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Stevenson v. Macpherson, Maclachlan, and Macnicol.
$\mathrm{T}_{\text {HIs was an action of damages by a person }}$ who had been bankrupt, and alleged that the trustee on his estate, and the agents employed by him, had agreed to reconvey to him the stock on his farm at a valuation, and afterwards. sold it.

Defence.-The pursuer did not pay the price, or find security in terms of the agreement. Before, at, and after the sale, the pursuer, by his conduct, homologated every thing that was done.

Mr Robertson opened the case for the pursuer, and stated the facts.-The first piece of evidence tendered was a copy of the sederuntbook under the sequestration, which it was stated had been in process, and was admitted in the answers to the condescendence as a true vol. iv.

Mackay

Lord Chief Commissioner.-In fact, by the statute there are two originals, but this is neither of them, and the admissions not having been taken in the usual way, this copy must be rejected. As this is the foundation of the pursuer's case, if I had the power to nonsuit, this would be a proper case to exercise it. But not having this power, I must direct a verdict for the defender.

## Verdict-" For the defender."

Robertson, for the Pursuer.
Hope, Sol.-Gen., and D. M‘Neill, for Macpherson and Maclachlan.
Monteith for Macnicol.
(Agents, Thomas Ker, w.s. David Brozen, w.s. James Hamilton, w.s.)
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