

No. 16.

The Lord Grange Ordinary sustained the subscription by initials, unless the defender would consign and improve: To which the Lords adhered, since it was not denied that the mark adhibited to the tack charged on was the suspender's mark.

*Act. Ch. Areskine.**Alt. Arch. Murray.**Clerk, Justice.**Edgar, p. 131.*

* * Lord Kames mentions a case under the same names, as follows :

1723. *February*.—A single writ of the same form with that quarrelled, was sustained as an evidence that the party was in use to subscribe by initials. (See APPENDIX.)

Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 533.

No. 17.

1729. *July*.THOMSON *against* SHIEL.

A bill was sustained, signed only by the initial letters of the acceptor's name, it being proved, That the defunct was in use to sign by initial letters, and that the subscription was like his ordinary subscription, and by the writer of the bill, that he saw him actually sign. (See APPENDIX.)

Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 534.

No. 18.

1735. *February*.PRINGLE *against* KEILL.

A bill subscribed with initials, by an ignorant country woman, who could not read, nor ever had been in use to write, blank scores being drawn by another hand, which she was made fill up with a pen, was found null; it being pleaded, That this could not be called the person's ordinary subscription, which is what makes a writ effectual, nay, that it could not be called a subscription at all, not being a writing in any proper sense. (See APPENDIX.)

Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 533.

1739. *February 27*. IRVINE of Neworchard *against* _____.

No. 19.

In a process of removing, the defenders proponed an exception to the execution of warning, That it was not duly signed, having only the initial letters of the officer's name. The Court seemed all satisfied, that this was no just objection to the execution of a baron-officer, because persons are not always to be had to undertake that low office who can sign their name at length. (See APPENDIX.)

Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 534.