(RANKING of Adjudgers and Apprisers.)

No 28. verified, That, in anno, long before the comprising which was deduced in anno 1609 allenarly, the faid John Aslowen was infest in the property, and, by virtue of his infestment, was in possession.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 16. Hope, (Poinding & Apprising.) folio 208.

1629. December 9.

Moncrief against L. of Balnagowan.

No 29.

A comprising for the King's blench duty, found preferable to all infeftments anterior, by disposition or comprising. \*

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 16..

1675. July 7. MARGARET SCRIMZEOR against the Earl of Northesk.

No 30.

An adjudication, for bygone feu-duties, was preferred to prior comprisings for personal debts.

In a reduction, at the inflance of Margaret, as heir to her father, who flood publicly infeft in the lands of Auchmouthie, against the Earl of Northesk, of his right and disposition, made to him by Patrick Guthrie, who was common debtor. whereupon no infeftment followed until the year 1655, which was four years after the public infeftment upon the pursuer's father's comprising, and so was a non habente potestatem, the disponer being denuded: It was answered, for Northesk, That the reason was noways relevant; because, albeit his father's infeftment was posterior, yet his disposition was prior to the comprising, and was granted for the feu-duties of the lands, which was a prior cause, and did affect the same before the purfuer's comprising; feu-duties being debita fundi, and a real right which affects the ground against all fingular successors. It was replied, That the faid difposition did only bear for an onerous cause and relief of cautionry, and not flowing from the superior, either by disposition or assignation, could not give the defender right to the same; the superior having granted a discharge of the feu duties, the same was extinct, and could not affect the lands against a singular succeffor. It was duplied, That the disposition was affected with a back bond of the fame date, bearing, that Northesk's being cautioner for the feu-duties, was the true cause thereof; neither could the seu-duties be said to be extinct, seeing the heritor was not discharged, who was principally liable. The Lords, having confidered the first reason and reply, did fustain the reduction of the disposition, as being voluntary, and flowing from Auchmouthie, after he was denuded by comprifing, there being no decreet obtained, nor the lands affected for the feu-duties; and the Earl of Panmure, as donator, having only granted a discharge, but no affig-

<sup>\*</sup> Lord Kames mentions the above, from the authority of Hope's MS., stating, that it is under the subject, Biench Duty. The Editor has not yet found any such title in the book. The particulars of the case, if afterwards found, will appear in an Appendix.