No 127.

it liquidates the decreet of removing. The Lords would not sustain the allegeance as it was proponed, except he would say as in the reply.

Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 37. Spottiswood, (Successors and Succession), p. 315.

*** Auchinleck reports this case:

The Laird of Carnossie pursued Alexander Fraser, as successor to umquhile Alexander Fraser of Mensir his father titulo lucrative, for making payment to him of the violent profits contained in a decreet obtained by Carnossie's father against the defender's father. It was excepted by Alexander Fraser, that he cannot be convened as successor to his father in the land of Mensir, because he was infeft by his father therein upon his contract of marriage, which contract was made before any decreet of violent profits was obtained. To which it was replied, That the exception ought to be repelled, except it were alleged, that the contract of marriage was before the decreet of removing, whereupon the decreet of violence followed; for by the decreet of removing, his father was constituted debtor, and the decreet of violence was only a liquidation of the debt which depended upon the decreet of removing. Which reply the Lords found relevant.

Auchinleck, MS. p. 4.

Ş. .

No 128.

1637. February 23.

LIGHTON against L. KINABER.

IF a disposition be before the existence of the debt though infeftment be after, there is no room for the passive title.

*** See this case, No 106. p. 9772.

No 129. A son as luerative successor post contractum de bitum, was found obliged to enter heir to his father the wadsetter, in order to resign in favour of the reverser, because there was an obligation in the wadset to resign upon payment, which was before the

1668. January 14.

EARL of KINGHORN against The LAIRD of UDNEY.

The Earl of Kinghorn did wadset to the deceast Laird of Udney the barony of Balhaves, and the sum due upon the wadset being paid to Udney, he did by his letter to the said Earl, promise a renunciation of the said wadset to be granted by him. The Earl of Kinghorn as heir to his father, having pursued the now Laird of Udney as representing his father upon the passive titles, and especially upon that, as successor titulo lucrativo, in so far as he was infeft in the lands condescended upon acquired by his father to himself in liferent, and to the defender in fee, with power to the father or his assignee to redeem the same upon payment of three pounds, and to set, wadset, and dispone without his consent; it was alleged, the sons right was prior to the said letter, and that the father did not make use of the said power. It was replied, That the wad-