uplifting the maills and duties thir two last terms. The Lords preferred John Ferguson aye and while Kilkerran obtained the suspension discussed.—31st January 1632.

Thereafter the said suspension was discussed in July 1632, and the superior ordained to infeft the charger; after the which decreet of suspension, the action of double poinding being again called, the Lords ordained Kilkerran to be answered and obeyed.

Page 39.

The said Mr John Ferguson of Kilkerran,—having comprised the lands of Dalduff, holden of the Earl of Cassils, and having charged the said Earl to receive him vassal, who suspending; and having discussed the said suspension, and being willing to satisfy for his entry, yet the said sum not being paid to the superior, nor he infeft; -pursues Thomas Davidson of Pennieglen, who had comprised the said lands, and procured himself infeft; and, by virtue thereof, had uplifted the mails and duties of the lands comprised for the space of three years; to refund to him the said mails and duties, as he who had used the first diligence by comprising and charging the superior. It is excepted by the defender, That he ought not to refund the mails and duties intromitted with by him; because he had uplifted the same, by virtue of his infeftment; and, as yet, the pursuer was not infeft, in his own default, for not paying to the superior his due; and, since his charge, which was suspended, he has done no diligence to discuss the suspension, for the space of three or four years; in the which time the defender had good reason to uplift the mails and duties, by virtue of his infettment. Which exception the Lords found relevant, quoad fructus perceptos.—1st December 1632.

Page 39.

1632. December 1. ROBERT MASTERTON and GRAHAM against Andrew Stewart.

ROBERT Masterton and Graham pursue Archibald Stewart for the sums addebted to them by bond, bearing annualrent and expenses. Other creditors of the said Archibald, compear, and allege, That if annualrent and expenses be allowed to the pursuer, nothing or little will be left among them, who are content to quit a great part of their just debt. The Lords, in respect of the inhability of the debtor, and that some help might be gotten to the rest of the creditors, will neither allow annualrent nor expenses to the pursuers, albeit one of the pursuers's bond bears annualrent.

Page 39.

1633. January 17. Wood against Blair.

An heir being pursued as lawfully charged to enter heir, his procurator produces a renunciation. It is alleged, The renunciation produced is not sufficient; because it was general, and made no mention that it was given for obedience of the charge; so that, in respect of the generality thereof, the charger cannot pursue for adjudication. The Lords found it sufficient, seeing the party charged