TUTÓR—CURATOR—PUPIL.

16384

No. 312. security that it shall be applied for their behoof.

The charger, on the other hand, maintained it as a settled point, that a father acting as tutor or curator for his children is not obliged to find security.

Upon advising minutes, it was

Observed on the Bench: The ordinary rule, that a father is not obliged to find security for his intromissions, does not apply to this case.

The Lords unanimously found, that the money could not be paid without security.

Clerk, Menzies.

Lord Ordinary, Methven.

March 9.

For the Suspender, Ja. Gordon. A

Alt. Ja. Fergusson, jun.

D. D.

Fac. Coll. No. 108. p. 239.

1796.

MACKAY against Houston.

No. 313.

In the county of Sutherland where enrolment to vote for a member of Parliament is competent on lands held of a subject superior, a charter granted by a factor *loco tutoris* for the superior who was fatuous and cognosced, was sustained by the Court of Session, though it was urged that such deed was beyond the ordinary acts of administration.—See Appendix.

Fol. Dic. v. 4. p. 385.

1798. February 22.

Daniel Hamilton Macneil, against Roger H. M. Macneil, and Dr. Macneil.

No. 314. A declarator of contravention and irritancy raised in name of an infant against his father, allowed to proceed under authority of a tutor ad litem afterwards appointed.

A declarator of contravention and irritancy was raised in name of Daniel Hamilton Macneil, a boy of ten years of age, second son of Roger H. M. Macneil, against his father, as heir in possession of an entailed estate, and against Dr. Macneil, to whom the former had granted an heritable bond over it.

The action was brought by direction of the boy's mother, who lived separate from her husband.

The competency of the action was objected to; but the Lord Ordinary allowed it to proceed in name of a tutor ad litem, and appointed the counsel for the pursuer to suggest a proper person for the office. The defender, in a petition, contended, That it was incompetent and mali exempli for a married woman, herself under curatory, to bring an action in name of her infant child against his father, his legal administrator; 16th November, 1704, Ross, No. 258. p. 6050. Ersk. B. 1. Tit. 7. § 13, 14.: That no injury could be qualified from allowing the claim to lie over till the infant came of age; and that there was a hardship in permitting the action to proceed under authority of a tutor ad litem, whose duty would be