

No. 63. also confirmed by the authority of Craig, Feud. Pag. 156, and from the common law, Nov. 73. Cap. 8.

*Forbes, p. 566.*

---

1725. June 29.

A. against B.

No. 64.

The Lord Royston asked the Lords, if a disposition to lands, subscribed only by one notary and two witnesses for the party, was null by the act of Parliament 1579, when the value of the lands was within £100 Scots? "The Lords were of opinion, that any heritable right, though the subject were never so small, ought to be subscribed by two notaries and four witnesses, when the granter could not sign."

*Edgar, p. 184.*

---

1729. July.

WILSON against WILSON.

No. 65.

A tack was found null, as being subscribed by only one notary. See APPENDIX.

*Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 535.*

---

1731. December.

CULLEN against THOMSONS.

No. 66.

It was objected against a writ attested by notaries, that the notaries had not subscribed their attestations. Answered, The names of the notaries are at length in the attestations in their own hand writing, which is sufficient; the Lords repelled the objection. (See APPENDIX.)

*Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 536.*

---

1737. June 28.

DUNWOODIE against JOHNSTON.

No. 67.

A bill sustained accepted by notaries for the party. (See APPENDIX.)

*Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 535.*

---

1739. July 6.

JOHN CORSBIE against JAMES SHIELL.

No. 68.

The informality of a subscription, by

Corsbie being creditor to Shiell for the sum of 400 merks, due by bond, charged him for payment, which he suspended on this ground, That, by a mutual con-