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1685. January. Mr James Wright against Isobel Brown.

An heiress who with curators had intromitted with the mails and duties of lands her father died in possession of, being married during her minority, and the husband having continued in possession several years after her majority, and she being pursued by the father's creditors on the passive title gestio, she revokcd , and raised reduction intra annos utiles.

Alleged for the creditors, That she could not be restored, or allowed to renounce, till her intromissions and her husband's were refunded to the creditors.

Answered, The husband's intromission could not be charged upon her; but he must answer for it himself.

Replied, As mails and duties fall under an apparent heil's testament jure apparentice, so the husband's jus mariti is a legal ássignation, equivalent to a voluntary right from the wife, and must be purged as her deed before she be rerestored.

The Lords found the reply relevant.
Harcarse, (Minority.) No 711.p. 201.
1697. November iI. Henderson against Lafreis.

No 164.
In a reduction of a bond upon minority and lesion, it being objceted that the minor, at granting, was a writer, and attendant about the session, and therefore

