No 6. rester could not be prejudiced by the inferting a perfon's name in a blank obligation; but that the fatt and the time could be afcertained only by the oath of the person whose name was inserted.

being addebted to James Kniblo, burgefs of Edinburgh, in a debt; for payment of this debt Kniblo arrefts the forefaid fum in Malcolm Craufurd's hands, and Malcolm having confest that he was jowing that sum to Craufurd this creditor, but that he had given his obligation to his faid creditor thereupon, blank in the name, to be filled up with any person's name whom his creditor pleased to insert; and that he had understood, since that time, that there was insert therein the name of Andrew Craufurd of Baidland, who being called to this double poinding, the fuspender is content to pay to any of the parties, who shall be found to have right; and Baidland compearing, and alleging that the fum should be found to pertain to him, because his name was insert in the bond; for albeit he had neither borrowing nor lending with this suspender, yet seeing his name was in the obligation, and that nothing intervened which could prohibit Craufurd, to whom the fum was owing, truly to fill in his name, nor to have given the funt to him, albeit it had been filled up with the creditor's proper name; therefore he ought to be preferred: Kniblo, on the other part, contended, that the fuspender confessing that the sum was due and proper to his debtor, albeit the bond was blank, and that he had arrefted the same as his debtor's money, in the suspender's hands, at which time of the arrestment the blank was yet unfilled up, that then it was his debtor's money still; thereafter the filling up of another person's name in the blank by his debtor, after the arrestment which affected it to him, cannot prejudge him; which filling up, fince the arrestment, he offered to prove by the witnesses insert in the bond. The Lords found, that after the arrestment, nothing could be done to the prejudice of the creditor arretter, by filling up thereafter of a person in the blank, by him who was the arrester's debtor; and so the Lords found the arrester's allegeance relevant, that, fince the arrestment, Baidland's name was insert therein, but found that the same was only relevant to be proven by Baidland's oath, and not by the witneffes infert therein; for they could not take away the obligation from Baidland by witnesses, but by his own oath; and this being so proven, the Lords found, that Kniblo should be preferred; but if it had been alleged that the bond, albeit blank, had been really delivered to Baidland before the arrestment to his own use, that would have been found relevant against the arrester, and the inserting of his name therein fince the arrestment would not have been enough to prejudge him thereof.

Ad. Belsches.

Alt. Mowat.

Clerk, Gibson.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 103. Durie, p. 270.

1665. November 1.

Telfer against Geddes.

No 7.
An arrester
was preferred
to a party

Marjory Sandilands having granted to Samuel Veitch a blank bond of 2000 merks, Telfer, being creditor to Samuel Veitch, arrefts all fums in her hand

owing to Samuel: She depones, That she was no ways debtor to Samuel but by a bond given blank in the creditor's name, and that she knew not whose name is filled up therein; compearance is made for Marion Geddes, whose name is filled up in the bond; and she alleges, she ought to be preferred to the arrefter, because she offers to prove her name was filled up in the bond, and that, before the arrestment, the bond was registrate in her name; and that, before the faid Marjory deponed, she had used inhibition thereupon, which she could not but have known. It was answered for the arrester, That he ought to be preferred, because albeit the bond was blank ab initio, yet, in rei veritate, Samuel Veitch was creditor, and so he behoved to be legally denuded, which could not be done by filling up any other person's name, without intimation thereof made to the debtor; for feeing a direct affignation was not valid without an intimation, much less should this indirect way, by the creditor's filling up another name than his own in the blank; which is in effect an affignation: And seeing the Lords have already found, that the debtor acknowledging that he gave a blank bond to any person, and knowing not whose name is filled up in it, is liable to any arrester, albeit he be under hazard to pay again to that person who has his bond; in justice it followeth, that such bonds must be intimated, otherways it will unavoidably infer double payment. It was answered, That the law requires intimation to an affignation as a necessary folemnity, but has not required the same to the filling up of a blank bond, the case whereof is not alike with an affignation, because, where the bond is blank, the debtor cannot pay any thing bona fide safely till he see the bond filled up; but where he sees the name filled up, he may pay bona fide to the cedent, not knowing of the affignation. It was answered, That the law did require to all affignations intimation, but the case of blank bonds was but a late invention, to defraud creditors, that it might not be known who was creditor: but feeing it is truly an affignation, it deserves no favour more than a direct affignation; and so should have as much folemnity.

The Lords preferred the arrester; but because the case was a leading case, and new, after a second interlocutor adhering, they allowed the advocates to offer, by bill, any new reasons; and, particularly, if it could be alleged, that the debtor, granter of the blank bond, had, before the arrestment, seen the blank bond filled up, and so had deponed, or could depone, that the time of the arrestment the debtor saw himself to be debtor to another person, filled up in the blank, than he for whose debt it was arrested; for, in that case, as the first creditor that got the blank bond might have caused his debtor retire that bond, and give a new one, before any arrestment, so the showing of the filling up of the blank was equivalent, especially if the debt could be proven no otherways but by the debtor's oath.

