COMPETITION.

SECT. I.

Arresters with Poinders.

1611. June 5. WRIGHT against THOMSON and ARCHIBALD.

A NE debtor being obliged to two or more creditors, who has decreets or reregistrate bonds against him, gif any of them arrest his guids in any man's hands, and the other creditour poind the same guids, the party in whais hands the guids were, will not be halden to make them forthcomand to the arrester. Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 178. Haddington, MS. No 2. p. 194.

No 1.
Arrestment does not bar other creditors from carrying off the goods by poinding.

1634. July 29.

HUNTER against WILLIAM DICK.

One Hunter, arresting in William Dick's hands some wares pertaining to James Spence his debtor, and pursuing to make the same furthcoming, and referring the summons to the said William Dick's oath, who granting the having of the wates, and the being thereof in one of his cellars in Leith the time of the arrestment, but declared that one Thomson, another creditor of the said Spence, had poinded the same out of his cellar, by virtue of a sentence, and intromitted with the same; and the pursuer answering, That after his arrestment, he ought not to have suffered any other to have intromitted with the said goods arrested, to his prejudice, but should have suspended against both parties, that they might have disputed their rights, which of them should be preferred;—— THE LORDS found, That a prior arrestment was no impediment to any other creditor to execute his sentence, by pointing the same goods arrested before, and that the person in whose hands the goods were arrested, had neither reason, nor any necessity to have stayed the poinding, nor to have suspended upon double poinding; for no deed was done by him, to give any advantage to the one party before the other; for if any sums of money, or other thing had been

No 2. Found as above.

No 2. in his hand, which he had given out of his hands without order of law, that would have been done upon his own hazard and peril; but here, where there was no accession of any fact done by him, in whose hands the arrestment was made, to further the poinder, which poinding he could not stay; therefore the arrestment was found could not make him liable to the arrester; but reserved to the arrester to pursue him who had poinded, for rendering or repeating of the goods, prout de jure.

Act. M'Gill & Sibbald.

Alt. Nicolson & Stuart. Clerk, Scot. Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 178. Durie, p. 735.

1535. March 11. Dick against Spence and Thomson.

No 3. Found in conformity with the above.

WILLIAM DICK having certain goods belonging to Spence, a bankrupt, in his hands, which being arrested by one Hunter, creditor to the said Spence, the said William is cited upon the arrestment, to make the goods furthcoming; and after that arrestment and citation, Thomson, another creditor of the said Spence. having, upon his bond registrate against Spence, by virtue of the Lords' letters. poinded the same goods, out of the said William Dick's cellars in Leith, where they were the time of the arrestment preceding, and also at the time of the poinding; the said William being convened by the arrester, to make the arrested goods furthcoming, and he defending, that the same were poinded from him, as said is; likeas the charger compeared, and in respect of his poinding claimed preference to the arrester.—And the arrester alleging, That he ought to be preferred to the poinder, in respect to his anteriority of diligence, in his prior arresting, and citation also of the haver before the poinding, which so affected the goods, that the haver could not have suffered any other to poind in his prejudice thereafter; seeing if that were allowed, it should tend to make all arrestments unprofitable, and should give liberty to the haver to elide all diligence of the creditors, and to give way to the payment of any other creditors he pleased to prefer, which were against justice; for the haver should not have suffered the poinder to enter within houses to poind, while his arrestment had been tried, whereupon he was summoned before the poinding, as said is, and the collusion of the haver with the poinder is manifest herein; likeas he offers to prove by William Dick's oath, that by express paction betwixt him and the poinder, they convened and agreed together, that he should give way to the poinder to poind. and make open doors to him for that effect, to the effect he might be preferred. and the other creditor prejudged, which was not lawful to him to do; and the time of the said arrestment, he took the poinder expressly bound to warrant him of the said prior arrestment, and of all danger which he might incur thereby; and after that agreement, the said William Dick sent down his servant to make his cellars open, that the poinder might have free access thereto, and so