

BARONIES
in the Chester county pleas,
CHES 29/1–22
© 2021 David Bethell

**THE LITTLEBURY SHARE OF SHIPBROOK
BARONY**

*Blakenhall, Chackiley, Dudington, Briddesmere, Hunsterton et Lee, non sunt de baronia
ista, sed de baronia de Kinderton et Shipbrooke.*

The division of Shipbrook barony is conventionally supposed to have taken place after the death of Warin Vernon leaving three sisters as coheireses:

Visitation of Cheshire 1580 (Harleian Society xviii pp 230-232):
Vernon ‘ex relatione Samp. Erdeswik, ar.’: Harley 1424 f.138v, 1505 f.142v]:

...
Warin^s de Vernon Baro de Shibroc
[married] Auda filia & hæres Will’mi de Malbank
[issue:]
Warinus s. p.
Ada vxor Will’mi Stafford.
Margeria nupta Ric’o Wilbraham.
Roisia vxor Joh’is de Litlebury

Vernon, Baron of Shubbroc, vulgo Shipbroke: Harley 1424 f.139]:

...
Warren de Vernon of Shipbroke
[married] Marian after married to John Litlebury. She was married 34 H. 3.²¹⁴ as by
deed appeareth.
[issue:]
Warren de Vernon s. p. ARMS. – Or, a fesse Azure.
Mary vx^r S^r Rich. Wilbraham.
[issue:]
Margery vx^r Rob. Winington
[issue:]
Rich. Winington of Leftwich: [issue]
Rose vxor John Litlebury
[issue:]
Roger
Auda vxor W^m Stafford & after to W^m Tromwin 46 H. 3.²¹⁵

If these pedigrees were broadly correct, then at the beginning of our period of interest there should have been thirds of the barony in the hands of the Littlebury, Stafford/Trumwin and Wilbraham families.

²¹⁴ 1249-1250

²¹⁵ 1261-1262

BARONIES
in the Chester county pleas,
CHES 29/1–22
© 2021 David Bethell

John and Roesia Littlebury sold all their lands in Cheshire by charter in 1259 for 180 marks (£120) to John de Wetenhall. Wetenhall paid 100 marks immediately and pledged to pay the balance by two instalments of 40 marks.

In 1260 Roesia was examined privately and the charter was read out to her, to ensure that she freely agreed to the transaction.

However, Randle de Oldington then appeared in court with a charter whereby John and Roesia had previously granted him a sixth part of the township of Minshull; and a William Woodnot brought a charter whereby they had granted him the sergeancy of Acton.

Woodnot agreed to renounce his claim on John paying him £2, and John let the sergeancy to Woodnot for five years at 1 mark (13s 4d) per annum.

1:20: 18 November 1259

Memo^d q'd Joh's de Litlebur' in pleno Comit' Cestr' die m^artis p^xa p^s conu^rc'om s'ci Pauli²¹⁶ coram d'no Justic' concessit q'd ducit Roeis[am] vx' suam ad p^xim' Comit' Cestr' ad concedendu' & inrot'lari faciend' feoffamentu' q'd d'ci Joh's & Roeis' vx' eius fec^ru't Joh'i de Wethenhal de om'ib^s t^ris & Tenement^s cu' p^{tin}' q^as habueru't u'l aliq^o casu h'ere potueru't inf^a Comit' Cestr' Et ad hoc fidelit' & s'n aliqua fraude seu dil'acone ult^riori. faciend' obligauit d'cus Joh's de Lyttlebur' om'ies du' quos d'cus Joh' de Wethenhal sⁱ deb' p p^d'cis t^ris & Tenem' scil' q^at^rvigint' m^arcas volu'tati d'no Edward' u'l Justic' sui qui p tempe fu'it vt ip'e d'cos dieb^s soluendis capiat & optineat Et d'cus Joh's de Wethenhal d'cas t^ras & Tenem' cu' om'ib^s p^{tin}' possideat et imp^{petuu}' teneat de d'no Edwardo & hered' suis. s'n aliq^o clamio u'l calu'pnia. d'ci Joh' u'l Roys' vx' sue aut heredu' eor^u p s'uicia d'cis t^ris debet' & c^{sueto} & c'

