No 2. by Balgray against William Gray.-It was alleged, That his assignation to Parbroth's contract could give him no interest to reduce William Gray's alienation to Balegarno, he not being made assignee to the inbibition.-It was answered, That the assignation made to the contract betwixt Balgray and Parbroth, with all action competent to Balgray thereupon was sufficient, albeit it expressed not the inhibition; which the Lords found sufficient.

Fol. Dic.v. 1. p. 422. Haddington, MS. No 1932.
$\underset{\text { Tound in }}{\text { No }}$
Found in eonformity with Craigie against Boyd, No 1. p. G301.
1610. Fuly 24. Sheriff of Teviotdale against Elinot.

He who has gotten wadset of the lands, to be holden of himseif under reversion, resigning these lands in his superior's hands, in favour of him who obtains infeftment thereupon, the party so infeft may redeem the wadset lands, albeit he be neither heir nor assignee to the wadsetter, but only successor by the infeftment, which transfers with it the right of the reversion, and needs no declarator, but may be a lawful ground to a decreet of redemption.

Fol. Dic. v. I. p. 422. Haddington, MS. No 197 C .

162a. Januay 17. Walter Hay agaiast Mark Kerr.
Found, that an inhibition pertains to the assignee, albeit it be not assigned per expressum.

$$
\text { Ful. Dic. v. 1. p. } 422 . \text { Kirse, (Inhibition.) fol. } 57 .
$$

1027. July 18 . La. Boyd against His Temanis.

A back-tack found to accresce to a woman, liferenter, who is infeft after the wadset, she paying the duty to the wadsetter.

This found thereafter betwixt Sewart and Fleeming, 19th December 1627 , Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 422. Kerse, MS. fol. 90.
4627. Nouember 23. Duxbar against Williamson.

No 6.
A plason infeft in an annualrent right, having conveyed the same to an assignee who was infeft, the assignee was found to have right to the perso ala contrast betwat the heritor and first ammahenter, by waich the herits was persually ubliged to pay the money, though not expresly conveyed; and there-

