

SUMMARY: The documents below are the bill of complaint in the Court of Requests, dated 20 January 1584, by John Newman and William Hunnis against Anne Farrant, who had sued both Newman and Hunnis separately in the Court of Common Pleas for forfeiture of a bond of £100 in connection with the lease of the first Blackfriars theatre; the answer, dated 27 January 1584, of Anne Farrant; the replication, dated 27 May 1584, of Newman and Hunnis; and three orders and decrees of the Court of Requests.

The background to Anne Farrant's suits against Newman and Hunnis in the Court of Common Pleas, which led to the suit below in the Court of Requests by Newman and Hunnis against Anne Farrant, is put into perspective by Sir William More's notes made shortly after he had recovered the Farrant lease via his own court proceedings (see Folger MS L.b.425):

Touching the matter in variance between me and Anne Farrant, widow, for an house in Blackfriars

1 First I let the said house to Sir Henry Neville for a term of one-and-twenty years, and took of him no fine for the same. Sir Henry Neville added a new kitchen and set up (blank) partitions in the house. Afterward Sir Henry Neville sold me his lease thereof for an hundred pounds, which I paid him at one payment, besides forbearing of two or three years' rent, so far as I remember.

2 Afterward Sir Henry Neville desired me by his letter to let the said house to Farrant, which I did upon condition that he should not let nor set the same nor any part thereof to any person without my consent had and obtained in writing under my hand and seal.

3 Farrant pretended unto me to use the house only for the teaching of the Children of the Chapel, but made it a continual house for plays, to the offense of the precinct, and pulled down partitions to make that place apt for that purpose, which Sir Henry Neville had set up, and contrary to the condition let out part of the said house, for the which I charged him with the forfeiture of his lease, whereunto he yielded and offered composition, but before I could take remedy against him he died.

4 After whose death I entered upon the said house and refused to receive any rent but conditionally, nevertheless offering Farrant's widow that if she would commit the cause to two lawyers indifferently chosen, or to any two judges, I would yield to whatsoever they should determine therein, which she utterly refused.

5 Immediately after she let the house to one Hunnis, and afterward to one Newman or Sutton, as far as I remember, and then to Evans, who sold his interest to the Earl of Oxford, who gave his interest to Lyly, and the title thus was posted over from one to another from me, contrary to the said condition.

6 At what time Evans was so possessed of it I brought my action against him for the same, and when it came to be tried he demurred in law upon it, which was done in Trinity

term. The demurrer being drawn, the said Evans kept the same in his hands all Michaelmas term next following, using many delays. After the demurrer had, I caused my learned counsel in Hilary term to demand judgment, arguing the case at the usual place, but the recorder argued against me. The judges would not then give judgment, but required to have books of the whole proceedings delivered to them, whereof I delivered one to every of them. At the end of Easter term following I had judgment against Evans, and process awarded to the sheriff to give me possession.

7 In all which time of my suit I never heard of Farrant's widow, but only by her said means I was put to this great charges of suit very injuriously. My charges in following the said suit and lying in London for that business stand me in not less than forty pounds. The house is much impaired by the pulling down the partitions thereof. She had of the said Newman or Sutton thirty pounds in money at his entry into the said house, as he told me.

Thus, while suits in the Court of Common Pleas and the Court of Requests were ongoing, as noted in Anne Farrant's answer, Sir William More had made a re-entry on the leased premises and had made a new lease to Thomas Smallpiece, who had sued Henry Evans, to whom Newman and Hunnis had sublet.

