## SECT. XV.

## Bankruptcy, how Proponable.

1663. June 19. George Reid against Thomas Harper.

These parties competing in a double poinding, George Reid craved preference because he was assigned to the mails and duties by Thomas Mudie, heritor of the land.-Thomas Harper alleged, That he had arrested the duties upon a debt owing to him by William Mudie, father to the said Thomas, and any right Thomas had was fraudulent and null by exception, by the express words of the act of Parliament 1621, being betwixt father and son, without any onerous cause, and he ought not to be put to reduce in re minima, his debt being within L. 100.

The Lords found he behoved to reduce, conform to their constant custom in heritable rights.

Fol. Dic. v. ェ. p. 172. Stair, v. 1.p. 192..
1664. Fuly 22. Lord Loure against Lady Cíaig..

Lord Loure being infeft in the estate of Craig, pursues for mails and duties. Compearance is made for the Lady Craig, liferenter, who alleges she stands infeft, and in possession of the lands.-The pursuer answered, That any infeftment, as to that part thereof that was not for fulfilling of the contract of marriage, was fraudulent, and in prejudice of lawful creditors, and so null by exception, conform to the act of Parliament 1621.-It was answered for the Lady, They ôpponed the Lords' daily practice ever since the said act, that infeftments were never taken away thereupon by exception or reply.

Which the Lords found relevant. Fol. Dic. v. I.p. 172.: Stair, v. I. p.:222.:
1669. Fanuary 5: Isobel and Margaret Simes against Marion Brown,

By contract of marriage betwixt umquhile Thomas Sime and Marion Brown, John Flowan, Marion's master, is obliged to pay 300 merks of tocher, and Thomas Sime is obliged to employ the said 300 merks, and 200 merks further for the said Marion, her liferent use. The said Thomas having two daughters,

No 65. A right by infeftment, granted contrary to the act of Parlizment 1621, cannot be challenged by exception, but by reduction.

No 66.
Found as above.

No 67.