1:60: 13 January 1260

M^d quod Joh' de Litlebur' in pleno Com' die m^artis p^xa p^s conu^rsione' s'ci Pauli²¹⁷ coram Justic' concessit quod Roes' vx^r sua ducet ad p^ximu' Com' Cestr' ad concedend' & faciend' inrotulari feoffamentu' q'd D'ci Joh' & Roes' ux' eius fec^ru't Joh' de Wethenhale de om'ibus t^ris & ten' cu' p^{tin}' quas h'uerunt ul' aliquo casu h'ere potuer' t infra Com' Cestr' Et ad hoc fidelit' & sine ult^riore dil'acone fac' obligauit d'cs Joh' om's den' quod p^rfat^s Joh' de Wethenhale sⁱ debet p p^d'cis t^ris & tenementis. scil't quat^ruiginti m^arcas voluntate d'ni Eduuardi u'l Justic' sui Cestr' qui p tempe fu'it ut ip'e d'cos den' diebus soluend' capiat & obtinuit Et d'cs Joh' de Wethenhale d'cas t^ras & ten' cu' p^{tin}' possideat & in p^{petuu}' teneat de d'no Eduuard' p s'uicio de d'cis t^ris debito p consueto & c'

1:73: 27 January 1260

Terminat^r

Joh's de Litlebur' & Roys' vx' sua pon't loco suo +Joh' de Wethenhale+ ad luc^and' u'l p^dend' de Toto Tenem' suo cu' p^{tin}' In Ciuit' Cestr' vers^s quoslib' & c' tam de t^ris tenementis. lib'is homi'bus & natiuis q^m eor^u s'uiciis se consuetudinibus c^{tigend}' optiniend' & deffendend' qu' & quociens necc'e fu'it.

1:114: 27 January 1260

²¹⁶ Tuesday 27 January 1260

²¹⁷ Tuesday 27 January 1260

BARONIES
in the Chester county pleas,
CHES 29/1–22
© 2021 David Bethell

Recordu' loq^ele Joh' de Wetinhale

Memorand' quod die m^otis p^xima²¹⁸ S'ci Gregorij. Anno regni regis Henr' pat's d'ni Eduuardi²¹⁹ compuer't in pleno Com' Cestr' Joh' de Litlebur'. & Roesia uxor sua offerentes q^amda' cartam in qua continebatur quod p^rfati Joh' & Roesia deder't concesser't & carta sua confirmauerunt Joh' de Wetinhale totam t^ram & tenementu' cu' p^rtinenc' quod h'uer't u'l quod aliquo casu h'ere potueru't u'l debuer't in Com'tu Cestr'. Et insimul om'e ius & clamiu' quod eos po^rit conting'e in eodem Com'tu in p^petuu' sine aliquo retenemento p^r nouem viginti marcis. de qⁱbus p^rfatus Joh' de Wetinhale soluit p^rd'cis Joh' & Roesie ux^r sue centu' marcas p^r manibus. Et de residuis soluet ad p^xm pasch' quadragin^a marcas. Et ad festum s'ci Joh' bapt' p^ximu' sequens quadraginta marcas. Et cu' recitata fuit carta p^rd'ca in pleno Com'tu die p^rd'ca. vacata fuit p^rd'ca Roesia sepatim a viro suo. coram d'no Fulcone de Orrebi tu'c Justic' Cestr' D'nis Ham' de Mascy Rog'o de Venablis Egidio de Erdinton'. & aliis militibus & lib'is homi'bus & ball'is ibidem p^rsentibus. Que cu' diligent^r examinata consulta & int^rrogata fuit si feoffamentu' illud concederet. dixit quod plene & ex mera uoluntate sua consensu & consilio suo collata fuit f^rca carta p^rfato Joh'. Ex tu'c petier't p^rtes ut inrotularetur & concessum fuit. postea com^puit Rond' de Aldeton' ostendendit²²⁰ quamd' cartam q^am dixit quod p^rfati Joh' & Roesia e' contuler't de sexta p^rte uille de Munsul exigens a p^rno' iatis Joh' & Roesia uxor sua si illam cartam concedere & warantizare voleba't necne. Ad quod Joh' de Wetinhale respondens dixit quod illa carta nu'q^am a d'na Roesia loco copetenti nec sufficienti fuit concessa nec in aliqua curia recitat. Nec t'nc nollere deberet d'co Rond'. nec ip'i Joh'ni nocere q^amuis d'na Roes' illam concederet. cu' p^rius totu' ius suu' d'co Joh'ni co'tulerat ante q^am illa carta in Com'tu esset u'l alibi a d'na concessa. Eodem modo actu' fuit de quad' carta q^am Will' Wodenot ostendit de quad' s'iantia de Acton'. Et ad hoc dicit quod Com' quod ex hoc no' tenent^r alt'ni p^rti iudiciu' exhibere desicut neut^a p^s vad' condidit nec pleg' de p^s inuenit. &c'.

