The Loans found, that Aldie had no prejudice by the arbiters delegation of the Lady's aliment, claimed by Invertytie, in respect he passed from the same judicially; and, therefore, sustained the decreef-arbitral, except as to the penalty.

No 6.

Forbes p. 327

SECT. H.

Writs of importance subscribed by only one Notaty.

1616 November 29:

GIESON against Executors of Edgar.

No 7.

In an action pursued by David Gibson contra the Executors of umquhile Edward Edgar, the Lords found a bond of L. null, because it was only subscribed by one notary; and where the party would have retrenched his sum to L. , the Lords found, that the bond was not divisible.

Fok Div. v. v. p. 463. Ker ve, MS. fot. 44.

1623. November 13.

MARSHALL against MARSHALE.

In amaction of transferring, Marshall contra Marshall, the Lords sustained assasing produced, to verify the defender to be heir to his predecessor, which was given to him by hasp and staple; by the bailies of Kirkcaldy, of a tenement of land in Kirkealty; which savine, the Lords found sufficient to prove the defender heir, albeit that it was alleged, that it could not prove, wanting aniadministe, being only the assertion of a notary; and no retour, nor other warrant produced for giving thereof. And where it was answered by the pursuer, That Kirkardy was the King's free burgh; and that the form in all burghs was to give sasines after this manner, without any other adminicle; the defender duplied, That albeit Kirkcaldy had the privilege of the King's free burghs royal, yet they hold not their lands; nor the town of the King's Majesty in burgage; but they hold the same of the Prince, as Lord of Dumfermine; so that sasine of the lands, so Holden, could not be given without some warrant or adminicle; albeit the King granted them the liberty of a burgh; which altered not the holding of their town and lands; which allegeance and duply was repelled, in respect the said sasine was the defenders

No. 8...
Found in conformity with the above.