

he was not ignorant of the transaction, a copy of the deed having, before his enrolment, been read over to him.

A majority of the Lords were of opinion, that, as the freehold-qualification of Mr George Buchanan had been found to be nominal and fictitious, the one in favour of Mr Andrew Buchanan could not be viewed in a different light.

After advising a complaint in the name of Mr Macdowall, with answers for Mr Buchanan ;

The Lords found, " That the freeholders did wrong in admitting Andrew Buchanan to the roll of freeholders, and ordered his name to be expunged."

*Fac. Col. Vol. 9, No. 314, p. 488.*

1794. December 10. JANET OLIPHANT *against* MARGARET and ELEONORA OLIPHANTS.

THIS case is a sequel of that reported, *Fac. Coll.* 19th June 1793, *Oliphant against Oliphant.*

Janet Oliphant, in consequence of the reservation in her favour in the interlocutor, stated in that report, brought an action against her two sisters by the former marriage, and against her brother, the heir of entail, concluding, as a posthumous child, for her share of the bond of provision.

The Lord Ordinary " Found her entitled to one-third of the provision in question."

And, on advising a reclaiming petition and answers, the Court, proceeding on the grounds mentioned in the former report, with only one dissenting voice, " adhered."

*Fac. Col. Vol. XI, No. 143, p. 327.*