

## THE EVERY FAMILY AND THE CIVIL WAR.

### A tale of loyalty.

By F. N. FISHER, T.D., A.R.Hist.S.

WHEN Charles I raised his standard at Nottingham on 22 August 1642 the die was cast and there began the bloodiest and most deplorable struggle between Englishmen on their native soil. Neighbouring families were ranged on opposing sides and even brother fought against brother.

The rightness of either cause is not our theme and it is intended rather to dwell upon one small aspect of the struggle and its aftermath, namely, its impact upon a local county family who were called upon to suffer much because of their loyalty to Charles.

The family of Every had its origin in Normandy and one branch was long settled in Somerset. A member of this branch, one Simon, came to Egginton to marry Anne, eldest daughter and co-heiress of Sir Henry Leigh, Kt. By virtue of this marriage he came into possession of the manors of Egginton and Newton Solney.

His eldest son, Henry, was baptised on 15 November 1629. There were also two younger sons, John and Francis, and a daughter Katherine, of the marriage. Simon was created a baronet on 26 May 1641, paying for the honour the large sum of £1,095. He was, along with Sir John Curzon, Receiver-General of the Duchy of Lancaster until deprived of this office on 29 September 1643, but how long he held the appointment is not clear.

The first manifestations of the struggle in Derbyshire were the assembling of a small force of Royalists in the Wirksworth area under Sir Francis Wortley, and a vigorous recruiting campaign at Chesterfield by Sir John Gell on behalf of Parliament. As a result of Gell's

activities a group of prominent local landowners with Royalist sympathies, including the earls of Devonshire and Chesterfield, Sir John Harpur of Calke, Sir John Harpur of Swarkestone, Sir John FitzHerbert of Norbury, Sir Edward Vernon and Sir Simon Every met at Tutbury in October 1642 and sent him a letter of protest. For their pains they received a forthright answer in which Gell said that he acted for no other reason than to rid the country of thieves and robbers and to maintain the laws of the land and liberties of the subjects according to the ordinances of Parliament.

Gell then marched to Derby, scattering Wortley's little force *en route* and arrived on 31 October. A fruitless meeting at Etwall between the Royalists who had met at Tutbury and Sir George Gresley, Lt.-Col. Thomas Gell (Sir John's brother), Major Thomas Sanders and Nathaniel Hallowes, all no doubt nominated by Sir John Gell, showed that any idea of compromise so far as Derbyshire was concerned was out of the question. The struggle now began in earnest, only to be ended by the defeat of Charles and the loss of his head.

We may fairly assume that Sir Simon threw himself wholeheartedly into the fray, rendering with zeal such services on behalf of his King as he was called upon to do. His name has not been handed down to us as one of the noted commanders, in fact I have gleaned little of his military activities.

After Wingfield Manor had surrendered in December 1643 the "Loyal Earl" of Newcastle proceeded to York, leaving behind him his own garrison at Bolsover, and six colonels. Of these, five, including Sir John FitzHerbert and Sir John Harpur, had regiments but the sixth, Sir Simon Every, "haveing neither men nor armes, and wanting meanes to trouble this county, he went to Oxford to expect the success of the ante-parliament there".<sup>1</sup> On informing against him, Richard Ford, a mercer of Repton, stated that Sir Simon was in the "Commission of Array, was in arms at the taking of Leicester, lived long in Oxford, Lichfield and Tutbury garrisons

<sup>1</sup> Glover, *History and Gazetteer of Derbyshire*, Vol. 1, p. 74.

and brought up the rear against the Derby Regiment of Horse''.<sup>2</sup>

Wars, even civil wars, are expensive undertakings and Parliament for its part soon evolved means of raising money. Two committees were set up, one in November 1642 known as the Committee for the Advance of Money and the other in September 1643 known as the Committee for Compounding, which met at Goldsmiths Hall. The former was for the purpose of receiving loans, voluntary at first, but later, people were assessed by it for the amount they were to provide according to their estate, real and personal. Initially it dealt with assessments but subsequently it was ordered to deal with those who had compounded but who had concealed assets. In this latter connection there was a clause whereby an informer was to be allowed one-fifth of the money recovered as the result of his information. It was this clause which was to cause the Every family such trouble and anguish over the years. Because of their position they were more or less at the mercy of any jealous neighbour hoping for a picking out of the estates, and they, and countless others, had to answer any charge however ill-founded.

