

appealed to a jury. The jury sat in 1340, before William de Shreshull, and Henry de Mortimer, and the result was a verdict for William de Perton and William the parson had to pay him £36 7s. 6d. At Michaelmas 1343 Alianora formerly wife of William de Weston, John son of William de Weston and William de Wettenhull, executors of the Will of William de Weston again sued William son of John de Perton for a debt of £26. Defendant still did not appear and the Sheriff returned that he held nothing within his bailiwick, by which he could be attached; but it was testified that he held sufficient. The Sheriff was therefore ordered to distrain and produce him at Hillary. At Easter, 1337 the Sheriff, Simon de Ruggeley, had been commanded, to take with him four discreet and lawful knights of his county, and to proceed himself to the court of Tettenhall, and in full court there, cause to be recorded, the suit which was before the court, by the King's lesser writ of right, between Roger son of Roger de Blackeley, near to Wrottesley, plaintiff, and Walter son of John de Perton, prebendary of Tettenhall, tenant of a messuage, sixteen acres of land, and an acre of meadow, in Tettenhall; and to return the record, under his seal, into court, at this term, and summon the parties for the same date. And the said Walter appeared by attorney; but Roger did not appear; and the Sheriff now returned that he had gone in person, to the said court, and had taken with him four discreet and lawful knights, and the suitors of the court had refused to make a record. The Sheriff was fined half a mark, for not mentioning, in his return, that he had summoned the parties. At Trinity Walter appeared by attorney, but Roger did not appear so the suit was dismissed. The bailiffs of the court, were ordered, in case of attempted injury to the said Walter, that the said Walter should be restored and compensated. At the same court the essoin of Leon de Perton sued John de Fulford and Ralph his brother, and John the bailiff of the abbot of Dore, in Derhysire, in a plea that they, together with William son of William de Pyletenhale, John de Levynton, Thomas de Pyletenhale, John of the Hall of Newport, and John de Honton, had forcibly reaped his growing corn at Wyghtwyck, and carried it off to the value of £10. None of the defendants appeared, and the Sheriff returned that they held nothing, by which they could be attached. He was therefore ordered to arrest and produce them at the quindene of Hillary. The case came on again for hearing in 1338, when none of the defendants appeared, and the Sheriff returned certain sums into court as proceeds of distrains made against them. He was therefore ordered to distrain again, and to arrest John de Fulford and Ralph, who could not be found, and to produce them at the quindene of Hillary. On 12th December 1338, an assize took place, as to whether William son of Hugh de Wrottesley, (a younger brother of William who died 1313, and not Hugh de Wrottesley, the family head); Thomas Grey; Richard de Ovyoteshaye; Thomas his son; Ralph de Fulford; and John his brother had unjustly disseized Walter son of John de Perton of thirty acres of land, two acres of meadow, three acres of wood, and four acres of pasture in Tettenhall, William appeared by William de Hampton, his attorney, who also answered for the others, as their bailiff, and denied the disseizin, and stated that the tenements were a parcel of the Manor of Tettenhall, which is of ancient demesne of the crown, and in which no writ would run, except the lesser writ of right, and he prayed for judgment on this point. Walter did not deny that the Manor of Tettenhall was of ancient demesne of the crown, nor that the tenements were a parcel of the Manor, but he pleaded that the said tenements, in the time of Edward the first, formed part of the demesne lands of the Manor, in