

LANDMARK CASES IN EQUITY

Landmark Cases in Equity continues the series of essay collections which began with *Landmark Cases in the Law of Restitution* (2006) and continued with *Landmark Cases in the Law of Contract* (2008) and *Landmark Cases in the Law of Tort* (2010). It contains essays on a series of landmark cases in the development of equitable doctrine running from the seventeenth century to recent times.

The range, breadth and social importance of equitable principles, as these affect commercial, domestic and even political matters, are well known. By focusing on the historical development of these principles, the essays in this collection help us to understand those principles better, and provide insights into the processes of legal change through judicial innovation. Themes addressed in the essays include the nature of the courts' equitable jurisdiction, the development of property rights in equity, constraints on the powers of settlors to create express trusts, the duties of trustees and other fiduciaries, remedies for breach of these duties, and the evolution of constructive and resulting trusts.

Landmark Cases in Equity

Edited by
Charles Mitchell
and
Paul Mitchell



• H A R T •
PUBLISHING

OXFORD AND PORTLAND, OREGON

2012

Published in the United Kingdom by Hart Publishing Ltd
16C Worcester Place, Oxford, OX1 2JW
Telephone: +44 (0)1865 517530
Fax: +44 (0)1865 510710
E-mail: mail@hartpub.co.uk
Website: <http://www.hartpub.co.uk>

Published in North America (US and Canada) by
Hart Publishing
c/o International Specialized Book Services
920 NE 58th Avenue, Suite 300
Portland, OR 97213-3786
USA
Tel: +1 503 287 3093 or toll-free: (1) 800 944 6190
Fax: +1 503 280 8832
E-mail: orders@isbs.com
Website: <http://www.isbs.com>

© The editors and contributors severally 2012

The editors and contributors have asserted their right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, to be identified as the authors of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of Hart Publishing, or as expressly permitted by law or under the terms agreed with the appropriate reprographic rights organisation. Enquiries concerning reproduction which may not be covered by the above should be addressed to Hart Publishing Ltd at the address above.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data Available

ISBN: 978-1-84946-154-2

Typeset by Compuscript Ltd, Shannon
Printed and bound in Great Britain by
TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall



Preface

Readers of our previous volumes of *Landmark Cases* essays—on the law of restitution, contract and tort—will notice something different about *Landmark Cases in Equity*. It is twice the length of its predecessors. This expansion is not meant to suggest that equity is somehow more important than the other topics, or that there are twice as many landmark cases in equity as there are in restitution, contract or tort. The reason is rather that we were fortunate enough to obtain funding from the Society of Legal Scholars to hold a significantly larger event than the workshops out of which the earlier volumes were born: a two-day conference at the Faculty of Laws, University College London, at which earlier versions of the essays in this volume were presented to a large audience of equity scholars, legal historians, judges, legal practitioners and students. We are most grateful to the Society of Legal Scholars, and also to Richard Hart of Hart Publishing, for their financial support, without which staging the event would not have been possible. We are also grateful to Lisa Penfold, the UCL Faculty of Laws events manager, for her expert professional assistance in making the occasion a rewarding experience for all who attended.

Although it is longer than its predecessors, readers of our earlier volumes will recognise many features of *Landmark Cases in Equity*. The authors were given a free choice of topic and methodological approach, and a wide range of equitable doctrines is investigated in this volume. Some authors have chosen to examine their cases within the framework of their contemporary settings, others to take a longer view and to consider the impact which their cases have had on the thinking of subsequent generations. Some have focused their attention on purely doctrinal developments, while others have looked at the social, economic or political background to their case. A variety of topics is addressed, including the nature of the courts' equitable jurisdiction (*The Earl of Oxford's Case*; *Penn v Lord Baltimore*; *Re Earl of Sefton*), the development (or non-development) of property rights in equity (*Burgess v Wheate*; *Tulk v Moxhay*; *Ramsden v Dyson*; *National Provincial Bank Ltd v Ainsworth*), constraints on the powers of settlors to create charitable trusts (*Morice v Bishop of Durham*; *National Anti-Vivisection Soc v IRC*), the duties of trustees and other fiduciaries (*North-West Transportation Co Ltd v Beatty*; *Regal (Hastings) Ltd v Gulliver*; *Boardman v Phipps*), remedies for breach of trust and breach of fiduciary duty (*Re Hallett's Estate*; *Nocton v Lord Ashburton*; *Paragon Finance plc v DB Thakerar & Co (a firm)*), and the evolution of constructive and resulting trusts (*Coke v Fountaine*; *Lord Grey v Lady Grey*;

Gissing v Gissing). Recurring themes include a concern with classification, the dominance of particular individuals in the development of equitable principles, equity's relevance to political questions (both domestically and abroad), and the interpenetration of equity and common law.

Since this is likely to be the last of the *Landmark Cases* series that we edit together, we should like to take this opportunity to express our thanks to all of the authors of essays in the volumes on restitution, contract, tort and equity. We hope that these volumes show that the study of individual cases, as pioneered by the late Brian Simpson, is a flourishing and fruitful form of academic literature. There is much to be gained from reassessing what we know about the cases by which we habitually orientate ourselves.

Charles Mitchell and Paul Mitchell
University College London

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	v
<i>Contributors</i>	ix
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xi
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xxxix
1. <i>The Earl of Oxford's Case</i> (1615).....	1
<i>David Ibbetson</i>	
2. <i>Coke v Fountaine</i> (1676).....	33
<i>Mike Macnair</i>	
3. <i>Grey v Grey</i> (1677).....	63
<i>Jamie Glister</i>	
4. <i>Penn v Lord Baltimore</i> (1750)	87
<i>Paul Mitchell</i>	
5. <i>Burgess v Wheate</i> (1759).....	115
<i>Paul Matthews</i>	
6. <i>Morice v Bishop of Durham</i> (1805)	157
<i>Joshua Getzler</i>	
7. <i>Tulk v Moxhay</i> (1848)	203
<i>Ben McFarlane</i>	
8. <i>Prince Albert v Strange</i> (1849)	235
<i>Lionel Bently</i>	
9. <i>Ramsden v Dyson</i> (1866).....	269
<i>Nick Piška</i>	
10. <i>Bishop of Natal v Gladstone</i> (1866)	305
<i>Charlotte Smith</i>	
11. <i>Earl of Aylesford v Morris</i> (1873).....	329
<i>Catharine MacMillan</i>	
12. <i>Re Hallett's Estate</i> (1879–80).....	357
<i>Graham Virgo</i>	
13. <i>North-West Transportation Co Ltd v Beatty</i> (1887).....	393
<i>Lionel Smith</i>	

viii Contents

14. <i>Rochefoucauld v Boustead</i> (1897)	423
<i>Ying Khai Liew</i>	
15. <i>Re Earl of Sefton</i> (1898)	453
<i>Chantal Stebbings</i>	
16. <i>Nocton v Lord Ashburton</i> (1914).....	473
<i>James Edelman</i>	
17. <i>Regal (Hastings) Ltd v Gulliver</i> (1942).....	499
<i>Richard Nolan</i>	
18. <i>National Anti-Vivisection Society v Inland Revenue</i> <i>Commissioners</i> (1948)	529
<i>Jonathan Garton</i>	
19. <i>National Provincial Bank Ltd v Ainsworth</i> (1965).....	557
<i>Alison Dunn</i>	
20. <i>Boardman v Phipps</i> (1967)	581
<i>Michael Bryan</i>	
21. <i>Pettitt v Pettitt</i> (1970) and <i>Gissing v Gissing</i> (1971)	611
<i>John Mee</i>	
22. <i>Paragon Finance plc v DB Thakerar & Co (a firm)</i> (1999)	643
<i>Christian Daly and Charles Mitchell</i>	
<i>Index</i>	673

Contributors

Lionel Bently is Herchel Smith Professor of Intellectual Property, and Director of the Centre of Intellectual Property and Information Law, at the University of Cambridge, and a Professorial Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

Michael Bryan is an Emeritus Professor of Law at the University of Melbourne.

Christian Daly is a Lecturer in Law at BPP Law School.

Alison Dunn is a Senior Lecturer in Law at Newcastle University.

The Hon Justice James Edelman is a Justice of the Supreme Court of Western Australia.

Jonathan Garton is an Associate Professor (Reader) in Law at the University of Warwick.

Joshua Getzler is a Fellow and Tutor in Law at St Hugh's College, Oxford, Professor of Law and Legal History at the University of Oxford, and Conjoint Professor of Law at the University of New South Wales.

Jamie Glister is a Senior Lecturer in Law at the University of Sydney.

David Ibbetson is Regius Professor of Civil Law in the University of Cambridge, and a Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

Ying Khai Liew is a Lecturer in Law at King's College London.

Catharine MacMillan is a Reader in Legal History at Queen Mary, University of London.

Mike Macnair is Ann Smart Fellow and Tutor in Law at St Hugh's College, Oxford.

Paul Matthews is a Visiting Professor of Law at King's College London, a consultant solicitor with Withers LLP, a deputy chancery master, a recorder in the specialist civil jurisdiction and coroner for the City of London.

Ben McFarlane is a Fellow and Tutor in Law at Trinity College, Oxford, and a Reader in Property Law at the University of Oxford.

John Mee is a Professor of Law at University College Cork.

Charles Mitchell is a Professor of Law at University College London.

Paul Mitchell is a Professor of Laws at University College London.

Richard Nolan is a Fellow and Tutor in Law at St John's College, Cambridge, a Reader in Corporate and Trust Law at the University of Cambridge, and a barrister at Erskine Chambers, Lincoln's Inn.

Nick Piška is a Lecturer in Law at the University of Kent.

Charlotte Smith is a Senior Lecturer in Law, and Co-Director of the Forum for Legal and Historical Research, at the University of Reading.

Lionel Smith is James McGill Professor of Law, and Director of the Paul-André Crépeau Centre for Private and Comparative Law, at McGill University.

Chantal Stebbings is Professor of Law and Legal History, and Director of the Centre for Legal History Research, at the University of Exeter.

Graham Virgo is a Fellow and Senior Tutor of Downing College, Cambridge, Professor of English Private Law at the University of Cambridge, and a Bencher of Lincoln's Inn.

Table of Cases

Aas v Benham [1891] Ch 244 (CA).....	593, 597
Abbey National Building Society v Cann [1991] 1 AC 56 (HL)	431
Abbot v Burton (1708) 2 Salk 590, 91 ER 494	134
Abernethy v Hutchinson (1824–25) 1 H & Tw 28, 47 ER 1313, (1825) LJ Ch (OS) 209	241, 247, 248, 254, 255, 256, 261
Ackroyds (London) Ltd v Islington Plastics Ltd [1962] RPC 97	259
Adamson, ex parte (1878) 8 Ch App 807.....	490
A-G v Bishop of Oxford (1786)	185
A-G v Doyley (1735) 4 Vin 485, 2 Eq Cas Ab 194, 22 ER 167.....	190, 194
A-G v Duke of Leeds (1833) 2 My & K 343, 39 ER 974	117, 146
A-G v Guardian (No 2) [1990] AC 109 (HL).....	260, 262, 266, 671
A-G v Ironmongers' Company (1834) 2 My & K 576, 39 ER 1064	189
A-G v Jonathan Cape [1976] QB 752	260–61
A-G v Lady Downing (1767) Wilmot 1, 97 ER 1	183–86
A-G v Marquis of Ailesbury (1887) 12 App Cas 672	467
A-G v Mayor etc of Coventry (1700) 3 Madd 353, 56 ER 535	60
A-G v Whorwood (1750) 1 Ves Sen 534, 27 ER 1188	181–82
A-G (ex rel Elisha & Ors) v Holy Apostolic and Catholic Church of the East (Assyrian) Australia NSW Parish Association (1989) 98 ALR 327.....	306
A-G for Hong Kong v Reid [1994] 1 AC 324 (PC).....	603, 671, 672
A-G of Ontario v Mercer (1883) 8 App Cas 767.....	116–17
A-G of Victoria (ex rel Archbishop Harkianakis) v St John the Prodromos Greek Orthodox Community Inc [2000] VSC 12	306
Agip (Africa) Ltd v Jackson [1990] Ch 265, [1991] Ch 547 (CA)	381–82, 387, 665
AIB Group (UK) Plc v Mark Redler & Co (a firm) [2012] EWHC 35 (Ch).....	645
AID/Watch Inc v Commissioner of Taxation [2010] HCA 42, (2010) 241 CLR 539	199, 554–55
Alec Lobb v Total Oil [1985] 1 WLR 173 (CA)	354
Allen v Rea Brothers Trustees Ltd [2002] EWCA Civ 85, (2002) 4 ITELR 627	665
Allen v Snyder [1977] 2 NSWLR 685	666
Amalgamated Investment Ltd v Texas Commerce Bank Ltd [1982] QB 84 (CA)	578
Ambrose v Ambrose (1716) 1 P Wms 321, 24 ER 407.....	60
Anchor Line (Henderson Brothers) Ltd, In re [1937] Ch 483 (Ch D)	111
Anderson v McPherson [No 2] [2012] WASC 19	83

xii *Table of Cases*

Andrew v Wrigley (1792) 4 Bro CC 125, 29 ER 812	659
Anglia Roman Catholic Trustee v Milthorn Engineering Ltd, 18 Trust Law International, 160.....	153
Angus v Angus (1737) West Temp Hardwicke 23, 25 ER 800.....	102
Anon (1683) 2 Ventris 361, 86 ER 486.....	60
Anon (1692) 2 Freem 123, 22 ER 1100.....	60
Anon 2 P Wms 75, 24 ER 646	99
Appleton v Appleton [1965] 1 WLR 25 (CA).....	563, 574, 615, 620, 624
Apsley and Ruswell's Case 1 Rolle 192, 81 ER 424, 1 Rolle 218, 81 ER 443	28
Archbold v Scully (1861) 9 HLC 360, 11 ER 769.....	651
Argyll (Duchess of) v Argyll (Duke of) see Duchess of Argyll v Duke of Argyll	
Arklow Investments Ltd v Maclean [2000] 1 WLR 594 (PC).....	489
Armitage v Nurse [1998] Ch 241 (CA)	354, 491
Armstrong DLW GmbH v Winnington Networks Ltd [2012] EWHC 10 (Ch).....	672
Ashburn Anstalt v Arnold [1989] Ch 1 (CA).....	564
Astor's Settlement Trusts, Re [1952] Ch 534 (Ch D).....	159, 199
Atkinson v Leonard (1791) 3 Bro CC 218, 29 ER 499.....	104
Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust, Re (1991) 30 FCR 491	666
Baden (No 2), Re [1972] 2 All ER 1304 (CA).....	228
Bagus Investments Ltd v Kastening 2010 JRC 144, 2010 JLR 355.....	664
Bailiff of Burford v Lenthall (1743) 2 Atk 553, 26 ER 731	189
Bairstow v Queens Moat Houses plc [2001] EWCA Civ 712, [2001] 2 BCLC 531	663
Baker v Read (1854) 18 Beav 398, 52 ER 157	650, 651
Baker v Sutton (1836) 1 Keen 224, 48 ER 292.....	195
Balfour v Balfour [1919] 2 KB 571 (CA).....	623
Bank of Credit & Commerce International (Overseas) Ltd (in liq) v Jan unreported 17 November 1999 (Ch D)	670
Bank of Credit & Commerce International SA v Saadi [2005] EWHC 2256 (QB).....	670
Bank of Ireland v Pexxnet Ltd [2010] EWHC 1872 (Comm).....	672
Bank of Montreal v Stuart [1911] AC 120 (PC).....	484
Banner Homes Holdings Ltd v Luff Developments Ltd (No 2) [2000] Ch 372 (CA)	663, 666, 667
Bannister v Bannister [1948] 2 All ER 133 (CA)	439, 446, 447–48, 451
Banque Belge pour l'Etranger v Hambrouck [1921] 1 KB 321 (CA).....	386–87, 665
Barclay v Russell (1793) 3 Ves Jun 424, 30 ER 1087	147
Barclay's Bank plc v O'Brien [1994] 1 AC 180 (HL).....	354, 568–69
Barclays Bank Ltd v Bird [1954] 2 WLR 319 (Ch D).....	561, 562, 567
Barker v Stickney [1919] 1 KB 121 (CA).....	220, 226, 229
Barlow Clowes International Ltd v Vaughan [1992] 4 All ER 22 (CA).....	385

Barnes v Addy (1874) LR 9 Ch App 244.....	665
Barney, Re [1892] 2 Ch 265 (Ch D).....	665
Barnhart v Greenshields (1853) 9 Moo PC 18, 14 ER 204.....	565
Barron v Martin (1815) 19 Ves Jun 327, 34 ER 539.....	653, 655, 657
Barron v Potter [1914] 1 Ch 895 (Ch D).....	527
Barrow v Wadkin (1857) 24 Beav 1, 53 ER 257.....	147
Barrow's Case (1880) 14 Ch D 432 (CA).....	77
Bartlett v Barclays Bank Trust Co Ltd (No 2) [1980] 1 Ch 539 (Ch D).....	490
Bartlett v Pickersgill (1760) 1 Cox 15, 29 ER 1041.....	435–36
Bates' Case (1606) Lane 22, 145 ER 267.....	24
Bath v Standard Land Co Ltd [1911] 1 Ch 618 (CA).....	668
Bathurst CC v PWC Properties Pty Ltd (1998) 195 CLR 566.....	666
Baugh v Price (1752) 1 Wil K B 320, 95 ER 640.....	333
Bax, ex parte (1751) 2 Ves Sen 388, 28 ER 248.....	490
BCE Inc v 1976 Debentureholders [2008] SCC 69, [2008] 3 SCR 560.....	411
Beale v Symonds (1853) 16 Beav 406, 51 ER 835.....	146
Beall v Smith (1873) LR 9 Ch App 85.....	460
Beaney (dec'd), Re [1978] 1 WLR 770 (Ch D).....	79
Beatty v Neelon (1885) 9 OR 385 (Ch D) 387, (1885) 12 OAR 50 (CA), (1886) 13 SCR 1 (SCC).....	401–2, 406
Beatty v North–West Transportation Co (1884) 6 OR 300 (Ch D), (1885) 11 OAR 205 (CA), (1886) 12 SCR 598 (SCC).....	404, 406–8, 413–14
Beatty v Oille (1886) 12 SCR 706.....	404
Beaumont v Oliveira (1868–69) LR 6 Eq 53, LR 4 Ch 31.....	199
Beckford v Wade (1805) 17 Ves Jun 87, 34 ER 34.....	659
Beckley v Newland (1723) 2 P Wms 182, 24 ER 691.....	60, 333
Beemer v Brownridge [1934] 1 WWR 545 (Sask CA).....	432
Bell Group v Westpac (No 9) [2008] WASC 239.....	664
Belmont Finance Corp Ltd v Williams Furniture Ltd [1979] Ch 250 (CA).....	645
Bendall v McWhirter [1952] 2 QB 466 (CA).....	559–61, 564–65, 573, 577
Benjamin, Re [1902] 1 Ch 723 (Ch D).....	145
Bennet v Davis (1725) 2 P Wms 316, 24 ER 746.....	575
Bennett, ex parte (1805) 10 Ves Jun 381, 32 ER 893.....	668
Beridge, Re (1884) 50 LT 653.....	466
Berney v Pitt (1686) 2 Vern CC 14, 23 ER 620, (1686) 2 Ch Rep 396, 21 ER 697.....	332
Bertie v Falkland (1697) 3 Ch Cas 129, 1 Salk 231, 91 ER 205.....	130
Berty v Falkland 12 Mod 182, 88 ER 1248.....	60
Beverley's Case (1603) 4 Co Rep 123b, 76 ER 1118.....	461
Beynon v Cook (1875) LR 10 Ch App 389.....	354
Binions v Evans [1972] Ch 359 (CA).....	564, 572, 578
Birt v Burt (1879) 11 Ch D 773n.....	371
Birtchnell v Equity Trustees, Executors and Agency Co Ltd (1929) 42 CLR 384.....	593

xiv *Table of Cases*

Bishop of Cape Town v Bishop of Natal (1869)	
6 Moo PC NS 203, 16 ER 702	311, 326
Bishop of Cloyne v Young (1750) 2 Ves Sen 91, 28 ER 60	187, 190
Bishop of Natal v Gladstone (1866) LR 3 Eq 1	305–28
Bishop of Natal v Green (1868) 18 LT 112	311, 326
Bishop of Natal, Re (1864) 3 Moo PC (NS) 115, 16 ER 43 (PC)	311–15, 318, 321, 324
Biss, Re [1903] 2 Ch 40 (CA)	596, 670
Blake, Re (1889) 60 LT 663	655
Blake, Re [1932] 1 Ch 54 (Ch D)	659
Blomley v Ryan (1956) 99 CLR 362 (HCA)	354
Bloye's WT, Re (1849) 1 Mac & G 488, 41 ER 1354	668
Blyth v Fladgate [1891] 1 Ch 237 (Ch D)	665
Boardman v Phipps [1967] 2 AC 46, [1966] 3 WLR 1009, [1966] 3 All ER 721 (HL)	499, 517–18, 522, 580, 581–610
Bofinger v Kingsway Group Ltd [2009] HCA 44, (2009) 239 CLR 269	497
Bolkiah v KPMG [1999] 2 AC 222 (HL)	592
Bonanza Creek Gold Mining Co v R [1916] 1 AC 566 (PC)	412
Bonar Law Memorial Trust v Inland Revenue Commissioners (1933) 17 TC 508	541
Bond, Re [1901] 1 Ch 15 (Ch D)	147, 148
Bonney v Ridgard (1784) 1 Cox 145, 29 ER 1101	652, 659
Boscawen v Bajwa [1996] 1 WLR 328 (CA)	383, 387
Bostitch Inc v McGarry & Cole Ltd [1964] RPC 173	259
Boston Deep Sea Fishing & Ice Co v Ansell (1888) 39 Ch D 389	480, 514
Boswell v Coaks (No 1) (1886) LR 11 App Cas 232	668
Boumediene v Bush 553 US 723 (2008)	66
Bowling v Bank of New Haven 219 Ky 731 (1927)	388
Bowman v Secular Society [1917] AC 406 (HL)	199, 539, 541–43
Box v Barclays Bank plc [1998] Lloyd's Rep Bank 185 (Ch D)	672
Bradley-Hole v Cusen [1953] 1 All ER 87 (CA)	560, 561
Bramwell v Bramwell [1942] 1 KB 370 (CA)	561
Brandon v Robinson (1811) 18 Ves 429, 34 ER 379	576
Bray v Ford [1896] AC 44 (HL)	514
Brazilian Rubber Plantations & Estates Ltd, Re [1911] 1 Ch 425 (Ch D)	504
Bree v Holbech (1781) 2 Doug 654, 99 ER 415	478
Breen v Williams (1996) 186 CLR 71	497
Brian Collins (Engineers) Ltd v Charles Roberts & Co Ltd [1965] RPC 429	259
Bridgeman v Green (1755) 2 Ves Sen 627, 28 ER 399	49, 177
Briggs v Penny (1849) 3 De G & Sm 525, 64 ER 590	199
Briggs v Penny (1851) 3 Mac & G 546, 42 ER 371	36
Bright v Legerton (1860) 29 Beav 60, 54 ER 548, (1861) 2 De G F & J 606, 45 ER 755	656, 657