1:117: 27 January 1260

T^rminat^r

Will'. Wodenot. optulit se u^rsus Joh' de Wetinhale p^r br'e de vi recenti de quad' s'iantia bedelleria & forestaria de quibus Joh' de Litlebur' & Roesia ux^r eius ip'm feoffauer't. ut dicit. Tande' quieuit contentio int^r eos modo subscⁱpto scil't quod d'cs Will's renu'ciauit omi'modo feoffamento quod p^rius exigit & cartam suam q^am h'uit de p^rfatis Joh' & Roes'. reddidit d'co Joh' de Wetinhale Pro h^ac v^o feoffamenti renu'ciac'oe & carte p^rd'ce redd'. p^rfatus Joh' dedit d'co Will'o xl.s'. Et insup^r concessit d'co Will'o ut ball'as p^rd'cas h'eat ad t^rminu' quinq' Annor^r incipient' ad Anu'ciacio'm b't Marie. Anno r' r' H. xliij^{to}²²¹ reddendo inde p^r Ann' .I. marc' scil't ad Nat' s'ci Joh' bapt' dim' m^arc' & ad Natale d'ni dim' m^arc'. p^rt^rea p^rd'cs Will's respondebit & soluit p^rd'co Joh' s'cdm legalem comp't om's exit^s nemor^r d'ci Joh' que p^rd'cs Will' ad opus suu' habet custodiend' usq' p^rd'cm t^rm. Et d'cs Will' ref^axit se de br'i suo p^s. Id'o in m'ia. pl' vic'.

²¹⁸ ante or post omitted

²¹⁹ regnal year omitted

²²⁰ sic

²²¹ Thursday 25 March 1260

BARONIES
in the Chester county pleas,
CHES 29/1–22
© 2021 David Bethell

Randle de Oldington later in 1260 was ordered to take an oath in an inquisition, and said that he was not bound to take part in any assize because he was a cleric.

1:235: 31 August 1260

Memo^{d'} q'd p^rcept' fuit Rond' de Aldeton'. pr'are sac^amentu' in q^oda' inquisic'oe & dicit q'd in nulla assisa e'e tenet' qa cl'icus est & inde petit iudiciu' q'd progatu' fuit vsq' p^ximu' comitatu'. & inuenit pl' co'pand' ad audiend' iudiciu' suu' scil' Rob' de Moldewrth' & Hamon' le Bret. esson'.

In 1279 Roger son of John de Littlebury appears in a case in Staffordshire where William Trumwin claimed to have been disseised of a share of the manor of Sandon. We have seen that the visitation pedigrees show *Auda vxor W^m Stafford & after to W^m Tromwin 46 H. 3.*²²² as Roger's aunt and another coparcener of the Wych Malbanc barony.

Staffordshire assizes 23 September 7 Edward I 1279 m.6: Salt 6 i 142

Assize Roll of divers counties 7–12 E. I.

Assizes taken at Stafford before R. de Hengham and on the Saturday after the Feast of SL Matthew, 7 E.

