1609.

Fuly

MUEUAL CONTRACT.

in general for the sums which might become due to her in virtue of the marmage contract. But the petition was refused.

Act. Wight, C. Hay. Lord Ordinary, Branfield. Alt. Lord Advecate, Solicitor General. Clerk, Home. Fol. Dic. v. 4. p. 18. Far. Col. No 327. p. 501.

SECT. IV.

Contract when understood Mutual, when Conditional.

EARL of MORTON against Douglas.

A PARTY having granted bond to another, wherein he binds himself to set a tack of a mill to him, provided he should pay the granter a certain sum at a certain term, the Lorps, at the instance of the granter, reduced the bond for not performance of the condition; and this notwithstanding there was no clause irritant in the bond, and that the party, within ten days after the term, made offer of the money.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 597. Kerse

*** This case is No 78. p. 7256. voce Irritancy.

1667, July 18.

EXECUTORS of the EARL of DIRLETON against DUKE of HAMILTON, EARL of CRAWFORD, and Others.

IN August 1645, the Earls of Crawford, Lanark, and several other noblemen and gentlemen, granted bond to the Earl of Dirleton, bearing an obligement therein, conjunctly and severally, to pay ten merks for each boll of 6000 bolls of victual, that should be delivered by Dirleton to James Riddel, or his deputies, the said Earl always obtaining James Riddel's receipt thereupon ; which delivery and receipt were to be betwixt and a blank day, and the receipt to be delivered before payment; the term of payment of the price was Candlemas 1646; whereupon Dirleton's executors pursue the subscribers of the bond, who alleged, That this bond was clearly conditional, that the victual should be delivered betwixt and such a time, which, though it be blank, yet must be understood to be before Candlemas, which was before the term of payment of the price, and upon obtaining James Riddel's receipt thereof; ita

No 54.

No 55. A party was

bound to pay a sum for

every boll of grain deliver-

ed by a cer-

found to be a conditional

bargain, and

the purchaser free, because

the grain had? not been de-

livered as

stipulated.

tain day. This was

No 531

9203