed. Paſch. 23 Car. 2. B. R. 1 Mod. 16. 38. 40. Smith v. Wheeler

2 Lev. 169. S. C. and ſays, that in 1 W. & M. this Judgment was Affirmed in Parliament by one Voice only. Ibid. 171.—Pollex 185. 3 Keb. 459.

19. Upon a ſpecial Verdict in Ejectment, the Caſe was, viz. *A.* the Father of the Leſſor of the Plaintiff *was in* Anno Dom. 1646. *Tenant in Tail* of the Lands in Queſtion, and afterwards Inſtrumental in bringing the late King Charles to Death, and ſo was *Guilty of High Treaſon and died*; afterwards the Act of Pains and Penalties, made 13 *Car.* 2. 15. Enacted, *That all the Lands, Tenements and Hereditaments, which Sir John Danvers had the 25th Day of March* 1646. *or at any time ſince ſhall be forfeited to the King*; and whether theſe entailed Lands ſhall be forfeited to the King by Force of this Act was the Queſtion? and adjudged that the Lands were forfeited. Mich. 28 Car. 2. B. R. 2 Mod. 130. Brown v. Waite als. Sir John Danvers's Caſe.

(D) In Caſes of Felony.

1. IF a Felon be *aljured*, he ſhall forfeit his *Lands and Goods*. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 121. cites 6 E. 2.

Contra where the *Donor diſtrains the Tenant in Tail for Rent*, and

2. A Man *diſtrained his Termor for Rent* Arrear, and after the *Termor is attained for Felony done before the Diſtreſs taken*; and by the Opinion of the Court, the King ſhall not have the Diſtreſs as forfeit, unleſs he ſatisfies the

the Party who diſtrain'd; For it was *lawfully taken Tempore Captionis.* Br. Pledges. pl. 31. cites 13. R. 2. 13.

after the Tenant in Tail is *attainted for Felony done before the Diſtreſs*; For the Donor may diſtrain the Heir of the Tenant in Tail after Execution of his Father; But in the firſt Caſe he has no other Remedy. Br. Pledges, pl. 31. cites 13 R. 2. 13.

3. If a Man *pledges his Goods, and after is attainted of Felony*; yet the King ſhall not have the Goods pledg'd, without paying the Sum for which they were pledg'd. Ibid.

4. *By 24 H. 8. cap. 5. If any be indicted or appeal'd, for the Death of one attempting to murder, rob or commit Burglary (and ſo found by Verdict) he ſhall forfeit no Lands or Goods for the ſame, but ſhall be fully acquit and diſcharged thereof.*

5. For ſuch Crimes as Murder, Homicide, burning of Houſes, &c. *for which Judgment ſhall be given, that he be hanged by the Neck till he be dead*; the Offender ſhall forfeit all his Lands in Fee Simple, and his Goods and Chattels. Co. Litt. 391. a.

6. *But* for Felony by *Chance-Medley, Se Defendendo*, or *Petty Larceny*, he ſhall forfeit his Goods and Chattels, but no Lands of any Eſtate of Freehold or Inheritance. Co. Litt. 391. a.

(E) In what Caſes not. Killing in Defence, &c.

1. HE who kills a Man *ſe Defendendo* * ſhall forfeit his Goods; but *the Acceſſory* was not arraigned, therefore it ſeems that he ſhall not forfeit his Goods; for the Principal was not Felon of Death, and ſhall not have Judgment of Life; and ſo ſee that *a Man ſhall forfeit his Goods where Judgment ſhall not be given.* Br. Forfeiture de Terres pl. 13. cites 15 E. 3. Fitzh. Coron 116. & 11 H. 4. 93.

* Br. Forfeiture de Terres pl. 51. S. P. cites 4 H. 7. 2.

2. If a Man is arraigned de Morte Hominis, and it is found ſe Defendendo, yet he ſhall forfeit his Goods; For it was ſaid, that *by the Common Law, he ſhall have Judgment of Death*; and the Statute of *Glouceſter c. 9.* gives no Remedy but for his Life only, and not for his Goods. Br. Forfeiture de Terres pl. 15. cites 21 E. 3. 17.

Br. Corone pl. 40. cites S. C. ——— 3 Inſt. 56. 220.

3. A Man was arraigned of the Death of W. N. and pleaded Not Guilty; and the Jury found, that the *deceaſed ſtruck the Defendant to the Ground, and drawed his Knife to have killed him, and the Defendant* * *likewiſe drawed his Knife*; and the *Deceaſed, for Haſte to have killed the Defendant, fell upon the Defendant's Knife, and ſo killed himſelf*, and demanded Judgment, &c. Per Knivet, If he had killed him ſe Defendendo, he had forfeited his Goods and his Body at the Grace of the King to have his Charter of Pardon; but now 'tis found that he killed himſelf; therefore we will adviſe, if he ſhall be adjudged Not Guilty, or if his Chattels ſhall be forfeited or not. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 8. cites 44 E. 3. 44. ——And after 44 Aſſ. 17. he was *adjudged Not Guilty, and his Chattels ſaved.* Br. ibid.

* Lying upon the Ground. Br. Corone pl. 12. cites S. C.

4. In Appeal of Murder againſt A. the Jury found that *the Deceaſed made the firſt Aſſault prope altam Viam*, but did *not ſay, ad ipſum murderandum*, and therefore the Judges were clearly of Opinion that A. ſhould forfeit his Goods, and that by the 24 H. 8. c. 5. Mich. 3 & 4 Ph. & Ma. Bendl. 47. pl. 86. Newman v. Punter.

But upon the ſame Stat. the Judges of B. R. held that *where one lies in wait near the Highway, or in the Highway to murder or rob another, or to commit Burglary*; there if the *Party* ſo to have been murdered, &c. *kills the Felon* in his own Defence, he ſhall not forfeit his Goods. Mich. 3 & 4 Ph. & Ma. Bendl. 47. pl. 86. Newman v. Punter.

5. *A Felon robs a Merchant and kills him; the Merchant's Boy comes quickly after*, and finds this Fact juſt done, *and kills the Felon.* In this Caſe there is no Forfeiture of Goods to the King; and the Stat. 24 H. 8. 5. is only an Affirmance of the Common Law. Jenk. 30. pl. 57.

(F) If

(F) In Caſes of Felony by Acceſſories.

Br. Corone pl. 8. cites 43 E. 3. 17. —Br. Appeal. pl. 7. cites 43 E. 3. 17, 18, 19.

1. WHERE *Exigent* is *awarded in Appeal of Death*, the Goods are forfeited, and Exigent *ſhall not be awarded againſt the Acceſſory, till the Principal is attainted, if it may appear to the Court, who is Principal and who Acceſſory.* But where *Appeal* is brought *againſt* 3, and *at the Exigent one is outlawed*, and *the others render themſelves*, and the *Plaintiff counts that he who is outlawed was Principal, and the other* 2 *Receivers of him*, there the Goods of the Acceſſories are forfeited; For it does not appear to the Court till the Count; and a Thing veſted cannot be deveſted, per Knevet clearly, notwithſtanding that the Appeal be adjudged againſt the Plaintiff, becauſe the Act was done in one County, and the receiving in another County. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 6. cites 43 E. 3. 18.

2. A Man is indicted as acceſſory *to the Death of a Man before the Coroner*; and 'twas found that he fled for the Felony; and by all the Juſtices of both Places, he ſhall forfeit his Goods; and ſo of *all Acceſſories at the Time* of the Felony done, *but not of Acceſſories after the Felony done.* Per Townſend, where the Acceſſory is acquitted, yet it ſhall be inquired of the Flying. Per Huſſey Ch. J. this is the Courſe in B. R. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 52. cites 4 H. 7. 18.

(G) In Caſes of Felony. Eſtates in Lands.

1. A Man ſeiſed of Land, ſhall forfeit it for Felony; and by Attainder of him, the *Feme* ſhall *loſe her Dower.* Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 78. cites 21 E. 3. 49.

2. 25 *E.* 3. *Stat.* 5. *cap.* 14. Enacts that *after a Man is indicted of Felony before the Juſtices to hear and determine, it ſhall be commanded to the Sheriff to attach his Body by Writ or Precept of* Capias; *and if the Sheriff return that the Body is not found, another* Capias *ſhall be made returnable at* 3 *Weeks, and in it ſhall be compriſed, that the Sheriff cauſe to be ſeiſed his Chattels, and keep them till the Return of the Writ; and if the Sheriff return that the Body is not found, and the Indictee cometh not; the Exigend ſhall be awarded, and the Chattels ſhall be forfeit.*

3. A *Diſſeiſor is attainted* of Felony, and the Land was holden of the Crown. The *Diſſeiſee enters* into the Land, and afterwards *Office is found* that the Diſſeiſor was ſeiſed. The *Remitter is deveſted* out of the Diſſeiſee. Arg. Godb. 326. cites 3 E. 4. 25.

4. Tenant in Fee of a *common Lord* is attained of Felony; his Lands remain in him during his Life, *until the Entry of the Lord*, and where the *King is Lord*, until Office found; but in the Caſe of a common Lord after the *Death of a Perſon attainted*, they are in the Lord before Entry, and in the Caſe of the King before Office, for the Miſchief of Abeyances. Arg. 2 Le. 126. in Caſe of Venables v. Harris.

5. *Lord and Tenant.* Tenant is Attaint of Petty Treaſon or Felony. Eſcheat of the *Land* of the Tenant with the *Charters* of the Land, *belong to the Lord*; but *Goods, Leaſes* for Years or Life, and *Choſes en Action* belong *to the King*, and *Year Day and Waſte.* Jenk. 125. pl. 52.

6 *Truſt of Inheritance* not to be forfeited by Attainder of Felony to the Lord by *Eſcheat.* Paſch. 21 Car. 2. 3 Ch. R. 36. * Att. Gen. v. Sands. —cites 3 Rep. . . . . Marq. of Wincheſter's Caſe.

* N. Ch. R. 133. S. C.— S. P. But it is otherwiſe of a Chattel.

A Feoffee of a Truſt at this Day, commits Treaſon or Felony, the Land is loſt, and eſcheats, and the Truſt is extinct; For the King, or Lord by Eſcheat, cannot be ſeiſed to an Uſe or Truſt; for they are in the Poſt; and are Paramount the Confidence. Jenk. 190. pl. 92. ——*And ſo upon a Title elder* than the Uſe or Truſt, viz. the Right of his Lordſhip by Eſcheat for want of a Tenant Jenk. 245. pl. 30. ——Arg. Hard. 466 & per Hale Ch. B. 697. that he who comes in the Poſt ſhall not be liable to a Truſt Trin. 9 Car. 2. In Scatt. in Caſe of Pawlet v. Att. General.

7. Attainder

7. Attainder of Felony makes a Forfeiture of the Eſtate to the *Lord* by way of *Eſcheat* only, pro Defectu Tenentis, and the not deſcending is the Conſequence of the Corruption of Blood. 1 Salk. 85. Hill. 8 Annæ. In the Houſe of Lords. Sir Salathiel Lovel's Caſe. Hard. 496. Att. Gen. v. Sir Geore Sands.——N. Ch. R. 133. 21 Car. 2. In the Exchequer S. C.——Jenk. 245. pl. 30.

(H) In Caſes of Felony. What Eſtates in Offices, Dignities, &c.

1. IF the King creates one to be a *Baron to him and his Heirs Males of his Body iſſuing, without ſaying of any Place*, he ſhall not have an Eſtate Tail, but a *Fee Simple Conditional*, which ſhall lie forfeited for Felony. But if he creates him Baron of a Place, then he ſhall have an Eſtate Tail. 12 Rep. 81. Paſch. 9 Ja. Anon.

2. *Ceſty que Truſt of a Grant of the Licence of Wines for Years* committed Felony; it was reſolved by the Judges una Voce, that the ſame was forfeited. And after it was reſolved ſo in the Exchequer. Hob. 214. pl. 275. the E. Somerſet's Caſe. Cro. J. 512. S. C. Mich. 16 Jac. B. R. —Jenk. 293. pl. 39.

(I) In Caſes of Felony, &c. to whom.

9 *H.* 3. *cap.* 22. ENACTS that *the King ſhall* * *not hold the Lands of Perſons convict* ‡ *of Felony, longer than a Year and a Day, and then they ſhall be delivered to the Lords of the Fee.*

* If there be *Lord Meſne and Tenant*, and the Meſne is attainted of Felony, the Lord Paramount ſhall have the Meſnalty preſently; For this Prerogative belonging to the King *extends only to* the *Land, which might be waſted*, in Lieu whereof the Year and Day was granted. 2 Inſt. 37.——And this is to be underſtood when a *Tenant in Fee Simple* is attainted; For when Tenant *in Tail, or for Life* is attainted, there the King ſhall have the Profits of the Lands during the Life of Tenant in Tail, or of the Tenant for Life. Ibid.

‡ This muſt be underſtood of all manner of *Felonies puniſhed by Death*, and *not of Petit Larceny*, which notwithſtanding is Felony. Ibid. 38.

2. 17 *E.* 2. 14. Enacts that *the King ſhall have the Eſcheats, during the Vacancy of the Biſhoprick.*

3. 17 *E.* 2. 16. Enacts that *the King have all the Goods of Felons and Fugitives; and the Year-Day and Waſte of their Land, and then the Land ſhall be delivered to the Lord of the Fee, who may alſo (if he pleaſe) compound with the King for the Year, Day and Waſte.*

Except Lands holden in Gavelkind, &c. where the Lands of the Felon go to the Heirs by Cuſtom; And the Wife has Dower.

4. *Obligee in Truſt is Felo de Se*, Ceſty que Truſt was relieved againſt the King in Equity upon the Statute 33 H. 8. 39. Hard. 176. Hill. 12 & 13 Car. 2. In the Exchequer. Hix v. the Att. Gen. and Sir W. Cooper.

5. If I purchaſe an Eſtate in the Name of J. S. and after am attaint of Felony, the *Truſtee* ſhall hold the Land to him and his Heirs, *free of all Truſts*. Sid. 403. Hill. 20 & 21 Car. 2. in the Exchequer. Sir G. Sand's Caſe.

6. In Caſes of Penalty *by Statute for any publick Offence* the King is intitled to the Penalty, if *no particular Application of it* is directed. MS. Rep. ſaid to be Ld Harcourt's. tit. Forfeiture cites 23 Feb. 1720. Thornby v. Fleetwood.

(K) For Crimes at Common Law.

1. ALL Felonies puniſhable according to the Courſe of the Common Law, are either by the Common Law, or by Statute. There is alſo a Felony puniſhable by the Civil Law, becauſe it is done upon the High Seas, as *Piracy*, Robbery or Murder, whereof the Common Law did not take Notice, becauſe it could not be tried by 12 Men. If this Piracy be *tried before the Lord Admiral* in the Court of the Admiralty, according to the Civil Law, and the Delinquents there attainted; yet ſhall it work no Corruption of Blood, nor Forfeiture of his Lands; otherwiſe 'tis if he be *attainted before Commiſſioners* by Force of the Statute of 28 *H.* 8. Co. Litt. 391. a.

2. The Judgment againſt a Man for Felony is, that he be hanged by the Neck till he be dead; and *by the* Common Law he was puniſhed alſo; Firſt, in his Wife, that ſhe ſhould loſe her Dower; Secondly, in his *Children*, that they ſhould become *baſe and ignoble*; and his Blood ſo ſtained and corrupted, that they can't inherit to him or any other Anceſtor; Thirdly, that he ſhall forfeit *all his Lands and Tenements* which he had *in Fee*; *and* which he has *in Tail for Term of his Life*; and all his Goods and Chattles, 3 Inſt 211. but Acts of Parliament have altered the Common Law in ſome of theſe Points. Firſt, by the *Statute de Donis Conditionalibus*, Lands in Tail were not forfeited, neither for Felony nor for Treaſon; but for the Life of Tenant in Tail: And this Statute was made to preſerve the Inheritance in the Blood of them to whom the Gift was made, notwithſtanding any Attainder of Felony or Treaſon; and this Law continued in Force from 13 Ed. 1. until the 26 *of H.* 8. when by Act of Parliament Eſtates in Tail were forfeited by Attainder of High Treaſon; but as to Felonies, the Statute de Donis Conditionalibus, does yet remain in Force; ſo as for Attainder of Felony, Lands or Tenements in Tail are not forfeited, but only during the Life of Tenant in Tail; the Inheritance being preſerved for the Iſſue. R. S. L. 3 Vol. 197. cites 1 Inſt.

(L) In Caſes of Felony. In Reſpect of the Place where.

1. FOR *Robbery*, *Pyracy* or *Murder* committed *ſuper altum Mare*, and *tried in the* Court of *Admiralty* by the Civil Law, and *not by Jury*, the Attainder there, works no Corruption of Blood or Forfeiture; *but if* he be attainted *before Commiſſioners by* Force of 28 *H.* 8. it doth. L. P. R. 627.

(M) What may be forfeited.

1. THE *Donor in Tail* may give or forfeit *his Fee Simple*, Quod nota. Br. Eſtates pl. 40. cites 4 H. 6. 119. and 5 H. 7. 14.

2. A Man has the *Ward of his Son and Heir Apparent*, and he is outlawed; yet 'tis ſaid, that the Father ſhall not forfeit this Ward; for he cannot compel his Son to marry, as the Lord may his Ward, no more than a Guardian in Socage. Br. Forfeiture de terres. pl. 70 cites 33 H. 6. 55.

3. A Man is *attainted of Felony*, he ſhall not forfeit his *Charters of his Land*; nor ſhall he, who has Catalla Felonum & Fugitivorum, have them. But, per Moile, the *Lord ſhall have the Charters with the Land.* Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 60. cites 10 E. 4. 14. and 21 H. 6. 1.

4. *Goods*

4. *Goods ſtolen, and Waiv'd* are forfeited, quære, if the Owner makes *Freſh Suit.* Br. Forfeiture de Terres pl. 62. cites 12 E. 4. 5.

5. *And* in Appeal of Robbery, if the Plaintiff takes * the *Mainour* [*or* Thing taken in the Manner,] and the *Defendant diſclaims in the Property, and after is acquitted*; the King † ſhall have the *Mainour* [*or* Thing taken in the Manner.] Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 62. cites 12 E. 4, 5.

* Orig. (ameſne le manour.

† Orig (averale manure).

6. Note, if a Man be *attainted of Treaſon by Parliament*, his Lands and Goods are thereby forfeited, *without Words of Forfeiture* of Land or Goods in the Act. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 99 cites 35 H. 8. and 4 H. 7. 11. concordat per Townſend.

7. *Grant of* Licence *of Wines*, ſhall be forfeited for Felony of Ceſty que Truſt. Hob. 214. E. of Somerſet's Caſe.

8. A *Founderſhip* can't eſcheat or be forfeited by Attainder of Felony or Treaſon; For it is a Thing *annexed to the Blood*, which can't be ſeparated. Arg. 4 Le. 138. cites Br. Time of H. 8.

Br. Tit. Corody. pl. 5. cites 24 E. 3. 33. 72.——7 Rep. 13. a. Arg.

9. *A Man ſeiſed in Right of his Wife*, may grant, but not forfeit; and ſo may * *Guardian in Socage.*——The Husband may grant a Term for Years, which he hath in the Right of his Wife, but he cannot forfeit it, &c. Arg. 2 Le. 126. in Caſe of Venables v. Harris.

3 Le. 190. S. C.——4 Le. 112. S. C. and P.——Arg. Godb. 316. S. P. in Caſe of Sheffield v. Ratcliff——* Pl. C. 293. Osborne's Caſe.

Executor may give Teſtators Goods, but not forfeit them by Outlawry. Guardian in Socage may grant his Guardianſhip, but not forfeit. Arg. 2 Roll. R. 325. cites Pl. C. Osborne's Caſe.——10 E. 4. 1.——Godb. 316. Arg.——323. S. P. in Caſe of Sheffield v. Radcliff.

Tenant by the Curteſy, in the Life of his Wife, cannot grant his Eſtate of Tenant by the Curteſy to another, *but he may forfeit it* for Treaſon or Felony, viz. *by Way of Diſcharge*, Arg. Godb. 323.

10. *Annuity pro Conſilio* impendendo, cannot be granted or forfeited. Arg. 3 Le. 185. becauſe there is a Confidence. Wroth's Caſe.

And notwithſtanding Attainder and Impriſonment of the Grantee, yet he may give Counſel, if the Grantor comes to him as well as he could before the Attainder and Impriſonment. D. 1. b. 2. a. Mich. 6 H. 8. Oliver v. Emſon.

11. An *Earledom* may be forfeited *by Way of Diſcharge* and Exoneration. Godb. Arg. 325. cites 7 Rep. 33. Nevil's Caſe.

12. A Park may be forfeited by Attainder, but a * *Parker-ſhip* is a *Matter of Service*, and cannot be forfeited as an Intereſt may. Arg. Godb. 418, 419. cites Pl. C. 399.

* The King ſhall not have the Office of Keeper for a Forfeiture, becauſe 'tis a *Matter of Truſt.* But if *Keeper of the King's Park* be attainted, he ſhall forfeit his Office *by Way of Diſcharge* and Exoneration. Arg. Godb. 323. in Caſe of Sheffield v. Ratcliff.——Pl. C. 379. Sir H. Nevill's Caſe.

13. One *may forfeit as much as he may grant.* Arg. Litt. R. 122.

Contra, For if *Iſſue in Tail in Life of his Father*, is *attaint* of Treaſon, and dies, 'tis no Forfeiture of the Eſtate Tail; but if he levies a Fine in his Father's Life, 'tis a Bar to his Iſſues. Arg. Godb. 316. cites 3 Rep. 50. Sir George Brown's Caſe.

14. If by Forfeiture of all *Goods and Chattels*, a *Bond* be forfeited to the King? Per Coke Ch. J. it ſeems not. Roll. R. 7. Paſch. 12 Jac. B. R. Cullom, Betts, &c. v. Sherman.

2 Show. 133. Mich 32 Car. 2. B. R. Anon. It is held, that where a Perſon hath a Grant of Bona Felonum & Fugitivorum, he ſhall have *ready Money*——See Inf. pl. 24.

15. At Common Law *Ceſty que Uſe* did not forfeit the Uſe for Felony or Treaſon; For it was only a Confidence; and it is the ſame at this Day, for a *Truſt of Inheritance or Freehold, but otherwiſe of a Chattel.* Jenk. 190. pl. 92.

And if a Feoffee upon Truſt at this Day, *commits Treaſon or Felony*, the Land is loſt, and Eſcheats and the Truſt is extinct. For the King or Lord by Eſcheat cannot be ſeiſed to an Uſe or Truſt; Becauſe they are in the Poſt, and are Paramount the Confidence. Jenk. 190. pl. 92.

16. *Uſe*

Jenk. 245. pl. 30.—*An Use in Contingency*, ſo long as it is ſo, can't be forfeited; as if the *Mortgagor* be attainted and pardoned meſne between the Mortgage and Day of Redemption, &c. per Wray Ch. J. Le. 260. 18 Eliz. B. R. in Caſe of Manning v. Andrews

16. *Uſe* was not forfeitable *at Common Law*, but it was grantable. *Truſt* is not grantable at this Day by Law, nor forfeitable, but for *Chattels*. Jenk. 219. pl. 66. cites Hob. 214.

17. *Common* or *Rent* cannot be forfeited. Arg. Hard. 492. in Caſe of Att. Gen. v. Sir Geo. Sands.

18. *Inſtantaneous Seiſin* gained by a Fine is not forfeited for Treaſon. 2 Lev. 170. in Caſe of Browne v. Waite.

3 Inſt. 19. 21

19. It is ſaid, that the Inheritance of *Things not lying in Tenure*, as of *Rent-charge*, Rent-*Seck*, *Commons*, &c. ſhall be forfeited to the King by an Attainder of High Treaſon, and that the Profits of them ſhall be forfeited to the King by an Attainder of Felony, during the Life of an Offender, and that the Inheritance ſhall be extinguiſhed by his Death; For it cannot Eſcheat, becauſe there is no Tenure; nor deſcend, becauſe the Blood is corrupted. 2 Hawk. Pl. C. 449. cap. 49. S. 4.

Staundf. 45, 46 S. P. C. 187 (D)Cro. C. 566 12 Rep. 121. S. P C. 188. ch. 28. 44 E. 3. 44. Fitz. Coro. 317, 318, 319, 323, 334, 379, 380. 2 Le. 5, 6. And. 19. Mo. 100. D. 309, 310.

20. It ſeems agreed, that *all Things* whatſoever, which are *comprehended under* the Notion of a *perſonal Eſtate*, whether they be *in Action or Poſſeſſion*, which the Party hath or is intitled to in his own Right, and *not as Executor or Adminiſtrator* to another, are liable to ſuch Forfeiture. 2 Hawk. Pl. C. 450. cap. 49. S. 9. The Book cites as in the Marg.

Truſt of a Leaſe for Years, granted by the King's Patent, is forfeited to the King by Attainder of Felony. Cro. J. 512. the King v. Daccombe, Executor of the Earl of Somerſet. ——So it was held, 24 Eliz. in one Armſtrong's Caſe. Ibid.——But, 'twas ſaid to be held by all, that in one ... 's Caſe, that a Truſt of a Freehold was not forfeited upon Attainder of Treaſon. Ibid,

21. It ſeems to be ſettled, That a *Bond taken in another's Name*, or a *Leaſe* made to another *in Truſt*, for a Perſon who is afterwards convicted of Treaſon or Felony, are as much liable to be forfeited, as a Bond made to him in his own Name, or a Leaſe in Poſſeſſion. 2 Hawk. Pl. C. 450. cap. 49. S. 10. The Book cites Cro. J. 312, 313. Hob. 214.

2 Keb. 564. 608, 644, 763, 772, Lev. 279. Lane 54, 113. Mod. 16, 38. Hard. 466. And. 294. Raym. 120. 2 Roll. Abr. 34, pl. 1, 2. Roll Abr. 343. F. 5, 6, 7. Mar. 45, 88. Sid. 260, 403. 1 Keb. 909.

22. Alſo it ſeems to be in a great Meaſure ſettled, That the *Truſt of a Term* granted by a Man, *for the Uſe of himſelf, his Wife and Children*, &c. is liable in like Manner to be forfeited, if *fraudulently made* with an Intent to avoid a ſubſequent Forfeiture; but that it ſhall be forfeited ſo far only, as it is reſerved to the Benefit of the Party himſelf, if made Bona Fide, whether before or after Marriage for good Conſideration, without Fraud, which is to be *left to a Jury on the whole Circumſtances of the Caſe*, and ſhall never be preſumed by the Court, where it is not expreſsly found. 2 Hawk. Pl. C. 450. cap. 49. S. 11. The Book cites as in the Marg.

(N) In Caſes of Treaſon or Felony. Chattels.

1. IF a Man be *arraigned of Felony, and takes to his Clergy*, he ſhall forfeit his *Goods, and the Profits of his Land*. Br. Forfeiture de Terre pl. 117. cites 4 E. 3. 46.

2. Indictment *of the Death of a Man, the Exigent is awarded*, and the *Party comes, and is found not Guilty*; yet the Goods are forfeited, and the Inqueſt compell'd to ſay what Goods he had: who ſaid that he had to the Value of 40*s*. Thorp asked what Vill ſhould anſwer for the Chattels; the Inqueſt ſaid the Vill of W. and ſo 'twas entered in the Roll. Br. Forfeiture, de Terres. pl. 32. cites 22 Aſſ. 81.

3. A. was brought into the Exchequer to anſwer the Queen for a *certain Sum of Money*, by him *received* of B. *to pay over to C. attainted of Treaſon*, and a *Bill made by C. to B.* but not ſealed was ſhewn forth, upon which A. demurred in Law; and becauſe, 'tis only a *Choſe en Action*, and a *naked Contract* upon the Matter, he was diſmiſs'd. But if a Servant receive Money to the Uſe of his Maſter, and brings this into the Houſe of his Maſter, who after is attainted; this is forfeited which is *in the Maſter's Poſſeſſion*. Savil. 40. pl. 91. Mich. 24 and 25 Eliz. Anon.

S. P. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 47. cites 50. Aſſ. 1. & that, tho' the Matter be found by Office for the Queen.—*But* ibid. pl. 48. cites 50 Aſſ. 5. Contra. That the Queen ſhall have the Money, and that the Land of A. ſhall be thereof charged, notwithſtanding that A. *might have waged his Law againſt C.* where the Receipt was by his proper Hands. Brooke makes a Quere how this Caſe, and the former Caſe pl. 47. agree.

Br. Choſe in Action. pl. 10. cites S. C. and P. and ſays, that *A. was ſeiſed of* certain *Land*, *after* that he was Debtor to the King, *Part in Fee Simple*, *and Part for* 20 *Years*, and ſhewed who was Tenant of the one, and who of the other, by which a Scire facias iſſued againſt the Tertenants, and the King had Execution, and ſo ſee *Choſe in Action* forfeited to the King.———Br. Charge pl. 34. cites S. C.

4. A Termor is diſtreined for Rent behind; afterwards he is attained for Felony *done before the Diſtreſs taken*; the King ſhall not have this Diſtreſs as a Forfeiture, unleſs he *ſatisfies* the Party that diſtrein'd; For this was lawfully taken Tempore Captionis, per Doderidge J. 3 Buls. 17. Hill. 12 Jac.

5. If A. *gage Goods to B. and after A. is attainted of Felony*, yet the King ſhall not have the Goods thus gaged, without Payment of the Sum for which they were gaged; becauſe *neither of them hath the abſolute Property* in the Goods ſo gaged, per Doderidge J. 3 Buls. 17. Hill. 12 Jac.

6. A *Covenant to pay Money* ſhall be forfeited to the King by Attainder of Felony, per Cur. Noy. 155. and ſays that ſo it 'twas adjudged in the Caſe of George Norris.

7. If a Perſon is attainted, the King is intitled to *perſonal Things intirely*, as to an Obligation, Horſe, &c. ſo the Attainder of one *Jointenant* forfeits all, Arg. Raym. 121. but *not ſo of Things in Poſſeſſion*, *which may be divided*. cites 3 Inſt. 55. of a Chattel real in Poſſeſſion; and that Pl. C. 243. * intimates ſo much, becauſe he inſtances only in entire Chattels.

It ſeems that this ſhould be Dame Hale's Caſe in Pl. C. 253. to 264.

8. *Truſt* of a *Chattel* is forfeited for Felony, if it be a *Leaſe* in Groſs; but otherwiſe, if it be to *attend the Inheritance*. 3 Ch. R. 36. Paſch 21 Car. 2 in the Exchequer, in Caſe of the Att. Gen. v. Sir Geo. Sands.

Jenk. 293 pl. 39 cites Hob. 214. Marqueſs of Winchester's Caſe.———Arg. Hard. 466. and per Hale Ch. B. 467

(O) In Caſes of Treaſon or Felony, what is to be done with Chattels before Conviction.

1. 18. *E.* 2. Enacts that *Felon's Goods may be ſecured before Attainder*, *but he ſhall be maintain'd out of them*, *and they ſhall be be reſtored to him if acquitted.*

2. *Stat. de Catallis Felonum*, Enacts that *None taken for Felony*, *for which he ſhall be impriſoned*, *ſhall be diſſeiſed of his Lands or Chattels*, *until he be convicted thereof*; *but as ſoon as he is taken*, *his Tenements and Chattels ſhall be viewed by the Sheriff*, *and other Officers of the King and lawful Men*, *and inventoried*, *and kept by the Bailiff of him that is ſo taken*, *who ſhall give Surety to the Juſtices*, *of the Chattels*, *or the Price*; *ſaving to the Accuſed and his Family their Neceſſaries*, *as long as he ſhall be impriſoned*, *and his reaſonable Eſtover*; *ſo that when he is convicted*, *the Reſidue of his Chattels (beſides his Eſtover) may remain to the King*, *with the Year and Day of his Lands*; *but if he be acquit*, *his Chattels ſhall be reſtored.*

3. The *Vill may ſeiſe* the Goods of a Man outlawed for Murder, where they can find them. Quod nota. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 32. cites 22 Aſſ. 81.

* Of a Felon. Br. Office and Of. pl. 3 cites S. C.—Br. Corone, pl. 9. cites S. C.—Br. Forfeiture de terres. pl. 44. cites 44. Aſſ. 14.

4. The Officer nor the Sheriff cannot take * the Goods away with him, unleſs they be forfeited. But where one is *appealed or indicted of Felony*, he muſt ſeiſe and take *Security, that they ſhall not be eſſoign'd*, but not remove them; and if the Party will not find Surety, he ſhall put them *into the Hands of the Neighbours to keep*, per Cur. Br. Forfeiture de Terres, &c. pl. 7. cites 43 E. 3. 24.

S. P. per Finch. Quod Curia conceſſit. And it ſeems that this ought to be of Order every one that commits Felony, till he is attainted.

5. If a Man *kill another by Misfortune*, he ſhall forfeit his Goods, and he ought to have his Charter of Pardon of Grace, per tot. Cur. Br. Forfeiture de Terres, &c. pl. 9. cites 2 H. 4. 18.

6. Where a Man is indicted of Felony, till he be attainted, his Goods *ſhall not be removed out of his Houſe, but* ſhall be *in keeping of the Neighbours quouſque, &c.* and all the mean Time, the Felon *ſhall have his Living of his Goods*; Quod nota, that they are not forfeited before Attainder. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 10 cites 7 H. 4. 47. per Huls.

This Statute is ſaid to be in Affirmance of the Common Law, 2 Hawk Pl. 455. Ch. 49 S. 39.

7. 1 *Ric.* 3. *cap.* 3. Enacts that *No Sheriff, Under Sheriff, Eſcheator, Bailiff of Franchiſe, or other Perſon, ſhall ſeiſe the Goods of any Perſon arreſted or impriſoned for Suſpicion of Felony, before he be convicted or attainted thereof, or the ſame Goods be otherwiſe lawfully forfeited, on Pain of double the Value of the Goods ſo taken, to the Party grieved, to be recover'd by Action of Debt, &c. wherein no Eſſoin, &c. to be allow'd.*

It was *Enacted by* 25 *E.* 3. 14. *That in the ſecond Capias*, given by that Statute, on the Return of a *Non Inventus, it ſhall be compriſed, that the Sheriff* ſhall *cauſe the Party's Chattels to be ſeiſed, and ſafely kept till the Day of the Writ or Precept returned*, &c. and this is ſtill in Force, notwithſtanding this Statute of 1 R. 3. 3. For this prohibits only the ſeiſing of the Goods of thoſe who are arreſted. 2 Hawk. Pl. C. 455. Ch. 49. S. 37.

It ſeems plain from this Statute, that Goods may be ſeiſed as ſoon as they are forfeited; and it ſeems the whole Townſhip is anſwerable for them to the King, and may ſeiſe them wherever they can be found. 2 Hawk. Pl. C. 455. Ch. 49. S. 40.

See Lutw. 132. for the Pleadings upon this Statute.——*Debt* upon this Statute, for that the Plaintiff being *impriſon'd upon Suſpicion of Felony*, the *Defendant took his Goods before he was convicted or attainted, Contra Formam Statuti*, &c. and demanded the double Value. Upon the Iſſue non Debet, it was *found for the Plaintiff*, and moved in Arreſt of Judgment, that the Declaration was not good, for that it is *not alleged that they were ſeiſed for this Cauſe*. For if he took them as Treſpaſs, an Action lies not upon this Statute, Sed non Allocatur: Becauſe it ſhall be *intended*, that he ſeiſed them for this Cauſe, when no other Cauſe is ſhewn. And the Addition of *Contra Formam Statuti explains it*, and makes it good, if it had been before ambiguous. As in 14 Eliz. D. 312. in an Action for diſtreining Avera Carucæ, contra Formam Statuti; altho' it be not averr'd, that he had other Goods ſufficient for the Diſtreſs, 'tis well enough. For contra Formam Statuti implies as much, wherefore it was adjudged for the Plaintiff. Cro. E. 749. Paſch. 42 Eliz. B. R. Hill v. Langly.

Treſpaſs upon this Statute for taking the Plaintiff's Goods (being arreſted for Suſpicion of Felony) before Conviction, and declares of *ſeiſing* a certain Parcel of *Money*; and after Verdict for the Plaintiff, 'twas moved in Arreſt of Judgment, becauſe the Words of the Statute are, *That none ſhall ſeiſe the Goods of any Perſon, &c.* and that Money is not Goods cites Fitz. Brief. 512. But adjudged for the Plaintiff, and that Money is Goods; and that Caſe is only the Opinion of Finchden. Mich 32 Car. 2. B. R. Raym. 414. Osborne v. Wandell.

And upon Exception taken in an Action upon this Statute, after Verdict; For that the Declaration ſays, Bona & Catalla, and then alleges Money and Goods, whereas Money is not included under Bona, according to * Fitzh. 'twas anſwered, That 'tis true, tho' *Money can't be demanded by the Name of Bona*, yet it *may be granted by that Name*; For the Perſon who hath the Grant of Bona Felon. & Fugitivorum, ſhall, without Doubt, have his ready Money, tho' a Declaration for Money is pro Pecuniis numeratis. 2 Show. 132, 133. Mich. 32 Car. 2. B. R. Anon. ſeems to be S. C as above, Osborn v. Wandell. ——* Fitzh. Abr. Tit. Brief. 512 cites M. 39. E. 3. 23.

It has been adjudged to extend, as well to the Seiſure of Money, as of any other Chattels. 2 Hawk. 455

And another Exception was, for that the *Declaration recited* the Statute, and ſaid, *no Sheriff nor Under-Sheriff, nor Eſcheator, nor any other Perſon*; and *in the Statute, Under-Sheriffs are not mention'd*; yet held that this doth not enlarge the Statute; For that 'tis included in the Word Sheriffs; and then 'tis, *nor any other Perſon*, and therefore that is well enough. 2 Show. 132, 133. Mich. 32 Car. 2. B. R. Anon.

An Action being brought upon this Statute, and a Verdict for the Plaintiff, 'twas moved in Arreſt of Judgment, that the Statute was *miſrecited*, whereupon the Parliament Roll was brought into Court and read, and the Statute was for *Suſpicion of Felony*; whereas the Declaration was for Felony, which being Matter of Subſtance, the Court ordered a Nil Capiat, per Billam. Sty. 185 Mich. 1649. B R. Archer v. Holbidge.

(P) From what Time; and what Power the Offender has over Goods before Conviction.

1. IF *Goods are forfeited* by Outlawry or Attainder of *Treaſon*, the Property is in the King immediately, and the King may grant them over immediately; and the Grantee may have an Action in his own Name. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 26. cites 39 H. 6. 26.

2. If a Felon be *convicted by Verdict*, *Confeſſion* or *Recreancy*, he doth forfeit his Goods and Chattels, &c. *preſently*; For, where a Reaſon has been yielded in our Books, that the * *praying of his Clergy* was a Refuſal of the Judgment of the Law, and a Flight in Law, and that for that Cauſe he forfeited his Goods and Chattels, that doth not hold; For if a Man be convict of Petit Treaſon, or Murder, or any other Crime, for which he can't have his Clergy, yet by the very Conviction he forfeiteth his Goods and Chattels before Attainder. And Stanford (ſpeaking of a *Felon convict* by Verdict) ſaith, that he ſhall forfeit his Goods which he had at the Time of the Verdict given, which is the Conviction in that Caſe, and by the Stat. 1 R. 3. 3. no Sheriff, Bailiff, &c. ſhall ſeiſe the Goods of a Felon before he be convicted of the Felony, whereby it appeareth that the Goods may be ſeiſed as Forfeit after Conviction. Co. Litt. 391. a.

* See the Note on pl. 4

3. 'Twas held by all the Barons, and ſo they deliver'd the Law to the Jury; That where B. entered into a *Statute* to A. and A. afterwards was a *Fugitive* beyond the Seas in 27 Fliz and after, *before Office*, A. *returned, and releaſed this Stat.* and Office is after found, this Releaſe ſhall not be a bar to the *King*; For he *was intitled by the Flight*, and the Office is but an Informing of him, and the Statute was in him before the Office. Mich. 3. Jac. 1. Cro. J. 82. the King v. Sir Rich. Wendman.

4. The Goods are not forfeited *till Conviction*, and till then the Party ought to have them *for his Maintenance*. And before Conviction they cannot be ſeiſed for the King's Uſe, tho' they may be put *in Salva Cuſtodia*. Godb. 206. Mich. 11 Jac. in the Starr Chamber, in the Caſe of Miller v. Reynolds and Baſſet.

The *praying of Clergy* does not make any Forfeiture, but his Goods and Chattels are forfeited immediately upon his Conviction. 12 Rep. 121. Mich. 12 Jac. Anon

5. *So*, a Felon or Traytor may, after the *Felony or Treaſon*, and before Conviction, *ſell Bona fide for his Suſtenance, &c.* his *Chattels*, be they *real or perſonal*; per Coke Ch. J. 8 Rep. 171. b. Paſch. 8 Jac. in Sir George Fleetwood's Caſe.

6. *Trover* for diverſe Goods was brought againſt the Defendant, being *Sheriff of London*, *by* the Plaintiff, who was the *Son of Jones*, who was *executed for Robbery*, and Burglary; and he being in Newgate, and his Goods ſeized by the Defendant, Jones *made a Bill of Sale* of the Goods mention'd in the Declaration, to the Intent *to make Proviſion for the Plaintiff*, being his Son; and by Holt Ch. J. the Bill was ruled *fraudulent*; For tho' a Sale *Bona fide*, and for a valuable Conſideration, had been good, becauſe the Party had a Property in the Goods *till Conviction*, and *ought to be reaſonably ſuſtained out of them*; yet ſuch a Conveyance as this, cannot be intended to any other Purpoſe, than to *prevent a Forfeiture*, and defraud the King; and Holt Ch. J. ſaid, that there was a Fraud at Common Law, as in ſuch a Caſe as here; and tho' this Bill would not be fraudulent againſt a ſubſequent voluntary Diſpoſal by Jones; yet, when he is *convicted for a Fact* before the Sale, *this ſhall relate* and avoid the Sale, and no Countenance ought to be given to ſuch a Contrivance as this, where a Man has gained an Eſtate to a conſiderable Value by Robbery, and when he is detected, he would give this to his Poſterity; and the Plaintiff was Nonſuit. Skin. 357. on a Trial at Guildhall. Trin. 5 W. & M. Jones v. Aſhurſt.

7. No Part of the perſonal Eſtate is veſted in the King, before the

Self-Murder

Self-Murder is *found* by ſome Inquiſition, and conſequently the Forfeiture thereof is ſaved by a *Pardon* of the Offence, before ſuch finding. 1 Hawk. Pl. C. 68. cap. 27. S. 9.

8. But if there be no ſuch Pardon, the whole is forfeited immediately after ſuch Inquiſition, from the Time ſuch Mortal Wound was given, and all intermediate Alienations are avoided. 1 Hawk. Pl. C. 68. cap. 27. S. 10.

(Q) Forfeiture of one Perſon, in what Caſes it ſhall be of another.

1. A. *was bound to two* in 20l. and *one* of the two *was Felo de ſe*, which was found by Office, and per Chocke J. the * whole Obligation is forfeited. But contrary per Younge; For by the Death it is veſted in the other by the Survivor; and the Office which came after, cannot deveſt this which was veſted before, quære. Br. Jointenants pl. 34. cites 8 E 4. 4.

* Br. Forfeiture de Terres pl. 58. S. P. after Office found thereof. cites S. C —— Br. Prærog. pl. 67. cites S. C. —— Jenk. 65. pl. 22. S. P. Becauſe the outlawed Perſon, without the other, might have releaſed the Obligation.

2. Goods *taken by a Treſpaſſor* ſhall be forfeited by the *Attainder of the Owner* for Felony; For the Right and Property remains in the Owner, and the Law ſhall adjudge them in him, untill he makes his *Election* to the contrary, *by bringing Writ of Treſpaſs*. Cro. E. 824. Paſch. 43. Eliz. C. B. in Caſe of Biſhop v. Lady Montague.

3. *Two Jointenants* of a Ward, *one does Waſt*, both ſhall be puniſhed in Action of Waſt. Co. Litt. S. 67. 54.

4. *Mortgagee of Lands forfeited* to the King muſt make his Demand of the Money at the Exchequer, and not upon the Land, nor need the King tender it. Golds. 137. pl. 41. Sir Rowland Heyward's Caſe.

5. A. *deviſed to B.* the Father *for Life*, *Remainder to C.* his Son *an Infant in Fee*, *and* deviſed 400*l. to the Son*, to be paid at 21; A. made the Father Executor, and left 2000l. perſonal Aſſets, and *B.* having ſpent the perſonal Aſſets, *mortgaged* the Lands *to J. S. and made Affidavit that they were free from Incumbrances*, and that he was ſeiſed in Fee, *and levied a Fine* for corroborating the Mortgage, and ſo declared the Uſe thereof for him and his Heirs; the *Son* having *entered for a Forfeiture*, the Mortgagee brought his Bill to be relieved, and the Court decreed that the Mortgagee, notwithſtanding the Forfeiture, ſhould hold and enjoy the Lands againſt the Son, during the Life of the Father. Hill 1699. Abr. Equ. Caſes 257. Willis v. Fineux.

6. If *Tenant for Life*, *of the Office of Marſhal of B. R.* grants an Office for Life, and then commits a Forfeiture of his Eſtate; yet the Under Grantee ſhall continue in for the Life of the Grantor; becauſe the Grantor ſhall not, by his own Act, defeat his own Grant; per Holt Ch. J. 12 Mod. 558. in Sutton's Caſe.

(R) Relation as to Lands and Chattels.

1. A *Ttainder* in *Felony* or *Treaſon*, by Verdict, Confeſſion or Outlawry forfeits all from the Time of the Offence committed, as to Lands; and ſo 'tis upon an Attainder of * *Outlawry*. But for † Goods, Chattels or Debts, the King's Title ſhall look no farther back than to thoſe Goods the Party, attainted *by Verdict or Confeſſion*, had at the Time of

S P. Br. Relation. pl. 36. cites 33 E. 3. and Fitzh. Forfeiture 30. —— * S P. Bur

of the Verdict and Confeſſion, and in Outlawries at the Time of the *Exigent*, as well in Treaſons and Felonies. Bacon's Uſe of the Law. 41.

Brook makes a Quære thereof; for he ſays, that it ſeems to him, that it ſhall only be from the Time of the *Outlawry pronounced, or after*; For Outlawry *has no Relation*, as Verdict has. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 98. cites 30 H. 6. 8. [but it ſhould be 30 H. 6. 5.]——S. P. Br. Relation. pl 42. cites 30 H. 6. 5. as well as upon Attainder by Verdict.——*Contra* held in the Time of H. 8. of Attainder *of Felony*; *but* it is good Law upon Attainder *by* * *Verdict*; For this ſhall have Relation to the Act; contra of Outlawry. Note the Diverſity. Ibid. ——* S. P. Br. Relation. pl. 14. cites 42. E. 3. 26.

Attainder *by Outlawry* ſhall have Relation unto the ‡ *Exigent*, as unto Lands and Tenements; ſo that a Feoffment of the Land or Grant of a Rent, before the Exigent awarded by him that is attainted in ſuch Manner is good. Perk. S. 28.——‡ Br. Relation. pl. 14 cites 42. E. 3. 26. S. P.

And Attainder *by Verdict* ſhall have Relation unto the Time of the *Felony committed according to the Suppoſal of the Indictment*, as unto Lands and Tenements, and *ſo* ſhall an Attainder *by Confeſſion*. Perk. S. 28. cites 30 H. 6. 5.

† Perk. S. 29. So that a Gift made of the Goods before Judgment, is good. cites 41 Aſſ. 13.—— Br. Forfeiture de Terres, pl. 58. cites 8 E. 4. 4. acc. per Danby Ch. J. and Needham J. *Quære, if by Covin*, per Brook. ibid.

2. Where a Man *is arraigned of Felony, and acquitted*, and 'tis found that he fled for the Felony, he ſhall forfeit his *Goods which he had at the Time of the Acquittal, and not* at the Time *of his Flight*. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 119. cites 3 E. 3. It. Nor.

S. P. Br. Relation. pl. 31. cites S. C. Goldsb. 135 cites S. C. and Fitzh. Corone 296.

3. *But* where *the flying is found before the Coroner*, they are forfeited which he had *at the Time of the Verdict taken before the Coroner*. Br. Forfeiture de Terres pl. 119. cites 3 E. 3. It. Nor.

4. In *Attaint*, Judgment was given againſt the Petit Jurors, and it was doubted, if the *Jurors* having *alien'd their Lands meſne between the Teſte of the Writ and the Judgment*, whether the King ſhall have thoſe Lands or not? therefore quære of the Relation of it. Br. Relation. pl. 14. cites 42 E. 3. 20.

The Judgment, as to the Goods, ſhall have Relation *to the Teſte of the Writ of Attaint*, where they have alien'd for fear of the Attaint, viz. by Covin. Br. Relation. pl. 45. cites 8 E. 2. and Fitzh. Aſſiſe. 360.——S. P. Br. Colluſion. pl. 44. cites 8 E. 2. and Fitzh. Aſſiſe 396.——Therefore it ſeems contra of Goods ſold before, or after the Teſte of the Attaint Bona Fide; For if they are ſold before Judgment, it ſeems that the Sale is good. Quære, of a Sale before Execution.

5. *And* of the Relation of a Judgment *in Premunire alſo*, and ſee the Statute thereof. Ibid.

Quære, as to an Indictment on a *Præmunire*, on 13 Eliz. For it was not reſolved. Cro. C. 172. Mich. 5 Car. B. R. Groſs v. Gayer.—— Jo. 217. S. C. by Name of Groſs v. Gayne.

6. *And*, it ſeems, that where *Treaſon* is *made by Statute*, ſhe ſhall forfeit in like Manner. Ibid.

7. *Quære*, if it be not *the ſame Law in the Premunire or Attaint*. Ibid.

8. If a Man *commits Felony, and after Purchaſes* Land, *and after is attainted*; there the Land purchaſed is forfeited, as well as the Land which he had at the Time of the Felony committed, per Perſey and Belknappe. Quod nullus dedixit. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 80. cites 48 E. 3. 2.

9. If *Goods be given to A. by Deed in his Abſence*, and *A. commits Felony* before Notice of the Gift, yet the King ſhall have the Goods; For his Notice ſhall have Relation to the Gift. Br. Done &c. pl. 30. cites 7 E. 4. 29.

10. If one be found *Felo de ſe* by Office, the Office ſhall have Relation *to the firſt Stroke*, per Littleton. Br. Prærog. pl. 67. cites 8 E. 4. 4.

Baron and Feme *Jointenants for Years*; the *Baron is Felo de ſe*, Feme is in by Survivor; yet if this be afterwards found by Office, the King ſhall have the whole Term. Pl. C. 458. Trin. 3 Eliz. Hales (Dame) v. Petit.

11. There is a great *Diverſity*, as to the Forfeiture of *Land, between* an *Attainder of Felony by Outlawry, upon an Appeal, and* upon an *Indictment*; For in the Caſe of an Appeal, the Defendant ſhall forfeit no Lands, but ſuch as he had at the Time of the Outlawry pronounced; but in Caſe of Indictment, ſuch as he had at the Time of the Felony committed,

and the Reaſon of this Diverſity is evident; For that *in* Caſe of *Appeal* there *is no Time alleged* in the Writ, *when the Felony was done*; and therefore of Neceſſity it muſt relate, in that Caſe, only to the Judgment of the Outlawry; but in the Caſe of Indictment, there is a certain Time alleged; and therefore, in that Caſe, it ſhall relate to the Time alleged in the Indictment when the Felony was committed. Co. Litt. 390. b.

*Forthenthe Title of the King appears of Record. 8 Rep. 170. in Tourſon's Caſe.—and cites Pl. C. 488.

12. *But* in the Caſe of the *Indictment*, *there is alſo a Diverſity* to be obſerved; For as it hath been ſaid, it ſhall relate to the Time alleged in the Indictment *for avoiding of Eſtates, Charges and Incumbrances, made* by the Felon *after the Felony* committed; *but for the mean Profits* of the Land, it ſhall relate only to the * Judgment, as well in this Caſe of Outlawry, as in other Caſes. Co. Litt. 390. b.

13. A. committed Treaſon, 18 Eliz. for which 26 Eliz. he was attainted by Trial; and in the mean Time, between the Treaſon and the Attainder, he was *Conuſee of a Fine* of certain Lands, convey'd *by one B. to the Uſe of the ſaid B. and his Wife*, Siſter of the ſaid A. *and of the Heirs of the ſaid B.* And after this, *B. and his Feme bargained and ſold* the Lands *to J. S. for Money, and they convey'd them to him by Fine.* And now upon Diſcovery of the Treaſon, and the Attainder of A. J. S. was adviſed by Plowden, Popham, and many others, that the Eſtate of the Land was in the Queen, becauſe the Queen is intitled to all the Land that Traitors had at the Time of the Treaſon, or after. So the Uſe, which ſhould create Eſtate to B. and his Wife upon the Fine, by the Relation of the Right of the Queen by the Attainder, is deſtroyed; wherefore J. S. ſued to the Queen, and ſhe granted him the Land again by Patent. Mo. 196. Trin. 27. Eliz. Pimb's Caſe.

14. The Treaſon of *compaſſing the King's Death was laid* in the Indictment to be the 30*th of May*, 11 *Car.* 2. yet upon the *Evidence*, it appeared that Sir Henry Vane, *the very Day the late King was murder'd, did ſit in Counſel* for the ordering of the Forces of the Nation *againſt the King*, that now is, *and ſo continued* on all along, *until a little before the King's coming in.* It was *reſolved*, that the Day laid in the Indictment is not material, and the *Jury* are not bound to find him guilty that Day, but *may find the Treaſon* to be as it was in Truth, *either before or after the Time laid in the Indictment*, as is reſolved in Dyer's Caſe. Co. Pl. Coron. 230. And accordingly, in this Caſe, the Jury found Sir Henry Vane guilty of the Treaſon in the Indictment, the 30th of January, 1 Car. 2. which was from the very Day the late King was murder'd, and ſo all his *Forfeitures relate to that Time*, to avoid all Conveyances and Settlements made by him. Kelyng. R. 16. pl. 6. Trin. 14. Car. 2. Sir Henry Vane's Caſe.

But if a Common Perſon's Title is prior to the King's, it is otherwiſe. Ibid cites 49 E. 3. 16.

15. If there are *two Joint-Obligees*, and *one* of them *is outlawed*, the King ſhall have the whole, becauſe each had Power of the whole. Hard. 26. Arg. cites Fitzh.. Execution 113.

16. If A. *gives B. a mortal Wound*, and then *A. ſells his Land*, and then *B. dies*; there ſhall be ſuch Relation as to make the Land forfeited from *the firſt Stroke.* Arg. Vent. 371 cites Pl. C. 293. Dame Hale's Caſe.

(S) Purged, or diſpenſed with, by what.

Ibid. pl. 46 S. P. cites 45 Aſſ.

1. IT was agreed, that where Exigent is awarded in Felony, and after the Party ſhews *Charter of Pardon of elder Date than the Exigent* awarded, *and Surety put in in Chancery, Secundum Formam Statuti, before the Exigent*, the Goods are ſaved and not forfeited; becauſe the Charter and Surety appear by Matter of Record. Br. Forfeiture de Terre. pl. 6. cites 43 E. 3. 18.

2. No

2. No Part of the perſonal Eſtate is veſted in the King before the *Self-Murder* is *found by ſome Inquiſition*; and conſequently the Forfeiture thereof is *ſaved by a Pardon* of the Offence before ſuch finding. 1 Hawk. Pl. C. 68. cap. 27. S. 9.

3. But if there be no ſuch Pardon, the whole is forfeited immediately after ſuch Inquiſition, from the Time ſuch mortal Wound was given, and all intermediate Alienations are avoided. 1 Hawk. Pl. C. 68. cap. 27. S. 10.

(T) What Charges are avoided by it.

1. *Tenant in Tail, Reverſion in the King.* Tenant in Tail made a *Leaſe for Years, and levied a Fine to the King.* The King ſhall not avoid the Leaſe; For he comes in in the Reverter. But in ſuch Caſe, if he be *attainted* of Treaſon, the King ſhall avoid the Leaſe. So a Statute of Forfeiture is ſtronger than a Statute of Conveyance. Arg. Godb. 324. cites 2 Mariæ. Auſtin's Caſe cited in Walſingham's Caſe.

(U) Forfeiture. By Flight; and how to be ſeiſed, and when.

1. NOte, That if it be *found before a Coroner by Inqueſt, that a Felon or Thief withdrew himſelf*, the *Chattels* are forfeited without more; and the Sheriff ought immediately to ſeiſe his *Land* into the Hands of the King, by ſimple Parol *without Inqueſt*, and cauſe to ſeiſe all his Chattels into the King's Hands, and *to cauſe 'em to be appriſed, as well by Villains as by Free Men*, and *put the Price in the Roll of the Coroner, and deliver them to the Vill*, to anſwer to the King. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 33. cites 22 Aſſ. 96.

2. In *Appeal of Death*, the Defendant made *Default*, by which *Exigent was awarded*; and thereby the Goods and Chattels were forfeited. A *Writ* may iſſue *to the Sheriff, or to the Eſcheator*, to ſeiſe them. But per Knevet, *Commiſſion out of the Exchequer*, to ſeiſe them, is againſt Law; For they were not forfeited till now. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 40. cites 41 Aſſ. 13.

3. A Man was taken for *Suſpicion of Larceny, and bailed to J. N. Bailiff of D. to keep him*, and he *eſcaped* for Default of good keeping; and there 'twas ſaid, that if he *was not indicted*, his Goods ſhall not be forfeited; quod Mirum! For he who flies for Felony ſhall forfeit his Goods. But it ſeems, that this Word *(indicted)* is intended, that it ſhall be found by Indictment, that he fled for Felony before the Goods were forfeited; For the Flying ought to be of Record. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 43. cites 42 Aſſ. 5.

4. *Appeal* was brought by a Feme againſt three, *of* the *Death* of her Husband, *one is outlawed*, and the *other two render themſelves at the Exigent*, and their Goods were forfeited, becauſe they ſtaid till the Exigent. Br. Forfeiture de Terres, pl. 45. cites 44 Aſſ. 16.

5. *Appeal againſt two*, the *one as Principal in one County*, and the *other as Acceſſary* to the ſame Murder *in another County*, and *the Exigent was awarded*; and after the *Acceſſory goes quit*, becauſe 'twas in another County, and prayed Reſtitution of his Goods, and could not have it; For the *Goods are forfeited by the awarding of the Exigent*, which yet ſtands in Force. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl. 46. cites 45 Aſſ. 9.

6. Upon a *Jury's finding* that the Defendant fled at the ſame Time that they acquit him of an Indictment of capital Felony, or as ſome ſay,

of

of Larceny before Juſtices of Oyer, &c. he forfeits all his perſonal Eſtate. But ſuch a finding cauſes no Forfeiture of the Iſſues of the Land; becauſe by the Acquittal, the Land is diſcharged. Neither will it have any Effect as to the Goods, if the *Indictment* were *inſufficient*; or if the Flight be *diſproved on a Traverſe*, which, as all agree, may be taken to any ſuch Finding, except that by a *Coroner's Inqueſt*; and as ſome ſay, even to that, as well in Reſpect of the Flight, as of the Particulars of the Goods. 2 Hawk. Pl. C. Abr. 445. cap. 49. S. 11.

7. Upon a *Preſentment, by the Oaths of* 12 Men, that a Perſon, arreſted of Treaſon or Felony, fled from, *or reſiſted* thoſe who had him in Cuſtody, *and was killed* by them in the Purſuit or Scuffle, he forfeits all his *perſonal Eſtate*. 2 Hawk. Pl. C. Abr. 445. cap. 49. S. 11.

(W) In Caſes not Treaſon nor Felony, or of inferior Nature.

1. IF a Man be *Miſcreant*, 'tis a Forfeiture of his Land, per Belknap. Br. Forfeiture de terres, pl. 94. cites 5 R. 2.

2. In Treſpaſs, it appears, that where the Defendant is *attached for Goods in* an Action of *Treſpaſs, and makes Default* at the Day, his Goods are forfeited. Br. Forfeiture de Terres, pl. 23. cites 14 H. 6. 14.

And the *Default of the Feme*, in ſuch Caſe, is the Default of Baron and Feme. Br. Forfeiture de Terres. pl 23. cites 14 H. 6. 14.

3. *For Petit Larceny*, under 12d. the Party ſhall forfeit *all his Goods, but no Land*, quod Nota; For this is Felony, tho' not Felony of Death. Br. Forfeiture de Terres, &c. pl. 1. cites 27 H. 8. 22. per Fitzherbert J.

4. Attainder of *Premunire* works no Corruption of Blood, but is a Forfeiture of Lands in Fee Simple, but not of *Lands in Tail*. Co. Litt. 391. a.

5. *By* 9 *Annæ*. 14. *One challenging another for Money won at play forfeits his Goods.*

6. 1 *Geo.* 1. 55. *Papiſts not regiſtering their Eſtates forfeit them.*

7. An *Heretick*, tho' burnt for Hereſy, forfeited neither Lands nor Goods. Becauſe the Proceedings againſt him were only Pro Salute Animæ. Hawk. Pl. C. cap. 2. S. 10.

(X) Where, after Forfeiture, a Subject may enter without Livery of the King.

1. WHere a Man is *attainted of Treaſon by Parliament, and to forfeit his Land in Uſe, and in Poſſeſſion*, and after *the Heir is reſtor'd by another Parliament after that the King had made a Feoffment in Fee of a Manor*; he ſhall not have Scire Facias to reſume the Land, and to have Livery; For *where the King departs with Fee Simple, he cannot reſume*. Br. Livery, pl. 13. cites 7 H. 4. 20.

2. *But where* the King is *ſeiſed by Attainder of Felony, and leaſes for Life*, and J. N. has Title, he ſhall ſue to have Reſumption to the King, and to have Livery out of the Hands of the King; For the *Reverſion and Fee was in the King*. Ibid.

So where the King makes a *Feoffment in Fee of the Land of the Heir in Ward*, there ſhall be Reſumption and Livery made to the Heir; For the *King had not the Fee Simple to give*; contra where he has the Fee, and gives the Fee; Note, a Diverſity. Ibid.

3. *Tenant in Tail* levied War againſt the King by Treaſon, and was *kill'd in Battle*, and ſo died before he was attainted, by which it was *enacted by Parliament, that he ſhould forfeit all his Lands of Fee Simple*, and that

that the King ſhould ſeiſe as well the Land of Fee-Simple as the Land tailed; and by Mandamus it was *found that the Land tailed was tailed*, &c. *and that the Heir is within Age*, upon which the Heir at full Age, ſued in the Chancery to have Livery of the Land tailed, where, upon Argument, the beſt Opinion was, that he ſhall have Livery; For *where the King ſeiſes by a Title ſurmiſed, and has other true Title, the Law will adjudge him in by the juſt Title*, which is here by the Wardſhip; For nothing was forfeited by the Act of Parliament but Land of Fee Simple, and it appears there, that none ſhall have Livery without Office ſerving for him; and ſo the beſt Opinion is, that he ſhall not be put to ſue by Petition. Br. Livery, pl. 14. cites 7 H. 4. 32.

4. Office was found that *J. N. who held of the King, alienedwithout Licence* to W. S. and returned in the Exchequer, and thence ſent into Chancery, and thence into B. R. to be diſcuſſed; and there *found for W. S. that it was held of T. R. who held over of the King*; by which he had Livery out of the Hands of the King, with the Iſſues in the mean time. Br. Livery, pl. 15. cites 7 H. 4. 41.

5. *Where the King is intitled to ſeiſe, as for Outlawry of Felony*, Ward, Alienation without Licence, &c. there the Party who has Title ſhall be compelled to ſue Livery; *contra* upon Outlawry *in a perſonal Action*; For there the King *ſhall not ſeiſe, but only take the Profits*. Br. Livery, pl. 5. cites 9 H. 6. 20. *And therefore* there, and when a *Termor is Outlawed*, and the Term *expires*, the Leſſor, or *he who has Right, may enter without Livery*; For the King is not ſeiſed but of a *Chattel*, or of the Profits of the Land and never could ſeiſe the Soil of the Tenant of the Franktenement but only the Profits in the one Caſe, and the Chattels in the other. Br. Livery, pl. 5. cites 9 H. 6. 20.

(Y) Levied or * Recovered. How.

* See Prerogative.

1. 31 *E.* 3. *Stat.* 1. *cap.* 4. Enacts that *the Eſcape of Felons, and the Chattles of Felons, Fugitives, and Clerks Convict, adjudged by the Kings Juſtices ſhall be levied as they fall.*

2. T. B. of Kent Knight, was *Attainted of Treaſon*, and the *King by his Letters Patents gave all his Goods to W.* and he *brought thereof Subpæna in Chancery eo quod bona devenerunt ad manus ejus*, and per Cur. it lies well, tho' he may have an Action of Detinue at Common Law. Br. Prerogative, pl. 45. cites 39 H. 6. 26.

(Z) Pleadings.

