paid by one of the comprisers; and, if that man's comprising be found null and reduced, the other compriser that prevails shall refund to the other the year's duty paid out by him.

Page 34.

1628. July 16. WILLIAM DOUGLAS against Douglas of Maines.

The fulfilling of a contract of marriage may be pursued by the father of either party, being contractor, albeit the clause be conceived in the young folks' favours.

Page 125.

1628. July 16. LORD YESTER against WIGTOUN.

Page 205--6.

1628. July. John Ballantyne against John Murray of Halmyre.

John Ballantyne having pursued for a declarator of the Laird of Drummell-zier's escheat and liferent, John Murray of Halmyre, pretending a prior gift, was admitted for his interest, and litiscontestation was made in the cause. John Murray compearing, who, thereafter, dies or any more was done in the cause, John Ballantyne seeks this act of litiscontestation to be transferred against the heir of the said umquhile John Murray, to the effect he may get one to represent the defunct, and so go on in the principal cause. It is alleged by the heir of John Murray, No process; because the principal party, Drumellzier, is not called in this transferring. It is answered by the pursuer, That there is no necessity to call him, seeing the transferring of this act can noways concern him. Which the Lords found relevant.

Page 118.