The Committee for Compounding at first concerned itself with selling estates of delinquents who had been sequestered, at six or eight years' purchase, but in August 1644 it conceived the novel idea of compounding whereby delinquents were called upon to pay fines, perhaps having to sell part of their estates to retain the remainder. Originally compounding was applied to prisoners only, but later it was applied to any who tendered themselves to the mercies of the Committee. Fines were proportionate to the degree of delinquency, being in some cases as high as two-thirds of the value of the estates. The two committees worked hand-in-hand and finally were amalgamated in 1650.

Sir Simon was early adjudged a delinquent and no doubt his estates were soon sequestered, although there is no evidence of the date. On 23 November 1643 the Committee for the Advance of Money assessed him at £100 and two years later, on 19 November 1645, he was again

<sup>2</sup> Cal. Committee for Compounding.

assessed, but this time for the large sum of £2,000. On 25 May in the following year, described as of St. Andrew's Holborn, he obtained a respite until such time as sequestration should be taken off his estate.

Sir Simon died in or about August 1647 and soon afterwards there began the long struggle of his family to retain their own possessions and inheritances. On 11 June 1649 Richard Ford, on behalf of himself, Dan Searle, Col. John Barkstead and Col. Nich. Devereux laid information before the Committee for the Advance of Money that Sir Simon was a delinquent and was so judged by the county commissioners. A year later Ford laid similar information but now he alleged that Sir Simon had defrauded the state by pretending that he had compounded at Goldsmiths Hall when he had not, and by producing a false deed conveying most of his lands to his younger children for the benefit of their education. Besides Egginton and Newton Solney, Sir Simon also had estates in Worcestershire and Gloucestershire.<sup>3</sup>

In answer to these charges, Ben Rowning, described as the servant of Sir Henry's solicitor, alleged that Ford had boasted that he had bargained with the committee for one-fifth of the estates of Sir Simon and Sir Henry, and with Col. Devereux for one quarter. Rowning further alleged that Ford attempted to obtain a bribe from Sir Henry to forbear prosecution, and had briefed witnesses to prove the delinquency of Sir Simon. Nevertheless Sir Henry and the other executors of Sir Simon were ordered to appear before the Committee for the Advance of Money on 27 September 1650. They failed to do so and the county committees of Derbyshire and Buckinghamshire were ordered to seize Sir Henry's estates.

On 9 October Sir Henry was allowed a copy of Ford's information and granted time to prepare his defence, but he was apparently dilatory in this, for on 4 December Sir Simon's estates were ordered to be seized and his goods sold for the benefit of the state. Sir Henry countered by requesting a copy of the charges against his father and begging to be allowed use of his estates

<sup>3</sup> Cal. Committee for Compounding.

on security. A fortnight later he and his mother begged for the return of documents from the Commissioners of Sequestration, having placed the matter before the Barons of the Exchequer. This was an adroit move as the time limit to compound would have expired before the Committee for the Advance of Money could have heard the case. The Commissioners returned the papers at once and granted Lady Every one-fifth of her estate as from the time of sequestration.

Hugh Peters, presumably Lady Every's counsel, wrote to the Committee for Compounding on 20 March 1651 and from this letter it appears that the committee had persuaded her to drop her appeal to the Barons of the Exchequer "which had she done there would have been no sequestration". Peters further complained that she is "like to have her own and her children's bread taken away", as the committee had not implemented its promise of relief and help, and begged immediate action.

