

account for the time they were the receivers of the monies of the said John de Aston: defendants did not appear, and the sheriff was ordered to attach them for the quindene of Trinity. It is evident that for some reason, before his death, John de Aston, knight was not in control of his own property, which had been managed by trustees as above. If it was on account of lunacy, he must have been *compos mentis* in 1347. In the same year as above (1354) William de Perton was a witness to a deed from Ralph, Earl of Stafford to John de Sutton of Dudley and Isabella his wife, granting them the Manor of Over Penne. At Michaelmas, 1357 Simon the abbot of Westminster, once more brought up the old claim of his abbey, and sued William de Perton for the Manor of Perton, as the right of his church of the blessed Peter of Westminster, by a writ of entry, William prayed a view, and the suit was adjourned until five weeks from Easter, the view to be made in the interim. At Michaelmas 1358 Simon, abbot of Westminster, again sued William de Perton, for the Manor of Perton, in which William had no entry, except by Hugh, formerly bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, to whom Walter, formerly abbot of Westminster, had demised it for a term, which had expired; and he stated that the said Walter was seized of the manor in Henry the third's reign, etc. William defended his right, and stated that John de Perton his father, and whose heir he is, had died seized of the manor as of fee, and after his death, he had entered as son and heir, and not by the said Hugh, as stated by the abbot in his writ. As the abbot could not deny this the suit was dismissed, and the abbot was *in misericordia* for a false claim. And now comes more trouble from the oppressed tenantry of Perton, for at Michaelmas 1358, Thomas o'th' Green of Perton, William Nicholes of Perton, and Henry atte Yate of Trescote, tenants of the king, in the Manor of Perton, which is a member of the Manor of Tottenhall, which was said to be of the ancient demesne of the crown of England, appeared by their attorney Richard de Fynchenfeld, against William de Perton, and John his son, in a plea that they exacted from them, other customs and services than they and their ancestors were wont to render in the time that the Manor was in the hands of king's progenitors. The defendants did not appear, and the Sheriff was ordered to distrain, and produce them on the quindene of Hillary. A postscript states that the Sheriff made no return, and he was ordered, again, to produce them, at three weeks from Easter. It is humiliating to see, in these records of our ancestors how frequently the action of the Sheriff, and others, depended upon the position and power of the relative parties in a suit; and the clap trap modern formula of 'one law for the rich, and another for the poor,' was in those days, a real factor. It is also remarkable to observe, how small a control seems to have been exercised by the judicial and higher authorities over the Sheriffs of those days, On Monday after the feast of saint Lawrence 1354, we find that Leo de Perton was one of a jury appointed by the Sheriff to draw up an extent of the goods and chattels that were held by Thomas de Gataore on April 11th, when he should have appeared to answer the charge made against him for the death of Philip de Lutteley. About this time the bitter feud, was in active progress between the friends of Sir William de Shareshull, the lord chief justice, on the one hand, and the friends of Sir Hugh de Wrottesley, K. G., on the other hand, amongst the former were the Pertons and Lutteleys, and for the latter were the Gataores, Tetteburys, etc. This had resulted in several violent deaths including those of John de Perton, Philip de Lutteley and Philip de Whittamers, opponents of the Wrottesley faction, and the two former related to Shareshull. It does not appear that