ing their allegeances, that they might know clearly the matter of fact, and if there was any fault, before sentence.

Page 59.

1669. June 29. Earl of Kinghorn against The Tenants of Dronlaw.

The Lords found the defence relevant, and that there was a necessity of a

new warning before the tenants could be decerned to remove.

Page 60.

1669. July 3. Anna Blair and her Spouse against Doctor Forbes.

The said Anna, pursuing for mails and duties of her conjunct-fee lands, to which she was provided;—It was alleged for the Doctor, who was infeft upon a comprising led for his wife's portion, That the pursuer's seasine was null, not being registrate. It was replied, That it was given upon a contract of marriage, clad with many years' possession, and acknowledged by the defenders, in so far as, in a double poinding, they had taken a decreet with the burden of her liferent.

The Lords sustained the reply; albeit the defender was a singular successor, and founded his allegeance upon the Act of Parliament.

Page 61.

1669. July 3.

Betwixt these same Parties.

THE Doctor and his Wife, pursuing the Mother and her Husband, for aliment, and referring the same to her oath, she did depone qualificate, that, as she was alimented, so it was upon an agreement to pay so much victual weekly.

The Lords sustained the quality; notwithstanding it was alleged, that it resolved in an allegeance that ought to be proven otherwise than by the deponent's own oath.

Page 61.

1669. July 3. George Stewart of Aldhame against The Tutor of Grant.

THE tutor being charged upon a bond granted to the said George for £300

of bygone pensions, due to him by the Laird of Grant, did SUSPEND, upon this reason:—That the bond was affected with a condition, That, in case he should offer a discharge of the pension to Grant's curators, and in case of refusal to return the same before a certain day, he should be liberated; and accordingly subsumed, that, within a month after the day, he did return the same; and gave that reason, That the charger had no written pension of the Laird of Grant; without which the curators could not allow the same.

The Lords, notwithstanding, found the letters orderly proceeded for the principal sum; seeing he did not instruct any diligence, that he had offered the same to the curators debito tempore; and that Grant himself, by a letter, did acknowledge the service; and that the pension had been paid by his father many years; and that the service and employment had been continued: but they suspended for the annualrent, in respect the tutor could get no relief of Grant and his curators.

Page 61.

1669. July 7. ROBERT RAIT against The CREDITORS of ALEXANDER IRVING.

The said Robert Rait having bought from Irving the lands of Swattoun, and given bond for the price thereof, with a provision, That he might retain as much as would satisfy all real burdens, and as much as would establish a right in his person; which price was arrested by Irving's creditors; and likewise some of them, having assignations, did charge for payment: The said Rait did suspend upon double poinding; wherein, there being a count and reckoning, he did crave allowance of his disbursements, and raising of suspension, and for his attendance and discussing thereof, and of what he had given to advocates and clerks, extending to about £300; which he craved the creditors to allow, as Irving himself would be obliged, if he were pursuing.

The Lords finding that the suspender might have consigned the money, and have been free of annualrent, and all considerable charges,—they only modified the sum of £50 to be detained from the creditors; and found, that they were not in a like condition liable as Irving would have been, if he had been pursuing.

Page 62.

1669. July 8.

SHAW against SHAW.

In a reduction of a bond, made by William Shaw to his uncle, and assigned to Robert Shaw; whereupon he had led a comprising for the sum of £20,000: The production being satisfied, the pursuer offered to improve the bond; whereupon an act was extracted and witnesses cited: But, fearing that the witnesses would not prove that the bond was false and feigned, the pursuer craved to be reponed, that she might insist upon the reasons of reduction: Whereupon it was debated amongst the Lords, if, in law and form of process, she might be re-