

No. 13. 1740. *January 11.* FRASER *against* HODGE.

COURTESY takes place only in lands or subjects wherein the wife succeeds as heir to some of her predecessors, but not to those conquest by herself.

---

No. 14. 1740. *November 4.* SIR WILLIAM DICK *against* LADY DICK.

WHETHER a husband can at his pleasure inhibit his wife, who is separated from him and has an aliment, without showing cause? Not decided. *Vide* the printed papers. (Decided in the case of the Earl of Caithness *against* the Countess of Caithness, No. 27. *infra*.)

---

No. 15. *A. against B.*

A HUSBAND being charged and denounced on a bill granted by his wife before marriage, the Lords, on report of Lord Dun from the bills, granted caption.

---

No. 16. 1741. *February 25.* BUCHANAN *against* LADY BARRAFIELD.

WIFE having an alimentary provision given by a third party, is personally liable, even after dissolution of the marriage, and after the aliment ceases, for bills granted by her for necessaries during the subsistence of the aliment, even though *de facto* she left the administration of the alimentary provision to her husband. But the Lords afterwards altered this interlocutor, because the right was in the name of a trustee for the aliment of the wife and children, (the husband himself being incapable of it;) but the husband still continued the management of his family, and even of the alimentary subject as formerly, so that the alimentary provision to the wife was in effect but a name and a cover to the husband.