*An assize, etc., if William de Stafford, Roger son of John de Lyttlebury, Thomas de Ferrars, Richard de Stratton, Walter de Stafford, William de Brunton, Robert de Verney, John de Say, James son of William de Stafford, Robert de Caverewelle and Richard his brother, Thomas the Provost of Saundon (Sandon), and twenty-nine others **named**, had unjustly disseised William Trumwyn of his free tenement in Great Saundon (Sandon) and Little Saundon, viz., of the third part of two parts of the manor of Great Saundon and Little Saundon, and a bovate of land, half a virgate of land, two parts of a mill, etc.*

William Trumwyne withdrew his suit, and it was agreed between the parties that the third part of the two parts of the manor claimed by him should be divided into three parts, of which one share should remain to the said William Trumwyne ana his heirs in fee for ever, and a second share should be held by William Trumwyne for term of his life by the courtesy of England, and after his death this share should revert to William de Stafford ana his heirs for ever, and the residue should belong to the said William de Stafford and his heirs for ever. A similar arrangement was made respecting the two parts of the mill, and the rest of the land claimed was conceded by William de Stafford to William Trumwyne and his heirs in fee for ever. m. 19

Roger de Littlebury confirmed a grant by John his father of land in Sandon to William Trumwin.

Undated charter: Salt MSS 30 [11-12]

²²² 1261-1262

BARONIES
in the Chester county pleas,
CHES 29/1–22
© 2021 David Bethell

Roger, son and heir of John de Littlebury, and Roysie (Roesia), daughter of Warin de Vernoun and wife of the said John, have inspected certain charters granted by the said John to William Trumwine. By these charters John granted to William a messuage and a bovat of land in Greater Sondon, formerly held by Robert, son of Osbert; four and a half acres of waste in Sondon; half a virgatc of land in Little Sondon formerly held by Henry de Covintre (?); and a certain part of the mill of Great Sondon. In consideration of six marks paid by William, Roger confirms these grants, and also gives him that part of appruiameto libere of the court of Sondon which should descend to him (Roger), after the death of Margery de Vernoun, as son and heir of John de Littlebury and Roysie. Tenure, a rose on S. John Baptist's Day.

Witnesses: John de Houton; Geoffrey, son of Geoffrey de Walton; Robert, son of Richard de Esington; Ralph de Burgo; Robert de Pipe; Adam Trumwine; William le Champion; Robert le Flemmeng; Herbert de Wirleye; John de Smalrys; Alan de Avila of Little Sondon.

From December 1286 William de Stafford, Roger de Littlebury, Robert de Winnington and Matilda his wife and Richard de Lostock and Agnes his wife sued out several cases as heirs of Warin de Vernon, including one against John de Wetenhall.

3:24: 17 December 1286

Dies datus Will'o de Staff' & aliis in br'i pet', & Rob'to de Winigton' & Matill' vx' eius +de pl'o t're+, vs' &c'. p'ce ptiu'.

Idem dies dat^s est eisd' petent', & Rad'o de Vernun de pl'o t're vs' &c' p'ce ptiu'.

Id' dies datus eisd', & Emme q' fuit vxor Ric'i de Lostok, de pl'o t're vs' &c'. p'ce ptiu'

m'ia. [xl.d']

Will's de Staff', Rog'us de Lyttelbur', Rob's de Winigton', Matill' vxor ei^s, Ric'us de Lostok & Agnes vxor eius qⁱ tuleru't br'e .u^s. Ran' de Thornton' & Kat'inam vx' eius de pl'o terre, veniu't & petu't licenc' quer' melius br'e. Id'o ip'i in m'ia ppl' p'd'cor Rob'ti, & Ric'i.

3:28: 17 December 1286

m'ia. xl.d'

Idem Will's & alij qⁱ tuleru't br'e .u^s. Vrianu' de S'co ²²³ & Margareta' vx' eius de pl'o t're, ven' & petu't lic' quer' melius br'e Id'o ip'i in m'ia ppl' p'd'cor Rob'ti & Ric'i

3:29: 17 December 1286

m'ia. [xl.d']

Id'm. qui tulerunt br'e .u^s. Ran' de Oldeton' de pl'o t're ven'. & petu't lic' quer' melius br'e. Id'o ip'i in m'ia.