According to Wickham, More's remark that 'the recorder argued against me' indicates that More had brought his suit in the Court of Husting in which the Recorder of the City of London was the 'assessor', and which concerned itself largely with 'pleas of land' in London. See Wickham, Glynne, and Herbert Berry and William Ingram, eds., *English Professional Theatre, 1530-1660*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 389 at:

https://books.google.ca/books?id=y82YJ1P5gksC&pg=PR4&lpg=PR4&dq=%22Glynne%22+%22English+professional+theatre%22&source=bl&ots=6vOZdG3M2l&sig=IRXbd62WYxhkbOeMKnnV2_xRowI&hl=en&sa=X&ei=85wuVenCL4PwoASEu4CQAw&ved=0CDAQ6AEwBDgK#v=onepage&q=%22Glynne%22%20%22English%20professional%20theatre%22&f=false

Sir William More's action via Smallpiece was ultimately successful, and the original Farrant lease was forfeited to More, along with Anne Farrant's sublease to Newman and Hunnis, and their sublease to Henry Evans.

In the documents below no mention is made of the fact that Oxford had acquired the lease from Evans, and had given it to his servant, John Lyly. However this fact was noted by Sir William More in Folger MS L.b.425 above.

It is evident from the surviving documents that Anne Farrant did not go to court with entirely clean hands. She states in her answer that her husband, Richard Farrant, had died intestate, and that she was merely the administratrix of his estate, rather than the executor. This error was corrected by the defendants in their replication, and Anne

Farrant offered no rejoinder. For the 1580 will of Richard Farrant, see TNA PROB 11/63/120.

Moreover Anne Farrant's answer below ignores the fact that she had not been granted permission by Sir William More to sublet to Newman and Hunnis. She was thus in violation of More's original lease to Richard Farrant, and in the two suits she had initiated in the Court of Common Pleas she was asking the court to enforce the forfeiture of a £100 bond with respect to a sublease which she herself had entered into with Newman and Hunnis in violation of the original 'grand lease', as she terms it.

In addition, Anne Farrant states in her answer below that 'the said complainants intend to cause this defendant to forfeit or lose her said lease whereby she holdeth the premises and divers other little parcels'. The mention of these 'divers other little parcels' appears to be a veiled reference to the two subleases which Richard Farrant had entered into before his death in violation of his original lease from Sir William More. For the terms of the lease, which prohibited Farrant from subleasing to anyone without More's permission in writing, see Folger MS L.b.350. Anne Farrant's reference to these 'divers other little parcels' thus suggests that she was still receiving rents from the two subleases which Richard Farrant had entered into before his death, and which had caused Sir William More to consider that Farrant had forfeited the lease before he died (see Folger MS L.b.425).

It seems possible that Richard Farrant had sublet these two small parcels to Lord Cobham's men, because Anne Farrant says in her answer below that:

... she hath been driven at some time of payments of the said rent to the said Sir William More by humble and pitiful suit to the right honourable Lord Cobham to obtain such favour and help of his good Lordship that one of his men would and might offer and tender to pay the rent then due in safeguard of the said grand lease.

It is difficult to determine why Anne Farrant would ask Lord Cobham to have one of his men pay rent unless this individual were one of the persons to whom Richard Farrant had sublet, and who thus owed Anne Farrant money under that sublease.

It should also be noted that there is a discrepancy between Anne Farrant's statement in her answer below that the rent due to her from Newman and Hunnis was £20 6s 8d (of which £14 was due by her to Sir William More under the original lease), and Newman and Hunnis' statement in their replication that their rent to Anne Farrant was £20 6s 4d.

No other documents from the case below in the Court of Requests have survived, and the outcome is unknown. As noted above, Anne Farrant failed to file a rejoinder to Newman and Hunnis' replication, which suggests that she abandoned her defence.

Similarly, according to Wallace, *infra*, pp. 159-60, there is no further record of Anne Farrant's cases against William Hunnis and John Newman in the Court of Common Pleas for forfeiture of the bond of £100 after these cases (which were originally set down for

Michaelmas term 1583) were postponed until the following Easter term, i.e. circa May 1584.

