

ALLEGED,—It is no new thing to see a burgh royal have jurisdiction where they have neither property nor superiority; and a burgh of barony and royal are consistent, as in Dysart. This was to be heard *in presentia*.

*Act.* Cunyghame. *Alt.* Lockhart and Wedderburne.

*Advocates' MS. folio 54.*

1665. June 24.

— against EDGAR.

THERE is a bond granted by one Edgar to his daughter, wherein he ties himself to pay her 4000 merks at her complete age of 18, with annualrent thereafter, she being married and provided to a jointure by her husband; and this sum falling to her after the marriage, by the decease of some of her brethren, to whom this sum was payable at their 18, and failyieing of them by decease, to accresce to the rest surviving: Thereafter her husband dying, his executors convene Edgar, son and heir to the father, to pay the sum.

ALLEGED,—That this being an heritable sum, and no particular assignation made thereof by the widow to her husband, *stante matrimonio*, they cannot have right thereto.

ANSWER,—It was moveable, for though the bond being prior to the act of Parliament 1641, was heritable, bearing annualrent after the time, yet the intervening act of Parliament made it cease to be heritable *quoad* the executors, but to stand in its own nature heritable *quoad fiscum et relictam*; and she having fallen that sum *stante matrimonio*, and before her husband's decease, there was *jus quæsitum* to the husband thereto as to a moveable sum, and so it belonged to his executors. ANSWER,—That grant the act 41 made sum moveable, *quoad* the executors, yet the subsequent act 1661 declared the husband from all benefit or right thereto, where the bonds are made to the wife, and the wife, where the bonds are made to the husband; which act is retroracted to the year 1641. ANSWER,—The act of Parliament 1661 does not derogate to the act 1641, but only declares the estate of man and wife, after their respective deceases, in relation to bonds made to man and wife *separatim*; but this being a sum moveable fallen to the wife *stante matrimonio*, before the husband's decease, there was *jus perfecte quæsitum* to the husband, and so to his executors. Which the Lords found true.

*Act.* Sinclar and Cunyghame.

*Alt.* Lockhart.

*Advocates' MS. folio 54.*

1665. June

THE Lords found, that in a sentence given against a party, wherein the defender declares he shall be satisfied with the probation of one witness singly, to

be binding ; and that though citation and probation be *juris naturalis*, wherewith a man cannot dispense, yet that in a civil matter he might do so. But in *delictis* it is far otherways.

*Advocates' MS. folio 54.*

---

1665. *July 24.*

SCOT *against* SOMERVELL.

IN this case, found that a party, in obedience of a charge of horning, having consigned the sum in the clerk's hands, not maliciously,—that the peril and hazard of the consigned money follows the charger, and not the consigner ; for at that time, Harie Hope being Thesaurer did bankerout.

*Act. Lockhart.*

*Alt. Wallace.*

*Advocates' MS. folio 54.*

---

1665. *July 24.*

Row *against* The VISCOUNT OF STORMOND.

IN a case betwixt Row and the Viscount of Stormond, [FOUND] that a summons raised within year and day, and not executed, prescribes. For which there is no reason at all, but the benefit of the signet.

*Advocates' MS. folio 54.*

---

1665. *November 1.*

DAVID THOIRES *against* SIR ANDREW RAMSAY.

COLONEL DAVID RAMSAY, by contract of marriage betwixt him and Janet Skein, is bound to provide her to eighteen chalders of victual, or 1800 merks of money yearly ; and having purchased the lands of Grangemoore, only worth nine chalders of victual, he takes the disposition in his and his wife's name ; wherein mention is made, that his wife accepts of that right and infetment of the lands, in satisfaction of all that she could crave from her husband, or his heirs, by virtue of her contract of marriage, and in acceptation thereof ; whereupon she is infet and in possession during his lifetime : Thereafter marrying Mr. David Thoires, there is a summons raised against Sir Andrew Ramsay, provost of Edinburgh, as heir, for implement of her contract of marriage, who obtruded the provision and infetment of the lands of the Grange, granted to her in satisfaction, likeas she had homologated the acceptation by possession of the said lands. Which the Lords, by their interlocutor, found relevant, and that her possession of the lands was an homologation of the provision. Which was hard, and the preparative dangerous ; but the consideration that moved the Lords was, that Colonel