

No 97.

It could never be the intention of the act 20th of his late Majesty, to abolish a jurisdiction of this kind belonging to a royal borough, and so necessary for preserving the public peace within the suburbs of that borough; on the contrary, the act does carefully preserve such jurisdictions and privileges, &c. by law vested in, or competent to such royal boroughs, whether within or without the royalty of such boroughs, without any distinction in what manner the right was originally acquired, or became vested.

Lastly, The supposed informalities in the procedure, if this Court could take cognisance of them, would evidently appear to be of no importance. The Bailie has proceeded in this case as the Magistrates of boroughs do in every case of the same nature; and no town in Scotland would be inhabitable, if such offence could not be inquired into in a summary manner.

All the Judges agreed, that the Magistrates of Gorbals had jurisdiction in this case, but some of them doubted, if the cause came properly before this Court, as it related to imprisonment for a crime; and, the question being put, it carried, that the bill of suspension was competent; and next, on another question put, it carried to refuse the bill.

Act. *Ilay Campbell.*Alt. *Geo. Wallace, Crosbie.*Clerk, *Tait.**Fol. Dic. v. 3. p. 345. Fac. Col. No 208. p. 154.*

No 98.

1776. August 10. DUKE OF GORDON *against* SIR JAMES GRANT.

THE COURT enacted penalties to enforce the statutable regulations respecting salmon fishing. See APPENDIX.

*Fol. Dic. v. 3. p. 343.**** See *Carnegie against Scot*, No 84. p. 7352.

No 99.

1778. July 28. CHALMERS *against* NAPIER.

ACTION brought for recovery of an indented apprentice to serve at sea, who had been illegally impressed, is not a cause strictly maritime, so as to exclude advocacy to the Court of Session.

*Fol. Dic. v. 3. p. 344.**** This case is No 11. p. 594. *voce* APPRENTICE.