# REPORTS

O F

## SIR GEORGE CROKE, KNIGHT,

FORMERLY ONE OF THE

### J U S T I C E S

OF THE

COURTS of KING's-BENCH and COMMON-PLEAS,

OF SUCH

### SELECT CASES

AS WERE ADJUDGED IN THE SAID COURTS DURING

### THE REIGN OF JAMES THE FIRST.

COLLECTED AND WRITTEN IN FRENCH,

By HIMSELF;

REVISED AND PUBLISHED IN ENGLISH,

By SIR HARBOTTLE GRIMSTON, BARONET, MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

THE FOURTH EDITION, CORRECTED,

WITH

MARGINAL NOTES and REFERENCES to the LATER REPORTS,
AND OTHER BOOKS OF AUTHORITY,

By THOMAS LEACH, Esq.
OF THE MIDDLE TEMPLE, BARRISTER AT LAW.

### L O N D O N:

PRINTED FOR E. AND R. BROOKE, BELL-YARD, TEMPLE-BAR; AND WHIELDON AND BUTTER WORTH, NO. 43, FLEET-STREET.

M,DCC,XCI,

### Trinity Term, 20. Jac. 1. In B. R.

gainst BIDGE. money laid out for the wife at her request: and the arbitrament is, that he shall pay three hundred and forty pounds for all sums laid out for the wife, omitting "at her request;" so it is more than was fubmitted.—All the Court was of that opinion.

In debt on an Cro. Car. 35.

385.

SECONDLY, The arbitrament is to pay three hundred and forty quest be part of pounds, cum inde requisitus esset: so, request being part of the agreethe agreement, ment, there ought to be an express request alledged; and licet sapius It must be spe- requisitus will not serve: and it is not like to debt due upon a bond cially alledged. or upon contract; for there the debt being due by specialty or con-Ante, 102.183. tract needs not a special demand, but licet sapius requisitus will serve; but being due by arbitrament, cum requisitus fuerit, it is not due but according to the arbitrament upon special demand.—ALL THE COURT was of that opinion. Wherefore the judgment was reverfed.

#### Case 4. Maby against John Shepherd, Executor of Edmund Shepherd.

If a declaration DEBT upon an obligation for forty pounds by Edmund Shepherd. The defendant demanded over of the deed, and of the concuted in the dition, which was entered in hac verba: "NOVERINT UNIVERSI name of Edmund, in which " per præsentes me EDWARDUM teneri, &c. in forty pounds;" and he he is named subscribed it by the name of Edmund Shepherd, which was his true Edward, the variance is fatal. name.

Ante, 221. Post. 261.

The defendant pleaded non est factum testatoris.

The jury found that it was the deed of the faid Edmund Shepherd S.C. Godh.283. the jury 1.Roll.Ab 872. the testator.

3. Lutw. 519. 2. Roll. Ab. 21. Owen, 48. Salk. 76

It was moved, that notwithstanding the verdict is found for the 3. Hen. 6. pl. 25 plaintiff, yet the judgment ought to be given against the plaintiff: for he declares upon a bond by Edmund Shepherd, and shews a bond Cro. Eliz. 897. of Edward Shepherd, which is another person; and they never were the same, but distinct names. And although it be subscribed by the name of Edmund, yet that is no part of the bond; which being apparent to the Court, the plaintiff cannot have judgment. but ought to be barred.

THE WHOLE COURT was of that opinion: and although the jury hath found it to be the deed of the faid Edmund, yet that will not help it; but he ought to have brought his action according to the bond. Wherefore it was adjudged, quod querens nibil capiat per billam. Vide Dyer, 279. in marg. Shotbolt's Case, and Watkins v. Oliver, Ante, 558.

CASE 5.

### Thomas Simpson and John Simpson against Jackson.

The guardian and the next characters; and

ERROR of a judgment in Durham. The error assigned was, Because in an ejectment against Thomas Simpson the father, and friend of an in- John Simpson his son, the father appearing by Timothy Commyn his fant are distinct attorney, and the said John Simpson by the said Timothy Commyn, an infant may proximum amicum fuum, who was admitted, per Curian, pro codem fue by either; Johanne Simpson ad presequendum, and pleaded not guilty; whereas but he must be ought to have been admitted to a little of the control of the he ought to have been admitted to plead by his guardian, and not defend by guar- by prochein amy; and the admittance ought to have been ad defendian, and not by hisprochein amy, dendum, and not ad prosequendum.

Ante, 217. 441. - Cro. Car. S6. 161. 2. Ind. 261. 300. Palm. 205. Co. Lit. 135. b. 4. Co. 53. 8. Roll. Rep. 257. F. N. B. 27. 1. Sid. 69. 173. Jones, 177. 1. Bulft. 24. Hutt. 92. 1. Lev. 224.

Sec 21. Jac. 1. c. 13.

DAM-

This (PDF) case report was prepared by, and is the copyright of, Deed Poll Office. You are free to use this report for non-commercial 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

