#### DIVISION IV.

# Poffeffor's recourse against the Drawer and Indorser.

## SECT. I.

### Whether value prefumed given, by the Perfon who holds the Bill.

#### 1672. February 9. Mr Robert Merchistoun against Thomas Robertson.

No 116. A precept for victual upon tenants, (with a correspondent receipt,) found obligatory against the perfon in whole favour it was drawn, for payment of the price, not demanded until after 16 years. It was not prefumed that value was given, when the precept was granted, it not bearing fo.

In a reduction of a decreet given by the Commiffaries of Edinburgh, against Thomas Robertion, for payment of the price of 56 bolls of bear, fold by Mr. James Winrame, and which was arrefted at Merchistoun's instance as a creditor to Mr James: The reason libelled was iniquity, in to far as, albeit there was a fubscribed receipt produced to make Robertson debtor, yet it depended supon a precept granted by Mr James Winrame, who muff be prefumed to have received payment, and, by fubicribing the precept, might have been compelled in law to caufe deliver the victual; especially seeing he did never purfue for the price thereof these fixteen years bygone ; and that the purfuer was content to make faith, that truly he had made payment when he received the precept. And for the receipt fubfcribed, it was not relevant per se to make him debtor. feeing it is most ordinary for buyers of victual to subscribe receipts to those that deliver the fame, that the tenants or chamberlains may count with their mafters, but they are feldom retired by the merchants; and if, after fo long time; they fhould be fufficient to prove a debt, it would be of a general and dangerous confequence. It was answered, That the precept and receipt were. opponed, bearing a receipt upon the tail of the precept, upon the account of Mr James Winrame, the drawer; fo that if payment had been made, the precept or receipt would have born the fame; and a precept being of the nature of a factory, unless it bear for an onerous cause, is not in law obligatory. THE LORDS, before answer, ordained Mr James's oath to be taken, if truly he was paid when he granted the precept; but, in cafe he denied, they decerned Robertfon to be liable, and affoilzied from the reduction.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 100. Gosford, MS. p. 243.