3:30: 17 December 1286

m'ia. [xl.d']

Id'm qui tuleru't br'e .u^s. Joh'em de Wetenhal ven' & petu't lic' quer' melius br'e. Id'o ip'i in m'ia.

²²³ omitted: Petro

BARONIES
in the Chester county pleas,
CHES 29/1–22
© 2021 David Bethell

3:73: 11 March 1287

Ad Jud'm

H'nt die' vs' ad px' Com'.

Ass^a venit recogn', si Warinus le Vernoun, Auunc'ls²²⁴ + Will'i de Stafford & Rog'i de Litlebur'+ & Matill' & Agnet' filiar Ric'i de Wilburh^am fuit seis' in d'nico suo &c' die quo &c'. +de vno Mes'. septe' bouatis t're & sexta pte vni^s molend'i aquatici cu' p^{ti}n' in Piketon'+. Et si obiit postq^a &c'. Et si p^rd'ci Will's, Rog'us, Matill' & Agnes p^{pi}nquiores h'edes eius sint. Et vnde Will's de Staff', Rog'us de Littelbur', Rob's de Wynigton' Matill' vxor eius, Ric'us de Lostok & Agnes vxor ei^s q'runt' q'd Vrianus de s'co Petro & Margareta vxor eius eis deforc' ten' p^rd'.

Et p^rd'ci Vrianus & Margareta p attorn' suu' ven' & dicu't q'd assi'a no' debet inde pced'e, Dicu't eni' q'd p^rd'ci Rog' & alij alias in Cur' ista tulerunt quodda' br'e de ingr'u u'sus p^rd'cos Vrianu' & Margareta' de p^rd'cis tenem'tis, Quod quide' br'e est de altiori natura & tangit ip'm ius & petu't iud'm si ad br'e assi'e mortis antec' quod est de ip'a poss'oe possint resortire, desicut br'e istud est inferioris nature q^am aliud br'e pⁱus impet^atum.

Et p^rd'ci Will's & alij d'nt q'd ass^a debet inde pced'e no' obstante eo q'd alias se impet^arunt p aliud br'e, & si br'e illud fuit br'e altioris nat'e, dicu't eni' q'd br'e de poss'one posterius impet^atum, pced'e debet in natura sua, eo q'd in alio br'i prius impet^ato no' fuit aliquis exitus placiti, nec visus exactus nec iud'm in pendulo sup ip'o iure, n^c iud'm exspectaru't, s'cdm natura' pⁱoris br'is de ingr'u, +~~nec fuit petie'o in alio br'i de t^ans~~ ius inde s' de+ quia q^amcito circu'specti extit'ant q'd pⁱmu' br'e in casu suo Fuit eis min^s idoneu' an impet^acione illa recesseru't. Et petu't q'd ass' inde pcedat

Et p^rd'ci Vrianus & Margareta d'nt q'd Will's, Rog'us & alij pⁱmu' breue de ingr'u impet^atum in Cur' ista p^{se}nt' fueru't, & de seisina p^rd'ci Warini antec' sui narrau'nt vt de feodo & iure, ita q'd s'cdm forma' meri iuris in curia ista solempnit' p^{nu}ciati sectam sua' manifeste fec'unt u'sus p^rd'cos Vrianu' & Margar' de ten' p^rd'cis, n'lla variac'oe graduu' f'co medio t'pre, & petit iud'm si ass^a debeat inde pced'e.

