

from James Ruthven of Ruthven. Mr Moncrieff was not within year and day of the College, and therefore objected that the adjudication was null, or otherwise that the other adjudications where he was designed Ruthven were null. But the Court repelled both objections, and sustained all the adjudications.

No. 4.

---

1753. July 6. PROVOST HAMILTON *against* DALGLIESH.

No. 5.

A PROCESS of sale against *William* Hamilton, but erroneously called in the summons and executions *George*, and founded on an adjudication against him labouring under the same defect; we sustained the objection and found no process. (See DICT. No. 9. p. 4163.)

See Lord Pitsligo's Case, Cluny Macpherson's Case, Lochiel's Case, *voce* FORFEITURE.

See Barisdale's Case, (in the Notes.)

See NOTES.