Bristol & West Building Society v Mothew [1998] Ch 1 (CA).....	497, 644, 645
British Mutual Investment Co v Cobbold (1875) LR 19 Eq 627	493
British Red Cross Balkan Fund, Re [1914] 2 Ch 419 (Ch D).....	385
British South Africa Co v Companhia de Moçambique [1893] AC 602 (HL)	88
Brittlebank v Goodwin (1868) LR 5 Eq 545	655, 656
Bromley v Smith (1859) 26 Beav 644, 53 ER 1047	331
Brooks v Muckleston [1909] 2 Ch 519 (Ch D).....	651
Brown v Adams (1869) LR 4 Ch 764.....	366, 371, 373
Brown v Brown [1993] NSWCA 38, (1993) 31 NSWLR 582	79–80, 82
Brown v Higgs (1803) 8 Ves Jun 573, 32 ER 473	190
Brown v Inland Revenue Commissioners [1965] AC 244 (HL)	520
Brown v Savage (1674) 73 SS 103.....	45
Brown v Yeall unreported, noted in Moggridge v Thackwell.....	181, 195
Brownlie v Campbell (1880) LR 5 App Cas 925	487
Bulmer, Re [1937] Ch 499 (CA).....	668
Burdick v Garrick (1870) LR 5 Ch App CA (Ch) 233.....	433, 495
Burge, Re (1887) 57 LT 364.....	655
Burgess v Wheate (1759) 1 Wm Bl 123, 96 ER 67, 1 Eden 177, 28 ER 652	115–55
Burland v Earle (1900) 27 OAC 540 (CA), [1902] AC 83 (PC)	409, 414
Burns v Burns [1984] Ch 317 (CA)	575, 580, 629, 636
Burrowes v Locke (1805) 10 Ves 470, 32 ER 927	480, 486, 487
Byrnes v Kendle [2011] HCA 26	191
Cadd v Cadd (1909) 9 CLR 171 (HCA).....	79, 433
Cadogan Petroleum plc v Tolley [2011] EWHC 2286 (Ch), [2012] 1 P. & C.R. DG5	670
Caffrey v Darby (1801) 6 Ves Sen 489, 31 ER 1159	596
Caird v Sime (1887) 12 App Cas 326 (HL)	257–58
Calvin v Smith (1608) 7 Co Rep 1a, 77 ER 399.....	311
Campbell v Mirror Group Newspapers [2004] UKHL 22, [2004] 2 AC 457	264–66
Campbell Discount Co Ltd v Bridge [1961] 2 WLR 596 (CA)	561
Campden Hill Ltd v Chakrani [2005] EWHC 911 (Ch).....	382
Canadian Oil Works Corp, Re (1875) LR 10 Ch App 593.....	668
Candler v Crane, Christmas & Co [1951] 2 KB 164 (CA)	496
Cann v Wilson (1888) 39 Ch D 39.....	479
Cartwright v Pettus (1675) 2 Ch Ca 214, 22 ER 916	100
Casborne v Scarfe (1737) 1 Atk 603, 26 ER 377.....	429
Case of Tanistry (1608) Dav 28, 80 ER 516.....	25
Catt v Tourle (1869) LR 4 Ch App 654.....	219
Cattley v Pollard [2006] EWHC 3130 (Ch), [2007] Ch 353.....	647
Caudrey’s Case (1591) 5 Co Rep 1a, 77 ER 1	320
Cave v Mackenzie (1877) 46 LJ Ch 564 (Ch).....	434, 435, 436
Cedric Slack & Partners Ltd (in liq) v Slack [2010] EWCA Civ 204.....	670

xvi *Table of Cases*

Central Bank of Nigeria v Williams [2012] EWCA Civ 415	647, 664
Central Bayside General Practice Association Ltd v Commissioner of State Revenue (2006) 228 CLR 168	549
Central London Property Trust Co Ltd v High Trees House Ltd [1947] KB 130	222
Chalmer v Bradley (1819) 1 J & W 51, 37 ER 294	655
Chameleon Mining NL v Murchison Metals Ltd [2012] FC AFC 6	605
Chan v Zacharia (1984) 154 CLR 178	520, 596, 610, 669
Chapman, Re [1896] 2 Ch 763 (CA)	490
Charitable Corp v Sutton (1742) 2 Atk 400, 26 ER 642, 9 Mod 349, 88 ER 500	165, 492
Charles Marshall Pty Ltd v Grimsley (1956) 95 CLR 353 (HCA)	79
Chase Manhattan Bank v Israel-British Bank (London) Ltd [1981] Ch 105 (Ch D)	606, 672
Cheung v Worldcup Investments Inc [2008] HKCFA 78	71, 84
Chichester Diocesan Fund v Simpson [1944] AC 341 (HL)	199
Chirnside v Fay [2006] NZSC 68, [2007] 1 NZLR 433	609
Cholmondeley v Clinton (1820) 2 J & W 1, 37 ER 527	648, 650–51, 652, 654–55, 656
Christ’s Hospital v Grainger (1849) 1 M & G 460, 41 ER 1343	655, 656
Christian Revival Crusade Inc v Milne & Ors [2007] SADC 125	306
Chudleigh’s Case (1595) 1 Co Rep 113b, 76 ER 261	229
Church of England BS v Piskor [1954] Ch 553 (CA)	431
Churcher v Street [1959] 1 All ER 23 (Ch D)	560, 577
City Equitable Fire Insurance Co, Re [1925] Ch 407 (CA)	504
Clare v Joseph [1907] 2 KB 369	668
Clark v Browne (1854) 2 Sm & Giff 524, 65 ER 510	36
Clark v Cutland [2003] EWCA Civ 810, [2004] 1 WLR 783	665
Clarkson v Davies [1923] AC 100 (HL)	649
Clarkson v Hanway (1723) 2 P Wms 203, 24 ER 700	60
Clayton’s Case see Devaynes v Noble	
Cleaver v Mutual Reserve Fund Life Association [1892] 1 QB 147 (CA)	139
Clore v Theatrical Properties [1936] 3 All ER 483	564
Cobb v Cobb [1955] 1 WLR 731 (CA)	562, 563, 620, 641
Coco v Clark [1968] FSR 415 (Ch D)	259
Coke v Fountain (1686) 1 Vern 413, 23 ER 554	55
Coke v Fontaine (1676) 73 and 79 SS, 77 SS 362, 3 Swanst 585, 36 ER 984	33–61, 82, 130
Colburn v Simms (1843) 2 Hare 543, 67 ER 224	608
Colchester v Law (1873) LR 16 Eq 253	147
Cole v Gibbons, Martin v Cole (1734) 3 P W 290, 24 ER 1070	333
Coleman Taymar Ltd v Oakes [2001] 2 BCLC 749 (Ch D)	517
Colin Gwyer & Associates Ltd v London Wharf (Limehouse) Ltd [2003] 2 BCLC 153 (Ch D)	526, 527
Collard v Hare (1831) 2 Russ & M 675, 39 ER 552	659

Collins v Plumb (1810) 16 Ves Jr 454, 33 ER 1057	212
Colonial Bishopricks Fund 1841, Re [1935] Ch 148 (Ch D)	307, 311, 326
Colonial Trusts Corp, ex p Bradshaw, Re (1879) 15 Ch D 465	229
Colt v Woollaston (1723) 2 P Wms 154, 24 ER 679	480
Comes Arglasse v Muschamp (1682) 1 Vern 75, 23 ER 322	100
Commerzbank AG v IMB Morgan plc [2004] EWHC 2771 (Ch), [2005] 1 Lloyd's Rep 298	385, 672
Commissioners of Inland Revenue v G Angus & Co (1889) 23 QBD 579	87
Commissioners for Special Purposes of Income Tax v Pemsel [1891] AC 531 (HL)	192, 199, 534, 537–38, 541
Commissioner of Stamp Duties v Byrnes [1911] AC 386 (PC)	80–81
Committee for Privileges v The Aylesford Peerage (1886) LR 11 App Cas 1	353
Communities Economic Development Fund v Canadian Pickles Corp [1991] 3 SCR 388	412
Companhia de Moçambique v British South Africa Co [1892] 2 QB 358 (CA)	88
Connolly Bros (No 2), Re [1912] 2 Ch 25 (CA)	431
Cook v Duckenfield (1743) 2 Atk 562, 26 ER 737	186
Cooke v Chilcott (1876) 3 Ch D 694	221
Cooke v Fountain (1680) 1 Ventris 347, 86 ER 224	44
Cooke, ex parte (1876) 4 Ch D 123	371, 373
Cooper v MacDonald (1877) 7 Ch D 288	575
Cooper v PRG Powerhouse Ltd [2008] EWHC 498 (Ch), [2008] 2 All ER (Comm) 964	200
Coote v Jecks (1872) 13 LR Eq 597	111
Corbett v Brown (1831) 8 Bing 33, 131 ER 312	478
Corbyn v French (1799) 4 Ves Jun 418, 31 ER 213	182, 185
Cornfoot v Fowke (1840) 6 M & W 358	479
Corporation of Gloucester v Osborn (1846–7) 1 HLC 272, 9 ER 760	36
Countess of Bristol v Hungerford (1709) 2 Vern 645, 23 ER 1021	47
Courtney, ex parte Pollard, In re (1840) Mont & Ch 239	110–11, 113–14
Coventry Permanent Economic Building Society v Jones [1951] 1 All ER 901 (Ch D)	431
Cowcher v Cowcher [1972] 1 WLR 425 (Fam D)	572
Cox v Jones [2004] EWHC 1486 (Ch), [2004] 2 FLR 1010	667
Cox v Parker (1856) 23 Beav 168, 52 ER 1072	146
Cradock v Owen (1854) 2 Sm & Giff 241, 65 ER 382	
Cranston, Re [1898] 1 IR 446 (CA Ireland)	535
Crédit Lyonnais Bank v Burch [1997] CLC 95	354
Cresswell v Potter [1978] 1 WLR 255 (Ch D)	354
Crop v Norton (1740) 2 Atk 74, 26 ER 445, Barn CC 179, 27 ER 603, 9 Mod 233, 88 ER 418	631
Cross, Re (1882) 20 Ch D 109	657
Crossco No 4 Unlimited v Jolan Ltd [2011] EWCA Civ 1619, (2011) 4 ITELR 615	663

xviii *Table of Cases*

Crowley's Case (1818) 2 Swanst 1, 36 ER 514.....	35
Cullen v Lowndes (1771) unreported.....	245
Cullum, Re [1924] 1 Ch 540 (Ch D).....	147
Cunnack v Edwards [1896] 2 Ch 679.....	147
D&C Builders Ltd v Rees [1966] 2 QB 617 (CA).....	212
D'Jan of London Ltd, Re, Copp v D'Jan [1994] 1 BCLC 561 (Ch D).....	504
Da Costa v De Paz (1754) Dick 249, 21 ER 268, Amb 228, 27 ER 150, 2 Swanst 532, 36 ER 715.....	185–86, 197
Dale v Inland Revenue Commissioners [1954] AC 11 (HL).....	515
Dale, ex parte (1879) 11 Ch D 722.....	367–69, 376, 378–80
Damberg v Damberg [2001] NSWCA 87, (2001) 52 NSWLR 492.....	83
Dann v Spurrier (1802) 7 Ves Jun 231, 32 ER 94.....	284–86, 297
Daraydan Holdings Ltd v Solland International Ltd [2004] EWHC 622 (Ch), [2005] Ch 119.....	671
Dart Industries Inc v Décor Corp Pty Ltd [1993] HCA 54, (1993) 179 CLR 101.....	608
Davall v New River Co (1849) 3 De G & Sm 394, 64 ER 531.....	146
Davis v Duke of Marlborough (1819) 2 Swan 108, 36 ER 555.....	331, 332, 333
Davis Contractors Ltd v Fareham UDC [1956] AC 696 (HL).....	624
Davy v Garrett (1878) 7 Ch D 473.....	645
De Bussche v Alt (1878) 8 Ch D 286.....	514
de Mattos v Gibson (1849) 4 De G & J 276, 45 ER 108.....	218–21, 226
De Themmines v De Bonneval (1828) 5 Russ 288, 38 ER 1035.....	541
DEG-Deutsche Investitions- und Entwicklungsgesellschaft mbH v Koshy (No 2) [2002] 1 BCLC 478 (Ch D).....	664
Denley's Trust Deed, Re [1969] 1 Ch 373 (Ch D).....	200
Derry v Peek (1889) 14 App Cas 337 (HL).....	481–88, 493, 495–97
Deschamps v Miller [1908] 1 Ch 856 (Ch D).....	112–14
Devaynes v Noble, Clayton's Case (1816) 1 Mer 572.....	358, 366–69, 372–73, 384–85, 391
Dewdney, ex parte (1809) 15 Ves Jun 479, 33 ER 836.....	657
Dexter Motors Ltd v Mitcalfe [1938] NZLR 804.....	388
DHN Food Distributors Ltd v Tower Hamlets [1976] 1 WLR 852 (CA).....	578
Dick v Alston [1913] SC (HL) 57.....	484
Dickens v Hawksley [1934] 1 Ch 267 (CA).....	251
Dillwyn v Llewelyn (1862) 4 De GF & J 517, 45 ER 1285.....	77, 605, 662
Diplock's Estate, Re [1948] Ch 465 (CA).....	357, 366, 381, 384–85, 387, 665
Dixon v Wilkinson (1859) 4 De G & J 508, 45 ER 198.....	484
Docker v Somes (1834) 2 My & Keen 655, 39 ER 1095.....	489
Doctor Bonham's Case (1610) 8 Co Rep 113, 77 ER 646.....	30
Dodsworth v Dodsworth (1973) 228 EG 1115 (CA).....	604
Doe d Leicester v Biggs (1809) 2 Taunt 109, 127 ER 1016.....	151
Doe d Toone v Copestake 6 East 328, 102 ER 1313.....	198
Donaldson v Beckett (1774) 2 Bro PC 145, 1 ER 837 (HL).....	239, 247, 251
Donoghue v Stevenson [1932] 1 AC 562 (HL).....	496
Douglas v Hello! Ltd (No 3) [2005] EWCA Civ 595, [2006] QB 125.....	264–66

Douglas v Hello! Ltd (No 5) [2003] EMLR 30	265
Douglas, In re (1887) LR 35 Ch D 472 (CA)	199, 534–35
Downes v Grazebrook (1817) 3 Mer 200, 36 ER 77	668
Drummond, Re (1836) 1 My & Cr 627, 40 ER 516	466
Drury v Smith (1716) 1 P Wms 404, 24 ER 446	60
Du Boulay v Raggett (1989) 58 P & CR 138 (Ch D)	435
Dubai Aluminium Co Ltd v Salaam [2002] UKHL 48, [2003] 2 AC 366	663, 664
Duchess of Argyll v Duke of Argyll [1967] Ch 302 (Ch D)	261–62, 264
Duckwari plc (No 2), Re [1999] Ch 253 (CA)	663
Duder v Amsterdamsch Trustees Kantoor [1902] 2 Ch 132 (Ch D)	111
Duke of Bedford v Trustees of the British Museum (1822) 2 My & K 552, 39 ER 1055	211, 213
Duke of Marlborough, Re [1894] 2 Ch 133 (Ch D)	449
Duke of Norfolk v Howard (1681) 2 Ch Cas 14, 22 ER 939, (1683) 1 Vern 163, 23 ER 388	130
Duke of Queensberry v Shebbeare (1758) 2 Eden 329, 28 ER 924	241, 247
Duke of Rutland v Duchess of Rutland (1723) 2 P Wms 210, 24 ER 703	60
Dumas, ex parte (1754) 1 Atk 232, 26 ER 149	367, 370, 389
Dutton v Howell (1693) Show 24, 1 ER 17	99
Dyer v Dyer (1788) 2 Cox Eq Cas 92, 30 ER 42	76–78, 630
Dyke v Walford (1846) 5 Moo PC 434, 13 ER 557	147
Dyson Holdings v Fox [1976] QB 503 (CA)	577
Dyson Technology Ltd v Curtis [2010] EWHC 3289 (Ch)	603, 671
Eales v England (1702) Precedents in Chancery 200, 24 ER 96	190
Earl of Aldborough v Trye (1840) 7 Cl & F 436, 7 ER 1136	334
Earl of Anglesey v Annesley (1741) 1 Bro HL 289, 1 ER 573	95
Earl of Arglasse v Muschamp (1684) 1 Vern CC 237, 23 ER 438	332
Earl of Aylesford v Morris (1873) LR 8 Ch App 484	329–55
Earl of Aylesford, In re, Machell v Poulett, <i>The Times</i> , 20 April 1886, 4	353
Earl of Aylesford's Family Settlement, In re Poulett v Finch, <i>The Times</i> , 7 May 1885, 11	353
Earl Cadogan v Sportelli [2007] 1 EGLR 253	10
Earl of Chesterfield v Janssen (1751) 2 Ves Sen 125, 28 ER 82	330–32, 334, 341, 344
Earl of Kildare v Eustace (1686) 1 Vern 419, 23 ER 559	100–1
Earl of Oxford's Case (1615) Ch Rep 1, 21 ER 485	1–32, 284–87
Earl of Pembroke's Case (1379) Rot Parl 60–61	194
Earl of Plymouth v Hickman (1690) 2 Vern 167, 23 ER 712	60
Earl of Portmore v Taylor (1831) 4 Sim 182, 58 ER 69	333
Earl of Sefton, Re [1898] 2 Ch 378 (CA)	453–72
Earl of Suffolk v Greenville (1641) 3 Ch Rep 89, 21 ER 738	130
Early v Garrett (1829) 9 B & C 928, 109 ER 345	478
East-India Co v Vincent (1740) 2 Atk 83, 26 ER 451	297
Edgware Highway Board v Harrow Gas Co (1874) LR 10 QB 92	437

xx *Table of Cases*

Edwards v Burt (1852) 2 De G M & G 55, 42 ER 791	334
El Ajou v Dollar Land Holdings plc [1993] 3 All ER 717 (Ch D).....	387, 672
Elibank v Montolieu (1801) 5 Ves 737, 31 ER 832.....	576
Elkington & Co v Hurter [1892] 2 Ch 452 (Ch D)	482
Ellenborough, Re [1903] 1 Ch 697 (Ch D)	436, 441
Elliot v Cordell (1820) 5 Madd 149, 56 ER 852	575
Elliot v Elliot (1677) 2 Chan Cas 231, 22 ER 922.....	75–77, 82
Ellis v Selby (1836) 1 My & Cr 286, 40 ER 384.....	199
Ellison v Ellison (1802) 6 Ves Jun 656, 31 ER 1243.....	437
Equitable Life v Bowley [2003] EWHC 2263 (Comm), [2004] 1 BCLC 180	504
Erlanger v New Sombrero Phosphate Co (1878) LR 3 App Cas 1218.....	608, 651–52
Errington v Errington & Woods [1952] 1 KB 290 (CA).....	564
Evans v Bicknell (1801) 6 Ves Jun 174, 31 ER 998	478, 479, 480, 482
Evans v Chesshire (1806) Ves Sen Supp 300, 28 ER 532.....	331
Evans v Llewellyn (1787) 12 Bro CC 150, 29 ER 86.....	331
Eves v Eves [1975] 1 WLR 1338 (CA)	572, 579
Ewing v Orr Ewing (1883) 9 App Cas 34.....	88
Exchange Banking Co, Re (1882) 21 Ch D 519	658
Exchange Telegraph v Central News [1897] 2 Ch 48 (Ch D)	257
Exchange Telegraph v Gregory [1896] 1 QB 147 (CA).....	257
Eyre v Countess of Shaftesbury (1722) 2 P Wm 103	579
Eyre v Hughes (1876) LR 2 Ch D 148	354
Eyre-Williams, Re [1923] 2 Ch 533 (Ch D).....	659
F & C Alternative Investments (Holdings) Ltd v Barthelemy [2011] EWHC 1731 (Ch)	497
Fane v Fane (1681) 1 Vern 30, 23 ER 284	187
Farepak Food and Gifts Ltd, Re [2006] EWHC 3272 (Ch), [2007] 2 BCLC 1, [2009] EWHC 2580 (Ch), [2010] 1 BCLC 444	672
Farrow Finance Co Ltd (in liq) v Farrow Properties Ltd (in liq) [1999] 1 VR 584	666
Fattal v Walbrook Trustees (Jersey) Ltd [2010] EWHC 2767 (Ch), [2012] Bus LR D7	644
Fawcett v Whitehouse (1829) 1 Russ & M 132, 39 ER 51.....	668
Feilden v Slater (1869) LR 7 Eq 523	221
Ferris v Weaven [1952] 2 All ER 233	560
FHR European Ventures LLP v Mankarious [2011] EWHC 2999 (Ch).....	670
Finch v Throckmorton (1597) BL MS Harl 6686 f 222v.....	2, 31, 32
Fisher v Brooker [2009] UKHL 41, [2009] Bus LR 1334	651
Floyd v Nangle (1747) 3 Atk 567, 26 ER 1127.....	484
Foley v Hill (1844) 1 Ph 399, 41 ER 683	654
Formby v Barker [1903] 2 Ch 539 (CA).....	220, 223, 226
Forrester v Waller (1741) unreported	245, 247
Foskett v McKeown [1997] 3 All ER 392 (CA), [2001] 1 AC 102 (HL)	383, 387, 388–90, 580, 665

Foster v Charles (1830) 6 Bing 396, 130 ER 1333	478
Foster v Vassall (1747) 3 Atk 587, 26 ER 1138	103, 109
Fountain v Coke (1674) 1 Mod 107, 86 ER 768.....	43
Fountain v Gnales (1687) Comberbach 59, 90 ER 343.....	44
Fountain v Guavers (1683) 2 Shower KB 333, 89 ER 971	44
Fountain v Guavers (1683) Skinner 146, 90 ER 68	44
Foveaux, Re [1895] 2 Ch 501 (Ch D)	534–39
Franks v Bollans (1868) LR 3 Ch App 717	668
Fraser Edmiston Pty Ltd v AGT (Qld) Pty Ltd [1988] 2 Qd 1 (QSC)	609
Fribance v Fribance [1957] 1 WLR 384 (CA).....	620
Friend v Brooker [2009] HCA 21, (2009) 239 CLR 129.....	497
Frith v Cartland (1865) 2 Hem & M 417, 71 ER 525.....	366, 371
Fry v Lane (1889) LR 40 Ch D 312	354
Furnis v Leicester (1619) Cro Jac 474, 79 ER 404	478
Furs Ltd v Tomkies (1936) 54 CLR 583.....	668
Futter v Futter [2010] EWHC 449 (Ch), [2010] STC 982	146, 666
Galambos v Perez [2009] SCC 48, [2009] 3 SCR 247	497
Gallard v Hawkins (1884) 27 Ch D 298	148
Gallard, Re [1897] 2 QB 8.....	659
Gambrell v Nivens 275 SW 3d 529 (2008).....	203
Gardner v Hart (1676) 73 SS 329	45
Garmonsway v Raglan Developments Ltd [2009] NZHC 488	664
Garrett v Wilkinson (1848) 2 De G & Sm 244, 64 ER 110.....	78
Gartside v Outram (1856) 3 Ju (NS) 39	254, 261
Gascoigne v Thwing (1685) 1 Vern 366, 23 ER 526	60
Gawton v Lord Dacres (1590) 1 Leo 220, 74 ER 201	588
Gee v Pritchard, (1818) 2 Swanst 402, 36 ER 670.....	245, 252
Gibbons v Wright (1954) 91 CLR 423 (HCA)	79
Gibbs v Rumsey (1813) 2 Ves & Bea 294, 35 ER 331.....	187, 198
Gilchester Properties Ltd v Comm [1948] 1 All ER 493.....	482
Gillies v Keogh [1989] 2 NZLR 327	636
Gilmour v Coats [1949] AC 426 (HL)	199, 541, 548
Gissing v Gissing [1971] AC 886 (HL).....	572, 574, 611–42
Giumelli v Giumelli [1999] HCA 10, (1999) 196 CLR 101.....	604, 662, 664
Glamorganshire Iron & Coal Co v Irvine (1866) 4 F & F 947, 176 ER 861	478
Glanvill's Case, see Glanville v Courtney	
Glanville v Courtney 2 Bulst 301, 80 ER 1139, Cro Jac 343, 79 ER 294, 1 Rolle 111, 81 ER 365, 1 Rolle 219, 81 ER 444, Moo 838, 72 ER 839, 118 SS 440	3, 28
Godbold v Freestone (1694) 3 Lev 406, 83 ER 753	134
Goldie v Getley (No 3) [2011] WASC 132	664
Goode v Martin [2001] EWCA Civ 1899, [2002] 1 WLR 1828.....	644
Googe and Smith's Case (1615) 1 Rolle 278, 81 ER 487, 3 Bulst 115, 81 ER 98	2, 20, 31
Gordon v Gordon (1821) 3 Swanst 400, 36 ER 910	146
Gore v Gore (1722) 10 Mod 501, 88 ER 827	130
Gorringe v Taylor (1596) C 33/91 f 424, 117 SS 210 no 235, 224 no 332.....	28

xxii *Table of Cases*

Gosman, Re (1880) 15 Ch D 67.....	145, 146, 147
Gowland v De Faria (1810) 17 Ves Jun 20, 34 ER 8.....	331
Grand Junction Canal Co v Dimes (1850) 2 H & T 92, 47 ER 1610	668
Grant v Edwards [1986] Ch 638 (CA)	575, 636, 639, 642
Gray v Johnston (1868) LR 3 HL 1.....	665
Green v Bridgeman (1757) Wilmot 58, 97 ER 22.....	49
Green's WT, Re [1985] 3 All ER 455 (Ch D).....	145
Greenhalgh v Arderne Cinemas Ltd [1951] Ch 286 (CA).....	410
Greenwood v Bennett [1973] 1 QB 195 (CA).....	598
Gregory v Gregory (1815) G Coop 201, 35 ER 530.....	652
Grey v Grey (1677) 1 Chan Cas 296, 22 ER 809, Rep Temp Finch 338, 23 ER 185, 2 Freem 6	63–85
Griggs (R) Group Ltd v Evans [2004] EWHC 1088 (Ch), [2005] Ch 153	100, 112–13
Grimstone, ex parte (1771) 2 Ves 74, 30 ER 527	466
Grove-Grady, Re [1929] 1 Ch 557 (CA).....	535–36, 540–41
Guavers v Fountain (1687) 2 Freeman 99, 22 ER 1083	47
Guinness plc v Saunders (1987) 3 BCC 271 (Ch D), [1990] 2 AC 663 (HL).....	523, 668
Gwembe Valley Development Co Ltd v Koshy (No 3) [2002] 1 BCLC 478 (Ch D), [2003] EWCA Civ 1048, [2004] 1 BCLC 131.....	669
Gwynne v Heaton (1778) 1 Bro CC 1, 28 ER 949	331, 344
Gwynne, Re (1912) 5 DLR 713 (CA Ont).....	535
H v H (1947) 63 TLR 645	560, 563
H v S [2002] EWCA Civ 79, [2003] QB 965.....	667
H's Settlement, Re [1909] 2 Ch 260 (Ch D)	579
Hall v Ewin (1888) LR 37 Ch D 74	203
Hallett's Estate, Re; Knatchbull v Hallett; Cotterill v Hallett (1879–80) 13 Ch D 696 (CA).....	357–92
Halton International Inc v Guernroy Ltd [2006] EWCA Civ 801, [2006] WTLR 1241	670
Hancock v Smith (1889) 41 Ch D 456 (CA)	384
Harcourt v White (1860) 28 Beav 303, 54 ER 382	650, 651
Harding v Glyn (1739) 1 Atk 469, 26 ER 299	190
Hardwicke v Johnson [1978] 1 WLR 683 (CA)	636
Harford v Lloyd (1855) 20 Beav 310, 52 ER 622	371
Harris v Horwell (1708) Gilb Rep 11, 25 ER 8.....	60
Harris v Truman (1881) 7 QBD 340, affd (1882) 9 QBD 264 (CA).....	377, 378
Harrison v Gurney (1821) 2 Jac & W 563, 37 ER 743	108
Hartley v Cummings (1847) 5 CB 247, 136 ER 871	438
Harwood v Tooke (1812) 2 Sim 192, 57 ER 76	333
Hastings, Re (1887) 35 Ch D 94.....	653, 655
Hastings Bass, Re [1975] Ch 25 (CA)	225
Haycraft v Creasy (1801) 2 East 92, 102 ER 303.....	479
Haywood v Brunswick Permanent Building Society (1881) 8 QBD 403 (CA)	221–23

