provision did not prejudge any lawful creditor, but gave her right only to the liferent of all moveables deducte ere alieno, and could only be extended to free goods and gear.

No 179.

Gosford, MS. No 72. p. 26.

1671. June 16.

Bowers against LADY COUPAR.

The executors of Mr Frederick Bowers, minister, having obtained decreet against the Lord Coupar, for some by-gone stipends, did pursue the Lady Lindores, relict of the Lord Coupar, as intromitter with his goods and gear, for payment. It was alleged, That the Lady had right by disposition from Lord Coupar to his whole moveables, which ought to defend her ay and while it were reduced, and that the pursuers ought to confirm themselves executors-creditors to the Lord Coupar. The Lords did repel the defence, and found that the disposition being made by the Lord Coupar to his Lady, and the goods remaining in his own possession until his death, could not prejudge lawful ereditors, who needed not to reduce, nor to confirm themselves executors-creditors; but did decern the Lady only to be liable for the goods disponed and intromitted with, but not as a vitious intromitter.

Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 43. Gosfard, MS. No 451. p. 169.

** Stair's report of this case is No 68. p. 2734. voce Competent.

1674. June 10. LADY Spengerfield against Hamilton.

Found sufficient to elide the passive title, that the defender did intromit either by virtue of a gift to himself, or by warrant from the donatar, though the gift was not declared; for his possession ab initio being in virtue of a title, though not perfected, could not be said to be vitious, and quivis titulus etiam coloratus purges the vitiosity of the intromission.

Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 43. Stair. Dirleton.

** This case is No 97. p. 9762,

1674. December 16. Drummond against Menzies.

In the process at the instance of George Drummond, for payment of a sum due by Alexander Menzies of Rotwell, as intromitter with the debtor's goods, it was found, (as in diverse cases before) That the pretence, that the defunct was rebel, and his escheat gifted, doth not purge vitious intromission, unless it

No 180. Found in conformity with Chalmers against Dalgarno, No 176. p. 9857.

No 181.

No 182. Found in conformity with Lady Spencerfield against Hamilton, supra.