

1744. *November 30.* MEEK *against* M'LELLAN.

No. 25.

A WIFE, proprietor of some lands, and her right continuing something like an implied limitation not to prejudge her children, joined with her husband in an heritable bond to a creditor of the husband's, and who was also cautioner for the husband, and both were bound in the personal obligation, as well as the right in security in the wife's lands; this right found reducible by these children.

---

1747. *July 22.* BURTON *against* AGNES CORSE, HIS WIFE.

No. 26.

THE Lords thought that a husband could not inhibit a wife on a false and injurious narrative, and therefore on a complaint of such inhibition, ordered it to be seen as to that point, but refused to stop the inhibition.

---

1747. *November 21.*

EARL of CAITHNESS *against* COUNTESS of CAITHNESS.

No. 27.

WE decided the question betwixt the Earl and Countess of Caithness. We thought that a husband may *ad libitum* inhibit his wife, but may not use false and injurious expressions; therefore we repelled the Countess's reasons of reduction of the Earl's inhibition, but remitted to the Ordinary on the Bills to delete any such expressions, (if any such were,) out of the inhibition. (See DICT. No. 235. p. 6025.)

---

1748. *February 5.*

ANN FINLAY *against* HAMILTON, Younger of Garthamlock.

No. 28.

A SHERIFF having refused to sustain process at a wife's instance against her husband's brother, for what was charged as a great riot, without the husband's concurrence, which he could not give; on advocation we remitted, with instructions to authorise the wife to carry on the process. (See DICT. No. 259. p. 6051.)