This case was not debated, nor was the hazard considered, that the debtor's oath might prefer one party to another; nor was the case alike to a renewed

No 7. whose name was filled up in a blank bond, as the filling up was not intimated to the debtor before the arrestment.

No 7. bond; because a renewed bond would bear a new date, and different witnesses, that saw the new creditor's name filled up, and would not depend upon the fingle testimony of the debtor.

December 1. 1665.—The competition between Telfer and Geddes, mentioned the 11th of November last, being this day again called, debated and reconfidered by the Lords at length: The question being, that Marjory Sandilands having granted a bond to Samuel Veitch, blank in the creditor's name, Samuel filled up Marion Geddes' name therein, whereupon she registrated the bond, and charged him; in the mean time, Telfer, as Veitch's creditor, having arrested all sums in Marjory Sandilands' hands, addebted by her to Samuel Veitch, and purfuing to make the same furthcoming, she depones, that the time of the arrestment she was no ways debtor to Veitch, but by a bond, blank in the creditor's name, and that she did not know whose name was filled up in it: But now Telfer the arrefter compearing, craves to be preferred, because he had arrested the sum, as belonging to Samuel Veitch his debtor, before Samuel Veitch was denuded, by filling up Marion Geddes's name, and intimating, or showing the same to Sandilands the debtor; and that the filling up of Geddes's name, being but an affignation, did necessarily require to accomplish it, to denude the cedent, an intimation; for feeing express assignations do necessarily require intimation, to prefer them to arrestments; much more ought indirect affignations, which are suspect of fraud, and by which a debtor may keep all his effate in a cloud, that none of the creditors can reach the same, by arrestment or otherwise. And it being answered, That the bond being delivered blank, there was no present creditor, but a power granted to the receiver of the bond to make creditor whom he pleased; at least there was no certain creditor. fo that Samuel Veitch was never creditor, but had only the power to make the creditor, and so needed not to be denuded, nor was there any law or custom requiring intimation of the names filled up in blank bonds, and if any fuch thing were done, upon the account of expediency, it ought only to be in time com-

THE LORDS adhered to their former interlocutor, and found Veitch to have been the true creditor, and the filling up of the other name, to be a transmission equivalent to an assignation, and required intimation, as well for cases past as to come; for they thought that if Veitch, before the filling of the bond, had been rebel, it would have fallen within his escheat.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 103. Stair, v. 1. p. 306. 318.

.*** Gilmour reports the same case:

THE relict of Mr John Alexander, advocate, being debtor by bond to Samuel Veitch in a fum of money; it is arrested by Patrick Telfer, and thereupon a

No 7.

fummons raifed for making furthcoming, and at compearance the debt is referred to her oath, who depones and confesses the debt, but that she gave the bond blank in the creditor's name, and that she knew none other to have right thereto but the faid Samuel Veitch. Compears Marion Geddes, and produces the bond registrated, and her own name insert therein, before the arrestment, and thereupon an inhibition ferved against the deponer before her deposition and oath. It was alleged for the arrester, That he ought to be preferred, because the bond being ab initio the evident and debt of the faid Samuel Veitch, and being affected with the arrestment, before any intimation made to the debtor of inserting Marion's name (though Geddes's name had been inferted, and that the bond had been delivered to her before the arrestment), yet it was of no greater force than if the bond had been filled up in the faid Samuel Veitch's name, and had been affigned by him to the faid Geddes; which affignation could not have preferred her to the arrester, unless it had been intimated before the arrestment. It was answered, That the debtor having delivered the bond blank, no certain creditor was condescended upon; and therefore, till it was filled up, payment could not have been made in whole or in part to any body, but fuch as should be inferted; and Geddes's name being inferted, and the bond delivered to her. and registrated before the arrestment, there being no law obliging her to make a formal intimation now, while the money is still resting, she ought to be preferred to the arrester, the debtor not being debtor to the arrester's debtor the time of the arrestment.

THE LORDS preferred the arrester.

Gilmour, No 164. p. 115.

*** See The same case by Lord Newbyth, titled Telser against Jamieson, voce Competition.

1668. Fanuary 18.

Mr Andrew Brown against David Henderson and Thomas George.

MR Andrew Brown granted a bond of 700 merks, blank in the creditor's name, to George Short, wherein the name of David Henderson is now filled up. Thereon Alexander having arrested all sums due to George Short in the hands of Mr Andrew Brown, he raises a double poinding; wherein the competition arises betwixt the arrester, and the person whose name is filled up in the blank bond. It was alleged for the arrester, That he ought to be preferred, because he arrested Short's money; and, at the time of the arrestment, this bond having been delivered to Short blank in the creditor's name, Short was creditor ay and while not only another name were filled up, but also an instrument of intimation were taken thereupon; for Short's filling up of the name of Henderson is no more than an assignation, which requires intimation, and is excluded by an arrestment before

No 8. Where the blank in a deed was filled up, and intimated to the debtor before arrestment, the arrestment ineffectual.