sentence;—the Lords, before they would discuss whether this reason should be received or not, notwithstanding that the party contended that it ought not to be received, in respect of the said sentence given against them compearing, and that he alleged res judicatæ non debent retractari prætextu instrumentorum noviter repertorum; and also (notwithstanding that the tack was not instantly produced, to verify the reason, as the party alleged ought to be done in the case of instruments new come to knowledge,) they assigned a day to the suspender to produce these tacks, and to recover the same out of the parties' hands in Ireland; and reserved then to the party, after sight of the tacks, to oppone what he might against the same, either why it should not be received then, or why it proved not the reason; to which time all further proceeding was superseded, sed cum onere expensærum.

Act. Nicolson and Gilmor. Alt. Mowat. Scot, Clerk. Vid. 9th June 1624,

L. Touch; and 20th January 1631, E. Galloway.

Page 667.

## 1633. February 20. LADY ATHOL against The EARL of ATHOL.

A SUBMISSION being made by the Lady Athol to the Earl of Kinghorn, the Lairds of Auldbar, Inchmartine, and ———, immediately after her husband's decease, of all which she could crave of the Earl of Athol by any right competent to her; and they decerning her to have yearly 500 merks for all:—this decreet being desired to be reduced upon the reason of most enorme lesion, qualified in that she was provided to a conjunct fee of fifty chalders of victual, beside that she was one of the heirs of the Earldom of Athol; for all which rights the said judges had ordained only the said 500 merks yearly, which was vehemens læsio, and so insufficient for the entertainment of the meanest person whatsoever, far less for one of her birth and estate;—that the Lords, who were supreme judges, ought to repone her against that unjust decreet, which was so partially pronounced by the arbiters, wherein they had not behaved themselves as boni viri, according to trust committed to them; and, therefore, ought to be mended by the Lords, who were sovereign judges, and to whom recourses were permitted in law, as to the best men, to rectify such wrongs;—the parties being heard to reason in this cause at great length, and having considered the defender's exception, specially that in law it was alleged that both in ff. and c. it is expressly decided, Quod sit standum sententiæ arbitri, sive æquæ sive iniquæ, et sibi imputet qui compromisit, nam et minus probabilem sententiam ferre debet æquo animo; and the pursuer's answers in law made thereto, as may be more particularly considered in my other book of notes, fol. 27;—and also, the Lords having heard the defender, upon declaring the burdens wherewith the conjunct fee lands were alleged to be affected, before her conjunct fee granted thereof to her, and whereby he alleged the most that was free to her did not exceed 19 or 20 chalders of victual; so that he alleged that the lesion was not so great to reduce the decreet given by so honourable arbiters, granting that that lesion was a cause of reduction, which he altogether denied;—the Lords found this lesion to be most enorme, and that it was a cause to rectify the said decreet-arbitral, notwithstanding of the allegeance. And, therefore, they found that the lady ought to have yearly given to her, in place of the 500 merks decerned, 1200 merks yearly in all time coming, during her lifetime; for which sum they ordained the lady to have right sicklike as if that sum had been decerned by the sentence; and also, they ordained to be paid to her, for the space of a year which was expired since her husband's decease, 1000 pounds, by and attour 500 merks which she had gotten paid to her before. And this the Lords ordained to stand, as if it had been expressly decerned by the arbiters in their sentence.

Act. Stuart and Baird. Alt. Nicolson and Nairn. Hay, Clerk.

Page 676.

1633. February 26. The LAIRD of CONHEATH against The LAIRD of EARL-STON.

Maxwel of Conheath being made assignee to certain goods, by Katharin Glendinning, owner thereof, which were intromitted with by Gordon of Earlston, and for which he was pursued by the assignee; and he dying, pendente lite, the action was transferred in the heir of Earlston; who compearing, alleged that the cedent was at the horn before the making of the assignation, and he has obtained the gift of her escheat and declarator thereon; which, albeit it be after the assignation, yet the horning is anterior to the assignation; after which horning she could do nothing in prejudice of the fisk, which might derogate to the escheat. This exception was found relevant, and admitted to the defender's probation; whereby the donator was preferred to the assignee made before the escheat was gifted, seeing the cedent was at the horn when the assignation was made by her, at which time she could do no deed to prejudge the fisk. The act of litiscontestation in this cause is dated December 6, 1631, and it was decreeted February 23, 1633.

Act. Cunninghame. Alt. Nicolson and Mowat. Scot, Clerk. Vid. 2d February 1632, Lindsay; 6th December 1631, betwixt these parties.

Page 678.

1633. July 20. LADY ROTHEMAY against JANET OGILVIE and GEORGE ABERNETHY.