1639. Fanuary 3 5. Dundass against Hiṣ Father's Executorṣ.

A certigicate signed by a minister, bearing, that the testator left a particular legacy, above 100 Scots, to a person named in the certificate, found a sufficient eyidence of the legacy, tbough not signed by the testator, nor by the minister in his name, but only as a certificate of a fact, drawn out in the shape of a notorial instrument; and this, notwithstanding the testator had formerly made his testament, without mention of any such legacy.

> Fol. Dic. v. 2.p.243. Durie.
*** This case is No 38. p. 2195. voce Citation.

## 1665. Fanuary 13. Charles Charters against a Skipper.

Charles Charters having fraughted a ship to Queensburgh, by charter party, the Skipper was to lie so many lie days, and to bring a fraught thence. He returned without full fraught, whereupon Charles refuses full payment; and being decerned by the Bailies of Leith to pay the rest, he suspends, on this reason, that the Skipper ought to get the fraught only proportionally to the loading, and offers to prove the third part less than the full loading brought home, and that the skipper could not have his full fraught, unless he instruct that he intimated to the factor at Queensburgh, to whom he was directed, of his coming, and that he lay his lie days; and after intimation to the factor, to give him any ware he had, he took instrument, or protested thereon.

The Lords found, he ought to prove the intimation, ut supra, by witnesses, But required no protest, or instrument thereon.

Stair, v. 1. p. $25^{3}$.

## 3671. February 4. Lawrie against Gibson.

No 370.
Whether an instrument of intimation is necessary, that a ship lies waiting freight?

The offer of a disposition, in consequence of an exceptionable decreet, pleaded upon as an homologation of the decreet, was not found proved by an instrument, taken in the hands of a notary upon the offer; but it was found necessary that the same should be adminiculated by the oaths of the instrumentary witnesses.

> Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 243. Stuir. Gosford.
*** This case is No 5. p. 5 622. voce Homologation.