The committee acted quickly and a week later accepted a deed dated 22 March 1627 whereby Sir Henry Leigh and Dame Katherine his wife conveyed the manor of Newton Solney and all their property there to Sir Simon for life, to pass to Lady Every for her life and then to the heirs of Sir Simon. Also by the same deed a moiety of their lands in Egginton was conveyed to Sir Simon for life, then to Dame Anne and then, at her death, to Sir Simon's heirs. At the same time the committee ordered sequestration on all estates conveyed to Sir Simon and Sir Henry and further ordered the county commissioners for sequestration, Gervase Bennett and Robert Mellor, to examine deeds dated 7 May 1639, 13 May 1640 and 1 February 1642.

The first deed was one whereby Sir Henry's grandmother, Elizabeth Moore, conveyed to him lands and tenements in the borough of Buckingham and in Maids Morton and Chackmore in Buckinghamshire. James Clarkson of Egginton swore that he was present when Mrs. Moore appended her seal to the document. The same witness also attested that he was, along with Edmund Machanna(?), present on 1 February 1642 when Sir Simon signed the deed conveying four farms in Egginton in the occupation of Gilbert Wakelyn, John Gilliver,

Symon Wallanck (*sic*) and Nicholas Byard respectively, together with the impropriated rectory of Newton Solney, to his younger sons John and Francis. Edward Potterell of Makeney affirmed that he was present on 13 May 1640 when Sir Simon conveyed the lease for eighty years to his sister-in-law Mary Leigh, of two closes in Egginton, Mill-holme and Middle Sitch, to provide her with an income of £20.<sup>4</sup>

It is apparent that the family, trying to minimise the penalty for Sir Simon's delinquency, were endeavouring to prove that he was a life tenant only of the estates. As regards the personal possessions they were ready to swear that much of the contents of Egginton were their own property and were either purchased by them or inherited.

The state however made every investigation possible as the estates and personal goods were substantial in value. Sir Henry's estates in Buckinghamshire produced £100 before the war<sup>5</sup> and John and Francis Every derived an annual income of £50 from the Egginton farms to which must be added £360 from the rectory, glebe and tithes of Newton Solney. Lady Every had an income of £350 from the manor of Newton Solney, £66. 13. 7. from the moiety of farms in Egginton and £100 from the manor house of Egginton and its adjacent lands. Katherine Every had a farm in Egginton worth £50 per annum whilst Mary Leigh's two closes in Egginton were worth £30 per annum.<sup>6</sup>

Inventories of personal goods were submitted to Mellor and Bennett on 3 June 1651:

Lady Every

In ye Kitchinge chamber

One pair of Curtaynes & Vallance of blew-sarsnett  
20 pairs of sheets

<sup>4</sup> Every MSS. This reference and others noted as "Every MSS" refer to transcripts of the proceedings of the Committee for the Advance of Money and the Committee for Compounding made before the publication of the Calendars. The two volumes of these transcripts are in the possession of Sir Edward Every, Bart., who kindly placed them at my disposal.

<sup>5</sup> Sir Henry subsequently sold these properties to George Bate, M.D., and John Smith who on 21 Oct. 1652 successfully petitioned for discharge from sequestration.

<sup>6</sup> Every MSS.

In my Ladys Chamber  
 One Cabinet  
 In ye Redd Chamber  
 One ffether Bedd  
 One Boulster  
 2 pillows & 2 blankets  
 In ye inner Chamber  
 One ffether Bed  
 One Boulster and 3 blankets  
 In ye Garrett Chamber  
 One Bedd  
 One Boulster  
 3 Blanketts  
 In ye Buttery Chamber  
 3 stools  
 3 chairs  
 In ye Scullery  
 2 basons  
 Cullender  
 2 fflagons

Sir Henry Every

2 Birdinge peices  
 In ye Buttery Chamber  
 One Bedstead  
 One ffether Bed  
 2 Blanketts  
 One Boulster  
 2 Pillowes  
 Redd Curtains and Vallance with silke fringe and  
 hangings in the Chamber

Katherine Every

In my Ladys Chamber  
 One Bedd  
 One Bedsteed  
 One Boulster  
 2 pillowes  
 2 Blanketts Curtaines and Vallance<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Every MSS.

