

- No 2. Prince, yet he should have designed himself Prince in the gift, and given it as Prince, otherwise it was null, as breeding confusion of the King's lands and the lands of the principality; and produced a practick of reduction of the retour of the lands of Laurieston *in anno 1511*, because they were retoured holden of the King, they being lands of the principality, albeit the King was then Prince. THE LORDS, considering that Alexander Hepburn, and Archibald his brother, were never proprietors of the lands, and had no declarator, and that the lands being held of the Prince, their gift was not given by the King as Prince, the LORDS repelled the exception in respect of the replies.

*Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 166. Haddington, MS. No 1461.*

- 
- No 3. 1626. July 14. HAMILTON *against* VASSALS OF BARGENY.

WHEN there is a Prince existing, a disposition from the King of principality lands, must expressly bear the King's title as administrator to the Prince, otherwise the disposition is null.

*Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 166. Durie.*

\* \* \* This case is No 19. p. 6622. *voce* IMPROBATION.

- 
- No 4. 1680. January 9. PURVES-*against* Ld LUSS.

THE principality of Scotland, which belongs to the King's eldest son, belongs to the King himself *jure proprio* while there is no Prince existing, and not as administrator for an heir *in spe*.

*Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 165. Stair.*

\* \* \* This case is No 40. p. 8542. *voce* MARRIAGE, AVAIL OF.