surance, and cause themselves, and them, and each of them, to be insured." The declaration says, "It was further agreed by said deed, that in case of loss, &c. it should be lawful for the said Graham, his factors, servants and assigns, to sue," &c. The policy says, "in case of loss, &c. it shall be lawful to and for the assured, (to wit, Hugh and William Young,) and their factors," &c. The decleration says, "and so The Maryland Insurance Company aforesaid did bind themselves to the said Graham for the true performance," &c. The policy says, "do bind themselves to the assured, (the said Hugh and William,) their executors," &c. The declaration says, "confessing themselves paid the consideration due to them for the said insurance by the said Graham." The policy says, "by the said assured, (the said Hugh and William,) or their assigns." The declaration says, "and it was agreed by the said deed between the said Graham and The Maryland Insurance Company aforesaid, that in case of loss the said Graham should abate two per cent. to The Maryland Insurance Company aforesaid, and that such loss should be paid by The Maryland Insurance Company aforesaid, to the said Graham, in ninety days," &c. The policy has only these words, "and in case of loss the assured, (Hugh and William,) is to abate two per cent. and such loss to be paid in ninety days," &c. The declaration says, in case of disputes they are "to be referred to two persons, one to be chosen by the said Graham," &c. The policy only says, "one to be chosen by the assured," to wit, Hugh and William Young. Thus the court will perceive, that the declaration is, as if the insurance had been effected by Graham in his own name, but through his attorneys. Whereas the policy is entered into by Hugh and William Young in their own names, though for the use of Graham; and hence comes within the decisions referred to in Abbott and Shepherd's Touchstone, that though Graham has an equitable interest in the policy, yet the suit upon the policy must be in the name of Hugh and William Young. That the suit at law must be brought in the name of him who has the legal title, whoever may be interested, is so clear, that it would be superfluous to cite authorities to prove it. The court are however referred to one of a very recent date, and of high respectability, Lewis vs. Harwood, 6 Cranch, 82. In that case Whetcroft assigned a bond given to him by Lewis, to T. & B. Harwood, who instituted a suit