James Clarkson and Katherine Leigh, presumably a sister of Lady Every, swore on oath that they knew the above particulars to be correct.

On the same day (3 June 1651) Lady Every affirmed on oath that the following personal effects were bequeathed to her sister Mary Leigh by her father and remained in Egginton manor house as she "being a maid hath lived and tabled with her sister".

In the Kitchin

4 Brass potts, three Brass Kettels, 9 spits, 2 Dripping panns, 2 Racks, and other Iron & 3 little stools

In ye Larder

One old Brasse pott, one Brass Morter

In ye Parlor

4 chargers, 3 stooles, 2 quissons [cushions]

In ye scullery

2 dozen of dyshes small and great, One dozen & a halfe of plates

In ye Dyneinge Roome

17 turkey wrought Chaires

In ye studdy next ye Dyneinge Room

One ffether Bedd, one Boulster, 3 chairs, one stoole

In ye Kitchinge Chamber

One Bedd, 2 Bedsteads, One Coverlet, 4 blankets

One pair of Green Curtains, 3 trunks

In Miss Kath Everyys Chamber

One Bedstead, one Bedd, one Boulster, 2 blankets

In ye Redd Chamber

2 Chaires, 2 stooles, one Rugg, Vallance and Curtains

In ye inner Chamber

2 trunks, one chest, one table, 2 old chaires, one Cork Cupbord, one dozen and a halfe of Needle Wrought qushons, one pair of Vallances

In ye Garrett Chamber

One table

In ye Maids Chamber and Lininge garrett

One presse, one Bedd and Bedstead, 2 Blanketts, one quilt, one mattris, 3 old chests.

In ye Dairy

4 Brasse panns



In ye Brew House

One lead, one copper, one lead cooler, 4 greate fflatts

In ye Hinds Chamber

2 bedsteads, one feather bed, 2 boulsters, one Blankett, one coverlett

In ffootmens Chamber

One bed, one Boulster, one Blankett

In ye Buttery Chamber

One Rugg<sup>9</sup>

On 13 June 1651 Ford wrote to the Committee for the Advance of Money and questioned the legality of the deed of entail dated 3 March 1641 whereby Sir Simon granted his eldest son and his heirs the manors of Eggington and Newton Solney and lands there and in Marston-on-Dove, fishing rights in the Trent, and one fourth of the advowson of Eggington together with the tithes there. He also raised doubts on the validity of the deed of 1 February 1642, but evidently without avail as the Committee for Compounding allowed the deed and the children of Sir Simon were allowed to benefit from them "sequestration notwithstanding".

Ford however persisted in his efforts to cause his neighbours every embarrassment and made a further protest in August. He argued that the deed of 1 February 1642 was made invalid by an Act of Parliament of August 1643 which rendered void any conveyance of delinquents' lands except by sale. There is unfortunately a break in the records regarding this aspect of the case but it seems safe to assume that the county commissioners and the authorities in London were busy seeking means to exact the largest possible penalty.

On 22 June 1652 we find Sir Henry still praying recognition of the deed of entail, and the next day Lawrence Squibb, acting for the family, complained that their personal possessions (p. 117) had been seized by the County Committee as being part of Sir Simon's estates. These matters were referred back to Mellor and Bennett to examine witnesses and take depositions. This took time and meanwhile, on 13 July, Sir Henry, on being informed that the Barons of the Exchequer Commissioners

<sup>9</sup> Every MSS.

of Appeal had given judgment that they had found no cause to take off the sequestration, begged to compound for the estates. He also sought leave to compound for lands and tenements in the manor of Eaton, Doveridge, bequeathed him by his father.<sup>10</sup>

