

# Selden Society

FOUNDED 1887

To encourage the Study and Advance the Knowledge of the History of English Law  
1989

## Patron

HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCE PHILIP, DUKE OF EDINBURGH, K.G.

## President

SIR IRVINE GOULDING

## Vice-Presidents

THE HON. MORRIS S. ARNOLD  
MRS. MARJORIE CHIBNALL, F.B.A.  
THE RT. HON. CHIEF JUSTICE R.G.B. DICKSON  
THE RT. HON. LORD TEMPLEMAN, M.B.E.

## Council

Professor Thomas G. Barnes	Professor S. F. C. Milsom, Q.C., F.B.A.
Dr. M. T. Clanchy	His Honour Judge E. F. Monier-Williams
Professor W. R. Cornish, F.B.A.	Mr. C. G. Prestige
Professor Charles Donahue Jr.	Mr. M. J. Prichard
Professor Sir Geoffrey Elton, F.B.A.	Professor G. O. Sayles, F.B.A.
The Right Hon. Lord Fletcher	Professor A. W. B. Simpson, F.B.A.
Mr. P. N. Gerrard	Sir Robert Somerville, K.C.V.O.
Professor R. H. Graveson, C.B.E., Q.C.	Sir Richard Southern, F.B.A.
Professor Richard H. Helmholz	Mr. G. D. Squibb, Q.C.
Mr. E. R. Heward, C.B.	Mr. S. A. Stamler, Q.C.
Professor J. C. Holt, F.B.A.	Professor P. G. Stein, F.B.A.
Professor A. M. Honoré, Q.C., F.B.A.	Mr. P. W. E. Taylor, Q.C.
Dr R. F. Hunnisett	Professor Samuel E. Thorne
Sir Jack Jacob, Q.C.	The Hon. Mr. Justice Vinelott
Professor H. R. Loyn, F.B.A.	Colonel Frederick Bernays Wiener
The Right Hon. Sir Robert Megarry, F.B.A.	

## Literary Directors

MR. D. E. C. YALE, F.B.A.      PROFESSOR J. H. BAKER, F.B.A.

## Honorary Treasurer

MR. BRIAN J. PRICHARD (8 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, London, WC2A 3QJ)

## Secretary

MR. VICTOR TUNKEL  
(Faculty of Laws, Queen Mary College, Mile End Road, London, E1 4NS)

## Trustees

MR. E. R. HEWARD, C.B.      THE RIGHT HON. SIR ROBERT MEGARRY, F.B.A.  
MR. BRIAN J. PRICHARD

## Honorary Secretaries and Treasurers Overseas

Australia: Mr. G. LINDELL  
(Faculty of Law, Australian National University, Canberra 2600)  
Canada: PROFESSOR DELLOYD J. GUTH  
(Faculty of Law, University of British Columbia, 1822 East Mall, Vancouver V6T 1Y1)  
New Zealand: Dr. D. W. MCMORLAND  
(Faculty of Law, University of Auckland, Private Bag, Auckland 1)  
United States: PROFESSOR CHARLES DONAHUE Jr. (Treasurer), Ms. DIANA MOSES (Secretary)  
(Harvard Law School, Langdell Hall, Cambridge, Mass 02138)

READINGS AND MOOTS  
AT THE INNS OF COURT  
IN THE FIFTEENTH  
CENTURY

VOLUME II  
MOOTS AND READERS' CASES

EDITED FOR  
THE SELDEN SOCIETY  
BY

SAMUEL E. THORNE, LL.D., F.B.A.

*Emeritus Professor of Legal History,  
Harvard Law School*

AND

J. H. BAKER, LL.D., F.B.A.

*Professor of English Legal History, Cambridge;  
Honorary Bencher of the Inner Temple*

LONDON  
SELDEN SOCIETY

1990

one of us, that shall serve him against both of us, because one shall not put his life twice in jeopardy for one same felony.

And *Frowyk* and *Brudenell* thought clearly that here the defendant must do battle with all the plaintiffs in an appeal together, and if he vanquishes one of them in the field that is a discharge against them all, like a release by one. And they said that if the battle is done only [between] one plaintiff and the defendant, who vanquishes the plaintiff, the trial is nothing but a jeofail; and his death shall abate the writ, and the others shall both have a fresh appeal by survivorship. (That differs from the reader's view.) But *Brudenell* thought that where the defendants in an appeal join in one plea, such as Not guilty, they must join in trial by the country [or] in battle. (Query this.)

[104]<sup>1</sup> In an indictment or an appeal the defendant shall have his peremptory challenges, [which he does not have] in other actions, because when his life is at risk he is so troubled in his mind through fear of death that he has neither the boldness nor the presence of mind to show cause; and because the law presumes that he has a secret cause in his mind, which he does not know how to show in a suitable manner, he may therefore challenge thirty-five peremptorily without showing cause. This is in favour of his life in these cases, more than in other actions. And he said he had seen it adjudged that where the defendant on indictment challenged a juror for insufficiency of freehold he was received on the same day to challenge him peremptorily, but it was never doubted that on another day the peremptory challenge would be bad. And he said that if a sheriff receives money from the plaintiff to make a panel, but does not return anyone at [the plaintiff's] nomination, this is not a principal challenge. (Query.)

[105] A jury finds for the plaintiff, and the judgment is reversed by [writ of] error; then one of the same jurors is made sheriff; in another action on the same matter, on which issue [is joined], this is a principal challenge to the array, according to *Littleton*, reader.

*Frowyk* to the contrary. Nor is it a challenge to the poll if one of that *venire facias* was one of the former jurors, because it is presumed that upon better information and evidence the same jurors may change their first verdict. And it is not improper on such considerations, because at common law before the new statute<sup>2</sup> it was no challenge when a party was arraigned to say that one of the jurors now returned was one of his indictors. That fully proves this case; and of that you may see the opinion of the justices in 8 Edw. IV.<sup>3</sup> That was where on an indictment for trespass the defendant pleaded Not guilty, and on the *venire facias*

<sup>1</sup> The subject of challenges is discussed in *Littleton's* reading, CUL MS. Hh. 3. 6, fo. 8v.

<sup>2</sup> 25 Edw. III, st. 5, c. 3 (SR, II, 320).

<sup>3</sup> Presumably Pas. 7 Edw. IV, fo. 4, pl. 11. Cf. Mich. 8 Hen. IV, fo. 2, pl. 4; Mich. 18 Edw. IV, fo. 13, pl. 8.