1. 3 *E.* 3. *Stat.* 1. *cap.* 3. Enacts that *If any charged with the Goods of Fugitives and Felons will, in diſcharge of himſelf, allege another that is chargeable therewith he ſhall be heard, and Right ſhall be done him.*

2. In an *Information for a Debt forfeited*, and found by Inquiſition to be due to the Felon by Bond, it muſt be directly charged againſt the Debtor; that he became bound by his Bond, in ſuch a Summe, and muſt not be laid by a *Prout patet* by an Obligation hic in Cur. prolat. Per Saunders. Sand. 275. Trin. 21 Car. 2. in the Caſe of King v. Sutton.

(A. a) Forfeiture. * Relieved in Equity.

* See (Q) pl. 5.—See Condition.

1. IN Caſe of Forfeiture *Equity can Relieve*, where they can give Satisfaction. 1 Salk. 156. Grimſton v. Lord Bruce & Ux. in Canc. 2 Vern. 594. Mich. 1707. S. C.

2. A *wilful* Forfeiture, by *ſuffering a Recovery* in Point of Law was ſupplyed and helped in Equity, becauſe of an *Agreement precedent*. Paſch. 16 Car. 2. Chan. Caſes 49. Goodrick v. Brown.

3. A Forfeiture of a *Copyhold by feling Timber* was relieved in Equity; but Lord Keeper declared, that in Caſe of a *wilful Forfeiture* he would not relieve Hill. 19 Car. 2. Chan. Caſes 96. Mary Thomas v. Porter and the Biſhop of Worceſter.

See Copyhold.

4. In Caſe of a Forfeiture of a *Leaſe for Non-Payment of a Ground Rent*, and a Recovery in Ejectment, Chancery will not relieve on tender of Arrears and Coſts, where the Forfeiting Perſon was offered the ſame Terms by the Ground-Landlord before the Bill brought and refuſed them, per Jefferies C. Vern. 449. Paſch. 1687. Dorrington v. Jackſon & Watſon.

See Rent.

5. An *Aſſent after Refuſal* was allowed to prevent a Forfeiture; For a Forfeiture ſhall not bind where a Thing *may be done afterwards*, or any *Compenſation* made for it, unleſs where there is a Deviſe over to a third Perſon. 2 Vent. 352. Cage v. Ruſſell.

6. Equity will not relieve againſt a Forfeiture *incurred by Act of Parliament*. MS. Rep. ſaid to be Ld Harcourt's tit. Forfeiture 1723. Sweet v. Anderſon.

(B. a) How far Equity will aid the taking Advantage of a Forfeiture.

1. UPON the Diſabling Statute of 11 & 12 *W.* 3. *cap.* 4. §. 4. Ld Cowper inclined, upon a Bill brought by an after Proteſtant Remainder-man, and upon another Bill by the Heir at Law a Proteſtant, to direct an *Iſſue to try whether J. S.* to whom a firſt Remainder was limited, *was a Papiſt at the Time that the Remainder ſhould have veſted in him*; and this was deſired by the Plaintiffs; but in regard, the Act inflicts a Forfeiture and Diſabitity, and therefore is to be taken ſtrictly, and that J. S. being above 18 at the making the Settlement, and ſo *not within the Clauſe of Retrieving* the Eſtate *by returning to the Proteſtant Religion* (which probably was intended by the Parliament) his Lordſhip would not aſſiſt the Plaintiffs ſo far; but left them to go on and try their Ejectments upon ſeveral Demiſes, and *directed that none of the Truſt-Terms, or Eſtates in the Settlement, previous to the ſaid Eſtate limited to J. S. or Meſne betwixt him and the after Proteſtant Remainder-man, ſhould be given in Evidence, or inſiſted upon*; to the Intent, that it might be tryed whether J. S. who was ſtrongly affirmed to be a Papiſt but had controverted it, was capable of taking or Not, and who had the Title, in Caſe he was not Capable of taking, whether the Remainder-man by the Settlement, or the Heirs at Law. Wms's Rep. 352, 353. Trin. 1717. Vane v. Fletcher.

Forgery.

(A) At Common Law, or Now. In Reſpect of the Deed or Writing, or Thing contained therein.

1. 1 *H.* 5. 3. *WHEREAS Perſons have forged falſe Deeds to change the Lands of the good People of the Country, and to deſtroy and trouble the Poſſeſſions and Titles of the Subjects of our Lord the King, therefore our Lord the King, &c. provides and ordains, that the Party ſo grieved, may have his Suit in ſuch Caſe.*

If a Man forges *a Leaſe for Years*, he *is not within this Statute:* For where the Statute ſays, *to change the Lands, and trouble the Poſſeſſion and Title*, it cannot be intended of an Eſtate for Years. Pl. C. So. Arg. in the Caſe of Partridge v. Strange.

2. In Forger of a Deed, becauſe the Defendant forged a *Deed of certain Land, and four Shillings Rent, and Letter of Attorney* of the ſame Land, and Rent. Defendant demanded *Judgment of the Bill; for Rent does not lie in Livery* of Seiſin, and therefore cannot be * grieved of the Rent, by the Letter of Attorney. And yet becauſe by this the Tenant may give 1d. in the Name of Seiſin, and ſo the Plaintiff may be diſturbed and vexed, therefore he was awarded to anſwer, quod nota. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 4. cites. 33 H 6. 12.

* Orig. (greave,) and in the Year-Book it is (greve.)

3. If a Notary, or other Perſon, of Covin counterfeit *Seal of any Parſon or Vicar, and forge Letters of Reſignation* of his Parſonage or Vicaridge *in the Name of the Parſon or Vicar of his Benefice*, he ſhall thereupon have a Writ of Diſceit. But whether by that he ſhall be Reſtored to his Beneſice, Quære? It ſeemeth not, becauſe the removing of him is a Spiritual Act. F. N. B. 99. (K)

4. 5 *Eliz. cap.* 14 *S.* 2. Enacts that, *If any one alone, or with others, ſhall willingly, ſubtilly, and falſly forge or* make, *or cauſe, or aſſent to be forged or made, any falſe Deed, Charter, or Writing ſealed, Court-Roll, or Will in writing, to the Intent that the Freehold or Inheritance of Lands, or the Right or Title thereof, may be troubled, defeated or charged, or ſhall* publiſh *or ſhew forth in Evidence, any ſuch forged Writing as true, knowing the ſame to be falſe and forged, and ſhall be thereof convicted upon an Action of Forger of falſe Deeds (to be founded upon this Statute) at the Suit of the Party grieved, or otherwiſe, he ſhall pay to the Party grieved double Coſts, &c.*

Forgery of a *Will, whereby a Leaſe for Years is conveyed*, &c. is within the Statute, by Reaſon of the Word (Writing) only. Trin. 13 El. D. 302. b. pl. 45. Anon.——Grandfather, Father and Daughter. Land deſcended from the Grandfather to the Father. *The Father made a Leaſe for* 100 *Years and died.* The *Daughter, to avoid an Execution of a Statute-Staple, (the Leaſe being defeated) forged a Will of the Grandfather, by which he gave the Land to the Father for Life, the Remainder to the Daughter in Fee.* It was argued by the Solicitor General, to be within the firſt Branch of the 5 Eliz. Becauſe *Leſſee for Years* has a Title, an Intereſt, and a Right, and therefore within the Words of the Statute, and that thoſe Words ſhall be referr'd to the Words, *Lands, Tenements, &c* But Coke on the other Side ſaid, that they ſhould be referred to the Words Precedent, viz. *Eſtate of Freehold or Inheritance*, and then a Leaſe for Years is not within them. Then the Solicitor inſiſted, that a *Teſtament in Writing* is within the Words, *If any plead, publiſh, or ſhew forth, &c. to the Intent; to have or Claim* thereby *any Eſtate of* Inheritance, Freehold *or Leaſe for Years.* And he ſaid, that a *Statute Staple* is an Eſtate for Years, tho' it be not a Leaſe for Years, becauſe it is not certain. But Coke anſwered, that the Statute is, whereby an *Eſtate for Years ſhall be claimed*, and that in this Caſe, *the Daughter would defeat an Eſtate for Years*, and not claim one, and a Statute Staple is not a Leaſe for Years, and that the Statute is a *Penal Law, and not be taken by Equity.* The Sollicitor replied, that when the Statute is extended it is a Leaſe for Years, tho' it be uncertain. If a Man forge a Leaſe for Years, it is directly within the Statute. But if a *Man has a Leaſe, and another is forged to defeat it*, it is a Queſtion, whether it be within the Statute. And all the Doubt of this Caſe, is upon the *Reference of theſe Words, Right, Title, and Intereſt.* And it was adjourned. Godb. 62. Mich 28, 29 Eliz. B. R. Sturgie's Caſe.——Nelſ. Abr. tit. Forgery. pl. 3. S. C. ſays, the Court ſeemed to incline, that this was not within the Statute; for an Eſtate for Years was not ſuch an Intereſt or Title as is intended by the Statute, by ſuch a forged Will or Deed; beſides the Defendant did

did not claim the Leaſe, for her Intent was to defeat it; and this being a Penal Statute, ſhall not have an equitable Conſtruction, and cites S. C. and Book. But Quære; for there is nothing more there, than in the Principal Caſe here.

If a *Perſon convicted of Publication* of a Deed of Feoffment or Rent Charge, knowing the ſame to be forged, *afterwards forges another Deed* of Feoffment or Rent-Charge, the firſt whereof is within the ſecond Branch of the Statute, and the ſecond, viz. Forging is within the firſt Branch, it was reſolved, that the ſecond Offence, (tho' not of the ſame Nature with the firſt Offence, the one being Publication and the other Forgery) is Felony; ſo if he be convicted of forging or publiſhing any Writing, concerning Freehold, within the firſt Branch, or concerning Intereſt or Term for Years, within the ſecond Branch, and be convicted, if he afterwards offends, either againſt the firſt or ſecond Branch, the ſame is Felony. 13 Rep. 34. Paſch. 7 Jac. Read v. Booth.

One Handford, *before this Stat. forged a Leaſe for Years, which Leaſe was afterwards* redeemed by one Weynman for 200*l.* *and cancelled.* After Weynman, perceiving it to be forged, ſued Handford for Reſtitution of the 200*l.* and then Hanford, after this Stat. maintained the Leaſe as good and true; whereupon Weynman ſued him in the Star Chamber, and there *it was holden, not to be within the Statute*, becauſe the Deed was cancelled, and Hanford made no Title to the Intereſt of the Term. 3 Inſt. 172. cites Trin. 11 Eliz. Weynman v. Hanford.

§. 3. *A Forger, &c. of a* Leaſe for Years, *of Land not Copyhold, or of an* Annuity, Obligation, Bill, Acquittance, Releaſe, *or other Diſcharge of any Perſonal Thing, and he who ſhall publiſh and give the ſame in Evidence ſhall pay double Coſts, &c.*

The 5 *Eliz.* 14. *extends not* to Forgery of a Deed, conveying a Gift of *Chattels perſonal*, and as to that Point, extends *but to Obligations, Bills Obligatory, *Acquittance, Releaſe or other Diſcharge.* And it extends not to an Aſſignment of a *Leaſe of Land in Ireland.* But the Court may puniſh ſuch Offences, as Miſdemeanors at Common Law. 3 Le. 170. Mich. 29 Eliz. in the Star Chamber. Newman v. Sheriff. ———4 Le. 25 Mich. 29 Eliz. S. R.———*Counterfeiting an Acquittance for Money, was held Forgery, tho' without a Seal. 2 New. Abr. 568. cites Mich. 12 Geo. 1. The K. v. Ward.———S. P. Sid. 278. Paſch. 18 Car. 2. B.R. The King v. Ferrars———The Defendant was indicted for publiſhing a falſe, forged and counterfeited *Affidavit, and* likewiſe *a Certificate of J. S. a Juſtice of P.* knowing the ſame to be forged, by Virtue and Colour whereof, he did unlawfully and fraudulently, *procure the Sum of 57 l. 8 s. to be paid him for four Months Penſion, due to A. B. as a Widow of a Seaman* who died in the Service. It was moved in Arreſt of Judgment, that this was no Offence indictable at Common Law; For that the forging ſuch Affidavit and Certificate, was no Offence; and if ſo, the publiſhing ſuch Affidavit could be none neither. The Court eaſily over-ruled the Exception, admitting the Forgery not to be a Common Law Offence: Becauſe it was making Uſe of the Affidavit, whether forged or not, as a falſe Token, and in Order to cheat. But it was likewiſe reſolved, per Cur' that this would have been a good Indictment for Forgery at Common Law, and that had it been laid on any of the Statutes of Forgery, it would have been ill, for the Stat. of 33 H. 8 ſpeaks only of counterfeit Letters and privy Tokens, which has always been interpreted real Tokens; as a Watch, Ring, &c. belonging to the Party. The 5 Eliz. extends only to Deeds and Charters relating to Land, and the 2 Geo. 2. 25. extends to Deeds, Bills of Exchange, Notes and Aſſignments, Indorſements of Bills of Exchange, and nothing elſe; and they held, that nothing could be inferred from its being omitted in the Statutes, to prove it therefore to be no Offence at Law; but that all Forgeries were indictable as ſuch, before any Statute was made, where it appears, that *a third Perſon* has been *prejudiced* thereby For all which, the Caſe of the **King v. Ward.** Mich. 12 Geo. 1. was relied on, as in Point. Mich. 14 Geo. 2. B. R. King v. Obrian.

Forgery of a *Rent Charge*, or a *Leaſe for Years*, is within the Statute. But Forgery of *an Aſſignment*, or [of] a *Rent Charge in eſſe*, or a *Leaſe for Years*, is not within the Statute; For that does not charge the Inheritance of any; ſaid by Coke to have been agreed by the Juſtices in the Star Chamber. Noy. 42. in Markham's Caſe.———S. P. 3 Inſt. 170. ſays it was ſo reſolved, Paſch. 38 Eliz. in the Star Chamber, between the Lady Greſham and Booth. Markham & al.

Indictment for forging a *Deed of Aſſignment of a Leaſe ſigned with the Mark of* one Godard. Cujus tenor Sequitur, but *ſets down the Mark*, as in the Aſſignment, and yet well. 1 Salk. 342. Paſch. 2 Annæ. Queen v. Smith.———It is directly within the Statute. 3 Inſt. 170.

§. 9. *Provided this Act ſhall not extend to charge any Ordinary, Commiſſary or Official for putting their Seal of Office to any Will not knowing the ſame to be forged, nor for Writing ſuch a Will or the probate thereof.*

§. 12, 13, 14. *Provided, this Act ſhall not extend to any Proctor, Advocate or Regiſter, for Writing, ſetting forth, or pleading of any Proxy for the Appearance of any Perſon cited to appear in the Eccleſiaſtical Court, nor to any Archdeacon, nor Official for putting their Seal to ſuch Proxy, nor to any Eccleſiaſtical Judge, for admitting the ſame, nor to any Attorney or Counſellor for pleading or giving in Evidence any ſuch forged Writing, being not Party nor privy thereunto, nor to any Perſon that ſhall plead or ſhew forth any Writing exemplified under the Great Seal, or the Seal of any of the Courts of this Realm, nor to any Judge, Juſtice, or other Perſon that ſhall ſet any ſuch Seal thereunto, not knowing the ſame to be forged.*

5. If

5. If a Man forge *a Statute Staple, or a Recognizance in the Nature of a Statute Staple*, viz. *acknowledges them in the Name of another*; theſe are Obligations within the Statute; For each of them hath the Seal of the Party; otherwiſe of *a Statute Merchant, or Recognizance*, becauſe they have no Seal of the Conuſor. 3 Inſt. 171. cites Mich. 13 and 14 Eliz. Hinde v. Grevill.

Error of a Judgment in Ireland, was aſſigned, that forging a *bare Recognizance*, is not within the Statute, as [it would be] if it were in the Nature of a Statute Staple, being only before a Maſter of Chancery there. But per Cur' this Recognizance, being no Writing ſealed by the Conuſor, is not within the Statute. 3 Keb. 486. pl. 22. Trin. 27 Car. 2. B. R. the King v. Leſtrange.—cites Newton's Caſe.

6. A Copyholder of a Manor made a *Cuſtomary of the Manor* in Parliament, *with Labels and Seals* of himſelf, and other Tenants of the Manor, *inſerting therein diverſe Cuſtoms* very falſe, tending to the Diſherſon of the Lord, and by the Title thereof, pretended to be collected, renewed, and ſet forth by Conſent of all the Freeholders and Copyholders of the Manor, being at leaſt 100 and allowed and permitted by the Lord of the Manor, and ſeveral Names were ſubſcribed and Seals put, and mentioned to be ſo done the Day and Year above-mentioned, but no Day nor Year appeared in the Title, nor was there in Fact any Conſent of all the Tenants, or Allowance of the Lord: This by the Opinion of the Major Part of the Judges, upon a Reference to them, was held to be Forgery within the Statute. D. 322. b. pl. 26. Paſch. 15 Eliz. in the Star-Chamber. Taverner's Caſe. 3 Le. 108. Jenk. 240. pl. 23.

7. If a *Soldier* counterfeits the *Warrant of his Captain*, 'tis Felony. 2 Roll. R. 266. Mich. 20 Jac. B. R. in Stones Caſe cites Statute 39 E. 3. 17.

8. An Information was brought againſt three for forging, &c. an Entry *in the Regiſter Book* of a *Marriage*, between the Husband and another Woman, *to the Impeachment of the Dower of the true and lawful Wife*, and to the Deprivation of the Inheritance of the Daughters by the true Wife, and Judgment was given againſt him. Paſch. 1658. B. R. 2 Sid. 71. Dudly's Caſe.

9. One counterfeited *a Protection, in the Name of a Privy Counſellor of the King, but neither a Nobleman nor Member of Parliament*, and ſold this Protection for 6*l.* He was try'd, and found Guilty of this Counterfeiting and Extortion. It was mov'd, that this was no Offence, inaſmuch as the *Protection was merely void*. But the Court thought it a great Offence, becauſe by ſuch Protections many were impoveriſhed and diſabled to recover their juſt Debts, and fin'd him 50*l.* and Impriſonment 'till paid. Sid. 142. Paſch. 15 Car. 2. B. R. The K. v. Deakins.

10. The *Plaintiff produced a Deed inrolled*, at a Trial at the Aſſiſes, *which* in Fact, *never was inrolled*; and the Defendant moved for a new Trial, which the Court refuſed, altho' there is no Remedy againſt any of the Parties for Forgery or Perjury. And Twiſden ſaid that ſo was the Caſe of one **Pulington**, who had paid Fees, but the Clerk omitted the Inrollment, and the Party added it, and no Remedy againſt him; ſo of a *Cyrograph of a Fine* But by Keeling, ſuch an Indorſement is Forgery, when nothing will paſs without it; Sed Curia contra, that it is *only a great Miſdemeanor*, but no Forgery. 1 Keb. 568. pl. 15. Mich. 15 Car. 2. Noy v. Tucker.

11. Putting the *Chief Juſtice's Hand to Common Bail*, is Forgery. 1 Keb. 841. pl. 28. Hill. 16 and 17 Car. 2. B. R. Sherwood's Caſe.

12. Defendants were indicted at common Law for forging two Patents under the Great Seal, by *affixing an old Seal to a new Patent*. 2 Keb. 74. pl. 57. Trin. 18 Car. 2. B. R. The King and Monox v. Winter & al.

13. In Information for *Deceit in counterfeiting a Letter*, the Court were divided, whether it was puniſhable as an Offence at the Common Law, where *no Miſchief* is *intended*, *nor* does *any enſue*. Mich. 30 Car. 2. 2 Show. 20. The King v. Emerton.

14. A. B. and C. were indicted upon the Coroner's Inquest for the Murder of R. D. at H. in Kent, and were thereupon indicted and arraigned. The Fact upon the Evidence appeared to be, that the Prisoners were Customhouse Officers, and suspecting that some Wool would be transported, went to the Sea Side in the Night, where there happened an Affray, and A. was twice knock'd down, and recovering himself, shot the Deceased. They were all acquitted of the Murder, and then upon Complaint made, that A. only was found guilty upon the Coroner's Inquest, two of the Jury deposed in Court, that they, *upon the Coroner's Inquest, found the Indictment against A. alone*, which Indictment was *in English*; *But* one *J. D. who was then Mayor of H. and* by Virtue of that Office was *also Coroner, took the Indictment, and told the Jury it must be turn'd into Latin*, which was done; *and he then inserted the Names of B. and C.* the other two Prisoners at the Bar, whereupon J. D. was called, and he appearing, was bound in a Recognizance to answer this Matter. And upon an Information, was found Guilty; but having spoke with the Prosecutor, he was only fined 20 Nobles. 3 Mod. 66 Pasch. 1 Jac. 2. The King v. Marsh.

5 Mod 137. S. C.— For forging *a Cocket* for five Packs of

15. A Man was indicted for forging *a Bill of Loading*, but the Indictment being uncertain, was held naught. 1 Salk. 342. Mich. 7 W. 3. The K. v. Stocker.

Linnen Cloth. 6 Mod. 87. Mich. 2 Annæ. The Queen v. Browne.

16. It is no Forgery, where *no Person can be prejudiced but* the *Person doing* it. 1 Salk. 375. Hill. 11 W. 3. B. R. The K. v. Knight

17. A Man was indicted, for that he *quoddam Scriptum Obligatorium fabricavit & contrafecit*; Exception was taken, that it was a *Bond to the Sheriff* of London, *for the Appearance* of a Person under Arrest *a Die Purificationis in Octavis Diebus*, and there is no such Day, and therefore the *Bond is void*, not being according to the Statute, and by Consequence, the Forgery, no Crime, because *no prejudice to any*. But it was held, that the *Octavis Diebus*, may well be understood for the Octave of, &c. Besides these Bonds are not merely void by the Statute, but only voidable, and therefore you must plead the Special Matter, and not Non est factum. And you may say, that a forged Bond binds no Body, (as in Truth it does not) and thence infer, that it is no Crime to forge. Per Holt, Ch. J. and the Queen had Judgment, notwithstanding this and other Exceptions. 7 Mod. 150, 151, 152. Hill. 1 Annæ. The Queen v. King.

18. By 7 *Annæ, cap.* 20. §. . *Any Person forging or counterfeiting any* Entry of the acknowledgment of any Memorial, Certificate, *or* Indorsement, *as is therein mentioned or directed* to be Registred, *and be thereof lawfully convicted, such Person shall incur, and be liable to such Pains and Penalties as are imposed upon Persons for forging and publishing of false Deeds, &c. by* 5 *Eliz. cap.* 14.

19. By 8 *Geo.* 1. *cap.* 22. §. 1. *Forging Authorities, &c. to transfer* Stock, *or receive Dividends, &c. and personating Proprietors is made Felony.*

20. 9 *Geo.* 1. *cap.* 12. §. 4. Enacts that *If any Person after the second of April*, 1723. *shall Forge or Counterfeit, or procure to be forg'd, &c. or knowingly Act or assist in the Forging, &c. any* Order *made forth in pursuance of the Acts of* 6 *Geo.* 1. *c.* 11. *and* 8 *Geo* 1. *c.* 20. *or of this Act*, or *any* Assignment of such Order, or of the Annuities payable thereon, or *any* Receipt or Discharge to the Exchequer, for the Annuity due *on such Standing Order*, or *any* Letter of Attorney, *or other Authority*, to transfer, assign, *&c. any such Order*, or to receive the Annuities due *thereon*, or *shall* counterfeit, *&c.* any Name of the Proprietor *of such Order, in any Assignment, Receipt, Letter of Attorney, &c.* or *shall fraudulently* demand to receive any such Annuity, by Virtue of such forged Receipt, *&c.* or *shall falsly, and deceitfully* Personate any true Proprietor *of any the said Orders, thereby assigning or endeavouring to assign any such*

If

Order, or receiving or endeavouring to receive the Money of such Proprietor, as if such Offender were the lawful Owner thereof, in every such Case, every such Person, (being convicted thereof in due Form of Law) shall be adjudged Guilty of Felony, without Benefit of Clergy.

21. 12 *Geo.* 1. *cap.* 29. §. 4. Enacts that *Persons convicted of Forgery, &c. Practising as* Attornies, &c. *offending against the Act for preventing frivolous and vexatious Arrests shall be* transported for 7 Years.

22. 2 *Geo.* 2. *cap.* 25. §. 1. Enacts that *Forger, &c. or Counterfeiter, or Assister, &c. of any Deed, Will, Testament, Bond, Writing Obligatory,* Bill of Exchange, *or* Promissary Note *for Payment of Money, Indorsement or Assignment of such Bill or Note, or any* Acquittance *or Receipt either for Money or Goods, or shall utter or publish any such Deed, &c. with Intention to defraud any Person knowing the same to be false, &c. shall suffer Death as a Felon, without Benefit of Clergy.*

23. 4 *Geo.* 2. 18. §. 1. Enacts that *Any Person Forging or Counterfeiting any Pass, for any Ship, commonly called a* Mediterranean Pass, *or who shall alter or erase any Pass, made out by the Commissioners for Executing the Office of Lord High Admiral; or shall publish as true, any forged, altered, or erased Pass, knowing the same to be Forged, &c. shall be guilty of Felony without Benefit of Clergy.*

24. 7 *Geo.* 2. 22. *Makes the Forging, altering, &c. the* Acceptance of Bills *of Exchange, or the Number or Principal* Sums of accountable Receipts, *for any Note, Bill, or other Security for Payment of Money, or Delivery of Goods, &c. and the uttering, &c. the same as true, with Intent to defraud any Person, and knowing the same to be false, &c. to be Felony without Benefit of Clergy.*

25. 9 *Geo.* 2. 11. *Makes the* 2 *Geo.* 2. *perpetual.*

(B) In Respect of the making or proclaiming the Deed or Writing, &c.

1. IT WAS agreed, that if a Man *Forges a Deed, and does not proclaim it,* Action does not lie. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 1. cites 9 H. 6. 26. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 12. cites 22 H. 6. 16. S P. Per Paston.

2. If the *Father Forges a Deed and dies,* and the *Son knowing it, proclaims it*; Action lies against the Son, *quod ipse Sciens Factum illud fore falsum & Fabricatum illud proclamavit.* Per Bab. & Paston. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 1 cites 9 H. 6. 26.

3. In Trespass upon the Case, the best Opinion was, that where a Man *Forges an Obligation against me, and puts it in Suit,* I shall have Action upon my Case for the Vexation; *contra, if he Forges* it *and does not put it in Suit.* Br. Action sur le Case. pl. 89. cites 5 E. 4. 126.

4. So, I shall have Action upon the Case for *Forging of a false Testament,* or of a false *Release which is pleaded against me, by which I am delayed*; wherefore after Argument, the Defendant pleaded Not Guilty, notwithstanding it was said for the Defendant, that the Action does not lie, inasmuch as the Plaintiff, in Suit thereupon, may plead Non est factum; and Action upon the Statute is not given in this Case. Ibid.

5. If *one Forges* a Deed, *and another proclaims* it, Action of Forgery of Deeds does not lie against him who proclaimed; for the *Writ is Fabricavit & Proclamavit,* and 'tis sufficient for the Defendant to *traverse the Forging, without the Proclaiming in an Action against one,* otherwise 'tis in an Action against two; For one may forge and the other proclaim. Per Needham J. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 18. cites 14 E. 4. 32.

6. If

And if the Feoffee cauſes the *Livery to be Indorſed generally*, without eſpecial

6. If A. makes a Deed of Feoffment in December, and after this, and before Livery and Seiſin executed, the *Feoffor ſells the Land by good Aſſurance to another*, and *after this, firſt Feoffee takes Livery of Seiſin of the Feoffor*; this is Forgery in the Feoffor and Feoffee. Mo. 655. Mich. 44 & 45 Eliz. in the Star Chamber. Salway v. Wale.

Day of the making of it, this Indorſement is alſo Forgery, becauſe 'tis writen to the Intent to defraud the mean Aſſurance. So 'tis of * *Antedating* of a Deed, for ſuch Purpoſe. Mo. 655. Salway v. Wale. ——* 3 Inſt. 169.

But Antedating is not Forgery, if there be not a mean Intereſt in any

7. *And Antedating*, a Counterfeit Deed is Forgery, and ſo is *Counterfeiting the Hands, Names, and Seals of the Feoffees to the Counterpart* of the Forged Deed. And. 102. Trin. 24 Eliz. Puckering v. Fiſher and Langton.

third Perſon to be prejudiced by it. Mo. 655. Salway v. Wale.

If *a* Man makes an Obligation in my Name, I ſhall not have Diſceit, becauſe I may

8. If a Man forges a *Bond in my Name*, it's poſſible I may be damnified by it, but 'till 'tis put in Suit againſt me, I cannot bring *Action* againſt the Forger. Per Gold. J. Arg. 6 Mod. 46. cites 19 H. 6.* 24. Hob. 267. 6 E. 4. 7. 2 Buls. 268.

plead Non eſt factum. F. N. B. 96. (B) Marg. cites 19 H. 6. 44.—*This ſeems miſprinted.

9. A Perſon *cut off a dead Man's Hand, and put a Pen and a Seal in it, and ſo Signed and Sealed and delivered the Deed with the dead Hand*, and ſwore that he ſaw the Deed ſealed and delivered, and upon this he was convicted of Forgery. Sti. 362, 363. Hill. 1652. The King v. Howell Gwin.

10. Darnell (Serj.) ſaid, that Defendant may bring an Action upon his *Caſe* againſt the Plaintiff, *for ſuing him upon a Forged Bond*, and that a *Verdict therein would be Evidence* for him, it being between the ſame Parties. 6 Mod. 234. in Caſe of Selby v. Green.

(C) In Reſpect of the Alteration of the Deed, &c.

If ſuch Perſon ſo inſerts a Clauſe in the Will concerning the Deviſe of any Lands or Tenements, which

1. ONE wrote the Will of a Perſon mortally Sick, and *inſerted a Clauſe in the Will after the Teſtator was Speechleſs and without Memory and without any Direction before*, for the inſerting of it, and it being mov'd, whether this was Forgery of the Will and puniſhable, by the Stat. 5 Eliz. it was agreed and reſolved by the better Opinion, that it was not. D. 288. pl. 52. Paſch. 12 Eliz. In the Star Chamber. The Caſe of Sir John Marvin's Will.

Teſtator had in Fee Simple falſly, without any Warrant or Direction, tho' he did not forge, or falſly make the Whole Will, yet he is puniſhable by the Statute 5 Eliz. as hath been often held in the Star-Chamber, contrary to the Opinion reported by my Ld Dyer. 3 Inſt. 170.

Nov. 99. S. P. Mich. 42 & 43 Eliz. Black v. Allen.— 1 Salk. 375. S. P. Hill. 11 W. 3. B. R. in Caſe of the K. v. Knight.

2. If Obligee Alters or Razes (*Libris*) & inſerts (*Marcis*,) this is not Forgery puniſhable, becauſe it prejudices no body but himſelf in voiding his Bond, and leſſening the Duty; but if he had *increaſed the Sum*, or *leſſened* it *to avoid any Collateral Prejudice to himſelf*, or to prejudice another, 'twould be Forgery. Mo. 619. Mich. 42 and 43 Eliz. in the Star Chamber. Blake v. Allen.

3. *Omitting* a Thing or *Legacy out of a Will*, which is appointed to be inſerted is not Forgery. But if he is directed to give Eſtate for Life, with Remainder to another in Fee, and he *omits the Eſtate for Life, by which Remainder* in Fee *takes Effect preſently*, this is Forgery. *Writing a Will* and bringing it to a Perſon *of non ſanæ Memoriæ*, and he allows it, it is void but no Forgery; but *filling up Blanks*, during the Time of his being non ſanæ Memoriæ, was thought to be a *Miſdemeanor if he knew*

him

him to be non ſanæ Memoriæ. Mo. 760. Paſch. 3 Jac. in the Star Chamber, Combes's Caſe.

4. If A. makes a *true Deed* of Feoffment of the Manor of *Dale* unto B. — and B. or ſome other *raſe out D.* (the firſt Letter of Dale) and *put in S.* whereby it is falſly altered, and made the Manor of *Sale*: This is within the Statute. 3 Inſt. 169.

So if *a Rent Charge of one Hundred Pounds* by the Year be granted out of Land in Fee, or for Life, &c. and the Grantee or any other *raſe out* (*one*) and inſtead thereof *write* (*two*) this is within the Statute. 3 Inſt. 169.

5. *But* if one having a *Leaſe for twenty Years*, alters the ſame into *thirty* Years; this is no Forgery, becauſe it was a good Deed, and not forged at the firſt making. Star Chamber Caſes. 44.

6. A Man may loſe an honeſt Debt by playing a Trick to come at it; and Sir Wm. Beverſham's Siſters Caſe, was cited, who *adding a Seal to a Note*, which was ſufficient without a Seal, loſt her Security; cited, by Hutchins Commiſſioner. Trin. 1690. 2 Vern. 162. in Caſe of Hitchcox v. Sedgwick.

(D) Forger. Who.

1. NO *Acceſſory* can be in Forgery, but all are Principals. Mich. 44 & 45 Eliz. Mo. 666. Booth's Caſe.

2. *To cauſe, is to procure or counſel one to forge*, &c. *To aſſent*, is to give his Aſſent or Agreement afterwards to the Procurement or Counſel of another; *To conſent*, is to agree at the Time of the Procurement or Counſel, and he in Law is a Procurer. 3 Inſt. 169.

3. In a ſtrict Senſe, he that *Cauſes* a Forgery to be done is a Forger himſelf; But then it ought to be laid ſo in the Indictment. 5 Mod. 138. Per Cur. Mich. 7. W. 3. in Caſe of the King v. Stocker.

(E) Publication thereof; What is, or amounts to it.

1. FORGER of Deed lies where *Termor may pray to be received, and ſhews a forged Deed of Leaſe*; per Moile; for he cannot be received without ſhewing Deed. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 15. cites 9 E. 4. 37.

2. A Man ſhall ſhew Deed *in Formedon* in Remainder, and yet, though when it is ſhewn, the Tenant ſhall not have Anſwer to it, if the Deed be forged, he ſhall have an Action of Forger of the Deed; per Cur. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 20. cites 10 E. 4. 1.

3. If *A. telleth B. that ſuch a Deed is falſe, and forged*, and *yet B. will after pronounce or publiſh this to be a true Deed*, and afterwards it falleth out by Proof, that the Relation of A. was true, and the Deed forged; *B. is in the Danger* * *of this Statute*; And ſo was it reſolved in the Caſe of the **Lady Gresham v. Booth**, &c. 3 Inſt. 171.

* 5 *Eliz. cap.* 14. which ſee at (A)

4. If an *innocent Perſon receive Money upon a forged Note*, not knowing any thing of the Forgery, it is no Crime in him; but he ſhall anſwer for the Money ſolely; *But* receiving Money upon a forged Note, *knowing the Forgery*, is a Publication of the Forgery. Per Holt, Ch. J. 12 Mod. 494. Paſch. 3. W. 3. the King v. Eller.

(F) What may be done in Caſe a Deed be denied, as forged; And if found forged, what ſhall be done with the Deed, &c.

1. A *Aſſiſe* was *adjourned* into Banco, *upon Demurrer of Baſtardy*, and the *Defendant at the Day would have pleaded Releaſe*, and was not ſuffered; For *it was not made after the Adjournment*, and the Plaintiff recovered; and notwithſtanding that the *Deed of Releaſe appeared to be falſe*, and Ouſter is confeſſed; yet the Defendant was not impriſoned, for the Juſtices are out of the County where the Aſſiſe was brought. But it ſeems to me that the Reaſon is, becauſe the Plea was not admitted of the Releaſe; For the Juſtices of Banco, upon Adjournment, ſhall give ſuch Judgment as the Juſtices of Aſſiſe ſhould give in the County. Br. Impriſonment. pl. 54. cites 23. Aſſ. 5.

2. In Aſſiſe, the Tenant *pleaded falſe Releaſe*, to which the Plaintiff was a Stranger, and therefore they were at *Iſſue upon the Seiſin of the Feoffor*, and found for the Plaintiff, and that the Releaſe was falſe, and the Tenant was taken, quod mirum! where the Releaſe was not in Iſſue, and alſo the Releaſe was *made to A. Que Eſtate the Tenant claim'd, and not to the Tenant himſelf.* Br. Impriſonment, pl. 55. cites 24. Aſſ. 3.

3. In *Debt for forging* of Deeds, if *Judgment* paſs for the Ptaintiff, it ſhall be *a good Barr in every Court* afterwards, in Action brought upon this Deed. quod nota bene. Br. Faits pl. 43. cites 37 H. 6. 13. per Choke.

4. When a Deed is denied, the Law has appointed it to remain in Court, and the *Cuſtos Brevium to have the Cuſtody of it.* 5 Rep. 75. a. per the Reporter cites F. N. B. 243. (L) [but it ſhould be (I).]

5. If the *Husband and Wife ſue a Bond, made to the Wife*, in C. B. and the Deed is there denied, for which Reaſon it remains in the keeping of the Cuſtos Brevium, and the *Husband dies*, the *Wife may have a Writ out of Chancery*, directed to the *Cuſtos Brevium* in C. B. *to deliver the Deed to the Wife*, becauſe the Plea is determined by the Death of the Husband. F. N. B. 243. (I)

A Bond being found forged, the Defendant prayed, that it might remain in Court; but the Court denied it, and ſaid, that

6. A Deed upon Evidence was found not to be the Defendant's Deed, and by Conſequence forged; and it was inſiſted on, that the Court ought to cancel it, yet the Court denied it, becauſe *there might be Error in the Proceedings*, for which the Verdict might be ſet aſide, and then the Bond would ſtand unimpeached, and ſo the Matter be brought in Queſtion again; and ſo it was reſolved it ſhould not be cancelled, but *remain in Court uncancelled.* 6 Mod. 233. in Caſe of **Selby** v. **Green**. Cited per Holt, Ch. J. as Sir Sol. Swale's Caſe.

ſuch Matter had been often moved, but never granted, and cauſed the Bond to be delivered to the Plaintiffs. Sid. 131. Paſch. 15 Car. 2. B. R. Guillims v. Huley.—Jenk. 70. in pl. 32.

A Deed found forged by Verdict, and which concerned an Eſtate of 1200 l. a Year, was, *by Order, brought into Chancery, and a Years time given to juſtify* the Deed, by a new Trial, where he pleaſe; and becauſe within the Year he had a *new Trial* at Cheſter, and *found againſt* him, it was now moved, that the Year being paſt, the Deed ſhould be *cancelled*, and damned, and decreed accordingly. Sid. 170. Mich. 15 Car. 2. Gerard v. Phitton.

* Sid. 131. Paſch. 15 Car. 2. B. R. S. C.
† 5 Rep. 74.

7. A. was ſued as Executor to J. S. upon a *Bond* of 10,000 l. ſet up by an old Woman, that looked after J. S. an old Miſer, as his Nurſe; and upon *Non eſt Factum* pleaded, it was *found* upon a Trial at Bar, *not to be the Deed* of J. S. and upon the Authority of † **Wymark's** Caſe, in 5 Rep. it was made a Queſtion if the Bond ſhould not be cancelled? and it was *held that it ſhould not be cancelled*, becauſe the Judgment might be reverſed by Writ of Error, but ſhould be kept in Court. 1 Salk. 215. cited per Holt, Ch. J. as Sir Huley's Caſe.

8. The Plaintiff making Default, and upon opening of the Cauſe, it appearing that the Plaintiff had forged ſeveral Notes or Writings in the Defendant's Name, it was prayed by the Defendant's Counſel, that ſuch Bills or Notes might be torn or obliterated; but Mr. Solicitor General obſerved to the Court, that a forged Deed or Writing, *cannot be torn or defaced by Law, but* muſt be *kept*, ſo *that the King may proceed upon it* againſt the Criminal. Mich. 1682. Vern. 66. Frankland v. Hampden.

9. The *Obligee made* a material *Razure in the Condition* of a Bond, and after brought an Action upon the Bond; and the Defendant having had *Oyer*, and the Bond being now in Court, and the Razure diſcovered, the Defendant pleads Non eſt Factum, and Notice of Trial given; but when the Plaintiff underſtood that the Defendant had found out the Cheat, and could prove it, he countermands the Notice; and it was moved, upon Affidavits of this Matter, that the Bond ſhould *remain in the Cuſtody of the Officer* of the Court till the Cauſe was tried; For otherwiſe the Plaintiff would ſtay until the Defendants Witneſſes were dead, and put this forged Bond in Suit againſt him, when he could by no Poſſibility relieve himſelf againſt it; and now if he ſhould try it by Proviſo, the Plaintiff would be Nonſuited, and might begin again. Per Cur. the Defendant's beſt way would be to carry the Cauſe down by Proviſo; and if the Plaintiff would ſuffer himſelf to be nonſuited, whereby the Suit would be at an end, and the Plaintiff entitled to take his Bond out of Court, yet the *Nonſuit would be great Evidence* againſt him *in another Action* to be brought thereupon, or elſe he might get his Witneſſes Teſtimony perpetuated in Chancery. 6 Mod. 233. Mich. 3. Annæ. B. R. Selby v. Green.

Darnel, Serjeant, moved this Caſe, and after the Court had given their Opinion, he ſaid, that the Defendant might bring an Action on the *Caſe, for ſuing him on a falſe Bond*; and that a Verdict therein would be Evidence for him, it being between the ſame Parties; and ſo he took nothing by his Motion. Ibid. 234.

10. In *Ejectment* the Plaintiff made his Title under ſeveral Deeds, but the Jury *found againſt the Deeds*; and upon Motion, the *Court ordered them to be kept in the Officer's Hands, in order to a Proſecution for Forgery*; But upon Application to the *Court of Chancery, whence the Iſſue was directed, a new Trial was granted*, and therefore the *Plaintiff moved to have the Deeds out of Court*; And Holt, Ch. J. held, that they muſt be delivered out, as this Caſe was, becauſe the Deeds *were not in Iſſue directly upon the Pleadings* in the Cauſe; otherwiſe if the Iſſue had been Non eſt Factum. 1 Salk. 215. Hill. 4 Annæ. B. R. Fitch v. Wells.

(G) Actions and Pleadings.

1. CONſpiracy *againſt ſeveral for forging a Deed of Entail* of Land of the Plaintiff, by which he was put to great Travail, Coſts, and Expences, and [forced] to ſell his Chattels, but becauſe *it was quod talis procuravit ſuch a one to forge the Deed, and he was the ſame Perſon who was named in the Writ*, and ſo he cannot procure himſelf, therefore the Writ was abated quod nota; but it is badly reported. Br. Conſpiracy, pl. 7. cites 46 E. 3. 20.

2. In Forger, &c. Defendant ſaid, *that at the time of the making and publiſhing ſuppoſed he himſelf was ſeiſed of the Tenements in Fee, abſque hoc that the Plaintiff then had any thing.* Newton ſaid, 'twas no Plea, for it may be that he diſſeiſed us, and made the Deed, and we re-entered, and ſo diſturbed of the Poſſeſſion; after Cot. J. ſaid the Plea is good prima facie; For then you cannot be diſturbed of your Poſſeſſion, and if you have ſpecial Matter ſhew it. But note, that the Stat. of 1 H. 5. 3. ſpeaks of Poſſeſſion

Poſſeſſion and Title, and Diſſeiſor has Title. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 9. cites 8 H. 6. 33.

3. If a Man brings an Action, and *ſuppoſes that the Defendant forged and proclaimed a Deed*, he *ſhall anſwer to both.* per Bab. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 1. cites 9 H. 6. 26.

* Not Guilty was admitted for good Iſſue, without Argument. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 17. cites 37 H. 6. 37.

4. If an Action be brought *againſt two*, and *one ſays*, that *he did not forge*, and the *other ſays*, that *he did not proclaim*, it is not good; But *each muſt plead* * *Not Guilty as to all.* per Bab. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 1. cites 9 H. 6. 26.

——S. P. Ibid. pl. 21. cites 21 H. 7. 15. and 10 H. 6. 3. acc.

Br. Accord. pl. 8. cites S. C. — Br. Barre. pl. 22. cites S. C.

5. Forger de faits; Defendant, *Proteſtando that he did not forge, pro placito* ſaid *he gave a Gallon of Wine in Satisfaction of the Treſpaſs, to which Plaintiff agreed*, Judgment ſi Actio. Plaintiff ſaid, this is no Plea, without ſaying, that they accorded, &c. Newton ſaid, Defendant has pleaded beſt; *by which Plaintiff ſaid, he did not receive it in Satisfaction of this Treſpaſs, priſt.* 19 H. 6. 29.

* The *Writ was*, that *ſeparalia Facta* fabricavit, and *counted* that he forged *one Deed only*; Judgment of the Count; & non allocatur; the Reaſon ſeems to be, becauſe *there is no other Form* of the Writ. Br. Forger de faits, pl. 9. cites 8 H. 6. 33. Br. General Brief. pl. 6. cites S. C. 8 H. 6. 34.

In forger of Deeds, the *Defendant ſaid that the Plaintiff was ſeiſed of the Manor of D. in Fee, and covenanted with J. N. to enfeoff him* of the Manor of D. *and J. N. prayed the Defendant to write the Deed* accordingly, which he did, and put a Seal to it, by the Command of the Plaintiff, and read the Deed at the [making] the Livery and Seiſin, which is the ſame forging and proclaiming; Judgment ſi Actio; and a good Plea, per tot. Cur. notwithſtanding that the Writ be * ſeparalia facta fabricavit; *and he juſtified vera facta*; quod nota. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 10. cites 21 H. 6. 4.

S. P. per Paſton, tho' he *does not ſay, at the time of the proclaiming*; for the Forgery and proclaiming is ſuppoſed on one and the ſame Day; and after they were at Iſſue ut ſupra, viz. without mentioning of the Proclaiming as it ſeems. Brook ſays, he wonders at the Plea; for it may be that he had in *Reverſion or Remainder*, though he had not in the Franktenement, and the Iſſue is good. Br. Forger de faits, pl. 12. cites 22 H. 6. 16.

7. The *Defendant ſaid, that the Plaintiff had nothing in the Franktenement at the Time* of the Forgery and proclaiming, which was admitted a good Plea, and Iſſue taken thereupon; quod nota bene. Br. Forger de faits, pl. 11. cites 21. H. 6. 51.

And the Iſſue was received. 27 H. 6. 3. a. pl. 21. — Fitzh. tit. Iſſue. pl. 61. cites S. C.

8. In Forger of Deeds, for that the Defendant ſuch a Day and Year forged and proclaimed a *Deed, by which the Feme of the Plaintiff made a Feoffment to N. of his Land* in D. *and Letter of Attorney, by which the ſame Defendant ſhould be Attorney to deliver Seiſin* to the ſaid N. &c. to which the *Defendant ſaid, that the Feme, before the Coverture, was ſeiſed in Fee, and cauſed the Defendant to write the ſaid Deed and Letter of Attorney* of the ſaid Lands in D. to the ſaid N. *but he alleged other Date than the Plaintiff alleged, and that he wrote it, and delivered it to the Feme of the Plaintiff to ſeal, which ſhe ſealed and delivered as her Deed, by which the Defendant made livery of* Seiſin, *and publiſhed it prout ei bene licuit, abſque hoc*, that he is guilty of any ſuch falſe forging or publiſhing modo & forma. Br. forger de faits. pl. 3. cites 27 H. 6. 3.

Br. Traverſe per &c. pl. 330. cites 32 H. 6. 12. — But it ſhould be 32. H. 6. 1. b. pl. 4.

9. Forger and proclaiming of a *Deed by A. to W. N.* in Fee, &c. the *Defendant ſaid that A was ſeiſed, and infeoffed W. and his Feme in Fee who died, and he as Heir read and proclaimed the Deed*, &c. and the beſt Opinion was, that it is no Plea without *traverſing* the Forgery; but by others it cannot be *intended the ſame Deed*, for that which was a Deed to W. and his Feme, was a Deed alſo to W. and ſeveral e contra, in as much as it not to W. only, therefore quære. Br. Confeſs and avoid, pl. 62. cites 32. H. 6. 1.

10. The Plaintiff counted (inter alia) that he forged a falſe *Releaſe, by which J. ought to releaſe to the Defendant all the Right which he had* in certain Land, the *Defendant ſaid, that the ſaid J. by the Deed which he ſhewed, releaſed to him all the Right*, &c. which is *the ſame Deed*, which he pronounced, publiſhed, and read; *abſque hoc that this Releaſe is forged and falſe*, &c, and *no Plea*; *For* the abſque hoc, *does not anſwer the Declaration*; by which he juſtified ut ſupra, *abſque hoc, that he is guilty of the making, pronouncing, or publiſking of any ſuch Deed as in the Declaration aforeſaid ſpecified*; and a good Plea. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 5. cites 33 H 6. 21.

11. *And* note, that none can juſtify as above, if he has not the Deed in his Hands ready to ſhew; and if not, muſt plead Not Guilty generally. Br. Forger de Faits. pl. 5. cites 33 H. 6. 21.

12. In Forger of Deeds, the *Writ was, diverſa ſeparalia Facta & Miniamenta*, and the *Count was of a Deed of Feoffment, and a Letter of Attorney*; and therefore the beſt Opinion was, that the *Count ſhall abate*, becauſe it is not warranted by the * Writ. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 7. cites 35 H. 6. 37.

S. P. Br. Count. pl. 22. cites S. C. — * In Br. it is Count.

13. Forgery of Deeds, and proclaiming of them *at D. by which the Plaintiff was interrupted of his Poſſeſſion of certain Land in S.* the *Defendant ſaid* that *No ſuch Vill Hamlet nor Place was known out of the Vill and Hamlet, by the Name of S. in the ſame County*; And this, &c. Judgment of the Writ, and the others econtra, and this Iſſue ſeems to be by Reaſon of the Viſne. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 19. cites 3 E. 4. 26. and 4 E. 4. 41. accordingly.

14. And Quære if it be a good Plea to ſay, *that the Plaintiff never had Land or Tenement in S.* for it ſeems that he may plead Not Guilty, and *give this Matter in Evidence*. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 19.

15. Forgery of Deeds, the *Defendant ſaid, that J. S. made the Deed, and ſealed it, and delivered it to the Defendant, ſecundum vim Facti, abſque hoc, that he forged or proclaimed*; Wood ſaid, *the ſpecial Matter ſhall* not *be entered*, & Cur. contra. But per Brian, he ſhall ſhew the Deed, and otherwiſe it ſhall not be entered, becauſe it ſeems that it is only the *general Iſſue*. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 23. cites 10 H. 7. 29.

16. Note, it was agreed Arguendo, that *Ne forgea pas*, or *Not Guilty*, is a good Iſſue in Forgery of Deeds. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 21. cites 21 H. 7. 15.

17. For Pleadings on this Statute, *5 Eliz* 14. *S.* 2. ſee Lutw. 190. Collingwood v. Jefferyes.

(H) Actions; By what Perſons, in reſpect of Eſtate.

1. IN Forger of Deeds by W. againſt J. and ſaid that he had *forged and proclaimed* certain falſe Deeds of ſuch Land *in Diſturbance of the Title and Poſſeſſion* of the Plaintiff. Halz. *Proteſtando, not confeſſing the making*, and *for Plea ſaid, that at the time of the making ſuppoſed*, &c, *the Defendant himſelf was ſeiſed of the Land in Fee.* Cot. *before the Defendant had any thing the Father and Mother of the Plaintiff were ſeiſed in Fee, in Right of the Wife, and had Iſſue the Plaintiff*; the *Feme died*, and the *Father was Tenant by the Curteſy till diſſeiſed by the Defendant, which Defendant, ſeiſed by Diſſeiſin, made the falſe Deeds*, &c. and ſo ſee, that at the Time of the Diſſeiſin, he in Reverſion had neither Poſſeſſion nor Reverſion, but *Right of Reverſion*, And yet, by the Opinion of the Court, the Action well lies; by which he bid Halz. to anſwer Quod nota. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 14. cites 4 H. 6. 25

So where *one abates and forges*, &c. the *Heir* ſhall have Action. Br. Forger de Faits. pl. 14. cites 4 H. 6. 25.

2. Plaintiff declared, that the Defendant forged a *Releaſe in Name of the Anceſtor of the Plaintiff.* Fulthorp ſaid, that the ſame Anceſtor made the Releaſe to R. then Tenant of the Land, whoſe Eſtate we have, and after the Releaſe came to us, and we proclaimed it prout bene licuit, abſque hoc that we forged prout, &c. Per Paſton, you forged, priſt. &c. and ſo ſee here, that *the Heir ſhall have this Action of Forgery in the time of his Anceſtor.* Br. Forger de faits. pl. 8. cetes 7 H. 6. 34.

3. If a Man diſſeiſes me, and, *during the time of the Diſſeiſin, J. N. forges Deeds*, &c. *and I re-enter*, I ſhall not have Action; per Newton. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 12. cites 22 H. 6. 16.

4. In Forger of Deeds by T. M. againſt R. D. *Defendant ſaid, that where the Writ is of Forger of Deeds, of his Lands and Tenements in D.* he ſaid, that *the Plaintiff had nothing in them the Day of the Writ purchaſed, nor ever after*, Priſt. the *Plaintiff ſaid, that long time before the Forging, A. was ſeiſed in Fee, and gave to K. in tail, the Remainder to the Plaintiff*, &c. and the *Statute is, Si quis de Poſſeſſione terre & Tenementi turbatus & vexatus fuerit*, &c. And the beſt Opinion was, that it well lies, for he has *Poſſeſſion of the Remainder*, though he has not Poſſeſſion of the Demeſne during the Tail; but it is not adjudged; and cited 15 E. 4. by Skreene, that a Remainder may be limited, and therefore it is a Tenement. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 6. cites 33 H. 6. 22.

5. If a Man forges Deeds *of the Land of my Father, in the Life of my Father, and after his Death it is proclaimed*; I who am *Heir* at the Time the Deed was proclaimed, ſhall not have a Writ of Forger of falſe Deeds; For the Son *had no Right in the Life of the Father*, and the *Action is forging and proclaiming.* Br. Forger de faits. pl. 14. cites 15 E. 4. 24. per Brian, Littleton, and Choke.

And per Littleton, where a Man *forges and proclaims in the Time of the Diſſeiſor*, and the Diſſeiſee re-enters, *each of them ſhall have Forger of Deeds*; for *one had Right*, and the *other had Poſſeſſion.*

6. *But* if a Man forges *in the time of the Diſſeiſor*, and *the Diſſeiſee re-enters, and the Forgery is proclaimed*, the *Diſſeiſee* ſhall have an Action; For he *had Right during the Diſſeiſin.* Per Chocke, Littleton, and Neale. Br. Forger de faits. pl. 14. cites 15 E. 4. 24.

Br. Forger de faits. pl. 14. cites 15 E. 4. 24.

7. *And* if *Tenant for Life* be, the *Remainder over in Fee*, and a Man forges and proclaims falſe Deeds, the *Tenant for Life ſhall have Action, and* he in *Remainder* ſhall have *another Action alſo.* Br. Forger de faits. pl. 14. cites 15 E. 4. 24.

(I) Indictment. Before whom.

1. BY 5 *Eliz. cap.* 14. §. 4. Juſtices of Oyer, and Terminer, and Aſſiſe, *in their Seſſions ſhall hear and determine theſe Offences.*

So of Forging *a Letter in the Name of J. S.* &c. For their Power is created by Act of Parliament within time of Memory, and they have no other Authority than what is thereby given them; and the general Words of their Commiſſion, De omnibus aliis Tranſgreſſionibus & Malefactis quibuſcunque, muſt be underſtood of ſuch Crimes as they have Power over by the ſeveral Statutes which created or inlarged their Power. 1 Salk. 406. Mich 9 Annæ B. R. the Queen v. Yarrington.

2. *Juſtices of the Peace in their Seſſions*, cannot inquire of Forging a *Falſe Deed* on the Statute of 5 Eliz. Cro. E. 87. Hill. 30 Eliz. B. R.

3. *But* this Felony is to be heard and determined *before Juſtices of Oyer and Terminer, and Juſtices of Aſſiſe*, in their Circuit; and tho' Juſtices of Peace have Power to hear and determine Felonies, Treſpaſſes, &c. yet they are not included under the Name of Juſtices of Oyer and Terminer; For Juſtices of Oyer and Terminer, are known by one diſtinct Name and

Juſtices

Juſtices of Peace by another. But the *Juſtices of B. R.* are Juſtices of Oyer and Terminer within this Statute. 3 Inſt. 103. cap. 41.

4. Indictment for Forgery upon the Statute of the 5 El. *before A. and B. Juſtices of the Peace, nec non ad diverſas Felonias*, &c. *audiend. & terminand. aſſignat.* It was held by three Judges, Popham doubting, that they had not Power to take this Indictment; For the *Statute*, which appoints that the Offences ſhall be enquired before Juſtices of Aſſiſe, or of Oyer and Terminer, *intends* thoſe who have *general Commiſſions*, and not thoſe who have but a ſpecial Commiſſion, as Juſtices of Peace. Mich. 39 & 40 Eliz. B. R. Cro. E. 601. Wilſon's Caſe.

Indictment taken before Juſtices of Peace, *concluding contra formam Statuti*, being coram non Judice; *yet*, being for Forgery, the Court *refuſed to quaſh* it, but left him to Demur, or Plead the King v. Nithingale. 3 Keb. 773. pl. 12. Trin. 29 Car. 2. B. R.

(K) Indictment. Exceptions to Indictments, or Informations.

1. THE Indictment was, that he *ſcienter ſubdole & falſo fabricavit quoddam falſum Factum & Scriptum indentatum Barganiæ & Venditionis*, which was ſaid to be *Inrolled, per quod A. and B. did ſell to J. S. ſuch Lands*, and then ſets forth the Indenture Verbatim, *& quod Poſtea prædictus R.* (the Defendant) *Sciens prædict. Chartam eſſe falſam & contrafactam vi & armis pronunciavit & publicavit*, and this was *ea Intentione ad perturbandum Statum titulum & Intereſſe of A. and B. and their Heirs.* It was aſſigned for *Error* * that *the Indentures ſet forth were a Leaſe and Releaſe*; but the Indictment was of a Bargain and Sale, *and it did* † *not appear where it was inrolled*, and it muſt be inrolled in one of the four Courts at Weſtminſter, or before the Juſtices of Peace at the Seſſions, to make it a Bargain and Sale; and *that only A. was Party to the Deeds ſet forth*, tho' the Indictment is of a Deed by which A. and B. did ſell; and that it ought to have been ‡ *in quo continetur that they did ſell*, and Not that they did ſell; becauſe the Deed was void, which was ſaid to be Oppoſitum in Objecto; and *that Vi & Armis Chartam pronunciavit, &c.* ſhould have been Vi & Armis *prædictam Chartam* pronunciavit, &c. and alſo that the Forgery was laid to be ea Intentione *ad perturbandum ſtatum, &c. of them and their Heirs*, and it did || *not appear that they had a Freehold*; and alſo, that it ** *ought to appear in whom the Freehold was at the Time of the Forgery.* Adjornatur. Vent. 23, 24. Paſch. 21 Car. 2. B. R. the King v. Ring.

* Non allocatur. 2 Keb. 501. S. C. — † To this it was anſwer'd Arg. that were it not a Bargain and Sale to raiſe an Uſe by the Statute, yet it carries an Uſe at Common Law; and per Cur. any Thing purporting a Deed is within the Statute. But adjornatur. 2 Keb. 502. S. C.—This is but Inducement, and therefore

Non allocatur. 2 Keb. 501. Paſch. 21 Car. 2. S. C.——‡ It ſeems by Keble, that thoſe Words were in the Indictment, and that for want of alleging, that he did ſell or convey, it was held by Twiſden to be ill, but Keeling and Windham contrà. 2 Keb. 245. Trin. 19 Car. 2. S. C.—But 2 Keb. 532. Trin. 21 Car. 2. ſays it was aſſigned for Error, that the Indictment was *fabricavit Scriptum*, and that by that Deed A. and B. Bargained and Sold, and does not ſay, *Colore*, or that he Forged a Deed purporting a Bargain and Sale, and that Twiſden agreed this Exception on Lapdon's Caſe, that, being on an Indictment, it muſt be taken ſtrictly, and muſt expreſs all without Intendment, which is without prejudice, becauſe the Party may be Indicted again; but Curia contra; yet adjornatur.——|| Per Cur. this is *intended Freehold*, the Forgery being of a Deed, by which Copyhold cannot paſs; and a Leaſe for Years may paſs without it. 2 Keb. 532. S. C.——** Non allocatur. 2 Keb. 501. S. C.——3 Keb. 51 S. C. and Judgment for the King.

2. An Information was brought *againſt three* for Forging, and malitiouſly Conſpiring and contriving an Entry of a Marriage in the Regiſter Book, between Sir R. Dudley and Fra. Vavaſor, to the Impeachment of the Dower of the true Wife of Sir R. Dudly, and to deprive his Daughters of their Inheritance; *one only* of the Defendants was *found guilty.* It was Objected in Arreſt of Judgment, that as two were acquited, the other could not be alone guilty of the Conſpiracy; but it was anſwered that the Indictment was good without the *Conſpiracy*, which *was only an Inducement* thereto;

thereto, and not the Ground of the Indictment. Judgment was given againſt the Defendant. Paſch. 1658. B. R. 2 Sid. 71. Dudly's Caſe.

3. The Statute requires it to be a *Deed ſealed, and* here it was only *Scriptum*; Sed non allocatur; For when the Deed is recited, 'tis concluded with dat. & ſigillat. ſuch a Day and Year, tho' before it is only ſaid quoddam Scriptum; the Judgment was affirmed. Paſch. 30 Car 2. B. R. 2 Show. 5. the King v. Marriot.

4. Error was aſſigned, for that the Indictment had not in it *Vi & Armis*, and that the Indictment is not for Nonfeaſance, but for Misfeaſance; and Jones J. held that this is cured by the expreſs Words of the Statute 37 H. 8. 8. and cited Cro. J. Hart's Caſe, ſo Reſolved. But Twiſden and Windham J. totis viribus Contra, and to this Rainsford Ch. J. inclined; but as to this Curia adviſare Vult. But afterwards, on reading the Statute, it was agreed by all, that the want of Vi & Armis was cured. Another Error was, that the Indictment lays, that he *Forged it Super Caput ſuum proprium*, where it ought to be Ex Imaginatione ſua propria or Ex Capite ſuo proprio; For as it is, it muſt be intended, that the Writing was written upon his Head, and this might be by another; but this was a *Literal Tranſlation of the words of the Statute*, and therefore by all held well enough, tho' it be not ſo Elegant Tranſlation as might be. 2 Lev. 221. Paſch. 30 Car. 2. the King v. Mariot.

5. Information ſet forth, that the Defendant did Forge *quoddam Scriptum continens in ſe Scriptum Obligatorium per quod* quidem Scriptum Obligatorium *A. Obligatus fuit prædict. Defendenti in* 40 *libris*, &c. the Defendant was found Guilty, and Exception was taken, that the Fact alleged was *a Contradiction of itſelf*; For how could A. be bound when the Obligation was Forged? and alſo, that it did *not ſet forth what that Scriptum Obligatorium was, whether* it was Scriptum *Sigillatum or Not?* Per Cur. the Defendant is found Guilty of the Forging of a Writing, in which was contained quoddam Scriptum Obligatorium, and *that may be a true Bond.* Judgment was arreſted. 3 Mod. 104. Paſch 2 Jac. 2. the King v.....

5 Mod. 137. S. C. 6. The Indictment was, that the Defendant *fabricavit ſeu fabricari cauſavit* a Bill of Loading, and it was held Naught up on Demurrer; For an Indictment ought to be certain and poſitive. 1 Salk. 342. Mich. 7 W. 3. the King v. Stocker.

The Reaſon of the Exception was, that if it was forged, it was not Obligatory; but the Court Reſolved, that tho' in reality it is not, yet in ſhew and appearance it is, and that is enough; and ſo it is an Obligation, tho' a Falſe one. 7 Mod. 151. S. C. 7. Indictment was for Forging *Quoddam Scriptum Obligatorium of J. S.* it was objected that it ſhould be *Scriptum purporting a Writing Obligatory* of J. S. Sed non allocatur; For the 5 Eliz. 14. mentions Falſe Deeds as well as Falſe Writings. 1 Salk. 342. Hill. 1 Annæ B. R. the Queen v. King.

8. In the Indictment it was laid, that the Defendant *falſo & malitioſe, &c. quoddam Scriptum Obligatorium fabricavit & contrafecit.* Exception was taken, that the Crime charged was *Forging falſely*, whereas it could be no Crime, if it was not truly Forged; but per Holt Ch. J. the falſo fabricavit is as much as to ſay, that he, being a falſe and malitious Man, did Forge, and not that the Forgery was a true Forgery, but the Thing forged was not true but falſe; and Judgment accordingly. 7 Mod. 150, 151. Hill. 1 Annæ. the Queen v. King.

9. Indictment was for *Forging a Cocket for 5 Packs of Linnen Cloth*; and it was moved in Arreſt of Judgment, for that it was too *uncertain.* But it was held well enough; and per Holt it ſuffices that the Things which it contains be certain enough, and if any new Action be brought, Defendant ſhall ſay, that a former Action was brought for the ſame by the Name of ſo many Bundles, &c. and the Queen had Judgment. 6 Mod. 87. Mich. 2 Annæ. the Queen v. Browne.

10. Indictment for Forging a Deed of *Aſſignment of a Leaſe ſigned with the Mark* of one Godard, cujus tenor Sequitur; *but ſets not down the Mark*

as in the Aſſignment; and this was Objected for without that it could not be a Forgery. Sed non Allocatur. 1 Salk. 342. Paſch. 2 Annæ Queen v. Smith.