The report of Mellor and Bennett was sent to the Committee for Compounding on 30 July. Among the depositions was one by James Clarkson, who swore that he was a witness to the deed of entail. This report was duly considered and the long drawn-out wrangles of the preceding years were now brought rapidly to a conclusion. On 21 September the estates were ordered to be freed from sequestration on payment of a fine of £110. The fine was duly paid two days later and the estates discharged. Sir Henry was also allowed to compound for one half of the profits of the Receivership of the Duchy of Lancaster due to Sir Simon by Sir John Curzon "who is to account for the other moiety".<sup>11</sup>

No doubt Sir Henry and the other members of the family breathed sighs of relief at the comparative smallness of the penalty but as we shall see this was by no means the end of their troubles. We have already seen (p. 115) that Ben Rowning gave evidence that Richard Ford had boasted that he had bargained with the Committee for the Advance of Money for one-fifth of Sir Simon's and Sir Henry's estates, and with Col. Devereux for one quarter, and had also tried to obtain a bribe from Sir Henry in return for withdrawing his charges. This was in July 1651 and in September Ford, not unnaturally, took exception to these accusations and rather piously stated that all his actions were "for his faithful service to the State in his discoveries against the Everys". He begged, and was granted, leave to call and examine witnesses who were to include Cromwell's son-in-law Ireton. Nothing more is heard of the matter until 23 June 1652 when Ford pleaded before the Committee for the Advance of Money to be cleared of Rownings' charges, and claiming damages for the scandal. Unfortunately there is no documentary evidence to shew if Ford obtained any satisfaction from Rowning.

<sup>10</sup> Every MSS.

<sup>11</sup> Cal. Committee for Compounding.

The Repton mercer, however, had not finished with Sir Henry. After the fine was paid and the estates discharged he was still on the look-out for any evidence to cause him harm. On 26 April 1653 he claimed before the Committee for the Advance of Money that Sir Simon's executors had embezzled plate and goods to the extent of £600 as valued by the County Commissioners. The Committee of course considered the case but put the onus on Ford to prove whether or not the sequestration of Sir Simon's personal estate took place before or after the Act of General Pardon. Nothing more is heard of the matter in the proceedings of this or its sister committee, and from lack of evidence it appears that Ford failed to prove his point. Nothing more is heard of Ford and we are thus left in the dark regarding the reward, if any, of informing against his neighbour.

In the meantime, however, Ford's ally, Col. Devereux was persisting in his claim for financial reward and on 10 September 1651 he petitioned for payment of a sum of £100, already received from Sir Simon's estate. He claimed that he was the discoverer, but the Committee for the Advance of Money decreed, on grounds not stated, that the whole amount could not be allowed, whereupon the colonel, on 19 September, claimed the usual fifth, and the matter was referred to the Army Committee. Events moved slowly and it was not until 4 June 1652 that the Committee for the Advance of Money, on the advice of the Army Committee, allowed him the £100 as part of his arrears of pay. At the same time it was stated that Col. Barkstead had relinquished any interest in Sir Simon's estate and that Dan Searle had forfeited any claims by accepting a sum from the Treasury in lieu of his order of Parliament.

Devereux was certainly not satisfied with the £100, in point of fact he claimed that Dawson, the treasurer, had withheld £5 but this seemingly was paid later. He persisted in his efforts to get a larger share of the spoils and at his request the Every estates were re-sequestered on 23 June, notwithstanding the fact that Sir Henry had petitioned to compound. Following a further petition in November he was granted £10 "for present use" with

a promise that further consideration would be given to his case. On 1 December he was informed that the Committee for the Advance of Money had decided that no more than the £110 already paid could be allowed him. The colonel of course protested and at his request the matter was referred to Parliament. After a further petition it was ordered on 12 January 1653 that as he had presented the case at his own cost and as £301. 15. 4. had been paid in by the county commissioners, he was to receive that amount less the £10 already paid. Translated into present day monetary values Devereux received a substantial reward, but we must not lose sight of a suggestion that the authorities may have been influenced by the fact that he had arrears of pay due to him.

