remptoriam ex altera parte propositam quam de practica dominorum inducit litiscontestationem, postea de jure actor libellum mutare addere aut minuere non potest, nec in ea aliquid pro deleto habere.

10 10 mg

No 229. the pursuer cannot alter or pass from any part of his libel.

Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 197. Sinclair, MS. p. 66.

1554. February 23. The QUEEN against CAPRINGTON.

No 230.

Anen'r the action pursued by the Queen's grace against the Laird of Caprington and others of inquest for an assize of error, it was alleged by the said inquest, That the Queen should not pursue summons, because she had raised and pursued other summonses of error to the same effect of before depending before the Lords, and the exception is peremptory given in in writ to the Lords, and answers thereupon, wherefore litiscontestation was made. It was alleged by the Queen's advocate, That he would renounce the foresaid summons. The other party alleged, That he might not renounce post litiscontestatione made. It was alleged by the Queen's advocate, That there was no litiscontestation made without there had been an exception peremptory admitted, or else the libel denied, or else the actor getting the libel to his probation, which was admitted, and ordained farther process, notwithstanding the allegeance of the inquest.

Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 197. Maitland, MS. p. 113.

1574. July 1. Earl of Sutherland against Earl of Caithness.

promote the same of the same o

No 231.

The Earl of Sutherland pursued the Earl of Caithness for production of a contract of marriage made betwixt them for marriage of the said Earl of Caithness's daughter to the Earl of Sutherland, alleged by the pursuer to be in the defender's hands and keeping, and referred the same to the defender's oath. The defender alleged, He should not give his oath de veritate, because the pursuer already had pursued him for it, and had got it to his probation, that the defender had it, and had produced certain witnesses thereupon, who were sworn and examined, and so litiscontestation made, and therefore he was not obliged to give his oath de veritate in the said cause; which allegeance of the defender, the Lords admitted.

Fol. Dic. v. 2: p. 200. Colvil, MS. p. 241.

1575. January 20. GLENBER VIE against UDNEY.

Anent the action pursued by the Laird of Glenbervie against the Laird of Ucney, for the double of Udney's marriage, by reason, that he married by Glenbervie's daughter, who was offered by her father as party agreeable, as he

No 232. Found as a-