

1773. August 10. ABERCROMBIE *against* GORDON.

No 69.

MILLS, where they have been once valued, ought to receive a proportion of the *cumulo* to be divided. See APPENDIX.

*Fol. Dic. v. 3. p. 409.*

1791. February 23. DUNDAS and LAING *against* TRAIL.

No 70.

THE statute 1649, directing the Commissioners to report the value of all feu or tack-duties payable to any person, his Majesty's duties excepted, it was questioned, whether, on account of this exemption on lands holden of the Crown, the lands liable in payment of these duties were to be retoured at their full value, or with a deduction corresponding to their feu-duties.—THE LORDS found, That such lands ought to be retoured at their full value.

*Fol. Dic. v. 3. p. 409.*

\*\*\* This case is No 48. p. 8639. *b. t.*

---



---

S E C T. V.

How a division of Valuation may be set aside.—Every Party interested in a division ought to be made a Party to it.—Erroneous division.

1751. February 12. GORDON *against* GORDON.

No 71.

THE Court of Session is competent to set aside divisions of valuation made by Commissioners of Supply, upon defects in point of form.

*Fol. Dic. v. 3. p. 411. D. Falconer.*

\*\*\* This case is No 79. p. 7345, *vove* JURISDICTION.

1753. February 21. COLONEL ABERCROMBY *against* LESLY of Melross.

AT a meeting of freeholders of the county of Banff, *anno* 1752, William Lesly of Melross, was inrolled for certain lands, valued at L. 400, by a decree of the Commissioners of Supply produced to the meeting.

No 72.  
There can be  
no regular  
meeting of