11. The Defendant was Convicted on an Indictment, for that A. and his Wife being *ſeiſed of Lands, &c.* known by the Name of *Jaywick*, the *Defendant Forged a Conveyance from them of Jaywick-Park*, with intent to moleſt and diſturb the Seiſin and Enjoyment, &c. and for this Variance it was moved in Arreſt of Judgment, there being *no Averment*, that Jaywick was known by the Name of Jaywick-Park, or was Parcel thereof, or that A. and his Wife were ſeiſed thereof, or that there was a previous Treaty concerning Jaywick, and that in Conſequence thereof, a Conveyance was of Jaywick-Park, an Averment of any of which, it was held, would have been Material; but as there was a Forgery, and an * Intent to moleſt the Owners of Jaywick fully laid in the Indictment, and found by the Jury, 'twas adjudged by the whole Court to be within the Statute. Paſch. 2 Geo. 2. B. R. Gibb. 57. and 261. Paſch. 4 Geo. 2. the King v. Croke.

* S. P. 5 Keb 51. Trin. 24 Car. 2 B. R. the King v. Ring.

(L) Verdict, &c. What is a ſufficient Finding, or Proof.

1. IN Forger of Deeds the Defendant pleaded Not Guilty, and 'twas *found* that he was *guilty of the Publication and not of the Forgery*; and 'twas doubted if the Plaintiff ſhould recover or Not. Br. Forger de Faits, pl. 2. cites 20 H. 6. 11.

And yet 'twas agreed by Forteſcue and Newton, that if Forger of Deeds be *brought againſt two*, and 'tis found that *one is Guilty of the Forgery, and not of the Proclaiming, and* that the *other Proclaimed, but not Forged*, that by this the Plaintiff ſhall recover. Br. Forger de faits, pl. 2. cites 20 H. 6. 11.

2. In Forger of Deeds, if Judgment paſſes for the Plaintiff, this ſhall be a Bar in every Court, in an Action brought upon this Deed after; quod nota bene; and ſo ſee that a Deed found forged is not Pleadable. Br. Forger de Faits, pl 16. cites 37 H. 6. 13.

S. P. per Choke and Priſot. Br. Bar, pl. 45. cites S. C.

3. A. brought a Writ of Forger of Falſe Deeds againſt B. and *counted of an Indenture in quo continetur* quod quidam Abbas Monaſterii de Glouceſter *dimiſit ſitum manerii de R. & terras Dominicales*, &c. The Leaſe produced in Evidence contained the *Site, and all the demeſne Lands, except 2 ſeveral Cloſes there, &c. called, &c.* This Evidence was held good enough; For it is not Neceſſary to conſtrue Terras Dominicales to mean Omnes terras Dominicales, for the Lands not excepted are terræ Dominicales and ſo the Count is Satisfied by that Evidence, &c. 1 Le. 139. pl. 192. Hill. 30 Eliz. C. B. Atkins v. Hales.

Information ſuppoſed that Defendant had forged a *Leaſe*, and ſaid, that the Leaſe was *of diverſe Lands by Name, and long Meare was inſerted amongſt the Reſt*, but upon producing the diſputed Leaſe *Long Meare was not contained in it*, either by Name, or by general Words, but all the Reſt of the Lands were in it. And the Defendant having pleaded Not Guilty, the Court held, that as the Bill was laid, he was Not Guilty; For it *is not the ſame Leaſe*. Hob. 272. pl. 358. Mich. 17 Jac. Meyre's Caſe.

4. The wrong alleging the *Time* of the Forgery is not Material, be it *before or after the Offence committed, if* it be *committed before the Exhibiting the Bill*; but if the *Date* of the Writing ſuppoſed to be forged had been *miſtaken*, there the Defendant could not be condemned of a Deed of another Date; For that is not the Offence complained of in the Bill, of which the Court can give Sentence; reſolved in the Star Chamber 13 Rep. 34. Paſch. 7 Jac. Read and Booth.

S. P. tho' it was objected that there were other Treſpaſſes in the Indictment which ſatisfied the word Treſpaſs; For Tranſgreſs. prædict. includes Forgery and all the other Treſpaſſes. 2 Lev. 221. Paſch. 30 Car. 2 the King v. Marriot.

5. Upon an *Indictment for Forging and Publiſhing* a Deed, the Jury found the Defendant *Guilty of the Treſpaſs and Forgery aforeſaid*; it was Objected, that this was inſufficient; becauſe nothing is found as to the Publication, ſed non allocatur; For de Tranſgreſſione prædicta includes it, as in Treſpaſs of Aſſault and Battery. 2 Lev. 111. Trin. 26 Car. 2. B. R. the King v. Newton.

6. In a Writ of Error brought on a Judgment given upon an Indictment for Forgery, ſome of the Exceptions were, that *the Jury had found him guilty, de Forgeria*, whereas there is *no ſuch Word*; ſed non allocatur. For the Words make it plain enough what their Verdict means. Paſch. 30 Car. 2. B. R. 2 Show 5. the King v. Marriot.

(M) * Puniſhment. And what ſhall be recovered.

* See (A)

1. *5 Eliz. cap.* 14. §. 2. Enacts that *any one who ſhall be Convicted upon an Action of Forger of Falſe Deeds (to be founded upon this Statute) at the Suit of the Party grieved, or otherwiſe, ſhall pay to the Party grieved* double Coſts and Damages *to be aſſeſſed in the Court where ſuch Conviction ſhall be, ſhall be* ſet upon the Pillory *in ſome Market Town, or other open Place, and there have* his Ears cut off, *and alſo his* Noſtrils ſlit and ſeared with an hot Iron; *he ſhall alſo forfeit to the Queen her Heirs and Succeſſors the Iſſues of his Land*, and ſuffer perpetual Impriſonment *during his Life; and the ſaid Coſts and Damages ſhall be firſt levied upon the Goods and Iſſues of the Lands of the Offender, notwithſtanding the Queen's Title thereunto.*

A. being indebted to B. upon a *Recognizance* of 600*l.* Penalty for payment of 300*l.*

§. 3. *A Forger &c. of a* Leaſe for Yeaſe *of Land not Copyhold, or of an* Annuity, Obligation, Bill, Acquittance, Releaſe, *or other Diſcharge of any Perſonal thing; and he who ſhall Publiſh and give the ſame in Evidence, (except Lawyers &c not Party or Privy to the Forgery) ſhall pay* Double Coſts and Damages *to the Party grieved, be Pilloried and loſe an Ear &c.*

was Convicted in the Star-Chamber of Forging a *Releaſe* thereof; and the Queſtion was, whether the *double Damages*, given by the Statute, ſhould be according to the Penalty, or only the Debt? It was Reſolved, by all the Judges, that the *Damages* ſhould be aſſeſſed to *double the Penalty*; For the Penalty ſhould have been recovered by Law, if the Releaſe had not been. Mich. 13 & 14 Eliz. D. 304. pl. 51. Mich. 13 & 14 Eliz. Hind v. Grevil.

§. 4. *Remedy for Coſts &c may be by Originall Writ out of Chancery as in Caſe of Treſpaſs by Bill in the King's Bench or Exchequer, and no Eſſoign, &c. to be allowed.*

§. 6. *Plaintiff's Releaſe ſhall not ſtop the Proceedings for the Forfeitures to the Queen.*

* MrHughes in his Abridgment tit. Forgery pl. 11. calls the Offender a(Taverner) and Mr Nelſon in his Abridgment has varied the word into (Vintner) but the Book is plainly (Scrivener) as here.

2. A. *delivered* 1000l. *to a * Scrivener to put out at Intereſt*, who ſpent the Money but *delivered to A. ſeveral Bonds, as entered into by ſeveral Perſons of Credit and Sufficiency*, for ſeveral diſtinct Sums, amounting in all to the ſaid Sum of 1000*l.* and he witneſſed the ſame as a publick Notary, but in Truth, the Parties knew nothing of the Matter, and the Bonds were forged by the ſaid Scrivener, as he confeſſed on his Examination upon Interrogatories. The Doubt was *whether* he *ſhould loſe one Ear only, or both his Ears*? and whether A. being but the *Obligee*, and not any of the Parties in whoſe Names the Obligations were forged, *ſhould have double Coſts and Damages*? and Reſolved, per Fleming and Coke Ch. Juſtices, he ſhall loſe but one Ear; For it ſhould be *taken as one Forgery*, being made at one time, and A. was the *Party griev'd* within the Statute; but the Ld Chancellor expounded the *double Damages* not to be *intended* double Intereſt but only *the principal Debt.* 2 Brownl. 49. Hill. 8. Jac. Andrew v. Ledſam.

3. For Forging the Chief Juſtices Hand to Common Bail, and taking Fees thereof, as Attorney, being only a Clerk, the Court adjudged him *to pay a Fine of* 20l. to *come with Papers to every Court with his Confeſſion*, to *ſtand in the Pillory here* from 10 to 12, and *in London* 2 Hours, *and in the Marſhalſea* an Hour, 3 *Months Impriſonment, and good Behaviour for a Year.* 1 Keb. 841. pl. 28. Hill. 16 & 17 Car. 2. B. R. Sherwood's Caſe.

4. One was convicted of Forging an Acquittance, and *Fined* by the Court 100*l.* and to be on his *good Behaviour for one Year.* Note, he was a Perſon

Perſon of 700*l.* per Annum, and the Acquittance forged for 7*l.* Paſch. 18 Car. 2. B. R. Sid. 278. the King v. Ferrers.

5. For forging a Will, he had Judgment to *ſtand in the Pillory* 3 *times*, viz. at Weſtminſter, the Exchange, and Ratcliff; was *fined* 40 l. *and impriſoned*, till Sureties found for good Behaviour during Life. 2 Keb. 376. pl. 32. Trin. 20 Car. 2. B. R. the King v. Tymberley.

(N) Puniſhment for ſecond Offence.

1. 5 *Eliz. cap.* 14. §. 7. 8. Second Offence *after Conviction, or Condemnation as aforeſaid, is made Felony without Benefit of Clergy, but not to bar* Dower, *or diſinherit the* Heir.

The Forgery which is Felony by this Act ought to be after the Conviction, or Condemnation, as to a former Writing; For the Forgery of ſeveral Writings one after another, ſo as the ſame were all forged before any Conviction, is not Felony by the expreſs words of the Statute. 13 Rep. 35. Paſch. 7 Jac. Read v. Booth.

(O) Puniſhed in Chancery. and Relieved.

1. A Perſon was *ſentenced in* the Court of *Chancery* for Forgery. 8 Jac. Toth. 167, 168. Barker v. Ireland & Morris.

2. A. by a forged *Letter of Attorney* atteſted by 2 Witneſſes *transfers S. S. Stock of B. to J. S.* for a valuable Conſideration paid by J. S. who after received the next Dividend; Lord Macclesfield held this Transfer void, and that it was Incumbent on the Purchaſor, and more in his Power than any other Perſon's, to ſee that the Letter of Attorney be valid, and Real; and Decreed, that the Company, (who were (as he ſaid) only Inſtruments and Conduct pipes) take the Stock from the Defendant, the Transferree, and reſtore it to the Plaintiff, the original Proprietor, and that the Defendant, and not the Company, pay back the Dividend, which he has without any good Authority received, to the Plaintiff, and pay both the Company and Plaintiff their *Coſts*, the Default being the Defendant's by reaſon of his Neglect. 2 Wms's Rep. 76. to 78. Trin. 1722. Hildyard v. S. S. Company & Keate.

3. *So* of a *forged Letter of Attorney* in the Name of a Copyholder to A. *to ſurrender Copyhold to the Uſe of J. S.* who ſurrenders accordingly, and J. S. is thereupon admitted, yet this *admittance is void*; per Lord C. Macclesfeld Ibid. 77, 78.

Formedon.

(A) Of Formedon in General.

1. Formedon *is a Writ of Poſſeſſion, and* * *no Writ of Right.* Br. Formedon. pl. 31. cites 38 † E 1. 37.

* Br. Formedon, pl. 44 cites 4 H. 7. 10. Contra, per Fairfax J.——Br. Monſtrans. pl. 18. cites S. C. per Huſſey and Fairfax, that it is in the Right.——Br. Formedon. pl. 48. cites 18 E. 4. 23. That Formedon in Deſcender is a *Writ of Right* in its Nature, per tot Cur'——*So* ibid. pl. 77. cites 40 E. 3. 21. per Belk.——† This ſeems to be miſprinted in all the Editions, and that it ſhould be 38 E. 3. 37. Vid. Br. Juris Utrum. S. C. and P.

2. Formedon

S. P. agreed Arg. and ſays that at Common Law, there was no Formedon *in Deſcender*, but 'tis given by W. 2. 1. Goldsb. 5, 6. pl. 11. Paſch. 28 Eliz. in Capel's Caſe.

2. Formedon *in Remainder* was *not at common Law*; becauſe at common Law, all Eſtates in Fee were Fee Simple abſolute, or Fee Simple Conditional, which now are called Eſtates Tail, and ſo no Remainder could be limited on the later, becauſe 'twas a Fee Simple. But the Formedon in Remainder was by the *Stat. de Donis.* See Pl. C. 239. a. b. Trin. 4 Eliz. Arg. in Caſe of Willion v. Berkley.

3. Formedon, or de forma Donationis is *ſo called, becauſe* the Writ comprehends the Form of the Gift. Co. Litt. 326. b.

(B) Of the Formedon in the *Deſcender*, and in what Caſes it lies.

3 Rep. 9. a. in Lepdon's Caſe, cites

1. LITT. S. 76. tit. Tenant by Copy, takes Notice of a Formedon in Deſcender *at common Law.*

Litt. S. P. and adds, that it appears in our Books, that in Special Caſes, Formedon in Deſcender lay at common Law before the Statute of Weſtm. 2. and cites 4 E. 2. tit. Formedon 50. and 10 E. 2. tit. Formedon 55. 21 E. 3. 47. Pl. C. 246. b. &c.——Contra by Popham and Fenner. Poph. 34. Mich. 35 and 36 Eliz. in Caſe of Gravenor v. Brooke.——And ſo is 2 Inſt. 336.

As where an Aſſiſe of Mortdanceſtor would not ſerve the Iſſue, as if a Man had Iſſue a Son, and his Wife had died, and then he took another Wife, and *Land was given to him and his ſecond Wife, and to the Heirs of their Bodies*, begotten, and they have another Son, and the ſecond Feme dies, and then the Father dies and a Stranger abates; in ſuch Caſe, before the Statute, the Son could not have Aſſiſe of Mortdanceſtor, becauſe one Point of the Writ is to inquire if Demandant be *next Heir to his Father*, which he is not, but his Elder Brother is, and therefore he ſhould have a Formedon in Deſcender, before the Statute, which was no other than a Writ founded upon his Caſe; But then this Writ was *to recover Fee Simple.* per Bendlowe Pl. C. 239. 4 Eliz. in Caſe of Willion v. Barkley.

But Brook makes a Quære thereof, for 'tis ſaid contrary, tempore H. S. if he be barred by Judgment.

2. *If the Iſſue in Tail be barred by Warranty, and aſſets deſcend*, and after he *aliens the Aſſets and has Iſſue and dies*, or if *the Aſſets be recovered againſt him by Elder Title*, the *Iſſue* of *the Iſſue ſhall have Formedon* of *the firſt Land tail'd*; ſaid, per Finch, for Law. Br. Formedon. pl. 18. cites 48 E. 3. 9.

But if ſuch a thing happens, *before he be barr'd by Judgment*, the Iſſue of the Iſſue ſhall have Formedon, as appears in the Formed' in Old Nat. Br. Br. Formedon. pl. 18.

3. If Land in Fee Simple, and Fee Tail deſcend to two Siſters, and ſhe who has the Fee Simple Land aliens it, and has Iſſue and dies, the Iſſue ſhall have Formedon of the Moiety of the Land tail'd. And ſo ſee that *after Partition* the one Heir ſhall have Formedon alone. Br. Formedon. pl. 2. cites 20 H. 6. 2. 13.

Formedon lies for a *Younger Son inheritable by the Cuſtom.* F. N. B. 486. In the Notes there (a.)

4. Formedon in Deſcender is *grounded upon the Stat. of Weſtm. 2. c. 41.* and lies where a Man gives Lands *to one and the Heirs of his Body*, or *unto a Man and Woman, and the Heirs of their Bodies*, or unto a Man and Woman, who is Couſin, in Frank-marriage, by Force of which Gift, they are ſeiſed, and afterwards he alieneth theſe Lands, or is diſſeiſed of them, and dies; his Heir ſhall have the Writ; and ſo, upon every Gift in Tail of Lands or Tenements, if the Anceſtor aliens or be diſſeiſed and dies, he who is Heir by Force of the Gift ſhall have ſuch Writ. F. N. B. 211, 212. (L)

5. Tenant in Tail *diſcontinues in Fee and dies*; the *Diſcontinuee makes a Leaſe for Life*, and *grants the Reverſion to the Iſſue*; he ſhall not have a Formedon againſt the Tenant for Life; for by his Formedon he muſt recover the Eſtate of Inheritance, which the Leſſee for Life hath not, but the Iſſue in Tail hath it himſelf. Co. Litt. 297. b.

(C) In

(C) In the *Remainder*. In what Caſes it *lies*.

1. FOrmedon in Remainder, upon an Eſtate Tail, *lay not at Common Law*; becauſe it was a Fee Simple conditional, whereupon no Remainder could be limited at the Common Law; but ſince the Stat. W. 2. 13 E. 1. a Remainder may be limited upon an Eſtate Tail in Reſpect of the Diviſion of the Eſtates. 2 Inſt. 336.

2. Formedon in Remainder lieth, where a Man *giveth Lands* to one *in Tail*, the *Remainder to another in Tail*, and the *firſt Tenant in Tail dieth without Iſſue*, and a *Stranger abateth* and deforceth him in Remainder, he in Remainder, or his Heir ſhall have this Writ. F. N. B. 217.

So it is if the Iſſue of the *Iſſue* in Tail, *dies without Iſſue*; for then on the Whole Matter, the Tenant in Tail is dead without Iſſue. F. N. B. 499. (b) in the Notes cites D. 4 Eliz. 233.

3. *So* if the *firſt Tenant* in Tail *alieneth* in Fee * *and dieth without Iſſue*, he in Remainder ſhall have this Writ to recover his Eſtate. F. N. B. 217. (D)

*Or in Tail, or for Life. F. N. B. 217. (E)

4. If a Man *give Lands for* Term of *Life*, the *Remainder to another and the Heirs of his Body*, and the *Tenant for Life dieth*, and a *Stranger abateth*, and deforceth him in Remainder, he in Remainder or his Heir ſhall have Formedon in Remainder to recover his Eſtate. F. N. B. 217 (E)

So it ſeems if a Man leaſe Lands *for Life Remainder to another in Fee*, and the *Tenant for Life aliens* in Fee, or in Tail, or for Life; *and dies*; and a *Stranger abates*, he in Remainder, or his Heir ſhall have this Writ. F. N. B. 217. (E)

5. If he, who hath the Remainder, or his Heir be once *ſeiſed* of the Lands *by Force of the Remainder*, he ſhall never have a Formedon in Remainder for that Land but a Formedon in Deſcender, becauſe the Remainder is once executed. F. N. B. 219. (A)

(D) In the *Reverter*. In what Caſes it lies.

1. AT *Common Law*, if a Gift had been to a Man and his Heirs of his Body, or Heirs Males of his Body, *if he had Iſſue*, then *he ſhould have Fee Simple*, and if he dy'd his *Iſſue ſhould have Mortdanceſter*; For it was Fee Simple at Common Law; Contra after the Statute of Weſtm. 2. c. 1. Per Grene J. and Huſe agreed to the Mortdanceſtor, and that *after Iſſue had, he might alien*; But if he died without Iſſue and did not alien Formedon in Reverter * lay; And by him, Heir Collateral ſhall not have Mortdanceſtor. Br. Tail & Dones, &c. pl. 19. cites 18 Aſſ. 5.

* Formedon in Reverter lay at Common Law. 2 Inſt. 336.

2. If a Man *gives Land in Tail, ſo that the Donee may alien in Advantage of his Iſſue, and warrants* the Land *to him, his Heirs and Aſſigns*, and the *Donee aliens and dies without Iſſue*, the Donor ſhall not have Formedon in Reverter, per Wilby; becauſe he has Warranted the Land to the Donee and his Aſſigns, and the *Alienee is Aſſignee*. But Brook makes a Quære thereof; for *nothing is given but Eſtate Tail*, and the Words after, and the Warranty, cannot make Fee Simple in a Donee; contrary it may be in a Deviſe or Will. Br. Formedon. Pl. 57. cites 46 E. 3, 4.

3. Formedon in Reverter lieth where one *gives Lands* to a Man *in Tail* or Frankmarriage with his Daughter, and afterwards the *Donee or his Heirs die without Iſſue*, then the Donor or his Heirs may bring this Writ againſt the Tenant of the Lands ſo given. F. N. B. 219. (E)

So if one give Lands to another *in Tail*, the *Reverſion in Fee to another*, and the Donee in Tail dies without Heir of his Body, the Grantee of the Reverſion, ſhall have a Formedon in Reverter to recover the Land. F. N. B 219 (E)

(E) Lies *of what.*

1. IN Scire facias, a *Fine* was levied to J. S. ſur Conuſance de Droit *come ceo*, &c. and the *Conuſee* grants and *renders to the Conuſor* again for Life, the *Remainder* over *in Tail*, 'tis ſaid there by diverſe, that he in Remainder ſhall not have Formedon, becauſe there is not any Gift, and others econtra; therefore quære, if Formedon lies not as well *upon a Grant and Render*, as upon a Gift. Br. Formedon, pl. 9. cites 42 E. 3. 5.

2. *For* of *Land recovered in Value* Formedon lies, and yet it was not given. *And* Formedon lies *upon Deviſe*. Br. Formedon. pl. 9.

3. *Rent is given with a Seigniory in Tail*, and *Donee aliens the Rent*; the *Tertenant does Felony and is attainted*; the *Donee dies without Iſſue*; the *Donor ſhall have Writ of Eſcheat*; *but if the Donee had not alien'd, but had entered into the Land after the Attainder*, and had died without Iſſue, the *Donor ſhould have Formedon in Reverter* of the Land, and not Writ of Eſcheat; for this was in lieu of the Land and veſted. And ſo ſee Formedon [lies] *of a Thing which was not given*. Br. Formedon. pl. 15. cites 46 E. 3. 4.

4. If *Lands* are *recover'd in value for Lands intail'd*, the Iſſue ſhall have Formedon in Deſcender upon the ſpecial Matter. Br. Scire facias. pl. 47. cites 48 E. 3. 11.

Br. Formedon. pl. 65. S. P. cites 33 E. 3.

5. The Iſſue in Tail ſhall not have Formedon of an *Advowſon in Groſs* alien'd by his Anceſtor, but a Quare Impedit at the next Avoidance in his Time, and ſo it ſeems, that Præcipe quod Reddat, lies not of an Advowſon. Br. Formedon. pl. 28. cites 4 H. 14. 33.

So if a Man grants the *Moiety of the the Profits of his Mill* unto another and the Heirs of his Body,

6. A Man may have a Formedon in Deſcender of the *Profit apprender in Lands* or Tenements, *or iſſuing thereout.*——*As*, if a Man grants 20*s.* or, &c. iſſuing out of Lands or Tenements unto a Man and the Heirs of his Body, or unto a Man in Frankmarriage with his Daughter, if the Donee aliens that *Rent*, or is diſſeiſed and dies, his Heir who is his Son or Daughter ſhall have the Writ. F. N. B. 212. (A)

and the Donee dies, and his Heir is deforced, the Heir ſhall have Formedon in Deſcender. F. N. B. 212. (B)

But if *common of Paſture* be granted to one and the Heirs of his

7. *So* it ſeems, if a Man grants to one and the Heirs of his Body *Paſture for* 20 *Oxen*, or 100 Sheep, &c. and the Donee dies, and his Son, who is his Heir, is deforced thereof, he ſhall have Formedon in the Deſcender. F. N. B. 212. (B)

Body, and the Donee die and the Heir be deforced, the Heir ſhall not have Formedon in Deſcender, but a *Quod permittat*, in the Nature of a Formedon. F. N. B. 212. (B)——A Formedon in Deſcender of a *Serjeanty of the Cathedral of L.* brought againſt the Biſhop there, and one J. S. was, without being joined to a Quod permittat, adjudged good. F. N. B. 487. Notes (C) there cites 18 E. 3. 27.

* Pl. C. 154. b. Arg.

8. A Formedon ſhall be brought of * *Gorſes*, but not of an *Advowſon*. F. N. B. 217. (B)

9. If *Land Eſcheat to the Seigniory, which was given in Tail*, Formedon lies of the Land, and yet the Seigniory was given, and not the Land. Br. Formedon. pl. 43. cites 3 H. 7. 9.

Litt. S. 77 Co. Litt. 60. a. b. —*S. C. cited by Popham and Fenner. Poph. 34. Mich. 35 & 36 Eliz. in Caſe of Gravenor v. Brookes.

10. Formedon may lie of *a Copyhold* in the Deſcender, *by Proteſtation, in Nature of a Writ of Formedon in Deſcender at the Common Law*, well by all the Juſtices, for tho' Formedon in Deſcender was not given, but by Statute, yet now this Writ lies at Common Law, and it ſhall be intended, that it has been a Cuſtom there Time out of Mind, and the Demandant recovered by Advice of all the Juſtices. Br. Tenant per Copie, &c. pl. 24. cites * 15 H. 8.—and Brook ſays, the like Matter was in Eſſex, Mich. 26 H. 8. and that Fitzherbert affirmed it afterwards in the Dutchy Chamber,

ber, and that the ſame is agreed by Littleton, in his Chapter of Tenants by Copy.

11. It will not lie of a *Croft of Land*; but an Aſſiſe doth well lie, becauſe a Formedon is Breve adverſarium; therefore, where a Judgment was given in a Formedon for a Croft, and for other Parcels of Land, it was reverſed for the Whole upon a Writ of Error; 2 Bulſt. 214. Paſch. 12 Jac. Ellis v. Wallis.

(F) In what Caſes Formedon *in general lies.*

1. IF *Alienation* [were made] *by the Donee* in Tail, *before the Statute, and before Iſſue had*; yet if he *had Iſſue after*, *the Alienation* was good. Br. Formedon. Pl. 70. cites 19 E. 2. and Fitzh. Foremdon. 61. *But* if he *died without Iſſue*, *Formedon in Reverter lay for the Donor*, his Heirs or Aſſigns. Br. ibid.——*And* ſee that a Leaſe was made *for Life*, the *Remainder in Tail*, the *Remainder in Fee* to the Demandant. Br. Formedon pl. 70. cites Fitzh. Formedon. 66. and 11 E. 3. ca. 31. *And upon a Deviſe for Life*, the *Remainder to B. and his Heirs*, B. ſhall have Formedon in Remainder, where there was no Tail in any Part of the Gift. Br. Formedon. pl. 70. cites 34 E. 3. ca. 68.

2. Formedon *in Remainder was at Common Law*; for it lay *upon a Leaſe* for Life, the *Remainder over* for Life, *or in Fee*, and where there was no Tail and ſo it continues to this Day; which can't be by reaſon of the Statute of *W.* 2. *c.* 1. for 'tis not Tail, and the Statute *gives Formedon in Deſcender*. And it was ſaid, that Formedon in Reverter is enough uſed in Chancery; for by the Common Law the Donee had Fee Simple conditional, and had Power to alien, but if he had alien'd before he had Iſſue, and had died without Iſſue, *Formedon in Reverter lay at Common Law*, and ſo if he had had Iſſue, and after, he or his Iſſue died without Iſſue; Formedon in Reverter lay at Common Law, contrary if he had had Iſſue, and had alien'd and died without Iſſue. But Formedon in Remainder is not mentioned in the Statute aforeſaid, therefore it ſeems that this was at Common Law, and eſpecially where there is no Tail, as above. Br. Formedon. pl. 69. cites Old Nat. Br. *And* ſee in the ſaid Writ of Formedon in Remainder in Old Nat. Br. that *upon a Leaſe for Life*, the *Remainder in Fee*, he in *Remainder ſhall have Formedon* in Remainder. Br. Formedon. pl. 69. cites 24 E. 3.

3. If *Tenant in Tail enters into Religion, and J. N. enters*, the *Iſſue in Tail ſhall have Formedon immediately*, inaſmuch as his Father took upon him a Religious Habit. Br. Formedon. pl. 74. cites Old Nat. Br. *Contra*, where the *Tenant in Tail aliens* the Land, *or charges it, and enters into Religion*; for this ſhall take Effect during his Natural Life; contrary of Abatement, ut ſupra. Br. Formedon. pl. 74. cites Old Nat. Br

4. If the *Heir in Tail* be *once ſeiſed after the Death of his Anceſtor*, he *ſhall not have Formedon*, *'till this Seiſin be lawfully defeated, tho' he be ouſted*, *but* ſhall have *Action of his own Poſſeſſion*. Br. Formedon. pl. 47. cites 7 E. 4. 19. Per Danby Ch. J.

5. *As* where the *Iſſue in Tail enters upon the Diſcontinuee, and another ouſts him*; he ſhall not have Formedon unleſs *the Diſcontinuee enters*. Br. Formedon. pl. 47. cites 7 E. 4. 19. *And if the Iſſue* in Tail *enters* after the Death of his Anceſtor, *upon the Diſcontinuee within Age, and Aliens in Fee*, he ſhall not have Formedon, but *Dum fuit infra ætatem*, becauſe the *Diſſeiſin is not purged by the Deſcent*. Br. Formedon. pl. 47. cites 7 E. 4. 19. Per Danby Ch. J.

6. If the *Husband alieneth the Land of his Wife in Fee, and* afterwards the Husband and Wife *are divorced*; the Wife ſhall have a Writ of Cui ante Divortium againſt the Alienee. *But* if the Lands be *to the Wife of an Eſtate Tail*, and *not in Fee*, and after they are divorced, and the *Wife dieth*; the *Heir* of the Wife ſhall not ſhall not have a ſur Cui in Vita ante Divortium,

Divortium against the Alienee, but in such Case the *Heir shall be put to his Writ of Formedon* in the Descender. Fitzh. Nat. Br. 204. (F) (K)

7. In a Formedon in the *Discender*, if the Demandant be *barred by Verdict or Demurrer*; *yet the Issue* in Tail *shall have a new Formedon* in the Descender: *So if* he be *barred in* a Writ of *Error upon the Release of his his Ancestor*, his Issue shall have a new Writ of Error; for he *claims in, not only as Heir, but per formam doni*, and by the Statute of West. 2. shall not be barred by feint, or false pleading of his Ancestors, so long as the Right of the Entail remains. 6 Rep. 7. b. in Ferrer's Case.

(G) Writ and Pleadings in general.

1. *Omission of the Cosinage* in the Writ of Formedon shall abate the Writ, notwithstanding that it be express'd in the Count; Contra in Scire Facias. Br. Omission. Pl. 5. cites 49 E. 3. 20, 21.

S. P. Ibid. pl. 36. cites S. C. And in Formedon in Remainder, it shall be *to them* * *remanere debet*; pl. 4. cites 35 H. 6. 10. 13. per Wangforde; quod nullus negavit.

2. Formedon in Reverter *by Baron and Feme*, [where the Reversion was limited to the Feme] *shall be ad Virum & Uxorem revertere debet*, &c. But Formedon in Descender by them shall be *ad Uxorem* * *descendere debet*; for the Baron is not Heir to the Tail. Br. Formedon. pl. 68. cites 19 H. 6. 46.

for she is Purchaser, and it cannot remain to one without the other. ——— S. P. Ibid.

3. In Formedon upon a *Gift made to W. and J. his Feme, and that after the Death of W.* &c. and did not speak of the Death of J. his Feme, the other Donee, and therefore the *Writ was abated* without Amendment. Br. Formedon. pl. 64.

4. By 1 *H.* 7. 1. *It was maintainable against the Pernor of the Profits.*

5. In Formedon, if the *Tenant pleads Non-tenure*, the *Demandant says, that he made a Feoffment to Persons unknown* to defraud him of his Action, and averrs that he took the Profits; there the Feoffment to Persons unknown is not traversable. Br. Traverse, per &c. pl. 180. cites 4 H. 7. 9.

6. In every Formedon, there are *two things requisite*; one is the *Gift*, the other is *Conveyance to the Demandant*; and if either of these fail, the Writ is insufficient in Substance, nor helped by the Statute. Hill. 43 Eliz. Goldf. 126. Dewnall versus Catesby.

7. 21 *Jac.* 1. *cap.* 16. *S.* 1. Enacts, that *all Writs of Formedon in Descender, in Remainder, and in Reverter, shall be sued within* 20 *Years after, the Title and Cause of Action first fallen; and no Person shall make any Entry into Lands, but within* 20 *Years after his Right or Title shall first accrue.*

S. 2. *If any Person, that shall be entitled to such Writs, or shall have such Right or Title of Entry, be at the time of the said Right or Title first accrued within the Age of* 21 *Years, Feme covert, Non compos mentis, Imprisoned or Beyond the Seas; such Person and his Heirs may bring Action, or make Entry, within ten Years after their full Age, Discoverture, coming of sound Mind, Enlargement out of Prison, or coming into this Realm, or Death.*

* And the Judgment is only upon the Default. Cro. C. 517. Mich. 14. Car. B. R. S. C. by Name of Tomlins v. Brett.

8. A. brought Formedon in Descender against B. for 23 Acres of Land in H. The *Tenant vouched to warranty C.* The *Plaintiff counterpleaded* the Voucher, *that the Vouchee, nor any of his Ancestors, aliquid in Tenementis predict. &c.* (leaving out the Word *habuerunt.*) The *Vouchee joined Issue* upon it, and *Nisi Prius awarded*, Demandant appeared, but *Tenant made Default*; Ideo prædict. 23 Acres capiantur in manus, & sum. returnable 1 Mich. & Vic. non misit Breve, and Summons in Nature of a Petit

a Petit Cape returned, and Tenant made Default, and Sheriff returned quod cepit in Manus Domini Regis, upon which Judgment pro Quer. and *Error* brought; and tho' no Iſſue was well joined for Default of (habuerunt) yet, when the Tenant made Default, * all the Pleading before the Counterplea of the Voucher, was out of the Court, and Judgment well given, and the firſt Judgment affirmed. Jo. 412. Mich. 14 Car. B. R. Brookebutt v. Tomlyn.

9. In Formedon in Deſcender; Exceptions were taken to the Count, for that the Demandant, (being *Brother to the Tenant in Tail*, who died without Iſſue) *ſet forth, that the Lands belonged to him poſt mortem of the Tenant in Tail*, without ſaying, *that he died without Iſſue*; the Precedents are, *quæ poſt mortem* of the Donee *reverti debent, eo quod the Donee died without Iſſue*; which is very true *in a Formedon in Reverter*, becauſe there the Eſtate-Tail being ſpent, the Donor may not know the Pedigree; and thereupon it is ſufficient to ſay, that *poſt mortem* of the Tenant in Tail *deſcendere debet, without ſetting forth, that he died without Iſſue*; for if he had any Iſſue, then it could not deſcend to the Brother. Trin. 28. Car. 2. C. B. 2 Mod. 94. Anon.

(H) Pleadings. Writ and Declaration in the Deſcender.

1. FOrmedon in Deſcender, the Demandant *counted that A. gave to B. in Tail*, and *from B. it deſcended to H.* as Son and Heir, &c. and *from* H. *to G. the Demandant*, as Son and Heir, &c. and the *Writ was*, and *that after the Death of the aforeſaid B. to the aforeſaid G.* Couſin and Heir of the aforeſaid B. *deſcendere debet, &c.* which was challenged for Variance between the Writ and the Count, becauſe *H. did not * hold Eſtate*; and therefore there is no Occaſion to make mention of him in the Writ, as in a Writ of *Aiel*, [for] there the Demandant ſhall make himſelf Heir to the Grandfather, and not to the Father. Br. Formedon. pl. 66. cites 5 E. 3.

* Viz. was never *ſeiſed*.

2. Land is *given to J. and his firſt Wife whom he ſhould marry, and to the Heirs of their Bodies*, &c. and after *he eſpouſed A. and had Iſſue, and alien'd, and died*, the Iſſue brought *Formedon as Heir of the Bodies of J. and A.* and therefore the Writ was abated; For A. had nothing by the Gift, and therefore it ſhould be, that deſcendere debet to the Demandant, *as Heir of J. of the Bodies of J. and A. begotten.* Br. Formedon. pl. 78. cites Tempore E. 3. Itin. North.

3. Formedon in Remainder; the *Demandant ſet forth ſpecially*, (as he ought) that is to ſay, *that the Land given to N.* &c. *revertatur to the Demandant*, where it *ſhould be remaneat*, &c. and the Tenant challenged it, and dared not demur; for Revertatur *is a good Remainder*, and this Action does not lie without ſhewing ſpecialty; and yet when it is ſhewn, the Party, Tenant, ſhall not have Anſwer to it, and *Ne dona pas by the Deed* is no Plea, wherefore by Award he was compelled to Anſwer over, and ſaid, that he, *Ne dona pas as ſuppoſed by the Writ*, Priſt; and the others econtra. Br. Formedon. pl. 33. cites 21 E. 3. 49.

4. Formedon of a *Gift to his Grandfather*, and *makes the Deſcent from him to his Father, and from him to the Demandant*; Fencot ſaid, after the Death of the Grandfather, the Father was ſeiſed, ſo *ought he to be made Heir to his Father*, and demanded Judgment of the Writ; the *Demandant ſaid, that the Grandfather enfeoffed the Father, and his Feme, and the Heirs of the Feme, and this Eſtate continued till he died*; Judgment; the *Tenant ſaid*, that the Father was *within Age at the Time of the Feoffment, and ſo remitted and ſeiſed in Tail*; and after they paſſed over; and ſo ſee that *laſt Seiſin* is a good Plea to the Writ in Formedon. Br. Formedon. pl. 29. cites 38 E. 3. 24.

S. C. cited F. N. B. 488. In the Notes (e) —— * Orig. (tend) —— Contra. that he ought not to mention every Heir in the Writ, though he muſt make himſelf Heir to him who was laſt ſeiſed of the Eſtate Tail. Het. 78. Hill. 3 Car. C. B. Jenkins v. Dawſon.

5. In Formedon by B. the Writ was, and *that after the Death of R. and W. Son and Heir of the ſame R. to the aforeſaid B. Son and Heir of the aforeſaid W.* deſcendere debet, &c; and the Tenant * pleads that *W. was never ſeiſed*; Judgment of the Writ, which makes him Heir to W. where he ſhould be made Heir to him who was laſt ſeiſed, and by Award the Writ is good, for by this Way he is made Heir to R. alſo. Br. Formedon. pl. 38 cites 39 E. 3. 10.

S. C. cited F. N. B. 502. (a) in the Notes there. ——*But* Brook ſays, that it ſeems, that he *might have ſuppoſed the immediate Gift* to have been *to P. and omitted E.* as he is *dead without Iſſue*, and then well. Br. Formedon. pl. 39.

6. Formedon of a *Gift to E. in Tail*, the *Remainder to P. and that after the Death of the aforeſaid E. and P. and R. Son of the ſame P. to the aforeſaid W.* the Demandant, *Brother and Heir of the aforeſaid R.* deſcendere debet, *becauſe the aforeſaid R. died without Heir of his Body*; and becauſe he did *not ſhew* alſo, *that E. is dead without Iſſue*: therefore his Writ was abated, and yet it was Formedon in Deſcender. Br. Formedon. pl. 39. cites 39 E. 3. 27.

In ſuch Caſe it ſhall abate *Ex Officio Curiæ after the View*, and ſo it ſeems that the Party ſhall not plead it after the View, but ſhall *ſhew it as Amicus Curiæ*, and the Court for Error ought to allow it. Br. Brief. pl. 124. cites 12 H. 4. 1.

7. Formedon *as Couſin*, the Plaintiff ought to *ſhew how Couſin in the Writ*, otherwiſe it ſhall abate; *contrary in Scire Facias*, as Couſin and Heir. Note a Diverſity. Br. Formedon. pl. 6. cites 41 E. 3. 14.

8. In Formedon in Deſcender, the *Demandant made the Deſcent from H. the Donee to A. Daughter*, &c. and *from A. to the Demandant, as Couſin and Heir to H.* The *Tenant ſaid, that A. Mother of the Demandant, was ſeiſed by Force of the Tail, after the Death of H. and therefore ſhe ought to have been made Heir to A.* Judgment of the Writ; and the Demandant was compelled to anſwer to it; per Cur. Br. Formedon. pl. 53. cites 43 E. 3. 7.

9. *Wherefore* he *ſaid, that A. was ſeiſed in Fee by the Feoffment of H.* Judgment, &c. The *Tenant ſaid, that H. leaſed to A. for Life, and* after *died, by which he was then ſeiſed in Tail*; the *Demandant ſaid, that he was ſeiſed in Fee*, Priſt; and the others econtra. Note, the *laſt Seiſin* was in Iſſue. Br. Formedon. pl. 53. cites 43 E. 3. 7.

Br. Omiſſion, pl. 4. cites S. C.— * Orig. (tend)

10. Formedon of a *Gift to the Baron and Feme* in Tail, the *Demandant made Deſcent from them to P. as Son and Heir*; and *from P. to the Demandant, as to the Son and Heir*; the *Tenant ſaid, that the Baron and Feme had Iſſue D. Elder than P. who * held the Eſtate, and ſurvived the Donees, and died ſeiſed*, of which D. he has made *Omiſſion*, Judgment of the Writ; and becauſe *P. was made* Son and *Heir* to the Baron and Feme, *where he ought to have been made Brother, and Heir to D. of the Bodies of the Baron and Feme begotten*, therefore the Writ was abated. Br. Formedon. pl. 55. cites 46 E. 3. 9.

* He muſt ſhew expreſſly the Name of him who was laſt ſeiſed as Heir. D. 216. a. pl. 56. Trin. 4 Eliz. Anon.— And he muſt make himſelf either *Son and Heir, or Couſin and Heir*; for a later Seiſin in any Heir in Tail after will abate the Writ. 8 Rep. 88. b. Reſolved in Buckmer's Caſe.

11. In Formedon of a *Gift to J. and A. his Feme in Tail*, the *Writ was*, and *that after the Death of the aforeſaid J. and A. and R. Son, and* Heir of the aforeſaid J. and A. and *T. Son of the aforeſaid R. to the aforeſaid Plaintiff, Son of the aforeſaid T. as Couſin and Heir of the aforeſaid R. deſcendere debet* by Form of the Gift aforeſaid, &c. And the Tenant demanded Judgment of the Writ, for where the Demandant is made Heir to R. he ſaid, that the ſaid R. never had any Thing, and the other econtra, but not de Rigore juris, but by Accord; and ſo it ſeems that that the * *Demandant ought to make himſelf Heir to him who was laſt ſeiſed.* Br. Formedon. pl. 17. cites 48 E. 3. 7.

12. In

12. In Formedon the Writ was Præcipe the Tenant quod Juſte &c. reddat to the Demandant &c. the *Manor of D. which J. T. gave to R. and M. his Wife, and the Heirs of their Bodies, &c. and that after the Death of the aforeſaid R. and M. and N. Son* and Heir of the aforeſaid R. and M. *and N. Son and Heir of the aforeſaid N. and R. Son and Heir of the aforeſaid N. Son of N. Son of the aforeſaid R. and M, to the aforeſaid Demandant*, Couſin and *Heir of the aforeſaid R. Son of N. the Son of N. Son of the aforeſaid R. and M. deſcendere debet*, by Form of the Gift, &c. And the Demandant counted further, how ſhe was Couſin and *Heir to the ſaid R. Son of N. viz. Daughter of T. Son of M. Siſter of N. Son of R. and M.* the Donees; And * becauſe the Coſinage was not alleged as well in the Writ as in the Count, the Court was of Opinion, that the Writ ſhould abate; and after, becauſe the *Tenant had had the View*, tho' *no Count was made before* the View, and ſo affirmed the Writ, therefore he ſhall not have Advantage after, and ſo the Tenant was awarded to anſwer to the Writ, quod Nota. Br. Formedon. pl. 19. cites 49 E. 3. 20.

* Ibid. pl. 26. cites 12 H. 4. 1. S. P. and therefore the Writ was *abated after the View*, ex officio Curiæ. ——*But* in Writ of *Aiel and Coſinage*, he need not ſhew how Coſin in the Writ. Note, a Diverſity. Br. Ibid.

13. *But* contrary *in Scire Facias* upon Tail by Fine, there it ſuffices to count * further; note a Diverſity. Br. Formedon, pl. 19. cites 49 E. 3. 20. Per Wiching.

* Orig. (dehors.)

14. And in Formedon, *the Writ ſhall be (where the Heir is not ſeiſed)* and *that after the Death of the Donee, and R. Son of the Donee*, &c. without this Word *(Heir)* and *to make the Demandant Heir to him who was laſt ſeiſed.* Br. Formedon. pl. 19. cites 49 E. 3. 20. Per Wiching.

The younger Son of the Donee counted in Formedon, *that his eldeſt Brother was Heir to his Father, and that after his Death, he is now Heir*, and Exception was taken, that this cannot be; for that none is Heir to the Father, but the eldeſt Son, and that the elder Brother being dead without Iſſue, the next Brother is Heir to him who was laſt ſeiſed, and not to the Father; But the Court held, it to be no Contradiction to ſay, that two are Heirs of one *Tempore diviſo*. 2 Mod. 94. Trin. 28. Car. 2. C. B. Anon.—But 1 Mod. 219. is S. C. by Name of Burrow v. Hagget.

15. *But where the Heir is ſeiſed*, there he ſhall ſay, and *that after the Death of the Donee, and R. Son and Heir of the aforeſaid Donee*, and ſo on. Br. Formedon. pl. 19. cites 49 E. 3. 20.

16. Formedon in Deſcender, and counted how the *Donor leaſed to W. for Life*, and granted the *Reverſion to J. and T. and to the Heirs of T. who granted* the Reverſion *to the Father of the Demandant in Tail, and that the Tenant for Life is dead*, and ſo *deſcended* to him *by Form of the Gift and Grant* aforeſaid, and it was doubted of the Form, if he ſhall ſay by Form of the *Gift only*, or not. Br. Formedon. pl. 20. cites 50 E. 3. 1.

Where a *Leaſe* is made *for Life*, the *Remainder* over *in Tail*, and the *Tenant for Life dies*, and he in *Remainder enters*, and *aliens and dies*; the *Iſſue in Tail*, after the Death of the Leſſee, and of his Father, who entered and diſcontinued, *may* chuſe in his Writ to *make mention of the Leaſe for Life*, and of the Remainder; or to *allege immediate Gift* to be made to his Father. Quod Nota. Br. Formedon. pl. 62. cites 11 H. 6. 20. ——The Iſſue need not make mention of the Leaſe for Life, but that the Donor gave to his Anceſtor, &c. per Marten, J. Br. Formedon. pl. 79. cites 9 H. 6. 53.

17. In Formedon in Deſcender, the Count was, *that the Land deſcended from the Donor to B* and from B. *to C.* and from C. *to the Demandant, as Brother and Heir*; and it was pleaded to the Writ, becauſe he did *not ſhew that C. his Brother was dead*; But non allocatur in this Action; Contra in Formedon in Remainder. Br. Formedon. pl. 21. cites 3 H. 4. 1.

Formedon in Deſcender; the Tenant pleaded in Abatement, and excepted againſt the *Count*, becauſe it *was that the Right deſcended to him after the Death of* Leonard, *as Brother and Heir to* Leonard, who was *Son and Heir of the Donee*, and did *not allege, that Leonard died without Iſſue*; it is true, this might have been an Objection in a Formedon in Remainder or Reverter, but it is not a Formedon in Deſcender; for in the laſt Caſe the Demandant is only to ſet forth the Pedigree, and therefore they do not mention, that the Perſon under whom they claim, died without Iſſue; beſides, in this Caſe the Demandant could not be Heir to Leonard, if he had left Iſſue. Nels. a. 882. pl. 5. cites 1 Mod. 219. * Burrow verſus Hagget. —— * Trin. 28. Car. 2. C. B.

Br. Nugation, pl. 4. cites S. C.—Ibid. pl. 10. cites S.C. —*But* if a *Gift* be made *in Tail to D.* and his Heirs Males the *Remainder to A. in Tail*, and *D. diſcontinued in the Life of A.* and died without Iſſue, and *the Heir of A. brought his Writ, as the immediate Gift to A.* his Anceſtor, who never was ſeiſed in his Life, and for that Cauſe the Writ was naught; But if A. had been ſeiſed of the Land, then it had not been neceſſary to have ſhewed the firſt Gift to D. by the Opinion of the whole Court. 1 Brownl. 155.—When the *Remainder is once executed*, Formedon in Remainder does not lie, but the *general Writ in the Deſcender* ſhall ſerve, and he ſhall *count as of an immediate Gift.* 8 Rep. 88. Trin. 7 Jac. a Note of the Reporter's in Buckmere's Caſe.—— S. P. and ſhall not mention the Remainder. F. N. B. 219. (D) ſays, it ſo appears by the Rule in the Regiſter.

18. Formedon in Deſcender, tho' the *Gift* was *of a Reverſion of a Tenant for Life to two in Tail*, the *Remainder to the Anceſtor of the Demandant, who was ſeiſed by the Remainder*, ſo that the Remainder was *executed*, the *Plaintiff may ſay*, in his Writ and Declaration, *that the Gift was immediate to his Anceſtor.* Br. Formedon. pl. 23. cites 11 H. 4. 39.

If Tenant in Tail hath two Sons, and a Stranger abates, and enters into the Land, and afterwards the eldeſt Son dies before he entereth, the youngeſt need not name his eldeſt Brother Heir to his Father, in the Writ, but only Son, becauſe he never had Seiſin. F. N. B. 212, 213. (J)

19. If *Tenant in Tail has Iſſue a Son and a Daughter, and diſcontinues*, and after the *Son dies without Iſſue, in the Life of the Father*, and then the *Father dies*; the Daughter ſhall have Formedon, and may make *Omiſſion of the Son*, becauſe he died in the Life of his Father, and therefore now the *Daughter is immediate Heir* to him who was laſt ſeiſed. Br. Omiſſion pl. 7. cites 11 H. 4. 72.

If the Father does not ſurvive the Grandfather, the Son need not mention the Father in his Writ. F. N. B. 489. in the Notes there. (a) cites 5 E. 2. S E. 2. pl. 54.

20. *Contra* it ſeems, *where there are Grandfather, Father, and Son, and the Grandfather Tenant in Tail diſcontinues*, the *Father dies*, and after *the Grandfather dies*, and the *Son* brings Formedon, he *ought to make mention of the Father*; *For* the Son *cannot be immediate Heir to the Grandfather*, but by Means of the Father. Ibid.

S. C. cited F. N. B. 488. In Notes (a)

21. In Formedon the Writ was, *that R. P. gave to N. and B. his Wife, and to the Heirs which the ſaid N. of the Body of the ſaid B. ſhould beget*; Norton demanded Judgment of the Writ, for it ought to be, that R. gave to N. and B. his Wife, and the Heirs of their Bodies *begotten*; & non allocatur; but the Writ awarded good, for it is all one. Br. Formedon. pl. 26. cites 12 H. 4. 1.

22. Formedon in Deſcender; the Writ was, and *that after the death of W. the Donee, and W. Son and Heir of the aforeſaid W.* [*and*] *J. Son and Heir of the aforeſaid W. Son of W. and W. Son and Heir of the aforeſaid J. and T. Son and Heir of the aforeſaid W. to the aforeſaid A. the Demandant, as Daughter and Heir of the aforeſaid T. deſcendere debet*, &c. the *Tenant ſaid, that T. never held Eſtate*, and yet the Writ awarded good by Judgment, for where he is made Heir to every one as here, therefore he is made Heir to the Donee, and to him who was laſt ſeiſed, whoſoever he was; and where the Grandfather is Donee, and he and the Father die, the Father not ſeiſed, and the Writ of the Son is, and that after the Death of the Grandfather, and the Father, Son and Heir to the Grandfather, to the Demandant, Son and Heir of the Father deſcendere debet, &c. it is a good Writ, per Cur' and *laſt Seiſin pleaded in a Writ of Aiel, Mortdanceſtor and Coſinage goes to the Action*, therefore 'tis a good Plea there accordingly. *But in Formedon it does not go but to the Writ.* Quod Nota diverſity. Br. Formedon. pl. 62. cites 11 H. 6. 20.

In Formedon by E. ſuppoſing the *Gift* to be *to A. and M. his Wife for Life*, the *Remainder to B. and N*

23. *And* Note per Cur' that where the *Writ is*, and *that after the Death of the Donee, and W. Son of the Donee, without the Word Heir, &c. to the Demandant deſcendere debet as Son and Heir of W.* ſuch Writ ſhall abate, for he does not make himſelf Heir to the Donee; for it may be that W. was younger Son; for in Formedon in Deſcender, the *Demandant always ought to be made Heir to the Donee, and to him who was laſt ſeiſed*, &c. Br. Formedon. pl. 62. cites 11 H. 6. 20.

his Wife in Tail, and that after the Death of the aforesaid A. and M. B. and N. and C. Son of the aforesaid B. and N. and D. Son of the aforesaid C. to the aforesaid E. Daughter and Heir of the aforesaid C. descendere debet, &c. Skrene demanded Judgment of the Writ; For *E. ought to be made Sister and Heir to D.* & non allocatur, because *C. was the last who was seised*, and she is made Heir to him, as she ought. And therefore the Tenant was compelled to Answer, Quod nota. Br. Formedon. pl. 25. cites 11 H. 4. 72.

24. In Formedon *upon Discontinuance*, the *Demandant counted that descendit Jus, &c.* and *not, quod descendit feodum.* But *Contra upon Abatement against the Abator.* Br. Formedon. pl. 61. cites 19 H. 6. 30.

25. In Formedon, if the Descent be made [thus, viz.] *from the Donee descendit Jus, &c. to J. as Son and Heir to him*, and *from J. to R. as Son and Heir to him*, and *from R. to W. as* Son and Heir to him, and *from W. to him*, as Son and Heir, *and makes himself Heir to the said W. his Father and no other*; albeit that *W. was not seised by Force of the Gift, but* some of the *others, by whom he has made the Conveyance*, were seised, the Writ is good, and shall not abate, because he has made every one Heir to the other. Per all the Justices. Br. Formedon. pl. 37. cites 22 H. 6. 36.

S. C. cited, and says, that the most sure Way for the Demandant is to make every one, who is named in the Writ, to be Son and Heir in the Writ, tho' they never were seised by Force of the Tail, and if he names them Heir, it is not Material whether they were seised or not, and by this Means the Demandant will be certain to make himself Heir as well to the Donee, per formam Doni, as to him that was last seised. 3 Rep. 88. b. the 4th Resolution. Buckmer's Case.——F. N. B. 212. (H) S. P. and S. C. cited in the Notes there (c).——Hob. 51. in Case of Freake v. Bindford.

26. *But* if the Writ be [thus, viz.] *and from the Donee descendit Jus to J. as Son and Heir*, and *from J. to R. Son of J.* and *from R. to W. Son of R.* there *he ought to make himself Heir to him who was last seised by Force of the Tail.* Per all the Justices. Quod Nota Diversity. Br. ibid.

S. P. Hill. 3 Car. C. B. Hetley. 7. S. Jenkins v. Dawson.

27. Formedon *by two Barons and their Femes in jure Uxoris*; the Writ was, *& quod post Mortem &c. to the Barons and their Femes descendere debet*, where it should be to the Femes only, and 'twas amended; For 'twas not well. But per Wangsorde, *in Formedon in Remainder*, he shall say, remanere debet to the Baron and Feme. Quod nullus negavit. Br. Formedon. pl. 4. cites 35 H. 6. 10. 13.

S. P. Hob. 1. and S. C. cited. Mich. 14 Jac. Rot. 60. in Case of Clanrickard, (E. of) v. Sidney.

28. In Formedon in Descender, which is only by Statute, the *Statute is not re-hears'd*, but this is *inasmuch as the Writ is re-hears'd in the Statute*, as it is of the Quod ei Deforceat. Br. Action sur le Statute. pl. 47. cites 5 H. 7. 17.

29. The *Demandant shall make himself Heir in Formedon in Descender to him who was last seised in fact*, and not of the last Seisin in Law, and yet he *shall make mention in his Writ of him who so* * *held Estate, tho' he did not enter in Fact*, but shall not make himself Heir to him; but yet the Pleading of him who held Estate is, to say, that he was seised; and so without Seisin in him, the Writ shall not abate, which is Seisin in Fact, as it seems. Br. Formedon. pl. 66. cites F. N. B. 212. (F).

None holds an Estate but he who survives the Ancestor. Br. Omission 1. Pl. S. cites. 4 E. 2. and Fitzh. Formedon. 48, 49.——But Brook says, the Younger pl. 8.——

see there 11 E. 2. pl. 56. that *it is not holding* of an Estate, *unless he* who held *was seised. quære inde*, for the *Descent to the Heir who dies before Entry is a Seisin in Law*, and upon this Brother shall make himself Heir to him of the Body of his Father. Br. Omission.

* Orig. (tend)

30. The Clause of *(eo quod, &c.)* serves most conveniently when Estate Tail is spent, and so is well in Formedon in Reverter or Remainder, but not in Descender, unless *in Special Cases.* 8 Rep. 88. b. a Nota of the Reporter.

31. In a Formedon, the Count was of a *Gift to B. and Hæredibus de Corpore suo* legitime *procreat.* The Tenant demanded Judgment of the Writ, for that (among other Things) the Word (Procreat.) ought not to be in the Writ, but *exeuntibus.* But the Court thought it might be amended. Het. 78. Hill. 3. Car. C. B. Jenkins v. Dawson.

32. In a Formedon in Descender, the Demandant set forth *that* H. O. being *seised in Fee, made a Feoffment*, &c. *to* the Use of *himself for Life*, Remainder *to* the Use of *E. V. and Ellen his Wife, for their Joint Lives*, and

This is only a State of the Case, and

the Obſervations of the Serjeant, and nothing is mentioned of the Court in the whole Report, and as to the Opinion of Fitzherbert, he cites Br. tit. Pleadings. pl. 3. where Brooke makes a Quære of it, and cites Litt S. 26. where it is ſaid. that if

and after their Deceaſe *to* the Uſe of the Heirs of the Body of the Husband begotten *on the Body of the Wife*; that *H. O. died, and that*, by Virtue of the ſaid Feoffment, the *Husband and Wife were ſeiſed*, that is to ſay, the Husband in Fee-Tail, and the Wife of the Freehold, during their joint Lives; that the *Husband died, and* then the Wife became *ſole ſeiſed* for Life, *Remainder to* H. *her Son*; *that the Wife died*, and then the Whole ſurvived *to her Son, and from him*, jus deſcendit *to the Demandant, as Couſin and Heir of E. V.* (that is to ſay) *Son and Heir of Hugh*, who was *Son and Heir of H.* (the Son) who was *Son and Heir of E. V. on the Body of Ellen begotten*; In this Caſe the Seiſin was alleged right, contrary to the Opinion of Fitzherbert, who held that Seiſin muſt be thus alleged, (viz.) By Virtue whereof the Husband and Wife were ſeiſed together, and to the Heirs of the Body of the Husband begotten on the Body of the Wife, and muſt not ſay, that either of them were ſeiſed of a Freehold for Life, or of a Fee-Tail. Nelſ. Abr. tit. Formedon. 879. pl. 12. cites * 1 Lutw. Rep. 974. Vaughan v. Rowland.

Lands are given to the Baron and Feme, and to the Heirs of the Body of the Baron, in this Caſe the Baron has Eſtate in Tail general, and the Feme has only an Eſtate for Life, and the common Form of Precedents is accordingly.——* It ſhould be 2 Lutw. 974 to 276.

(I) Pleadings, Writ and Declaration in the Remainder.

In Formedon in Remainder, the Plaintiff intitled himſelf, becauſe

1. WHERE a Man conveys by Remainder, he *ought to allege the Gift in Tail, and all the Remainders before him to be determined* by dying without Iſſue, otherwiſe his Writ ſhall abate. Br. Formedon. pl. 39. cites 39 E. 3. 27.

the *Iſſue in Tail is dead without Iſſue*, but does *not ſay the Tenant in Tail is dead without Iſſue*. Holt Ch. J. held, that it muſt be ſhewn, that the Tenant in Tail is dead without Iſſue; for that it is the very Point of the Action; and it muſt be ſhewn, that the firſt Donee is dead without Iſſue; and it is *not implied* at all, that becauſe the Iſſue is dead without Iſſue, that therefore the Tenant in Tail is; For he may have other Sons beſides his Eldeſt. 5 Mod. 17. Hill. 6 W. & M. Herbert v. Morgan.

S. P. where the Formedon in Remainder is

2. In Formedon in Remainder or Reverter, the Demandant ſhall make *mention of the Death of every one who held Eſtate and ſurvived*, &c. *Contra in Scire Facias*. Br. Formedon, pl 11. cites 42 E. 3. 20.

brought as Heir. 8. Rep. 88 a. in a Note of the Reporters. in Buckmere's Caſe.———Br. Omiſſion, pl. 1. cites 42 E. 3. 19, 20.

* Same Caſes cited 3. Lev. 219. and there it is ſaid, in the Regiſter 243. they are mentioned to be

3. Formedon in Remainder was brought upon an Eſtate *Tail limited to B.* Remainder *to C. in Fee, and* was, *which, after the Death of B. and C. to D. Son and Heir of C. remanere debet.* And the Writ was adjudged good *without laying expreſsly the Death of C.* tho' the Form of the Regiſter was ſo; becauſe the *laying of D. to be Heir* of C. imports as much. Hob. 51. in Caſe of **Fleak v. Bindford**, cites * 5 E. 5. 35. and 7 E. 3. 47, 48. cited in the Regiſter.

ruled good, and that there is no mention there, of their being not good, but only that the Form of the Regiſter is better, Arg. and the Court ſeem'd to be of the ſame Opinion: Trin. 1 Jac. 2. C. B. in Caſe of Dinghurſt v. Batt.

4. If a *Leaſe for Life* be made to A. *Remainder in Tail to B.* Remainder *in Tail to C.* If *B. dies without Iſſue in the Life of A.* and afterwards a Formedon in Remainder is brought by *C.* he *ought to mention the Remainder to B.* tho' it was determined and ſpent as aforeſaid; For the Demandant, in the Formedon in Remainder, ought to mention all precedent Remainders in Tail. 8 Rep. 88. a. in a Nota of the Reporter, cites 8 E. 3. 19. a.

5. In

5. In Formedon, the Demandant *counted, that J. was ſeiſed, and aſſigned it in Dower to A. and* after *granted the Reverſion to G. for Life*, the *Remainder to S. in Tail*, and that *S. was ſeiſed and conveyed to the Demandant*; and the Writ was, that J. granted, &c. and after the Death of A. &c. to hold, &c. and that after the Death of the aforeſaid G. Remainder to S. &c. and does *not mention in the Writ, whether the Baron was ſeiſed, ſo that* there may be *Dower*, &c. or not, and yet well, per Thorp. For it is the Courſe of the Chancery. Quære, for 'tis not expreſsly adjudged. Br. Formedon. pl. 8. cites 41 E. 3. 27.

6. Formedon in the Remainder, the Writ was *Præcipe quod reddat one Meſſuage and one Acre of Land*, &c. ſo that if the aforeſaid Donee ſhould die without Heir, &c. that then the aforeſaid *Meſſuage, Land, and Meadow* ſhould remain to the Demandant, &c. So that there was *more in the Percloſe than in the Premiſſes*, by this Word *(Meadow)*, &c. And therefore Fencot pleaded it to the Writ. Finch ſaid, you have had the View, therefore it is paſs'd the Advantage, and it *is only Surpluſage*, which ſhall not abate the Writ. Per Fencot, of falſe Latin, and Thing apparent, a Man ſhall have Advantages always before Judgment, Quod non Negatur; and the Writ awarded good, and this by Reaſon, that it is only Surpluſage, as it ſeems. Br. Brief. pl. 68. cites 44 E. 3. 14.

7. J. S. and M. his Wife brought Formedon in Remainder in Right of M. of 3 Meſſuages, which *A. gave to B. in Tail, Remainder to C. in Fee*, and ſets forth, *that after the Death of the ſaid B. and C. to the aforeſaid J. S. and M. Daughter and Heir of E. Brother and Heir of D. Son and Heir of C. aforeſaid remanere debet by Form of the Gift* aforeſaid, *eo quod, the aforeſaid B. died without Heir of her Body iſſuing*, &c. The Defendant pleaded in Abatement of the Writ, that by the Form in the Regiſter, Demandant ſhould have ſuppoſed, that *after the Death of B. and C. to the aforeſaid J. S. and M. as Couſin and Heir of C. remanere debet, &c.* But it was held good enough by three J. againſt Warburton J. becauſe it appears to the Court, by the Pedigree ſet down, that ſhe is, and muſt needs be, Couſin and Heir to C. And that the Form in the Regiſter may bear ſuch an Alteration. Hob. 51. Hill. 11 Jac. Rot. 30. Freak v. Bindford.

