

not received such previous determination, yet it was supportable by principles of law and reason: *an appeal of common right lies to the superior*. And seeing that no writ of error lay, because the proceedings there were not according to the common law, therefore, of necessity, an appeal must lie to the King in a summary way. In fact, such applications have been from the Isle of Man to the King, as it appears from the Council register. On the 18th August, 1669, a petition of James Christian was read, setting forth a prosecution of Robert Calcot; and that he had dispossessed him of his estate, praying relief, with an affidavit annexed thereto. Thereupon, it was ordered by the King in Council, that a copy of the said petition and affidavit should be transmitted to the Earl of Derby, who was thereby directed to hear and end the case; and if he could not end it, to represent a state of the case to the Council Board, that his Majesty according to justice, might finally determine the same. Afterwards, the 15th of April, 1760, a state of the case reported by the Officers of the Isle of Man, was laid before the Council Board; and ordered to be transmitted to the Bishop of St. Asaph, who had been Bishop of Man; who, together with the Attorney and Solicitor-General were to consider this matter, and report the same, that so such further and final determination might be taken therein as was agreeable to justice. On the 6th May, 1670, the Attorney and Solicitor-General reported that Christian's claim was under a prior lease, which they conceived to be void; and that Calcot's claim was by a subsequent good lease; whereupon Christian's petition was dismissed. There was said to be also another petition by one Curry in 1670, which was received; and afterwards on the merits dismissed.

For these and other reasons the Lords Committee determined to go on with the appeal; and ordered it to be determined on the merits the 12th December following; when the Committee reversed the decree of the Earl of Derby, and ordered the appellant to be put into possession of the lands out of which he had been ejected by the execution of the said judgment, and that the respondent should account to him for the profits since his having possession of the premises.

No. 3.—*John Skelton's Case, 1st Henry 4th, 1399.—Payment of Allowances to a Crown Officer.*—The petition of John Skelton, stating, that he had discharged a commission from the late King to Scotland, prays, an account to be taken on his oath concerning what is due for the journey and the commission, at the rate paid to others before for the same service; and for payment, according to the report of the King's Treasurer, and Chamberlain of the Exchequer.

This petition was agreed to at the Council Board.

No. 4.—*Confirmation of Officers, 1 Henry 6th, 1423.*—It was ordered, that all those who held their offices under patents of the late King, during their good behaviour, should be confirmed in the same as if they held them for life, unless they have been found undeserving, or notoriously inefficient.—(Proceedings of the P. C., vol. iii. p. 23.—So Lord J. Russell above, p. 34, Note.)

No. 5.—*William Mill's Case.—Vindication of an Injured Public Officer.*—William Mill held an office in the Star Chamber, of which the reversion was granted to Lord Bacon. In 1594, he was punished by imprisonment for alleged corruption. Several years afterwards, other charges were made against him; but he obtained a hearing, with the result, expressed in the following commission from the Queen to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Keeper, and four others, concerning the case:—"Whereas, our servant, William Mill, Clerk of our Council, hath for two years been charged with sundry supposed offences, the examination whereof are committed to you; and finding from precedents of the Court of Star Chamber, and breviate of the cause, that the pretended offences are neither in their own nature, nor