6550

No 12. A relict being infeft in a jointure of victual, the heir, or his tenants, were found obliged to deliver the victual.

1680. July 29.

The Countess Dowager of Errol against The Earl of Errol.

The Earl offering to pay her annualrent and victual at his own girnells, and on the ground of the lands, and he could in law be decerned in no more; alleged, That the tenants are bound to carry it for the Earl to Aberdeen, where either he sells or transports it, and he ought to do the same for her, and the Lords may enlarge and explain their sentences in those things which are but consequences thereof and necessary to their execution. The Lords declared the Earl and his tenants liable to transport her victual to any ports or places, as they do to the Earl himself, by tacks or custom, and ordained those to be proved or produced; and this same was decided formerly in between Halton and the Countess of Dundee.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 440. Fountainhall, MS.

1738. January 4. John Mackenzie against John Somervell.

John Somervell being creditor to Campbell of Carrick, by bill, indorsed the same to James Lochead, on this condition, That the indorsee should take his hazard thereof without recourse. Lochead, after this, protested the bill, whereupon Carrick applied to Somervell the indorser to use his interest with Lochead for a delay, upon which Somervell wrote a letter to him of the following tenor: "Sir, Carrick came here this day, who says it is not in his power to pay his bill I indorsed you these two months, having a sum to pay at Whitsunday; and, as he has all the inclination you should have the money, if he could raise it, I therefore beg you'll give him a delay for the time he demands, which will oblige him and me, and ye'll lose nothing by it.—I am," &c. After this, Lochead assigned this debt to Mackenzie, who insisted against Somervell, libelling on the above letter, as importing a cautionary obligement for Carrick.

For the defender, it was urged, That the import of the missive was no more than giving an opinion Lochead would eventually lose nothing by the the favour asked; but could not mean, that he intended to come under an obligation to make up such loss, if it should happen; which appears from the expression, 'and ye'll lose nothing by it;' for the contraction ye'll is made use of instead of you will, but is never used as a contraction of you shall; betwixt which two expressions there is a great difference, as the one imports the writer's opinion about what would happen; but the other, viz. you shall, implies an engagement in the writer to make good the verity of his assertion.

For the pursuer, it was answered, That, from the letter, it was plain, the defender did not interpose as a friend or adviser anent what he thought most

No 13. An indorser of a bill wrote to the indorsee, desiring him to give the acceptor the delay he requested, adding, "you'll lose nothing by it." Found that he was obliged to relieve the indorsee of what damage he might sustain by the delay.