6616

IMPROBATION.

SECT. I.

No 9. were called for to be reduced and improved, except it had been libelled and instructed.

Kerse, MS. fol. 206.

1620. January 16. MONYMUSK against PITFODDELS.

No 10.

DECREET of improbation reduced, given against the principal party compearing, at the instance of a party having interest, and knowing thereof; being proven by a decreet given at the instance of —— Forbes of Monymusk, subvassal to Thomas Menzies contra Gilbert Menzies of Pitfoddels, obtainer of the improbation.

an a china a se

Kerse, MS. fol. 206.

1620. December 7. LA. HUNTLY against Lo. Forbes.

No II. In improbations, found that a precept of sasine granted by a predecessor, not being of *clare constat*, did not stay certification, because the precept bore in feu-farm, and bore not the duty.

Kerse, MS. fol. 207.

No 12.

1621. January 31. Mr JAMES BAILLIE against SILVERTONHILL.

THE LORDS found no process in improbations, except the advocate be pursuer, albeit the decreet obtained at the advocate's instance was craved to be reduced, and that the advocate was defender.

Found by the LORDS, that a decreet of improbation, given against a minor of six years not compearing, was reduceable, and that he could not be heard to produce.

In the same cause found, that he should be heard to improve the executions of the summons, albeit the process bore that he compeared and proponed an exception dilator, and thereafter passed from his compearance.

Kerse, MS. fol. 207.