8. In Formedon in Remainder, the Demandant declared of a *Gift to A. for Life, Remainder to M. the Wife of A. and the Heirs of her Body, by A.* ita quod, *after the Death of A. M. and E. their Daughter, to* (the Demandant) *G. Son and Heir of E. remanere debet*, &c. The Defendant *pleaded* in Abatement, *that E. had Iſſue F. a Son and Heir, who ſurvived M. and E. not named in the Writ, Judgment* of the Writ; and the Court upon the firſt Argument inclined, that the Writ was ill by Reaſon of the Omiſſion of F. who had a *Right, tho'* he had *never any Seiſin*. But afterwards, upon a further Argument for the Demandant, in which the* above and other Books were cited, they gave Judgment to anſwer over Niſi Cauſa, within a Week. 3 Lev. 218. Trin. 1 Jac. 2. C. B. Dinghurſt v. Butt & al. *Pl. 3. Marg.

(K) Pleadings, Writ and Declaration in the Reverter.

1. IN *Formedon in Reverter, Omiſſion* is not material, *unleſs he who is omitted* in the Deſcent *ſurviv'd his Father*. As where the Father has Iſſue two Sons, and the Eldeſt dies in the Life of his Father without Iſſue, there the Omiſſion of him is not material. Br. Omiſſion. pl. 10. cites * 18 E. 2. In Formedon in Reverter, he ought to mention the Eldeſt Brother, who ſurvived the Father, &c. becauſe he held the Eſtate, altho' he was not ſeiſed of the Land. F. N. B. 220. (D)——* S. C. cited F. N. B. 489. in Notes there. (a)

2. In

If one brings Formedon in the Reverter or Remainder as Heir, the *Omiſſion of an Eldeſt Son, who ſurvived his Father*, or the like *in the Pedigree of the Part of the Donor*, or of him in Remainder, ſhall abate the Writ. *But of the Part of the Donee*, (tho' the Donee had many Iſſues in lineal Deſcent, inheritable to the Eſtate Tail, and who held the Eſtate) the *Demandant need not name any* of the Iſſues in the Clauſe, et quæ poſt Mortem; but ſhall ſay, *et quæ poſt Mortem of the Donee ad ipſum reverti debet, eo quod* the Donee *died without Iſſue*. Becauſe the Demandant is a * *Stranger to the Pedigree of the Donee*. And alſo becauſe if the Iſſue ſhall be ſuppoſed by the Writ to die without Iſſue, yet it may be, that the Eſtate Tail is not ſpent; For the *Iſſue may have Brothers or Couſins inheritable to the Donee*, and the Land ought not to revert to the Donor ſo long as the Eſtate Tail continues. 8 Rep. 88. a. in a Nota of the Reporter in Buckmere's Caſe.—And he ſays, that in ſome ancient written Regiſters, the Clauſe is, (eo quod the Iſſue died without Iſſue) but the printed Regiſter which imitates the moſt ancient and trueſt Precedents, is (et quod poſt Mortem, of of the Donee reverti debet, eo quod the Donee died without Iſſue,) and cites 22 H. 6. 36.—* D. 216. a. pl. 56. Trin. 4 Eliz. Anon.—But adds a Quære of Formedon in the Remainder.

2. In Formedon in Reverter he need not ſhew otherwiſe, but *that the Donee died without Heir of his Body*, tho' 20 were ſeiſed after his Death, &c. Br. Formedon. pl. 37. cites 22 H. 6. 36. per all the Juſtices.

Brownl. 134. S. C.

3. A Formedon in the Reverter was brought by J. S. and F. his Wife againſt W. R. of divers Meſſuages and Lands in E. which Lands A. *and the ſaid F. then his Wife did give to B. and C. to the Uſe of E. Daughter and Heir of Sir P. S. Knt. and the Heirs of her Body; & quæ poſt mortem prædict. Eliz. ad præfatam F. revertere debent. &c.* The Defendant pleaded in abatement of the Writ, that the ſaid F. at the Time of the Death of the ſaid Eliz. *was married to the Plaintiff, ſo that the right* of the ſaid Lands *ſi quod*, &c. *to her Husband and her did revert*, and ſo by the Writ it ought to have been ſuppoſed; upon which, the Demandant did demur in Law. It was adjudged, that the Writ was good: and this *Difference* taken, if it were a *Formedon in the Deſcender*, upon a Deſcent to the Wife, there the Deſcent *muſt be* made in the Writ *to the Wife alone*; for the Deſcent followeth the Blood, and to that the Husband is a Stranger; *but* in a Formedon *in the Reverter*, where nothing is already veſted, but the right only returns, there this Right *may be* layed to return either to the Wife alone, or to the Husband and Wife: Hughes's Abr. 966. pl. 7. cites 33 H. 6. 54. Mich. 11 Jac. in C. B. The Earl of **Clanrickard**, and the Lord Viſcount Sidney's Caſe, Hob. 1. and 2.

* Nelſ. Abr. Formedon. (C) pl. 2. S. C. and there this Word is (Satisfied).—But it ſhould be (Falſified)

4. Note. If the Demandant in a Formedon in the Reverter, be *barred of a third Part of the Land upon her own ſhewing*; as where *the Demandant ſheweth, that a Fine was levied of a third Part* of the Land; in ſuch Caſe, the whole Writ, of Formedon, brought for the whole Land, ſhall abate; For that the Writ is * teſtified by the Demandant's own ſhewing; and that in a ſubſtantial Point. Hughes's Abr. 966. pl. 2. cites Hobart. 279. Mich. 13 Jac. in the Earl of Clanrickard's Caſe.

5. In a Formedon in Reverter, the Caſe was, Wm. Veſcy the Father, being ſeiſed in Fee, deviſed his Lands *to his Eldeſt Son John Veſcy, and the Heirs Males of his Body; and for Default* of ſuch Iſſue, *to William Veſcy, and the Heirs Males of his Body*, being another Son; and for Default of ſuch Iſſue, Remainder over, &c. The *Father died*, then *John entered, and died without Iſſue Male, leaving two Daughters*, Elizabeth and Sarah, the now Demandants; then *Wm.* the other Son *entered, and* in Conſideration of a Marriage intended between him and Anne Hewet, he *made a Feoffment to two Truſtees, and their Heirs*, Habendum *to the Uſe of* the ſaid *Wm.* the Feoffor, *for Life*, then to *Anne, his intended Wife, for Life*, (who was now Tenant) Remainder to the Uſe of *the Heirs Males of the ſaid Wm. and Anne in Special Tail*, Remainder *to his own Right Heirs, with Warranty* from him and his Heirs, to the Feoffees and their Heirs; *and* afterwards he *died ſeiſed without any Iſſue*; after his Death *Anne his Widow entered*, and had the Poſſeſſion, and the Demandants Elizabeth and Sarah, *the Daughters*, and Co-heirs of John, and Couſins and Co-heirs of William Veſcy the Teſtator, *brought a Formedon in Reverter*; Anne the *Tenant would rebut*, and bar them of the Reverſion *by this collateral Warranty*

Warranty of her Husband William Veſcy, *who was Tenant in Tail, as deſcending on them as Couſins and Co-heirs, who were likewiſe Couſins and Co-heirs of the Donor:* The Court was divided, (viz.) the Ch. Juſtice Vaughan and Archer for the Demandants, who held this Warranty of the Tenant in Tail, tho' tis a *collateral Warranty*, will not bar the Donor and his Heirs of the Reverſion. Nels. 880. Abr. tit. Formedon. (C) pl. 4. cites Vaugh. 360. Bole v. Horton.

6. Formedon in Reverter: the Tenant demurred to the Declaration, for that *no Explees are alleged in any Donor*, and the Books go upon this Difference, that where a Fee-ſimple is demanded, (as 'tis always in a Formedon in Reverter,) there the taking the Profits muſt be alleged both in the Donor and Donee; *but where an Eſtate Tail* only is demanded, then it is ſufficient to allege the Explees in the Donee only. 2 Lutw. 963. Hill. 3 W. & M. Hunlock v. Petre.

(L) Pleadings, Writ and Declaration by Parceners.

1. FOrmedon ſhall be of the Seiſin of him, who was laſt ſeiſed. Br. Formedon. pl. 5.

2. *As* if Land *tail'd deſcend to two Daughters*, and *one enters into the Whole, and dies without Iſſue*, and the *other has Iſſue and dies*; the Iſſue ſhall have *two Writs* of Formedon, the *one of the Seiſin of his Grandfather, as Heir to the Grandfather of one Moiety*, and *ſhall not ſay, that his Mother inſimul tenuit*, for ſhe was * not ſeiſed, *and* he ſhall have *another Formedon of the other Moiety, as Heir to his Aunt, who inſimul tenuit with his Mother*, and yet his Mother was never ſeiſed. Per Wiching, quod Nota, for 'twas not denied. Br. Formedon. pl. 5. cites 40 E. 3. 8.

But if *one enters into the Whole, and has Iſſue and dies*, and the *other* Siſter *dies without Iſſue before any Entry*, the *Iſſue of the other ſhall have two Writs* of Formedon, if a Stranger, &c. enters; *or one and the ſame Writ, by ſeveral Præcipes*; [but in ſuch Caſe] *of the one Moiety, he ſhall make himſelf Heir to his Mother, who inſimul tenuit with his Aunt*, by Reaſon that his Mother entered, and was ſeiſed, *and of the other Moiety, ſhall make himſelf Heir to his Grandfather*, becauſe the *laſt Seiſin* is Material here; and his *Mother* was not ſeiſed of both Moieties in Tail, but *was Abatreſs againſt her Siſter of one Moiety*, and the *inſimul tenuit of the other Moiety ſhall not prejudice him*, by Judgment. Br. Formedon. pl. 54. cites 43 E. 3. 16.——* Was only an Abatreſs. Br. Brief. pl. 508. cites 43 E. 3. 16. 27.

3. *And* it ſeems that he may have *One Formedon* of theſe two Moieties *by ſeveral Præcipes*; and ſo ſee two Formedons, by one and the ſame Heir, upon one and the ſame Gift, by Reaſon that he claims by two ſeveral Anceſtors ſub Dono. Br. Formedon. pl. 5. cites 40 E. 5. 8. and 43 E. 3. 16 and 27. S. P.

4. In Formedon the Writ was *Quod reddat 20 Acres, which together with other 20 Acres W. gave to R. and the Heirs of his Body*, and that after the Death of R. and K. one of the Daughters of the ſaid R. who them inſimul tenuit with J. another of the Daughters of the aforeſaid R. to the aforeſaid Demandant, Son and Heir of the aforeſaid K. deſcendere debet, &c. And 'twas held, that the Writ is ill; For it *ought to be the Moiety of* 40 *Acres* of Land, *becauſe* the Writ *is which they held in Common*; For it ſeems that *before Partition, it ſhall be Inſimul tenuit* by Moieties, and *after Partition, of Acres which in Purpartia tenuit.* But becauſe the Tenant had had the View, he could not abate the Writ. Br. Formedon. pl. 6. cites 40 E. 3. 35.

5. Formedon, that he render the *Moiety of* 30 *Acres of Land, which D. together with another Moiety of* 30 *Acres of Land, gave*, &c. where the Writ ſhould be with the other *Moiety of the aforeſaid* 30 *Acres* of Land, and therefore the Writ was *abated.* Br. Brief, 133. cites 5 H. 5. 8.

And after if *she who has the Land in Fee Simple aliens* it and dies, her Iſſue ſhall

6. Where Land of *Fee Simple*, *and* Land *tail'd*, *deſcend to* 2 *Siſters*, and they *make Partition*, ſo that *one has the Fee Simple* Land, *and the other the Land tailed*, and *ſhe who has the Land tail'd Aliens* and dies, her Iſſue ſhall have Formedon, and ſhall recover the Whole. per Newton. Br. Formedon. pl. 2. cites 20 H. 6. 2. 13.

have Formedon, and ſhall recover the Moiety of the Land tail'd. Quære of the Recovery of the Whole. Br. Formedon. pl. 2. cites 20 H. 6. 2. 13.——*Fer* if the *Tenant ſhews the Matter of the two Siſters in the firſt Formedon of the Whole, they ſhall join*, and one ſhall recover the Whole, per Portington. ibid.——But Brook makes a Quære thereof for that the *other Siſter, who has the Land, can't join* in the Formedon; For ſhe has her Portion. *But if ſhe had alien'd the Fee Simple Land alſo before the Iſſue of the other brought the Formedon*, then it ſeems that there both may well join.

7. Lands given *to A. in Tail, Remainder to the Right Heirs of B.*——B. has Iſſue 2 *Daughters* C. and D. Donee died without Iſſue; Demandants as Heirs to C. and D. brought *Formedon in Remainder*; the Writ ſhall abate; For it ſhould be brought by the *Heirs of the Survivor* of the two Daughters, becauſe they have the Remainder *as Purchaſors*. 3 Le. 14. Mich. 8 Eliz. C. B. Lady Stowell v. E. of Hertford.

(M) Plea, by Tenant in Abatement, and at what Time.

* This ſeems to be miſprinted in all the Editions, and that it ſhould be 38 E. pl. 4 37.

1. FOrmedon *is a Writ of Poſſeſſion, and no Writ of Right*; for there, tho' he cannot have another Writ, yet *if the Tenant can deſtroy the Poſſeſſion, 'tis ſufficient*, Br. Formedon. pl. 31. cites 38 * E. 1 37.

See Br. Juris Utrum. 3. S. C. and P.

2. Formedon in Deſcender, the Demandant counted of a *Gift* made *to W. and M. and to the Heirs of their two Bodies*; *and* that *after the Death of the aforeſaid W. and M. and K. Daughter of the aforeſaid W. and M. and H. Son and Heir of the aforeſaid K. to J. Son of H. as Couſin* and Heir of the aforeſaid W. and M. *deſcendere debet*, &c. And the *Demand was of the Moiety of three Parts of an Acre* of Land, and the Tenant demanded Judgment of the Writ; For the *Demandant had brought other Formedon againſt him, of the other Moiety* of the ſame Land there demanded, ſuppoſing that after the Death of the aforeſaid W. and M. and K. Daughter, &c. and J. Son of the aforeſaid K. who held together with H. Son of the aforeſaid K. &c. by which Writ he ſuppoſed the Seiſin of H. and this Writ is contrary, Judgment of the Writ; and 'twas held no Plea by Award, *without ſaying that H. was ſeiſed in Fact*; For the Writ is but a Suppoſal, which may be falſe, and therefore it ſhall not abate this Writ which is better; and alſo the other Writ is of the other Moiety. Br. Formedon. pl. 5. cites 40 E. 3. 8.

S. P. per Finchedon, clearly; *Contra if both had been of one and the ſame Gift*; Note the Diverſity by him, and yet *by the one, he demanded Fee Simple, and by the other only Tail.*

3. Formedon *in Deſcender* by J. S. the Tenant ſaid that *at another Time, Demandant brought Formedon in Remainder againſt him of the ſame Tenements, by which he demanded Fee Simple, to which Tenant pleaded in Bar*, and ſo he prayed Judgment of the Writ. But per Belk the Formedon in Remainder is not more high than this Writ is; For the Formedon in Deſcender is a Writ of Right it its Nature; and becauſe he did not take the firſt Writ of the ſame Gift which he took now, therefore the Writ is good; per Fincham J. Quære. Br. Formedon. pl. 77. cites 40 E. 3. 21.

Br Brief pl. 503. citet S. C.——Br. Eſtoppel. pl. 225. cites 40 E 3. 14 21.

Arg. cites S E. 3. 55 that the Writ abated after the View for *Fact appearing in the Writ* it'ſelf, and that in 46 E. 3 Writ of Coſinage abated after the View, becauſe it appeared upon the Writ it ſelf that Writ of Beſaiel lay, and not Writ of Coſinage,

4. If the Tenant hath *had the View*, he can't abate the Writ. Br. Formedon. pl. 6. cites 40 E. 3. 35.

Coſinage. But that in 40 E. 3. 35, 36. it was held, that after the View, nothing ſhould abate the Writ, but *what aroſe upon the View*. But it was inſiſted, that then it ought to have been pleaded, and that if it appears not on the Record, the Court can take no Notice of it, tho' the Writ itſelf, and the Return of it, be brought into Court; but the greater Part of the Juſtices thought that the Court might take Notice thereof, the Writ being returned here, and a Record of this Court, tho' not entered upon the Roll; and a Reſpondeas Ouſter was awarded, Niſi Cauſa, &c. 3 Lev. 219. Trin. 1 Jac. 2. C. B. Dinghurſt v. Batt.

5. Formedon in Deſcender, *the Writ was*, *J. N. gave* and this *immediately to his Father*, where the *Truth was*, *that he gave to one W. for Life*, the *Remainder to the Anceſtor in Tail*; by which the *Tenant ſaid*, that he *Ne Dona pas in the Manner*, &c. and the *Demandant ſhew'd the ſpecial Matter*, *and that his Father entered*; by which the *Tenant*, *of his* * *Conuſance*, *pleaded to the Writ*, *becauſe mention is not made of the Tenant for Life*; and yet the Writ was awarded good; For 'tis ſaid, that the one Writ and the other is good. Nevertheleſs Thorp ſaid, that the Writ is beſt, if it makes mention of the Tenant for Life; but Quære in Formedon in Remainder, for there he ſhall ſhew Deed. Br. Formedon pl. 14. cites 44 E. 3. 8. Br. Formedon pl. 62. S. P. cites 11 H. 6. 22 — * Viz. of the Demandant's own Confeſſion, that the Eſtate of his Anceſtor was by Cauſe of a Remainder. The Year, Book 8. a. pl. 7.

6. In Formedon, a Fine with Warranty was pleaded; and, as *to Part*, the Tenant ſaid, that he himſelf was *ſeiſed at the Time of the Fine* levied, and *to the reſt*, he ſaid *Nient Compriſe*, &c. Br. Fines pl. 26. cites 46 E. 3. 14.

7. Formedon of a Manor, which *the Mother of the Demandant held in Purparty*, &c. the Tenant demanded Judgment of the Writ, becauſe he *did not ſhew that other Land was allotted to the other Siſter*. Per Markham, this was a good Exception in a Formedon upon a *infimul tenuit*, but contra here, for he cannot hold infimul, but with other Lands, which Newton and Paſton agreed. Br. Formedon. pl. 2. cites 20 * H. 6. 13. * (20 H. 6. 13. b. 14.)

8. In Formedon, the Defendant *ſaid*, *that after the Gift*, *he brought Aſſiſe againſt the Donee*, *and the Seiſin and Diſſeiſin was found*, *and he recover'd*; Judgment ſi Actio. And 'twas held no Plea, unleſs he ſays, that the *Gift* was *meſne between the Diſſeiſin and the Recovery*, or ſhews *how the Gift was determined*. Br. Formedon. pl. 3. cites 27. H. 6. 8.

9. In Formedon, *laſt ſeiſed* is a good Plea, *and ſo conclude to the Writ*, *Judgment of the Writ*, and not Judgment *if the Court will take Conuſance*. Br. Formedon. pl. 51. cites 38 H. 6. 18.

10. A Man ſeiſed of Lands in *Gavelkind* had Iſſue *three Daughters*, *A. B. and C.* and *deviſed* all his Lands *to A. in Tail*, the *Remainder of the one half to B. in Tail*, *the Remainder of the other half to C. in Tail*: And *if B. dy'd without Iſſue*, the *Remainder of her Moiety to C. and her Heirs*; and *if C. died without Iſſue*, the Remainder of *her Moiety to B.* and her Heirs; the Deviſor died, A. and B. both died: Whether C. in the Remainder ſhould have one Formedon for this Land, or ſeveral Formedons, was the Queſtion? It ſeemed to all, That one Formedon lyeth well for all the Land; for that it was *by one Self-ſame-conveyance*, tho' the Eſtate came by ſeveral Deaths; the Action was brought by the Heir of C. after the Death of C. 2 Brownl. 274, 275. 7 Jac. in C. B. Buckmer v. Sawyer. 8 Rep. 86, 87. b. Trin. 7 Jac. Buckmere's Caſe.

11. Formedon in the *Deſcender againſt A. B. and C.* who *pleaded Non tenure*, and upon Iſſue thereupon it was *found* ſpecially, *that A. and B. were Leſſees for Life*, *Remainder to C.* and the Queſtion was, whether the three were Tenants as ſuppoſed by the Writ? And the better Opinion was for the Demandant; For the Tenants *ſhould have pleaded Several Tenancy*, and then the Demandant might [muſt] maintain his Writ. But by this General Non tenure, it is *ſufficient*, *if any be Tenant*; and the Præcipe may be brought againſt one who is not Tenant, as againſt a Mortgagor or Mortgagee. Brownl. 153, Trin. 14 Jac. Rot. 112. Pit v. Staple.

12. Formedon in Remainder, (viz.) there were *three Siſters*, the *eldeſt had an Eſtate Tail of a fourth Part of* 140 *Acres in three Vills*, the *Remainder to the other two in Fee*; the *Tenant in Tail married the now Defendant*, and then *they both joined in a Fine ſur Cognizance de Droit*, *&c. and*

S. C Cart. 239. Trin. 25 Car. 2. C. B. —241 Mich. 25 Car. 2. C. B. adjudged for the Tenant.

and declared the Uſes to the Husband and Wife, and the Heirs of the Body of the Wife, Remainder in Fee to the Right Heirs of the Husband, with Warranty againſt them and the Heirs of the Wife; ſhe died afterwards *without Iſſue*, and the other two *Siſters bring a Formedon in Remainder againſt the Husband, who pleaded, as to* 100 *Acres*, part of the Lands in Demand, *Non Tenure, and that ſuch a Perſon was Tenant; and* as *to the reſt, he pleaded this Fine with Warranty*; as to that Part of the Tenure the Demandant demurred, and as to the reſt, he made a frivolous Replication; to which the Tenant demurred; and it was objected againſt the Plea of *Non Tenure*, that the Demandant ſhould have ſet forth in which of the Vills the 100 Acres were; beſides, he who pleads *Non Tenure* in Abatement ought to *ſet forth who was Tenant Die Impetrationis Brevis Originalis*; but adjudged, that the Tenant is not obliged to *ſet forth where thoſe Acres lie*, to which he pleads *Non Tenure*; neither is he obliged to ſet forth who was Tenant Die Impetrationis Brevis Originalis; For 'tis ſufficient to tell the Demandant who was Tenant generally, and that he himſelf was not Tenant *Die Impetrationis, &c.* but that *W. R. eodem Die*, was Tenant, which is certain enough. Nelſ. Abr. 288. Formedon pl 4. cites 1 Mod. 181. * Fowle v. Doble.

* Paſch. 22 Car. 2 C.B.

13. In Formedon in Deſcender the Tenant, *after Imparlance, pleaded Non Tenure*; but upon Demurrer, it was reſolved by the whole Court, that it is not pleadable after General Imparlance, tho' it was objected, that General Non Tenure of the whole is; but Non Tenure of Part is not. 3 Lev. 55. Mich. 33 Car. 2. C. B. Barrow v. Hagget.——cites 5 E. 3. 2. and 41 E. 3. 31.

Lutw. 849. b. to 865.—

14. Formedon *of the Remainder of Etwall cum Pertin'*, &c. *& de 35 Meſſuagiis*, &c. the Tenant defendit Jus ſuum quando, &c. and * the ſaid ſix Meſſuages, Parcel of the ſaid Tenements in Etwall ſuperius petit' are, and Time out of Mind have been, Parcel of the Manor of Etwall aforeſaid; whereupon, for that they are *Bis petit'* the Tenant petit Judicium de Brevi; and upon Demurrer to this Plea, it was adjudged ill, becauſe the ſix Meſſuages may be Parcel of the Manor, over and above the thirty-five Meſſuages; For the Manor might comprehend fifty Meſſuages; it *ſhould have been, that the ſix Meſſuages, Parcel of the thirty-five Meſſuages, are Parcel of the Manor*, and then they might appear to be Bis petita. Nelſ. Abr. 882. Formedon (D.) pl. 2. cites 3 Lev. 67. † Chetham verſus Sleigh.

* This is miſprinted, and ſhould be (*ſaid that ſix Meſſuages*, &c.)

† Trin. 34 Car. 2. C. B.

Lutw. 963. to 974.

15. Formedon in Reverter; the *Tenant pleads Non Tenure*; the Demandant *replies, and maintains* his Writ, *that he is Tenant*; and upon Demurrer to the Replication, it was inſiſted for the Tenant, that the Demandant cannot maintain this Writ, for no Damages are to be recovered, becauſe upon ſuch a Plea of Non Tenure he may enter; which is very true, if the Plea had been Non Tenure *with a Diſclaimer*, but not where Non Tenure is pleaded, and no more; For in the laſt Caſe, nothing is diſowned, but the Freehold, and 'tis probable he may have a Reverſion in Fee; and if ſo, then upon the Plea of Non Tenure the Demandant cannot lawfully enter; but upon ſuch a Plea with a Diſclaimer he may, becauſe the Tenant hath diſclaimed the whole. Nelſ. Abr. 882. Formedon (D.) pl. 3. cites 3 Lev. 330. Hunlock v. Petre.

* Trin. 4 W. & M. C. B.

(M. 2) Plea by Tenant. In Bar.

1. IF *the Donee be impleaded and loſes, and recovers in Value upon Voucher, and has Execution, and aliens and dies, or a Stranger abates*, Formedon lies *of the Land recover'd in Value*; For it comes in lieu of the Land which was given in Tail, and the *Writ ſhall be General, and if the Tenant pleads Ne Dona pas*, the *Demandant ſhall reply by the ſpecial Matter* how other Land was given in Tail, and loſt, and this Land was recover'd in Value, and conclude, *and ſo Dona* [*gave*], and well, and yet this Land was not given, but other Land. Br. Formedon. pl. 75. cites old Nat. Br.

2. In

2. In Formedon; the *Tenant pleaded Warranty and Aſſets*, the *Demandant pleaded Riens per Deſcent*; if 'tis *found that he had by Deſcent*, he ſhall be barr'd of all, notwithſtanding that the Deſcent be not to the Value, &c. quære inde. Br. Formedon. pl. 32. cites † 21 R. 3. 10. per Wilby, Hill and Shard.

If the Iſſue in Tail *aliens the Aſſets and dies*, the *Iſſue of that Iſſue ſhall recover the Land*; becauſe the lineal Warranty deſcends only to him without Aſſets. For neither the Pleading the Warranty without the Aſſets, nor the Aſſets without the Warranty, is any Bar in Formedon in Deſcender; but had he brought other Formedon, he had been barred, and * ſo had the Tail for ever. Co. Litt. 393. b.——* S. P. Obiter. Hob. 40. in Caſe of Cowper v. Andrews.——† So it is in all the Editions of Brook; but it ſhould be 21 E. 3. 9. pl. 28.

3. If *Tenant in Tail of a Rent grants it in Fee with Warranty, and dies, and Aſſets deſcend in Fee*; if the Heir brings Formedon of the Rent, the Warranty and Aſſets ſhall be a Bar, but if he diſtrains and does not bring Formedon, it ſhall be no Bar; For a Rent cannot be diſcontinued. Br. Formedon. pl. 65. cites 33 E. 3.

4. In Scire facias, *Confirmation with Warranty to the Tenant for Life of the Tenant, and Aſſets* deſcended *from him who made the Warranty having Right in Tail*, is a good Bar to the Iſſue in Tail, who brought the Scire facias, to execute the Remainder in Tail by Fine. Br. Formedon. pl. 12. cites 43 E. 3. 9.

5. If a *Man gives Land in Tail, and warrants* the Land *to him his Heirs and Aſſigns*; and *he aliens, and dies without Iſſue*, the Donor ſhall be barr'd in Formedon in Reverter by this Warranty. Br. Formedon pl. 15. cites 46 E. 3. 4.

6. In Formedon, the *Tenant pleaded a Feoffment of the Grandfather of the Demandant*, whoſe Heir he is, *with Warranty*, Judgment, &c the *Demandant ſaid, that the ſame Grandfather gave in Tail to his Father, and entered upon him, and made the Feoffment* with Warranty immediately, ſo that the Warranty *commenced by Diſſeiſin*, Judgment, &c. by which the Tenant took other Iſſue; and ſo ſee that collateral Warranty, which commences by Diſſeiſin, does not bind. Br. Formedon. pl. 16. cites 49 E. 3. 6.

7. In Formedon, the *Tenant pleaded in Bar, that the Grandmother of the Demandant was ſeiſed in Fee, and took to Baron J. N. and had Iſſue E. Mother of the Demandant*, and the ſaid *J. N. gave in Tail to the ſaid E. and her Baron, and after J. N. and his Feme died, and the Baron of E. died and ſhe ſurvived and enfeoff'd the Tenant*, Judgment, &c. and a good Plea to bar the Tail by the beſt Opinion; For the ſaid E. was *remitted to the Fee Simple*, which voids the Tail. Br. Formedon. pl. 63. cites 11 H. 4. 50.

8. Formedon in Reverter *upon a Gift in Tail to the Baron and Feme, who died without Iſſue*; the *Tenant ſaid*, that the *Donor enfeoff'd the Donees in Fee*, & non allocatur, without *traverſing* the Gift in Tail; For 'tis only Argument, &c. Br. Formedon, pl. 1. cites 2 H. 6. 15.

9. *Wherefore* he *ſaid, that after the Gift the Donor enfeoff'd them in Fee*, & non allocatur, without *ſaying that the Donor was ſeiſed in Fee* after the Gift, *and ſo ſeiſed enfeoff'd* the Donees; Quod Nota; and ſo he did, and the Demandant imparled. Br. Formedon, pl. 1. cites 2 H. 6. 15.

10. It was doubted, whether *Judgment final againſt Tenant in Tail after the Miſe joined* ſhall be a Bar in Formedon? Wherefore they took Adviſement. Br. Formedon, pl. 56. cites 3 H. 6. 55.

11. In Formedon, the *Tenant pleaded a Deed of the Father of the Demandant, with Warranty and Aſſets deſcended in Fee* by the ſame Father; the *Demandant demanded Oyer of the Deed*, and had it, *and it appeared that* 'twas an Exchange, and that *the Father had Land in Exchange for the Land tail'd, and died ſeiſed thereof*, after whoſe Death, the *Demandant did not agree* to the Exchange, *nor occupied it*, but utterly diſagreed to the ſame, *Abſque hoc, that he had other Land deſcended to him by the ſame Anceſtor*, and demanded Judgment, &c. and held a good Plea in Avoidance of the Warranty, and yet he confeſſed the Warranty, and the Deſcent in Fee Simple. Br. Formedon pl. 40. cites 14 H. 6. 3.

But 'twas admired, why the Warranty and Aſſets deſcended is not a Bar, as well as in other Caſes; For *in other Caſes, the Deſcent only without Entry is*

ſufficient to bar the Demandant, if he does not enter into the Land exchanged, becauſe he has brought the Action of Formedon; contrary, it ſeems, if he had enter'd and taken *Aſſiſe*, as he might; for an Exchange is no Diſcontinuance. Br. Formedon, pl. 40. cites 14 H. 6. 3

Lineal Warranty and Aſſets deſcended, is a good Plea in Formedon in the Deſcender; but if there be no Warranty, the Heir will not be barred. Litt. S. 749.

12. If a Man bring Formedon, and the *Tenant pleads Warranty and Aſſets deſcended in Fee*, by which the Demandant is barr'd, and *after the Aſſets is recover'd from him by elder Title*, he ſhall have another Formedon, and the firſt Judgment ſhall not be a Bar; For 'twas no *Bar*, but *for a Time*, per Markham. Quod nullus negavit. Br. Formedon, pl. 34. cites 19 H. 6. 37.

13. In *Formedon of the Gift* of J. the Demandant is *nonſuited*; he may have other *Formedon of the Gift of W.* and the firſt Recovery no Eſtoppel. Br. Eſtoppel, pl. 162. cites 5 E. 4. 7, 8. and 7 E. 4. 19, 20.

The other Editions are (9) and the laſt Fol. in the Year Book is Fol. 8. but it is in the long Quinto, &c.

14. Formedon in Deſcender of a *Gift to the Father and Mother*; the *Tenant ſaid, that before the Donor had any Thing he himſelf was ſeiſed in Fee*, and, being *within Age, enfeoff'd the Donor in Fee*, who was ſeiſed and gave ut ſupra, *and after*, the Tenant *within Age reenter'd, and ſo is ſeiſed* in Fee *in his Remitter*. Br. Formedon, pl. 45. cites 5 E. 4. * 19.

of E. 4. Pag. 9. and there the Demandant maintain'd the Gift, &c Abſque hoc, that the Tenant enfeoffed the Donor, and the Queſtion was, if the Traverſe ſhould be of the Feoffment or of Seiſin ſuppoſed in the Tenant within Age. And there, Pag. 12. it is ſaid, that it ſeems, that the Subſtance of the Bar is the Feoffment by the Tenant himſelf, during his Nonage, againſt which the Demandant had maintain'd the Gift, and traverſed the Feoffment over, which as it ſeems ſuffices in Avoidance of the Bar, &c.

15. Where the *Iſſue in Tail enters upon the Diſcontinuee, and another ouſts him*, he ſhall not have Formedon unleſs *the Diſcontinuee enters*. And in this Caſe, in pleading, the *Tenant ſhall not ſay that the Heir after the Death of his Anceſtor in Tail, entered, and was ſeiſed in Tail, but* it ſuffices to ſay, *that he entered, and was ſeiſed, after the Death of the Father*. Br. Formedon, pl. 47. cites 7 E. 4. 19.

But Brook makes a Quære of this and ſays, *'tis a new Right deſcended after*. Br. Formdon. pl. 50.—*But* per Cat. the Plea is good,

16. In Formedon, the *Tenant ſaid that after the Gift the Demandant and two others were thereof ſeiſed, and enfeoffed W. S. whoſe Eſtate the Tenant has*, Judgment Si Actio; and per Brian and Cat. J. *if the Feoffment was* made by the Demandant *in the Life of his Father without Warranty by Dedi, or other Warranty*, it ſhall not be a Bar in Formedon, no more than a Releaſe in the life of the Anceſtor without Warranty. But Trem. J. contra, and that the Feoffment without Warranty ſhall be a Bar againſt the Feoffor. Br. Formedon. pl. 50. cites 21. E. 4. 81.

becauſe *it ſhall be intended to be after the Death of the Anceſtor*; For if 'twas in the Life of the Anceſtor, he held it otherwiſe. But Brook makes a quære thereof for 'twas not pleaded whether 'twas in the Life of the Anceſtor, or after. Br. Formdon, pl. 50. cites 21 E. 4. 81.

17. In Formedon, the Tenant may *plead, that a Stranger has recovered againſt him by ſuch Writ, by Elder Title, by Confeſſion of the Tenant, and the Eſtate of the now Demandant meſne between the Title of him who recovered, and the Judgment, Que Eſtate of the Recoveror the now Tenant has*, and if he recovers by Formedon in Deſcender, he ought to aver that he is yet alive. Br. Judgment, pl. 151. cites 5 H. 7. 40.

18. A *Bar in one* Formedon in Deſcender *is a good Bar in any other* Formedon in Deſcender to be brought afterwards *upon the ſame Gift*. Co. Litt. 393. b.

19. In a Formedon in the Diſcender brought *by A. B. and C. of* Lands in *Gavel-kind*, the *Warranty of their Anceſtor was pleaded in Bar* againſt them; upon which they were at *Iſſue, if Aſſets by diſcent?* it was *found* by Verdict, *that the Father* of the Demandants *was ſeiſed in Fee*, being of the Nature of Gavelkind, *and deviſed the ſame to the Demandants, being his Heir by the Cuſtom, and to their Heirs equally to be divided* amongſt them; and if the Demandants ſhall be accounted in of the Lands by diſcent, or deviſe

deviſe, was the Queſtion? it was the Opinion of the Court, that they ſhould be in by the Deviſe; For they are now Joyntenants, and the Survivor ſhall have the Whole; whereas if the Lands ſhall be holden in Law to have Deſcended, they ſhould be Parceners, and ſo, as it were, Tenants in Common; and ſo by the Opinion of the Court, the Warranty pleaded with Aſſets was no bar. Hughes's Abr. 966. pl. 4. cites Paſch. 30 Eliz. in C. B. Leon. 113. Bear's Caſe.

20. Land was *given to Husband and Wife, and* to the *Heirs of their two Bodies* begotten; the *Husband made a Feoffment* in Fee, and died, leaving *Iſſue a Son* of that Marriage; the *Wife died* without making any *Entry*. Adjudged, that this Feoffment by the Husband made a Diſcontinuance of the Eſtate tail, which might have been purged by the Entry of his Mother; but now it cannot be done after her Death, therefore his Entry cannot be lawful; becauſe he muſt claim as Heir of their two Bodies; and he is prevented by the Feoffment to inherit as Heir to his Father; and if he ſhould bring a Formedon in Deſcender, it muſt be, for that the Donor gave the Lands to the Husband and Wife, & hæredibus de corporibus eorum, the Husband and Wife, exeuntibus, & quæ poſt mortem prædict' the Husband and Wife præfat' B. G. filio & hæredi ipſorum, the Husband and Wife, deſcendere debent per formam doni, which cannot be in this Caſe, becauſe by the Feoffment he cannot inherit as Heir to his Father. Nels. Abr. Formedon (A) 878. pl. 6. cites 8 Rep. 71. * Greenly's Caſe. Hughes's Abr. 965. pl. 13. cites S.C. *Paſch. 7 Jac.

21. A. made a *Feoffment to* the Uſe of *himſelf for Life*, Remainder *to B. in Tail; A. died, B. had Iſſue a Son and 2 Daughters; B. and his Son join in a Feoffment with Warranty and die without Iſſue.* The Daughters bring a Formedon; the Tenant pleaded this as a collateral Warranty, where in Truth it was Lineal, and it was held naught; becauſe the Warranty was Lineal. Brownl. 153. Trin. 16 Jac. Rot. 62. Biſhop v. Coſſen.

(N) Pleadings in Abatement, or Bar by Confeſſing and Avoiding.

1. FOrmedon of the Gift of R. the *Tenant ſaid, that A. leaſed to R. for Life, who gave*, by which *he entered for the Alienation, which Eſtate the Tenant has* Judgment, &c. the *Demandant ſaid, that after this R. was ſeiſed in Fee and gave*; and no Plea, without *ſhewing how he came by it after*; by which he *ſaid, that after the Death of A. T. was ſeiſed and infeoff'd R. who gave*, &c. and the Demandant ſaid that R. had nothing of the Feoffment of T. priſt; and the others econtra. Br. Confeſs and Avoid. pl. 11. cites 3 H. 4. 17.

(O) Pleadings. In what Caſes there muſt be Profert, or Monſtrans of Deeds.

1. FOrmedon *in Remainder*; the Defendant muſt ſhew Deed, and yet the Deed *is not traverſable*. Br. Monſtrans, pl. 48. cites 21 E. 3. 49. Br. Formdon pl. 33. cites S. C—S. P. ibid. pl. 14. cites 44 E. 3. 8.——Br. Monſtrans, pl. 22. cites 45 E. 3. 28.——S. P. and yet he ſhall not Count by the Deed, quod nota inde bene, per Brian, in a Note. Br. Monſtrans, pl. 110. cites 9 H. 7, 15.——S. P. F. N. B. 219. (C)

2. *But* he need *not, till* it be *demanded* by the Party, per Finche. Br. Monſtrans, pl. 15. cites 41 E. 3. 23.

3. *Formedon of a Rent-charge* againſt Tertenant, who ſaid that the Land is Hors de ſon Fee, Judgment, if without Specialty, &c. & non Allocatur, but was compelled to anſwer. And there 'twas agreed that, where the Rent

Rent had its commencement *before the Gift*, he might ſay, that ſuch a one was ſeiſed and gave, without ſhewing Specialty; *contra, if the Rent commenced by this Gift*, and this was the Opinion in ancient Time. But it was agreed, that *at this Day all is one*, and that he need not ſhew Specialty in the one Caſe, nor in the other; For if the Anceſtor imbezels, or * burns the Deed, the Heir ſhall not be without Remedy, and therefore was compelled to anſwer without ſhewing Specialty, quod nota. Br. Monſtrans, pl. 21. cites 45 E. 3. 14, 15.

* S. P. per Marten. but Cott. contra. Br. Monſtrans, pl 2. cites 2 H. 6. 14.

4. In Formedon *in Deſcender*, which is always executed, a Man *need not* ſhew Deed. Br. Monſtrans, pl. 34. cites 11 H. 4. 39.

Br. Nugation. pl. 4. cites S. C — Ibid. pl. 10. cites S. C. ——— Br. Formdon, pl. 23. cites S. C.

5. If a *Gift in Tail* be by the King *by his Letters Patents* which is *executed*; yet the Heir ſhall not have Formedon againſt the Letters Patents, per Marten, clearly. Br. Monſtrans, pl. 2. cites 2 H. 6. 14.

Formedon in Deſcender upon a Gift of King E. 2. and counted of the *Gift* of the Land *by Letters Patents*, &c. and per Brian and the beſt Opinion, he muſt ſhew the Letters Patents, notwithſtanding that the *Gift was executed*, and after the Defendant ſhewed the Letters Patents, therefore Brook ſays, Quære legem. Br. Monſtrans, pl. 112. cites 12 H. 7. 11.

6. In Formedon in Remainder, the *Tenant demanded Oyer of the Deed*, and the *Demandant would not ſhew Deed*; the Tenant ſhall go * ſine die; and yet if the Tenant had anſwered without challenging the Deed, it had been good. Br. Formdon, pl. 42. cites 38 H. 6. 19.

* *Orig.* [a dieu]

7. Tho' *Iſſue in Tail be of a Gift of Rent in* Tail, &c. which can't paſs but by Deed, yet *if the Gift be executed*, the * Heir in Tail ſhall have *Formedon* without ſhewing Deed; For he is *aided by the Statute of W. 2. cap.* 1. if the Deed be burnt or loſt, per Littleton, Choke and Brian J. Br. Monſtrans, pl. 60. cites 15 E. 4. 16.

* S. P. Br. Taile and Dones, pl. 26. cites 4 H. 7. 10. per Keble and Fairfax; For the *Formedon* is in the Right.

8. *So* where it is *by way of Defence*. Ibid.

9. Note that the *Deed of Tail belongs to the Heir in Tail*, and if the *Father breaks it*, yet the Heir ſhall have Formedon, tho' it be of * *Rent* without ſhewing of the Deed; For Formedon *is in the Right*, but *contra of Avowry or Aſſiſe for this is in the Poſſeſſion*. Br. Formedon, pl. 44. cites 4 H. 7. 10.

S. P. Br. Monſtrans, pl. 112. cites 12 H. 7. 11. per Vaviſour. —* S. P. Br. Formedon, pl. 52. cites 12 H. 7. 11. But Brook makes a Quære of it.

10. Leaſe for Life Remainder in Tail; Tenant for Life dies; Remainder-man enters and dies; his Iſſue ſhall have Formedon and declare on an immediate Gift, and not ſhew the Deed of it; but otherwiſe if 'twas *to execute* it, per Hales J. Pl. C. 52. in Caſe of Wimbiſh v. Talbois. —— cites 18 H. 8. 4. Br. Monſtrans 1.

Pl. C. 57. S. P. per Mountague Ch. J agreed; becauſe all paſſes at one time and by one Livery. ——— But if 'twas by Grant of Reverſion, there tho' he was once ſeiſed, yet it ſhould be otherwiſe; For in the 20 lib. Aſſ. placito ultimo the Difference is taken between *Remainder* and *Reverſion* Pl. C. 57. b. ——— Pl. C. 149.

Former Action.

(A) Pleadings. Good Plea, in what Caſes in general to the bringing a New Action.

1. THE bringing of a *quod permittat* by the Anceſtor, is no Eſtoppel to the Heir to bring *Aſſiſe of the ſame Common*. Br. Eſtoppel, pl. 188. cites 15 Aſſ. 3.

2. *In Aſſiſe by A. and B.* the Tenant demanded Judgment of the Writ; For *at another time A. B. and C. brought Aſſiſe, and appeared and made Plaint, and*

and this ſame Land was *put in View, and againſt this Tenant, and which C. is yet alive not named*; & non allocatur; For if the firſt Writ was ill brought, it is Reaſon that this Writ may be well brought, and alſo it may be that they entered, and C. releaſed to A. and B. and after they are diſſeiſed, and brought the Aſſiſe, by which the Writ was awarded good; and it appeared that *in the firſt Writ they were Nonſuited.* Br. Brief, pl. 301. cites 31 Aſſ. 14.

3. If a Man be barred in *Treſpaſs*, yet he may have *Appeal of Robbery*; quod nota. Br. Eſtoppel, pl. 217. cites 2 R. 3. 14.

4. A *Bar* in a *former Action wrongly brought* is not any bar in an Action rightly brought; as where one delivers Goods, and brings *Treſpaſs* againſt the Bailee for thoſe Goods, and he is barred by Verdict, or Demurrer, yet he may bring *Detinue* or *Account*. Cro. E. 668. Paſch. 41 Eliz. C. B. Ferrers v. Arden.

Tho' once a Bar in a *Perſonal Action* is a Bar perpetual; that is to be underſtood when it is a *Bar to the Right*. But where an Executor brought Debt on Bond as Adminiſtrator, he not knowing that he was Executor, and had taken Adminiſtration, by which the Action abated: this was only a *Miſconceiving his Action*, and is no Bar in a new Action brought by him as Executor. Cro. J. 15. Robinſon v. Robinſon.———See 5 Rep. 32. b. 33. Robinſon's Caſe.———6 Rep. 7. a. Ferrer's Caſe.—The meaning of Ferrer's Caſe is that it is a Bar *for the ſame Individual Thing*, per Holt Ch. J. Comb. 167.

5. *But* where a *Title* is pleaded in *Bar* to a Thing demanded, and, by Reaſon thereof, the Plaintiff is barred upon *Demurrer, or Verdict*, the Intereſt thereby is bound, and the Plaintiff barred from bringing a New Action, per Walmſley J. Cro. E. 668. Paſch. 41 Eliz. C. B. Ferrers v. Arden.

6. *A. brought Treſpaſs againſt B.* for digging and carrying away Turf and Stones; B. pleaded a Preſcription, and upon Iſſue joined, a *Verdict was for B.* Afterwards *A. and J. S. bring Treſpaſs againſt B.* and declare for digging and carrying away Turf and Stones; B. pleads that he was ſeiſed of a Meſuage or Tenement there, and ſo juſtified by a Preſcription; Plaintiffs in their *Replication traverſed the Preſcription*, and the Defendant *rejoined* by way of Eſtoppel, *that A. ſuch a Term brought Treſpaſs againſt the Defendant, wherein Defendant pleaded the ſame Preſcription, and upon Iſſue joined thereupon, it was found by Verdict for Defendant*, and the Record was ſet forth in certain, and *averred*, that it was the *ſame Title*, and that this A. and the A. in the other Action, are the ſame Perſon, and ſo concluded by way of Eſtoppel by the Verdict. Mich. 1 W. & M. B. R. Incledon v. Burges.

This Caſe is Reported Carth. 65 & 67. and ſays, that as to the Matter in Law, (viz.) the Eſtoppel the Court gave no Opinion; but Judgment was for Defendant on another Point in Pleading. ——Show. 27. S. C. Reports that the Court gave no Opinion as to the Eſtoppel, but only ſaid, that an Eſtoppel upon a Verdict goes a great way; and that Iſſue in Tail ſhall never falſify it; cites 1 Cro. 325. but if *one Man is eſtopped, and he joins another with him*; whether this ſhall avoid the Eſtoppel is a Quære.——Comb. 166. S. C. Reports that it being inſiſted by the Defendant's Counſel, that as to the Matter in Law, where in perſonal Actions the Perſon is once barred by Verdict, he is for ever concluded, and cited 6 Rep. 7. Ferrers's Caſe, to which Holt Ch. J. anſwered, that the Meaning of Ferrer's Caſe is, that it is a Bar *for the ſame individual Thing*; but *here is a new Cauſe of Action.* 13 E. 4. 2, 3, 4. there *one Treſpaſs* is a *Bar to another* by way of Eſtoppel, but that is *for taking a Villain*, but that is grounded, perhaps, on the Reaſon of the *Favour of Liberty.* 7 H. 6. 8. In Treſpaſs on an *Iſſue, whether ſuch a one died ſeiſed*, a *Verdict* was a Bar to another Action of Treſpaſs by way of Eſtoppel, becauſe there Iſſue was joined on a *Matter in the Realty.* Dolben J. ſaid Ferrer's Caſe is not like this; For here is a new Cauſe of Action, a new Treſpaſs; but in Ferrer's Caſe, 'twas another Action for the ſame Treſpaſs, and the Court was entirely againſt what was ſaid by the Defendant's Counſel.

7. Action ſur Caſe for erecting of a *Nuſance* 20 February; the Defendant pleaded a Prior Action, brought for erecting a Nuſance 20 die Martii, and a Recovery thereupon, and avers theſe to be the ſame Nuſance and Erection. The Plaintiff demurred and Judgment againſt him; For he may have an Action for *continuing of the ſame Nuſance*, but can never have a new Action for the *ſame Erection.* 1 Salk. 10. Mich. 10 W. 3. B. R. Johnſon v. Long.

8. Where a *Record of the ſame Court* is pleaded in Abatement, and the Plaintiff demands *Oyer* of the Record, and 'tis not given him in convenient Time, the *Plea* ought not to be received, but the Plaintiff may Sign his

Carth. 51. Hill. 11 W. 3. B. R. Cremer v. Wickett.

his Judgment; and the Rule was, that unleſs the Defendant gave Oyer of the Record the next Day, Judgment ſhould be for the Plaintiff. Carth. 454. Trin. 10 W. 3. B. R. Theobald v. Long.

9. *New conſequential Damages* ſhall not give a new Action in *Aſſault* Battery and Maihem after a former Recovery had. 1 Salk. 11. Trin. 13. W. 3. B. R. Fetter v. Beale.

10. The Plaintiff *counted upon ſeveral Promiſes for Work and Labour* in the Pariſh of St Mary le Bow, London; the *Defendant pleaded* in Abatement, that before this Action brought the *Plaintiff had Libelled in the Admiralty for the ſame Cauſe of Action.* Upon Demurrer it was inſiſted for the Plaintiff, that this was within the Rule of Sparrie's Caſe. 5 Rep. 62. that a Priority of Suit, in an Inferiour Court, is no Plea to an Action brought in any of the Courts at Weſtminſter, and the whole Court gave Judgment againſt the Defendant, quod reſpondeat ouſter. Gibb. 313, 314. 5 Geo. 2. C. B. Dudfield v. Warden.

(B) Pleadings. Varying the Places in which, &c. from what they were alleged to be in the former Action.

1. ASSISE *of Lands in M.* the *Tenant ſaid that* at another Time the *Plaintiff brought Aſſiſe in T. and the ſame Land put in View* which is now put in View, *ſuppoſing it in T.* Judgment of the Writ which now ſuppoſes it in M. and becauſe he did not deny but that M. and T. are diverſe Vills, nor alleged Judgment to be given in the firſt Aſſiſe, nor did he allege in Fact that the Land is in T. therefore the Plea was not allowed; and ſo it ſeems here, that *Record is no Eſtoppel, unleſs Judgment was given in that Writ*, quod nota. Br. Eſtoppel, pl. 137. cites 30 Aſſ. 32.

2. *Aſſiſe*, the *Defendant ſaid that at another Time the Plaintiff brought Cui in Vita of the ſame Lands againſt J. S. which Eſtate this Tenant has*, Judgment if a Writ of a baſe Nature may be brought; the *Plaintiff ſaid that the ſame J. S. diſclaimed in the Cui in Vita, by which the now Plaintiff entred, and was ſeiſed till by the Defendant diſſeiſed*, and good Maintenance of the Writ. Br. Maintenance de Brief, pl. 32. cites 33 Aſſ. 5.

(C) Pleadings; Againſt the ſame Parties, with a different Charge, as charging the one as Principal, and the other as Acceſſory, and after Vice Verſa.

Br. Peremptory, pl. 85. cites S. C. And it was awarded, that the Plaintiff Capiatur.

1. APpeal of *Maihem againſt A. as Principal, and B. as Acceſſory*, the *Defendant ſaid, that the Plaintiff*, at another time, *brought ſuch Appeal againſt B. as Principal, and A. as Acceſſory*, and appeared to it, and after was nonſuited; Judgment, if, &c. by which he took nothing by his Writ. Br. Eſtoppel, pl. 143. cites 40. Aſſ. 1.

Former Suit.

(A) Former Suit in Equity. In what Caſes it is a good Plea.

1. THE Defendant pleads, that the Plaintiff brought a *former Suit for the ſame Matters, which Suit is ſtill depending for ought he knows to the contrary.* It was inſiſted for the Plaintiff, that this Plea was not good, becauſe he does not poſitively aver, that the former Suit is ſtill depending; and no Iſſue can be taken upon his Knowledge to the contrary. But the Maſter of the Rolls allowed the Plea, becauſe the Defendant [Plaintiff] ought not to have *ſet it down to be argued*; for by that he *admits that the former Suit is depending*; but the Plea *ought to have been referred* to a Maſter, to examine whether there was a former Suit depending for the ſame Matter, or not; and ſaid, that there needs no poſitive Averment, that the former Suit is ſtill depending, for that is examinable by the Maſter; and the Defendant *never ſwears a Plea of a former Suit depending*, but it is always put in without Oath. Vern. 332. Trin. 1685. Urlin v. .....

2. The general Rule is, that the Party ſhall not be twice vexed for the ſame Cauſe of Action; but then it muſt appear, that the *Court firſt poſſeſſed of the Cauſe had Juriſdiction*, and nothing ſhall be intended to be within the Juriſdiction of an inferior Court, but what is *averred* ſo to be. per Eyre, Ch. J. Trin. 5 Geo. 2. Gibb. 314. in Caſe of Dudfield v. Warden.

Fractions.

(A)

1. THE Law will divide the *Operations of Acts* done, and *place one before another*, though done at one, or ſeveral times; as if Tenant for Years makes Leaſe for Life, &c. the Law ſays, that Leſſee was ſeiſed in Fee, and demiſed for Life, yet before he made the Leaſe for Life, he was not ſeiſed in Fee, but by making it he became ſeiſed in Fee, and gained the Reverſion to him, for ſo long as the Leaſe ſhall continue; So if A. conveys a Manor by Feoffment, now the Manor does not paſs, and yet by Attornment of the Tenants it paſſes in ſome Reſpects from the time of the Feoffment, and ſo as to paſſing the Manor, the Attornment ſhall relate to other time than that in which it was made; ſo that in ſome Caſe, the Law makes a thing done after another Act, as if it had been done before, and other Acts done at one Time, as done at ſeveral, and Joint Acts as ſeveral. And. 301. in Caſe of Matthew v. Johnſon and Taylor.

2. *Deviſe* was allowed to work by Fractions. See Deviſe, ( ) Nurſe v. Yarmouth.

(B) As

(B) As to * Eſtates.

* See Eſtate, (J. b) pl. 9.

1. THE *Law* * *loves not* Fractions of Eſtates, nor to divide and multiply Tenures; and therefore Jointenancies were favoured, per Holt, Ch. J. 1 Salk 392. Hill. 12. W. 3. B. R. in Caſe of Fiſher v. Wigg.

* 1 Rep. 87. Corbet's Caſe. — As to *Rent Common*, &c. there may be, but not as to Land; yet one *Parcener*, by Feoffment, may enjoy the Land one part of the Years and the other the other Part, becauſe, 'tis only at to *Poſſeſſion*, or taking the Profits, but is not Severance of the Inheritance; per Walmſley. J. 1 Rep. 87. Paſch. 41 Eliz. C. B. in Corbet's Caſe.— —Wms's Rep. 21. per Holt.

2. *Act* of *Parliament* may make Diviſion of Eſtates. 1 Rep. 137. Hill. 31 Eliz. in Chudley's Caſe.

See 1 Rep. 45. b. in Altonwood's Caſe.

3. *Seigniory*, or *Rent*, cannot be *ſuſpended in Remainder*, and in Eſſe for a particular Eſtate in Poſſeſſion, for then will enſue Fraction of Eſtates, and particular Eſtates will be created without Donors or Leſſors againſt the Rules and Maxims of the Law. 9 Rep. 134. b. Mich. 9 Jac. in the Court of Wards, in Aſcough's Caſe.

Vent. 277. per Hale. Ch. J. cont. as to the Rent; For where the Leſſor does not enter wrongfully, there can be no Suſpenſion or Extinguiſhment; and there can be no Apportionment againſt the *Agreement of the Parties*. Mich. 27. Car. 2. B. R. Hodgkins v. Robſon and Thornborough.———2 Lev. 143. S. C.

4. Nor can they be *ſuſpended* for part, and in Eſſe for part, *in reſpect of the Land out of which* it is iſſuing. 9 Rep. 134. b. in Aſcough's Caſe.

5. Where the Copyholder has the *Nomination of his Succeſſor*, Coke, Ch. J. conceived, he cannot nominate part to one, and part to another, nor divide it into Fractions. 2 Brownl. 199. Trin. 10 Jac. C. B. Rowles v. Maſon.

Mo. 894. Mich. 16 Jac. C. B. S. C. Sir Geo. Shirley v. Underhill and Burſey. This ought to be underſtood, if there be no Judges have cites 12 E. 4. 4. Caſe.

6. Advowſon is an *Hereditament Incorporeal*, and may be divided by Fraction, ſo as one ſhall have the Nomination, and another the Preſentation; and the Nomination may be appendant to a Manor to one, and the Preſentation in Common to the other. per Hutton, J. Jo. 25. Hill. 20 Jac. C. B. cites Sir George Shirley's Caſe.

7. *Eſtates* ſhall *not paſs by* Fractions. Arg. 2 Mod. 113. in Caſe of Pigot v. the Earl of Salisbury.

Inconvenience the other way, but frequently *to avoid a Tort*, or an *Inconvenience*, the interpreted Eſtates to paſs by Fractions. Arg. 2. Jo. 69. Hill. 28. Car. 2. B. R. S. C. 4. Co. Lit. 42. 26 H. 8. 13. Roll. Eſtate 854. Clanrickard's Caſe. — 1 Rep. 76. Bredon's Caſe.

(C) As to Time.

1. AN *Act of Record* will not admit any Diviſion *of a Day*, but is to be ſaid done the firſt Inſtant of the Day, Arg. and Judgment, accordingly. Paſch. 23 Eliz. Mo. 137, in Shelly's Caſe.

Hard. 24. S. C. cited.

2. If the *King's Tenant pays his Rent upon the Day*, the King's Succeſſor ſhall have it paid over again; tho' otherwiſe it is in Caſe of a common Perſon. Mich. 11 Jac. 10 Rep. 127. b. cites 44 E. 3. 3. b.

3. *Aſſumpſit, to pay* 40 *l. by* 5 *s. per Month*; where a Man brings an Action for breach, on the firſt Day, it is beſt to count of the Damages for the entire Debt; For he cannot have a new Action; But he muſt not declare that the 40 l. is not paid, nor any part of it; For the

the 40 l. is not yet due. Cro. J. 505. Mich. 16 Jac. B. R. Beckwith v. Nott.

4. In Presumption of Law, when a thing is to be done upon one Day, all that *Day* is allowed to do it in for the avoiding of Fractions in Time, which the Law admits not of, but in Case of Necessity. Per Roll. Ch. J. Sti. 119. Trin. 24 Car. B. R. in Case of **Cornish v. Conste**, cites H. 14 Jac. More v. Musgrave.

5. If a *Bishop collates the same Day that he dies*, his Successor shall present. Arg. Hard. 24.

6. Insurance for H's Life; H. died on the last Day. Per Holt, Ch. J. The Law makes no Fraction *in a Day*; yet, in this Case, he dying after the Commencement, and before the end of the last Day, the Insurer is liable, because the *Insurance* is *for a Year*, and the Year is not compleat till the Day be over; yet, if A. be *born* on the 3d Day of September, and on the 2d Day of September, 21 Years afterwards, he makes his Will, this is a good Will; For the Law will make no Fraction of a Day, and by Consequence he was of Age. 2 Salk. 625. Trin. 11 W. 3. B. R. at Guildhall. per Holt, Ch. J. in Sir Robert Howard's Case.

Fraight.

(A) Fraight. How much. In what Cases.

1. WHERE a Ship *goes from one Port to another, and there unloads*, and then *goes over to another Place, but* in her Passage, *before her second Unloading, is lost*, the Owner shall not recover for Freight, but from the time of the Loading to the Unloading, and nothing for the second Loading; For if a Ship be lost before her Unloading, no Freight shall be paid, but every one must bear his Part of the Loss; and this is the reason that Mariners lose their Wages in such Cases. Sid. 236. Hill. 16 & 17 Car. 2. B. R. Anon.

2. If a Merchant *put in more Goods than were conditioned*, in such Case the Master may *take what Fraight he please*. Mal. Lex. Merc. 99. Molloy 258.

3. If a Ship be fraighted *by the Great*, Posito 200 Tons, for the Sum of 600 l. *to be paid at the Return*; the said Sum of 600 l. is to be paid, altho' the Ship were not of that Burthen. Mal. Lex. Merc. 100. Molloy 260.

4. If the like Ship of 200 Tons be fraight, and the *Sum is not* (either by the Great or Ton) *expressed*; then such Fraight as is accustomed to be paid in the like Voyage is due, and ought to be paid accordingly. Mal. Lex. Merc. 100. Molloy 257.

5. If the like Ship of 200 Tons be fraighted *by the Ton, and full laden, according to their Charter-Party*, then Fraight is to be paid for every Ton; otherwise but for so many Ton as the Lading in the same was. Mal. Lex. Merc. 100. Molloy 256.

6. If the Ship of 200 Tons be fraighted, and *named to be of that Burthen in their Covenant*, and, being fraighted by the Ton, shall be *found to be less* in bigness, there is no more due to be paid than by the Ton, for so many as the same did carry and brought in Goods. Mal. Lex. Merc. 100. Molloy 257.

7. If the like Ship be fraighted *for* 200 *Tons, or thereabouts*, this Addition (or *thereabouts*) is within 5 Tons commonly taken and understood Molloy 257.

ſtood, as the Moiety of the Number 10, whereof the whole Number is compounded. Mal. Lex. Merc. 100.

Molloy 25- 8. If the like Ship be fraighted *by the Great, and the Burthen* of it is *not expreſſed* in the Contract, yet the Sum agreed upon is to be paid, without any Cavillation. Mal. Lex. Merc. 100.

9. If Fraight be agreed upon for the Commodities laden, or to be laden, for *a certain Price for every Pack*, Barrel, Butt, and Pipe, &c. *without any Regard had to the Burthen of the Ship*, but to give her the full Lading: No Man maketh Doubt, but that the ſame is to be performed accordingly. Mal. Lex. Merc. 100.

But if the Fraight be contracted *for the tranſporting* them, if Death happens, there ariſeth due no more Fraight than only for ſuch as are living at the Ship's Arrival at her Port of Diſcharge, and not for the Dead. Molloy 256. ——— *But* if the Cattle or Slaves are ſent aboard, and *no Agreement* is made, *either for Lading or Tranſporting* them, *but generally*, then Fraight ſhall be paid, as well for the Dead as the Living. Molloy 256.

10. If Fraight be contracted *for the Lading of certain Cattle*, or the like, from Dublin to Weſt-cheſter, if *ſome* of them happen to *die before the Ship's Arrival* at Weſt-cheſter, the whole Fraight is become due, as well for the Dead as the Living. Molloy. 256.

11. If Fraight be contracted for the *tranſporting of Women*, and they happen in the Voyage to be *delivered of Children on Ship-board*, no Fraight becomes due for the Infants. Molloy. 256.

12. If Goods are ſent on board *generally*, the Freight muſt be according to Freight for the like accuſtomed Voyages. Molloy. 257.

13. If *Goods* are *brought* into a Ship *ſecretly againſt the Maſter's Knowledge*, the ſame may be ſubjected to what Freight the Maſter thinks fitting. Molloy 258.

(B) Fraight. Due. In what Caſes.

1. COvenant was made by the Merchant with a Maſter of a Ship, viz. *that if he would bring his Freight to ſuch a Port*, then *he would pay him ſuch a Sum*; Maſter brings Action, and ſhews that *Part* of the Goods *were taken* away *by Pirates, and* that *the Reſidue* of the Goods *were brought to the Place appointed*, and there unladed, and that the Merchant hath not paid, and ſo the Covenant broken. And the Queſtion was, whether the Merchant ſhould pay the Money agreed for, ſince all the Merchandizes were not brought to the Place appointed? and the Court was of Opinion, that he ought not to pay the Money, becauſe the Agreement was not by him performed. Brownl. 21. Trin. 9 Jac. Bright v. Cowper.

* Roll R. 312. S. C. takes no Notice of the not mentioning any time. Neither does 3 Buls. 152. 153. S. C. but only that Coke Ch. J. ſaid, that if one aſſumes to pay another ſo much within a Year, but no certain Time limited when this ſhall be, he ought here to give *Notice of the Time* when it ſhall be, that ſo he may then attend it ——— Molloy 253. S. C. according to Jenk. 324. pl. 39.

