

Ranulph de Suthenhead

Robert ap Ithel of Grappenhall sued the earl, William de Codnor, William de Hallam and Ranulph de Suthenhead for having taken his animals.

7:33: 28 October 1292

p^r

Joh's Box essoniator Rob'i fil' Ithell op se u^rsus Henr' de Lascy Will' de Codenou^re Will' de Hallum & Ran' de Suthdeneheued de pl'o capt' au^rior Et p^rd'cs Will' de Codenou^re & alij p^rter Henr' de Lascy qui no' venit & de ip'o mandavit vic' q'd no' est attach' I'o p^rcept' est vic' sicut pⁱus q'd ponat eum p^r vad' &c' q'd sit &c' ad respond' &c' de pl'o p^rd'co Et id' dies dat^s est p^rd'cis Will' & aliis &c'

7:107: 20 January 1293

m'ia xijd'

D Rob'to fil' Ithell de Gropenhal & pl' suis vid'lt Joh' Boydell & Joh' p^rpo'ito de Gropenh' qa no' est ps' v^rs Henry de Lascy & alios in br'i

Gregory de Grappenhall sued Henry de Lacy, William de Codnor, William de Hallam and Ranulph de Suthenhead for taking a bullock.

7:40: 28 October 1292

p^r

Ad' Fox essoniator Gregorij de Gropenhale op se vers^s Henr' de Lascy Will' de Codenou^re Will' de Hallum & Ran' de Suhteneheued [de] pl'o capc' cuiusd' bouetti & p^rd'cs Will' & alii p^rt' Henr' de Lascy veniunt Et p^rcept' fuit vic' q'd pon^ret p^rd'cm Henr' p^r vad' &c' q' nich' inde [fec'] I'o p^rcept' est ei sicut pⁱus

7:109: 20 January 1293

m'ia xijd'

D Gregorio de Gropenhal & pl' suis de pros' vid'lt Joh' de Boydell & Joh' p^rpo'ito de Gropenh' qa no' est ps' v^rs Henr' de Lascy &c'

Peter de Dutton sued Ranulph de Suthenhead for having taken a bullock. Peter said that a false judgment had been made against him in the court of Henry de Lacy earl of Lincoln at Halton. The justice ordered the sheriff to bring the record of that action to court; but when the sheriff went to Halton he was told that that plea had not been enrolled, nor were any *sectatores* of that court present, who might be able to recall the matter, apart from one Henry le Norris. The justice therefore appointed four men to return to Halton to obtain the record, which was as follows: that Peter de Dutton and Robert son of Elias had been attached to answer Ranulph de Suthenhead in a plea that 13 November 1297 Peter had (by Robert) taken a bullock in Appleton and driven it to Peter's fold, and kept it there until it was brought back by the Constable's serjeant, William de Flixton; and when Ranulph sued them in Halton court, Peter and Robert counter-sued Ranulph, whereas Ranulph said that they should have

answered the original suit against them and were therefore undefended. He had waived any damages because he was himself one of Peter's tenants.

The county court was now to consider, with reference to this record, whether, as Peter had alleged, the Halton court had entered a false judgment, i.e. had entered the suit as undefended. But Peter then withdrew from prosecuting his case. It seems evident that the matter arose in the first place by Suthenhead distraining on Dutton, and Dutton's rescue of the distraint.

10:117: 11 February 1298

p^r.

Petrus de Dutton' p^r attornatu' suu', optulit se u^r sus Ranulph' m de Suthdeneheued, de pl'ito capc'ois vnus bouetti vnde id'm Petrus quer' falsum sⁱ f^{cm} fuisse iud'm in Cur' Henr' de Lascy com' Lyncoln' de Haulton'. Et vnde mandatu' fuit vic' q'd assumptis secu' q^atuor &c' accede't &c'. & loquelam &c'. Et q'd h'eret recordu' illd ad Com' istu' s'b sigillo suo, & p^r q^atuor &c'. Et q'd sumon' &c'. p^rd'cm Ranulph' q'd esset hic auditur' recordu' ill'd +&c'.+. Qui nich' inde fecit s' mandauit q'd accessit ad Cur' illam, & in plena Cur' illa peciit q'd Ball's illius Cur' recordarent loquelam illam, qui responder't q'd loquela illa no' fuit irrot'lata, & q'd no' h'ueru't +aliquos+ sectatores Cur' p^rsentes, qui recordo illo int'fueru't, nisi Henr' le Norreys vnus sectator p^rd'cor p^r quod record' +ill'd+ fac'e potuer't, & pecier't die' vsq' ad p^rx^am Cur'. & tu'c venire fac'ent sectatores & fac'ent recordari loquelam illam &c'. Et i'o p^rcept' est vic' sicut p^rius &c'. q'd assumptis &c' accedat &c'. & record' &c'. & sumon' &c'