In Easter term 1584 Sir William More was granted judgment in his suit against Henry Evans, and the original 'grand lease', as Anne Farrant terms it, was forfeited to More, which may have caused Anne Farrant to abandon her two suits against Newman and Hunnis in the Court of Common Pleas, and Newman and Hunnis to abandon their suit below against her in the Court of Requests.

Anne Farrant then petitioned the Privy Council, and on 18 January 1587 More's son-in-law (and later Oxford's trustee), Sir John Wolley (d.1596), wrote to More that:

Likewise Mr Waad, Clerk of the Council, telleth me of Farrant's widow's renewing of her complaint, which he prayeth me at your coming to London may be ended between you and me and her, which at your coming I have promised him for my part to do.

See Wallace, Charles William, *The Evolution of the English Drama up to Shakespeare*, (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1912), pp. 174-7, and LM/COR/3/395. For Sir John Wolley, see the *ODNB* article.

For William Hunnis (d.1597), see the *ODNB* article.

John Newman is described as a gentleman in the documents below, but is otherwise unknown.

For William Brooke (1527-1597), 10th Baron Cobham, mentioned in the documents below, see the *ODNB* article.

For Sir Henry Seckford (d.1610), mentioned in the documents below, see the *ODNB* articles on his father-in-law, Sir Henry Bedingfield (1509x11–1583), and on Seckford himself:

Queen Elizabeth made Seckford one of her grooms of the privy chamber in 1558, with an annual fee of £20, supplemented by a rich gift in 1562 for his services. Following the death in 1559 of Sir Thomas Cawarden, master of the tents and revels, Seckford became master of the tents, haies, and pavillions by royal patent of 1560, with an annual fee of £30 and accommodation in part of the former hospital of St John of Jerusalem in Clerkenwell, a post he held until Elizabeth's death. Seckford's duties required him to make, store, and keep in repair the canvas haies (open shelters) and tents which housed horses and grooms on Elizabeth's progresses round England. More elaborate canvas structures were made to accommodate the entertainments performed for Elizabeth over Christmas. Seckford incurred heavy debts on these duties, which the queen was slow to honour. From 1570 he was also keeper of the privy purse, in charge of the queen's private expenses. He was master of the toyles (hunting nets), in effect from 1576 but officially from 1585, giving him responsibility for the royal deer. Benefiting from the indirect rewards available to crown servants, he was appointed guardian to minors and

rented lands in Shropshire from the queen. In recognition of his loyal service to Elizabeth, James I knighted him at Clerkenwell on 11 May 1603.

The modern-spelling transcript below has been prepared from the original-spelling transcript in Wallace, *supra*, pp. 160-8.

Vicesimo die Ianuarij Anno Regni Domine nostre Elizabethe xxvjto [=20 January 1584]

fiat breue sub privato Sigillo directum parti infrascripte ad Comparendum coram dictam Dominam Reginam octabis Sancti Hillarij proximo et hoc sub pena Centum librarum

To the Queen's most excellent Majesty, our dread Sovereign Lady

In most humble wise complaining showeth unto your most excellent Majesty your Highness' faithful and obedient subjects, John Newman and William Hunnis of the city of London, gentlemen:

That whereas one Anne Farrant, late of Greenwich, widow, by indenture bearing date the twentieth day of December in the four and twentieth year [=20 December 1581] of your Majesty's reign did demise and let certain rooms, parcel of the dissolved house of Blackfriars within the said city of London, unto your said subjects for divers years yet enduring, yielding and paying for the same such yearly rent and at such days and times as in the said indenture is expressed, with other covenants by your said subjects to be performed, as by the said indenture more at large it doth and may appear;

And for the performance of the said covenants your said subjects became bound by obligation jointly and severally in the sum of one hundred pounds, as by the said indenture and obligation appeareth;

