No. 25.

No. 26. Penalty for

refusing to

enter vassals.

charged and denounced for not fulfilling of the bond; thereafter the creditor pursues the said debtor, and the Bailies of Montrose, viz. the debtor to give him infeftment, and if he do not, the Bailies to infeft him; and the party being absent in the process, it was found, that the order could not be sustained against the Bailies, and that the act of Parliament of tinsel of superiority of those who enters not thereto, being charged to that effect by vassals, as the act prescribes, militates not to produce this action.

Clerk, Gibson.

Durie, p. 474.

1632. March 24.

HAY against L. ACHNAMES.

James Hay seeking declarator of Achnames's life-rent of escheat of the lands of - holden of the said James; and Achnames alleging, that no life-rent can fall to James Hay, because he was infeft in these lands, holden of the Prince upon James Hay's contumacy, for refusing to infeft him, so that the benefit of the life-rent thereby cannot belong to him; this allegeance was repelled, for the infeftment granted by the Prince, for the immediate superior's disobedience, or refusal to receive his vassal, was found a good and lawful reason to exclude all nonentry, which the superior might seek for the vassal's non-entry, seeing the superior was charged, and refused; and the entry by the Prince was found to purge the same, and to supply that defect; but it was found nowise to exclude the immediate superior from any other casualities of his superiority, which otherwise might belong to him as ward, life-rent, recognition, and others; and also the duties, if any were payable by the tenor of the infeftment, are due to the superior, notwithstanding of the vassal's entry by the prince; for these casualities accresce to the superior for the fault of the vassal's self, wherein the superior cannot be hurt sine sua culpa, but in the non-entry he is prejudged for his own fault, for therein habet seipsum auctorem culpæ, et non vassallum, et in aliis vassallus est auctor culpæ, et delictorum, et non dominus.

Act. Gilmore.

Alt.

Clerk, Hay.

Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 408. Durie, p. 633.

1749. June 21. JAMES COOK against DICK of Grange.

Dick of Grange obtained a decreet of non-entry of certain lands feued by him, whereupon houses had been built, which was reduced at the instance of James Cook, an adjudger, and he found liable to account; and in the accounting, the Lord Ordinary, 23d July, 1748, "sustained a claim of annual-rent of money advanced by Grange, for the repairs and meliorations of the subjects in controversy,

No. 27.
A superior possessing on a decree of non-entry, which was afterwards reduced, it