Mit Thomas Stampens Opinion of the 10th of October 1744 in relation to Brading churches, about the Declinations of

Mechel into the Burker of Edward the Sette which is only a grant of a market to be lived weekly an Mednesday, and of two Faves on a year, but takes no notice of any The Form payable to the Come or of any charge on the inhabitants of Brading towners direlanging the The Farm Sout - There must therefore be another chartes granke to this corporation or Brading must be a experation by prescription which supposes a Gra exigenally, but in cetter case of pur the Bayliffe of that Burrough must comfeel the Bestwallors of the Down Der shillings and right power for setting fore. For a prescription to charge them must have been find ordain and invariable, and could adout of no allocation, and must be envoluntary and not by agrament, but this has been from how to line allowed as an agreement sould be made - the that account of the Unsunt Buttern of the Venn good left with met, the Orchialines are charged but Ity, so that wen the account if widown at all would be wedered against against the Backiffs of the Heart on Their claim of 6/8, though it think this court to william of a prescription, books without date and by the little the originate of this outen yers no farther look then Source the seall time , one the account elect oppears to be only a copy - In 1610 the Distrations were charged strack - Ju ton so amongs him, the Some again in 1815 - In 1613 If each 1644 8/ vach - Saltall of each - after this it affects that was paid une an againent with the thoughts yearly and so lattle as the year 1701 et appears that some of the Sectuallers from Os and some of them but 3 so that Athenk those is no probability of of supporting this prescription therefore d'earl adver the Bayleys to mes a Village or hing any astron for recovery of this yearly charge of bys on the Betweeters But I think the Buyless man were support a distrip on Balo fames for the Heat in pay ent of the lands or they may mountain an action of thest against him to that thent and may by their associat rest rolls from the charge on their longs -

BTT 1075-2-19

Mr Thomas Stamfords Opinion of the 10th of October 1744 in relation to Brading Charter, about the Victuallers &c.

I looked into the Charter of Edward the Sixth which is only a grant of a Market to be held weekly on Wednesday, and of two Fairs in a year, but takes no notice of any Fee Farm payable to the Crown or of any charge on the inhabitants of Brading towards discharging the Fee Farm rent. There must therefore be another Charter granted to this corporation or Brading must be a corporation by prescription which supposes a Grant originally, but in either case I fear the Bayliffs of that Borough can't must compel the Victuallers of the Town to pay Six shillings and eight pence for selling beer. For a prescription to charge them must have been fixed certain and invariable, and could admit of no alteration, and must be involuntary and not by agreement, but this had been from time to time altered as an Agreement could be made. In that account of the Ancient Custom of the Town you left with me, the Victuallers are charged but 3/4, so that even that account if evidence at all, would be evidence against against the Bayliffs of the Town in their claim of 6/8, though I think this can't be evidence of a prescription, because without date and by the Title the original of this custom goes no farther back that Edward the Sixth time, and the account itself appears to be only a copy. In 1610 the Victuallers were charged 5/ each. In 1611 30/ amongst them, the same again in 1612. In 1613 5/ each, 1614 5/ each. In 1616 5/ each. After this it appears that was paid under an Agreement with the Bayliffs yearly, and so lately as the year 1701 it appears that some of the Victuallers paid 6/8 and some of them but 5/ so that I think there is no probability of ef supporting this Prescription, therefore I can't advise the Bayliffs to make a Distress or bring any action for recovery of this yearly charge of 6/8 on the Victuallers. But I think the Bayliffs may well support a distress on Duke James for the Rent he pays out of the lands or they may maintain an action of debt against him for that Rent and may by their ancient rent rolls prove the charge on these lands.