(The LEGAL.)

had apprifed both their effates, and thereupon alleged. That he being thereupon infeft in the estate of Torwood-head, the Lady can have no access to the rents thereof; and the decreet of Council can only be understood as to the husband, but cannot exclude the infeftment upon an apprifing, and whatever effect it could have had, during the legal, yet now after the legal is expired, Gardner hath the full right.—It was answered, 1mo, That Gardner was compearing in the decreet of Council. 2do, That by the act of Parliament 1661, betwixt Debtor and Creditor, it is statute, 'That the Lords of Session may restrict the possession of apprifings to such part of the apprifed lands, as they see cause, providing that the same be sufficient for their annualrent, and that during the legal. And albeit the years of the legal be expired, yet the fame is interrupted by an order of premonition and confignation used by Edward, Ruthven, fon to the Lord Forrester, and affiguee constitute by him to the legal reversion of his estate, apprified by feveral creditors, whereof Gardner was one.—It was replied, That any order used being only in relation to the Lord Forrester his estate, can have no effect as to Torwood-head's effate.—It was duplied, That Florence Gardner having apprifed both Forrefter's efface and Torwood-head's for the fame fum; the confignation made by Forrester or his assignee, doth not only retain Forrester's estate. but doth extinguish the debt, whereupon it was apprifed, and consequently all apprifings following upon that debt, in the fame way as if payment had been made.

Which THE LORDS found relevant, and by virtue of the act of Parliament 1661, restricted Gardner's possession, so that 600 merks might remain free for the Lady's aliment, providing that Gardner had enough behind for his annual-rent.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 21. Stair, v. 2. p. 320.

1676. July 7.

Edgar against Miln.

JOHN EDGAR being infeft in a tenement in Edinburgh, upon an appriling, pursues for mails and duties. Compearance is made for Patrick Miln, who alleges absolviter, because the appriling is satisfied by intromision within the legal, which legal is propogated by an order of redemption.—It was answered, That there was no declarator after the order, which behaved first to be obtained, and then thereafter the posterior intromission liquidated.

THE LORDS sustained the declarator, as incident in this process; and found the intromission after the legal, relevant to extinguish the apprising, in respect of the order, albeit the appriser had builded considerably upon the tenement, after the expiring of the legal.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 20. Stair, v. 2. p. 441.

No 3. proprietor of one of the fubjects, was found to keep the legal open as to both.

No 4. The legal of an apprifing is prorogated, by a fimple order of redemption, without declarator.