took place at that date, to return whether it would be to the detriment of the king, or any other person, if John de Perton, knight, enclosed a certain road, leading from the village of Pattingham, under the manor house of the said John to the will of Tettenhall, for the purpose of enlarging his said manor house. The enquiry was held at Perton, on the Friday after the feast of saint Clement the Pope 1364, on the oath of Thomas Buffary, Adam Warings, John de Wightwick and others, who say, that the new road will be more convenient for travellers; and the road to be enclosed contained 106 perches of land in length, and 26 in breadth. In the originalia of 1365, under the head of *grossae fines*, it states that John de Perton, knight, paid half a mark for a license to enclose this road. In 1367 John de Perton chivaler, is named in the Kinver Forest proceedings as a verderer of the forest, and Leo de Perton his cousin as a regarderer of the said forest, and in the same year the former sued William son of Peter Tandy and Joan his wife for four acres of land in Seisdon, which he claimed by writ of *quare cessavit per biennium*; the defendants did not appear, and the Sheriff was ordered to take the tenements into the king's hand, and to summon them for a month from Michaelmas. In the following court, Sir John de Perton recovered the four acres from William son of Peter Tandy, and Joan his wife through the defendants making default. In 1368 we find a remarkable record where a prisoner surrendered to a charge preferred against him thirty-two years after the commission of the crime and which General Wrottesley considers to be an evidence of the general corruption and unjust extortion connected with the administration of justice at this period. William Buffary son of Hugh Buffary of Penn, had a very serious charge preferred against him in 1336, and which was no less than the abduction of Margaret the wife of John de Tresel, together with goods and chattels belonging to the said John valued at twenty shillings, which latter probably represented the wearing apparel and jewelry upon her person at the time. This occurred on Monday after the feast of All Saints, and was followed on Monday after the feast of saint Michael, ten months later, by the poisoning of John de Tresel, the husband himself, probably in order to obtain for the said Margaret her dower of one-third of the husband's property. For these crimes, after a protracted trial and repeated adjournments, without the arrest of the accused, a process of outlawry was eventually promulgated against him, by the hundred of Seisdon in 1365, or twenty-nine years after the commission of the first crime, and things were thereby made so unpleasant for him that in this year of 1368 he surrendered himself at Michaelmas term, and was admitted to bail. General Wrottesley remarks, that this leniency is probably explained by a suit that follows, when William Buffary was opposed to Sir John de Perton, the grand nephew of the victim, and as we have seen, the son-in-law of the lord chief justice. A writ was produced which stated that the king has been informed that whereas William son of Hugh Buffary of Penn was bound by a statute merchant at Shrewsbury, to John de Perton knight, in a sum of £26-13-0, to be repaid at a certain date named, and the same John de Perton under the name of John son of William de Perton, chivaler, had afterwards by an indenture made between the said John son of William, and William son of Hugh, granted that if the said William Buffary would stand to the award of William de Shareshull, and John de Newenham, respecting certain debates which had been moved between the said John de Perton and William son of Hugh Buffary, that then the said recognizance of £26-1-0 should be held as null. And whereas the said William son of Hugh from the date of indenture, had been always prepared, and is still prepared