wanting, that she might be preferred in the first place, and Patrick Marray in the second place. See Husband and Wife place in the ferrod place.

Fol. Div. v. 1. p. 89. Stair, v. 1. p. 230.

1667. July 18.

LADY BURGY against Her Tenants, and Sir John Strachan. Man on

THE Lady Burgy purfues the tenants of her liferent lands to remove; compearance is made for Sir John Strachan, who alleges that he stands publicly infeft in this land, and in possession, and will not suffer his tenants to remove. It was replied. That the pursuer's infeftment in liferent is long before Sir. John's and could take no effect till now that her husband is dead. It is answered. That the Lady's infeftment is base, and, therefore, though it be prior to Sir John's public infeftment, it cannot be preferred thereto; unless it were alleged it was clad with possession before the public infestment, either by the Lady's own possession. or at least by her husband's possession; but the cannot allege either, because these parties were in possession from the date of ther infestment, till the date of this public infeftment. It was answered for the Lady, That the offered to prove, her husband was in possession after her insestment, and before the defender's infeftment, by himself, or at least by those who derived temporary; or redeemable rights from him, or his authors, as liferents, wadlets, and unexpired comprisings. It was answered, That albeit favore matrimonii the husband's possession, though common author, be counted the wife's possession, yet the possession of a wadfetter. or appriler, are neither faid to be the wife's possession, nor the husband's, because they possess preprie jure, and the husband had only a reversion.

THE Loans found the allegenne relevant for the Lady, that her hulband posfessed after her infestment, and before the public insestment, either by himself, or by any deriving a temporary right from him, or his authors.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 89. Stair, v. 1. p. 475.

## \*\*\* Dirleton reports the same case:

A best insessment given by a husband to a wife, was sustained after the husband's decease, as public, and clad with possession, albeit the husband was not in possession the time of granting the right: In respect, either he, or others, by redeemable rights and tacks given by him, came in possession thereafter.

Dirleton, No 100. p. 39.

1672. February 21. JAMES REID against Countess of DUNDER.

MR JAMES REID being infeft in an annualrent by the Earl of Dundee, purfues a pointing of the ground; compearance is made for the Counters of Dun-

No 46.

The hufband's possession is accounted the wife's possession, so as to validate her base right; at hough it be not the natural possession, but by tenants, wadseters, &c.

No 38. A wife's bafe right, flowing from her hutband, was No 38. held to be good by the husband's possession, although not the natural possession; which was enjoyed for the time by his mother, a liferenter.

dee, who produces her infeftment by the Earl her husband, of the lands in question in liferent, and that in lieu and place of certain other lands, whereunto she was provided by her contract of marriage, and which she renounced at her husband's defire; and bearing, because the Earl's mother was infest in the same lands in liferent, that in place thereof the Countess should be infest in other lands, during his mother's liferent, and thereupon craves preference.—It was answered. That the Lady's infeftment is base, not clad with possession, whereas the purfuer's infeftment is public; and albeit the husband's possession is ordinarily holden to be the wife's possession, yet that is only as to infestments for implement of contracts of marriage in favorem matrimonii, but not as to any other infeftments. Ita est, This infeftment is not for implement of the contract of marriage. but in place of the lands so provided and renounced. 2do, The act of Parliament anent public and private infeftments, allows only base infeftments clad with possession; and though custom hath extended that statute, that although the wife possess not, yet the husband's possession shall be repute hers, which is introduced by custom in favour of wives that cannot otherwise possess; yet custom hath never extended it further than to the natural possession of the husband; and here the husband's mother being in natural possession, the husband cannot be said to possess, unless he did either possess by himself, or by his tenants, or chamberlains; but a possession derived from his father or himself, to a wadsetter or liferenter, cannot be faid to be his possession; these possessing proprie jure, and not being in his power; and though a liferenter's possession might be interprete to be a civil possession for the fiar, yet that is but fictione juris, and there cannot concur two fictions in the fame point, otherwise there could be no end; for if the mother had given a diffinct right, and that party had been in possession, that party's posfession would be the mother's possession, and the mother's possession would be the fon's poffession, and the son's poffession, as husband, would be this Lady's poffession; and albeit if the old Lady's right had been constitute by a reservation in this Lady's right, the old Lady's possession might be interprete as slowing from this Lady's right; yet here it is not constitute by refervation, but is only related as being already conflitute.—It was replied for the Lady, That by the conflant custom the husband's possession is understood to be the wife's possession, to all effects and purposes; neither is there any distinction, what kind of possession it be: and albeit by the act of Parliament, base and private insestments, without posfession, be postponed to posterior public infestments, yet that is expressed in regard of the fraudulency and latency thereof; but where there is no fraud, but an onerous cause, the least possession is sufficient, as the possession of warrandice lands is sufficient by possessing the principal lands; and infestment of annualrent is valid against public infeftments before the term at which the annualrent is payable, because the annualrent cannot be accounted latent while it cannot act; so this Lady's infeftment being not only for an onerous cause, viz. in lieu of an equivalent infeftment renounced; but also being most favourable, being a wife's provision, which creditors have good reason to inquire after; and cannot be faid

No 38.

and due by husbands who have ought to provide their wives; and this being in place of the provision by the contract of marriage, hath the same privilege and favour therewith; but whatsoever might have been pretended against base infestments, as latent and fraudulent, before the act of Parliament anent the registration of sasines, this infestment being granted after that act, no creditors can pretend that it was latent, or they deceived thereby.