So it is, if it may please your most excellent Majesty, that although your said subjects and their assigns have from time to time paid the said yearly rents reserved upon the said lease, and as they verily think have observed the covenants in the said indenture mentioned, yet notwithstanding the said Anne Farrant, of a covetous and greedy mind, seeking the utter spoil of your Majesty's said subjects, hath of late, contrary to all equity and good conscience, commenced her several suits at the common law upon the said bond of one hundred pounds against your said subjects in your Majesty's Court of Common Pleas, surmising and making speech that the said rent hath not been duly paid to the said Anne at the days and times appointed in the said indenture, which your said subjects do think to have been paid at the said days, or at the least very shortly after, which said rent the said Anne Farrant did notwithstanding by her own consent voluntarily receive, and made thereof acquittance from time to time;

In tender consideration whereof, and forasmuch as your said subjects have not the said indentures to show forth in court, and thereby to plead at the common law the

performance of the said covenants, nor have any remedy by the due course of the common laws of this realm to aid and relieve themselves in discharge of the payment of the said hundred pounds, the extremity whereof being showed unto your said subjects upon so small a cause will tend to their utter undoing unless your Majesty's accustomed clemency be unto them showed in this behalf;

May it therefore please your most excellent Majesty, the premises considered, to grant your Highness' most gracious writ of privy seal to be directed to the said Anne Farrant, commanding her thereby at a certain day and under a certain pain therein by your Majesty to be limited and appointed personally to appear before your Majesty in your Highness' Court of Requests, then and there to answer to the premises;

And farther to grant your most gracious writ of injunction to be likewise directed to the said Anne, enjoining her thereby not to proceed any farther to sue and vex your subjects or either of them at the common laws of this realm touching the premises, but the said Anne to abide and to stand to such order and direction in the same as to the said Court shall seem best to stand with equity and good conscience;

And your said subjects according to their bounden duties shall daily pray unto Almighty God that your Highness in great felicity and renown may long reign over us.

Dale

xxvijmo Die Ianuarij Anno Regni Regine Elizabeth &c xxvjto [=27 January 1584]

The answer of Anne Farrant, widow, to the bill of complaint of William Hunnis and John Newman, complainants

The defendant by protestation, not acknowledging anything in the said bill to be true, and saving to herself all advantages of and concerning the uncertainty and insufficiency of the said bill of complaint and to the jurisdiction of this most honourable Court in and concerning the matters therein mentioned and surmised against this defendant to induce this Court to stay this defendant from proceeding in and with her lawful and just action and suit at and according to the course of the common law, for answer in and to the said bill of complaint and for more full declaration of the truth of the matters therein untruly touched and mentioned, saith that long time before that the said defendant did demise and grant by her indenture the said rooms, parcel of the said dissolved house of the Blackfriars within the city of London, to the said complainants, as in the said bill is alleged, one Sir William More of Loseley in the county of Surrey, knight, was thereof seised in his demesne as of fee;

And so being seised, by his indenture of lease bearing date the twentieth day of December in the nineteenth year [=20 December 1576] of your Majesty's reign did, amongst other things, demise, grant and to farm let unto one Richard Farrant, late of New Windsor in the county of Berkshire, gentleman, then husband to this defendant, the said

rooms in the said bill mentioned for the term of one and twenty years to be accounted next and immediately following from and after the feast of St Michael th' Archangel then last past, yielding and paying therefore yearly to the said Sir William More, his heirs and assigns, fourteen pounds of lawful money of England at the feast of the Nativity of Our Lord God, th' Annunciation of the Virgin Mary, the Nativity of St John Baptist, and the feast of St Michael th' Archangel, or within fifteen days after every of the said feasts, by even portions, with an especial clause of distress for non-payment of the said rent, and also a clause of re-entry if the said rent or any part thereof be arrear [sic?] by the space of twenty days;

In and by which indenture the said Richard Farrant did covenant for him, his executors and assigns, to repair, sustain and amend the said rooms and the buildings, tilings, leads and other things in or about the same when and as often as need shall require, and that neither he nor any of his assigns should assign, demise or let the premises or any part thereof, nor use or occupy the water of the pipe or conduit therein letten but to their own use, as in and by the same indenture more at large appeareth;

