No 2.

1664. December 15.

INGLIS against KELLIE.

Found that an apparent heir, though he cannot remove tenants, yet he may defend them in a removing pursued by another.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 357. Gilmour.

** See the particulars of this case, No 100. p. 2230.

1666. June: 26.

WEDDERBURN against KING.

No 3.

In a reduction of a feu ob non solutum canonem, found that the apparent heir might be allowed to purge at the bar, though not infeft.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 357. Newbyth.

* * See the particulars of this case, No 2. p. 2256.

1569. November 12. ARKINLEYS against CAMPBELL of Glencaradeal.

No 4.
Found in conformity with
Inglis against
Kellie, No 2.
supra.

In a removing pursued at Arkinley's instance, as having right to a gift of forfaultry of his father's escheat whereupon he was infeft, it was alleged for the defenders, that they bruiked by virtue of tolerance from Campbell of Kilberry, who was apparent heir to his goodsire, who was heritably infeft in the lands libelled, and by virtue thereof had been seven years in possession. It being replied that the tolerance behaved to be proven scripto, at least that the apparent heir had continued in his goodsire's possession, without which having no title in his own person, nor possession, his right as apparent heir could not defend; it was duplied, that the pursuer's having — in these lands, in the gift of forfaulture, whereby neither the person forfaulted, nor any of his predecessors, were ever in possession; the apparent heir now compearing, and defending upon his predecessor's right, and concurring with the defenders, they had good interest to propone the foresaid allegeance, seeing an apparent heir quocunque tempore may defend, and enter to the possession of his predecessor's lands, against a person who can allege no possession either in his own person or his authors. THE Lords sustained the defence and duply, the apparent heirs goodsire's poossession being proven.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 357. Gosford, MS. No. 202. p. 81.