The Lords fullamed the liferenter's infeftment, and preferred the fame to the

creditors posterior public infestment.

Fol. Dic. v. t. p. 90. Stair, v. 2. p. 74.

## \*\* Gosford reports the same case:

Mr. James Reid, as being infeft in an annualrent of lands in the parish of Innerkeithing, did purfue a pointing of the ground against the tenants, wherein compearance was made for the Counters, as liferenter of the faid lands, who alleged, That albeit her infestment was posterior, yet it being given her in remuneration of the lands provided to her by contract of marriage, which fire had renounced, and flie being in possession by virtue thereof, in so far as her finishand being Earl of Dundee, and liettor, did possels the same by his mother, who was liferencer of the lame lands, and uplifted the mails and duties during her lifetime. -It was replied, That albeit the proprietor of lands, out of which a lifetent is given, is able, by the liferenter's possession, to defend against prescription, or to give the benefit of a possessory judgment to the heritor; yet a third party getting a right from the heritor, who is not in natural possession, but only fictione juris, by the liferenter's possession, as said is, the third party's right can never be said to be clad with possession by such a refervation, out of the author's right; which were of a most dangerous consequence; feeing those who bona side acquired a right to lands, can never be in security, if such private rights, not clad with natural possession, but by subtile reservation, should be sustained. THE LORDS did, notwithstanding, prefer the Countess, albeit the lands in question were only given in remuneration of those contained in her contract of marriage, upon this special ground. That her infestment did bear, that the lands being affected with the old Lady's liferent, therefore, during her lifetime, the was provided to the like rent, out of the barony of Glassary, which did import a refervation of the old Lady's liferent; and so her pessession was the Countels's possession, and made her right public. That by act of Parliament, ordaining all falines to be put in the public register, creditors who contracted with the husband, might easily know what infeftments of liferents were given to their wives, either of lands contained in the contract of marriage, or given in remuneration.

Gosford, MS. No 479. p. 249.

## \*\*\* Dirleton reports the same case:

No 38.

An infeftment granted to the Lady Dundee by her husband, in recompence of a former provision she had by her contract of marriage, and which she had renounced, was questioned by a creditor, who also was infest; upon that ground, that the Lady's right was base; and though rights granted to wives, upon their contracts of marriage, or after marriage when they have no provision, or in recompence of former provisions, are fuffained albeit base, because the husband's possession is the wife's possession; yet the right in question ought not to be suftained upon that ground; in respect the husband was not in natural possession, the lands being liferented by his mother; and, by the act of Parliament, the possession whereupon base rights are sustained, is only to be understood of natural possession: The Lords preferred the Lady, and repelled the said defence, upon these confiderations, that infestments given to wives, in the cases abovementioned, are conftrued to be public, and are not prefumed to be fraudulent: And wives are not in the condition of other creditors who may perfect and make their rights public; whereas wives can do nothing themselves; and it is to be prefumed that wives are provided by their husbands; so that those who are toacquire rights from them, ought to enquire if their wives be infeft, especially seeing, fince the act of Parliament 1617, anent registration of sasines, they may eafily know the fame.

Act. Cunninghame, &c

For the Lady, Lockbart & Lermonth.

Dirleton, No 161. p. 65.

No 39.
A Lady's right of life-rent was referved in the body of her hufband's right; but his charter and fafine did not mention it, yet it was preferred to donatars of his forfeiture.

1685. March 17. LADY EARLSTON against Colonel Mayne and Others.

MARY HOPE, Earleston's Lady, competing with Colonel Mayne, Ogilthorp and Cornwal, the three English donatars of her husband's forfeiture, on this ground; that her right of liferent was public, in so far as it was reserved in the body of her husband's infestment:—Answered, The charter and sasine, which only make a right public, bears nothing of her liferent.—Replied, The charter related expressly to the conditions and provisions contained in the procuratory of resignation, whereof her jointure is one.—The Lords, in respect of the favour of a jointure, found this general reservation equivalent to a confirmation; and so preserved her to the donatars, who, in strict law, had much to say.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 90. Fountainball, v. 1. p. 353.