1666. December 18. LORD NEWBEATH against DUNBAR of BURGIE.

THE Lord Newbeath having right from James M'Ken, who had apprifed the lands of Burgie, pursues reduction and improbation against young Burgie and John Watson; and infifts on this reason, that any rights they have are null, and fraudulent, being contracted after his debt; and the right granted to young Burgie is null. as being but a base infestment, not clad with possession, before the pursuer's public infeftment. The defender alleged, that his infeftment was clad with possession, in fo far as his father's liferent was referved thereby, and his father poffeffing by virtue of the refervation, did validate his infeftment. 2dly, Albeit the father's own possession could not be sufficient, yet the father having transmitted his right. to Watson, and Watson possessing, the suspicion of simulation ceased: and there is a disposition produced by the father to Watson, which though it bear to be of the fee, yet can import no more, but to be of the liferent, feeing the father had no more; neither needs it have an infeftment, feeing it hath but the effect of ans affignation to a liferent. It was answered, that if the father had expressly affigned his liferent, referved in the base infestment, it might have been the ground of a question, whether the assignee's possessing so, would have validate the base infeftment? But fince the father has not taken notice of the refervation, but difpones as heritor, it clears that he did not possess by the refervation, but by his own prior right.

The Lords found the reason of reduction and reply relevant; and that the father's possessing by himself, or Watson's possessing by himself, could not validate the base infestment.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 90. Stair, v. 1. p. 414.

1668. June 30. George Shein against James Christie.

David Christison of Bassallie, gave an infestment to his eldest son, of the lands of Bassalie, and to his second son, of an annualment of 86 merks forth thereof, both of one date, and both reserving the father's liferent. James Christie hath
right by apprising, led against the eldest son, in his father's life, to the lands.
George Shein hath right by adjudication, against the second son, to the annualrent, and pursues a poinding of the ground. It was alleged for James Christie,
that Shein's author's right was base, never clad with possession, and so null;
whereas his right was public by an apprising, and had attained to possession. It
was answered, that the father's liferent being reserved, the father's possession was
both the sons' possession, and did validate both their rights. It was answered,
that a disposition by a father to his own children, reserving his own liferent,
though infestment follow, is always accounted simulate, and never accounted
clad with possession, by the father's possession, as hath been frequently decided.

No 46.
Found again
that a father's
possession, on
a reserved
liferent, did
not validate a
base right of
the see granted by him to
his son.

No 47. A father granted, at the same time, two base infestments to two of his fons, referving in both his own liferent. In a competition betwixt fingular fuccesfors in thefe base rights, the father's poffession was found fufficiently to validate both,