No. 3. it was alleged by one of the Lords, that for the same cause witnesses were repelled of before, in the cause of the community of Renfrew and Rugland; in qua causa erat quidam Pauper. R. Neilson. But this day, in causa communitatis de Selkirk non fuit decisum.

Sinclair MS. (Second cony.)

1541. February 16. P. GIBSONE against S. THOMAS WAUCH.

No. 4. Thir persounis under-written may be repellit fra passing upon ony assise, and alswa fra beiring of ony testimonie or witness. In the first, the father of the partie quha sould produce the witnessis, his sone, his cousing, his brother, or ony of his consanguinitie, affinitie, or allya, within the feird degre inclusive, Leg. Burg. C. 143. Bot it is to wit, that witnessis beand sib or attingent to the persewar and defendar, in the like degre defendand of consanguinitie or affinitie, aucht and sould nevertheles be repellit fra beiring witnessing; because of the law of this realme, paritas gradus, seu par affectionis causa, non tollit suspicionem.

Balfour, p. 377.

1542. May 16.

Dobie against Glenbervie.

No. 5.

In a cause of non-entry of certain lands of Broadwoods, moved by John Dobie, donatar by the King's gift to the same at the King's Advocate's instance, against the Laird of Glenbervie, the Lords repelled a testificando in illa causa, the witnesses that were in degree descendant of consanguinity to the Laird of Craigiehall, albeit the summons was not intented at his instance, because he was hail solicitor, pursuer, and maintainer of the cause, and insisted therein upon his own expenses, as was notourly known to the Lords; and so gave their interlocutor.

Sinclair MS. p. 48.

1542. February 16. DICKSON against VEITCH.

No. 6.

The Lords, in a cause of one Patrick Dickson of Dudhope against Sir Thomas Veitch, notary-public, and John Dickson for his interest, repelled certain witnesses produced by the said Patrick ratione consanguinitatis in gradu prohibito inter ipsos et testes, licet testes ipsi allegant alteri parti in gradu æque propinquo; and that because that of our practicks, the theories of the legists and canonists, quod par affectionis causa tollit suspicionem has not place; and also in the said cause, the Lords admitted the practick foresaid to prove an instrument, which he desired the said notary to give him, which the notary refused to