2. A. contracts with B. and aſſumes to him *to deliver* to him 100 *Quarters of Barley on Ship-Board* in ſuch a Port, viz. *at Barton Haven in Com' Ebor.* and does *not mention at what Time it is to be carried thither, &c.* A. [B] aſſumes to B. [A.] to carry it, and to be at this Port with it, and B. [A.] agrees to pay ſo much for [the Fraight of] the ſaid Quarters of Barley. A. [B.] arrives with his Boat there. A. is bound to ſeek B. at the ſaid Haven, and to deliver to him the ſaid 100 Quarters as aforeſaid. A. does not perform this, altho' B. has perform'd his Promiſe, and was there ready to receive it. B. brings an Action on this Aſſumpſit, and it well lies. The Place in this Caſe is certain, the Time uncertain; the Law gives convenient Time. And in this Caſe, B. after the ſaid Agreement came to the Port and ſtaid there a convenient Time; and A. did not come, &c. Jenk. 324. pl. 39. cites Mich. 13 Jac. Atkinſon v. Buckle.

3. Fraight is the *Mother of Wages*, and wherever Fraight is due, Wages are. If a *Ship is loſt before it comes to a delivering Port*, no Fraight nor Wages is due; if loſt *afterwards*, 'tis due at the laſt delivering Port. If *Advance Money* be paid before in Part of Fraight, and named ſo in the Charter-Party, tho' the Ship be loſt before it comes to a delivering Port, yet Wages are due according to the Proportion of the Fraight paid before; For the Fraighters cannot have their Money. Ruled per Saunders Ch. J. at Guildhall. 2 Show 283. Hill. 34 and 35 Car. 2. Anon.

4. If the *Ship in her Voyage become unable without the Maſter's Fault*, or that the Maſter or Ship be *arreſted by Authority* of the Magiſtrates in her Way; the Maſter may either mend his Ship or fraight another. * But in Caſe the *Merchant agree not thereunto*, then the Maſter ſhall at leaſt recover his Fraight, ſo far as he hath deſerved it. For otherwiſe, (except the *Merchant conſent*, or † *Neceſſity conſtrain* the Maſter, *to put the Goods into another Ship* worſe than his own) the Maſter is herein bound to all Loſſes and Damages, except both Ships periſh in that Voyage, and that no Fault or Fraud be found in the Maſter. Mal. Lex Merc. 98.

Molloy 254. —* Molloy 255. —† If there be extreme Neceſſity, as that the *Ship is in a ſinking Condition, and an empty Ship is paſſing by*, or at Hand, he may tranſlate the Goods; and if that Ship ſink or periſhes, he is there excuſed: But then it muſt be apparent that that Ship *ſeemed probable and ſufficient*. Molloy 255.

5. If a Maſter ſet forth his Ship for *to take in a certain Charge* or Lading, and then *takes in* any *more*, eſpecially *of other Men*, he is to loſe all his whole Fraight; For by other Men's Lading, he may endanger his Maſter's Goods divers Ways. Mal. Lex Merc. 99. Molloy 258.

4. If a Ship (being fraighted *by the Great for a Sum certain*) happen to be *caſt away*, there is nothing due for Fraight; *but* if the Ship be fraighted *by the Tun*, or Pieces of Commodities and is *caſt away*, *and ſome Goods are ſaved*, then it is made queſtionable, whether any Fraight be due for the Goods ſaved *pro rata*. Mal. Lex Merc. 100. Molloy 260. S. P. and in Marg. ſays, that whenever ſuch Misfortune happens, the Enſured commonly *transfer theſe Goods over to the Aſſurers*, who take them towards Satisfaction of what they pay by Virtue of their Subſcriptions.

7 If *Goods* are *fully laded Aboard*, *and the Ship hath broke Ground*, the *Merchant*, on Conſideration afterwards, reſolves not on the Adventure, but *will unlade again*; by the Law Marine, the Freight is due. Molloy 254.

8. If it be *agreed*, that the Maſter *ſhall ſail from London to Leghorn in two Months*, and Fraight accordingly is agreed on, if he *begins the Voyage within the two Months*, tho' he does not arrive at Leghorn within the Time, yet the Fraight is become due. Molloy 255.

9. If Fraight be taken for 100 *Tuns of Wine*, and 20 *of them leak out*, ſo that there is not above 8 Inches from the Buge upwards, yet the Fraight become due: One Reaſon is, becauſe from that Gage the King becomes entitled to Cuſtom; but if they be under 8 Inches, by ſome, it is conceived to be then in the Election of the Fraighters to fling them up to the Maſter for Fraight, and the Merchant is diſcharged. But moſt conceive otherwiſe; For if all had leak'd out, (if there was no Fault in the Maſter) there is no Reaſon the Ship ſhould loſe her Fraight; For the Fraight ariſes from the Tonnage taken, and if the Leakage was *occaſioned thro' Storm*, the ſame, perhaps, may come into an Average. Beſides in Bourdeaux, the Maſter ſtows not the Goods, but particular Officers appointed for that Purpoſe, quod nota. Perhaps a *ſpecial Convention* may alter the Caſe. Molloy. 259.

10. A Ship in her Voyage happens to be *taken by an Enemy*, and afterwards in Battle is *retaken* by another Ship in Amity, *and Reſtitution is made*, *and* ſhe *proceeds on* in *her Voyage*; the Contract is not determined, tho' the taking by the Enemy diveſted the Property out of the Owners, yet by the Law of War, that Poſſeſſion is defeaſible, and being recover'd in Battle afterwards, the Owners become reinveſted: So the Contract, by Fiction of Law, becomes as if ſhe never had been taken, and ſo the entire Fraight becomes due. Molloy. 259.

(P. 2) Fraight. Decreed in Equity.

1. MOnies agreed to be paid for the Fraight of a Ship were decreed to be paid, tho' the Ship *did not arrive at the delivering Port*, ſhe being unladed at another Port, and *fraudulently cauſed by* one of the Fraighters, (and who was likewiſe *a Part-Owner) to be condemn'd* there; but for the *Value of the Ship*, the Plaintiffs could not be relieved in this Court but at Law. Mich. 26 Car. 2. Fin. R. 149. Norton & al. v. Barnard, Serle, & al.

2. A. was Owner, and B. Maſter of a Ship; C. entered into a Charter-Party, by which A. agreed *that the Ship ſhould ſail to New England to take in Fiſh* on the Account of C. *and thence to Barcelona, and there to deliver the Fiſh.* And *C. covenanted with A. to pay* the Fraight *on Delivery* of the Fiſh. The Ship arriv'd at Barcelona, and the *Fiſh are deliver'd to D.* and *B. demanded the Fraight of D.* and *D. demanded a Deduction* out of the Fraight *for* 170 *Kintals of Fiſh wanting*, as D. pretended, of what was to be deliver'd, and for Damage of Part of what was deliver'd. Croſs Suits were commenced between B. and D. in the Courts at Barcelona, by which Means, the *Fraight being ordered to be brought into Court*, and Conſideration to be had for Damages for D. and by D's appealing after to a ſuperiour Court there, *B. finding his Fraight not likely to be got out of Court in ſome Years, came away without any Fraight for Want of Money.* Then *A. ſues C. on his Charter-Party here* for his Fraight. C. brings his Bill to ſtop the Proceedings here, tho' the Suit was not for the Penalty, but only to recover Damages. Ld Chancellor, taking Notice that the Cauſe was not fully determined at Barcelona, becauſe the Damages were not fully aſcertain'd, order'd that A. ſhould proceed to Trial againſt C. upon his Covenants, and therein give in Evidence the Non Payment of his Fraight, and what Damages he had thereby, and that C. might give Evidence in Mitigation of the Damage. Mich. 33 Car. 2. 2 Chan. Caſes 74. Newland v. Horſeman.

3. Tho' a *Charter-Party* is *worded ſo that no Fraight can be recovered at Law* upon it, yet they may be relieved in Equity. Hill. 1690. 2 Vern. 210. Edwin v. E. India Company.

4. *As*, A. and B. were Part-Owners of a Ship, of which C. was Maſter, and A. and B. by Charter-Party, dated 20 Feb. 1652. let her to fraight to the E. J. Company, and agreed to fit her up with all Neceſſaries, ſo as ſhe might be ready to ſail by 10th of March then following, and ſhe was to go from Port to Port, *and to any Port within the Limits of the Company's Charter, as they ſhould direct, but to be diſpatched back for England on or before the 24th of January* 1684, *or ſo ſoon after as to ſave her Moorſoon for England that Year*; *or in Default* of her being diſpatched within the Time, *the Owners were to pay four Months Demurrage*, at 7 l. 10 s. a Day for her Moorſoon ſo loſt, and her Stay in India after the 20th January 1684. And there was this further Clauſe, that the *Company might detain the Ship* in their Imployment in Trade or Warfare, *for any longer Time not exceeding* 12 *Months*, after the 20th January 1684. *after the Rate of* 7 l. 10 s. 6d. a Day Demurrage, *untill the Ship be diſpatched from the laſt lading Port, or Expiration of* 12 *Months, which ſhall firſt happen; but after the* 12 *Months expired, ſhe is to return to England, and the Company not to be liable for any further Demurrage, or any Damage* that may accrue *by her Detention after.* The Company covenant *to pay Fraight on the Ship's Arrival into England, for* 301 *Tun, and Demurrage from 20th January* 1684. *until ſhe be diſpatched for the Space of* 12 *Months after the ſaid 20th January* 1684. And it was thereby provided, *that until ſix Days after the Ship's Return to the Port of London, and making a full Diſcharge of all her Lading the Company are not to pay any of the Sums* of Money agreed on for Fraight or Demurrage or for detaining her in India; *it being the Intent of the Parties, that if the*

Ship

Ship ſhould be loſt either in her outward or homeward bound Voyage, *nothing ſhould be paid by the Company for Demurrage.*——The Ship ſet ſail according to the Charter-Party, and arrived in India, and was employ'd by the Company in Trading from Port to Port for one Year and upwards. She arrived in India 23 November 1684, and was to enter into Demurrage in four Months after, which was the 23 March 1684, and the 12 Months after (during which Time the Company by their Charter-Party might detain her) ended 23 March 1685. But the Ship *was imploy'd in the Company's Service, ſo that ſhe did not arrive at Surat till* 1686, *and thence was ordered to Bombay*, where ſhe having been ſo long detain'd in thoſe Seas, was ſurvey'd, and *found not ſufficient for a Voyage to England*, and on Sept. 24, 1686. *the Seamen were diſcharged, and the Ship left there.* The Company refuſed to pay any Thing for the Fraight or Demurrage, becauſe by the expreſs Proviſion of the Charter-Party, they were not to pay till ſix Days after the Ship's Arrival in England, and diſcharged of her Lading. And if they were to pay any Thing, yet they were to be charged with Demurrage until March 23, 1685 only, and no longer, and that ſo it is provided by the Charter-Party, and refuſed likewiſe to account for the Value of the Ship, or ſhew how they had diſpoſed of her. The Court held that tho' the *Charter Party was ſo penn'd, that nothing could be recover'd at Law*; yet the Plaintiff had a juſt Demand, and *ought to be reliev'd in Equity*; And decreed the Company to account for what they made of the Ship, that they ſhould pay Demurrage according to the Rate mention'd in the Charter-Party, and ſhould alſo be charged in reſpect of the Fraight. But as to the Quantum of the Fraight, the Court would further conſider of it, in regard, that by the Charter Party, there are *ſeveral Rates agreed on to be paid for the Homeward bound Cargo of the ſeveral Sorts of Goods*, viz. for Callicoes, &c. 21*l.* a Ton for Salt Peter 18*l.* a Ton for Iron, Copper, &c. 6*l.* a Ton; and therefore, before final Judgment, would be informed what Quantities of theſe Reſpective Commodities were *uſually brought Home on ſuch a Voyage*, and how much in Proportion to each other. Hill. 1690. 2 Vern. 210. Edwin & al. v. the Eaſt India Company.

5. Fraight was *agreed* to be paid, not for the Goods exported, but *only for Goods imported.* No Goods were provided by the Factor Abroad, ſo that the Ship *returned empty.* The Court decreed the Payment of Fraight, cited per Cur. Hill. 1690. 2 Vern. 212. as the Caſe of Weſtland v. Robinſon.

(C) Who liable for Fraight or Loſſes.

1. IF a Merchant in Ireland *conſign* Goods to a Merchant in London, and the *Maſter ſigns a Bill of Lading*, the Merchant here ſhall be liable for the Fraight by the Cuſtom of Merchants, and held good. 2 Show 443. Mich. 1 Jac. 2. B. R. Roberts v. Holt.

2. Three Part-Owners of a Ship, one refuſed to fit out the Ship to Sea, and the *others fit out without his Conſent, and the Ship is loſt in the Voyage.* Per Ld North; The Loſs of the Ship ſhall be equally born by all three. For he that refuſed would have been intitled to one Part of the Fraight, and ſhould have had an Account here of the Profits; but if the other Part-Owners had *applied to the Court of Admiralty*, as regularly they ſhould have done, that Court would have made an Order, that on one Part-Owner refuſing to navigate the Ship, the other two ſhould have had Liberty to do it alone, and ſhould not have been *accountable* to the other Part-Owner, that refuſed to join, for any of the Profits; and there, in Caſe the Ship had been loſt, the whole Loſs muſt have reſted on thoſe two that ſet out the Ship, but in the preſent Caſe, the third Perſon, that refuſed to join with the other two, would have been intitled to a Share of the Profits of the Voyage, if any had been made by the Ship, and ſo ought to bear his Proportion of the Loſs. Hill. 1684. Vern. R. 297. Strelly v. Winſon.

Molloy 257. ——S. P. per Nottingham. C. Tr. 32 Car. 2. 2 Ch. Caſes 36. Anon.—The Part-Owners refuſing, applied to the Admiralty for *Security to be given* by the Fraighters, and a Prohibition deny'd in B. R Gibb. 197. Hill. 4 Geo. 2. B. R. Dimmock v. Chandler.

But where this is occaſioned by taking in more Goods, eſpecially of other Men than agreed for, it ſhall not be made good by Contribution or Average, but by the Maſter's own Purſe For if he *over burthen* a Ship above the true Mark of Lading, he ſhall pay a Fine. Mal. Lex Merc. 99.—Molloy 258.

3. Where *Part* of a Fraight of a Ship is *flung over Board for ſaving the reſt*, the Remainder ſhall be *contributory* to the Loſs. But where Part is *carried to Land* and ſaved, that ſhall not be contributory to the Loſs of the reſt being *taken by an Enemy* for fear of whom the other was carried to Land. Parl. Caſes 18. Sheppard v. Wright——als. Dormer v. Wright.

(D) Who liable. How far.

1. THE Charter-Party values the Ship at a certain Rate, and you ſhall not oblige the *Owner* further, and that only with Relation to the Fraight, not to the *Value* of the Ship. Per Finch. C. Mich. 29 Car. 2. 2 Chan. Caſes 238. Anon.

2. Where an Action is brought for Fraight and *Damages laid to double the Sum* of the Penalty of the Charter-party; Execution ſhall not go beyond that Penalty, tho' more ſhould be recovered in Damages. Mich. 31 Car. 2. Fin R. 435. Betſworth v. Clerk, Archer and al.

(E) Who liable. At what Time.

1. BY the Courſe of Merchants the *Receiver is to pay* Fraight on the Receipt of the Goods. Mich. 33 Car. 2. 2 Chan. Caſes 75. in Caſe of Newland v. Horſeman.

2. If a Ship be *fraighted out and in*, there ariſes due for Fraight nothing till the *whole Voyage* be *performed*, ſo that if the Ship die, or is caſt away coming home, the Fraight outwards as well as inwards becomes loſt. Molloy 257.

(F) Pleadings.

Molloy 252. S. 4

1. INdenture of *Charter Party dated* 8 *Sept.* 38 *Eliz.* made between A. the Plaintiff, and B. A. having *hired* of B. *a Ship* for a Voyage *to Dantzick for Corn*; upon taking the Ship, it was agreed between them, that the Ship ſhould be laden with Corn to Dantzick, and to ſail to Leghorn. Now by the ſaid Indenture, upon Conſideration *A.* had *agreed that B. ſhould have the Moiety* of the Corn, *quod tunc fuit, or afterwards ſhould be laden* in the Ship in the ſaid Voyage, *B. promiſed to pay the Moiety of the Money for the ſaid Corn, quod tunc fuit, or afterwards ſhould be laden* &c. And allegeth in Facto, that upon the *9th October* 38 *Eliz. the Ship was laden* with 60 Laſtes of Corn, and for non Performance of this Covenant brought the Action. *B. pleaded* that the *Deed was ſealed and delivered* the *28th October* 8 *Eliz.* Et *quod ad tunc vel poſtea*, there *was not any Corn laden there*, and *traverſes the Delivery* thereof 9 *October*, or at any Time *afterwards before the 28th October* 38 Eliz. And it was thereupon demurred, (the Truth is, the Corn was caſt away between the 9th and 28th of October). Reſolved by all the Court, that in Regard, he declares upon a Deed dated the 9th October 38 Eliz. It ſhall be always *intended to be delivered*, and have his Eſſence *at that Time*, and at no other; and if he would afterwards confeſs it to be delivered at any other Time, it is a Departure from his Declaration, as ‡ 5 H. 27. primo Eliz. D. 167. 1 H. 6. 4. and 5 Rep. fol. 1. And the Words of the Deed, That he ſhould pay for the Corn then laden, or afterwards to be laden therein: This

‡ 5 H. 7. 27. a.

Word

Word *tunc*, is *referr'd to* the Time of the Eſſence of the Deed by the *Delivery*, *and not to the Date*; For if it were deliver'd 10 Months after the Date, he ſhould not have any Benefit of the Corn laden, and ſpent or ſold before the Time of the Delivery, therefore he ſhall not be charged with it for the Time before the Delivery, wherefore the Plea and the Traverſe are good. And it was adjudged for the Defendant. Cro. J. 263, 264. Mich 8 Jac. B. R. Offley v. St Baptiſt Hicks.

2. A. aſſum'd to B. for a valuable Conſideration to *go ſuch a Voyage* in ſuch a Ship *before Auguſt following*. B. brings Aſſumpſit and alleges a Breach in the *Non Performance*. A. pleaded that before any Breach, B. on the *4th April*, at ſuch a Place, *Exoneravit eum*, *of the ſaid Promiſe*. And upon Demurrer, it was adjudged a good Diſcharge; For as the Action was grounded on a Parol Promiſe, it may be diſcharged by Parol. Cro. C. 383. Mich. 10. Car. B. R. Langden v. Stokes.

3. A. the Maſter of a Ship, covenanted with B. a Merchant, *to go with his Fraight the firſt fair Wind*, and B. covenanted to pay ſo much for the Fraight. A. brought Action of Covenant for his Wages, and alleged that he had performed his Voyage. B. *traverſed that he did not go with the firſt fair Wind*. And upon Demurrer, it was held, that the Traverſe was not good; For it is only a Circumſtance, and nothing is traverſable, but what is material. See Lat. 12. 49. Conſtable v. Clobery. Poph 161 S. C——Palm. 397. Paſch 21 Car. 1. B. R. S C.

4. W. *was to raiſe* 500 *Soldiers*, *and to bring them to ſuch a Port*, and *C. was to find Shipping*, for which he ſued upon the Covenant tho' the other had not rais'd the Soldiers; For that can be only alleg'd in Mitigation of Damages, and is no Excuſe for the Defendant; And adjudg'd that this was not a Condition precedent, but diſtinct and *mutual Covenants*, upon which ſeveral Actions might be brought. Arg. 2 Mod. 75. cites Sti. 186. Ware v. Chappel. At firſt the Court was divided, (viz.) Roll Ch. J. and Aſk. againſt Jermin and Nicholas, but afterwards Nicholas changed his Opinion, and it was adjudged for the Plaintiff. Niſi Cauſa. Sti. 186. Hill. 1649 B. R S. C.

5. In Covenant, the Plaintiff declared that he *covenanted* to ſail with a Ship to D. and there *to take* 280 *Men* of the Defendant, and to carry them to J. and *Defendant covenanted to have the* 280 *Men ready* there, and to pay for the Fraight *5 l.* for each Man; and that *Defendant had not the* 280 *Men* ready, *but only* 180. That the Plaintiff took and carry'd them, but that Defendant hath not paid him for them. Defendant *pleads* that that he had the 280 *Men ready and tender'd them* to the Plaintiff, but that he would not receive them: *But* the Defendant ſaid *nothing* in his Plea *as to the Carriage of the* 180 Men, *nor as to the Non Payment* of the Fraight for them. And upon Demurrer, the Plaintiff had Judgment, becauſe it was not a Plea to the whole Declaration, but only as to the Carriage. Lev. 16. Hill 12 and 13 Car. 2. B. R. Tompſon v. Noël.

6. A Maſter of a Ship *covenanted with A. to ſail to M.* and to have Mariners ready to re-lade the Ship, and then to return with the firſt fair Wind to L. and deliver the Goods. *A. covenanted to pay ſo much* for the Fraight and Demurrage. Upon an Action brought by the Maſter for the Freight, Defendant *pleads that the Ship did not return directly* to L. but *made ſeveral Deviations*, *by which the Goods were ſpoil'd*. But upon Demurrer, the Plaintiff had Judgment. For the *Covenants are mutual*, and reciprocal, and each Party may have his Action againſt the other, but one is not pleadable in Bar of the other. 3 Lev. 41. Trin. 33 Car. 2. C. B. Cole v. Shallet. S. P. 2 Jo. 216. Shower v. Cudmore.

7. The Maſter of a Ship covenants *that the Ship ſhall be* well *furniſhed with Men*, and the Fraightors covenant that the Ship ſhall return in 12 Months; 'tis a good Plea that the Ship was *not ſufficiently provided* with Men. Show. 334. Mich. 3 W. & M. B. R. Wynne v. Fellowes.

Franchiſes.

(A) What a Franchiſe, or Liberty is; And how it may be.

1. FRANCHISE *is* Royal Privilege in the Hands of a Subject. Fin. 38.

2. At Niſi Prius at *Exeter*, *Charter was ſhewn for the Vill, that of Iſſue ariſing within their Vill, the Inqueſt ſhall be taken by Denizens Inhabitants only*, and *not by Foreigners*, and prayed Allowance, by which the Foreigners were ouſted, and was taken all of the Denizens. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 17. cites 29 Aſſ. 15.

3. Franchiſes cannot be divided, if they are entire Franchiſes, as to have Goods of Felons, Outlaws, &c. or Waiſs, and Strayes, &c. and therefore if they deſcend to two *Coparceners*, no Partition can be made of them. Godb. 17. Paſch. 25 Eliz. C. B. Lord Mountjoy v. Earl of Huntington.

4. Every Franchiſe, Liberty, or Privilege, *either lies in Point of Charter*, and cannot be granted by Preſcription, *as Bona & Catalla Felonum, &c. or* lies *in Preſcription* on Uſage in Pais, without the Aid of any Charter, *as Wreck, Waif, Straies*, &c. 9 Rep. 27 b. in a Nota of the Reporter's, in the Caſe of the Abbot of Strata Marcella.

5. Franchiſes which lie *in Point of Charter*, are *either before time of Memory, or within time of Memory*; (viz. from the time of R. 1.) if before time of Memory, either it was *by ſpecial Words*, which ſeldom or never was done, *or by general, ancient, obſcure, ambiguous, and obſolete Words*; and whether by the one or the other, yet becauſe they were made time out of Mind, and ſo are not any Record pleadable of themſelves, they ought to be aided by ſome other Matter of Record within
* 2 Inſt. 281. time of Memory, as Allowance * before Juſtices in Eyre, or of B R. or C. B. or Barons of the Exchequer, or by Confirmation by the King's Charter of Record, within time of Memory, and ſhall be allowed but for ſuch part only of the Grant, as had been ſo allowed or confirmed, though all be in one and the ſame Patent; And ſuch ambiguous, &c.
† 2 Inſt. 282. Grant, ſhall be † conſtrued as the Law was taken, when ſuch Charter was made. 9 Rep. 27. b. 28. a. in a Nota by the Reporter, in the Caſe of the Abbot of Strata Marcella.

6. Franchiſe *tenere placita is* Power to hold Plea of Matters within ſuch a Precinct, but does *not exclude any other Juriſdiction*, nor entitle the Lord to claim Conuſance. per Holt Ch. J. 12 Mod. 645. Hill. 13. W. 3. B. R. in Caſe of Croſſe v. Smith.

See Preſcription.

(A. 2) How they may be by Preſcription or Appendant, &c. And claimed How; And Allowance thereof.

Nor he who has Liberties in Groſs by Preſcription, 1. IF the *King grants Liberties to J. S.* he cannot grant them over. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 38. cites 6 E. 2.

as *Hundred*, &c. cannot grant them over. Br. Franchiſes pl. 38. cites 6 E. 2.

2. In

2. In Account, the *Defendant ſhall not plead that the Matter aroſe in a Franchiſe*, which has Conuſance of Pleas, *but the Bailiff's ought to demand it*; for otherwiſe it ſhall not be granted. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 11. cites 39 E. 3. 17.

3. If a Patent grants Tenere placita *before his Steward*, and *he has not any Steward*, it is good; for he may make a Steward; But it ſeems that he *ought to have Court before*. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 4. cites 7 H. 4. 5.

4. If a Man has uſed *by Preſcription to hold Plea by Writ of Right-Cloſe*, and *has alſo a Charter of the King of Conuſance of Pleas, and accepts the Franchiſe in Court of Record*, by the Charter, he loſes the Advantage of the Preſcription to hold Plea by Writ of Right; per Gaſcoigne. Br. Franchiſe, pl. 6. cites 8 H. 4. 19. —— But 21 H. 7. 5 Contra by three Juſtices. Ibid.

5. Men have *ſeveral Liberties* in England, which *never were allowed in Eyre*; per Thirn; But it ſeems, that they are *thoſe which never were ſeiſed in any Eyre*. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 7. cites 11 H. 4. 16.

6. In Recordare, it was agreed, that where a Man claims *Cuſtom to have a Fine for Alienation* of his Tenant, it ſhall not be allowed, without ſhewing Allowance in Eyre or elſewhere; becauſe it *is againſt common Right*. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 8. cites 14 H. 4. 3.

7. Note, that a *Corporation*, who *appoint a General Attorney for them in C. B.* &c. may, by the ſaid Attorney, challenge Liberties. Br. Corporations, pl. 36. cites 4 H. 6. 6.

8. Franchiſes, *which lie in Point of Charter*, may be preſcribed for, if the Party has an Allowance in Eyre, which is ſuch Poſſeſſion as the Statute 18 E. 1. intends. 9 Rep. 29. in Caſe of the **Abbot of Strata Marcella**, in a Nota of the Reporter there; cites 18 H. 6. tit. Preſcription, 45, and ſays, it ſtands upon great Reaſon; For that the *Charter might be made before the Conqueſt*, and ſo anciently, that the Charter itſelf, and every Inrollment of it, might be utterly periſhed and conſumed.

9. If Conuſance of Pleas, or other Franchiſes, are allowed, it *binds the King till it be reverſed*. By all the Juſtices. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 32. cites 13 E. 4. 5.

10. Note, that Allowance of Franchiſes *in Quo Warranto, or in Eyre, ſhall conclude the King*; For this is the Suit of the King to try Franchiſes. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 40. cites 10 H. 7. 13.

Contra of Allowance *in C. B. or other Court.* Br. Franchiſes, pl. 40. cites 10 H. 7. 13.

11. A Patent of *Grant of Conuſance of Pleas*, which is *before time of Memory*, viz. in the Time of King H. 2. ſhall not be allowed at this Day, if it has not been allowed after in Eyre. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 13. cites 21 H. 7. 29. per tot. Cur.

And if it be *granted in D. and C. and has been allowed in D. and not in C.* it ſhall not now be allowed in C. though it be one entire Patent. Br. Franchiſes. pl. 13 cites 21 H. 7. 29.

(B) Power and Privilege; of * Bailiffs of Franchiſes, and in what Caſes puniſh'd.

*See Return, (R. 2) Trefpaſs, (G. a. 3) pl. 21.

1. WHERE *Præcipe* quod reddat is brought *of Land, Parcel in Guildable, and parcel in Franchiſe*, the Writ ſhall abate, if the Franchiſe has Conuſance of Pleas; Contra, if the Franchiſe has only returna Brevium. per Gaſcoign & Huls. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 27. cites 8 H. 4. 7.

*So where Aſſiſe is brought, &c. Br. Brief. pl. 114. cites S. C. —— S. P. granted, per Cur. Arg. Ibid pl. 138. cites 38 E. 3. 16.

2. If a Man has a Leet, and may enquire of Felony, and has ſuſpected Perſons, he *cannot deliver them*; but the Juſtices of Delivery ſhall do it. per Cur. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 5. cites 8 H. 4. 18.

3. In Quare impedit, it was granted, that where the *Sheriff does Execution in Franchiſe*, it is good; For he is immediate Officer to the Court; Contra where Bailiff [of a Franchiſe] does Execution in the Guildable; And the *Lord* of the Franchiſe, in the firſt Caſe, *ſhall have his Remedy for the breaking of the Franchiſe*. Br. Executions, pl. 32. cites 11 H. 4. 7. 9.

4. Note, for Law that thoſe who have *Liberties of Infangthief*, cannot uſe *Gaol Delivery*, *nor give Judgment of Death*; And if they do, it is Miſpriſion, and they ſhall make a great Fine to the King. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 33. cites 2 R. 3. 9.

5. By Grant of *Conuſance of Pleas*, the *Franchiſe ſhall make the like Proceſs and Execution as is at Common Law*; For this belongs to the Conuſance of Pleas. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 39.

6. Per Glynn Ch. J. Mich. 1658; If one be arreſted *by the Sheriff* of the County within a Liberty, without a *Non omittas*, yet the Arreſt is good; For the Sheriff is Sheriff of the whole County, but the Bailiff of the Liberty may have his *Action* againſt the Sheriff, for entering of his Liberty; But upon a *Quo Minus*, a Sheriff may enter any Liberty, and execute it Impune. R. S. L. 116. cites Pract. Reg. 72.

7. The Sheriff, upon a *Non Omittas*, *Capias utlagatum*, or *Quo minus*, may enter and make an *Arreſt* in any Franchiſe. L. P. R. 635.

8. The *Authority* of Bailiffs of a Liberty, and *in what Caſes* the *Sheriff may intermeddle*, and where he muſt direct his Warrant to the Bailiff of the Liberty; and in what Manner the *Proceſs out of the Palace Court* muſt be executed, and to whom it muſt be directed. See Skin 413 to 418. the Reporter's Argument. Hill. 5 W. & M. B. R. in the Caſe of **Wentworth v. Broadwater**, for executing the Proceſs of the Palace Court, within the Liberty of the Savoy.

(C) Extinguiſhed or loſt.

1. THe *Sheriff wrote* his Mandate *to the Bailiff*, *upon a Venire Facias*, and the *Bailiff was the Defendant's Servant*, *and returned the Lands of the Plaintiff and Defendant*, by which *Non Omittas iſſued*, and the Lord loſt his Franchiſe *for the time*, Quod Nota. Br. Franchiſe, pl. 29, cites 38 E. 3. 25.

Br. Juriſdiction. pl. 17. cites S. C.

2. Unity of Poſſeſſion in the King of a *Manor*, which is *within the Cinque Ports*, which *came to the King by Eſcheat*, *as parcel of his Manor of E.* was not an Extinguiſhment of the Liberty, nor did this make it Guildable; And therefore it ſeems, that *it is a Cuſtom which goes with the Land*, as Gavelkind, &c. and not with the Seigniory. Br. Franchiſes. pl. 3. cites 49 E. 3. 24.

3. It was agreed, that where theee are *Bailiffs of a Vill.* and they *have Liberties* by Grant of the King, and after the *King alters their Corporation* into Sheriffs, yet they ſhall enjoy their firſt Liberties. Quod Nota. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 12. cites 14 H. 6. 12.

4. Where the *Inheritance of the Crown was given to King H. 7. and the Heirs of his Body*, *with all Pre-eminences and Prerogatives*, yet it did not extend to the Franchiſes and Liberties of other Men; by all the Juſtices. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 20. cites 1 H. 7. 12.

5. If a *Vill be incorporated* by the King before time of Memory, and the *Franchiſe never was uſed within time of Memory*, they have loſt their Franchiſe. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 10. cites 14 H. 7. 1. per Vaviſor.

6. Ancient Franchiſes are by Forfeiture *extinct in the Crown*, but new Franchiſes

Franchiſes are not ſo. The Dutchy of Lancaſter, being forfeited for Treaſon, is not extinct, being a *new Creation*. Jenk. 160. pl. 3.

(D) Reſtrained.

1. WHERE the *King is Party*, the *Venire Facias ſhall make Mention of Non Omittas*; for where the King is Party, the Sheriff ſhall not write to the Bailiff of the Franchiſe, but ſhall ſerve the Proceſs himſelf. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 18. cites 41 Aſſ. 17. per Knivet, Ch. J. S. P. per Grene. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 31. cites 38. Aſſ. 19 And that the Franchiſe ſhall not hold Place. *But* if this Clauſe, *licet fuerimus pars*, be in the Charter, then it ſeems it is otherwiſe.

2. No Franchiſe ſhall be allowed in any Caſe, where the Franchiſe doth *fail to Adminiſter Juſtice* within the Franchiſe; but if there be ſuch a failer, this Court by their Authority may intermeddle (notwithſtanding the Privileges of the Franchiſe) to compel them to do Juſtice (Mich. 22 Car. B. R.) For Privileges are not granted to protect Men in neglecting to do Right, or to do Wrong; and this Court is the Superintendent Court of the Nation to ſee Juſtice equally diſtributed to all Perſons. L.P.R. 635.

(E) Forfeited.

1. A Man has Franchiſe, and *uſes more than he ought*; this is a Forfeiture but if he *uſes leſs*; this is finable; For the one is Miſ-uſer and the other Non-uſer. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 37. cites the Time of E. 1. Itin. Not.

2. If a *Man has ſeveral Franchiſes*, and the *one does not depend upon the other*, if he *miſuſes any*, he ſhall not forfeit all, but only thoſe which are miſuſed. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 14. cites 22 Aſſ. 34. per Thorp. *But if the one depends upon the other* there if he miſ-uſes the one, all ſhall be ſeiſed and forfeited to the King. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 14. cites 22 Aſſ. 34.——S. P. Fin. 38.

3. *And* if a *Man has Franchiſe and uſes it well*; there *if he makes Purpreſture upon the King*, he forfeits nothing but that which is taken in; per Bank. Br. Ibid. *As* where he has *Market to hold every Week on the Friday*, and he *holds it the Friday and the Monday*, in this Caſe nothing ſhall be forfeited but that which he has purpriſed. Br. Franchiſe, pl. 14. cites 22 Aſſ. 34.——*But* he who has *Fair to hold at 2 Days, and holds it 3 Days*, he forfeits the whole Fair. Ibid——*So* where a Man has *Market to hold the Saturday, and he holds it another Day*, the Market ſhall be forfeited, and he ſhall make Fine for the Miſ-uſing, per Bank, quod nota, double puniſhment, quia non negatur. Br. ibid.——Fin. 38.

4. If a Man has *Gaol Delivery* by Liberty, and *holds Men in Priſon, becauſe he will not be at the Charge to have Deliverance*, this is a Forfeiture of his Liberty. Br. Forfeiture de terres, pl. 93. cites 8 H. 4. 18. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 5. cites S. C.—If he who has Gaol keeps *Priſoners acquitted, who had paid their Fees*, the King * ſhall re-ſeiſe for ever for the Miſ-uſer Br. Franchiſes, pl. 26. cites 20 E. 4. 5.——* *Orig.* (reſceivera.)

5. Error ſued to the Bailiff of Reading, and *at the Pluries*, the *Bailiffs came and prayed another Day, and had one*, &c. *by Aſſent of the Party*, and *at the Day did not return the Record, but came and prayed another Day*, and the *other Party would not Aſſent*; and per Vaviſor, the Franchiſe ſhall be re-ſeiſed. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 26. cites 20 E. 4. 5.

6. For if the *Warden of the Fleet be commanded to bring in his Priſoner, and does not*, the Office ſhall be ſeiſed, and this *where he is commanded by the*

the Court; contra where he is commanded by Proceſs, per Vaviſor. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 26. cites 20 E. 4. 5.

S. P. Br. Forfeiture de terres, pl. 115 cites 20 E. 4. 6 per Pigot.—See Show. 276. Mich. 3 W. & M. in Caſe of the King v. the Mayor of London.

7. If a *Lord refuſes to do a Thing according to his Franchiſe, or does contrary* to his Franchiſe, *or Miſ-uſes it by himſelf by his Bailiff or Deputy*, or *Non-uſes* the Franchiſe, the Franchiſe ſhall be reſeiſed, per Huſſey. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 26. cites 20 E. 4. 5.

S. P. Br. Forfeiture de terres, pl. 115 cites 20 E. 4. 6. per Pigot.

8. *And all Lords who have Franchiſe ſhall be Attendant upon the Juſtices of Aſſiſe* in Perſon, or by their Bailiffs, and otherwiſe they forfeit their Franchiſes for this Nonfeaſance, per Pigot. Br. ibid.

But if he *claims one Day by the Patent, and another by Preſcription*, which is found falſe in the Preſcription, yet he ſhall not forfeit his Patent. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 22. cites 2 H. 7. 11. per Brian——*And Market* ſhall not be forfeited *by Nonuſer, unleſs of a Thing which of Neceſſity ought to be done* as of Clerk of the Market, &c. For there Non-uſer is a Forfeiture. Ibid—Fin 38.

9. If the King grants to one a *Fair for one Day in the Year*, and he *holds Fair 2 Days*, and *claims this in the Exchequer upon Proceſs*, he forfeits all his Franchiſe. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 22. cites 2 H. 7. 11. per Brian.

10. If the *Under-gaoler* often ſuffers Priſoners, viz. 2 or 3 times, to eſcape, 'tis a *Forfeiture* of Liberties. Savil. 15. pl. 40. Paſch. 22 Eliz. Sir John Arundell's Caſe.

11. Franchiſe ſhall be ſeiſed if it be *claimed by any but by him that has the Freehold.* Yelv. 191. Mich. 8 Jac. B. R. in Caſe of the King v. Staſſerton, cites Cro.

12. Quo Warranto was brought againſt the Mayor and Burgeſſes of Wiggan in Lancaſhire, for Uſing of certain Liberties, viz. Fairs, Markets, and Courts, and at the Day of the Return of the Writ they *do not appear*; and it was agreed, per totam Cur. that if they do not ſhew good Cauſe in Excuſe of their Default, then their Liberties ſhall be *ſeiſed into the King's Hands* according to the Book of 15 E. 4. and * Brigg's Caſe. 2 Roll. R. 92. Trin. 17 Jac. B. R. the Caſe of Mayor and Burgeſſes of Wiggan.

* 2 Roll. R. 46. Trin. 14 Jac. B. R.

13. *In a Court Leet* of a Manor *in a Foreſt* the *want of an able Steward*, is a Cauſe of Seizure, and *ſo* is the not having Officers and Things for the Execution of Juſtice, as *Conſtables, Aletaſters*, &c. and *Pillory, Stocks*, and *Cuckingſtool, &c. ſo* likewiſe for *puniſhing Bakers more than three times, and not ſetting them on the Pillory*, all theſe are Cauſes of Seizure, 'till Payment of a Fine for the Abuſe, and Replevin of the Franchiſe, by Noy 8 Car. 1. Jo. 283. Totterſall's Caſe.

14. One claimed Waifs and ſtrays within his Manor in a Foreſt; by Noy, theſe Franchiſes may be ſeiſed, till they be replevied, if there had been no Allowance in the laſt Eyre. 8 Car. 1. Jo. 285. Englefield's Caſe.

15. A Judge *ignorantly condemns* a Man to Death *for Felony*, when it is not Felony, in a Manor Court which has the Franchiſe of Infangthief; for this Offence the Judge ſhall be *Fined and Impriſoned, and loſe his Office*, and the Lord ſhall loſe his Franchiſe. Theſe Points were reſolved in the Star-Chamber, upon an Aſſembly of all the Judges there, by the Command of King Ric. 3. Jenk. 162. pl. 7.

16. The conſtant Practiſe of Inferiour Courts to *iſſue* Precepts of *Capias without Summons*, I think, is ſuch an *Abuſe* of their Franchiſe, that peradventure, this ſhall be a *Forfeiture* of it; I know no other Method to remedy it; per Powell J. 2 Lutw. 157. Mich. 4 & 5 W. & M. in Caſe of Gwynn v. Poole.

17. All Franchiſes are granted on Condition, that they ſhall be *duly Executed according to the Grant*, and if they neglect to perform the Terms, the Patents may be repealed by *Scire facias*. 12 Mod. 271. Hill. 11 W. 3. in Caſe of the City of London v. Vanacre.

(F) Diſpute

(F) Diſputes between them and the Sheriff.

1. IF *Bailiff* of Fee, or Bailiff *of a Franchiſe returns a Pannel to the Sheriff*, and *he returns other Pannel of himſelf*, this ſhall not be outed at the Prayer of the Bailiff, but they ſhall have their Action againſt the Sheriff. Br. Action ſur le Caſe, pl. 83. cites 30 Aſſ. 5.

2. If the *Sheriff makes Execution in the Franchiſe this is good*; For he is Officer immediate to the Banks; but if *Bailiff of the Franchiſe does ſo in the Guildable, this is Error*, and this by Hill and Norton, quod non contradicitur. Br. Office & Off. pl. 35. cites 11 H. 4. 9.

3. *Sheriff enters* into ſuch Liberty, and the Grant is ſhewn to him; if he *makes Execution* 'tis good, but Lord of the Franchiſe ſhall have Action on the Caſe againſt him. Arg. Roll. R. 119. Hill. 12 Jac. B. R. Derby (Vill) v. Foxley. Arg Hard. 12 admitted, becauſe the Court takes no Notice of Franchiſes, and the Sheriff is the Officer to the Court, notwithſtanding the Franchiſe and the Lord of the Franchiſe is but a ſubordinate Miniſter to the Sheriff. Mich. 1655. in the Exchequer in the Caſe of Newman v. Phillips.

(G) Pleadings, &c.

1. WHERE Proceſs is *re-ſummoned out of the Franchiſe to the Bank*, there the Tenant need not to *ſave the Default* which was made in the Franchiſe, per Cur. For there nothing ſhall be of Record in the Bank but the Original only, and not the meſne Acts which were done in the Franchiſe. Br. Franchiſes, pl. 28. cites 2 H. 4. 8.

2. *Treſpaſs of taking Beaſts in the County of Northumberland, and Chaſing to N.* where N. was *in the Biſhoprick of Durham*, and this pleaded, and yet the Defendant was compelled to Anſwer, and the Reaſon ſeems to be inaſmuch as *Communis Lex eſt magis digna.* Br. Juriſdiction, pl. 22. cites 2 H. 4. 25. Br. Brief, pl. 22. cites S. C.

3 Upon Iſſue joined, one came for the Mayor and Bailiffs of Oxford, and *ſhew'd a Charter that they of Oxford ſhall not be impannelled with Foreigners*, and prayed Allowance; per Cur. the Mayor and Bailiffs cannot plead it, but the Men impannelled ſhall ſay it upon their Appearance; by which the Juror who appeared pleaded it, but the Juror may relinquiſh the Advantage of it if he will, and ſo he did. Br Franchiſes, pl. 30. cites 4 H. 6. 6.

4. Tho' the Charter, or *Letters Patents are loſt*, yet the *Exemplification*, or Conſtat of the Roll may be ſhewed forth, by the Statutes of 3 E. 6. and 13 Eliz. And when any claimed before the Juſtices in Eyre, any Franchiſes by an *Ancient Charter*, tho' it had expreſs Words for the Franchiſes claimed, or if the Words were general, and a *continual Poſſeſſion pleaded of the Franchiſes claimed*, or if the Claim was by old and obſcure Words, and the Party in pleading expounding them to the Court and averring continual Poſſeſſion according to the old Expoſition, the *Entry was* always *Inquiratur ſuper Poſſeſſionem & Uſum, &c.* 2 Inſt. 282. where Ld Coke ſays, he had obſerved as above in divers Records of Eyres according to that old Rule.

5. The Difference between an *Avowry and a Quo Warranto* is, that in an Avowry the Avowant is not compelled to *ſhew his Title to* his Franchiſe, but only to ſay generally, that he hath ſuch a Franchiſe; but in a Quo Warranto he muſt ſhew it particularly. 9 Rep. 29. b. in a Note of the Reporter there, in the Caſe of the Abbot of Strata Marcella.——— cites 8 Ed. 3. 10. b. 11.

6. If the Party has continued Poſſeſſion tortiouſly, the Judgment is that he ſhall be *ouſted*; but if he had once a Title and loſt it, the *Judg-*

ment ſhall be that the Liberty ſhall be *ſeiſed*. Yelv. 192. cites 15 E. 4. 7. Mich. 8. Jac. B. R. in Caſe of the King v. Staverton.

7. When any Thing is ſhewed to be done within a Liberty, or a Franchiſe, 'tis not neceſſary to *ſhew within what County*, that Liberty, or Franchiſe *doth lie*; For the Franchiſe hath no Relation to the County. L. P. R. 635. cites Trin. 23 Car. 1. B. R.

8. *Caſe by Bailiff* of a Liberty, that has the Execution and Return of Writs, againſt one for *entring his Liberty*, and executing a Fi. fa. is good *without ſhewing by what Right* he claimed the Liberty. Show. 17. Paſch. 1 W. & M. B. R. Cary v. Bacchus, als. Matthews.

9. In ſome Caſes you cannot ſet up a Franchiſe, tho' you have *Letters Patents* for it; as if I have a *Ferry*, I will bring an Action againſt you for ſetting up another; becauſe I muſt keep up mine for the Good of the Publick, which would be hard upon me if you get all the Profit. But otherwiſe it is where the *Publick is not concerned*; per Holt Ch. J. and Judgment acc. Holt's Rep. 20. Hill. 5 Annæ in Caſe of Keeble v. Hickeringil.

*Frankalmoigne.

*See Co. Litt. tit. Frankalmoign. 93. b. to 100. b.

(A)

1. *Frankalmoigne is not any Service.* Br. Aid del Roy. pl. 13. cites 35 H. 6. 56.

2. 12 *Car.* 2 24. §. 7. Enacts, that this Act *ſhall not take away Tenures in Frankalmoigne, nor ſubject them to greater Services.*

Fraternity.

(A)

1. GUild or Fraternity *cannot be made, unleſs by ſpecial Incorporation.* Per Littleton, Juſtice. Br. Corporations. pl. 60. cites 20 E. 4. 2.

2. Fraternity *is* ſome People of a Place united together in reſpect of a Miſtery and Buſineſs into a Company, and their Laws and Ordinances cannot bind Strangers, for they have not a local Power or Government. 1 Salk. 193. Hill. 2 Annæ. B. R. Cuddon v. Eaſtwick.

3. Corporarion *may make* a Fraternity. per Cur. 1 Salk. 193. Hill. 2 Annæ. B. R. Cuddon v. Eaſtwick.

Fraud.

(A) Fraud. [*To prevent Forfeiture to the King, or Lord, for Crimes.*]

See (C) pl. 1. Marg. Paunceſoot v. Blunt.

1. IF a Man make Feoffment of his Land to the Uſe of his Son, being an Infant, and not upon Communication of Marriage, and then that is to ſay ten Days after commits Treaſon, of which he is afterwards attainted, This Land ſhall be forfeited to the King; for the Feoffment, ſhall be adjudged fraudulent, and void againſt the King. H. 8 Jac. in the Exchequer. per Cur.

But if this Feoffment was made in Performance of an Agreement made a Year before, by which it was agreed, that the Feoffor ſhould make ſuch Conveyance, &c. and the Feme of the Feoffor being Inheatrix, ſhould make ſuch Conveyance of the Land, which was alſo done accordingly, in this Caſe this Feoffment ſhall not be adjudged fraudulent againſt the King. H. 8 Jac. In the Exchequer. per Cur.

2. If a Man alien Land, to the Intent that it ſhall not be forfeited, and after does Felony, this Land ſhall be forfeited. P. 48 E. 3. B. R. Rot. 1.

(A 2.) Fraud. What is in general.

1. QUOD *alias bonum & Juſtum eſt, ſi per vim vel fraudem petatur, malum & injuſtum efficitur.* 3 Rep. 78. Hill. 44 Eliz. in Chancery in Farmor's Caſe.

2. Fraud ought to be Fraud at the beginning; For *ſubſequent Fraud*, will not make a Conveyance to be fraudulent. 2 Buls. 226. Paſch. 12 Jac. Stone v. Grubham.

It is not conſiſtent with Common Senſe, that a preſent Agreement, not then fraudulent, ſhould be varied, and *become fraudulent by future Accidents*; per Raymond and Gilbert, Commiſſioners, and they ſaid, it muſt be conſidered as it is in itſelf, without Regard to any thing Extrinſick. Sel. Ch. Caſes, in Ld King's Time. 6. Paſch. 11 Geo. 1. in Caſe of Dews v. Brand.—See (A. 3) pl. 4.

3. Where *Recovery* is upon *legal Cauſe*, it cannot be ſaid Covinous, tho' it was on *Conſent*, and to the Intent to prevent another of his Debt. Jo. 92. Hill. 1 Car. B. R. in Caſe of Veale v. Gateſdon.

4. A Merchant *imports 9 Tons and a half of Wine*, he ſhall pay *Priſage* notwithſtanding; for it is Fraud apparent. Hard. 56. Paſch. 1656. in the Exchequer. Att. Gen. v. Shirt.

5. A. on his *Marriage with B. a Dutchwoman in Holland, agrees to leave a compleat Maintenance* for her and her Children, but *not expreſſing what.*—A. afterwards aſſigns Bonds to Truſtees, and gives a Letter of Attorney to receive the Money. By the *Cuſtom in Holland*, ſuch Agreement between Baron and Feme, and ſuch Aſſignment of Bonds are good, and therefore are to be allowed here. Per Ld K. Finch. Trin. 26 Car. 2. 1 Chan. Caſes. 232. Athcomb's Caſe.

6. A. indebted to B. *aſſigns Land by Way of Truſt, to pay* B. 750*l.* A. confeſſes *Judgment to C.*——*B. receives, and pays to A.* the Profits, to the Amount of 800*l.*——B. had no notice of the Judgment, nor was there any Extent on the Judgment. Ld K. decreed an Account, and the 800*l.* not

to

to be allowed otherwiſe than as to go in Satisfaction of B's Debt. Mich. 27 Car. 2. 2 Chan. Caſe. 207. Miller v. Stephens.

7. A. and B. make *Croſs-Settlements of their Eſtates*; A's Eſtate was of moſt Value, and he conveyed it by Bargain and Sale inrolled.——B. ſettled his by Covenant to ſtand ſeiſed. Afterwards A. propoſed to ſell Part of his Eſtate, and B. negotiated the Sale. A. by Will, deviſed his Eſtate to a Relation, and dy'd. The Court held the *inequalities of Value*, and alſo *of Aſſurance*, and B's negotiating the Sale as *Badges* of Fraud, and decreed A's Eſtate to the Deviſee. 33 Car. 2. 2 Ch. R. 221. King v. Hele.

(A. 3) Fraudulent Conveyance.

Sir Ed. Northey ſaid, it had been ruled forty Times in his Experience, at Guild-Hall, that if a Man *ſells Goods*, and continues in Poſſeſſion as viſible Owner, 'tis fraudulent, and void as to the Creditors, and that it has always been ſo held. Hill. 1709. Ch. Prec. 287. in Caſe of Bucknal v. Royſton. ——Mich. 28 Car. 2. Fin. R. 271. Oakover v. Pettus.

1. AN abſolute Conveyance, and a *Continuance in Poſſeſſion* afterwards, ſhall be adjudged in Law fraudulent. per Coke, Ch. J. 2 Buls. 226. Paſch. 12 Jac. Stone v. Grubham. 2 Vern. R. 262. S. P. P. 1692. in Caſe of Hungerford v. Earle.—5 Rep. 60. b. Mich. 32 & 33 Eliz. B. R. Gooch's Caſe.——Mo. 638. Paſch. 44 Eliz. in the Star Chamber. Chamberlain v. Twyne.

2. If A. aſſigns a Leaſe to B. and the Leaſe *continues in the Cuſtody* of A. 'tis fraudulent; otherwiſe not. 2 Bulſ. 226. Paſch. 12 Jac. Stone v. Grubham.

3. A Conveyance cannot be fraudulent *againſt Articles*, unleſs another Conveyance be executed in a legal Courſe. Arg. Hill. 23 and 24 Car. Chan. Caſes. 217. Holford v. Holford.

See (A. 2) pl. 2.

4. A Deed not at firſt fraudulent, may *afterwards become ſo*, by being *concealed*, or *not purſued*; by which Means Creditors are drawn in to lend the Money. Per Hutchins Commiſſioner. Paſch. 1692. 2 Vern. R. 262. in Caſe of Hungerford v. Earle.

(B) Fraudulent Conveyances *of* * *Lands* ſet aſide.

*Voucher (N. b) pl. 1, 2.

Savil 126. S. C. by Name of White v. Bacon.

1. IN Formedon, Tenant pleads Non Tenure, and it was found by Verdict, that *before the Writ, the Tenant enfeoff'd ſeveral Perſons*, with Intent to defraud ſuch as had Cauſe of Action for the ſame Lands; and yet *he took the Profits*. This Verdict was adjudged for the Demandant; for the Feoffment was void againſt him by the 13 Eliz. 5. Cro. E. 233. Paſch. 33 Eliz. C. B. Leonard v. Bacon.

Jenk. 261.

2. Feoffment on Condition to be void on Payment of 100 *l.* in a Year to the Heirs, Executors, &c. of B. within a Year after the Death of B.—B. dies Inteſtate.—C. takes Adminiſtration, and grants *Letter of Attorney irrevocable* to D. (to whom B. had aſſigned the Eſtate) to receive the 100 *l.* to his own Uſe if it ſhall be paid. (Note, C. was Heir as well as Adminiſtrator.)—Afterwards by Agreement, between the Feoffor and C. Feoffor was to *pay the Whole Money in Shew, but to be repaid a third Part inſtanter*. This was not a ſufficient Performance of the Condition, becauſe of the Covin. Mo. 708. Hill. 37 Eliz. B. R. Goodall v. Wiatt.

3. *Fine by Covin* ſhall not bind. Hill. 44 Eliz. in Chancery. 3 Rep. 77. b. Farmer's Caſe. al. Fermor's Caſe.

4. The

4. The Earle of L. *purchaſed* a Manor *in his Daughter's Name*, and afterwards kept the Courts, and made Leaſes in his own Name, and always took the Profits, and then ſold it to Sir S. Mountague; tho' the Daughter never queſtioned it in the Life of her Father, yet 'twas held, in B. R. that unleſs there be ſome Fraud diſcovered, 'tis not within the 27 Eliz. tho' there be many Badges of Fraud; cited Cro. Car. 550. 10 Car. Lady Gorge's Caſes. Lane 48 cites Sir Walter Raleigh's Caſe.

5. *Fine paſſed by Circumvention*, was decreed not to extinguiſh a Rent Charge, but Relief againſt the Circumventer. Hill. 27 and 28 Car. 2. 1 Chan. Caſes 273. ..... v. Hawkes.

6. If a Contingent Remainder be deſtroyed by a legal Conveyance, and that *Conveyance is obtained by Fraud*, Equity will relieve againſt it. Hill. 1686. Vern. 443. Englefield v. Englefield.

(C) Fraudulent Conveyances of Goods ſet aſide.

1. 3 *H.* 7. *cap.* 4. Enacts that, *All Deeds of Gift, of Goods and Chattels, made in Truſt to the Uſe of the Grantor, to defraud Creditors, ſhall be void.* P. was indicted of *Recuſancy*, for not *coming to Divine Service*. Upon this he makes a *Gift of all his Leaſes and Goods*, coloured under *feigned Conſiderations*, and flies beyond Sea, in Order *to defraud the Queen* thereby, of what might accrue to her by his Recuſancy, or *his Flight*. Afterwards he was outlawed on the ſame Indictment. This Caſe ſeemed to ſome within this Statute, becauſe tho' the *Preamble* ſpeaks only of *Creditors*, yet the Body of the Act is general, that all Gifts of Goods and Chattels, made in Truſt to the Uſe of Grantor, are void. This is only with Regard to *Strangers who would be prejudiced* by ſuch Gift: But is ſtill good to bind the Parties themſelves. But adjudged, that 13 *Eliz.* 5. extends to this Caſe. 3 Rep. 82. cited in Twine's Caſe, as Mich. 35 and 36 Eliz. in the Exchequer Chamber, the Cauſe of Pauncefoot v. Blunt.

A Feme has a *Term*, *as Adminiſtratrix* to A. her firſt Baron, and marries B. who, being indebted by Contract to C. *granted* the Term *to C. to the Uſe of B. and his Wife for their Lives, and after to the Uſe of C*— C. ſues and gets Judgment. Per Cur' this Grant is not to avoid Creditors; For the Term being in Right of the Feme, as Adminiſtratrix, if it had ſo continued in the Hands of B. and had never been granted, it was not extendible for the Debt of B. and Fraud ſhall not be intended, unleſs it be *expreſsly found*, and this Grant is out of this Statute, and all the Statutes of Frauds. Cro. E. 291. Ridler v. Punter.

Leſſee for Years, after Judgment againſt him, aliens his *Term*. After the Year, the Plaintiff ſues out a *Scire facias*, and *has Execution*. The Term is not liable, if the *Aſſignment* was made *Bona Fide*. Godb. 161 Paſch. 8 Jac. C. B. Wilſon v. Wormal.

2. A *General Deed of Gift of all his Goods* is ſuſpicious to be done upon Fraud to deceive Creditors. Bacon's Uſe of the Law. 62. 3 Rep. 81. Twine's Caſe —Mo 638. Paſch. 44 Eliz. Chamberlain v. Twyne.

3. If a Man that is *Debtor* make a *Deed of Gift* of all his Goods to protract the taking of them in Execution for his Debts; this Deed of Gift is void againſt thoſe to whom he was indebted; but againſt himſelf, his own Executors, or Adminiſtrators, or any Man to whom he ſhall after ſell or convey them it is good. Bacon's Uſe of the Law. 62. Cro. E. 445.

4. By *Sale*, any Man may convey his Goods to another; and though he fear Execution for Debts, yet he may ſell them *out-right* for Money at any Time before the Execution ſerved, ſo that there be *no Reſervation of Truſt* between them, [as that] paying the Money, he ſhall have the Goods again; for that Truſt proves a Fraud to prevent the Execution. Bacon's Uſe of the Law. 62. Stat. 29 Car. 2, 3.

5. A. makes a *Deed of Gift* of all his valuable Goods to B. (who was his *ſecond Wife, the firſt then living*) and makes B. Executrix, and dies. —B. refuſes the Probat, by which the Ordinary granted Adminiſtration to C.—C. has no Aſſets, and if Action be brought againſt B. ſhe will plead, that there is an Adminiſtrator.—Per 3 J —B. is chargeable as Executrix de ſon Tort. Dal. 94. pl. 16 15 Eliz. The Gift is void by the Comon Law, and alſo by 13 Eliz. 5. and ſo the *Creditor* may bring Debt againſt B. as Executor, de Son Tort, and that ſuch Gift is void by the Common Law. Per Dyer, Ch. J. 2 Le. 223. Stamford's Caſe. S. C.—3 Le. 57. S. P.—Brownl. 112. * Hawes v. Leader. S. P.—So if C. grants the Goods to B. 3 Le 57. Mich 15 Eliz. C. B. Anon.—* Vid. (I)

S. P. that it ſhall void by 13 Eliz. 5. *as to Creditors*, but *not againſt ſecond Adminiſtrator.*

6. *Sale* of Inteſtates Goods *by firſt Adminiſtrator*, whoſe Adminiſtration is repealed upon Citation, and granted to next of Kin by Averment of Covin, may be avoided. Mo. 396. Hill. 37 Eliz. Wilſon v. Pateman. 6 Rep. 18. b. Packman's Caſe.

Cro. E. 405. Wilcox v. Watſon. S. C.

7. Wife was made *Executrix*, and made Gift of the Goods before Marriage, and yet *reteins* them in her Poſſeſſion, and *takes to Baron the Defendant*; The Wife dies; Baron has in his Hands ſo much Goods now, as will ſuffice to pay the Creditors their Debts. Judgment pro Quer. For the Defendant has confeſſed himſelf Executor, by the Plea of fully adminiſtred, and ſo is chargeable; Becauſe the Property of the Goods does not paſs out of the Wife by the Grant, being made by Fraud, as aforeſaid, by the Statute 13 Eliz. 5. Mo. 396. Hill. 37 Eliz. Watſon's Caſe.

Ow. 132. S. C. — Cro. E. 810. S. C. reports, that B. intermeddled after the Father's Death, with the Goods, and afterwards the *Daughter*, by this Gift, *took the Goods*, and then *Adminiſtration was granted to B.*

8. Goods made over by A. to his Daughter, after Judgment had againſt him, *Revocable* on Tender of five Shillings; A. died; The Daughter being 16 Years old, by Deed authorizes B. to take the Goods to her Uſe, and diſpoſe of them accordingly; and after willeth one C. to be Aſſiſtant to the ſaid B. in diſpoſal of the Goods to her Uſe. C. afterwards by Appointment of the Daughter and B. ſells the Goods for 250 l. which is paid to B.——B. takes Letters of Adminiſtration.——Agreed, that B. had Aſſets; And —— that the Grant of the ſaid Goods was void, by the Statute of 13 El. 5. 2 And. 172. Trin. 43 Eliz. Bithel v. Stanhop. Adjudged, that this Gift is in itſelf fraudulent, as appears by the Condition, and the *Covin expreſſly found by the Jury*, and then *it is utterly void againſt the Creditors, by* 13 *Eliz.* and the *Inteſtate died poſſeſſed of them*; and when the Donee afterwards took them, it was a *Treſpaſs againſt the Adminiſtrator*, for which he has his Remedy; and they are always *Aſſets* in his Hands, and he is chargeable for them as Executor de ſon Tort, by his intermeddling before Adminiſtration granted; and *by Law they remained always in his Poſſeſſion.*

3 Rep. So. b. S. C. by the Name of Twyne's Caſe.

9. A. indebted to three Perſons, has Goods to ſatisfy but one of them, and after Suit commenced by one, or *after Notice of Suit to be commenced*, or Arreſt made, makes *Gift* of all his Goods *to another Creditor*, in Satisfaction of his Debt.—This is fraudulent againſt him who ſo has commenced his Suit, or made the Arreſt for his Debt; per Popham, Ch. J. and And. Ch. J. Mo. 639. Paſch. 44 Eliz. in the Star Chamber. Chamberlaine v. Twyne, & al.

10. If A. *gives Goods to B.* with Intent to defraud C. though *B. knows not of the Fraud*, yet the Gift, as to him, is void; per Altham, J. Lane 102. cites 34 E. 1. .... tit. Warranty acc. — And 6 Rep. 72. [Paſch. 5 Jac. C. B.] Burrell's Caſe.

11. A. is indebted to B. and makes C. his Executor, and dies. — C. promiſes B. upon good Conſideration, that if he can diſcover any Goods, parcel of the Eſtate of the Teſtator, at the Time of his Death, then B. ſhall have the Goods in Satisfaction: The Queſtion was, whether a *Leaſe for Years, conveyed to a Stranger by the Teſtator in his Life, to the Intent to defraud his Creditors*, ſhould be in Law ſaid to be Parcel of his Eſtate at the time of his Death? and the whole Court reſolved that it was; For though the Sale bound himſelf, yet it was void againſt the Creditors. Trin. 18. Jac. B. R. 2 Roll. R. 173. Anon.

Hill. 8. Jac. B. R. Cro. J. 271. Hawes v. Leader. S. P.

12. An *Executor* or Adminiſtrator ſhall not avoid a fraudulent *Bill of Sale* as Executor or Adminiſtrator, but when he is a principal Creditor. Cumb. 348. per Holt. Mich. 7. W. 3. B. R. Orlabar v. Harwarr.

(D) Where

(D) Where Conveyances ſhall be * Good in Part and fraudulent in Part.

* See (S) Jaſon v. Gervois.

1. A. In Conſideration that his Son ſhall marry the Daughter of B. covenants to ſtand ſeiſed to the Uſe of his Son for Life, and after *to the Uſe of other his Sons in Reverſion or Remainder*; Theſe Uſes, thus limited in Remainder, are fraudulent againſt a Purchaſor, though the firſt be upon good Conſideration; viz. upon Marriage. Lane. 22. Anon. Sti. 428.

2. A Deed may be fraudulent *as to A. and good as to B.* Chan. Caſes 244. Mich. 26 and 27 Car. 2. Bellingham v. Lowther. Anon. —— Hard. 353. per Rainsford, J.

(E) Fraud at Common Law.

1. WHere no *former Intereſt* of the Party is *wrong'd*, there no fraudulent Conveyance was void at Common Law. Arg. Lane. 105.

2. Holt, Ch. J. ſaid, that there was a Fraud at Common Law, as in Caſe where a *Perſon in Priſon, and afterwards executed for Robbery, made a Bill of Sale of ſeveral Goods, with Intent to make Proviſion for his Son*; and that no Countenance ought to be given to ſuch a Contrivance as this, where a Man has gained a conſiderable Eſtate by Robbery, and when he is detected, that he ſhould give it to his Son; And the Plaintiff was nonſuited accordingly. Skin. 357. Trin. 5 W. & M. at Guildhall. Jones v. Aſhurſt.