Heard v Pilley (1869) 4 Ch App 548 (CA)	434, 435, 436
Heath v Pugh (1881) 6 QBD 345 (CA) 428, affd (1882) LR 7	
App Cas 235 (HL)	428
Heaven v Pender (1882) LR 11 QBD 503	496
Hedley Byrne and Co Ltd v Heller & Partners Ltd [1964]	
AC 465 (HL)	495, 496
Henchman v A-G (1826) 2 Sim & St 498, 57 ER 436	117
Henchman v A-G (1834) 3 My & K 485, 40 ER 185	148
Henderson v Merrett Syndicates Ltd (No 1) [1995] 2 AC 145 (HL)	497, 669
Heningbrook v Steel (1676) 73 SS 301	45
Hercy v Dinwoody (1793) 2 Ves Jun 87, 30 ER 536	650, 651
Heseltine v Heseltine [1971] 1 WLR 342 (CA)	579
Heskell v Continental Express Ltd [1950] 1 All ER 1033	496
Hicks v Powell (1869) LR 4 Ch App 741	113
Hicks v Sallitt (1854) 3 De G M & G 782, 43 ER 307	654
Hilton v Barker Booth and Eastwood (a firm) [2005] UKHL 8,	
[2005] 1 WLR 567	497
Hine v Hine [1962] 1 WLR 1124 (CA)	563, 616, 620
Hitchcock v Giddings (1817) 4 Price 135	481
Hoburn Aero Components Ltd's Air-Raid Distress Fund,	
Re [1946] Ch 86 (Ch D)	385
Hodgson v Marks [1971] Ch 892 (CA)	449
Hodley v Healey (1819) 6 Madd 181, 56 ER 1062	652, 653
Holland v Holland (1869) LR 4 Ch 449	655
Holmes, Re (1827) 4 Russ 182, 38 ER 774	579
Holroyd v Marshall (1862) 10 HL Cas 191, 11 ER 999	436, 437
Holthausen, ex parte (1874) LR 9 Ch App 722	111
Hood, Re [1931] 1 Ch 240 (CA)	542
Hope v Hope (1854) De GM & G 328, 43 ER 534	579
Hopkinson, Re [1948] 1 All ER 346	545
Hopper v Conyers (1866) 2 LR Eq 549	389, 390
Hospital Products Ltd v United States Surgical Corp (1984)	
156 CLR 41	593, 669
Hovenden v Lord Annesley (1806) 2 Sch & Lef 607	648–50, 654–57
How v Stile (1675) 2 Levinz 126, 83 ER 481	43
How v Stile (1675) 3 Keble 430, 84 ER 805	43
How v Stiles (1674) 3 Keble 283, 84 ER 722	43
How v Style (1674) 1 Freeman 384, 89 ER 286	43
Howard E Perry & Co Ltd v British Railways Board [1980]	
1 WLR 1375 (Ch D)	605
HR v JAPT [1997] OPLR 123	668
Hughes v La Baia Ltd [2011] UKPC 9, [2011] 2 P & CR DG7	651
Hughes v Lloyd [2007] EWHC 3133 (Ch), [2008] WTLR 473	667, 668
Huguenin v Baseley (1807) 14 Ves Jun 275, 33 ER 526	177
Hummeltenberg, Re [1923] 1 Ch 237 (Ch D)	540
Hunt v Luck [1901] 1 Ch 45 (Ch D)	567
Hunt v Severs [1994] 2 AC 350 (HL)	667

Hunter, In re, <i>Hunter v Attorney-General</i> [1899] AC 309 (HL).....	199
Hurst v <i>Picture Theatres Ltd</i> [1915] 1 KB 1 (CA)	564
Hussey v <i>Palmer</i> [1972] 1 WLR 1286 (CA)	578, 579
Iliffe v <i>Trafford</i> [2001] All ER (D) 306 (Dec)	491
<i>Indata Equipment Supplies Ltd v ACL Ltd</i> [1998] FSR 248 (CA)	489
<i>Independent Trustee Services Ltd v GP Noble Trustees Ltd</i> [2009] EWHC 161 (Ch), [2012] EWCA Civ 195	665–66
<i>Inland Revenue Commissioners v Baddeley</i> [1955] AC 572 (HL).....	192, 199
<i>Inland Revenue Commissioners v Temperance Council</i> of <i>Christian Churches of England and Wales</i> (1926) 136 LT 27	542
<i>International Corona Resources Ltd v LAC Minerals Ltd</i> (1987) 25 DLR (4th) 504, affd [1989] 2 SCR 574.....	669
<i>Isaac v Gompertz</i> (1786) unreported.....	186
<i>Jackson v Cator</i> (1800) 5 Ves Jun 688, 31 ER 806.....	297
<i>Jackson v Hobhouse</i> (1817) 2 Mer 483, 35 ER 1025.....	576
<i>Jackson v Petrie</i> (1804) 10 Ves Jun 164, 32 ER 807.....	107
<i>Jacobus Estates Ltd v Marler</i> (1913) 114 LT 640n (HL)	500
<i>James Roscoe (Bolton) Ltd v Winder</i> [1915] 1 Ch 62 (Ch D).....	383, 607
<i>James v Allen</i> (1817) 3 Mer 17, 36 ER 7.....	198–99
<i>James v Smith</i> [1891] 1 Ch 384 (Ch D).....	435
<i>James v Williams</i> [2000] Ch 1 (CA)	667
<i>James, ex parte</i> (1803) 8 Ves 337, 32 ER 385	514, 522
<i>Jansen v Jansen</i> [1965] 3 All ER 363 (CA)	563
<i>Jasmine Trustees Ltd v Wells & Hind (a firm)</i> [2007] EWHC 38 (Ch), [2008] Ch 194.....	663, 666
<i>JD Wetherspoon plc v Van de Berg & Co Ltd</i> [2009] EWHC 639 (Ch).....	664, 670
<i>Jefferys v Boosey</i> (1854) 4 HLC 814, 10 ER 681 (HL).....	248–53
<i>Jenkin's and Randall's Contract, Re</i> [1903] 2 Ch 362 (Ch D).....	599
<i>Jenks' Case</i> (1676) 6 St Tr 1189.....	35
<i>Jennings v Rice</i> [2002] EWCA Civ 159, [2003] 1 P & CR 8.....	640
<i>Jermy v Best</i> (1819) 1 Sim 373, 57 ER 617	650
<i>Jess B Woodcock & Sons v Hobbs</i> [1955] 1 WLR 152 (CA).....	559, 560
<i>Jesse v Bennett</i> (1856) 6 De G M & G 609, 43 ER 1370	665
<i>JJ Harrison (Properties) Ltd v Harrison</i> [2001] EWCA Civ 1467, [2002] 1 BCLC 162.....	670
<i>John Alexander's Clubs Pty Ltd v White City Tennis Club Ltd</i> [2010] HCA 19, (2010) 241 CLR 1.....	497, 605, 607
<i>John v Dodwell & Co Ltd</i> [1918] AC 563 (PC)	665
<i>Johnson v Gallagher</i> (1861) 3 D F & J 494, 45 ER 969.....	653
<i>Johnstone v Beattie</i> (1843) 10 Cl & F 42, 8 ER 657	579
<i>Jones v Kernott</i> [2009] EWHC 1713 (Ch), [2010] WLR 2401, [2010] EWCA Civ 578, [2010] WLR 2401, [2011] UKSC 53, [2011] 3 WLR 1121	612–14, 617–19, 621–22, 626–28, 632–34, 636–38, 641–42
<i>Jones v Nabbs</i> (1718) Gilb Rep 146, 25 ER 102	60

Jones v Smith [1954] 1 WLR 1089 (Ch D).....	565
Jones v Tuberville (1792) 2 Ves Jun 11, 30 ER 498	651, 654
Jones, Re (1929) 45 TLR 259	541
Jyske Bank (Gibraltar) Ltd v Spjeldnaes [1999] 2 BCLC 101 (Ch D)	666
Kauter v Hilton (1953) 90 CLR 86 (HCA).....	79
Kaye v Robertson [1991] FSR 62 (CA)	264
Keech v Sandford (1726) Sel Cas Ch 61, 25 ER 223	187, 292, 604, 670
Keene, Re [1922] 2 Ch 475 (CA)	595
Kelly & Co, ex parte (1879) 11 Ch D 306	490
Kelly v Cooper [1993] AC 205 (PC).....	593
Kemp v Kemp (1801) 5 Ves Jun 849, 31 ER 891	188
Kendar v Milward (1702) 2 Vern 440, 23 ER 882	60
Kennedy v Earl of Cassillis (1818) 2 Swan 313, 36 ER 635	108
Keppell v Bailey (1834) 2 My & K 517, 39 ER 1042	210–10, 212–13, 219–20, 227, 232, 299
Kernott v Jones see Jones v Kernott	
Kerr v Baranow 2011 SCC 10, [2011] 1 SCR 269	611, 630
Kerr, Re [1927] NZLR 177	388
Kilcarne Holdings Ltd v Targetfollow (Birmingham) Ltd [2004] EWHC 2547 (Ch), [2005] 2 P & CR 8 affd [2005] EWCA Civ 1355, [2006] 1 P & CR DG20	663
Kinder v Miller (1701) Prec Ch 171, 24 ER 83	60
King v David Allen & Sons [1916] 2 AC 54 (HL)	226, 564
King v Hamlet (1835) 3 Cl & F 218, 6 ER 1419.....	333, 346
Kirk v Webb (1698) 2 Freem 229, 22 ER 1177, Prec Ch 84, 24 ER 41	60
Kirkby Ravensworth Hospital, ex parte (1808) 15 Ves Jun 305, 33 ER 770	189
Kirkham v Peel (1880) 28 WR 941, affd (1880) 44 LT 195 (CA).....	378–79
Kitechnology BV & Ors v Unicor GmbH Plastmaschinen & Ors [1995] FSR 765 (CA).....	262
Knight v Knight (1840) 3 Beav 148, 49 ER 58	159, 427
Knight, Re (1937) 2 DLR 285 (Ont SC).....	548
Knox v Gye (1872) LR 5 HL 656.....	653, 654, 655, 657
LAC Minerals Ltd v International Corona Resources Ltd (1989) 61 DLR (4th) 14 (SCC)	605, 671
Minera Aquiline Argentina SA v IMA Exploration Inc (2007) 10 WWR 648	671
Lady Astley v Fountaine (1673) Rep t Finch 4, 23 ER 3.....	48, 59
Lady Bellasis v Compton (1693) 2 Vern 294, 23 ER 790	60
Lady Gorge's Case (1634) unreported, cited in Crisp v Pratt (1634/5) Cro Car 549, 79 ER 1072, Prolegomena, ch 13, s 10.....	73, 74, 75
Lake v Gibson (1729) 1 Eq Ca Abr 290	631
Lamb v Evans [1893] 1 Ch 218 (CA)	244, 254
Lamplugh v Lamplugh (1709) 1 P Wms 111, 24 ER 316	77
Lancaster v Handle Artists Management Ltd unreported, 15 September 2007, [2008] EWCA Civ 1111	670

Lands Allotment Co, Re [1894] 1 Ch 616 (CA)	658
Lane v Dighton (1762) Amb 409, 22 ER 274.....	389
Lashmar, Re, Moody v Penfold [1891] 1 Ch 258 (CA).....	115, 150–52
Last v Rosenfeld [1972] 2 NSWLR 923 (NSW SC).....	432
Latec Investments Ltd v Hotel Terrigal Pty Ltd (in liquidation) (1965) 113 CLR 265 (HCA).....	566
Latimer v Commissioners of Inland Revenue [2004] UKPC 13, [2004] 1 WLR 1466	645
Lavelle v Lavelle [2004] EWCA Civ 223, [2004] 2 FCR 418	73
Law Society v Habitable Concepts Ltd [2010] EWHC 1449 (Ch).....	645
Law Society v Isaac & Isaac International Holdings Ltd [2010] EWHC 1670 (Ch), [2011] WTLR 425	645
Le Cren Clarke, Re [1996] 1 WLR 288 (Ch D)	541
Leahy v A–G for New South Wales [1959] AC 457 (PC).....	199
Leakins v Clissel (1663) 1 Sid 146, 82 ER 1022.....	478
Lee v Lee [1952] 2 QB 489n	563
Lehman Brothers International (Europe), Re [2009] EWHC 3228 (Ch), [2010] 2 BCLC 301	357
Leigh & Sillivan Ltd v Aliakmon Shipping Co Ltd [1986] AC 785 (HL).....	231
Leslie Engineers Ltd [1976] 1 WLR 292 (Ch D).....	357
Lewis v Madocks (1810) 17 Ves 48, 34 ER 19.....	389
Lincoln v Wright (1859) 4 De G & J 16, 45 ER 6	79
Lind, Re [1915] 2 Ch 345 (CA).....	437
Lindsay Petroleum Co v Hurd (1874) LR 5 PC 221	651
Lindsley v Woodfull [2004] EWCA Civ 165, [2004] 2 BCLC 131.....	669
Lister v Pickford (1865) 34 Beav 576, 55 ER 757	655
Lister and Co v Stubbs (1890) 45 Ch D 1	380, 671
Lloyd's Bank Ltd v Bundy [1975] QB 326 (CA).....	354
Lloyd's Bank Ltd v Oliver's Trustee [1953] 1 WLR 1460 (Ch D)	562
Lloyds Bank Plc v Rosset [1991] 1 AC 107 (HL)	575, 619, 636
Lloyds TSB Bank Plc v Markandan & Uddin (a firm) [2012] EWCA Civ 65.....	645
Lockey v Lockey (1719) Prec Ch 518, 24 ER 232	653, 657
Lomax v Ripley (1855) 3 Sm & G 48, 65 ER 558.....	191
London & South Western Rwy Co v Gomm (1881) 20 Ch D 562	222–24, 231
London Borough of Hounslow v Twickenham Garden Development Ltd [1971] Ch 233 (Ch D)	564
Long v Bishop of Cape Town (1863) 1 Moo PC NS 411, 15 ER 756	311–16, 321
Lonrho plc v Fayed (No 2) [1992] 1 WLR 1 (Ch D)	662
Loosemore v Tiverton and North Devon Railway Co (1883) LT 162.....	376
Lord Ashburton v Pape [1913] 2 Ch 469 (CA).....	476
Lord Chedworth v Edwards (1802) 8 Ves June 46, 32 ER 268.....	370
Lord Compton's Case (1587) 3 Leo 197, 74 ER 629.....	229
Lord Cranstown v Johnston (1796) 3 Ves Jun 170, 30 ER 952	110–11, 113–14
Lord Dacre of the South, Re (1535)	194
Lord Falkland v Bertie (1696) 2 Vern 333, 23 ER 814	60

Lord Mohun v Lady Mohun (1671) Prolegomena 242.....	58
Lord North & Lord Dacres v Millett (1593) 117 SS 197 No [10].....	45
Lord Pawlet's Case (1685) 2 Vent 366, 86 ER 489.....	135
Lord Portarlington v Soulby (1834) 3 My & K 104, 40 ER 40.....	108
Lord Provost, Magistrates and Town Council of Edinburgh v The Lord Advocate (1879) 4 App Cas 823.....	390
Lord Winsor's Case (1611) Ley 31, 80 ER 608.....	13
Love v Baker (1665) 1 Ch Ca 67, 22 ER 698.....	108
Love v L'Estrange (1727) 5 Bro PC 59, 2 ER 532.....	135
Low v Bouverie [1891] 3 Ch 82 (CA).....	482
Luker v Dennis (1877) 7 Ch D 227.....	219–20
Lumley v Gye (1853) 2 El & Bl 216, 118 ER 749.....	219
Lumley v Wagner (1852) 1 De GM & G 604, 42 ER 687.....	219
Luxor (Eastbourne) Ltd v Cooper [1939] 1 All ER 623 (KBD), [1939] 4 All ER 411 (CA), [1941] AC 108 (HL).....	500, 501, 502, 508, 515
Lyde v Barnard (1836) 1 M & W 101, 150 ER 363.....	479
Lyell v Kennedy (1889) 14 App Cas 437.....	378–79, 588, 661
Lysaght v Edwards (1876) LR 2 Ch 499 (Ch).....	434
Macduff, In re [1896] 2 Ch 451 (CA).....	199
Macklin v Richardson (1770) Amb 694, 27 ER 491.....	247
Macmillan v Dent [1907] 1 Ch 107 (CA).....	251
Magdalen College Case, Warren v Smith (1615) 1 Rolle 151, 81 ER 394, 11 Co Rep 66, 77 ER 1235, Cro Jac 364, 79 ER 312.....	2, 11, 12, 13, 16, 20, 27
Maguire v Makaronis (1997) 188 CLR 449.....	669
Mainstream Properties Ltd v Young [2007] UKHL 21, [2008] AC 1.....	266
Manby v Scott (1659) 1 Sid 109, 82 ER 1000.....	560
Manisty's Settlement [1974] Ch 17 (Ch D).....	200
Mann v Stephens (1846) 15 Sim 377, 60 ER 665.....	213–14, 224
Mansell v Mansell (1732) 2 P Wms 678.....	665
Mansell v Valley Printing Co [1908] 1 Ch 567 (Ch D).....	251
Marquess of Northampton v Pollock (1890) 45 Ch D 190 (CA).....	429
Marriott, Re (1808) 2 Molloy 516.....	467
Mars UK Ltd v Teknowledge Ltd [1999] EWHC 226 (Pat), [2000] FSR 138.....	595
Martin v Strachan (1742) 2 Stra 1179, 93 ER 1111, Rolle, Abr, vol 2, fo 780.....	134
Mason, Re [1928] 1 Ch 385.....	659
Masters of Bedford Charity, In re (1819) 2 Swanst 470, 36 ER 696.....	186
Matthias v Yetts (1882) 46 LT (NS) 497.....	479
Mayer v Townsend (1841) 3 Beav 443, 49 ER 174.....	36
Mayor Aldermen and Burgesses of Gloucester v Wood (1843) 3 Hare 131, 67 ER 326.....	36
MCC Proceeds Inc v Lehman Bros International (Europe) [1998] 4 All ER 675 (CA).....	229
McCormick v Grogan (1869) LR 4 HL 82.....	663

xxviii *Table of Cases*

McGovern v A-G [1982] Ch 321 (Ch D).....	540, 544
McLaughlin v Duffill [2008] EWCA Civ 1627, [2010] Ch 1	434
McPhail v Doulton [1971] AC 424 (HL).....	200, 228, 580
McPherson v Watt (1877) 3 App Cas 254.....	668
Mercer and Moore, Re (1880) 14 Ch D 287.....	118
Meredith v Heneage (1824) 1 Simons 542, 57 ER 681.....	191
Merrick v Harvey (1649) Nels 48, 21 ER 786.....	45
Merriman v Ward (1860) 1 J & H 371, 70 ER 790	373
Merriman v Williams (1882) LR 7 App Cas 484.....	307, 311
Merryweather v Moore [1892] 2 Ch 518 (Ch D)	254
Metall und Rohstoff AG v Donaldson Lufkin and Jenrette Inc [1990] 1 QB 391 (CA).....	666
Metropolitan Bank v Heiron (1880) 5 Ex D 319.....	380, 480, 658
Metropolitan Petar v Mitreski [2003] NSWSC 262.....	306
Mettoy Pension Trustees Ltd v Evans [1990] 1 WLR 1587 (Ch D)	200
Meux v Smith (1843) 11 Sim 410, 59 ER 931.....	431
Middleton v Baldock [1950] 1 All ER 708	565, 577
Middleton v Pollock (1876) 4 Ch D 49.....	378
Middleton v Spicer (1783) 1 Bro CC 201, 28 ER 1083	146
Midland Bank v Cooke [1995] 4 All ER 562 (CA).....	574, 580, 630, 637
Midland Bank Trust Co Ltd v Green [1981] AC 513 (HL).....	446
Millar v Taylor (1769) 4 Burr 2303, 98 ER 201.....	240, 247
Miller v Bain [2002] 1 BCLC 266 (Ch D)	670
Mills v Drewitt (1855) 20 Beav 632, 52 ER 748	657
Moens v Heyworth (1842) 10 M & W 147, 152 ER 418.....	479
Moggridge v Thackwell (1802) 7 Ves Jun 36, 32 ER 15.....	163, 181–83, 186, 194, 198
Montagu's Settlement, Re [1987] Ch 264 (Ch D).....	665
Morgan v Stephens (1861) 3 Giff 226, 66 ER 392	665
Morice v Bishop of Durham (1804) 9 Ves Jun 399, 32 ER 65 (MR), (1805) 10 Ves Jun 522, 32 ER 947 (LC)	157–201
Morison v Moat (1851) 9 Hare 241, 68 ER 492.....	254, 255, 257, 259, 260, 261, 262
Morland v Cook (1868) LR 6 Eq 252	221
Morris v Whiting (1913) 15 DLR 254 (Manitoba KB).....	432
Morrison v Coast Finance Ltd (1965) 55 DLR (2d) 710 (BCCA).....	354
Mortlock v Buller (1804) 10 Ves Jun 292, 32 ER 857.....	435
Mouat, Re [1899] 1 Ch 831 (Ch D)	380
Mountain v Styak [1922] NZLR 131.....	448
Movitex Ltd v Bulfield [1988] BCLC 104 (Ch D).....	526
Moxhay v Inderwick (1847) 1 De G & Sm 708, 63 ER 1261	208–9
Muggeridge v Stanton (1859) 1 De G, F & J 107, 45 ER 300	36
Mumford v Gething (1859) 7 CB (NS) 305, 141 ER 834.....	438
Murad v Al-Saraj [2005] EWCA Civ 959, [2005] WTLR 1573	523, 597
Murray v Heath (1831) 1 B & Ald 804, 109 ER 985.....	254
Mutton v Peat [1899] 2 Ch 556 (Ch D)	384
Nab v Nab 10 Mod 404, 88 ER 783.....	60

