

No 239. whereof the said Robert moved action, as done in his defraud, and unlawfully, after that he was in effect her husband, without his consent; which summons the LORDS found relevant, and declared the said dispositions and renunciations null.

*Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 404. Haddington MS. v. 2. No 2261.*

No 240. 1633. Jan. 29. SCOT against BROWN.

A BOND made by Mary Hamilton, before her marriage with Scott, her spouse, but after she was proclaimed with her said spouse, found null and of no force to bind her husband, more than the said bond had been given *stante matrimonio*.

*Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 404. Auchinleck MS. p. 17.*

\* \* \* See Durie's Report of this Case, No 24. p. 2710.

\* \* \* Spottiswood reports the same case.

1633. Jan. 22. THE LORDS would not find process upon a bond granted by a woman after she was contracted and proclaimed upon her husband. Margaret Scott against Brown and her debtors. The like had been found twice before.

*Spottiswood, v. 1. p. 159.*

No 241. 1665. December. The Lady BUTE, against her Son, The SHERIFF of BUTE.

DAME GRISSEL CAMPBELL, relict of the sheriff of Bute, after she was contracted in marriage with Mr Archibald Grahame, now her second husband, and after she was proclaimed with him in the parish kirk, granted a renunciation of a part of her liferent lands; in favour of her son, this sheriff, (the rest unrenounced, being but very mean), whereof she, with consent of her husband, intents reduction upon this reason, That she could do no deed, after she was contracted and proclaimed, without her husband's consent, no more than if she had done it the time of the marriage.

Which the LORDS found relevant, notwithstanding of any thing alleged to the contrary; and specially, That her husband, before the solemnization of the marriage, knew of the granting of the renunciation, and said nor did nothing against the same.

*Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 405. Gilmour, No 171. p. 122.*