

## UNION.

---

1564. Feb. 1. The LADY SYMONTOUN *against* The LAIRD of SYMONTOUN.

**G**IF ony persoun havand divers and sindrie landis unitit and annexit in ane barony, sellis and annailzeis ane part thairof in conjunct-fie or liferent, he dissolvis and brekkis not the union thairby; bot efter the conjunct-fear or liferentar's deceis, the samin landis return to the said baronie.

No. 1.

*Balfour, (SASINE) p. 177.*

---

HOME *against* TENANTS of AYTON.

Where lands lie run-ridge within burgh, if a party take sasine upon one part thereof, this was found sufficient; and that he could not be compelled to take it at the particular ridges, acres, or sheds thereof.

No. 2.

*Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 496.*

\* \* This case is said to be in Haddington MS. Having no date, the Editor has not found it.—See APPENDIX.

---

1620. March 8.

A. *against* B.

It was found, That the union of lands in a barony could not be extended to a subaltern sasine granted by a baron, of an annual-rent forth of the barony, but that the sasine taken upon the ground of the lands of the barony should only be extended to the lands whereupon sasine was taken.

No. 3.

*Kerse MS. fol. 77.*

---

1623. January 16. AITKEN *against* L. GRINISLAW.

In a removing pursued by Mr. Hary Aitken *contra* L. Grinislaw, the Lords found, That no subject under the King might, in his charter of divers lands lying dis-

No. 4.