1779. June 25. David Pattillo, Suspender, against Sir William Maxwell and Others.

## JURISDICTION.

Power of Review inherent in the Court of Session not excluded by the Comprehending Act.

## [Dictionary, 7386.]

COVINGTON. The commissioners do not specify the grounds of their sentence.

Hailes. I formerly doubted, and I still doubt of that incontrollable Parliamentary power vested in the commissioners; but although we should hold that, in matters of opinion, their judgment cannot be reviewed, yet in matters of mathematical demonstration it may: and if they choose to find that a person falls under the statute, who demonstratively does not, I cannot suppose that they act under the statute,—their decree cannot make a man taller or younger than the statute requires.

GARDENSTON. Approved of the distinction between judgments in matters of opinion and judgments in matters of demonstration.

JUSTICE-CLERK. The suspender must show that he does not fall under the statute.

PRESIDENT. It is dangerous to limit legal remedies: he who applies by suspension, must verify his reasons; but he cannot verify them while he remains a prisoner.

On the 25th June 1779, "The Lords remitted to the Lord Ordinary to pass

the bill;" altering Lord Ankerville's interlocutor.

Act. A. Crosbie. Alt. J. M'Laurin.

N. B.—Lord Ankerville gave judgment, contrary to his own opinion, in consequence of what he understood to have been the sense of the Court in other cases.

1779. June 29. James Good against Christian Smith.

## INDEFINITE PAYMENT.

The creditor, in an account, of which a part was prescribed, was found entitled to impute partial payments, in satisfaction of articles of his account, three years preceding the date of such payment; though these articles were part of those which had fallen under prescription.

## [Faculty Collection, VIII. 158; Dict. 6816.]

Monbodo. The statute 1579 is a most beneficial statute, and the Court has done well in applying it to the case of tradesmen's accounts; but I have a