SECT. IX.

Offer of Payment, if it stops incurring the Irritancy?

1556. May 14. Bishop of Murray against Laird of Kinfauns.

No 100.

ANENT the action pursued by the Bishop of Murray against the Laird of Kinfauns, for reduction of a feu, for not-payment of the feu-mails, by the space required of the law, it was alleged by the said Laird, That he offered the said mail-duty to them having power to receive the same of the Bishop, being his chamberlain for the time. It was alleged by the said Bishop, That it was not enough to offer the mails, but it should have been consigned; which allegeance was repelled by the Lords, and found it was enough to offer the mails, without consignation.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 491. Maitland, MS. p. 119.

*** The like was decided 26th July, 1678, Powrie against Hunter, No 145. p. 2685. voce Compensation.

1595. June 3. BISHOP of DUNKELD against The LAIRD of ARDROSS.

No Ioia

In a cause betwixt the Bishop of Dunkeld and his wife against the Laird of Ardross, the Lords found a back-tack, during the non-redemption of an annualrent, containing a clause irritant, in case of non-payment of the duty, to be mull, in respect of non-payment at the terms set down in the contract; albeit they offered to prove real offer debito tempore, because they alleged not that they had consigned the silver.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 401. Haddington, MS. No. 545.

1610. July 18. Lord Torphichen against The Laird of Pitfoddels.

No 102. A feu being granted, with a clause irritant, it was found not sufficient to offer payment to the procurator, who made requisition; but that the clause irritant was incurred, unless

Vol. XVII.