And the said Richard Farrant so being possessed thereof by virtue of the same demise, about three years now last past died intestate, after whose decease the administration of all the goods and chattels of the said Richard were committed to this defendant, then and yet widow and late the wife of the said Richard Farrant;

By virtue of which letters of administration the said defendant did enter and was possessed of the things in and by the said indenture demised, and by virtue thereof was chargeable with the same rent, condition, covenants, [+and?] articles;

And being a sole woman, unable of herself to use the said rooms to such purposes as her said husband late used them, nor having any need or occasion to occupy them to such commodity as would discharge the rents due for the said rooms in the bill alleged, nor being able to sustain, repair and amend the said rooms according to the reservations, conditions, covenants and articles in the said indenture made between the said Sir William More, knight, and the said Richard Farrant, late husband to the said defendant, which she was bound to pay, perform and fulfill, for her further help, ease, comfort and commodity, and at the earnest request and desire of the said complainants, she, this defendant, was content to let the rooms in the said bill mentioned to the said complainants, yielding and paying therefore to her yearly the sum of twenty nobles [=£6 13s 4d] more than the said fourteen pounds due to the said Sir William More;

Which lease the scrivener which by their appointment made the indenture of the same lease did make yielding only the yearly rent of twenty pounds six shillings and eight pence of lawful money of England at the said four feasts of the year most usual aforesaid, or within eight days then next following, whereby this defendant is driven by oversight to lack one noble [=an English gold coin first minted by Edward III, usually valued at 6s. 8d. (half a mark)] yearly of the rent she meant to have, for which the complainants promised her a satisfaction which she never yet could get of them;

By which indenture also the said complainants did covenant, grant and agree with the said defendant to repair, sustain and amend at all times as often as need shall require during the said term the said rooms and the buildings, tilings, leads and other the premises which her said husband by his said covenant was charged to do;

And further the said complainants became bound by obligation in one hundred pounds to this defendant with condition well and truly to observe, perform, fulfill and keep all the covenants, grants, articles, payments and agreements on their part and behalf which in the said indenture of lease by her to them made are mentioned;

In and by which indenture also the said now defendant hath covenanted not only to save these complainants harmless of the said rent reserved to the said Sir William More, but also to pay or tender the same at or upon the days whereon it ought to be paid by reason of the lease to her said late husband made, since which demise and grant made to the said complainants the said complainants, as this defendant hath credibly been advertised, have granted all their estate and term in and to the premises unto one Henry Evans, citizen and scrivener of London, and they have of & by virtue thereof had and reaped far greater profit than the said yearly rent amounteth unto, and as this defendant by divers good presumptions hath good cause to suspect, they or some of them have sought, contrived and practised divers means to avoid and defraud this defendant of and from the rent which she hath reserved to herself in and upon the said demise by her made, and, contrary to the true intent and good meaning and express words of the reservations and articles contained in the said indenture of lease by her made, have not at any time since, to this defendant's now remembrance, paid their quarter rent due at any of the quarter days above mentioned for the payment of the said rent, and many times have withholden the said rent for and by the space of half a year and more;

And this defendant being left very bare and poor, and with great charge of children and debts of her said late husband, and thereby and by divers evil means to her used by them or some of them having great lack of money, and not having money in hand to satisfy the rent due to the said Sir William More, she hath been driven at some time of payments of the said rent to the said Sir William More by humble and pitiful suit to the right honourable Lord Cobham to obtain such favour and help of his good Lordship that one of his men would and might offer and tender to pay the rent then due in safeguard of the said grand lease;

And at another time this defendant hath been urged to crave and obtain of Mr Henry Seckford, esquire, of her Majesty's Privy Chamber, to lend to this defendant so much money as would and did pay the said quarter's rent to the said Sir William More upon the last day of fifteen days after the said quarter for safeguard of the grand lease aforesaid;

