1710. December 20. BAILLIE against CUNINGHAM.

No 107.

An objection against an apprising, that the execution did not bear a copy to have been affixed to the market-cross, but only that a copy was left there, was found relevant to keep the legal open, and restrict the apprising to the principal sum and annualrents.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 265. Forbes.

** See This case No 5. p. 173.

o 1711. November 30.

The LADY SEMPLE against The LORD SEMPLE and his TENANTS.

No 108.

In the process of general and special declarator of single and liferent-escheat, at my Lady Semple's instance, against my Lord Semple and his tenants, the Lords repelled this objection made against the denunciation whereupon the escheat fell, that it did not bear that a copy was affixed and left upon the market-cross, and sustained the denunciation notwithstanding that omission.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 265. Forbes, p. 551.

1712. June 19.

DR JAMES GARDEN against MR DAVID ANDERSON, Professor of Divinity.

No 109.

In the reduction at the instance of Dr Garden against Mr David Anderson and others, for reducing Mr David's right to the office of professor of theology in the King's College of Aberdeen, the Lords repelled this dilatory defence against the executions, that they did not bear copies to have been left at the most patent doors of the defender's dwelling-places; but only that copies were left at the doors of their dwelling-places simply, without the addition of most patent.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 264. Forbes, p. 600.

1714. January 26.

The CREDITORS of PATRICK DUNBAR of Sidera against Robert Murray of Pulrossie.

No 110.

In a competition betwixt Robert Murray of Pulrossie, and the Creditors of Sidera, the Lords sustained an inhibition at the instance of Pulrossie, albeit