(F) Frauds *as to Creditors*. Caſes in Law and Equity upon the ſeveral Statutes.

50 *Ed.* 3. 6. *FRaudulent Aſſurance of Lands or Goods, to deceive Creditors, ſhall be void, and the Creditors ſhall have Execution thereof, as if no ſuch Gift had been made.* This Act extends only in Relief of Creditors, and to ſuch Debtors only, as *ſhake to Sanctuaries*, or other *privileged Places*. cited 3 Rep. 82. in Twyne's Caſe, as Mich. 35 & 36 Eliz. in the Exchequer Chamber, Pauncefoot v. Blunt.

2. A Man made *a Gift of his Goods* with Intent to defraud his Creditors, and yet *continued the Poſſeſſion of them*, and *took Sanctuary*, and died there; now his Executors, having the Goods, were charged towards the Creditors. Cary's Rep. 25. cites 16 E. 4. 9. Br. Conſcience, &c. pl. 19. cites S. C.

3. 13 *Eliz. cap. 5. S.* 2. Enacts, that *all fraudulent Conveyances of Lands, Tenements, Hereditaments, Goods or Chattels, and all ſuch Bonds, Suits, Judgments, and Executions, made to avoid the Debt or Duty of others, ſhall (as againſt the Party only whoſe Debt or Duty is ſo endeavoured to be avoided, their Heirs, Succeſſors, Executors, or Aſſigns) be utterly void, any Pretence, feigned Conſideration, or &c. notwithſtanding.*

By *S.* 4. *Common Recoveries had againſt Tenants of the Freehold ſhall be good, notwithſtanding this Act; and ſo ſhall all Eſtates made for the procuring of a Voucher in* Formedon; *neither ſhall this Act extend to Grants made* bona fide, *and upon good Conſideration to Perſons not privy to ſuch Colluſion.*

4. A. ſeiſed of Land, as *Heir to his Father*, covenants for *natural Affection to ſtand ſeiſed* to the *Uſe of himſelf* for Life, Remainder to his *firſt Son in Tail*, &c. Remainder to *himſelf in Fee*, with a *Power* to make *Leaſes*,

Leaſes, and to *revoke the Uſes*, he having Notice at the ſame Time, *of a Bond entered into by his Father* to B. Afterwards B. brings *Debt* upon this Bond againſt A. as Heir; 'twas held that this Conveyance *by the Heir* ſhall be *fraudulent* againſt B. as a Conveyance *by the Father* who is the *Principal Debtor*. Cro. E. 350. Mich. 36 and 37 Eliz. C. B. Apharry v. Bodingham.

5. If a Debtor will *collude* with ſome of his Friends *in Fraud of his Creditors*, and the *Friend break Truſt with him*, this Court will not puniſh the Breach; Yet Green and Cotterell's Caſe to the contrary. (Fraus non eſt fallere fallentem) But two Doctors and I took Order in ſuch a Caſe, between Woodford and Fulton. Mich. 42 & 43 Eliz. by our Report that the *Goods, ſo conveyed* in Fraud, ſhould be *transferred to* the Benefit of *the Creditors*. Cary's Rep. 18.

6. Good Conſideration is not ſufficient, unleſs it be made *bona fide* too; and no Deed ſhall be deemed to be made Bona fide within the Proviſo of 13 Eliz. 5. which is accompanied with any Truſt; as if A. be indebted to B. C. D. E. and F. in 20 l. each, and has Goods worth 20 l. and makes a *Gift of his Goods to one of his Creditors*, in Satisfaction of his Debt, but in Truſt, that the Donee ſhall favour him, or permit him, or any other to poſſeſs them, and to pay the Debt when he is able; this is not Bona fide. 3 Rep. 81. Paſch. 44 Eliz. in the Star Chamber, in Twyne's Caſe.

7. It is the Advice of Lord Coke, that when any *Gift* ſhall be made *in Satisfaction of a Debt*, by one who is indebted to others alſo; 1. That it be done *publickly*, and before the Neighbours, and not privately; For Secrecy is a Badge of Fraud. 2. That the Goods and Chattels be *appraiſed* by honeſt People, to the true Value, and take a Gift in particular in Satisfaction of the Debt. 3. Immediately after the Gift, to *take the Poſſeſſion* of them; For Continuance in Poſſeſſion of the Donor, is a Mark of Truſt. 3 Rep. 81. Paſch. 44 Eliz. In the Star Chamber, in Twyne's Caſe.

Cro. J. 270, 271. Hawes v. Leader. S.C. Brownl. 112. S. C.

8. A. *In Conſideration of* 20 *l.* makes a *Bill of Sale* to B. of all his Goods mentioned *in a Schedule*, and gives Poſſeſſion by a Platter, and *A. covenants that the Goods ſhall remain in his Houſe as before*, but *to be taken away by B. on Demand*, and that A. and his Executors, &c. ſhall keep them ſafely, and quietly deliver them, &c. A. 4 Years after dies Inteſtate, and his Adminiſtrator refuſes to deliver the Goods. It was adjudged, that if this Deed was fraudulent, yet it was void only againſt Creditors, and *not void againſt the* * *Party*, his Executors or Adminiſtrators; and where the Executor pretended, that it would be a Devaſtavit in him to deliver the Goods to A. this is not ſo; for if the Deed was fraudulent, they are liable in B's Hands, as Executor de ſon Tort; But if any of the *Creditors had recovered, and had taken the Goods in Execution* for the Value, and the Adminiſtrator had pleaded this, it might be a good Plea by him. Yelv. 196. Hill. 8. Jac. B. R. Hawes v. Loader.

* Arg. Le. 308. in Caſe of Carter v. Claypole.

9. If A. make a *Deed of Gift*, and the *Conſideration* be *future*, the Donor's *Continuance in Poſſeſſion* is not fraudulent, unleſs it be expreſſly *proved*, that it was made upon Fraud, to deceive the Creditors; and ſo Coke, Ch. J. directed the Jury. Roll. R. 3. Paſch. 12. Jac. B. R. Stone v. Grubham.

10. *Leaſe for Years, conveyed* to a Stranger by Teſtator in his Life fraudulently, viz. to the Intent *to defraud his Creditors*, is parcel of *Teſtator's* Eſtate at the time of his Death, ſo as to be anſwerable to Creditors. 2 Roll R. 173. Trin. 18 Jac. B. R. Anon.

2 Roll. R. 495. Hill. 22. Jac. 1. S. C. Debated by the Name of Turbervil v Tipper.

11. In *Treſpaſs for Goods taken* againſt a *Bailiff*; Defendant juſtifies as Officer of a Court Baron, &c. and pleads, that the *Plaintiff claimed under Colour of a fraudulent Gift*; and held a good Plea, by two J. tho' he is not a Creditor; For if a Bailiff ſhall not be *aided by* 13 *Eliz.* 5. becauſe he is not a Creditor, *no meſne Proceſs* could be executed; and when

when a Statute gives the *Principal*, it gives all the *Accidents*. Lat. 222. Sir Ambroſe Turvill, v. Tipper.

12. A. and *B.* were joint Obligors; A. as Principal, and *B.* as *Surety*. A. (to ſave B. harmleſs) upon his *Death-Bed* made *B. a Deed of Gift*, of all his Goods, but they were *not removed* but remained in A's Poſſeſſion, ſo long as A. lived, which was but a very little Time; and tho' 'twas good Conſcience to free his Surety, and A's continuance in Poſſeſſion after the Death was very ſhort, yet 'twas ruled a fraudulent Deed and Gift; For Debts upon Specialty are to be preferred to this Equity, and it was his Folly not to take Counter-Security. Clayt. 38 Auguſt. 11 Car. Per Berkley J. Legard v. Linley.

And where ſuch Goods are omitted in the Inventory exhibited by the Executor, a Legatee may *falſify the Inventory* in the Spiritual Court, but a Creditor cannot. 8 Mod. 168. Hinton v. Parker. ——It ſeems a Creditor may falſify too, by the Civil Law. Dom. 622. cited in Marg.

13. Fraudulent Deed to *deceive Creditors* was ſet aſide. 15 Car. 1. Chan. Rep. 132. Naylor v. Baldwin.

Jenk. 49. pl. 94 cites D. 295 ——

A. has *Goods worth* 30 *l.* and owes 20 l. to B. and 10 l. to C. and *aſſigns his Goods to C.* to the Intent, that for the Reſidue above the Debt of 10 l. he ſhall be *favourable to him*. Per Coke, Ch. J. it is altogether void, becauſe it is fraudulent in Part; But per Foſter, J. it is void only for the Surpluſage. Godb. 161. Paſch. 3 Jac. C. B. in Caſe of Wilſon v. Wormal.——cited. 3 Rep. 81. Twine's Caſe.

14. Tenant for Life, being *in Debt*, to defraud his Creditors *commits a Forfeiture*, to the End that he in Reverſion may enter, who is made privy to the Contrivance; Per Hale, the Creditors ſhall avoid this, as well as any fraudulent Conveyance. Vent. 257. Paſch. 26 Car. 2. B. R. Anon.

15. A voluntary Settlement *diſables a Deviſe of the ſame*, though it be for payment of his Debts; For, per Jefferies C. it is not revocable. Vern. 464. Trin. 1687. Eale v. Newton.

Such Conveyance having been got from A. *by undue Means*, a few Months before his Death, he deviſed *all his Land for Payment of his Debts*. On a Bill by Creditors to ſubject theſe Lands, it was objected, that at beſt this was but in Nature of a Choſe en Action, and not aſſignable; but Lord Wright, and Maſter of the Rolls held, it was in Nature of an Equity of Redemption, and aſſignable, and as he might have been relieved, ſo may his Deviſees. Ch. Prec. 142. Hill. 1700. Blake v. Johnſon.

16. 3 & 4 *W. & M. cap.* 14. *S.* 2. Enacts, that *all Wills concerning Lands, or any Rents, Profits, Term, or Charge out of the ſame, whereof the Deviſors ſhall be ſeiſed in Fee Simple in Poſſeſſion, Reverſion or Remainder, ſhall be deemed to be fraudulent and void againſt Creditors upon Bonds, or other Specialties, their Executors, Adminiſtrators, &c.*

S. 3. *And every ſuch Creditor may maintain an Action of Debt upon the ſaid Bond and Specialties againſt the Heir at Law, and ſuch Deviſee * jointly, and ſuch Deviſee ſhall be liable, and chargeable for a falſe Plea, as an Heir at Law ſhould have been for any falſe Plea pleaded, or for not confeſſing the Lands and Tenements to him deſcended.*

A Man *binds himſelf and his Heirs*, and dies, *leaving a real Eſtate* to deſcend to his Heir, *ſubject to a Mortgage* for Years; the *Heir aliens* the real Eſtate before a Bill brought, and if the Obligee was relievable here, againſt the Heir and Purchaſor, on the Statute for preventing fraudulent Deviſes, or if he was to be ſent to Law to get Judgment firſt, was the Queſtion? The Lord Keeper thought, that Statute being *introductive of a new Law*, the Relief on it muſt be at Law; and held likewiſe, that a Bond Creditor could not redeem a Mortgage for Years, without firſt having Judgment at Law againſt the Heir, though it might have been otherwiſe in Caſe of a Mortgage in Fee. Tr. 1702. Ch. Prec. 198. Bateman v. Bateman. ——— Note, Chancery at this Day, gives Relief upon the ſaid Statute in ſuch Caſe. Ch. Prec. 198. in a Nota there.

A. *bound himſelf and his Heirs* in a Bond, *and deviſed all his Lands to J. S.* a Bill was brought upon this Statute, to affect the real Aſſets in the Hands of the Deviſee; But the Heir not being made a Party, it was objected to; But it was anſwered, that nothing being deſcended to him, it would be in vain to make him a Party; for it would only oblige the Plaintiff to pay Coſts. And though in an Action at Law it was neceſſary to make him Defendant, it was becauſe the Debt was in the Debet & Detinet, and the Heir at Law privy to the Anceſtor, and the Deviſee not; and ſo for Conformity the Statute in Action at Law directed the Heir to be a Co-Defendant; yet that it was otherwiſe in a Court of Equity; But Lord C. Cowper ſaid, that it is the Act of Parliament makes this Aſſets in the Deviſee's Hands, and that requiring the Heir to be made Defendant, you muſt follow the Remedy therein preſcribed, and *this Bill in Equity, is as an Action at Law; Otherwiſe if there were no Heir; and perhaps* it might

might be otherwiſe too, *if the Bill had charged, that the Plaintiff had made Inquiry, and could find or diſcover no Heir.* Wms's Rep. 99, 100. Mich. 1707. Gawler v. Wade.

Though by the ſaid Statute, a Man is prevented from defeating his Creditors by his Will; yet *any Settlement* or Diſpoſition he ſhall make *in his Life*-time of his Lands, whether voluntary or not, *will be good againſt Bond Creditors*; For that was not provided againſt by the Statute, which only took Care to ſecure ſuch Creditors againſt any Impoſition, which might be ſuppoſed in a Man's laſt Sickneſs; but if he gave away his Eſtate in his Life-time, this prevented the Deſcent of ſo much to his Heir, and conſequently took away their Remedy againſt him, who was only liable in Reſpect of the Lands deſcended; And as a *Bond is no Lien* whatſoever *on Lands in the Hands of the Obliger*, much leſs can it be ſo, when they are given away to a Stranger. Decreed. Trin. 1718. Abr. Eq. Caſes. 149. Parſlow v. Weedon. ———S. C. cited per Mr. Vernon. Chan. Prec. 521. though he ſaid, that till that Reſolution, he ſhould have been of another Opinion, and that ſuch a Diſpoſition had been held fraudulent againſt Creditors by Lord Ch. J Holt, in the Caſe of Templeman v. Beke.

S. 4. Deviſes for payment of Debts, or Children's Portions, purſuant to a Marriage Agreement excepted.

17. A Man ſteals a young Woman, who had a conſiderable *Portion in Truſtees Hands*; After the Marriage, *her Friends refuſed to part with the Portion without Security* from the Husband, *that it ſhould be ſettled on the Wife*, who gave a Judgment, that it ſhould be laid out in Land, to be ſettled to them, and the Heirs of their Bodies; A Creditor of the Husband brought a Bill for his Debt, and to be let in; for that it was after Marriage, and voluntary, and ſo ought not to prevent a Creditor of his Debt; But the Court diſmiſſed the Bill, though without Coſts. Ch. Prec. 22. Paſch. 1691. Moor v. Rycault.

18. *Goods were taken in Execution in the Poſſeſſion of S.* who had them by Virtue of a Sale from G. Upon which S. brought an Action, and the Defendant inſiſted, that the *Sale to S.* was fraudulent againſt him, he being a Creditor by Judgment; Holt, Ch. J. ſaid, that if the *Judgment was upon a Point tried*, in ſuch Caſe he *need not to prove the Conſideration*, but it ſhall be intended good: *but if* it be a Judgment *by Confeſſion*, he ought to *prove* it to be for *a juſt Debt*, otherwiſe he ſhall not overthrow the Sale, though it be fraudulent; For it is good againſt all but Creditors for a juſt Debt bona Fide due. Skin, 586. Trin. 7 W. 3. B. R. Sanders, v. .....

19. A. being in Debt to ſeveral Perſons, and apprehenſive of a Verdict, and great Damages to be given againſt him, in an Action brought againſt him by B. for *Criminal Converſation with B's Wife*, *conveys his Eſtate to Truſtees*, *for payment of Debts* mentioned in a Schedule, and ſuch other Debts as he ſhould mention in 10 Days afterwards. A Verdict is given againſt him, and 5000 *l.* Damages. B. by Bill endeavours to ſet aſide this Settlement as fraudulent *to defeat his Recovery*. But the Court held it not fraudulent, either in Law or Equity, for ſuch Debts as are named in the Deed, thoſe being real Debts, and his only *ex Maleficio*. But he may have an Intereſt in the Surplus, and ordered him to declare, if he would controvert any of the Debts, and come in upon the Surplus after the Debts mentioned in the Schedule, or ſuch other, as were appointed within 10 Days purſuant to the Deed, are ſatisfied. Mich. 1699. Ch. Prec. 105. Lewkner v. Freeman.

20. It was held by the Court of Chancery, that if there be *two Dealers*, and *one* of them is very *much indebted to the other*, *and*, in Order to get an Abatement from him, he *makes him believe he is inſolvent*, *by abſconding*, skulking, or ſhutting up Shop, whereby the other has *juſt Cauſe to fear the Loſs of his Debt*, and thereby *procures a Releaſe* or an *Abatement*, *when* in Truth, the Man *was really ſolvent*, this Court would relieve againſt ſuch Releaſe, &c. and this was agreed to have been often done, and the Caſe of Barney and Bonney quoted for an inſtance; ſecus if the Party had not juſt Cauſe to fear the Loſs of his Debt. 12 Mod. 558. Mich. 13 W. 3. cites the Caſe of Monger v. Kett.

21. A. *purchaſes* a Leaſe of a Houſe *in B's. Name*, and takes a Declaration of Truſt *to permit A. to enjoy for Life*, and then *in Truſt for C. who liv'd with A. as his Wife*, and was ſo reputed. Wright K. inclin'd, that this Leaſe is not Aſſets of A. nor liable after his Death to his Creditors; for when a Man purchaſes, he may ſettle as he pleaſe; and thought that

that fraudulent Conveyances are made ſo only by the ſeveral Statutes made for that Purpoſe. Hill. 1704. 2 Vern. 490. Fletcher & al. v. Lady Sidley & al.

22. A. *conveys* his Eſtate to the *Uſe of himſelf for Life, with Power to mortgage ſuch Part as he ſhall think fit*, Remainder to the Truſtees to ſell and pay all his Debts, but *continues Poſſeſſion*, and *keeps the Deed.*—A. becomes indebted afterwards by Judgments, Bonds, and Simple Contracts. The Deed of Truſt is fraudulent as againſt Creditors by Bond and Judgment, who, having *no Notice of the Settlement*, ſhall not come in in Average only with the other Creditors. Trin. 1705. 2 Vern. 510. Tarback v. Marbury.

23. If A. makes a *Bill of Sale to B. a Creditor, and afterwards to C. another Creditor*, and *delivers Poſſeſſion* at the Time of the Sale *to neither*, and after *C. gets Poſſeſſion* of the Goods, and B. *takes them out of his Poſſeſſion*; C. can't maintain Treſpaſs, becauſe the *firſt Bill of Sale is fraudulent againſt Creditors, and ſo is the Second*, yet they both bind A. and B's. is the Elder Title; and the naked Poſſeſſion of C. ought not to prevail againſt the Title of B. that is prior, where both are equally Creditors; and Poſſeſſion at the Time of the Bill of Sale is delivered over to neither. Per Holt, Ch. J. 2 New Abr. 606. cites Trin 1706. Baker. v. Lloyd.

24. A. made a *Bill of Sale of Goods* on Ship-board, (which were Invoyced particularly) *and of the Produce and Advantage that ſhould be made of them* to B. and this was in Nature of a Security for Money lent on a Bottomree Bond. Theſe Goods were afterwards *inveſted in other Goods*, and thoſe again bartered for others. A. dies, and was *indebted by Judgment to J. S.* Ld Cowper thought, that this was no fraudulent Bill of Sale; For the *Truſt appeared on the very Face of the Bill of Sale*, and here B. was intitled preſently to the Truſt of thoſe Goods on the Sale, and to all the Advantages conſequential to that Truſt, and may *follow the Goods* for that Purpoſe, and if that could be diſtinguiſhed from other Goods, then B. was to be paid Prior to J. S. but otherwiſe, J. S. muſt be preferred, and B. paid only in a Courſe of Adminiſtration. Hill. 1709. Ch. Prec. 285. Bucknal v. Royſton.

25. A. going beyond Sea, conveys an Eſtate *to Truſtees to raiſe 5000 l. for a Daughter's Portion, to be paid 3 Months after Marriage.* About a Month after, A. being on Ship-board, *wrote a Letter to the Truſtees, to correct* the Abſoluteneſs of the Truſt. While A. was beyond Sea, the Daughter marries and dies. The Husband had an Eſtate of about 800 *l.* per Ann. Ld Cowper was againſt reading the Letter, and ſaid it could be no controul of the Deed, eſpecially being a Month after, and that ſuch a Method would break through all Settlements, and cited the Caſe of **Clavering v. Clavering**. He ſaid, that *as to Creditors*, this Deed would be voluntary; but there being no ſuch, he decreed the 5000 *l.* to be raiſed for the Husband, with Intereſt from three Months after the Marriage, but being againſt the Heirs at Law, would allow no Coſts. Ch. Prec. 306. Mich. 1710. Clavel v. Littleton. G Equ. R. 37. S. C.

26. A. conveyed Lands in *Truſt to raiſe Portions for his Children*, and 5 *s.* only, or ſuch a trifling Sum, was paid by the Feoffee for Land worth 1000 *l.* A. died, and B. was his Heir. It was held, that this Land is not extendible on a Judgment had againſt B. ſo that the Conveyance was not fraudulent. Clayt. 7. March. 8 Car. per Davenport Ch. B. Sir Francis Ireland's Caſe.

A. going beyond Sea, in the Service of the Eaſt India Company *gives Bond to the Company of* 2000 l. *for his Fidelity*, and a few Days after conveyed Land in Truſt to raiſe 5000 *l. for his Daughter's Portion, payable 3 Months after Marriage.* B. married the Daughter; and afterwards A. *embezelled* 26000 *l. of the Company's Effects.* Decreed the 5000 l. to B. after Payment of 2000 l. only to the Company. Ch. Prec. 377. Paſch. 1714. E. Ind. Comp. v. Clavel.

27. *A Man being much indebted gave* 600 *l. for the Benefit of his Younger Children* 6 *Hours before his Deceaſe.* This is not fraudulent, as againſt Creditors, though it would have been ſo of a real Eſtate or *Chattel Real*; yet

yet the Court would not have taken it Pro Confeſſo, to be ſo, but would have *directed an Iſſue to try it*, as the ſame was done in Ld Sommers's Time, and, on Iſſue directed, determined fraudulent before Holt Ch. J. Sel. Ch. Ca. in Ld King's Time. 77. 14. July, 1729. Duffin v. Furneſs.

28. 5 *Geo.* 2. *cap.* 30. §. 11. Enacts that, *Every Bond, Bill, Note, Contract, Agreement, or other Security, whatſoever to be made or given, by any Bankrupt or other Perſon unto, or to the Uſe of, or in Truſt for any Creditor or Creditors, or for the Security of the Payment of any Debt or Sum of Money due from ſuch Bankrupt, at the Time of his becoming Bankrupt, or any Part thereof, between the Time of his becoming Bankrupt, and ſuch Bankrupt's Diſcharge, as a Conſideration, or to the Intent to perſwade him, her, or them to conſent to, or Sign any ſuch Allowance or Certificate, ſhall be wholly void, and of no Effect; and the Monies thereby ſecured, or agreed to be paid, ſhall not be recovered or recoverable.*

(C) By one Creditor, Protecting or Screening againſt another.

1. A. Deviſed Lands to B. *charged with* 600 *l. and in default of Payment, deviſed them to C.* afterwards *B. and C. joined in a Mortgage* to D. and D. ſuffered B. to continue in Poſſeſſion, and to fell Timber, ſo that the Eſtate would not anſwer the Legacy and Mortgage. But decreed the Legacy to be paid firſt, D. having Notice of the Will. Trin. 27 Car. 2. Fin. R. 225. Green v. Gardiner.

So, where *Mortgagor becomes a Bankrupt*, & Mortgagee refuſes to enter, and permits the Bankrupt to

2. Mortgagee recovers Judgment in *Ejectment*, but, in *Combination* with the Tenant in Poſſeſſion, *refuſes to take out Execution*. North K. thought it reaſonable, that if he would not receive the Profits, the Rent ſhould be brought into Court, and ordered, that unleſs he took out Execution before the End of the Term, he ſhould be anſwerable for the Profits, as in Caſe of wilful Default. Mich. 1684. Vern. 258. D. of Bucks v. Sir Rob. Gayer.

continue in Poſſeſſion, and to Fence againſt the *Ejectment*, brought by the Aſſignees, with this Mortgage. Mortgagee ſhall be charged with the Profits from the Time of the Ejectment delivered. Mich. 1684. Vern. 267. Chapman v. Tanner.——*So* where Mortgagee enters, and thereby prevents ſubſequent Incumbrancers from entring, and yet *permits Mortgagor to receive the Profits*, he ſhall be charged with all the Profits he had, or might have received ſince his Entry. Mich. 1684. Vern. 270. Coppring v. Cook.

3. A. has *Judgment* againſt B. for a juſt Debt.——A. takes out a *Fi. Fa.* and gets the Sheriff to *ſeize*, but would not let him proceed further, and lets the *Goods remain in B's Hands*.—C. who had alſo a Judgment for a juſt Debt againſt B. takes out a Fi. Fa.——C. may ſeiſe the Goods; For the former was a *fraudulent Execution*, and the Sheriff might very well return Nulla Bona, on the firſt Execution. Farr 37. Trin. 1 Annæ. B. R. Rice v. Serjeant.

4. There being *Accounts current, between A. and B. a Goldſmith, B. gives* out his *Caſh Note to C. for* 5000 *l.* and *A. mortgages his Eſtate as a Collateral Security* for the Money. *B. gives C.* 100 *l. for his Favour* in the Matter, *who keeps the Caſh Note by him.* Some time *after, the Mortgage forfeited B. becomes a Bankrupt.* A. prays Relief, becauſe C. neglected to turn his Caſh Note into Money, when he might have done it. It was directed, that an Account be taken, how Matters ſtood been A. and B. M S. Rep. ſaid to be Ld Harcourt's. tit. Fraud; cites 10 Feb. 1717. Maſon v. Lake.

(H) By

(H) By Conveyance or Gift, to Perſons not Creditors, to ſcreen.

1. TEnant in Tail, by Fraud, *grants to the King*, and after bargains to another. This Conveyance is void to the King; becauſe 'tis by Fraud; per Coke, and cites it to be ſo held by Popham. Roll. R. 167. Paſch. 13 Jac. B. R. Anon.

2. A. made a *Leaſe* for Years to B. and others for Payment of his Debts, and dy'd. The *Reverſion deſcended to C.* The *Truſtees and C. aſſign* the Term to D. by way of Truſt, *to pay D. 750 l.* C. confeſſes *Judgment to R.—D. receives the Profits and pays them to C.* to the Value of 800 *l. but D. had no Notice* of the Judgment, nor was there any Extent on the Judgment. Decreed by Ld Keeper, that he Account, and the 800 *l.* not to be allowed otherwiſe than as to go in Satisfaction of his Debt, viz. D's Debt. Mich. 27 Car. 2. 2 Chan. Caſes. 207. Miller v. Stephens.

3. A. makes an *abſolute Conveyance to B.* for 1500 *l.* B. executes a *Defeazance upon Payment* of 1500 *l. within 6 Years*, and after *on Marriage ſettles it* as an abſolute Eſtate, *on his Wife and Iſſue.* There being Proof, that A. made the *Conveyance, to enable B. to get a Fortune*, though that was another Lady, and not the Wife B. really married, it was decreed, that A. was *bound as Particeps Criminis*, and this Decree was now affirmed by Eight Lords againſt Seven. Cowper and Harcourt, againſt the Decree. Parker for it. MS. Rep. ſaid to be Ld Harcourt's tit. Fraud. 21 Jan. 1718. Webber v. Farmer.

There is added a Note in the M S. that the Wife's Father had Notice of the Defeaſance, before the Settlement made. Ibid.

(I) As to Purchaſors. Caſes in Law and Equity, upon the ſeveral Statutes.

1. A. Has theſe *four Feoffees to his Uſe B. C. D. and E.*—A. *ſells this Land to F. and requires B. and C. to paſs the Eſtate* of it *to F.* and A. alſo requeſts B. and C. to require D. and E. in the Name of A. that they alſo ſhall paſs the Eſtate to F. and they and B. and C. do all this and paſs the Eſtate accordingly to F. but A. did not ſpeak with D. and E. to this Purpoſe; A. *afterwards ſells the ſame Land to G. and requires D. and E. to make an Eſtate* to him of it, and they do ſo. Upon a Suit in Chancery by F. againſt D. and E. they were diſcharged by the Advice of the Juſtices; For A. did not perſonally require them to make an Eſtate to F.——F. may ſue A. and alſo G. if G. had notice of the firſt Sale; and G. may alſo ſue A. for this Diſceit. Jenk. 107. pl. 5. cites 39 H. 6. 36. and 7 E. 4. 14.

2. *Leſſee for 60 Years, if he ſo long lived, forged a Leaſe for 90 Years abſolutely, and* then *by Indenture, reciting the forg'd Leaſe, ſold the ſame, and all his Intereſt in the Eſtate* to R. G. *for valuable Conſideration.* It ſeem'd to Coke, that R. G. was no Purchaſor within the Statute 27 Eliz. for he contracted not for the true and lawful Intereſt, (for that was not known to him, or otherwiſe perhaps he would not have dealt for it, and the viſible and known Term was forg'd), and tho' [it was] by general Words, [yet that] the true Intereſt paſt, notwithſtanding he gave no valuable Conſideration, nor contracted for it. And all the Judges of Serjeant's-Inn in Fleet-Street, were of this Opinion. Co. Litt. 3. b.

3. If a *Leſſee for Years demiſeth Parcel of the Term* to another, and covenouſly *forfeits his Whole Leaſe* for any Condition broken, and takes the Land back in Leaſe again, his Leſſee ſhall find Help in Chancery. Cary's Rep. 25. cites Crompton 64.

4. The Plaintiff bought Land of the Defendant, which the Defendant had *conveyed* before *to the Uſe of himſelf, his Wife and Son.* It was decreed, that the Plaintiff ſhould have the Land againſt all. Toth. 125. cites 13 and 14 Eliz. Frankland v. Gray.

5. The Bill ſets forth, that G. one of the Defendants, *in Conſideration of* 286*l.* did Bargain and Sell unto the Plaintiff certain Lands in the Bill mentioned; and made unto him a Deed of *Feoffment*, and a Letter of Attorney, to make Livery and Seiſin; and *before Livery made a Leaſe to C. who knew of the Bargain*, and he leaſed to B. who knew alſo of the Bargain, and this appearing to this Court to be true, an Injunction is granted to the Plaintiff, until the Cauſe ſhould be heard and determined. Cary's Rep. 117, 118. cites 21 and 22 Eliz. Ireby v. Gibone, & al.

Vid. Recovery (C.a.2)

6. By the Statute 27 Eliz. 4. where a Sale was alleged to be fraudulent within that Statute, againſt a Grant of Rent made by a Remainder Man, to Iſſue out of the ſame Land, it was held not to be fraudulent. Becauſe the *Grant and Sale ſhould be made by the ſame Perſon*, and here Tenant in Tail made the Sale, and the Remainder Man granted the Rent. Mo. 158. Paſch. 23 Eliz. Hunt v. Gately. al. Capel's Caſe.

This Statute *extends* only *to Purchaſors* of Lands, and *not to Creditors.* 1 Lut. 435. Hill. 2 and 3 Jac. 2. Young v. Johnſon.

7. 27 *Eliz. cap.* 4. §. 2. Enacts that, *Every Conveyance, Grant, Charge, Incumbrance, and Limitation of Uſe or Uſes of in or out of any Lands, or other Hereditaments, made to defraud any Purchaſor of the ſame in Fee, in Tail for Life or Years: Shall (as againſt ſuch Purchaſors only, and every other Perſon lawfully claiming from, by or under him) be utterly void, the ſaid Purchaſor having obtained the ſame for * Money, or ſome other good Conſideration.*

Tenant in Tail, Remainder over; if he in *Remainder* perceiving Tenant in Tail about to alien and bar him of his Remainder, *grant his Remainder to the Queen, by Deed inrolled*, with Intent *to deceive the Purchaſor*, and Tenant in Tail dies without Iſſue, the *Purchaſor* ſhall *enjoy* the Land *againſt the Queen*, by this Statute; for the Statute makes void, not only fraudulent Conveyances, made by the *Vendor himſelf*, but every ſuch Conveyance, made with intent *to deceive Purchaſors*, and even *Grants to the King*, the Statute being general, and made in Suppreſſion of Fraud. per Coke Ch. J. Paſch. 13 Jac. 11. Rep. 74. in Magdalen College Caſe.——And ſays Popham Ch. J. was of the ſame Opinion.

* One Covenanted to *convey to the Uſe of himſelf and his Feme, and the Heirs* of his Body, with Remainders over, before ſuch a Day; but *in the mean Time makes a Leaſe* of his Eſtate to others for ſeveral Years, and after makes an Aſſurance according to the Covenant, and held a good Leaſe, and out of this Statute; For this Act is only in Favour of *Purchaſors*, who give *Money, or other Conſideration* for the Land. per 3 Juſt. And. 233. Trin. 32 El. Beaumont v. Needham.———S. C. cited 3 Rep. 83. b. ———In the Preamble it is ſaid, *for Money or other good Conſideration*, and ſo it is in the Body of the Act, yet thoſe Words are to be *intended only of Valuable Conſideration*, as appears by the Clauſe about Revocation, in which it is ſaid, (Money, or other good Conſideration) and the Word (paid) is to be referred to the Money, and (given) to the Conſideration, and thoſe Words *exclude all Conſiderations of Nature or Blood*, &c. 3 Rep. 83. a. in Twine's, cites it as adjudged. 37 Eliz. in C. B. in Caſe of Upton v. Baſſet.

A. made a *Feoffment to the Uſe of himſelf for Life*, Remainder *to his Son in Tail*, Remainder over, with *Power of Revocation, by Writing under his Hand and Seal, and publiſhed in Preſence of three Witneſſes.* Afterwards in Conſideration of 400*l.* he *entered into a Recognizance* of 800*l.* and died, and held that this Recognizance was *extendible againſt the Son*, by this Statute, becauſe the Statute aids, not only *Purchaſors of Lands*, but thoſe who, for *valuable Conſideration*, have any *Charge out of, or upon it.* And tho' it does not expreſsly ſpeak of *Conuſees*, yet it ſhall be expounded to extend to them. In Canc. Vid. Bridg. 22. Garth and Eresfield.

A. becomes *Tenant for Life*, Remainder *to his Son B. and his Wife for their two Lives, Remainder to them in Special Tail, Remainder to B. in Tail general*, with a *Power* reſerved to A. *by any Writing, to charge* the Lands *with* 2000*l.* A. and B. after *Mortgage Part* of the Land to C. *in Fee*, with Condition of *Re-entry, on Payment* of the 2000*l.* in 10 *Years*; A. dies. B's Wife dies without Iſſue. B. marries again, and has Iſſue a *Son*, and dies; the 10 Years *expire.* Held that the Eſtate limited *to the Heirs general of B.* is not fraudulent, nor within the *Words*, or the *Equity* of this Statute, and ſo good againſt the *Mortgagee*, tho' perhaps he may have *Relief in Equity* for the 2000*l.* Per Hale, Ch B. Hardr. 397. Paſch. 17 Car. 2. Jenkins v. Keniſh.——A Bill was afterwards brought in Chancery, and there decreed that the Conſideration of the firſt Settlement, (viz. Marriage and Marriage Portion) may extend to the Iſſue of ſuch ſecond Marriage, and that the Power being executed by Leaſe and Releaſe, was not a good Execution, and the Bill was diſmiſſed Lev. 237. S. C.——Ch. R. 274. S. C.——Chan. Caſes 104, S. C. Paſch 20 Car. 2.

A. *Bargains and ſells a Term* to B. *in Conſideration* that B. was *Surety for him*, for 3000*l.* to J. S. and covenants, that he had Power to grant it, whereas he had *before ſettled it*, in Conſideration of a Marriage Portion, *in Truſt to the Uſe of himſelf and his Wife* for Life, *and then of his Iſſue Male.* All agreed, that this Leaſe ſhall not avoid the Eſtate of the *Feme and Iſſue in Tail.* Ley Ch. J. ſaid, that in Caſe A's *Wife had died, and the Children by her*, the *Leaſe would be good againſt* A's *Right Heirs.* But whether A's

A's Eſtate ſhall be void by this Statute, as fraudulent againſt B. at leaſt *during A's Life*, Quære. 2 Roll. R. 305. Paſch. 21 Jac. B. R. Beverly v. Gatacre.——[*So that* it ſeems upon the laſt Caſe, a *Surety* to whom a Security is made of Lands for his Indemnification, by the Perſon for whom he is Surety, is a Purchaſor within this Statute.]

§. 4 *Conveyances made upon good Conſideration, & bona fide, ſhall be good, notwithſtanding this Act.*

8. Fraudulent Conveyance within the 27 Eliz. 4. is void againſt a Purchaſor, notwithſtanding, during the Treaty; the *Purchaſor had Notice* of the Fraud. For the Notice can't make that good which an Act of Parliament has made void, as to him. per Wray Ch. J. 5 Rep. 60. b. Mich. 32 & 33 Eliz. B. R. in Gooch's Caſe.

5 Rep. 60 b. cites Paſch 3 Jac. C. B S. P. Standen v. Bullock. ——Mo. 615. S. C.— cited Bridgm 23.— ——2 Lev. 106

9. At *Common Law*, there was not any Fraud remedied, which ſhould *defeat an after-purchaſe*, but that only which was committed to defraud a former Intereſt. Cro. E. 444. Mich. 37 and 38 Eliz. C. B. in Caſe of Upton v. Baſſet.

10. If a Perſon, that has *not good Government of himſelf*, by Advice of Friends conveys his Lands *in Truſt*, and *without any Conſideration*, and afterwards one procures him to ſell him Land of 500*l. per Ann. for* 500*l.* or other petty Conſideration.——Tho' this laſt Purchaſor pays Money, yet he ſhall not avoid the firſt Conveyance; for the Statute was made to help thoſe that came to Land on good Conſideration lawfully, and not without Conſideration, or by any *indirect Means*; cited by Anderſon Ch. J. to have been ſo adjudged. Cro. E. 445. Mich. 37 and 38 Eliz. C. B. in Caſe of Upton v. Baſſet.

S. P. Per Anderſon, Ch. J. 3 Rep. 83. b. cited in Twine's Caſe.

11. A. a Woman living ſeperate from her Husband had ſaved Money, and *purchaſed in B's Name in Truſt*. B. lying ill, *made a Leaſe at the Requeſt of A. for* 200 *Years to C.* on Condition that C. ſhould pay the Profits to A. and alſo upon Condition, that if B. ſurvived the firſt Day of June, and then pay'd 1 Shilling to C. the Leaſe ſhould be void. B. ſurviv'd the Day but paid not the Shilling. But after *B. for* 100*l. made a Leaſe to J. S.* with Covenants for quiet Enjoiment, and againſt Incumbrances made by him. B. died. C. having Notice given him now, and not before, of the Leaſe made to him, enters upon J. S. The Queſtion was, whether the Leaſe made by B. at A's Requeſt, in Part of Performance of the Truſt, be fraudulent and void by the Statute 27 Eliz. 4. againſt J. S. as Purchaſor, or by Virtue of the Revocation left to B. who made the Leaſe to C. and alſo the after Leaſe to J. S. As to the Intent, it was ſaid againſt the Fraud, that the *Intent* was the Performance of the Truſt, and could not be to deceive a Purchaſor, becauſe in good Conſcience it was to perform the Truſt to One, who did not direct any ſecond Sale. As to the ſecond Branch, it was ſaid, that at the Time of the ſecond Leaſe, the *Power to revoke was laps'd* and void, and ſo the firſt Leaſe became Abſolute and Irrevocable. Mo. 757. Trin. 2 Jac. Sheldon v. Hanbury.

12. In an Information on the Statute, it was adjudged, that if one, *after Marriage, voluntarily aſſigns a Leaſe in Jointure* to his Wife, *without any Conſideration of* the Wife's *Portion*, or any *other Recompence* by her Friends, and takes the Profits himſelf, and afterwards ſells it to one who had not any Notice of this Aſſignment; 'tis within the Statute, becauſe voluntary, which ſhall be intended fraudulent; but if it had been in Conſideration of a Portion, and for a Proviſion for the Wife, and had taken the Profits, and then ſold the Term, it had been otherwiſe. Nelſ. Abr. 890. pl. 9. cites Cro. J. 158. Colvil v Parker.

Upon Evidence to the Jury this Caſe was cited by Tanfield J. to have been ſo adjudged in one Woodies Caſe. Vid Cro. J. 158 Paſch. 5 Jac. B. R. in Caſe of Colvil v. Parker.

18. A. the Grandfather, B. the Father, and C. the Son; A. on the Marriage of B. made the Feme of B. a Jointure of S. and at the ſame Time, *covenanted*

covenanted to demiſe D. to B.—A. demiſed one Moiety accordingly, *to commence after A.'s Death, for* 1000 *Years*, and the other Moiety to commence from a Day to come, *Proviſo if B. die without Iſſue, or make any Leaſe, without reſerving the Ancient Rent, the Leaſes to be void; B. aſſigned over the Leaſes to the Uſe of C. an Infant to prevent a Merger by Deſcent of the Inheritance, and* with this colourable Pretence, *that C. ſhould pay his Debts.* The Aſſignment was to ſeveral Perſons of Credit, but delivered in a ſecret Manner to one of a meaner Quality; A. died; B. for a great Sum of Money, by Indenture inrolled, bargained, and ſold D. to W. R. It was Reſolved, that tho' at the Time of the Aſſignment, the Inheritance was in A. yet after A's Death the Vendee ſhall avoid the Term, the ſaid Aſſignment upon the Evidence being taken to be fraudulent. 6 Rep. 72. Paſch. 5 Jac. C. B. Burrel's Caſe.

Cro. J. 158. Colvil v. Parker.

14. The Words of 27 Eliz. 4. are general, and there's no need that he that ſells the Land ſhould be the *Maker of* the Fraudulent Eſtate, or Incumbrance; but if the Eſtate be fraudulent the Purchaſor ſhall avoid it, *be who will the Seller*, nor ſhall any *colourable Pretence* of Payment of Debts, &c. or his making privately a *Jointure* on his Wife ſecure it, if the Fraud be proved in Evidence, or confeſſed in pleading. Paſch. 5 Jac. C. B. 6 Rep. 72. in Burrel's Caſe.

15. If the *Father make a Leaſe to a Stranger* for 40 Years and *continues Poſſeſſion*, and after *conveys to a younger Son, who ſells it* for a valuable Conſideration, it was doubted if the *Purchaſor* ſhould avoid this Leaſe. But it was ſaid, that if in that Caſe the Father, after the making ſuch Leaſe, had ſuffered the Land to deſcend to his eldeſt Son, who had been privy to this Truſt, then the Purchaſor *from the eldeſt Son* ſhould avoid this Leaſe. Lane 113. Paſch. 9 Jac. in the Exchequer, in Caſe of Clerk v. Rutland.

Chan Caſes 21. Holford v Holford 8 P. where there is a

16. Every voluntary Conveyance is *not Fraudulent*, but prima facie it is *preſumed* to be ſo againſt Purchaſors, unleſs the contrary be made appear. Chan. Caſes 100. Hill. 19 & 20 Car. 2. Douglaſs v. Ward.

Conveyance for a Conſideration——So where Perſons of Honour are Truſtees, per Finch. C. Chan. Caſes 291. Mich. 28 Car. 2. Biſco v. E. of Banbury.

17. A *Conveyance* cannot be fraudulent *againſt Articles*, unleſs another Conveyance be executed in a legal Courſe. Hill. 23 & 24 Car. 2. 1 Ch. Caſes 217. Holford v. Holford.

Mortgagor marries and *after Marriage ſettles on his Wife* the mortgaged Lands which

18. A. made a *Leaſe for 99 Years in Truſt to raiſe Portions for his Children*; ſome Years after A. *mortgages* the ſame to B. for 500 Years, but with *Notice* of the Settlement; the laſt Leaſe was ſet aſide ſo as not to hinder the raiſing the Portions. Fin. R. 439. Mich. 31 Car. 2. Aldridge and al. v. Duke and al.

was recited to be in Conſideration of a Portion paid, and then *he mortgages a 2d time to another Perſon who had Notice of the Jointure at the time* of the Mortgage; there were *no Articles previous to the Jointure, nor any Money proved to be paid after the Marriage*; the Husband died; on a Bill by the Wife to be let into her Jointure, on Payment of one third due on the firſt Mortgage, without being obliged to redeem the ſecond, as having Notice of the Jointure, it was decreed at the Rolls, that ſhe muſt redeem Both; and on Appeal Ld C. King ſaid, it can never be a Queſtion, whether a voluntary Settlement, be good againſt Purchaſors, and affirmed the Decree. Sel. Ch. Ca. in Ld King's time. 65. Mich. 12. Geo. 1. 1726. Gardiner v. Painter.———A Purchaſor for valuable Conſideration *ſhall hold*, or take Place againſt a Prior voluntary Settlement, *tho' he had Expreſs Notice* thereof; at the Time of his Purchaſe ſuch voluntary Settlement by 27 *Eliz.* being made void againſt a Purchaſor with or without Notice. Mich. 1727. per Cur. Abr. Equ. Caſes 334. Tonkins v. Ellis.

2 Ch. R. 74. 24 Car. 2. Thorn v. Newman.

19. A voluntary Conveyance is a fraudulent Conveyance as to a *Purchaſer*, and therefore *Notice*, or no Notice is not material in ſuch Caſe. 1 W. & M. N. Ch. R. 161. Watkins v. Stevens.

20. A. enters into *Partnerſhip* with B. C. and D. for 21 Years, *for digging Mines in A's Lands*, and A. to have ſuch a Share in Conſideration of his Ownerſhip of the Land; A. dies; his Widow ſets up a *voluntary Settlement, after marriage for a Jointure*; it was inſiſted that the Plaintiffs B. C. and

C. and D. were in nature of Purchaſors, and that by 27 El. all voluntary Conveyances are void as againſt Purchaſers; and there was a *Difference between Purchaſors* and *Creditors*; for the 13 El. makes not every voluntary Conveyance, but only fraudulent Conveyances, void as againſt Creditors, ſo that as to Creditors 'tis not ſufficient to ſay the Conveyance is voluntary but muſt ſhew they were Creditors at the Time of the Conveyance made, or by ſome other Circumſtances, ſhew 'twas *made with intent to deceive*, or defraud a Creditor. But as to Purchaſors all voluntary Conveyances are void without more. The Court inclined that Plaintiffs were as Purchaſors and to Decree an Execution of the Agreement againſt the voluntary Settlement. Mich. 1695. 2 Vern. 326. Shaw and al. v. Standith.

21. Reverſioner in Fee of a *Copyhold* Eſtate ſurrenders it to his Heir Apparent in Tail, Remainder to his own Right Heirs, and this was *in Order that his Son, coming in as a Purchaſor*, and not as Heir, after his Death *ſhould pay a leſs Fine*; afterwards the *Father on a Treaty of Marriage of his Son with B. tells B's Friends that this Copyhold was ſo ſettled*, and propoſed therefore a Settlement of other Lands on B. Whereupon a Settlement was made, the Marriage was had, and a Portion paid of 2000 *l.* Afterwards the *Father ſettles the Copyhold on a ſecond Wife*. Ld Cowper Decreed the Surrender good to the Son, and tho' *voluntary at firſt*, yet upon his Treaty of Marriage, it being regarded as a principal Inducement to it, it *now became valuable*, and ought to be conſidered as if it had been then ſurrendered to the Son, and diſmiſſed the Bill of the Father's ſecond Wife and her Truſtees with Coſts. Ch. Prec. 275. Hill. 1708. Kirk v. Clark.

22. A *Settlement* may be *made after Marriage* [without Articles or Agreement precedent] and not be fraudulent againſt Purchaſors; as if a Marriage be had and *in Conſideration of a Sum of Money paid after the Marriage* [and which the Husband was not intitled to before] it will be good, as was ſaid by Counſel; to which Ld C. King ſaid, that that would be *as a new Agreement for a valuable Conſideration*, and for a Sum of Money to which he had not been intitled, unleſs he had conſented to the making ſuch Jointure, and would be good againſt Purchaſors; but if he make a Jointure in Conſideration of Money which he was then intitled to, it is voluntary. Sel. Ch. Ca. in Ld King's time. 65. Mich. 12 Geo. 1. 1726. in Caſe of Gardiner v. Painter.

(K) Relating to Landlords and Tenants, and other Perſons claiming Right in the Lands.

1. A. Held Lands of *ſeveral Lords*, and in order *to Defraud* 'em *of their Heriots* made a fraudulent *Gift of all his Horſes* to B. who, to prevent the Lord from ſeiſing, inſiſted on his fraudulent Gift; upon which the Lord brings *Debt* on the Statute 13 Eliz. 5. *for the Value of all the Horſes* ſo given away, tho' he claimed *but one Heriot*; and whether or no the Plaintiff could *recover the Value* but *of one or of all* was the Queſtion? and per Dyer and Harper J. the Action well lies; but Manwood e contra. D. 351. b. pl. 23.

2 Le. 8. S. C. per Dyer and Manwood J. the Action did not lie; but per Mounſon J. it did lie. 19 Eliz. C. B. Creſwell v. Coke.——

S. C. cited Arg. 3 Lev. 354. out of D. 351.

2. If A. *makes a Leaſe for Years by Fraud* and Covin, *and after makes another Leaſe bona fide*, but *without Fine or Rent* reſerved; the ſecond Leſſee ſhall not avoid the firſt Leaſe; For it was agreed, firſt, That by the Common Law, Eſtate made by Fraud ſhall be avoided by him only who had former Right, Title, Intereſt, Debt, or Demand, but that he who has a later Right, &c. could not avoid Gift or Eſtate precedent by Fraud at the Common Law. Secondly, that no Purchaſor ſhould avoid precedent Conveyance made by Fraud and Covin, but he who is Purchaſor for Money, or other valuable Conſideration. 3 Rep. 83. cites it adjudged Trin. 37 Eliz. C. B. Upton v. Baſſet.

Cro. E. 444. Mich. 37 & 38 Eliz. C. B. S. C. reported as here, that no Rent was reſerved tho' Hughes Abr. tit. Deeds 605. pl. 13 is miſprinted by ſaying that Rent

Rent was reſerved, and Nelſon's Abr. tit. Fraud, pl. 4. by copying from Hughe's is ſo too, and as Hughes cites no Book, ſo neither does Mr Nelſon, and both give it as a Reaſon, why the ſecond Leaſe ſhould not avoid the firſt, viz. "becauſe an Eſtate by Fraud, ſhall be avoided only by him who "has a former Right;"——without taking Notice that it was ſo by the Common Law.——*Leſſee at a Rack Rent* has been adjudged at Law, tho' he paid no Fine, to be a *Purchaſor* within the Statute. 2 Vern. 327. Arg. in the Caſe of Shaw & al. v. Standiſh.——6 Rep. 72. b. Burrel's Caſe.—Cro. J. 181. cites is as adjudged 29 Eliz. in Caſe of Hind v. Collins.

See Faits (S)

3. *One, that could read*, made an *Agreement for a Leaſe for* 21 *Years*, the *Leſſor* himſelf *drew the Leaſe but for one Year*, and *read it for* 21 Years, and after the Expiration of a Year ejected the Leſſee, and he brought a Bill in Chancery, to be relieved upon all this Matter which was in Proof; but it was *diſmiſſed with Coſts*; For it was within the Statute of Frauds and Perjuries; and being able to read it was his own *folly*; otherwiſe if he had been *unlettered*. Hill. 35 & 36 Car. 2. Skin. 159. Anon. in Chancery.

4. 11 *Geo.* 2. *cap.* 19. §. 12. *Every Tenant, to whom any Declaration in Ejectment ſhall be delivered, ſhall forthwith give Notice thereof to his or her Landlord or Landlords, or his, her, or their Bailiff, or Receiver, under Penalty of forfeiting the Value of* 3 *Years improved or Rack Rent of the Premiſes ſo demiſed or holden in the Poſſeſſion of ſuch Tenant, to the Perſon of whom he or ſhe holds, to be recovered by Action of Debt, wherein no Eſſoign, Protection, or Wager of Law ſhall be allowed, nor any more than one Imparlance.*

(K. 2) Voluntary Conveyances. In what Caſes they ſhall be ſaid to be Fraudulent.

1. IF one makes a voluntary Conveyance in Conſideration of Natural Affection, and is *not* at that Time *indebted* to any, *nor in Treaty* with any *for the Sale* of the Lands, ſuch Conveyance has no Badge of Fraud, but otherwiſe it is if he be indebted, or in Treaty for the Sale of the Lands. Sti. 446. Paſch. 1655. Anon.

2. A. ſeiſed in Fee-Tail, in purſuance of ſeveral Promiſes to M. his Couſin, ſuffered a Common Recovery, and declared the Uſes to M. and her Heirs after his Death, and after he *ſold the Land* to J. S who was alſo his Couſin for a 1000*l.* the ſaid *firſt Conveyance not being diſcovered till after his Death*; the Court held the *Deed of Uſes of the Common Recovery* to be fraudulent within the Statute. Sid. 133. Paſch. 15 Car. 2. B. R. Fitzjames v. Moys.

3. In a Trial at Bar, *the Son and Daughter* of A. were Defendants; the Action was an Ejectment; the Defendants admitted the Point of A.'s *Bankruptcy*, but ſet up a *Conveyance* made by A. to them *for* the *Payment of* 1500*l. apiece, being Money given them by their Grandfather* B. to whom A. took out Adminiſtration. Per Hale Ch. J. it is a voluntary Conveyance unleſs you can prove that A. had *Goods in his Hands* of B.'s *at the Time of the Executing it*; ſo they proved that he had, and there was a Verdict for the Defendants. Mod. 76. Mich. 22 Car. 2. Sir Anthony Bateman's Caſe.

4. If the *Son be Diſſolute*, and the *Father* with Advice of Friends doth *ſettle Things ſo that he ſhall not ſpend all*, tho' here be not a Conſideration of Money, yet it is no fraudulent Deed; and a Deed may be voluntary, and yet not Fraudulent, otherwiſe moſt of the Settlements in England would be avoided; per Hale Ch. J. and Twiſden Juſtice. Mod. 119. Paſch. 26 Car. 2. Lord Tenham v. Mullins.

2 Vern. 271. Trin. 1692. Sanders v. Debew.

5. Voluntary Settlement made *by the Father*, is fraudulent as to any Mortgage made by himſelf, otherwiſe as to a *Mortgage made by the Son*. Vern. 46. Paſch. 1682. Jones v. Pureſoy.

6. Every

6. Every voluntary Conveyance is not therefore fraudulent; but if there was a *reaſonable Cauſe for making it*, may be good and valid, even againſt a Creditor; per Jeffries C. 2 Vern. 44. Paſch. 1688. in Caſe of Sagittary v. Hide.

If a *Feme* joins in Aliening her *Jointure*, and the ſame Day a New one is made, and of greater Value, and without Articles, or Agreement, 'tis not fraudulent againſt Purchaſors. 2 Lev. 70. Mich. 24 Car. 2. B. R. Scot v. Bell.——A *Temporary* Conveyance made by a Husband in Place of a Jointure before Marriage agreed to be made on the Wife, and of a like Value, tho' by a Different way of Grant, as by a Leaſe to Truſtees for 100 Years, and tho' it was *Indorſed that when a Jointure ſhould be ſettled upon her of* 1000*l. per Ann. according to the firſt Agreement, then the Leaſe ſhould be void*; yet it was held after the Baron's Death, he having made no other Jointure, that this Conveyance was good againſt a Purchaſor. Cro J. 454. Mich. 15 Jac. B. R. Griffin v. Stanhop.——Vent. 194. Paſch. 24 Car. 2. Sir Ralph Bovey's Caſe.—Clayt. 39. Lent Aſſiſe 11 Car. 1. coram Vernon. Anon.

7. In Debt upon a *Recognizance* forfeited by Reaſon of an *Eſcape*, a voluntary Settlement *made* 30 *Years before* the Eſcape was adjudged to be fraudulent. Arg. Paſch. 1688. 2 Vern. 44. cites it as adjudged in B. R. in Lenthall's Caſe.

8. A. purchaſes a Copyhold, and takes a *Surrender to himſelf, his Wife and his Daughter*, and their Heirs; A. as viſible Owner of the Eſtate takes on him to make a Conditional ſurrender by way of *Mortgage* to the Plaintiff, and dies; Plaintiff brings a Bill againſt the Mother and Daughter to diſcover their Title, and to ſet aſide their Eſtate as fraudulent againſt him, who was a Purchaſor; but Bill diſmiſſed, tho' without Coſts; For per Lds Commiſſioners, the Husband and Wife take one Moiety by Entierties, ſo that the Husband can't alien, nor diſpoſe of it, ſo as to bind the Wife, and the other Moiety is well veſted in the Daughter. 2 Vern. 120. Hill. 1690. Back v. Andrewes.

9. Father makes a voluntary Settlement *on Truſtees to raiſe Money to pay his Debts and Portions for younger Children*, reſerving 50*l.* per Ann. to himſelf for Life, Remainder to his Son for Life, Remainder, &c. Father continues in Poſſeſſion, and 12 *Years after contracts new Debts by Bond*. Per Hutchins Commiſſioner, 'tis a fraudulent Settlement and not purſued; For the Truſtees did not enter according to the Deed, but let the Father live in the Houſe, but, the other 2 Commiſſioners doubting, it was ſent to Law. 2 Vern. 261. Paſch. 1692. Hungerford v. Earle.

(L) In Reſpect of Power of Revocation.

1. By 27 *El. cap.* 4. §. 5. *If Lands be firſt conveyed with Clauſe, Proviſion, or Condition of Revocation, Determination, or Alteration, and afterwards ſold, or changed for Money, or other good Conſideration before the firſt Conveyance was revoked, altered, or made void, according to the Power given thereby; in this Caſe ſuch firſt Conveyances ſhall be void againſt the Vendee, and all others lawfully claiming from, by, or under him. Howbeit, no lawful Mortgage made* bona fide *without Fraud ſhall be impeached by this Act.*

A Conveyance by *Covenant to ſtand ſeiſed* in Conſideration of *nearneſs of Blood* is not a Conveyance upon *valuable Conſideration*, within this Statute, to make void a *former* Conveyance with *Power of Revocation*. Mo. 602. Trin. 42 Eliz. in Chancery, Burgh's Caſe. als. Burgh (Lady) v. Williams.

If A. *bargains and ſells* his Land to B. with intent *to make B Tenant to the Precipe*, and B. ſuffers a *Recovery*, declaring by Indenture the *Uſes to A. for Life*, Remainder over with *Power* to A. *of Revocation*, A. ſhall be ſaid to be the *Perſon who makes the Conveyance*, and therefore if A. *ſells* the ſame Land afterwards to C. for *valuable Conſideration*, the firſt Conveyance is void as to C. by this Statute, and if A. had made a *Leaſe* of the Land, after the firſt Conveyance, this ſhall not be ſaid an *Extinguiſhment of the Power of Revocation*, ſo as to make void the Sale to C. Per Cur. Mo. 615. Paſch. 42 Eliz. C. B. Bullock v. Thorne.

A. *ſeiſed* of Land *in Truſt* for B. makes a *Leaſe for Years* at B.'s requeſt *to C.* on Condition that *C. pay the Profits to B* and that *if A. ſurvive ſuch a Day* the Leaſe *to be void on Payment of* 12*d* to C.—A. ſurvives the Day, but does not pay the Money; and after, in *Conſideration of* 100*l. A.* makes a *Leaſe to D.* and then dies, after which C. on Notice of the Leaſe to him, enters, and D. brought Ejectment. It was ſaid, that the *firſt* Leaſe is not fraudulent, nor within this Statute, and that, the *Power of Revocation* being *extinguiſhed* at the Time of making the *ſecond* Leaſe, the firſt became *abſolute and irrevocable*. Mo. 757. Trin. 2. Jac. Sheldon v. Handbury.

2. If

2. If A. reſerves a Power to himſelf to revoke *by Aſſent of B.* and after A. *bargains and ſells the Land to C.* this is a good Bargain and Sale, and within the Remedy of the 27 Eliz. 4. 3 Rep. 82. b. in Twine's Caſe

3. If a Man has Power of Revocation, and after, to the Intent to defraud a Purchaſor, he *levies a Fine, or makes Feoffment*, or other Conveyance *to a Stranger, and thereby extinguiſhes his Power, and* then *bargains and ſells the Land to a third Perſon for a valuable Conſideration*, the Bargainee ſhall enjoy the Land; For as to him the Fine, &c. by which the the Condition was extinct, was void by the Statute, and ſo the *firſt Clauſe, which makes all fraudulent* and Covenous *Conveyances void as to a Purchaſor, extends to the laſt Clauſe* of the Act, viz. *when he who makes the Bargain and Sale had Power of Revocation.* 3 Rep. 83. a. in Twine's Caſe cites 38 Eliz. C. B. Lee v. Colſhill.

4. *Voluntary Eſtates* made with Power of Revocation are, by the Statute of 27 Eliz. as to purchaſors, put upon the ſame Foot with Conveyances made by Fraud to deceive Purchaſors. 3 Rep. 83. reports that it was ſo ſaid.

5. A Man had *conveyed* his Land to the Uſe of *himſelf for Life*, and then to the Uſe *of diverſe others of his Blood*, with future *Power of Revocation*, as *after ſuch a Feaſt*, or after the *Death of ſuch a one*, and after, and before the Power of Revocation commenced, he (for a valuable Conſideration) did bargain and ſell the Land to another and his Heirs; this Bargain and Sale is within the Remedy of the Statute; for altho' the Statute ſaith, (*the ſaid firſt Conveyance not by him revoked according to the Power by him reſerved*) which ſeems, by the literal Senſe, to be intended of a preſent Power of Revocation,) for no Revocation may be made by Force of a future Power until it comes in eſſe;) yet it was holden that the Intention of the Act was, that ſuch a voluntary Conveyance which was Originally ſubject to the Power of Revocation, be it in preſent, or in future, ſhall not be good againſt a Purchaſor bona Fide upon a valuable Conſideration, and if other Conſtruction be made, the Act will ſignify very little, and it will be eaſy to evade ſuch an Act. Bridgm. 23. in Caſe of Garth v. Eresfield, cites it as Mich. 42 & 43 Eliz. 3 Rep. 82. b. Standen v. Bullock.

So, where A. had made ſuch Conveyance, and had made a *Leaſe reſerving Rent*, without other Conſideration, it was ſaid to be reſolved that it was ſufficient, and a Revocation of the former Eſtate quoad that Leaſe. Cro. J. 180. cites 29 Eliz. B. R. Hinde v. Collins.

6. A. *Covenants to ſtand ſeiſed* in Conſideration of Love &c. to himſelf for Life, Remainder to his eldeſt Son, &c. *with Power to Leaſe for 21 Years*, and reſerving a *Power to revoke* the Uſes; A. for 30*l.* made a Leaſe to B. for 21 Years; Tho' the Power was ill, being on Covenant to ſtand ſeiſed, yet, having Power of Revocation, the Law conſtrues it as revoked and void quoad the *Leaſe*, and that A. was a Tenant in Fee when he made the Leaſe; and 'tis expreſsly within the 27 El. 4. being in Conſideration of a *Fine paid.* Cro. J. 180. Trin. 5 Jac. B. R. Croſs v. Fauſtenditch als. Shoreditch.

Godb. 289. pl. 416. S. C. —2 Roll. R. 294. S. C.— S. P. and Reſolved that it was ſo without averment of Fraud under the Inquiſition Quæ terras & tenementa habuit. S. C. cited Hob. 339. in Caſe of Lord Sheffield v. Ratcliff.

7. The *King's Debtor* is ſeiſed of Lands in Fee; and being ſo indebted and ſeiſed *makes a Feoffment* to a Stranger, with Power of Revocation, and *dies without Revocation.* This Land is liable to the King's Debt; For it was in the Power of the Debtor to revoke this Feoffment, and then without doubt the Land had been liable to this Debt; and his not revoking it was *with an Intent to defraud the King* as the Law will preſume; and therefore it was adjudged by the two Chief Juſtices and Chief Baron, that this Land is liable to the King's Debt by the Common Law. Jenk. 285. pl. 19.——Marg. cites Paſch. 21 Jac. in the Court of Wards, Sir Edward Coke's Caſe.

8. A. before Marriage with M. *agreed to aſſure* 1000 l. *a Year for a Jointure*, and after Marriage *conveyed Lands of greater Value to Truſtees to her Uſe for* 100 *Years, if ſhe ſo long live*, to commence after his Death, but there was an Indorſement to make void the Deed upon the making a Jointure of 1000 *l.* a year according to the firſt Agreement, and in the Leaſe there was a *Proviſo to determine at the Will of A.* This was held a good Leaſe being made in purſuance of the firſt Agreement, tho' no mention then was of any Leaſe to be made, but it is founded on a good Conſideration and not fraudulent. Cro. J. 454. Mich. 15 Jac. B. R. Griffin v. Stanhope. Nels. Abr. Fra (A) pl 10 cites S. C. but omits the the Proviſo.