10:226: 17 June 1298

Prec' fuit vicecom' q'd assumptis secum quatuor discretis & legal' Militib^s de Com' suo in pp^a psona accederet ad Curia' Henr' de Lascy Comit' Lyncoln' de Haulton' & in plena Cur' illa recordari faceret loquelam que fuit in ead'm Cur' sine b'n R^s int' Ranulphu' de Suthdeneheued querentem & Petrum de Dutton' de pl'o capcio'is vn^s bouetti capti & iniuste detenti. vnde id'm Petr^s quer' falsum sibi f^{cm} fuisse iudiciu' +in+ ead'm Cur' & recordu' ill'd h'eret hic ad hunc diem sub sigillo suo & p^r quatuor legal' ho'ies, ex ill' qui recordo illo interfuerunt, & vicecom' modo misit recordu' p^r d'cos q^atuor legal' ho'ies scil't Ranulphum de Berthinton'. Eydrop de Mulinton' Ric' de Lostok & Henr' le stoner qui recordum ill'd iustu' & legal' aduocant, quod tale est

Petr^s de Dutton' & Rob's fil' Elie atach' fu'nt ad respondend' Ran'o de Suthdeneheued de pl'o quare id'm Petr^s cepit & cape fecit p^r p^rd'cm Rob'tum au'ia ip'i^s Ran'i iniuste & vn' id'm Ran's quer' q'd p^rd'cs Petr^s iniuste cepit & capere fecit pp^rd'cm Rob'tm vnu' bouettum in Apilton', & illum bouettum fugauit & fuga^ri fecit iniuste ad faldam ip'i^s Petri in Apilton' die Mercur' p^rx^a post f'm s'ci Martini vlti'o p^rt'ito²⁴ & illum bouettu' in falda p^rd'ca iniuste detinuit & detinere fecit p^r p^rd'cm Rob'tum quousq' id'm bouett^s delib'at^s fuit p^r Will'm de Flixton' s'ruiente' iur' d'ni Henr' de Lascy Comit^s Lyncoln' & Cust' Cestr' & vn' id'm Ra'us dic' q'd def'iorat^s est & dampnu' h't ad ualenc' duor sol' & inde p^rduxit sectam .&c'. Et p^rdicti Petr^s & Rob's ven' & defend' vim & iniuriam, & iniustam capcio'em, fugacoem, +in+parcacio'em & detencio'em p^rd'ci bouett' & dampnu' ip'i^s Ranulphi duor sol'. &c'. Et defendent vbi & q'n defendere debe't .&c'. Et p^rd'cs Ran's pet' si p^rd'ci Petr^s & Rob's velint narratorem suu' aduocare de defens' p^rd'ca p^r p^rd'cm narratorem suu' f'ca, Et p^rd'ci Petr^s & Rob'i^s habito sup hoc consilio ven'nt & aduocaueru't defens' p^rd'cam p^r narratorem suu' f'cam, Et p^rd'cs Ran's dicit q'd p^rd'ci Petrus & Rob'tus sunt indefens'.

²⁴ Wednesday 13 November 1297

Quia. dicit q'd ad querelam & narracio'em suam p'd'cas affirmandas pduxit sectam sufficien' sec'dm consuetudine' Cur' de Haulton', Et dicit q'd secta q^am ip'e Ran's pduxit, posuit p'd'cos Petrum & Rob'tm ad respondendu' eid'm Ran'o in p'd'ca Cur', Et de sicut iid'm Petr^s & Rob's defenderunt iniustam capcio'em, fugacio'em, inparcacio'em & detencio'em p'd'ci bouetti & dampna .ij.s'. ip'i^s Ranulphi cont^a ip'm Ran' & non cont^a sectam suam q' quidem secta posuit ip'os Petrum & Rob'tm ad respons' faciendam ip'i Ran'o de querimonia sua p'd'ca pet' iud'm de ip'is tanq^am indefens' Et Judicatores illi^s Cur' p assensu' sectator p'fate Cur', consideraueru't q'd p'd'ci Petr^s & Rob'ts fu'nt indefens' u'r^s p'd'cm Ranulphu' p antiq^am consuetudinem illi^s Cur'. a tempe quo no' extat memoria vsitat^{am} qa non defenderunt cont^a sectam ip'i^s Ran'i, Et simil'r considerauerunt q'd p'd'ci Petr^s & Rob's e'ent in m'ia Et q'd p'd'cs Ran's recuparet dampn' sua u^s p'd'cos Petrum & Rob'm, p taxacio'em ei^sd'm Cur', et requisitu' fuit a p'fatis Petro & Rob'to si vellent q'd dampn^s ip'i^s Ran'i taxarent', d'nt q'd sic, Et p'd'cs Ran's dicit q'd no' est necesse q'd dampna sua p Cur' sint taxata qa g^atis vult illa remittere p eo q'd est tene's d'ci Petⁱ, Pl' de m'ia Joh' cleric', Dies dat^s est ptib^s & ecciam quatuor ho'ib^s p'd'cis vsq' ad p'xim' Com' ad pcedend' sup Recordo p'd'co Ad quem diem ptes ven'unt. Et p'd'cus Petr^s dicit, f'cm sibi fuisse falsum iud'm in hoc, q'd Cur' considerauit ip'm esse indefens'

12:385: 21 October 1298

[m'ia] di'm'.

D Petro de Dutton' qa no' est ps'. u^rsus q^atuor ho'ies Comit'is Linc' de Haulton' de f'lo iudic'o sibi f'co in ead'm in pl'ito capc' au'ior inter Ranulph' de Sudeneheued & d'cm Petru', I'o p'd'cus Ran's & q^atuor ho'ies sine die — ppl' Will'i Danyers & Rob'i cl'ici de Scc^aio