in anno 1618. The father charges the son by the former letters to fulfill the said decreet 1617, and denounces him to the horn; whereupon John Hay, superior to the said young Laird, pursues for a declarator of his life-rent. It was alleged for Aikman, that this horning was null, in respect the letters, and hail contents of the decreet-arbitral, which were the ground of the charge, were suspended in anno 1616, and the suspension intimated to the parties before denunciation, so no posterior charge given upon the letters which were suspended could be a ground to denounce him. It was replied, that the obedience given to the first charge by the son is a passing from the suspension; and he might very well charge for the subsequent years, without discussing the suspension. The Lords found the exception relevant.

Auchinleck MS. p. 87. & 228.

1632. November 18. TURNBUL against ———

No. 9.

No. 8.

In a suspension, where the suspender called the charger to produce his charges, and to hear and see the same suspended *simpliciter*, the charger produces not, but is content that, according to the custom, the letters be suspended ay and while they be produced. The suspender alleged, that seeing he satisfied the production himself, and verifies the reason of his reduction instantly, he ought to have the letters suspended *simpliciter*; which the Lords sustained, and ordained this cause to be observed hereafter.

Auchinleck MS. p. 228.

1634. July 24. BRUNTFIELD against TROTTERS.

Eupham Bruntfield pursues Trotters for contravention, the deed whereof was the taking away of her oxen out of her wains, in harvest 1633, casting down the corns, and taking away her kine; against which the defenders excepting, that they poinded the same lawfully, conform to a decreet for poinding of the ground for an annual-rent of £.100, owing for the space of six or seven years by-past, preceding the year 1633; the pursuer replied, that the decreet was suspended before the poinding; to which it was duplied, that the suspension was only in a double-poinding, raised by the tenants of the lands out of which the annual-rents should have been paid, complaining that they were distressed in the said lands by the annual-renter, on the one part, and by the pursuer, claiming right by wadset to the duties of the lands, on the other part, for the crop 1633; which double-poinding being only raised for that year, and no other year, and they suspending both the parties' rights, and charges, and decreet, only for that one year, the same could not extend to any of the preceding years contained in the sentence, which were not questioned by that suspension and double-poinding. The Lords repelled the exception and duply on the poinding, in respect of the said preceding double-

No. 10. Creditors pursuing tenants for payment of a particular year's rent. and being suspended on a multiplepoinding, cannot lawfully poind for any other year's rent, till the suspension be discussed.

VOL. XXXIV.

82 P