Nabb Brothers Ltd v Lloyds Bank International (Guernsey) Ltd [2005] EWHC 405 (Ch).....	664
Nabob of Arcot v East India Co (1791) 3 Bro CC 292, 29 ER 544, (1792) 4 Bro CC 180, 29 ER 841	96
National Anti-Vivisection Society v Inland Revenue Commissioners [1946] KB 185 (CA), [1948] AC 31 (HL)	529–55
National Discount Co of Ireland v Burr, <i>The Times</i> , 23 January 1885, 3	353
National Provincial Bank Ltd v Ainsworth [1965] AC 1175 (HL).....	557–80, 616, 635
National Provincial Bank Ltd v Hastings Car Mart Ltd [1964] Ch 9 (Ch D), [1964] Ch 665 (CA)	559
National Westminster Bank v Morgan [1985] AC 686 (HL)	354
Navy Health Ltd v Federal Commissioner of Taxation (2007) 163 FCR 1.....	547
Nelan v Downes (1919) 23 CLR 546 (HCA)	548
Nelson v Nelson [1995] HCA 25, (1995) 184 CLR 538	76, 84
Ness v O’Neil [1916] 1 KB 706 (CA).....	428
Neste Oy v Lloyd’s Bank Plc [1983] 2 Lloyds Rep 658	672
Nevil v Saunders (1686) 1 Vern 415, 23 ER 555, 1 Eq Cas Abr 383.....	150
Nevill v Snelling (1880) LR 15 Ch D 679.....	354
Neville Estates v Madden [1962] Ch 832 (Ch D)	548
New Zealand Netherlands Society ‘Oranje’ Inc Ltd v Kuys [1973] 1 WLR 1126 (PC)	523, 593, 669
New, Re [1901] 2 Ch 534 (Ch D).....	600
Newbery v James (1817) 2 Mer 446, 35 ER 1011.....	255
Newgrosh v Newgrosh (1950) 210 LT Jo 108.....	562
Newton v Preston (1699) Prec Ch 103, 24 ER 50	60
Nichrotherm Electrical Co Ltd v Percy [1956] RPC 272, [1957] RPC 207 (CA).....	259
Nightingale v Goulbourn (1848) 2 Ph 594, 41 ER 1072	199
Niru Battery Manufacturing Co v Milestone Trading Ltd (No 1) [2002] EWHC 1425 (Comm), [2002] 2 All ER (Comm) 705	672
Nisbet & Potts’ Contract, Re [1905] 1 Ch 391 (Ch D), [1906] 1 Ch 386 (CA)	224, 227, 229, 231, 656
Nocton v Lord Ashburton [1914] AC 932 (HL).....	473–98, 500
Nolan v Nolan [2004] VSCA 109	667
Norman v Theodore Goddard [1991] BCLC 1028 (Ch D).....	504
Norris v Chambres (1861) 29 Beav 246, 54 ER 621, (1861) 3 De GF & J 583, 45 ER 1004.....	112–14
North v Crompton (1671) 1 Ch Cas 176, 22 ER 759	52, 187
North-West Transportation Co Ltd v Beatty (1887) 12 App Cas 589 (PC).....	393–422
Norton v Florence Land and Public Works Co (1877) 7 Ch D 332	114
Nott v Hill (1682) 1 Vern 167, 23 ER 391.....	331
O’Connor v Hart [1985] 1 NZLR 159 (JCPC).....	354
O’Hanlon v Logue [1906] 1 IR 247	548, 549
O’Rorke v Bolingbroke (1877) LR 2 App Cas 814.....	354
Oatway, Re [1903] 2 Ch 356 (Ch D).....	382–83

Obee v Bishop (1859) 1 De G F & J 137, 45 ER 311.....	655
OBG v Allan [2008] 1 AC 1 (HL)	262
Okeover v Lady Pettus, Reports, case 347.....	82
Old Colony Trust Co v Welch (1938) 25 F Supp 45 (DC Mass).....	535
Old Gate Estates Ltd v Alexander [1949] 2 All ER 822 (CA).....	565
Oldham v Litchford (1705) 2 Freem 284, 22 ER 1214.....	60
Ommanney v Butcher (1823) Turn & R 260, 37 ER 1098.....	191
Onslow v Wallis (1849) 1 Mac & G 506, 41 ER 1361.....	149–52
Organ v Sandwell [1921] VLR 622 (SC Vic) 630	432
Ormrod v Huth (1845) 14 M & W 401.....	478
Orr, Re (1917) 40 OLR 567.....	548
Osbond v Morgan (1851) 9 Hare 43.....	576
Oxenden v Lord Compton (1793) 2 Ves Jun 69, 30 ER 527	461, 466
Oxley v Hiscock [2004] EWCA Civ 546, [2005] Fam 211	575, 614–15, 637–39
P & O Nedlloyd BV v Arab Metals Co (The UB Tiger) (No 2) [2006] EWCA Civ 1717, [2007] 1 WLR 2288	651, 656, 657
Page v Hewetts Solicitors (a firm) [2011] EWHC 2449 (Ch), [2012] 1 P & CR DG3	670
Palette Shoes Pty Ltd v Krohn (1937) 58 CLR 1	437
Palin v Gathercole (1844) 1 Coll 565, 63 ER 545	245
Pallant v Morgan [1953] Ch 43 (Ch D).....	439–40, 663, 667
Panama, New Zealand and Australian Royal Mail Co (1870) 5 Ch App 318	229
Panweld Trading Pte Ltd v Yong Kheng Leong [2012] SGHC 57.....	648, 664, 670
Papamichael v National Westminster Bank plc (No 2) [2003] EWHC 164 (Comm), [2003] 1 Lloyd's Rep 341	672
Paragon Finance plc v DB Thakerar & Co (a firm) [1999] 1 All ER 400 (CA).....	377, 450, 643–72
Pares, Re (1879) 12 Ch D 333	459
Parker v Brooke (1804) 9 Ves 583, 32 ER 729.....	575
Parsons v Spooner (1846) 5 Hare 102, 67 ER 845	591
Partington v Reynolds (1858) 4 Drew 253, 62 ER 98	490
Pascoe v Turner [1979] 1 WLR 431 (CA)	605
Pasley v Freeman (1789) 3 TR 51, 100 ER 450.....	478–81
Patman v Harland (1881) LR 17 Ch D 353	221
Paul (Printing Machinery) Ltd v Southern Instruments [1964] RPC 118.....	259
Pavesich v New England Life Insurance Co 50 SE 68 (1905) (Georgia SC).....	263–64
Peachy v Duke of Somerset (1721) 1 Stra 447, 93 ER 626	140
Peacock v Evans (1809) 16 Ves Jun 512, 33 ER 1079	331, 333
Pearne v Lisle (1749) Amb 75, 27 ER 47	104
Pechar (deceased), Re [1969] NZLR 574	671
Peconic Industrial Development Ltd v Chio Ho Cheong [2009] HKFCA 16, [2009] WTLR 999	648

Pecore v Pecore [2007] SCC 17, [2007] 1 SCR 795 (SCC)	73, 84
Peek v Derry (1887) 37 Ch D 541	479
Peek v Gurney (1873) LR 6 HL 377 (HL)	486, 491
Peffer v Rigg [1977] 1 WLR 285 (Ch D)	666
Penn v Lord Baltimore (No 1) (1745) Ridgeway Cases temp Hardwicke 332, 27 ER 847	88, 91, 93–95, 98
Penn v Lord Baltimore (1755) Dick 273, 21 ER 273	98
Penn v Lord Baltimore (No 2) (1750) 1 Ves Sen 444, 27 ER 1132	87–114
Pennell v Deffell (1853) 4 De G M & G 372, 43 ER 551	366–68, 371–73
Perceval v Phipps (1813) 2 V&B 19, 35 ER 225	247
Permanent Building Society v Wheeler (1994) 14 ACSR 109	497
Permanent Trustee Co v Scales (1930) 30 SR (NSW) 391 Eq	432
Peso Silver Mines Ltd v Cropper (1965) 56 DLR (2d) 117 (BCCA), [1966] SCR 673, (1966) 58 DLR (2d) 1 (SCC)	500, 505, 523, 526–27
Peter Pan Manufacturing Corp v Corsets Silhouette Ltd [1964] 1 WLR 96 (Ch D)	259
Peterson v Parrys and Hickman (1597) C 33/93 f 125, 117 SS 263 no 248	29
Pettitt v Pettitt [1968] 1 WLR 443 (CA), [1970] AC 777 (HL)	562, 563, 572, 574, 577, 611–42
Phillips v Phillips (1862) 4 De G F & J 208, 45 ER 1164	565
Phipps v Boardman [1964] 1 WLR 993, [1964] 2 All ER 187 (Ch D), [1965] Ch 992, [1965] 2 WLR 839 (CA), affd sub nom Boardman v Phipps	581–610
Pickering v Stamford (1795) 2 Ves Jun 581, 30 ER 787	651
Pierson v Garnet (1786–87) 2 Bro CC 38, 29 ER 20	190, 193, 197
Pike v Hoare (1763) 2 Eden 182, 28 ER 867, Amb 428, 27 ER 286	109
Pilmer v Duke Group Ltd (in liq) [2001] HCA 31, 207 CLR 165	497, 593
Pinkett v Wright (1843) 2 Hare 120, 67 ER 50, affd (1846) 12 Cl & Fin 764 (HL)	372
Pitt v Holt [2011] EWCA Civ 197, [2011] 3 WLR 19	225, 497, 665
Pitt v Pelham (1670) 1 Ch Rep 149, 21 ER 574, 1 Ch Cas 176, 22 ER 750, 2 Freem 134, 22 ER 1110	36, 58
Plunkett v Barclays Bank Ltd [1936] 2 KB 107	377
Pole v Pole (1747/8) Ves Sen Supp 54, 28 ER 454	77
Pollard v Photographic Co (1888) 40 Ch D 345	254, 255
Pope v Curl 2 Atk 342, 26 ER 608	245, 247, 252
Port Line Ltd v Ben Line Steamers Ltd [1958] 2 QB 146	220
Porter's Case (1592) 1 Co Rep 22b, 76 ER 50	163
Portman Building Society v Hamlyn Taylor Neck (a firm) [1998] 4 All ER 202 (CA)	646
Powell v Merrett (1853) 1 Sm & Giff 381, 65 ER 167	147
Practice Statement (Judicial Precedent) [1966] 1 WLR 1234 (HL)	542
Preston v Dania (1872) LR 8 Ex 19	342, 344, 355
Price v Blakemore (1843) 6 Beav 507, 49 ER 922	389

Primeau v Granfield 184 F 480 (1911).....	383, 388
Prince Albert v Strange (1849) 2 De G & Sm 652, 64 ER 293, (1850) 13 Jurist (OS) 45, 1 Mac & G 25, 45 ER 1171, 1 H & Tw 1, 47 ER 1302, (1850) 13 Jurist (OS) 109 (LC).....	235–67
Public Trustee v A-G (1997) 42 NSWLR 600.....	555
Pullan v Koe [1913] 1 Ch 9 (Ch D).....	135
Pulvers (a firm) v Chan [2007] EWHC 2406 (Ch), [2008] PNLR 9.....	645
Pybus v Smith (1790) 1 Ves 189, 30 ER 294.....	490
Pype v Spinola (after 1558) c3/143/81.....	7
Quennell v Maltby [1979] 1 WLR 318.....	578
R v Coggan (1805) 6 East 431, 102 ER 1352.....	117, 148
R v Eton College (1857) 8 El & Bl 610, 120 ER 228.....	310–311
R v Fletcher (1862) Le & Ca 180, 169 ER 1353.....	36
R v Inhabitants of North Nibley (1792) 5 Term Reports 21, 101 ER 12.....	160
Radmanovich v Nedeljkovic (2001) 52 NSWLR 641.....	306
Ramsden v Dyson (1866) LR 1 HL 129 (HL).....	27, 269–304, 640
Ramshire v Bolton (1869) 8 LR Eq 294.....	481, 491
Rasmanis v Jurewitsch (1969) 70 SR (NSW) 407.....	671
Read's Case (1605) 5 Co Rep 33b, 77 ER 103.....	490, 588
Redgrave v Hurd (1881) 20 Ch D 1.....	386, 481
Reese River Silver Mining Co v Smith (1869) LR 4 HL 64.....	481
Reeves v Pope [1914] 2 KB 284 (CA).....	565
Regal (Hastings) v Gulliver [1967] 2 AC 134, [1942] 1 All ER 378 (HL).....	499–528, 668
Regentcrest plc v Cohen [2001] 2 BCLC 81 (Ch D).....	514
Rhodes v Bate (1865) LR 1 Ch 252.....	484
Rhone v Stephens [1994] 2 AC 310 (HL).....	222
Richardson v Hamilton (1733) unreported.....	95, 106
Richardson, Re [1920] 1 Ch 423 (CA).....	650
Riddle v Emerson (1682) 1 Vern 108, 23 ER 348.....	60
Riddle v Riddle (1952) 85 CLR 202.....	600
Rimmer v Rimmer [1953] 1 QB 63 (CA).....	562, 574
Rither v Tempest (1581) Ch C Ch 145, 21 ER 186, 117 SS 370 No [10].....	45
Robb v Green [1895] 2 QB 1.....	254–55
Roberdeau v Rous (1738) 1 Atk 543, 26 ER 342.....	102–3
Robertson v Wilkie (1753) Amb 177, 27 ER 119.....	104
Robins v Incentive Dynamics Pty Ltd (2003) 45 ACSR 244.....	666
Robinson v National Bank of Scotland Ltd [1916] SC (HL) 154.....	493–94
Robinson, Re [1911] 1 Ch 502 (Ch D).....	659
Rochevoucauld v Boustead (1896) 65 LJ Ch 794 (Ch D), [1897] 1 Ch 196 (CA).....	79, 423–52, 657, 663
Rock Permanent Benefit Building Society v Kettlewell [1956] EGD 315.....	561
Rogers v Hosegood [1900] 2 Ch 388 (CA).....	223–24
Rolfe v Gregory (1865) 4 De G J & S 576, 46 ER 1042.....	665
Roper v Radcliffe (1712) 9 Mod 181, 88 ER 387.....	47
Roper v Williams (1822) Turn & R 18, 37 ER 999.....	211

Rosenfeldt v Olson [1985] 2 WWR 502.....	671
Royal Bank of Scotland plc v Etridge (No 2) [2001] UKHL 44, [2002] 2 AC 773.....	354, 569
Royal Brunei Airlines v Tan [1995] 2 AC 378 (PC).....	564
Royal North Shore Hospital of Sydney v A–G (1928) 60 CLR 396.....	554, 555
Rushworth’s Case (1676) 2 Freem Chy 13, 22 ER 1026	520
Russell-Cooke Trust Co v Prentis [2002] EWHC 2227 (Ch), [2003] 2 All ER 478	385
Ryall v Rolle (1749) 1 Atk 165, 26 ER 107	367, 370
Ryall v Rowles (1750) 1 Ves Snr 348, 27 ER 1074.....	130
Salmon, Re (1889) 42 Ch D 351	492
Salomon v A Salomon and Co Ltd [1897] AC 22 (HL).....	400
Salt v Cooper (1880) 16 Ch D 544.....	363, 386
Saltman v Campbell (1948) 65 RPC 203 (HC, CA)	258–59, 262
Samuel v Newbold [1906] AC 461 (HL).....	355
Saunders v Vautier (1841) 4 Beav 115, 49 ER 282 (MR), Cr & Ph 240, 41 ER 482 (LC).....	135, 188, 586
Saunders and Benning v Smith and Maxwell (1838) 3 My & Cr 710, 40 ER 1100	235
Savage v Hubble [1953] EGD 150	560
Sayers, ex parte (1800) 5 Ves Jun 169, 31 ER 528	367
Scales v Baker (1859) 28 Beav 91, 54 ER 300.....	390
Schmidt v Rosewood Trust Ltd [2003] 2 AC 709 (PC).....	200
Schobelt v Barber (1966) 60 DLR (2d) 519.....	671
Schroeder v Mendl (1877) 37 LT 452.....	491
Scmla Properties Ltd v Gesso Properties (BVI) Ltd [1995] BCC 793 (Ch D)	118
Scott v Scott (1963) 109 CLR 649	388, 389, 668
Scott v Surman (1742) Willes 400, 125 ER 1235	367
Scowcroft, Re [1898] 2 Ch 638 (Ch D).....	541
Scroope v Scroope (1663) 1 Ch Cas 27, 22 ER 677, 2 Freem Ch 171, 22 ER 1138, Prolegomena, ch 13, s 2.....	73, 75, 83
Security Trust Co v Royal Bank of Canada [1976] AC 503 (PC).....	431
Selangor United Rubber Estates Ltd v Cradock (No 3) [1968] 2 All ER 1073 (Ch D)	664
Sempra Metals Ltd v IRC [2007] UKHL 34, [2008] AC 561	391
Shales v Shales (1701) 2 Freem 252, 22 ER 1191.....	60, 77
Shallcross v Oldham (1862) 2 J & H 609, 70 ER 1202.....	433
Shalson v Russo [2003] EWHC 1637 (Ch), [2005] Ch 281.....	383, 387, 672
Shapland v Smith (1780) 1 Bro CC 75, 28 ER 994	128
Sharp v Jackson [1899] AC 419 (HL)	359
Sharpe, Re [1892] 1 Ch 154 (CA)	658
Sharpe (A Bankrupt), Re [1980] 1 WLR 219 (Ch D).....	567
Shaw v Foster (1872) LR 5 HL 321	434
Shell UK Ltd v Total UK Ltd [2011] QB 86 (CA).....	231
Shelly v Nash (1818) 3 Madd 232, 56 ER 494.....	331, 346

xxxiv *Table of Cases*

Shephard v Cartwright [1953] Ch 728 (CA), revd on different point [1955] AC 431 (HL)	73, 649–50, 660–62
Short v Short [1960] 3 All ER 6	577
Shrewsbury v Blount (1841) 2 Man & G 475, 133 ER 836	479
Silverstone v Silverstone [1953] 1 All ER 556 (PDAD).....	560, 577
Sinclair v Brougham [1914] AC 398 (HL).....	357, 376, 380, 381, 382, 387, 485, 564
Sinclair Investment Holdings SA v Versailles Trade Finance Ltd (in admin recship) [2007] EWHC 915 (Ch), (2007) 10 ITELR 58	664
Sinclair Investments (UK) Ltd v Versailles Trade Finance Ltd [2010] EWHC 1614 (Ch), [2011] WTLR 839, affd [2011] EWCA Civ 347, [2011] Bus LR 1126	380, 603, 663, 670–72
Singh v Anand [2007] EWHC 3346 (Ch).....	451
Sir George Sands' Case (1676) Hard 405, 145 ER 520, (1679) Hard 488, 145 ER 561, (1667) 1 Sid 403, 82 ER 1182, 2 Freem 129, (1669) 3 Ch Rep 33, 21 ER 720, (1670) Nelson 130, 21 ER 808	137, 139, 140, 143
Sir John Fryar v Vernon (1724) 9 Mod 124, 88 ER 355, Select Cases Temp King 5, 25 ER 191	101
Sir John Fryer v Bernard (1724) 2 P Wms 261, 24 ER 722	101
Skett v Whitmore (1705) 2 Freem 280, 22 ER 1211	60
Sleight v Lawson (1857) 3 K & J 292, 69 ER 1119.....	490
Slim v Croucher (1860) 1 De G F & J 518, 45 ER 462	480–83, 488, 491
Smethurst v Hastings (1884) 30 Ch D 490.....	492
Smith v Baker (1737) 1 Atk 385, 26 ER 246.....	77–78
Smith v Chadwick (1882) 20 Ch D 27, overturned on different grounds (1884) LR 9 App Cas 187 (HL).....	479
Smith v Clay (1767) 3 Bro CC 646n, 29 ER 743.....	650, 652–53
Smith v Kay (1859) 7 HLC 750, 11 ER 299n.....	346
Smith v Matthews (1861) 3 De G F & J 139, 45 ER 831	432
Smith v Pockocke (1854) 2 Drew 197, 61 ER 694	656
Smith New Court Securities Ltd v Scrimgeour Vickers (Asset Management) Ltd [1997] AC 254 (HL)	644
Smith's Will Trusts, Re [1962] 1 WLR 763 (CA).....	552
Smout v Ilbery (1842) 10 M & W 1, 152 ER 357.....	479
Soar v Ashwell [1893] 2 QB 390 (CA)	659, 661
Solowij & Ors v The Parish of St Michael & Ors [2002] SASC 408	306
South Australia Asset Management Corp v York Montague Ltd [1997] AC 191 (HL)	644
Southwood v A-G [2000] WTLR 1199 (CA).....	547
Space Investments Ltd v Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce Trust Co (Bahamas) Ltd [1986] 1 WLR 1072 (PC).....	357
Springette v Defoe [1992] 2 FLR 388 (CA)	634
Spycatcher see A-G v Guardian (No 2)	
Stack v Dowden [2007] UKHL 17, [2007] 2 AC 432.....	572, 575, 580, 612–15, 618–21, 626–27, 636–37, 639, 641–42

Stackhouse v Barnston (1805) 10 Ves Jun 453, 32 ER 921	650, 652, 654
Stamford's Case (1574) 2 Leo 223, 74 ER 496.....	588
State of South Australia v State of Victoria [1914] AC 283 (PC).....	96
Statek Corp v Alford [2008] EWHC 32 (Ch), [2008] WTLR 108	647, 670
Stenning, Re [1895] 2 Ch 433 (Ch D).....	384–85
Stewart v Stewart [1948] 1 KB 507 (CA)	560
Stiles v Cowper (1748) 3 Atk 692, 26 ER 1198	297
Stokes v Anderson [1991] 1 FLR 391 (CA).....	637, 639
Stone v Stone (1869) LR 5 Ch 74.....	656
Strachan, Re (1876) 4 Ch D 123	665
Strathmore v Bowes (1788) 2 Cox Eq Cas 28, 30 ER 14.....	575
Street v Denham [1954] 1 WLR 624.....	559, 560, 561, 578
Strode v Strode (1672) 2 Ch Cas 196, 22 ER 908, Reports, case 211, Prolegomena, ch 13, s 13	74
Sturgis v Champneys (1839) 5 My & Cr 97, 41 ER 308	576
Suhner & Co AG v Transradio Ltd [1967] RPC 329.....	259
Sutton, Re, Stone v A–G (1885) LR 28 Ch D 464	187
Swift v Hawkins (1768) 1 Dallas 17.....	105
Swiss Bank v Lloyd's Bank [1979] Ch 548 (Ch D)	220
Syndicat Northcrest v Amselem [2004] SCC 47, [2004] 2 SCR 551.....	548
Taddy & Co v Sterious & Co [1904] 1 Ch 354 (Ch D).....	226, 229
Tailby v Official Receiver (1888) 13 App Cas 523 (HL).....	437
Talbot v Jevers [1917] 2 Ch 363 (CA).....	148
Tanfield v Davenport (1638) Tothill 114	576
Tapp v Lee (1803) 3 Bos & P 367, 127 ER 200	478
Target Holdings Ltd v Priestley (1999) 79 P & CR 305 (Ch D).....	434
Target Holdings Ltd v Redferns (a firm) [1996] AC 421 (HL).....	645
Taylor Fashions Ltd v Liverpool Victoria Trustees Co Ltd [1982] QB 133 (Ch D).....	574
Taylor v Davies [1920] AC 636 (PC).....	649, 668
Taylor v Haygarth (1844) 14 Sim 8, 60 ER 259.....	146, 147, 148
Taylor v McHale [1948] EGD 299.....	565
Taylor v Plumer (1815) 3 M & S 562, 105 ER 721.....	367, 371, 386
Taylor, Re (1900) 81 LT 812	657
Tchenguz v Imerman [2011] EWCA Civ, [2011] Fam 116.....	244, 265–66
Terrapin Ltd v Builders' Supply Co (Hayes) Ltd [1967] RPC 375, [1960] RPC 12, (CA).....	259
Thompson v Earthy [1951] 2 All ER 235	560, 565
Thompson v Stanhope (1774) Amb 737, 27 ER 476.....	245, 247
Thompson's Trusts (1856) 22 Beav 506, 52 ER 1203	148
Thomson v Shakespeare (1859) Johnson 612, 70 ER 564, affd (1860) 1 De GF & J 399, 45 ER 413.....	199
Thorner v Major [2009] UKHL 18, [2009] 1 WLR 776.....	605
Thornton v Howe (1862) 31 Beav 14, 54 ER 1042.....	548–49
Tilley's Will Trusts, Re [1967] Ch 1179 (Ch D).....	382, 388
Tilt, Re (1896) 40 Sol Jo 224 (Ch D).....	436
Tipping v Clarke (1843) 2 Hare 383, 67 ER 157	241, 254, 255, 261
Tito v Waddell (No 2) [1977] Ch 106 (Ch D)	668

