## SUNDAY.

1622. February 9. Mortimer against Scrimzeour.

In an action pursued by William Mortimer, burgess of Edinburgh, who was donatar to the escheat goods of one James Watson, and whereupon he had obtained decreet of general declarator against one Scrimzeour, for making them forthcoming to the donatar; the Lords found the poinding executed at Scrimzeour's instance, by virtue whereof he would have purged his intromission with the said rebel's goods libelled, to be null, because the same was executed upon a Sunday, which the Lords found not to be a competent day for such acts, and therefore repelled the allegeance founded upon the said poinding.

No. I.
Poinding executed on a
Sunday null.

Clerk, Hay. Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 405. Durie, p. 16.

1627. February 24. EARL CASSILS against MACMARTIN and Lows.

In an action, Earl of Cassils against Macmartin and Andrew Lows, whereof mention is made, 15th of February, 1627. No. 1. p. 2167. voce CHARGE TO ENTER HEIR, the Lords repelled the allegeance, whereby it was alledged, that Mr. Andrew Low's comprising was null, because he had deduced the same, upon an heritable sum of money, the same not being made moveable before the comprising, which could not be sustained, seeing comprising could not be deduced, but for not payment of moveable sums. This allegance was found could not be received in this place, by way of suspension or exception, but only was competent to be received by way of reduction, albeit it was alleged, that it was instantly verified by consideration of the tenor of the bond, insert in the body of the comprising; which was repelled hoc loco, as said is. Item, in this same process the Lords sustained the comprising, albeit the letters whereby the same was raised, and the bill which was the warrant thereof, was dated upon a Sunday, and the letters signed upon a Sunday; whereby the party alledged, the same being done upon a Sunday, could not be found lawful, that day not being a convenient day for such acts; which was also repelled; for albeit of the law vox preconis debet cessare, yet there was no prohibition, which extended to acts which had no citation upon that day, and which albeit they were judicial,

No. 2. A comprising sustained, tho' the letters were signed on a Sunday, and the bill, which was the warrant of it, was dated on a Sunday, but the I ords inclined to make a statute to prohibit the like in time coming.