9. A. ſetled a *Jointure on his Wife, with Power of Revocation*, and afterwards A. on the Marriage of B. his Nephew with M. agreed to ſettle *on B. Lands of* 700 *l. per Ann.* Tho' the *Lands fall ſhort of that Value*, it ſhall not be ſupply'd out of the Jointure; For tho' the Jointure, being with Power of Revocation, was fraudulent as to Purchaſors, yet 'twas not ſo to the Nephew or his Wife, being made long before the Marriage. Mich. 26 Car. 2. Fin. R. 146. Parker v. Serjeant.

10. *Baron and Feme* ſeiſed in Right of Feme, of a *Rectory*, in Conſideration of *Marriage of their Son, and of a Portion* to be paid him, levy a *Fine* to four others, to the Uſe *of Baron for Life*, and then of *Feme* for Life, Remainder *to the Son and his Heirs*, with a *Power* to Baron and his Feme, *with Conſent of the ſaid four Perſons*, or *the Survivor of them to revoke* the Uſes. Baron dies, *Feme* enters and *ſells the Rectory for* 1400 *l.* to J. S. (who had *Notice of the Fine and Uſes)* and *without Conſent of the Survivor* of thoſe four, there being only one then living; and reſolved per Cur. that this firſt Conveyance is not within the 27 *Eliz.* nor fraudulent againſt J. S. the *Purchaſor* Jones. 94. Mich. 29 Car. 2. B. R. Buller v. Waterhouſe.

11. A. makes a voluntary Settlement reſerving a *Power to Mortgage*, and charge the Eſtate with *what Sums he thought fit*; ſo that he may charge it to the full Value. This, in Effect, *amounts to a Power of Revocation*; and therefore fraudulent, as againſt Creditors, by Statute and Judgment. 2 Vern. 511. Trin. 1705. Tarback v. Marbury. *But* if no Fraud be found, a Proviſo to charge with 2000 *l.* (being *a particular Sum*) is not within the Statute, per Cur. Lev. 152. Mich. 16 Car. 2 B. R. Jenkins v. Keymis.

(M) Forfeitures or Penalties inflicted for fraudulent Conveyances and abetting the ſame.

1. 13 *Eliz. cap.* 5 §. 3. Enacts that *Every of the Parties to ſuch a fraudulent Conveyance, Bond, Suit, Judgment or Execution, who, being privy thereunto, ſhall wittingly juſtify the ſame to be done* bona fide, *and upon good Conſideration, or ſhall alien or aſſign any Lands, Leaſe or Goods ſo to them conveyed as aforeſaid, ſhall forfeit one Year's Value of the Lands, Leaſe, Rent, Common or other Profit out of the ſame, and the whole Value of the Goods, and alſo ſo much Money as ſhall be contained in ſuch covinous Bond; and being thereof convicted, ſhall ſuffer half a Year's Impriſonment without Bail. And here the ſaid Forfeitures are to be divided between the Queen and the Party grieved.* *Avowing* a fraudulent Conveyance of Goods, in *Delay of Execution of Proceſs* by *Attachment*, was held within this Statute. Le. 47. Mich. 28 and 29 Eliz. C. B. Pendleton v Gunſton.

2. A. *owes B.* 20 *l* and he makes a fraudulent *Gift of his Goods worth* 2000 *l.* tho' A. is defrauded but of 20 *l.* yet B. ſhall forfeit the whole Value of the Goods ſo contracted; per Mounſon J. becauſe the Perſon of the Debtor is chargeable. 2 Le. 8. 19. Eliz. C. B. Creſwell v. Coke.

Reſolved, 1ſt, that where W. had agreed for 1000l. paid by one T. to aſſure 100l. per Ann. to him during his own Life and his Wife's, and for Aſſurance of which, a *Mortgage* was made, tho' W. did *not pay* the Money, yet is he a *Purchaſor within* 27 *Eliz.* becauſe *named as Party in Truſt for Benefit of T.*——2dly, That the Eſtate on the Mortgage was a *ſufficient Purchaſe*, within the Statute.——3dly. That *one entire Year's Profit* ſhall be forfeited without *Apportionment*, on a Mortgage, as well as on an *abſolute Sale*; ſo on a *Leaſe* or a petty *Annuity* made by Fraud——4thly. That every Defendant found guilty ſhall pay a Year's Value of the Land, *every one by himſelf*, and not *jointly* amongſt them all.——5thly. That a Defendant being 16 *Years of Age*, and privy to the Conveyance, and having *juſtify'd* it to be made bona fide, ſhall be puniſhed as of *full Age.*——6thly. The Bill being preferred *only on this Statute*, the Court of *Star-Chamber* could not *increaſe* or *diminiſh the Penalty* of the Statute, nor *impoſe a Fine for the King*. Noy. 105. Poulton v. Wiſeman.

3. 27 *Eliz. c.* 4. §. 3. Enacts that *Every of the Parties to ſuch fraudulent Conveyances, or being privy thereunto, who ſhall juſtify the ſame to be made* bona fide, *and on good Conſideration, to the Diſturbance and Hindrance of the Purchaſor, or of any other lawfully claiming, from by or under him, ſhall forfeit one Year's Value of the Lands, or other Hereditaments ſo purchaſed or charged, to be divided betwixt the Queen and the Party grieved, and being thereof convicted, ſhall ſuffer half Year's Impriſonment without Bail.*

Upon Evidence in an Action on this Statute, Defendant on his *Examination in Chancery* depoſed, that *he thought it a good Deed, and on good Conſideration*, and reſolved——1ſt. That a *Purchaſor*, after ſuch *Avowing*, ſhall not have an *Action.*——2dly. That (*Thought*) or (*Believing*) is not a direct *Affirmation.*——3dly. That it is not a *voluntary* Avowing, but *ſub Pœna*, and ſo not within the Statute.——4thly. That he that had the *future Intereſt for Years* might have an Action on the Statute, as *he in Remainder* might have an Action for *forging Deeds, &c.* Noy: 115 Covil. v. Barton.

(N) Actions and Pleadings on the ſeveral Statutes of Frauds.

1. THE Action on the 13 Eliz. 5. *is not a popular Action*, but extends only to the Party grieved, per Dyer and Manwood J. 19 Eliz. C. B. 2 Le. 9. in the Caſe of Creſwell v. Cook.

2. The *Father aliens to his Son and Heir for Money* (and Money is really paid) yet it ſhall be intended fraudulent, unleſs the contrary be ſhewed and averred; per Harris Serjeant. 3 Le. 254. Mich. 32 Eliz. C. B. in the Serjeant's Caſe, ſays 'twas lately ſo adjudg'd in the Court of Wards.

3. A. brought *Debt on a Bond* againſt B. as Heir to his Father, who entered into the Bond. B. pleaded *Riens per Deſcent.* He having, long before the Action brought, made a *Feoffment of the Lands by Deſcent* to one W. But this was proved to be by *Fraud, to bar A. of his Action*, and ſo avoid Feoffment by the 13 *Eliz.* 5. and this was allowed to be *given in Evidence* without pleading it, becauſe the Statute was made in *Suppreſſion of Fraud*, and therefore muſt have a favourable Interpretation; and it would be very unreaſonable to oblige the Party to plead a Feoffment to which he is an entire Stranger. 5 Rep. 60. Mich. 32 and 33 Eliz. B. R. Gooch's Caſe.

4. If the Party be charged with a *Special Fraud*, he may *plead* that the Conveyance was made *Bona Fide*, and it will be a good Plea *without any Traverſe*. Arg. Goldsb. 119. Hill. 43 Eliz. in Caſe of Price v. Sands.

5. If the *Iſſue* is General, *Seiſed or Not* Seiſed *by the Feoffment*, the Covin may be given in Evidence, when the Feoffment is given in Evidence; *but* if the Iſſue be taken directly, *Infeoffed or Not* infeoffed, the Feoffment muſt be avoided by pleading the Covin ſpecially; For it is a Feoffment Tiel quel. Hob. 72. Trin. 12 Jac. Humberton v. Howgill.——*Ne Infeoffa pas*, can't be pleaded. Hob. 166.

6. An *Information* upon the Stat. 27 Eliz of fraudulent Conveyances by the Party geiev'd, tho' *brought after the Year*, is good, and not within the Stat. 31 Eliz. 5. For that is to be intended of Common Informers. Noy. 71. Anon. cites it to have been ſo agreed in one Holden's Caſe.

7. A Conveyance made *to avoid a Wardſhip* was decreed not to be given in Evidence. Toth. 105. cites Mich. 6 Car. Biſhop of Hereford v. Bright and Barkley.

8. If

8. If the Stat. of 29 Car. 2, 3. be *not inſiſted upon*, the Court will compell the Performance of an Agreement, tho' not in Writing. Arg. 10. Mod. 404. cites it as held in Caſe of Kingſman v. Kingſman. And the ſame was done per Parker C. Paſch 4 Geo. 1. 10 Mod. 405. in Caſe of Nab v. Nab ——And G. Equ. R. 146. Jones v. Nab. S. C.

(O) By Perſons intruſted. See (U)

1. A. gave to B. ſeveral Sums of *Money to put out at Intereſt* for his Uſe. B. pretended he had put it out, and that he had the Securities in his Cuſtody, when in Truth he had *purchaſed Copyhold Lands in his own Name* with the Money, and was admitted, and ſurrendered the ſame to himſelf for Life, and after to a Nephew. This being found out, B. entered into a Statute to ſurrender to A. the Copyhold, and B. ſurrendered accordingly, but before that A. was admitted B. died. The Nephew being preſented as next Heir of B. the Lord would not admit A. On a Bill brought by A. and the Eſtate of B. appearing not ſufficient to ſatisfy A. and B. having promiſed, that his Nephew, when of Age, ſhould ſurrender, it was decreed that A. ſhould hold the Lands till the Infant come of Age, and then he ſhould ſurrender; Per Ld K. Coventry. Nelſ. Ch. R. 33. Coſin v. Young and Fuller.

(P) By Conſtruction.

1. A. Was *Tenant for Life, Remainder in Tail to B.* his Son. *J. S. thinking that A. had Fee, apply'd to B. to procure a Leaſe for three Lives of A. for 400 l Fine*, and a ſmall yearly Rent. *B. told J. S. that A. had power to grant ſuch Leaſe, and intermedled in the procuring it*, and part of the Money was apply'd to B's uſe. Decreed that A. and B. both join at their own Coſts to confirm the Leaſe to J. S. the Plaintiff during the Eſtate thereby granted. Anno 1649. N. Ch. R. 46. Hunt v. Carew. So where *A. granted a Leaſe for 30 Years*, and the Son, knowing that the Father had no Power to grant ſuch Leaſe, acquainted the Father of it; but *B. ſuffered the Leſſee to lay out 2Sool. in Improvements, without acquainting him that A. had no Right to grant ſuch Leaſe*, but encouraged him to proceed. It was decreed that the Leſſee ſhould hold during the Reſidue of the Term againſt B. his Father being dead. Hill. 9 Annæ G. Equ. R. 85. Huning v. Ferrers——Abr. Equ. Caſes, 357. S. C. Haning v. Ferrers.

2. A. having Title to an Eſtate *ſtood by, and ſuffering a Purchaſor to go on* without diſcloſing his Title was poſtponed. 2 Vern. 151. cited by the Court in the Caſe of Hunſden v. Cheyney. As the Caſe of Dr. Amias. ——The Caſe was Mortgagee or Conuſee of a Statute was inquired of by one treating for the Purchaſe of the Land, if it was free from Incumbrances, who ſaid it was, on which he purchaſed, and was relieved. Cited Mich. 34 Car. 2. in the Caſe of * Hobbs v. Norton. 2 Chan. Caſes 128. * Vern. 136. Hill. 1682 S. C.

3. A Gentleman of 3000 *l.* per Ann. being trick'd into a Recognizance, (by a *Scrivener*, who wormed himſelf in as a Co-Security) for 1000 *l.* of which 300 *l.* only was paid to himſelf; and the Reſidue, after ſeveral Delays, being made up in Money and Goods &c. to the Scrivener (in Confederacy with the Lender), was relieved on the Circumſtances of Fraud, and decreed to repay only the 300 *l.* and Intereſt, and a perpetual Injunction againſt the Statute, as to the Plaintiff; per Somers C. Hill. 1697. 2 Vern. 346. Smith v. Burroughs and Loader. This was firſt decreed by the Maſter of the Rolls, and upon Appeal to the Lord Chancellor, the Decree was affirmed. Hill. 1697. Ch. Prec. 80, 81. Smith v. Loader and Burroughs.

4 A. deviſed 300 *l.* to B. but *if B. married without Conſent of C.—C. to have*

have the 300*l.*—B. married D.—C. knew of the Courtſhip and the *Marriage had with the Privity of C.* but he never conſented or contradicted. Cowper K. thought it a *tacit Conſent and a Fraud*, and decreed the 300*l.* to B. Hill. 1706. 2 Vern. 580. Meſgret and Ux v. Meſgret.

'Tis not neceſſary that ſuch Feme Covert or Infant be *active in promoting* the Purchaſe, if it appears that they were *privy* to it, and that it could not be done without their Knowledge, and they gave no Notice. 9 Mod. 37.

5. A. had two Daughters B. and C.—A. was Tenant for Life of Lands, *Remainder to B. a Feme Covert in Tail*; On a Treaty of Marriage between J. S. and C. J. S. inſiſted on 1000*l.* which A. could not give. B. and her Husband encouraged the *Marriage*, and *ſollicited A. to convey the intailed Lands to J. S. and C.* which A. did; 'twas decreed after A's. Death, that B. ſhould be bound by the Conveyance, and levy a Fine on Penalty of Payment of Coſts; and a perpetual Injunction granted to J. S. and C. for quiet Poſſeſſion. Tr. 9 Geo. 9 Mod. 35. Savage v. Foſter.

6. *Qui tacet conſentire videtur.* See Maxims.

(Q) By Conſtruction, as to Mortgagees.

Where a firſt Mortgagee is *Witneſs* to a ſecond Mortgage, tho' it appears not, that he actually knew the Contents, yet ſince it did not appear but that he might know them, it would be preſum'd, that if he could write or read, that he knew the Subſtance of the Deed, which he, having atteſted it, undertook to ſupport by his Evidence, and he not acquainting the ſecond Mortgagee with his former Mortgage, the ſecond Mortgagee ſhall be preferr'd, per Cowper C. Wms's Rep. 394. Hill. 1717. Mocatto v. Murgatroyd.———But in a Note, there it is ſaid, that King Ch. in Mich. 1732. thought that a bare Atteſtation, without other Circumſtances of preſumptive Notice, was not ſufficient.

1. A Prior Incumbrancer *witneſſes a ſubſequent Mortgage*, and told the Money lent at his Maſter's Chambers, being his Clerk, and for that alone had his own Security poſtponed. Tr. 1690. 2 Vern. 151. in the Caſe of Hunſden v. Cheyney, cited as the Caſe of Clare v. Earl of Bedford.———Tho' he was an *Infant*. Tr. 9 Geo. 9 Mod. 38. Savage v. Foſter, cites the Caſe above, but adds that the Infant was Clerk to an Attorney, and *ingroſſed* the ſubſequent Mortgage.

2. A *Counſellor* has a Statute from A. and is *adviſed with about lending* 1000*l.* on a Mortgage by B. to A. and draws the Mortgage, in which was a Covenant that the Eſtate was free from Incumbrances, and *conceals his own Statute*. Per Cur. If he, who only conceals his Incumbrance, ſhall be *poſtponed*, much more ought a Counſellor acting thus, and decreed accordingly. Mich. 1699. 2 Vern. 370. Draper v. Hill. & al.

3. A. mortgaged his Land to B. and propoſing to borrow Money of C. on the ſame Land, C. ſends D. to B. to *ask B. if he had any Mortgage on A's Land.—B. ſaid he had not.*—but D. never told B. that C. was about to lend Money on the Security to A. and the Queſtion D. ask'd was in a publick Market, and 'twas, what A. ow'd him? Decreed at the Rolls, that the Eſtate ſhould ſtand changed with B's Debt firſt. But Lord King directed a Trial at Law, whether D. told B. that C. was about to lend Money on A's Eſtate when D. enquired what B's Debt was, and directed B's Anſwer to be read as Evidence. Paſch. 1706. 2 Vern. 554. Ibotſon v. Rhodes.

Mich. 2 Geo. G. Equ R. 122. S. C. and reports that A. borrow'd the Leaſe of B. a *ſecond Time, and then C. lent more Money*, but the Leaſe was returned to B. in an Hour's Time; and B. in his Anſwer denied, and no Proof was made of B's knowing the Occaſion of the borrowing it. But otherwiſe a *Combination between a firſt Mortgagee and Mortgagor* to draw in a ſecond Mortgage will poſtpone the firſt. But here C. truſted A. more than B. did.

4. A. having Leaſe-hold Eſtate mortgaged it to B. and afterwards, on a plauſible Pretence, *borrows of B. the original Leaſe, and ſhews it to C. of whom he then borrowed* 250*l. on it*, but returned the Leaſe to B.—Decreed at the Rolls to poſtpone B. to C. as guilty of a Fraud on C. But Cowper C. reverſed the Decree; For that B. had acted innocently in what he had done. Mich. 1716. 2 Vern. 726. Peter v. Ruſſel.

5. J. S.

5. J. S. an Owner of a Ship *mortgages his Ship to A. with whom he leaves the* original *Bill of Sale*, and this Mortgage was by Deed of Mortgage only, *without any Indorſement* or Notice of the Morgage *on the Bill of Sale*, as is uſual; Afterwards (at the Requeſt of J. S.) *A. lets J. S. have the original Bill of Sale*; and thereupon *J. S. made ſeveral ſubſequent Mortgages* of ſeveral Parts of the Ship, which were *indorſed* upon the original Bill of Sale, and ſome time after *J. S. deliver'd the Bill of Sale to A. who made no Objection* as to the Indorſements. Cowper C. decreed that this, together with the long Acquieſcence afterwards, amounted to an *imply'd Conſent* in A. to the ſubſequent Mortgages indorſed, and ſhould give them a *Preference*. Wms's Rep. 392, 393. Hill. 1717. Mocatto & al. v. Murgatroyd.

6. *And* in this Caſe, *A. was ordered to pay Coſts to the Indorſees* of the ſubſequent Mortgages on the Bill of Sale, who were the Plaintiffs; *but not to have his Coſts over againſt J. S.* in Regard, as Ld Chancellor ſaid, it was not reaſonable that A. ſhould onerate his Pledge with Coſts *occaſioned by his unjuſt Defence*. Ibid 395.

7. Tenant for Life borrow'd Money, and his Son, who was *next in Remainder* and an *Infant*, was a *Witneſs to the Deed of Mortgage*. The Mortgagee was relieved on the Foot of Fraud, becauſe the Infant did not give him Notice of his Title, cited as the Caſe of * Watts v. Paſcall. Tr. 9 Geo. 1. 9 Mod. 38. in the Caſe of Savage v. Foſter.

S. C. cited P. 10 Geo. Arg. accordingly. But by the Counſel of the other Side, 'twas ſaid, that the Son *ſolicited the lending the Money, and carried the Deed to Counſel*, and witneſſed the Mortgage. 9 Mod. 96. by the Name of Watts v. Treſwick.——A Leſſee for 21 Years was a Witneſs to a Conveyance in Fee, and ſome Years after, when his Leaſe was expired, and not before, he claimed by a prior Releaſe from the ſame Perſon that executed the Conveyance he was Witneſs to; but decreed againſt him by the Ld Keeper Coventry. Neſſ. Ch. R. 28. Gwin v. Edmonds.

(Q. 2) By Conſtruction. as to * Purchaſors.

* Vid (I)

1. THere is a great Difference between a *Mortgagee's not giving Notice* to a Perſon whom he knows to be in Treaty for the Sale, or any Settlement of the Land in his Mortgage, and where the Mortgagee himſelf *helps carry on* ſuch a Treaty. Paſch. 10 Geo. 1. 9 Mod. 96. Osborn v. Lea.

So where *Remainderman in Tail* expectant on Eſtate for Life, *encouraged* Leſſee of Tenant for Life *to expend Money on Repairs*; the Leaſe, tho' for 30 Years, was eſtabliſhed againſt the Remainderman, per Ld Harcourt. Hill. 9 Annæ. G. Equ. R. 85 Huning v. Ferrers.——Abr. Equ. Caſes 357. S. C.——*Concealment only* will not make a Grant ill, which at firſt was good. And all Acts ought to have Reſort to their firſt Original, per Montague Ch. J. on a Trial at Bar of an Iſſue out of Chancery. Cro. J. 455. Mich. 13 Jac. B. R. Griffin v. Stanhope.

(R) By Conſtruction, relating to Marriage.

1 THO' the Conſideration of *Marriage* be a good Conſideration, yet if *Power of Revocation* be annexed to it, it is void as to Strangers. Lane 22. Mich. 4. Jac. in the Exchequer. Anon.

2. A *Widow* makes a Deed of her *former Husband's Eſtate*, and marries, the ſecond Husband not privy to it; decreed the ſecond Husband to enjoy the Eſtate notwithſtanding. 2 Car. 2. 2 Chan. Rep. 81 Howard v. Hooker.

3. Plaintiffs were the Defendant's Siſter's Children, and on a Bill againſt Defendant (being an Infant) to diſcover a Deed, the Queſtion was, If Defendant's Father had ſettled Lands on Plaintiff's Mother? The Proof was, that about two Years before her Marriage, he *had put* her *in Poſſeſſion* of theſe Lands, and had *articled*, on her ſaid Marriage, *to ſettle them* on her and her Heirs, and the *Defendant, (then an Infant)*

was a Witness to the Articles. But tho' there was no other Proof of such Deed of Settlement, yet the Court decreed for the Plaintiff. But it was reckoned a hard Case to decree an Equity on a Deed which had no other Proof. N. Ch. R. 94. Kingston v. Manwaring.

4. A *Recognizance* entered into by the *Wife, the Day before Marriage*, was set aside, and a perpetual Injunction granted, tho' one Witness deposed, the Husband's Consent to the Drawing it, but that Witness had an Assignment of it to himself. 24 Car. 2. 2 Chan. R. 79. Lance v. Norman.

5. A *Widow intitled to Dower released the same, upon a false Suggestion*, viz. that her Husband by his Will had given her 3500*l.* in lieu thereof; and this Release having been *produced to M. and her Relations, on the Son's Marriage with M. and a Settlement made, and Portion paid*, the Mother the Widow, shall be bound by it, and even tho' her Son, who surpriz'd her into such Release, had defrauded her of all the Money left her by her Husband's Will, and which was the like Sum of 3500*l.* which was given her absolutely, and not intended to be in lieu of Dower. Hill. 1690. 2 Vern. 133. Beverley v. Beverley.

6. On a Treaty of Marriage, the *Mother hears her Son declare, that* such a Term was to come to him after his Mother's Death, and *witnesses a Deed of Settlement* of the Reversion thereof on the Issue of that Marriage, after the Mother's Death; the Term was in Truth entailed on the Mother. Yet she is decreed to make good this Settlement, and to settle the Reversion accordingly after her Death; per Commissioners. Trin. 1690. 2 Vern. 150. Hunsden v. Cheyney.

And if the Father in Law alone had brought the Bill, he would be relieved. per Master of the Rolls. Mich. 1718.

7. A. the *Father, denied to consent to his Son's Marriage* with B's Daughter, *unless he would give Bond to pay* 100*l.* *to him*, which he pretended he wanted for a Provision for younger Children, upon which the Son, rather than the Match should go off, complied. But upon a Bill brought by the Son and his Father in Law, he was reliev'd. Arg. 10. Mod. 448. cites it as the Case of Sloan v. Fowler.

Wms's Rep. 497. in Case of Turton v. Benson.——S. P. Ibid. 498. by Parker C. for he is as a Purchasor, by giving a Portion or settling Lands.

(S) By Construction. As to Settlements or Portions.

See 2 Vern. 220. Pasch. 1691. Cottle v. Fripp.

1. *BOND to settle a Jointure.*—The Bond is given before Marriage, and after a Settlement is made, which settles the Estate on the Wife, and the Issue of the Marriage.——This Settlement is good, as to the Jointure, but fraudulent as to the Children, in respect of a Purchasor. Hill. 1684. Vern. 286. in the Case of Jason v. Jervis.

2. *Widow* before her Marriage with her second Husband, *assigns over* the greatest Part of her Estate to Trustees, *in Trust for her Children by her former Husband*, tho' this was without the Consent of her second Husband, yet per Jefferies C. it being done for a Provision for her Children by a former Husband, 'tis good, and decreed that the Husband, he having *suppress'd the Deed*, pay the Sum mentioned in the Deed to be the Value of the Goods. Mich. 1686. Vern 408. Hunt v. Matthews.

Mich. 1691. Ch. Prec. 35. S. C.—S. C. cited Mich. 2 Geo. G. Equ. R. 123. in Case of Perer v. Russel.—— S. C. cited P. 10 Geo. by the Name of

3. A. on his Marriage with M. settled on her the Lands in Question, for her *Jointure*. *B.* the second Brother of A. *was privy to an Entail, and to the Treaty of Marriage, and engrossed the Jointure Deed.* A. dying without Issue, devised the Inheritance to J. S. B. having the Deed of Entail, brought Ejectment and recovered. J. S. marries M. the Widow. Decreed for M's Jointure against B and all claiming by, or under him, but as to J. S. who claimed the Inheritance by a voluntary Devise, the Bill was dismissed. Mich. 1691. 2 Vern. 239. * Raw v. Pool,——affirmed in Dom. Proc. 240. ut ante.

Data

Laws v. Betts, but ſays, that the Brother B. who was the Remainderman, *joined in the Jointure* on M. was decreed to confirm it. 9 Mod. 96. Paſch. 10 Geo. in Canc. in Caſe of Osborn v. Lea.

4. *B. on Marriage with M. ſettles a Jointure on her, with the Approbation of A. his Father, and who witneſſed the Deed.* The Son died, afterwards *A. diſcovered, that B. was only Tenant for Life, and that the Fee was in himſelf*, and recovered at Law, upon a Bill by the Wife; Ld. C. King ſaid, he ſhould make no difference, whether A. knew of his Title or not, at the time, conſidering the near Relation of *Father and Son*, that it was plain, it was thought the Son had the Fee, and had it been known it had been in the Father, his joining would have been inſiſted upon, elſe the Marriage would not have been had, and as he knew of the Settlement, he ſhall not take Advantage againſt it. And tho' there was a *Covenant in the Deed, and the Son left aſſets* ſufficient, his Lordſhip ſaid, he would compleat her Jointure, and would not oblige her to have Recourſe to the Covenant. Sel. Ch. Ca. in Ld King's Time. 59. Mich. 1726. Teaſdale v. Teaſdale.

But by the Settlement, the Husband was made Tenant for Life, and the Wife, Tenant in Tail, which the Court would not decree, but ordered an uſual Jointure to be made on her, viz. an Eſtate for Life, impeachable of Waſte. Ibid. 60. in a Note there.

(T) By Conſtruction, as to Settlements, or Portions, in Reſpect of Promiſes, &c. for Refunding, &c.

See (R) pl. 7.

1. FAther promiſes 100 l. in Marriage with his Daughter to A. The *Daughter* in Conſideration of this *promiſes to pay 10 l. to the Father.* Per Popham, pleading the Covin will deſtroy the Father's Action. Mo. 468. Mich. 39 and 40 Eliz. Collins v. Willes.

Roll. 21. pl. 16. Collins's Caſe.—Cro. E. 774 S.C.—Ow. 63. S.C.

2. On a Treaty of Marriage between A. and the Daughter of B.—B. would not conſent to the Match, becauſe A. owed 200 *l.* to D.—To remove this Obſtruction, C. (A's Brother) takes up his Brother's Bond, and gives B. his own.——A. *privately gives C. a Counterbond*, and *B's Daughter is privy* to all this Matter, and encouraged it.——A. dies,—his Widow takes Adminiſtration. The Widow ſhall avoid this Counterbond, tho *Party to the Fraud.*—And if C. himſelf had been Plaintiff, he ſhould have been relieved.—And if this Bond ſhould be ſuffered to lie on A's Eſtate, it might ſwallow the Aſſets, and defraud the Creditors, as it alſo injured the Plaintiff, in the Right ſhe had by the Cuſtom of London, to the Perſonal Eſtate of her Husband. Mich. 1685. Vern. 348. Redman v. Redman.

2 Vern 500. S. C. cited Paſch. 1705. in the Caſe of Lamlee v. Haman.—S. C. cited Mich. 1719. Ch. Prec. 525. in Caſe of Turton v. Benſon.—Vern. 475. Mich. 1687. Gale v. Lin-

do. S. P.—cited 2 Vern. 500.———cited Ch. Prec. 522.

3. A. on the *Treaty of Marriage* of his Siſter with B. *lends her privately* 160 *l.* to make up the Fortune B. inſiſted upon, and ſhe gives *Bond* to A. for Re-payment.—A. and B. and the Siſter all die.—The Executor of A. ſues the Bond againſt the Siſter's Executor. Jefferies C. decreed the Bond to be deliver'd up as fraudulent. For *once a Fraud and always a Fraud.* Mich. 1687. Vern. 475. Gale v. Lindo. The Reporter makes a Quære, if the Condition had been that in Caſe ſhe had ſurvived the Husband, then ſhe ſhould repay, whether ſhe could have been relieved? and ſays, Note, it was opened in this Caſe, that *the Wife after the Husband's Death, agreed to repay* the Money, and actually paid part. Sed Non allocatur; ibid. 476.

4. A Widow agrees on Marriage of her Son to releaſe and ſettle her Jointure; the Son privately agrees to convey to her a Leaſehold. 'Tis an *underhand Agreement* to defeat the Agreement made on the Marriage, and ſet aſide as fraudulent. Mich. 1704. 2 Vern. 466. Lamlee v. Haman.

S. C. cited Arg. 10. Mod 448. —2 Vern. 499. S. C. and P——

Vern. 340. Paſch. 1684. Peyton v. Bladwell ———S. C. cited 2 Vern. 500.

5. Where

S. C. cited Arg. 10. Mod 447. —2 Vern. R. 764. Mich. 1719. Turton v. Benſon. S. P. and adds, that *an after Promiſe* by the Son to pay it, is but *Nudum Pactum*.—Wms's Rep. 496. 499. S. C. and P.

5. Where the *Son without the Privity of the Father* or Parent, treating the Match, gives a Bond to return, or *refund* any Part of the *Portion*, 'tis void. Mich. Vac. 6 Annæ. 1 Salk. 156. Kemp v. Coleman.—*But* where he delivered up and *releaſed a Skew-bond* for 100 *l.* as he promiſed, and gave a Releaſe for the real Portion; on the Payment to the Truſtees, the Son could have no Relief. Mich. 1717. 2 Vern. 752. Williams v. Callow.

And the *Aſſignment over* of ſuch Bond *to Creditors*, does not make the Bond Obligatory. Ch. Prec. 522. Turton v. Benſon ——S. P. 2 Vern. 764. S. C.——Wms's Rep. 496. 499. S. C. and P.

Where the Son covenanted in Conſideration of 3500 *l.* that his Father ſhould ſettle 300 *l.* per Ann. which the Father did, and the Son *over and above the Settlement*, [*voluntarily*] *gave a Bond to leave his Wife* 1000 *l.* if ſhe ſurvived him; The Son died, and on a Bill by the Father, to ſet aſide this Bond, as in Fraud of the Marriage Agreement, decreed againſt him. Mich. 1699. Abr. Equ. Caſes. 88. Gifford v. Gifford.

And the Court took a *Difference*, *where the Father was Party to the Articles*, and the Son privately agreed to Releaſe ſo much a Year to the Father; ſo as the Wife's Father, who was Party, was deceived. Whereas in this Caſe, *Son only is Party to* the Articles, *and was to have the Portion*, and might give it as he pleaſed. Ibid. S. C. cites the other Point, as the Caſe of Butler v. Chancey.——S. P. cited Wms's Rep. 121. by Ld Ch. in Caſe of D. Hamilton v. Ld Mohun.

See (O)

(U) By Conſtruction. In Breach or Prejudice of a Truſt.

1. STOCK was inveſted in Truſtees, by Will. The *Truſtees ordered their Agent*, the Teſtator's Brother, *to ſell* the Stock, *ſo that he did not ſell for leſs than* 2500 *l. and whatever he ſold for more ſhould be for his own Trouble. The Agent agrees* for the Sale of this Stock *for* 3400 *l. and after purchaſes the Stock from the Truſtees for* 2800 *l. who allow him* 100 *l. for his Trouble in Buying*, ſo that he got 600 *l.* by the Stock, beſides what was allowed for his Trouble. Upon a Bill brought for the Overplus, the ſame was decreed; the Court declaring, that no Truſtee, or any Perſon acting under a Truſtee, can ever be a Purchaſor in this Court, on Account of the great Inlet to Fraud. Sel. Ch. Caſes, in Ld King's Time. 13. Paſch. 11 Geo. 1. 1725. Whitaker v. Whitaker.

2. An *advantageous Leaſe made* of 9 Houſes, much under the real Value, *by a Charity to the Nephew of their Clerk*, and *which the Nephew afterwards aſſigned over to the Clerk*, in Conſideration of 100 *l.* proved to be paid, and of which Leaſe, the Clerk made great Advantages afterwards, was decreed to be ſet aſide. And the Court look'd upon the Payment of the 100 *l.* to be only colourable, and the granting the Leaſe, an Impoſition on the Truſtees, who are not ſuppoſed to know the Value ſo well as the Clerk. But he having made an under Leaſe of five of the Houſes to one, who paid the Clerk a Fine of 20 *l.* and covenanted to rebuild the ſame; that was decreed to continue, and the Rent to be paid to the Truſtees. But it appearing, that the Clerk had rebuilt one of the four remaining Houſes, the Court by Conſent, ſet the 20 *l.* received, and the Profits he had made againſt his Expences; otherwiſe would have ordered an Account of his Receipts and Expences, and the Eſtate to ſtand a Security for what he had laid out. Sel. Ch. Caſes in Ld King's Time. 40. 5 July. 1725. Pugh v. Ryall.

Vid. Faits. (R. a)

(W) By ſuppreſſing, &c. Wills, &c.

1. A. The Plaintiff, claimed as Deviſee under B. the Defendant's Father's Will. It appeared by *Proof*, *that there was ſuch a Will*, *but no exact Proof was given of the Contents* thereof. But becauſe the Court was ſatisfied that the Defendant had ſuppreſs'd the Will, and becauſe

cauſe, (tho' no exact Proof was made of the Contents) the Defendant might clear this, by producing the Will. It was *decreed, that the Plaintiff ſhould hold and enjoy, until the Defendant produced the Will, and farther Order*; cited, per Jekyl, Maſter of the Rolls, who ſaid it was decreed, firſt by the late Maſter, and after affirmed by the Ld Chancellor on Appeal, and afterwards by the Houſe of Lords. 2 Wms's Rep. 733. cites it as 1708. the Caſe of Hampden v. Hampden.

2. *But* in a like Caſe, where it was proved, that there was ſuch Will as Plaintiff ſuggeſted, and that Defendant had deſtroyed it, Parker C. *decreed the Defendant to convey* the Premiſſes to the Plaintiff *in Fee, and to deliver up the Poſſeſſion*, cited per Jekyl, Maſter of the Rolls, and which he ſaid, ſeem'd to him to be the moſt effectual and reaſonable Decree, and ſaid it was ſo decreed in Feb. 1719. Woodroff v. Burton.

(X) Fraud, to avoid Executions, &c.

1. TRespaſs of Cattle taken; 'twas found by Verdict at large, that *J. N. recovered Damages againſt W. N.* and that the *Defendant, as Officer, by Precept took theſe Beaſts in Execution*, but *that W. N. had given the Beaſts to the Plaintiff, by Covin, Meſne between the Judgment and the Execution*, to defraud the Execution. And the Plaintiff, by Reaſon of the Gift, brought the Action, and was barr'd by Judgment; For the Fraud [Gift] was awarded void. Quod Nota. Br. Treſpaſs, pl. 240. cites 22 Aſſ. 72.

The Gift is void, and the Plaintiff may have Execution thereof. Br. Done. pl. 20. cites 22 Aſſ. 72.—Br. Executions. pl. 80. cites S. C.

2. If a Man recovers Damages, and the Defendant *alieus his Goods* by Fraud, there *Iſſue may be taken* upon it; and if it be found, the Plaintiff ſhall have Execution of the Goods alien'd by Fraud; per Belknap. Quod non Negatur Br. Colluſion, &c. pl. 9.

3. *Judgment* was againſt A. for Debt and Damages, and after, by Covin to defraud the Execution, he *ſells his Goods* and receives the Money. Per Cur. if the Buyer had *Knowledge* of the Judgment, the Sale is void, and within the Purview of 13 Eliz. 5. Dal. 79. 14 Eliz. pl. 14. Anon.

4. In Information on the 13 Eliz. cap. 5. for that the Plaintiff had brought a *Plaint of Debt againſt J. S. &c.* whereupon an *Attachment iſſued*, and the Sheriff being ready to attach him by his Goods, the Defendant, in diſturbance of the Execution of the ſaid Proceſs, did publiſh, and *ſhew to the Sheriff, a Conveyance, by which he claimed the ſaid Goods*, and averred the Fraud. It was objected, that this is not within the Statute, becauſe the avowing the Conveyance, *goes* not in delay of Execution, no Judgment being given, but *only in delay of Proceſs*. But the Court held Contra, by reaſon of the Words, viz. delay, hinder or defraud Creditors of their juſt and lawful Actions, Suits, &c. here being Delay; becauſe for want of ſerving the Attachment, the Appearance of J. S. to the Plaintiff's Suit is delay'd, which Miſchief is within the Remedy of the Statute. Le. 47. Mich. 28 and 29 Eliz. C. B. Pendleton v. Gunſton.

And Periam and Rhodes J. conceiv'd that avowing ſuch Conveyance, *tho' no Suit, is depending*, is within the ſaid Statute, but Anderſon doubted. Le. 47. pl. 60.

5. J. S. ſues a *Replevin* to the Sheriff to Replevy the Cattle, and J. S. comes *and ſhews the Sheriff the Beaſts of a Stranger*, and ſaith they are his Cattle, and he makes Replevin of the Beaſts; he is a Treſpaſſor to the Stranger, and the Sheriff may have Treſpaſs againſt J. S. for his falſe Information; For the Sheriff muſt, at his own Peril, take Notice whoſe Cattle they are. 3 H. 7.... 14 H. 4.... But if there be any Fraud in the Matter, he may aver that. Brownl. 210. Mich. 5 Jac. Buckwood v. Beal.

So in Caſe of an *Arreſt*. Kelw 24. 119. b. pl. 64.—129. pl. 96.

2 Roll. R. 393. S. C.

6. One knowing that Execution would be made on his Goods, *procures J. H. to put his Cart in his Yard*, to the Intent that the Bailiff ſhall take it in Execution, and ſo have Treſpaſs againſt him. The Bailiff takes it, and after he knew the Matter, releaſes the Cart. Yet J. H. brought Treſpaſs. Per Lea Ch. J. the Bailiff may *plead the Fraud in Excuſe*. Palm. 395. Mich. 21 Jac. B. R. Grome v. Grome.

7. *One Defendant in Ejectment*, where the Plaintiff was nonſuit, and where that Defendant did not appear, and confeſs Leaſe, Entry and Ouſter, *releaſed Coſts*. The Court ſuppoſed, if there ſhould appear to be Covin between the Leſſor of the Plaintiff, and that Defendant, as to the Releaſe, that they might correct ſuch Practice, when it ſhould be made appear. 2 Vent. 195. Trin. 2 W. & M. C. B. Fagg v. Roberts.

Mo. 638. Mich. 44 El. In the Star-Chamber Chamberlain v. Twyne.

8. *Goods left in the Poſſeſſion* of a Perſon, againſt whom Judgment is had, and his diſpoſing of ſome of them, is a ſtrong Evidence and Badge of Fraud. Per Holt, Cumb. 348. Mich. 7 W. 3. B. R. Orlabar v. Harwar.

(Y) To avoid Decrees.

1. *Pending a Suit* for Land againſt the Father, he makes a *Conveyance* of it to his Son; this Conveyance, tho' Prior to the Decree, ſhall not defeat the Decree. cited Trin. 1687. Vern. 459. in the Caſe of **Self v. Madox**, as ſo decreed in 1680. in Caſe of Goldſon v. Gardiner.

2. A. being decreed to deliver Poſſeſſion of an Houſe, or pay a Sum of Money to B. by a certain time, after the Day voluntarily conveys the Houſe to a Creditor, *in Satisfaction of a real Debt by Bond*; this ſhall not defeat B. of the Benefit of the Decree. Trin. 1687. Vern. 460. Self v. Madox.

(Z) Purged. How.

S. P. Arg. Goldsb. 118. Pricev. Sands. cites 36 H. 6. 23.

1. IF Leſſee for Years, againſt whom Judgment is had, *aſſigns his Term* over by Fraud, *to avoid Execution*, and the Aſſignee *aſſigns to another bona fide*, 'tis not liable to the Execution in the Hands of the ſecond Aſſignee. Per Coke Ch. J. Godb. 161. Paſch. 8 Jac. C. B. in Caſe of Wilſon v. Wornal.

And the Eſtate is legitimated by the *Words of the Statute*, 27 *Eliz.* per Holt Ch. J. in Caſe of Porter v. Clinton.

2. *Leaſe* for 500 Years, *voluntary at firſt* is *made Good* by Money paid after, on an Aſſignment of it, before the Purchaſe of the Inheritance. 3 Lev. 388. Paſch. 6. W. & M. C. B. Smartle v. Williams. ——— Comb. 222. Mich. 5 W. & M. B. R. S. P. per Holt Ch. J. Comb. 249. S. C.

3. Where Fraud is, no *length of time* can bar. Arg. Sel. Ch. Caſes in Ld. King's time. 35. ſaid, it was ſo reſolved in the Houſe of Lords, in Caſe of **Ld. Warrington v. Booth.** And it was, by the Counſel of the other Side, admitted to be certainly true, that no Time will bar where there is Fraud, but ſaid, that that is to be underſtood where the Fraud is concealed; For if it be known it certainly may. Ibid.—— And of this Opinion Ld. C. King ſeemed to be. Ibid. 36. Trin. 11. Geo. 1. Weſtern, Executor of Weſtern v. Cartwright, Executor of Cartwright.

(A. a) Diſcountenanced, and ſet aſide; In what Caſes.

1. *FRAUS & Dolus nemini Patrocinari debent.* 3 Rep. 78. b. in Fermor's Caſe. Palm. 158.—The Law doth not favour Frauds. Godb. 39. Cropp's Caſe. —Fin. Law. 13.—So *though the Party has Right*; for if he, that has Right, is of *Covin with one to diſſeiſe* him that is in Poſſeſſion, *with Intent to recover againſt him*; Now this Recovery, tho' he hath Right, will do him no good, per. Popham, Goldsb. 179 in Caſe of Goodale v. Wiatt. — See Remitter (C.) ——— A Recovery upon a good Title by Colluſion, *ſhall not abate the Writ* 13 Rep. 24. Trin. 44 Eliz. B. R. in Caſe of Sprat v. Heale. cites 33 H. 6. 5.—See falſifying Recoveries. (F) (F. 2)

2. The *Juſtices reſpited Judgment, where the Tenant confeſſed the Action*, for Fear of Covin between the Demandant and the Tenant, *to make a third Perſon to loſe his Intereſt.* Br. Judges. pl. 14. cites 39 E. 3. 35.

3. *Uſurpation was of a Preſentation by Fraud* between the Uſurper and him that had the Grant of next Preſentation; but upon filing a Bill it was decreed, that no Benefit ſhould be had by this Uſurpation, ſo as to defeat the Plaintiff's Title; neither ſhould it be given in Evidence againſt him, at a Trial at Law. 3 Car. 1. N. Ch. R. 4. Market v. Hyde.

4. Debt is brought by a Feme Adminiſtratrix, ſhe obtains Judgment, but before Execution, the *Adminiſtration is revoked by Covin*, and committed to the Woman and her Son; The Son *releaſes the Debt*; the Woman ſues Execution; The Debtor brings an Audita Querela, but it does not lie, becauſe of the Covin. Jenk. 285. pl. 17. S. C. cited per Gawdy J. Goldsb. 178. in Caſe of Goodale v. Wyatt.

5. That cannot be called a good *Cuſtom*, which is *grounded on* Fraud. Mich. 15. Car. 2. Chan. Caſes. 30. Borr. v. Vandal.

6. A *Truſt* decreed for a Perſon, who, in his Anſwer on Oath in another Cauſe, had denied the Truſt, becauſe drawn in to anſwer ſo by Fraud. Mich. 21 Car. 2. Chan. Caſes. 134. Smith v. Palmer.

7. A *Tinner* Articles to deliver Tin to the Merchant *Cuſtom-Free*; After Delivery to the Merchant, it is ſeiſed for Cuſtom, and the Merchant ſues to be *relieved*, but denied; becauſe it is *in fraudem Regis*. Hill. 26, 27. Car. 2. 1 Chan. Caſes. 256. Papilion v. Hix.

8. A *Bill of Exchange* for 50 l. was made for *Value received*, but being gained by Fraud, and for a fictitious Conſideration was ſet aſide. Hill. 1690. 2 Vern. 123. Dyer v. Tymewell.

9. Equity has ſo great an Abhorrence of Fraud, that it will ſet aſide its own *Decrees*, if founded thereupon;

10. *As* Decree on a Commiſſion for *charitable Uſes*, fraudulently taken out, was ſet aſide, though confirmed by the Chancellor, and a new Commiſſion was ſued out, and the Lands charged with the Charity, tho' exempted on the former Commiſſion. Arg. Show. 206. cites Moore Char. 75. *And* in Caſes of Fraud, *Equity ſhould relieve againſt the very Words of a Statute*, as if *one Agreement in Writing*, ſhould be *prepoſed, and another fraudulently*, or ſecretly brought in, and *executed in lieu of the Former*; In this, or ſuch like Caſes of Fraud, Equity would relieve; But where there is no Fraud, but *only relying upon the Honour, Word, or Promiſe of the Defendant*, the Statute of Frauds making thoſe Promiſes void, Equity will not interfere. per Ld. C. Parker. Wms's Rep. 620. Paſch. 1720. in Caſe of Montague (Viſcounteſs) v. Sir Geo. Maxwell.

11. *Money paid upon a Bubble in the Year* 1720, and which was called the Land Security, and Oil Patent, being *for extracting Oil out of Radiſhes*, was *ordered to be re-paid with Intereſt and Coſts*; and the Maſter of the Rolls ſaid, that the gaining a Patent could be no Sanction to the Cheat. 2 Wms's Rep. 154 to 157. Trin. 1723. Colt v. Woollaſton and Arnold. ———And a like Decree at the ſame time for Spackman v. Woollaſton.

12. A *Fine and Non-claim* ought not to *skreen a fraudulent Purchaſe*, but the Conuſee ſhall be deemed a Truſtee for the equitable Title. So decreed; But the Caſe was compounded in the Houſe of Lords. M.S. Rep.

Rep. ſaid to be Ld. Harcourt's, tit. Fraud. 6. March. 1724. Martin v. Martin

13. Equity will never countenance *Demands of an unfair Nature*; In this Caſe it was to have an *Allowance for attending at Auctions, to enhance the Price of Goods*; Nor will Equity ſuffer them to be ſet againſt fair and juſt Demands in an Account; And a croſs Bill for that Purpoſe was diſmiſſed with Coſts. M.S. Rep. ſaid to be Ld. Harcourt's. tit. Fraud. 6 March 1726. Walker v. Gaſcoigne.

(B. a) Fraud ſet aſide. By what Court.

1. IT is no Objection, that the Parties to a Fraud have their Remedy at Law, and may bring Actions for Monies had, and received to their Uſe; For in Caſes of Fraud, the Court of *Equity has a* * *concurrent Juriſdiction with the Common Law*, Matter of Fraud being the great Subject of Relief there; And ſo Money paid by the Plaintiffs to the Defendants, as Managers and Projectors of a *Bubble*, (in the Year 1720) *called the Land Security, and Oil Patent*, (which was to extract Oil out of Engliſh Radiſhes) was decreed to be paid back, with Intereſt and Coſts; per the Maſter of the Rolls. 2 Wms's Rep. 154 to 157. Trin. 1723. Colt v. Woollaſton and Arnold.

* 2 Wms's Rep. 220. Paſch. 1724. by the Maſter of the Roll's, in Caſe of Stent v. Baylis.

(C. a) By Circumvention.

1. *CReditor* was *for Wares of which* the *Debtor could not make half the Money.* — The Court not favouring Contracts of that Kind, ordered the *Maſter to make Allowance* as he ſaw Cauſe. Chan. 15 Car. 1. 1. Rep. 132. Naylor v. Baldwin.

2. A. as Principal, and B. as Surety, were bound in a Bond to C. The *Obligee's Name was uſed only in Truſt for A. one of the Obligors*, and if any Money was paid, it was A's Money, but it did not appear that any Money was lent; B. being ſued, brought his Bill, and the Court decreed the Bond to be delivered up and cancelled, and Satisfaction acknowledged, with Coſts to the Plaintiff. See Mich. 26. Car. 2. Fin. R. 127. Launce v. Marden & al.

3. Tenant in *Tail of* 30 *or* 40 *l. per Annum in Remainder*, of old Houſes, after the Death of his Father, who would allow him no Maintenance, for 30 l. in Money paid, and 20 l. per Annum Annuity, during the joint Lives of himſelf and his Father, conveyed the old Houſes to A. in Fee. — The Annuity was paid 5 Years.—And though it was urged, that being Tenant in Tail, if he had died, the whole Money had been loſt; yet by Ld. Chan. the Bargain was ſet aſide; and he ſaid, By the civil Law, a Bargain of double the Value ſhould be avoided, and wiſhed it were ſo in England. Trin. 34. Car. 2. 2 Chan. Caſes, 120. Nott v. Hill.

North K. diſmiſſed the Bill. Vern. 167. Paſch. 1683. Nott v. Hill. —2 Vern. 27. S. C. and Ld. Guildford's Order of Diſmiſſion diſcharged, and Lord Nottingham's Decree confirmed by Jeffries C. Trin. 1687.

4. One intitled to an Eſtate after the Death of two old Lives takes 300 *l. to pay* 600 *l, when the Lives fall*, and mortgages the Eſtate as a Security.—The Lives die within two Years, yet no Relief againſt this Bargain, nor was any thing ill in it. Per North K. Hill. 1682. Vern. 141. Batty v. Lloyd.

5. A. *an old Man*, being *almoſt in his Dotage*, and ſeiſed of an Eſtate, was *made to believe* by W. S. and J. N. (who had an Intention to purchaſe his Eſtate at an Undervalue, as if it was for another Perſon, and in

This Caſe was cited by the Ld. Chancellor

in whoſe Name Letters were ſent to A. preſſing the Completion, and that it would not admit of any longer Delay) that they *could help him to a great Match, and told him, that to qualify himſelf for the Lady, he muſt convert his Land into Money*, whereupon he entered into Articles under Hand and Seal, and after conveyed the Lands purſuant to the Articles, and the Purchaſe Money was all paid, or ſecured; but what was paid, was all borrowed, and what *Money was ſecured*,, was *to be paid by Inſtalments*; and the Money agreed for, if really paid, was ſo much under the real Value, that the *Profits in a little time would pay the Purchaſe Money*. Afterwards, A. levied a Fine likewiſe to the Purchaſor, made his Tenants attorn, and his Son (who ſhewed a Diſcontent at what was done) releaſe all his Right to the Lands, with Intent to eſtabliſh the Purchaſe. On a Bill by the Son of A. (after A's Death) to ſet aſide this Purpoſe, as gotten by Circumvention, it was *proved, that A. was a ſenſible Man, and capable of managing his own Buſineſs*, and had *not any apparent Weakneſs* upon him; and that he had abſolute Power over the Eſtate, and after the Conveyance declared, that if it were then to do, he would do it again; Notwithſtanding all which, becauſe there appeared ſome Art uſed, the Ld. Keeper decreed the Purchaſe to be ſet aſide. Mich. 1683. Vern. 205. Coleby v. Smith.

Hill. 1685. who ſaid, that a *Fine, Conveyance, Releaſe, Articles, and ſeveral other Deeds, made at a conſiderable Diſtance of Time*, one after another, were all ſet aſide. Vern. 392.

6. A. articles for the *Purchaſe of B's Eſtate*, pretending he bought it for one whom B. was deſirous to oblige, but in Truth bought it for another, and by that Means got the Eſtate at an Undervalue. Equity will not decree an Execution of theſe Articles. Hill. 1683. Vern. 227. Phillips v. D. of Bucks.

7. An over-reaching Bargain, upon Contingency, was relieved; But the *principal Money and legal Intereſt* decreed to the Bargainee. 35 Car. 2. 2 Chan. Rep. 266 E. Arglaſs v. Muſchamp.

As Grant of a Rent-charge in Fee, of 300 l. per Annum, for 300 l. to commence *after the Grantee's dying without Iſſue*. The Grantor, by Debauchery, was diſabled to get Iſſue.—This per North K. was ſet aſide for Fraud, Paſch. 1684. Vern. 237. S. C. —S. P. decreed, by Jeffries C. tho' the Grantee anſwered, that he was wholly a Stranger to the Grantor, and the Matter was tranſacted by a third Perſon; Fraus eſt celare fraudem. 1685, or 1686. Vern. 239. Earl Ardglaſs v. Pitt.

8. A Man makes his *Will*, and his Wife Executrix; The Son after prevails on his Mother to get the Father to make a new Will, and to name him Executor, *promiſing* to be a Truſtee only for his Mother. *Truſt decreed*, notwithſtanding the *Statute of Frauds*, &c. Hill. 1684. Vern. 296. Thyn. v. Thyn.

9 Mod. 63. S. C. cited in Aliſon's Caſe. —Le. 192. Rockwood v. Rockwood

9. Money was lent at very great Advantage on *Contingency* of Deaths &c. by A. to B. — A. ſometime after brings a *Bill to be re-paid, or to foreclose B. of any Relief againſt the Bargain.*—B. anſwers, that the Bargain was fairly made, and intends to abide by it, and that *he would ſeek no Relief againſt it.*—The Contingencies happened.—B. brings a Bill againſt A's Executor, (A. being dead) and is relieved upon Payment of principal and Intereſt, without Coſts. Hill. 1690. Per Commiſſioners, 2 Vern. 121. Hill. 1690. Wiſeman v. Beake.

10. *Policy of Inſurance*, for inſuring a Life, was gained by Fraud, as by *falſe Pretences of Health*, and a *ſham* Inſurance, by a near Neighbour of the Inſured, ſet aſide after a Verdict at Law, with Coſts, both at Law and in Equity; and the Money received on the Policy to go in part of the Coſts. Hill. 1690. 2 Vern. 206. Whittingham v. Thornbury & al.

Chan. Prec. 20. S. C. — *So*, where a Merchant, who had a Ship at Sea, had an *Account of a Ship's being taken, which anſwered the Deſcription of his own Ship*, inſured her, without acquainting the Inſurers of any thing he had heard; Upon a Bill by the Inſurers, to be relieved, Ld. Macclesfield thought the Concealment to be a Fraud, and relieved the Plaintiff againſt the Policy, and with Coſts. 2 Wms's Rep. 170. Trin. 1723. Decoſta v. Scandret.

11. A. borrows Money of B. and gives a *Mortgage of a future diſtant Term of Years*, defeaſanc'd to be void on payment of 40 *l. per Annum for eight Years, by Quarterly Payments*, the Sum borrowed being but 200 l. Redemption was decreed on Payment of 200 l. with ſimple Intereſt. Mich. 1700. 2 Vern. 402. James v. Oades.

This goes beyond a *Briſtol Bargain*. Ibid.

12. J. S. who was to have had a conſiderable Advantage by a Will, was *drawn in by Fraud*, and falſe Suggeſtions, to make a Compoſition for his Intereſt, and *to give a Releaſe*; Afterwards J. S. being ſenſible of the Fraud, makes his Will, and thereby (after other Legacies) he deviſes all the reſt of his Goods and Chattels whatſoever to his Wife, upon Condition that ſhe paid all his Debts; and made her ſole Executrix. And it was held, that his *Right to ſet aſide the Releaſe*, was deviſable, and the Words proper for that Purpoſe. Decreed Trin. 1701. Abr. Equ. Caſes. 176. Drew v. Merry.

13. A. agreed for the *Purchaſe of Timber*; and *A. and B.* both *enter into a Bond, that A. his Executors and Adminiſtrators ſhall not cut down under ſuch a Size*; It comes out, that *A's Name was only made uſe of for B.* in the Agreement; *B. cuts down Timber under Size*; There can be no Remedy at Law againſt *B.* upon this Bond; But it is a Fraud on the Seller, and relievable in Equity. MS. Rep. ſaid to be Lord Harcourt's. tit. Fraud. 12 March. 1720. Butler v. Pendergraſs.

(D. a) By Circumvention, in Reſpect to *young Heirs*, &c. and relieved, On what Terms.

S. C. cited 3. Chan. R. 75. Hill. 1671. in Caſe of Williams v. Smith —N. Ch. R. 84. S. C.

1. An Infant, (newly come of Age) by Bill ſought to be relieved againſt ſeveral Judgments in Debt, which were got by *Practice between the Infant's Guardian*, and Attorney, and others; and drew into Examination the Reality of the Debt, for which the *Judgments* were, and how the ſame aroſe, and decreed to be referred accordingly; and thereupon further Order to be taken. 15 Car. 2. 3 Ch. Rep. 10. Godſcall v. Walker and Wall.

The Security was Bond and Judgment, and given when Defendant was *drunk*.

2. A Quadruple Security given by young Heirs, to be paid *on Contingency* of their Father's Death, or their own Marriage.—Equity will not help ſuch Security (which was a Judgment) to any Thing to attach upon, the Conſideration not being equitable, and ſo the Bill was diſmiſſed. 1671. 3 Ch. R. 74. Rich v. Sydenham.

Ch. Caſes 202. S. C. Paſch. 23 Car. 2.

Fin. R. 295. S. C. The Plaintiff by his Bill offer'd to pay Intereſt. Paſch. 29 Car. 2. —2 Vern. 78. Whitley v. Price. S. P. —So 300*l.*'s worth of Silk-Stockings.

3. A young Gentleman employ'd A. to borrow 500*l.* A. employs B.—B. goes to a Silkman, and *buys Silks for* 500*l.* of him.—Plaintiff gave Bond and Judgment for the Money.—B. ſold the Silks for 250*l.* kept 50*l.* for himſelf, and *paid* 200*l. to the Plaintiff*.—Defendant never treated with the Plaintiff, and denied on Oath that he ever treated about the Loan of Money, and depoſed the Silks to be of 500*l.* Value or there abouts; but Proof was to the contrary. Decreed only 200*l.* and Intereſt (Quære for the Intereſt) and Relief againſt the Defendant, quoad the Reſidue. Paſch. 28 Car. 2. 1 Chan. Caſes 276. Waller v. Dalt.

Decreed the Principal, but no Intereſt, and *Bond, Judgment, and Extent* ſet aſide. Fin R 214. Mich. 29 Car. 2. Fairfax v. Trigg.

4. A Sale of *Goods to a young Gentleman*, in the Life Time of his Father, at an Extravagant Price, ſome of which Goods were Horſes, &c. was reliev'd at the Suit of an *honeſt Mortgagee*, againſt whom the Vendor of the Goods had ſet up a Statute of 5000*l.* given in Conſideration of the Goods, as a prior Incumbrance on the Eſtate mortgag'd. Mich. 31 Car. 2. Fin. R. 439. Draper v. Dean and Jaſon.———Decreed that the Conuſee be allow'd according to the real Value at the Time of Delivery, with Intereſt from that Time, but the Plaintiff's *Coſts* to be deducted thereout. Ibid.

5. Goods were ſold to a young Gentleman Heir apparent to a good Eſtate, at

at a *double Value on a Contingency* of his ſurviving his Father, otherwiſe the whole Debt to be ſunk. Relief decreed againſt the Vendor; that Decree was afterwards reverſed, and after the laſt Decree was reverſed by Jeffries. C. Hill. 34 and 35 Car. 2. 2 Chan Caſes 136. Barny v. Beak. 2 Vent. 359. Barney v. Tyſon Mich. 33 Car. 2.—Skin. Stiſtead v. Barney. 107. ſays the main Reaſon of the Decree was that the *Father was ſick and like to die.*——2 Vern. 14. S. C. Wms's Rep. 312. S. C. cited per Cowper C. accordingly, only he adds that B. was to pay Intereſt for the ſame, in Caſe he ſhould marry in his Father's Life. And ſaid that the Reaſon inducing the Ld Jefferey's Decree was (probably) to diſcourage a growing Practice of devouring an Heir, on a Confidence in Ld Nottingham's Decree; but Ld Jefferey's Decree ſtanding ſhews that every one thought the ſame was juſt, and that there was therefore no Attempt in Parliament to reverſe it. Wms's Rep. 312. Paſch. 1716. in Caſe of Twiſleton v. Griffith.

6. A. lent B. a Remainderman in Tail, expectant on an Eſtate for Life of his Father, 1000*l.* *to receive* 2500*l.* *if B. ſurviv'd C. his Father*, and to loſe the 1000*l.* if B. died in his Father's Life Time, and ſecur'd the ſame by Judgment The Father died, A. ſued, and B. brought his Bill in Chancery, which was diſmiſſed by Ld Finch. 9 Feb 33 Car. 2. But upon rehearing the Cauſe by Jeffries C. the Plaintiff having before, by Order of the Court, paid the Money, his Lordſhip declared that theſe Bargains were corrupt and fraudulent, and tended to the Deſtruction of Heirs ſent hither for Education, and to the utter Ruin of Families; and that as there were new Contrivances for the carrying them on, ſo the Relief of the Court ought to be extended to meet with, and correct ſuch corrupt Bargains, and unconſcionable Practices, and decreed the former Order to be diſcharged, and the *Plaintiff to be reſtor'd to what he had paid over and beſides the principal Money and Intereſt.* 2 Ch. Rep. 396. 2 Jac. 2. Berny v. Pitt.

7. *So* where B. Remainder-man in Tail, having incurr'd his Father's Diſpleaſure, was adviſed by *one that had been an Attorney*, and who *pretended great Friendſhip* for B. and afterwards B's Father being reconcil'd to him, and offering B. 1000*l.* for his Reverſion, he was diſſwaded by the Attorney from accepting it, as not a valuable Conſideration, but about a Year after, the ſame Attorney, *when the Father was in a very declining State, bought it of B. for* 1050*l.* (the Eſtate being 150*l.* per Ann.) and B. was then about 34 Years of Age, and had a Child 10 Years old inheritable to the Intail, and B. levied a Fine to him of this Reverſion. In about two Years after B's Father died; B. brought a Bill to ſet aſide this Conveyance, and to get an Injunction; he, by Direction of the Court, ſuffered a Common Recovery, and declared the Uſes to the two ſenior Six-Clerks, ſubject to the Order of the Court. It was objected, among other Things, that at this Rate, it would be almoſt impracticable for an Heir ever to ſell a Reverſion; but Ld Cowper ſaid, that he ſaw no Inconvenience in that Objection; For it might force an Heir to go Home and ſubmit to his Father, or to bite on the Bridle, and endure ſome Hardſhips, and in the mean Time he might grow wiſer and be reclaim'd; ſo directed that the Plaintiff be *reliev'd on Payment of Principal Intereſt and Coſts*, but ſaid he meant *liberal Coſts.* Wms's Rep. 310. to 313. Paſch. 1716 Twiſleton v. Griffith.

8. A. draws in B. a young Gentleman, and *purchaſes an Eſtate at a great under Value* of him, and B. covenants for A's quiet Enjoyment. A. is *evicted*, and brings Action on the Covenant. Per North K. "Tis unreaſonable that A. who was a Lawyer, ſhould make Advantage of this catching Bargain; and ſo decreed A. his purchaſe Money with Intereſt, only diſcounting the Meſne Profits. Paſch. 1685. Vern. 320. Zouch. v. Swaine. But where Man and his Wife, being *very poor*, were drawn in to ſell an Equity of Redemption at a great under-Value, yet as no ſuch Fraud appear'd as to ſet it aſide, Ld Wright diſmiſſed the Bill. Ch. Prec. 206. Wood v. Fenwick.

9. A Contract to pay 450*l.* *and* 80*l.* *per Ann. till* the 450*l.* and every Part of it be paid, being made with a young Man on a ſecond Agreement, after a firſt Agreement made with his Friends, and the ſecond being made without their Privity, and by taking Advantage of the Plaintiff's Neceſſity, was ſet aſide per Jeffries C. but no Relief for what was overpaid. Mich. 1685. Vern. 352. Oddy v. Torlas.

10. The

Tr. 1688. 2 Vern. R. 77. Lamplugh v. Smith. S. P. —2 Vern. 8. Trin. 1688 Whitley. v. Price. S. P.

10. The Defendant ſold Goods to the Plaintiff and two others at extravagant Prices, and *to be paid five for one* or more *on the Death of their Fathers*, and ſo obtained from the Plaintiff and two other young Gentlemen that were Heirs to good Eſtates, ſeveral Securities, wherein they were bound ſeverally and jointly in 4000*l.* for Payment of great Sums of Money. The Court decreed the Plaintiff's Security to be deliver'd up, on Payment of what the Defendant really & bona fide paid to him alone, and for his own proper Uſe. Tr. 1687. Vern. 467. Bill v. Price.

