

*N. 1. The Lord of Durlston did pass a Bill of Arbitration of a cause between an Inferior Judge & his wife, which he was compelled upon the Reason that there was a composition of Double Rights. A Court of his Lord's own opinion, That the cause wherein there is a question of Double Rights may be Arbitrated by Inferior Appeal herein, there ought to be no Arbitration upon questions of Double Rights where there is no difficulty. Because Inferior Judges have as good Right to the Jurisdiction of causes compelled before them as to any other property, And if it were otherwise, the Jurisdiction of Inferior Judges would be altogether vacated, and the Losses incumbents with questions that may and ought to be determined by Inferior Judges contrary to act 39 in chapter 6. 2 March 1st part 3 Ch. 2. and others. For the in Rem Actions of debts of masts & victualls and the like Real actions when a Defense is founded on a Right or when parties appearing for their Interests produce Rights, it may always be presumed that the question is concerning Double Rights. Durlston 25 June 1675 D. 279.

*N. 2. you a cause for payment of a Bond purfult before an Inferior court that was compelled to judge therein was arbitrated upon this Reason that there was an Inquestion of the fact being depending before the Lord of Justice, and contentious cause non debet C. 2. id 2 July 1675 Robt of Bonner contra his Royal Indemnity offered by Durlston.

*N. 2. In a purfult at the instance of a Minor against his Father after she was married, the purfult having referred to her oath that she had Intervened before her marriage with Durlston particularly belonging to him. The Husband of the Father pleaded that she could not declare to his prejudice. It was Argued, that the purfult is to be given against his Father could not be in a worse case as to the modis probandi by her father inducing a Husband. And her Interven. being such as could not be known to any person but herself nor proved otherwise by the party, it was held that the minor should be absolved of his proof by her own D. 2. For this is not a case where the debt is to be constituted only by a wife's oath; but the Ground of the debt is constituite by nihil vita. By the nomination or Letter of Testimony. And when a purfult is convened against any person, that person cannot by affirmation cut off the purfult from his proof by the Party's oath. And all more are more precluded, al. draft ought so far to be followed as not to allow their Father to Ruin them contolando ad secundas nuptias ante et post Rationes. The Lord thought the case considerable. And ordaineth Father to declare upon oath referring to themselves to consider what her Declaration should import 15 February 1676 Marshal contra Tordoff and her Husband.

*N. 1. one who had made this agreement whom he purposed to be a pirate had taken a ship fraughted with guns and other timber upon the north coast of Scotland having bought a parcel of the said cargo from him, and the person with whom he purposed being found therfore to be a pirate and therefore fit to be a free ship imprelly taken by the pirates. The buyer purfult the owners of the cargo to bear and for reward and declared that he had for their Arbitrators made the said bargain; seeing otherwise the pirate might & would have carried away the said ship and cargo, or first having men enough in company to navigate both his own and that ship would have burnt & destroyed it. And that his owners ought to be let to make up to him what he had given to the pirates for the said parcel of guns & stores for their Arbitrators it was objected for the Defendants that they have no bind. also of their own ship and goods wherof they had thereby farre further of their commercium & navigatione; your persons who come to be brought them without being liable to reward the pirates. Nor piracy are of all the like the greatest. And being by the law of nations pirates or others breaking bulk or spoiling all their own Haudeman ships or cargo taken by them brashly or any way thereof without being first declared a lawful prize are looked upon as pirates, and those who buy or get such goods from them as Recipitators; and seeing the purfult had suspicion that he followed a pirate; He was in possession of the same as pirate & he had amicably dealing with him. No cause pretend to have been a negotiorum factio, where a friend is at home. & the party concerned sent him a post office or business, and upon no other consideration than that he may not suffer prejudicet, and so contract or quasi contract with the person ex ius negotiorum suorum: whereas in this case the owners were altogether unknown to the purfult and he evidently intended only his own Interest as far as he being a pirate had known to be under the character of a purfult apt enough to take the occasion of profitable Bargains, and yet not buy the whole ship and cargo for othermen, but only a parcel of the cargo at a very eny rate and great undervalue; and when the ship was brought before me it was not to any magistrate, that he should be forced to goe forthcoming to those having Interest. It was Argued for the purfult that even all the fidei professores habe necesse was Imponens allowed to them. To which it was replied, That such allowance is only given in the case of expenses laid out by expens in possession of Ruriorum Hostis which otherwise would be purfult could not be preferred from him without such defraudement or in such like cases. But pirates & Robbers and Reftors cannot pretend to have Reputacion of the price paid by them, the same not being Imperfect but perfictum. Some of the Lords were of opinion that there was no foundation for this purfult, and that there was ground to confirme the plaint as a Recipitator whose practice shold not be encouraged. But others being of opinion, That the purfult having profited the parcel bought by him, and a bought & bring to the owners by his transmission the case was favourable. The Lord recommended to the parties to settle their differences 14 June 1676 Cornelius Bulfin Contra offered by Durlston.

* 2. In the opinion of the Doctor of His Majesties Law. The buying of a thing stolen when in a publick Fair or market is bound to his loss & to the owner without bast from him the price being paid to the seller. pr. 2. 174 n. 31.

* 3. Also negotiorum gestorum or do in Rom. Corp. is not complaint to any who does another Business by order of a third person without Intention to妨害 him whos affair he manage; But he can only purfult in the name of his employer qui facit propter alienum and whos fault he followed. In which case all objections and defenses that lie against the Employer will be effectual against him. 25 June 1726 Johnston of Westerhall contra Marquess of Annandale.