

1649. *December 25.* ROBERT INGLES *against* The TENANTS of RAVENSTOUNE.

IN the action of removing pursued by Robert Ingles against the tenants of Ravenstoune, where litiscontestation was made against sundry parties, wherein probation was used;—the Lords would not receive, *hoc ordine et in hoc statu processus*, Sir William Lockard, who would have produced a prior infestment of his author; because, *in judicio possessorio*, it behoves him to prove them his tenants by payment of mail and duty, which were to make another litiscontestation; but reserved to him suspension, or rather to seek declarator on his right.

*Page 110.*

---

1649. *December 25.* MAJOR M'BIRNIE *against* WILLIAM LIVINGSTOUNE.

IN the action, Major M'Birnie against William Livingstoune, where the said Major had used witnesses, but had deponed, conform to a general discharge of satisfaction and complete payment, they being the parties who had paid the excise for transporting of goods, could not well use the said William his oath for clearing of the quantities, not having divided his probation by the act of litiscontestation;—the Lords would have some of their number to see the process, if the oath might yet be required.

*Page 111.*

---

1649. *December 25.* JOHN ORMESTOUNE *against* GRAY and BORELANDS.

JOHN Ormestoune having lent 300 merks to James Browne, who deceased, sought Janet Browne, apparent heir to the said James, for the same; who deceased also, and gave disposition of the lands to Gray and Borelands, which pertained to the said umquhile James; the which Gray and Borelands gave backbond to the said Janet, for her relief, and for payment of the said umquhile James his debt. Upon the which Ormestoune craves now payment by Gray and Borelands; who excepted, That they are content to pass from that disposition, having gotten another right of the lands. Which the Lords would not suffer; but condemned them in all contained in the bond, and £100 of expenses farther.

*Page 111.*

---

1649. *December 25.* MORTOUNE *against* SIR JAMES DOWGLAS.

IN the report betwixt Mortoune and Sir James Dowglas, the Lords would not have Mortoune to count with the said Sir James for the relief of the burdens of Kilspindie's debt, since the Earl of Mortoune, by the posterior contract, had granted the receipt of £4000, and obliged him to refund and repay the same

to him, notwithstanding of an idle reservation cast in the end of the decreet of redemption, without warrant of the contract foresaid, not bearing any such obligation.

*Page 112.*

---

1649. *December 26.* JOHN MAXWELL of GRIBTOUNE *against* JAMES MAXWELL.

IN the suspension, John Maxwell of Gribtoun, whose father was executor to the Lord Herreis, his own father, against James Maxwell, his uncle, who had obtained decreet against him for his portion natural, there was a reason, That, of the sum of £16,000 confirmed, he could only have a proportional part, according to seven or eight children, of the half of the testament; seeing, before the act 1617, the executor gained the dead's part; except they could show the schedules mentioned in the foresaid testament, whereby the father left legacies to his bairns. And here was controverted, That the daughters married out of the house could not come in to have a proportional part, as being forisfamiliated; except their contract of marriage did bear that they should be bairns of the house, notwithstanding the tocher given; likeas, mention was made *de collatione dotis*. Whereanent the Lords would have practiques to be produced. The other reason, That the Lord Herreis was rebel, and his escheat disposed to Andrew Ker of Fentoune, whereon he obtained general declarator, was repelled; because, after that general declarator, the foresaid executor confirmed his father's testament above mentioned, so that Andrew Ker his gift and declarator seemed to be to the bairns' behoof; neither could the blank assignation, purchased from Andrew Ker, eighteen years after, by the Lord Herreis, purge the negligence of the executor, who should have done diligence in executing the testament for his brethren's use, against the said Lord Herreis, as intruder.

*Page 113.*

---

1649. *December 26.* WILLIAM ACHESONE *against* JOHN ACHESONE.

IN the action of neighbourhood, William Achesone, nephew, heritor of the tenement of land in Niddry's Wynd, against Mr John Achesone, his uncle, who had gotten a dwelling-house with two cellars, opening to the south and west, disposed by his father to him first, and excepted expressly, as it was before designed, out of the posterior disposition of the whole tenement made to Gilbert, to whom the said William is heir; the said Mr John was thought to have done wrong, in opening up a passage to the east, towards the close, of the tenement, which might be built up in a new tenement by the heritor, although there were doors in the said east side of the cellar, but bigged up; because the common author having the whole, might have had passages as he liked. So, for the probation, the said William was preferred.

*Page 114.*