3:74: 11 March 1287

Ass^a ven' recogn', si +p^rd'cs+ Warinus p^rd'cus auunc'ls p^rd'cor Will'i &c', fuit seis' in d'nico suo vt de feodo, de duab^s bouatis t're, viginti & noue' ac's bosci cu' p^{ti}n', excepta vna ac^a t're in Monishull iux^a Wermingh^am die quo &c'. Et vnde p^rd'ci Will' de Staff', Rog's de Littelbur', Rob's de Wynington' Matill' vx' eius, Ric's de Lostoke, & Agn' vx' eius querunt', q'd Ran' de Oaldeton' eis deforc'. Et ip'e ven' & respondit eod'm m'o sic' fec'unt p^rd'ci Vrianus & Margareta & pet' iudiciu' simil'r. Et p^rd'ci Will's & alij d'nt sic' p^rdix'unt in pxi'o pl'o, & pet' q'd ass^a capiat'. vnde ad iud'm eod'm m'o quo pⁱus. Et p^{se}ea ad Com' die M^art^s p^xa p^s f'm s'ci Barth'i²²⁵ testific' e' q'd vna de p^{ce}nar' p^rd'cis .s. Matill' q' fuit vx' Rob'i de Wynington mortua est, I'o p^rd'cs Ran' inde s'n die. Et p^rd'ci Will' & alij, pquirant s' nouu' br'e si volu'int.

3:75: 11 March 1287

Ass^a ven' recogn', si id'm Warinus auunc'ls p^rd'cor Will'i & alior in p^rd'ca ass^a fuit seis' de t^bs bouatis t're & medietate vnius bouate t're & sexta pte vnius Molend'i aq^atici cum p^{ti}n' in Piketon', die quo &c'. Et si &c. Et vnde Will' de Staff' & alij quer'ntes in pxi'o pl'o

²²⁴ words erased

²²⁵ Tuesday 26 August 1287

BARONIES
in the Chester county pleas,
CHES 29/1–22
© 2021 David Bethell

querunt q'd Ran' de Thornton' & Kat'ina vx' eius eis deforc'. Qui ven' & respondent eod'm m'o sic' p'd'cm est, vnde h'[ent diem] inde ad iudiciu' in forma p'd'ca.

3:104: 22 April 1287

Jud'm int' Will'm de Staff' & alios i' br'i petentes, & Joh'em de Wetenhal +de pl'o t're+ ponit' in respectu vs' ad px' Com'

3:105: 22 April 1287

Jud'm int' p'd'cos Will'm & alios pete'tes, & Ran' de Thornton' & Kat'inam vx' eius de pl'o t're ponit' i' respectu &c'

3:106: 22 April 1287

Jud'm int' p'd'cos Will'm & alios pet', & Ran' de Oldeton', de pl'o terre ponit' in respectu vs' &c'.

3:107: 22 April 1287

Jud'm int' p'd'cos Will'm & alios pet', & Vrianu' de s'co Petro & Margar' vx' eius de pl'o t're ponit' i' respectu vs' &c'.

3:195: 3 June 1287

Jud'm int' Will'm de Staff' & alios in br'i petentes & Vrianu' de s'co Pet^o & Margaretam vx' eius po^r in r^m vs' &c'.

3:196: 3 June 1287

Jud'm int' p'd'cus Will' & alios in br'i petentes & Joh'em de Wetenhale poni^r in r^m vs' &c'.

3:197: 3 June 1287

Jud'm int' eosdem pet'ntes & Ran' de Oaldeton' poni^r in r^m vs' &c'.

3:198: 3 June 1287

Jud'm int' eosdem pet'ntes & Ran' de Thornton' & Kat'inam vx' eius pon^r in r^m vs' &c'.

In 1292-3, in the Staffordshire Assize Roll of 21 Edward I (m. 34: Salt 6a 226), the coparceners appear, possessing free warren, fair, market and waif in Alstonefield.

Nicholas de Audelegh, Hugh le Despencer, William de Stafford, Roger de Littleburi, Robert de Wymynton (Wilbraham), David de Haselwell, Margaret de Hogeleghe, and Robert le Grant Venur (Grosvenor), were summoned to show by what warrant they claimed free warren, fair, market, and wayf in Alstanefeld. The defendants all appeared except Robert de Wymynton, who was dead, and they stated that they held the said manor with all its liberties conjointly with Richard the son and heir of the said Robert de Wymynton, who was under age, and without whom they cannot answer. The suit is therefore to remain.

