## ȘECT. V.

## What Designation sufficient?

## 1672. February 21. BAILIE of Littlegill against Somervel.

In a competition between Baillie arrester, and Somervel assignee, having a prior intimation, which Baillie offered to improve, wherein there was but only two witnesses, the one designed William Wood indweller in Edinburgh; whereanent it was alleged that he ought to be more particularly designed, because it was not constant that ever there was such a person, and the designation was so general, that by no inquiry it could be found, unless all the indwellers in Edinburgh at that time were examined; it was answered, That the act of Parliament anent the designation of witnesses requires no further, and so the party was not obliged by any law to condescend further.

The Lords found that the assignee ought to condescend more particularly, that the witnesses might be found and known.

Stair, v. 2. p. 75.

No. 147. In an improbation of an execution in which one of the witnesses was designed indweller in Edinburgh, a particular condescend. ence of the designations: of the witnesses, was ordered to be given in.

1698. November 29.

GRANT, Wright in the Canongate, against CAPTAIN KEIR.

This was a reduction of a disposition made by Grant's wife, of some land at Musselburgh to the Captain, before her marriage to Grant, who suspected the right was antedated to defraud him, but being unwilling to venture it on the oaths of such witnesses, he first insisted on this reason, that the disposition was null, because, it having only two witnesses, one of them called Robert Rollo is only designed indweller in Edinburgh, which is not sufficient now, since the 5th act of Parliament in the year 1681; for there being so many inhabitants in Edinburgh, and sundry of the same name, they might as well design one indweller in such a shire, the intent of the law being to know witnesses in case falsehood were objected, as appears from act 80, 1579, and act 179, 1593; and from Stair, Title, Reductions and Improbations; 3d February, 1665, Falconer, No. 107. p. 16883; 21st February, 1672, Baillie, No. 147. supra; 22d February, 1676, Innes, Sect. 11. h. t.; and 21st July, 1680, The Comprisers of Enoch, No. 3. p. 183.

No. 148. Similar to the above.