No. 6. 1742, June 23. COLONEL DALRYMPLE against WALLACE.

See Note of No. 3, voce Sasine.

No. 7. 1742, Nov. 19. RAE against NIELSON.

See Note of No. 20, voce Arrestment.

No. 8. 1745, Jan. 26. Murdochs against Clerk.

WE had a process of division and sale of a partnery in a barley-mill near Glasgow, (much the same as we had some time ago of a ropery) at the instance of two surviving partners against the infant heirs of the deceased one, and Drummore, Ordinary, having ordered the Dean of Guild of Glasgow to estimate the subject of the partnery,—on report thereof we ordered a roup and sale, and remitted to the Ordinary to adjust the conditions. Vide February 1738, Bogle against Bogle and Tron, (No. 4, supra.)

No. 9. 1746, June 13. FREEBAIRN against WATKINS.

THE Lords, 27th June 1745, found that Watkins was not bound in time coming, either to print in company with Freebairn, or to count to him for profits made or to be made. And this day the Lords adhered, though in 1738 Watkins had but one-sixth of the patent, and at this day he has one-half, Freebairn one-third, and Greenyards one-sixth.

No. 10. 1748, June 24. Hogg against Weir.

Warden and Johnston were in copartnery, and Hogg drew a bill on Rodger Hogg at London to one Ringwood, value received from Warden, for L.109, who of the same date accepted a bill to him for the money, without mention of a Company. The Company broke, and Weir, who was a creditor of Johnston's, arrested some of the Company's effects, as Hogg also did upon Warden's bill, and claimed preference for it as a Company's debt, 1st, for that he had had several dealings with the Company by lending and otherwise, and which in his books he always settled in Warden's name; 2dly, that this bill was wholly applied to clear Company debts to Ringwood and others. But in respect the bill was drawn on the credit as of Warden, bearing value received from him, which value was his accepted bill, without mention of any Company, the Lords the 14th, found that it was not a Company debt, and therefore the arrestment could only affect Warden's interest in the Company's effects,—and this day adhered.

No. 11. 1749, July 12. PATERSON against GRANT and KEITH.

FIND unanimously, except Drummore, Ordinary, that Paterson has right to the third of free balance of profits, notwithstanding his insolvency.

No. 12. 1752, Nov. 16. ROBERT CRAWFURD against STIRLING, &c. See Note of No. 28, voce Bankbupt.