

No 21. ders condescend upon some persons who are known to be heirs, or apparent heirs.

Auchinleck, MS. p. 90.

*** See Durie's report of this case, No 81. p. 2219.

No 22. 1627. February 8. SIR JOHN HAMILTON *against* His VASSALS of Bargeny.

IN improbations, the pursuer being a singular successor, need not produce reversions, where no discharges of reversions are called for.

Auchinleck, MS. p. 90.

*** Kerse reports the same case.

1627. February 8.—IN improbations, found the pursuer has no necessity to produce any reversion, except such as were made to himself, and such as he has; but where discharges of reversions are called for to be produced, in that case, the Lords are in use to ordain the parties to produce *simul et semel*.

Kerse, MS. fol. 207.

No 23. 1627. February 13. LA. BOTHWELL *against* Her VASSALS.

IN Improbations, found not (necessary) to call for writs made to the father or goodsirē, except it were libelled that they were infeft, and the pursuer infeft as heir to them.

Kerse, MS. fol. 208.

*** Although the names are different, this is probably the same case with No 4. p. 25.

No 24. 1627. February 14. EARL of KINGHORN *against* LAIRD of Grange.

IT is sufficient that the pursuer of an improbation libel himself to be heir to his predecessors who were infeft, although he be not infeft himself in the particular lands, whereof he craves the evidents to be produced to hear and see them improven.

Auchinleck, MS. p. 91.

No 25. 1628. January 25. A. *against* B.

IN improbations, found that the production of my author's charter (he being in life,) whereupon he might take sasine, is sufficient to give me interest to call for writs made by my author; and also found, that to prove him author,