In 1294 Nicholas de Audley produced this charter of Henry III to his ancestor James de Audley as evidence of free warren in Alstonefield:

Coram Rege Trinity 22 Edward I m. 19d: Salt vii 16-17
Staff.

BARONIES
in the Chester county pleas,
CHES 29/1–22
© 2021 David Bethell

*In the suit of quo warranto of the king versus Nicholas de Aldithele, the claim of Nicholas to free warren in Endon, Aldithele, Rettele, Tunstal, Chesterton, Horton, and Alstanefeld, is allowed, Nicholas having produced a charter of king Henry granting free warren to his ancestor James de Aldithele in those manors; and he claimed view of frankpledge, amends of the assize of bread and beer, and infangenthef in Enedon, Aldithele, and Bettele by prescription, and appealed to a jury, and the jury stated that Nicholas and his ancestors had held those franchises in those manors before the time of king Richard.²²⁶ They are therefore allowed; and as regards the manor of Horton, he claimed view of frankpledge, amends of the assize of bread and beer, and infangenthef, and stated that the manor had formerly been in the seisin of one Henry (sic, Hervey) de Stafford, who in his time held them, and that in the seventeenth year of King Henry ²²⁷ a fine was levied between Henry de Aldithele his ancestor, and the said Hervey, by which Hervey acknowledged the said manor to be the right of the said Henry, and for which Henry gave him certain other tenements, and he produced the fine, and he called to warranty Edmund son of Nicholas de Stafford, the heir of the said Hervey, who is under age; and Hugh de Louthre the king's attorney objected, stating that the liberties in question belonged to the Crown, and did not appertain to a tenement, and there was no express mention of them in the fine; and he also pleaded that the said Hervey never possessed the franchises in that manor, and appealed to a jury; which found that Hervey possessed those franchises during his time. The suit is therefore to remain till the heir comes of age; and as regards the manor of Tunstall, Nicholas stated he claimed view of frankpledge, assize of bread and beer, and wayf, and that Engenulf de Grasele and Elena his wife, whose right the manor was formerly, gave it to one Adam de Aldithele his ancestor, and Engenulph and Elena from time out of memory had held those liberties in that manor, and he appealed to a jury, which found in his favour. And as regards the manor of Bettelegh, he stated he claimed to have in it a fair and market by a charter of king Henry, which he produced, and which testified that the king had given to Henry de Aldithele his ancestor that he and his heirs should have in perpetuity a weekly market on Thursdays, and a fair of three days on the vigil, the feast, and the morrow of St Margaret in the manor of Bettelegh. These franchises are therefore allowed to him. And as regards the manor of Chesterton, he stated that Ela formerly wife of James de Audele held it in dower, and that he claimed none of the above franchises in the manors of Chesterton and Alstanefeld; and as regards wayf, the king's attorney pleaded it was a *grossum de coronâ*, which could not be separated from the Crown without a special grant from the king; and a day was given to the parties to hear judgment on this point on the morrow of the Ascension, and which was adjourned from term to term till the octaves of Trinity ²²⁸ in this year, when Nicholas did not appear, and it was adjudged to the King by his default. A postscript states that afterwards, in the octaves of St. Michael, 22 E. I., ²²⁹ the king sent a writ stating that whereas he understood from the said Nicholas that the king had recovered the franchise of wayf against the said Nicholas in his manors of Enedon, Tunstal, Alditheleie, Horton, Chesterton, Betteleie, and Alstanefeld, through default of appearance of Nicholas, whilst he was in the service of Edmund the king's brother in Gascony, he was to be put into the same position as regards the*

²²⁶ 1189-1199

²²⁷ 1232-1233

²²⁸ Sunday 20 June 1294

²²⁹ Wednesday 6 October 1294

BARONIES
in the Chester county pleas,
CHES 29/1–22
© 2021 David Bethell

question as before his default. The sheriff was therefore ordered to put Nicholas again into seisin of the said liberty of wayf, saving the king's rights, etc.