1781. June 15.

11422

Doctor JAMES HAMILTON, Physician, against MARGARET and BARBARA GIBSON.

No 92. Physicians fees not always presumed paid.

It is presumed in law, that physicians' fees, like all honoraries, are instantly paid without receipt; and, therefore, action is not competent for the payment of them, against the representatives of a deceased patient.—The LORDS, however, found, that particular circumstances may make an exception; and, in the present case, *inter alia*, repelled the defence founded upon this general rule.

The attendance for which the fees in this case were due, was not during the last illness; for, as to that, the point has been formerly decided.

Lord Ordinary, Elliock.	Act. N. Fergusson.	Alt. Elphingston.
D.	Fol. Dic. v. 4. p. 121.	Fac. Col. No 65. p. 98.

1795. June 17.

Doctor JAMES FLINT against The TRUSTEES of DAVID ALEXANDER.

· + 150

JAMES FLINT, a regularly graduated physician, attended David Alexander, of St Andrew's, and supplied him with medicines, during an illness, which lasted two years, and which terminated in his death.

Dr Flint afterwards brought an action before the Commissary of the district, against the Trustees of the deceased, in which he claimed, not only payment of his account for medicines, but fees for his attendance during the whole of that period.

The pursuer stated, and it was not denied by the defenders, that it is the uniform practice in St Andrew's for the physician to furnish medicines, and to receive neither payment for them, nor any fees for attendance, until the termination of the disease, when both are regularly discharged; and that upon this footing, the pursuer himself had practised there during a period of 25 years.

The Commissary gave judgment against the defenders.

A bill of advocation having been passed, the defenders

Pleaded; It is a settled point, that physicians are not entitled to make any charge for attendance against the Representatives of a patient, except for the 60 days immediately preceding his death; 7th February 1755, Park against the Representatives of Langlands, (*supra*.) If this rule did not apply where the same person practised as surgeon and apothecary, as well as physician, it never would have been established, as, it is believed, the complete separation of these professions is but of modern date.

The presumption, that the fees of physicians are instantly paid, does not hold where it is not the practice of the place to pay them

immediately,

and where the physician

supplies the patient with

medicines, an

account for which is due

at his death.

No 93.