ASSIGNATION.

Nature and Effect of an Affignation.

1533. July 3. ROBERT CAIRNIS against ROBERT LEYIS.

Ane gift or dispositioun beand maid and gevin of ony thing to two persounis conjunctly and severally, and ony one of theme make and constitute an assignay, the samin assignay, be vertue of his assignatioun, may not clame mair nor the ane half of the said gift; for the uther half theirof partenis to the uther persoun to quhome the samin was maid, and quha maid no assignatioun thereof. And sicklike gif the said disposition be made to ma persounis, the assignay to have after the rate and quantitie thairof.

No 1.
One of two or more perfons, having right conjunctly and feverally, to a whole; by affigning the fubject, conveys only his own proportion.

Balfour, p. 169.

1533. November 29.

The Abbot of Kilwinning against Andro Auchinleck.

No 2.

All affignations or contract is not contenand ane titill, onerous or lucrative, are of nane avail, force, nor effect, be way of exceptioun.

Balfour, p. 160.

1558. March I. DAVID THOMSONE against WILLIAM CHIRNSIDE.

All affignatious and refignations maid be ony man to his fone, or to ony uther person, of landis, gudis, cornis, cattell, or utheris, are of nane avail be way of exception, gif the maker thairof remane still in possession of the samin guidis or landis, or of the maist part thairof, likeas he did before the making of the samin quia donans et retinens nibil agit.

No 3.
Assignation of moveables, retenta possessis ineffectual.

Balfour, p. 170.