And other times this defendant hath been by their negligence in not-payment of their rent driven for the payment of the said rent to the said Sir William More to sell divers of her goods and chattels at far lesser price than they were worth, as at one time a dozen of gold buttons, and at another time of a set of viols, and at some time when this defendant for extreme need hath borrowed of some of them [=Newman and Hunnis] some money, and

laid some of her plate and jewels to them or some of them in pawns, they have after the payment of the said rent to her defalked from the rent the money to her lent, and yet detained the said pawns;

And this last year, being the five & twentieth year of your Majesty's reign, three quarters' rents due or payable by them at the feasts of th' Annunciation of Our Lady, at the Nativity of St John Baptist, and at the feast of St Michael th' Archangel last past were not paid until near about All Saints Day [=1 November] last past;

And further the said complainants, being earnestly required by this defendant to do needful reparations upon the house, being greatly decayed by their not repairing thereof, they did drive the time so long until Sir William More was determined to come to London, whereby the said defendant, for that she would not incur the danger of the covenant in her grand lease, was constrained to amend and repair the leads of the said house, being before blown up with wind, the charges whereof did come unto fifteen shillings and six pence, and the said complainants never would pay the same, whereupon the workman did retain one of the knight marshal's [=an officer in the royal household, with judicial functions] men for arrest [+of?] this defendant for the same, and for the avoiding whereof this defendant paid the same fifteen shillings & six pence;

And further this defendant hath divers other manifest matters as well as the causes aforesaid, as also by some speeches uttered by the said complainants, which do persuade her that the said complainants intend to cause this defendant to forfeit or lose her said lease whereby she holdeth the premises and divers other little parcels, for that the said defendant, without the payment thereof and performance of the said covenants by the said complainants, is not able to pay the said Sir William More his rent and perform the covenants that she by the grand lease, and by the indenture by her made to the said complainants, is bound to do;

Besides that the said Sir William More hath since made some entry and a new lease of the premises to one who by colour thereof hath sued the said Evans, who hath without the privity of this defendant so faintly and falsely pleaded and defended the cause that judgment is like to be given against the said Evans, to the great prejudice of this defendant;

And they or some of them have at some times falsely protested that they or some of them had satisfied the rent due to Sir William More when in truth the rent due to Sir William More hath not been paid, the which cause, besides divers other unfriendly and hard dealings by them or some of them used to this defendant, this defendant thinketh to be such causes as this Court will vouchsafe so to consider of that she shall not be stayed or hindered to prosecute her just and lawful actions and suits at the common law against the said complainants;

Without that that the said complainants and their assigns have from time to time paid the said yearly rents reserved upon the said lease, or have observed the covenants mentioned in the said indenture, as in the said bill of complaint is alleged;

Without that that this defendant upon any covetous and greedy mind hath sought the utter spoil of the said complainants, or upon any such greedy and covetous mind, or contrary to equity and good conscience, hath commenced the said suits at the common law upon the said bond of one hundred pounds against the complainants upon surmise only that the said rent hath not been duly paid at the days and times appointed, or that the said rent hath been paid at the same appointed days or shortly after, as in the said bill is untruly surmised;

And without that that this defendant hath voluntarily received the said rents for which she now sueth the complainants at the common law, or hath made acquittances of the same rents from time to time;

And without that that any other matter, cause or thing in the said bill of complaint contained material or effectual for this defendant to answer unto, and not herein sufficiently answered unto, denied and traversed, or confessed and avoided, is true;

All which matters this defendant is ready to aver and prove as this most honourable court shall award, and prayeth to be dismissed out of and from the same with his [sic] reasonable costs and charges therein in that behalf wrongfully sustained.