Tollemache, Re [1903] 1 Ch 457 (Ch D).....	600
Toller v Carteret (1705) 2 Vern 494, 23 ER 916	102
Tonson v Collins (1761) 1 Bl W 321, 96 ER 180	247
Topp v Roberts (1636) Toth 27, 21 ER 113	45
Townley v Bedwell (1801) 6 Ves Jun 194, 31 ER 1008	182
Transvaal Lands Co v New Belgium (Transvaal) Land and Development Co [1914] 2 Ch 488 (CA)	668
Trustees of the Property of Jones and Sons v Jones [1997] Ch 159 (CA).....	387
Tulk v Metropolitan Board of Works (1867) LR 3 QB 94.....	216
Tulk v Metropolitan Board of Works (1868) LR 3 QB 682 (Exchq).....	216
Tulk v Moxhay (1848) 2 Ph 774, 41 ER 1143, (1848) 1 Ha & Tw 105, 47 ER 1435, (1848) 18 LJ Ch 83	203–33
Tullett v Armstrong (1839) 1 Beav 1, 48 ER 838	576
Turner v Jacob [2006] EWHC 1317 (Ch), [2008] WTLR 307.....	383
Turner v Robinson (1860) 10 Ir Ch R 121 (MR), 510 (CA in Ch)	248, 251
Twedell v Twedell (1822) TR 1, 37 ER 992	333
Twinsectra Ltd v Yardley [2002] UKHL 12, [2002] 2 AC 164	200, 645, 672
Twyne's Case 3 Co Rep 80b, 76 ER 809	58
UB Tiger, The see P & O Nedlloyd BV v Arab Metals Co	
UCB Home Loans Corp Ltd v Carr [2000] Lloyd's Rep PN 754.....	645, 670
UCB Home Loans Corp Ltd v Grace unreported, 15 December 2010 (Ch D).....	645
Ulrich v Ulrich [1968] 1 WLR 180 (CA)	635
Ultraframe (UK) Ltd v Fielding [2005] EWHC 1638 (Ch), [2006] FSR 17	603
United Australia Ltd v Barclays Bank Ltd [1941] AC 1 (HL)	661
United Dominions Ltd v Brian Pty Ltd (1985) 157 CLR 1	589
United Pan-Europe Communications NV v Deutsche Bank AG [2000] 2 BCLC 461 (CA).....	669, 671
University of London v Yarrow (1857) 1 De G & J 72, 44 ER 649.....	534
Vaughan v Vaughan [1953] 1 All ER 209 (CA)	561
Venables v Hornby [2002] EWCA Civ 1277, [2002] STC 148.....	665
Verge v Somerville [1924] AC 496 (HL).....	543
Vezey v Jamson (1822) 1 Simons & Stuart 69, 57 ER 27	198
Wainwright v Home Office [2004] 2 AC 406 (HL)	264
Walker v Denne (1793) 2 Ves Jun 170, 30 ER 577.....	148
Walsh v Deloitte & Touche Inc [2001] UKPC 58, [2002] 4 LRC 454	669
Walsh v Lonsdale (1882) 21 Ch D 9	386
Ward, Re (1862) 31 Beav 1, 54 ER 1037	481
Warman International Ltd v Dwyer (1995) 182 CLR 544.....	520, 609
Warman v Seaman (1674) 1 Freeman 306, 22 ER 1227.....	59
Warren v Smith see Magdalen College Case	
Wassell v Leggatt [1896] 1 Ch 554.....	575, 659
Watchel v Watchel [1973] Fam 72 (CA).....	577
Watson, Re [1973] 1 WLR 1472 (Ch D).....	541
Webb v Mansell, <i>The Times</i> , 1 February 1877, 11	355
Webb v Rose (1732) unreported.....	245, 247

Webb v Stenton (1881) 11 QBD 518.....	490
Wedgwood, Re [1915] 1 Ch 113 (CA)	535–36
Weir v Bell (1878) 3 Ex D 238	478
Wellesley v Duke of Beaufort (1827) 2 Russ 1, 38 ER 236.....	460, 579
Wellesley v Wellesley (1828) 2 Bli NS 124, 4 ER 1078	460
Wells, Re [1933] Ch 29 (CA)	128, 147
Westdeutsche Landesbank Girozentrale v Islington LBC [1996] AC 669 (HL).....	78, 144–45, 375, 380, 387, 391, 605, 665, 672
Westfield v Davidson (1887) 3 TLR 362	478
Westminster Bank Ltd v Lee [1955] 2 All ER 883 (Ch D)	560, 565, 567–68
Wethered v Wethered (1828) 2 Sim 183, 57 ER 757	333
Whatman v Gibson (1838) 9 Sim 196, 59 ER 333	213–14, 218, 223, 224, 227–28
Whicker v Hume (1851) 14 Beav 509, 51 ER 381	199
Whitecomb v Jacob (1710) 1 Salk 160, 91 ER 149	367, 370
Widdowson v Harrington (1820) 1 J & W 533, 37 ER 471	650
Wilder v Pigott (1882) 22 Ch D 263	466
Williams v Bishop of Salisbury; Wilson v Fendall (1863) 2 Moo PC NS 375, 15 ER 943	325
Williams v Commissioners of Inland Revenue [1965] NZLR 395	436
Williams v Lord Lonsdale (1798) 3 Ves Jun 752, 30 ER 1255.....	117, 146–48
Williams v Williams (1817) 3 Mer 157, 36 ER 61.....	255
Williams and Glyn’s Bank v Boland [1981] AC 487 (HL)	569
Willoughby, Re (1885) 30 Ch D 324.....	579
Wilson v Hart (1817) 7 Taunt 295, 129 ER 118	434
Wilson v Hart (1866) 1 Ch App 463.....	220–21
Wilson v Moore (1834) 1 My & K 126, 39 ER 629.....	665
Windham v Windham (1668/9) 2 Freem Ch 127, 22 ER 1103, 3 Chan Rep 22, 21 ER 717, Prolegomena, ch 13, s 5	52, 73
Winter Garden Theatre (London) Ltd v Millennium Productions Ltd [1948] AC 173 (HL).....	564
Wintle v Nye [1959] 1 All ER 552 (HL).....	47
Wiseman v Beake (1690) 2 Vern 121, 23 ER 688.....	331
Wood, Re [1896] 2 Ch 596 (Ch D)	153
Wratten v Hunter [1978] 2 NSWLR 367 (NSW SC)	432
Wray v Steele (1814) 2 V & B 388, 35 ER 366	631
Wylde v A-G (NSW) [1948] HCA 49, (1948) 78 CLR 224	306
Yovatt v Winyard (1820) 1 Jac & W 394, 37 ER 425	254, 255, 256, 261, 262
Zong, The, Gregson v Gilbert (1783) 3 Doug 232, 99 ER 629.....	170

Table of Legislation

National Legislation (alphabetical)

Act for the Encouragement of Learning, etc 1710	239, 247, 251
Administration of Estates Act 1925	
s 45(1)(d).....	118
s 46(1)(vi).....	118
Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1938	
s 12	118
Agricultural Holdings Act 1975	294
Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986	534
Bankruptcy Act 1861	346
Bankruptcy Act 1869	
s 23	118
Business Corporations Act 1985 (Can).....	415–17
Pt XX	417
s 2(1)	416
s 6(4)	417
s 106(3)	417
s 109(1)	417
s 120	415–16
(7)	415–17
(c).....	416
(8).....	416
s 173	417
s 183	417
s 188(5)	417
s 189	417
s 238	421
ss 239–40	417
s 241	417, 421
s 242	417, 422
Business Corporations Act [2011] (Quebec)	
ss 122–33	416
s 132	416–17
s 133	417
Business Corporations Act 1978 (Sask)	
s 115(8.1)	416
Business Corporations Act 2002 (BC)	
s 149	416
Chantries Act 1545	164
Chantries Act 1547	164

xi *Table of Legislation*

Charitable Uses Act 1601	160, 162, 189, 195, 197
preamble	543
Charitable Uses Act 1736.....	165–66, 182–84, 190
Charitable Uses Act 1891.....	165
Charities Act 2006	
ss 1–3	160
s 2	554
s 3(2).....	541
s 4	160
Charities Act 2011	
Pt 6.....	549
s 3(2)(i).....	551
(l).....	551
s 4(2).....	541
Church Discipline Act 1840	
s 16	324
Civil Partnership Act 2004	574
s 65	615
Civil Procedure Acts Repeal Act 1879.....	118
Civil Procedure Rules 1998 (SI 1998/3132)	
r 5(2).....	644
(5).....	644
r 17.4	644
Pt 64 PD para 64A.1A	524, 601
Common Law Procedure Act 1852	
s 24	118
Common Law Procedure Act 1854	
s 78	605
Common Law Procedure Act 1860	344
Companies Act 1929	
s 152	526
s 372	513, 517
Companies Act 1948.....	587
s 205	526
Companies Act 1985	
ss 309A–309C.....	526
Companies Act 2006	
Pt 10 ch 2.....	524
s 170(4).....	524
s 174	504
s 175	524, 525, 526
(4)–(6).....	524
s 176	524–25
(4).....	520, 521, 525, 528
s 180(4).....	524
(a).....	525
(b)	525

s 232 526
 (4) 524, 525, 526
 s 239(3) 416
 Companies (Table A) Regulations 1929 527
 reg 72 526
 Companies (Table A) Regulations 1948
 reg 84 526
 Companies (Tables A to F) Regulations 1985 (SI 1985/805)
 reg 70 526
 reg 85 526
 Constitutional Reform Act 2005
 Pt 2 120
 Copyright Act 1911 245, 253, 261
 s 31 253, 257, 262
 Copyright Act 1956
 s 46(4) 262
 Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988
 s 171(1)(e) 262
 Court of Chancery Act 1852 460
 Court of Chancery Procedure Act 1852
 s 61 129
 Cruel Treatment of Cattle Act 1822 531
 s 1 531
 Cruelty to Animals Act 1835 531
 Cruelty to Animals Act 1849 531
 Cruelty to Animals Act 1854 531
 s 3 531
 Cruelty to Animals Act 1876 532–34, 536–37, 539–40
 s 2 533
 s 3(1) 533, 534
 (2) 533
 (3) 533
 (4) 533
 (6) 533
 s 5 533
 s 12 533
 s 22 533
De Prerogativa Regis see Land of Lunatics Act 1324
 Directors Liability Act 1890 483
 Divorce Reform Act 1969 578
 Earl Aylesford’s Estate (Amendment) Act 1882 353
 Family Law Act 1996
 ss 30–33 573
 Felony Act 1870
 s 1 139
 Forfeiture Act 1870
 s 1 118

xlii *Table of Legislation*

Forfeiture Act 1982.....	139
Habeas Corpus Act 1679	66
Huddersfield Improvement Act 1848	272, 282
Human Rights Act 1998	264–66
Income Tax Act 1918	
s 37	535
Infants' Property Act 1830	
s 28	462
Infants' Relief Act 1874	355
Inheritance Act 1833.....	134, 155
Insolvency Act 1986	
s 178	118
Intestates Estates Act 1884	
s 4	118, 150, 153
Irish Land Act 1870	296
Joint Stock Companies Letters Patent Act 1869 (Can)	400
Knackers Act 1844.....	531
Land Charges Act 1972.....	573
s 2	573
s 4	569, 573
Land of Idiots Act 1324	462
Land of Lunatics Act 1324 (<i>De Prerogativa Regis</i>)	461–62, 464–66, 579
Land Registration Act 1925	573
s 70(1)(g).....	559, 569–70
Land Registration Act 2002	154
s 29	573
s 34	573
s 79(1).....	154
(2).....	154
sch 1(2)	569
sch 3(2)	569
Larceny Act 1901.....	361
Law of Property Act 1925	
s 40	434
s 53(1)(b).....	423, 426, 432, 434, 436, 442–49, 451–52
(2).....	436, 442, 443, 447, 450
s 62	570
s 148	118
s 199	567
Law of Property Amendment Act 1859.....	134, 155
Law of Property (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1989	
s 2	434
Law Reform (Husband and Wife) Act 1962.....	561
Law Reform (Married Women and Tortfeasors) Act 1935	
s 2	576
Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1949	579
Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1970	
s 2(1).....	615

Laws relating to Usury and to the Enrolment of Annuities Act 1854.....	334
Limitation Act 1623	
s 1	650, 654
s 3	650
Limitation Act 1939.....	662
s 26(6).....	661
s 19	649–50
Limitation Act 1980	
s 2	647
s 21	647–49
(1).....	645, 648
(a).....	646, 647
s 32	646
(1)(b).....	661
s 35	644
Lord Aylesford’s Estate Act 1882	352
Lord Aylesford’s Estate (Amendment) Act 1884	
s 4	352
Lord Tenterden’s Act see Statute of Frauds Amendment Act 1828	
Lunacy Act 1842.....	457
Lunacy Act 1890.....	465, 471
ss 90–107	457
s 108(2).....	463
s 117	463
s 120	463
s 124	463, 467
s 128	467
Lunacy Regulation Act 1853.....	462–63
s 26	459
s 42	457
s 116	463
Magna Carta 1215	
s 32	118
Married Women’s Property Act 1882	
s 17	560–63, 616, 641
Married Women’s Property Acts 1870–93.....	576
Married Women’s (Restraint on Anticipation) Act 1949	
s 1	576
Matrimonial Causes Act 1973.....	611
Matrimonial Causes (Property and Maintenance) Act 1958	
s 2	559
Matrimonial Homes Act 1967	575–76
s 2	573
Matrimonial Proceedings and Property Act 1970.....	611
s 37	611, 615
Mental Health Act 1959	468
Misrepresentation Act 1967	
s 2(1).....	496

Money-lenders Act 1900	355
Parry Sound Town Act 1950 (Ont)	
s 1	395
Poisoned Flesh Prohibition Act 1864.....	531
Praemunire Statute 1353	21, 31
Praemunire Statute 1402	3, 21, 31
Property of Lunatics Act 1852	
s 1	462
Property (Relationships) Act (NZ)	
s 4	84
Ramsden Estate Act 1867	302–3
Ramsden’s Estate (Leasing) Act 1859	279, 283–84, 302–3
Registration Act 1864 (Ind).....	113
Sales of Reversions amending Act 1867	334, 341
Settled Land Act 1882.....	352
Solicitors Act 1888.....	361
Stamp Duties Act 1898 (NSW).....	81
s 49(2)(A)(e)	81
Statute of Anne, see Act for the Encouragement of Learning, etc 1710	
Statute of Elizabeth, see Charitable Uses Act 1601	
Statute of Frauds 1677	37, 75
s 4	434, 435, 436
s 6	479
s 7	423, 426, 435, 439, 443, 444, 451
ss 7–9	59
s 8	58, 60, 436, 442, 442
Statute of Frauds Amendment Act 1828.....	479
Statute of Tenures 1660	118
Statute of Uses 1536.....	26, 119, 137, 150, 151
Statute of Wills 1540.....	163
Supreme Court of Judicature Act 1873	362–63, 375
s 25(11).....	386
Supreme Court of Judicature Acts 1873–75	571
Torts (Interference with Goods) Act 1977	
s 3(1)(a).....	605
(b).....	605
Town and Country Planning Act 1947	84
Town Gardens Protection Act 1863	
s 1	215
Trustee Act 1888	
s 1(3).....	649
s 8	649
Trustee Act 1925.....	583, 600
s 1	583
s 57	601
(1).....	600
s 61	146, 601, 646
s 68(17).....	646, 649

Variation of Trusts Act 1958 600

National Legislation (Regnal Year)

27 Edw III c 1 (1353) 31
17 Ric II c 6 (1393) 491
4 Hen IV c 23 (1402) 31
4 Hen VII c 4 (1488) 12
32 Hen VIII c 46 (1540) 460
13 Eliz c 5 (1571) 77
13 Eliz c 10 (1571) 16–17
 s 2 5
14 Eliz c 11 (1572) 16
 s 5 16
18 Eliz c 2 (1576) 12, 16–17
12 Car II c 24 (1660) 460
2 & 3 An c 12 (1703) 67
3 Geo II c 30 (1729) 124
59 Geo III c 60 (1819) 315
7 & 8 Vic c 21 (1844) 272–73, 285, 289
11 & 12 Vic c 14 (1848) 272
14 & 15 Vic c 83 (1851) 460

International Treaties and Conventions

Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration
of Marriages 1962 578
Convention on the Nationality of Married Women 1957 578
Convention on the Political Rights of Women 1952 578
European Human Rights Convention 1950
 Art 8 265

1

The Earl of Oxford's Case (1615)

DAVID IBBETSON*

A. INTRODUCTION

IT IS THE fate of cases, over time, to be classified and pigeon-holed to the extent that their original sense, or senses, are eroded out of view. The *Earl of Oxford's Case*¹ is no exception to this. It appears in White and Tudor's *Leading Cases in Equity*² as the principal case dealing with relations between Chancery and the Common Law, reflecting the very sharp focus on this issue in the reported judgment; and recent legal historians have placed it firmly in the context of the dispute over jurisdiction between Sir Edward Coke and Thomas Egerton, Lord Ellesmere.³ This was, undoubtedly, one of the issues in the case. As with most Equity cases in the

* I am grateful to Steven Churches, David Hoyle, Richard Hoyle, Neil Jones, Colin Lizieri, Mike Macnair, Richard Nolan and Graham Virgo for assistance and comments; they bear no responsibility for errors or misinterpretations that remain. Particular thanks are due to the Master, Fellows and Scholars of Magdalene College, Cambridge, for permission to consult and quote from their archives.

Unless otherwise stated, manuscript references are to sources in The National Archives, London. Other conventional abbreviations used are: MCC—Magdalene College Cambridge; HLS—Harvard Law School; BL—British Library; CUL—Cambridge University Library; HMC—Historical Manuscripts Commission. Many of the archival documents are transcribed and translated by Nina Green at <<http://www.oxford-shakespeare.com/documents.html>>. When referring to State Papers I have added references to the volume and page of the relevant calendars: Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII ('L & P'), Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth ('CSPD'). The dating of the documents by the editors of the calendars is very unreliable. Spelling has been modernised throughout.

¹ (1615) Chan Rep 1, 21 ER 485. The very brief report at Tot 126, 28 ER 143 sub nom *Comes Oxon' v Neeth*, is of no value.

² EP Hewitt and JB Richardson (eds), *White and Tudor's Leading Cases in Equity*, 9th edn (London, Sweet & Maxwell, 1928) 1.615.

³ JP Dawson, 'Coke and Ellesmere Disinterred: The Attack on the Chancery in 1616' (1941) 36 *Illinois Law Review* 127; JH Baker, 'The Common Lawyers and the Chancery: 1616' (1969) 4 *Irish Jurist* 368; LA Knafla, *Law and Politics in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, CUP, 1977) 171–73; M Fortier, *The Culture of Equity in Early Modern England* (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2005) 76–81 (cf 'Coke, Ellesmere, and James I' (1998) 51 *Renaissance Quarterly* 1255). See too CW Brooks, *Law Politics and Society in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, CUP, 2008) 142–52.

period, it existed in relation to an actual or a potential decision at Common Law, in this case the decision of the Court of King's Bench in the *Magdalen College Case, Warren v Smith*.⁴ The *Magdalen College Case* had held for one party in the complex of litigation, Magdalene College Cambridge, acting through its Master Barnaby Goche and its Bursar John Smith, while the *Earl of Oxford's Case* in Chancery found for the other party, Henry, the Earl of Oxford. It was unavoidable, therefore, that the issue of the proper relationship between Common Law and Equity should have been raised. Moreover, alongside the *Magdalen College Case* and the *Earl of Oxford's Case* there was a reported habeas corpus action, *Googe and Smith's Case*,⁵ in which the King's Bench was asked to rule on the legitimacy of imprisonment by order of the Chancery when there had already been a judgment at Common Law. But careful reading of the records suggests that it was only one issue in the case, and a relatively minor one at that. Ellesmere's speech, as reported, was directed at this point alone; but there is some room for doubt whether it was ever actually delivered, and it should not be allowed to mask the broader issues in the litigation.

It is as well to sketch in this background at the start.⁶ The question whether Chancery had a power to act after judgment had been given at Common Law had been rumbling since the early years of the sixteenth century.⁷ The matter had been formally discussed by the Common Law judges in *Finch v Throckmorton* in 1597,⁸ and had there been resolved against Chancery intervention. Egerton, then Lord Keeper and not yet created Lord Ellesmere and elevated to the office of Lord Chancellor, may for the time being have accepted this. However, a contemporary poem to him by the poet Samuel Daniel, whose patron Egerton was, portrays him as holding the balance between the excessive rigour of the law and the rule of unbridled conscience;⁹ and it may be that this reflects Egerton's own perception of his role. In any event, from the beginning of the reign of James I he began to award injunctions against the enforcement of Common Law judgments, to the disapproval of the Common Law judges. Thomas Fleming, Chief Justice of the King's Bench from 1607, oversaw the use of legal means against these Chancery injunctions: habeas corpus applications to release those imprisoned by the Chancery for refusing to obey such

⁴ (1615) 1 Rolle 151, 81 ER 394; 11 Co Rep 66, 77 ER 1235; Cro Jac 364, 79 ER 312.

⁵ (1615) 1 Rolle 278, 81 ER 487.

⁶ Dawson (n 3); Baker (n 3); Knafla (n 3) 155–81.

⁷ JH Baker, *Oxford History of the Laws of England*, VI (Oxford, OUP, 2003) 173–79.

⁸ *Finch v Throckmorton* (1597) BL MS Harl 6686 f 222v (Coke's MS report), 118 S[elden] S[society] 441; Coke, *Third Institute*, 124; *Fourth Institute*, 86. Dawson (n 3) 134–35.

⁹ S Daniel, *A panegyrike congratulatorye deliuered to the Kings most excellent Maestie at Burleigh Harrington in Rutlandshire* (1603), sig C, 'To Sir Tho: Egerton Knight, Lord Keeper of the Great Seale of England'. For Daniel and his relation to Egerton, see J Pitcher, 'Samuel Daniel's Gift of Books to Lord Chancellor Egerton' (2005) 17 *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 216.

injunctions, and threats of indictments under the Statute of Praemunire (1402) for acting contrary to Common Law judgments. The situation was exacerbated when Fleming was succeeded by Coke in 1613. In *Glanville v Courtney* (1614–15)¹⁰ the friction between the two courts—and between the two men—came to a head with the Chancery re-imprisoning a man who had been released on habeas corpus by the King's Bench; and an attempt to resolve the problem in Parliament came to nothing. At this point the *Earl of Oxford's Case* arose, its report focusing on the legitimacy of the Chancery decree. The whole question was then referred to the Privy Council, and in June 1616 the King himself gave a speech in the Star Chamber affirming the legitimacy of Chancery intervention.¹¹

Yet behind the litigation were the parties, the facts and the eventual result. Neither the college nor the Earl of Oxford would have been particularly interested in the legal niceties or the fight between the Chief Justice and the Lord Chancellor; they simply wanted to win. We can reconstruct the facts behind the dispute in some detail, and in doing so we may cast some doubt on the story which has been told by biographers and by historians of Magdalene College and the University of Cambridge, who have not always appreciated the significance of the legal devices which were used or the subtleties of the parties' tactics in the litigation and in their attempts to get the conflict resolved in their own interests.

This chapter will examine in turn the land transactions which constitute the factual background to the litigation, the litigation itself and its contextual significance, and lastly the issue for which the *Earl of Oxford's Case* has, for better or worse, become famous.

B. THE LAND TRANSACTIONS

Travel north by punt from the centre of Cambridge, and within a few minutes you reach Magdalene College. There, on a modern building, is a gargoyle of a sixteenth-century Genoese moneylender, Benedict Spinola. Spinola is vilified in college tradition as the man who in 1575 cheated the college out of a potentially very valuable plot of land in London, began to build on it, and in a few years sold it on to the Earl of Oxford at a great profit. It is these transactions that we must examine carefully.