Soon after Sir Simon's death, allegations were made that he had not accounted for arrears of money paid to him as Receiver-General of the Duchy of Lancaster. In 1659 Christopher Vine, usher to the Exchequer, stated that with his three sons he had attended all the meetings of Parliament which sat in the Exchequer Chamber. He claimed that he had received emoluments of only £40 and no expenses, and he petitioned for financial redress. Among his expenses was the sum of £92. 18. 0, itemised as having been spent on firing, lights and paper. The Committee for Plundered Ministers awarded Vine £600, to be paid when the executors of Sir Simon paid in this amount due from his accounts of the Receivership of the Duchy.<sup>12</sup>

Vine, however, died before the money was paid, and on 14 August 1654 an Order in Council directed the Commissioners for Sequestered Estates to examine the case and to apply the £600 for the relief of Vine's widow and children.<sup>13</sup>

On 25 August the Committee for Compounding ordered Lady Anne Every and Sir Henry to appear before them to shew cause why they should not pay this money. They failed to appear and on 19 September they were peremptorily ordered to pay the £600 within three weeks. On 17 October and on 7 November Richard, one of Vine's

<sup>12</sup> Cal. State Papers, Domestic.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

sons, again petitioned for payment. A week later, on 14 November, Laurence Squibb, by now the husband of Lady Anne, acting for the executors, appeared before the Committee for Compounding and pleaded that they were ignorant of the debt of £600 and indeed hoped to prove that Sir Simon was "in surplusage on his account". He asked for full particulars of the case and begged time to consider the matter. On 12 December the case was ordered to be held within the next few days "as Squibb causes needless delay".

Squibb appeared before the committee on 2 January 1655 and declared that Sir Simon, along with Sir John Curzon, accounted for all payments and receipts in the Duchy until his appointment terminated on 29 September 1643. After Sir Simon's death in 1647 his accounts were cleared but the auditors charged his executors with one sum of £800 received by him from Bryan Stapleton in 1642, and another of £194. 13. 4. received from Sir Thomas Bishop. Squibb demanded proof from Stapleton and the executors of Bishop that these sums had been paid. Stapleton and Bishop's executors were duly ordered to appear before the Committee for Compounding and although there is no direct evidence that they did so yet the committee was satisfied that the sums had been paid to Sir Simon. The committee was also satisfied that Sir Simon had not accounted for this £994. 13. 4. nor also for a further sum of £388. 17. 5. Later the committee noted that £100 had been paid in and that a sum of £500 had not in fact been received by Sir Simon, and on 29 June 1655 an order was made that the balance of £738. 10. 9. was to be paid by Sir Simon's executors by 1 November following. The statement that £500 had not been received by Sir Simon might imply that either or both Stapleton and Bishop had made mis-statements or of course it might have been another account, but it hardly concerns us here.

On 17 July George Vine, another son of Christopher, petitioned that this sum be paid to the family. He stated that his father on his death left debts of £570, two state appointments worth £240 per annum had lapsed and a further appointment rendered void on his brother's death

“slain in the service of the State in Ireland”. An order was duly made, and from lack of evidence to the contrary, it appears that Sir Simon’s executors must have paid over the sum of £738. 10. 9.

