and insisting for poinding one of the tenant's goods, now belonging to the Lord Balmerino, for the whole annualrent, Balmerino suspends, on these reasons, 1mo, The heritor, against whom the decreet of poinding was obtained, and all his tenants, were dead; and therefore it can receive no summar execution against the present heritor and his tenants, but there must be a new decreet against them. 2do, Balmerino hath peaceably possessed this tenement 20 or 30 years, and thereby bath the benefit of a possessory judgment, by which his infeftment cannot be questioned without reduction and declarator. 3tio, The English possessed this tenement several years by the public calamity of war; and therefore there must be deduction of these years annualrents, as is frequently done in feu-duties. 4to, The two tenements being now in the hands of different singular successors, Balmerino's tenement can only be poinded for a part of the annualrent. The pursuer answered, That pointing of the ground is action realis, chiefly against the ground; and therefore, during the obtainer's life, it is valued, not only against the ground, while it belonged to these heritors and possessors, but against the same in whosoever hands it be, that the moveable goods therein, or the ground right thereof, may be apprised. To the 2d, Annualrents are debita fundi, and a possessory judgment takes neither place for them, nor against them. To the 3d, Though, in some cases, feu-duties cease by devastation, that was never extended to annualrents, due for the profit of a stock of money. To the 4th, The annualrent being out of two tenements promiscuously, the annualrenter may distress any part for the whole, in whosoever hands the tenement may be.

THE LORDS repelled all these defences, but superseded execution for one-half of the annualrent for a time; and ordained the suspender to give commission to Balmerino to put the decreet in execution against the other tenements for its proportion, for his relief, medio tempore.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 221. Stair, v. 1. p. 114.

1666. July 10. Dame MARGARET Home against DAVID CRAWFORD.

UMOUNILE John Earl of Loudon as principal, David Crawford of Kers, with eight others, as cautioners for him, being debtors to Dame Margaret Home, Lady Loudon, for payment making to her of the sum of 2700 merks yearly, during her lifetime, at the terms mentioned in the contract, passed amongst the parties, all the cautioners and principal being dead, except David Crawford, and he being charged, and having suspended, he only craved, that, in regard the contract bears no mutual clause of relief, and that he is the only person charged, the Lords would be pleased, upon payment of the money by him, to ordain the charger to assign the foresaid contract to the suspender, that he may obtain his relief. And it being controverted, whether the charger was obliged

No 3. ments, which came afterwards into the hands of two different singular successors, it was found, that the annualrenter might uplift the whole out of any one of the tenements, assigning against the other for relief.

No 4. A cautioner, upon payment, craved assignation against his co-cautioner. The Lords found the creditor not obliged to assign, the cautioner being sufficiently secured in law by his action of reNo 4.

in law to assign the suspender to the contract, that he might get his relief from the remanent cautioners;—The Lords found, that the charger was not obliged to assign against the rest of the cautioners; but that the suspender having paid, the law would supply the defect of the clause of the relief, which grants action to the cautioners for pursuing the remanent cautioners, according to the civil law;—in Novell. 4. c. 2.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 221. Newbyth, MS. p. 71.

\*\* This case is also reported by Stair, voce Cautioner, No 38. p. 2112.

1668. January 24.

MAGISTRATES of DUNDEE against The Earl of FINDLATER.

No 5. A Magistrate, upon his negligence in suffering a debtor to escape from prison, being condemned to pay the debt, has no recourse against the caution. ers, whether he obtain from the creditor a discharge only, or be assigned to the debt; because he is liable ex delicto, and comes in place of the principal debtor.

THERE was a bond granted by one Jackson principal, and a cautioner, which is also alleged to have been subscribed by umquhile Inchmartin as another cautioner; which bond being registrate at the creditor's instance, he did thereupon incarcerate the principal debtor, whom the Magistrates having suffered unwarrantably to escape, the creditor obtained decreet against the Magistrates for payment of the debt. The Magistrate pays the debt, but takes assignation from the creditor; and now, as assignee, pursues the Earl of Findlater, as representing Inchmartin, one of the cautioners, for payment, who alleged absolvitor, 1mo, Because the bond is null as to Inchmartin, wanting both date and witnesses; for it bears to have been subscribed by the principal, and the other cautioner, at such a place, such a day, before these witnesses, who are subjoined, and designed, and after the names of these witnesses says, 'and subscribed ' by Inchmartin at -;' after which there nothing follows in the bond but the subscription of parties, none of which subscribe as witness to Inchmartin. yet his subscription is amongst the subscriptions of the other parties, but as to him, it hath neither place, day, nor witnesses. The pursuer offered to condescend, that the day and place of the subscription of the witnesses were the same to Inchmartin as to the principal and other cautioner, which they alleged to be sufficient to make up this nullity, as is ordinary where the writer and witnesses are not designed, for thereupon the defender may improve the bond by the witnesses insert. The defender answered, That albeit the Lords supply the want of designation of writer or witnesses, by condescending on their designation, that means of improbation may be afforded, which is not the question here; yet the Lords did never suffer parties to fill up witnesses, where no witses were insert, nor no date, either as to year or month.

The Lords would not sustain the bond upon this condescendence, but ex officio ordained the witnesses (if they were alive) to be examined, whether they