The land which was to be the subject of the dispute was originally the property of the Priory of Holy Trinity, Christchurch. It had been surrendered to the Crown in 1532 as a result of unpaid debts, and had been granted

¹⁰ *Glanville v Courtney* 2 Bulst 301, 80 ER 1139; Cro Jac 343, 79 ER 294; 1 Rolle 111, 81 ER 365; 1 Rolle 219, 81 ER 444; Moo 838, 72 ER 839; 118 SS 440.

¹¹ JP Sommerville (ed), *King James VI and I: Political Writings* (Cambridge, CUP, 1995) 204, esp at 215.

to Thomas, Lord Audley in 1534.¹² Audley died in 1544, and it came to the newly-founded Magdalene College under his will, together with the rectory of the church of St Catherine Cree.¹³ Just outside the city walls, the land was known as the ‘Great’ or ‘Convent’ (or ‘Covent’) garden, and was approximately seven acres in extent. It lay between Bishopsgate to the west and Aldgate to the east, and was bounded to the south by Houndsditch and to the north by Hog Lane, later known as Petticoat Lane.¹⁴ For the time being it was little more than low-grade land, leased to one Thomas Casye at a rent of £9 per year;¹⁵ the Chancery litigation of the early seventeenth century was to describe it as having been a laystall, or rubbish tip, for the city of London.¹⁶

Almost immediately the land and rectory were leased for 50 years to Laurence Owen, a gunfounder whose property was contiguous to the college’s land, at a rent of £20 per year.¹⁷ According to the report of the commissioners enquiring into the affairs of the University in 1546, the rent was divided into two parts, £11 for the rectory and £9 for the land.¹⁸ This was a significant part of the college’s total annual income of £44.9s.6d.¹⁹ There was nothing unlawful in the college’s making a lease for 50 years, but Audley’s executors clearly thought that it was unwise. Exercising the power to make statutes for the college granted to them under Audley’s will, they therefore took steps to provide that the college might in future make leases for at the most 10 years.²⁰ They were, however, very slow, and it was not until 1555 that the statutes were in fact given to the college.²¹ Already, in 1547, the then Master Richard Carr and the fellows had made a lease of the reversion of the land for a further 21 years, from 1595 to 1616, to one Richard Noke, point-maker of Cambridge, at the same rent of £20 per year.²²

¹² *Victoria County History, London*, vol 1, 471.

¹³ PCC will dated 19 April 1544, proved 18 Feb 1545: PROB 11/31 f 3.

¹⁴ P Cunich and R Hyam, ‘Lost Inheritance: the College’s City of London Property at Aldgate’ (1991–92) 36 *Magdalene College Magazine and Record (New Series)* 42, 43–44.

¹⁵ PROB 11/31 f 3, at f 5.

¹⁶ C 78/291 no 18 m 2.

¹⁷ Lease referred to in C66/1128 m 6.

¹⁸ E 315/440 f 33v. To the same effect, *Earl of Oxford’s Case* 1 Chan Rep 1, 21 ER 485 erroneously printed as £40 and £9 (for variants between print and manuscript reports of the case, see below text after n 167); the same figure is given in SP 1/196 f 73 (L & P 19.2 477). The statement in SP 12/103 f 11 (CSPD 1547–80 493) that the division was £12.10s for the rectory and £7.10s for the land is inaccurate, but suggests that in reality it might have been treated as a lump sum payment of £20.

¹⁹ E 315/440 ff 32–33v; P Cunich, D Hoyle, E Duffy and R Hyam, *A History of Magdalene College Cambridge, 1428–1988* (Cambridge, CUP, 1994) 47.

²⁰ SP 12/103 f 3 (CSPD 1547–80 493); SP 15/39 f 141 (CSPD Addenda 1580–1625 520); SP 1/196 f 73 (L & P 19.2 477).

²¹ Cunich *et al* (n 19) 55.

²² SP 12/103 f 11 (CSPD 1547–80 493); date from patent making grant to Spinola. For Noke, who had been irregularly appointed university stationer some years previously, see D McKitterick, *History of Cambridge University Press*, vol 1 (Cambridge, CUP, 1992) 46–47.

Magdalene was not at all a wealthy college, 'by far the poorest of the colleges in Cambridge' at this time.²³ By the early 1570s, under the mastership of Roger Kelke, matters had become so bad that tradesmen were refusing to deal with the college, and only provided necessaries on the credit of the President, William Bulkeley.²⁴ It was in this context that it turned to its land in London to see if it was possible to increase the revenue from it. Contact was made between Kelke and Benedict Spinola, a Genoese merchant, moneylender to the Queen and one of the wealthiest men in London,²⁵ who was by then renting part of the Covent garden.²⁶ The proposal was that the land should be conveyed in fee farm to Spinola at a rent of £15 per year (perhaps originally £30), substantially more than what the college was then receiving.²⁷ Not all the Fellows were in favour of this, and one, John Bell, petitioned Lord Burghley to intervene to prevent the transfer.²⁸ But Bell's voice was clearly unable to prevail in the college, since in December 1574 it moved to grant the land to Spinola, together with the rectory.

This was not altogether simple. Leaving aside the limitation of leases to 10 years in the college's own statutes,²⁹ any grant to Spinola would come up against a parliamentary statute of 1571 which, inter alia, rendered void any feoffment or lease for more than 21 years or three lives made by a college to any person or persons, bodies politic or corporate.³⁰ In an attempt to get round this restriction, the college and Spinola undertook some rather complex manoeuvres: instead of conveying the property directly to Spinola, it was agreed to use the Queen as an intermediary. The essence of

²³ Cunich *et al* (n 19) 47.

²⁴ *Ibid*, 75–76, quoting SP 12/127 f 28 (dated 12 December 1578).

²⁵ For Spinola, see GD Ramsay, 'The Undoing of the Italian Mercantile Colony in Sixteenth Century London' in NB Harte and KG Ponting (eds), *Textile History and Economic History* (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1973) 22, 41–43.

²⁶ Spinola's name appears on a list of those renting land at this time (clearly as sub-tenants from the college: SP 12/288 f 63 (CSPD 1601–03 313) (undated)). See too SP 1/196 f 73 (L & P 19.2, 477), where John Bell, a fellow of the college, refers to 'one Benedict Spinola, having obtained part of the said former term in parcel of the said gardens'. The editors' dating of this document to 1544 is impossible, since Bell could not have held his fellowship until c1570 (JA Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (Cambridge, CUP, 1922), sub nom).

²⁷ SP 12/288 f 63 (CSPD 1601–03 313) refers to 'one of the college tenants so that he may have the gardens only, in fee farm, will presently pay to the college by year' £30; but the first use of the word 'college' is interlined as an addition, so it may well be that this refers to Spinola, who was the college's sub-tenant. If so, it suggests that he might originally have been offering to pay the larger sum to the college.

²⁸ SP 1/196 f 73 (L & P 19.2 477).

²⁹ Above, n 20.

³⁰ Stat 13 Eliz c 10 s 2 (*Statutes of the Realm*, 4 544). For the statute and the colleges' response, see S Bendall, C Brooke and P Collinson, *History of Emmanuel College, Cambridge* (Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 1999) 129–31. The Queen was not above ignoring the statute: in 1579 she granted Merton College's manor of Malden to the Earl of Arundel for 2,000 years at a rent of £40 per year: GH Martin and JRL Highfield, *History of Merton College, Oxford* (Oxford, OUP, 1997) 169.

the agreement was encapsulated in the five provisions of an indenture of 10 December 1574:³¹

- a) the college covenanted to grant to the Queen the rectory and the Covent garden, receiving £25 per year for the rectory and £15 per year for the garden;
- b) in exchange, Spinola covenanted to obtain from the Queen the rectory and the garden, provided that the college had duly made the conveyance to her;
- c) provided all this occurred, the college undertook to use its best endeavours to obtain parliamentary confirmation of the grant of the garden to Spinola;
- d) Spinola covenanted to convey the rectory to the college's nominee, free of any incumbrances imposed on it by him; and
- e) Spinola covenanted to make a further deed to the college giving a right to distrain for unpaid rent, with a backstop right of re-entry should the rent be still unpaid after a year.

In pursuance of this agreement, three days later the college by separate indentures granted the garden and the rectory to the Queen, at rents of £15 per year and £25 per year respectively, with a proviso that if she did not convey them to Spinola by 1 April 1575 the college's grants to her would be void and the college would have a right of re-entry. The indentures were duly acknowledged in the Chancery on 26 January 1575 by the college's attorneys: that of the land by Roland Broughton of the Inner Temple and that of the rectory by Thomas Walter of Gray's Inn.³² Three days later, by separate letters patent under the great seal, the Queen granted the garden and the rectory to Spinola in fee.³³

The traditional analysis of this transaction sees Spinola as the villain of the piece, laying his hands on valuable property for far less than its true value; Burghley is portrayed as Spinola's willing accomplice, serving his royal mistress by obtaining such favourable terms for the royal moneylender; and Kelke is treated as cravenly following Burghley's will however much this was to the disadvantage of the college.³⁴ There is, for sure, evidence to support this analysis. John Bell's petition to Burghley, cited above, points to Spinola as the moving force behind the transaction; a letter from Kelke to Burghley dated 26 January 1575 speaks of him and the fellows having 'satisfied your request

³¹ MCC A/27/5.

³² MCC A/27/6; A/27/7. It is not clear why separate attorneys should have been used. In the recognisance relating to the rectory, Walter is expressly vouched for by Broughton.

³³ C 66/1128 m 6, m 13 *Calendar of Patent Rolls 1572–75*, nos 2841, 2851.

³⁴ EK Purnell, *Magdalene College* (London, Robinson, 1904) 65–77, vi ('fraud, at which the highest in the land connived'); Cunich *et al* (n 19) 77–79; V Morgan, *A History of the University of Cambridge, II, 1546–1750* (Cambridge, CUP, 2004) 175–76; D Pearson, *Edward de Vere (1550–1604)* (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2005) 46–47.

touching Mr Spinola with all diligence and dutiful obedience accordingly, though not without evil report of some evil disposed persons';³⁵ and there is no doubt that Kelke, like many others in Cambridge and elsewhere in England, had sought Burghley's assistance in getting preferment. None the less, there is real room for doubt whether things were quite so underhand.

It is abundantly clear from Kelke's letter to Burghley that the latter had been putting pressure on the college in some way and for some reason, but it does not follow that his purpose was to despoil the college to the advantage of Spinola. The principal content of the letter was the reform of the college's statutes, requesting that Burghley should first cause them to be sealed by the Queen with the great seal before 'sending them home', so that they should have as much authority as the founder's statutes, which had themselves been made under the great seal. The number of fellowships was a matter for the statutes—it had been fixed at six in the reformed statutes of 1565³⁶—and although there are no accurate lists of Fellows at this time, it is known that there was a speedy turnover and not infrequent vacancies.³⁷ It would be little wonder that this was a matter of concern when the statutes were being amended, and that pressure might be put on the college to raise its income in order to support its statutory number of Fellows. Such an interpretation is consistent with an undated document commenting on changes which might be made to the college's statutes, which ends apparently inconsequentially with a reference to the sum of £20, 'which yearly shall grow by the grant in fee farm to Mr Benedict Spinola', which would provide an income of £6.13s.4d for each of two Fellows to be appointed, with the balance of £6.13s.4d to remain for the general purposes of the college.³⁸

Further evidence points against Burghley's close involvement in the transaction between Spinola and the college. On 21 January 1575, one Thomas Wattes wrote to him to say that following Burghley's instructions he had approached the Solicitor-General, Thomas Bromley, who had told him that Mr Hurleston of the Inner Temple was acquainted with the details of the college's conveyance to Spinola; we know from other sources that Hurleston acted as Spinola's lawyer.³⁹ Wattes then passed on to Burghley the details which he had obtained from Hurleston.⁴⁰ If Burghley was

³⁵ SP 12/103 f 14 (CSPD 1547–80 494).

³⁶ Cunich *et al* (n 19) 55.

³⁷ *Ibid*, 69.

³⁸ SP 1/244 f 238, 239v (L & P Addenda 1.2 558). There is no apparent warrant for the editors' attribution of this document to 1544.

³⁹ REQ 2/178/60/2, Spinola's answer to a petition in the Court of Requests from Julio Borgarucci in 1580, signed by Hurleston as his counsel. For this action, see below, n 61. Bromley himself had acted for Spinola in a Chancery case: *Pype v Spinola* (after 1558) C3/143/81.

⁴⁰ SP 12/103 f 11 (CSPD 1547–80 493), dated 21 January 1575. It may be no coincidence that the College's attorney and the draftsman of the indenture of 10 December between the college and Spinola was another Inner Templar, Rowland Broughton.

attempting to discover exactly what the college was doing as late as this, it is highly unlikely that he was collaborating with Spinola in a plot to further the latter's interests at the expense of the college. A more plausible reading of the evidence is that Burghley had been alerted to the concerns whether the transaction was in the college's interests by the petition of John Bell and a further one to the same effect, dated 8 January 1575, from Thomas Barber, one of Audley's executors,⁴¹ and that he was taking steps to discover exactly what it was that the college was doing.

The nub of the matter, surely, is that by the time of Kelke's mastership, Magdalene was abjectly poor. In the absence of another benefactor—a hoped-for benefaction from the Duke of Norfolk in 1564 had never materialised, and the first major gift since the college's foundation, a donation from Sir Christopher Wray, was not to arrive until 1589⁴²—if the college was to survive it had no obvious alternative but to increase the income from its existing assets; and the only exploitable asset which it had was its Aldgate property.⁴³ The real problem was not that the college was being hoodwinked by an Italian moneylender, blind to the potential value of the land which was said by Bell to be then producing a rental income (by sub-leases, evidently) of over £60 per year and which would be expected to produce double that when the leases ended and it finally returned into the hands of the college.⁴⁴ It was that the leases granted in the 1540s still had more than 40 years left to run.

It seems clear that Spinola was intending to break the existing leases of the land and rectory. Exactly how this was to occur is not clear. It may be that he was going to buy out the existing lessees, it may be that he was going to bully them out, it may be that he was going to use a combination of these. It is possible, even, that he had a legal right to do this because of the peculiarity of the grant to him via the Queen: the contemporary law books suggest that a grant of land in fee by the Crown without express reservations of any lesser rights would normally pass a full, unencumbered title to the grantee.⁴⁵ In any event, it is known that at about this time he was harrying John Casye (the successor of Richard Casye, who was farming the Aldgate land in 1544) with threats to dispossess him,⁴⁶ and in a

⁴¹ SP 12/103 f 3 (CSPD 1547–80 493).

⁴² Cunich *et al* (n 19) 76, 88–90.

⁴³ Its other main asset was a rentcharge of £20 per year on the manor of Purleigh, Essex; but this had been fixed by Parliament in 1543 and was not able to be changed: *ibid*, 43–44.

⁴⁴ SP 12/288 f 63 (CSPD 1601–03 313), probably dating from this time, lists 22 tenants paying a total of £39.17s.8d to Casye for lands in half of the Great Garden and a further nine paying £16.15s.6d to one Gibson for lands in the other half of the Great Garden, with Gibson receiving also £13 for the parsonage.

⁴⁵ Brooke *Abridgement, Patentes*, 3, 39. This would not mean that the sub-lessees were without remedy, but it would only have been a remedy in damages; Spinola would still have been able to get control of the land in order to develop it.

⁴⁶ SP 12/146 f 213 (CSPD 1547–80 701).

memorandum to Burghley in 1577, Richard Howland, Kelke's successor as Master of Magdalene, stated that, 'as Mr Spinola can better certify you', the leases were by then utterly void.⁴⁷ It is only the destruction of the lease that explains the otherwise incomprehensible transaction relating to the rectory: the transfer from the college to the Crown and from the Crown to Spinola, with a condition that Spinola should reconvey it to the college or its nominee. The whole purpose of this, according to Lord Ellesmere in the later litigation, was that the college should have the rectory free of the lease.⁴⁸

To assess the transactions of 1574/75, and Spinola's behaviour, we should begin with the grant of the rectory. Pulling the pieces together, before the college parted with it, it was receiving a rent of £11 per year, and according to the rental of c1574 its tenant had sub-leased it for £13 per year.⁴⁹ The actual income from it was probably little in excess of the £25 per year which Spinola had agreed to pay for it: Howland's memorandum to Burghley in 1577 says that the college was trying to find someone else to whom it could be assigned, but the only person who was willing to take it at a rate the same as or greater than Spinola was currently paying was of dubious financial credit,⁵⁰ and when a lease of it was made in 1578 the agreed rent was £28 per year.⁵¹ In effect, Spinola was guaranteeing the college something like the full commercial rent until a better lessee should have been found, and taking upon himself the responsibility of breaking the existing lease. Small wonder that when the rectory was leased to Ralph Parys of Dullingham, near Cambridge, in 1578, Spinola is described—by the college—as having been acting as its 'trustee'.⁵²

The land, though, was a different matter. It was later to be said in Chancery that it was Spinola's intention to turn the waste ground into garden plots and to build houses on these, and that he cleared and fenced the land, creating 50 plots which he leased out to individuals who built houses on them and himself building a house on part of the land which he retained.⁵³ When he attempted to sell it on to his countryman Julio Borgarucci in 1579, it was said that its rental value by then was £180 per year, its capital value something in excess of £2,000;⁵⁴ and when it was in fact sold later that year the purchase price was £2,500. Spinola had obvi-

⁴⁷ HMC 13 *Salisbury*, no 509.

⁴⁸ C 78/291 no 18 m 3, m 5.

⁴⁹ SP 12/288 f 63 (CSPD 1601–03 313).

⁵⁰ HMC 13 *Salisbury* no 509.

⁵¹ MCC A/27/10.

⁵² MCC A/27/10, college's annotation; Purnell (n 34) 72–73.

⁵³ C 78/291 no 18. Although this was an ex parte statement, taken to be true simply because it was formally unchallenged, there is no reason to doubt its fundamental veracity; if anything, it would have been in the petitioners' interest to have downplayed the extent of Spinola's development.

⁵⁴ REQ 2/178/60/1. The figures may not be wholly accurate, since they appear in Borgarucci's ex parte petition in the Court of Requests; but he would have had no reason to

ously made a very substantial profit. We do, however, have to be careful not to exaggerate this, since we do not know how much he had had to pay out to break the pre-existing leases or to develop the land, nor what his liabilities were to his own lessees against which he was to guarantee the Earl of Oxford.⁵⁵

That Spinola should have made a profit is hardly a cause for surprise: he was a shrewd businessman with a very large amount of capital which could be invested in the improvement of the land. The real question is how far the college had made a bad bargain. Taking together the transactions relating to the land and the rectory, as was clearly the parties' intention, the college was in effect conveying its freehold reversion in the land to Spinola in exchange for an immediate doubling of its rentcharge from £20 to £40.⁵⁶ The calculation of the value of freehold reversions is fraught with difficulty even today;⁵⁷ still less was it a science in the sixteenth century. However, making a number of assumptions which would have looked reasonable in 1575, and ignoring completely the college's impecuniosity (and hence the risk that it would have to sell at an inopportune moment), the capital value of the freehold reversion on the land would have been little more than £200.⁵⁸ If anything, even this is an exaggeration of the value on sixteenth-century approaches, for reversionary interests tended then to be

misrepresent them significantly. Spinola's reply is at REQ 2/178/60/2. See Pearson (n 34) 47 (erroneously stating that the rental value was £1,900 per year).

⁵⁵ C 54/1080 no 6.

⁵⁶ In fact this underestimates the college's gain, since the income from the rectory would increase if the value of the rectory increased as the college could call for its retransfer to it at any time; it was only the charge on the land that was fixed.

⁵⁷ For the calculation and its difficulties, see *Earl Cadogan v Sportelli* [2007] 1 EGLR 253. I am grateful to Professor Colin Lizieri for explaining the theory behind the valuation of reversionary interests; errors in its application are mine alone.

⁵⁸ The reversion is calculated as $MVO/(1+d)^t$, where MVO is the current market value, d the 'deferment rate', and t the number of years until the reversion; the deferment rate is defined as $RRFR + RP - RG$, where RRFR is the 'real risk free rate' (ie the risk-free rate of interest), RP the 'risk premium' (ie the risk that the property might have to be sold at an inopportune time), and RG the rate of growth (ie the real growth in value). In making the calculation I have made the following assumptions:

- MVO = £1200, calculated as 20 times the rental value obtained from SP 12/288 f 63 (CSPD 1601-03 313) (a factor of 20 is that normally used in calculating the relation between capital and rental at this time, though it is probably a slight overestimate); this is broadly in line with the estimate of John Bell in SP 1/196 f 73 (L & P 19.2 477).
- RRFR = 6% (from G Clark, 'The Cost of Capital and Medieval Agricultural Technique,' (1988) 26 *Explorations in Economic History* 265, 273, Table 3 (treating the nominal rate as the real rate, as would have been normal at this time: see Clark, *ibid*, 268).
- RP = 0 (see text).
- RG = 1.71 (based on the estimate of John Bell that the rental income from the land would have doubled by the time the leases had ended).
- t = 41 (the number of years remaining under the leases).

Applying these assumptions, the value of the reversion is estimated at £214.

undervalued.⁵⁹ Set against this is the value to the college of the increase in the rentcharge by £20 per year. This can be approximately capitalised by multiplying by 20, producing a value of £400. There is therefore no solid justification for the criticism of Spinola or those members of college who supported the sale. Of course, with hindsight, it would soon have been evident that the increase in the value of the land was far greater and far more rapid than would have been predicted; but that was only because of the sale to Spinola, followed by his breaking of the existing leases and investing in the development of the land; and we cannot take hindsight into account in evaluating the transaction.

After 1579 Spinola drops out of the picture. As noted above, the sale to Borgarucci did not take place, and instead agreement was made with the Earl of Oxford that the land would be sold to three of his servants (presumably acting as nominees for the Earl) for £2,500, payable by instalments,⁶⁰ with Borgarucci seemingly to receive a commission of £100.⁶¹ It is easy to conjecture why the land was not put into Oxford's own name: apart from the fact that his personal finances were in a disastrous state, he had a few days previously challenged Sir Philip Sidney to a duel and might reasonably have feared for his life.⁶² In the event, this transaction ran into difficulties too. According to Spinola's account, the first instalment of £500 was paid but not the balance, and as a result the sale may in theory have been avoided,⁶³ though Oxford's nominees none the less granted leases over parts of the land.⁶⁴

By this stage the precise whereabouts of title to the land was thoroughly confused.⁶⁵ In the early summer of 1580 steps were taken to clear it up. On 14 June, Oxford's nominees made an indenture conveying the land to

⁵⁹ I am grateful to Professor Richard Hoyle for this information.

⁶⁰ The indenture, dated 27 August 1579, is referred to in the later indenture to Oxford, C 54/1080 no 6. Spinola had had many previous dealings with Oxford; in particular, while Oxford was travelling in Continental Europe after 1575 Spinola had been a channel for communication—and more importantly cash—between him and his father-in-law, Lord Burghley.

⁶¹ This was to be the subject of a claim by Borgarucci in the Court of Requests in 1580: REQ 2/178/60. The outcome of this is not known (the entry book of the Court of Requests for this year does not survive), but it is likely that the claim came to nought as a result of Spinola's death. An endorsement on the petition shows that process issued against Spinola on 15 June 1580, within a few weeks he had fallen ill and was making his will (PROB 11/62 f 294, dated 6 July 1580), and he was buried in St Gabriel Fenchurch on 15 August 1580 (so recorded in Parish Register).

⁶² Pearson (n 34) especially ch 3; AH Nelson, *Monstrous Adversary: The Life of Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford* (Liverpool, Liverpool University Press, 2003) 195–200.

⁶³ REQ 2/178/60/2.

⁶⁴ C 54/1080 no 5.

⁶⁵ In 1608 an inquisition post mortem on the death of Oxford derived title from the servants, while the special verdict in the *Magdalen College Case* derived it from Spinola: C142/305/103; KB 27/1426 m 288.

