

the jurisdiction, yet it is not necessary, as the jurisdiction is founded by the situation of the effects locally within the territory.

In the answer, written by Alexander Garden, it was contended that it would be time enough to condescend on effects, when the interlocutor as limited by the Ordinary became final, the argument in the petition being inconsistent, as even arrestment could not be used without previous citation.

It does not appear by any notandum upon the printed papers whether the petition was refused or not.—EDITOR.

No. 2. 1736, July 14. ROBERTSON *against* POTTER.

THE President said he remembered while he was at the Bar, the Lords several times in suits at the instance of strangers obliged them to find caution in the re-convention against them. I also thought the Lords may *causa cognita* ordain such caution at the instance of parties not residing within the jurisdiction of this Court, yet I thought there was no reason for it here where the reason of reduction was proved, and the proof only allowed to prove Robertson's defence;—and upon a division it carried no caution.

No. 3. 1739, July 19. ROBERTSON *against* POTTER and HORN.

See Note of No. 6. *voce* FACTOR.

No. 4. 1745, June 11. WESTCOMB *against* DODDS.

DODDS pursued adherence and aliment against Westcomb who once had an office in Exchequer, but which he resigned several years ago; and as he was originally an Englishman, so now he resides there; but the pursuer alleged she was married to him while he resided here, but after he gave up his office, though she says she did not know it. He compeared by his procurator in the Commissary Court, and declined the Court, as being not subject to that jurisdiction. They repelled the declinator, and the question was brought before us by advocacy. Tinwald thought this being *locus contractus* it founded the jurisdiction, especially being a *questio status*. Arniston was of the same opinion, because of its being a *questio status*. The Lords sustained the jurisdiction by a great majority, *renit.* President, and Minto, Ordinary.

No. 5. 1749, June 8. COUNT ANTONIUS LESLIE *against* GORDON.

COUNT ANTONIUS LESLIE having carried the succession to the estate of Balquhain by an appeal to the House of Lords against a judgment given by us in favours of Major Leslie of Pitciple, the Count as heir of entail raised reduction of a settlement of a part of the estate made by the last Balquhain in favours of his brother-uterine James Gordon, and failing him of his two sisters-uterine, whereof the eldest is now Lady Forbes, as made contrary to the limitations of the entail of the estate. James Gordon being excepted from the indemnity and a bill for high treason found against him, no compearance was made for him, but it was made in name of his two sisters substitutes, who objected to the Count's title, that he was incapable to succeed to land in Scotland as an alien born out