the L. of Wedderburn, That the officer of arms was not deforced, be reason that he offered him to prove that the goods, after the alleged away-taking of them frae the officer, were delivered to the Lady again be her own consent, and she content thairwith. To the which it was answered, it was contrare to the execution of the officer of arms; and the Lords fand, that they wald admit na allegeance contrare to the execution of an officer, except they wald take to improve the same.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 173. Colvill, MS. p. 130.

No 40. plainly contrary to the execution of a messenger at arms, can be admitted, unless the party offer to improve the execution.

NÓ 41.

data repelled;

and action re-

improve a poinding in

1667. June 4.

ZINZIAN against KINLOCH.

ZINZIAN, having pointed, pursued a spuilzie against Kinloch, having medled with some of the pointed goods: The time of the advising the cause, the defender offered to improve the pointing in data. The Lords repelled the defence in boc statu, reserving action; in respect the pointing was produced ab initio; notwithstanding it was alleged, that the defence was noviter veniens ad notitiam; which the Lords did not respect; because the pointing being produced ab initio (as said is), the defender should have tried and might have had the same information which he has now of the same. In the same process, though the prices of the goods spuilzied were not proven, because it is to be presumed that the prices contained in pointings are not too high, and the Lords having considered the pointing, found the prices low.

Clerk, Haystoun.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 173. Dirleton, No 73. p. 30.

SECT X

Improbation how Proponable.

1614. December 21. Monteith against Carmichael.

In an action betwixt Robert Monteith and William Carmichael, the Lords sustained a decreet-arbitral, which was pronounced in ipso termino upon the day betwixt and the which the decreet should have been pronounced; and, in the same cause, the Lords would not hear the said Robert Monteith to improve, by way of suspension, albeit he offered to improve the same by the oaths of the Judges, who were both present.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 173. Kerse, MS. Fol. 180.

Vol. VII.

15 X

No 42. The Lords refused to hear a party propone improbation of a decree-arbitral by way of suspension, though he offered to improve it by the oaths of the Judges, who were both present.