TRANSFERENCE.

*** Durie reports this case :

In a suspension betwixt Liddel and Robbs, whereby a decreet was desired to: be suspended, which was transferred before the Commissary of Aberdeen, the principal decreet being recovered before the provost and Baillies of Aberdeen ; in the which suspension, the Lords found the reason thereof relevant, and the decreet of transferring foresaid, given by the Commissary of Aberdeen, to be null, because the Lords found that the Commissary's power and jurisdiction extended. not to transfer the decreet and sentence obtained before any other Judge; likeas they found, that no inferior Judge had power to transfer the decreet given and pronounced in another inferior Judge's Court ; for albeit a Judge might transferthe sentence, in some cases, given in his own Court, yet he had not that power. in sentences pronounced in other Courts, but such transferrings ought to be sought in the sovereign Courts, to which the other judicatories were subaltern. And this was found, albeit the decreet of transferring was desired to be maintained, as properly belonging to the jurisdiction of the Commissary, and as being a consistorial matter, because the decreet was transferred active, only in the executors of the defunct, obtainer of the sentence, and so pertaining to the executors, therefore the commissary was Judge; which was repelled.

Act. Mowat. Alt. Nicolson, younger.

Clerk, Gibson. Durie, p. 124.

1626. March'22. Mr. PATRICK COLLACE against The LAIRD of ELPHINSTON.

No. 4. Transference of a decree of comprising,

Mr. Patrick Collace, assignee constituted by William Henderson; and general heir served and retoured to John Henderson, burgess of Haddington, in and to a decreet of comprising deduced at the said John's instance, against umquhile Mr. Robert Johnston, charged the Laird of Elphinston as superior to infeft him. He suspended, alleging the decreet should be transferred in Mr. Patrick active; and against the heir or apparent heir of Mr. Robert and the Laird of Elphinston as superior *passive*, because umquhile John Henderson, at whose instance the comprising was deduced, was dead; and also Mr. Robert against whom it was led, and that long before this assignation; and so till it were transferred no process (it being of the nature of other decreets) till infeftment follow thereupon; for if Mr. Robert had given a bond to the said John for infefting of him in his lands, and John had registrated the same, and charged for 'implementing thereof,' and thereafter deceased, William his heir could have no action thereupon till first he had transferred the same in himself active; multo magis where they are both dead. The Lords sustained the charge against the superior.

Spottiswood, p. 340.