No 4.

thereof, he can have no right to the price by virtue of his comprising; but other creditors having right by assignation or arrestment can only have right to the money which is the price thereof. This case was thought to be of difficulty by some of the Lords, and so was continued to be advised for some days, but thereafter it was concluded by vote that the assignees and arresters should be preferred to the comprisers, which was most just, upon this reason, that not only it would bring a great hazard and uncertainty upon all public concern and trade, as to merchants who buy victual for satisfying of their own debt, and become debtors to others upon precepts or assignations, but likewise because a comprising being only a legal disposition of lands, if the compriser suffer his debtor to possess and dispose of the fruits before he do any diligence against the tenants for delivery of the same, all persons are in bona fide to contract with the common debtor, as being only possessor and heritor of the lands wherein he stands infeft, and the merchant who becomes debtor to him can never be liable to a compriser who hath only right to pursue the tenants or labourers of the ground for the fruits, as being pars fundi, but the price thereof after delivery can only be affected by arrestment or assignation.

Gosford, MS. No 501. No 797. & 798.

1677. November 22. GRAHAM and BOYD against MALLOCH.

GRAMAM and Boyd, apprisers of the Lady Barfoot's liferent, pursue a decharator against Robert Malloch a prior appriser, that he is satisfied by intromission. Alleged, 1 mo, This comprising is null in toto, because it is led both upon a bond and a decreet, proceeding upon a count and reckoning, and which decreet was turned into a libel, and the debt referred to the Lady's oath, who hath never yet deponed, and so that cannot be called due; and when a comprising is led for sums heritably not due, it is null in toto; 2do, He cannot exhaust the mails and duties by the sums in the decreet, but they must be attribed to the payment of the sum in the bond. Answered, He was in bona fide to intromit for the unmualrent of both. The Lords found he was not liable to refund the mails and duties intromitted with by him before intenting this process, though the said decreet was turned into a libel; and allowed him yet to prove the debt, in fortification of the apprising, for the Lords considered that these pursuers had done little diligence, and if Malloch had not intromitted, the common debtor would have done it. A bill given in seeking a rectification of this was refused.

Fol. Dic. v. 2. p. 353. Fountainball, MS.

No ς. Found that a compriser was not liable to refund mails and duties which he had intromitted. with, before a decree, on which his comprising was founded, had been turned in a libel.