write, was not a ground to take away the contract, the same being truly done by the notaries, the writ never being quarrelled by the party upon falsity, nor denied by her; and the Lords found it not necessary, that the pursuer should be urged to refer to the defender's oath, that she gave command to the notaries to subscribe the contract for her, it not being impunged by her upon that ground, as said is, nor to allege or prove any of the impediments foresaid, which might excuse her not subscription.

Act. Burnet &,

Alt. Craig.

Clerk, Gibson.

Durie, p. 825.

1666. June 29.

JANET KID against DICKSON.

Janet Kid pursues reduction of a disposition of some tenements in Forfar, made by her father on this ground, that the disposition is subscribed but by one notary and one witness, and the charter by one notary and two witnesses, and so is null by the act of Parliament, requiring two notaries and four witnesses in writs of importance. It was answered, That the tenements being small, the price of one expressed being 200 merks, and the other 300 merks, the foresaid two writs were sufficient, clad with many years possession in the defunct's time, who never challenged the same; 2dly, They are established by the sasine given propriis manibus, conform to the obligement of the disposition and charter by a town-clerk, registrated in the town-books.

The Lords having ordained the defenders to condescend, upon any adminicles they had, for astructing the verity of the subscription, they condescended only on seven years possession, which the Lords found was not sufficient to establish the right without reduction; but if the defender had condescended on 40 years possession, the Lords declared they would hear them dispute, whether that could be sufficient or not.

Stair, v. 1. p. 384.

1667. July 26. Mr. John Philip against Mr. John Cheap.

Mr. John Philip pursues his tenants upon a disposition granted by Michael Philip. Compearance is made for Mr. James Cheap, who apprized from Michael Philip's heir, who alleged that the disposition is null, neither being subscribed by the disponer, nor by two notaries for him, albeit it mention the subscription of three notaries, yet two of them subscribed not at the same time with the third; and neither of these two bear, that they did subscribe at command, but that they subscribed only for Michael Philip, because that he could not subscribe himself; and albeit the body of the writ mention such witnesses to the command given to

No. 50. Deed subscribed by one notary and two witnesses reducible.

No. 51. A writ subscribed by notaries, where the notaries' docquet bore that they subscribed for the party, but t did not mention whether at his command found null.