Oxford himself,⁶⁶ and one day later Spinola did the same.⁶⁷ The first of these preserved the rights of the two men to whom leases had been made, presumably with Oxford's consent, but in the second Spinola covenanted to save Oxford harmless against claims which might in the future be made by anyone tracing their rights through him. As well, it seems that there may have been doubts whether the college might not still have had rights, presumably on the basis that the conveyance of 1574/75 was of questionable validity. It had clearly been seen in 1574 that there might be difficulties—hence the term in the indenture between the college and Spinola that the college would seek parliamentary confirmation of the grant—and in 1576 a statute had been passed ratifying grants which had been made to or by the Queen.⁶⁸ However, there may still have been questions; justifiably so, since in the event the King's Bench was to hold in the *Magdalen College Case* that this statute had not made this grant good.⁶⁹ If there was uncertainty, this might have been brought to the surface through the Lincoln's Inn reading of Lent 1582 on the effects of the 1576 statute on grants by the Queen's letters patent, by Thomas Egerton.⁷⁰ Very shortly after this, no doubt to strengthen Oxford's position, Roland Broughton, the draftsman of that conveyance and the college's attorney, himself made a fine of all the lands to Oxford in consideration of £200.⁷¹ It is not clear why the fine should have been made by Broughton rather than the college, but since a fine was conclusive against third parties after five years⁷² it may simply have been a matter of convenience for Broughton to have done it, though it is perhaps more likely that it was an attempt to avoid the effects of the 1571 statute by making it appear that the grant was not in law made by the college.⁷³ In any event, the intended effect must have been that the college's potential rights were being bought out for £200.

This in effect marks the end of the property transactions giving rise to the *Earl of Oxford's Case*. Oxford was to convey the land away in 1591 for the benefit of his second wife, Elizabeth Trentham, part of a complex marriage settlement, but an inquisition post mortem taken after his death

⁶⁶ C 54/1080 no 5.

⁶⁷ C 54/1080 no 6.

⁶⁸ Stat 18 Eliz c 2 (*Statutes of the Realm* 4 608).

⁶⁹ Below, 15–18.

⁷⁰ CUL MS Dd 11.87 f 152, BL MS Harl 5265 ff 136–37; BL MS Harg 207 ff 58, 64, 65v. The surviving notes on the reading do not reveal this point to have been dealt with specifically, though it did deal with the requirement that grants to the Queen required good consideration: below, text at n 105.

⁷¹ CP 25/2/170/2949 no 5.

⁷² Stat 4 Hen VII c 4; Co Litt 262. For the operation of fines, which had changed little in its fundamentals since the twelfth century, see GJ Turner, *Calendar of the Feet of Fines relating to the County of Huntingdon* (Cambridge, CUP, 1913) cxxiv–cli. A contemporary description of the practice of making fines is Thomas Powell, *The Attourneys Academy* (London, B Fisher, 1623) 125–29.

⁷³ See below, text at n 108.

in 1604 shows that he died seised of the land, which therefore descended to his heir.⁷⁴ It was against the heir that the college was to take action in an attempt to recover the property.

C. THE LITIGATION

Oxford died on 24 June 1604. An inquisition post mortem on his Essex lands, taken in the September of that year, makes no mention of the London property, but since it was out of the county we should not necessarily expect it to do so.⁷⁵ There is no doubt, though, that it was still in the hands of the Oxford family, and at Michaelmas 1606 Barnaby Goche,⁷⁶ now Master of Magdalene, accepted the rent of £15 from one of the tenants of the Covent Garden, Edward Hamond, giving him an unsealed receipt to this effect.⁷⁷ However, the college soon began to move to question the position. On 5 February 1607, Goche, acting on behalf of the college, formally ejected Sir Francis Castillion, the lessee of one of the houses on the land, and made a lease for six years to John Smith, the Bursar of the college. This was not a pure fiction—the document making the lease was presented in evidence in the King's Bench in the *Magdalen College Case*—but there is no doubt that the lease was made with a view to an action of ejectment being subsequently brought.⁷⁸ Castillion re-entered immediately and continued to occupy the land,⁷⁹ but nothing further happened for a while. Matters seem to have been brought to a head when the next year's payment fell due to the college: at Michaelmas 1607, Castillion was once again ejected, but this time the college remained in possession.⁸⁰ The intention was no doubt to precipitate an action of ejectment at Common Law, but the new Earl was still a minor in wardship, and he—or more likely his representatives—brought suit in the Court of Wards against the college for its intrusion into the land.

The case was first heard in June 1608, when the plaintiff's claim and the defendants' defence were brought before the court.⁸¹ The court, however, at first declined jurisdiction. The inquisition of 1604 had made no reference

⁷⁴ C 142/305/103.

⁷⁵ C 142/286/165. HE Bell, *Court of Wards and Liveries* (Cambridge, CUP, 1953) 69–76, esp at 73–74, citing *Lord Winsor's Case* (1611) Ley 31, 80 ER 608.

⁷⁶ For Goche, see A Thrush and JP Ferris (eds), *History of Parliament, House of Commons 1604–1629*, vol 4 (Cambridge, CUP, 2010) 405, sub nom Barnaby Gooch. I adopt the spelling used by Goche himself.

⁷⁷ The receipt, transcribed in full in KB 27/1426 m 288, does not say on whose behalf Hamond was acting. Except where noted otherwise, the information which follows in this paragraph is derived from the special verdict in *Warren v Smith*, the *Magdalene College Case*, KB 27/1426 m 288, substantially reproduced in 11 Co Rep 66, 67–68; 77 ER 1235, 1236–39.

⁷⁸ WARD 9/530 f 337, describing this as an entry for trial of the title.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁸¹ WARD 9/530 f 185.

to lands outside Essex, and in the absence of an inquisition post mortem to the effect that the former Earl had died seised of these lands there could be no issue touching the wardship. It was therefore ordered that a further inquisition be taken as a matter of urgency, and that the parties should agree on the names of 'indifferent commissioners' to do this. John Smith, the college's Bursar, was subsequently to complain that the college had not had any part in the appointment of the commissioners and had not been able to bring witnesses before them;⁸² but be that as it may, the inquisition was duly made on 17 August 1608.⁸³ Three findings of the inquisition are pertinent: first, that the Earl had died seised of the Covent Garden in fee; secondly, that the lands were worth £5 per year; and, thirdly, that the commissioners did not know who had been receiving the profits since the death of the former Earl. The first of these was something which the college had wanted to question before the inquisition was made, on the basis that the land had been conveyed away in 1591;⁸⁴ though it is not clear why it should have mattered to the college specifically that it was the alienees rather than the Earl who were seised. The second point, that the land was worth only £5 per year, causes more of an eyebrow to be raised, given that it was already said to have been worth more than £2,000 in 1580 and even then producing rents of £180 per year. The explanation seems to be that the Earl's sub-leases, or at least many of them, had been made in exchange for capital payments and only a nominal peppercorn rent.⁸⁵ This too perhaps explains the third point: if the rents really were that minimal, it is understandable that there might have been doubt as to who—if anybody—had received them.

Once the inquisition had been taken, the new Earl's claim in the Court of Wards could proceed. On 19 October it was argued by Attorney-General Henry Hobart, the Recorder of London Henry Montagu and Lawrence Hyde on the part of the Earl; and Serjeant Augustine Nicholls and John Manningham⁸⁶ on the part of the college, where it was said that the college was seeking to traverse the inquisition, ie to have it overturned. In the light of this the case was adjourned, the college to retain possession of the land provided it gave a bond to keep the house in repair and to account for mesne profits should it eventually lose the action.⁸⁷ In time, the college

⁸² WARD 9/530 f 253.

⁸³ C142/305/103.

⁸⁴ WARD 9/530 f 253; above, text at n 74.

⁸⁵ This was said to be the case with the land in question in the Court of Wards, which Castillion was holding at a peppercorn rent (WARD 9/530 f 337), and in the later Chancery proceedings it was stated that the Earl of Oxford had made leases for great sums of money which he had taken as fines (C 78/291 no 18).

⁸⁶ Manningham was a former student of Magdalene, and it is tempting to guess that it was he who had seen the possibility of reversing the effects of the 1575 transaction.

⁸⁷ WARD 9/530 f 271v, amended f 337, continued f 436v.

formulated its traverse, and in February 1609 the case re-emerged, this time with the college as plaintiff.⁸⁸ It proceeded slowly. By the end of May the parties had agreed that there need be no examination of witnesses,⁸⁹ but it took another year for the court to resolve, after receiving advice from the judges, that the right should be decided at Common Law on a special verdict agreeing all the relevant facts.⁹⁰

Pursuant to this, Sir Francis Castillion re-entered the land. On 20 December 1610 he made a formal lease for two years to one John Warren, and on 23 December Warren was ejected by John Smith, the college's Bursar and lessee.⁹¹ All was set now for the bringing of an action of ejectment, by this time the normal method of trying title to land.⁹² The action was brought in the Hilary Term of 1611, and pleaded to issue in the Easter Term of that year.⁹³ The jury found a lengthy special verdict detailing the circumstances set out above and focusing on the legality of the grant of 1574/75; since it refers also to the Acts of Parliament of 1571 and 1576, we may well suspect that the verdict was in truth an agreed statement of facts and issues produced by the parties' lawyers, on the basis of the issues previously identified in the Court of Wards.

The case was argued several times between Hilary Term 1613 and Hilary Term 1615.⁹⁴ No conclusion was reached. At first it seems that Fleming CJ was inclined to uphold the grant and find against the college,⁹⁵ but Coke, who had succeeded him as Chief Justice of the King's Bench in October 1613, seems from the start to have favoured the college's case.⁹⁶ Perhaps because of this, while the argument in the King's Bench was still depending, an attempt was made on the part of the Earl to protect his position by presenting a bill in Parliament to confirm the grant of 1574/75, but this was

⁸⁸ WARD 9/530 f 504v. SP 15/39 f 141 (CSPD Addenda 1580–1625 520) looks to be a draft of the college's grounds for the traverse, but the document is badly mutilated so we cannot be sure.

⁸⁹ WARD 9/531 f 108.

⁹⁰ WARD 9/532 f 109 (16 May 1610). It was later said that there was a further decree made in Trinity Term 1610 which formulated the special verdict to be found (C 78/291 no 18, m 4); I have not been able to discover this. For the use of the judges in making decisions in the Court of Wards, see Bell (n 75) 98–100.

⁹¹ KB 27/1426 m 288.

⁹² JH Baker, *Introduction to English Legal History*, 4th edn (London, Butterworths, 2002) 301–03.

⁹³ KB 27/1426 m 288.

⁹⁴ According to the report in 1 Rolle 151 it was argued in Easter and Michaelmas Terms 1613 and Hilary Term 1614. There are manuscript reports from Hilary 1613 (HLS MS 109 f 23, CUL MS li 5.26 f 38v) and Michaelmas 1613 (HLS 109 ff 25, 27) and also Hilary Term 1615 (HLS 109 f 27v).

⁹⁵ HLS 109 f 23.

⁹⁶ HLS 109 f 27v.

abortive.⁹⁷ The issues were finally brought to a head in the Court of King's Bench in the Easter Term of 1615 and judgment given for the college.⁹⁸

The arguments in the King's Bench in the *Magdalen College Case* need not be analysed in detail. All the reports show that they were structured in the same way, with four principal points.

Most important was that the initial grant from the college to the Queen was avoided by the statute of 1571. It had already been resolved by the judges that the statute did apply to grants of this type,⁹⁹ and the arguments on both sides were effectively a reprise of those which had arisen earlier. They revolved largely around the question whether the statute bound the Queen, an aspect of the larger and constitutionally more interesting question of when statutes bound the Crown and when they did not. On its proper construction, however, the 1571 statute disabled the college (and other ecclesiastical corporations) from making grants rather than disabling others from receiving property, so the question of the applicability of the statute to the Queen did not directly arise. This point was made by Coke CJ in Hilary Term 1615,¹⁰⁰ and unanimously so held by the court giving judgment the following term.¹⁰¹

Given this, it had to be decided whether the grant to the Queen had been subsequently validated. The first possibility was that this had been done by a later statute. An act of 1572,¹⁰² excluding from the operation of the 1571 Act grants of houses (with less than 10 acres of land appurtenant to them) in cities, boroughs and suburbs, was at first relied upon, but this was eventually abandoned on the grounds that it had not been expressly referred to in the special verdict of the jury.¹⁰³ Alternatively, it might have been affected by the statute of 1576.¹⁰⁴ This rendered good grants which had been made to the Queen on good consideration,¹⁰⁵ but on the facts of

⁹⁷ *Commons Journals*, 13 May 1614. A draft of the bill is in BL MS Harl 6806 art 78, transcribed (somewhat inaccurately) in Purnell (n 34) 76–77.

⁹⁸ (1615) 1 Rolle 151, 81 ER 394; 11 Co Rep 67, 77 ER 1235; Cro Jac 364, 79 ER 312.

⁹⁹ *The Case of Ecclesiastical Persons* (1601) 5 Co Rep 14, 77 ER 69. The point is referred to in the reading of Lewis Prowd in Lincoln's Inn in 1606, noting that his original opinion had been that such grants were good since they could not be supposed to have been fraudulent (CUL MS Dd 5.50 f 38v at 39v); the fifth volume of *Coke's Reports*, containing this case, had been published in 1605.

¹⁰⁰ HLS 109 f 27v at f 28 (not in the brief report of the argument that term in 1 Rolle 151, 163; 81 ER 394, 402–03). It had been conceded by the Earl's counsel from the start that if this was the proper construction of the statute then the conveyance would have been void: HLS 109 f 23, *per* Hyde.

¹⁰¹ 1 Rolle 151, 163; 81 ER 394, 402–03.

¹⁰² Stat 14 Eliz c 11 s 5 (*Statutes of the Realm* 4 601).

¹⁰³ HLS 109 f 27v at f 28, *per* Mountague KS. The argument had formerly been put forward strongly by Hobart A-G (1 Rolle 151, 158; HLS 109 f 25 at f 25v) and Hyde (HLS 109 f 23, CUL MS li 5.26 f 38v).

¹⁰⁴ Stat 18 Eliz c 2 (*Statutes of the Realm* 4 608).

¹⁰⁵ More accurately, the statute read 'for any sum or sums of Money or other Considerations'; it was argued in the Exchequer Chamber that this had a wider meaning than the consideration

this case the college was to receive no consideration from the Queen, since her conveyance to Spinola was to take effect before the annual rent next fell due.¹⁰⁶ Consequently the initial grant to the Queen was void. The second part of the statute validated grants made by the Queen, but it was said by Croke J that the statute served only to give effect to voidable grants, not those which were absolutely void;¹⁰⁷ and since the 1571 act was quite clear that the grant by the college was void and this had not been cured by the first part of the 1576 act, it followed that the grant by the Queen to Spinola was also ineffective.

A second possibility was that the fine levied by Rowland Broughton in 1582¹⁰⁸ was conclusive against the college. The normal rule was that a fine was effective even against third parties after five years had elapsed from the proclamation of the fine in the Common Pleas.¹⁰⁹ However, the court held that the 1571 statute was sufficiently broadly worded to catch fines, even those levied by third parties: it referred to grants 'made had done or suffered', and the non-claim constituted a 'sufferance'.¹¹⁰ Were the law otherwise, it was said by Haughton J, the 1571 statute would have been a dead letter, since any college could allow a stranger to enter onto its land and levy a fine, and then sit back for five years until the transferee's title had fully ripened. We may suspect that this may have been exactly what the college had attempted to do.

Lastly, it was argued that Goche's receipt of the rent from Hamond in 1606 precluded the college from making its claim. But there was nothing formally to suggest that he was acting with the authority of the college, and the receipt was not under seal (presumably the college's seal¹¹¹ is meant), and the court was therefore clearly of the opinion that the college was not barred by this either. Indeed, according to Dodderidge J, Haughton J had thought the point so obvious that it was not even worth arguing.¹¹²

Throughout, the reasoning of both counsel and judges is markedly formalist. Although an abundance of case law was cited, it was in effect largely an exercise in statutory interpretation; and as such it has to be said that the analysis was impeccable. Thomas Egerton, Lord Ellesmere, was

that would have been sufficient to raise a use, and that the requirement was therefore satisfied since the grant from the college to the Queen had recited that it was made 'for divers considerations ... thereunto moving' the Master and fellows: HLS 1081 f 48v, 52v.

¹⁰⁶ 1 Rolle 151, 169; 81 ER 394, 407. In his reading on the statute in 1582, Egerton had examined the question of what constituted value: BL MS Harg 207 f 58, BL MS Harl 5265 f 136v.

¹⁰⁷ 1 Rolle 151, 170–71; 81 ER 394, 408.

¹⁰⁸ Above, n 71.

¹⁰⁹ Above, n 72.

¹¹⁰ 1 Rolle 151, 171; 81 ER 394, 408–09.

¹¹¹ Somewhat piquantly, this had been a gift to the college from none other than Benedict Spinola.

¹¹² 1 Rolle 151, 172; 81 ER 394, 409.

later to observe that the court had overturned an understanding of the law which had continued for many years,¹¹³ but this fails to do justice either to the length of the arguments or to the care with which they were crafted. What is noteworthy is this very formalism. Nowhere was it ever suggested that it might have been remotely relevant that Spinola, the Earls of Oxford and their tenants had spent a great deal of money developing the land, and that the college might have been attempting to make a wholly unjustified windfall profit.

The Earl of Oxford—still a minor—was no doubt understandably aggrieved by the decision. Apparently immediately he brought a writ of error to remove the case to the Exchequer Chamber.¹¹⁴ No less speedily, he went to Chancery, this time joining as co-plaintiff one Thomas Wood, another tenant who had been dispossessed by the college and whose land had been leased to John Smith, the bursar.¹¹⁵ The first entry of the case in the Chancery Decree Books is on 26 June 1615, a matter of weeks after the decision of the King's Bench.¹¹⁶ The Earl's bill has not been discovered in the Chancery records, but its gist may be reconstructed from the decree roll, checked against the report of the *Earl of Oxford's Case* in the Chancery Reports and the proceedings noted in the Chancery decree books and the Masters' report. After giving the facts at length, it picked out the following points: since the grant by the college in 1574/75, Spinola, the late Earl of Oxford and his tenants had expended a very considerable sum of money—£10,000 it was said—on the development of the land; the Earl and his tenants had given penal bonds for quiet possession to those to whom they had made leases, which bonds would be forfeit if the college was able to reclaim the property; those who had purchased leases had relied on the fact that the land had originally been granted to Spinola by the Queen's letters patent, the strongest guarantee of a good title; and that the purpose of the grant had been to improve to the greatest extent possible the college's financial position, a purpose which had been fulfilled:¹¹⁷

It being her Majesty's Intent, That the college should be advanced greatly in Profit, by having the Rectory to them and their Successors discharged of the Lease

¹¹³ C 78/291 no 17, m 7.

¹¹⁴ Noted in the margin of KB 27/1426 m 288 as having been received on 12 May 1615. There are reports of arguments in the Exchequer Chamber in HLS 1081 f 48v and HLS 2068 f 1. Coke's report of the decision of the King's Bench was already in print, and was expressly addressed by Serjeant Moore: HLS 1081 f 48v at ff 51, 52v. Process on the writ of error was subsequently discontinued.

¹¹⁵ MCC A/27/14, dated 20 December 1607.

¹¹⁶ C 33/128 f 1234; the entry in the decree rolls gives 9 June as the date of the petition (C 78/291 no 18). At 1 Chan Rep 1, 3; 21 ER 485, 485 it is said that the bill in Chancery was preferred before the judgment of the King's Bench had been entered on the roll.

¹¹⁷ 1 Chan Rep 1, 1–2; 21 ER 485, 485, the first paragraph significantly corrected by comparison with the manuscripts. The gain to the college is marked with a cross in the margin of the decree roll.

for Years ... And that Spinola and his heirs should have only the garden paying £15 per annum being the uttermost rent ...

Note; the college is hereby advanced £1700 more than they should have been if the former Lease had continued, which is not yet expired.

The petition would have raised matters which the college might have wished to dispute: the amount of money spent on the development of the land, the amount at risk from penal bonds, whether the college had made any profit and, if so, how much. The defendants Goche and Smith, though, refused to answer, but instead demurred to the bill and entered a plea which in effect restated the Common Law finding that the grant of 1574/75 was void. The basis for the demurrer, again reconstructed from the decree roll, was—significantly—not that the claim had already been adjudged at Common Law, but rather that the matters raised by the petitioners were appropriate to be determined at Common Law and not in Chancery, together with a denial that the erection of a ‘colony’ of buildings could affect the Common-Law rights of the owner of the land.¹¹⁸ The matter was immediately referred to two of the Masters in Chancery, and in the light of their report that the demurrer was insufficient, dated the following day,¹¹⁹ it was ordered that the defendants should answer the substance of the petition.¹²⁰ They refused to do so on the grounds that the matter was not within the jurisdiction of the Chancery, Smith saying that he was acting on the advice of Goche and Goche saying that he was acting on the advice of his counsel, and on 21 October 1615 the two men were committed to the Fleet prison for contempt.¹²¹ One can only speculate as to the conversation at dinner in Magdalene when the news arrived that the Master and Bursar had been sent to gaol. Three weeks later the Chancery turned the screw tighter, requiring an answer to have been made within one week on pain of

¹¹⁸ C78/291 no 18 m 3: ‘[T]he matters in the said bill contained were aptly determinable and to be determined by the common laws of this realm and not in this honourable court, neither did the same contain sufficient cause to draw into examination and question in this court matter of title and the validity and invalidity of estates derived from the said college which if they were ineffectual in law to debar the said college as of the complainants own showing they appeared to be as the defendant alleged then were not the same by colony of buildings upon any other persons loud and unjust pretence of recompense of the same things which was not warrantable by law of any sort to take away the right of the college neither were such unreasonable estates tending to the disherison of the said college and not warranted by law to be questioned in equity.’

¹¹⁹ C38/22 (unfoliated). The report was based on three grounds: that the college had received full consideration for the land; that a large amount of money had been spent on the development of it; and that at the time of the original grant it was generally thought that a conveyance via the Queen would take the grant outside the statutory restrictions.

¹²⁰ C 33/128 f 1259v.

¹²¹ C 33/130 f 39 (deleted), 53.

forfeiting £200.¹²² Meanwhile, the two men had brought a writ of habeas corpus to the King's Bench.

The intransigence of Goche and Smith and the bringing of habeas corpus brought into focus the whole question of the relationship between Common Law and Chancery, and it is for this that the case has become a landmark in the eyes of posterity. This context will be examined in due course,¹²³ but it was, of course, only peripherally relevant to the parties, for whom the real question was—as it always had been—whether the college could recover back the land which it had conveyed away in 1574/75.

The spotlight was only briefly on the habeas corpus case.¹²⁴ The King's Bench was divided over the question whether the Chancery suit could be said to have been brought in respect of the same cause of action as the *Magdalen College Case* at Common Law, for the co-plaintiffs with the Earl were different in the two cases, and hence presumptively the actions were being brought for different plots of land in the Covent Garden.¹²⁵ Dodderidge J was inclined to overlook this, since the reality of the situation was that both the Common-Law and Chancery claims were concerned with the underlying freehold of the Earl of Oxford. Coke CJ, however, stressed the technical point, and the court ordered that the Earl's bill and the associated documentation in the Chancery suit be brought into the King's Bench so that it could be verified whether or not the actions were being brought for the same matter.¹²⁶ When the bill was produced the court seems to have leaned in favour of the applicants, but in the event, the Chancery backed off. On 30 November, Lord Ellesmere ordered that Goche and Smith be released from the Fleet, but should be required to give sureties that they would attend the Chancery every day until given leave to depart.¹²⁷ Their attendance in the Chancery was duly noted every sitting day of the court in Hilary Term 1616, at the end of which their sureties were released, though Goche and Smith were again required to attend day to day in the Easter Term.¹²⁸

After two weeks of formal attendance, it seems that argument in the case was heard on 2 May.¹²⁹ Again, Lord Ellesmere LC demonstrated a marked

¹²² C 33/129 f 134v. It is to this point that the reported *Earl of Oxford's Case* probably belongs: below n 170.

¹²³ Below, 27–32.

¹²⁴ For the growth of habeas corpus at this time, see P Halliday, *Habeas Corpus* (Cambridge, Mass, Belknap, 2010).

¹²⁵ *Googe and Smith's Case* (1615) 1 Rolle 277, 81 ER 487; 3 Bulst 115, 81 ER 98; HLS 109 f 102v.

¹²⁶ It is worthy of note that Coke was generally unsympathetic to habeas corpus actions aiming to overrule Chancery orders to imprison: Halliday (n 124) 91.

¹²⁷ C 33/130 f 232v, noted at 1 Rolle 277, 278; 81 ER 487, 487.

¹²⁸ C 33/130 f 462.

