

GRAHAM  
v.  
GRAHAM.

“ ties ; and that no surplus value had been  
“ put on the policy and pleasure grounds.”

*Clerk, Cuningham, and Robertson, for the Pursuer.*

*Jeffrey and Cockburn for the Defender.*

(Agents, *James Robertson & Son, w. s.* and *John Campbell, w. s.*)

Expences re-  
fused, an ap-  
peal being en-  
tered.

On 31st December 1819, a motion for the expences was dismissed, on the ground that an appeal had been presented to the House of Lords, against the decision of the Court of Session.

PRESENT,  
LORD PITMILLY.

1818.  
December 16.

TENNENT & Co. v. HODGE.

A Jury dis-  
missed of con-  
sent, without  
returning a  
verdict.

IN this case, after the Jury were sworn, but before the case was opened for the pursuer, the parties agreed to a compromise.

Mr Jeffrey proposed, that the Jury should of consent find a verdict in terms of the compromise. This was objected to on the other side.

Counsel then gave in a minute, consenting that the Jury should be dismissed; and upon this consent, Lord Pitmilly granted an order accordingly.

TENNENT, &amp;c.

v.  
HODGE.

(Agents, *William Ellis*, and *John Young, Jun.*)



PRESENT,

LORDS CHIEF COMMISSIONER AND PITMILLY.



SNADON v. STEWART.

1819.

January 11.

DAMAGES claimed for arrestment of a vessel, and for calumny.

Damages claimed, but not found, for arrestment of a vessel, and defamation.

DEFENCE.—The vessel was not arrested as belonging to the pursuer. The calumnious expressions were not used.

## ISSUES.

“ 1st, Whether, on Wednesday the 11th  
 “ day of March 1818, or about that time,  
 “ the defender John Stewart arrested or  
 “ caused to be arrested a vessel, then ly-  
 “ ing in the harbour of Leith, called the  
 “ Janet of Kennet, with her float-boat, fur-