Then years later there was a further repercussion of Sir Simon’s receivership. On 29 November 1665 Peter Rycout petitioned the king for an order to the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster to permit him to “discover the invalidity of certain acquittances pleaded by the heirs of Sir Simon Every, late receiver-general, for £12,378. 8. 7. due ever since 1641, and to grant him such part as shall be found yet due, as requested in a former petition”. The order was granted. An appeal, dated 7 October 1668 was couched in similar terms, and that unfortunately is as much as I have been able to discover.<sup>14</sup>

From another case which appeared before the Committee for the Advance of Money we get an insight into the financial standing of Sir Simon some years before the Civil War. In 1634 he lent Mary, widow of Sylvester Plunkett, £1,000 to be repaid in eleven annual instalments of £160, her son-in-law Viscount Fitz-William standing surety. The lady defaulted and the debt was still unsettled when Sir Simon died. Lady Anne and Sir Henry brought a suit against the viscount and obtained judgment against him. Widow Plunkett’s estates had been sequestered but Fitz-William was able to get authority to have two-thirds of the income of these estates, which we must presume were used to pay Sir Simon’s executors.

Sir Henry married Vere, the elder of the two daughters of Sir Henry Herbert of Ribbesford, Worcestershire. A royalist, Herbert was assessed at £400 in 1647 by the Committee for the Advance of Money, and was also accused of concealing assets which included £3,000 owing to him by Sir John Danvers. From this case it transpires that on his second marriage Sir Henry Herbert deposited a sum of money for the benefit of his daughters with Danvers, who was their grandfather by marriage. On Vere’s marriage to Sir Henry Every, her sister then being dead, the sum amounted to £3,000 and Danvers gave

<sup>14</sup> Cal. State Papers, Domestic.

bond for this to Sir Henry Herbert "rather than give it to Every who was a stranger, but Sir Henry [Herbert] had no interest therein". We have failed to ascertain if Lady Vere ever received this money.

After his estates had been cleared of sequestration we can only assume that Sir Henry spent his time managing his property and perhaps discussing, with trusted friends, ways and means of restoring the monarchy. With Oliver's death, plotting no doubt followed and when Richard Cromwell "abdicated" in May 1659 the tempo quickened and it became manifest that the restoration could not long be delayed. Sir Henry, like his father before him, was prepared to risk everything for his rightful king and spared no effort to speed the return of Charles II to the throne. He made open avowal of his intention and was a Derbyshire ringleader in the premature rising organised by Sir George Booth.

Sir George had the rather grandiose plan of a main rising in Cheshire with himself at the head, and simultaneous risings in the neighbouring counties spreading eventually throughout the country. The Chester rising soon collapsed and Booth was taken prisoner and committed to the Tower. The Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire affairs shared a similar fate. Lord Byron and Colonel White assembled a force of 120 horse in Sherwood Forest which was scattered by the county troops, who took many prisoners. White escaped and, undaunted, made his way to Derby where he arrived on Friday August 12, long to be known as White or White's Friday. Many of the local gentry, including Sir Henry Every, John Mundy, sheriff of the county, Philip second earl of Chesterfield, John Stanhope, Anchitel Grey and Colonel Shalcross rallied round him. Colonel Thomas Sanders was quick in opposition and soon had the situation in hand, and any hope of success White may have had was shattered by the arrival of a troop of Lambert's horse. Many arrests were made and White was sent to the Tower. Sir Henry, described as a "principal actor and promoter of the Rebellion in Derby" was also arrested and his estates secured. How long he was imprisoned and what penalties were exacted have unfortunately not come to light.

When the Restoration came in May 1660 Sir Henry Every must have been jubilant, feeling a glow of deep satisfaction that all he had hoped and worked for had come to pass, and from thence onwards he played a prominent part in Derbyshire affairs. He was made a deputy-lieutenant in 1661 and for many years he was an energetic justice of the peace. Ironically enough he was one of the justices before whom Colonel Thomas Sanders in 1683 entered into recognizances for £2,000.

He died in 1700 at the age of seventy and was buried in Egginton church where a memorial to him erected by his widow is to be seen. Sir Henry was a man of character and he certainly possessed one of the great human virtues, loyalty. He was a true son of his father and never wavered in his loyalty to his rightful sovereign. His family must indeed have been proud of him for his unrelenting efforts to retain intact his estates.