¹²⁹ C 33/129 f 728. The first half of the entry is deleted (and marked as vacated), but the continuation at f 728v is not; the parallel entry in C 33/130 f 620 says merely that the defendants appeared. Though it may not have been relevant as part of the legal record, there is no good reason to reject the factual accuracy of the deleted entry.

reluctance to rush to judgment. The bill contained 'divers matters of great equity ... meet to be received in this court',¹³⁰ and nothing in it brought into question the proceedings in the Court of Wards or in the King's Bench. The implication of this was that the defendants' demurrer was not well-founded, and Ellesmere said that he would proceed to give judgment to that effect in one week's time unless Goche had by then waived the demurrer and answered to the bill.

Ellesmere's judgment was given on 6 May 1616.¹³¹ Right to the end he was urging the defendants to waive their demurrer and answer the points made in the petition, but Goche refused to do so despite the advice of his counsel that he should. Instead he insisted on the finality of the judgment at Common Law, making reference to the Statutes of Praemunire¹³² and referring to a recent case in Chancery on the application of the 1571 statute. Goche, a Doctor of Laws, was by this time making the arguments himself—his counsel is recorded as having agreed that the arguments were irrelevant and having said that he had tried to convince Goche of this—but Ellesmere none the less dealt with them carefully. Judgment was therefore decreed for the plaintiffs, the defendants having been taken to have confessed by their demurrer all the facts alleged in the petition, and an injunction was issued that the Earl and his tenants have quiet enjoyment of the lands and that all suits at Common Law be stayed.

This, one might have thought, would be the end of the matter, but Goche did not give up. Towards the end of 1616 the case took another turn. At Michaelmas, one Thomas Mosse, no doubt acting as the Earl's representative, arrived with witnesses at Magdalene to tender the £15 annual rent and the arrears which had accrued over the previous nine years. They said that they had waited in the college hall from 3.00 in the afternoon until sunset, but nobody from the college would come to accept the money from them. A further petition was brought, this time requiring the college to accept the rent, and on the college's refusal to do so it was ordered that the money be paid into court and that depositions be taken from witnesses to the tender which could be used in any future proceedings, protecting the Earl from the risk that the witnesses might have died in the meantime.¹³³ Still Goche remained intransigent, refusing to accept the rent as it fell due, and thereby creating the impression that the Earl's title was not secure so that he could not deal with it freely. In 1619 he petitioned the King for confirmation of the decree of 1616.¹³⁴ James referred the matter to Francis Bacon, now

¹³⁰ C 33/129 f 728 (deleted).

¹³¹ C 78/291 no 17. Curiously, the decree book makes no mention of this, noting simply the defendants' routine appearance: C 33/130 f 626.

¹³² Below, text at n 186.

¹³³ C 33/132 ff 342v, 600v.

¹³⁴ Details from C 78/291 no 17.

Lord Chancellor, the two Chief Justices, Montagu of the King's Bench and Hobart of the Common Pleas, and the Chief Baron, Tanfield, requiring them to certify their opinions in the matter.¹³⁵

The case was yet again argued by counsel, though unfortunately no report of this has been discovered. It was only now, after more than 10 years in the courts, that the substance of the Earl's case was subjected to judicial consideration. The basis of his position, as expressed in the original Chancery petition, was in effect that the college should be estopped from reclaiming the land, at least without paying compensation for the improvements:¹³⁶ those holding it had spent a good deal of money on the improvements and had put far more at risk through the giving of penal bonds, all of which they had done in good faith and in the apparently reasonable belief that the Queen's letters patent had given an irrefragible title; and the college had in no sense been cheated by the transaction or even taken advantage of, but on the contrary had made a considerable profit out of it. The Lord Chancellor, Chief Justices and Chief Baron largely accepted this. Whatever the true interpretation of the statute of 1576, ever since it had been enacted the view of lawyers had been that grants made by letters patent were good in law; as a consequence, very large sums of money had been expended by individuals in the belief that their estates were good, and no fault could be imputed to them for having been mistaken in this belief. In sum, it was not appropriate to dispossess bona fide purchasers who had remained in possession for many decades.¹³⁷ On receipt of this certification, the King instructed Lord Chancellor Bacon to affirm Ellesmere's earlier decree, saying that it was properly part of the King's function 'to take care and provide that the rigour of the law might be so tempered with equity as that his majesty's subjects might not by colour of law be pressed with any hard and avoidable extremities.'¹³⁸ John Manningham, still counsel for Goche and the college, argued that in refusing the rent they were not in any way impugning Ellesmere's decree, but Bacon rejected this since the refusal could not be interpreted in any other way than as implying that they still had a claim over the land.¹³⁹ In the light of this, a final decree was made requiring the college to accept the rent as it fell due and give acquittance under

¹³⁵ Montagu and Hobart had argued the Earl's case as counsel, but it would be wrong to conclude from that that they must have been biased in favour of him when sitting in a judicial capacity.

¹³⁶ It is clear from the college's demurrer (above, n 118) that the Earl would have been satisfied with this. The situation would therefore have been exactly the same as in Roman law if a *vindicatio* had been brought and the defendant raised an *exceptio doli*.

¹³⁷ Summarised in C 78/291 no 17.

¹³⁸ *Ibid*, m 8.

¹³⁹ C 33/314 f 921v.

seal for it and ordering that no further litigation over the original decree be permitted.¹⁴⁰ An injunction to this effect was served on the college.¹⁴¹

Goche then turned to Parliament, having been elected as MP for Cambridge University in 1621.¹⁴² He first attempted to proceed by way of petition, but it was resolved that he should instead proceed by bill.¹⁴³ Although as yet the only issue was whether Goche should be allowed to speak since the matter might have been thought to be his own cause, Sir Edward Coke's recorded remarks show that the point of substance might still have been a matter in dispute:¹⁴⁴

It is a great grievance that the parliament shall say, be it enacted that all such Leases shall be void, and the Chancellor, be it decreed that it shall be good; for it was done in Magdalen College Case, whereof Gouch spoke. The writ of error after that one judge had argued for the judgment was discontinued. The chancellor that made the decree held a lease from a college upon the same title. This particular involves a general; it toucheth every man in his inheritance.

The bill to avoid the Chancery decree against the college was duly presented, justified on the grounds that the Chancery should not decide matters of inheritance,¹⁴⁵ but lack of time meant that it was not fully debated or enacted. Re-elected to the 1624 Parliament, Goche again introduced a bill to overturn the decree, at the same time as the Earl of Oxford introduced a bill into the House of Lords to confirm it.¹⁴⁶ Although Oxford's bill made better progress, both bills stalled in committee and neither was enacted. This, finally, put an end to the matter, at least for a while: on several occasions since the college has investigated the re-opening of the question.¹⁴⁷

D. THE ISSUES IN THE LITIGATION

It is impossible to capture in any simple way what this complex of litigation was 'really' about. For Goche and the college, no doubt, it was seen as a

¹⁴⁰ C 78/291 no 17, m 8.

¹⁴¹ MCC A/27/16.

¹⁴² Thrush and Ferris (n 76) 408. He had unsuccessfully stood for election in 1614: *ibid.*, 407.

¹⁴³ W Notestein *et al*, *Commons Debates 1621* (New Haven, Conn, Yale University Press, 1935) vol 3, 158; vol 4, 299; vol 5, 139, 366. For procedure by petition, appropriate to the redress of a private grievance, see Coke, *Fourth Institute*, 10–11. The 1621 parliamentary proceedings are concisely described in Thrush and Ferris (n 76), 408.

¹⁴⁴ Notestein *et al* (n 143) vol 5, 139. For all his rhetoric, it is noteworthy that in 1613 Coke himself had intended to buy the lease of the manor of Cressingham, Norfolk, which had been conveyed to the Queen by the Dean and Chapter of Norwich: JP Collier (ed), *The Egerton Papers* (London, Camden Society, 1840) 462; I owe this reference to Dr Steven Churches.

¹⁴⁵ Notestein *et al* (n 143) vol 3, 197; noted also vol 2, 353; vol 4, 317.

¹⁴⁶ For the 1624 proceedings, Thrush and Ferris (n 76) 412.

¹⁴⁷ Cunich *et al* (n 19) 82–83.

matter of attempting to recover valuable land out of which they believed that they had been in some sense cheated in the 1570s. For the Earl of Oxford, no doubt, it was seen as a matter of retaining valuable land which he had always thought to be his, and where he was at risk of losing many thousands of pounds if his tenants were evicted from property which they had developed at considerable expense and in the belief that their rights were well-grounded. Both sides surely thought they were right, both were willing to exploit the potentials of the English legal and political system to press their own claims, and probably both were frustrated by the ability and willingness of the other side to do so.

For the historian, the most important feature is the jurisdictional plurality which characterised the early-modern legal system: the dispute was located in turn before the Court of Wards, the King's Bench, the Exchequer Chamber, the Chancery, the Chief Justices and Chief Baron acting on commission from the King, and finally in Parliament. In such a world, finality was a goal which could hardly be achieved where both parties were tenacious and determined to succeed. As well, we cannot help pausing in an attempt to understand how Parliament in 1571 might have legislated to outlaw transactions whereby colleges parted with their lands for lengthy terms of years or in perpetuity, only for the Queen to be used as an instrument to avoid the statute, with Parliament then unable effectively to deal with the problems created thereby.

For the lawyers, the issue at the heart of the dispute was the inviolability of Common-Law property rights. This was the basis of Goche's and Smith's demurrer in the Chancery—that the determination of property rights was a matter purely for the Common Law and not for the emergent equity of the Court of Chancery—and it lay behind Goche's bill in the 1621 Parliament, that the Chancery should not meddle in matters of inheritance.¹⁴⁸ This whole issue of the inviolability of property rights was a dominant theme in the political discourse of the reign of James I, intimately connected with arguments about the protection of individual liberty.¹⁴⁹ Its principal focus was the legitimacy or illegitimacy of extra-parliamentary taxation. It had been held by the Court of Exchequer in *Bates' Case* in 1606¹⁵⁰ that the King had a general power to levy taxes—in this case a levy on the importation of currants—for the public good. This decision, and the way in which it was being implemented, was a matter for sustained criticism in the Parliament of 1610: taxation at the will of the King was tantamount to the taking of

¹⁴⁸ Above, n 118, n 145.

¹⁴⁹ JP Sommerville, *Politics and Ideology in England, 1603–1640* (London, Longman, 1986) 145–63.

¹⁵⁰ *Bates' Case* (1606) Lane 22, 145 ER 267.

property without consent, something which was improper.¹⁵¹ For William Hakewill, certainty was the hallmark of the Common Law;¹⁵² the Common Law could be seen as the guarantor of the stability of property rights. Similar concerns lay behind the discussion of the Irish custom of tanistry, according to which land descended not according to some predetermined and certain rule, but to the kinsman who was deemed the most worthy. A statute of 1570¹⁵³ had made it possible for the current tanist to convert his interest into a Common Law estate by surrender to the Crown and regrant, but tanistry had not itself been abolished. In the early seventeenth century a move was made to do this, led by Sir John Davies, the Attorney-General in Ireland.¹⁵⁴ One aspect of this attack on tanistry was the argument that it was a custom which should not be admitted as valid by the Common Law. It did not satisfy the basic minimal criterion of reasonableness, argued Davies in the Irish King's Bench.¹⁵⁵ If the line of descent was not certain, the occupant for the time being would have no incentive to develop or improve the land; it encouraged crime, since men could have no confidence that their wives or children would be provided for after their death; and it went against the maxim of the Common Law that there could be no abeyance of the freehold. In sum, 'A commonwealth cannot survive without certain ownership of land.'¹⁵⁶ The *Case of Tanistry* might not at first have been familiar to lawyers in England, but the publication of Davies's report of it in 1615, in a volume dedicated to Ellesmere, would have ensured its entry into the legal consciousness.

That established property rights should be afforded strong protection by the law is no doubt something on which Magdalene and the Earl of Oxford would have agreed. The difference between them was that the college was arguing that property rights were to be identified solely by reference to the Common Law, whereas the Earl was placing greater weight on the fact that he and his tenants had been in occupation of the land for several decades and had in good faith spent a great deal of money in the development of it. This was the truly contested territory in the case, and the decision in favour of the Earl reflected two important points. First was that Common Law

¹⁵¹ See, eg, the speech of Thomas Hedley in the debate over impositions in 1610: ER Foster (ed), *Proceedings in Parliament 1610* (New Haven, Conn, Yale University Press, 1966) 188–89; Sommerville (n 149) 153–54.

¹⁵² W Hakewill *The Libertie of the Subject: Against the Pretended Power of Impositions. Maintained by an Argument in Parliament Anno 7o Jacobi Regis* (London, 1641) 10: 'That the Common-Law of England (as also all other wise Laws in the World) delight in certainty, and abandon uncertainty, as the mother of all debate and confusion, than which nothing is more odious in Law.'

¹⁵³ Stat 12 Eliz c 4.

¹⁵⁴ HS Pawlisch, *Sir John Davies and the Conquest of Ireland* (Cambridge, CUP, 1985) 55–81.

¹⁵⁵ *Case of Tanistry* (1608) Dav 28, 80 ER 516.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 33–34; 522–23.

did not have a monopoly over the determination of rights of real property, second that—in modern terms—the Court of Chancery had the power to manipulate property rights based on the working of what we would see as a broad principle of estoppel.

With hindsight, the first of these looks as if it could hardly have been controversial, and the speed with which the Masters in Chancery reported that Goche's demurrer was ill-founded¹⁵⁷ suggests that this is how they saw the matter too. However, it might not have been quite so clear-cut at the time. Sixteenth-century Chancellors had rather vacillated over the question of the extent to which they could or should interfere with property, commonly preferring to do so indirectly rather than directly,¹⁵⁸ and what we think of today as Chancery's property institutions were not yet established. Since 1536 the Statute of Uses had operated to convert most uses into legal estates, except where the feoffees had active duties to perform.¹⁵⁹ The passive trust, based on the use upon a use, was only just beginning to emerge, and the uncertainty which it introduced was a matter for criticism by Common Lawyers;¹⁶⁰ it was not until the time of Lord Nottingham later in the seventeenth century that it was to be truly established, and even then it was arguable that the beneficiary's interest was a purely personal right.¹⁶¹ The equity of redemption was still in the process of gestation;¹⁶² and equitable rights such as restrictive covenants were still centuries away. While for the modern lawyer the proprietary consequences of equitable rights are absolutely fundamental (though no longer centred on interests in real property), matters could have turned out very differently indeed. It is no exaggeration to say that had the *Earl of Oxford's Case* upheld Goche's demurrer, the subsequent history of the English law of property could have been unrecognisably different.

The second point, the operation of a broad principle of estoppel, is more technical. The Chancery decree roll shows that an idea of this sort was the basis of the Chancery judgment: Spinola, the Earl of Oxford and their tenants had expended very considerable sums on buildings; they had acted in

¹⁵⁷ A single day: above, n 119.

¹⁵⁸ E Henderson, 'Legal Rights to Land in the Early Chancery' (1982) 26 *American Journal of Legal History* 97.

¹⁵⁹ Such active uses did not compromise the dominance of the Common Law, since they were not concerned with the whereabouts of what we would today regard as beneficial ownership, only with how the undoubted holders of the fee simple should exercise their property rights.

¹⁶⁰ NG Jones, 'Trusts in England after the Statute of Uses: A View from the 16th Century' in R Helmholz and R Zimmermann (eds), *Itinera Fiduciaie* (Berlin, Duncker & Humblot, 1998) 173. Baker (n 92) 309. See in particular the Reading of Henry Sherfield on the Statute of Wills (Lincoln's Inn, 1623), in JH Baker and SFC Milsom, *Sources of English Legal History* (2nd edn by Sir John Baker, Oxford, OUP, 2010) 149.

¹⁶¹ M Macnair, 'The Conceptual Basis of Trusts in the Later 17th and Early 18th Centuries' in Helmholz and Zimmermann (eds) (n 160) 207.

¹⁶² GJ Turner, *The Equity of Redemption* (Cambridge, CUP, 1931) 27–28, 37–38.

good faith throughout, and in the reasonable belief that they had good title; the college had not been overreached but had itself made a considerable profit.¹⁶³ The last of these points may have been particularly important, for it is marked with a cross in the margin of the decree roll. Estoppels had long been recognised as a matter of Common Law, but only where there had been a positive act or representation by the person estopped.¹⁶⁴ Here there had been no such positive conduct, and it was presumably for this reason that the issue was not raised in the Common Law proceedings in the *Magdalen College Case*. Indeed, the word 'estoppel' was nowhere used in the Chancery proceedings in the *Earl of Oxford's Case*, and the printed report of the case focuses on the issue of the relationship between Chancery and the Common Law courts rather than the substantive ground of the decree in Equity. Equitable estoppel, as a basis of proprietary claims, hardly existed in the eighteenth century—the section devoted to it in Viner's *Abridgement*¹⁶⁵ is exiguous, for example—and it was not until the middle of the nineteenth century that this aspect of the *Earl of Oxford's Case* was to be resurrected, as one of the foundational authorities for the formulation of the idea of estoppel by acquiescence in *Ramsden v Dyson*.¹⁶⁶ But this could not be expressed as the formal basis of the decision in the *Earl of Oxford's Case*, for as yet the conceptual vocabulary was not there to do so.

E. 'THE EARL OF OXFORD'S CASE'

The heading of the *Earl of Oxford's Case*¹⁶⁷ in the Chancery Reports reads: 'The Earl of Oxford's Case in Chancery. With the Lord Chancellor's Arguments, touching the Jurisdiction of the said Court. Mich. 13 Jac. I.' The most noteworthy thing about this is the date, Michaelmas Term 1615, for the Chancery record has no trace of any judgment being given in the case in that term. It was, it is true, a busy term, with the Chancery much concerned with the contumacy of Goche and Smith;¹⁶⁸ but the first

¹⁶³ C 78/291 no 18.

¹⁶⁴ See, eg, J Rastell, *Exposition of Certain Difficult and Obscure Words, and Termes of the Lawes of this Realme* (Assignee of Charles Yetsewert, decd, 1595), f 84 and Co Litt 352, both of which are expressed in terms of a person being estopped by his own acts or writings.

¹⁶⁵ Viner, *Abridgement, Estoppel*, F (a).

¹⁶⁶ *Ramsden v Dyson* (1866) LR 1 HL 129, 134. On this case, see the essay by N Piška in ch 9 of this volume.

¹⁶⁷ (1615) 1 Chan Rep 1, 21 ER 485. I have compared the printed text to a selection of manuscript versions (CUL MS Gg 2.31 f 211v, CUL MS Mm 1.43 p 466, BL MS Harl 1767 f 29v, BL MS Harl 4265 f 67, BL MS Harg 227 f 279v, BL MS Harg 249 f 148v, BL MS Harg 269 f 25v, BL MS Lansd 613 f 31v, BL MS Stowe 296 f 65). All are substantially similar; points where the manuscripts vary from the printed text in some significant way are noted where appropriate.

¹⁶⁸ C 33/130 ff 39, 53, 235, 232v.

substantive decree in the case was on 6 May 1616, approximately six months later.¹⁶⁹ The date therefore gives the context for the report: it is concerned solely with the propriety of imprisoning the defendants for their contempt in refusing to answer the Earl's bill.¹⁷⁰

The way in which this issue is formulated reflects contemporary concerns. It need not have done so: Goche and Smith might have argued that it was their right to demur to the Earl's petition, taking the risk that the demurrer would be decided against them, and that consequently the Chancellor's requirement that they waive their demurrer and answer the petition was illegal. However, in 1615 the whole question whether the Chancery had a power to require a successful party to release a judgment at Common Law and to commit him to prison when he refused to do so was very much centre-stage. Matters had come to a head in Trinity Term, in *Glanvill's Case*.¹⁷¹ Contrary to Ellesmere's insistence on the legitimacy of doing so, Coke had led the Common Law judges to the opposite conclusion and had ordered Glanvill's release on habeas corpus. At the legal heart of *Glanvill's Case*, and of *Apsley and Ruswell's Case*¹⁷² at the same time, was whether a return to habeas corpus that the applicant was imprisoned by the order of the Chancery was good in itself, or whether the cause for which the imprisonment had been ordered had to be shown so that the King's Bench could evaluate its sufficiency.

Ellesmere's reasoning suggests that Goche and Smith were trying to place themselves within the Common-Law principle of *Glanvill's Case*, and his careful analysis looks to be directed at taking the case outside it.

The first point established by Ellesmere was that the Earl had a good claim in Equity or conscience.¹⁷³ In the absence of any answer by the defendants, it was said to be legitimate for the court to proceed on the basis of the facts alleged in the bill: *Gorringe v Taylor*.¹⁷⁴ This settled, the position in Equity could be considered on its merits. Here the Earl and his tenants had expended very considerable sums of money on the development of the land, and it was not conscionable for the defendants to insist on their strict legal rights without compensating the plaintiffs. Chancery

¹⁶⁹ Above, text at n 131.

¹⁷⁰ Above, text at n 124.

¹⁷¹ *Glanvill's Case* 1 Rolle 111, 81 ER 365; 2 Bulst 301, 80 ER 1139; Moo 838, 72 ER 939; Cro Jac 343, 79 ER 294. This paragraph largely summarises JH Baker, 'The Common Lawyers and the Chancery: 1616' (1969) 4 *Irish Jurist* 368, 374–76.

¹⁷² *Apsley and Ruswell's Case* 1 Rolle 192, 81 ER 424; 1 Rolle 218, 81 ER 443.

¹⁷³ 1 Chan Rep 1, 1–7; 21 ER 485, 485–86. For the role of conscience at this time, see D Klink, *Conscience, Equity and the Court of Chancery in Early Modern England* (Aldershot, Ashgate, 2010) esp at 157–58.

¹⁷⁴ *Gorringe v Taylor* (1596) C 33/91 f 424; 117 SS 210 no 235, 224 no 332 (not on this point). The reference to the case is omitted from the printed version.

authority was cited for this too: *Peterson v Parrys and Hickman*.¹⁷⁵ In that case land had been held by a husband and wife jointly; the husband made a lease, the lessee expended considerable sums in developing the land, and after the husband's death the wife initiated an action of ejectment to recover the land from the lessee. The Chancery refused to order a staying of the Common-Law action, but only on the basis that the lessee would be compensated in full for the value of the improvements. The situation in the *Earl of Oxford's Case* was exactly the same, said Lord Ellesmere: 'The Plaintiff in this Case only desires to be satisfied of the true Value of the new Building and Planting since the Conveyance, and convenient Allowance for the Purchase.'¹⁷⁶ This was sufficient to set down an independent basis for the Chancery action.

It should be noted that there is here a mismatch between the report of the case and the Chancery record. The report gives the reasons why the Earl's claim should succeed, but the record shows emphatically that this was not decided in Michaelmas Term 1615 but continued to be at issue until May 1616. We might strongly suspect that the report of the case does not represent Ellesmere's actual decision in 1615 but is a formalised version of his argument prepared for independent circulation. However, since it is this argument which is being examined, we may gloss over this mismatch.

Ellesmere's reasoning to justify the intervention was subtle. The first limb was to show that Chancery might legitimately intervene after a judgment at law, provided that the grounds of the judgment were not themselves questioned.¹⁷⁷ Hence it was possible to have recourse to Chancery where an action was brought at Common Law to enforce a bond, where it was asserted that the money due under the bond had already been paid (this not being a defence at Common Law). At this point (at the bottom of page 8 of the printed report) there is a small but important linguistic shift: instead of speaking of the intervention of *Chancery*, he moves to referring to the intervention of *Equity* after judgment at Common Law. The first example of this, relief against penal bonds, was indeed a case of Chancery involvement; but immediately thereafter the focus shifts to Common-Law intervention by the writ of *audita querela*, a remedy available to reverse the effect of a judgment at law on the basis of material extraneous to the initial claim,¹⁷⁸ described by Ellesmere as a 'Latin Bill in Equity'. Hence, there was room for Equity to neutralise the effect of Common-Law judgments, both through the Court of Chancery and in the Common Law courts themselves.

¹⁷⁵ *Peterson v Parrys and Hickman* (1597) C 33/93 f 125; 117 SS 263 no 248 (not on this point).

¹⁷⁶ 1 Chan Rep 1, 6; 21 ER 485, 486.

¹⁷⁷ 1 Chan Rep 1, 7–11; 21 ER 485, 486–87. The words 'And for the Judgment', marking the beginning of the section, form a header in the manuscripts.

¹⁷⁸ TFT Plucknett, *Legislation of Edward I* (Oxford, OUP, 1949) 145–46.