

No. 6. 1735, July 22. SIR THOMAS HAY *against* LORD GAIRLIES, &c.

THE Lords found (1st July) that the Justices of Peace ought to have access to the Court-House. The reason was that it was a part of the Tolbooth, which is the King's House.

The Lords (22d July) varied the words of their interlocutor of 1st instant, and found that the Justices of Peace ought to have access to the Town Court-House at all seasonable times for holding Justice of Peace Courts.

No. 7. 1735, July 25. HEPBURN of Monkkrigg *against* HAY of Hopes.

See No. 1. *voce* COMMISSIONERS OF SUPPLY.

No. 8. 1736, Feb. 6. GEORGE DRUMMOND, &c. *against* A. HENRY, &c.

THE Lords, (12th December 1735) remitted to the Ordinary to enquire whether this jurisdiction over the killers of fish in forbidden time was resigned in the charter of resignation and *novodamus* in 1678 obtained, and whether Logie-Almond who made that resignation connected any title to the charter by King Robert III. to Logie of Logie. The Lords (6th Febtuary 1736) found that Logie-Almond had not connected a title to the superadded jurisdiction of citing delinquents outwith his barony, and therefore found the *novodamus* by the Exchequer null.

No. 9. 1736, July 31. ANDERSON *against* CAMPBELL.

See Note of No. 1. *voce* COMMUNITY.

No. 10. 1736, June 24. MAXTON *against* MONCRIEFF.

See Note of No. 1. *voce* PATRONAGE.

No. 11. 1736, July 28. SIR ALEXANDER RAMSAY *against* CHALMERS.

THE Lords adhered to the Ordinary's interlocutor finding the bursars not bound to bring such certificates. Several of the Lords thought, though neither the assembly nor Mr Chalmers could make such a regulation however just in itself, yet if such a rational one was introduced by universal custom in this and all other Colleges in Scotland, that would be a good defence. Therefore the question was, adhere, or before answer allow such a proof, and it carried, adhere, *me inter alios renitente*.

No. 12. 1736, Dec. 2. EVELEIGH *against* SIR JOHN BRUCE.

THE Lords found this Court not competent to take any further proof of the values or surcharge more than is contained in the apprizement or second judgment of the Admiralty in Bermudas.

No. 13. 1737, June 21. MELDRUM *against* GIBB.

THE Lords thought they could not prescribe a scheme of labouring to the tenant; and therefore would not adhere to Drummore's interlocutor. But they thought, that if it were proven that the tenant's way of labouring would destroy the ground, they could discharge him to labour so in time coming; and therefore remitted the cause to the Ordinary.