Ch. Prec. So. S. C.

11. A young Gentleman of 3000*l.* per Ann. in Poſſeſſion of Truſtees, propoſed to a Scriviner to *borrow* 1000*l. on Mortgage*, but he trickiſhly drew him into the giving a *Statute* inſtead of a Mortgage, and was himſelf bound with him, and ſo let the *young Gentleman receive only* 300*l.* of the Money, and he *received all the reſt himſelf* in Goods of one Kind or other, and diſcounting a Debt of his own due to the Lender; decreed Payment only of the 300*l.* and Intereſt, and a perpetual Injunction againſt the Statute as to the young Gentleman. Hill. 1697. 2 Vern. 346. Smith v. Burroughs and Loader.

12. An unreaſonable Bargain bought of a young Heir, was reliev'd by *opening an Account*, and the young Gentleman allowing only what was juſtly due. Tr. 9 Geo. 9 Mod. 31. Spencer v. Chaſe.——But where the Security was deficient, 'twas ordered that the young Gentleman make it good at the others Expence, ſo as to ſecure the Money due. Ibid.

But had the *Bargain* been *to pay down* 3300*l. when he ſhould come into Poſſeſſion*, this would not have really been a Purchaſe of the Reverſion, but of an Eſtate in Poſſeſſion, as the Payment and Poſſeſſion would be at the ſame Time; and in that Caſe, on Account of the *Great Over Value*, Chancery would relieve; Per Raymoud and Gilbert Commiſſioners. Sel. Ch. Caſes, in Ld King's Time.

13. A. was Tenant for Life, *Remainder to B.* his Son *in Tail*, Remainder *to A. in Fee* of an Eſtate computed worth 7000*l.*—*B. at* 30 *Years of Age, in the Life of A. articled to ſell the Eſtate for* 3300*l. when he ſhould come into Poſſeſſion* of it, *and to have Intereſt for the ſame from the Time of the Articles to the Time of his being in Poſſeſſion.*——*A. died within two Years*, ſo that the Intereſt amounted to little. B. on his coming into Poſſeſſion, compleated his Agreement, and brings a Bill to be relieved. It was inſiſted for the Purchaſor, that there was a great Difference between defeating an Agreement, and carrying it into Execution; and Raymond and Gilbert Commiſſioners were of the ſame Opinion, and ſaid, that had the Bargain been to pay ſo much down in ready Money, it would undoubtedly have been good, otherwiſe there is an End of all Sales of Reverſions. And that this is the ſame as buying the Reverſion for preſent Money, and will be conſidered as ſo much Money put out at Intereſt by himſelf, and the ſame as if he had receiv'd it, and immediately lent it to the Vendor at Intereſt; that the Intereſt might have run to the Value of the Eſtate, tho' it has happen'd otherwiſe, which was *a Chance on both Sides*, and that it is not conſiſtent with common Senſe, that a preſent *Agreement* ſhould be *varied by future Accidents*; that it muſt be conſidered as it is in itſelf without any Thing Extrinſick; that *Bargains for Sales of reverſionary Eſtates by Heirs are never ſet aſide but on Account of Prodigality*; that nothing of that appear'd in the preſent Caſe, but the reverſe; For it appear'd that both the Father and he were in bad Circumſtances. Sel. Ch. Caſes in Ld King's Time. 7. 8. Paſch. 11 Geo. 1. Dews v. Brandt.

Sel. Ch. Caſes, in Ld King's Time 7. 8. Paſch. 11 Geo. 1. Dews v. Brandt.

(E. a) By Circumvention, in Reſpect of a preſent Want, or General Weakneſs *of Underſtanding*.

See Fines (O. b) pl. 3. Wright v. Booth. S. P.

1. A. the Plaintiff being ſimple, the Defendant got a *Conveyance of Lands* from him, but tho' the Defendant had *ſold the ſame* to Purchaſors, *and a Deſcent* was caſt, yet A. had the Lands reaſſured to him. Toth. 104, 105. cites 4 Jac. Lewis v. Vaughan.

2. If a *Scrivener* by ſiniſter Means *makes himſelf a Truſtee*, he ſhall have no Benefit

nefit by the Conveyances, and making himſelf Executor (the Teſtator being of weak Underſtanding) was ordered not to meddle in performing the Will without his Co-Executors. 3 Car. 1. 1 Chan. R. 22 Herbert v. Lounds.

3. A. *on Loan of* 90*l.* *got a Bond from B. of* 1600*l. for Payment of* 800*l.* A. by Bill ſued to ſubject certain Lands B. was intitled to in Right of his Wife, the Eſtate in Law being in Truſtees; but the Security being got when B. was *drunk*, Bridgman K. would not relieve A. in Equity even for the Principal which he had really lent, but diſmiſſed the Bill. Paſch. 23 Car. 2. 1 Chan. Caſes 202. Rich v. Sydenham.

4. A Woman *of weak Underſtanding*, tho' not a Lunatick, made a *voluntary Conveyance*; it was ſet aſide as fraudulent by Ld Chancellor. Paſch. 34 Car. 2. 2 Chan. Caſes 103. White v. Small. See 2 Vern. 189. Mich. 1690. Portington v. Eglington.

5. One of 72 *Years of Age*, *convey'd Lands of* 40*l. a Year for an Annuity for his Life of* 20*l. a Year*, who liv'd two Years after, but was ſet aſide upon a Bill brought by the Heir at Law, it appearing that the old Man was weak and eaſily to be impos'd upon. 2 Wms's Rep. 203. Mich. 1723. Clarkſon v. Hanway & al. This Decree was affirmed on Appeal to Ld Macclesfield. Ibid. 206.

(F. a) *Ignorance of Title* or Value, &c.

1. LAnds being originally charged with the Payment of Portions, A *Releaſe* upon a Covenant in Truſt to pay does not diſcharge the ſame, the Releſſor being ignorant of her real *Right*, and impos'd upon by the Releſſee. 31 Car. 2. 2 Chan. R. 173. Tucker v. Searle.

2. *Mortgage Money was reſerv'd*, *payable to himſelf or Heirs*; Mortgagee dy'd, and his *Executors conſented to the Heir's receiving it*, who got a Decree againſt the Mortgagor, and receiv'd the Money. Yet what the Executor did, being upon a Miſtake, as thinking the Heir was intitled by Reaſon of the Reſervation. It was decreed that the Heir ſhould repay all the Money receiv'd by him to the Executor. 31 Car. 2. 2 Ch. R. 154. Turner v. Turner.

3. *Tenant by the Curteſy* of Gavelkind Land, not knowing his Title as ſuch, but being otherwiſe in Poſſeſſion, *attorned Tenant*, tho' he had a Right to a Moiety, and ſometime afterwards brought Ejectment, and had a Verdict before Ld Ch. J. Hale. 32 Car. 2. Fin. R. 473. Vaulx v. Shelly.

4. Agreement being *to quit Poſſeſſion* of Lands, Chancery will not decree a Conveyance. But, per North K. If the Agreement had been to have *conveyed* thoſe Lands, he would have decreed the Agreement, tho' he was not *apprized what Eſtate* he had in them. Hill. 1682. Vern. 121. Gerard v. Vaux.

5. A Suit was to avoid a Conveyance by *Fine and Deed* to lead the Uſes of the Fine 23 *Years ſince* on Suppoſition of Fraud by purchaſing the Fee of the Land for 11*l.* worth 60*l.* per Ann. and the Plaintiff being *ignorant of the Value*, but the Defendant well apprized thereof, and the Plaintiff being *ignorant alſo of his Title*, which he came to the Notice of after the Fine. The Bill was diſmiſſed. Hill 35 and 36 Car. 2. 2 Chan. Caſes 159. Hobert v. Hobert.

6. *The Caſe was* thus, (viz.) A. having Title, and B. Poſſeſſion, *B. conveys* the Land *to A. in Truſt for B.* and then *gets A. to convey back to B. as in Execution of the Truſt*, whereby A. extinguiſhes his Title, yet Chancery will relieve. See Hill. 35 and 36 Car. 2. 2 Chan. Caſes. 160. in Caſe of Hobert v. Hobert.

7. *Copyhold Lands were deviſed* to J. S. Some were ſurrendered to the Uſe of the Will, and ſome were not. The *Heir at Law was a Feme Covert*, and J. S. for a ſmall Conſideration, drew them into Articles to confirm his Title without their being well appriſed of their Intereſt when they articled. The Maſter of the Rolls would not decree a ſpecifick Execution

of the Articles of a Feme Covert for conveying her Inheritance, but diſmiſſed the Bill. On Appeal to Ld Summers, he confirmed the Decree, but went upon the Fraud, and ſeem'd not to take Notice of its being the Inheritance of a Feme Covert. Tr. 1697. Ch. Prec. 76. Preſton v. Waſey.

But where by a Will *duely executed* A. gave all his Lands to C. his youngeſt Son in Fee, charged with an Annuity to B. his eldeſt Son for Life, on Condition B. ſhould releaſe all his Right to every other Part of A's Eſtate, but B. oppos'd the eſtabliſhing the Will in Chancery, inſiſting on a Will being made ſubſequent, which was denyed by C. and not proved by B. and after a Diſmiſſion of a Bill brought by B. an Agreement was made between B. and C. by which C. reciting the Will, agreed to convey to B. ſuch Part of the Eſtate. B. *releaſed* to C. *all the reſt of the Eſtate deviſed, or mentioned to be deviſed*, and afterwards brought a new Bill, upon Pretence of having made new Diſcoveries; and he dying, the ſame was revived by his Heir. Ld C. Macclesfield ſaid, that where two Parties are contending in this Court, and one releaſes his Pretenſions to the other, there can be no Colour to ſet this Releaſe aſide, on Account of the Maker's having a Right; For then there can never be any Compromiſe made, but every Releaſe may be avoided; and that this Releaſe was very particular, in reſpect of the Words of All Lands deviſed *or mentioned to be deviſed*; that indeed, if the Party releaſing, is *ignorant of his Right*, or if *his Right is concealed* from him by the Perſon to whom the Releaſe is made, theſe will be good Reaſons for the ſetting aſide of the Releaſe; but it not being ſo in this Caſe, and his Lordſhip, taking Notice that the Court ought to be very cautious of giving Relief in a Caſe ſo circumſtanced, and that the Plaintiff being asked at the Hearing of the Cauſe, whether he would reconvey the Part of the Eſtate convey'd by C. to B. his Father, declined the doing it, diſmiſſed the Bill of Revivor with *Coſts*. Trin. 1721. Wms's Rep. 723. to 728. Sir William Cann v. Cann.

8. *Deviſee of Lands, by a Will not duely executed*, by its not being atteſted in Preſence of the Teſtator, *prevail'd upon the Heir, for* 100 *Guineas, to execute a Releaſe, reciting that the Will was duly executed.* And afterwards, upon a Pretence of more ſpeedy Payments of the Deviſor's Debts, *for* 50 *Guineas more, gets him to join in a Leaſe and Releaſe to a pretended Purchaſor for* 4000 *l.* which was done in Form. But by Ld Harcourt * *Suppreſſio Veri*, or *Suggeſtio Falſi*, is either of them good Reaſon to ſet aſide any Releaſe or Conveyance, and both of them concur in this Caſe. And tho' one Witneſs ſwore, that the Heir declar'd to him before the executing the Releaſe, that the Will was not worth any Thing, yet his Lordſhip thought it not to be believ'd; and reliev'd againſt the Releaſe, and alſo the Leaſe and Releaſe, but the Heir to pay back the 100 Guineas, and 50 Guineas with Intereſt. Wms's Rep. 239. to 241. Mich. 1713. Broderick v. Broderick.

9. A *Statute* was made in Ireland, *that all Leaſes* which ſhould *not* be *regiſter'd by ſuch a Day ſhould be void.* The *Reſpondent*, who *lived in the remoteſt Part of Ireland*, not having Notice of the Act of Parliament, *did not regiſter* within the Time; whereupon *another Leaſe* was made, and regiſter'd, *to one who had Notice of the firſt Leaſe*; and an Ejectment was brought upon it; but the Reſpondent was relieved; Becauſe the *Statute* which was *made to prevent Fraud* ſhall never be *uſed as a Means to cover it.* Note, This Act was appointed to be read at every Quarter Seſſions and Aſſiſe. MS. Rep. ſaid to be Ld Harcourt's, tit. Fraud 23. Feb. 1722. Ld Forbes v. Deniſton.

(G. a) *Miſapprehenſion* reliev'd in Equity.

1. TEnant for Life of a *Copyhold*, with a contingent Remainder to his firſt Son in Tail, having no Son born, and thinking to veſt the whole Fee in himſelf, buys in the Reverſion in Fee of the Copyhold at 550 *l.* but finding this would not by Merger (the Freehold being in the Lord) deſtroy the contingent Remainder, brought his Bill to be reliev'd againſt the Security, he had given for the Purchaſe Money, being *deceived as to the Effect of his Purchaſe.* Per Cur. pay principal Intereſt and Coſts, or be diſmiſſed with Coſts. Mich. 1691. 2 Vern. 243. Mildmay v. Hungerford.

2. A *Conveyance* by Deed and Fine was *gained indirectly* by Impoſition, and without Conſideration, the Grantor intending it only in Truſt for her ſelf. Decreed the Conuſee to convey the Eſtate to the Deviſee of the Grantor and his Heirs. Mich. 1693. Vern. 307. Wilkinſon v. Brayfield.

3. An

3. An Eſtate was deviſed to the eldeſt Son, *provided* he or his Heirs *pay* 100*l. a Piece* to his three Siſters, *at* their Age of 21 *or Marriage*; one of the Daughters dies before 21 unmarried; after T. S. buys the Eſtate, and thinking it ſubject to the dead Daughter's Portion, (a Bill being brought for it in Canc.) gave Bond to her Executrix to pay it; but being afterwards adviſed, that the Lands would not be liable, he brings his Bill to be relieved againſt it; and 'twas held by my Ld Keeper, that tho' by the Law now uſed in Canc., the Land would not be liable to the Portion, yet perhaps when the Bond was given, it might have been otherwiſe taken: and there being no Fraud in getting the Bond, he would not relieve againſt it. Mich. 1702. Abr. Equ. Caſes 269. pl. 9. Smith v. Avery.

4. Where a *deliberate Act* is done, tho' it attains not the End deſign'd and ſhould in Conſequence prove quite contrary, 'tis not relievable in Equity. Mich. 1708. 2 Vern. 615. Hodges v. Hodges.

5. A. on a Marriage with M. entred into Articles to purchaſe Lands, and makes a Settlement on himſelf and M. and the Iſſue Male of the Marriage, and for Default of ſuch Iſſue, the ſame was to be to A.'s next younger Brother, and for Default of iſſue Male of him, then to go to the next Brother, &c. The Marriage took Effect; A. died without iſſue Male, or making any Settlement, but made M. Executrix, leaving Aſſets; after A's Death, the Brothers immediately applied to M. who promiſed by Letters to purchaſe and ſettle agreeable to the Articles; but Ld C. King held that thoſe Letters ought not to bind her, unleſs ſhe was before bound by the Articles, (which he held ſhe was) For that ſhe might be well under an Apprehenſion of being liable by them, and therefore wrote ſuch Letters; but that would be no Reaſon to conclude her by her Miſapprehenſion. 2 Wms's Rep. (594) 599. Trin. [1730] 1731. Vernon v. Vernon.

(H. a) By *Miſinformation*, and what ſhall be ſaid ſuch.

1. AN *Agreement* by an Heir at Law upon a Miſtake and Miſinformation, as to his Right to Land deviſed from him to his younger Brother, was decreed. 1 Chan. Caſes 84. Paſch. 19 Car. 2 Frank v. Frank.

2. A. had an *Annuity* iſſuing *out of Lands* of B. C. purchaſes Part of the Lands charged and diverſe other Lands of B. and Notice is taken of the Annuity by way of Exception in the Deed of Purchaſe; C. *ſells* to D. *the Lands not charged, and Part of the Lands charged by general Words*, and deſired A. to join in a Fine to D. he aſſuring A. that it would not prejudice him in the Lands ſettled on him; but this was proved by one Witneſs only, and his Depoſitions uncertain as to the Particulars. Finch C. ſaid that Here was no Conſideration for the Rent, and *no Agreement to extinguiſh* it, and when the Land was ſold, it was ſold for 800*l.* of which 700*l.* was paid to C. and that A. was circumvented, and Decreed relief againſt C. Hill. 27 & 28 Car. 2. 1 Chan. Caſes 273. ..... v. Hawkes.

3. A Man going to diſturb a Conventicle, asked a Conventicler there what his Name was, he anſwered James (who was a known Conventicler) whereas in truth James was not there, and the Fellow that anſwered knew it, but Defendant did not; Defendant made Oath according to the *falſe Name told him*, and was convicted of *Perjury*, but the Verdict was ſet aſide, it not being willful and corrupt Perjury, but a plain Miſtake, and a new Trial granted. 2. Show. 165. Mich. 33 Car. 2. B. R. the King v. Smith. 2 Jo. 163. S. C.

4. A. Articles with B. for purchaſing B's Eſtate, *pretending he bought for one whom B. deſired to oblige*, but really for one whom B. would by no means conſent to ſell it to, and ſo got an Agreement at a low Price. Equity will *not decree an Execution* of theſe Articles; Per North K. Hill. 1683. Vern. R. 227. Philips v. D. of Bucks.

5. A

2 Chan. Caſes 128. per Finch C. Mich. 34 Car. 2. Hobs v. Norton. N. Ch. R. 46. contra 1649. Hunt v. Carew.——Vern. 136. Hobs v. Norton, decreed Hill. 1682. per North K. to confirm the Annuity.

5. A Man being *about to purchaſe a Rent-charge* makes inquiry of the Title of one that had a Right to the Land, and to hold it diſcharged, but at the Time knew nothing of his Title, and told the Purchaſor as much, yet this will not prejudice him who was *Ignorant of his own Title.* Trin. 34 Car. 2. 2 Chan. Caſes 108. Dyer v. Dyer.

Raym. 186. Frere's Caſe.

6. A Fine ſet 2 or 3 Terms ſince was *ſet aſide*, becauſe of ſome ſurreptitious Practiſe and Miſinformation to the *Judge*. Vent. 69. Paſch. 22 Car. 2.

7. *Mortgagee*, to whom 200*l.* Intereſt Money was due for 500*l.* being inquired of, as to how much was due, by one that was going to be married to the Heir of the Mortgagor, and *ſaying the Intereſt was all clear* to that time, ſo that a Settlement was taken of the Lands, and the 200*l.* being ſecured by Bond, decreed that the jointured Land ſhould be charged only with 500*l.* and Intereſt from the Time of the Inquiry. Mich. 1700. Ch. Prec. 131. Barret v. Wells.

8. *A. charged all his Lands by his Will, for Payment of* 500*l. a Year to M. his Wife for Life, and made her Executrix and Reſiduary Legatee*, and ſubject to this Annuity he *gave his Real Eſtate to R. L.* afterwards R. L. and M *articled that M.* ſhould Renounce the Executrixſhip, and *deliver up the Perſonal Eſtate to R. L. and that R. L.* ſhould indemnify M. from A.'s Debts, and *ſhould pay M. a further Annuity of* 40*l. a Year*, and the 540*l.* a Year was *to be ſecured on Part of the Eſtate* only. R. L. prayed Relief againſt theſe Articles, pretending that the Value of the Perſonal Eſtate was miſrepreſented to him, and that in Reality it proved to be 4000*l.* leſs than the Teſtator's Debts amounted to. But it appearing that there *was no falſe Inventory*, or Particular made *of A.'s perſonal Eſtate, nor any Eſtimate given of it, whereby to induce R. L. to come into thoſe Articles* on Account of the Value, *and there being another Motive* (viz.) *M.'s accepting the Rent-charge* of 540*l* a Year *out of Part of the Eſtate only*, Ld Cowper diſmiſſed the Bill with Coſts; but as to M.'s Croſs Bill ordered a Performance of the Articles. Wms's Rep. 541. Trin. 1719. Litton v. Litton.

9. A *Releaſe of an Equity of Redemption* obtained by Miſrepreſentation was ſet aſide for that Reaſon. MS. Rep. ſaid to be Lord Harcourt's, tit. Fraud. 23 May 1721. Kirwan v. Blake.

10. An *Aſſignment of a Leaſe got by* Miſinformations of the Value of the Land, and of the Fine for Renewal was ſet aſide, and the Defendant the Executor of the Aſſignee ordered to Account for the Moiety of the Profits, during his Teſtator's Life, and ſince his Death, and to pay Coſts of Suit. Hill. 10 Geo. 1. 9 Mod. 83. Evans v. Hoskins and Glouceſter City.

11. Obligor for 200*l.* and 100*l.* by Note, on Payment of 20*l.* to Obligee, who was a Man of weak Parts and Memory, procured the Bond and Note to be delivered up upon *pretence that he was poor, and nearly related to the Obligee*, but that not being proved, he was ordered to Account for the Bond and Notes to the Executor of Obligee. Mich. 11. Geo. 1. 9 Mod. 118. Lucas v. Adams.

(I. a) *Who* ſhall be *Bound by it*, and how Puniſhable.

1. THE Heir is *bound to Warranty*, and *aliens the Aſſets* by Covin; the *Feoffee is impleaded* and Vouches the Heir; in this Caſe, upon the Matter found, he ſhall recover in Value againſt the Heir Land purchaſed by the Heir, but not the Land aliened by him. Br. Colluſion, pl. 49. cites 31 E. 3.

2. *Formedon* was brought by Covin of the Tenant againſt himſelf, becauſe he was *Feoffee upon Condition*, and *had broken the Condition, and would have the Land to be loſt againſt the Feoffor*, and this Matter was alleged by Feoffor who was a Stranger to the Action; For the Defendant confeſſed the

the Action, and thereupon Proclamation was made, if any one could ſay any Thing why the Demandant ſhould not have Judgment and Execution? whereupon the Feoffor came in as above, and ſhewed as above; and the Matter was examined and confeſſed, and the *Tenant put to give Bail to attend his Puniſhment for the Deſceit.* Br. Colluſion, &c. pl. 15. cites 7. H. 4. 19.

3. A Deed of Gift of Goods ſhall *bind the Maker, his Executors and Adminiſtrators*, notwithſtanding the 13 Eliz. 5. Brownl. 111. Hill. 8 Jac. Hawes v. Leader. Cro. J. 270. S. C. Yelv. 196. S. C.

4. *Action* will lie againſt a Defendant for *confeſſing a Judgment* by Fraud in order to prevent Plaintiffs having benefit of a Judgment he had obtained againſt him. Trin. 3 Jac. 2. B. R. Carth. 3. Smith v. Tonſtall.

5. In Caſe of a *Groſs Fraud* the Court will give *Coſts*, to be aſcertain'd by the Party's own Oath; Per Commiſſioners. Hill. 1690. 2 Vern. 123. Dyer v. Tymewell.

(K. a) Pleadings. Averred in what Caſe.

1. IN a Formedon, Defendant *pleads Non-tenure*; Jury find that Defendant made Feoffment of the Tenements to divers Perſons to their own Uſe before the Writ purchaſed, and that the *Feoffees never took the Profits*, but the Feoffor, till the Day of the Writ purchaſed, which Feoffment was made by Covin and Fraud, to the Intent that the Plaintiff ſhould not know againſt whom to bring his Action; adjudged that the Defendant was Tenant of the Tenements to this Action, and that, in reſpect of the bringing this Action, the Feoffment ſhall be void againſt the Plaintiff and that he is ſufficient Tenant to anſwer. Savil. 126. Hill. 32 Eliz. White v. Bacon.

2. Upon the Statute 13 *Eliz. cap.* 8. *againſt Uſury*, and 27 *Eliz.* 4. *againſt Fraud*, tho' *Fines are Levied* where there is Uſury, Fraud or Covin, thoſe are *averrable* to be ſo againſt any Deed. Jenk. 254. pl. 45. 3 Rep. 77. Hill. 44 Eliz. in Chancery, Farmer's Caſe.

3. A. *in Conſideration of* 20 l. *paid* by B. *granted all his Goods in a Schedule annexed*, and gave Poſſeſſion by a Platter, but there was a *Covenant that they ſhould remain in A.'s Houſe, and to be carried away by B. on Demand*, and A. to keep them ſafely in the mean time. A. died; B. demanded the Goods of J. S. the Adminiſtrator of A. but he not delivering them B. brought his Action; J. S. *pleaded* the Statute of 13 *Eliz. of fraudulent Deeds of Gift, and that A. was indebted* to ſeveral Perſons amounting to 100 l. in ſeveral Sums, and, being ſo indebted, made the Grant, being at ſuch time poſſeſſed of thoſe and of other Goods, not amounting to more than 80 l and that this was by Covin to Defraud his Creditors, and that A. dying Adminiſtration was granted to him; Plaintiff *replied that the Defendant had Aſſets to ſatisfy the Debts demanded, and that the Grant was upon good Conſideration*; and upon Demurrer adjudged for the Plaintiff. Firſt, becauſe the Defendant had *not averred in his bar, that the Debts remained yet unpaid* to the Creditors named, there being 4 Years between the Deed of Gift and A.'s Death, in which time the Debts may well be preſumed to be ſatisfied. Secondly, the Defendant did *not ſhew that the Debts due to the ſuppoſed Creditors were by ſpecialty*, and then the Matter of his Plea is not good; For he cannot plead this but in excuſe to free him from a Devaſtavit, which cannot be here, he as Adminiſtrator not being chargable, unleſs the Debts are by ſpecialty. Thirdly, where Defendant ſuggeſts, *that his Delivering the Goods would be a Devaſtavit*, this cannot be; For as to the Creditors, they are liable in the Hands of the Plaintiff as Executor de ſon Tort, if the Deed of Gift be fraudulent. 4thly, it may be the Creditors named will never ſue for their Debts, and ſo the Defendant will detain the Goods for ever; but had he *pleaded a Recovery by any of the Creditors, and thoſe Goods to the Value taken in Execution*, it Cro. J. 270. S. C. and ſeems to be a Tranſcript of Yelverton's Report.—And ſo does Brownl. 111 S. C.

had been a good Plea. Fifthly, the *Defendant is not a Perſon enabled by the Stat. 13 Eliz. to plead this Plea*; For tho' the Deed is void againſt all Creditors, yet it is not ſo againſt the Party himſelf, his Executors and Adminiſtrators, and againſt them it remains a good Deed; per tot. Cur. Yelverton a Counſel with the Defendant. Yelv. 196. Hill. 8 Jac. B. R. Hawes v. Loader.

4. Covin ſhall not be intended unleſs it be *averred*, per Jones J. Jo. 20. cites 10 Rep. 56. a. Trin. 11 Jac. Chancellor of Oxford's Caſe.

5. A *Leaſe for Years* was *conveyed by A. with an intent to defraud his Creditors*, and died, making B. his Executor; C. was a Creditor of A. B. promiſed C. upon good Conſideration, that if he could diſcover any *Goods, Parcel of the Eſtate of Teſtator at the Time of his Death*, then he ſhould have the Goods in Satisfaction; the Court held the Leaſe ſo conveyed to be Parcel of his Eſtate at the Time of his Death; For tho' the Sale bound himſelf, yet it was void as to Creditors; and they agreed that the Plaintiff in his *Replication, ſhewing this ſpecial Conveyance of the Term by Fraud in maintenance of his Count* is good and purſuant, and no Departure from it. 2 Roll. R. 175. Trin. 18 Jac. B. R. Anon.

6. An *Executor confeſſes a Judgment*, as he may lawfully do, yet this *may be averred* to be entred, or kept on foot by Fraud, and that *by the Common Law*, which hates all Frauds. Vent. 329. Trin. 30 Car. 2. B. R. in Caſe of Knight v. Peachy & Freeman.

Vent. 329. 331. S. C. by the Name of Knight v. Peachy & Freeman.—Raym. 303. Trin. 31 Car. 2. S. C. in the Exchequer on Error brought there, but no Judgment; for the Parties agreed. But a Diſtinction was taken by the Counſel for the Defendant, that *in Caſe of a Recovery by Default*, Fraud may generally be alleged, as in Pl. C. 47. in Caſe of Wimbiſh v. Talbois.——but if *after a Verdict*, there it *muſt be ſpecially alleged*, and for this cited 9 Rep. 110. a. Treſhham's Caſe.

7. In *Debt for Rent againſt Aſſignee of the Executor of Leſſee for Years*, Defendant *pleaded an Aſſignment* by him to J. S. ſuch a Day, *and* that he gave *Notice* of it to the Leſſor *before any Rent due*; the Leſſor, *Plaintiff, replied that* the Aſſignment was to defraud him of his Action *by Fraud and Covin*; Defendant demurred and 'twas urged that Fraud is not to be *averred* in this Caſe; For the Aſſignment is a lawful Act; but it was anſwered, that Fraud and Covin make legal Acts illegal and void; and Judgment was given for the Plaintiff, Diſſentiente Scrogs Ch. J. 2 Jo. 109. Trin. 30 Car. 2. B. R. Anon.

(L. a) In what Caſes, and where the Fraud ſhall be tried, and whether by Jury, or by the Court.

1. WHERE *Land is recovered by Jury, the ſame Jury may enquire of the Right and Colluſion*, and *where* 'tis *by Default* without Jury, as in a Præcipe quod Reddat, it ſhall be enquired *by quale jus of Office*, and ſo 16 Aſſ. p. 1. and there 'tis determined, that *this Inquiry is only an Inqueſt of Office*, ſo that if they find therein Matter of Abatement of the Writ, yet the Writ ſhall not abate, for 'tis only an Inqueſt of Office. Br. Colluſion, &c. pl. 25. cites 14 Aſſ. 13.

2. In an Action of *Waſt* by an Abbot, the *Sheriff returned the Writ of Enquiry of the Waſt for the Abbot*, and Judgment was given for the Abbot, but *Execution was ſtayed till the Colluſion was enquired into*; but otherwiſe, it ſhall be *if the Inqueſt had been before Juſtices*; for then *the ſame Inqueſt*, after the Iſſue tried, *ſhould enquire of the Colluſion preſently*, but now this ſhall be by *quale jus*. Br. Colluſion, &c. pl. 18. cites 38 E. 3. 12.

† Arg. Bridg. 112. S. C. cited——S. C. 10 Rep. 56. b. Trin. 11 Jac. B. R. in the Chan-

3. Jury found a Deed, but left it to the Court, if by the 27 Eliz. it be Fraudulent againſt the Defendant, and ſo void; 'Twas argued that the *Court* can *judge of Fraud without the Jury's finding it ſo*, but inſiſted on by the other ſide, that the Court might judge of the Proviſo in the Statute 27 Eliz. and if this Settlement were void within that Act; adjornatur. 2 Show. 46. Butler v. Waterhouſe.—The * Court will not adjudge it

Fraud

Fraud, where the Jury do not expreſsly find the Fraud; For the Judges have nothing to do with Matter of Fact, and ſo per tot. Cur. no Fraud. Brownl. 36 ‡ Crier v. Littleton.

cellor, &c. of Oxford's Caſe.—— Per Yelverton Serjeant,

Cozin apparent need not be proved 3 Le. 256.—contra, per Beaumont Serjeant 3 Le. 255. Mich. 32 Eliz. C. B. in the Serjeant's Caſe.——— * Fraud is a pure Matter of Fact which is to be found by the Jury, and *cannot* in any Caſe *be preſumed by the Court*, per Ramsford J. Vent. 129. Paſch. 23 Car. 2. B. R. Smith v. Wheeler.

4. Where Fraud is *apparent* Chancery will Decree againſt it without ordering a *Trial*. 32 & 33. Car. 2. 2 Chan. Caſes 46. Colſton v. Gardner.

5. A. conveyed Lands to B. and C. for 99 Years in Truſt to raiſe a Sum of Money, the Reverſion to J. S. Afterwards J. S. ſettled the Reverſion on C. and his Heirs in *Truſt* for A. for Life, and to the Heirs of the Survivor; 10 Years afterwards *B. lends Money to J. S. and takes a Mortgage of the Truſt Lands ſubject to the Truſt*, and *without Notice of the Conveyance to C. in Truſt for A.* J. S. dies, living A. On a Bill by B. againſt A. and C. the laſt Conveyance was ſet aſide as fraudulent, tho' A. ſwore that J. S. agreed at firſt to make ſuch Re-conveyance bona Fide, and that ſhe knew not of B.'s lending Money to J. S. and decreed that it was not neceſſary to ſend it to be *tried at Law, whether a voluntary Conveyance be fraudulent or Not*, but the Court may decree it to be ſo meerly for being Voluntary. Trin. 1691. Ch. Prec. 13. White v. Huſſey.

6. Fraud, *as to the Settlement of a poor Perſon*, is to be judged of *by the Juſtices of Peace* and not by B. R. Per Pratt J. 10 Mod. 393. Trin. 3 Geo. B. R.

7. In Caſe of *great Fraud*, Equity will not direct an Iſſue. MS. Rep. ſaid to be Lord Harcourt's. tit. Fraud. 5 Feb. 1722. White v. Lightburn.

(M. a) Evidence. In what Caſes Fraud may be given in Evidence.

1. IN *Debt againſt the Heir*, the Defendant *pleaded Riens per Deſcent*, and the Plaintiff reply'd,——that Aſſets in the County of S. It appeared upon the Trial, that Lands deſcended, but *before Action brought, Defendant had enfeoffed J. S. which was proved to be by Fraud.* Upon a ſpecial Verdict found, it was reſolved, that this Matter might well be given in Evidence. 5 Rep. 60. Mich. 32 & 33 Eliz. B. R. Gooch's Caſe.

(N. a) Badges of Fraud. What are.

1. DEfendant in Debt, *after Judgment*, *aliens* his Goods, and he *himſelf takes the Profits*; yet the Plaintiff ſhall have them in Execution. Arg. Lane. 105. cites 22 Aſſ. 72. 43 E. 3. 2.

2. A *Gift of Goods* was held fraudulent on divers Circumſtances. 1. It was *General*, without any Exception. 2. It was *antedated*, and Direction given to the Attorney, to uſe his Skill to prevent the Plaintiff. 3. The making and ſealing it was *in the Donee's Abſence*. 4. It was agreed to be *kept ſecret*. 5. The * *Donee never had Poſſeſſion of the Deed*, but it was kept by the Brother of the Donor. 6. The Donor himſelf had all the *Uſe of the Goods*, and dwelt in the Houſe, and bought and ſold, and killed the Cattle into his Houſe, and altered them, and ſpent the Corn in his Family all the time after; And they *coloured this by Account made annually* between Donor, and Donee, for ſhew only; but no Money

* Fin. R. 20. Mich. 28 Car. 2. Oakover v. Pettus.

Money paid to the Donee. 7. The Donor after the Deed, being Assessor, *assessed himself to the Subsidy seven Pounds*; whereas, if the Deed was good, he had nothing. 8. The *Donee took out an Extent* upon a Statute afterwards against the Goods of the Donor, for a Debt owing to him; And for these Reasons, tho' the Deed was made upon good and valuable Consideration, to save harmless the Donee from a just and true Debt, for which the Donee was bound as Security for the Donor, the Deed was adjudged fraudulent. Mo. 638. Pasch. 44 Eliz. in the Star Chamber. Chamberlayne v. Twyne.

3. *Tenant in Capite* made a *Lease for* 1000 *Years to B.* and further covenanted with B. and his Heirs, that *upon Payment of* 5 *s.* he and his Heirs *would stand seised to the Use of B. and his Heirs*, and in the Deed were all the ordinary Clauses of a Conveyance bona fide. B. died, and the Question was, if the Heir should be in Ward? It was held, that the Heir had Power of the Inheritance on Payment of 5 s. and that the Lease carries with it the Badges of Fraud. Godb. 191. Trin. 10. Jac. in the Court of Wards. Cotton's Case.

4. If a Man has any Intention to evade the Statute 13 Eliz. 5. whatsoever he shall say afterwards, will not any ways salve and amend the Matter, but the same is Fraud, and within the Statute, and *Secrecy* is a *Badge* of Fraud, but no concluding Proof; per tot. Cur. 2 Buls. 226. Pasch. 12 Jac. Stone v. Grubham.

5. It was said, that if one make a *voluntary Conveyance* upon Consideration of natural Affection, and is *not* at that Time *indebted* to any Person, *nor in Treaty* with any one *for the Sale* of the Lands, such Conveyance has no Badge of Fraud; but otherwise it is, if he be indebted, or in Treaty for Sale of those Lands. Sty. 445, 446. Pasch. 1655. B. R. Anon.

6. In Evidence to a Jury, it was held by the Court, that a *voluntary Conveyance* executed is not fraudulent, because voluntary; but it is great Evidence of Fraud *against an after Conveyance made bona fide*; because the *Statute avoids* such *Deeds* as are *bona fide*, and on Consideration, *if made ea Intentione, to defraud Purchasors*; And therefore this Fraud must be found by the Jury. 1 Keb. 486. Pasch. 15 Car. 2. B. R. Garth v. Mois.

7. *Executor pleads a Judgment*—Per fraudem was reply'd, and Issue thereupon; and by Evidence it appeared, the *Dettee was willing to take less than was recovered*, it is Evidence of Fraud; but if it be shewn, that Administrator had not Assets to pay that Sum, it is no Fraud, 1 Salk. 312. Trin. 13 W. 3. B. R. Parker v. Atfield.

8. An *Agreement for a Purchase was with an old Woman*, 90 *Years of Age*, by an Attorney, but *no Money paid*, and pretended he bought it for another, of the Name of the Tenant in Possession, to whom she was Heir, if he died without Issue, and several other suspicious Circumstances appearing, the Court would neither decree it to be carried into Execution against the Heir at Law, nor to be delivered up. Hill. 1708. 2 Vern. 632. Green v. Wood.

9. A. and B. married two Sisters, presumptive Heirs of J. S. and *articled to divide equally between them, whatsoever should be given by the Will of J. S. to either of them.* J. S. by his Will, gave a great real and personal Estate to A. and only a small real Estate to B. who brought a Bill against the Executors of A. for an Account of the real and personal Estate which came to A. by the Will of J. S. and insisted, that after the Articles, *A. prevailed on J. S. to devise the greatest Part of his Lands to the Sons of A. and that as soon as his Sons came of Age, A. got his Sons to convey the Lands to himself and his Wife for Life, Remainder to Trustees for* 500 *Years, to raise* 3000 *l. a-piece for two younger Sons, not provided for by the Will of J. S.* so that in effect A. had the same Power over the Estate, as if it had been devised to himself in Fee. Ld. C. Macclesfield declared, that if the Estate had continued in the Sons of A. he would not have compelled the Conveyance of a Moiety to B. the Plaintiff, according to the Articles,

Articles, there being no Writing to manifeſt the Truſt, as the Statute of Frauds requires; but that if the Sons ſhould *without any Conſideration*, convey to A. their Father the Eſtate left them by J. S. then he thought he might juſtly Decree, that A. ſhould convey a Moiety of the Premiſſes to B. agreeable to the Articles. 2 Wms's. Rep. 182 to 185. Trin. 1723. Beckley v. Newland.

10. Land of 40 l. a Year was conveyed by one of 72 Years of Age, for an Annuity of 20 l. a Year for Life, and there being *no Evidence of any Inſtruction given by the Grantor to the Drawer of the Deed for preparing it, tho' the Drawer has been examined*, but the Inſtructions were given by the Grantee only; and it *not appearing that the Deed was read to the Grantor* at the time of executing the ſame; and the *Annuity being ſecured by Covenant only*, inſtead of a Mortgage of the ſame Eſtate, and *he not having the Deed itſelf in his Hands*, the Maſter of the Rolls ſaid, that all this is Fraud apparent, and that judging upon the Face of a Deed, is judging upon Evidence, which cannot err, whereas the Teſtimony of Witneſſes may be falſe. 2 Wms's Rep. 203 to 206. Mich. 1723. Clarkſon v. Hanway, & al.

(O. a) As to Creditor's relieved in Equity.

1. DEED of *Gift of all his Goods*, Chattels, and houſhold Stuff, by Baron, in Truſt for his *Wife*, the Baron continued in *Poſſeſſion* during his Life, and after his Death, the Widow admitted it to be a Truſt, by exhibiting an Inventory of them into the Spiritual Court; Decreed, to be a Fraud againſt *Creditors*, there not being Aſſets ſufficient, without thoſe Goods to pay the Debts; and ordered, after Debts paid with them, that the Surplus be accounted for to the Adminiſtrator, when an Adminiſtrator ſhall appear. Mich. 28 Car. 2. Fin. R. 270. Oakover v. Pettus, Haughton, & al.

2. Sale by *Commiſſioners of Bankrupts* is good againſt fraudulent *Debt* or Judgment, and ſhall be ſo taken in any Action brought for the Goods, if Fraud be *proved upon the Trial*. 2 Jo. 41. Mich. 27 Car. 2. C. B. Smith v. Harward.

3. A. got *Judgment againſt B.* for 1400 l. on Bond conditioned for Payment of 700 l. and Intereſt, and brings a Bill, charging that *B. had conveyed his Eſtate to Truſtees*, and had lent 1200 l. to C. in the Name of J. S. and prays that this may be made liable to the Plaintiff's Debt. Defendant demurs, for that he in his Life-time was not bound to *diſcover* his perſonal Eſtate, and Demurrer over-ruled. per Jeffries C. Paſch. 1686. Vern. 398. Smither v. Lewis.

4. A. got *Judgment againſt B.* for 100 l. —— C. on Pretence of a Debt due to him, and to prevent A's having the Benefit of his Judgment, had *got Goods of B's*, of great Value, into his Hands, ſufficient to ſatisfy his Debt *with a great Overplus*, and prayed an Account and *Diſcovery* of theſe Goods.——C. demurred, becauſe A. had not alleged, that he had ſued out Execution, and actually taken out a Fi. Fa; for till he had ſo done, the Goods were not bound by the Judgment, nor A. intitled to a Diſcovery or *Account* thereof. Per Jeffries C. the Plaintiff ought actually to have *ſued out Execution before he had brought his Bill*, and allowed the Demurrer. Paſch. 1686. Vern. 399. Angell v. Draper.

5. At Law, where a Conveyance is found to be fraudulent, the Creditor comes in and avoids all, *without Re-payment* of any Conſideration Money. Per Cur. Trin. 1687. Vern. 466. in the Caſe of Hern v. Meers.

6. A. in order to draw in his Creditors, *to compound his Debts* at an eaſy Rate, made an *underhand Agreement* with ſome of them, *to pay them the whole*, in Caſe they would ſeemingly come in; The Creditors came in, but A. failed in Payment at the Time agreed, and now ſome of the

But where A was intruſted by B. to receive Intereſts due

upon Tallies, and he received Principal as well as Intereſt, and compounding with his other Creditors, made ſuch an underhand Agreement with B. and brought a Bill to be relieved, Lord Cowper diſmiſſed his Bill, A. having *been guilty of as great Breach of Truſt* and Fraud as could be and not be criminal, and having agreed to make ſome Satisfaction, he himſelf ought not to be relieved againſt ſuch Promiſe or Security for Performance. Hill. 1707. 2 Vern. 602. Small v. Brackley.

Creditors refuſe to ſtand to the Agreement, which being under Hand and Seal, A. brought a Bill to compel a Performance; But the Fraud appearing, Ld. Jeffries diſmiſſed the Bill. Trin. 1688. 2 Vern. 71. Child v. Dandridge.

7. A. *purchaſes Land in Name of B.* his eldeſt Son, *and puts B. in Poſſeſſion*; Afterwards B. falling *ſick*, *A. takes a Declaration of Truſt* from B. ——B. recovers, continues Poſſeſſion, and marries, and dies; A. gets a Conveyance from the younger Son, B. dying without Iſſue; By Agreement on the Marriage B. was bound to leave the Wife 4000 l. But nothing of Dower mentioned. Widow brought her Writ of *Dower*. A. ſued in Equity for Relief, and decreed him by Maſter of Rolls. On Appeal, Wright K. diſmiſſed the Plaintiff's Bill, declaring it to be a ſecret and fraudulent Deed of Truſt, to deceive Purchaſers and Creditors. Paſch. 1702. 2 Vern. 436. Bateman v. Bateman.

8. A. makes a *Bill of Sale of his Goods* to a *Truſtee for one* that lived with him as his Wife, and was *reputed as a Wife*. Bill of Sale ſet aſide as fraudulent, as to Creditors. Hill. 1704. Vern. 490. Fletcher & al. v. Lady Sidley, & al.

9. A. indebted to B. 100 l. on Bond, and to C. 200 l. on ſimple Contract, makes his Will, and D. Executor; *C. purchaſes a Leaſehold of D. the Executor for* 900 *l. and diſcounts his own Debt of* 200 *l.* and 550 *l. due from D. to C. and pays* 150 *l. in Money*. On a Bill by A. 'twas decreed at the Rolls, and after, on Appeal, per Cowper C. that this Sale is not good to bind A. an unſatisfied *Creditor*. Mich. 1708. 2 Vern. 616. Crane v. Drake & al.

10. A. being about to marry M. the Daughter of J. S. *gave a Bond for* 500 *l. payable to the Father of A. at a Day certain*, but *defeaſanced not to be put in Suit, but for Security of the Daughter, in Caſe any Misfortune ſhould happen to the Husband, to be paid before other Creditors*. Ld. Ch. King held, that this is a fraudulent Bond on the Face of it, to diſappoint Creditors. Sel Ch. Caſes in Ld. King's time. 46. Trin. 11. Geo. 1. 1725, Wife's Caſe.

(P. a) As to obtaining Wills, relieved in Equity.

1. A *Will*, whereby the Heir was diſinherited, and the Eſtate given to two Infants, Strangers, though obtained by great Fraud and Circumvention of the Father of one of the Infants, was denied to be ſet aſide, for *want of a Precedent*, though the Lord Chancellor declared his Reſolution to do all that he could; and though he had directions from the Houſe of Lords, to decree according to Juſtice and Equity though no Precedent could be found. 15 Car. 2. Ch. R. 236. Roberts v. Wynne.

2. Jekyl, Ld. Commiſſioner, took a *Difference between a Will*, and a *Deed gained upon a weak Man, and upon a Miſrepreſentation* or Fraud; For if a Will be gained from ſuch, by falſe Miſrepreſentation, this is not Reaſon ſufficient to ſet it aſide in Equity, as was determined in the late Duke of Newcaſtle's Will, betwixt Ld. Thanet and Ld. Clare, and in Caſe of * Bovil and Roberts; But where a Deed, which is not revocable as a Will is, is ſo gained from ſuch a Perſon, and without any valuable Conſideration, the ſame ought to be ſet aſide in Equity. 2 Wms's Rep. 270. Paſch. 1725, in Caſe of James v. Greaves.

* See pl. 1 Robert's v. Wynne. S. C.

3. A Bill was brought to ſet aſide a Will *of a perſonal Eſtate*, and to ſtay the Probate, upon a Suggeſtion of it's being obtained by Fraud, and the Defendant demurred to the Juriſdiction of the Chancery, whereupon an Injunction was moved for, inſiſting that the Demurrer confeſſed the Fraud, and that Fraud was cognizable in Equity, as well as in the Spiritual Court. But per Cur, the Spiritual Court has Juriſdiction of Fraud, relating to a Will of a perſonal Eſtate, and can examine the Parties, by way of Allegation, touching the ſame, and if the Will *was falſely read to the Teſtatrix*, then it was not her Will, and denied the Injunction. Trin. 1725. 2 Wms's Rep. 286. Stephenton v. Gardiner.

(Q. a) What Acts are to be ſaid fraudulent, in regard to After-Creditors or Purchaſors.

1. THE Plaintiff had brought his *Action* againſt M. *for lying with his Wife*; and 13 January, 1689. M. made a Conveyance of his Lands to Truſtees, in *Truſt, to pay his Debts mentioned in a Schedule* annexed to the Deed, *and ſuch other Debts as he ſhould appoint within ten Days in Hillary Term* following; The *Plaintiff recovered* 5000 *l. Damages* againſt M. and brought this Bill to be relieved againſt the Deed as fraudulent againſt him, and made to defeat him of his Debt. Per Cur. this Deed is not fraudulent, either in Law or Equity, for ſuch Debts as are named in the Deed; for the Plaintiff was no Creditor at the making of the Deed; and though it were made with an Intent to prefer his real Creditors before this Debt, yet, when it became afterwards to be a Debt, it was a *Debt founded in Maleficio*, and therefore it was conſcientious in him to prefer the other Debts before it; but the *Plaintiff may come in upon the Surplus*, after the Debts mentioned in the Schedule, or appointed within ten Days, purſuant to it are ſatisfied. Mich. 1699. Abr. Equ. Caſes. 149. Lewkner v. Freeman.

2. A *Man indebted to his Daughter-in-law* for Money of hers received by him, *purchaſed a Leaſe for Years, and had the ſame originally conveyed to her.* She had no Bond, or any other Security for her Money, at the time of the Conveyance, nor till ſeveral Years after, when he gave her a Bond, and died without Aſſets. A Creditor for a Debt contracted after the Conveyance brought his Bill, to ſubject this Leaſe to his Debt; But Ld. C. King ſaid, he thought it would be very extraordinary to do ſo for *Debts not then contracted*; and that he did not know that it had ever been determined, that a Man indebted, minding *to provide for his Children, has an Eſtate originally conveyed to them*, it ſhould be ſubject to Debts; whereas, here the Father-in-law was indebted to her, and ſo denied to ſubject it to the Plaintiff's Debt. Sel. Ch. Ca. in Ld. King's time. 78 Mich. 1729. Proctor v. Warren.

Freſh

Freſh Suit.

(A) At what Place.

S. P. agreed by Pigot. Br. Freſh Suit. pl. 2. cites S. C.

1. IF I take your Beaſts as a Diſtreſs, which come back to you of their own Accord, I cannot retake them by reaſon of the firſt Diſtreſs, without freſh Suit. 9 E. 4. 2. b. per Dandy.

2. Dy. 8 El. 246. 70. Replevin brought for taking of Beaſts in Dale. Defendant ſaid, that he took them in another Place for Damage feaſant, and ſhewed that the Beaſts eſcaped to Dale, as they were driving to the Pound, and upon freſh Suit, he retook them in the Place called Dale, and admitted a good Juſtification.

3. Old Natura Brevium, 53. after ſuch Diſtreſs, Eſcape, and Freſh Suit, if the Party who diſtreined prays Deliverance, and he will not [deliver them] Writ of Reſcous lies.

4. If I diſtrain for Damage feaſant, or for Rent, and in chaſing them to the Pound, they eſcape into the Soile of another, yet upon Freſh Suit I may re-take them. 33 H. 6. 55.

S.P.Br.Freſh Suit. pl. 5. cites 33 H. 6. 52. S. C.

5. So if the Tenant reſcues, and drives them out of the Land. 33 H. 6. 53. agreed.

6. If a Miniſter of the Court, by the Cuſtom, attaches a Man by a Horſe, yet upon Freſh Suit he may re-take in other County. 33 H. 6. 52. b. 55. adjudged.

7 Note, that it was touched, if a Man *makes an Affray*, and the *Juſtices of the Peace, or Conſtable ſeeing it, come to it, and would arreſt him, and he flies into another County*, and the other freſhly purſues him, he may arreſt him in the other County; and for Affray, Freſh Suit is Material, *but* if it was *for Felony*, it is not material; For he may take him in any County. Br. Freſh Suit. pl. 3. cites 13 E. 4. 8.

(B) What ſhall be ſaid, Freſh Suit.

1. WHERE Felony is done, and the Felon is not taken, *within a Year after* the Felony done; *yet if he*, who was robbed, *does his Endeavour to take* the Felon, and to eſpy him, and he is taken, *tho' it be not at his Suit*, it ſhall be adjudged freſh enough, per tot. Cur. and therefore the Party ſhall be reſtored to his Goods. Br. Freſh Suit. pl. 1. cites 7 H. 4. 44.

2. If *Beaſts eſcape in View of the Owner, by default of Incloſure*, as out of an Highway, &c. and Freſh Suit be ſhewn in Juſtification, but it appears not, that they were in View of the Owner, Freſh Suit ſhall not be pleaded in Bar, except the *Plaintiff alleges Notice*. F. N. B. 128. (298) in the Notes there, cites 15 H. 7. 17. 21 E. 4. 8. 49. 10 E. 4. 8.

(C) Neceſſary in what Caſes, to preſerve Property.

Br. Freſh Suit. pl. 5. cites 33 H. 6. 52.

1. HE, *who takes Goods from the Enemies* of the King, *which were taken before from an Engliſhman*, ſhall have it as a *Thing gained in Battel*, and not the King, the Admiral, nor the Party to whom the Property was before

before, becauſe the Party came not freſhly, the ſame Day that it was taken from him, and before Sun ſet, and claim'd it. Br. Forfeiture de terres. pl. 57. cites 7 E. 4. 14.

2. If *Goods* are *Stole*, and they *come into a Franchiſe*, the *Lord* of the Franchiſe *ſhall have them*, if freſh Suit be not made, and *if it be no Franchiſe*, the *King ſhall have them*, if the Party does not make *Freſh Suit*. But this ſeems to be of ſuch Franchiſe as has a Waiſe, or Bona & Catalla Felonum & fugitivorum. Br. Forfeiture de terres. pl. 110. cites 21 E. 4. 16. Br. Freſh Suit. pl. 4. cites S. C.

3. *And* 'twas granted, per tot. Cur. that if a Man *ſteals Goods, and waives them*, he who was robbed, may *ſeiſe them* 20 *Years after*, if the King, nor the Lord of the Franchiſe have not ſeiſed them; but if they are ſeiſed, then he who was robbed ought to ſue Appeal, and ſhall have them, if he makes Freſh Suit. Quod nota. Br. Forfeiture de terres. pl. 110. cites 21 E. 4. 16. Br. Freſh Suit. pl. 4. cites S. C.

(D) In Treſpaſs, In what Caſes it is a good Plea in Treſpaſs.

1. TReſpaſs in the County of E. of a Horſe taken, the *Defendant ſaid, that the City of E. is an ancient City*, and a Corporation of Mayor and Sheriff, and *have had a Court before the Mayor every Day*, and *that one T. affirmed a Plaint* againſt the Plaintiff, and ſhew'd Proceſs in certain, 'till an Attachment, *and how he attach'd him by the Horſe, as Officer in the City* of E. *and the Plaintiff reſcued it, and went into the County of E.* and the Defendant freſhly purſued and re-took, which is the ſame taking, &c. Judgment, &c. and a good Plea; for *by the Freſh Suit, the Horſe was always in his Poſſeſſion in the Law*, and therefore the *re-taking good, in the Foreign County, and out of the Juriſdiction of the City* of E. Quod nota. Br. Treſpaſs, pl. 32. cites 33 H. 6. 52.

2. Treſpaſs of Cattle taken in A. in D. the *Defendant ſaid, that he was ſeiſed of four Acres, called C. in D. and found the Cattle there Damage Feaſant, and chas'd them towards the Pound, and they eſcaped* from him, *and went into A. and he freſhly re-took them*, which is the *ſame* Treſpaſs, and admitted for a good Plea. Quære, if he ought not to ſay, that they *eſcaped* into A. *againſt his Will?* Br. Treſpaſs. pl. 355. cites 21 E. 4. 64.

(A) Fugitives.

See Gavelkind (D) pl. 1.

1. A. Went beyond Sea, without Licence of the King, with Robert de Mortimer, and the *King certified the ſame into Chancery, reciting, that he had ſent his Privy Seal*, &c. but that the ſaid A. *(Spretis Mandatis noſtris redire recuſavit)* and thereupon iſſued a Commiſſion to ſeiſe, &c. Le. 10. ſays, that ſuch a Precedent of Seizure was ſhewn as of 18 E. 2. * Edmond de Woodſtock's Caſe.

* S. C. cited by Manwood Ch. B. in delivering the Judgment of the Court. Mo. 111. in S.C Knowles v. Luce, by the Name of Mortimer's Caſe ——— S. P. and upon a Bill of Intruſion againſt the Grantee of the Queen, and Judgment thereupon for him, it was aſſigned for Error, that it was *not alleged in the Replication of what Date the Privy Seal was, nor that any Notice* of the Privy Seal *was given to A.* But it was anſwered, that the Privy Seal needs not any Date, eſpecially in this Caſe. For the Matters which are under the Privy Seal, are not iſſuable and cites * D. 177. nor can any Traverſe be taken to it; And *this Privy Seal is not* as other Writs and Præcipes are, *returnable in any Court, but the Queen herſelf*, from whom it originally came, *ſhall receive it, and alſo the Meſſage upon it, and ſhe herſelf*

herſelf in ſuch Caſe, is Judge of the Contempt and no Record of that Privy Seal, *remains in any Court*, but ſhe herſelf ſhall keep it, and then when ſhe is informed of the Contempt, *ſhe makes a Warrant*, ſometimes to the Ld Chancellor, ſometimes to the Ld Treaſurer and Barons of the Exchequer, to the ſame Purpoſe *to ſeiſe the Lands*, and that Warrant is *ſigned with the Seal Manual* of the Queen, and ſhe may certify and ſet down ſuch Cauſe of Seiſure in ſuch Warrant, and no other Certificate is made by her, and ſhe may *certify the ſame Commiſſion by Word of Mouth*, and the Party ſhall be concluded by the Commiſſion under the Great Seal to ſay that ſhe hath not certified it. And of this, divers Precedents were ſhewn, and the ſame was all agreed to by the Chancellor, Treaſurer, and Juſtices.† And alſo, that the *Queen may ſeiſe and aſſign* her Intereſt over, and that ſuch *Aſſignees may grant Copyholds*, being Parcel of a Manor aſſigned, and that they ſhall bind any, that come in, after the Queen's Hands are amoved. And alſo, that the Statutes of 13 *and* 14 *Eliz.* do not amend the Eſtate of the Queen, but it continues as before, and ſo do all the Eſtates under it. Le. 9 Mich. 25 and 26 Eliz. in the Exchequer Chamber. Cater's Caſe.———* D. 176. b. 177. a. pl. 30, 31. Bartues Caſe.———F. N. B. [85] (A) in the Notes there (a) cites D. 176. 189. 375. and ſays Note, that the King has only the Profits of the Lands.———† In ſuch Caſe, the K. has only *Veſturam terræ*, as in Caſe of Outlawry, and cannot grant Copyholds. D. 176. b. Marg. pl. 30. cites it as held in Lady Baſſet's Caſe.

It was alſo held, that whereas the *Queen ſeiſed by Force of the common Law, and granted a Copyhold* out of it; now when the Statutes *of* 13 *and* 14 *Eliz.* [3.] was made, ſhe had not any Eſtate thereby; For ſhe had ſuch Intereſt before; and this new Seiſure after the Statute, works nothing, and nothing accrues to her thereby, whereof ſhe can make a Seiſure; For ſhe had departed with the Whole before. And Note, that the Grant in the Caſe at Bar, was Quamdiu in Manibus fore contigerit. And Judgment was affirmed in Omnibus. Le. 10. Cater's Caſe.———S P, Paſch. 23 Eliz. in Scacc. D. 375. b. pl. 21. S. C.———And. 95. S. C. and P by Name of Knollis v. Carter.———S. C. cited. Mo. 779.

The Statutes of 13 *and* 14 *Eliz.* were made *in Affirmance of the common Law*, and gave to the Queen nothing new, but *explained that which ſhe had before*; ſo that ſhe having upon the Seiſure of the Manor prior to thoſe Acts, granted the Manor to B. and C. Quamdiu in Manibus noſtris fore contigerit Ratione Contemptus, the ſame is not by thoſe Acts veſted again in the Queen, and ſhe cannot ouſt the Patentees, by Reaſon of thoſe Acts, in favour of any after Patentees. Mo. 109. S.C. by Name of Knowles v. Luce.

This was the Method taken. D. 176. b. pl. 30. 177. a. pl. 31. Hill 2 Eliz. in Bartue's Caſe.

2. *The Letters* under the Great Seal or Privy Seal, to re-call any from beyond Sea, *ought to be ſerved by ſome Meſſenger, who upon his Oath, is to make a Certificate thereof in Chancery, and thence a Mittimus to be ſent into the Exchequer*, and thereupon a Commiſſion to be granted to ſeize the Lands and Goods of the Delinquent. 3 Inſt. 180.

D. 296. pl. 19. Mich. 12 & 13 Eliz. S. C. Anon.

3. A *Merchant* of London *departing* the Realm, to the Intent to live freely from the Penalty of the Law, and out of his due Obedience to the Queen, and *not for any Merchandize*, was reſolved by all the Juſtices except two, to be no Contempt to the Queen; For Merchants were excepted out of the Statute of 5 R. 2. cap. 2 and by the Common Law, Merchants might paſs the Sea without Licence, tho' it were not to Merchandize. 3 Inſt. 180.

4. The King cannot *re-call* one that is beyond Sea, but by the Great Seal, or Privy Seal, and not by the Privy Signet. 3 Inſt. 180.

D. 176. b. pl. 30. Hill. 2 Eliz. The Q. v. Bartue, and Dutcheſs of Suffolk.

5. A. Privy Seal, was iſſued to *re-call a Fugitive*, but the Servants of the Fugitive *hindered the Service of it*, of which the Meſſenger made Affidavit; This Affidavit is not traverſable, and the Matter being out of the Realm cannot be try'd by a Jury, and this Matter being tranſmitted by Mittimus into the Exchequer, and the Fugitive not returning, his Lands and Goods were ſeiſed. Jenk. 220. pl. 69.

D. 375. b. pl. 21.

6. The King may *Fell ſeaſonable Woods*. Jenk. 246. pl. 35.

Mo. 111. Knowlls v. Lucy.

7. Per Tanfield, Ch. B. upon the *Return* of a Fugitive he ſhall re-have his Eſtate again in Right, and not of ſpecial Grace only, but the Lord Treaſurer ſaid, he ſaw no Reaſon, for that. Lane. 48. Sir Robert Dudly's als. Ld Nottingham's Caſe.

8. 5 *Geo.* 1. *cap.* 27. §. 3. Enacts that *if any Artificer in Wool, Iron, Steel, Braſs, Metal. Clock-Maker, Watch-Maker, or any other Artificer of Great Britain, being the King's Subjects, ſhall go into any Country, out of his Majeſty's Dominions, to Exerciſe or Teach the ſaid Trades to Foreigners; and if any of the King's Subjects, in any ſuch Foreign Country, Exerciſing any of the ſaid Trades, ſhall not return in this Realm, within 6 Months after Warning given by the Ambaſſador, Miniſter, or Conſul of Great Britain, in the Country where ſuch Artificers ſhall be, or by any Perſon authoriſed by ſuch Ambaſſador, &c. or by any of the Secretaries of State, and from thenceforth inhabit*

inhabit within this Realm; ſuch Perſon ſhall be incapable of taking any Legacy, or of being an Executor or Adminiſtrator, and of taking any Lands, &c. within this Kingdom, by Deſcent, Deviſe, or Purchaſe, and ſhall be deemed alien, and out of his Majeſty's Protection.

(A) Funeral Charges.

1. A Perſon died in Debt, and 600*l.* was laid out in his Funeral, Decreed the ſame ſhould be a Debt, payable out of a Truſt Eſtate, charged with Payment of Debts, he being *a Man of a great Eſtate and Reputation in his Country, and buried there*, but had he been buried elſewhere, it ſeemed his Funeral might have been more private, and the Court would not have allowed ſo much. Trin. 1691. Ch. Prec. 27. Offley v. Offley.

2. Where a Citizen of *London* deviſed 700*l. for Mourning*, the Queſtion was, if it ſhould come out of the Whole Eſtate, or out of the Legatory Part only; it was inſiſted, if there had been no Direction by the Will, or if the Will had directed, that the Expences of the Funeral ſhould not exceed ſuch a Sum, there the Deduction muſt have been out of the Whole Eſtate. Per Cur. Mourning deviſed by the Will, muſt *come out of* the Legatory Part, and not to leſſen the Orphanage and Cuſtomary Part. Mich. 1691. 2 Vern. 240. Deakins v. Buckley.

3. *Executor* is *not liable* to pay for Funeral Expences, *unleſs he contracts for it*. Per Holt Ch. J. 12. Mod. 256. Mich. 10 W. 3. Anon.

4. Settlements for *ſeperate Maintenance of the Wife* ſhall never extend to Funeral Charges, and tho' ſhe made a Will, (according to a Power given her) and an Executor, and gave ſeveral Legacies, but there was no Reſiduum for the Executor, the Husband's Eſtate in the Hands of a Deviſee ſubjected to the Payment of Debts was made liable to the Funeral Charges of the Wife. 9 Mod. 31. Trin. 9 Geo. at the Rolls. Bertie v. Ld Chelterfield.

In ſtrictneſs no *Funeral Expences* are allowable againſt a Creditor, except for the Coffin, Ringing the Bell, Parſon, Clerk, and Bearer's Fees; But not for Pall or Ornaments. Per Holt. 1 Salk. 296. Trin. 5 W. & M. B. R. Shelley's Caſe.——10*l.* is enough to be allowed for the Funeral of one in Debt. Per Holt. Baron Powell in his Circuit would allow but 11 *s.* 6*d.* as all the neceſſary Charge. Cumb. 042. Trin. 7 W. B. R. Anon.