REPORTS

C A S E S,

In the time of Queen ELIZABETH, King JAMES, and King CHARLES;

Collected and Reported by that Learned Lawyer

WILLIAM NOY,

Sometimes READER of the Honourable Societie of

LINCOLNES-INNE, SINCE

ATTOURNEY GENERALL to the late KING CHARLES.

Conteining most Excellent matter of Exceptions to all manner of Declarations, Pleadings, and Demurrers, that there is scarce one Action in a Probability of being brought, but here it is throughly examined and Exactly laid.

The Second Edition Corrected and Amended.

With Two neceffary Tables of the Cafes and Contents, for the Readers eafe and benefit.

LONDON,

Printed by T. R. for Samuel Heyrick at Grayes-Inne Gate in Holborn. 1669.

Breerton and? SAyres against his Wife. S? Ofwell.

135

yhillid.

Breerton and his Wife.

T Der bronght an action upon the cale upon an Aflumplic to the wife ; dum fola fuit against 3. 15g the Court it was rul'o,

1. Dat if 3 allume, and one dies, the Survivors thall be charg'd. But if they are alive the action thall be brought again it them all.

2. If 3 allume to pay 02 gibe, ec. upon requell, ec. If the requelt be made to sue of them it is good,

Ayres against Oswall;

A follen my Appletrees out of my Orchard. By the Court maintaina, ble. Bat otherwise it had been if he had sato, For thou hast stollen, &co,

Brumley against Todd.

T. allumes, that if B. marries his ferbant, &c. that he will give him sol. And the Plaintiff in the allumplit thews, that he had taken the ferbant to wife, and that the Wefendant licet ferius requilit, hath not pay'd, cc. And it was moved in arceft of Indgement, What the Plain tiff hath not thown, that he had given notice of the marriage to the Plain fendant : And yet Indgement was given for the Plaintiff. And a prefident was thewed in 34 Eliz. An allumplit to pay 1001. at the day of marriage, and no notice was thewa, and yet good, and affirm's upon errour brought.

Stone & alii against Browicke.

This tenants in Common (And fo expleting faid in the Declaration throughout) bying an action upon the cafe against B. for stopping of a Kiber, so that it overflowed the Beadow whereof they were tenants in Common. And well, so that is but a trespals upon the matter; In which they may soon. But in forging of faile beeds or flander of title ; Ever ought to sever. For that prejudices them with respect to the Inheritance, and Franktenement. And so twas now adjudg'd.

Symonds against Barham?

Ekrour upon a Judgement in the Common Bench in an Ejectione firm. byought by a Garbian in Soccage, because he has not them in the writ that the heir was within age at the time, sc. But by the Court it is yet good. And Judgment affirm's. But note that the nonage of the heir appears in the Declaration 14 H. 4. 13 brc. 471. 17 E. 3. 30. 22 Eliz. C. B. rot, 733, Aff.

Loyds Cafe,

A Rescons was returned againt Evanum alias Jevanum Loyd, which M. Jac. B.R. appears upon the Estgent. And by the Court the Rescons is naught, because he cannot have two Christian names.

John Rivet against Dowe.

The Lozo may difficen the Copyholder for the ferbices, or be may fette the Copyholders land.

Cham-

This (PDF) case report was prepared by, and is the copyright of, Deed Poll Office. You are free to use this report for noncommercial purposes, so long as you do not modify this (PDF) document and you keep every part of the report (including this notice) intact.

Find more cases like this at:

https://deedpolloffice.com/change-name/law/case-law https://deedpolloffice.com/change-name/children/case-law

Deed • Poll • Office