Pigott

xxvijo Die Maij Anno Regine Elizabeth xxvjto [=27 May 1584]

The replication of William Hunnis and John Newman, complainants, to the answer of
Anne Farrant, widow, defendant

The said complainants reply and sayen and either of them saith and affirmeth and averreth and maintaineth all and every matter, thing and things therein contained to be true in such manner and form as in and by the said bill of complaint is set forth;

And for further replication sayen and either of them saith that the said Sir William More, knight, did demise and let to farm the premises in the said answer mentioned unto the said Richard Farrant, as in and by the same answer is declared;

And also that the said Richard, so being thereof possessed by virtue of the same demise, about three years now last past made his last will and testament and died, but not intestate, as by the said defendant is supposed;

Without that that the said complainants or either of them or the said Henry Evans have sought, contrived and practised divers or any ways and means to avoid and defraud this defendant of and from the rent which she hath reserved to herself in and upon the said demise by her made or any part thereof, but have paid the whole sum of twenty pound

thirteen shillings and four pence according to the true intent and meaning of the said parties touching their said bargain;

And sayen and will aver and prove that they, the said plaintiffs and their assignees, have and will aver and maintain that they have done from time to time and were ready to have done sufficient reparations in and upon the said premises as need required, but in one time when the said defendant wilfully obtruded herself into some botching and unfit dealing in the same reparations, and did let the sufficient and due performing thereof by the said complainants, and to their great loss and hindrance;

With that that [+the] said complainants will aver and maintain that they or some of them have paid or satisfied or were always ready to pay and satisfy the said yearly rent, and that wilfully refused by the said defendant according to the true intent of the reservation thereof;

And without that that she, the said defendant, hath been by their negligence in not payment of rent unto the said Sir William More driven to sell divers of her goods and chattels at a far lesser price than they were worth;

And without that that she, the said defendant, sold the said goods and chattels in the said answer mentioned before the said demise made of the premises unto the said complainants;

Without that that any other thing in the said answer material to be replied unto, traversed, confessed or avoided and herein not specially replied unto, traversed, confessed or avoided, is true in such manner and form as in and by the said answer is alleged;

All which matters the said complainants are ready to aver and prove as this honourable Court shall award, and prayen as they before have prayed.

Archer

REQ 1/13, f. 41v

Vicesimo septimo die Ianuarij Anno Regni Regine Elizabethæ &c xxvjto [=27 January 1584]

Newman, Farrant

In the cause at the suit of John Newman and William Hunnis, complainants, against Anne Farrant, defendant, it is ordered that the counsel of both parties shall be heard upon Wednesday next concerning the maintenance of the bill of complaint.

REQ 1/13, f. 43v

Tricesimo die Ianuarij Anno Regni Regine Elizabethæ &c xxvjto [=30 January 1584]

Newman, Farrant

In the cause at the suit of John Newman, gentleman, and others complainants, against Anne Farrant, widow, defendant, at the motion of Mr Molyneux, being of counsel with the complainants, it is ordered that both parties shall, with their counsel learned, attend upon Monday next then to be heard upon this point only, whether that an injunction shall be granted in the same cause or not.

REQ 1/13, ff. 119v-102r

Vicesimo tercio die Iunij Anno Regni Regine Elizabethæ &c xxvjto [=23 June 1584]

Newman, Farrant

In the cause depending in variance in her Majesty's honourable Court of Requests at the suit of John Newman and William Hunnis, complainants, against Anne Farrant, widow, defendant, at the motion of Mr Duncce, being of counsel with the complainants, it is this day ordered that both parties shall attend with their counsel learned upon Saturday next, then to be heard upon the points of the breach of the obligation mentioned in th' answer of the said defendants, which is in the same answer assigned to be for non-payment of the rent reserved and payable by force of the indenture of lease made to the complainants, and whether that thereupon an injunction shall be awarded out of this Court for the stay of the defendant's proceedings in the said cause or not, and that the complainants shall give notice of this order to the defendant in convenient time.